

The Semantics of Habitual Sentences in Jordanian Arabic

Ruba Al-Refai, Aziz Jaber *

The Department of English Language and Literature, Yarmouk University, Jordan

Received on: 12-9-2023

Accepted on: 5-9-2024

Abstract

This article investigates the semantic structure of habituals in Jordanian Arabic. The article challenges the prevailing view that simple habituals are merely a homogeneous subtype of generics (Carlson 2012). Instead, it advocates the existence of a distinct operator named 'Hab,' separate from 'Gen'. This operator functions as a "modalized existential quantifier over sums of events." (Boneh and Doron 2013, 177) Habituals in the dialect can be categorized into two types: quantificational and non-quantificational. The former exhibits a restrictor in the form of an adverbial adjunct, often exemplified by cyclicity adverbials such as *da:jman es^s-s^subeħ*, 'always in the morning'. On the other hand, the latter refers to bare habituals that do not include such a constraining adjunct. These habituals often occur in conjunction with atelic predicates. Furthermore, the investigation underscores the feasibility of deriving habituals from kind generics, where such constructions either incorporate stage-level predicates or present a form of weak generalization.

Keywords: habitual sentences, generic sentences, quantificational habituals, bare habituals, Jordanian Arabic.

1. Introduction

Since the publication of the seminal collective work "The Generic Book" (Carlson and Pelletier 1995), generic sentences have been a primary focus for semanticists. With a unified analysis, genericity serves as a linguistic tool to convey generalizations about the world (Langacker 1997). Certain generic sentences are employed to depict a regularity in which a generalization over a collection of specific facts or particular instances holds true (Carlson and Pelletier 1995). This category is referred to as characterizing sentences or I-generics (Krifka et al. 1995). However, characterizing sentences give rise to various constructions. One of these is habitual sentences, which express a consistent plurality of events. This regularity isn't defined by mere succession or iteration but is manifested through the representation of habituals, encompassing an infinite number of events (Krifka et al. 1995; Schubert & Pelletier 1989; Carlson 2005).

Generic sentences can sometimes be ambiguous between two readings: characterizing and habitual (Boneh 2019). For instance, "Ahmad sells furniture" can be interpreted either as Ahmad having the

© 2026 JJMLL Publishers/Yarmouk University. All Rights Reserved,

* Doi: <https://doi.org/10.47012/jjml.18.1.1>

* Corresponding Author: aziz@yu.edu.jo

characteristic of selling furniture or as Ahmad being engaged in the habitual activity of selling furniture. The challenge lies in determining whether a single, underlying generic operator can account for both characterizing and habitual interpretations, or if these are two distinct types of construals with separate semantic representations.

Nonetheless, habitual-characterizing sentences and lexical-characterizing sentences represent two distinct constructions. In contrast to characterizing sentences, the predicates utilized with habituals are non-stative. While characterizing sentences involve attributing a descriptive property to the referent, habituals focus on describing regular and recurrent events in which the referent takes part. This contrast is applicable in Jordanian Arabic (JA). The distinction becomes evident when considering the examples provided in (1 & 2)¹.

(1) ʔajman bi-ʕrif ʔingli:zi.
 Ayman 3.know English
 ‘Ayman knows English.’

(2) ʔajman bi-ħki: ʔingli:zi.
 Ayman 3.speak English
 ‘Ayman speaks English.’

In (1), the predicate *bi-ʕrif* ‘know’ is stative. It doesn’t indicate an internal change; instead, it refers to a lasting state of knowing English that holds true across all time intervals (i.e., homogeneous). As a result, the sentence in (1) is a lexical characterizing sentence interpreted as ascribing the enduring trait of knowing English to Ayman. Consequently, it doesn’t align well with contextual limitations and conveys a law-like generalization.

However, the predicate *bi-ħki:* ‘speak’ in (2) is dynamic; nevertheless, it remains compatible with a habitual interpretation. The generalization applies to instances of speaking English involving Ayman. Predicates employed in habitual constructions shift from dynamic to stative by the effect of a covert operator. Because this operator isn’t phonologically realized, it carries a meaning akin to quantifying adverbs like ‘typically’ or ‘usually’ (Krifka et al. 1995). Consequently, adding quantifying adverbs to habitual sentences brings about minor changes. Conversely, lexical characterizing sentences seem semantically awkward with such adverbs. Thus, introducing the adverb *biʕa:deh* ‘usually’ in JA brings about slight alterations in habituals. For instance, attempting to rephrase (1) into (3) results in an awkward sentence, while reworking (2) into (4) is acceptable:

(3) *ʔajman biʕadeh bi-ʕrif ingli:zi.
 Ayman usually 3.know English
 ‘*Ayman usually knows English.’

(4) ʔajman biʕadeh bi-ħki: ingli:zi.
 Ayman usually 3.speak English
 ‘Ayman usually speaks English.’

The sentence produced in (3) with the added adverb becomes semantically infelicitous because the predicate type is stative and thus unchangeable (Al-Aqarbeh 2015). Consequently, including the adverb *bilʕa:deh* 'usually' implies that there are situations in which Ayman does not know English. To support this assertion, it's noteworthy that, unlike eventive predicates, statives such as the example provided in (3) are considered unacceptable when combined with the adverb *ʕamdan* 'deliberately'. However, a different pattern emerges, as demonstrated in (4), where only minor alterations are apparent in the resulting proposition.

Drawing on data from JA, this article challenges the notion that simple habituals are a homogeneous subset of generics (Carlson 2012), instead aligning with the perspective that they incorporate a distinct operator termed 'Hab'. This operator distinguishes itself from "Gen" and is defined as "a modalized existential quantifier over sums of events" (Boneh and Doron 2013, 177). In other words, the habitual reading originates from the verb itself and thus encompasses the multiplication of events as an outcome of Hab.

2. Methodology

The current study doesn't rely on a corpus-based approach; instead, it employs a qualitative, theory-driven methodology. The data used in this study comprise constructed utterances situated in specific contexts, validated by the authors themselves—native speakers of two varieties of JA: rural and urban. The accuracy and appropriateness of these utterances within their respective contexts were further evaluated by four linguists, all native speakers of JA (two urban and two rural). The study aims to address a range of issues concerning the meanings and functions of habitual sentences, striving to establish meaningful connections and clear distinctions between habituals and the broader semantic phenomena of genericity and quantification. The theoretical framework adopted in this research is rooted in truth-conditional semantics, forming the basis for calculating the meanings of habitual sentences in the dialect.

