

Andra KALNAČA, Ilze LOKMANE

University of Latvia

POLYFUNCTIONALITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF REFLEXIVE VERBS IN LATVIAN

Abstract. The aim of the current paper is to analyze Latvian reflexive verbs from the point of view of their polyfunctionality and distribution. The study confirms the assumption that reflexive verbs are independent lexemes as opposed to non-reflexive verb forms. Each reflexive verb has its distinct semantic system and distribution which is different from polysemy of non-reflexive verbs and their distribution. The system of reflexive verbs in Latvian is open where new meanings and even new reflexive verbs arise particularly in colloquial use.

Keywords: Latvian; syntax; reflexive verbs; subject verbs; object verbs; impersonal verbs; evaluation; aspect.

1. Introduction

The aim of the current paper is to analyze Latvian reflexive verbs from the point of view of their polyfunctionality.

Sequence of description is envisaged as follows:

- 1) a brief insight into the research methods;
- 2) overview of the semantic groups of reflexive verbs;
- 3) analysis of the Latvian data samples;
- 4) main conclusions about the semantics of reflexive verbs and their distribution.

The classification of Latvian reflexive verbs is based on the relationship between semantic roles and syntactic structure according to the principles devised by Palmer (1994) and Saeed (1997). The approach of describing the voice system and reflexive verbs in the context of semantic roles has been widely used in modern linguistics (see, for example, Shibatani 1988; Klaiman 1991; Kemmer 1993; Plungian 2000; 2011; Haspelmath 2002; Knjazev 2007). The theoretical framework and classification of reflexive verbs is mainly based on Geniušienė (1983) and (1987), Faltz (1985) and Gerritsen (1990), developed further by Kemmer (ibid.),

Wierzbicka (1996), Enger, Nettet (1999), Plungian (ibid.), Holvoet (2001), Haspelmath (ibid.), Knjazev (ibid.). A similar approach has been applied to the Latvian reflexive verbs in Kalnača, Lokmane (2012) and Kalnača (2013).

Geniušiene (1987, 137–141) has discussed polysemy and overlapping of semantic classes of reflexives, these specific features are discussed in Kemmer (1993) in connection with emotion and some other reflexive verbs. However, polyfunctionality of Latvian reflexive verbs is described chiefly in dictionaries of Latvian from the point of view of their meaning, but never in connection with their distribution. Traditionally different cases of reflexive verbs used in colloquial Latvian are not reflected in dictionaries in spite of the fact that they are widespread, for example, reflexive verbs *smērēties* ‘to be made (about sandwiches)’ and *rakstīties* ‘to spell’ in the following cases:

- (1) a. passive meaning

<i>Tiek</i>	<i>vārīta</i>	<i>kafija,</i>
be.AUX.PRS.3	boil.PTCP.NOM.F	coffee.NOM.F
<i>smērējas</i>	<i>maizes.</i>	
smear.PRS.3.REFL	bread.NOM.PL.F	

‘The coffee is being made, the sandwiches are being prepared.’

(www.korpuss.lv)

- b. impersonal meaning

<i>Kā</i>	<i>pareizi</i>	<i>rakstās</i>	<i>režisorsa</i>
How	correct	write.PRS.3.REFL	director.GEN.M
<i>vārds?</i>			
name.NOM.M			

‘How do you spell the director’s name?’

(www.korpuss.lv)

Latvian grammars normally do not present the analysis of either polyfunctionality or the colloquial usage of reflexive verbs (for example, Ahero et al. 1959; Nītiņa 2001; Paegle 2003), as traditionally these questions are discussed in the research connected with the language culture (for example, Blinkena 1966; Endzelīns 1980, 42; Freimane 1993, 207–208).

The new *Grammar of the Latvian Language (Latviešu valodas gramatika)* and Kalnača, Lokmane (2012) is an exception in the culture of the description of the verb, as it discusses the semantics and the distribution of the reflexive verbs, without avoiding the colloquial language – use cases to depict the system of the verb more fully (Kalnača 2013, 512–515).

The polysemy of the reflexive verbs is not usually discussed in the connection with its distribution pattern in the sentence either. This can be partly explained by the fact that the reflexive verb can have some non-standard language meanings, which following the established practice of the traditional grammars and sometimes even dictionaries, were not depicted in the language system description either, see more on this reflexive verb description problem in (Kalnača 2009). So the current paper is an attempt to analyze the polyfunctionality of reflexive verbs in connection with their semantic and syntactic functions, without judging the language use from the normative point of view.

The data are taken from the *Līdzsvarots mūsdienu latviešu valodas tekstu korpuss (The balanced corpus of Modern Latvian)* (available at www.korpuss.lv). Materials from explanatory dictionaries *Latviešu valodas vārdnīca (Latvian Language Dictionary)* and *Latviešu literārās valodas vārdnīca (Standard Latvian Language Dictionary)* (both available at www.tezaurs.lv), www.google.lv, news portals and newspapers are used as well.

