

VILNIUS UNIVERSITY

Agnė Navickaitė-Klišauskienė

NOUN FORMATION SYSTEM (*NOMINA AGENTIS*
AND *NOMINA ACTIONIS*) IN CONTEMPORARY LATVIAN

Summary of Doctoral Dissertation
Humanities, Philology (04 H)

Vilnius, 2014

The research has been mainly performed at Vilnius University in 2006–2010 and 2013.

Research supervisor:

Prof. Dr. Habil. **Bonifacas Stundžia** (Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

The dissertation defence is to be held at the Academic Council of Philology, Vilnius University:

Chair:

Assoc. Prof. Dr. **Daiva Sinkevičiūtė** (Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

Members:

Prof. Dr. **Laimute Balode** (Helsinki University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

Prof. Dr. **Alvydas Butkus** (Vytautas Magnus University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

Prof. Dr. **Birutė Jasiūnaitė** (Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

Prof. Dr. **Andra Kalnača** (University of Latvia, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

Official Opponents:

Assoc. Prof. Dr. **Jurgis Pakerys** (Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

Prof. Dr. Habil. **Pēteris Vanags** (University of Latvia, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

The dissertation will be under open consideration at 2.00 p.m. on 22 of April 2014 at the open session of the Academic Council of Philology at Donelaitis auditorium, Faculty of Philology, Vilnius University.

Address: 5 Universiteto Str., LT-01513, Vilnius, Lithuania.

Summary of the doctoral dissertation has been distributed on _____ March 2014.

The doctoral dissertation is available at Vilnius University Library.

VILNIAUS UNIVERSITETAS

Agnė Navickaitė-Klišauskienė

DABARTINĖS LATVIŲ KALBOS DAIKTAVARDŽIŲ
DARYBOS SISTEMA
(*nomina agentis ir nomina actionis*)

Daktaro disertacijos santrauka
Humanitariniai mokslai, filologija (04 H)

Vilnius, 2014

Disertacija rengta Vilniaus universitete 2006–2010 ir 2013 metais.

Mokslinis vadovas:

prof. habil. dr. **Bonifacas Stundžia** (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

Disertacija ginama Vilniaus universiteto Filologijos mokslo krypties taryboje:

Pirmininkas:

doc. dr. **Daiva Sinkevičiūtė** (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

Nariai:

prof. dr. **Laimute Balode** (Helsinkio universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

prof. dr. **Alvydas Butkus** (Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

prof. dr. **Birutė Jasiūnaitė** (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

prof. dr. **Andra Kalnača** (Latvijos universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

Oponentai:

doc. dr. **Jurgis Pakerys** (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

prof. habil. dr. **Pēteris Vanags** (Latvijos universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

Disertacija bus ginama viešame Filologijos mokslo krypties tarybos posėdyje 2014 m. balandžio 22 d. 14 val. Vilniaus universiteto Filologijos fakultete, Donelaičio auditorijoje.

Adresas: Universiteto g. 5, LT-01513, Vilnius, Lietuva

Disertacijos santrauka išsiuntinėta 2014 m. kovo _____ d.

Disertaciją galima peržiūrėti Vilniaus universiteto bibliotekoje.

Introduction

Object of research. The object of this research is two main word-formation categories of Latvian verbal nouns: agent names (*nomina agentis*) and action names (*nomina actionis*).

Research sources. The main sources for the current research were Latvian language corpus (www.korpuss.lv) and lexicographical sources: *Dictionary of Literary Latvian* (*Latviešu literārās valodas vārdnīca*) (www.tezaurs.lv/llvv), *Dictionary of Contemporary Latvian* (*Mūsdienu latviešu valodas vārdnīca*) (www.tezaurs.lv/mlvv), K. Mülenbach's and J. Endzelīns' *Latvian Dictionary* (www.tezaurs.lv/mev).

Aims. This paper aims to provide a description of two main word-formation categories of Latvian nouns: agent names and action names. It was attempted to divide the collected data (suffix and ending derivatives) into clearly defined word-formation types, to determine the meaning of different word-formation types and productivity of word-formation types, analyse the semantics and structure of derivatives, and to provide a clear systematic description of the formation of the aforementioned Latvian language word formation categories.

Methodology. This research employs classic synchronic systematic analysis methods to analyse the Latvian agent and action name categories.

Relevance and novelty of the subject. The subject of this paper is relevant and important, as it is the first attempt to analyse word-formation categories, determine productive and unproductive word-formation patterns instead of describing separate Latvian derivational affixes (suffixes and endings). Previous works on the subject provide exhaustive descriptions of particular derivational affixes, yet fail to clearly define the meanings of the derivatives they produce, they lack any division of word-formation into types and categories. A systematic description of Latvian word-formation would facilitate Latvian language fact comparison with word-formation systems of other languages, to analyse Latvian language word-formation in a broader typological context.

Thesis statements.

1. The analysed Latvian *nomina agentis* and *nomina actionis* word formation categories consist of considerably more word-formation types than have been described

in previous researches. Agent name formation category consists of 64 word-formation types (61 suffixial and 3 ending formation types). Modern Latvian has regularly used 27 agent name suffixial formation types and 3 types of derivative formation by ending (the Grammar of Modern Latvian describes only 9 suffixes and 3 endings which produce agent names), while action name formation category consists of 37 suffixial and 4 ending derivatives. There are 22 suffixial derivative formation types regularly used in modern Latvian (the Grammar of Modern Latvian describes 6 suffixes).

2. There is a tendency for Latvian ending derivatives that carry agent name meaning to be substituted by the derivatives of the most productive suffixial word-formation types, while action name formation category is affected by opposite tendency – the derivatives of even the most productive suffixial word-formation types are often substituted by ending derivatives.

3. In comparison to Lithuanian language, the processes of word compounding is significantly more active in Latvian language.

The history of Latvian word-formation research

1. During the 17th and 18th ct. hardly any attention was devoted to Latvian word-formation in the grammar books. In the first grammar of Latvian language, The Johan Georg Rehehūzen's *Manuductio ad linguam lettonicam facilis et certa* (1644), merely a single page deals with word formation, the author discusses the use of suffixes meant for formation of diminutive forms, naming people according to their living location, formation of agent and action names.

In the most prominent piece of Latvian writing of the 17th ct., Heinrich Adolphi's grammar *Erster Versuch einer kurtz verfasseten Anleitung zur Lettischen Sprache* (1685), includes a brief overview of noun formation (mostly of diminutive forms) and also verb formation (the author makes a distinction between the basic and derivative forms). In comparison to Rehehūzen's grammar Adolphi's work significantly expanded the notion of Latvian word formation and general understanding of grammar system.

In his grammar manuscript Janis Langijs vaguely adressed word formation issues that were entirely missed by Rehehūzen and Adolphi: resident names with the suffix

-nieks, possessive adjectives with suffixes *-isks*, *-īgs*, and adjective derived nouns with the suffix *-ums*: *labums*, *saldums* etc.

