

THE VERB *VAJADZĒT* ‘TO NEED, MUST’ IN LATVIAN: ITS LIVONIAN ORIGINS, MODAL AND DISTRIBUTIONAL FEATURES

Andra Kalnača, Ilze Lokmane

University of Latvia, LV

andra.kalnaca@lu.lv, ilze.lokmane@lu.lv

Abstract. The focus of this study is on the Latvian modal verb *vajadzēt* ‘to need, must’ derived from the noun *vajaga* ‘need, necessity’ believed to be a borrowing from Livonian *vajag*, *vajāg* ‘need, necessary’. The objective of this study is to provide a full, comprehensive description of the grammatical forms and distribution of the verb *vajadzēt*, and an analysis of its modal and evidential semantics. This is essential, first and foremost, for contrastive language studies (*vis-à-vis* Livonian and Estonian counterparts of the verb *vajadzēt*) and will help to lay the necessary foundation for further research on modal verbs and their associated syntactic constructions in Latvian (Baltic) and Finnic language contacts.

The verb *vajadzēt* is part of a larger system of Latvian impersonal modal verbs taking a dative experiencer/agent/possessor; it is also, by virtue of its semantics and functions, one of the primary lexical means for expressing deontic modality in contemporary Latvian.

This study takes a closer look at the distribution, semantics of the verb and its syntactic constructions, which are clearly related to the expression of deontic, sometimes also epistemic, and evidential meanings. In addition, the study provides an overview of the grammatical forms of the verb *vajadzēt* and its parallel uses with the debitive mood.

Keywords: modal verb, deontic modality, epistemic modality, evidentiality, paradigm, distribution, Latvian, Livonian

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.12697/jeful.2022.13.1.04>

1. Introduction

It has long been a tradition in Latvian linguistics to limit the analysis of modality to the domain of verbal moods. As a result, other linguistic means of expressing modal meanings, such as modal verbs, have been

relatively little studied – mainly, in the context of semantic verb classes and, to an extent, the debitive mood (e.g., Ahero et al. 1959, Paegle 2003, Kalnača & Lokmane 2021). Latvian has a rich system of verbal moods; it is probably for this reason that the functions of modal verbs are not as grammaticalised as, for example, in English or German. At the same time, modal verbs (both personal and impersonal) in Latvian are quite numerous and varied, e.g., personal *drīkstēt* ‘to be allowed, may’, *ļaut* ‘to let’, *gribēt* ‘to wish, to want’, *varēt* ‘to be able, can’, *spēt* ‘to be able’, *mēgt* ‘to sometimes/habitually happen’, *vēlēties* ‘to wish’, impersonal *vajadzēt* ‘to need, must’, *nākties* ‘to be obliged to, to have to (due to some circumstances)’, *laimēties* ‘to be lucky’, *izdoties* ‘to manage, to succeed’, *gadīties* ‘to happen’, *šķīst* ‘to seem’, *derēt* ‘to be advisable/ desirable from the point of view of usefulness’ (also see Holvoet 2007: 43–48 on modality in Latvian and Lithuanian), and have a distinct role in the semantic and syntactic structure of the sentence (usually discussed under simple sentence structure and predicate typology) apart from grammatical modality expressed by verbal moods (see, e.g., Kārklīšs 1976, Freimane 1985, and Kalnača & Lokmane 2021: 406–410). The semantic and morphosyntactic aspects of Latvian modal verbs have been discussed, e.g., in Holvoet (2001, 2007), Ivulāne (2012, 2015), and Ivulāne & Kalnača (2013).

This study focuses specifically on the modal verb *vajadzēt* ‘to need, must’, which, although etymologically a foreign word, in terms of semantics and functions is one of the most important lexical means of expressing deontic (less frequently, epistemic) modality in contemporary Latvian. Most descriptions of Latvian grammar limit their discussion of the verb *vajadzēt* to the construction *vajadzēt* + *infinitive*, i.e., as a secondary means of expressing necessity (see, e.g., Ahero et al. 1959: 623, Mathiassen 1997: 131, Daugavet 2017). The broader syntactic usage of *vajadzēt* thus remains virtually unstudied despite close links with modal semantics. To date, the only more or less detailed analysis of the distribution of the verb *vajadzēt* has been provided in Kalnača, Lokmane (2012a) and Kalnača (2013a). Some syntactic constructions of the verb *vajadzēt* have also been discussed as part of Estonian language contact studies (e.g., Lindström, Uiboed & Vihman 2014, Lindström & Uiboed 2017).

The objective of the current study is to fill this gap, by providing a full, comprehensive description of the grammatical forms and

distribution of the verb *vajadzēt*, and an analysis of its modal and evidential semantics. This will enable a more nuanced and precise contrastive analysis of the verb *vajadzēt* and its Livonian and Estonian counterparts, helping to lay the overall foundation necessary for further research on modal verbs and their associated syntactic constructions in Latvian (Baltic) and Finnic language contacts.

The article consists of six sections: 1) introduction, 2) origins of the verb *vajadzēt*, 3) grammatical forms of the verb *vajadzēt* and their use in context, 4) syntactic constructions and their associated modal/evidential meanings, 5) parallelism between the verb *vajadzēt* and the debitive mood in Latvian, 6) conclusions.

The study relies on the following basic notions:

- 1) deontic modality expresses obligation or permission emanating from an external source, typically and frequently the authority is the actual speaker, who gives permission to, or lays an obligation on, the addressee (Palmer 2001: 9–10, also see Auwera and Plungian 1998: 81, Brantjes 2007);
- 2) epistemic modality indicates the speaker’s evaluation of the contents of a proposition (judgement, assertion) from the point of view of likelihood, probability, certainty (e.g., Palmer 2001: 8–9, Portner 2018: 10);
- 3) evidentiality is “a linguistic category whose primary meaning is source of information” (Aikhenvald 2004: 3, also see Portner 2018: 247). As pointed out by Diewald & Smirnova (2010: 1), “The basic characteristic of linguistic evidentiality is the explicit encoding of a source of information or knowledge (i.e., evidence) which the speaker claims to have made use of for producing the primary proposition of the utterance.”;
- 4) modal verbs are verbs whose uses are typically deontic or epistemic or whose lexical meaning is modal (e.g., Matthews 1997: 228); for the purposes of this study, modal verbs are verbs entering into the construction **modal verb**_{FIN} + **verb**_{INF}, and also verbs with modal semantics functioning as predicates;
- 5) aspectual verbs are a lexical class of verbs expressing meanings related to the phases of an event (e.g., onset, duration, cessation/completion), state, etc. (e.g., Matthews 1997: 13).

The bulk of examples come from two corpora – “The balanced corpus of modern Latvian LVK2018” (*Līdzsvarotais mūsdienu latviešu valodas tekstu korpuss LVK2018*) (abbreviated as LVK2018) and “The corpus of early written Latvian SENIE” (*Latviešu valodas seno tekstu korpuss SENIE*) (abbreviated as SENIE), with some additional examples from literary prose, news articles, and business texts. The study does not involve the use of statistical methods.

2. The origin of the verb *vajadzēt* in Latvian

The verb *vajadzēt* is a derivative of the noun *vajaga* ‘need, necessity’, which is believed to be a borrowing from the Livonian word *vajag*, *vajāg* ‘need, necessary’ (e.g., Mülenbachs & Endzelīns 1932: 445, also see Karulis 1992: 472, Beitiņa 1997, and Holvoet 2007: 47). The precise period of time when the borrowing took place is unknown, but the word *vajaga* is attested in 16th century texts.

According to Viitso & Ernštreits (2012: 351), the Livonian word *vajāg* is an adverb (also see Pajusalu 2014: 130 on Salaca Livonian *vajag*), which they view as an equivalent of Latvian *vajag*, giving the examples shown below in (1)–(2):

- (1) *Mi'nnõn u'm vajāg tõ'rmidi.*
 I.DAT be.AUX.PRS need.ADV acorn.PRT.PL
 Latvian: ‘Man **vajag** zīles/ zīli.’
 ‘I need some acorns / an acorn.’
- (2) *Sīe vò'ļ vajāg kō'uriz tutkāmōks.*
 it.GEN.SG have.AUX.PST need.ADV curved.GEN.SG tip.INS.SG
 Latvian: ‘Tas bija **vajadzīgs** ar līku galu.’
 ‘It had to have a curved tip.’

