

Marija Ž. Nenadić¹
University of Kragujevac
Faculty of Philology and Arts
Scientific Research Center
ORCID 0000-0001-7949-9825

THE DISCURSIVE FUNCTIONS OF *HAJDE*: SOME CONSIDERATIONS FOR A RELEVANCE- THEORETIC APPROACH²

The paper presents a relevance-theoretic analysis of the Serbian secondary interjection *hajde* (and its interjectional variants). The corpus material of 45 randomly selected examples is analyzed using qualitative methodology, focusing on the foregrounding and backgrounding of encyclopedic assumptions during ad-hoc concept construction. The results of the analysis show that *hajde* shifts the order of encyclopedic content in comparison with its imperative pro-concept, with previously foregrounded assumptions becoming backgrounded or entirely erased. However, the conceptualist approach is insufficient to fully explain the meaning of this lexeme. The analysis shows that *hajde* encodes both conceptual and procedural content, meaning that the processes of ad-hoc concept construction (conceptual component) and grammaticalization (procedural component) occur simultaneously. In other words, the findings obtained through the qualitative analysis suggest that the existing theoretical model should be complemented by insights from procedural semantics to account for the multifaceted nature of the selected expression.

Keywords: conceptual semantics, procedural semantics, ad-hoc concept construction, grammaticalization, *hajde*

1. INTRODUCTION

The paper presents a relevance-theoretic analysis of the Serbian lexeme *hajde* (and its reduced, interjectional variants), tracing how its imperative form undergoes semantic transposition to function as a secondary interjection in contemporary discourse. To achieve this goal, the corpus-based analysis is combined with relevance-theoretic postulates, focusing primarily on the lexical pragmatic process of ad-hoc concept construction. The corpus used in this study consists of 45 randomly selected examples excerpted from the *CLASSLA-web.sr* sub-corpus within the *CLARIN.si* infrastructure. The corpus material was selected according to three

1 marija.nenadic@filum.kg.ac.rs

2 The author gratefully acknowledges the financial support from the Ministry of Science, Technological Development and Innovation of the Republic of Serbia (contract no. 451-03-33/2026-03/ 200198).

criteria: sound elision, reduplication, and syntactic autonomy achieved through punctuation devices.

After the introduction, the paper is organized into several subsections: 1) Section 2 provides an overview of the diachronic development of interjections from antiquity to the 21st century and examines their treatment in the Serbian linguistic tradition, contrasting morphological criteria with contemporary pragmatic perspectives; 2) Section 3 presents the post-Gricean Relevance Theory, focusing on the foregrounding and backgrounding of encyclopedic assumptions during the ad-hoc concept construction; 3) Section 4 presents the corpus material in a tabular format; 4) Section 5 offers a qualitative analysis of the empirical data, organized into several subsections based on the functions identified within the corpus; and, lastly, 5) Section 6 synthesizes the findings obtained through the qualitative analysis.

2. INTERJECTIONS ACROSS LINGUISTIC TRADITIONS: FROM ANTIQUITY TO THE 21ST CENTURY

Interiectio est pars orationis significans mentis affectum voce incondita.^{3, 4}

Aelius Donatus, 4th century AD

Interjections constitute one of the most debated categories in grammatical description. They occupy a “marginal” place within syntax, are closely associated with emotions and spontaneous expressions, and often deviate from traditional word formation patterns, which has resulted in different ways of describing them within various linguistic traditions. Historically, interjections have been viewed both as an independent part of speech, and as a subset of another category; additionally, they have also been described by some grammarians as elements that exist outside the realm of grammar (Buridant, 2006, p. 3).

This marginal status is evident in their own etymology. According to *Online Etymology Dictionary*,⁵ the English word *interjection* is attested from the early fifteenth century, where it originally referred to “an outcry, a word of exclamation”. The term entered English via Old French *interjeccion* and ultimately derives from Latin *interiectio*, meaning “a throwing or placing between”. The underlying verb *intericere* “to throw between” provides a metaphor that resonates with grammatical accounts in which interjections

3 English translation by T. Viljamaa: “Interjection is a part of speech signifying an emotion by means of an incodite word” (Aelius Donatus, as cited in Viljamaa, 2019, p. 220).

4 Unless otherwise indicated, all translations in this paper were made by the author.

5 For a complete etymological description, see the following link: <https://www.etymonline.com/search?q=interjection> (accessed December 21, 2025).

are treated as elements inserted into discourse, lacking stable syntactic integration with other parts of the sentence.

The grammatical treatment of interjections can be traced back to classical antiquity. Greek grammarians did not establish interjections as a distinct part of speech, but rather as a subclass of adverbs, based on the belief that both adverbs and interjections modify the verb, regardless of whether the verb is expressed or implied (Ameka, 1992, p. 102). By contrast, in the Latin grammatical tradition, the lack of an article allowed interjections to be elevated to an independent part of speech, thereby establishing the standard number of eight *partes orationis* (ibid.).

Medieval Modists offered more detailed and sometimes differing interpretations. While some, such as Martin of Dacia and Thomas of Erfurt, followed the Greek tradition by emphasizing a close conceptual link between interjections and verbs – arguing that interjections determine the verb by indicating the speaker's state of mind – others maintained their syntactic autonomy. Siger of Courtrai and Boethius of Dacia, for instance, asserted that interjections convey mental states independently, frequently realized through sounds that are difficult to analyze linguistically (ibid., p. 103).

Following these historical developments, Renaissance scholars had moved away from medieval interpretations and, influenced by Platonic principles, simplified the traditional parts of speech to three main categories: noun, verb, and conjunction. As a result, interjections were pushed to the periphery of grammatical inquiry, existing at the boundary between structured language and natural vocal expressions (Viljamaa, 2019, p. 228). During the Enlightenment, philosophers such as Leibniz and Herder built on earlier ideas, proposing that instinctive sounds were the earliest forms of human speech. From the perspective of early psychology, interjections were seen as part of a pre-linguistic or “primitive” system of communication, expressing spontaneous emotions before formal language structures developed (ibid., p. 229).

For the majority of the 20th century, interjections were excluded from general grammatical categorizations because of their atypical morphological characteristics, relatively few syntactic connections with surrounding words and phrases, as well as high dependence upon context for their interpretation (Jespersen, 1924, p. 90). However, with the turn of the 21st century, this view began to change. The publications of special issues in *Journal of Pragmatics* (1992) and *Langages* (2006) recognized interjections as valid subjects of language studies. Subsequent research investigated their communicative roles and context-dependent meanings, moving beyond earlier views that focused chiefly on emotion and spontaneity.