The anonymous 18th ct. grammar in Latin, *Dispositio imperfecti ad optimum seu Rudimenta grammatices Lotavicae* (1732) (it is presumed that its author was Georgs Špungjanskis) mostly focuses on the formation of Latvian diminutives, just as the earlier works. It is noteworthy that the other of the latter grammar provided more *augšzemnieki* dialect examples.

The most significant 17th and 18th ct. works, which devoted some attention to word-formation, were written by Gothard Fridrich Stender. In his grammars (*Neue vollständigere Lettische Grammatik...* (1761) and *Lettische Grammatik* (1783)) Stender attempted to define the principles of word-formation analysis: to figure out the nature and meaning of word formation and the relationship between a derivative and a basic word.

2. The grammars of the beginning of the 19th century followed Stender's tradition, tried to supplement his grammar with new data. However, the works of the latter period were overshadowed by two tomes of August Bielenstein's grammar *Die lettische Sprache, nach ihren Lauten und Formen...* published in 1863 and 1864. This grammar is considered to be the first scientific Latvian grammar, that promoted more extensive research of Latvian language and comparative historical linguistics by the other authors of the same period. A considerable part of Bielenstein's grammar is devoted to word-formation. It is the first description of Latvian word-formation of such extent and depth.

The author of the grammar distinguishes three kinds of word-formation: 1) shift of stem vowels; 2) derivation (word formation by addition of suffixes) and 3) word compounding to which he also added prefix derivatives. In his discussion about formation of nominals the author distinguished two kinds of suffixes: vowel suffixes (*-a*, *-i*, *-u*) and consonant suffixes. Bielenstein attempted to group derivatives according to their meaning, thus there are some traces of word-formation categories. The author also mentioned suffix distribution in dialects, tried to compare Latvian language properties to Lithuanian language. Bielenstein did not leave out compounds, he presented and thoroughly discussed 7 ways of compound word formation, but he paid

little attention to Latvian verb formation, there is merely a vague distinction between verb formation and verb derivation.

3. Equally important was Jānis Endzelīns' *Lettische Grammatik* published in 1922. It is a thorough comparative historical piece on Latvian language. To reinforce his statements, the author employs numerous examples from Lithuanian, Prussian, Slavic and other Indo-European languages, compares them with Latvian language properties, analyses their origins. The grammar contains a great many references to other sources (as well as Bielenstein's grammar). However Endzelyn's grammar was more comprehensive than Bielenstein's, it contains significantly more authentic and reliable factual material, various explanations of the origin of grammatical phenomena, a variety of remarks. This grammar discusses Latvian suffixes according to their main consonant, while prefix derivatives are attributed to compounds. Endzelyn's analysis of Latvian word-formation pays more attention to various issues of derived word structure and their similarity to the ones in related languages, and less attention to the meaning of formed words, its influence to word formation processes. Nonetheless, derivative semantics was not overlooked – the author divided formed words into certain meaning groups.

4. In 1959 *Grammar of Modern Latvian language (Mūsdienu latviešu literārās valodas gramatika)* – the most comprehensive description of Latvian word formation, that covers the entire Latvian word-formation, not merely separate parts of speech – was published. The grammar describes word-formation rather comprehensively and the analyzed data is quite extensive, however, it employs traditional principles of analysis. Even though the grammar mentions productivity, it is tied to separate derivational affixes and not to word-formation types. Division into word-formation categories (presented in the end of the overview) is also determined by lexical, not derivational meaning.

5. The very first linguist to employ clear systematic view to Latvian word-formation was Latvian linguist Emilija Soida. In her discussions about Latvian word-formation she was the first to describe the essence of synchronic and systemic word-formation, defined the main notions: motivation, word-formation meaning, formation type etc. Soida was the first to clearly define the notion of word-formation type and the principles of division into word-formation types, discussed the role of ending in

Latvian form and word-formation system, provided a thorough description of Latvian ending derivatives, which divided the ending derivatives into types, defined their meanings.

The most important work of Soida *Vārddarināšana* was published only in 2009, even though it was written significantly earlier in 1972. In her latter work she discussed not only synchronic Latvian word-formation system and its main elements, but also presented an extensive description of Latvian adjective and verb formation.

Agent names in Latvian language

1. According to typological analysis of 42 genetically unrelated languages, agent names are the second most frequently morphologically realized category – there was at least one agent name formation model in 57 per cent of researched languages. This word formation category is immensely miscellaneous. The number of their formation types and their scopes are also very diverse, derivatives differ semantically: some define an agent according to its active random action, the others – according to constant action or work, there are derivatives that refer to an experiencer of certain states.

The category of agent names is quite closely related to tool names. Both in Lithuanian and Latvian languages their close relationship is demonstrated by suffix “exchange” when agent names are coined with derivational affixes characteristic to tool name formation category, while agent name suffixes are actively used to name certain tools.

2. The research discovered 64 Latvian agent name formation types (61 suffixial and 3 ending formation types). Modern Latvian has regularly used 27 agent name suffixial formation types and 3 types of ending derivative formation, cf. the description in modern Latvian grammar contains 9 suffixes which produce agent names. Latvian linguist Kornelija Pokrotniece described 4 Latvian consonant suffixes which can produce agent names. Derivatives of the most productive formation types usually refer to an agent of active random or continuous action (the “real” agent), however, derivatives of most of word-formation types are dedicated to verbal characteristic names.

3. Two types of the greatest scope and productivity comprise the centre of Latvian agent name formation category. They are *-tājs* and *-ējs* formation types which differ only by primary word structure: derivatives with the suffix *-tājs* come into opposition only with suffix verbs, while *-ējs* derivatives are opposed only by primary verbs. Derivatives also differ by primary stem: the stem for the suffix *-tājs* derivatives comes from suffixial infinitive, while *-ējs* takes the past tense stem, cf. *spēlētājs*, *-a* ‘a player’ (: *spēl-ē-t* ‘to play’), *dibinātājs*, *-a* ‘a founder’ (: *dib-inā-t* ‘to create, to found’), *uzvarētājs*, *-a* ‘a winner’ (: *uzvar-ē-t* ‘to win’); *braucējs*, *-a* ‘a rider’ (: *brauk-t* ‘to ride’, *brauc-a*), *glābējs*, *-a* ‘a saver’ (: *glāb-t* ‘to save’, *glāb-a*), *pārdevējs*, *-a* ‘a seller’ (: *pārdo-t* ‘to sell’, *pārdev-a*) etc. Similar suffixes *-tojas* ir *-ējas* are used to form the most productive agent name word-formation types in Lithuanian language.