3. Viewpoint Aspect in Jordanian Arabic

The temporal features of pluractional constructions in natural languages are essential for judging the truth or falsity of a situation (Hinrichs 1986). Tense specifies the time of a situation in terms of the speech time; thus, it is deictic (Comrie 1976). Aspect clarifies the perfective/imperfective distinction, defining whether the situation is complete or incomplete, ongoing, durative, iterative, or habitual (Mudhsh 2021). In Arabic, predicate inflection indicates both tense and aspect (Comrie 1976; Fehri 1993). Specifically, the perfective form includes past tense and perfectivity, while the imperfective form expresses present tense and imperfectivity in the absence of any contextual clues or adverbial elements. Yet, tense is sometimes expressed in the context alongside aspect (Comrie 1976). However, predicates in Jordanian Arabic (JA) have two morphological forms: perfective and imperfective. The latter is marked by the aspectual prefix "bi-" in JA. Agreement forms with the perfective occur as both a prefix and a suffix, whereas the imperfective expresses agreement inflections with only a prefix (Al-Aqarbeh, 2015).

In JA, *al-ma:dʕi:* (perfective/past) refers to the perfective aspect and denotes complete actions (i.e., bounded or telic events), while *al-mudʕa:riʕ* (imperfective/present) refers to the imperfective aspect and

denotes incomplete actions (i.e., unbounded or atelic events) (Ryding, 2005). An example of the simple past tense in JA is *nimet* "I slept," while the present tense is *bokel* "I eat/I am eating." Unlike English, which exhibits tense markers such as the "be" marker, the simple and progressive aspects have no morphological markers in JA (Al-Aqarbeh 2015). For example, the imperfective expresses both the present simple and present continuous, especially in the absence of temporal adverbials (Mudhsh 2021). Tense in JA is captured either by temporal references or by context. For instance, (2) above, repeated in (5), could have an episodic reading, referring to a particular individual, Ayman, who is speaking English at the moment, or a habitual interpretation, referring to repeated situations of Ayman speaking English.:

(5) ?ajman bi-hki: ?ingli:zi.
 Ayman 3.speak English
 'Ayman knows English.'

In JA, it is difficult to differentiate between habitual and progressive situations in the absence of tense markers. This is supported by Carlson (2012), who claims that in languages that lack a specific habitual form and provide an imperfective form, the imperfective includes both a habitual interpretation and an episodic reading akin to the progressive aspect. Comrie (1976) supports this claim by stating that habituality is one of the meanings of imperfectivity. Bybee et al. (1994) conclude that habituality is part of the imperfective meaning. Thus, the imperfective raises two ambiguous readings: a habitual-type reading and a progressive-type reading. Moreover, the perfective aspect is used to express both the past continuous tense and the past simple tense with the use of the perfective verb *ka* in JA (Mudhsh 2021). The auxiliary *ka:n* is similar to the "to be" verb in English, as in *?ajman ka:n ta?ba:n* "Ayman was tired." The auxiliary verb *ka:n* is located outside the VP since it works as a tense/aspect marker in JA. Thus, it expresses functional meaning rather than lexical meaning (Yasin and Hussein, 2021). This auxiliary verb in JA has different uses based on the complement type. When the verb *ka:n* is followed by an imperfective verb, it is used either to express a past habit similar to "used to" in English, as in (6), or to denote a progressive aspect, as in (7):

(6) ka:n ?ajman yi-rkab ba:s^f edʒ-dʒa:mʃah kul jo:m
 was Ayman 3.Pres-ride bus the-university every day
 'Ayman used to take the university bus every day.'

(7) ?ajman ka:n bi-judrus ?imba:rih
 Ayman was 3.Pres-study yesterday
 'Ayman was studying yesterday.'

Both readings can be distinguished based on the adverbial elements. In (6), the habitual adverbial forces a habitual reading. This is supported by Fehri (1993), who states that when *ka:n* is followed by the present tense, it denotes a habitual or iterative meaning. On the other hand, (7) forces an episodic interpretation since it describes the spatiotemporal properties of the individual Ayman. The progressive *ka:n* is compatible with the auxiliary verb *qa:ʃid* "literal meaning: sit, functional meaning: progressive marker". This verb is considered an overt lexical progressive marker in JA and functions as

an auxiliary that occurs before the imperfective verb (Sellami, 2022). However, the habitual *ka:n* is not compatible with the progressive marker *qa:fid*.

3.1 *Disassociating Habituality from Progressivity in JA*

Habitual and progressive constructions are represented in linguistic literature in two distinct ways. Some scholars represent them as being subtypes of imperfectivity (Comrie 1976; Ferreira 2005). They are analyzed semantically and morphologically as having the same operator, which quantifies over events. The only distinguishing factor is the event number: the progressive aspect includes singular events, while habituals refer to plural events. Others assume that there are two distinct operators for each construction (Giannakidou 1995; Boneh and Doron 2008).

This study follows the latter approach, arguing that the progressive and habitual constructions are not analyzed by the same operator. Nevertheless, the progressive and simple aspects in JA do not have morphological modifications to distinguish between them; both are used in simple forms. In English, progressive morphology includes an auxiliary and a verb with a suffix (-ing), as in “Ahmad is playing football.” Such constructions are interpreted episodically (Mudhsh 2021). While JA has no overt tense marker, the present tense with eventive predicates is ambiguous between progressive and habitual readings.

However, several tests can be used to differentiate the two aspects. The first is the type of temporal adverbials. Habituals are used with frequency adverbs such as *da:jman* “always,” *bilʕa:deh* “usually,” and *marrah bil-ʔisbu:ʕ* “once a week,” among others. In contrast, temporal adverbials with non-stative predicates describe properties of spatiotemporal slices of individuals, thereby raising episodic interpretations, and are used with the progressive aspect (Carlson 1977). Like Modern Standard Arabic (MSA), the progressive aspect in JA is compatible with reference adverbials such as *l-jo:m* “today,” *hassa* “now,” *min sa:ʕa* “since an hour,” as well as locatives like *fi: el-matʕbax* “in the kitchen” and perception verbs such as *fu:f* “look” (Jaber 2014). This is illustrated in (8) and (9):

- | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------|
| (8) ʔajman | b-o:kil | tuffa:hah | hassa | [Episodic] |
| Ayman | 3.Pres-eat | apple | now | |
| ‘Ayman is eating an apple now.’ | | | | |
| (9) ʔajman | da:jman | b-o:kil | tuffa:hah | [habitual] |
| Ayman | always | 3.Pres-eat | apple | |
| ‘Ayman always eats an apple.’ | | | | |

In (8), the progressive reports an accidental fact about Ayman eating an apple at a specific time and place, making it interpreted episodically. Unlike habitual constructions, it is evident that the progressive aspect renders sentences with the temporal adverb *hassa* “now” felicitous. In contrast, (9) reports multiple situations of Ayman eating an apple, and the habitual reading is compatible with temporal adverbs like *da:jman* “always.” Unlike habitual constructions, the progressive aspect in JA can either be null or lexicalized with the optional active participle of the verb *qa:fid* “progressive marker” to indicate an ongoing activity at the time of the utterance. This is exemplified in (10), which denotes a continuous

action of eating an apple, and (11), which seems grammatically and semantically unacceptable with habitual interpretations:

(10) ?ajman qa:ʕid b-o:kil tuffa:ħah hassa
Ayman Prog. 3.Pres.eat apple now

‘Ayman is eating an apple now.’