Unlike Livonian *vajāg*, the word *vajag* in Latvian does not function as an adverb and, consequently, does not occur in adverbial predicates. Both, however, require a dative experiencer (cf. constructions with adessive (also, allative) and *on vaja* ‘need’ in Estonian, e.g., Erelt & Metslang 2006: 264, Lindström & Trigel 2010: 375). In fact, as Mülenbachs & Endzelīns (1932: 445) and Karulis (1992: 472) point out, *vajaga* was used as a noun in the 16th century – as shown in (3a)

(from 1585) – and 17th century – as shown in (3b) (from 1631) (also see Holvoet’s (2007: 47) remarks on this):

- (3) a. /.../ *lote tas wayage gir /*
 very it.NOM.SG **necessary.NOM.SG** be.COP.PRS.3
ka them nemacigems Loudems /.../
 that this.DAT.PL uneducated.DAT.PL people.DAT.PL

Contemporary Latvian:

‘/.../ ļoti tas **vajadzīgs** ir / ka tiem nemācītiem ļaudīm /.../’

‘/.../ it is very necessary / that these uneducated people /.../’ (SENIE)

- b. /.../ *kas teem pee Meešas in*
 what.NOM this.DAT.PL for body.GEN.SG and
Dwehšeles dšihwojoht wajaga buhs/
 soul.GEN.SG live.PTCP.IND **need.NOM.SG** be.FUT.3
to lai Deews wiņņeem ar šawu baggatu Rohku peemett /.../

Contemporary Latvian:

‘/.../ kas tiem pie miesas un dvēseles dzīvojojot **vajadzīgs** būs / to lai Dievs viņiem ar savu bagātu roku piemet /.../’

‘/.../ whatever they need for their body and soul / let God give them with his bounteous hand /.../’ (SENIE)

Vajag as a verb with a dative experiencer is attested as early as the 17th century, as in (4):

- (4) /.../ *tad šackaita: Tam Kungam wayaga*
 then say.IMP.2PL that.DAT.SG Lord.DAT.SG **need.PRS.3**
thäß /.../
 these.ACC.PL

Contemporary Latvian:

‘/.../ tad sakiet: tam Kungam vajag tās /.../’

‘/.../ then say: the Lord needs them /.../’ (SENIE)

Thus, *vajaga* was the base from which the verb *vajadzēt*, as well as the noun *vajadzība* ‘need, necessity’ (5) and the adjective *vajadzīgs* ‘needed, necessary, required’ (6) were derived. Various grammatical forms of the verb *vajadzēt* can be attested as early as the 17th century – there are instances of past indefinite (7), conditional (8), oblique (9), and past active participle (10) forms.

- (5) *Peejemeetees tho Swāhto WayadŠibu.*
 contribute.IMP.2PL that.GEN.PL saint.GEN.PL **need.ACC.SG**
 Contemporary Latvian:
 ‘Pieņemieties to svēto **vajadzību.**’
 ‘Contribute to the needs of the saints.’ (SENIE)
- (6) */.../ pellniet ar Rokahms ko labb /*
ka tas warr doht tam WayadŠigam.
 that that.NOM.SG may.PRS.3 give.INF that.DAT.SG **need.DAT.SG**
 Contemporary Latvian:
 ‘/.../ pelniet ar rokām ko labu / ka tas var dot tam **vajadzīgam.**’
 ‘/.../ do honest work with your own hands / so that you may have some-
 thing to share with anyone in need.’ (SENIE)
- (7) */.../ Kad tee Bašnizaskungi eekšchan to Bašnizu ghribbeyušchi sattaišsiet /*
kas vs Šwāhtkeems wayadŠeya /.../
 what.NOM for celebration.DAT.PL **need.PST.3**
 Contemporary Latvian:
 ‘*Kad tie baznīckungi iekš to Baznīcu gribējuši sataisīt / kas uz svētkiem*
vajadzēja /.../’
 ‘When the priests wanted to get the Church ready / as was necessary for
 the celebration /.../’ (SENIE)
- (8) *Kad tu to šinnatu / tad buhtu tu šchinny tawa` laika` arridšan*
apdohmayušši /
kas py tawu Meeru wayadŠātu.
 what.NOM PREP your.ACC.SG peace.ACC.SG **need.COND**
 Contemporary Latvian:
 ‘Kad tu to zinātu, tad būtu tu šinī tavā laikā arīdzan apdomājuši / kas pie
 tavu mieru **vajadzētu.**’
 ‘If you had known, at least on this day, what would be needed to bring
 you peace.’ (SENIE)

- (9) *Titus / ka Egešippus raxta / gir adbilldeyis / kad winjo Bašniza vnd
Deewa=kallpošchana pohšt gir /
tad irr to Bašnizaskungo nhe wayagoht.
then PTCL that.GEN.PL priest.GEN.PL no need.OBL.PRS*
Contemporary Latvian:
‘Titus / kā Egezipus raksta / ir atbildējis / kad viņu baznīca un dieva
kalpošana posts ir / tad ir to baznīckungu **nevajagot.**’
‘Titus / according to Hegesippus / answered / that if their church and
service did harm / there was no need for the priests.’ (SENIE)
- (10) [bez] *Kurrpehm / giragg jums kas
sandal.DAT.PL be.PRS.3 you.DAT.PL anything.NOM
wayadšeyis?
need.PTCP.PRS.SG*
Contemporary Latvian:
‘[bez] Kurpēm / ir jums kas **vajadzējis?**’
‘[Without] sandals / were you in need of anything?’ (SENIE)

As seen in (3), (7), (8), and (10), the distribution of *vajag* in the 16th and 17th century was different from contemporary usage in that in the past *vajadzēt* as a finite verb could take a nominative object, whereas in contemporary Latvian, the genitive or accusative are far more common (e.g., Nītiņa & Grigorjevs 2013: 349). This will be addressed in greater detail in Section 4.

From its early days as a noun the verb *vajadzēt* has inherited a defective paradigm: the only person form it has is the 3rd person form *vajag* (it should be stressed that in Latvian the finite 3rd person form is not inflected for number, see, e.g., Kalnača 2014: 84), all other person forms being impossible even in theory. In this respect, the verb *vajadzēt* differs from many other impersonal verbs, which can be and sometimes actually are used in their 1st and 2nd person forms, e.g., for artistic purposes in fiction (see, e.g., Kalnača 2013b: 529).

Despite its foreign – i.e., Finno-Ugric – origin, the verb *vajadzēt* has managed to both semantically and functionally integrate into the Latvian system of impersonal modal verbs alongside such verbs as *laimēties* ‘to be lucky’, *gadīties* ‘to happen’, *nākties* ‘to be obliged to, to have to (due to some circumstances)’, which, just like *vajadzēt*, are used only in the 3rd person and take a dative agent or experiencer, cf. (11) and (12):

- (11) a. /.../ viņiem varbūt **nāksies** īpašumu pārdot/.../
 they.DAT probably **have.FUT.3** property.ACC.SG sell.INF
 ‘/.../ they may have to sell the property /.../’ (LVK2018)
- b. Mums **laimējas** sastapt
 we.DAT **be_lucky.PST.3** meet.INF
 vēl arī Sidaru ģimeni,
 PTCL also Sidars.GEN.PL family.ACC.SG
kura trīsstāvu namiņā kādu laiku dzīvo kopā ar Hermanoviču ģimeni /.../
 ‘We are lucky to meet the Sidars family, who are living in the little three-storey house together with the Hermanovičs family for a while /.../’ (LVK2018)
- c. Šo rindu autoram [kritiķim]
 these.GEN line.GEN.PL author.DAT.SG [critic]
gadījās noskatīties,
happen.PST.3 see.INF
 šķiet, otro vai trešo
 maybe second.ACC.SG or third.ACC.SG
 [teātra] izrādi /.../
 [theatre] performance.ACC.SG
 ‘The author of these lines [a critic] happened to see the performance on the second or, maybe, the third night /.../’ (LVK2018)
- (12) a. *Kādēļ* mums **vajag** uzlabot
 why we.DAT **need.PRS.3** improve.INF
 valsts uzņēmumu pārvaldi?
 government_owned.GEN.SG company.GE.PL management.ACC.SG
 ‘Why do we need to improve the management of government-owned companies?’ (LVK2018)
- b. /.../ man **vajadzēja** pierādīt savu patiesību.
 I.DAT **need.PST.3** prove.INF own.ACC.SG right.ACC.SG
 ‘/.../ I needed to prove that I was right.’ (LVK2018)
- c. *Kad* tev manis **vajadzēs** – būšu klāt.
 when you.DAT.SG I.GEN **need.FUT.3** be.FUT.1SG there
 ‘When you need me, I’ll be there.’ (LVK2018)