Latvian suffix *-ējs* has an allomorph, the suffix *-ājs*, which produces considerably less derivatives due to the “limitations” of the primary stem form. This suffix produces new agent names only with primary past tense verb stem that contains the long *ē*. In all other cases the suffix *-ējs* is used, for instance, *ēdājs*, *-a* ‘an eater’ (: *ēs-t* ‘to eat’, *ēd-a*), *ķērājs*, *-a* ‘a catcher’ (: *ķer-t* ‘to catch’, *ķēr-a*) etc. Less frequent use of *-ājs* derivatives demonstrates that there is a tendency in Latvian language to generalize one type of agent name formation from primary verbs, therefore, derivatives with *-ājs* are dominated by *-ējs* derivatives, e.g. the derivative *ņēmājs* ‘the one who takes’ is only found in Latvian corpus once, while *ņēmējs* – 468 times. More frequent use of some derivatives with *-ājs* is determined by their specific lexical meaning, e.g. *dzērējs* (1 instance in the corpus) ‘the one who drinks’ and *dzērājs* (294) ‘a drunkard’.

In modern Latvian suffixes *-tājs* and *-ējs* that comprise the most productive Latvian agent name formation types are used not only for agent name formation but also to form names of modern appliances and machines. Since such use is well rooted, the same word usually has two meanings: agent (that performs random or continuous action) and appliance, cf. *kopētājs* ‘a copier (person); a copier (machine)’, *krāvējs* ‘a loader (performer of a random action); a loader (a laborer who loads cargo); a loader (a machine used for loading)’ etc. In Lithuanian language the use of derivatives with suffixes *-tojas* ir *-ējas* is avoided, their use is deemed nonstandard, they are substituted with other derivatives formed with suffixes of tool word-formation category, however, undoubtedly, there are various derivatives used in spoken language, e.g.: *pakrovėjas* ‘a

charger’, *prailgintojas* ‘an extension cord’ etc. However, consider the use of Lithuanian word *sukėlėjas* (*Kai astma sergantis asmuo susiduria su astmos sukėlėju (pavyzdžiui, žiedadulkėmis), jo liga paūmėja* ‘‘When a person affected by asthma meets asthma trigger (e.g. pollen), the person’s illness flares up’’).

4. Word-formation types with suffixes **-(i)nieks**, **-(i)niece**; **-onis**, **-one**; **-oņa** and **-ulis**, **-ule** are less productive. Derivatives with the suffix **-(i)nieks** hold the strongest positions in literary Latvian. In some cases agent names with the suffix **-(i)nieks** are more frequent than **-tājs** derivatives, cf. *pētnieks* (more than 700 instances in the corpus) and *pētītājs* (17 instances), *liecinieks* and *liecinātājs* (respectively 350 and 2 instances) etc. Latvian language examples show a use of compound suffix **-ībnieks**, e.g. *lielībnieks* ‘the one who is proud’ (: *liel-ī-ties* ‘to be proud’, *liel-ās*, *liel-īj-ās*), *sūdzībnieks* ‘the one who complains, who writes complaints’ (: *sūdz-ē-ties* ‘to complain’, *sūdz-as*, *sūdz-ēj-ās*), *dalībnieks* ‘a participant, the one who participates’ (: *(pie)dal-ī-ties* ‘to participate’, *(pie)dal-ās*, *(pie)dal-īj-ās*).

Agent name suffixes **-onis** and **-oņa** are rather closely interrelated, as the meaning of their derivatives is quite similar (often negative), moreover, these suffixes are used to produce variants, e.g.: *blandonis* and *blandoņa* ‘a drifter, a stroller’ (: *bland-ī-ties* ‘to drift, to stroll’, *bland-ās*, *bland-īj-ās*), *muldonis* and *muldoņa* ‘a chatterer, a blabber’ (: *muld-ē-t* ‘to chat, to blabber, to chit-chat’, *muld*, *muld-ēj-a*) etc. All derivatives with the suffix **-oņa** belong to *substantiva communia*. According to the corpus, priority is usually given to **-oņa** derivatives in Latvian language.

Equally productive is the suffix **-ulis**, **-ule** word-formation type. The *nomina agentis* produced with the latter suffix often carry pejorative meaning.

The derivatives with suffixes **-onis**, **-oņa** and **-ulis** comprise not only agent name, but also *nomina actionis* word formation category types of various productivity.

5. Even though agent name formation types with **-īķis** and **-eklis** have a rather significant number of derivatives, they are quite unproductive in the literary language, a considerable part of derivatives with the latter suffix is rarely used in literary Latvian. Among the most frequent derivatives with the suffix **-īķis** are *glūniķis*, **-e** ‘the one who watches in hiding, lurker’ (: *glūn-ē-t* ‘to watch, to prowl’, *glūn*, *glūn-ēj-a*), *lūriķis*, **-e** ‘a lurker; the one who watches secretly’ (: *lūr-ē-t* ‘to watch secretly’, *lūr*, *lūr-ēj-a*), *stostiķis*, **-e** ‘stutterer’ (: *stost-ī-ties* ‘to stutter’, *stost-ās*, *stost-īj-ās*). In literary language

there are more instances of *nomina agentis* with the suffix *-eklis*: *bļausteklis* ‘the one who shouts, cries, bellows’ (: *bļaušt-ī-ties* ‘to shout, to cry’, *bļaušt-ās*, *bļaušt-īj-ās*), *skaudeklis* ‘the envious one’ (: *skaus-t* ‘to envy’, *skauž*, *skaud-a*) etc. Formation type with the suffix *-eklis* is more productive in tool name formation category.

6. Other non-productive types of agent name formation category which have 10–30 derivatives. It is noteworthy that not all derivations that belong to the listed formation types are used in modern Latvian, a part of them are rarely or never used:

- The suffix *-lis*, *-le* word-formation type: *bēglis*, *-e* ‘a runaway; a refugee’ (: *bēg-t* ‘to run’, *bēg*, *bēg-a*), *zaglis*, *-e* ‘thief’ (: *zag-t* ‘to steal’, *zogs*, *zag-a*), *neveiklis*, *-e* ‘loser; lubber’ (: *neveik-ties* ‘to fail; to be down on luck’, *neveic-as*, *neveic-ās*) etc.;

- The derivatives that belong to the suffix *-nis*, *-ne* word-formation type have a dual meaning. Some agents are named after the action they perform themselves, e.g.: *aizbildnis*, *-e* ‘a protector; a pleader’ (: *aizbils-t* ‘to plead’, *aizbilst*, *aizbild-a*), *pārbaudnis* ‘an inspector’ (: *pārbaud-ī-t* ‘to inspect’, *pārbaud-a*, *pārbaud-īj-a*) etc. Agents belonging to the other group of derivatives are named after the action performed (and usually completed) by others and directed to the agents, e.g.: *sūtnis*, *-e* ‘the sent one; envoy’ (: *sūt-ī-t* ‘to send’, *sūt-a*, *sūt-īj-a*) etc. *Nomina agentis* derivatives with the suffix *-enis*, *-ene* fall into similar groups, cf. *atklīd-enis*, *-e* ‘a wanderer by’ (: *atklīs-t* ‘to wander by, to arrive, to come’, *atklīd-a*) (action performed by the agent) and *ieliktenis*, *-e* ‘a placeman, a delegate’ (: *ielik-t* ‘to install, to place’, *ieliek*, *ielik-a*) (action performed by others, yet directed towards the agent) etc.

