UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Aspect and past habituality in Slavic

a preliminary survey

Genis, R.; Barentsen, A.; van Duijkeren-Hrabova, M.; Kalsbeek, J.; Kyselica, P.; Lučić, R.; Fortuin, E.

Publication date
2021

Document Version
Final published version

Published in
Linguistics in Amsterdam

Link to publication

Citation for published version (APA):
Genis, R., Barentsen, A., van Duijkeren-Hrabova, M., Kalsbeek, J., Kyselica, P., Lučić, R., & Fortuin, E. (2021). Aspect and past habituality in Slavic: a preliminary survey. *Linguistics in Amsterdam*, *14*(1), 2-38.
https://www.linguisticsinamsterdam.nl/download?type=document&identifier=720235

General rights
It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations
If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, P.O. Box 19185, 1000 GD Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

UvA-DARE is a service provided by the library of the University of Amsterdam (https://dare.uva.nl)

Download date:11 Oct 2026

Aspect and past habituality in Slavic: a preliminary survey*

René Genis
Adria(a)n Barentsen
Magda van Duijkeren-Hrabová
Janneke Kalsbeek
Paula Kyselica
Radovan Lučić
ACLC / CSVA, University of Amsterdam

Egbert Fortuin
CSVA, Leiden University

In this paper the authors attempt to make some inroads into compiling a survey of expressions of past tense habituality across Slavic languages – to date a lacuna. Slavic languages share an aspectual system that is binary (perfective opposes imperfective) and lack a specific habitual aspect. Nevertheless, aspect does play a part in the expression of habituality, which is not restricted to imperfective verbs. That said, habituality usually "arises" in context and needs to be studied as such, also in order to establish its actual nature: a matter that we will only be able to touch upon. The starting point of our inventory is twofold: first we attempt to demonstrate the different use of the aspects in the context of a past narrative passage from Bulgakov's The Master and Margarita*, and point out the variety of aspect choice amongst Slavic languages in situations of habituality. Then we list and discuss expressions sourced from the available literature and some own research. Especially as specific studies into habituality for quite a few Slavic languages are lacking to date, this contribution is not exhaustive.*

* This paper by the members of CSVA, that is, the ACLC research group 'Comparative Slavic Verbal Aspect' (https://aclc.uva.nl/content/research-groups/comparative-slavic-verbal-aspect-and-related-issues/comparative-slavic-verbal-aspect-and-related-issues.html) is part of the project on habituality by the 'Language Description and Typology Research Group' (Eva van Lier) of the ACLC.

Linguistics in Amsterdam, 14,1 (2021): 2–38
© René Genis et al.

1 Introduction

Whilst habituality, especially in the context of aspect studies, has enjoyed a fair amount of attention from Slavists,[1] both a single clear-cut definition of habituality and an overview of verbal markings in expressions of habituality in Slavic languages seem to be lacking to date.[2]

The main aim of this paper is to make some inroads into compiling an inventory and discussion of verb forms encountered in renditions of habitual situations in a cross-Slavic linguistic perspective, but for this we shall first briefly outline our take on the definition of habituality for our present purposes in Section 2, and then proceed with Section 3, which offers a short "introduction" to Slavic aspect, deemed necessary also because Slavic languages do not have a specific "habitual aspect" and yet aspect plays an important part in the expression of this category.

Our ensuing survey of verb forms in habitual expressions is restricted to past tense situations as it seems most wanting for that tense, the present tense having been discussed amply, most recently by Dickey (2000). As Dickey's discussion of past habituality is restricted to expressions allowing perfective aspect, there is room still to be covered.[3] Also, it is quite apparent that across Slavic the wealth of habitual expressions to consider for the past tense is greater than for the present tense, which makes the former typologically more interesting and perhaps relevant; moreover, in many languages beyond Slavic (e.g., Romance) habituality is only an aspectually relevant category in past tense contexts.[4] We propose to tackle the matter in two ways:

1. As a specific "habitual" aspect is lacking in Slavic, our point of departure is that the aspect use in habitual expressions is best studied in context. In Section 4, we discuss a cross-Slavic comparison of how aspect and other verbal

[1] Notably Kopečný (1965), Ivić (1983), Mønnesland (1984), Dickey (2000: 49–94), and Danaher (2003). In the Slavic linguistic tradition, many more authors deal with habituality in the context of so-called "unbounded repetition" (unquantified repetition) also called iterativity, frequentativity; we mention just Stunová (1986, 1993), Khrakovskij (1997), Stawnicka (2007), and Fortuin (2008).

[2] Of the overviews published, we would like to mention in particular here: for Russian, Forsyth (1970, chapter 6) (Multiple action); for Polish, Bacz (2009) and Sawicki (2019); for Czech, Danaher (2003); for BCS, Grickat (1998) and Kalsbeek & Lučić (2008); for Macedonian, Kamphuis (2014: 131–136). For Sorbian cf. also Šolʹce (2015).

[3] For reasons of space and to limit the scope of this preliminary overview, we have left out of our discussion the use of reflexive impersonal / non-agentive past forms as, in our view, more research is required to establish how these are used to express habituality (rather than genericity, which latter is also not included here). For a recent discussion of such forms in Polish, cf. Sawicki (2019: 178 ff.).

[4] Cf. in this respect also Bybee, Perkins & Pagliuca (1994: 151–160).

categories are represented in a text passage from Bulgakov's *The Master and Margarita* describing habitual situations. The overview is a comparison of forms in the original Russian and translations in almost all Slavic languages (as well as English for reference).
2. In Section 5, the inventory the Bulgakov fragment yields, is supplemented by further habitual forms sourced from extant descriptions and own research.

We will wrap up with some concluding remarks in Section 6. Throughout, we will point out research opportunities.

2 Definition of habituality: features mentioned in previous research

As mentioned before, a single clear-cut (generally accepted) definition of habituality in Slavic languages is missing, and so at this point we would need to provide our own. As the main aim of this paper concerns a survey of forms encountered in habitual expressions, and as it is also our impression that a proper consideration of the definition requires in-depth material study to establish what is at play in Slavic in particular, we propose that in lieu of a (working) definition of habituality, we will enumerate here the features mentioned in publications on habituality in Slavic that we have included. This is not an exhaustive overview (nor indeed an index) of how these features are handled by all authors on habituality in Slavic, but our "list" will give an impression of the features that would need to be considered when drawing up a definition in the context of these languages.

Habituality is usually (implicitly and explicitly) in studies of Slavic connected primarily to "iterativity" / "frequentativity" and so to repeated events.[5] This constitutes so-called unbounded repetition and so situations of unquantified occurrences. Mønnesland refers to such situations as FREQUENTATIVE HABITUAL and sets them apart from STATIVE HABITUAL propositions as in Czech *Stával tam dům* 'A house used to stand there' (1984: 59). The latter type is described for English by Comrie (1976: 26–32) as involving a (single) individual situation that is protracted in time. Although this is rejected as habitual expression for English by Binnick (2006), we shall not avoid it here, even though it only really is noteworthy in the context of Czech and Slovak so-called "specialized habitual verbs" (cf. Section 5.4.4 below).[6] Comrie accepts both these types as habitual, and so shall we.

Comrie (1976: 28) and Sawicki (2019: 161) mention a further, in our view important, factor: the habitual expression presents a situation as a characteristic

[5] The authoritative publication by Dickey mentions only this feature for habituality (2000: 50).
[6] A number of peculiarities of the semantic make up and use of the so-called specialized habitual verbs of Czech and Slovak are particularly interesting in view of defining linguistic habituality.

feature for a (certain) period. Danaher (1996, 2003) explicates certain cases of habituality (in Czech) as generalizing tendencies about subjects, and so as properties of subjects (restricted in his description to unbounded repetitive events), but otherwise this feature seems not to have been dealt with by other authors, although Mønnesland (1984: 56) mentions it, but rather in the context of generic properties and their closeness to frequentative habitual situations.[7]

Ivić (1983: 38 ff.) and Hellman (2005) in particular discuss the need to consider the (ir)regularity and frequency (rate) of habitual repetition. For this inventory we will include propositions containing both regular and irregular repetition.

Comrie mentions one further feature that seems to be lacking in publications on Slavic but that we think should be mentioned as it concerns the habitual past in particular (1976: 28 ff.). It is the "claim" that "the situation described [by the past habitual expression] no longer holds". For example, *Bill used to be a member of a subversive organization* would imply that Bill is no longer a member. Comrie goes on to falsify this claim but settles in there being a case of implicature (rather than implication) and that the default reading of past tense habituality would indeed be about the non-actuality of the situation, but that the non-actuality can be denied (... *and he still is*). This feature crops up in our discussion in Section 5.4.4, but is not taken as decisive for the inclusion or exclusion of forms as habitual.

This concludes the discussion of the features of habituality, all of which are taken on board in our discussion.

3 Some introductory notes on verbal aspect in Slavic languages

In his recent overview of aspect in Slavic languages, Kamphuis (2020) adopts from Tomelleri (2010) the terms SLAVIC-STYLE aspect for the system that is present in all Slavic languages, albeit it with variation between the languages as its innovation started in Proto-Slavic times and diverged as languages grew apart, and ROMANCE-STYLE aspect that essentially constitutes Indo-European inheritance.[8] The latter exists in addition to Slavic-style aspect in Bulgarian and Macedonian (and to a much lesser degree in Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian (henceforward BCS)).[9] What follows is a brief outline of both types.

[7] Cf. also the discussion of Danaher by Dickey (2000: 88).

[8] Especially the by now established term *Romance-style aspect* is in our opinion not very well chosen as the system it represents is not restricted to Romance languages, nor are they the best representatives of this system. However, we feel that this is not the place to introduce a new term.

[9] The use of aorist and especially imperfect in BCS is limited. We will mention these forms for these languages as the need arises and otherwise, we shall leave them out of the discussion.

Slavic-style aspect is essentially a binary category with the opposition perfective vs. imperfective. Morphologically speaking the opposition is derivational rather than inflectional and it involves suffixes (prefixes, infixes): in Slavic linguistics it is customary to speak of opposing verbs that are either perfective or imperfective, each with full inflectional paradigms (person, number, tense etc.). Languages also have varying small numbers of bi-aspectual verbs. Semantically speaking, TERMINATIVITY is the first of three hierarchically ordered features of Slavic aspect that need to be mentioned as it is the basis for the aspect opposition: only terminative predicates enter the aspect opposition and non-terminative situations involve imperfective verbs only.[10] The terminativity feature involves as its most prominent characteristic an inherent boundary to the situation it describes. Perfective aspect presents the terminative event in its TOTALITY, with the boundary attained (and situational change effectuated). This totality is the second feature at play in Slavic-style aspect and imperfective aspect in terminative verbs is about backgrounding the inherent boundary (and so the totality). This principle results in terminative meanings being expressed by aspectual pairs – two verbs expressing the same meaning but differing in aspect (and labelled for their aspect in dictionaries as a property of the verbal lexemes) – with some types restricted to perfective aspect only.[11] States and activities are limited to imperfective aspect (for want of the inherent boundary: they are non-terminative). The features terminativity and totality figure throughout Slavic and their absence in a typical situation prohibits the use of the perfective verb. The third feature has been called SEQUENTIAL CONNECTION (*sekventnaja svjaz'*) by Barentsen (1985: 60, 1995: 16, 1998: 49 ff.) and TEMPORAL DEFINITENESS by Dickey (2000: 5 ff.), and both labels are in use at present. In very brief terms, this feature is about anchoring a terminative, total event in time, relative to (an)other definite situation(s), following and/or preceding it. In restrospective use of the past tense, the prototypical anchoring point is the speech situation. In such cases, the perfective past comes quite close to, for instance, the English perfect. In narrative contexts, the sequential connection manifests itself in the choice of perfective aspect in expressing a single chain of events. In such cases, the post-terminal situation of each event provides a definite starting point for the realization of the next event.