In contemporary linguistic analyses, interjections are generally categorized as primary and secondary. The former category encompasses monomorphemic units that are not homonymous with other lexical categories and appear as independent, non-elliptical utterances that rarely

combine with other word classes (e.g. *aha*, *boo*, *meh*) (Wierzbicka, 1992, p. 161–163). Morphologically, they remain invariable; phonologically, they often exhibit atypical patterns; and syntactically, they function autonomously, usually appearing alone as complete utterances. Because they lack conventional denotational meaning, their interpretation is largely indexical and highly context-dependent.⁶

By contrast, secondary interjections come from other lexical categories and function independently to express a speaker's mental state or attitude. Unlike primary interjections, they keep their original lexical meaning when used outside interjectional contexts and are open to ongoing lexical innovation, drawing on nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs (Quirk et al., 1985, p. 74). Within this group, a distinction can be made between simple secondary interjections (e.g. *Fire!*) and standardized interjectional phrases (e.g. *Bloody hell!*) (Padilla Cruz, 2017, p. 2).⁷ Secondary interjections develop through grammaticalization, a process in which lexical items gradually acquire new grammatical and morphological properties while their meanings become more abstract, enabling them to convey emotions, attitudes, or a speaker's stance. At the same time, subjectification occurs, and items shift from expressing neutral or objective content towards signaling the speaker's perspective (Traugott, 2012, p. 9). These modifications give secondary interjections considerable flexibility in discourse, allowing them to appear across diverse communicative contexts, and in some cases they become standardized expressions whose internal structure resists alteration (Buridant, 2006, p. 7).

Recognizing the difference between primary and secondary interjections is important for this study, as it reflects how lexemes gradually change in meaning and gain new pragmatic functions over time. In the Serbian linguistic tradition, however, interjections are not usually classified in this manner. The following section will examine this issue more closely through a review of relevant literature on Serbian interjections.

2.1. SERBIAN INTERJECTIONS: HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT AND FUNCTIONAL PERSPECTIVES

In the context of early Serbian linguistic thought, interjections were generally not classified as an independent part of speech. Novaković (1984, p. 11) states that they should not be regarded as words, but rather as “...

6 For a detailed discussion of formal properties of interjections, see Padilla Cruz (2010).

7 The reference corresponds to the version of the paper that was made publicly available by the author online. This version does not provide page numbers and may differ slightly in formatting from the official publication in the proceedings. The citation identifies the original source, ensuring transparency, while acknowledging that the consulted document is an author-posted version. In-text references can therefore use section headings or paragraph numbers in place of page numbers, following APA 7th edition guidelines for sources without pagination.

vocal expressions used to convey emotion or imitate natural sounds”.⁸ Similarly, Belić (1958, p. 179) argues that interjections lack “... a compositional meaning”⁹ but still function as independent units, allowing for their conditional inclusion among word classes. Their exclusion from even earlier grammatical sources, most notably Daničić’s *Mala srpska gramatika* (1850), further confirms their marginal position in 19th century linguistic studies.

By contrast, contemporary Serbian grammars systematically recognize interjections as an autonomous word class – the tenth in their classification (see, for example, Klajn, 2005, p. 173–174; Stanojčić & Popović, 1992, p. 121–122). These studies, however, stress that interjections comprise sounds or sound clusters that do not denote any specific concept, but rather express “... an indeterminate feeling”¹⁰ (Stevanović, 1986, p. 385). Synthesizing the results of the previous studies, Stijović et al. (2019, p. 39) draw the following conclusion:

In [Serbian] linguistics, it has therefore prevailed that interjections are linguistic signs, atypical, semantically bound words that lack conceptual content; their meaning is pragmatic, determined by the context or situation in which they are used. They express emotions, in other words, the subjective mental state of the speaker.¹¹

When their formal properties are considered, interjections constitute an open word class; typical representatives, however, display certain shared characteristics.¹²

I. Phonetic and Phonological Characteristics

1. They are typically composed of one or two sounds, or of unconventional combinations of sounds that deviate from the phonotactic and prosodic norms of Serbian.
2. They are characterized by the reduplication of sounds or sound sequences.
3. They are distinguished in speech through prosodic features such as intonation, rhythm, or pauses.

8 Original in Serbian: “... нису речи него гласови којима се исказује осећање, или се природним звуцима подражава”.

9 Original in Serbian: “... нерашчлањено значење”.

10 Original in Serbian: “... неодређено осећање”.

11 Original in Serbian: “У науци је, дакле, преовладало мишљење да су узвици језички знаци, нетипичне, синсематске речи, које немају појмовног садржаја, већ је њихово значење прагматичко, условљено контекстом, односно ситуацијом у којој се употребљавају. Они изражавају осећања, односно субјективно, ментално стање лица које говори”.

12 Given the absence of a comprehensive account of interjectional characteristics in contemporary Serbian grammars, and considering that individual authors (Klajn, 2005; Milosavljević, 2021; Stanojčić & Popović, 1992; Stijović et al., 2019) have highlighted only selected features, the present classification is thus a synthesis of these observations.

II. Syntactic Characteristics

1. They function autonomously within the sentence, seldom forming grammatical dependencies with other constituents.
2. They are capable of substituting for an entire clause.
3. They are marked in writing by punctuation devices, including dashes, commas, or exclamation marks.

III. Semantic and Pragmatic Characteristics

1. Their meaning is contextually determined, relying on situational and interactional factors.
2. They represent conventionalized expressions within a speech community.
3. They serve predominantly to convey the speaker's emotions or subjective mental states.

These characteristics are derived strictly from morphological criteria, according to which interjections are defined as a distinct part of speech. This stance is in accordance with Serbian lexicographic practice, in which only morphologically recognizable interjections are included in this category, while other lexical or syntagmatic units that may adopt interjectional functions are not treated within the same analytical framework (Stijović et al., 2019, p. 41). Once morphological criteria interact with a pragmatic perspective, a great number of lexical items that operate as interjections in various communicative contexts are assigned an interjectional value. Examples include nouns (e.g. *Požar!*), adverbs (e.g. *Dosta!*), and formulaic optative expressions (e.g. *Živi bili!*). These lexemes, however, are not reclassified as interjections in Serbian dictionaries; instead, they remain within their original lexical categories and are accompanied by a parenthetical expression 'in the function of an interjection'. Such a procedure shows that Serbian lexicographers interpret secondary interjections as instances of semantic transposition, whereby an item belonging to one grammatical category is employed within the functional domain of another (Lazić-Konjik, 2019, 133–136).¹³

The tendency to classify secondary interjections as instances of semantic transposition is evident in the lexical item examined in this paper. In the major dictionaries of Matica Srpska – *Rečnik srpskohrvatskoga književnog jezika* (1976, p. 705) and *Rečnik srpskoga jezika* (2011, p. 1422)¹⁴ – *hajde* is recorded with several functions: interjectional uses conveying encouragement (e.g. *Hajde da večeramo.*) or disapproval (e.g. *Hajde, okani me se.*); clearly verbal, imperative uses (e.g. *Hajdemo kući.*); and uses an-

¹³ This process does not entail conversion, which represents a complete categorical reassignment.