2. General description of the reflexive verb semantics

As Haspelmath (2002, 213) argues, in the case of reflexive verbs “the agent and the patient are co-referential and can hence be thought of as occupying a single syntactic function”. The relations between semantic roles and syntactic arguments can be represented as follows, where A is the agent, P is the patient, and S the subject:

A=P
S

Figure 1. **Subject reflexive verbs**

According to Wierzbicka (1999, 60–64; see also Schladt 2000; König, Siemund, Töpfer 2008; Kalnača, Lokmane 2010), this model

can be related to the prototypical or primary meaning of reflexivity which is the so-called middle meaning in its traditional sense. In Latvian the following reflexive verbs have the prototypical meaning:

- (2) *ietīties* ‘to wrap oneself up (in), to tuck oneself in’
atjaunoties ‘to be renewed’
mainīties ‘to change oneself’

The semantics and distribution of reflexive verbs in Latvian are described *ibid.* as follows (see Kalnača, Lokmane 2012; Kalnača 2013, 512; examples from Kalnača, Lokmane *ibid.*):

1) **subject reflexive verbs** – the agent and the patient are fully or partly co-referential; the agent is the syntactic subject of the sentence (see Figure 1) – *mazgāties* ‘to wash [oneself]’; *celties* ‘to get [oneself] up’; *ķemmēties* ‘to comb [one’s] hair’; *slaucīties* ‘to wipe [oneself] dry’; *ģērbties* ‘to dress [oneself]’

- (3) *Es* *mazgājos* *dušā.*
 I.NOM wash.PRS.1SG.REFL shower.LOC.F
katru *rītu.*
 every.ACC.M morning.ACC.M
 ‘I take a shower every morning.’

Some subject reflexive verbs can express autocausative action, if the subject, that is, the agent (animate or inanimate), makes oneself do something (Geniušienė 1987, 86; Siewierska 1988, 267; see also Kalnača 2013, 507), for example, *celties* ‘to get [oneself] up’, *liekties* ‘to bend’.

2) **object reflexive verbs** – the agent and the patient are not co-referential; the patient (P) is the syntactic subject (S) of the sentence – *glabāties* ‘to be kept’, *krāties* ‘to accrue’, *šūties* ‘to be sewn’, (see Figure 2 and example 4):




Figure 2. **Object reflexive verbs**

- (4) *Nauda* *glabājas* *bankā.*
 money.NOM.F **keep.PRS.3.REFL** bank.LOC.F
 ‘Money is kept in the bank.’

Some object reflexive verbs can express decausative action, where the agent turns into the experiencer in dative or is dismissed altogether as unimportant (Plungian 2000, 212–213). Decausative action borders on passive action (cf. the Latvian standard language use cautionary note examples (1a) and (1b); more on this see in Kalnača, Lokmane 2012; Kalnača 2013, 507), the decrease of the role of the agent or the lack of agent brings the meanings closer (Siewierska 1988; Plungian 2000, 214).

3) **impersonal reflexive verbs** – instead of an agent there is an experiencer (E, typically in the dative case), used in the function of the indirect subject (IS) – *iesāpēties* ‘to feel a sudden pain’, *iesmelgties* ‘to begin aching’ (see Figure 3 and example 5):




Figure 3. **Impersonal reflexive verbs**

- (5) *Man* *iesāpējās* *vēderā.*
 I.DAT **ache.PST.3.REFL** stomach.LOC.M
 ‘I felt sudden pain in my stomach.’

A slight note in the connection with the indirect subject. As it can be seen in example (5) (see also examples 21; 23; 26), the dative functions as an indirect subject and denotes the role of an experiencer. Richardson (2007, 39), who has focused on similar examples of dative use in the Slavonic languages, labels these *dative ‘subject’ experience constructions*, which can be fully referred to Latvian as well. Blake (1997, 144–151) in his turn points out that dative can have the function of the indirect subject next to the functions of the direct object and the indicator of possession. This is why this study will be using the term *indirect subject*.

It should be noted that the idea of the dative as subject has a considerably long history in Latvian linguistics. Ozols (1957) proposed this idea by

mentioning the term *netiešais teikuma priekšmets* ‘indirect subject’ and Freimane (1985), Kārklīņš (1968; 1976; 1985), and Lokmane (2002; 2007) have perpetuated this idea. For the analysis of Ozols’ ideas see also Freimane 2013; Lokmane 2013; Vogina 2013. The relation of the dative to the subject function in Latvian is also pointed out in recent research, for example, Seržants 2013a; 2013b; Holvoet 2013); Holvoet, Grzybowska, Rembiałkowska 2015; Kalnača 2014.

