1 Introduction

In this talk, we use data from Chuj negation—as well as from other sources—to argue that progressive clauses involve an aspectual predicate and an embedded nominalized clause. Following previous work on other Mayan languages, this accounts for the appearance of aspect-based split ergativity.

- Like many other Mayan languages, Chuj exhibits aspect-based split ergativity, seen via two sets of markers on the predicate.
- Clauses in non-progressive aspects—like the perfective in (1)—along with aspectless non-verbal predicates, exhibit an *ergative-absolutive* alignment:
  - Transitive subjects are marked with a morpheme immediately preceding the predicate *(ergative; “Set A”)*
  - Transitive objects and intransitive subjects pattern alike *(absolutive; “Set B”)*

\[\begin{align*}
\text{(1) a. } & \text{ Ix-ach-ko-chel-a’}. \\
& \text{PRFV-B2-A1P-hug-TV} \\
& \text{‘We hugged you.’} \\
\text{b. } & \text{I-x-ach-b’ey-i}. \\
& \text{PRFV-B2-walk-ITV} \\
& \text{‘You walked.’}
\end{align*}\]

- In the progressive aspect, we find the split: both transitive and intransitive subjects pattern as *Set A*

---

*We are especially grateful to Magdalena Torres for her time and patience in sharing her language with us. Thanks also to Alan Bale, Cristina Buenrostro, Louisa Bielig, Lauren Clemens, Mitch Erlewine, Pedro Mateo Pedro, Adán Pascual, and the McGill Chuj Lab for general discussion and feedback. Any errors in data or interpretation are our own. This work is supported by an FRQSC Nouveaux-Chercheurs grant and a SSHRC Insight Grant.

1Unless otherwise noted, all data are from our elicitation notes. Abbreviations in glosses are as follows: A – Set A (ergative/possessive); B – Set B (absolutive); CLF – nominal classifier; DEM – demonstrative; DET – determiner; DIR – directional; FOC – focus; IMPF – imperfective; IRR – irrealis; ITV – intransitive verb suffix; MASC – masculine; NEG – negation; NML – nominal suffix; P – plural; PRFV – perfective; POS – positional suffix; PROG – progressive; PROSP – prospective; SUB – subordinating suffix; TV – transitive verb suffix.
a. Lan  **hach**-ko-chel-an-i.  
  PROG B2  A1P-hug-SUB-ITV  
  ‘We’re hugging you.’

b. Lan  **ko**-b’ey-i.  
  PROG A1P-walk-ITV  
  ‘We’re walking.’

- Set B is impossible on progressive intransitives:

  (3) * Lan  **hach**-b’ey-i.  
    PROG B2-walk-ITV  
    intended: ‘You’re walking.’

- In the terminology of Dixon 1979, 1994, this represents an **extended ergative** pattern:
  - We might call it “nominative-accusative” insofar as both transitive and intransitive subjects pattern alike...
  - But note that this is simply an **extension** of the Set A marker to mark subjects of certain intransitive predicates

  (4) **ERGATIVE-PATTERNING**  
    transitive:  B-A-stem  
    intransitive:  B-stem  

  (5) **“EXTENDED ERGATIVE”**  
    transitive:  B-A-stem  
    ➽ intransitive:  A-stem

- Analogous splits are found in other Mayan languages: Chol (Coon 2013), Yucatec (Bricker 1981), Q’anjob’al (Mateo-Toledo 2003), and others (see e.g. Larsen and Norman 1979)

- Comparable “extended ergative” splits in these languages have been explained as follows:
  - The progressive aspect marker (lan) is a **predicate**
  - It takes a nominalized clause as its complement (in brackets)

  (6) a. Lan  [**NP hach**-ko-chel-an-i].  
    PROG  B2  A1P-hug-SUB-ITV  
    ‘We’re hugging you.’ (lit.~ ‘Our hugging you is happening.’)

  b. Lan  [**NP ko**-b’ey-i].  
    PROG  A1P-walk-ITV  
    ‘We’re walking.’ (lit.~ ‘Our walking is happening.’)