(11) *?ajman qa:ʕid dayman b-o:kil tuffa:ħah
Ayman Prog. always 3.Pres.eat apple

‘*Ayman is always eating an apple.’

The last distinguishing factor is the negative polarity test. Habitual sentences in JA license the existence of the negative polarity item ?*ajj* "any," as in ?*ajman da:jman bo:kil ?ajj tuffa:ħah* "Ayman always eats any apple." In contrast, progressive constructions do not license ?*ajj*, producing semantically odd propositions, as in *?*ajman qa:ʕid bo:kil ?ajj tuffa:ħah hassa* "Ayman is eating any apple now" (Giannakidou, 1995). Sometimes, the context is used to disambiguate between the two aspects by limiting the set of situations to a semantically definite one (Jaber, 2014). For instance, if Abeer and Julia are discussing the healthy habits that Ayman usually follows, Julia might tell Abeer that ?*ajman da:jman bo:kil tuffa:ħa* "Ayman always eats an apple." Here, only the habitual reading is available. Conversely, if Abeer asks Julia about Ayman's current location and Julia responds with ?*ajman ga:ʕid bo:kil tuffaħah* "Ayman is eating an apple," the episodic reading is more salient, as it describes an action in progress at the time of utterance.

In summary, progressives and habituais are not construed as two faces of the same coin in JA. Although both are imperfective, different factors are used to differentiate between them. Habitual constructions can also be interpreted episodically when referring to a particular event using the progressive aspect, or habitually when reporting variable situations using the present simple (Jaber, 2014).

4. A Generic (Gen) or A Habitual (Hab) Operator: Evidence from JA

Some constructions express a habitual reading based on the presence of an overt quantificational element (Lenci 1995). For instance, (12) expresses a regular event of cooking mansaf every Friday by using the quantificational element *kul dʒumʕa* 'every Friday':

(12) el- ʔurdunijji:n b-utʕbux-u: mansaf kul dʒumʕa.
the-Jordanians 3.cook-pl mansaf every friday

‘Jordanians cook mansaf every Friday.’

This type of habitual construction is known as quantificational habituais (Vogeleer 2012). It is worth mentioning that such constructions are represented by a relational approach described by Krifka et al. (1995) as having a tripartite structure. Thus, habituais as generics tolerate exceptions. The only difference between them is that Gen with habituais binds situations. The logical form (LF) of a habitual sentence is given below (Krifka 1989, 15)

GEN [...s.;.] (Restrictor [...s.]; Matrix [...s.]), where s is a situation variable”

Therefore, the LF of the sentence in (12) includes the quantifier Gen restricted to Jordanians-every-Friday events, and a mansaf can scope under Gen, allowing a different mansaf per Jordanians-every-Friday cooking event.

(12. a) Gen e [kul-dzumʕa (e, el- ʔurdunijji:n)] ∃x [mansaf(x) & cook(e, el- ʔurdunijji:n, x)]

On the other hand, some forms of habitual constructions need not be restricted. The event multiplications occur at the VP level. That is, the verb phrase itself denotes a plurality of situations without the need for an explicit restrictor (Boneh & Doron 2013). These predicates function as statives since they change from activities to states (i.e., from stage-level to Individual-level predicates) through the event iteration expressed (Landman & Rothstein 2010 and Jaber 2014). Such constructions are known in the literature as unrestricted habituals, bare habituals, or non-quantificational habituals (e.g., Cohen 2004; Rimell 2004; Vogeleer 2012; Boneh and Doron 2013). They are analyzed as having a binary structure in which the subject receives the topic's function, and the predicate includes an informational focus (Krifka et al. 1995). They are divided into two categories. The first is inductive in which a generalization is based on the observation of episodic events (Vogeleer 2012). The first category is dubbed 'complex bare habituals (CBH)' since it is instantiated in the actual world, while the second is deductive since it is constructed without actualization (Vogeleer 2012).

The present study adheres to the analysis put forth by Boneh and Doron (2008) that the dynamic predicates incorporate an iterative operator attached to the verb itself, not to the NP. Thus, the notion of iterativity excludes singularity. It is derived from the plural event which stems from Link's sum operator (1983). The operator lacks scope; consequently, it cannot distribute over the habitual operator. In other words, non-quantificational habituals which include bare singulars reveal scope ambiguities because the operator couldn't distribute bare singulars in an object position (Vogeleer 2012).

Both types in JA use the present tense with atelic predicates to refer to repeated situations or event iteration (Slal 2009). In other words, the present tense in JA is employed for constructing habitual expressions, especially when the predicate is paired with the prefix "b-" as seen in examples such as *b-alfab* 'play' and *b-amfi:* 'walk'. Consider examples (13) and (14):

(13) Simple Bare Habituals

ʔajman bi-daxxin si:ga:r.
 Ayman 3.smoke cigar
 'Ayman smokes cigars.'

(14) Complex Bare Habituals

b-axllis^s wa:ʒiba:t-i bakki:r.
 I.finish homework-my early
 'I finish my homework early.'

In (13), the verb phrase is an activity-like predicate, which functions as stative. The source of multiplicity is the predicate itself. This advocates Kratzer's analysis (2007) that verbs are originally formed as plurals. This type of bare habitual is referred to as simple bare habituals (SBH) since the event iteration is expressed without the need for either a quantificational element or an instantiation in the

actual world. This phenomenon primarily occurs because such habitual constructions are utilized when referring to stereotypical habits, encompassing behaviors such as negative habits, obligations, or occupations. Therefore, the modification relies on a commonly shared understanding of the nature of these habits (Porterfield 1993) or "given what we know" (Krifka et al. 1995, 50).

The plurality of events in (13) is thus the output of the operator Hab distinct from Gen, as shown in (13. a) below:

(8) $\exists x$ [si:ga:r(x) & Hab e bi-daxxin (e, Ayman, x)]

The proposition in (13) is interpreted as 'if s is a situation that includes Ayman, Ayman smokes in that situation'. The restriction is imposed based on the speaker's knowledge about the world. The operator of SBH is a necessity modal (Krifka et al. 1995). It is not a modal by itself but rather triggers a covert strong epistemic modal akin to MUST. The modal base is captured by either the context or by a lexical item. The modal base of Must, for instance, is epistemic i.e.in view of what is known. Thus, the model base depends on the speaker's knowledge of the world.

For example, (13) is based on real-world knowledge about Ayman's habit of smoking regardless of the actualization of this habit. This means that the predicate directly denotes a regularity based on what is known rather than what is observed. This knowledge comes from clear evidence (Krifka et al 1995). The ordering source is stereotypical; hence, the set of possible worlds is ordered based on their closeness to the ideal world that matches our exceptions. Put differently, the truth conditions are calculated deductively based on the real-world knowledge of a set of possible worlds akin to the modal base provided by the modal MUST. This modal quantifies over worlds restricted by the ordering source. It is defined by Vogeleer (2012) as:

"MUST(Φ) is true in w with respect to the modal base $\cap f(w)$ iff Φ is true in all worlds w' in the modal base ordered in terms of their closeness with respect to a set of ideal worlds in which duties, abilities, and dispositions are realized." (P.210)

To substantiate the concept of the necessity modal, the reading above can also be expressed by using the epistemic necessity modal *ʔaki:d* 'must' used under the assent/dissent test (Faller 2002). For instance, in a context where Abeer and Julia talk about Ayman and how he always has an ashtray butt bucket in his car

Julia: ʔajman ʔaki:d b-idaxxin.

