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1. Introduction: Overview of the aspectual system of Lithuanian

- Rather, a system of lexical aspectual classes coupled with productive aspectual derivation. Aspectual classes differ as to the interpretations of the Present and Simple Past tenses (cf. the procedure for identification of actional classes proposed in Tatevosov 2002).

### Major aspectual classes in Lithuanian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Simple Past</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stative</td>
<td>state</td>
<td>state</td>
<td>gulėti ‘lie’, laukti ‘wait’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processual</td>
<td>process</td>
<td>process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. atelic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. inherently telic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a. suktis ‘rotate’, kalbėti ‘talk’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. multiplicative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. rašyti ‘write’, tirpti ‘melt’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telic</td>
<td>process</td>
<td>change of state</td>
<td>atidaryti ‘open’, mirti ‘die’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. without a presupposed process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. with a presupposed process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctual</td>
<td>habitual or praesens historicum, *process</td>
<td>change of state</td>
<td>a. rasti ‘find’, susirgti ‘fall ill’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inchoative</td>
<td>state</td>
<td>change of state</td>
<td>patikti ‘like’, suprasti ‘understand’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major aspectual derivations

- “Perfectivizing” prefixation: turns inherently telic processual verbs into punctual verbs denoting the natural endpoint of the process (cf. Armoškaitė 2006, inter alia):

  1. a. Jon-as raš-ė laišk-q.
     John-NOM.SG write-PST letter-ACC.SG
     ‘John was writing a letter.’

  b. Jon-as pa-raš-ė laišk-q.
     John-NOM.SG PRV-write-PST letter-ACC.SG
     ‘John wrote a letter.’

- Delimitative prefixation: turns stative, atelic processual, and certain telic processual verbs into predicates denoting a bounded situation with arbitrary endpoints:

  2. a. Jon-as gyven-o Vilni-uje.
     John-NOM.SG live-PST Vilnius-LOC.SG
     ‘John lived/was living in Vilnius.’

     John-NOM.SG PRV-live-PST two year-ACC.PL Vilnius-LOC.SG
     ‘John lived in Vilnius for two years.’
Chronos 09, Paris, 2–4 September 2009

- Punctual prefixation: turns stative and processual verbs into verbs denoting entry into the state or process denoted by the base:
  (3)  
  a. *Jon-as sirg-o grip-u.*
  John-NOM.SG be.ill-PST influenza-INS.SG
  ‘John was ill with influenza.’
  b. *Jon-as su-sirg-o grip-u.*
  John-NOM.SG PRV-be.ill-PST influenza-INS.SG
  ‘John caught influenza.’

- Semelfactive prefixation or suffixation: turns verbs denoting multiplicative processes (consisting of a series of identical subevents) into predicates expressing a single quantum of such a process:
  (4)  
  a. *Jon-as kosė-jo.*
  John-NOM.SG cough-PST
  ‘John coughed <several times>.’
  b. *Jon-as su-kosė-jo.*
  John-NOM.SG PRV-cough-PST
  ‘John coughed <once>.’

  (5)  
  a. *Jon-as knark-ė.*
  John-NOM.SG snore-PST
  ‘John was snoring.’
  b. *Jon-as knark-telė-jo.*
  John-NOM.SG snore-SML-PST
  ‘John gave a snore.’

- Iterative suffixation (Geniušienė 1997: 238–240): turns (almost) any verb into a (processual) predicate denoting an indefinite repetition of the event denoted by the base:
  (6)  
  a. *Jon-as rašė laišk-us.*
  John-NOM.SG write-PST letter-ACC.PL
  ‘John was writing letters.’ (at a particular occasion)
  b. *Jon-as raš-inė-jo laišk-us.*
  John-NOM.SG write-ITER-PST letter-ACC.PL
  ‘John wrote letters from time to time.’

  (7)  
  a. *Jon-as atidar-ė lang-us.*
  John-NOM.SG open-PST window-ACC.PL
  ‘John opened the windows.’
  b. *Jon-as atidar-inė-jo lang-us.*
  John-NOM.SG open-ITER-PST window-ACC.PL
  ‘John was opening the windows <one after another>.’

