

A layered approach to habitual expressions: Typological generalizations

Hongmei Fang¹, Egbert Fortuin², Rene Genis¹, Riccardo Giomi¹, Sune Gregersen³, Kees Hengeveld¹, Lois Kemp¹, Paula Kyselica¹, Ezra La Roi⁴, Hella Olbertz⁵, Eugenie Stapert³, Jacques van der Vliet², Hein van der Voort⁶, Sjaak de Wit¹, Arok Wolvengrey⁷, Ewa Zakrzewska¹.

¹*University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands*, ²*Leiden University, The Netherlands*, ³*Kiel University, Germany*, ⁴*Ghent University, Belgium*, ⁵*Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, Spain*, ⁶*Museu Goeldi, Belém, Brazil*, ⁷*First Nations University of Canada, Regina, Canada*.

Abstract

This chapter presents typological generalizations that can be derived from a comparison of the data presented in Chapters 2–11 in this volume. The languages are compared in the light of the two predictions presented in Chapter 1: (i) across and within languages, dedicated habitual expressions may differ from one another in terms of the layer(s) at which they apply; (ii) if a habitual expression may apply at more than one layer, the layers involved will be contiguous in the hierarchy of layers established within Functional Discourse Grammar. Both predictions are confirmed without exceptions, and thus support the new approach to habitual meanings elaborated in this volume.

1. Introduction

In this chapter we bring together the results of the different language-specific chapters in view

of the typological predictions presented in the introduction to this volume. We show that these correctly describe the distribution of constructions with habitual meaning across the different layers recognized in Functional Discourse Grammar (FDG; Hengeveld & Mackenzie, 2008). In Section 2 we briefly recapitulate the predictions and the ways these were tested in the volume. Section 3 then presents the results and their interpretation in the FDG framework. In Section 4 we briefly discuss how our findings supplement earlier work on habituais and how they may be of use to linguists describing habituais in other languages. Our conclusions are summarized in Section 5.

2. Predictions and background

In Chapter 1 of this volume, we presented a preliminary classification of habitual and related constructions based on the layered approach to grammatical categories in FDG. We also indicated how the possible types of habitual constructions could be identified using criteria inspired by the same framework. We will not repeat those aspects of the introduction here, but instead restrict ourselves to repeating the classification resulting from that procedure. Table 1 presents this classification.

Table 1. Habitual and related constructions

<i>Layer</i>	<i>Type of habitual/related construction</i>
Propositional Content (p)	1. Genericity at the layer of the Propositional Content: The propositional content is always true.
Episode (ep)	2. Habituality at the layer of the Episode: The series of States-of-Affairs constituting the Episode occurs regularly.
State-of-Affairs (e)	3. Habituality at the layer of the State-of-Affairs: An individual State-of-Affairs occurs regularly.

Situational Property (s)	4. Habituality at the layer of the Situational Property: A certain type of State-of-Affairs occurs regularly due to a propensity of a participant involved.
Lexical Property (f)	5. Multiplicativity at the layer of the Lexical Property: A single State-of-Affairs can be subdivided into several identical subparts.

We made a distinction in Chapter 1 between habitual constructions proper (types 2–4) and related categories, that is, constructions that often share their expression format with a habitual construction (types 1 and 5). There is a conceptual link between all five constructions as they all express different types of event quantification. As in the contributions to the volume, types 1 and 5 are only taken into account when their expression format is also used for a habitual construction proper.

The two predictions presented in Chapter 1 are repeated here as well:

1. Across and within languages, habitual expressions may differ from one another in terms of the layer(s) at which they apply.
2. If a habitual expression may apply at more than one layer, the layers involved will be contiguous in the hierarchy.

Prediction 1 follows directly from the approach taken in this book. The volume investigates whether habitual constructions with different scope can indeed be identified. It may then be observed that habitual constructions in the various languages may express different meanings that are associated with different layers of the hierarchy.

Prediction 2 follows from the FDG claim that in grammaticalization, contentive change is generally a matter of scope increase, a process in which a grammatical element assumes new

meanings or functions by moving up step by step along the layered hierarchies. The synchronic correlate of this is that, if a grammatical marker operates at more than one layer on either the Interpersonal or the Representational Level, these layers will be contiguous in the hierarchy.

3. Results

Table 2 presents the results reported in Chapters 2–11 on habitual constructions in the individual languages as well as the English constructions discussed in Chapter 1.