The verb *vajadzēt* has, to an extent, adjusted to the Latvian system of verbal imperfective/ perfective and inchoative meanings. Alongside the imperfective verb *vajadzēt* there are perfective *ie-vajadzētie-s* and *sa-vajadzētie-s* derived by means of circumfixation (a combination of the prefix *ie-* or *sa-* with the reflexive element *-s*) and used to express sudden, unexpected occurrences (for a more detailed discussion of these aspectual meanings in Latvian see Kalnača 2013b: 514, Kalnača & Lokmane 2012b: 252, Kalnača & Lokmane 2021: 313–316), as in (13):

- (13) *vajadzēt* ‘to need’ – *ie-vajadzētie-s*, *sa-vajadzētie-s* ‘to suddenly start to need’

Overall, the role of circumfixation in expressing aspectuality is minor in Latvian. The aspectual opposition imperfective/ perfective is normally expressed by means of prefixation, e.g., *lasīt* ‘to read’ – *iz-lasīt* ‘to read from beginning to end’, *no-lasīt* ‘to read from (perf.)’, *pār-lasīt* ‘to read once again (perf.)’; *nest* ‘to carry’ – *aiz-nest* ‘to carry in the direction from/away (perf.)’, *at-nest* ‘to carry in the direction towards (perf.)’, *ie-nest* ‘to carry into (perf.)’; *smieties* ‘to laugh’ – *pa-smieties* ‘to laugh a little (perf.)’, *iz-smieties* ‘to laugh to satiation (perf.)’, *pār-smieties* ‘to laugh a lot (perf.)’; in addition to perfectivity, prefixes simultaneously also express spatial, quantitative, temporal, and other meanings (Kalnača & Lokmane 2021: 282, 307–313). However, neither purely prefixal derivatives, nor a reflexive **vajadzētie-s* exist for *vajadzēt*, the only perfective derivatives being circumfixal, as shown in (13).

The etymology of the modal verb *vajadzēt* in Latvian exemplifies a grammaticalisation process shared by several languages, whereby a noun expressing need/ necessity gives rise to a verb with a similar meaning (see, e.g., Kuteva et al. 2019, also see Seržant & Bjarnadóttir 2014 on verbalisation processes in Baltic and Slavic languages). In Latvian, the verb *vajadzēt* is the only modal verb that has originated in this way.

3. The system of grammatical forms of the verb *vajadzēt*

As was already noted in Section 2, the verb *vajadzēt* is used only in the 3rd person (the form is the same for singular and plural). It does, however, inflect between the indefinite and perfect tenses, as well as the indicative (12), conditional (14), and oblique moods (15) (see Table 1). The imperative and debitive moods are precluded by the lexical meaning of the verb. The verb *vajadzēt* is predominantly used in the active voice.

- (14) a. *Mums vajadzētu pētīt un kontrolēt*
 we.DAT **need.COND** study.INF and control.INF
augšnes eroziju.
 soil.GEN.SG erosion.ACC.SG
 ‘We should be studying and controlling soil erosion.’ (Ir)
- b. *Elektrifikācijas darbus būtu*
 electrification.GEN.SG work.ACC.PL **be.AUX.COND**
vajadzējis pabeigt jau martā.
need.PTCP.NOM.SG complete.INF already March.LOC.SG
 ‘Electrification should have been completed in March.’ (LVK2018)
- (15) a. *Nesen Marija paziņojusi,*
ka šovasar ģimenei noteikti
 that this_summer family.DAT.SG definitely
vajagot kaut kur aizlidot.
need.OBL.PRS somewhere fly.INF
 ‘Recently, Maria announced that this summer the family would definitely need (OBL) to fly somewhere.’ (LVK2018)
- b. *Komisijai vajadzēšot nedaudz vairāk laika,*
 committee.DAT.SG **need.OBL.FUT** little more time.GEN.SG
lai kvalitatīvi veiktu [direktora amata] pretendentu izvērtējumu [...]
 ‘The committee will need (OBL) a little more time to thoroughly evaluate the applicants [for the director’s post] /.../’ (LVK2018)

- c. *Deputāta kungs uzskata,*
ka uzņēmumus Latvijā
 that company.ACC.PL Latvia.LOC.SG
esot vajadzējis likvidēt
 be.AUX.OBL.PRS need.PTCP.NOM.SG liquidate.INF
un ka tas esot bijis pareizi.
 ‘The MP believes that these companies had to be (OBL) liquidated in
 Latvia and that it was the right thing to do.’ (LVK2018)

The mood and tense paradigm of *vajadzēt* can be represented as in Table 1.

Table 1. Grammatical forms of the verb *vajadzēt* in Latvian (Kalnača 2013b).

	indefinite tense form	perfect tense form
Indicative mood		
PRS	<i>vajag</i> ‘need/needs’	<i>ir vajadzējis</i> ‘have/has needed’
PST	<i>vajadzēja</i> ‘needed’	<i>bija vajadzējis</i> ‘had needed’
FUT	<i>vajadzēs</i> ‘will need’	<i>būs vajadzējis</i> ‘will have needed’
Conditional mood		
PRS	<i>vajadzētu</i> ‘would need’	<i>būtu vajadzējis</i> ‘would have needed’
Oblique mood		
PRS	<i>vajagot</i> ‘reportedly need/needs’	<i>esot vajadzējis</i> ‘reportedly have/has needed’
FUT	<i>vajadzēšot</i> ‘reportedly will need’	<i>būšot vajadzējis</i> ‘reportedly will have needed’

In perfect tense (and mood) forms, the past active participle *vajadzējis* ‘needed’ is always in masculine singular, as in (16). In contrast to other verbs, the participle *vajadzējis* is never used in feminine or plural.

- (16) a. *Katru gadu, gredzenojot gulbjus,*
ir vajadzējis palīdzēt
be.AUX.PRS.3 need.PTCP.NOM.SG.M help.INF
vairākiem putniem.
 several.DAT.PL bird.DAT.PL
 ‘Every year, when ringing swans, there were several birds that needed help.’ (Diena)
- b. *Vilcienam pirms līkuma esot*
 train.DAT.SG before curve.GEN.SG **be.AUX.OBL.PRS**
vajadzējis samazināt ātrumu /.../
need.PTCP.NOM.SG.M slow_down.INF speed.ACC.SG
 ‘The train had to (OBL) slow down when approaching the curve /.../’
 (www.apollo.lv)
- c. *Izoldei sen būtu vajadzējis*
 Isolde.DAT.SG years_ago **be.AUX.COND need.PTCP.NOM.SG.M**
pārcelties uz dzīvi pilsētā.
 move.INF to living.ACC.SG city.LOC.SG
 ‘Isolde should have moved to the city years ago.’ (LVK2018)

Therefore, the masculine form can be viewed as an unmarked element not involved in grammatical agreement. Predicate-internal feminine and plural forms occur when this is required for grammatical agreement with a nominative subject. The latter, however, is absent in constructions with *vajadzēt*.

Although the perfect future oblique form *būšot vajadzējis* is, in principle, possible, it is almost never used. Since necessity as such is often future-oriented, a perfect future oblique form of a modal verb would be, in all likelihood, semantically overloaded, expressing at least four grammatical meanings simultaneously – evidentiality, deontic modality, tense (future), and aspect (evaluation of the consequences of a completed action).