Inflectional and periphrastic aspectual categories

  (8)  
  a. *Jon-as atvažiav-o pas ĭėv-us.*
  John-NOM.SG come-PST to parent-ACC.PL
  ‘John came to his parents.’
  b. *Jon-as dažnai atvažiou-dav-o pas ĭėv-us.*
  John-NOM.SG often come-HAB-PST to parent-ACC.PL
  ‘John often visited his parents.’ (Geniušienė 1997: 231)

  (9)  
  a. *J-is (yra) šiltai apsireng-ės.*
  3-NOM.SG.M AUX+PRS.3 warmly dress.oneself-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M
  ‘He has dressed himself || is dressed warmly.’ (Geniušienė, Nedjalkov 1988: 370)
  b. *J-is buv-o šiltai apsireng-ės.*
  3-NOM.SG.M AUX-PST warmly dress.oneself-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M
  ‘He had dressed himself || was dressed warmly.’ (ibid.)
2. The “continuative” prefix be-: General issues

- A non-derivational prefix of unclear origins attaching to the left of the aspectual prefixes.
- A diverse range of uses, both aspectual and non-aspectual; poorly described.

(10) Aldon-a būv-o be-išein-a-nt-i, bet persigalvoj-o ir sustoj-o.
Aldona-NOM.SG AUX-PST CNT-leave-PRS-PA-NOM.F but change.mind-PST and stop-PST
‘Aldona was about to leave, but she changed her mind and stopped.’


(11) Aš ne-be-suprant-u, k-ą j-is kalb-a.
I(NOM) NEG-CNT-understand-PRS.1SG what-ACC he-NOM.SG.M say-PRS
‘I no more understand what he is saying.’

when I(NOM) come-PST-1SG Kazys-NOM.SG POS-CNT-write-PST letter-ACC.PL
‘When I came home, Kazys was still writing letters.’

- Other uses not considered here in detail:
  - “emphatic” use, mainly with non-finite predicates, cf. the following two examples from a folktale “Eglė žalčių karalienė” (Egle the Queen of Serpents):

(13) Žiūr-i jauniausioji Egl-ė — j-os rūb-uose
lookPRS youngest-NOM.SG.F.DEF Egle-NOM.SG 3-GEN.SG.F clothes-LOC.PL
žalt-ys be-gul-įs.
green.snake-NOM.SG CNT-lie-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M
‘The youngest, Egle, looks, and hark! there is a grass snake in her clothes.’

(14) ...gegut-ė j-iems kukuo-ja netikr-ą nuotak-ą be-vež-a-nt ...
cuckoo-NOM.SG 3-DAT.PL.M cuckoo-PRS fake-ACC.SG bride-ACC.SG CNT-carry-PRS-PA
‘... the cuckoo says (lit. cuckoos) to them that they are carrying a fake bride’.

- “dummy” use with reflexive participles: the prefix shifts the reflexive marker to the prefixal position (“reflexive displacement”, see Stolz 1989), which allows to avoid the morphophonological complications arising when the reflexive marker attaches to the adjectival desinence (Ambrazas (ed.) 1997: 348):

(15)a. juok-iq-s-is
laugh-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.RFL
b. be-si-juok-ia-nči-o // #juokiančiosi
CNT-RFL-laugh-PRS-PA-GEN.SG.M

3. The Avertive

Kuteva (2001: 78): “an action which was potentially imminent but did not ultimately get realized”.

FRENCH: failir + Vinf
(16) ... et ça a failli amener une rupture entre ma femme et moi. (Maupassant, Bel ami: 15)
‘...and this has almost brought about a break-up between my wife and myself.’

Lithuanian data is not considered in Kuteva’s cross-linguistic discussion, though the construction shown in (10) is a good representative of the cross-linguistic Avertive gram.
Morphosyntactic properties

The auxiliary is most often in the Simple Past tense, more rarely in the Past Habitual (17), but never in the Present (18), which is consistent with the essential characteristics of Avertive (Kuteva 2001: 84): imminence, pastness, counterfactuality.

