Two perfects in Lhasa Tibetan and the lack of cessation inferences of pa.ree.w

Introduction Lhasa Tibetan has two perfect aspect morphemes *pa.ree.w* and *yoo.v.ree.w*. Traditional grammars treat these two morphemes as identical in their evidentiality values but as differing in their tense-aspect semantics (Hoshi 2003). In this abstract, I will provide evidence that their semantics correspond to existential perfect and universal perfect readings (Iatridou et al 2001). We have an example below with a stative verb which illustrates a difference between the two morphemes:

(1) (Context: I heard my friend Trashi has lived in Dawa's place at some point since January this year. Trashi doesn't live there anymore)

(tha.v.löö.f ta.v.wa.f thang.v.po.f nää.w-chä.v) tra.f.shii.h-ke ta.v.wää.f
this.year.GEN month first from-do Trashi-ERG Dawa.GEN
nang.v-la tää.w-(tää.w/cä.v.tää.w)-pa.ree.w/#yoo.v.ree.w
home-DAT stay-IPFV.I/IPFV.II-PERF.I/PERF.II
'Trashi has stayed at Dawa's place since January this year.'

(Speaker A's comment: If uttered out of blue, (1) with *pa.ree.w* still sounds like Trashi still lives at Dawa's place at the moment of speech)

Both morphemes encode Perfect aspects I argue that *pa.ree.w* and *yoo.v.ree.w* are both perfect aspects here, as they can shift the ET relative to a past or future topic time. *yoo.v.ree.w* has some additional properties which are similar to present perfect in languages like English, as it exhibits the present perfect puzzle and is incompatible with past time adverbials out of blue as in (2).

Statives vs non-statives When co-occurring with an atelic non-stative predicate, an imperfective morpheme is required for the universal reading with either perfect aspect, although the sentence (3) with *pa.ree.w* is compatible with an existential cessation reading. Sentence (4) shows that *pa.ree.w* in its existential single event reading can occur without low aspect morphemes, whereas *yoo.v.ree.w* is flatly infelicitous here in the existential reading.

(2) *tha.v.lo.f ta.v.wa.f.ku.v.pa.f tshee.f.pa.f cii.h-la kho.f.ntshöö.f lop.f.tra.f tshoo.h-pa.ree.w/**??yoo.v.ree.w***
this.year September day first-DAT they.GEN school convene-PERF.I/PERF.II
'Their school started on September 1st this year.'

(3)
*(ta.v.löö.f lo.v.saa.f-nää.w-chä.v) ta.v.wa.f lu.f.khang.f-nang.v nang.v.ma.f trhap.h- **#(tää.w/cä.v.tää.w)**- pa.ree.w/ yoo.v.ree.w*
Dawa dragon.temple-inside Nangma dance-IPFV.I/IPFV.II-PERF.I/PERF.II
Intended: 'Dawa has often danced Nangma in Lukhang park. (She still has this habit.)'

(4)
*(ta.v.löö.f lo.v.saa.f-nää.w-chä.v) ta.v.wa.f lu.f.khang.f-nang.v nang.v.ma.f trhap.h-**pa.ree.w/#yoo.v.ree.w***
this.year new.year-from-do Dawa dragon.temple-inside Nangma dance-PERF.I/PERF.II
'Dawa has danced Nangma in Lukhang park since Losar this year.'

Puzzle and Proposal Based on the present perfect puzzle of *yoo.v.ree.w* in (2), I will argue that *pa.ree.w* encodes a Perfect Time Span (PTS) and it optionally overlaps with the evaluation time. *yoo.v.ree.w* requires the PTS to overlap with the evaluatuon time, which will be the utterance

time (UT) by default. There's another puzzle, if we assume these two perfect morphemes are in competition and *yoo.v.ree.w* encodes anti-cessation in its semantics, namely the weaker *pa.ree.w* doesn't strengthen such that the PTS doesn't overlap with the evaluation time, as shown by the speaker's comment in (1). To explain this, I will argue that *yoo.v.ree.w* additionaly requires universal quantification over a fined-grained partition of its PTS interval such that every sub-interval overlaps with the Event Time (ET). The universal quantification of PTS might come from *yoo.v.ree.w* itself, or alternatively, the durative temporal adverbials or the low imperfective aspects *yoo.v.ree.w* obligatorily selects. This additional semantic difference thus allows *pa.ree.w* to not strengthen with cessation semantics. This is unlike competition attested between other tense-aspect operators such as that between optional past tense and Non-future tense in languages like Tlingit, Atayal, and Javanese (Cable 2017, Chen et al 2021).