- Derivatives of yet other three word-formation types, the ones with suffixes *-ata*, *-aļa* and *-ka*, belong to *substantiva communia* and usually carry a pejorative meaning, cf. *klabata* ‘a chatterer’ (: *klab-ē-t* ‘to chat’, *klab*, *klab-ēj-a*), *dīkaļa* ‘the one who frequently whines; the one who frequently and obnoxiously complains’ (: *dīk-t* ‘to whine, to plead obnoxiously’, *dīc*, *dīc-a*), *bļauka* ‘the one who cries loudly’ (: *bļau-t* ‘to cry, to bellow’, *bļauj*, *bļāv-a*) etc.

7. The following formation types consist of merely few derivations with agent name meaning. Most of them are no longer used in the modern language: *-ainis* (*zīdainis* ‘a suckling baby’ (: *zīd-ī-t* ‘to suckle’, *zīd-a*, *zīd-īj-a*)), *-elis*, *-ele* (*iznirelis*, *-e* ‘the one who dishonourably earns a better position, parvenu’ (: *iznir-t* ‘to emerge, to show oneself’, *iznirst*, *iznir-a*)), *-ins* (*ļurkšins* ‘a chatterer’ (: *ļurkš-ē-t* ‘to chatter’, *ļurkš*,

ļurkš-ēj-a)), **-ala** (*čīkstala* ‘a weeper, a whimperer’ (: *čīkst-ē-t* ‘to whimper fussily, complain’, *čīkst*, *čīkst-ēj-a*)), **-inis** (*pļepinis* ‘a chatterer’ (: *pļep-ē-t* ‘to chatter, to blabber’, *pļep-ē*, *pļep-ēj-a*)), **-ete** (*ķepete* ‘the one who scoops a full spoon when eating’ (: *ķep-ē-t* ‘to repulsively eat a great deal, to stuff a full mouth’, *ķep-ē*, *ķep-ēj-a*)), **-aks** (*blorzaks* ‘a chatterer’ (: *blorz-ā-t* ‘to chatter’, *blorz-ā*, *blorz-āj-a*)), **-ša** (*brēkša* ‘a screamer’ (: *brēk-t* ‘to scream’, *brēc*, *brēc-a*)), **-la** (*mirla* ‘a weak, ailing person; an ailing animal’ (: *mir-t* ‘to die’, *mirst*, *mir-a*)) etc.

When speaking about formation types that consist of merely few derivations, some attention should be devoted to the so-called “lonely” word-formation types that consist of one or two derivatives widely used in the modern Latvian. Those are word-formation types with consonant suffixes **-ris** and **-ois** which produce such derivatives as *bļauris* ‘a screamer’ (5 instances in the corpus) and *burvois* ‘a magician’ (570 instances).

8. Latvian derivatives with derivational endings **-is**, **-e**, **-a**, **-s** which have the meaning of agent also belong to *nomina agentis* word-formation category, however these formation types are not productive in the modern language, e.g: *melis*, **-e** ‘liar’ (: *mel-o-t* ‘to lie’, *mel-o*, *mel-oj-a*), *bļāva* ‘a whiner, a crier’ (: *bļau-t* ‘to weep, to whine’, *bļāv-a*), *aizsargs* ‘a defender’ (: *aizsarg-ā-t* ‘to defend, to protect’, *aizsarg-ā*, *aizsarg-āj--a*) etc. The most productive type of word-formation by derivational ending is comprised of derivations with endings **-is**, **-e**, though, in comparison to the more productive types of word-formation by derivational suffix, it consists of relatively few derivations. Generally speaking, there is a tendency in modern Latvian to substitute certain ending derivations with more common suffix derivations that belong to the most productive word-formation types. A great deal of ending derivations carry pejorative meaning (mostly derivations with endings **-is** and **-a**).

9. Derivations belonging to Latvian *nomina agentis* word formation category are produced exclusively from verbs, they are usually based on infinitive ad past tense stems, in rare cases derivations are based on present tense stems. Determining the base stem of certain types of word-formation is quite complicated due to the lack of uniformity within the word-formation types. The structure of the derivatives that belong to most productive word-formation types is the clearest – derivatives with the suffix **-tājs** are produced from infinitive (*raudātājs* ‘the one who cries’ (: *raud-ā-t* ‘to cry’, *raud-ā*, *raud-āj-a*)), while agent names with the suffix **-ējs** are based on the stem

of past tense verbs (*gājējs* ‘the one who goes’ (: *ie-t* ‘to go’, *iet*, *gāj-a*)). Other suffix and ending derivative types demonstrate a tendency to produce its derivatives from a trimmed (disintegrated) infinitive stem (if the base verb is suffixial, its suffix is usually dropped).

10. Suffix *-tājs* and *-ējs* derivatives and a part of suffix *-(i)nieks* derivatives carry pure agent meaning. Most of the derivatives of other word-formation types are the names of verbal property holders. It is quite characteristic for the agent names to carry some emotive value, usually negative. Derivatives that carry pejorative meaning usually belong to *substantiva communia*.

11. Traditionally compounds are not divided into word-formation categories, however, Latvian language contains compound words that clearly carry *nomina agentis* meaning – there are around 80 instances of such words in the corpus and lexicographical sources. Those are the so-called compounds with a second verbal constituent. The first constituent of such compounds is usually a noun (*grāvracis* ‘a trenchdigger’ (: *grāvis* ‘a trench’, *rakt* ‘to dig’), less frequently – an adjective, adverb, pronoun. Compounds produced from a noun and certain verbs (*kopt* ‘take care, to keep’, *vest* ‘to lead, to transport’, *nest* ‘to carry’, *darīt* ‘to do’ etc.) can create entire compound groups, e.g.: *biškopis*, *-e* ‘bekeeper’ (: *bite* ‘a bee’, *kopt* ‘to take care, to keep’), *lopkopis*, *-e* ‘animal herder’ (: *lops* ‘animal’, *kopt* ‘to take care, to keep’), *dārzkopis*, *-e* ‘gardener’ (: *dārzs* ‘garden’, *kopt* ‘to take care, to keep’), *zirgkopis*, *-e* ‘a horse-breeder, horse-herder’ (: *zirgs* ‘a horse’, *kopt* ‘to take care, to keep’) etc.

Action names in Latvian language

1. *Nomina actionis* derivatives in Latvian language are produced by adding suffixes and endings to verbs. This word-formation category in Latvian is one of the largest in terms of word-formation types: action name formation category consists of 37 suffix and 4 ending derivatives. 18 out of 37 suffixial word-formation types are used in modern Latvian, furthermore, derivatives with action name meaning are produced with 4 international suffixes. Not all Latvian action names discussed in this paper have the pure action meaning names, it is most characteristic in *-šana* derivatives, which can be produced from any Latvian verb. Other derivatives, even those, belonging to

productive word-formation types, have a tendency to become more concrete, their meaning often approaches the meanings of action result names (*nomina acti*). Typological studies of different languages reveal that the tendency of verbal abstracts to become more concrete is a wide-spread phenomenon in most languages.