Table 2. Habitual and related constructions in the languages discussed in this volume

<i>Construction</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>ep</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>s</i>	<i>f</i>
English <i>will</i>					
Coptic <i>šare</i>					
English <i>would</i>					
Dolgan <i>-A:ččI</i>					
Ancient Greek <i>eío:tha</i>					
Ancient Greek modal past habitual					
European Portuguese <i>costumar</i>					
European Portuguese <i>ter.PRS</i>					
Russian <i>byvalo</i>					
Kwaza <i>-ta a-</i>					
Mandarin <i>guànyú</i>					
Spanish <i>solér</i>					
Ancient Greek iterative habitual					
Kwaza <i>-nāi e-</i>					
Plains Cree <i>māna</i>					
English <i>used to</i>					
Slovak <i>zvyknúť</i>					
Kwaza person reduplication					
Mandarin <i>ài</i>					
Spanish <i>acostumbrar</i>					
Ancient Greek <i>philéo/ethélo</i>					
Kwaza <i>ĩ'íta</i>					
Plains Cree <i>-ski</i>					

Slovak <i>va</i> -verbs					
Plains Cree <i>Cāh</i> - reduplication					

When confronting the results in Table 2 with Prediction 1, it is clear that Prediction 1 is borne out. For each type of habitual construction, there are indeed constructions in some sample languages that encode one of the habitual meanings only. For instance, the English construction with *would* operates only at the layer of the Episode, the Plains Cree *māna* construction only at the layer of the State-of-Affairs, and the Kwaza *ĩ'ũta* construction only at the layer of the Situational Property. For habitual markers operating at these different layers, we propose the terms EPISODE-ORIENTED HABITUAL, EVENT-ORIENTED HABITUAL, and PARTICIPANT-ORIENTED HABITUAL, respectively. We will now discuss markers that exclusively express one type of habitual meaning, and provide arguments for their classification.

Table 2 shows that English *would* only expresses Episode-oriented habitual meaning. We cannot use the complement clause test to corroborate this, as *would* is a portmanteau morpheme that combines habitual and past meaning (see Hengeveld et al., 2021, p. 73). However, *would* can occur within the scope of modifiers expressing unique temporal reference at the Episode layer (1), but has scope over recurring temporal modifiers at the State-of-Affairs layer (2):

- (1) You know, *back in those days*, they would print these books one at a time using a potato they carved. (TV Corpus)
- (2) *At night*, he would tell me stories or sing to me. (TV Corpus)

Furthermore, in terms of interpretation, as argued in Section 5 in the introductory chapter

(Gregersen & Hengeveld, this volume), *would* differs from *used to* in that, with the former, the repeated events involve non-specific participants, whose identity may vary across the different instances of the repeated event. Taken together, these properties of *would* provide grounds to classify it as a dedicated expression of Episode-oriented habitual meaning.

The Slovak construction *zvyknúť* + infinitive expresses Event-oriented habituality only. This may be shown most clearly by tests involving adverbials: in (3) we find the construction scoping over the event-oriented modal adverbial *povinne* ‘mandatorily’.

Slovak (Indo-European; Genis & Kyselica, this volume)

(3) *Európske lode plaviace sa do Ázie zvyk-l-i*

European ships sailing REFL to Asia AUX.HAB-PPT-[3]PL

povinne zastavova-t' v Kapskom Meste.

mandatorily halt.IPFV-INF in Cape Town

‘European ships sailing to Asia used to make a mandatory stop in Cape Town.’

[<https://www.actualidadviajes.com/sk/Kapsk%C3%A9-Mesto/> – Feb. 12, 2023]

The construction itself cannot be used within the scope of such adverbials, nor any other adverbials operating at the layer of the State-of-Affairs. The strategy does, however, occur within the scope of objective epistemic adverbials such as *naozaj* ‘really’, which operate on the level of the Episode, as in (4).

Slovak (Indo-European; Genis & Kyselica, this volume)

- (4) *Zdá sa, že Woods naozaj zvyko-l mieri-t'*
seem.IPFV.3SG REFL CONJ Woods really AUX.HAB-PPT.M.[3]SG aim.IPFV-INF
na jamku nie-len na domácom greene.
for hole not-only on home green
'It seems that Woods really used to aim for the hole, not just on his home green.' [SNK
- DŠ2009/12]

This already shows that the *zvyknúť* + infinitive construction itself operates at most at the layer of the Episode. Its scope can be narrowed down to that of the State-of-Affairs by tests involving operators (see the chapter on Slovak in this volume) and confirmed by the occurrence of the construction in the complement clauses down to the layer of the State-of-Affairs, as in the complement of the verb of immediate perception *vidieť* 'see', as in (5).