  ➽ The Set A marker co-indexes a grammatical **possessor** (ergative and possessive are identical)

  (7) **ko**-nun  
    A1P-mother  
    ‘our mother.’
• In languages like Chol, we find support for this not only in the behavior of the aspectual marker itself, but also in the morphological form of the complement clause predicates, as in (8)—see Coon 2013:

(8) **CHOL INTRANSITIVES**

a. Tyi [way-i]-yet .
   PRFV sleep-ITV-B2
   ‘I slept.’

b. Choñkol [a-way-el].
   PROG A2-sleep-NML
   ‘I’m sleeping.’

(9) **CHUJ INTRANSITIVES**

a. Ix-ach [way-i].
   PRFV-B2 sleep-ITV
   ‘You slept.’

b. Lan [ha-way-i].
   PROG A2-sleep-ITV
   ‘You’re sleeping.’

○ In Chol, non-split perfective (=verbal) predicates appear with a vocalic status suffix, while embedded forms appear with the nominal suffix -el
  – -el suffixes are found on nominals throughout Mayan (see e.g. Bricker 1981 and §4.4 below)
  ➺ But in Chuj perfective (ergative) and progressive (split) stem forms like (9) are morphologically identical (we return to transitives below)

○ We argue below that progressive stem forms like (9b) are nonetheless nominal

• **Outline of the remainder of this talk:**
  □ §2 Chuj aspect
  □ §3 Progressives as predicates
  □ §4 Predicate stems as nominalizations
  □ §5 Summary and conclusions

2 **Chuj background**

• Compared with other Mayan languages, there has been relatively little work on Chuj—a language of the Q’anjob’alan branch spoken by around 40,000 people in the department of Huehuetenango in Guatemala

• As in other Mayan languages, predicates in Chuj can be divided into two types:
  1. **Verbal** (~eventive) predicates — require an aspectual marker
  2. **Non-verbal** (~stative) predicates — no aspectual marker possible

• A template for a Chuj verbal predicate is given in (10)—nominal arguments may be dropped; when overt they appear either post-verbally, or in pre-verb al topic/focus positions

(10) TAM — SET B — SET A — Root — VOICE — STATUS SUFFIX
• As is common throughout Mayan, Set A (ergative markers) are prefixes, while Set B (absolutive markers) are clitics (Maxwell 1976)²

(11) **CHUJ PERSON MARKERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Set B</strong> (absolutive)</th>
<th><strong>Set A</strong> (ergative/possessive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1s hin</td>
<td>1s hin- w-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s hach</td>
<td>2s ha- h-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3s Ø</td>
<td>3s s- y-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p honh</td>
<td>1p ko- k-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p hex</td>
<td>2p he- hey-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p heb’</td>
<td>3p s- heb’ y- heb’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Preverbal TAM markers in Chuj (see Carolan 2015):

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tz</td>
<td>imperfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix</td>
<td>past+perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ol</td>
<td>prospective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lan</td>
<td>progressive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• First, note that unlike in the perfective, imperfective, and prospective aspects, the stem in the progressive is written orthographically as a separate word (see e.g. Buenrostro 2004, 2007; Domingo Pascual 2007)

(13) a. Tz-ach-b’ey-i. IMPF-B2-walk-ITV ‘You walk.’
b. Ix-ach-b’ey-i. PRFV-B2-walk-ITV ‘You walked.’
c. Ol-ach-b’ey-ok. PROSP-B2-walk-IRR ‘You will walk.’
d. **Lan ha-b’ey-i.** PROG A2-walk-ITV ‘You’re walking.’