The semantic differences can also be attested by differences in distribution of reflexive verbs. The previously mentioned schema, where the agent is co-referential with the patient and in the surface syntax appears as the subject, should be modified accordingly to include the changes in the meanings of reflexive verbs. Further on, the semantic features specify (including also a schematic description of semantic roles and syntactic arguments) how exactly the agent in autocausative constructions loses its outstanding position of the syntactic subject where, as the result, the position of subject gets occupied by that of the patient. The next step is decausative constructions, where one of the participants – the agent – is eliminated from the situation and there is only one participant in the speaker’s field of vision. The impersonal meaning reflects the final step or the result of the action rather than the dynamic process itself.

Latvian allows for certain constructions where one and the same reflexive verb depending on the context represents different semantic roles (agent, patient, experiencer) and consequently appears in different distribution. Depending on their distribution, most Latvian reflexive verbs can be both subject and object (or impersonal) verbs. Object verbs usually have additional semantics (for example, evaluative, iterative or the semantics of unintentionality). Furthermore, one and the same reflexive verb can belong to different semantic groups of subject or object, or impersonal verbs, that is, every meaning of the polysemantic reflexive verb can belong to a different group. The distribution of the verb and the syntactic structure of the sentence will vary accordingly.

3. Reflexive verb – subject verb / object verb

MAZGĀTIES ‘to wash’

a. subject reflexive verb, the relations between semantic roles and syntactic arguments can be represented as in Figure 1:

- (6) *Kapēc kaķis tik ilgi mazgājas?*
 why cat.NOM.M so long wash.PST.3.REFL
 ‘Why is the cat licking itself for so long?’

(www.delfi.lv)

b. object reflexive verb + evaluative meaning, the relationship between the semantic and syntactic structure is as in Figure 2:

- (7) *Audums labi mazgājas.*
 material.NOM.M well wash.PRS.3.REFL
 ‘Laundry washes well.’

(www.tvnet.lv)

The verb *mazgāties* in this context has evaluational meaning – the event is interpreted as positive.

Plungian (2011) points out that evaluative (modal) meanings arise from the context where the identity of the agent is not important and the emphasis is laid on the event itself or the result involving the object. As the consequence of this the modal meaning of possibility or impossibility arises, that is the object’s ability to participate or not participate in the event is assessed (Plungian 2011, 269–270). This meaning peculiarity can be attested in the analysis of Latvian reflexive verbs – the example (6) shows reading of the verb *mazgāties* ‘to wash oneself’ as the subject verb without evaluative meaning while in the object function the event is assessed as a positive event, see example (7). The same can be observed in the distribution of the reflexive verb *stiepties* ‘to reach, to drag, to stretch’ (examples 8–10) although this verb allows for polyfunctionality in its function as the subject verb – in specific contexts it can encode iterative, that is – aspectual meaning.

STIEPTIES ‘to reach, to drag, to stretch’

a. subject reflexive verb

- (8) *Es stiepos pēc piena krūzes.*
 I.NOM reach.PRS.1SG.REFL for milk.GEN.M jug.GEN.F
 ‘I am reaching for the milk jug.’

(www.google.lv)

a₁. subject reflexive verb + aspectual (iterative) meaning

- (9) *Pēc darba mājās vienmēr*
 after work.GEN.M home usually
ar savu smago rokassomu stiepjos
 with my.INS.F heavy.INS.F handbag.INS.F **bring.PRS.1SG.REFL**
kā traka.
 as mad.NOM.F

‘After the work I am dragging my usually heavy handbag home.’

(www.tvnet.lv)

Verbs like *stiepties* with iterative meaning usually occur in a pattern without a coreferential patient. The relations between semantic roles and syntactic arguments in this case are as follows:




Figure 4. **Subject reflexive verb with the aspectual (iterative) meaning**

b. object reflexive verb + evaluative meaning, the relationship between the semantic and syntactic structure is as in Figure 2 (see examples 4; 7):

- (10) *Veca gumija slikti stiepjās*
 old.NOM.F elastic.NOM.F badly **stretch.PRS.3.REFL**
un plīst.
 and break.PRS.3

‘An old elastic stretches badly and breaks easily.’

(www.google.lv)

It is not always possible to interpret the meaning of reflexive verbs based on their distribution and to mark clearly the borderline between the subject and object meanings. The interpretation of meaning largely depends on the meaning of the agent – whether the agent is animate or via personification we can also include agents that typically are not characterized as possessing volition and which either perform an action or the action occurs by itself. Subject

reflexive verbs usually have an animate agent, but we can also here include the reflexive verbs that have a personified inanimate agent (see Kalnača, Lokmane 2012):

(11) a. *Koks* *liecas* *vējā.*
 tree.NOM.F **bend.PRS.3.REFL** wind.LOC.M
 ‘The tree is bending in the wind.’

b. *Temperatūra* *ceļas.*
 temperature.NOM.F **rise.PRS.3.REFL**
 ‘The temperature is rising.’