Slovak (Indo-European; Genis & Kyselica, this volume)

- (5) *Vidí-me, že ropa zvykn-e v januári klesa-t'*
see.IPFV-PRS.1PL that oil AUX.HAB-PRS.3SG in January decline.IPFV-INF
a dno dosahuj-e na začiatku marca.
and bottom reach.IPFV-PRS.3SG on beginning March
'We see that oil tends to decline in January and bottoms in early March.' [SNK -
HN2009/08]

Importantly, the construction has not been found in the complement of predicates that operate

at the lower layer of the Situational Property. This confirms that *zvyknút* + infinitive may be typified as an Event-oriented habitual construction.

Ancient Greek *philéo* and *ethélo* only express Participant-oriented habitual meaning. On the one hand, this becomes evident from the source meanings of these habitual auxiliaries, namely ‘love’ and ‘want’, respectively: what someone (i.e. animate) or something (i.e. inanimate) ‘loves’ or ‘wants’ to do may be used to ascribe habitual *propensities* to such participants. Note that the participants of this type of habituality need not be animate, because propensity, or rather the typicality of a participant’s behaviour, may be understood metaphorically, as illustrated below in example (6).

Ancient Greek (Indo-European; la Roi, this volume)

(6) *áneu gâr anankaíe:s ischurê:s sumbásies*
 without PTC^C constraint.GEN strong.GEN agreements.NOM
iskhurai ouk ethélousi summénein.
 strong NEG want.3PL.IND.PRS remain.INF

[they brought it about that there should be a sworn agreement and a compact of marriage between them: they judged that Alyattes should give his daughter Aryenis to Astyages, son of Cyaxares;] for without strong constraint agreements are not wont to keep their force (Hdt. 1.74.18-19)

On the other hand, operators and modifiers from hierarchically higher layers, such as the State-of-Affairs layer, scope over this type of habituality, such as negation of the State-of-Affairs in (6), and relative temporal modification in (7):

Ancient Greek (Indo-European; la Roi, this volume)

(7) *phileî* *dè* *tiktein* *húbris* *mèn* *palaià*
love.3SG.IND.PRS PTC^C generate.INF hubris.NOM PTC^C old.NOM
neázousan *en* *kakoîs* *brotô:n* *húbrin* *tót' _è: _tóth'*,
young.PTCP.ACC amid evil.DAT mortals.GEN hubris.ACC sooner.or.later
hóte *tò* *kúrion* *móle:* *pháos* *tókou*,
when the fated.NOM come.3SG.IND.PRS light.NOM birth.GEN

‘But old Hubris tends to bring forth in evil men, sooner or later, whenever the fated hour of birth comes, a young hubris’ (A. Ag. 763-767)

Crucially, these two auxiliaries can be shown to express a different type of habituality than the other main auxiliary, *éio:tha* ‘used to’, which has ‘be in the habit of’ as source meaning and is used to express habituality on the layers of the State-of-Affairs and the Episode (see la Roi, this volume).

In Table 1 we identified two meanings related to the three habitual ones, namely genericity and multiplicativity. In Table 2 constructions expressing these meanings are only included when they also express one or more habitual meanings. Note that there are also languages that have dedicated expressions for these constructions: in Section 5 of the introduction to this volume (Gregersen & Hengeveld, this volume) we mentioned the case of the Portuguese future, which in one of its uses expresses genericity at the Propositional Content layer only, and the case of A’ingae reduplication, which expresses multiplicativity at the layer of the Lexical Property only.

Not only does Table 2 meet Prediction 1, but it also strongly confirms Prediction 2. As the table shows, 17 out of the 25 constructions studied indeed occur at more than one layer, and when they do, they span contiguous categories of habitual and related meanings. There is overlap between constructions at the Propositional Content and Episode layers in two cases, between the Episode and State-of-Affairs layers in twelve cases, between the State-of-Affairs and Situational Property layers in eight cases, and between the Situational Property and Lexical Property layer in four cases. In several cases a habitual construction spans more than two categories of meaning, with a maximum of five, as is the case for Coptic *šare*. The Ancient Greek iterative habitual and the Kwaza *-nāi e-* construction span four layers. We will illustrate the use of one construction to express contiguous meanings in a pairwise fashion.