Conditional mood forms of *vajadzēt* could be seen as syncretically expressing deontic and epistemic (on account of the conditional mood) modality (see Kalnača 2013a), as in (17):

- (17) a. *Ko vajadzētu zināt par hibrīda*
 what.ACC **need.COND** know.INF about hybrid.GEN.SG
autobiļu akumulatoriem?
 car.GEN.PL battery.DAT.PL
 ‘What should one know about hybrid car batteries (COND)?’ (www.delfi.lv)
- b. *Vīnai [vecaimātei] tagad vajadzētu būt*
 she.DAT.SG [grandmother] now **must.COND** be.INF
apmēram simt gadus vecai /.../
 approximately hundred year.ACC.PL old.DAT.SG
 ‘She [the grandmother] must be approximately one hundred years old by now /.../’ (LVK2018)

Another possible and perhaps more accurate interpretation is that conditional mood forms of *vajadzēt* involve a weakening of the deontic modality expressed by the lexical meaning of the verb, as opposed to a combination of two modal meanings (also see Lokmane & Kalnača 2014 on similar cases involving the debitive mood).

In oblique (inferential, renarrative) usages of *vajadzēt*, the deontic meaning is accompanied by evidentiality, indicating that the information reported by the speaker comes from an external source. The main clause of such sentences usually contains a *verbum dicendi* or a cognition verb, as in (18):

- (18) a. *Uzņēmuma prezidents laikrakstam norādīja,*
ka Latvijai vajagot būt pēc
 that Latvia.DAT.SG **need.OBL.PRS** be.INF PREP
iespējas mazāk atkarīgai no
 possibility.GEN.SG little dependent.DAT.SG from
citas valsts piegādātās gāzes.
 another.GEN.SG state.GEN.SG imported.GEN.SG gas.GEN.SG
 ‘The CEO told our correspondent that Latvia needs to be (OBL) as little dependent on imported gas as possible.’ (Latvijas Avīze)

- b. *Pilsētas mērs uzskata, ka ir iespējams koncertzāli uzbūvēt līdz 2015. gadam –*

tas ir mērķis,
 this.NOM.SG be.PRS.3 goal.NOM.SG
uz ko vajagot tiekties.
 for what.ACC need.OBL.PRS strive.INF

‘The city mayor believes that the concert hall can be built by 2015, and that this is the goal one should (OBL) strive for.’ (www.liepa-jniekiem.lv)

- c. *Deputāte domā,*

ka skolās vairāk vajagot runāt
 that school.LOC.PL more need.OBL.PRS speak.INF
par ģimenes vērtībām.
 to family.GEN.SG value.DAT.PL

‘The MP believes that schools should (OBL) pay more attention to family values.’ (Latvijas Avīze)

Although, as pointed out by Palmer (2001) and Holvoet (2007), defining universal typological features of modal verbs is problematic, tending not to be used in the imperative mood and the passive voice is a feature shared by modals in many languages (also see Heine 1995, Torn-Leesik 2007, Kehayov & Torn-Leesik 2009). The verb *vajadzēt*, in this sense, is no exception.

There are, however, occasional uses of the verb *vajadzēt* in the passive indicative in contemporary Latvian, mostly in mass media, business texts, and sometimes also in texts stylistically close to colloquial speech (internet comments, tweets, etc.). More often than not these are passive present perfect tense forms consisting of the auxiliary verb *būt* ‘to be’ in a finite form and a declinable past passive participle, as in (19):

- (19) *Funkcijas būs jāizpilda citai iestādei,*

kuru tad ir vajadzēts
 which.ACC.SG than be.AUX.PRS.3 need.PTCP.PST.NOM.SG
izveidot likvidētās vietā.
 create.INF closed.GEN.SG place.LOC.SG

‘These functions will have to be taken over by another institution, which should (PASS) have been created to replace the one [that was] closed down.’ (Ir)

At present, there is no telling whether such occasional uses mean that the verb *vajadzēt* is actually developing a passive voice system. They do indicate, however, that language users sometimes feel the need for the passive forms of the verb *vajadzēt* even though there is no discernible difference in meaning (19), for instance, can be rephrased as follows: .. *iestādei, kuru tad vajadzētu / būtu vajadzējis izveidot ..*).

Incidentally, *vajadzēt* is not the only modal verb producing occasional passive voice forms in contemporary Latvian. Such forms are also possible, e.g., for the verbs *drīkstēt* ‘to be allowed to, to dare, can’, *varēt* ‘to be able, can’, and *gribēt* ‘to wish, to want’, as in (20):

- (20) a. */.../ pretī runāt nav drīkstēts.*
 back talk.INF not_be.AUX.PRS.3 allow.PTCP.PST.NOM.SG
 ‘/.../ one was not allowed (PASS) to talk back.’ (LVK2018)
- b. *Šajā laikā dzima doma būvēt jaunu [auto]ostu,*
bet nav varēts dabūt
 but not_be.AUX.PRS.3 be_able.PTCP.PST.NOM.SG get.INF
pilsētā nolūkoto zemi.
 city.LOC.SG desired.ACC.SG plot.ACC.SG
 ‘Back then, there was an incentive to build a new [bus] terminal, but we were unable to (PASS) get the desired plot in the city.’ (LVK2018)
- c. *Šoreiz ir gribēts*
 this_time be.AUX.PRS.3 wish.PTCP.PST.NOM.SG
[skaisti uzklāt vakariņu galdu] un izdarīts.
 [to set the table beautifully for supper] and do.PTCP.PST.NOM.SG
 ‘This time, the wish (PASS) [to set the table beautifully for supper] was followed by action.’ (LVK2018)

The use of modal verbs in the passive voice is probably due to the need to either avoid naming, obscure, or generalise the doer, since active-voice compound tense forms require a participle marked for gender and number (corresponding to the doer). The existence or non-existence of passive-voice forms of modal verbs in Latvian is a question worth further consideration – is there a new tendency that can change our views on modal verb passivisation, or are these more or less isolated, non-systemic cases.

4. The distribution and modal semantics of *vajadzēt*

The verb *vajadzēt* typically occurs in two types of predicates – simple and complex. Its syntactic distribution can be summarised as follows:

1. simple predicate

1) **experiencer**_{DAT}/**possessor**_{DAT} + *vajadzēt*_{FIN} + **patient**_{ACC/GEN}, as in (21):

- (21) a. *Bērnam vajag gan tēti, gan mammu.*
 child.DAT.SG **need.PRS.3** PTCL dad.ACC.SG PTCL mom.ACC.SG
 ‘A child needs both a dad and a mom.’ (LVK2018)
- b. *Vilnis stingri stāv uz kājām.*
Ne viņam vajag palīga, ne atbalsta.
 not he.DAT.SG **need.PRS.3** help.GEN.SG not support.GEN.SG
 ‘Vilnis keeps both feet firmly on the ground. He needs neither help, nor support.’ (G. Priede)

In all dialects – Livonic (both Courland Livonic and Vidzeme Livonic subdialects), Central (the Curonic subdialects and some Semigallic subdialects), and even High Latvian (Selonic subdialects) – a nominative patient is also possible (Stafecka 2022, for Selonic subdialects see also Poiša 1991: 107, for Curonic subdialects see Ozola, Markus-Narvila 2021: 359–363), as in (22) from Irlava, Semigallic subdialect (Stafecka op. cit.):

- (22) *maņ vajag naūda*
 I.DAT **need.PRS.3** money.NOM.SG
 ‘I need money’

This is consistent with the distribution of the verb *vajadzēt* attested in texts from the 16th and 17th centuries (see (3), (7), (8), (10) in Section 2). At the same time, genitive and accusative objects occur with *vajadzēt* in most dialects and in Standard Latvian, the accusative being more common in contemporary Latvian, compare (21a) and (21b) (on the genitive and accusative with *vajadzēt* see Mülenbachs & Endzelīns 1932: 445, Endzelīns 1951: 579, Blinkena 1977).

