

\*only non-statives occur in the progressive.

tijnaq? NO ix loq'owinaq? NO in ti'ojirnaq? YES

other stative verbs: nojinaq NO, seqnaq NO, ajonaq NO, etamanaq NO, vs. nojin ri k'ayewal YES ha sido ideado, seqon ri kotz'i'j YES, ajowan ri xtan YES, etaman ri tijonik YES.

other activity verbs: has activity, achievement, and accomplishment verbs. both inherently punctual and durative.

### 1. Check compatibility with 'right now', progressive vs. continuous

2. Check to make sure tajin is really incompatible with passive -naq, passive and transitive -on, and actually compatible with intransitive -naq. ri ya' tajin tixnaq NO; ri ulew tajin samajin NO, q'aq' tajin chupun(aq), NO, NO. tajin petenaq ri xtan NO? YES? said it; najin aninaq NO; najin in kosnaq NO. (Dowty says incompatibility with the progressive is a stative characteristic)

### 3. Imperfective paradox:

a. [ri ixoq] ruch'ajon ri jay. Wi nitane', la xuch'aj yan ronojel? NO

b. [ri potz'] rukamisan ri achin. Wi nitane', la xukamisaj yan? NO. hard, default interpretation of kamisaj is one and off. have to specify that it's like beating or something. Better with nintzu' chi.

c. petenaq ri ala'. Wi nitane', la xpe yan? NO

a. k'ayin ri tra's [roma ri achin]. Wi nitane', la xuk'ayij yan ronojel? NO. tuera are still af ew that need to be siold.

b. jok'on ri ke'en [roma ri ixoq]. Wi nitane', la xujok' yan ronojel? NO. man ronojel ta.

c. k'ayinaq ri tra's [roma ri achin]. Wi nitane', la xuk'ayij ronojel yan? NO not necessarily all of them.

chojmin, you fixed some but not all. chojminaq it's fixed.

a. chojmitajnaq ri jay [roma ri achin]. Wi nitane', la xuchojmij yan?

b. ti'ojirnaq ri ala'. wi nitane', la xto'ijir yan? YES

how else to get at termination? combine i with a clause that requires the action to have been finished to make sense

ruchojmin ruch'ich' to' xtikir xuk'waj pa Armita. la xk'is ri samaj? manaq chojmin ruch'ich' to' xtikir xuk'waj pa Armita. la k'is yan ri samaj? manaq

chojmin b'a ri ch'ich' roma re nib'iyin. cojin chik es completado.

chojminaq ruch'ich' to' xtikir xuk'waj pa Armita. la xk'is yan ri samaj?

chojminaq b'a utz chuqa. medioarreglado.

b'enaq ri ala' pa rochoch. La xapon yan?

### 5. Adverbs:

\*all night? specification of duration and endpoint. durante toda la noche (no todas noches)

ruchupun ri q'aq' pa jun aq'a (ronojel ri aq'a). k'a pa nik'aj aq'a

chupun ri q'aq' pa jun aq'a (ronojel ri aa'a)

chupunaq ri q'aq' pa jun aq'a

ruchojmin ri ch'ich' k'a pa nik'aj aq'a'. man kan ta

xuchojmij/nuchojmij ri ch'ich' k'a pa nik'aj aq'a

chojmin ri ch'ich' k'a pa nik'aj aq'a (and it's fixed). ninojij chi utz.  
chojminaq ri ch'ich' k'a pa nik'aj aqua. yes , but it happened and is in the state.

jaqatajnaq  
at tzojinaq

\*always?

jantape ruk'aton runway. YES  
jantape k'aton ruway. YES causante man qetaman ta ruach.  
jantape k'atinaq ruway. YES is there a meaning difference in these two? today la vida la tortilla es quemada. como estada de tortilla.

X time ago not compatible with the perfect in English (McCoard 1978:135)

ruk'aton ruway wo'o q'ij kan. NO  
k'aton ruway wo'o q'ij kan. NO  
k'atinaq ruway wo'o q'ij kan. NO. has to be present time: the tortilla is burned RIGHT NOW

phrasal vs. lexical participles: lexical don't allow adverbs.

tikon ri ixim chanin chanin YES  
tiknaq ri ixim chanin chanin NO

**chojmin ri ch'ich' eqal equal YES**  
**chojminaq ri ch'ich' eqal equal NO. chojminaq xb'nataj yan**

5.1 Can the subject be generic? if it's adjectival, then it can't be a generic

Winaqi' kich'ajon laq NO, even if the object is definite  
laq ch'ajon koma winaqi' YES  
laq ch'ajnaq [koma winaqi'] NO. ch'ajnaq rupam laq

[just ask if it feels like the same distinction as 'el te es servido vs. el te esta servido']

6. By-phrase acceptability

chupun ri q'aq' roma ri ak'wal YES. very utz  
chupunaq ri q'aq' roma ri k'wal NO  
ch'ajon ri tzyaq roma ri te'ej YES  
ch'ajnaq ri tzyaq roma ri te'j NO  
sa'on ri ti'ij roma ri achin YES  
sa'onaq ri ti'ij roma ri achin NO

7. stative participles can be either resultant or target. Target can take 'still', 'resultant' cannot. get reading on which form, if either, is better with 'still'. [ideal if all -naq can't take still, but all -vn can. But other source states that 'still' forces a stative reading! also 'resultative' is still eventive] [the fact that -naq lacks a by phrase suggests that they aren't really voice, but rather more like german state participles. **is there a correlation between those that allow na and don't take an agent?** also suggested by other article] —also check if agent is good. or maybe the split is between inherently intrans. naq and derived intransitive naq???