Analysis: Infelicity of yoo.v.ree.w in (4) The entries of *pa.ree.w* and *yoo.v.ree.w* are proposed as (5) and (6), based on Pancheva and Von Stechow (2004)'s PTS account of the source of the present perfect puzzle in English.

(5) [| *pa.ree.w* |] = $\lambda p_{<i, t>}.\lambda t.\exists t' [t' \preceq t \ \& \ p(t')]$ ($t' \preceq t$ iff there's no $t'' \subseteq t'$, s.t. $t'' > t$)

(t' may either entirely precede, entirely overlap with, or partially overlap with t)

(6) [| *yoo.v.ree.w* |] = $\lambda p_{<i, t>}. \lambda t. \exists t'[t' \between t \ \& \ p(t')]$ (to be modified)

$t' \between t$ iff $t' \cap t \neq \varnothing$ and there's no $t'' \subseteq t'$, s.t. $t'' > t$

Considering *yoo.v.ree.w* is infelicitous in (4) in the existential reading, there are several options we can pursue to modify (6). (i) *yoo.v.ree.w* must combine with an imperfective operator, which partitions an interval as in Deo (2009) (ii) left-bounded since adverbials are ambiguous between durative and inclusive readings (Mittwoch 1988) and *yoo.ree.w* must take a durative one, which encodes partition of the PTS in its lexical entry as in (8). (iii) *yoo.v.ree.w* itself partitions the PTS interval as in (7). Via either option (ii) or (iii), we can derive the semantics of (3) as in (9). Assuming in (4) there's a covert perfective morpheme and the dancing Nangma event is a single atomic event, this event can't not be discontinuously contained within distinct cells of intervals, yielding the expected infelicity in (3).

(7) [| *yoo.v.ree.w* |] = $\lambda P_{<i, t>}. \lambda t. \exists t'[t' \between t \ \& \ \forall t'' \in t' \rightarrow P(t'')]$

(8) [| *ta.v.löö.f lo.v.saa.f-nää.w-chä.v* |] = $\lambda P_{<i, t>}.\exists t'[$ LB (t') = New.Year & $\forall t'' \in t' \rightarrow P(t'')$]

(9) $\exists t'[t' \between t$ & LB (t') = New.Year & $\forall t'' \in t' \rightarrow [\tau(e) \subseteq t''$ & Dance.Nangma (e) & Agent (e) = Dawa]]

Summary I hereby argue that the restrictions of *yoo.v.ree.w* with low imperfecive morphemes in atelic predicates indicate a parallel with the universal reading of perfect aspects in languages like English. In English where PTS is argued to always overlap with the evaluation time, adverbial-less perfects with progressives or statives are still compatible with both universal and existential readings, but they don't show cessation inferences either (Mittwoch 1988). This may be explained by the presence of adverbials enforcing an existential reading like 'before/x-times' (Pancheva 2003). It's also possible the nature of competition between U and E readings simply doesn't lead to cessation inferences of E readings. By arguing that *pa.ree.w* and *yoo.v.ree.w* sentences encode different PTS and quantification requirements simultaneously, this analysis can potentially capture the lack of cessation inferences of *pa.ree.w* in Lhasa Tibetan as well.

References: Cable, Seth. 2017. The implicatures of optional past tens in Tlingit and its implications for 'Discontinuous Past'. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 35: 635–681; Chen, Sihwei, Jozina Vander Klok, Lisa Matthewson, and Hotze Rullmann. 2021. The 'experiential' as an existential past: Evidence from Javanese and Atayal. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 39: 709–58; Deo, Ashwini. 2009. Unifying the imperfective and the progressive: Partitions as quantificational domains. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 32: 475–521; Hoshi Izumi (2003). 現代チベット語動詞辞典 *(ラサ方言)* Doctoral dissertation, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies; Iatridou, Sabine, Elena Anagnostopoulou, and Roumyana Izvorski. 2001. Observations about the form and meaning of the perfect. In *Ken Hale: A life in language*, ed. Michael Kenstowicz, 189–238. Cambridge: MIT Press; Mittwoch, Anita. 1988. Aspects of English aspect: On the interaction of perfect, progressive and durational phrases. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 11(2):203–254; Pancheva, R. (2003). The aspectual makeup of perfect participles and the interpretations of the perfect. *Perfect explorations*, *2*, 277; Pancheva, Roumyana & Arnim von Stechow. 2004. On the present perfect puzzle. In Moulton, K. & M. Wolf (Eds.) *Proceeding of the North East Linguistics Society (=NELS)* 34