To illustrate we will discuss the verbs *smērēties* ‘to get dirty’ (examples 12–14) and *rauties* ‘to pull away’ (examples 15–19).

SMĒRĒTIES ‘to get dirty’

a. subject reflexive verb

(12) *Es* *nosmērējos* *ar* *sveķiem.*
 I.NOM **stain.PST.3.REFL** with resin.INS.PL.M
 ‘I stained myself with resin.’

(www.google.lv)

b. object reflexive verb

(13) *Smērējas* *visu* *veidu*
get_dirty.PRS.3.REFL all.GEN.PL.M type.GEN.PL.M
plastmasas *logi.*
 plastic.GEN.F window.NOM.PL.M
 ‘All types of plastic windows tend to get dirty.’

(www.korpuss.lv)

In this group of reflexive verbs, the semantic structure can be interpreted variously (also on this, see Plungian 2000, 215). The event described in the example (13) can be interpreted:

- 1) some animate agent is making the windows dirty; the reflexive verbs are object verbs; the syntactic subject of the sentence is the patient *logi* ‘windows’ (see also Figure 2);

2) the reflexive verb can be analyzed as the subject verb via personification, than *logi* is agent and the syntactic subject of the sentence (see Figure 1);

3) windows get dirty by way of dust, rain etc. without participation of an animate agent.

Also, in the example (14) there are two possible interpretations – mascara can either be smeared with the help of brush in one’s hand (an animate agent) or mascara itself under certain conditions (water, rain, heat etc.) smear around the eyes (the agent is inanimate or does not exist at all):

- (14) *Skropstu tuša nav*
 lash.GEN.PL.F mascara.NOM.F not_be.COP.PRS.3
noturīga un smērējas.
 long_lasting.NOM.F and smear.PRS.3.REFL
 ‘Mascara is not long-lasting; it smears’

(www.korpuss.lv)

RAUTIES ‘to pull’

a. subject reflexive verb

- (15) *Bērns raujas no mātes*
 child.NOM.M pull.PRS.R.REFL from mother.GEN.F
rokām.
 arm.DT.PL.F
 ‘The child is pulling away from his mother’s arms.’

(www.google.lv)

a₁. subject reflexive verb (reciprocal), where several agents are co-referential with several patients (at least two); there is only one syntactic argument in the sentence – the subject:

- (16) [mēs] *Rausimies, kurš stiprāks!*
 [we] wrestle.IMP.1.PL.REFL who.NOM.M stronger.NOM.M
 ‘Let’s wrestle and see who is stronger!’

(*Latviešu valodas vārdnīca*)

The relations between semantic roles and syntactic arguments are basically the same as in the Figure 1.

a2. subject reflexive verb + aspectual (iterative) meaning

- (17) *Es un brālis rāvāmies*
 I.NOM and brother.NOM.M **toil.PST.1PL.REFL**
plavā cauru dienu.
 meadow.LOC.F all.ACC.F day.ACC.F
 ‘Me and my brother toiled in the field all day.’

This kind of reflexive verb *rauties* use in example (17) is usually found in colloquial speech, where it means ‘work a lot, invest a lot of effort’, while the basic meaning of the verb is ‘pull something in different directions, compete’ (example 16) (see *Latviešu valodas vārdnīca*; similar explanation in *Latviešu literārās valodas vārdnīca*). The relations between the semantic roles and the syntactic arguments in this case are the same as for the verb *stiepties* ‘to stretch out’ in example (9), where the agent is the syntactic subject, but the patient is absent (see also Figure 4).

b. object reflexive verb (see Figure 2 and examples 7; 10)

- (18) *Mazgājot [lina] audums raujas.*
 wash.PTCP [linen] fabric.NOM.M **shrink.PRS.3.REFL**
 ‘[Linen] fabrics tend to shrink during washing.’

(www.google.lv)

The verb *rauties* ‘pull away’ in the object function is semantically similar to the above discussed verb *smērēties* ‘to get dirty’ in the object function (example (13)). However, the reflexive verb *rauties* ‘ibid.’ in the example (19) most probably is interpreted as the subject verb where *dienas* ‘days’ is the personified agent:

- (19) *Dienas raujas īsākas.*
 day.NOM.PL.F **get.PRS.3.REFL** shorter.NOM.PL.F
 ‘Days are getting shorter.’

(www.delfi.lv)

4. Reflexive verb – subject verb / impersonal verb

ŠŪPOTĪES ‘to sway’

a. subject reflexive verb

- (20) *Es šūpojos šūpolēs.*
I.NOM swing.PRS.1.SG swing.LOC.PL.F
‘I am swinging.’