2. The core of Latvian action name formation category consists of three most productive word-formation types: derivatives with suffixes *-šana*, *-iens* and *-ums*. These *nomina actionis* word-formation types clearly differ by the meaning of their respective derivations. The suffix *-šana* derivations usually refer to a simple continuous action, the suffix *-iens* is used to name a sudden, instant action, while the suffix *-ums* derivatives signify a complete, finished action.

- The suffix *-šana* is the main suffix of Latvian action names. This word-formation type could even be called hyper-productive, this suffix can produce *nomina actionis* derivatives from any (both primary and suffixial) verb. The suffix *-šana* derivatives usually refer to continuous action, derivatives derived from base prefixial verbs receive the meaning of completeness, e.g. *elpošana* ‘breathing’ (: *elp-o-t* ‘to breathe’), *finansēšana* ‘financing’ (: *finans-ē-t* ‘to finance’), *aizbraukšana* ‘departure’ (: *aizbrauk-t* ‘to depart, to go’), *izveidošana* ‘production, creation, formation’ (: *izveid-o-t* ‘to produce, to create, to form’) etc.

Due to active model of its formation the suffix *-šana* word-formation type is constantly supplemented with new terms. The active character of this model makes it possible to produce new action names with the suffix *-šana* not only from a verb in use, but also from potentially possible verbs, e.g. derivatives *dokumentēšana* ‘documenting’ (: *dokument-ē-t* ‘to document’) and *lietēšana* ‘watering, sprinkling, hosing’ (: *liet-ē-t* ‘to water, to sprinkle, to hose’). The base verb *dokumentēt* is used very actively (15 instances of use in the corpus), while the verb *lietēt* was not found.

- Another productive Latvian action name formation type consists of the suffix *-iens* derivatives. Most of them denote a sudden, instant action, e.g.: *belziens* ‘a strong hit, a punch’ (: *belz-t* ‘to hit, to punch’, *belž*, *belz-a*), *mājiens* ‘a wave, a nod’ (: *mā-t* ‘to wave, to make a sign’, *māj*, *māj-a*) etc. A much smaller part of the latter suffix derivatives denote continuous action, e.g. *brauciens* ‘going, riding’ (: *brauk-t* ‘to go, to ride’, *brauc*, *brauc-a*), *kāpiens* ‘climbing’ (: *kāp-t* ‘to climb’, *kāpj*, *kāp-a*) etc.

- Action names with the suffix *-ums* are semantically quite different, they usually mean a finished action, therefore it is sometimes rather complicated to discriminate *nomina actionis* derivatives from *nomina acti* word-formation category derivatives. Certain examples are even polysemous i.e. they can be attached to both categories depending on the context of their use, cf. example *pirkums* ‘purchase (action); purchase (item)’ in sentences, such as *Nekustamā īpašuma pirkuma līgums* („Real estate purchase agreement”) and *Labs vasaras pirkums būs ērtais šūpuļkrēsls* („A fine summer purchase would be the comfortable rocking chair”).

3. Word-formation types of lesser productivity that have smaller numbers of derivations consists of the suffix *-sme*, *-ība*, *-oņa* derivatives. The types consist of 100 and more derivatives.

- The suffix *-sme* is one of the most potent consonant suffixes in Latvian language. Most of the action names with this suffix are quite known in contemporary Latvian, however, the formation type, due to its narrow field of base verbs (only primary verbs, usually with prefixes), has no prospects of expansion. Despite that some suffix *-sme* derivatives are used even more frequently than derivatives of the similar meaning from the most productive suffix *-šana* word-formation type, cf. *tieksme* (687 instances of use in the corpus) and *tiekšanās* (113 instances) ‘reach, reaching’ (*tieksme pēc brīvības* and *tiekšanās pēc brīvības* ‘reaching for freedom’).

- It is characteristic for a part of the suffix *-ība* derivatives to have pure categorical verb abstract meaning, e.g. *aizstāvība* ‘defence’ (: *aizstāv-ē-t* ‘to defend, to protect’, *aizstāv*, *aizstāv-ēj-a*), *dalība* ‘participation’ (: *(pie)dal-ī-ties* ‘to participate’, *(pie)dal-as*, *(pie)dal-īj-ās*), *izplatība* ‘dissemination, spread’ (: *izplat-ī-ties* ‘to disseminate, to spread’, *izplat-ās*, *izplat-īj-ās*) etc. However, there are derivatives that have inclination towards concreteness, e.g. *liecība* ‘testimony (action); identification (e.g. student's identification card)’ (: *liec-inā-t* ‘to show, to testify’, *liec-in-a*, *liec-ināj-a*), *kustība* ‘movement, move; movement (organization)’ (: *kust-ē-ties* ‘to move’, *kust-as*, *kust-ēj-ās*) etc.

- The suffix *-oņa* formation type is quite deeply rooted in Latvian language, however, its potential to supply new derivatives is quite weak. The largest group of the suffix *-oņa* derivatives, that belong to the latter word-formation type consist of names of various sounds: *čaboņa* ‘rustle, sizzle’ (: *čab-ē-t* ‘to rustle, to sizzle’, *čab*, *čab-ēj-a*),

dimdoņa ‘rumble, knocking’ (: *dimd-ē-t* ‘to rumble, to knock’, *dimd*, *dimd-ēj-a*), *klaudzoņa* ‘clapping, rumble’ (: *klaudz-ē-t* ‘to clap, to rumble’, *klaudz*, *klaudz-ēj-a*) etc. Characteristically the derivatives of this suffix usually are semantically ambiguous: there are derivatives which belong both, to *nomina agentis* and *nomina actionis* word formation categories, cf. derivation *čīkstoņa* ‘squeak (action); whimperer (actor)’ (: *čīkst-ē-t* ‘to squeak, to screech’, *čīkst*, *čīkst-ēj-a*) in sentences *Man vispār nepatīk, ja vīrieši ir čīkstoņas* (“I can't stand men acting like whimperers at all”) and *Izoldi pamodināja baržas vieglā čīkstoņa un ūdens šļaksti* (“Izolda was awakened by gentle squeaking of the barge and rumble of the waves”).