¹⁴ Hereafter, the following abbreviations will be used: *Rečnik srpskohrvatskoga književnog jezika* (RSKJ) and *Rečnik srpskoga jezika* (RSJ).

notated as functions of a particle, including concessive or mitigating meanings (e.g. *Što je pogrešio, hajde de...*), admonition or warning, often expressed through reduplication (e.g. *Hajde, hajde!*), and expressions of incredulity (e.g. *Ma hajde, nemoj mi reći!*).¹⁵

The aforementioned dictionary descriptions show that even though Serbian grammar acknowledges the functional shifts of the lexeme *hajde*, it fails to explain the mental processes that allow this semantic change to happen. Since the morphological criteria used in previous research cannot account for such flexibility and pragmatic extensions, this paper applies a relevance-theoretic model to examine how ad-hoc concepts are developed from underspecified material. The following subsection focuses on the theoretical principles relevant to analyzing secondary interjections such as *hajde*.

3. RELEVANCE THEORY AND INTERJECTIONS

The analytical model applied in this paper is grounded in Relevance Theory (Sperber & Wilson, 1986; Carston, 2002), which views linguistic meaning as a set of instructions guiding the hearer towards an optimally relevant interpretation. This inferential paradigm is particularly suitable for analyzing interjections – context-dependent linguistic tokens that do not contribute to the truth-conditional content of an utterance (Wharton, 2003, p. 48).

While post-Gricean postulates have been applied to various socio-linguistic phenomena, secondary interjections remain an underexplored class of linguistic expressions. Existing accounts have largely focused on the procedural character of primary interjections and their role as triggers of higher-level explicatures (Wharton 2003, 2009). In this respect, a relevance-theoretic proposal by Manuel Padilla Cruz (2017) represents a significant contribution to this field of research, as it offers an account of the origin, meaning, and expressive potential of secondary interjections.

Padilla Cruz (ibid., *Introduction* Section, para. 1) argues that interjections are not instinctive vocalizations, but fully intentional lexical devices. When using them, speakers wish to make manifest a certain set of assumptions about their emotions or attitudes towards a particular state of affairs. Therefore, the choice of a secondary interjection from a plethora of suitable linguistic alternatives presupposes an evaluation of the contextual environment. As with other intentionally communicated expressions, interjections function as relevance-driven stimuli that compensate

15 Although these forms are lexicographically designated as particles, their properties correspond to the defining characteristics of interjections, particularly syntactic autonomy and reduplication. Given the scope of this paper, the analysis focuses exclusively on the interjectional use of *hajde*; however, preliminary observations regarding its dictionary descriptions point to the need to revise existing entries in order to provide a clearer account of both uses.

for the ineffability of emotional experience, allowing speakers to convey subjective mental states that are difficult to express through conceptual linguistic units.

The author's theoretical proposal also offers a reinterpretation of the conceptual-procedural distinction. Padilla Cruz (ibid., *Relevance Theory and Concepts* Section, para. 2) challenges the conventional relevance-theoretic view that interjections are exclusively procedural. Instead, the author suggests that secondary interjections may encode highly generalized, under-specified conceptual content. This schematic material is called a pro-concept, and it requires pragmatic adjustment, resulting in the construction of an ad-hoc concept tailored to specific contextual environments: "... [t]he concept associated with a word is merely considered a clue to the actual concept that the speaker intends to communicate when using that word" (ibid., *Relevance Theory and Concepts* Section, para. 3).

Communicated or ad-hoc concepts are constructed through two main processes: lexical narrowing (more specific sense than the encoded one) and lexical broadening (more general sense than the encoded one). Padilla Cruz (ibid., *Ad-hoc Concept Construction* Section, para. 3) argues that the origin of secondary interjections is explained through the lexical pragmatic process of conceptual broadening. Lexical items originating in other word classes – such as nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs – initially encode concepts referring to entities, actions, or properties. Through repeated use, these concepts undergo broadening, where their denotation becomes progressively looser and more abstract. Drawing on encyclopedic knowledge associated with lexical concepts, speakers develop ad-hoc concepts by foregrounding marginal or even stereotypical properties associated with emotions or attitudes. As a result, lexical items cease to function as descriptive markers and instead become indicators of affective behavior.

The author further argues that different word classes may undergo different types or degrees of lexical broadening. Adjectives and adverbs become secondary interjections through a process resembling over-inclusion, in which the ad-hoc concept "... is applied to instances of other categories within the same or adjacent conceptual domain" (Właszevska, 2011, p. 321). Nouns and verbs, on the other hand, undergo analogical extension realized through metaphorical or hyperbolic use. In both cases, the original conceptual content is not entirely erased but reorganized and backgrounded in favor of a more abstract, emotion-oriented interpretation (Padilla Cruz, 2017, *Secondary Interjections and Types of Overextension* Section, para. 2 & 3). In a broader sense, the two types of overextension correspond to the definitions of grammaticalization and subjectification (see Section 2 of this paper), where lexical concepts progressively shift their objective content to express the speaker's mental state or propositional attitude.

Conceptual overextension produces the range of possible meanings that secondary interjections can express. In some cases, these meanings

are contrasting, conveying even opposite emotions; in such instances, successive stages of lexical broadening occur. Padilla Cruz (ibid., *On the Various Meanings of Secondary Interjections* Section, para. 5) labels this phenomenon as radical or extreme broadening, the result of which is a highly diffused ad-hoc concept whose interpretation is heavily guided by prosody and paralinguistic cues.

While the principles described in this subsection offer a theoretical foundation for analyzing secondary interjections, it should be noted that they have not been tested against a specific corpus. As the author himself points out, "... [a] more fine-grained and detailed account should consider individual interjections and look into their original meanings in order to unveil how those meanings are actually broadened" (ibid., *Conclusion* Section, para. 3). Following this suggestion, the next section presents the corpus material selected for this study, which allows for a systematic re-evaluation of the functions of *hajde* based on its use in authentic discourse.

4. CORPUS

The data presented in section 5 was extracted from the CLARIN.si repository (*Common Language Resources and Technology Infrastructure, Slovenia*), more precisely from the CLASSLA-web.sr sub-corpus, which represents the largest Serbian language sub-corpus within the CLARIN infrastructure. Within this sub-corpus, the lexeme *hajde* occurs 403777 times with 401163 (93.54%) instances functioning as an interjection. Given the exceptional size of the sub-corpus, a random sample of 45 examples was selected and categorized according to the criteria set in Section 2.1. This sample comprises 15 examples for each of the three criteria: 1) Sound Elision, 2) Reduplication, and 3) Syntactic Autonomy via Punctuation Devices.

The first criterion, Sound Elision, captures the tendency of interjections to deviate from the phonotactic and prosodic norms of Serbian. The sample includes forms in which segments of *hajde* are elided, resulting in reduced two- or three-segment structures. All selected forms involve apheresis (loss of the initial segment), with additional cases of syncope (loss of the medial segment (e.g. *ae*)) and apocope (loss of the final segment (e.g. *aj*, *ajd*)). These examples were extracted by alphabetically sorting KWIC (*Key Word in Context*) lines, which enabled the manual identification of highly productive elided variants of the lemma. The second criterion, Reduplication,¹⁶ was examined using the collocation function, with the KWIC span set to one token to the right of the target lemma. This parameter allowed for the identification of repeated forms of the lexeme

16 In this paper, we focused on the reduplication of an entire lexeme, since it represents the most prominent type of this phenomenon. However, the reduplication of individual graphemes is also possible (see examples 10 and 11 in the *Syntactic Autonomy via Punctuation Devices* Section).

hajde. Finally, the third criterion, Syntactic Autonomy via Punctuation Devices, was considered using the same procedure, but instead of lexical collocates, punctuation marks occurring immediately to the right of the keyword were examined. The analysis focused on punctuation marks that proved most frequent in signaling the interjectional function of *hajde* in the corpus, namely commas, exclamation marks, and interrobangs.