(17) Kai j-ie atei-dav-o mīs-ų kvies-ti, mes jau when 3-NOM.PL.M come-HAB-PST we-GEN invite-INF we( NOM) already bū-dav-o-me be-ein-q iš nam-ų.
AUX-HAB-PST-1PL CNT-go-PRS.PA.NOM.PL.M from home-GEN.PL

‘When they would come to invite us, we would be already leaving home.’ (Sližienė 1995: 228)

(18) *Jon-as yra be-atidar-q lang-q.
John-NOM.SG AUX+PRS.3 CNT-open-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M window-ACC.SG

Examples with the auxiliary in the Future or the Subjunctive, given in the grammars, are judged as obsolete by the native speakers and anyway do not convey the Avertive meaning:

I(NOM) AUX-FUT-1SG CNT-sleep-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M when come-FUT-2SG I- GEN put.to.bed-INF

‘I’ll be sleeping when you come to put me to bed.’ (Ambrazas (ed.) 1997: 250)

(20) K-o j-is lauk-ė ši-o laik-o ne-ved-ęs,
what-GEN 3-NOM.SG.M wait-PST this-GEN.SG.M time-GEN.SG NEG-marry-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M
bū-tų be-tur-į šeiminink-ę!
AUX-SBJ CNT-have-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M housewife-ACC.SG

‘Why did he wait so long and didn’t marry, he would have a housewife now!’ (ibid.: 258)

However, such uses can shed light on the historical origins of the Avertive, i.e. the Progressive. The latter is attested in the Western Lithuanian dialects, as well as in the older texts (see Ambrazas 1990: 180–181). Cf. (21) showing a possible semantic link between the ‘focused’ Progressive (Bertinetto et al. 2000: 517) and the Avertive (22):

(21) Tawa tarn-as buw-a be-gan-ans aw-is sawa
your servant-NOM.SG AUX-PST CNT-pasture-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M sheep-ACC.PL his
Tiew-o,
father-GEN.SG and come-PST Lėw-as.

‘Your servant has been keeping his father's sheep, and a lion came...’ (Bretke’s 1579–1590 translation of Luther’s Bible, Sam. 17: 34, cited after Ambrazas 1990: 181)

(22) situation ongoing but interrupted → situation not realized

Avertive can be used in non-finite predications, such as Accusativus-cum-Participio:

(23) Mač-ia-u Kaz-į buv-us be-nukrint-a-ntį
see-PST-1SG Kazys-ACC.SG AUX-PST.PA CNT-fall-PST-PA.ACC.SG.M
ir atbég-a-u j-am padē-ti.
and come.running-PST-1SG 3-DAT.SG.M help-INF

‘I saw that Kazys had almost fallen down and came running in order to help him.’
Interaction with aspectual classes

Lithuanian Avertive is interesting in that it groups together verbs of ‘opposite’ actional properties: verbs denoting durative situations, on the one hand, and verbs expressing spontaneous momentary events, on the other.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspectual class</th>
<th>Interpretation of the Avertive</th>
<th>No. of ex.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stative</td>
<td>preparatory stage</td>
<td>(24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processual, type a</td>
<td>preparatory stage</td>
<td>(25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processual, type b</td>
<td>preparatory stage</td>
<td>(17), (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctual, type a</td>
<td>preparatory stage</td>
<td>(23), (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctual, type b</td>
<td>process</td>
<td>(28), (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telic</td>
<td>process</td>
<td>(30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Stative:**

(24) Aš *buv-a-u be-klaus-a-nt-i* muzik-os, 
I(NOM) AUX-PST CNT-listen-PRS-PA-NOM.SG.F music-GEN.SG 
*kai kiem-e pasigird-o triukšm-as.* 
when yard-LOC.SG be.heard-PST noise-NOM.SG
‘I was just going to listen to music when some noise came from the yard.’