4. Other Latvian types of action name formation could not boast high productivity, not all derivatives of word-formation types are used in contemporary Latvian language, some derivatives are obsolete. Such are word formation types with the suffix **-sma** (30 instances of use found¹) (*kauksma* ‘howling’ (: *kauk-t* ‘to howl’, *kauc*, *kauc-a*), *tieksma* ‘striving, aspiration, reach’ (: *tiek-ties* ‘to strive, to aspire, to reach’, *tiec-as*, *tiec-ās*) etc.); **-onis** (20) (*reibonis* ‘dizziness, giddiness, head-spin’ (: *reib-t* ‘to get dizzy, to spin’, *reibst*, *reib-a*), *šķīdonis* ‘thaw’ (: *šķīs-t* ‘to melt’, *šķīst*, *šķīd-a*) etc.); **-(t)ne** (20) (*atgādne* ‘reminder’ (: *atgād-inā-t* ‘to remind’, *atgād-in-a*, *atgād-ināj-a*), *nebūtne* ‘absence, non-existence’ (: *nebū-t* ‘to be not’) etc.); **-ulis** (18) (*skurbulis* ‘insobriety, dizziness, mellowness’ (: *skurb-t* ‘to get dizzy, to get drunk, to mellow’, *skurbst*, *skurb-a*), *drebulis* ‘shiver, shudder’ (: *dreb-ē-t* ‘to shiver, to shudder’, *dreb*, *dreb-ēj-a*) etc.); **-ene** (10) (*aizietene* ‘walkout’ (: *aizie-t* ‘to go away’, *aiziet*, *aizgāj-a*), *atgāzene* ‘unturn, uncrew’ (: *atgāz-t* ‘to unturn, to unscrew’, *atgāž*, *atgāz-a*) etc.); **-enis** (9) (*staipeinis* ‘stretching, leaning’ (: *staipe-ī-ties* ‘to stretch, to lean’, *staipe-ās*, *staipe-īj-ās*) and *dūcenis* ‘hum, drone, roar’ (: *dūk-t* ‘to hum, to drone, to roar’, *dūc*, *dūc-a*) etc.); **-(s)nis** (7) (*atkusnis* ‘thawing’ (: *atkus-t* ‘to thaw’, *atkūst*, *atkus-a*) etc.); **-me** (7) (*vilkme* ‘traction’ (: *vilk-t* ‘to pull’), *šalkme* ‘roar, sough’ (: *šalk-t* ‘to roar, to hum’) etc.); **eklis** (6) (*drebeklis* ‘shiver, trembling’ (: *dreb-ē-t* ‘to tremble’, *dreb*, *dreb-ēj-a*), *mulseklis* ‘bafflement, shock, confusion’ (: *muls-t* ‘to baffle, to shock, to confuse’, *mulst*, *muls-a*) etc.); **-otne** (4) (*atjaunotne* ‘renewal’ (: *atjaun-o-t* ‘to renew’, *atjaun-o*, *atjaun-oj-a*), *bangotne* ‘wave surge, waving’ (: *bang-o-t* ‘to wave’, *bang-o*, *bang-oj-a*) etc.). Word-formation types with suffixes **-esis**, **-okne**, **-sna**, **-tiene**, **-inis**,

¹ Further on the number in the brackets will denote how many instances of use were found.

-le, *-ula*, *-one*, *-sis*, *-tuve*, *-ka* consist of merely few derivatives used in literary Latvian.

5. There more ending derivatives that belong to *nomina actionis* word-formation category, than agent names produced in the similar manner. The most productive type of word-formation by ending consists of the ending *-e* derivatives (*pārbaude* ‘inspection’ (: *pārbaud-ī-t* ‘to inspect’, *pārbaud-a*, *pārbaud-īj-a*), *sakāve* ‘defeat, annihilation (of the enemy)’ (: *sakau-t* ‘to defeat, to annihilate’, *sakauj*, *sakāv-a*)), nearly equally productive is the word-formation type by ending *-a* (*pastaiga* ‘walk’ (: *pastaig-ā-t* ‘to go for walk’, *pastaig-ā*, *pastaig-āj-a*), *čala* ‘clatter, twitter, rustle’ (: *čal-o-t* ‘to clatter, to tweet’, *čal-o*, *čal-oj-a*)). The ending *-is* produces less derivatives, most of them denote various sounds: *baukšķis* ‘pop, bang’ (: *baukšķ-ē-t* ‘to pop, to bang’, *baukšķ*, *baukšķ-ēj-a*), *kraukšķis* ‘crackle, scrunch’ (: *kraukšķ-ē-t* ‘to crackle, to scrunch’, *kraukšķ*, *kraukšķ-ēj-a*) etc. There is a tendency in modern Latvian to substitute derivatives, belonging to types of word-formation by suffix, by shorter ending derivatives with the same meaning, cf. *apgāde* ‘catering, providing’ and *apgādāšana* ‘(similar meaning)’; *pārveide* ‘rearrangement, change’ and *pārveidošana*, *pārveidība*; *iebilde* ‘objection’ and *iebildums*; *šalkas* (pl.) ‘rumble, roar’ and *šalkoņa* etc.

6. Derivations that belong to *nomina actionis* word-formation category are produced only from verbs, while their base is usually infinitive or past tense stem, in rare cases derivatives are built on the present tense stem. Determining the base stem of certain types of word-formation is sometimes quite complicated due to the lack of uniformity within the word-formation types. The structure of the derivatives that belong to most productive word-formation types is the clearest: derivatives with the suffix *-šana* are produced from an entire infinitive stem, while suffix *-ums* and *-iens* derivatives are based on past tense stems. Derivatives belonging to the same word-formation type can be based on different base stems, usually infinitive and past tense stems (e.g. suffix *-(t)ne*, *-oņa* and ending *-e* word-formation types). Analysis of all collected derivatives of this word-formation category revealed a tendency to produce derivatives from trimmed (or disintegrated) infinitive stem (needless to say, if the infinitive is suffixial) – infinitive suffix is transmitted to the derivatives only in the case of word-formation with the suffix *-šana*.

7. There are only few compounds with the second verbal constituent in Latvian language, they usually belong to *-is* and *-e* (in rare cases to *-a*) flexion paradigms. The first constituent in such compounds is usually a noun (*asinsrite* ‘bloodstream’ (: *asins* ‘blood’, *ritēt* ‘roll, run’)), less frequently an adjective (*jaunrade* ‘creation’ (: *jauns* ‘new’, *radīt* ‘to create’)). Traditionally compounds are not divided into word-formation categories, therefore, what concerns compounds in this paper, composite words with action name meanings are not analyzed, they are attached to this word-formation category only according to lexical and not word-formation meaning.

Conclusions

1. More word-formation types belong to the category of Latvian agent names – it has 65 suffixial and 3 with the endings made word-formation types. 37 suffixial and 4 inflectional word-formation types consist the category of Latvian action nouns.

2. The most productive types of word-formation categories consist of suffixes – *-tājs* and *-ējs* (agent names) and *-šana* (action names) word formation types. Suffixes *-tājs* and *-ējs* are related by additional distribution: agent names with the suffix *-tājs* are produced from suffixial verbs, while the suffix *-ējs* derivatives are based on most primary verbs. Word-formation using the suffix *-šana* could even be considered hyper-productive, since derivations with this suffix can be produced from any Latvian verb. The aforementioned suffixes allow for production of derivations both from Latvian verbs and verbs of foreign origins.