(www.google.lv)

b. impersonal reflexive verb + evaluative meaning

- (21) *Lai jums labi šūpojas Lieldienās!*
let you.DAT.PL well swing.PRS.3.REFL Easter.LOC.PL.F
‘May you swing well!’ (an Easter greeting)

(www.korpuss.lv)

In such examples as (21) we can observe the agent turning into the experiencer in dative next to the reflexive verb (see also Figure 3). This kind of impersonal reflexive verbs stress the possible positive outcome of the action; although this kind of use is not recommended in standard Latvian, but in colloquial speech, as well as in media texts it can be found often, especially in all kinds of greetings (Kalnača 2013, 515).

The reflexive verb *dzīvoties* ‘to live’ (see examples 22; 23) has similar semantics and distribution. The use of the subject reflexive verb is different in the meaning of iterative action, where the verb has an iterative meaning, thus the distribution in Figure 4 is a pattern without patient and consequentially without the object as the syntactic argument. The impersonal reflexive verb use in its turn involves the meaning of the positive assessment.

DZĪVOTĪES ‘to live’

a. subject reflexive verb + aspectual (iterative) meaning

- (22) *Mēs dzīvojāmies netraucēti pa laukmali.*
we.NOM spend.PST.1.SG.REFL undisturbed on edge.ACC.F
‘We were spending the time on the edge of the field undisturbed.’

(*Latviešu literārās valodas vārdnīca*)

b. impersonal reflexive verb + evaluative meaning

- (23) *Lai jums labi dzīvojas!*
let you.DAT good live.PRS.3.REFL
'Have a good life!'

(www.google.lv)

5. Reflexive verb – subject verb / object verb / impersonal verb

Although less frequently, there are some reflexive verbs in Latvian that occur in subject, object and impersonal functions.

PRASĪTIES 'to ask'

a. subject reflexive verb

- (24) a. *Bērns prasās uz tualeti.*
child.NOM.M ask.PRS.3.REFL to bathroom.ACC.F
'The child needs to go to bathroom.'

(www.diena.lv)

and

- b. *Vairākkārt sodītais prasās atpakaļ cietumā.*
recurrently recidivist.NOM.M ask.PRS.3.REFL
back prison.LOC.M
'The recidivist is asking to get back in prison.'

(www.tvnet.lv)

b. object reflexive verb

- (25) *Pēc ābolu ēšanas zobiem prasās piens vai siers.*
after apple.GEN.PL.M eating.GEN.F tooth.DAT.PL.M
need.PRS.3.REFL milk.NOM.M or cheese.NOM.M
'After eating apples the teeth ask for some milk or cheese.'

(www.tvnet.lv)

c. impersonal reflexive verb

- (26) *Man* *prasās* *uz* *jūru!*
I.DAT **need.PRS.3.REFL** to sea.ACC.F
'I want to go to the sea!'

(www.google.lv)

In Latvian the experiencer may be omitted:

- (27) *Prasās* *pēc* *ballītes?*
need.PRS.3.REFL for party.GEN.F
'Are we feeling a need for a party?'

(www.tvnet.lv)

It follows from our analysis that the tendency of reflexive verbs to function with different meanings and assume different distribution arises from the functional system of reflexive verbs; it is a universal tendency as previously claimed by Kemmer (1993, 202). Thus, these universal tendencies also concern specific reflexive verbs that assuming different meanings occur in different distribution. We would like to think that this is due to meaning expansion of reflexive verbs where co-reference of the agent and patient the subject can be interpreted as either an agent or a patient. If there is no agent or the author of the text does not regard it as important, the one and the same verb can have impersonal semantics (see the distribution of reflexive verbs *šūpoties* 'to sway', *dzīvoties* 'to live', *prasīties* 'to ask'). However, the analysis of Latvian reflexive verbs demonstrates that most frequently reflexive verbs have combined the subject and object verb or impersonal meanings. So far we have not come across usage where one and the same verb assumes the object and impersonal verb distribution. This points to the fact that in Latvian the core of the functional system of reflexive verbs is formed by the subject verbs. The subject verbs respectively show most extensive polyfunctionality (see Kalnača, Lokmane 2012).

The system of reflexive verbs in Latvian is open where new meanings (examples 21; 23) and even new reflexive verbs arise particularly in colloquial use, such as the verb *tievēties* 'to slim down', where in example (28a) the reflexive verb has the meaning of the subject verb, while in example (28b) – the meaning of the impersonal verb:

- (28) a. *Nolēmu šonedēļ cītīgi tievēties.*
 decide.PST.1.SG this_week hard **slim_down.INF**
 ‘I decided to slim down this week.’