- **Processual, inherently atelic:**

(25) Aš *buv-a-u be-dirb-qs,* kai netikëtai atvažiav-o draug-as. 
I(NOM) AUX-PST CNT-work-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M when unexpectedly arrive-PST friend-NOM.SG
‘I was going to start working, when a friend of mine unexpectedly arrived.’

- **Processual, inherently telic:**

(26) Aš *buv-a-u be-raš-qs* laišk-us, kai suskamb-o telefon-as. 
I(NOM) AUX-PST CNT-write-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M letter-ACC.PL when ring-PST phone-NOM.SG
‘I was going to write letters, when the phone rang.’

- **Punctual without a presupposed process:**

(27) – Man čia patink-a, – pagaliau, kai jau *buv-a-u* 
I(DAT) here like-PRS finally when already AUX-PST-1SG 
*be-užmirš-qs* mūs-u buvim-q, pasak-ë, – bet... 
CNT-forget-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M we-GEN existence-ACC.SG say-PST but
‘I like it here, – finally said he, when I was already on the verge of forgetting about our existence, – but...’ (LKT)

- **Punctual with a presupposed process (derived from telic processual, cf. (26)):**

(28) Aš *buv-a-u be-pa-raš-qs* tau laišk-q, kai baig-ë-si rašal-as. 
I(NOM) AUX-PST-1SG CNT-PRV-write-NOM.SG.M you(DAT) letter-ACC.SG when end-PST-RFL ink-NOM.SG
‘I have almost finished the letter to you when the ink ran out.’

(29) *Aldon-a buv-o be-perplauk-ia-nt-i* Nemun-q, bet nuskend-o. 
A.-NOM.SG AUX-PST CNT-swim.across-PRS.PA-NOM.SG.F Neman-ACC.SG but drown-PST
‘Aldona has almost swum across Neman, but drowned.’

- **Telic:**

(30) *Penkt-q valand-q Jon-as buv-o be-parein-qs* namo, 
 fifth-ACC.SG hour-ACC.SG John-NOM.SG AUX-PST CNT-return-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M home 
kai j-am paskambin-o iš darb-o. 
when 3-DAT.SG.M call-PST from work-GEN.SG
‘At five o’clock John has almost come home, but someone called him from the office.’
Such a distribution is quite natural: Avertive denotes an imminent event which did not happen, and this event is either the endpoint of a telic situation (31a), or the starting point of a durative situation (31b). However, in order for a verb to yield the process interpretation of the Avertive, it must be able to denote a real endpoint, not a virtual one, as the inherently telic processual verbs (31c). The behaviour of the Avertive is a strong argument for treating the two kinds of Lithuanian processual verbs as belonging to the same aspectual class.

(31) a. Avertive b. Avertive c. Avertive

4. Continuative: te-be- ‘still’ and ne-be- ‘no more’
Morphosyntactic properties

- Morphological idioms: te-be- and ne-be- are not compositionally derived from te- or ne- + be-:
  (i) though widely used on its own, te- does not have the meaning of positive polarity in its independent uses (see Mathiassen 1996b: 171–172);
  (ii) Continuative be- is not the same as be- in the Avertive: the two have very different combinatorial restrictions with respect to aspectual classes of verbs (see below);
  (iii) Continuative be- is (at least synchronically) not the same as the “emphatic” be- (13)–(14), because the latter does not convey a clearly identifiable aspectual meaning;
  (iv) The behaviour of Positive Continuative (te-be-) and Negative Continuative, or Discontinuative (ne-be-) is not exactly parallel, and the differences between them cannot be reduced to mere difference in polarity.

