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In my paper (Arkadiev 2011, 57–58) dealing with aspectual uses of the Lithuanian ‘external’ prefix be- I say that action nominalizations cannot co-occur with be- in its continuative meaning. I based my observation on the fact that the native speakers of Lithuanian whom I had consulted had rejected such word forms as *tebe-miegoj-im-as CNT-sleep-NML-NOM.SG (intended meaning ‘the fact of being still asleep’) and ne-be-dainav-im-as NEG-CNT-sing-NML-NOM.SG (intended meaning ‘the fact of being no longer singing’), my examples (37a, b) from Arkadiev (2011, 58).

However, this statement of mine has to be qualified in the light of the data from Lithuanian corpora. The Corpus of Lithuanian Language (LKT, tekstynas.vdu.lt) attests about twenty deverbal event nominals formed by the productive suffixes -im-, -ym- containing the negative continuative (discontinuative) prefix nebe-¹, all in all yielding about 40 examples. Most such nominals are attested just once; those which are found in more than one context include nebegalėjimas ‘the fact that one is no longer able’ (from galėti ‘can’, 7 examples), nebeatitikimas ‘the fact that there is no longer a correspondence’ (from atitikti ‘correspond’, 2 examples), nebedalyvavimas ‘the fact of no longer participating’ (from dalyvauti ‘participate’, 2 examples), nebepasitikėjimas ‘the fact of no longer trusting’ (from pasitikėti ‘trust’, 2 examples), and nebetikėjimas ‘the fact of no longer believing’ (from tikėti ‘believe’, 2 examples).

¹ It must be noted that since LKT does not have morphological annotation, I had to limit my searches to the nominative singular forms of deverbal nominals (i. e., strings ending in imas and ymas); of course, more data would have been yielded by searching for other case-number forms.
Some illustrative examples of the use of such discontinuative deverbal nominals are given below. They clearly indicate that the discontinuative operator introduced by the prefix *nebe-* falls in the scope of the nominalization.

(1)  
*Tyl-a, stoj-us-i po silence-NOM.SG set-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F after kvaišinanči-o triukšm-o, atrod-ė kaip deafening-GEN.SG.M noise-GEN.SG seem-PST(3) as ne-be-gyven-im-as. NEG-CNT-live-NML-NOM.SG.*

‘The silence which arose after the deafening noise seemed like when life stopped.’ (lit. no longer living)

(2)  
*atmint-is — tai ne vien pasiyv-us memory-NOM.SG that NEG just passive-NOM.SG.M ne-be-galėj-im-as atsikraty-ti vien-q NEG-CNT-can-NML-NOM.SG throw.OFF-INF one-ACC.SG kart-q jau įsirėž-us-io time-ACC.SG already cut.into-PST.PA-GEN.SG.M įspūdži-o. impression-GEN.SG*

‘Memory is not just no longer being able to get rid of an impression that had already once become etched.’

(3)  

‘The land, like a sponge, is soaked with blood. It is worth blood! And the highest price for it (i. e. land) is being no longer able to come back to it.’

All this suggests that, though certainly infrequent, discontinuative event nominals are a productive and robustly established phenomenon of Lithuanian grammar. This is in sharp contrast with positive continu-
ative event nominals in tebe-, for which my statement from the 2011 article still holds: I could not find a single example of event nominals with the prefix tebe- in LKT, and similar results are yielded by Google searches: while such discontinuative event nominals as nebegalėjimas ‘no longer being able’ or nebetikėjimas ‘no longer believing’ are attested by hundreds of examples, their positive counterparts *tebegalėjimas and *tebetikėjimas do not occur on the Internet at all.

In addition to that it is worth mentioning that the discontinuative nebe- can even marginally co-occur with situation-denoting nominals with no direct or morphologically productive relation with verbs. Thus, on Google one can find such nouns as nebenoras ‘that one no longer wants’ (from noras ‘wish’, a morphologically opaque nominalization of norėti ‘want’, ca. 50 examples) and even nebeūpas ‘that one no longer is in a mood’ (from įpas ‘mood’, 2 examples), cf. the following sentences:

(4) pirm-ieji požymi-ai, jog laik-as į first-NOM.PL.M.DEF sign-NOM.PL that time-NOM.SG in mokykl-ą ... ne-be-nor-ąs eit-tį į school-ACC.SG NEG-CNT-wish-NOM.SG go-INF in daržel-į, miego-ti piet-ų mieg-o. kindergarten-ACC.SG sleep-INF noon-GEN.PL sleep-GEN.SG ‘the first signs that time has come (for the child) to go to school are when (the child) no longer wants to go to kindergarten, to sleep after lunch.’ (www.pasvalys.lt)

(5) Va ir baig-ėsi mano dviratuk-as, su so and finish-PST(3)-RFL my bicycle-NOM.SG with kreiv-u kažkai ne-be-ūpas važiuo-t. crooked-INS.SG.M somehow NEG-CNT-mood-NOM.SG drive-INF ‘So here my bicycle has come to an end, I am somehow not in a mood to ride a crooked one.’ (http://www.gerasdviratis.lt/forum/viewtopic.php?f=6&t=21294)

Here again, there are no corresponding nominals with the positive continuative in tebe- (though one example of tebenoras ‘continuous wish’ is found on Google, it cannot be considered fully significant). Such a sharp contrast between the negative and the positive variants of the Lithuanian continuative morphological marker with respect to event nominals constitutes a further argument (in addition to those
adduced in Arkadiev 2011, 54–55, 69–72) that the complex prefixes tebe- and nebe- do not just differ in polarity, but are in fact synchronically non-compositional morphological operators with distinct morphosyntactic properties.

To conclude, this shows how important it is not to base one’s statements about (non)existence of particular linguistic phenomena just on elicited data and native speaker judgments, but to take into account corpus evidence as well.
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