3. Only derivatives of the most productive word-formation types carry pure categorical word-formation meaning (agent name suffixes *-tājs*, *-ējs*, some derivations with the suffix *-(i)nieks*; action name suffixes *-šana*, *-iens*, *-oņa*, some derivations with the suffix *-ība*). Derivatives of less productive types of agent name formation usually name carriers of the verbal property and not the “real” agents. A significant part of derivations (even those of the most productive word-formation types) belonging to agent name formation categories have a tendency to become more concrete, acquire meanings that are characteristic to other word-formation categories – the meaning usually approaches the meaning of action result names.

4. Both agent and action names are based on verbs. The base stem for agent and action name formation is most consistently selected when producing the derivatives of the most productive word formation types: agent name formation suffix *-tājs* is attached to suffixial infinitive stem, while the suffix *-ējs* is attached to primary verb past tense stem. The derivatives of the most productive action name formation type (*-šana*) are based on infinitive stem, while derivatives with *-iens* and *-ums* are based on past tense stem. There is no such uniformity in other word-formation types of both word-formation categories, the choice of the base stem often varies. The least common base for derivatives is present tense stem – there is not a single word-formation type which would produce its derivatives based entirely on present tense verb stem.

5. Only derivatives with suffixes *-tājs* and *-šana* are based on full infinitive verb stem. Suffixial form of the base past tense stem is also consistently retained in action names produced with the suffix *-ums*. In other cases, when a derivative is based on infinitive stem in Latvian language, there appears to be a tendency to produce suffix and ending derivations from disintegrated infinitive stem.

6. Agent and action names in Latvian language can be formed using the same suffixes, for instance, word formation types that employ suffixes *-onis*, *-oņa*, *-ulis* are common for both word formation categories, cf. *čīkstoņa* ‘a whimperer’ and *čīkstoņa* ‘a squeak, a creak’ etc. Suffixes *-tājs* and *-ējs* are used to create both agent and tool names (however, not the traditional tools, but modern machines or appliances).

7. The use of Latvian endings greatly varies when producing agent and action names. Derivatives of both word-formation categories can be created with the same endings (*-is*, *-e*, *-a*) however it is clear that the use of endings is far more common in formation of action names. Ending derivatives of agent names are usually semantically tinged, they carry emotional evaluation, pejorative meaning, there is a tendency to substitute such derivatives with words belonging to more productive suffixial derivative formation types. In contrast, action names produced with endings are used to substitute suffix derivatives that belong to the most productive word-formation types.

DABARTINĒS LATVIŪ KALBOS DAIKTAVARDŽIŪ DARYBOS SISTEMA (*NOMINA AGENTIS* IR *NOMINA ACTIONIS*)

Reziūmē

Tyrimo objekts. Darbo objekts – divi pagrindinēs veiksmāžodiniŪ latviŪ kalbos daiktavardžiŪ darybos kategorijas – veikējŪ pavadinimai (*nomina agentis*) ir veiksmŪ pavadinimai (*nomina actionis*).

Tyrimo šaltiniai. Pagrindiniai medžiagos šaltiniai yra latviŪ kalbos tekstynas (www.korpuss.lv) ir leksikografiniai šaltiniai – „Bendrinēs latviŪ kalbos žodynas“ (*Latviešu literārās valodas vārdnīca*) (www.tezaurs.lv/llvv), „Dabartinēs latviŪ kalbos žodynas“ (*Mūsdienu latviešu valodas vārdnīca*) (www.tezaurs.lv/mlvv).

Tikslai. Šiame darbe siekiama išsamiai aprašyti divi pagrindines latviŪ kalbos daiktavardžiŪ darybos kategorijas – veikējŪ pavadinimus ir veiksmŪ pavadinimus. Surinktā medžiagā (priesagŪ, galŪniŪ vedinius) stengiamasi aiškiai suskirstyti į darybos tipus, nustatyti darybos reikšmes ir darybos tipŪ produktyvumą, išnagrinėti vediniŪ semantikā ir struktūrā ir pateikti aiškŪ sisteminį minētŪjŪ darybos kategorijŪ darybos latviŪ kalboje aprašā.

Metodologija. Šiame darbe, nagrinējant latviŪ kalbos veikējŪ ir veiksmo pavadinimŪ kategorijas, naudojamosi klasikinēs sinchroninēs sisteminēs analizēs metodu.

Temos naujumas ir aktualumas. Ši tema yra aktuali, nes iki šiol nėra išsamaus ir aiškaus sinchroninio dabartinēs latviŪ kalbos žodžiŪ darybos tyrimo. Esamuose darbuose pateikiama tik morfologinē kai kuriŪ darybos formantŪ analizē, aiškiai neapibrēžiamos su jais išvestŪ vediniŪ reikšmēs, visai nėra skirstymo į darybos tipus ir kategorijas. Pateikus sisteminį latviŪ kalbos žodžiŪ darybos aprašā, taptŪ paprasčiau šios kalbos faktus lyginti su kitŪ kalbŪ žodžiŪ darybos sistemomis, nagrinėti latviŪ kalbos žodžiŪ darybā platesniame tipologiniame kontekste.

Ginamieji teiginiai.

1. Nagrinėjamas latviŪ kalbos *nomina agentis* ir *nomina actionis* darybos kategorijas sudaro gerokai daugiau darybos tipŪ nei aprašyta iki šiol. VeikējŪ pavadinimŪ darybos kategorijā sudaro 64 darybos tipai (61 priesaginēs darybos ir 3

galūninės darybos tipai). Dabartinėje latvių kalboje nuolatos vartojami 27 veikėjų pavadinimų, pasidarytų su priesagomis, darybos tipai ir 3 galūnių vedinių darybos tipai (Dabartinės latvių kalbos gramatikoje (MLLVG) aprašytos 9 priesagos ir 3 galūnės, duodančios veikėjų pavadinimų), o veiksmo pavadinimų kategoriją sudaro 37 priesagų ir 4 galūnių vediniai. Dabartinėje kalboje vartojami 22 priesaginiai veiksmo pavadinimų darybos tipai (MLLVG aprašytos 6 priesagos).

2. Latvių kalbos galūnių vediniai, turintys veikėjo pavadinimo reikšmę, yra linkę užleisti vietą produktyviausių priesaginių darybos tipų vediniams, tuo tarpu veiksmo pavadinimų darybos kategorijoje matyti priešinga tendencija – net produktyvių priesaginių darybos tipų vediniai neretai keičiami galūnių vediniais.

3. Palyginti su lietuvių kalba, latvių kalboje daug aktyviau naudojamosi žodžių dūrybos teikiamomis galimybėmis.

Darbo aprobavimas.

Straipsniai disertacijos tema

1. Navickaitė-Klišauskienė Agnė 2009, Latvių kalbos žodžių darybos tyrimų istorija, *Baltistica* 44(1), 107-123.

2. Navickaitė-Klišauskienė Agnė (šiuo metu spausdinama), Word-formation in Latvian language in Peter O. Müller, Ingeborg Ohnheiser, Susan Olsen, Franz Rainer (eds.) *An International Handbook of the Languages of Europe*, Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

3. Navickaitė-Klišauskienė Agnė 2013, Latvių kalbos veikėjų pavadinimai, *Baltistica* 48 (2), 269–300.

Išvados.