[10] *Terminativity* is a term used mostly in Slavic studies (introduced by Maslov (1948) in Russian: *predel'nost'*) and it is akin to *telicity*, which, however, is narrower in scope and all telic predicates are also terminative. For an overview of the various terms, see Genis (2008a: 91–100). Please note that terminativity is either an inherent lexical semantic feature of verbs (e.g., *he appeared*), or it is achieved syntactically (e.g., *John wrote a poem*, terminative as opposed to non-terminative *John wrote in his room*). Cf. Comrie's discussion on telicity (1976: 44 ff.).

[11] For a discussion of the terminative meaning types, see Barentsen (1995) and Genis (2008a: 69–90).

Perfective aspect "moves the events forward". In cases of unbounded repetition in the past, however, the lack of definiteness of possible anchoring points leads to the choice of imperfective aspect, see below (Section 4).[12] The role sequential connection plays in individual Slavic languages varies and has given rise to Dickey's typology for Slavic aspect (2000), which has gained general acceptance and which we shall lay out in the briefest possible manner as it is relevant for our present purpose with its cross linguistic focus.

Since Dickey (2000) introduced his "geography" of Slavic aspect, scholars have started to refer to it as the "East-West typology".[13] A slightly elaborated version of Dickey's overview (2000: 5) is presented in Table 1.

Table 1: East-West typology of Slavic languages.[14]

West	**Transitional**	**East**
Sorbian	Polish	Russian
		Belarusian
Czech		Ukrainian
Slovak		
Slovene		Bulgarian
Croatian Serbian		Macedonian

Dickey (2000) set out differences in aspect choice in individual languages for seven "parameters" (a.o. habituality, historical present, verbal nouns, but also the discourse types running instructions and running commentaries).[15] On the basis of this, he was able to determine the meaning of imperfective and perfective aspect per language. This is where the feature sequential connection / temporal

[12] For an extensive treatment of sequential connection / temporal definiteness cf. Fortuin & Kamphuis (2015), in which paper the role of this feature in contexts of habituality in particular is discussed. This is taken up again in Fortuin & Kamphuis (2018: esp. 108 ff.).

[13] Dickey was not the first to plot Slavic aspect typology in geographic terms: Mønnesland (1984) especially needs to be mentioned. Aspectual differences between languages in situations of habituality had also already been noticed by especially Ivić (1983).

[14] This table includes Macedonian (included on account of Kamphuis (2014)), Serbian and Croatian (where Dickey had not separated them) but still lacks Bosnian and Montenegrin. These latter as well as the two Sorbian languages and Kashubian (as well as other, regional (variants of) languages) have not been included in our research in general to date nor indeed in this study, mostly on account of the fact that language material (esp. in the form of (translated) text corpora) is not readily available for comparison etc. Obviously, we think these languages and variants should ultimately be part of an all-encompassing study of habituality in Slavic. In fact, Dickey (2000: 261) also already points to some dialectal / regional variation that would confirm his typology.

[15] At this point, we need to refer to the recent polemic on several issues including habituality in Fortuin & Kamphuis (2015, 2018) and Dickey (2018).

definiteness is important: in more typically western-aspectual languages that feature plays no noteworthy role, whereas in the more eastern-aspectual languages it is crucial. In the west, the presentation of an event as a totality suffices to choose perfective aspect, in the East the sequential connection / temporal definiteness needs also to be evaluated. One easily perceived consequence of this is that typical western aspect languages allow for perfective aspect in more contexts, and, all in all, eastern Slavic aspect has a more frequent use of imperfective aspect.

A very important notion that we need to mention before we can proceed concerns a notable commonality of the aspectual system across Slavic. The central meaning of the perfective predicate includes the presentation of a terminative event as a totality and so, with the inherent boundary attained. In very general terms the Slavic perfective aspect actualizes the inherent boundary of the terminative event by presenting the totality (incl. the boundary) of the situation. Imperfective aspect presents situations in which such boundaries are either absent (non-terminative predicates) or with the boundaries backgrounded (in the case of terminative predicates). There are two applications of imperfective aspect with terminative predicates (cf. Barentsen 1995): one is to render the intraterminal, non-completed presentation of a single event (where the strong focus on the (process of the) event itself renders the inherent boundary vague), the other presents the "unbounded repetition" of an event (the boundaries of the individual repetitions are vague as there are many rather than just a single one).[16] This latter function of the imperfective aspect is highly relevant in the context of our discussion of habituality – in which unbounded repetition is one of the core notions to consider – especially in the light of the fact that there is no separate, specific "habitual aspect" in the general Slavic aspect system and the expression of habituality is often associated with imperfective aspect. In fact, prior to Maslov (1974), Galton (1976), Ivić (1983) and Mønnesland (1984), we have been unable to find mention of perfective aspect being used in situations of habituality or indeed unbounded repetition.

The aspectual system of in particular Bulgarian and Macedonian is rather more complex on account of the extra "layer" of aspect Kamphuis refers to as "Romance-style aspect" and which involves: "an opposition between perfective and imperfective verb forms, often restricted to the past tense, which revolves around a temporal boundary and which is not dependent on the lexical content [i.e., the terminativity] of the verb" (2020: xi). For our purposes, Romance-style aspect is very important in the description of *past* tense habituality for these two

[16] For which cf. Barentsen (1995), Genis (2008a: 69–91). Please note that this is not to say that "unbounded repetition" is the exclusive domain of imperfective verbs; the discussion of habitual events below will signal that it is not, especially in certain languages. For a discussion on the historical development into this system, cf. Kamphuis (2020).

languages: where other Slavic languages have just a general past tense (from the inherited periphrastic perfect), in some languages opposed by a pluperfect, Bulgarian and Macedonian boast a (synthetic) aorist and imperfect as well as (periphrastic) perfect and pluperfect, all presenting the temporal boundary in different ways and all overlaying the Slavic-style perfective and imperfective aspectual forms. In Bulgarian and Macedonian there is, then, a myriad of forms to choose from.[17]

4 Bulgakov – passage from *The Master and Margarita*

As stated above, our contrastive analysis is intended as a first step in taking stock of verbal marking, more particularly of verbal aspect in cases of past habitual situations in Slavic.[18]

The sample is taken from Mikhail Bulgakov's *The Master and Margarita*; the Russian original was written in the 1930s, but first published only in the 1960s. The sample is sourced from our ASPAC corpus, which apart from the original Russian includes translations in Dutch, English (3), German, French and Italian as well as in all main Slavic languages: Belarusian, Ukrainian (2), Polish (8), Slovak, Czech (2), Slovene, Croatian, Serbian (2), Macedonian, Bulgarian (2). Translations in the two Sorbian languages do not seem to exist and could therefore not be included.

We assume there to be a situation of habituality in the following passage, which for the convenience of the reader we have provided in an English version and which includes an introduction "to set the scene" in square brackets.[19] Note that this passage has been chosen because it describes the habitual occurrence of an entire chain of events. It appears that precisely in such cases the differences between the various (groups of) Slavic languages manifest themselves most clearly. We will concentrate here on the forms we have put in italics and which clearly describe events/situations of unbounded repetition that are read here as habitual, as confirmed by the use of the *would* construction in the English version. In Table 2 we have plotted the various grammatical forms in which these are

[17] The northern Slavic languages as well as Slovene lack aorist and imperfect with the exception of the two West-Slavic Sorbian languages, which have the general past tense form (again the original periphrastic perfect) and pluperfect as well as the "synthetic" general past tense (originally imperfect and aorist forms), which latter seems to be confined to written language and which is going out of use (Werner 1996: 126–129). Russian moreover lacks a pluperfect, which is still present in other languages albeit to varying degrees.

[18] A full investigation and inventory of forms would ultimately need to include present and future tenses as well.

[19] This version is a combination of the three available translations resp. by: Michael Glenny (1967) (Gl), Diana Burgin and Katherine O'Connor (1995) (BO), Richard Pevear and Larissa Volkhonksy (1997) (PV).

rendered in the Slavic translations. The table is followed by some notes on the verb forms and our discussion of the comparison.

(1) ['Let me introduce you – Signora Toffana. She was extremely popular among the young and attractive ladies of Naples and Palermo, especially among those who were tired of their husbands.] Well, Signora Toffana sympathized[20] with those poor women and (1a) *sold* them some sort of water in little vials. The wife (1b) *would pour*[21] this water into her husband's soup, he (1c) *ate* it, (1d) *thanked* her for being so nice, and (1e) *felt splendid*. True, a few hours later he (1f) *would begin to feel a terrible thirst*, then (1g) *lay down* on his bed and a day later the lovely Neapolitan who had fed her husband soup (1h) *would be free* as the spring breeze.'[22]

Please note that in the tables, the grey shading of cells indicates imperfective aspect and white cells signal perfective aspect.

Table 2: Verb forms per language in the Bulgakov sample

	(1a)	**(1b)**	**(1c)**	**(1d)**
English	*Sold*	*would pour*	*ate it*	*Thanked*
Russian	PST	PST	PST	PST
Belarusian	PST	PST	PST	PST
Ukrainian	PST	PST	PST	PST
Polish	PST	PST	PST	PST
Slovak	PST	PST	PST	PST
Czech	PST	PST	PST	PST
Slovene	PST	PST	PST	PST
Croatian	PST	COND	COND	COND
Serbian[23]	PST	COND	COND	CVB
Macedonian[24]	IMPRF	PST.FUT	PST.FUT	PST.FUT
Bulgarian[25]	IMPRF	IMPRF	IMPRF	IMPRF

[20] The original has *vxodila v položenie* 'entered into the situation' in this part of the sentence; this is dealt with in very deviating ways by the respective translators, rendering it unusable for our comparison and so it was left out.
[21] Gl and PV have *poured* in (1b). BO uses *would*-constructions in (1b)–(1h).
[22] See the Appendix (Section 8) for the Russian text and the respective translations.
[23] This is based on the translation by Zlata Kocić (1995). In (1d) a perfective gerund (converb *zahvalivši se* 'having thanked') is used. The other translation, by Milan Čolić, has the regular perfective conditional here but is otherwise less suitable on account of having a bi-aspectual verb in (1b).
[24] Macedonian: (1d) has the equivalent of *would be thankful*. As this is a non-terminative expression, perfective aspect is excluded.
[25] This is based on the translation by Tatjana Balova (2012). In the translation by Liljana Minkova, (1b)–(1h) have (a less typical) imperfective present.

Table 2 (cont.)