Other criteria proposed in Section 2.1. were either not applicable to a written corpus (e.g. the characteristics related to prosody, rhythm, and pauses) or were applicable to all examined instances (e.g. the criterion according to which interjections constitute conventionalized linguistic resources within a speech community). Having outlined the structural properties and extraction principles of the corpus material, the following subsection provides a qualitative analysis of the selected examples, applying the theoretical model introduced in section 3.

5. RELEVANCE-THEORETIC ANALYSIS OF *HAJDE*

Treating *hajde* as a pro-concept for the purpose of this analysis, an examination of its lexicographic account – defined as a verb with an incomplete paradigm in the imperative mood (see subsection 2.1. for dictionary description) – identifies five general encyclopedic assumptions that constitute its conceptual content:

[PHYSICAL MOVEMENT] → The subject moves from one location to another.

[VOLUNTARY ACTION] → It involves a conscious decision to initiate movement and overcome inertia.

[INTERPERSONAL PRESSURE] → The use of the imperative implies power asymmetry.

[COOPERATION] → It involves joint participation in movement.

[DYNAMICS/SPEED] → It refers to the assumption that the initiated action is expected to happen at a certain pace.

In the following subsections, we will analyze which encyclopedic assumptions are foregrounded and which are backgrounded or entirely erased. The examples are grouped into five categories based on their functional roles: 1) Directive and Hortative Function, 2) Modulatory Function, 3) Concessive Function, 4) Affective Function, and 5) Invalidation Function.¹⁷

¹⁷ Some examples may be classified into more than one category. We have classified such instances into categories where their primary function is attested.

5.1. DIRECTIVE AND HORTATIVE FUNCTION

Through corpus analysis, we observed that a group of examples performs directive or hortative functions. In such cases, interjections retain a substantial amount of the conceptual content of the verb *hajde*, which is typically used in imperative contexts. Depending on the type of action an interlocutor is supposed to perform, these interjectional utterances are subdivided into four categories: 1) Requests, 2) Joint Action Proposals, 3) Acceleration and Urgency Markers, and 4) Cognitive Directives. The following subsections provide the analysis of each category in turn.

5.1.1. Requests

This subcategory represents an asymmetrical interactional relation in which the speaker assigns a task to the interlocutor. *Hajde* (and its variants) modifies the directive force of a command by either mitigating or intensifying the meaning of an imperative in order to obtain a certain result, response, or service. The following examples illustrate this diametrical usage:

MITIGATOR

- (C1 (2)) **Ae** mi recite gde ima online da se kupi TDU + mega pack?? ne mogu vishe da se maltretiram...^{18, 19}
(C1 (3)) **Ae** javni mi na pp gde si i za koliko para uzeo tu matiču ako nije problem.²⁰
(C1 (11)) **Ajd** postavi slicicu molim te, mozda da neko drugi pokusa...²¹

INTENSIFIER/BOOSTER

- (C1 (15)) **Ajd** ustaj! 10 I 15 je!!!²²
(C2 (4)) **Ajde ajde** pajseri Da vidimo tu masu u subotu.²³
(C3 (3)) **Hajde**, daj neki dokaz za ovako smelu tvrdnju!²⁴
(C3 (6)) Budi covek i budi iskren, **ajde**!²⁵

18 The numbering of examples is conducted in the following way: *C + number* represents the criterion presented in the *Corpus* section, while the parenthetical number represents the order of the example within that criterion (e.g. (C1 (2)) refers to the second example in the *Sound Elision* criterion).

19 English translation: Come on, tell me where I can buy TDU + mega pack online?? I can't be bothered with this hassle anymore...

20 English translation: Hey, let me know via PM where you got that motherboard and for how much, if it's not a problem.

21 English translation: Go ahead and post a picture please, maybe someone else could give it a try...

22 English translation: Come on, get up! It's 10:15!!!

23 English translation: Come on, come on, you morons! Let's see that crowd on Saturday.

24 English translation: Come on, give some proof for such a bold claim!

25 English translation: Be a man and be honest, come on!

- (C3 (8)) **Ajde** izvini mi se! Klekni na kolena! -insistirala je Dragica od Bore.
Ajde! Debilčina!²⁶
- (C3 (9)) Evo mogu da se zakunem u majku i oca u sve najmilije, ako ja imam neki dogovor neka mi obe ruke ispadnu sada. Ko ti je rekao da imam dogovor? **Ajde!** Ko ti je rekao?²⁷

In its mitigatory use, the verb *hajde* serves as a pro-concept containing a schematic set of encyclopedic assumptions. Through a lexical pragmatic process of conceptual broadening, this pro-concept is adjusted to form an ad-hoc (interjectional) concept tailored to convey the meaning of polite solicitation. In all examples, the original conceptual content of physical movement is backgrounded in favor of the cooperation encyclopedic assumption, which is foregrounded. This adjustment allows the interjection to loosen the imperative force and replace the traditional interpersonal asymmetry of a command with that of an appeal.

In contrast, when used as an intensifier, the pro-concept *hajde* undergoes a different type of conceptual broadening to form an ad-hoc concept that amplifies the directive force. In such cases, the encyclopedic assumptions related to interpersonal pressure and dynamics are heavily foregrounded, while the assumptions about physical movement are backgrounded or entirely erased. This adjustment communicates the authoritative force of the speaker, conveying a propositional attitude of impatience and irritation.

5.1.2. Joint Action Proposal

The speaker and the interlocutor are viewed as a unified agent of action. In this context, *hajde* functions to establish cooperation and a shared objective. In English, this usage commonly corresponds to the syntactic construction *let us/let's*:

- (C1 (7)) **Aj** ga banujemo!²⁸
- (C1 (9)) Ovo je to mesto, meka je zemlja i neće niko da naiđe, **aj** kopamo.²⁹
- (C1 (10)) Al, **aj** jos malo da teoretišemo o antropološkoj skali projekcija-identifikacija iz Morenove vizure.³⁰

In these examples, the pro-concept *hajde* undergoes a process of conceptual broadening where the encyclopedic assumption of cooperation is

26 English translation: Come on, apologize to me! Get down on your knees! -Dragica demanded from Bora. Come on! You moron!

27 English translation: Look, I can swear on my mother and father and everything I hold dear, if I have any kind of deal, let both my hands fall off right now. Who told you I have a deal? Come on! Who told you?

28 English translation: Let's ban him!

29 English translation: This is the place, the ground is soft and no one will come by, let's dig!

30 English translation: But, let's theorize a bit more about the anthropological scale of projection-identification from Moreno's perspective.

foregrounded. The assumptions related to physical movement are entirely replaced by a movement towards a shared social goal. By using the reduced variants of *hajde*, the speaker creates a sense of solidarity and cooperation with the interlocutor.