2) experiencer_{DAT} + vajadzēt_{FIN} + adverb, as in (23):

- (23) a. *Man vajag vairāk...*
 I.DAT need.PRS.3 more
 'I need more ...' (www.tvnet.lv)
- b. *Tā tev vajag!*
 so you.DAT.SG need.PRS.3
 'It serves you right! / That's what you deserve!' (LVK2018)

3) experiencer_{DAT}/possessor_{DAT} + vajadzēt_{FIN} + subordinate clause, as in (24):

- (24) a. *Man vajag, lai strādājos*
 I.DAT need.PRS.3 CONJ work.PTCP.IND
var nopelnīt normālu algu.
 be_able.PRS.3 earn.INF honest.ACC.SG living.ACC.SG
 'I need to be able to earn an honest living with my work.' (Kas Jauns)
- b. *Vajag ik rītu brokastot,*
 need.PRS.3 PTCL morning.ACC.SG have_breakfast.INF
vajag, lai prāts pamostas.
 need.PRS.3 CONJ mind.NOM.SG wake_up.PRS.3
 'It's necessary to have breakfast each morning, one's mind needs to wake up.' (Ieva)

2. complex predicate

agent_{DAT}/experiencer_{DAT} + vajadzēt_{FIN} + verb_{INF} + patient_{ACC/GEN}, as in (25):

- (25) a. *Bet lielajiem vienmēr vajag*
 but grown-up.DAT.PL always need.PRS.3
visu samaitāt.
 everything.ACC.SG spoil.INF
 'But grown-ups always have to spoil everything.' (LVK2018)
- b. *Kamēr studēju,*
 while study.PST.1SG
vajadzēja kaut kur piepelnīties.
 need.PST.3 somewhere earn.INF
 '[I] needed somewhere to work to support myself through my studies.'
 (Latvijas Avīze)

In dialectal usage, a nominative object also occurs in the construction **vajadzēt**_{FIN} + **verb**_{INF} + **patient** when the infinitive is expressed by a transitive verb, as opposed to the accusative or genitive in Standard Latvian (Stafecka 2022, for the High Latvian dialect Selonik subdialects see Poiša 1999: 107, for Curonic subdialects see Ozola, Markus-Narvila 2021: 359–363), as in (26) from Nereta, Selonik subdialect (Stafecka op. cit.):

- (26) *nedēļa* *vaidzēja* *iztik*
 week.NOM.SG **need.PAT.3** manage_without.INF
 Standard Latvian:
 ‘nedēļi (ACC) vajadzēja iztik’
 ‘had to manage without for a week’

Endzelīns (1951: 553–554) attributes this usage to the syntactic distinctness of the infinitive as a former declinable verbal nominal, i.e., in the past, the object of an action expressed by the infinitive could stand as a nominative grammatical subject of a sentence, provided that the infinitive was dependent on a word or phrase expressing a need or desire, e.g., by means of the verbs *vajadzēt*, *gribēt* ‘to want’ (Endzelīns op. cit.). Notably, Endzelīns points to parallels in Lithuanian (see also Holvoet 2001: 15–16, 42, Ambrazas 2006: 327–328) and Slavic languages but does not mention the possible Finno-Ugric influence (likewise, Holvoet, Ambrazas op. cit., for a different opinion see, e.g., Timberlake 1974).

The occurrence of a nominative object in some syntactic constructions, such as **experiencer**_{DAT}/**possessor**_{DAT} + **vajadzēt**_{FIN} + **patient**_{ACC/GEN/NOM} and **agent**_{DAT}/**experiencer**_{DAT} + **vajadzēt**_{FIN} + **verb**_{INF} + **patient**_{ACC/GEN/NOM} raises further questions regarding the actual relationship between object cases in Latvian (the nominative, accusative, and genitive) and their historic development. Notably, Endzelīns (1951: 553–554) even provides examples of nominative objects in constructions with the verbs *ēst* ‘to eat’ and *dot* ‘to give’, as well as with adverbs expressing modal meanings, pointing to direct parallels in Lithuanian. Furthermore, in Latvian, nominative objects are also found in, e.g., the debitive (e.g., Nītiņa & Grigorjevs 2013: 345, 487, 762, also see Lokmane & Kalnača 2014).

Another important aspect is the relationship between object cases and the gender and animacy categories of nouns. In this respect, Blake (1997: 41–43), for example, points out the syncretism of the nominative and accusative case in the function of a direct object for neuter nouns (originally, the grammatical gender of inanimate things), which is common in Indo-European; the relationship between animacy and object cases is discussed, in a similar vein, in Lyons (1968: 293–294). This may well apply to Latvian and Lithuanian: both languages had neuter gender in the past (e.g., Endzelīns 1951: 395) and it could have brought forth the nominative–accusative object syncretism.

Interestingly, regarding its historical origins, the nominative object in the construction *nominative + infinitive* in Latvian, Lithuanian, and the Slavic languages, has been construed in two contrary ways – firstly, as an old relic from Indo-European, since it also occurs in languages having no historical contacts with Finno-Ugric (e.g., Kiparsky 1969, stating that the continuing existence of nominative objects, e.g., in the Baltic languages, is due to contacts with Finno-Ugric), secondly, as a syntactic borrowing from Finnic into Latvian, Lithuanian, and North Russian (e.g., Timberlake 1974). A typological analysis of the origins of the second construction with *vajadzēt* involving a nominative object, i.e., **modal verb + patient**_{NOM}, might also turn out to be helpful in resolving some of the inconsistencies.

From the point of view of distribution, it is noteworthy that *vajadzēt* is one of the few impersonal modal verbs in Latvian that can be used in both types of constructions, i.e., **experiencer**_{DAT}/**possessor**_{DAT} + **vajadzēt**_{FIN} + **patient**_{ACC/GEN/NOM} and **agent**_{DAT}/**experiencer**_{DAT} + **vajadzēt**_{FIN} + **verb**_{INF} + **patient**_{ACC/GEN/NOM}. The impersonal modal verb *gribēties* ‘to want, to wish’ is another example, cf. (21), (25), and (27):

- (27) a. *Vakarā pirms gulētiešanas*
 evening.LOC.SG before sleeping.GEN.SG
bērnam gribas kādu pasaciņu /.../
 child.DAT.SG **want.PRS.3** some.ACC.SG story.ACC.SG
 ‘At night, before going to sleep a child wants a bedtime story /.../’
 (www.jumava.lv)

- b. *Jums taču arī gribas ēst?*
 you.DAT.PL PTCL PTCL **want.PRS.3** eat.INF
 ‘You are hungry, too, aren’t you?’ (LVK2018)

This flexibility could be due to the modal semantics of the verbs *vajadzēt* and *gribēties* or the fact that they are used only in the 3rd person and take a dative agent/ experiencer/ possessor.

In Latvian, a dative experiencer/ agent/ possessor can remain unexpressed with both types of predicates (simple and complex) if it is mentioned elsewhere in the context, as in (25b), or is generalised, as in (24b), (28b), and (28c). Although, more often than not, dative experiencers/ agents/ possessors are animate, in Latvian, as opposed to, e.g., Estonian where “modals have impersonal forms when they can be construed as referring to an implicit human actor” (Torn-Leesik 2007: 180), they can also be inanimate as exemplified by (15a), (16b), (18a), (30c), (31).

The distribution of *vajadzēt* affects the semantic roles of the dative element. When *vajadzēt* is followed by an infinitive, as in (25) and (26), the dative element is the agent of the infinitive and the experiencer of the necessity. When *vajadzēt* is followed by an accusative or a genitive noun (or a pronoun), as in (21), the dative element is a possessor and an experiencer. In constructions with *vajadzēt* and an adverb, the dative element is an experiencer, as in (23).

Constructions where *vajadzēt* combines with the infinitive can be varied by adding an additional modal (28a–b, 29a) or aspectual (28c, 29b) verb, forming a complex predicate:

1) *vajadzēt*_{FIN} + modal / aspectual verb_{INF} + verb_{INF}, as in (28):

- (28) a. *Cilvēkam vajadzēja prast savaldīties.*
 person.DAT.SG **need.PST.3** **know_how.INF** control.INF
 ‘One had to know how to control oneself.’ (A. Eglītis)
- b. *Atbilstoši aprakstam šajā vietā vajadzēja varēt nokļūt droši.*
 according description.DAT.SG this.LOC.SG place.LOC.SG
vajadzēja varēt nokļūt droši.
need.PST.3 be_able.INF get.INF safely
 ‘According to the description, it had to be possible to get there safely.’
 (LVK2018)
- c. *Vajag sākt darboties!*
need.PRS.3 start.INF act.INF
 ‘[You] need to start to act!’ (www.sirius-riga.lv)

2) modal / aspectual verb_{FIN} + *vajadzēt*_{INF} + verb_{INF}, as in (29):

- (29) a. *Katram, īpaši Twitter lietotājiem,*
 everyone.DAT.SG especially Twitter user.DAT.PL
ikdienā var vajadzēt saīsināt
 week-day.LOC.SG **may.PRS.3** **need.INF** shorten.INF
garo [elektroniskās adreses] saiti.
 long [URL] link
 ‘Everyone, especially Twitter users, may need to shorten a long URL
 now and then.’ (LVK2018)
- b. *Man to tagad sāk vajadzēt zināt.*
 I.DAT it.ACC now **begin.PRS.3** **need.INF** know.INF
 ‘I am now beginning to need to know it.’ (www.art-of-peace.info)

The primary modal meaning of the verb *vajadzēt* – regarding something as necessary, advisable, or required – is deontic. It follows from the lexical meaning of the verb and is not tied to any particular construction, as in (30).