➤ The progressive forms in (13d) and (14d) have a different structure from the forms in (13a–c) and (14a–c)

○ In §3 we show that lan behaves as a predicate; in §4 we show that the embedded form behaves as a nominal

---

²The initial h- of these markers is an orthographic convention used to indicate that there is no initial glottal stop, as occurs with other vowel-initial forms in Chuj (Buenrostro 2004). Contrast for example onh [oŋ] ‘avocado’ with h-onh [oŋ] ‘your avocado’. For this reason, we use h- only word-initially, though some authors do not transcribe it.
3 Progressives as predicates

3.1 Negation

• In non-progressive aspects, negation in Chuj is expressed by a pre-verbal particle man and a particle, laj which follows the verb stem:

NEG PROSP-B2-A1-hug NEG
‘I will not hug you.’

b. Man ol-in-b’ey laj.
NEG PROSP-B1-walk NEG
‘I will not walk.’

• In the progressive aspect, however, laj appears following lan and before the stem:

• Lan also appears with the irrealis marker -ok, found on intransitive irrealis predicates

(16) a. Man lan-ok laj hach hin-chel-an-i.
NEG PROG-IRR NEG B2 A1-hug-SITV
‘I’m not hugging you.’

b. Man lan-ok laj hin-b’ey-i.
NEG PROG-IRR NEG A1-walk-ITV
‘I’m not walking.’

• Compare the lan forms with other negated stative intransitives:

(17) Man hin k’ayb’um-ok laj.
NEG B1 teacher-IRR NEG
‘I’m not a teacher.’

• Craig (1977, 93) reports similar facts for related Popti’ (Jakaltek)—“The fact that lanhan is a higher predicate and a stative verb is indicated by the negative construction”

  ○ Compare the negated progressive in (18a) with the negated intransitive stative predicate in (18b)

(18) Popti’

a. Mat lanhan-oj ha-wayi.
NEG PROG-IRR A2-sleep
‘You are not sleeping.’

b. Mat sonlom-oj hach.
NEG marimba.player-IRR B2
‘You are not a marimba player.’ (Craig 1977, 94)
3.2 Particles

- The particles \(=xo\) ‘already’ and \(=to\) ‘still’ provide additional evidence for a structural difference between progressive and non-progressive verbal predicates.

- In the progressive, these particles attach directly to the progressive predicate:

  \[
  \begin{align*}
  \text{(19) a. } & \text{ Lan=}xo \text{ hach-ko-chel-an-i.} \\
  & \text{PROG=ALREADY B2-A1P-hug-SUB-ITV} \\
  & \text{‘We’re already hugging you.’} \\
  \text{b. } & \text{ Lan=to ko-b’ey-i.} \\
  & \text{PROG=ALREADY A1P-walk-ITV} \\
  & \text{‘We’re already walking.’}
  \end{align*}
  \]

  \[
  \begin{align*}
  \text{(20) a. } & \text{ Lan=to hach ko-chel-an-i.} \\
  & \text{PROG=STILL B2 A1P-hug-SUB-ITV} \\
  & \text{‘We’re still hugging you.’} \\
  \text{b. } & \text{ Lan=to ko-b’ey-i.} \\
  & \text{PROG=STILL A1P-walk-ITV} \\
  & \text{‘We’re still walking.’}
  \end{align*}
  \]

- In non-progressive aspects, they must appear sentence-initially; they cannot attach to the aspect marker\(^3\)
  - They also appear attached to a host \(to—to\) is also a complementizer used to embed finite clauses, and we tentatively suggest that it is inserted here to host the clitic

  \[
  \begin{align*}
  \text{(21) a. } & \text{ To=}xo \text{ ix-ach-ko-chel-a’.} \\
  & \text{C=ALREADY PRFV-B2-A1P-hug-TV} \\
  & \text{‘We already hugged you.’} \\
  \text{b. } & \text{ To=to ix-onh-b’ey-ok.} \\
  & \text{C=ALREADY PRFV-B1P-walk-IRR} \\
  & \text{‘We already walked.’}
  \end{align*}
  \]

---

\(^3\)Though Buenrostro (2013, 121) reports that \(=to\) and \(=xo\) may appear after all aspect markers, our consultant only accepts them after the progressive marker; in other aspects, the must appear initially. More work is needed to determine if this is a more general point of variation.