The combination of generic meaning and Episode-oriented habitual meaning is present in the Coptic habitual construction with *šare*. This construction can express situations considered to be always true and thus has generic meaning, which pertains to the layer of the Propositional Content. Examples of such omnitemporal truths include definitions, naming constructions, maxims and proverbs as well as articles of faith, such as in (8):

Coptic (Afro-Asiatic; van der Vliet & Zakrzewska, this volume)

(8) I said to the angel: “My Lord, how much is the stadium of God?”. The angel said to me:

ⲗⲉ ⲩⲁⲣⲉ ⲡⲈⲤⲀⲔⲔⲒⲐⲐⲐⲐ ⲛⲉ ⲒⲟⲩⲙⲐⲛⲏ.

če šare pe-stadion r ou-monē

QUOT HAB DEF.SG.M-stadium make INDF.SG-day’s.journey

“The stadium equals a day’s journey.” (Paul 23, 2).

At the layer of the Episode, the habitual expresses a series of States-of-Affairs which occurs regularly. The States-of-Affairs within an Episode are temporally and spatially coherent. In Coptic such a series is marked grammatically by means of the so-called Conjunctive conjugation which continues the TMA values of the initial verb, expressing subsequent States-of-Affairs within the Episode. As (9) demonstrates, a new temporal frame opens up a new Episode and consequently the description of the habits of the same participant, a holy monk, starts anew with the habitual and is then continued in the Conjunctive:

Coptic (Afro-Asiatic; van der Vliet & Zakrzewska, this volume)

- (9) ⲉⲙ ⲡⲱⲱⲙ ⲗⲉ ⲉⲱⲱϥ **ϣⲁϥⲗⲗⲉⲣⲁⲧϥ**
hm p-šōm *de hōō=f* **ša=f-aaherat=f**
 in DEF.SG.M-summer PTC self=3SG.M HAB=3SG.M-stand=3SG.M
- ⲉⲛ ⲧⲙⲏⲏⲧⲉ ⲙⲡⲕⲁϥⲙⲁ **ⲛϥϣⲗⲏⲗ**
hn t-mēēte *m-p-kauma* **n=f-šlēl**
 in DEF.SG.F-midst GEN-DEF.SG.M-heat CNJ=3SG.M-pray

‘In summer, on the other hand, he would stand in the middle of the heat (and) pray.’

(Aaron 130).

The combination of Episode-oriented and Event-oriented habitual meaning is found in Dolgan -A:ččI, as shown by (10) and (11):

Dolgan (Turkic; Stapert, this volume)

- (10) *hild'-a:čči-bit palatka egel-s-t-e:čči-bit iti*
go-HAB-1PL tent bring-COLL-CAUS-HAB-1PL that
Diana palatka egel-s-t-e:čči onno
Diana.[NOM] tent bring-COLL-CAUS-HAB.[3SG] there
onn'o:-čču-but palatka ih-i-ger
play-HAB-1PL tent inside-3SG-DAT

‘We walk around, we bring a tent, well Diana brings a tent, there we play in the tent’

[AnKA_2009_Story_nar.008 (011)]

- (11) *Tolor-o:ru pla:n-i tolor-o:ru ilči d'ie-ge*
fill-CVB.PURP plan-ACC fill-CVB.PURP very house-DAT
egel-e-egel-e tik-te:-čči e-ti-bit
bring-CVB.SIM-bring-CVB.SIM sew-MLTPL-PTCP.HAB be-PST1-1PL

‘To fulfil [it], to fulfil the plan well, we always took stuff home and sewed there’

Literal translation: ‘we always sewed it, taking it home’

[AkNN_KuNS_200212_LifeHandicraft_conv.AkNN.055 (001.067)]

Both examples (10) and (11) contain multiple States-of-Affairs as well as habitual verb forms, marked by the suffix *-(A:)ččI*. However, they differ regarding the scope of the habitual suffix. In (10), a dedicated habitual verb is used to describe habituality for each separate event in the sentence (*hild'a:ččibit* ‘we walk around’, *egelse:ččibit* ‘we bring’, *onn'o:ččubut* ‘we play’), showing that the habitual suffix *-A:ččI* scopes over just a single State-of-Affairs each time. This means that it can be conceived of as an Event-oriented habitual. At the same time, example