	(1e)	**(1f)**	**(1g)**	**(1h)**
English	*felt splendid*	*would begin* (*to feel*)	*lay down*	*would be free*
Russian	PST	PST	PST	PST
Belarusian	PST	PST	PST	PST
Ukrainian	PST	PST	PST	PST
Polish	PST	PST	PST	PST
Slovak	PST	PST	PST	PST
Czech	PST	PST	PST	PST
Slovene	PST	PST	PST	PST
Croatian[26]	PST	COND	COND	COND
Serbian	PST	COND	COND	COND
Macedonian	PST.FUT	PST.FUT	PST.FUT	PST.FUT
Bulgarian	IMPRF	IMPRF	IMPRF	IMPRF

It will be clear at first glance from the table that, although the use of imperfective aspect is considerable, in a large number of Slavic languages perfective aspect actually predominates.

The first column of the table, representing the unbounded repetition of the terminative event *sell a poison*, shows that all languages allow imperfective aspect. This is most appropriate here, as it provides a rather general characterization of Signora Toffana's occupation. As the narration switches to the description of the chain of events usually occurring after the selling of the poison, quite a lot of the languages switch to perfective aspect for the terminative events in the chain.[27] In these languages, aspect can easily operate on the "microlevel", the level of the individual events, whereas in Russian and a number of other, more Eastern-oriented languages attention is given primarily to the "macrolevel" of the whole situation characterized by the unbounded repetition of the events.[28] Since the totality of all these terminative events is apparent on the microlevel, perfective aspect is a natural choice for the western aspect type. In the eastern aspect type the choice of imperfective aspect is necessitated by the impossibility of making a sequential connection between each of the (total) events with a sufficiently definite (following and/or preceding) situation. The unbounded repetition of the

[26] Croatian (1f) has *On* bi bio *jako žedan*, lit.: 'He would be very thirsty'. As is the case in Macedonian (1d), the non-terminative character of the expression chosen by the translator excludes perfective aspect.

[27] The fact that non-terminative events are restricted to imperfective aspect explains the lack of the switch to perfective aspect in (1e) and (1h) (and also (1d) in the Macedonian and (1f) in the Croatian translation; cf. also footnotes 24, 26).

[28] The distinction *microevent* vs. *macroevent* seems to have been introduced in Timberlake (1982: 315). See on these two levels also Mønnesland (1984: 72) and Stunová (1993: 35).

situations in cases such as in the example makes it impossible for them to be singled out to play the role of a unique anchoring point for making this connection.

Other than the difference in aspect, the most typical Western-type languages (Czech, Slovak, Slovene) have a normal past tense form whilst the transitional languages (Croatian, Serbian and Macedonian) have a modal construction, which is very similar to the English *would*-construction. In contrast to indicative past tense forms, that are usually imperfective in cases of unbounded repetition, the modal constructions appear to concentrate on the micro-level which usually leads to the choice for perfective aspect (as in our example).

It is important to note that the differences in aspect choice in this text are mainly encountered with verb forms in independent constructions. In the sample text, the underlined relative clause *who had fed her husband soup* is an example of a dependent structure and it corresponds to a perfective past active participle in the original Russian and in Bulgarian, and to a relative clause in the other Slavic translations. Disregarding the fact that this event is clearly also repeated, perfective aspect is used in all Slavic languages.[29]

4.1 Notes on the encountered verb forms

4.1.1 Past tenses

Signaled in Table 2 by PST is the descendant of the inherited periphrastic perfect. In most contemporary Slavic languages, this is the general past tense form and it consists of the so-called *l*-participle (an active past participle) accompanied in most languages by (remnants of) the present tense of the auxiliary 'to be'. In Russian this is the only remaining past tense form. In most of the other languages, it can be opposed by the pluperfect (with the auxiliary in the past tense), although this latter form is used to quite different extents in the languages that still have it.

Croatian and Serbian, our two representatives of BCS in this comparison, have imperfective general past tenses in (1a) and (1e). As already mentioned in Section 3, in BCS the general past (originally the perfect) exists next to the aorist and (rarely) imperfect. The aorist is not infrequently used in literary texts but is not suited to express unbounded repetition (and thus habituality). In principle, the imperfect could be used in such cases, but in the (modern) standard languages this form is practically extinct.

In Macedonian and Bulgarian past tense marking, there are forms from the perfect opposed to pluperfect, aorist and imperfect (IMPRF in the table), all of which can be made with perfective and imperfective verbs (cf. Section 2). In these

[29] See Section 4.1.4 for a discussion of complex sentences with a dependent temporal clause. Other examples of dependent constructions would be gerunds (as (1d) in the Serbian translation) or infinitives.

languages, alongside the expression of resultative meaning, the perfect plays an important role in signaling various types of inferentiality, e.g., renarration.[30]

4.1.2 Conditional

In Croatian and Serbian, the conditional consists of the *l*-participle with a specific form of the auxiliary 'be' (*bih*, *bi* etc.). Alongside the expression of conditional meaning, it is often used for the expression of habituality in the past (with both aspects), and as such it might compare to the English *would*-habitual (Kalsbeek & Lučić 2008).

4.1.3 Future in the past

Although formally similar to that of Croatian and Serbian, the Macedonian conditional is not used to express habituality. Instead another compound form, the so-called future in the past (PST.FUT in the table) is used; it consists of the imperfect (both aspects) plus the particle *ќе* (a remnant of the verb 'to want'). The combination of this particle with the present tense form is the regular future tense of Macedonian. Alongside their temporal meaning these forms may also express habituality in the past or present, respectively. As far as we know this is only rarely the case with the comparable forms of closely related Bulgarian (Belyavski-Frank 2003: 7).

4.1.4 Aspect: dependent clause vs. main clause.

In addition to this overview and our discussion of the Bulgakov fragment, we need to mention that research has shown that across Slavic the position of verbs within complex sentences (i.e., in the main clause or the dependent clause) has an influence on the choice of aspect (Barentsen 2008). Table 3 shows the regular forms in sentences expressing unbounded repetition of complete terminative events, in complex sentences with temporal conjunctions of the type *as soon as*, expressing that each individual dependent clause event is immediately succeeded by each individual main clause event.

The table covers cases as in the following example from Bulgakov's *The Master and Margarita*:

(2) As soon as the telephone *started* to ring, Varenukha *would pick up* the receiver and lie into it: [...][31]

[30] In Bulgarian the function of renarrative is marked in the 3rd person by omitting the auxiliary.
[31] This is taken from the translation by Richard Pevear and Larissa Volkhonksy (1997). The other two translations have *picked up* and *lied* in the main clause, which makes the interpretation of unbounded repetition totally dependent on the context (as is also the case in the Czech, Slovak and Slovene translations.) For a complete set of the various Slavic translations, see (Barentsen 2008: 14–15) and the Appendix (Section 8).

Table 3: Verb forms (in repeated terminative completed events) (cf. Barentsen 2008: 29)

	Dependent clause		**Main clause**		
Russian Belarusian Ukrainian	PST		PST		
Polish	PST	/ PST	PST		
Slovak Czech Slovene	PST		PST		
Croatian Serbian	COND		COND	/ COND	/ PST
Macedonian	PST.FUT		PST.FUT		/ IMPRF
Bulgarian	IMPRF		IMPRF		

The table reflects the interesting fact that in dependent clauses of this kind also Polish can use perfective aspect whereas in Russian (as in the other East-Slavic languages) this is excluded. This possibility is not used in the Polish translations of the Bulgakov example but is found in the translation of the following sentence from Kipling's *The Jungle Book*:

(3) Ilekroć Messua *wymówi-ł-a* jakieś słowo, on
Whenever Messua pronounce.PFV-PST-F.SG a word he

natychmiast *powtarza-ł-ø* je głośno.
immediately repeat.IPFV-PST-M.SG it out.loud.

'So as soon as Messua *pronounced* a word Mowgli *would imitate* it almost perfectly [...].'[32]

Especially noteworthy is that in cases like this, Bulgarian prefers the perfective imperfect in the dependent clause such as in the translation of (2) and in the following example, which is, more clearly than (3), a habitual situation:[33]

[32] This example is also discussed in Barentsen (2008: 19–20) and Genis (2008b: 253). Comparable examples are in Barentsen (2008: 17, 24, 27). The Polish translation is by Józef Birkenmaier (1931).
[33] Examples of this kind are discussed in Fielder (1985).

(4) *Sreštn-ex* li văzrasten, kojto mi se
meet.PFV-IMPRF.1SG if adult REL me.DAT REFL

struva-še malko po-prozorliv, go *proverjav-ax*
seem.IPFV-IMPRF.3SG a.little more.clear-sighted him try.IPFV-IMPRF.1SG

s mojata risunka nomer 1, ...
with my drawing number 1

'Whenever *I met* one of them who seemed to me at all clear-sighted, *I tried* the experiment of showing him my Drawing Number One, ...'

[Bulgarian, Antoine de Saint-Exupéry, *Le petit prince*[34]]

4.2 Discussion of the comparison

Table 1 shows that in the Russian original and the Slavic translations, imperfective verbs are often used but that in some languages, perfective aspect is also easily allowed in cases of repeated complete terminative events such as (1a), (1b), (1c), (1d), (1f) and (1g) of the predicates under discussion; (1e) and (1h) are non-terminative and so there is no aspectual opposition as only imperfective verbs are available for such meanings. This is entirely in accordance with earlier findings on situations of unbounded repetition and on the face of it there does not seem to be any difference specific to habitual marking (cf. a.o. Dickey 2000; Stunová 1993; Barentsen 2008; Fortuin & Kamphuis 2015, 2018). Certainly for Russian, Belarusian, Ukrainian, Polish, Czech, Slovak and Slovene, matters concerning habituality are not very complex, and the state of affairs there also confirms that more "eastern-aspect" languages pattern towards the imperfective, whilst the "western-aspect" languages allow perfective – nothing new there. Polish is transitional in this typology and it follows the eastern pattern in main clauses and allows perfective in dependent clauses, which in Russian – a clear representative of the east – would not be allowed so easily (cf. Barentsen 2008; Genis 2008b). Such languages that do not disallow perfective verbs in habitual contexts show that some Slavic languages deviate from the classification of aspectual opposition posited by Comrie (1976: 25), which has habituality firmly on the imperfective side of the spectrum.

Matters in the south are different, and the (exceedingly) complex nature of the tense-aspect systems of Macedonian and Bulgarian need further attention as publications of specific research on situations of habituality (rather than iterativity or unbounded repetition) seem to be lacking.

[34] Original French: "Quand j'en *rencontrais* une (grande personne) qui me paraissait un peu lucide, je *faisais* l'expérience sur elle de mon dessin numéro 1 ... ." English translation by Katherine Woods (1943). The Bulgarian translation is by Konstantin Konstantinov (1978). In the other Slavic translations, the distribution of forms in the dependent clause corresponds to those in Table 3. Polish has imperfective here.

The situation for Croatian (and Serbian) is very different as far as research is concerned, and our comparative survey supports a.o. Kalsbeek & Lučić (2008) on the Croatian conditional to express past habituality and unbounded repetition. The use of the conditional in these contexts calls to mind the English *would*-construction.[35] Also, the use of the aspects in the translation of the Bulgakov sample is not surprising and the fact that perfectivity plays an important part underlines the fact that Croatian (and Serbian) pattern in this respect towards the western aspect type although they are transitional.