- \(\ast\) Ol=\(xo\=onh-k’och-ok.
  \text{PROSP=ALREADY=B1P-arrive-IRR} \\
  \text{intended: ‘We are already arriving.’} \quad \text{(our notes)}

- \(\checkmark\) Ol=\(to\=in-mujlaj-ok.
  \text{PROSP=STILL=B1-work-IRR} \\
  \text{‘I will still work.’} \quad \text{(Buenrostro 2013, 121)}

Note that forms like (ii) are not a problem for this analysis—we might simply say that \(=to\) and \(=xo\) are second-position clitics and do not care about the predicate status of the aspect marker.
3.3 Other embedding verbs

- The stem forms embedded under the progressives aspect marker are identical to embedded stem forms embedded under elements that are clearly matrix predicates, like *yamoch* ‘begin’:

(22) a. **Lan** hin-munlaj-i.  
    PROG A1-work-ITV  
    ‘I’m working.’

b. **Ix-in-yamoch** hin-munlaj-i.  
    PRVF-A1-begin A1-work-ITV  
    ‘I began to work.’

(23) a. **Lan** hach in-chel-an-i.  
    PROG B2 A1-hug-SUB-ITV  
    ‘I’m hugging you.’

b. **Ix-in-yamoch** hach in-chel-an-i.  
    ‘I began to hug you.’

3.4 Progressives and positionals

- Though *lan* is the most common progressive we have encountered in our work with Chuj, *Domingo Pascual* (2007, 155) also lists *wan*, and *Buenrostro* (2004) adds *leman*:

(24) a. **Lan** y-il-an heb’.  
    PROG A3-see-SUB 3PL  
    ‘They are seeing it.’

b. **Wan** s-way winh.  
    PROG A3-sleep CLF.MASC  
    ‘He is sleeping.’

c. **Leman**=to y-ak’-an lesal winh.  
    PROG=STILL A3-give-SUB pray CLF.MASC  
    ‘He is still praying.’  

(25) a. **Lanh**-an ek’ kamix sat lu’um.  
    extended-POS DIR shirt on ground  
    ‘The shirt is lying (extended, carelessly) on the ground.’

b. **Ling**-an ek’ nok’ chej.  
    standing-POS DIR CLF.ANIMAL horse  
    ‘The horse is standing.’

*Just as the shirt in (25a) is extended over space, the event in the progressive is extended over time; see *Bybee et al.* 1994 for cross-linguistic similarities between locative and progressive constructions*
4 Complements as nominalizations

- In this section we discuss evidence that the stem form embedded under the progressive predicate is a nominal. Like other nominals, these stems may:
  - Serve as sentential subjects (§4.1)
  - Trigger overt agreement (§4.2)

- We provide an analysis of the structure of these forms in §4.3, where we argue that these forms are nominalized above vP

- Time-permitting, we compare them with other nominal stems in §4.4

4.1 As arguments

- Recall the stem forms we’re looking at (the final status suffixes delete when not phrase-final; see Henderson 2012):

  (26) a. Lan [s-way winh].
      PROG A3-sleep CLF.MASC
      ‘He’s sleeping.’

  b. Lan [ko-xik-an k’atzitz].
      PROG A1P-chop-SUB wood
      ‘We’re chopping wood.’

- The non-verbal predicate in (27) has a regular possessed noun as its subject:

  (27) Man te wach’-ok laj [NP ko-kape].
      NEG very good-IRR NEG A1P-coffee
      ‘Our coffee isn’t very good.’