(11) shows that *-A:ččI* can also have scope over a series of States-of-Affairs, represented by *egele* ‘taking stuff home’ and *tikte:čči etibit* ‘we used to sew’. Although the habitual meaning clearly applies to both States-of-Affairs, it is represented overtly only once, namely on the finite verb *tikte:čči etibit* ‘we used to sew’. This shows that the suffix *-A:ččI* in Dolgan can scope over multiple States-of-Affairs, and thus also operates at the layer of the Episode.

The combination of Event-oriented and Participant-oriented habitual meaning is found in Mandarin *ài*. This is evident from the fact that it can occur within the scope of operators expressing perfect aspectual meaning at the State-of-Affairs layer (12), can have scope over operators expressing the multiplicative aspect at the Lexical Property layer (13), and can occur in complement clauses of phrasal predicates at the Situational Property layer (14). These phenomena suggest that *ài* operates at the layer of the Situational Property.

Mandarin (Sino-Tibetan; Fang, this volume)

- (12) *Zuìjìn yī duàn shíjiān, nǎinai fāxiàn, qíqí jìngrán ài*
 recent one period time grandma find Qiqi surprisingly HAB
sāhuǎng le
 lie PRF

‘Recently, grandma, to her surprise, discovered that Qiqi started to lie.’

- (13) *Bǎobǎo wǎnshàng shuìjiào zǒng ài fānláifùqù*
 baby night sleep always HAB toss.and.turn

‘Babies always tend to toss and turn (lit. ‘turn come toss go’) in their sleep at night.’

- (14) *Érzi liǎng suì líng sān gè yuè, kāishǐ ài dǎ rén le*
 son two year plus three CLF month begin HAB hit people PRF
 ‘(My) son is two years and three months old, and he has started to hit people.’

However, *ài* can also scope over modifiers of the State-of-Affairs, such as the recurrent temporal modifier *wǎnshàng* ‘at night’ in (15), but not over higher modifiers, which shows that it also operates at the layer of the State-of-Affairs:

Mandarin (Sino-Tibetan; Fang, this volume)

- (15) *Wèishéme bǎobǎo ài wǎnshàng chūshēng?*
 why baby HAB night be.born
 ‘Why do babies tend to be born at night?’

Semantically, the Mandarin *ài* can indicate either that an individual State-of-Affairs occurs frequently or that the repetition of a certain type of State-of-Affairs is characteristic of the participant involved.

The combination of Participant-oriented habitual meaning and multiplicativity is found in Plains Cree *Cāh-* reduplication. This overlap can be shown with the following examples. In (16)–(17), the two main types of reduplication, durative *Ca-* (16) and frequentative *Cāh-* (17) are exemplified, functioning at the level of the Situational Property (cf. Wolvengrey, this volume).

Plains Cree (Wolwengrey, this volume; Bear et al., 1992, pp. 208–209)

(16) *kī-māci-ma~mātow*

kī-māci-**ma**~māto-w

PST-ING-DUR~VAI.cry-3SG

‘S/he started crying.’

(17) ... *ahpō māna pihēwa ē-kī-nitawi-pāh~pāskiswāt sakāhk māna nimāmā.*

ahpō māna pihēw-a ē-kī-nitawi-**pāh**~pāskiswāt

or generally NA.partridge-OBV CNJ-PST-TRLOC-FREQ~VTA.shoot-DIR-3SG

sakāw-ihk māna ni-māmā

NI.bush-LOC generally 1-NDA.mom

‘... or she would go and shoot partridges in the bush [my mom would]’

When these two types of reduplication co-occur, they must occur in the order *Ca-Cāh-*, in which case the heavy reduplicative *Cāh-* serves to mark the multiplicative nature of the verb (i.e. the Lexical Property) within the single durative Situational Property, as shown in (18) and (19).

Plains Cree (Ahenakew & Wolfart, 1983, p. 372; Masuskapoe, 2010, p. 96)

(18) *nima~māh~matwēhikān* (*nimāh-ma-matwēhikān)

ni-**ma**~**māh**~matwēhik[ē>ā]-n

1-DUR~MLTPL~VAI.knock-1/2SG

‘I keep knocking (on a door, with a hammer) repeatedly.’