(www.google.lv)

and

- b. Čau, meitenes, kā tievējas
 hi girl.NOM.PL.F how **slim_down.PRS.3.REFL**
 pa svētkiem?
 during feast.DAT.PL.M
 ‘Hi girls! Have you been losing a lot of weight during the feast?’

(www.google.lv)

6. Conclusions

1. One and the same reflexive verb may have different lexical meanings with a different distribution for each of the meanings. One and the same verb can belong to different subclasses of the subject and object (or impersonal) verbs.
2. Some reflexive verbs have evaluative or aspectual (iterative) meanings. The evaluative meanings usually are manifested by a positive or negative assessment of the event (the context can be enhanced by the adverbs *labi* ‘good’ or *slikts* ‘bad’) and the consequences while the aspectual meaning is manifested by the intensity of the action, that is – iterativity.
3. Some reflexive verbs can have different semantic readings and analyzed as subject or object verbs respectively.
4. The study confirms the assumption that reflexive verbs are independent lexemes as opposed to non-reflexive verb forms as assumed by Soida (2009), Kuplā (2012), and *Latviešu valodas gramatika* (see Kalnača 2013, 512; Vulāne 2013, 291–292). Each reflexive verb has its distinct semantic system and distribution which is different from polysemy of non-reflexive verbs and their distribution.

ATGRIEZENISKO DARBĪBAS VĀRDU DAUDZNOZĪMĪBA UN SAISTĀMĪBA LATVIEŠU VALODĀ

Kopsavilkums

Atgriezenisko darbības vārdu daudznozīmība, lai gan daļēji atspoguļojas latviešu valodas vārdnīcās, parasti netiek saistīta ar teikuma sintaktisko struktūru, resp., saistāmību. Vārdnīcās (un gramatikās) parasti netiek iekļauti arī sarunvalodā plaši lietoti atgriezeniskie darbības vārdi vai to nozīmes. Tāpēc šis pētījums ir mēģinājums aplūkot atgriezenisko darbības vārdu polisēmiju saistībā ar to semantiskām un sintaktiskām funkcijām, ietverot arī sarunvalodas un neliterārus lietojuma gadījumus, tomēr valodas materiālu nevērtējot valodas kultūras aspektā.

Pētījumā latviešu valodas atgriezenisko darbības vārdu klasifikācija ir balstīta uz atšķirībām starp semantiskajām lomām un teikuma sintaktisko struktūru.

Pētījuma novitāte ir tā, ka tiek aplūkoti viena un tā paša atgriezeniskā darbības vārda daudznozīmība un saistāmība teikumā. Arī katrai atgriezeniska darbības vārda nozīmei var būt atšķirīga saistāmība, turklāt viens un tas pats darbības vārds var piederēt pie dažādām subjekta un objekta (vai bezpersonas) darbības vārdu apakšgrupām. Daļai atgriezenisku darbības vārdu ir arī vērtējoša (modāla) vai veida nozīme. Vērtējošās nozīmes parasti ir saistītas ar pozitīvu vai negatīvu notikuma vērtējumu, savukārt veida nozīmes rāda darbības intensitāti (īteratīvumu).

Atgriezenisko darbības vārdu grupas var robežoties. Dažas atgriezenisko darbības vārdu nozīmes var interpretēt gan kā subjekta, gan kā objekta nozīmes. Pētījums apliecina, ka atgriezeniskie darbības vārdi ir uzskatāmi par atsevišķām leksēmām, nevis darbības vārdu gramatiskajām formām. To nosaka fakts, ka atgriezenisko darbības vārdu nozīmju sistēma un distribūcija atšķiras no atbilstošo neatgriezenisko darbības vārdu sistēmas, kas parasti nav vērojams vienas gramatiskas kategorijas robežās. Atgriezenisko darbības vārdu sistēma latviešu valodā papildinās arī ar jauniem darbības vārdiem un jaunām nozīmēm, kas vispirms parādās sarunvalodā un plašsaziņas līdzekļos.

Atgriezenisko darbības vārdu piemēri iegūti www.korpuss.lv, www.google.lv, kā arī plašsaziņas līdzekļu tekstos.

ABBREVIATIONS

1, 3	Person	F	Feminine
A	Agent	INF	Infinitive
ACC	Accusative	INS	Instrumental
DAT	Dative	IS	Indirect Subject
E	Experiencer	LOC	Locative
GEN	Genitive	M	Masculine

NOM	Nominative	PST	Past
P	Patient	REFL	Reflexive verb
PL	Plural	S	Subject
PRS	Present	SG	Singular
PTCP	Participle		

SOURCES

Diena (newspaper)

Latviešu literārās valodas vārdnīca. www.tezaurs.lv

Latviešu valodas vārdnīca. www.tezaurs.lv

Līdzsvarots mūsdienu latviešu valodas tekstu korpuss. www.korpuss.lv

www.delfi.lv (news portal)

www.diena.lv (news portal)

www.google.lv (Internet search engine)

www.tvnet.lv (news portal)

REFERENCES

Ahero, Antonija et al. 1959, *Mūsdienu latviešu literārās valodas gramatika 1: Fonētika un morfoloģija*, Rīga: LPSR ZA izdevniecība.