- (30) a. *Vienmēr vajag cienīt otru cilvēku.*
 always **need.PRS.3** respect.INF other.ACC.SG person.ACC.SG
 ‘One must always respect the other person.’ (Ieva)
- b. *Ventspils policijas šefam jau sen vajadzēja aiziet no darba.*
 Ventspils.GEN.SG police.GEN.SG chief_officer.DAT.SG PTCL
 long_time_ago **need.PST.3** quit.INF from job.GEN.SG
 ‘The Ventspils police chief ought to have quit a long time ago.’ (Kas Jauns)
- c. *No 2020. gada 1. janvāra katrā mājoklī vajadzēs būt dūmu detektoram.*
 from 2020th year.GEN.SG 1st January.GEN.SG every.LOC.SG
 home.LOC.SG **need.PST.3** be.INF smoke.GEN.PL detector.DAT.PL
 ‘Starting on 1 January 2020, all homes will have to have a smoke detector.’ (www.ventasbalss.lv)

The verb *vajadzēt* can also express the meaning of something being seen as possible or likely, which is epistemic. Epistemic uses of *vajadzēt* often occur in constructions of the type *vajadzēt*_{FIN}+ *būt*_{INF}, where *būt*

‘to be’ is a stative verb and the dative is inanimate and refers to a thing, which is either located somewhere (31a), (31c) or has a certain property (31b) (Kalnača 2013b, also see Lokmane & Kalnača 2014 on epistemic uses of the debitive):

- (31) a. *Vīņš domājis,*
ka tanī vietā
 that that.LOC.SG place.LOC.SG
vajag būt apraktai naudai.
need.PRS.3 be.INF bury.DAT.SG money.DAT.SG
 ‘He believed that there had to be money buried at that place.’ (Latvian folk tales)
- b. *Tai kartei vajag būt pareizai.*
 this.DAT.SG map.DAT.SG **need.PRS.3 be.INF** accurate.DAT.SG
 ‘This map should be accurate.’ (LVK2018)
- c. *Nākot Latgales pusē no Daugavas, mežā uzdūros baravikai, likās,*
ja ir viena, vajag būt vēl.
 if be.PRS.3 one.NOM.SG **need.PRS.3 be.INF** more
 ‘On my way [home] from the Daugava through a forest somewhere in Latgale, I came across a penny bun. It occurred to me that if there was one, there had to be more.’ (www.copeslietas.lv)

Some sentences with the construction *vajadzēt*_{FIN} + *būt*_{INF} may be interpreted as expressing either deontic or epistemic modality, according to the context, as in (32):

- (32) *Māsai šovakar vajag būt mājās.*
 sister.DAT.SG tonight **need.PRS.3 be.INF** home
 ‘[My] sister needs to stay at home tonight.’ (deontic)
 ‘[My] sister must be home tonight.’ (epistemic)

This capacity for expressing two modal meanings is consistent with the functions of modal verbs in many, especially Germanic, languages where modal verbs in general are primarily based on deontic modality, which, in turn, often gives rise to derived epistemic uses (Nordström 2010: 162–163). Thus, many verbs can be used both deontically and epistemically, though epistemic meanings are often peripheral and less

widespread (Nordström, op. cit.). This is fully applicable to the uses of the verb *vajadzēt* in Latvian.

Abraham & Leiss (2008: xiii) point out that deontic and epistemic uses of modal verbs may correlate with aspect. For example, deontic modality tends to occur in modal verbs that combine with a perfective infinitive, while epistemic modality is often found in modals co-occurring with an imperfective verb. As far as the verb *vajadzēt* is concerned, this thesis holds true in the sense that epistemic modality typically appears in constructions with the infinitive of the imperfective verb *būt* ‘to be’, i.e., *vajadzēt*_{FIN} + *būt*_{INF}.

5. The parallelism of *vajadzēt* and the debitive mood

Unlike other modal verbs in Latvian, the verb *vajadzēt* exhibits semantic parallelism with the debitive mood, which occurs when the verb *vajadzēt* is used in the syntactic construction *vajadzēt*_{FIN} + **verb**_{INF} (active), cf. (33a) and (33b):

- (33) a. *Man vajag nopirkt maizi.*
 I.DAT need.PRS.3 buy.INF bread.ACC.SG
- b. *Man ir jānopērk maize.*
 I.DAT be.AUX.PRS.3 DEB.buy bread.NOM.SG
 ‘I need to / I have to buy some bread.’

Ahero et al. (1959: 623) and Paegle (2003: 119) (referring to Endzelīns (1971: 138–142)) point out that there may actually be a semantic difference. According to this view, the debitive mood expresses objective, external necessity (deontic modality proper), while the construction *vajadzēt*_{FIN} + **verb**_{INF} indicates subjective, internal necessity (a weaker version of deontic modality or even epistemicity). However, Ahero et al. (1959: 623) also mentions that, e.g., in the work of the writers of the 1950s this semantic distinction was no longer consistently maintained: the verb *vajadzēt* followed by a lexical verb in the infinitive was often used for objective necessity rather than utility. In sum, one has to conclude that nowadays the debitive and the construction *vajadzēt*_{FIN} + **verb**_{INF} function as morphological variants without a definable semantic difference. This conclusion is confirmed by Holvoet (2001: 32, 2007:

163–166, also see Kalnača 2013a: 489). There is, however, a stylistic difference – the construction *vajadzēt*_{FIN} + *verb*_{INF} is rather colloquial, while the debitive mood is used in all registers. Language style manuals, for instance, recommend using the debitive instead of the construction *vajadzēt*_{FIN} + *verb*_{INF} in business writing (Skujīņa 1999: 64).

One of the consequences of this semantic parallelism is that some descriptions of Latvian grammar have tended to view the verb *vajadzēt* only as a grammatical synonym of the debitive, neglecting its diverse syntactic environments (e.g., Ahero et al. 1959: 623, cf. also Daugavet 2017).

6. Conclusions

At this stage of research, it may be concluded that, despite its Livonian, i.e., Finno-Ugric origins, the verb *vajadzēt* has fully integrated into the Latvian system of impersonal modal verbs. The verb *vajadzēt* primarily expresses deontic modality. The deontic meaning of the verb *vajadzēt* is most typically expressed in the constructions **agent/experiencer**_{DAT} + *vajadzēt*_{FIN} + *verb*_{INF} + **patient**_{ACC/GEN/NOM} and **experiencer**_{DAT}/**possessor**_{DAT} + *vajadzēt*_{FIN} + **patient**_{ACC/GEN/NOM}, and it is one of the few impersonal modal verbs that can be used in both types of constructions. At the same time, the construction *vajadzēt*_{FIN} + *verb*_{INF}, if it contains the verb *būt* ‘to be’ (as a stative verb), can also be used epistemically.

In contemporary Latvian, the construction *vajadzēt*_{FIN} + *verb*_{INF} functions as a semantically equivalent alternative to the debitive mood. There is, however, a stylistic difference – while the debitive is used in all registers, the construction *vajadzēt*_{FIN} + *verb*_{INF} is largely relegated to colloquial and informal use. The verb *vajadzēt* is the only modal verb in Latvian that has developed a semantic parallelism with a verbal mood.

Further research is needed on combinations of the verb *vajadzēt* with other modals in order to determine the extent to which deontic modality is retained and whether two modal meanings (deonticity and epistemicity) can be realised syncretically in a complex predicate.

Combinations involving the verb *vajadzēt* and other modal verbs are also interesting from the point of view of modality–aspect relations, e.g.,

to what extent can the marking of an onset / duration / completion of an action affect the realisation of modal, especially deontic, meanings.