1. Daugiau darybos tipų priklauso latvių kalbos veikėjų pavadinimų kategorijai – ją sudaro 65 priesagų vedinių ir 3 galūnių vedinių darybos tipai. *Nomina actionis* kategoriją sudaro kiek mažiau – 37 priesaginės ir 4 galūninės darybos tipai.

2. Pačius produktyviausius aptariamų darybos kategorijų tipus sudaro priesagų *-tājs* ir *-ējs* (veikėjų pavadinimai) bei *-šana* (veiksmo pavadinimai) darybos tipai. Priesagas *-tājs* ir *-ējs* sieja papildomosios distribucijos santykis – su priesaga *-tājs* veikėjų pavadinimų pasidaroma iš priesaginių veiksmožodžių, o su *-ējs* – iš daugumos pirminių veiksmožodžių. Priesagos *-šana* darybos tipą apskritai galima laikyti hiperproduktyviu, nes su šia priesaga veiksmo pavadinimų galima pasidaryti iš

kiekvieno latvių kalbos veiksmažodžio. Su minėtomis priesagomis nevengiama vedinių darytis tiek iš latviškos, tiek ir iš svetimės kilmės veiksmažodžių.

3. Tik pačių produktyviausių darybos tipų vediniai turi grynąją kategorinę darybos reikšmę (veikėjų pavadinimų priesagų *-tājs*, *-ējs*, kai kurie priesagos *-(i)nieks* vediniai; veiksmo pavadinimų priesagų *-šana*, *-iens*, *-oņa*, kai kurie priesagos *-ība* vediniai). Ne tokių produktyvių veikėjų pavadinimų tipų vediniai paprastai įvardija ne „tikruosius“ veikėjus, o veiksmažodinės ypatybės turėtojus. Nemaža dalis veiksmo pavadinimų darybos kategorijai priklausančių vedinių (net ir produktyviausių darybos tipų) yra linę konkretėti, įgyti kitoms darybos kategorijoms būdingų reikšmių – dažniausiai reikšmė artėja prie veiksmo rezultato pavadinimų reikšmės.

4. Tiek veikėjų, tiek veiksmo pavadinimus pamatuoja veiksmažodžiai. Veikėjų ir veiksmo pavadinimų daryboje pamatinis kamienas nuosekliausiai pasirenkamas darantis produktyviausių darybos tipų vedinius: veikėjų pavadinimų darybos priesaga *-tājs* dedama prie priesaginių bendračių kamieno, o priesaga *-ējs* – prie pirminių veiksmažodžių būtojo laiko kamieno. Produktyviausio veiksmų pavadinimų darybos tipo (*-šana*) vediniai remiasi bendraties kamienu, o *-iens* ir *-ums* vedinius pamatuoja būtojo laiko kamienas. Kituose abiejų darybos kategorijų darybos tipuose didelės vienybės nėra, pamatinio kamieno pasirinkimas dažnai įvairuoja. Rečiausiai pamatiniu kamienu pasirenkamas esamojo laiko kamienas – nėra nei vieno darybos tipo, kuriam priklausančios vediniai ištiesai remtųsi tik veiksmažodžių esamojo laiko kamienu.

5. Tik priesagų *-tājs* ir *-šana* vediniai remiasi nesutrumpintu veiksmažodžių bendraties kamienu. Pamatinio būtojo laiko kamieno priesaginė forma nuosekliai išlaikoma ir veiksmų pavadinimuose, pasidarytuose su priesaga *-ums*. Kitais pamatavimo bendratimi atvejais latvių kalboje pastebima tendencija priesagų ir galūnių vedinių pasidaryti iš dezintegruoto (sutrumpinto) bendraties kamieno.

6. Latvių kalboje veikėjų ir veiksmo pavadinimai gali būti sudaromi ir su tomis pačiomis priesagomis, pavyzdžiui, priesagų *-onis*, *-oņa*, *-ulis* darybos tipai būdingi abiem nagrinėjamos darybos kategorijoms, plg. *čikstoņa* ‘zirzlys’ ir *čikstoņa* ‘girgždesys, čirpesys’ ir kt. Su priesagomis *-tājs* ir *-ējs* pasidaroma ne tik veikėjų, bet ir įrankių pavadinimų (tiesa, ne tradicinių įrankių, o modernių mašinų ar prietaisų).

7. Latvių kalbos galūnės nevienodai aktyviai vartojamos darantis veikėjų ir veiksmo pavadinimus. Su tomis pačiomis galūnėmis (*-is*, *-e*, *-a*) pasidaroma abiejų

darybos kategorijų vedinių, tačiau akivaizdžiai matyti, kad veiksmo pavadinimų darybos kategorijoje galūninė daryba yra aktyvesnė. Su galūnėmis išvesti veikėjų pavadinimai paprastai nėra semantiškai neutralūs, jiems būdingas emocinis vertinimas, menkinamoji reikšmė, vedinius linkstama keisti produktyviems priesaginių vedinių darybos tipams priklausančiais dariniais. Veiksmo pavadinimais, pasidarytais su galūnėmis, atvirkščiai, linkstama keisti net patiems produktyviausiems darybos tipams priklausančius priesagų vedinius.

Agnė Navickaitė-Klišauskienė (g. 1981 m.) 1999–2003 m. studijavo lietuvių filologiją ir užsienio (latvių) kalbą ir įgijo bakalauro kvalifikacinį laipsnį. 2003 m. įstojo į Vilniaus universiteto lietuvių kalbotyros magistrantūrą, kurią baigė 2005 m. 2006–2010 m. ir 2013 m. studijavo Vilniaus universiteto filologijos mokslo krypties baltų kalbų šakos doktorantūroje. Doktorantė buvo išvykusi dalinių studijų į Liepojos pedagogijos akademiją (2000.09–2001.09) ir Latvijos universitetą (2008.02–2008-06). Disertantė Vilniaus universitete dirba nuo 2004 m. (dėstomieji dalykai – Latvių kalba, Latvistikos pagrindai), dalyvauja Baltistikos katedros ir Skaitmeninės filologijos centro projektuose.

Agnė Navickaitė-Klišauskienė (born in 1981) studied Lithuanian philology and foreign language (Latvian) at Vilnius University from 1999 to 2003 (bachelor's degree). In 2003 she was accepted to Vilnius University Lithuanian linguistics master's program and graduated in 2005. From 2006 to 2010 and in 2013 she was a PhD student in the Department of Baltic Philology at Vilnius University. The student participated in partial studies in Liepāja University (from 2000 09 to 2001 09) and Latvian University (from 2008 02 to 2008 06). The student has been working in Vilnius University since 2004 (Latvian language, Introduction to Latvian studies), she participates in the projects of Department of Baltic Philology and Digital Philology Centre.