- Limited transcategoriality: can attach not only to verbs, but also to adjectives (32), (33):
  (32) Præj-o 40 met-u, Brigitte Bardot mit-as te-be-gyv-as.
  pass-PST year GEN.PL myth NOM.SG POS-CNT-alive NOM.SG.M
  ‘(Though) 40 years passed, the myth of Brigitte Bardot is still alive.’ (LKT)
  (33) Tačiau buv-im-as čia nusistovė-jo iš ties-u ne-be-sald-us.
  however BE-NML-NOM.SG here become-PST from truth GEN.PL NEG-CNT-sweet NOM.SG.M
  ‘However, staying here became indeed no more pleasant.’ (LKT)

- Genuine prefixes, not proclitics/particles, because, like aspectual prefixes (35b), trigger “reflexive displacement” (34c-d):
  (34a) džiaug-ė-si
  rejoice-PST-RFL ‘s/he rejoiced’
  (34b) ap-si-džiaug-ė
  PRV-RFL-rejoice-PST ‘s/he started rejoicing’
  (34c) te-be-si-džiaug-ė
  POS-CNT-RFL-rejoice-PST ‘s/he still rejoiced’
  (34d) ne-be-si-džiaug-ė
  NEG-CNT-RFL-rejoice-PST ‘s/he no more rejoiced’

- However, there exists a particle nebe, which is written separate and can attach to words of any class and have phrasal scope; tebe- lacks a corresponding particle-like use.
  (35) Es-u Indij-oje, jau nebe Tibet-e.
  be:PRS-1SG India LOC.SG already no more Tibet LOC.SG
  ‘I am in India, not in Tibet any more.’ (LKT)
Prefixal *tebe*- and *nebe*- freely attach to non-finite forms: infinitive (36), attributive participle (37), predicative participle in Nominativus-cum-Participio (38a), Accusativus-cum-Participio (38b), and Dativus-cum-Participio (39) constructions, converb (40), but not to deverbal nouns (41).

(36) *Nė kart-o ne-suabejo-ja-u dėl savo apsisprendim-o*
not.even time-GEN.SG NEG-doubt-PST-1SG because RFL.POSS self.determination-GEN.SG
*ne-be-dalyvau-ti rinkim-uose.*
NEG-CNT-participate-INF election-LOC.PL

‘I have never cast doubt on my determination to no more participate in the elections.’
(LKT)

(37) ... *tai stipr-us sukrėtim-as dar te-be-gyven-a-nt-iens*
this strong-NOM.SG.N.M shock-NOM.SG still POS-CNT-live-PRS-PA-DAT.PL.M
prieškari-o karinink-ams.
pre.war-GEN.SG military.officer-DAT.PL

‘... this is a strong shock for the still alive military officers of the pre-war times.’
(LKT)

Kazys-NOM.SG say-PST POS-CNT-live-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M Šiauliai-LOC.PL
‘Kazys said that he still lived in Šiauliai.’

b. *Žin-a-u Kaz-į ne-be-gyven-a-nt Šiauli-uose.*
know-PRS-1SG Kazys-ACC.SG NEG-CNT-live-PRS.PA Šiauliai-LOC.PL

‘I know that Kazys does not live in Šiauliai any more.’

(39) *Tok-s priežod-is buv-o paplit-ės Rom-oje dar*
such-NOM.SG saying-NOM.SG AUX-PST spread-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M Rome-LOC.SG still
*te-be-gyven-a-nt ši-am filosof-ui patriot-ui.*
POS-CNT-live-PRS.PA this-DAT.SG.M philosopher-DAT.SG patriot-DAT.SG

‘Such a saying has spread in Rome when this patriotic philosopher was still alive.
(LKT)’

(40) *Kunigaikšči-ai ir kit-i didžiūn-ai, ne-be-bijo-dam-i jau*
prince-NOM.PL and other-NOM.PL.M lord-NOM.PL NEG-CNT-be.afraid-CNVS-NOM.SG.M already
*popieži-aus, lup-o bažnyči-ęs ir klioštori-us...*
Pope-GEN.SG strip.off-PST church-ACC.PL and monastery-ACC.PL

‘Princes and other lords, already no more afraid of the Pope, plundered the churches and monasteries...’ (LKT)

(41) a. *te-be-miegoj-im-as*
POS-CNT-sleep-NML-NOM.SG NEG-CNT-sing-NML-NOM.SG
intended meanings: ‘that one is still sleeping’, ‘that one no more sings’