- This can be replaced by progressive stem forms:

  (28) a. Man te wach’-ok laj [NP s-way winh].
      NEG very good-IRR NEG A3-sleep CLF.MASC
      ‘His sleeping isn’t very good.’

  b. Man te wach’-ok laj [NP ko-xik-an k’atzitz].
      NEG very good-IRR NEG A1P-chop-SUB wood
      ‘Our chopping wood isn’t very good.’

- As with nominalizations in English, not all nominalizations are appropriate as subjects to all predicates (some sound unnatural or awkward), but with the right context, these are perfectly acceptable

- Here is another pair, also discussed in Buenrostro 2004:
(29) Ix-lajw-i [NP hin-wakax].
PRFV-finish-ITV A1-cow
‘My cows finished (e.g. died).’

(30) a. Ix-lajw-i [NP hin-munlaj-i].
PRFV-finish-ITV A1-work-ITV
‘I finished working.’

b. Ix-lajw-i [NP ko-xik-an k’atzitz].
PRFV-finish-ITV A1P-chop-SUB wood
‘We finished chopping wood.’

4.2 Triggering agreement

- Recall that 3rd person absolutive agreement is null in Chuj (and throughout Mayan), and we do not represent it in the examples here.

- If lan is the predicate, and its complement is a nominal argument, we don’t expect to find any overt reflex of this relationship. Compare:

(31) a. Lan-Ø [NP ko-mixnaj-i].
PROG-B3 A1P-bathe-ITV
‘We’re bathing.’ (∼ ‘Our bathing is happening.’)

b. Te tzalajnak-Ø [NP winh winak].
INTS happy-B3 CLF.MASC man
‘The man is happy.’

- However, in certain contexts we see evidence that nominalized clauses like ko-mixnaj-i in (31a) may trigger overt 3rd person Set A agreement:

PRFV-stop-ITV A1P-bathe
‘We stopped bathing.’

b. Lan [S]-numx-i ko-mixnaji.
PROG A3-stop-ITV A1P-bathe
‘We’re stopping bathing.’

▶ What is the 3rd person Set A morpheme doing in (32b)?

- What’s going on: (32a) has an intransitive matrix verb (numxi) and a nominalized complement (like (30) above):

(33) Ix numx-i [NP ko-mixnaj-i].
PRFV stop-ITV A1P-bathe-ITV
‘We stopped bathing.’ (lit. ∼ ‘Our bathing stopped.’)

- The progressive is more complex...
As usual under this analysis, lan takes a nominal complement

Here is a complex possessive construction: komixnaji ‘our bathing’ is the grammatical possessor of the nominal numxi ‘stopping’

(34) Lan \[ NP s_{-}numx-i \ [ NP ko-mixnaj-i ] \].

\[ PROG \ A3-stop-ITV \ A1P-bathe-ITV \]

‘We’re stopping bathing.’ (lit.∼ ‘Our bathing’s stopping is happening.’)

• Like other possessors, komixnaji follows the possessum and triggers Set A marking on it: here 3rd person s-. Compare:

(35) s-pat ko-nun

A3S-house A1P-mother

‘our mother’s house.’

• Side-by-side:

(36) a. \[ NP s_{-}numx-i \ [ NP ko-mixnaji ] \]

\[ A3-stop-ITV \ A1P-bathe \]

‘our bathing’s stopping’

b. \[ NP s_{-}pat \ [ NP ko-nun ] \]

\[ A3S-house \ A1P-mother \]

‘our mother’s house.’

4.3 Transitives and intransitives

• Buenrostro (2007) has discussed these constructions, and concluded that the forms embedded under lan cannot be nominal:

One of the most frequent explanations for this type of complement clause consists in saying that these are nominalized verbs. The explanation is based in the idea that the ergative marker of the intransitive verb is interpreted as possessive. However, when we see [transitive examples] this hypothesis is not sustainable, since the transitive verb stem has both of its person markers. (Buenrostro 2007, 255)\(^4\)

• We argue that this is not a problem, since these forms are nominalized above vP, and the transitive appears with a morpheme which licenses the transitive object

\(^4\)Our translation from Spanish.
• Recall the non-progressive and progressive stem forms from (1) and (2) above

(37) a. Ix-ach-

ko-

chel-

a’.