5.1.3. Acceleration and Urgency Marker

In this category, the speaker uses *hajde* to demand a faster performance of an action. This function is frequently emphasized through reduplication (e.g. *hajde, hajde*), which serves to increase the pressure on the interlocutor:

(C2 (7)) **Ajde ajde**, požurite!!! Šalim se, samo opušteno...³¹

(C2 (14)) **Hajde, hajde**, požuri u predsoblje.³²

In these cases, the encyclopedic assumptions related to dynamics are foregrounded, as the speaker's primary intent is to regulate the tempo of the interaction. While interpersonal pressure is also prominent, it is often mitigated by the context – such as the joking remark in (C2 (7)) – which prevents the urgency from being perceived as a genuine threat to the interlocutor's face. At the same time, the assumptions related to cooperation are backgrounded, since one of the speaker's objectives is to exert power over the interlocutor(s).

5.1.4. Cognitive Directive

In the final subcategory of utterances, *hajde* functions as a cognitive directive. In these instances, the speaker does not request physical action, but directs the interlocutor towards a specific mental process:

(C1 (5)) A, **ae** se priseti malo bolje oko onog mog pitanja...³³

(C1 (8)) **Aj** sad pročitaj ponovo.³⁴

The focus is on overcoming cognitive inertia, as the speaker prompts the interlocutor to start a specific mental process. Thus, the idea of physical movement is backgrounded because the speaker is asking for a “mental movement” or a change in focus rather than a change in location.

5.2. MODULATORY FUNCTION

In this category, the lexeme *hajde* functions as a modulator of the interlocutor's affective and volitional state. The speaker either tries to per-

31 English translation: Come on, come on, hurry up!!! Just kidding, take it easy...

32 English translation: Come on, come on, hurry to the hallway.

33 English translation: Come on, try to remember a bit better regarding that question of mine...

34 English translation: Come on, now read it again.

suade the interlocutor to overcome the state of inertia or tries to soothe the over-excitement. Accordingly, there are two ends of this continuum – a motivational function and a soothing function.

5.2.1. Motivational Function

In this subcategory, the speaker acts as a catalyst, recognizing that the interlocutor has the capacity to perform a certain action, but not necessarily the will or confidence to initiate it:

- (C2 (1)) **Ajde ajde**, nemoj da te mrzi, na raspustu si Možeš da probaš, ne može da škodi, a što ne škodi...³⁵
- (C2 (5)) **Ajde ajde**, nemoj da omeksas sad. Jeste glupo, ali i treba da bude glupo.³⁶
- (C2 (6)) **Ajde ajde**... sad lepo opet one knjige u shake pa na posao. Kad dodjem bice kontrolni a mozda i usmeno odgovaranje.³⁷
- (C2 (8)) **Ajde ajde** zivni malo evo, da ne bude za zabushavam.³⁸
- (C2 (10)) Zivot je pred nama, i ceka Nemoj da dozvolis da tuga jede tvoj zivot. Iskoristi svaki trenutak zivota, i bices srećniji, jer ces znati da ides napred. **Ajde ajde**... mlad si... Ima jos njih.³⁹
- (C2 (11)) **Ajde ajde**, nema mnogo, jos samo par kilometara ostalo - pomogo bi ti, al sam ceo dan moderisao, pa me ruke bole.⁴⁰
- (C2 (13)) **Ajde ajde**, ne budi lenj...⁴¹
- (C2 (15)) **Hajde, hajde**, mladicu, glavu gore...⁴²

In these instances, the pro-concept *hajde* undergoes conceptual broadening, where the encyclopedic assumptions related to overcoming a state of inertia are foregrounded. The encyclopedic assumptions about interpersonal pressure are also present, but somewhat mitigated. Namely, the speaker does not present himself/herself as having the upper hand over the interlocutor, but rather offers a supportive nudge (syntactically marked through reduplication) to perform a certain action. The assumptions related to physical movement are backgrounded and modified to convey a mental shift from a state of inactivity.

35 English translation: Come on, come on, don't be lazy, you're on break. You can give it a try, it can't hurt – and what doesn't hurt...

36 English translation: Come on, come on, don't go soft now. It is stupid, but it's supposed to be stupid.

37 English translation: Come on, come on... now pick up those books again and get to work. When I get back, there will be a test, maybe even an oral exam.

38 English translation: Come on, come on, cheer up a bit, so it doesn't look like I'm slacking off here.

39 English translation: Life is ahead of us and it's waiting. Don't let sadness eat your life. Use every moment of life, and you'll be happier, because you'll know you're moving forward. Come on, come on... you're young... There are others out there.

40 English translation: Come on, come on, it's not much, just a few kilometers left – I'd help you, but I've been moderating all day and my hands ache.

41 English translation: Come on, come on, don't be lazy...

42 English translation: Come on, come on, young man, chin up...

5.2.2. Soothing Function

The second subtype focuses on reducing negative effects, with *hajde* serving to comfort, reassure, and de-escalate emotional tension:

(C2 (2)) **Ajde ajde**, nemoj da ste na kraj srca, pa docekani ste braCki, samo vam jos to nisu javili!⁴³

(C2 (12)) **Ajde ajde** sta ste se uspanicili...jos nije Hvala Bogu ko nekad u Rusiji...na filmu je prikazano kako tip kaze da ima iznenadjjenje za svoju devojk...i vadi rolnu toalet papira a ona cvrkuce od sreće... takva je kriza bila... Neće biti poskupljenja cena malina.⁴⁴

In these instances, the encyclopedic assumption of cooperation is foregrounded, since the speaker wants to align his/her and the interlocutor's emotional states, as they are in discrepancy. Conversely, the encyclopedic assumptions related to dynamics and interpersonal pressure are backgrounded in order to avoid causing further distress to the interlocutor. However, as with other uses of the lexeme *hajde*, this function is highly context-dependent, which can be seen in (C2 (2)). Namely, the initial soothing tone is substituted with an ironic one by introducing the third clause (“[...] samo vam još to nisu javili!”). Here, the speaker uses this “stabilizing” frame only to amplify the subsequent critique.

5.3. CONCESSIVE FUNCTION

Through corpus analysis, it can be observed that in certain instances the speaker uses *hajde* to accept the interlocutor's claim or proposal, even when this conflicts with his/her initial stance or preference. This function is usually syntactically marked by contrasting conjunctions (*ali*, *no*), which highlight the difference between the speaker's internal disagreement and his/her external acceptance of the interlocutor's ideas:

(C1 (1)) **Ae** ako ti tako kazes, ali meni je zanimljivije kada igram na nekom jacem serveru gde ima vise igraca, pa kada mozda uspem i da naucim nesto!!⁴⁵

(C1 (6)) Idem ja sa drugom i on mene nesto ismejao kako ja hodam, nemam pojma zasto, to samo on vidi al **ae**...i kaze on meni “tvoj hod je cak i normalan ako se poredi sa onim Mladenom debilom, lik hoda kao

43 English translation: Come on, come on, don't be like that; after all, you've been welcomed like bros – it's just that nobody's told you yet!