Ayman must/certainly 3.smoke

Meaning: it is necessarily the case that Ayman smokes.

The second type of habituals is circumstantial. They are judged with respect to certain laws, rules, or facts in the actual world (Vogeleer 2012). More precisely, they have a deontic flavor, which is realized either by a context or by a lexical item. That is, it requires an actualization of the event in the actual world. One occurrence is sufficient to judge an event. We refer to this type of habituals as complex bare habituals (CBH) (see Ferreira 2005, 2016 and Vogeleer 2012).

However, CBH employs a covert modal operator known as Hab. This operator is a modal by itself which quantifies over the world. In these structures, the imperfective operator is affixed to a modal or stative predicate, and counterfactuals pertain to states of the world that exist at the time of utterance (Ferrira 2016). The modal base of the operator requires an instantiation of the event. The ordering source is stereotypical; thus, belongs to the epistemic family which orders the world according to the norms, ideals, beliefs, and normal course of events in the world (Kratzer 1981). For example, based on a rule proposed by the mother, for instance, (14) expresses recurrent events of finishing homework early. To evaluate CBH, we must consider all the stereotypical situations which contain the individual or the group of individuals.

5. Quantificational and Non-Quantificational Habituals in JA

The semantic territory of habituals is divided into quantificational and non-quantificational based on the covert/overt presence of an adverbial adjunct (Boneh and Doron 2013). The quantificational analysis considers habitual constructions as a subtype of generics by having the same underlying semantic structure, but they differ in that the Gen operator quantifies over a set of situations provided by context. They are analyzed as having a tripartite structure. On the other hand, the central component of habituals in the non-quantificational analysis is the plurality of events derived from the lexical verbs rather than the overt quantifiers. Thus, verbs themselves denote a sum of events. The same typological distinction applies in JA. The sentences below are divided into two types: quantificational and non-quantificational:

(15) el- ʔurdunjjī:n b-ut⁶bux-u: mansaf kul dʒumʕa.

the-Jordanians 3.cook-pl mansaf every friday

'Jordanians cook Mansaf every Friday.'

(16) el- ʔurdunjjī:n b-ut⁶bux-u: mansaf .

the-Jordanians 3.cook-pl mansaf

'Jordanians cook Mansaf.'

The difference between the two sentences is obvious. The sentence in (15) is considered quantificational. It contains an overt restrictor, which provides quantificational variability. This restrictor is an adjunct that comes after the indefinite singular (IS), such as cyclicity adverbials: *da:jman es⁶- s⁶ubeḥ* "always in the morning"; *kul ʔarbaʕ ʃhu:r* "every four months" or *kul dʒumʕa* "every Friday", and frequency adverbials such as *lamma* "when". The predicates incorporated are all SL predicates (Stage-level predicates) which function as IL predicates (Individual-Level Predicates) when incorporated in habitual sentences.

The NP in the subject argument is grammatically definite but semantically indefinite since the quantification is over situations. Instead of quantifying over a set of existentially calculated events, habituals quantify over a set of intentional situations. Hence, the individuals in (15) are not existentially calculated (Krifka et al. 1995). The results concur with Fehri (2004) in Arabic. He states that nominal argument denotes a generic or existential reading based on the presence of a definite article. For example, the generic reading is available with the overt definite article such as (a) *al-kalb-u y-anbaḥ-u* "The dog

barks”, the absence of the definite article on the other hand, expresses an existential interpretation such as (b) *kalb-u-n y-anbaḥ-u* “A dog is barking”

In (15), quantification is over multiple events of cooking Mansaf every Friday. Nevertheless, the proposition in (15) includes an indefinite noun phrase in the object position. This is problematic since bare nouns in JA force episodic interpretation in the sense that they refer to a particular object in the world. Nevertheless, (15) is felicitous. This is because quantification is over situation variables, not individual variables. Interestingly, the indefinite singular object has a narrow scope. That is, the object is different in each situation since one cannot cook the same Mansaf in different situations (Krifka et al. 1995).

Fehri (2012) states that “[s]ummarizing the contextual and interpretational requirements discussed so far, the following descriptive statements appear to apply to Definite and Indefinite Generics found in Arabic: Kind denoting Gen are expressible only through overtly definite DPs and are likely to be referential arguments (kind names). Object-denoting Gen is expressible through various sorts of indefinite DPs, bound (unselectively) by Gen operators; they are necessarily quantificational arguments. Gen operators (providing for characterizing environments) are: Habitual Aspect, Q-Adverbs, and appropriate Ps.” (P.200). However, (15) can include bare plurals in object position. They allow the distribution of objects over a multiplicity of events. Consider (17) where bare plurals assume that there are an undefined number of Mansaf plates in a sum of situations:

(17) *el-ḡurdunjjī:n b-utʔbux-u: mana:sif kul dʒumʕa.*
 the-Jordanians 3.cook-pl mansaf.pl every friday
 ‘The Jordanians cook Mansaf (dishes) every Friday.’

Following Scheiner's (2002) argument, quantificational habituals in JA also include a covert quantifier. Demonstrating this idea, the meaning of the quantificational habituals in JA hardly undergoes substantial alteration when the implicit quantifier is made explicit. Consider the paraphrase of (15) into (18) using a quantificational adverb such as *bilʕa:deh* ‘usually’:

(18) *el-ḡurdunjjī:n bilʕa:deh b-utʔbux-u: mansaf kul dʒumʕa.*
 the-Jordanians usually 3.cook-pl mansaf every friday
 ‘Jordanians usually cook mansaf every Friday.’

Conversely, the sentence in (16) lacks an overt adverbial phrase. Consequently, it lacks a distinctly stated restrictor. Therefore, it is ambiguous between episodic reading and habitual interpretation. For instance, (16) can be interpreted as referring to a particular situation of a specific group of Jordanians cooking mansaf now or referring to a group of individuals engaged in regular situations of cooking mansaf. The context helps differentiate between the two interpretations. In a context where Eman asks her mother about Jordanians' habits, she says: *el-ḡurdunjjī:n b-utʔbuxu: Mansaf* ‘Jordanians cook mansaf’.