Interaction with periphrastic forms: both *tebe*- and *nebe*- can attach to both auxiliary and participle in Perfect (42), Resultative (43), and Counterfactual (44) constructions without any discernable difference in meaning.

when return-PST-1SG Kazys-NOM.SG POS-CNT-AUX-PST go.out-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M

‘When I came back, Kazys was still gone.’

when return-PST-1SG Kazys-NOM.SG AUX-PST POS-CNT-go.out-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M

‘=44a’

(43) a. *Kai parėj-a-u, lang-as ne-be-buv-o atidary-t-ės.*
when return-PST-1SG window-NOM.SG NEG-CNT-AUX-PST open-PST.PP.NOM.SG.M

‘When I came back, the window was not open any more.’
b. Kai parėj-a-u, lang-as buv-o ne-be-atidary-t-as.  
when return-PST-1SG window-NOM.SG AUX-PST NEG-CNT-open-PST.PP-NOM.SG.M  
‘=45a’

(44)a. Jeigu Kaz-ys pernai te-be-bū-tų gyvenę-čs Vilni-uje,  
if Kazys-NOM.SG last.year POS-CNT-AUX-SBJ live-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M Vilnius-LOC.SG  
mes bū-tumė-m susitik-ę.  
we(NOM) AUX-SBJ-1PL meet-PST.PA.NOM.PL.M  
‘If last year Kazys had still resided in Vilnius, we would have met.’

(45) Kai aš parėj-a-u, vaik-as te-be-miego-jo.  
when I(NOM) return-PST-1SG child-NOM.SG POS-CNT-sleep-PST  
‘When I came back, the child was still sleeping.’

when I(NOM) return-PST-1SG Kazys-NOM.SG POS-CNT-write-PST letter-ACC.PL  
‘When I came back, Kazys was still writing letters.’

(47) Kai aš vėl atėj-a-u, Kaz-ys te-be-atidary-t-inėjo lang-us.  
when I(NOM) again come-PST-1SG Kazys-NOM.SG POS-CNT-open-ITER-PST window-ACC.PL  
‘When I came again, Kazys was still opening the windows.’

when I(NOM) return-PST-1SG Kazys-NOM.SG POS-CNT-PRV-write-PST letter-ACC.SG  

(49) *Kai aš parėj-a-u, vaik-as te-be-užmig-o.  
when I(NOM) return-PST-1SG child-NOM.SG POS-CNT-fall.asleep-PST  

The restriction that the “input” of the Continuative should be homogeneous is not lexical in nature. With Telic and Punctual verbs, tebe- is incompatible only with the Simple Past (48), (49), (50a), but its combinations with Present and Past Habitual are felicitous (50b,c), (51):

Kazys-NOM.SG POS-CNT-open-PST window-ACC.SG before fall.asleep-CNV.SG.M

Kazys-NOM.SG POS-CNT-open-HAB-PST window-ACC.SG before fall.asleep-CNV.SG.M  
‘Kazys still opened the window before going to sleep.’

Kazys-NOM.SG POS-CNT-open-HAB-PST window-ACC.SG before fall.asleep-CNV.SG.M  
‘Kazys still used to open the window before going to sleep.’
Continuative can have scope over the Habitual operator built into the Past Habitual and Present tenses. The Habitual serves as a “homogenizing” (Vikner 1994) operator feeding the Continuative.

However, with homogeneous verbs Continuative + Past Habitual can have two interpretations: Continuative > Habitual (52a) and Habitual > Continuative (52b):

\[(52)\]
\[a.\] Pernai tėv-as te-be-parėi-dav-o namo dešimt-q valand-q.
last.year father-NOM.SG POS-CNT-return-HAB-PST home tenth-ACC.SG hour-ACC.SG
‘Last year father used to come home at 10 o’clock.’

\[b.\] Pernai tėv-as te-be-parėi-dav-o namo dešimt-q valand-q.
last.year father-NOM.SG POS-CNT-return-HAB-PST home tenth-ACC.SG hour-ACC.SG
‘Last year father still comes home at 10 o’clock.’