5 Further forms connected with expressions of habituality

The inventory of forms yielded by the Bulgakov fragment very likely presents the core means employed in a past tense narrative in Slavic languages. The literature presents other forms associated with habituality across Slavic – sometimes specific to a single language or a few languages. Below is an account of some of these sourced from previous publications and some own research as well as a little discussion.

5.1 Verbs of motion

This section concerns West-Slavic and East-Slavic languages as they have a class of imperfective indeterminate motion verbs that oppose imperfective determinate motion verbs, which is lacking in the South-Slavic languages (bar some relics in Slovene) (cf., e.g., Herrity 2000: 225 ff.). The indeterminate motion verbs may be associated with the expression of habituality in certain conditions as we will put forward below. Languages vary somewhat as to the amount of such verbs they have, usually around twenty or so. Typical examples are the Russian pairs *idti* IPFV.DET, *xodit'* IPFV.INDET 'walk/go on foot'; *exat'* IPFV.DET, *ezdit'* IPFV.INDET 'ride'; *letet'* IPFV.DET, *letat'* IPFV.INDET 'fly'. Czech has e.g.: *jít* IPFV.DET, *chodit* IPFV.INDET, *chodívat* IPFV.INDET.HAB 'walk'; *jet* IPFV.DET, *jezdit* IPFV.INDET, *jezdívat* IPFV.INDET.HAB 'drive/ride'; *letět* IPFV.DET, *létat* IPFV.INDET, *létávat* IPFV.INDET.HAB 'fly'. Note that Czech as well as Slovak, exceptionally amongst Slavic languages, have an additional "specialized" habitual verb in each set.[36] We shall return to this below as well as in Section 5.4.4.

Although these verbs exist across these Slavic systems, their use is not identical in all languages but there would seem to be ample commonalities.

[35] Further research and especially a cross-linguistic survey of modal connections with habituality, also of other Slavic languages, might reveal further such instances.

[36] One such "third" verb exists in Polish: *chadzać* IPFV.INDET.HAB 'walk, go' next to *chodzić* IPFV.INDET. In the same meaning Russian has the rather rare verb *xaživat'* next to *xodit'* IPFV.INDET; there may be others that are still in use: cf. 5.4.4 on specialized habituals, to which class these also belong.

Without going into it too deeply, determinate verbs are generally used when the direction described concerns a trajectory from A to B. In the words of Dickey, the category of indeterminate motion is "unusual, if not unique, from the perspective of linguistic typology" and so is the existence of a special class, which "in addition to the expression of ability (i.e., the ability to walk, run, etc.) has been assumed to have two primary instantiations. One is that of habitual repetition, and the other is that of aimless motion, i.e., continuous motion not occurring along a single (goal-oriented) trajectory" (2010: 68–69).[37]

The matter that interests us here is that these verbs are mentioned in the context of habituality and their use warrants a special mention, although it needs to be said that also the verbs of determinate motion may occur in contexts of unbounded repetition and habituality – this is no different from other imperfective verbs (cf. Section 3). The following is a typical example of a determinate verb of motion from Polish to illustrate this point.

(5) Na umówione spotkanie zawsze jecha-ł-em taksówką.
Onto agreed meeting always ride.IPFV.DET-PST.M-1SG taxi
'I would always take a taxi to an agreed meeting.'
[Polish, J. Miliszkiewicz, *Przygoda bycia Polakiem* 2007[38]]

There are certain restrictions to the use of determinate verbs in habitual contexts, and in this case that is met by the motion path described as having one direction: only A to B (as opposed to implying, e.g., a return from such a meeting as well and hence the reversed direction – back to A – as well). Note that the adverb *zawsze* 'always' causes the habitual reading of this sentence, not the predicate itself; without this adverb the sentence's default reading would most likely be one of a single durative situation, the repetition still also being possible, but context dependent. The indeterminate motion verb needs none of that as might be deduced from (6).

(6) Po wojnie jeździ-ł-em do Izraela, jako dziennikarz
After war ride.IPFV.INDET-PST-M.1SG to Israel as reporter
śledzi-ł-em proces Adolfa Eichmanna, ...
followed.IPFV-PST-M.1SG trial Adolf Eichmann
'After the war I have been travelling to [and from] Israel, as a reporter I followed the trial of Adolf Eichmann, ...'
[Anna Bikont, *Wywiad* (Gazeta Wyborcza), 1993[39]]

[37] This topic has a long history of research by Slavists, and Dickey (2010) provides ample bibliography as well as general discussion and in fact re-evaluation of this verb class.
[38] Retrieved from *NKJP* (text ID: IJPPAN_k123091), 11 August 2020.
[39] Retrieved from *NKJP* (text ID: PELCRA_1303919931001), 11 August 2020.

As already stated, when used without an adverbial (or other indication or context) of direction or goal, the verb of indeterminate motion expresses ability or aimless motion. When, however, used with an indication of direction (here: "to Israel") the indeterminate motion verb indicates a movement to and from, and so a return: A – B – A. In Polish no further context is necessary to read this as unbounded repetition and habit (so: unbounded repetition of instances of "there and back"), and this holds for other languages too, certainly for Czech and Slovak. In Russian, though, these verbs may also be used for a single instance of "there and back", and consequently further context or an adverbial etc. is often necessary for the habituality to be brought to the fore. In certain (prototypical) instances, even there, no further information is required to arrive at the habitual interpretation, and this probably goes for all of these languages. Here is a common example from a few of our languages.

(7) a. Doč′ uže chodi-l-a v školu.
b. Córka już chodzi-ł-a do szkoły.
c. Dcera už chodi-l-a do školy.
d. Dcéra už chodi-l-a do školy.
daughter already go.IPFV.INDET-PST-F.3SG to school
'[My] daughter was already going to school.'
[a. Russian, b. Polish, c. Czech, d. Slovak, native informants]

This is the way these languages express the daughter having the daily (or so) routine to attend school.

There are many intricacies, similarities and differences, which could probably do with some further cross-Slavic research attention before more is said about this issue and general conclusions drawn. There is, however, one final point we can still include here. It concerns cases like the following in Czech, which also hold for Slovak.

(8) Jezdi-l-ø k vám? – Jezdí-va-l-ø.
go.IPFV.INDET-PST-M.3SG to you.PL? – go.IPFV.INDET-HAB-PST-M.3SG
'Did he [used to] come [to visit] to you? – He came now and then.'
[Czech, native informant co-author]

These two languages have specialized habitual derived verbs and they convey a diminished sense of frequency compared to the "regular" imperfective base-verbs. We shall deal with these further in Section 5.4.4. notably example (24).

5.2 Habitual verbs

5.2.1 Polish: zwyknąć */ Czech:* zvyknout si */ Slovak:* zvyknúť si + *IPFV.INF*

Polish *zwyknąć /* Czech *zvyknout si /* Slovak *zvyknúť si* are perfective verbs and mean 'to get used to'.[40] Etymologically the word is connected to the meaning 'custom' etc., and the link with that notion is felt quite strongly although its function is by now that of an auxiliary. Here is an example of its use.

(9) a. Mamusia zwyk-ł-a w niedzielę pie-c babkę.
Mummy HAB.PFV-PST-F.3SG in Sunday bake.IPFV-INF cake

b. Maminka si zvyk-l-a v neděli péc-t bábovku.
Mummy REFL HAB.PFV-PST-F.3SG in Sunday bake.IPFV-INF cake

c. Mamička si zvyk-l-a v nedeľu piec-ť bábovku.
Mummy REFL HAB.PFV-PST-F.3SG in Sunday bake.IPFV-INF cake

'Mummy is used to bake a cake every Sunday.'

[a. Polish, native informant[41], b. Czech, c. Slovak, native informant co-authors]

Very literally this means 'Mummy has in the past gotten used to bake a cake every Sunday, and as a result, she is now used to bake a cake every Sunday'.[42] In other words, the perfective event 'get used' was completed in the past, affected situational change and its effect, the situation whose beginning it marks, lasts and is linked to the deictic center.[43]

---

[40] Three important Polish dictionaries differ considerably: Doroszewski (1959–67) labels it perfective or imperfective, Szymczak (1978) as just imperfective, and Bańko (2000) as just perfective. Often dictionaries do not include this verb as it is going out of use and is anyway labelled as "bookish" for this language.

[41] Personal communication 29 July 2020. The sentence is felt as somewhat old-fashioned.

[42] We would like to note that these perfective verbs, when used in a present tense form in these languages, will usually have bearing on the future: 'Mama will at some point in the future have started and then uphold the habit of baking a cake on every Sunday'.

[43] We differ slightly from Sawicki's (2019: 175–178) unusual treatment of Polish *zwyknąć* as a defective verb that in spite of being restricted to past tense forms nevertheless has a present tense: in Slavic aspect it is not at all surprising that a past tense of a perfective verb has a relevance at / for the time of speaking or, depending on context, a relevant point (deictic center) in the past: in other words, there is no need to speak of it actually having a present tense. Whilst aspectually nothing out of the ordinary, the verb is indeed unusual, although not unique, in still being used in what certainly formally constitutes a pluperfect – a tense that otherwise has almost

5.2.2 Slovak: zvyknúť$_2$*:IPFV + I/PFV.INF*

An as yet seemingly unrecorded case is presented by the Slovak verb *zvyknúť* without *si* (reflexive pronoun) – we will refer to it as *zvyknúť*$_2$ to distinguish it from the reflexive verb in Section 5.2.1 – used in a clearly felt durative sense 'to be used to / to have / be in the habit of' in present and past tense.

(10) a. Mamička dlhé roky zvyk-l-a$_2$ v nedeľu
Mummy long years HAB.IPFV-PST-F.3SG in Sunday
piecť bábovku.
bake.IPFV-INF cake
'For many years mummy used to bake a cake on Sunday.'

b. Mamička dlhé roky zvykn-e$_2$ v nedeľu
Mummy long years HAB.IPFV-PRS- 3SG in Sunday
piecť bábovku.
bake.IPFV-INF cake
'Mummy has been baking cakes on Sunday for many years.'
[Slovak, native informant co-author]

As the past tense example may not be felt as enough to go by, we have provided (10b) in the present tense, and this urges us to reevaluate the aspect which in dictionaries is given as being perfective: it needs to be imperfective in the Slavic system for it to be used like this. Curious is also that – unlike the perfective version discussed in the section above (ex. (9c)), where the following main verb needs to be imperfective – with *zvyknúť*$_2$ there is no such restriction; (11) is an example with a whole string of perfective infinitives.

(11) Mamička zvyk-l-a$_2$ / zvykne$_2$ v nedeľu upiec-ť
mummy HAB.IPFV-PST-F.3SG HAB.IPFV-PRS- 3SG in Sunday bake.PFV-INF
bábovku, navari-ť obed a slávnostne prestrie-ť stôl.
cake cook.PFV-INF lunch and ceremoniously lay.PFV-INF table
'Mummy used to bake / is in the habit of baking a cake on Sunday, cook lunch and lay the table ceremoniously'.
[Slovak, native informant co-author]

disappeared from active usage in Polish. It functions to present a situation that lasted for a period of time in the past but no longer does so. This is not the place to go into the reasons why the pluperfect was maintained for this and a few other verbs in Polish.

Examples of *zvyknúť*$_2$ abound in the Slovak National text Corpus, and native informants judge it as wholly acceptable. The lack of specific research, however, makes it impossible at this time to elaborate on its exact usage (and restrictions and the like).