However, bare singulars in object argument have scopal ambiguities; they could have a narrow scope and a wide scope (Vogeleer 2012). For example, (16) could express a wide-scope reading by assuming that Jordanians cook the same mansaf again and again or a narrow-scope by postulating that Jordanians

cook a different mansaf in different situations. The wide-scope interpretations arise from the lack of explicit restrictors. In other words, restrictors are provided to make existential quantifier scope under Gen, but the proposition in (16) could have a wide scope over Gen and thus produce a semantically odd interpretation. Conversely, the narrow scope represents the contrary. In other words, there is a type of mismatch between the predicates and the indefinite arguments in the object position. Specifically, the predicate is atelic (i.e., the event has no final endpoint), and the referent of the indefinite singular object argument doesn't change across variable situations. Therefore, the habitual interpretation with a fixed object is semantically odd. A potential explanation for this issue is to posit that non-quantificational habituals (i.e., those with implicit restrictors) quantify over a simple situation, and each simple situation should be restricted to a different object. Therefore, the appropriate reading for both bare singulars is determined by either the context or the real-world knowledge. In a simple situation restricted by the context, bare singulars denote different objects in each situation (Krifka et al 1995). That is, if the situation *s* is a simple situation restricted by context, then Jordanians cook a different mansaf in each situation.

However, the plurality of situations can be expressed by using bare plurals in object position, e.g., English can refer to multiple events using bare plural objects since a different event is attached to a different individual instantiating the indefinite singular. For example, habitual reading is possible in “John repairs bicycles,” since bare plurals in the object argument allow the distribution of objects over variable situations (Carlson 1977; Rimell 2004). In JA, bare plurals show a different behavior since bare plurals behave like indefinite singulars. More precisely, bare plurals also have a scopal ambiguity. For instance, when replacing bare singulars in non-quantificational habituals with bare plurals, the outcome is as follows:

(19) el-ʔurdunji:n b-utʔbux-u: mana:sif.
 the-Jordanians 3.cook-pl mansaf.PI
 ‘Jordanians cook mana:sif (dishes).’

The addition of bare plurals to habitual sentences with implicit restrictors does not necessarily indicate that there are a variety of situations related to a variety of objects. Bare plurals can also have both wide and narrow scope interpretations. The sentence in (19) could be interpreted as Jordanians repeatedly cooking the same **mana:sif** again and again, or as Jordanians habitually cooking different dishes of **mansaf** on different occasions. This is because bare plurals in JA behave like bare plurals in Modern Standard Arabic (Fassi Fehri 2004, 2007). In other words, bare plurals in Arabic exhibit the same quantificational features as bare singulars per scope, telicity, and opacity. Hence, they can be taken as the Plural of the Singular. This is explicated in (20):

(20) a. Negation: Narrow and Wide scope
 ʔajman ma: b-o:kil tuffa:h.
 Ayman Neg 3.eat apples
 ‘Ayman doesn’t eat apples.’

b. Quantifiers: Narrow and Wide scope
 kul l-imʔallma:t buktub-u: ʔimti:ha:na:t.

all the-teachers.3.f 3.write-pl exams

‘All (female) teachers write exams.’

c. opacity: Narrow and Wide scope

biddi: ?aqra: kutub.

1.sg-want 1.read books

‘I want to read books.’

d. Telicity: with bare singular and plural

s^hahba:ti ?akal-u: samak/samakah b-sa:ʕah

friends-my 3.ate-pl fish-Pl/fish-sg in- hour.

‘My friends have eaten fish/(one)fish in an hour.’

In all the constructions in (20), bare plurals behave as bare singular nouns in having either a narrow or a wide scope over negation and universal quantifiers. This is evident in (20a) which is interpreted as either ‘Ayman doesn’t eat any apples’ or ‘there are apples, and Ayman doesn’t eat them’. The universal quantification in (20b) is also ambiguous between two interpretations: ‘all the teachers write different exams’ or ‘there are exams that all the teachers write’. Moreover, bare plurals are like bare singulars with opacity predicates. The sentence in (20c) is interpreted as ‘I want to read any collection of books’, or ‘I want to read the same collection of books’. In contrast to the English language, which allows telic predicates with bare plurals but prohibits them with bare singulars and cardinalized arguments (e.g., “John reads #a book/#two books/books”), both bare singulars and bare plurals in JA occur with telic predicates (Hofherr 2012). Therefore, arguments in object position can occur with b+ time “in + time” regardless of their number feature as it is illustrated in (20d).

Since both bare plurals and bare singulars have the same quantificational properties, they both exhibit scopal ambiguities. The appropriate reading for both bare plurals and bare singulars is determined by either the context or the real-world knowledge. In a simple situation restricted by the context, bare singulars denote different objects in each situation, while bare plurals denote an unspecified number of objects. The following table summarizes the differences between quantification and non-quantificational habituals in JA concerning the four areas: semantic structure, telicity, bare object, and scopal distinction.

	Quantificational habituals	Non-quantificational habituals
The semantic structure	Tripartite structure	Binary structure
Telicity	compatible with telic predicate	compatible with atelic predicate
Restrictor	Provide a restrictor	Lack of a restrictor of overt quantifiers
Bare objects	Allow multiplication of bare singulars and bare plurals	Allow multiplication of bare singulars and bare plurals
Scopal distinction	Habituals with cyclicity adverbial have an obligatory narrow scope.	Scopal ambiguity: narrow and wide scope

6. Habituals and Kind-Generics

Many semanticists state that habituals and kind-generics are two different constructions (e.g., Krifka et al 1989; Carlson 1977; Kratzer 1989). On one hand, habituals convey generalizations about situations, while on the other hand, kind generics express generalizations about objects (Krifka et al. 1995). The

current study argues that this does not hold in JA. Habituals can be derived from kind generics, which report a weak generalization. In other words, kind generics that signify accidental properties can be interpreted as denoting habitual actions. This is explicated in (21):

- (21) *el- baʕu:ðʕ fa:yiʕ.*
 the-mosquitos widespread
 ‘Mosquitos are widespread.’

The sentence in (21) denotes an accidental property attributed to a kind; *el-baʕu:ðʕ* ‘Mosquitos’. These properties exhibit variability concerning various factors, including the type of referent. In reference to kind generics denoting weak generalizations, only definite plurals (DP) are capable of possessing the attributed property. Definite singulars (DS), on the other hand, are excluded since they refer to episodic interpretations in JA (Omar 2022).

However, it is noteworthy that these constructions can also be employed to form habitual sentences. This can be achieved by introducing an implicit or explicit restrictor. An implicit restriction can be incorporated based on stereotypical knowledge of the world. For example, it is known that mosquitos in Jordan are usually widespread in hot weather. Thus, the context works as a restrictor and the focus becomes on the situations which include mosquitoes. Based on the analysis provided for non-quantificational habituals, (21) is interpreted such that ‘every world that includes mosquitos in a world close to the actual world and matches our exception based on the ordering source, is a world in which there are multiple situations of mosquitos being widespread. It is worth noticing that (21) doesn’t require to be instantiated in the actual world; thus, it is SBH (see section 4).