Blake, Barry J. 1997, *Case*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blinkena, Aina 1966, Nepareizs verba refleksiīvās formas lietojums, *Latviešu valodas kultūras jautājumi 2*, Rīga: Liesma, 128–134.

Endzelīns, Jānis 1980, Dažādas valodas kļūdas, in *Darbu izlase*, III₂, Rīga: Zinātne, 9–45.

Enger, Hans-Olav, Tore Nettet 1999, The value of cognitive grammar in typological studies: the case of Norwegian and Russian passive, middle and reflexive, *Nordic Journal of Linguistics 22*, 27–60.

Faltz, Leonard M. 1985, *Reflexivization: A study in universal syntax*, New York & London: Garland Publishing, Inc.

Freimane, Inta 1985, *Vienkāršs teikums un tā paplašināšana*, Rīga: LVU.

Freimane, Inta 1993, *Valodas kultūra teorētiskā skatījumā*, Rīga: Zvaigzne ABC.

Freimane, Inta 2013, Arturs Ozols latviešu sintaksē, Kalnača Andra, Lāms Ojārs (eds.), *Arturs Ozols (1912–1964). In Honorem*, Rīga: LU Akadēmiskais apgāds, 17–34.

Geniušienė, Emma 1983, *Refleksivnye glagoly v baltijskich jazykah i tipologija refleksivov*, Vilnius: Vilnjusskij gosudarstvennyj universitet.

Geniušienė, Emma 1987, *The typology of reflexives*, Mouton de Gruyter.

Gerritsen, Nelleke 1990, *Russian reflexive verbs: in search of unity and diversity*, Amsterdam-Atlanta, GA: Rodopi.

Haspelmath, Martin 2002, *Understanding morphology*, London: Hodder Education, part of Hachette Livre, UK.

Holvoet, Axel 2001, *Studies in the Latvian verb*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

Holvoet, Axel 2013, Obliqueness, quasi-subjects and transitivity in Baltic and Slavic, In Ilja A. Seržant, Leonid Kulikov (eds.), *The diachronic typology of non-canonical subjects* (= *Studies in language companion series* 140), Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 257–282.

Holvoet, Axel, Grzybowska Marta, Rembiałkowska Agnieszka 2015, Middle voice reflexives and argument structure in Baltic, in Axel Holvoet, Nicole Nau (eds.), *Voice and argument structure in Baltic. Valency, argument realization and grammatical relations in Baltic 2*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 181–210.

Kalnača, Andra 2009, Atgriezeniskums plašsaziņas līdzekļu tekstos, in Ilze Lokmane (ed.), *Valoda: nozīme un forma. Plašsaziņas līdzekļu valoda*, Rīga: LU Akadēmiskais apgāds, 73–79.

Kalnača, Andra 2013, Darbības vārds (verbs). In Nitiņa Daina, Grigorjevs Juris (eds.), *Latviešu valodas gramatika*, Rīga: LU Latviešu valodas institūts, 456–564.

Kalnača, Andra 2014, *A Typological perspective on Latvian grammar*. Warsaw, Berlin: De Gruyter Open.

Kalnača, Andra, Ilze Lokmane 2010, Defective paradigms of reflexive nouns and participles in Latvian, in Greville Corbett, Matthew Baerman, Dunstan Brown (eds.), *Defective paradigms: Missing forms and what they tell us* (= *Proceedings of the British Academy* 163), Oxford: Oxford University Press, 53–67.

Kalnača, Andra, Ilze Lokmane 2012, Semantics and distribution of Latvian reflexive verbs, in Aurelija Usonienė, Nicole Nau, Ineta Dabašinskienė (eds.), *Multiple perspectives in linguistic research on Baltic languages*, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 231–259.

Kārklīš, Jūlijs 1968, Dātīva semantisko un strukturālo funkciju problemātika vienkāršā teikumā, in Daina Zemzare (ed.), *Latviešu leksikas attīstība*, Rīga: Zinātne, 267–297.

Kārklīš, Jūlijs 1976, Vārda formas sintaktisko potenci problēma, in *Valodniecības un literatūrzinātnes teorijas un prakses jautājumi*, Rīga: Zvaigzne, 54–101.

Kārklīš, Jūlijs 1985, Sintagmātikas un paradigmatikas attieksmes teikuma strukturālās tipoloģijas interpretācijā, in Aina Blinkena (ed.), *Baltu valodas senāk un tagad*, Rīga: Zinātne, 174–186.