5.2.3 BCS: znati *and* um(j)eti *as habitual auxiliaries*

Hellman discusses the grammaticalization of the BCS verbs *znati* 'know, to be able to' and *um(j)eti* 'can, to be able to' into "auxiliaries denoting habitual, characteristic or sporadic activity" (2005: 7). These verbs occur as such in the construction with an (im)perfective infinitive or conjunction *da* + (im)perfective present. (12) is a typical example of habitual use.

(12) Sestre su zna-l-e leža-ti na hladnom
sisters AUX-PRS.3PL AUX.IPFV-PART.PST-F.PL lie.IPFV-INF on cold
podu kapelice i moli-ti se.
floor chapel and pray.IPFV-INF REFL[44]
'The sisters used to lie on the cold floor of the chapel and pray.'
[Croatian, Hellman (2005: 45)]

A further example, this time with auxiliary *umeti* and conjunction *da* + PRS.

(13) Ume-o je da kaž-e: Mirko,
AUX.HAB-PART.PST.M.SG AUX-PRS.3SG CONJ say.PFV-PRS.3SG Mirko
ti nikada ne-ćе-š bi-ti bogat.
you never not-AUX-PRS.2SG be.IPFV-INF rich
'He used to say: Mirko, you will never be rich.'
[Serbian, Hellman (2005: 26)]

Also, the combination of the habitual auxiliary *znati* and a construction with the conditional occurs (cf. Section 4.1.2).

[44] The combination of auxiliary and past participle constitutes the general past tense (originally the perfect); cf. Section 4.1.1.

(14) Zna-l-i bi doći u obliku
AUX.HAB-PART.PST-M.PL AUX.COND.3 come.PFV.INF in shape
životinja, no najčešće bi se pojavljiva-l-i
animals but most.often AUX.COND.3 REFL appear.IPFV-PART.PST-M.PL
kao ljudi.
as people
'They would come in the shape of animals, but most often they would appear as people.'
[Croatian, Internet[45]]

5.3 BCS regional: additional inflectional forms

5.3.1 Bosnian dialects: imperative + particle bi

In addition to the colloquial Bosnian, Croatian, and Serbian so-called "narrative" or "historical imperative", Bosnian dialects can use the imperative in a habitual function (Valjevac 2002, cited in Kalsbeek & Lučić 2008: 11). This is a combination of the narrative imperative (singular only), with the conditional particle *bi* (no other forms of the conditional auxiliary), e.g.:

(15) Dođ-i bi oni kod nas, pa bi onda
come.PFV-IMP.2SG COND.3 they to us and COND.3 then
zapjeva-j
sing.PFV-IMP.2SG
'They would come to us, and then they would start to sing.'
[Bosnian Sarajevo dialect, Halilović 2009 n.v., cited in Ibrišimović 2011: 37]

(16) Pokojni bi otac rec-i.
deceased COND.3 father say.PFV-IMP.2SG
'[My] deceased father would say [it like that].'
[Bosnian, dialect of Paklarevo near Travnik, Valjevac 2002: 240, cited in Kalsbeek & Lučić 2008: 11]

5.3.2 Kvarner dialects: PFV.IMPRF

In Old Croatian texts at least until the 16th century (cf. Kalsbeek 2008), and, at least until recently, in some Kvarner dialects, the perfective imperfect functions to present repeated complete events in the past (cf. Xoutzagers 1991).

[45] Retrieved from www.jutarnji.hr/kultura/art/jutarnji-prvi-predstavlja-novu-carobnu-knjigu-zdenka-basica-slikovnica-o-mitskim-bicima-iz-turopolja-koja-stite-od-bolesti-10160500, 8 August 2020.

(17) A jâ pones-âh obȅdi, već ȍstanj-ah
And I bring.PFV-IMPRF.1SG lunch then stay.PFV-IMPRF.1SG
kopȁ-t.
dig.IPFV-INF
'And I would bring [their] midday meals, and then I would stay to dig.'
[Croatian, Kvarner, dialect of the island of Pag, Xoutzagers 1991: 80]

5.4 Derived "habitual" verbs

In a number of Slavic languages, most notably Czech and Slovak, but also Polish, BCS, Russian and possibly others, there is a class of imperfective verbs that in grammars and dictionaries are generally described as having a specialized function to express frequentativity / iterativity, or more precisely "irregular recurrence" (Galton 1976: 62). Dickey (2000: 86) calls these "the class of specifically habitual verbs". They are derived in very similar ways, that is, by means of the infixation of (with very few exceptions) simplex (non-prefixed) imperfective (or biaspectual) verbs. Often the base verbs have a non-terminative meaning, although there is some variation in languages. The infixes in question usually also function to derive (regular) imperfective verbs from perfective verbs. Although not exclusive in this function, on the face of it the most common infix in this function across languages seems to be one that might be rendered -/va/-. To give an impression, these examples are of the derivations from the base verbs for 'be': BCS *biti* → *bi**va**ti*; Polish *być* → *by**wa**ć*; Czech *být* → *bý**va**t*; Slovak *byť* → *bý**va**ť*; Russian *byt'* → *by**va**t'*.[46]

Although morphologically related, in the size of this verb class and the functioning of the verbs, as well as their use and frequency, there are notable differences between the languages. In the following, we shall briefly discuss this for Russian as a representative of languages where the group is (almost) out of use, Polish and BCS in which groups of such verbs exists and there is a very modest productivity, and finally Czech and Slovak, where this is very much a productive verb type with quite specific usage.

5.4.1 Russian: very limited use

An up-to-date description and evaluation of Russian verbs and verb derivation of this class is Uluxanov (2017: 45–51). Uluxanov reviews earlier evaluations of the

[46] This verb exists in other languages as well, even ones that don't otherwise seem to have the verb class (e.g., Slovene *bívati*; Belarusian *byvac'*; Ukrainian *buvaty*). Often they have deviating lexicalised meanings but they may also appear with the habitual / frequentative notion. For these languages, matters are as yet a little unclear when it comes to the verb class, and therefore we will leave them out of the present discussion.

class and mentions that they seem to have the status of relics and no more than a dozen actually figure in modern press and literature, even though the "algorithm for their formation" has not been lost and new forms pop up every now and then. Apart from their infinitive form, they are otherwise practically restricted to use in the past tense. As is often the case in Slavic linguistic literature, Uluxanov rather deals with these verbs in terms of frequentativity / iterativity than of habituality. Often mentioned in this context are, among others, *govarivat'* (cf. *govorit'* IPFV 'talk, say'); *vidyvat'* (cf. *videt'* IPFV 'see'); *sižívat'* (cf. *sidet'* IPFV 'sit'); *xažívat'* (cf. *xodit'* IPFV 'walk'); *našívat'* (cf. *nosit'* IPFV 'to wear'); *znavat'* (cf. *znat'* IPFV 'know').[47]

Reading Uluxanov one gets the distinct impression that Russians find these forms old-fashioned, and initial searches in the *NKRJ* corpus yield very few recent examples. Example (18) is the most recent attestation of *sižívat'* 'sit' in the corpus to date. The literary narrative context is clearly habitual and enumerates that the subject would usually get a free drink, have a bite to eat, and then would sit down at a table, and ...

(18) Vsegda odin siži-va-l-ø.
Always alone sit.IPFV-HAB-PST-M.SG
'He would always sit alone.'
[Russian, Viktor Remizov, *Volja vol'naja*, 2013[48]]

Other verbs of this group seem to function mostly in phraseological units such as ... *kak govarival / ljubil govarivat' X* 'such as X used to (like to) say'.

Russian developed the particle *byvalo* from the impersonal past tense form of the habitual verb *byvat'* 'be'. It may be used with imperfective past or present forms and even with perfective non-past (future!) forms. Interestingly, also combinations with the past tense of habitual verbs like *govarivat'* can be found. In all cases this particle seems to emphasize the 'non-actuality' of the situations with regard to the present.[49]

5.4.2 Polish: limited number, not infrequent use

The Polish situation is not much different from that in Russian, and only very few fossilized verbs belong to this class (cf. a.o. Mønnesland 1984: 59; Sawicki 2019: 172). Galton (1976: 62) mentions that in Polish the "straight" (non-marked for habituality) imperfective equivalent is on the advance at the cost of these verbs,

[47] Cf. Forsyth (1970: 168–171) for examples with English translations.
[48] Retrieved from the *NKRJ*, 9 August, 2020.
[49] For more on *byvalo* cf. Černov (1970), Forsyth (1970: 182), Comrie (1976: 70), Grønn (2011), and Sičinava (2013).

which he calls frequentatives, although, as in Russian, new forms do occur sometimes, never to gain a foothold. This is perhaps a sign that in Russian and Polish (and perhaps elsewhere, other than in esp. Czech and Slovak) rendering "unbounded repetition" has become the domain more and more of the meaning of the "straight" imperfective verbs. Sawicki (2019: 171) mentions that although the class is not truly productive, the verbs of this class that do exist belong to the core vocabulary, and their use is not infrequent. Sawicki further mentions that the habitual reading is not context-dependent. Examples are: *pisywać* (cf. *pisać* IPFV 'write'); *bijać* (cf. *bić* IPFV 'hit, beat'); *pijać* (cf. *pić* IPFV 'drink'); *siadywać* (cf. *siadać* IPFV 'sit'); *widywać* (cf. *widzieć* IPFV 'see'); *miewać* (cf. *mieć* IPFV 'have'); *sypiać* (cf. *spać* IPFV 'sleep'); *bywać* (cf. *być* IPFV 'be'); *jadać* (cf. *jadł* 'he ate' < *jeść* IPFV'eat'). A typical and frequent case is presented by the reflexive use of *widywać*, which we present here to demonstrate another particular function of these verbs within the scope of habituality.

(19) Ojciec i stryj nie przepada-l-i za sobą i
father and uncle not like.IPFV-PST-M.3PL for each_other and

wid-ywa-l-i się rzadko.
see.IPFV-HAB-PST-M.3PL REFL occasionally

'[My] father and uncle didn't like each other and saw each other [only very] occasionally.'

[Polish, Mariusz Urbanek, *Kisielewscy* 2006[50]]

Please note the insertion of "[only very]" in the translation. If in this context the habitual verb is replaced by the regular imperfective verb, *widzieli się*, there is still talk of a habit (on account of the adverb *rzadko* 'occasionally'). The use of the so-called habitual verb signals a diminished, irregular frequency of the situation. It would seem that the presence of a derived so-called habitual verb in the system does not take the habituality function away from the regular imperfective base verb. The focus of the derived verbs seems to be primarily on the frequency feature, where the default habitual reading of the base verb may involve regular recurrences of the event (or backgrounded regularity). We shall return to this matter in the context of Czech and Slovak habituals in Section 5.4.4.

5.4.3 BCS: limited use and regional variation

In Standard Croatian there is an extremely limited number of these verbs that, like in Polish, belong to the core vocabulary and are in frequent use. This group includes *viđati* (cf. *vid(j)eti* I/PFV 'see'); *bivati* (cf. *biti* IPFV 'be').

[50] Retrieved from *NKJP* (text ID: PWN_3102000000035), 9 August 2020.