This phenomenon can be clarified by observing that sentences referring to kinds aim to establish the NP as denoting a kind or species. Consequently, such sentences can accommodate S-level predicates, as long as the NP used is generic. In simpler terms, the importance of the predicate is secondary when compared to the NP in these instances. On the other hand, habitual sentences generalize across collections of events extracted from S-level predicates, which have been transformed into stative predicates through expressed regularities. As a result, these predicates operate similarly to I-level predicates. This suggests that S-level predicates hinder the expression of generality in characterizing sentences but permit it in both reference-to-kind sentences and habitual expressions. These disparities validate the assertion presented in Krifka et al. (1995, 63) that, unlike the generality derived from inherent characteristics, which involves the cooperation of all sentence constituents, the generality tied to kind-based genericity is a phenomenon "linked to the specific NPs in question and not to the sentences as a whole."

Additionally, an explicit restrictor can also turn kind-type reading into habitual-type reading. For instance (21) is turned to (22) by the addition of an explicit restrictor:

- (22) *el- baʕu:ðʕ bi-ku:n fa:yiʕ bi-sʕ-sʕeif.*
 the- mosquitos Pres-be widespread in-the-summer
 ‘Mosquitos are widespread in summer.’

The only available reading in (22) is habitual. It generalizes over a variable situation in which mosquitos are widespread in summer. If situation *s* is a summer situation, then situation *s* states that

mosquitos are widespread. To substantiate this claim, incorporating the habitual adverb *bilʕa:deh* ‘usually’ into (22) results in a subtle change in meaning, as demonstrated in (23):

- (23) el- baʕu:ð^ʕ bilʕa:deh bi-ku:n fa:yʕeh bi-s^ʕ-s^ʕeif.
 The- mosquitos usually Pres-be widespread in-the-summer
 ‘Mosquitos are usually widespread in summer.’

The copular verb *biku:n* ‘Pres-be’ in (16) which is similar to the verb ‘to be’ in English is optional and occurs with verbless sentences as a marker of habituality (Jaber 2014). However, there are additional instances where kind-generics are converted into habitual constructions. Put differently, it is possible to form a habitual construction using a subject that denotes a kind and incorporates an SL predicate in the present tense as is illustrated in (24) below:

- (24) A: ju: b-itsa:wi: el-ʕas^ʕa:fi:r bi-ll-i:l?
 what 3.f-do the-sparrows at-the-night?
 ‘What do sparrows do at night?’
 B: el-ʕas^ʕafi:r bitna:m.
 the-sparrows 3.f-sleep
 ‘Sparrows sleep.’

The proposition in (24) furnishes a generic reading only and blocks an episodic one. This claim can be explicated by the infelicitous proposition resulting from the addition of progressive adverbials *as el-jo:m* ‘today’, or time-related adverbials, such as *qabl sa:ʕa* ‘an hour before’, *men sa:ʕa* ‘since an hour’, and *hassa* ‘now’. For instance, **el-ʕas^ʕafi:r bitna:m el-jo:m* ‘*sparrows sleep today’ is both unacceptable and semantically odd in JA and English as well. The restriction is imposed by the question presented in (24a). Thus, it is interpreted as in night situations, the sparrows sleep.

However, it is worth mentioning that kind-generics incorporating K-level predicates (kind-level predicates) cannot be used to form habitual constructions since they include properties that can only apply to kinds, (25a). Moreover, it is difficult to construe habitual readings from reference to kind generics with k-level predicates because such statements are also incompatible with either quantificational adverbs such as *da:jman* ‘always’ or quantificational phrases such as *muʕð^ʕam* ‘most’, (25b):

- (25) a.* el- ʕarab da:jman ʔixtaraf-u ʕilm ed-ʔdabir.
 The-Arabs always 3.invent-pl science the-algebra
 ‘*The Arabs always invented algebra.’
 b. * el-ma:mo:θ da:jman ʔenqarð^ʕ.
 the-mammoth always (became) extinct
 ‘*The mammoth always became extinct.’

The sentences in (25) are infelicitous. The unacceptability arises due to the inconsistency between the habitual adverbials and the denoted properties. The property of inventing Algebra in (25a) is not compatible with the quantificational adverb *da:jman* ‘always’. Similarly, the property of being extinct is not compatible with the adverbial phrase *da:jman* ‘always’. Fassi Fehri (2004) states that only reference to a kind reading is available with Kind-Level predicates in Arabic. For instance, the predicate extinct is

applicable only to a kind or genus in *fiyalat-u-n baydaa^s-u nqarad-a-t^s* ‘(Some) white elephants became extinct’.

7. Habituals and Individual-level Predicates

Carlson (1977) classifies predicates into individual-level (I-level/IL) predicates, which attribute a property to the referents, and stage-level (S-level/SL) predicates, which describe the spatiotemporal representations of individuals (i.e., stages). The former denotes permanent and stable properties, whereas the latter refers to ephemeral or temporary properties. A similar distinction is observed by Chierchia (1995), who describes IL as denoting inherent generic properties in the sense that these properties are stable, while SL employs transient properties. However, contra to characterizing sentences that are expressed with IL predicates and blocked with SL predicates, habituals in JA use both I-level and S-level predicates to generalize over situations. This is supported by Cohen (2020), who argues that predicates such as "like" or "hate" (i.e., individual-level predicates) can have quantificational readings with the presence of a quantificational element, as in: "I usually love sonatas by Dittersdorf." Consider (26) in which an IL predicate is used to construe a habitual sentence interpretation:

Context: Julia asks her mother about Abeer’s favorite hobby, and she tells her:

- (26) a. ζ abi:r bithib til ζ ab rija:d^sah kul jo:m es^s- s^subeh.
 Abeer 3.f.like 3.f.play sport every day the- morning
 ‘Abeer likes to play sports every day in the morning.’

Context: Professors are talking about the reasons that make their students feel depressed during exams. One suggests that they get too much pressure, while the other says:

- b. et^s-t^sula:b bikrah-u: el- η imti:ha:na:t.
 the-students 3.hate-pl the-exams
 ‘Students hate exams.’

The propositions in (26) receive habitual readings. They generalize over a sum of situations. While (26a) reports a regular situation about Abeer who loves to play sports every morning, (26b) expresses a state of repeated occasions of students hating the exam. Whenever there is an exam, the students hate it. The predicates used in these expressions are individual-level predicates. They don’t have an episodic counterpart since they are not compatible with the progressive verb *ga:fid* ‘Progressive auxiliary. This verb is considered an overt lexical progressive marker in JA, and it functions as an auxiliary that occurs before the imperfective verb (Sellami 2022). For example: ** ζ abi:r ga:sideh bithib til ζ ab rija:d^sah es^s- s^subeh* ‘*Abeer is liking to play sports in the morning’ is infelicitous in JA and English as well. The NP used as a subject argument in (26b) doesn’t denote a unique, familiar, or identifiable subject salient in the domain of the context. Rather, it is semantically indefinite. For instance, the definite plural *et^s-t^sola:b* ‘the students’ doesn’t refer to a particular delimited group of students. There is no clue that the professors talk about particular, unique individual students. The sentence in (26a) is quantificational habitual; whereas, (26b) is non-quantificational (i.e., SBH). The only difference between quantificational and bare habituals is the source of generalization. More precisely, the event plurality of bare habituals stems from the VP, while quantificational habituals quantify over a singular event by the use of quantificational elements.