PRFV-B2-A1P-hug-TV

‘We hugged you.’

b. Ix-ach-

b’ey-

i.

PRFV-B2-walk-ITV

‘You walked.’

(38) a. Lan

[ np hach ko-

chel-

an-

i ].

PROG B2 A1P-hug-SUB-ITV

‘We’re hugging you.’

b. Lan

[ np ko-

b’ey-

i ].

PROG A1P-walk-ITV

‘You’re walking.’

○ We assume that the -a’ and -i suffixes on the non-progressive forms in (37) are instances of transitive and intransitive v₀ respectively

• What about progressives?

➽ Transitive stems in the progressive aspect—along with all other embedded transitives—require the suffix -an, glossed SUB (for “subordinate clause”)

➽ Both transitive and intransitive stems take the suffix -i (dropped in non-final position)

4.3.1 -an

• Following Coon et al. (to appear) on Q’anjob’al, we assume that absolutive arguments in Chuj are licensed by finite Infl₀ (absolutive = nominative; see Legate 2008 for discussion)

➽ Absolutes should be impossible in non-finite embedded clauses (i.e. nominalizations)

○ No absolutive appears in the embedded intransitive in (38b)—the subject is cross-referenced by Set A (which we take to be possessive)

○ The possessor controls the null subject in the embedded vP

(39) Lan

[ np ko-

b’ey-

i ].

PROG A1P-walk-ITV

‘You’re walking.’ (lit. ∼ ‘Your walking is happening.’)

(40)

n

v

b’ey

walk

PRO

subj

V

-ITV

- i

vP

A1P

ko-

n

DP

n

nP

- PL

○ What about the hach (2ABS) in the transitive in (38a)?
(41) \[
\text{Lan} \quad \text{[NP} \quad \text{[hach] ko-chel-an-i]}. \quad \text{PROG} \quad \text{B2} \quad \text{alp-hug-SUB-ITV}
\]

‘We’re hugging you.’ (lit. ∼ ‘Our hugging you is happening.’)

\[
(42)
\]

Following Ordóñez (1995) on Popti’ and Coon et al. (to appear) on Q’anjob’al, we assume that -an is inserted in non-finite embedded transitives in order to Case-license the transitive object

- Ordóñez (1995) likens this to of-insertion in English (e.g. ‘destruction of the city’)
- As support, note that Mayan languages of the Kichean branch do not use -an (or a cognate) in embedded clauses, and full transitives are impossible in non-finite contexts—all transitives must be either passivized or antipassivized in order to embed (see discussion in Imanishi 2014)

4.3.2 -i

- Mateo Pedro (2009) notes formal similarity between the Q’anjob’al progressive stem suffix -i and the nominalizer -Ik in Kichean-branch languages
- Here we do not take a stance on whether -i in progressives is the -ITV marker, or an accidentally homophonous nominalizer (i.e. located in \( n^0 \) in (40–42) above)

4.4 Types of nominalization: -i vs. -el

- Parallelism between progressive stems and nominal forms is not perfect...
- And there are morphological forms that are more clearly nominalized (here we focus only on the intransitives):
(43) a. Ix-in-b’at [ wa’-el ].  
PRFV-B1-go  eat-NML  
‘I went to eat.’

b. Ol-ach-b’at [ mol-øj kape ].  
PROSP-B2-go  gather-NML coffee  
‘I will gather coffee.’  