(20) Viđa-l-i smo je često na
see.IPFV.HAB-PST.PART-M.PL AUX.PRS.1PL her often on

nogometnim stadionima, ali na sajmovima knjiga nikada.
soccer stadiums but on fairs books never

'We often used to see her in soccer stadiums, but never at book fairs.'

[Standard Croatian, Internet[51]]

Bivati occurs a.o. in combinations with a passive participle, which construction is always clearly habitual, as in example (21) from a text on the history of Bosnia.

(21) Narodni običaji ... bi-va-l-i su
Folk customs be.IPFV-HAB-PST.PART-M.PL AUX.PRS.3PL

prihvaćen-i, ...
accept.PASS.PART-M.PL

'Folk customs ... would be accepted ...'

[Standard Croatian, Internet[52]]

According to Dickey (2000: 87) standard Serbian can form explicitly habitual verbs from biaspectual verbs, e.g.: *kršćavati* (cf. *krstiti* I/PFV 'baptize'); *noćivati* (cf. *noćiti* I/PFV 'spend the night'); *ručavati* (cf. *ručati* I/PFV 'eat lunch'); *večeravati* (cf. *večerati* I/PFV 'eat dinner'). However, according to our observations, these verbs do not always have a habitual interpretation but can be used in a durative meaning, as well; other than their base verbs they are explicitly imperfective.

There are verbs derived from imperfective verbs of motion in standard Croatian that are often used in habitual contexts: *dovađati* (cf. *dovoditi* IPFV 'lead (to)'), *donašati* (cf. *donositi* IPFV 'bring, carry (to)'). The verbs *nosati* (derived from *nositi* IPFV 'carry') and *vodati* (derived from *voditi* IPFV 'lead') indicate indeterminate repeated motion ('carry around in no particular direction, back and forth' and 'lead, guide along', respectively).[53]

[51] Retrieved from hr.n1info.com/Vijesti/a443452/Predsjednicu-smo-vidjali-na-nogometnim-stadionima-ali-na-sajmovima-knjiga-nikada.html, 9 August 2020.

[52] Retrieved from treca-gimnazija.edu.ba/novosti/konferencija-izgubljeni-obicaji-u-religijskim-tradicijama-naroda-bosne-i-hercegovine/, 9 August 2020.

[53] As BCS lacks the systematic opposition between imperfective verbs of indeterminate motion and imperfective verbs of determinate motion, as mentioned in Section 5.1, this batch of forms belong in this section, although the similarities with what has been discussed on the basis of Russian and Polish may seem close.

(22) Skuše, srdele i inćuni do-naša-l-i
Mackerels sardines and anchovies to-bring.HAB-PST-PART-M.PL
su se u ribarnicu u tolikoj količini ...
AUX.PRS.3PL REFL at fish_market in such quantities ...
'Mackerel, sardines and anchovies would be brought to the fish market in such quantities [that they could not be sold].'
[Standard Croatian, Internet[54]]

In comparison with other languages, the verb here is quite special for having a (termanitivising) prefix; this does not happen with verbs of this class in Russian and Polish, but cf. Czech and Slovak in Section 4.1.4.

In some North-West Čakavian Croatian dialects, there is a class of habitual verbs, which, like in Czech and Slovak, is productive: cf. a.o. Žminj (Istria) *hićievȁt* (cf. *hȉtat* IPFV and *hȉtit* PFV 'throw') (cf. Kalsbeek 1985). The following is a typical example.

(23) Smo čuvie-vȁ-l-e skȕpa.
AUX.PRS.1PL tend.IPFV-HAB-PST.PART-F.PL together
'We used to tend [the sheep] together.'
[Croatian, North-West Čakavian (Žminj), Kalsbeek 1998: 294]

5.4.4 Czech and Slovak: highly productive

In Czech and Slovak this imperfective verb class is very productive and a fair bit of research has been published.[55] In these languages the usage of these verbs is very particular, which may already be apparent from the mere fact that none of these feature in the Bulgakov sample discussed in Section 4. Below are first a note on the extent of the derivation, then a brief note on its use in Czech and Slovak. In the context of these languages, we feel it is important to point out that these verbs are referred to here, esp. after Dickey (2000: 50 ff.), as "habitual" verbs, whereas in the (esp. Czech) literature already mentioned, they are more usually referred to as "frequentative" verbs.

As in the languages discussed above, the main suffix for this kind of derivation also functions to form regular imperfective verbs from perfective ones. Also like elsewhere it is applied to simplex (unprefixed) imperfective verbs to form the so-called habituals, e.g., *kouří-va-t* (cf. *kouřit* IPFV 'smoke'), *stá-va-t* (cf.

[54] Retrieved from www.narodni-list.hr/posts/194255006, 9 August 2020.
[55] Cf. Karlík (2017), Kopečný (1965), Danaher (2003), Nübler (2017), and their bibliographies.

stá-t IPFV ‘stand’).[56] Other than in other languages, this process is also seemingly freely applied to prefixed imperfective verbs (which in Slavic languages generally are explicitly terminative), which usually are partners to perfective verbs, to form a second, “habitual” imperfective, e.g., *přepisová-va-t* (IPFV.HAB) (cf. *přepisovat* IPFV and *přepsat* PFV ‘rewrite’).

As mentioned before for all Slavic languages (Section 3), in Czech and Slovak too, all imperfective verbs may be used for situations of “unbounded repetition” and thus also habituality, also the ones not specifically marked for habituality. Example (24) illustrates this point.

(24) Anna kouři-l-a? – Kouří-va-l-a.
Anna smoke.IPFV-PST-F.3SG – smoke.IPFV-HAB-PST-F.3SG
‘Did Anna smoke [e.g. when she was alive] – she smoked / used to smoke sometimes.’
[Czech, native informant co-author]

As was the case for the Polish example (19), the habitual verb in this kind of context indicates a diminished frequency, an irregularity of the event, whereas the habit expressed by the “straight” imperfective verb in habitual use – here: *kouřila* – expresses a default regular repetition or perhaps a backgrounded frequency. Also very important to note is that the habitual verb in this context can only be used if the proposition is no longer true at the time of utterance or some other deictic center.[57]

On the present tense of these verbs, Kopečný (1965) writes that “because of the strongly iterative meaning, they cannot refer to the actual present which strictly speaking excludes repetition …”. This restriction to non-actual use also seems to run parallel to a restriction in the past tense, as the habitual verbs cannot perform a durative (progressive) function, which becomes apparent in (25).[58]

[56] Please note that in this section, examples are in Czech but they were approved for Slovak also by our native informant and bar a different spelling and minor phonological and morphological issues, what is said here holds for that language as well.
[57] Interestingly Isačenko (1962: 407, cited also in Comrie 1976: 28) mentions the same non-actuality for the Russian *Ja ego znaval* ‘I used to know him’, which also has the verb belonging to the class under scrutiny.
[58] These so-called *-va*-verbs and their restrictions are also discussed in Dahl (1995). The most extensive discussion is in Mendia & Filip (2018).

(25) Zatímco Anna kouři-l-a / *kouří-va-l-a,
During Anna smoke.IPFV-PST-F.3SG / smoke.IPFV-HAB-PST-F.3SG
sta-l-a se nehoda
happen.PFV-PST-F.3SG REFL accident
'While Anna was smoking, an accident happened.'
[Czech, native informant co-author]

A further noteworthy use of habitual derived verbs is in statives, as in the following example.

(26) Na předměstí stá-va-l-ø dům, ...
On outskirt stand.IPFV-HAB-PST-M.3SG house
'On the outskirts used to stand a house, ...'
[Czech, Internet[59]]

This is then the type Mønnesland (1984: 59) refers to as stative habitual (cf. Section 2). As a repeated occurrence of the event is not intended, this use explicitly denotes just the other function of the verbs in this class, i.e., that the situation is no longer current: the house is no longer there at the time of utterance or other deictic center.[60] Had this sentence included the non-habitual imperfective equivalent *stál*, then the truth at the moment of utterance or deictic center would be irrelevant and the house might or might not still be there. The verb *stál* may serve to indicate the presence of the house in the past as a background to some other event, a use that is not open to any item in the class of *va*-verbs, also not to these statives.

6 Concluding remarks

From our rundown of aspect choices in cases of habituality / unbounded repetition in the narrative past text fragments from Bulgakov, it is clear that the languages pattern neatly according to the East-West typology of Slavic aspect, first proposed by Dickey (2000) and then expanded upon by others, notably Kamphuis (2014). Of course this concerns the cases in the Bulgakov fragment where there actually is a choice of aspect and so with respect to the terminative events in the habitually occurring chain: (1b), (1c), (1d), (1f) and (1g). We pointed out that the remaining cases in the example are either non-terminative or may be thought of as falling outside the habitual chain of events. Fragment (1) and its patterning for Macedonian corroborate Kamphuis's (2014) conclusion to situate Macedonian

[59] Retrieved from zpevnik.antonio.cz/spiritual/az-vzletnou-ptaci, on 10 August 2020.
[60] Cf. Comrie (1976: 29) and note the resemblance to English *used to* with a stative verb.

slightly further to the west than closely related Bulgarian on account of the more frequent use of perfective aspect in certain instances, such as here, as may be surmised from Table 2. Also for the other languages, the aspect choices in the fragment support the earlier typology with respect to aspect. It needs to be pointed out that south Slavic languages, except Slovene, regularly use forms other than past tense in expressions of habituality: BCS has the conditional, often in perfective aspect, Macedonian abounds in future-in-the-past forms, and in Bulgarian perfective imperfect predominates (independent clauses, as in (4)).

Other expressions connected to habituality in the past that have been listed in Section 5 certainly occur outside the narrative past tense context but may also still be found within. On the face of it, all of these other expressions concern imperfective aspect. The auxiliary discussed in Section 5.2.1 for Polish (*zwyknąć*), Czech (*zvyknout si*) and Slovak (*zvyknúť si*) itself is perfective and marks a beginning point to a habitual event, but here too, the event itself needs to be expressed in imperfective aspect.

Languages vary considerably as concerns the presence of habitual auxiliaries, and it may very well be that not all of these have been recorded for all varieties of Slavic languages. Some languages have remnants of derived specifically imperfective habitual verbs, but outside the languages discussed in Section 5.4, it is as yet unclear whether and how these function as habituals in all Slavic languages; the impression is that they are rather poorly described for some languages. In Czech and Slovak this group is (highly) productive and functions certainly for unbounded repeated events, but also for statives in temporally protracted single situations. Habitual eventives, as we have shown, express a diminished regularity to the habit (cf. (8), (24)), something that also seems to hold for Polish (cf. ex. (19)) and perhaps also elsewhere. The observation made for Czech and Slovak that verbs of this class are restricted to non-actual (non-specific referential) use, might also hold true for verbs of this class in other languages, but it does not seem to hold for some of these verbs mentioned for Serbian (cf. Section 5.4.3, *kršćavati* ‘baptize’etc), raising the question whether or not these verbs should be listed as habituals for this language at all.