44 English translation: Come on, come on, what are you panicking for... thank God it's not like it used to be in Russia. In a movie, there's a scene where a guy says he has a surprise for his girlfriend... and he pulls out a roll of toilet paper and she chirps with joy... that's how bad the crisis was... There won't be a hike in raspberry prices.

45 English translation: Alright, if you say so, but for me it's more interesting to play on a more competitive server with more players, so that maybe I can even manage to learn something!!

retard" i krene da ga imitira, da se nesto gubi levo desno i da sepa, za malo sto nije pao.⁴⁶

(C1 (12))Turbina razbija a motor ni ne zujem. Neko kao tiho zujanje se cuje ponekad i neko silno krckanje i sumovi svakakvi. Dobro, **ajd** cuje se i ona road noise, ali motor nikako.⁴⁷

(C1 (13))Nisi mi jasan sto jednostavno ne izguglas.... Ja reko da sve lepo pise na appleovom sajtu no **ajd**....⁴⁸

(C1 (14))Elem, te sto si nabrojao niko nije satanista, **ajd** da si reko Venom, Sodom, Slayer pa da budes u pravu, ali Pantera koja peva o zivotu i tako tim nekim licnim problemima, ima i nasilja doduse, i ova "dva Heada" veze sa satanizmom nemaju.⁴⁹

(C2 (3)) **Ajde ajde** da ne raspravljamo i ne davimo narod.⁵⁰

(C3 (1)) **Ajde**, kapiram što uvek maznu zastavu (boooo, hoću i jaaaa), ali što porazbijaju staklo, e to nikako da shvatim...⁵¹

(C3 (2)) Ali **ajde**, očekivao sam neko "logičnije" objasnjenje svega toga.⁵²

(C3 (4)) Piter je odradio dobar posao, ali problem je opet u detaljima, i da je njih ispravio, film bi bio savršen. Ali, **ajde**, dokaži ti režiseru.⁵³

In the aforementioned examples, the encyclopedic assumptions of cooperation are foregrounded, as the speaker prioritizes the progression of the dialogue and the maintenance of the interpersonal relationship over the exertion of power. Moreover, the encyclopedic assumptions concerning interpersonal pressure are inverted: the speaker does not hold authority over others and instead recognizes external pressure, whether it originates from an authoritative figure (e.g. the director in instance (C3 (4))) or from the futility of further argument (exemplified in (C2 (3))). At the same time, assumptions related to spatial movement are modified to represent a mental movement towards acknowledging the interlocutor's position.

46 English translation: I'm walking with a friend and he was mocking the way I walk for some reason, I've no idea why, he's the only one who sees it, but whatever... and he says to me "your walk is actually normal compared to that moron Mladen, the guy walks like a retard" and he starts imitating him, losing his balance left and right and limping, he almost fell over.

47 English translation: The turbine is roaring but I can't even hear the engine humming. Some kind of quiet humming can be heard sometimes, along with a lot of cracking and all sorts of noises. Okay, sure, you can hear that road noise too, but definitely not the engine.

48 English translation: I don't get you, why don't you just google it.... I already told you it's all clearly written on Apple's website, but whatever....

49 English translation: Anyway, none of those you listed are Satanists; now, if you'd said Venom, Sodom, or Slayer, you'd be right, but Pantera sings about life and those kinds of personal problems – there is some violence, admittedly – and these "two Heads" have nothing to do with Satanism.

50 English translation: Come on, come on, let's not argue and bore everyone to death.

51 English translation: Alright, I get why they always swipe the flag (boooo, I want one toooo), but why they smash the glass – now that, I'll never understand...

52 English translation: But fine, I was expecting a more "logical" explanation for all that.

53 English translation: Peter did a good job, but again, the problem is in the details; if he had fixed those, the movie would have been perfect. But, oh well, you try proving that to a director.

5.4. AFFECTIVE FUNCTION

In these instances, the speaker expresses a desire for a successful outcome, but has no direct control over the events:

(C2 (9)) **Ajde ajde ajde ajdee** Djole, jos samo jedan mec...⁵⁴

(C3 (5)) Bravo Viktore, bravo!!! Protiv Vavrinke imas sansu, dobar i server...
ajde!⁵⁵

(C3 (7)) Na kraju sam vrištao zajedno sa njom, dernjao se **AJDE!**⁵⁶

(C3 (11)) Ja čvrsto vjerujem da ćeš se plasirati u svoje prvo finale na Wimbledon-u, pa ako Bog da, i prva Wimbledon-ska titula! Samo napred, ponosimo se tobom! **AJDEE!**⁵⁷

The pro-concept *hajde* undergoes conceptual broadening, where the encyclopedic assumptions related to overcoming inertia are foregrounded and projected onto a third party, typically an athlete or a person performing a certain task. At the same time, assumptions about physical movement are entirely backgrounded, since *hajde* represents a metaphorical movement towards a desired outcome. Namely, in such situations, *hajde* functions as an emotive marker, primarily serving to relieve tension rather than to issue specific instructions. This function is further confirmed by the use of capital letters, an orthographic convention employed to signal louder pronunciation.

5.5. INVALIDATION FUNCTION

While the previous categories suggest that the lexeme *hajde* can be described in terms of encyclopedic assumptions – thereby confirming its conceptual nature in those instances – there is also a usage in which the original pro-concept does not undergo ad-hoc concept construction. Instead, through grammaticalization, *hajde* acquires a purely procedural function, which enables it to function as a pragmatic marker. Consider the following examples:

(C1 (4)) Ljubav?! Pa, neće niko da ti uloži 500+ milona eura zato što te voli... Da nam izvuku što više para?! A, inače je Srbija jedna bogata država u....., pa sad oni kao dolaze da izvuku nama pare.... **ae**, molim te... Fiat bez nas može... Zastava bez njega (ili nekog drugog jačeg proizvođača) ne može...i nikada nije ni mogla.⁵⁸

54 English translation: Come on, come on, come on, come ooon Djole, just one more match...

55 English translation: Well done Viktor, well done!!! You have a chance against Wawrinka, a good server too... come on!

56 English translation: In the end, I was screaming along with her, yelling COME ON!

57 English translation: I firmly believe you'll reach your first Wimbledon final, and God willing, your first Wimbledon title too! Just keep going, we are proud of you! COME OON!

