Workshop: **Habituality and Genericity in Flux**

Organizers: Nora Boneh & Łukasz Jędrzejowski

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel / University of Potsdam, Germany

(bonehn@mscc.huji.ac.il / lukasz.jedrzejowski@uni-potsdam.de)

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)?

Covert patterns of genericity/habituality in non-finite contexts

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.

References

Boneh, Nora & Edit Doron (2010): Modal and temporal aspects of habituality, in: *Lexical semantics, syntax, and event structure* ed. by Malka Rappaport Hovav, Edity Doron & Ivy Sichel, 338-363. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Boneh, Nora & Edit Doron (2013): Hab and Gen in the expression of habituality, in: *Genericity* ed. by Alda Mari, Claire Beyssade & Fabio del Prete, 176-191. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bybee Joan, Revere Perkins & William Pagliuca (1994): *The evolution of grammar: tense, aspect, and modality in the languages of world*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Carlson, Gregory N. (1977): *Reference to kinds in English*. PhD thesis, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

Carlson, Gregory N. (2005): Generics, habituals and iteratives, in: *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. 2nd edition. Elsevier.

Comrie, Bernard (1976): *Aspect*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dahl, Östen (1985): *Tense and aspect systems*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Dahl, Östen (1995): The marking of the episodic/generic distinction in tense-aspect systems, in: *The generic book* ed. by Gregory N. Carlson & Francis Jeffry Pelletier, 412-425. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Ferreira, Marcelo (2005): *Event quantification and plurality*. PhD thesis, MIT.

Filip, Hana & Gregory N. Carlson (1997): Sui generis genericity, in: *Penn working papers in linguistics* 4: 91-110. Philadelphia: The University Pennsylvania.

Geenhoven, Veerle van (2004): *For*-adverbials, frequentative aspect, and pluractionality, in: *Natural Language Semantics* 12(2): 135-190.

Iordăchioaia Gianina & Elena Soare (2008): Two kinds of event plurals: Evidence from Romanian nominalizations, in: *Empirical Issues in Syntax and Semantics* 7 ed. by Olivier Bonami & P. Cabredo Hofherr, 193-216.

Krifka, Manfred, Francis Jeffry Pelletier, Gregory N. Carlson, Alice ter Meulen, Gennaro Chierchia & Godehard Link (1995): Genericity: an introduction, in: *The generic book* ed. by Gregory N. Carlson & Francis Jeffry Pelletier, 1-124. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Landman, Fred (2008): 1066: On the differences between the tense-perspective-aspect systems of English and Dutch, in: *Theoretical and crosslinguistic approaches to the semantics of aspect* ed. by Susan Rothstein, 107-166. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lenci, Alessandro (1995): The semantic representation of non-quantification habituals, in: *Temporal reference aspect and actionality. Semantic and syntactic perspectives* ed. by Pier Marco Bertinetto, Valentina Bianchi, James Higginbotham & Mario Squartini, 143-158. Torino: Rosenberg & Sellier.

Lenci, Alessandro & Pier-Marco Bertinetto (2000): Aspect, adverbs, and events: habituality vs. perfectivity, in: *Speaking of events* ed. by James Higginbotham, Fabio Pianesi & Achille C. Varzi, 265-287. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rimell, Laura (2005): Habitual sentences and generic quantification, in: *Proceedings of West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics* 23: 663-676.

Scheiner, Magdalena, J. (2002): Temporal anchoring of habituals, in: *Proceedings of ConSole XI.*

Schubert, Lenhart, K. & Francis Jefry Pelletier (1987): Problems in the interpretation of the logical form of generics, bare plurals, and mass terms, in: *New directions in semantics* ed. by Ernest LePore, 387-453. London: Academic Press.

Soare, Elena (2006): 'Why smoking is a bad habit?', in: *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics*, University of Bucharest Review.

Speyer, Augustin (2014): Semantic factors for the status of control infinitives in the history of German. Manuscript submitted to the volume *Infinitives at the syntax-semantics interface: A diachronic perspective* ed. by Łukasz Jędrzejowski & Ulrike Demske. Berlin: de Gruyter, 11 pp.

Tagliamonte, Sali & Hellen Lawrence (2000): "I used to dance but I don't dance now": the habitual past in English, in: *Journal of English Linguistics* 28(4): 324-353.

Vogeleer, Svetlana (2012): Habituals with indefinite singular objects: aspect and modality, in: *Recherches Linguisticiques de Vincennes* 41: 191-214.

Xrakovskij, Victor, S. (1997): *Typology of iterative constructions.* München: LINCOM Europa.