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**Workshop description**

Habituality and Genericity refer to regularities of eventualities, as opposed to episodic descriptions of eventualities (cf. Krifka et al. 1995, Carlson 2005). Views diverge as to whether habituality and genericity are two separate categories, underlying two separate operators Hab and Gen, at work in natural languages, or should the former be subsumed under the latter. Some of those who consider the terms as separate see habituality as aspectual expressing iteration over a long period of time (cf. e.g. Xrakovskij 1997, Lenci & Bertinetto 2000, van Geenhoven 2004), whereas genericity is taken to be a modal notion (cf. Dahl 1985, Carlson 1977, Schubert & Pelletier 1987, Krifka et al. 1995, Landman 2008). Others separate construction expressing a regular recurrence of events into bare or modified by a quantificational adverbial expression (Boneh & Doron 2013, Vogleer 2012, Ferreira 2005, Rimell 2005, Scheiner 2002, Lenci 1995), noting that the former differ semantically from the latter, for a recent proposal see Boneh & Doron 2013, who suggest that bare habituals feature the operator Hab defining it as modalized existential quantifier over sums of events, whereas quantified habituals feature Gen, a modalized universal quantifier, in the sense of Krifka et al. (1995). The fact that habituality and genericity are not overtly expressed in many instances (cf. e.g. Dahl 1995) is an impediment for settling the existing debate and establishing a shared understanding of the nature of habituality in language. Additionally, the question has not received a varied enough empirical coverage, synchronically and diachronically.

In this respect, the proposed workshop is intended to create a forum for the discussion of habitual and generic expressions from a diachronic point of view. Its aim is twofold: first, to shed light, from a diachronic perspective, on the question whether habituality and genericity are two distinct categories or not; second, to investigate the nature of changes with respect to various habitual/generic forms and their interactions with (A)spect-(T)ense-(M)ood categories. Accordingly, we invite contributions dealing with various historical aspects of habitual and generic expressions.
The issues we would like to address include, but are not limited to, the following ones:

**Genericity and habituality in flux**

How could genericity/habituality be expressed in older stages of natural languages? Under which circumstances and how do generic/habitual expressions evolve in general? What are necessary/sufficient conditions for an expression to develop into a generic/habitual? Which semantic properties of the source construction facilitate the development into a generic/habitual expression? Do their sources differ from those of iteratives and frequentatives? How do forms overtly expressing habituality/genericity with dedicated forms differ from those covertly expressing these categories? Is there historical evidence for distinguishing two operators Hab and Gen underlying expressions of regularly recurring eventualities?

**Interaction with ATM-categories**

To what extent is genericity/habituality as a grammatical category related to other aspectual, temporal and/or modal categories from a diachronic point of view? What are common patterns of interaction? Specifically, with respect to tense, why do there seem to be more habitual/generic expressions in the past tense, compared to the present/future tenses? With respect to aspect, why are habitual/generic expressions strongly related to imperfectivity (cf. Comrie 1976, Lenci & Bertinetto 2000, Ferreira 2005, and for a minority opposing Boneh & Doron 2013, Vogeleer 2012, Filip & Carlson 1997)?

**Periphrastic constructions**

Cross-linguistically, there exist various periphrastic structures encoding habitual meaning, e.g. *used + to-infinitive* in English, a tensed form of the root *hyy 'be' + participle* in Modern Hebrew, *pflegen + zu-infinitive* in German, *zwyknąć + bare infinitive* in Polish, *bruka + infinitive* in Swedish, etc. Bybee et al. (1994: 155) point out that little is known about how lexical verbs develop into habituals. Here we would like to pursue the question about their emergence circumstances. Did all periphrastic habitual means undergo a grammaticalization process? What role do inanimate subjects play? What are their common interpretative traits? In particular, what is responsible for the fact that some of habituals are restricted to a past tense form (cf. e.g. Tagliamonte & Lawrence 2000 for English)? What kinds of restrictions do habituals impose on the predicates they combine with? How do these constructions differ interpretatively from simple forms expressing habituality/genericity (Boneh & Doron 2010, 2013 have shown for English and for Modern Hebrew that periphrastic forms are always imperfective and that they express actualized habituals)?
Speyer (2014) has recently observed that in older stages of German object control verbs selecting to-infinitives, the complement clause may give rise to a habitual interpretation, contrasting with a bare infinitive complement, which tends to be episodic. Similarly, in Romanian it is reported that the Supine is a verbal-noun dedicated to the expression of event plurality and habituality (cf. Soare 2006, Iordăchioaia & Soare 2008). We would be interested in better understanding how this context of habituality/genericity can help shed light on the initial questions of the Hab/Gen distinction, what is their interaction with other ATM categories and in general? And whether this type of covert habituality/genericity differs from the one found with fully inflected verbal forms.

The aim of this workshop is to bring together scholars interested in habitual and generic expressions in general, and from a diachronic perspective in particular so as to adduce new insights for a better understanding of how habituality and genericity as grammatical categories are encoded in natural language. The workshop is of interest to both historical linguists, typologists and formal linguists working on syntax, semantics, pragmatics and their interfaces.
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