Czech and Slovak need to be singled out in discussions on habituality. The Bulgakov fragment yields perfective past tense forms for the terminative events that are part of the habitual chain of events described there, but outside this particular narrative context, these languages also use imperfective past tense and moreover boast a productive so-called “class of specifically habitual verbs” (Dickey 2000: 86). To date it is not completely clear exactly in which situation any of these forms is most fitting, but the specifically habitual verbs express irregularity and specific non-actuality. Other than that already Stunová (1993: 193) suggested that the narrative character of a given text plays an important part

for aspect choice in Czech and regarding the habitual verbs the role of the text type needs further research.

All in all the present inventory is not exhaustive as further data from these languages needs to be gathered to complete the picture and indeed, enable a true comparison.

7 References

7.1 General

Bacz, B. 2009. Aspect and expressions of habituality in Polish. *Lacus Forum* 35: 81–89.

Bańko, M. 2000. *Inny słownik języka polskiego*, tom I–II. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo naukowe PWN.

Barentsen, A.A. 1985. *'Tijd', 'aspect' en de conjunctie* poka*: over betekenis en gebruik van enkele vormen in het moderne Russisch*. PhD dissertation, University of Amsterdam. Amsterdam.

Barentsen, A.A. 1995. Trexstupenčataja model′ invarianta soveršennogo vida v russkom jazyke. In St. Karoljak (ed.), *Semantika i struktura slavjanskogo vida*, I. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe WSP, 1–26.

Barentsen, A.A. 1998. Priznak "sekventnaja svjaz′" i vidovoe protivopostavlenie v russkom jazyke. In M.Ju. Čertkova (ed.), *Tipologija vida: problemy, poiski, rešenija*. Moskva: Škola "Jazyki russkoj kul′tury", 43–58.

Barentsen, A.A. 2008. Vyraženie posledovatel′nosti dejstvij pri povtorjaemosti v prošlom v sovremennyx slavjanskix jazykax. In P. Houtzagers, J. Kalsbeek & J. Schaeken (eds.), *Dutch Contributions to the Fourteenth International Congress of Slavists, Ohrid* (Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics 34), Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi, 1–36.

Binnick, R.I. 2006. *Used to* and habitual aspect in English. *Style* 4(1–2): 33–45.

Belyavski-Frank, M. 2003. *The Balkan Conditional in South Slavic. A Semantic and Syntactic Study* (Slavistische Beiträge 421). München: Verlag Otto Sagner.

Bybee, J., R. Perkins & W. Pagliuca. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Černov, V.I. 1970. O priglagol′nyx časticax *bylo* i *byvalo*. *Učënye zapiski Smolenskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogičeskogo instituta* 24: 258–264.

Comrie, B. 1976. *Aspect: an Introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect and Related Problems* (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dahl, Ö. 1995. The marking of the episodic/generic distinction in tense-aspect systems. In G.N. Carlson & F.J. Pelletier (eds.), *The Generic Book*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 415–425.

Danaher, D.S. 1996. A semiotic approach to the semantics of Czech verbs of the type *říkávat*. *The Slavic and East European Journal* 40(1): 118–133.

Danaher, D.S. 2003. *The Semantics and Discourse Function of Habitual-iterative Verbs in Contemporary Czech* (LINCOM Studies in Slavic Linguistics 22). Munich: LINCOM publishers.

Dickey, S.M. 2000. *Parameters of Slavic Aspect: A Cognitive Approach* (Dissertations in Linguistics). Stanford CA: Center for the Study of Language and Information.

Dickey, S.M. 2010. Common Slavic "indeterminate" verbs of motion were really manner-of-motion verbs. In V. Hasko & R. Perelmutter (eds.), *New Approaches to Slavic Verbs of Motion* (Studies in Language Companion Series 115). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Dickey, S.M. 2018. Thoughts on the 'typology of Slavic aspect'. *Russian Linguistics* 42(4): 69–103.

Doroszewski, W. 1958–67. *Słownik języka polskiego*, tom 1–10. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Fielder, G.E. 1985. Aspect and modality in Bulgarian subordinate clauses. In M.S. Flier & A. Timberlake (eds.), *The Scope of Slavic Aspect.* Columbus, OH: Slavica Publishers, 181–193.

Forsyth, J. 1970. *A Grammar of Aspect. Usage and Meaning in the Russian Verb.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fortuin E.L.J. 2008. Frequency, iteration and quantity: The semantics of expressions of frequent repetition in Russian and the relationship to aspect. *Russian Linguistics* 32(3): 203-243.

Fortuin, E.L.J. & J. Kamphuis. 2015. The typology of Slavic aspect: a review of the East-West Theory of Slavic aspect. *Russian Linguistics* 39: 163–208.

Fortuin, E.L.J. & J. Kamphuis. 2018. Unanswered questions of Slavic aspect: a reply to 'Thoughts on the 'Typology of Slavic aspect''. *Russian Linguistics* 42: 105–121.

Galton, H. 1976. *The Main Functions of the Slavic Verbal Aspect*. Skopje: Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts.

Genis, R.M. 2008a. *Studies on the Polish Verbal Prefix* prze-. PhD dissertation, UvA. (Pegasus Oost-Europese Studies 7). Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Pegasus.

Genis, R.M. 2008b. Repetition and aspect in the past tense in Polish compound sentences. In E. de Haard, W. Honselaar, & J. Stelleman (eds.), *Literature and Beyond: Festschrift for Willem G. Weststeijn: on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday* (Pegasus Oost-Europese Studies 11/1). Amsterdam: Pegasus, 249–261.

Grickat, I. 1998. Potencijal u službi iskazivanja habitualnosti – i nekoliko napomena povodom ove konstrukcije. *Južnoslovenski filolog* 54: 35–40.

Grønn, A. 2011. 'Byvalo' and 'used to' as verbal quantifiers. *Slovo. Journal of Slavic Languages and Literatures* 52: 63–80.

Hellman, M. 2005. *The Verbs* znati *and* um(j)eti *in Serbian, Croatian and Bosnian: A Case Study in the Grammaticalisation of Habitual Auxiliaries*. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press.

Herrity, P. 2000. *Slovene: A Comprehensive Grammar* (Routledge Comprehensive Grammars Series). London and New York: Routledge.

Ibrišimović, N. 2011. Neke osobitosti upotrebe imperativa u romanu Vječnik. *Motrišta* 59/60: 35–41.

Isačenko, A.V. 1962. *Die Russische Sprache der Gegenwart, I, Formenlehre*. Halle (Saale): Niemeyer.

Ivić, M. 1983. Načini na koje slovenski glagol ovremenjuje ponavljanu radnju. In M. Ivić, *Lingvistički ogledi*. Beograd: Prosveta, 37–56.

Kalsbeek, J. 1985. Izvedeni nesvršeni glagoli u nekim čakavskim govorima. *Naučni sastanak slavista u Vukove dane. Referati i saopštenja* 14/2. Beograd: MSC, 169–176.

Kalsbeek, J. 1998. *The Čakavian Dialect of Orbanići near Žminj in Istria* (Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics 25). Amsterdam/Atlanta, GA: Rodopi.

Kalsbeek, J. 2008. Past tense habitual expressions in Old Croatian texts. In P. Houtzagers, J. Kalsbeek & J. Schaeken (eds.), *Dutch Contributions to the Fourteenth International Congress of Slavists, Ohrid* (Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics 34), Amsterdam/ New York: Rodopi, 333–348.

Kalsbeek, J. & R. Lučić. 2008. Oblik kondicionala u funkciji označavanja ponavljane radnje u prošlosti. *Croatica et Slavica Iadertina* 4: 7–21.

Kamphuis, J. 2014. Macedonian verbal aspect: East or West? In E.L.J. Fortuin, P. Houtzagers, J. Kalsbeek & S. Dekker (eds.), *Dutch Contributions to the Fifteenth International Congress of Slavists, Minsk: Linguistics* (Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics 40). Amsterdam/New York, 127–153.

Kamphuis, J. 2020. *Verbal Aspect in Old Church Slavonic: A Corpus Based Approach* (Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics 45). Leiden/Boston: Brill/Rodopi.

Karlík, P. 2017. HABITUÁLNOST. In P. Karlík, M. Nekula & J. Pleskalová (eds.), *CzechEncy - Nový encyklopedický slovník češtiny*. www.czechency.org/slovnik/HABITUÁLNOST. Accessed: 25 July 2020.

Khrakovskij, V.S. (ed.). 1997. *Typology of Iterative Constructions* (LINCOM Studies in Theoretical Linguistics 04). Newcastle: LINCOM Europa.

Kopečný, F. 1965. K pojmu ‘neaktuálnost’ ve vidové soustavě českého slovesa. *Slovo a Slovesnost* 26: 23–26.

Maslov, Ju.S. 1948. Vid i leksičeskoe značenie glagola v sovremennom russkom literaturnom jazyke. *Izvestija akademii nauk SSSR: Otdelenie literatury i jazyka* 7(4): 303–316.

Maslov, Ju.S. 1974. Zur Semantik der Perfektivitätsopposition. *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch* 20: 107–122. [Russian version: Sistema častnyx vidovyx značenij i tipy protivopostavlenij soveršennogo i nesoveršennogo vida. *Maslov*, *Ju. S. Izbrannye trudy. Aspektologija. Obščee jazykoznanie.* Moskva: Jazyki slavjanskoj kul′tury. 2004: 96–110.]

Mendia, J.A. & H. Filip. 2018. *Characterizing Genericity and Epistemic Commitments* (Lecture hand-out). https://jamendia.github.io/files/MendiaFilip2018Gen.pdf. Accessed: 16 August 2020.

Mønnesland, S. 1984. The Slavonic frequentative habitual. In C. de Groot & H. Tommola (eds.), *Aspect Bound: A Voyage into the Realm of Germanic, Slavonic and Finno-Ugrian Aspectology*. Dordrecht: Foris, 53–76.

Nübler, N. 2017. ITERATIVNOST. In P. Karlík, M. Nekula & J. Pleskalová (eds.), *CzechEncy - Nový encyklopedický slovník češtiny*. www.czechency.org/slovnik/ITERATIVNOST. Accessed: 25 July 2020.

Sawicki, L. 2019. Expressions of habituality in Polish. *STUF – Language Typology and Universals* 72(1): 161–184.

Sičinava, D.V. 2013. Časticy *bylo* i *byvalo*: russkie "vtoričnye modifikatory" v svete tipologii i diaxronii. In V.V. Ivanov (ed.), *Issledovanija po tipologii slavjanskix, baltijskix i balkanskix jazykov (preimuščestvenno v svete jazykovyx kontaktov).* Sankt-Peterburg: Aletejja, 175–194.

Šol′ce, L. 2015. Glagol′nyj vid i povtorjaemost′ / xabitual′nost′ v verxnelužickom i češskom jazykax: v sravnenii s russkim jazykom. In R. Benakk′o (ed.), *Glagol'nyj vid: grammatičeskoe značenie i kontekst* (Die Welt der Slaven 56). München: Verlag Otto Sagner, 451–466.

Stawnicka, J. 2007. *Aspekt – iteratywność – określniki kwantyfikacyjne: na materiale form czasu przesłego w języku polskim*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.

Stunová, A. 1986. Aspect and iteration in Russian and Czech: A contrastive study. *Dutch Studies in Russian Linguistics* (Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics 8). Amsterdam: Rodopi, 467–501.

Stunová, A. 1993. *A Contrastive Study of Russian and Czech Aspect: Invariance vs. Discourse*. PhD dissertation, University of Amsterdam. Amsterdam.