Interestingly, many semanticists (e.g., Carlson 1977; Kratzer 1995; Milsark 1974, 1977) report the following characteristics for IL predicates: (a) they are incompatible with temporal adverbials; (b) they are not allowed with locatives; (c) they are not allowed with ‘there’ sentences; (d) they are not allowed as a complement of perception verbs. For instance, In JA, the individual level predicates are incompatible with temporal adverbials such as *hassa* ‘now’ or *el-jo:m* ‘today’. They are also incompatible with locatives such as *fi-l-mat‘bax* ‘in the kitchen’ and *fi-s^s-s^sa:lo:n* ‘in the living room’. Finally, they are also prohibited with the perception verb as *fu:f* ‘look’. The sentences in (27) render semantically and grammatically unacceptable with the aforementioned tests which differentiate IL and SL predicates. Consider (27):

(27) a. *ʃu:f ʃabi:r biḥib tilʃab rija:ð^hah kul jo:m es^s- s^sobeḥ.
 2.look Abeer 3.f.like 3.f.play sport every day the- morning
 ‘*Look, Abeer likes to play sports every day in the morning.’

b. * et^s-t^sula:b bi-kraḥ-u el-ʔimti:ḥa:na:t hassa.
 the-students 3.hate-pl the-exams now
 ‘*Students hate exams now.’

Though IL denotes a permanent property, the aforementioned propositions in (26) provide habituality. A crucial question about the source of event iteration poses itself here. One plausible answer might be that habituals are constructed with IL predicates through a process of shifting an individual-level predicate into a stage-level one. The shift occurs at the level of the background assumptions, not at the level of the lexical meaning of the predicates. Thus, there is no grammatical difference between the two predicates. Rather, the contrast stems from what is compatible with either the context or our encyclopedic knowledge about the world (Chierchia 1995). If the sentences are uttered out of the blue, then they would express I-generics (characterizing sentences) in which a characterizing property is attributed to the referent. The context, therefore, must be postulated to raise habitual interpretations. This generalization is compatible with habitual constructions in a language like English (Porterfield 1993). This is supported by the neo-Davidsonian view which indicates that all predicates include an event; therefore, SL and IL are not distinct in this respect (Chierchia 1995).

It is worth noticing that none of the propositions are necessarily instantiated in the actual world. Thus, all of them are true even when the event has never occurred. This results from the utilization of imperfective aspects in forming habituals that involve IL predicates. More accurately, the imperfective aspect does not require the realization of events in the actual world. Brustad (2000) argues that the imperfective aspect is utilized to indicate an underlying process of acquiring knowledge. Nevertheless, IL with perfectives (i.e., past predicates) denote completed actions, and hence no habitual reading is available as exemplified in (28):

(28)*a. ʃabi:r ḥabb-at tilʃab rija:d^hah kul jo:m es^s- s^subeḥ.
 Abeer 3.liked-f 3.f.play sport every day the- morning
 ‘Abeer liked to play sports every day in the morning.’

b. et^s-t^sula:b kirh-u: el-ʔimti:ḥa:na:t.

the-students 3.hated-pl the-exams

‘Students hated exams.’

The quantificational habituais with IL predicates and adverbial adjuncts are semantically and grammatically odd as in (28a). The adverbial phrase *kul jo:m es^ʕ-s^ʕubeḥ* ‘every day in the morning’ is incompatible with the perfective aspect since it expresses events that are continuous to the present moment and the perfective aspect refers to completed actions. In contrast, bare habituais with IL predicates in the perfective aspect denote an episodic reading. For instance, (28b) refers to particular boy individuals who hated the exams at a specific time and place in the past.

8. Conclusion

This study investigated habitual constructions in JA using a truth-conditional approach. It explored the varied interpretations of these statements to delve into their contribution to our understanding of the world. The study demonstrated that habitual sentences originate from characterizing sentences, but they exhibit significant differences. Furthermore, it showed that habitual sentences in JA manifest in diverse forms. The first form is quantificational habituais, which possess a restrictor in the form of an adverbial adjunct, such as the cyclicity adverb *da:jman es^ʕ-s^ʕubeḥ* ‘always in the morning’. The second form is bare habituais, which lack a restrictor. These sentences incorporate atelic predicates. Similar to quantificational habituais, they allow for the multiplication of bare NPs. However, bare plurals in JA appear to display scope ambiguity, behaving similarly to bare singulars in terms of scope. At the predicate level, habituais in JA are found with both IL and SL predicates.

Reference to kind generics that describe accidental properties can convey habitual interpretations in JA. This can be achieved by introducing either an implicit or explicit restrictor. Furthermore, kind generics that involve S-level predicates can denote habitual interpretations. On the contrary, kind-generics that involve K-level predicates cannot form habitual constructions in JA. Interpreting habitual readings from reference to kind generics with K-level predicates proved to be challenging.

دلالة جمل العادة في اللهجة الاردنية

ربا الرفاعي، عزيز جابر

قسم اللغة الإنجليزية وآدابها، جامعة اليرموك، الأردن

الملخص

تبحث هذه الدراسة في البنية الدلالية العميقة لبناء جمل العادة في اللهجة الأردنية. استناداً إلى البيانات المأخوذة من اللهجة الأردنية، تناقش هذه الدراسة الرأي السائد أن جمل العادة ما هي الا مجرد مكوّن متجانس من العبارات التعميمية، كما افترضه كارلسون (2012). بدلاً من ذلك، تبيّن الدراسة وجود أداة ربط تسمى 'هاب'، منفصلة عن 'جن'. وكما أوضح بونيه ودورون (2013:177)، فإن هذه الاداة تعمل كـ "أداة ربط مميزة لمجموعة من الأحداث". يمكن تصنيف جمل العادة إلى نوعين: كمية وغير كمية. يتضمن النوع الأول مقيد على شكل ملحق ظرفي، وعادةً تُمثله ظروف مثل 'دائماً في الصباح'. بينما يشير النوع الثاني إلى جمل عادة مجردة لا تتضمن مثل هذا المقيد الظرفي. هذه الجمل غير الكمية غالباً ما تحتوي أفعالاً غير محددة النهاية. وعلاوة على ذلك، يُظهر البحث إمكانية استمزاج جمل العادة من جمل النوع التعميمية، حيث تتضمن هذه الجمل اما مسنداً مرحلياً أو تقدم نوعاً من التعميم الضعيف.

الكلمات المفتاحية: جمل العادة، جمل التعميم، جمل العادة التكرارية، جمل العادة المجردة، اللهجة الأردنية.

Endnotes

¹ **1, 2, 3** stand for 1st/2nd /3rd person, respectively, **m & f** stand for masculine and feminine, **sg.** stands for singular, and **pl** stands for plural.