Kemmer, Suzanne 1993, *The middle voice*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Klaiman, Miriam H. 1991, *Grammatical voice*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Knjazev, Jurij P. 2007, *Grammatičeskaja semantika. Russkij jazyk v tipologičeskoj perspektive*, Moskva: Jazyki slavjanskich kultur.

König, Ekkehard, Siemund Peter (with Töpfer Stephan) 2008, Intensifiers and reflexive pronouns, in Martin Haspelmath, Matthew S. Dryer, David Gil, Bernard Comrie (eds.), *The World atlas of language structures online*. Munich: Max Planck Digital Library, chapter 47 (<http://wals.info/chapter/47> [Accessed on 2011-02-13]).

Kuplā, Ieva 2012, Atgriezenisko kustības verbu daudznozīmība latviešu valodā, in Andra Kalnača, Ilze Lokmane (eds.), *Valoda: nozīme un forma 2: Gramatizēšanās un leksikalizēšanās latviešu valodas sistēmā*, Rīga: LU Akadēmiskais apgāds, 94–105.

Lokmane, Ilze 2002, Datīvs latviešu valodas sintaktiskajā sistēmā, *Linguistica Lettica* 10, Rīga: LU Latviešu valodas institūts, 151–161.

Lokmane, Ilze 2007, Datīva funkciju paplašināšanās mūsdienu latviešu valodā, *Valoda – 2007. Valoda dažādu kultūru kontekstā* 17, Daugavpils: Saule, 272–278.

Lokmane, Ilze 2013, Arturs Ozols un mūsdienu sintakses problēmjaudājumi, in Andra Kalnača, Ojārs Lāms (eds.), *Arturs Ozols (1912–1964). In Honorem*, Rīga: LU Akadēmiskais apgāds, 100–108.

Nītiņa, Daina 2001, *Latviešu valodas morfoloģija*, Rīga: Rīgas Tehniskā universitāte.

Ozols, Arturs 1957, Vārds datīvā kā teikuma loceklis, *LVU Zinātniskie raksti*, 7–81.

Paegle, Dzintra 2003, *Mūsdienu latviešu literārās valodas morfoloģija* 1, Rīga: Zinātne.

Palmer, Frank. R. 1994. *Grammatical roles and relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Plungian, Vladimir A. 2000, *Obščaja morfoloģija*, Moscow: Editorial URSS.

Plungian, Vladimir A. 2011, *Vvedenije v grammatičeskuju semantiku: grammatičeskie značenija i grammatičeskie sistemy jazykov mira*, Moscow: RGGU.

Richardson, Kylie R. 2007, *Case and aspect in Slavic*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Saeed, John I. 1997, *Semantics*, Blackwell Publishers.

Schladt, Martin 2000, The typology and grammaticalization of reflexives, in Zygmunt Frajzyngier, Traci S. Curl (eds.), *Reflexives. Forms and functions*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 103–124.

Seržant, Ilja A. 2013a, Rise of canonical subjecthood, in Ilja A. Seržant, Leonid Kulikov (eds.), *The diachronic typology of non-canonical subjects* (= *Studies in Language Companion Series* 140), Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 283–310.

Seržant, Ilja A. 2013b, The diachronic typology of non-canonical subjects and subject-like obliques, in Ilja A. Seržant, Leonid Kulikov (eds.), *The diachronic typology of non-canonical subjects* (= *Studies in Language Companion Series* 140), Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 313–360.

Shibatani, Masayoshi (ed.) 1988, *Passive and voice*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Siewierska, Anna 1988, The passive in Slavic, in Masayoshi Shibatani (ed.), *Passive and voice*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 243–289.

Soida, Emīlija 2009, *Vārdarināšana*, Rīga: LU Akadēmiskais apgāds.

Vogina, Līga 2013, Atzinumi par teikuma semantiku Artura Ozola darbos, in Andra Kalnača, Ojārs Lāms (eds.), *Arturs Ozols (1912–1964). In Honorem*, Rīga: LU Akadēmiskais apgāds, 165–172.

Vulāne, Anna 2013, Darbības vārdu derivatīvais raksturojums, in Daina Nītiņa, Juris Grigorjevs (eds.), *Latviešu valodas gramatika*, Rīga: LU Latviešu valodas institūts, 278–293.

Wierzbicka, Anna 1996, *Semantics. Primes and universals*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Andra KALNAČA, Ilze LOKMANE
Latviešu un vispārīgās valodniecības katedra
Latvijas Universitāte
Visvalža iela 4a
LV-1050 Rīga
Latvia
[*kalnaca@latnet.lv*]
[*ilze.lokmane@lu.lv*]