There is a relatively new tendency in Latvian to use the verb *vajadzēt* and other modal verbs in the passive voice. It is yet too early to say whether and how this process will evolve, and whether it will have any far-reaching consequences for the language system. In this respect, as in many others, data from other languages may turn out to be very helpful, i.e., to evaluate whether a similar phenomenon is seen in other languages and what its possible causes may be.

Likewise, further research is needed regarding object cases in constructions with the verb *vajadzēt* (in contemporary Standard Latvian – the accusative, less frequently, the genitive; in dialectal usage – also the nominative). Originally, as evidenced by Latvian texts from the 16th and 17th centuries, these constructions required a nominative object (and it still occurs in dialectal usage). Although there are typological parallels between constructions with a nominative object in Latvian and Lithuanian and constructions in Finnic, the question of their actual origin in the Baltic languages, incl. borrowing, still remains.

Data from Livonian and Estonian (e.g., comparing the functional similarities and differences between the cognate verbs in all three languages) could contribute to a fuller understanding of the distribution and modal meanings of the Latvian verb *vajadzēt*. It might also help establish whether *vajadzēt* in Latvian retains any syntactic and semantic features from its Finno-Ugric beginnings.

Abbreviations

1, 2, 3 – persons, ACC – accusative, ADV – adverb, AUX – auxiliary, COND – conditional, CONJ – conjunction, DAT – dative, DEB – debitive, F – feminine, FIN – finite, FUT – future, GEN – genitive, IMP – imperative, IND – indeclinable, INF – infinitive, INS – instrumental, LOC – locative, M – masculine, NOM – nominative, OBL – oblique, perf. – perfective verb, PL – plural, PREP – preposition, PRS – present, PRT – partitive, PST – past, PTCL – particle, PTCP – participle, SG – singular

Sources

- Eglītis, Anšlavs. 1960. *Ilze*. [s.l.]: Grāmatu Draugs.
- Ir* (weekly magazine)
- Kas Jauns* (weekly magazine)
- Latvijas Avīze* (daily magazine)
- Līdzsvarotais mūsdienu latviešu valodas tekstu korpuss LVK2018*. <http://www.korpuss.lv/id/LVK2018> (8 January, 2022).
- Priede, Gunārs. 2013. Lai arī rudens. In Ieva, Struka (ed.), *Gunāra Priedes dzīve un darbi. 1928–1958*, 456–501. Rīga: Jumava.
- Latviešu valodas seno tekstu korpuss SENIE*. <http://senie.korpuss.lv/toc.jsp> (20 December, 2021).
- Ancelāne, Alma (1991) *Latviešu tautas teikas: izcelšanās teikas. Izlase*. Rīga: Zinātne.
- www.apollo.lv (news portal)
- www.art-of-peace.info (special interest website)
- www.copeslietas.lv (special interest website)
- www.delfi.lv (news portal)
- www.jumava.lv (website of a publisher)
- www.liepajniekiem.lv (informative publication of a regional municipality)
- www.tvnet.lv (news portal)
- www.sirius-riga.lv (special interest website)
- www.ventasbalss.lv (news portal)

References

- Abraham, Werner & Elisabeth Leiss. 2008. Introduction. In Werner Abraham & Elisabeth Leiss (eds.), *Modality-Aspect Interfaces. Implications and typological solutions.*, xii–xxiv. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.79>.
- Ahero, Antonija et al. 1959. *Mūsdienu latviešu literārās valodas gramatika*. (I. Fonētika un morfoloģija). Rīga: LPSR Zinātņu akadēmijas izdevniecība.
- Ambrazas, Vytautas. 2006. *Lietuvių kalbos istorinė sintaksė*. Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.
- Auwers, Johan van der & Valdimir Plungian. 1998. Modality's semantic map. *Linguistic Typology* 2. 79–124. <https://doi.org/10.1515/lity.1998.2.1.79>.
- Beitiņa, Maigone. 1997. Kā no lībiešu nomena vajāg radās latviešu verbs vajadzēt. In *Vārds un tā pētīšanas aspekti. Zinātniskās konferences tēžu krājums*, 7–9. Liepāja: LiePA.
- Blinkena, Aina. 1977. Verba vajadzēt rekcija. *Latviešu valodas kultūras jautājumi* 13. 154–158.
- Brantjes, Janneke. 2007. Deontic modal constructions in Dutch with *zou kunnen* 'could, may'. *Interlingüística* 17. 192–199.

- Daugavet, Anna. 2017. A corpus-based study of the Latvian debitive vs. *vajadzēt*. *Baltic Linguistics* 8. 9–56. <https://doi.org/10.32798/bl.376>
- Diewald, Gabriele & Elena Smirnova. 2010. Introduction. Evidentiality in European languages: the lexical-grammatical distinction. In Gabriele Diewald & Elena Smirnova (eds.), *Linguistic Realization of Evidentiality in European Languages*, 1–25. Berlin/ New York: De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110223972>.
- Endzelīns, Jānis. 1951. *Latviešu valodas gramatika*. Rīga: Latvijas Valsts izdevniecība.
- Endzelīns, Jānis. 1971. Kā cēlies un lietojams latviešu valodas dēbitīvs? In *Darbu izlase*. I, 138–142. Rīga: Zinātne.
- Erelt, Mati & Helle Metslang. 2006. Estonian clause patterns – from Finno-Ugric to Standard Average European. *Linguistica Uralica* 42(4). 254–266. <https://doi.org/10.3176/lu.2006.4.02>.
- Freimane, Inta. 1985. *Vienkāršs teikums un tā paplašināšana*. Rīga: Latvijas Valsts universitāte.
- Heine, Bernd. 1995. Agent-oriented vs. epistemic modality. In Joan L. Bybee & Suzanne Fleischman (eds.), *Modality in Grammar and Discourse*, 17–54. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.32>.
- Holvoet, Axel. 2001. *Studies in the Latvian Verb*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo universitetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Holvoet, Axel. 2007. *Mood and Modality in Baltic*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo universitetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Ivulāne, Baiba. 2012. Palīgnozīmē lietoti darbības vārdi bērnu valodā. *Valoda: nozīme un forma* 2. 75–85. <https://doi.org/10.22364/vnf.2>.
- Ivulāne, Baiba. 2015. *Palīgnozīmē lietotu darbības vārdu sistēma latviešu valodā*. PhD Thesis. Rīga: Latvijas Universitāte.
- Ivulāne, Baiba & Andra Kalnača. 2013. Darbības vārda gramatiskās resp. sintaktiskās funkcijas. In Daina Nītiņa & Juris Grigorjevs (eds.), *Latviešu valodas gramatika*, 462–470. Rīga: Latvijas Universitātes Latviešu valodas institūts.
- Kalnača Andra. 2013a. Darbības vārda *vajadzēt* modālā semantika. *Vārds un tā pētīšanas aspekti* 17(1). 80–88.
- Kalnača Andra. 2013b. Darbības vārds (verbs). In Daina Nītiņa & Juris Grigorjevs (eds.), *Latviešu valodas gramatika*, 456–563. Rīga: Latvijas Universitātes Latviešu valodas institūts.
- Kalnača Andra. 2014. *A Typological Perspective on Latvian Grammar*. Warsaw, Berlin: De Gruyter Open. <https://doi.org/10.2478/9783110411317>.
- Kalnača, Andra & Ilze Lokmane. 2012b. Semantics and Distribution of Latvian Reflexive Verbs. In Aurelija Usonienė, Nicole Nau, and Ineta Dabašinskienė, eds. *Multiple Perspectives in Linguistic Research on Baltic Languages*, 231–259. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Kalnača, Andra & Ilze Lokmane. 2021. *Latvian Grammar*. Rīga: University of Latvia Press. <https://doi.org/10.22364/latgram.2021>.
- Kārklīšs, Jūlijs. 1976. *Infinitīva sintaktiskās potences*. Rīga: Pēteru Stučas Latvijas Valsts universitāte.
- Karulis, Konstantīns. 1992. *Latviešu etimoloģijas vārdnīca*. 2. Rīga: Avots.