58 English translation: Love?! Well, nobody's going to invest 500+ million euros just because they love you... To squeeze as much money out of us as possible?! As if Serbia is some wealthy country...,

- (C3 (10)) Kažeš “Dinarci oduvek živeli u slobodi”, a “Rajinci su oduvek služili druge”!? **Ajdeee!**⁵⁹
- (C3 (12)) Verovali ili ne, nije im uspelo, uhvatila ih CIA, i krenuli da prete: kažu, u ozbiljnoj si nevolji, preti ti smrtna kazna zbog terorizma. **Ajde?!** Zbog kupovine kuće u blizini aerodroma? Naravno, ta imbecilna pretnja urodi plodom, duhom slabašna teroristkinja-u-pokušaju poklekne i sve im prizna...⁶⁰
- (C3 (13)) Ekonomska i socijalna pitanja i problemi su kod svih drugih društava bila drugo ime za tranziciju, a kod nas su to prečesto “sporedna” pitanja, jer, bože moj, ima toliko značajnijih tema! **‘Ajde?!** Šta je neminovna posledica? Više od 60% zaposlenih žena ima još jedan posao “u fušu”, a o ženama na selima da ne pričam. Mislim, i mi žene imamo dušu!⁶¹
- (C3 (14)) Jer, ne smetaju meni oni zato što vole pare (svi ljudi vole novac) nego što lažu da ne rade (to što rade) zbog novca, nego zbog nas! Da, kao, nama bude bolje?! **Ajde?!** Mrzim svaku demagogiju, laž i proketo licemerje!⁶²
- (C3 (15)) A ja sam, verovatno, neki militantan tip kad ne razumem savremene tokove civilnog društva, liberalnog kapitalizma i slobodnog tržišta. Ljudske slobode, ajde?! Kakva sloboda, bre, kad ti kuća niz vodu ode.⁶³

These examples demonstrate that *hajde* can modify either a propositional constituent or an entire proposition.⁶⁴ When it functions as a modifier of a propositional constituent, as illustrated in (C3 (15)), it modifies the noun phrase *ljudske slobode*. In this case, *hajde* encodes procedural information of ironic denial, functioning similarly to the pragmatic marker *tobože*. As a result, the intended interpretation is that the notion of freedom does

so now they're supposedly coming here to take our money.... oh, please... Fiat can do without us... Zastava cannot do without them (or some other major manufacturer)... and it never could.

59 English translation: You say “Dinaric people have always lived in freedom”, while “the Rajinci have always served others”! Oh, come on!

60 English translation: Believe it or not, they didn't succeed, the CIA caught them, and they started threatening: they said, you're in serious trouble, you're facing the death penalty for terrorism. Really?! For buying a house near the airport? Of course, that imbecilic threat bears fruit, the weak-willed terrorist-to-be gives in and confesses everything to them...

61 English translation: Economic and social issues and problems have been another name for transition in all other societies, while here they are too often “secondary” issues, because, heaven forbid, there are so many more important topics! Is that so?! What is the inevitable consequence? More than 60% of employed women have another job “on the side”, not to mention the women in rural areas. I mean, we women have souls too!

62 English translation: Because, they don't bother me because they love money (everyone loves money) but because they lie that they don't do (what they do) for the money, but for us! Like, for our own good?! Give me a break! I hate all demagoguery, lies, and damned hypocrisy!

63 English translation: And I'm probably some militant type since I don't get the modern trends of civil society, liberal capitalism, and the free market. Human freedoms? Give me a break! What kind of freedom is that, when your house goes down the drain.

64 The aforementioned categories occur in expressions across various communicative genres. For informal discourse, see Manojlović (2025).

not truly exist in the given context. Similarly, when the pragmatic marker *hajde* modifies an entire proposition, it signals the speaker's dissociative attitude towards the propositional content. This gives rise to a higher-level explicature 'It is wrong/naïve to believe that *P*', where *P* represents the proposition within the marker's scope. In the examples discussed above, the propositions falling under the scope of the marker are underlined.

6. CONCLUSION

The qualitative analysis suggests that the lexeme *hajde* retains a considerable degree of conceptual content as a secondary interjection, since its meaning can be decomposed into encyclopedic assumptions – more precisely, five of them: 1) physical movement, 2) voluntary action, 3) interpersonal pressure, 4) cooperation, and 5) dynamics/speed. However, the redistribution of these assumptions varies across functions. The encyclopedic assumptions about physical movement are largely backgrounded or erased, extending them to the mental domain. In directive/hortative uses, encyclopedic assumptions related to dynamics and interpersonal pressure are foregrounded for intensifiers/boosters and urgency markers, while cooperation is foregrounded for mitigated requests and joint action proposals to soften the imperative force. Cooperation is also foregrounded in concessive uses, where the speaker prioritizes conversational progression, and in soothing uses, where interpersonal pressure is backgrounded to relieve tension.

By contrast, the motivational and cognitive functions foreground the encyclopedic assumptions of voluntary action (overcoming inertia), changing the focus from physical movement to a change in mental state or will. The most radical change occurs in the affective and invalidation functions. In the former, overcoming inertia is projected onto a third party, while the latter is fully grammaticalized; namely, the original encyclopedic assumptions are erased and the lexeme functions to signal a dissociative stance, instructing the hearer to negate the relevant proposition or propositional constituent.

Furthermore, an additional indicator of the presence of conceptual content is the possibility of substituting the lexeme *hajde* with conceptual synonyms. In the concessive category, *hajde* (and its variants) can be replaced by the adverb *dobro* (*fine/okay*) without a significant change in meaning. This substitution suggests that the conceptual content is more prominent in this category than in others in the analyzed corpus. However, other diagnostic tests for distinguishing conceptual from procedural meaning – the ability to be negated, being the focus of cleft sentences, and combining with other conceptual lexemes – were not applicable in this corpus.⁶⁵

65 The diagnostic tests were taken from Infantidou (1994, p. 218)

Overall, the qualitative analysis suggests that the secondary interjection *hajde* encodes both conceptual and procedural content, with the proportion varying across different functional categories. For instance, directive/hortative and concessive uses display a greater amount of conceptual content, whereas the invalidation function is purely procedural. This conclusion is consistent with recent findings in the domain of Relevance Theory, particularly with the claim that conceptual and procedural meanings are not mutually exclusive and that many content words may encode procedural information (Wilson, 2011, *Concluding remarks* Section, para. 2).

Considering that ad-hoc concept construction (conceptual component) and grammaticalization (procedural component) occur simultaneously, we suggest that the existing theoretical model should be complemented by findings from procedural semantics.⁶⁶ The synthesis of insights from these two categories would provide a more comprehensive account of secondary interjections such as *hajde*.

Despite these observations, this study is subject to certain limitations that offer possibilities for future research. Firstly, the encyclopedic assumptions that constitute the imperative pro-concept *hajde* were derived by the author based on dictionary descriptions. Subsequent research should therefore apply empirical methods – such as questionnaires or surveys – to determine which encyclopedic assumptions native speakers of Serbian actually associate with this concept. Secondly, the qualitative analysis was conducted on a limited number of examples. A larger corpus might reveal additional functions of this secondary interjection or change the proportional distribution of the functions identified in this study.

SOURCE

CLARIN. *Common Language Resources and Technology Infrastructure*. <https://www.clarin.si/ske/#concordance?corpname=classlaweb2_sr&tab=advanced&queryselector=cql&cql=%5Blemma_lc%3D%22hajde%22%5D&showresults=1>. December 21, 2025.