(Buenrostro 2007, 262)

• -el is cognate with nominal suffixes across Mayan (see e.g. Bricker 1981)

Apparently we have two types of nominal intransitives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Root</th>
<th>-el nominals</th>
<th>-i nominals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa’</td>
<td>‘eat’</td>
<td>wa’-el</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>munlaj</td>
<td>‘work’</td>
<td>munlaj-el</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lolon</td>
<td>‘speak’</td>
<td>lolon-el</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• -el forms are banned in progressive environments (45a), but required as complements of motion verbs (45b):

(45) a. Lan { *[ ko-munlaj-el ] } / ✓[ ko-munlaj-i ] }  
PROG  A1P-work-NML  A1P-work-ITV  
‘We’re working.’

b. Ix-in-b’at { ✓[ munlaj-el ] } / *[ munlaj-i ] }.  
PRFV-B1-go  work-NML  work-ITV  
‘I went to work.’

• So far, we have only seen determiners, demonstratives, and fronting with -el forms:  

(46) [ A   jun munlaj-el tik ] ch’oklaj.  
FOC  one work-NML DEM  strange  
‘This work is strange.’

• But either form is possible with aspectual verbs:

(47) a. Ix-a-yamoch [ ha-munlaj-el ].  
PRFV-A2-begin  A2-work-NML  
‘You began to work.’  

b. Ix-in-yamoch [ hin-munlaj-i ].  
‘I began to work.’  

5Like other Q’anjob’alan languages, Chuj has a series of nominal classifiers (see e.g. Craig 1986; Zavala 2000; Hopkins 2012), which have a determiner-like function. However, these generally do not appear on abstract nouns and are correctly predicted to be absent from nominalizations.
• As subjects in (48), either is possible:

(48) a. Man te wach-ok-laj [ ko-munlaj-el ].
    NEG very good-IRR-NEG A1P-work-NML
    ‘Our work isn’t very good.’

b. Man te wach-ok-laj [ ko-munlaj-i ].
    NEG very good-IRR-NEG A1P-work-ITV
    ‘Our working isn’t very good.’

⇒ Our consultant remarks: in (48a), we are talking about the work that was done, i.e. the result; in (48b) it is more like we don’t work well

○ This seems roughly consistent with the English bare noun vs. gerund form in the translations

• Though more work is needed, we tentatively suggest that -el forms are smaller nominalizations—perhaps directly from the root—not involving a vP layer. Compare:

(49) nP  (50) nP
    DP_i
    ko-  DP_i  ko-
    A1PL- n   A1PL- n
    n   vP    √   vP
      v   VP   vi
    -i   V   PRO_i
    -ITV V  PRO_i
    munlaj work

⇒ The differences between the availability of one form or another may ultimately fall out front these different structures

⇒ Since the aspectual predicate lan does not introduce a thematic subject, it may require the embedded nominalization to assign a θ-role to one (i.e. PRO) in (45a)

⇒ The appearance of D⁰ elements only with smaller -el forms like (46) would have some cross-linguistic precedent. Compare, e.g. the ungrammaticality of determiners and demonstratives with English poss-ing gerunds (see Borsley and Kornfilt 2000):

(51) a. We discussed this/that/the **criticism of the book**.
    b. * We discussed this/that/the **criticizing the book**.
5 Conclusions

- In this talk, we examined progressive constructions in Chuj, an understudied Mayan language of Guatemala
  - Building on work on other Mayan languages, we suggested that the appearance of a split in person marking in the progressive aspect, is due to differences in structure between progressive and non-progressive aspects
  - Namely, the progressive aspect marker behaves as a stative predicate, taking a nominalized verb form as its complement
- §3 — evidence that the progressive marker behaves like a predicate
- §4 — evidence that the stem form behaves like a noun

- However, the stem form does not behave like any noun in the language: it behaves like a nominalized vP
  - This is especially clear in the case of embedded transitives, which show reflexives of case-assigning Voice morphology
  - Though not discussed here, passives are also possible in such forms
- Finally, in §4.4 we examined a different “more noun-like” type of nominal stem form
- In future work, we hope to connect this to differences in the point at which the root/stem is nominalized
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