- Kehayov, Petar & Reeli Torn-Leesik. 2009. Modal verbs in Balto-Finnic. In Björn Hansen & Ferdinand de Haan (eds.), *Modals in the Languages of Europe*, 363–401. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110219210>.
- Kiparsky, Valentin. 1969. Das Nominativobjekt des Infinitivs im Slavischen, Baltischen und Ostseefinnischen. *Baltistica* 5(2). 141–148. <https://doi.org/10.15388/baltistica.5.2.1737>.
- Kuteva, Tania, Heine, Bernd, Hong, Bo, Long, Haiping & Seongha Rhee. 2019. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. 2nd, extensively revised and updated revision. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316479704>.
- Lokmane, Ilze & Andra Kalnača. 2014. Modal semantics and morphosyntax of the Latvian DEBITIVE. In Werner Abraham & Elisabeth Leiss (eds.), *Modes of Modality. Modality, typology, and universal grammar*, 167–192. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.149>.
- Lindström, Liina & Iiona Tragel. 2010. The possessive perfect constructions in Estonian. *Folia Linguistica* 44(2). 371–400. <https://doi.org/10.1515/flin.2010.014>.
- Lindström, Liina, Kristel Uiboaed & Virve Vihman. 2014. Varieerumine tarvis-/vajakonstruktsioonides keelekontaktide valguses. *Keel ja Kirjandus* 57(8–9). 609–630. <https://doi.org/10.54013/kk682a4>.
- Lindström, Liina & Kristel Uiboaed. 2017. Syntactic variation of ‘need’-constructions in Estonian dialects. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 40(3). 313–349. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586517000191>.
- Lyons, John. 1968. *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139165570>.
- Mathiassen, Terje. 1997. *A Short Grammar of Latvian*. Ohio: Slavica Publishers, INC.
- Mülenbachs, Kārlis & Jānis Endzelīns. 1932. *Latviešu valodas vārdnīca. Lettisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*. IV. Rīga: Kultūras fonda izdevums.
- Nītiņa, Daina & Juris Grigorjevs (eds.). 2013. *Latviešu valodas gramatika*. Rīga: Latvijas Universitātes Latviešu valodas institūts.
- Nordström, Jackie. 2010. *Modality and Subordinators*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.116>.
- Ozola, Ieva & Liene Markus-Narvila. 2021. *Valoda. Laiks, Lejaskurzeme*. Liepāja, Rīga: Liepājas Universitāte, Latvijas Universitātes Latviešu valodas institūts.
- Paegle, Dzintra. 2003. *Latviešu literārās valodas morfoloģija*. Rīga: Zinātne.
- Pajusalu, Karl. 2014. Verbal categories in Salaca Livonian grammar. *Valoda: nozīme un forma* 4. 119–135. <https://doi.org/10.22364/vnf.4>.
- Palmer, Frank R. 2001. *Mood and Modality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139167178>.
- Poiša, Maija. 1999. *Vidzemes sēliskās izloksnes*. Vol. 2. Rīga: Latviešu valodas institūts.
- Portner, Paul. 2018. *Mood*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780199547524.001.0001>.
- Seržant, Ilja A. & Valgerður Bjarnadóttir. 2014. Verbalization and non-canonical case marking of some irregular verbs in *-ē- in Baltic and Russian. In Tatjana, Civjan, Marija, Zavjalova & Artūras Judžentis (eds.), *Baltai ir slavai: dvasinių kultūrų sankirtos*, 218–241. Vilnius: Versmė.

- Skujiņa, Valentīna. 1999. *Latviešu valoda lietišķajos rakstos*. Rīga: Zvaigzne ABC.
- Stafecka, Anna (ed.). 2022. *Latviešu valodas dialektu atlants. Morfoloģija. II. Sintakse*. Rīga: Latvijas Universitātes Latviešu valodas institūts (forthcoming).
- Timberlake, Alan. 1974. *The Nominative Object in Slavic, Baltic, and West Finnic*. München: Verlag Otto Sagner. <https://doi.org/10.3726/b12499>.
- Torn-Leesik, Reeli. 2007. Voice and modal verbs in Estonian. *Linguistica Uralica* 43(3). 173–186. <https://doi.org/10.3176/lu.2007.3.02>.
- Vitso, Tiit-Rein & Valts Ernštreits. 2012. *Līvõkīel-ēstikīel-leŕkīel sōnārōntōz / Liivi-eesti-lāti sōnaraamat / Lībiešu-igauņu-latviešu vārdnīca*. Tartu/Rīga: Tartu Ülikool, Latviešu valodas aģentūra.

Kokkuvõte. Andra Kalnača, Ilze Lokmane: Lāti verb vajadzēt 'vajama, pidama': selle liivi juured ning modaalsuse ja distributsiooni eripärad. Selle uurimuse keskmes on lāti modaalverb *vajadzēt* 'vajama, pidama', mis on tuletatud nimisõnast *vajaga* 'vajadus, tarvidus', mida omakorda peetakse laenuks liivikeelsest sõnast *vajag*, *vajāg* 'vajadus, vajalik'. Uurimuse eesmärk on anda kõikehõlmav ülevaade verbi *vajadzēt* grammatilistest vormidest ja distributsioonist ning analüüsida selle modaalsust ja evidentsiaalset semantikat. See on oluline eelkõige kontrastiivse keeleuurimise jaoks (verbi *vajadzēt* võrdlemisel liivi ja eesti vastetega) ning aitab luua vajaliku aluse modaalverbide ja nendega seotud süntaktiliste konstruktsioonide edasiseks uurimiseks seoses lāti (balti) ja läänemeresoome keelekontaktidega.

Verb *vajadzēt* on osa suuremast lāti üldisikuliste modaalverbide süsteemist, kus kogeja/agent/valdaja ühildub daativis; samuti on see oma semantika ja funktsioonide tõttu üks peamisi leksikaalseid vahendeid deontilise modaalsuse väljendamiseks tänapäeva lāti keeles.

Käesolevas uurimuses vaadeldakse lähemalt verbi distributsiooni, semantikat ja selle süntaktilisi konstruktsioone, mis on selgelt seotud deontiliste, mõnikord ka episteemiliste ja evidentsiaalsete tähenduste väljendamisega. Lisaks antakse uurimuses ülevaade verbi *vajadzēt* grammatilistest vormidest ja selle paralleelsest kasutusest debitiiviga.

Märksõnad: modaalverb, deontiline modaalsus, episteemiline modaalsus, evidentsiaalsus, paradigma, distributsioon, lāti keel, liivi keel

Kubbõvõttõks. Andra Kalnača, Ilze Lokmane: Leŕkīel verb vajadzēt: sīe līvõd jūrd, modalitāt ja distribūtsij eņtšsuglit. Sīe tuņšlimiz sidāms um leŕkīel modāli verb *vajadzēt* 'um vajāg', mis alīzõks um nimsōnā *vajaga* 'vajāgōm', mis tegīz um tāpīņtōd līvõ kīel sōnāst *vajāg*. Tuņšlimiz merk um

tāmikšō iļvaņtļōks iļ verb *vajadzēt* formōd ja distribūtsij, ja tuņšlō sīe modāliz ja evidentsiāliz semantik. Se um tādzi amā jeds kontrastīviz kīel tuņšlimiz pierāst (ītlōs verb *vajadzēt* līvō ja ēsti kīelkōks) ja ābņōb lūodō tārpaliz alīz modālizt verbōd ja nāntkōks sidtōd sintaks konstruksijd jeddōpēđiz tuņšlimiz pierāst leņķīel (baltōd) ja vāldamiersūomō kīeld kontaktōd kontekstōs. Verb *vajadzēt* um ikš jag jo sūrst leņķīel modālizt verbōd sistēmst; nei īž eņtš semantik ja funksijd pūolst tāmpizōs leņķīels se um ikš tādzi leksikāli vaindōks deontiliz modalitāt nāgņimiz pierāst. Sīes tuņšlimizōs jo ležgōld sōbōd vaņtōltōd verb distribūtsij, semantika ja sīe sintaks konstruksijd, mis ātō sieldist sidtōd deontiliz, vaišti ka epistēmīliz ja evidentsiāliz tāntōks nāgņimizōks. Nei iž tuņšlimi tāmikšōb iļvaņtļōks iļ verb *vajadzēt* formōd ja sīe paralēliz kōlbatimiz īdskubs debitīvōks.