References

- Al-Aqarbeh, Rania. 2015. Temporal Interpretation in Standard and Jordanian Arabic. *Dirasat: Human & Social Sciences* 42 (3): 999–1026.
- Boneh, Nora. 2019. Dispositions and Characterizing Sentences. *Glossa: A Journal of General Linguistics* 4 (1).
- Boneh, Nora, and Edit Doron. 2008. Habituality and the Habitual Aspect. *Theoretical and Crosslinguistic Approaches to the Semantics of Aspect* 110: 321–348.
- Boneh, Nora, and Edit Doron. 2013. Hab and Gen in the Expression of Habituality. *Genericity* 43: 176–191.
- Brustad, Kristen. 2000. The Syntax of Spoken Arabic: A Comparative Study of Moroccan, Egyptian, Syrian, and Kuwaiti Dialects. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Bybee, Joan L., Revere D. Perkins, and William Pagliuca. 1994. The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World. Vol. 196. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Carlson, G. N. 1977. Reference to Kinds in English. PhD diss., University of Massachusetts Amherst.
- Carlson, Gregory Norman. 2005. Generics, Habituals and Iteratives. Carlson, Gregory Norman. 2012. "Habitual and Generic Aspect."
- Carlson, Gregory Norman, and Francis Jeffrey Pelletier, eds. 1995. The Generic Book. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Chierchia, Gennaro. 1995. Individual-Level Predicates as Inherent Generics. In The Generic Book, edited by Gregory Norman Carlson and Francis Jeffrey Pelletier, 125. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cohen, Ariel. 2004. Existential Generics. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27 (2): 137–168.
- Cohen, Ariel. 2020. Generics and Habituals. In Something out of nothing: The Semantics and Pragmatics of Implicit Quantification, 100–134. Leiden: Brill.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1976. Aspect: An Introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect and Related Problems. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Faller, M. T. 2002. Semantics and Pragmatics of Evidentials in Cuzco Quechua. PhD diss., Stanford University.
- Fassi Fehri, Abdelkader. 1993. Issues in the Structure of Arabic Clauses and Words. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Fassi Fehri, Abdelkader. 2004. Nominal Classes, Reference, and Functional Parameters, with Particular Reference to Arabic. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 4 (1): 41–108.
- Fassi Fehri, Abdelkader. 2007. Bare, Generic, Mass, and Referential. In Phrasal and Clausal Architecture: Syntactic Derivation and Interpretation: In Honor of Joseph E. Emonds, 101: 40.

- Fassi Fehri, Abdelkader. 2012. Key Features and Parameters in Arabic Grammar. Vol. 182. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Ferreira, Marcelo. 2005. Bare Habituals and Plural Definite Descriptions. In *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung* 9: 102–115.
- Ferreira, Marcelo. 2016. The Semantic Ingredients of Imperfectivity in Progressives, Habituals, and Counterfactuals. *Natural Language Semantics* 24 (4): 353–397.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia. 1995. Subjunctive, Habituality and Negative Polarity Items. *Semantics and Linguistic Theory* 5: 94–111.
- Hinrichs, Erhard. 1986. Temporal Anaphora in Discourses of English. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 9: 63–82.
- Hofherr, Patricia Cabredo. 2012. Bare Habituals and Singular Indefinites. *Genericity* 43: 192.
- Jaber, Aziz. 2014. On Genericity and Definiteness in Modern Standard Arabic. PhD diss., the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
- Jaber, Aziz, Reem Al-Momani, and Osama Omari. 2022. Form-Function Mismatches: The Semantics of the Definite Article in Jordanian Arabic. *Lingua* 266: 103169.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 1981. The Notional Category of Modality. In *Words, Worlds, and Contexts: New Approaches to Word Semantics*, 38–74. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 1989. An Investigation of the Lumps of Thought. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 12: 607–653.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 1995. Individual-Level Predicates. In *The Generic Book*, edited by Gregory Norman Carlson and Francis Jeffrey Pelletier, 125. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 2007. Situations in Natural Language Semantics.
- Krifka, Manfred, Francis Jeffrey Pelletier, Gregory Carlson, Alice ter Meulen, Gennaro Chierchia, and Godehard Link. 1995. *Genericity: An Introduction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Landman, Fred, and Susan Rothstein. 2010. "Incremental Homogeneity in the Semantics of Aspectual For-Phrases." In *Syntax, Lexical Semantics and Event Structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Langacker, Ronald Wayne. 1997. Generics and Habituals. *Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science Series* 4: 191–222.
- Lenci, Alessandro. 1995. The Semantic Representation of Non-Quantificational Habituals. *Temporal Reference, Aspect, and Actionality* 1: 143–158.
- Leslie, Sarah-Jane. 2007. Generics and the Structure of the Mind. *Philosophical Perspectives* 21: 375–403.
- Link, Godehard. 1983. The Logical Analysis of Plurals and Mass Terms: A Lattice Theoretical Approach. *Formal Semantics: The Essential Readings*: 127–147.
- Milsark, G. 1974. Existential Sentences in English. PhD diss., Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Milsark, Gary. 1977. "Toward an Explanation of Certain Peculiarities of the Existential Construction in English. *Linguistic Analysis* 3 (1): 1–29.

- Mudhsh, B. A. D. 2021. A Comparative Study of Tense and Aspect Categories in Arabic and English." *Cogent Arts & Humanities* 8 (1): 1899568.
- Omar, A 2022. Genericity in Jordanian Arabic: Reference to Kind NPs. Master's thesis, Yarmouk University.
- Porterfield, Leslie Anne. 1993. *Habituals*. Ithaca: Cornell University.
- Rimell, Laura. 2004. Habitual Sentences and Generic Quantification. *Proceedings of WCCFL* 23: 663–676.
- Ryding, Karin C. 2005. *A Reference Grammar of Modern Standard Arabic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Scheiner, Magdalena. 2002. Temporal Anchoring of Habituals. In *Proceedings of ConSole XI*. Leiden: Universiteit Leiden.
- Schubert, Lenhart, and Francis Jeffrey Pelletier. 1989. Generically Speaking, or, Using Discourse Representation Theory to Interpret Generics. In *Properties, Types, and Meaning, Vol. II: Semantic Issues*, edited by Gennaro Chierchia, Barbara H. Partee, and Raymond Turner, 193–268.
- Sellami, Z. 2022. The Typology of Progressive Constructions in Arabic Dialects. *STUF - Language Typology and Universals* 75 (4): 555–582.
- Slal, Saad. 2009. Tense and Aspect in Arabic and English: A Contrastive Study. *Journal of the College of Basic Education* 12.
- Vogeleer, Svetlana. 2012. Habituals with Indefinite Singular Objects: Aspect and Modality. *Recherches Linguistiques de Vincennes* 41: 191–214.
- Ayman Rashad, and Ibtisam Hussein. 2021. Auxiliary Verbs in Jordanian Arabic. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies* 17 (4): 1888–1906.