Similar duality can be observed in the Present tense, too, cf. (53a) Continuative > Habitual vs. (53b) Habitual > Continuative:

\[(53)\]
\[a.\] Šiemet tėv-as dešimt-q valand-q ne-be-dirb-a.
this.year father-NOM.SG tenth-ACC.SG hour-ACC.SG NEG-CNT-work-PRS
‘This year father does not work at 10 o’clock any more.’

\[b.\] Šit-as knygyn-as aštunt-q valand-q ne-be-dirb-a.
this-NOM.SG.M bookstore-NOM.SG eighth-ACC.SG hour-ACC.SG NEG-CNT-work-PRS
‘This bookstore is already closed at 8 o’clock.’

Is this ability of the Continuative to attach both over and beneath the Habitual akin to its morphologically overt duality with respect to periphrastic constructions (42)–(44)? Cf. similar interaction with modal verbs:

\[(54)\]
\[a.\] Galėjo muleis-ti galv-q ir te-be-maty-ti žvaigžd-es.
can-PST lower-INF head-ACC.SG and POS-CNT-see-INF star-ACC.PL
‘He could lower his head and still see the stars.’ (LKT)

\[b.\] Aš niek-o ne-be-galė-ja-u maty-ti.
i(NOM) nothing-GEN.SG NEG-CNT-can-PST-1SG see-INF
‘I couldn’t see anything any more.’ (LKT)

In contrast to the Positive Continuative, nebe- can attach to the Simple Past forms of Punctual and Telic verbs yielding the meaning ‘the event did not occur another time’:

\[(56)\]
\[a.\] Motin-a paliet-ė rank-a j-o koj-as, j-is ne-be-krūp-telė-jo.
mother-NOM.SG touch-PST hand-INS.SG 3-GEN.SG.M leg-ACC.PL 3-NOM.SG.M NEG-CNT-start-SML-PST
‘Mother touched his legs with her hand, and this time he did not give a start.’ (LKT)

\[b.\] Bet į kit-q susitikim-q j-is ne-be-atėj-o.
but in other-ACC.SG meeting-ACC.SG 3-NOM.SG.M NEG-CNT-come-PST
‘But he did not come to the next meeting.’ (LKT)

In this use the Negative Continuative shifts towards a more discourse-oriented interpretation, which has to do with the expectations of the speech-act participants rather than with aspect proper, cf. (58), (59), which do not imply that the situations denoted by the VP (‘write an article’, ‘spoil’) have occurred before the reference time.
The semantic development of *nebe-* can be hypothesized thus:

(60)a. A situation of type V no more lasts / situations of type V occur no more →
   b. An expected situation of type V did not occur another time →
   c. An expected situation of type V did not occur

The development in (60) involves the loss of the presuppositional component of the meaning of the Discontinuative (‘a situation of type V held/occurred before the reference time’) and the highlighting of the component ‘a situation of type V was expected to occur’ (which is merely an implicature of the regular aspectual use of the Discontinuative).

5. Conclusions

- Lithuanian has no systematic morphological opposition between the cross-linguistically well attested Perfective and Imperfective, but has grammaticalized several less common aspectual categories: Avertive, Continuative, and Discontinuative.
- From the point of view of grammaticalization, Lithuanian Avertive exemplifies a poorly documented development of the Progressive.
- Though all three forms employ the same formal marker (prefix *be-*), which suggests a possible common origin, they differ substantially in their morphosyntactic and semantic properties, most importantly in their ability to combine with predicates of different aspectual types.
- Both Continuative and Discontinuative show variable scope with respect to the Habitual and modal operators, paralleled by semantically vacuous (at least, so it appears on the current stage of the investigation) variability of attachment in periphrastic forms.
- Combinatory possibilities and restrictions of the “peripheral” forms employing the prefix *be-* can prove to be of no less importance for our understanding of the covert hierarchical structure of the Lithuanian verbal complex than the better known morphological devices (lexical aspectual prefixation and suffixation).
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