‘I keep a slow, steady beat’

(19) *ēkosi, ē-wa~wāh~wīcēwak, ...*

ēkosi ē-wa~wāh~wīcēw-ak

so CNJ-DUR~MLTPL~VTA.accompany-1SG>3SG

‘So, while I was accompanying him on occasion, ...’

‘So, as I am seeing him serially, ...’

4. Discussion and suggestions

As we mentioned in the introductory chapter (see Gregersen & Hengeveld, this volume, Section 2), the literature on aspectual meanings has generally treated habituality as a single semantic category. On the basis of our cross-linguistic survey, we suggest that the picture is rather more complicated: languages may have more than one habitual marker, and habitual markers may differ semantically between languages. In the surveyed languages, we found habitual markers which operate at only one of the layers distinguished by FDG (e.g. Kwaza *ĩʔta*), habitual markers operating at more than one layer (e.g. Spanish *soledad*), and habitual markers “extending” into neighbouring semantic domains, namely genericity (e.g. Coptic *šare*) or multiplicativity (e.g. Plains Cree *Cāh-* reduplication).

While the syncretic expression of habitual and other meanings has certainly been noted before – cf. e.g. Dahl’s (1985, pp. 98–100) ‘habitual-generic’ category or the ‘iterative/habitual’ grams mentioned by Bybee *et al.* (1994, p. 159) – we are not aware of any literature taking a layered perspective like the one adopted in this volume (with the exception of Hengeveld *et al.*, 2021). However, we believe that this approach has great potential for a more detailed

description of habituality and related categories in the world’s languages. On the one hand, the classification may be used to shed light on distributional and functional differences between habitual markers in individual languages, such as the differences between Slovak *zvyknúť* and *-va* noted by Genis & Kyselica (this volume). On the other hand, the recognition that habituality represents a family of related meanings may inform grammatical descriptions of languages with habitual markers differing from e.g. English, Spanish, and other common “reference languages”. Consider the recent description of the Amazonian language Tikuna, where Bertet (2020, pp. 345–347) describes a “tendency” suffix *-tq’a* (glossed ‘with.a.tendency’ in the grammar). This expresses that the subject referent “has a tendency or a propensity to perform the process” denoted by the predicate (Bertet, 2020, p. 345), as illustrated in (20)–(21):

Tikuna (Isolate; South America; Bertet, 2020, p. 346)

(20) *tãu ní̄=dé’â-tq’a*

NEG 3M/N/NS.SBJ.PC̄̄=speak-with.a.tendency

‘They won’t speak’ (lit. ‘they don’t have a tendency to speak’)

(21) *tãu ì=âirũ-ã-tq’ũ*

NEG PC̄̄.SBJV=dog-POSS-with.a.tendency\SBJV

‘You don’t usually take a dog along’ (lit. ‘you don’t tend to have a dog with you’)

In the terms suggested above, this might be described as a PARTICIPANT-ORIENTED HABITUAL, i.e. a habitual marker operating at the Situational Property layer, though further work on the

language is of course necessary to confirm this.¹

Finally, it is worth noting that there may of course also be differences between habitual constructions which pertain to other factors – e.g. semantic, syntactic, or stylistic – than the layered structure. For instance, the two habitual constructions described by Widmer (2017) for Bunan (Sino-Tibetan; India) appear to have different evidential values: one construction presents the information as “based on the speaker’s personal experience (egophoric form) or on common knowledge (allophoric form)”, whereas the other presents it “without specifying the way in which it relates to the speaker’s knowledge” (Widmer, 2017, pp. 567–568). These and other semantic distinctions in the domain of habituality still require further investigation. We hope that this book is a step in the right direction.

5. Conclusions

The results of the cross-linguistic project presented in this volume show that Functional Discourse Grammar correctly predicts the existence of a variety of habitual and related constructions, the differences and similarities between which can be captured in terms of the notion of scope that underlies the hierarchical structure of FDG. The three types of habitual meaning identified in this volume find unique expression in 8 out of the 26 constructions studied in this volume, and unique expression of the related generic and multiplicative meanings has

¹ A similar case is found in the grammar of Lao (Tai-Kadai; Laos) by Enfield (2007). Here an “aspectual-modal marker” *makl* is described, glossed ‘tend (to)’ or ‘TEND’ (Enfield, 2007, pp. 221–222). Judging from the glossed examples, we think this might also be an example of a participant-oriented habitual in our terms.

been attested as well. When habitual constructions are used at more than one layer, these layers are always contiguous, which follows from the approach to grammaticalization adopted in FDG.