REFERENCES

- Ameka 1992: F. Ameka, Interjections: The universal yet neglected part of speech, North-Holland: *Journal of Pragmatics*, 18, North-Holland, 101–118.
- Belić 1958: А. Белић, *О језичкој њприроди и језичком развјуику*, Београд: Нолит.
- Buridant 2006: C. Buridant, L'interjection: jeux et enjeux, Paris: *Langages*, 161(1), Paris, 3–9.
- Carston 2002: R. Carston, *Thoughts and Utterances: The Pragmatics of Explicit Communication*, Oxford: Blackwell.

⁶⁶ This is not a novel proposition. Padilla Cruz (2009) proposed a continuum ranging from less to more conceptual representations for primary interjections. Our findings suggest that the same dichotomy can be applied to secondary interjections as well.

Daničić 1850: Ђ. Даничић, *Мала српска грамаџика*, Беч: Штампарија јерменскога манастира.

Infantidou 1994: E. Infantidou, *Evidentials and Relevance* (Doctoral Dissertation), London: University of London.

Interjection. *Online Etymology Dictionary*. <<https://www.etymonline.com/search?q=interjection>>. December 21, 2025.

Jespersen 1924: O. Jespersen, *The Philosophy of Grammar*, London: Allen & Unwin.

Klajn 2005: I. Klajn, *Gramatika srpskog jezika*, Beograd: Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva.

Lazić-Konjik 2019: И. Лазић-Коњик, Узвици у служби других врста речи у српском језику, Београд: *Наш језик*, 50(2), Београд, 131–139.

Manojlović 2025: Н. Манојловић, Шта (ко)бајаи заправо кодира? Когнитивнопрагматичка анализа, у: М. Ковачевић, Ј. Петковић (уред.), *Српски језик, књижевност, уметност: Српски језик – систем и ујошреба* (Књига 1), Крагујевац: Филолошко-уметнички факултет, 73–85.

Milosavljević 2021: Т. Милосављевић, Узвик или ономатопеја: карактеристике и функције, Београд: *Наш језик*, 52(1), Београд, 33–43.

Novaković 1984: С. Новаковић, *Српска грамаџика*, Београд: Државна штампарија.

Padilla Cruz 2009: M. Padilla Cruz, Might interjection encode concepts? More questions than answers, Warsaw: *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics*, 5, Warsaw, 241–270.

Padilla Cruz 2010: M. Padilla Cruz, What do interjections contribute to communication and how are they interpreted? A cognitive pragmatic account, in: I. Witczak-Plisiecka (ed.), *Pragmatic Perspectives on Language and Linguistics (Volume I): Speech Actions in Theory and Applied Studies*, Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 39–68.

Padilla Cruz 2017: M. Padilla Cruz, On the origin and meaning of secondary interjections: A relevance-theoretic proposal, in: A Piskorska, E. Wałaszewska (eds.), *Applications of Relevance Theory: From Discourse to Morphemes*, Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 299–326.

Quirk et al. 1985: R. Quirk, S. Greenbaum, G. Leech, J. Svartvik, *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, London/New York: Longman Group Limited.

RSJ 2011: М. Вујанић, Д. Гортан-Премк, М. Дешић, Р. Драгићевић, М. Николић, Љ. Ного, В. Павковић, Н. Рамић, Р. Стијовић, М. Радовић-Тешић, Е. Фекете, *Речник српскога језика*, Нови Сад: Матица српска.

RSKJ 1976: М. Стевановић, С. Марковић, С. Матић, П. Рогић, М. Пешикан, Д. Гортан-Премк, М. Вујанић, С. Ковачевић, *Речник српскохрватскога књижевног језика* (Књига шеста: С–Ш), Нови Сад: Матица српска.

Sperber, Wilson 1986: D. Sperber, D. Wilson, *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Stanojčić, Porović 1992: Ж. Станојчић, Љ. Поповић, *Грамаџика српскога језика: уџбеник за I, II, III и IV разред средње школе*, Београд: Завод за уџбенике и наставна средства.

Stevanović 1986: М. Стевановић, *Савремени српскохрватски језик: Грамаџички системи и књижевнојезичка норма I*, Београд: Научна књига.

Stijović et al. 2019: Р. Стијовић, И. Лазић-Коњик, М. Спасојевић, Узвици у савременом српском језику: Класификација и лексикографска обрада, Београд: *Јужнословенски филолог*, 75(1), Београд, 37–61.

- Traugott 2012: E. C. Traugott, Intersubjectification and clause periphery, Amsterdam: *English Text Construction*, 5(1), Amsterdam, 7–28.
- Viljamaa 2019: T. Viljamaa, Words or sounds? Ancient grammarians on interjections, Helsinki: *Arctos*, 53, Helsinki, 219–246.
- Wałaszewska 2011: E. Wałaszewska, Broadening and narrowing in lexical development: How relevance theory can account for children's overextensions and underextensions, Amsterdam: *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, Amsterdam, 314–326.
- Wharton 2003: T. Wharton, Interjection, language, and the 'showing/saying' continuum, Amsterdam: *Pragmatics and Cognition*, 11, Amsterdam, 39–91.
- Wharton 2009: T. Wharton, *Pragmatics and Non-Verbal Communication*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wierzbicka 1992: A. Wierzbicka, The semantics of interjection, North-Holland: *Journal of Pragmatics*, 18, North-Holland, 159–192.
- Wilson 2011: D. Wilson, The conceptual-procedural distinction: Past, present and future, in: V. Escandell-Vidal, M. Leonetti, A. Ahern (eds), *Procedural Meaning: Problems and Perspectives*, Leeds: Emerald Group Publishing, 3–31.

Марија Ж. Ненадић / ДИСКУРЗИВНЕ ФУНКЦИЈЕ УЗВИКА ХАЈДЕ: РАЗМАТРАЊА ИЗ ПЕРСПЕКТИВЕ ТЕОРИЈЕ РЕЛЕВАНЦИЈЕ

Резиме / У раду је спроведена когнитивнопрагматичка анализа секундарног узвика *хајде* и његових аломорфа. Корпус истраживања чини 45 насумично одабраних реченица које у својој синтаксичкој структури садрже ову лексему. Анализирани примери класификовани су у пет категорија према њиховим прагматичким функцијама: 1) директивна и хортативна, 2) модулаторна, 3) допусна, 4) афективна, и 5) функција поништавања пропозиционог садржаја. Применом квалитативне методологије утврђено је да узвик *хајде* показује другачију прераспodelу енциклопедијских претпоставки у односу на свој изворни про-концепт – глагол са непотпуном парадигмом у императивном глаголском начину. Међутим, концептуална анализа није довољна за потпуно дефинисање значењског опсега испитиваног израза. Резултати указују на то да *хајде* кодира и концептуални и процедурални садржај, што сугерише да се формирање *ad-hoc* концепта и процес граматикализације одвијају упоредо током значењског развоја ове лексеме. Другим речима, истраживање наглашава потребу за допуном постојећег теоријског модела налазима из домена процедуралне семантике како би се на адекватан начин описала вишеслојна природа испитиваног секундарног узвика.

Кључне речи: концептуална семантика, процедурална семантика, формирање *ad-hoc* концепта, граматикализација, *хајде*.

Примљен: 17. 2. 2026.

Прихваћен марта 2026.