

REFLECTIONS ON HABITUALITY ACROSS OTHER GRAMMATICAL CATEGORIES

Xabibullina Liliya Jaxonovna

Ingliz tili kafedrasи o'qituvchisi Buxoro davlat tibbiyot instituti

liliya86xab@gmail.com

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14676529>

The observation that habituality may with evidentiality is typologically not surprising. In the Yukaghir languages mentioned above, a distinction between future and non-future tense is made. Correspondingly, the use of a particular evidential expression strongly depends on tense and aspect values. For example, if a verb is marked for the continuous aspect and if it occurs with an inferential evidential marker, the embedded proposition is anchored in the past. This restriction disappears as soon as a direct realis marker is attached to verb stem. In this case, both past and present tense anchoring is possible. What is interesting in this context is that no temporal-evidential restrictions arise when the speaker quantifies habitually over embedded proposition; see also Huber and Cahlon, this issue, for similar (diachronic) observations on Shumcho and Quzco Quechua, respectively. Why habituality appears to be compatible with both types of evidential expressions and overwrites temporal restrictions observed for the aspectual values still remains an open issue.

A completely different picture arises respect to Khakha, a Mongolian language. According to Brosig and Skribnik (2018: 562), the presence or absence of evidential marking is rare if a statement is interpreted habitually. On the other hand, if the speaker refers to a simple temporary statement using a progressive form, an evidential expression has to be used. More in-depth cross-categorical studies are needed in order to understand this variation between Yukaghir and Khalkha. In a similar vein, in Qiang, a Tibeto-Burman language mainly spoken on the eastern edge of Tibetan plateau in the mountainous northwest part of Sichuan Province (China), Lapolla (2003: 67) observes an interesting relation between habituality and evidential strategies. The default inferential morpheme is *k*: depending on the event and the information source, it can express either inferentiality or mirativity in sense claimed by DeLancey (1997, 2001, 2012). In fact, if the speaker having access to inferred evidence reports about a state or a perfective situation, (s)he can do so by using one of the two morphemes: i) the adverbial phrase *xsuni* 'seems', ii) the possibility marker *tan* or *lahan*. However, the choice of the embedded proposition is interpreted episodically or habitually:

Generally, the inference marker is used for single instances of an event, such as if someone was supposed to quit smoking, but then the speaker sees cigarette butts in an ashtray, the speaker could use the inference marker to comment that (it seems) the person had smoked. If was discussed as a habitual action, then again generally the construction with construction with [*tan*] or [*lahan*] would be used. (LaPolla 2003: 67)

It needs to be examined more systematically to what habituality and evidentiality may affect each other. Not much is known about their interdependency, but see Huber (this issue) on Shumcho and Bhat (1999) on other Tibeto-Burman languages, for some interesting observations. Both categories seem to be connected diachronically, too. Nikolaeva and Tolskaya (2001: 461) report that in Udihe, a Tungus language spoken by approx. 100 people in the southern part of the Russian Far East, the reported speech marker *gune* goes back to a habitual

form of the verb 'say'. How this happened requires further investigation, but it is reasonable to assume that diachronic pathway of development relies on some common modal feature common to habituality and evidentiality.

A similar observation has been made by Tatevosov (2005) considering a recurrent diachronic pathway between habitual and future forms and suggesting that both underlie a common ability modal (cf. Kozlov on Moksha Mordvin this issue). Relatedly, it seems that nominalizations can also be a source for modal genericity that feed the formation of habitual constructions (see Cahlon on Cuzco Quecha and Huber on Shumcho, this issue).

Moving on to consider the interaction between habituality and tense, and in some contrast to the semantic and diachronic affinity between habituality and future time reference, it has been observed by typologists that habituality is more richly expressed in the past tense than in the present (cf. Bybee et al. 1994: 155, Crisofaro 2006: 154). This need not to be a property specific to habitual, if one considers the Romance languages, since there the past tense is more nuanced in terms of grammatical aspect compared to non-past tense forms. This presumably goes back to the tight affinity noted in the previous section between habituality and grammatical aspect. However, in some cases, even outside the Romance languages, the past tenses. English used to and the Hebrew periphrastic construction, which is only available when the auxiliary is inflected for past tense, exemplify such a state of affairs.

References:

1. Barcz, Barbara. 2009. Aspect and expressions of habituality in Polish. *Lacus Forum* 35. 81-89.
2. Bertinetto, Pier Marco & Alessandro Lenci. 2012. Habituality, pluractionality, and imperfectivity. In Robert I. Binnick (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of tense and aspect*, 852-880. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
3. Bhat, Darben N. Shakara. 1999. The prominence of tense, aspect and mood. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
4. Binnick, Robert I. 2005. The markers of habitual aspect in English. *Journal of English Linguistics* 33(4). 339-369.
5. Binnick, Robert I. 2006. 'Used to' and habitual aspect in English. *Style* 40(1). 33-46.
6. Bonomi, Andrea. 1997. Aspect, quantification and when-clauses in Italian. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 20(5). 469-514.
7. Brosig, Benjamin & Elena Skribnik. 2018. Evidentiality in Mongolic. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvaivd (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of evidentiality*, 554-579. Oxford University Press.