Acknowledgements

We are very grateful to J. Lachlan Mackenzie for his helpful comments on an earlier version of this paper.

Abbreviations not included in the Leipzig Glossing Rules

CNJ conjunctive mood	NS non-salientive
COLL collective	PC \bar{i} predicative class \bar{i}
CONJ conjunction	PC \emptyset predicative class \emptyset
DIR direction	PL plural
DUR durative	POSS possessive
FREQ frequentative	PPT past participle
HAB habitual	PRF perfect
ING ingressive	PTC particle
MLTPL multiplicative	SIM simultaneity
NA animate noun	TRLOC translocative
NDA dependent animate noun	VAI animate intransitive verb
NI inanimate noun	VTA animate transitive verb

References

- Ahenakew, F., & Wolfart, H. C. 1983. Productive reduplication in Plains Cree. In W. Cowan (Ed.), *Actes du Quatorzième Congrès des Algonquistes* (pp. 369–377). Ottawa: Carleton University.
- Bear, G., Fraser, M., Calliou, I., Wells, M., Lafond, A., & Longneck, R. (1992). *kôhkominawak otâcimowiniwâwa/Our grandmothers' lives as told in their own words*. Ed. by F. Ahenakew & H. C. Wolfart. Saskatoon: Fifth House Publishers.
- Bertet, D. (2020). *Aspects of Tikuna grammar (San Martín de Amacayacu variety, Colombia): Phonology, nominal phrase, predicative phrase*. PhD Thesis, L'Université Lumière Lyon 2.
- Bybee, J., Perkins, R., & Pagliuca, W. (1994). *The evolution of grammar: Tense, aspect, and modality in the languages of the world*. Chicago University Press.
- Dahl, Ö. 1985. *Tense and aspect systems*. Blackwell.
- Enfield, N. (2007). *A grammar of Lao*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Fang, H. (this volume). Habitual constructions in Mandarin. In S. Gregersen, & K. Hengeveld (Eds.), *A layered approach to habitual expressions* (pp. ##-##). John Benjamins.
- Genis, R., & Kyselica, P. (this volume). Habitual constructions in Slovak. In S. Gregersen, & K. Hengeveld (Eds.), *A layered approach to habitual expressions* (pp. ##-##). John Benjamins.

- Gregersen, S., & Hengeveld, K. (this volume). A layered approach to habitual expressions: Introduction. In S. Gregersen, & K. Hengeveld (Eds.), *A layered approach to habitual expressions* (pp. ##-##). John Benjamins.
- Hengeveld, K., & Mackenzie, J. L. (2008). *Functional Discourse Grammar: A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford University Press.
- Hengeveld, K., Clarke, C., & Kemp, L. (2021). A layered approach to (past) habituality in English. *Linguistics in Amsterdam*, 14(1), 65–80.
- la Roi, E. (this volume). Habitual constructions in Ancient Greek. In S. Gregersen, & K. Hengeveld (Eds.), *A layered approach to habitual expressions* (pp. ##-##). John Benjamins.
- Masuskapoe, C. (2010). *piko kikway ê-nakacihât: kékék otâcimowina ê-nêhiyawastêki*. Ed. by H. C. Wolfart & F. Ahenakew. Winnipeg: Algonquian and Iroquoian Linguistics.
- Stapert, E. (this volume). The habitual construction in Dolgan. In S. Gregersen, & K. Hengeveld (Eds.), *A layered approach to habitual expressions* (pp. ##-##). John Benjamins.
- van der Vliet, J., & Zakrzewska, E. (this volume). The habitual construction in Sahidic Coptic. In S. Gregersen, & K. Hengeveld (Eds.), *A layered approach to habitual expressions* (pp. ##-##). John Benjamins.
- Widmer, M. (2017). *A grammar of Bunan*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Wolvengrey, A. (this volume). Habitual constructions in *nêhiyawêwin* (Plains Cree). In S. Gregersen, & K. Hengeveld (Eds.), *A layered approach to habitual expressions* (pp. ##-##). John Benjamins.