Szymczak, M. 1978. *Słownik języka polskiego*, tom I–III. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Timberlake. A. 1982. Invariance and the syntax of Russian aspect. In P.J. Hopper (ed.), *Tense-Aspect: Between Semantics & Pragmatics.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Tomelleri, V.S. 2010. Slavic-style aspect in the Caucasus. *Suvremena Lingvistika* 69: 65–97.

Uluxanov, I.S. 2017. *Glagol'noe slovoobrazovanie sovremennogo russkogo jazyka,* T. II *Glagoly, motivirovannye glagolami*. Moskva: Izdatel′skij centr "Azbukovnik".

Valjevac, N. 2002. *Govor u slivu Lašve* (Bosanskohercegovački dijalektološki zbornik 9). Sarajevo: Institut za jezik.

Werner. E. 1996. *Studien zum sorbischen Verbum* (Schriften des Sorbischen Instituts – Spisy Serbskeho Instituta 13). Bautzen: Domowina-Verlag.

Xoutzagers, X.P. [Houtzagers, H.P.] 1991. Imperfekt v čakavskix dialektax ostrova Pag. *Sovetskoe slavjanovedenie* 5: 77–82.

7.2 Text corpora

ASPAC – Amsterdam Slavic Parallel Aligned Corpus (For information on this corpus, please contact: a.barentsen@xs4all.nl).

ČNK – Český národní korpus = Czech National Corpus (www.korpus.cz).

NKJP – Narodowy Korpus Języka Polskiego = National Corpus of Polish (www.nkjp.uni.lodz.pl).

NKRJ – Nacional'nyj korpus russkogo jazyka = Russian National Corpus (ruscorpora.ru).

SNK – Slovenský národný korpus = Slovak National Corpus (korpus.sk).

8 Appendix: Bulgakov text fragments

The Cyrillic has been transliterated. Glosses have been left out but the relevant data may be retrieved from Table 2 above.

8.1 Russian – original: Mixail A. Bulgakov 1976

(1) Da, tak vot-s, gospoža Tofana vxodila v položenie ėtix bednyx ženščin i (1a) *prodavala* im kakuju-to vodu v puzyrʹkax. Žena (1b) *vlivala* ėtu vodu v sup suprugu, tot ego (1c) *s"edal*, (1d) *blagodaril* za lasku i (1e) *čuvstvoval sebja prevosxodno*. Pravda, čerez neskolʹko časov emu (1f) *načinalo očen' sil'no xotet'sja pit'*, zatem on (1g) *ložilsja* v postelʹ, i čerez denʹ prekrasnaja neapolitanka, nakormivšaja svoego muža supom, (1h) *byla svobodna*, kak vesennij veter.

(2) Lišʹ tolʹko *načinal* zvenetʹ telefon, Varenuxa *bral* trubku i lgal v nee: [...]

8.2 Belarusian – translation: Ales' Žuk 1994

(1) Dyk vos', pani Tafana razumela hėtyx bednyx žančyn i (1a) *pradavala* im nejkuju vadu ŭ butėlečkax. Žonka (1b) *vylivala* hėtuju vadu ŭ mužavu stravu, toj (1c) *z'jadaŭ*, (1d) *dzjakavaŭ* za lasku i (1e) *adčuvaŭ sjabe cudoŭna*. Praŭda, praz nekal'ki hadzin jamu (1f) *pačynala strašėnna xacecca pic'*, potym ën (1g) *klaŭsja* ŭ ložak, a praz dzen' pryhožaja neapalitanka, jakaja nakarmila svajho muža, (1h) *byla vol'naja*, jak vjasnovy vecer.

(2) Jak tol'ki *pačynaŭ* zvinec' tėlefon, Varėnuxa *braŭ* sluxaŭku i xlusiŭ u jae: [...]

8.3 *Ukrainian – translation: Mykola Bilorus 2005*

(1) Tak osʹ, cja pani Tofana, spivčuvajučy cym žinkam u jix hirkij doli, (1a) *prodavala* jim jakusʹ vodyčku v slojikax. Družyna (1b) *vylyvala* tu vodyčku muževi v sup, toj (1c) *vyjidav* joho, (1d) *djakuvav* za lasku i (1e) *mavsja* prečudovo. Pravda, po kilʹkox hodynax jomu strax jak (1f) *prahlosja* pyty, potim vin (1g) *klavsja* v ližko, a čerez denʹ prekrasna neapolitanka, ščo

nahoduvala svoho čolovičen′ka supom, (1h) *stavala* vil′na, jak vesnjanyj lehit.

(2) Til′ky-no *počynav* dzelenčaty telefon, Varenuxa *brav* rurku i brexav u neji: [...]

8.4 Polish – translation: Irena Lewandowska & Witold Dąbrowski 1970

(1) Tak więc signora Tofana wczuwała się w sytuację tych biednych kobiet i (1a) *sprzedawała* im jakowąś wodę we flaszeczkach. Żona (1b) *wlewała* tę wodę mężowi do zupy, mąż to (1c) *spożywał,* (1d) *pięknie dziękował* i (1e) *czuł się znakomicie*. Co prawda po paru godzinach (1f) *zaczynał mieć ogromne pragnienie,* potem (1g) *kładł się* do łóżka i nie mijał dzień, a piękna neapolitanka która podała swemu mężowi tak znakomitą zupę, (1h) *była* już *wolna* jak wiosenny wiatr.

(2) Skoro tylko telefon *zaczynał* dzwonić, Warionucha *podnosił* słuchawkę i łgał: [...]

8.5 Slovak – translation Magda Takáčová 1990

(1) Nuž tak, prosím, signora Toffana sa vedela vžiť do situácie nešťastných žien a (1a) *predávala* im akúsi vodičku vo fľaštičkách. Žena (1b) *naliala* vodičku mužovi do polievky, ten ju (1c) *zjedol,* (1d) *poďakoval sa* jej za dobrotu a (1e) *cítil sa znamenite*. Pravda, o pár hodín ho (1f) *pochytil* hrozný smäd, potom (1g) *si ľahol* do postele, a na druhý deň krásna Neapolčanka, ktorá nachovala muža takou polievočkou, (1h) *bola voľná* ako jarný vánok.

(2) Len čo *zazvonil* telefón, Varenucha *zdvihol* slúchadlo a cigánil: [...]

8.6 Czech – translation: Alena Morávková 1996

(1) Tak tedy signora Toffanová chápala tyhle ubožačky a (1a) *prodávala* jim jakousi záhadnou vodičku. Žena ji (1b) *nalila* manželovi do polévky, ten (1c) *zbaštil* polévku, (1d) *poděkoval* za péči a (1e) *cítil se v sedmém nebi*. Pravda, za pár hodin ho (1f) *popadla hrozná žízeň*, (1g) *ulehl* do postele a za dva dny půvabná Neapolitánka, která podala muži takovou polévku, (1h) *byla volná* jako ptáče.

(2) Sotva *zazvonil* telefon, Varenucha *zvedl* sluchátko a lhal, jako když tiskne: [...]

8.7 Slovene – translation: Janez Gradišnik 1984

(1) No, torej, gospa Tofana je imela razumevanje za položaj teh ubogih žen in jim (1) *je prodajala* neko vodo v stekleničkah. Žena (2) *je nalila* to vodo

možu v juho, ta jo (3) *je pojedel*, (4) *se zahvalil* za ljubeznivost in (5) *imel imeniten občutek*. Res pa je, čez nekaj ur (6) *se ga je polotila strašanska žeja*, potem (8) *je legel* v posteljo, čez en dan pa (8) *je bila* prelepa Neapeljčanka, ki je nahranila svojega moža z juho, *svobodna* kakor pomladni veter.

(2) Samo da je *zazvonil* telefon, pa je Varenuha *vzel* slušalko in se zlagal vanjo: [...]

8.8 Croatian – translation: Vida Flaker 1980

(1) Da, dakle, gospođa Tofana razumjela bi položaj tih jadnih žena i (1a) *prodavala* im neku vodu u bočicama. Žena (1b) *bi ulila* tu vodu suprugu u juhu, on (1c) *bi* je *pojeo*, (1d) *zahvalio* na brižljivosti i divno (1e) *se osjećao*. Istina, za nekoliko sati on (1f) *bi bio jako žedan*, zatim (1g) *bi legao* u postelju, i za jedan dan prekrasna Napuljka koja je svojeg muža nahranila juhom, (1h) *bila bi slobodna* kao proljetni vjetar.

(2) Tek što *bi počeo zvoniti* telefon, Varenuha *bi uzimao* (COND.IPFV) slušalicu i lagao: [...]

8.9 Serbian – translation: Zlata Kocić 1995

(1) Da, dakle, eto, gospođa Tofana stavljala se u položaj ovih jadnih žena i (1a) *prodavala* im nekakvu vodicu u bočicama. Žena (1b) *bi usula* tu vodicu suprugu u supu, ovaj (1c) *bi pojeo* (1d) *zahvalivši se* na ljubaznom trudu i (1e) *osećao se* divno. Istina, posle nekoliko sati on (1f) *bi* silno *ožedneo*, zatim (1g) *bi legao* u krevet i nakon jednog dana predivna Napuljka, koja je nahranila svogo muža supom, (1h) *bila bi* slobodna kao prolećni vetar.

(2) Čim *bi zazvonio* telefon, Varenuha *bi dizao* (COND.IPFV) slušalicu i lagao u nju: [...]

8.10 Macedonian – translation: Tanja Uroševiḱ 2006

(1) Da, i taka, taa gospoǵa Tofana im sočuvstvuvaše na tie bedni ženi i im (1a) *prodavaše* nekakva vodička vo šišenca. Ženata (1b) *ḱe* ja *naleeše* taa vodička vo supata na mažot, toj (1c) *ḱe* ja *izedeše*, (1d) *ḱe* ì *beše* blagodaren za vnimanieto i (1e) *ḱe se čuvstvuvaše* prekrasno. No, za žal, po nekolku časa toj (1f) *ḱe počneše* da čuvstvuva golema žed, potoa (1g) *ḱe legneše* v postela, i po eden den ubavata neapolitanka, što mu ja dala supata na svojot maž, (1h) *ḱe beše* slobodna kako proleten veter.

(2) Samo *ќe zadzvoneše* telefon, a Varenuha ja *krevaše* (IMPRF.IPFV) slušalkata i lažeše: [...]

8.11 Bulgarian – translation: Tatjana Balova 2012

(1) Da, ta gospoža Tofana vlizaše v položenieto na kletite ženi i im (1a) *prodavaše* njakakva tečnost v šišenca. Te (1b) *sipvaxa* tečnostta v supata na măža si, toj ja (1c) *izjaždaše*, (1d) *blagodareše* za nežnostta i (1e) *se čuvstvaše* prevăzxodno. E, sled njakolko časa (1f) *mnogo ožadnjavaše*, posle (1g) *si ljagaše* i podir den prekrasnata neapolitanka, podnesla na măža si supata, (1h) *beše svobodna* kato proleten vjatăr.

(2) Štom telefonăt *zazvăneše*, toj *vdigaše* slušalkata, i započvaše da lăže: [...]

Corresponding author's contact information

René M. Genis

ACLC / CSVA, University of Amsterdam

r.m.genis@uva.nl