with k'a...na

chupunaq na ri q'aq' hasta    chupun na ri q'aq' YES    ruchupun na ri q'aq' hasta

ya'	tixinaq na ri gasolina YES	tixon na ri gasolina YES, but intensional	rutixon na ri
	chojminaq na' ri ch'ich' hasta —pitz'inaq na ri limonix	chojmin na ri ch'ich' mana ruchojmin na ri ch'ich' hasta pitz'on na ri limonix rupitz'on na ri limonix	
	choxinaq na ri kinaq' YES	choxin na ri kinaq' YES ruchoxin na ri kinaq' YES	
	jab'inaq na ri ixim YES	jab'in na ri ixim YES rujab'in na ri ixim YES	
	k'ayinaq na ri xkoya' hasta	k'ayin na ri xkoya' manaq ruk'ayin na ri xkoya' hasta	
	tzijonaq na ri k'ayewal hasta	tzijon na ri k'ayewal YES rutzijon na ri k'ayewal YES	
	k'a(paxnaq) na ri b'ojoy YES	paxin na ri b'ojoy mana rupaxin na ri b'ojoy manaq	
	(sachnaq) na atz'i' YES	sachon na ri atz'i' manaq rusachon na ri atz'i' manaq	
	xupunaq na ri xupxup YES	xupun na ri rupam ri achin mana ruxupun na ri manaq	
	tzolinaq na ri akamixa' hasta	tzolin na ri akamixa' manaq rutzolin na ri akamixa' manaq	
	ch'ajnaq na ri jay hasta	ch'ajon na ri jay hasta ruch'ajon na ri jay	
	jaqanaq na ri ruchi' jay YES	jaqon na ri ruchi' jay YES rujaqon na ri ruchi' jay YES	
	k'isinaq na ri tijonik mana	k'ison na ri tijonik hasta ruk'ison na ri tijonik manaq	
	—ch'ayinaq na ri achin	ch'ayon na ri achin ruch'ayon na ri achin	
	wuxnaq na ri kinaq' hasta	wuxun na ri kinaq' hasta ruwuxun na ri kinaq'	
	tikinaq na ri awan mana	tikon na ri awan YES rutikon na ri awan YES	
	<b>sa'onaq na ri ti'ij NO</b>	<b>sa'on na ri ti'ij rusa'on na ri ti'ij</b>	
	poronaq na ri si' NO	poron na ri si' YES ruponon na ri si' YES	
	se ha podido quemar	ha sido quemado man k'is ta	
	ha abaldo		

**ch'owinaq na YES, ha seguido hablado**

poronaq na esta quemandose

k'a ...na hasta que se queme, sale bien

paxnaq na ri bojoy nto all the way broken. just partially broken

muqunaq na ri pwaq YES	muqun na ri pwaq YES	rumuqun na ri pwaq YES
nimbus es hasta		
kosnaq na ri k'wal YES	rija' chupuyon na ri q'aq' YES	
samajnaq na ri achin YES	k'a ja rija' tixiyon na ri ya' todavia es el quien arregado el agua	
ya'irnaq na ri ke'en YES	rija' chomiyon na ri ch'ich' YES	
b'anatajnaq na ri k'ayewal manaq?	rija' k'ayiyon na ri xkoya'	
	rija' paxiyon na ri b'ojoy YES, but better nipaxin	
	rija' sachiyon na ri tz'i'	
	rija' ch'ajayon na ri jay YES	
	rija' jaqayon na ri ruchi' jay	
	rija' k'isiyon na ri tijonik	
	rija' wuxuyon na ri kinaq' NO	
	rija' tikiyon na ri awan	
	rija' sa'oyon na ri ti'ij NO	
	rija' poroyon na ri si' NO, but poroyon is good	
	rija' muquyon na ri pwaq NO	

even tvs. state=telicity in q'anjob'al

8. acceptability with -Vla'

rub'anala'on? rutz'eteta'on?

Dowty p. 341: "I will base the treatment I give here on McCoard's favored theory of the present, the extended now theory. this is the view that the perfect serves to locate an event within a period of time that began in the past and extends up to the present moment, while the simple past specifies that an event occurred at a past time that is separated from the present by some interval..."

Definite differences:

accompaniment by adverbs:

in warnaq chanin chanin  
b'anatajnaq eqal eqal  
ya'irnaq ri ke'en chanin chanin  
to'ijirnaq ri ak'wal eqal eqal

ruch'ajon ri jay chanin chanin  
in ch'eleyon ri ne'y eqal eqal

ability to have an agent

acceptance of stative verbs (except -naq allows derived adjs)

Duration? one can take it, one can't?

ti'ojnaq ri ala' k'a pa ri juna' apo  
choxinaq ri kinaq' k'a pa nimaq'a' chwaq  
sachnaq ri atz'i' k'a pa xoqa ri q'ij  
kosnaq ri ala' k'a pa xuk'is rutijonik

Similarities:

can't have a generic subject

none compatible with the progressive (maybe aspectual, but maybe because they are less than verbal. mention )

very flexible in terms of termination: chik and na (trans also)

not compatible with X time ago

have some sort of target vs. resultative difference, but interesting since it is not ingrammaticality, but a reinterpretation. not always consistent between forms.

On stativity tests:

according to Dowty:

1. cannot appear w/ progressive (YES BOTH PASS)
2. cannot appear w/ imperatives (NA, bc it's an aspect)
3. cannot appear w/ 'force' (NA, because the complement is an imperative. xinb'an chi tutaqa' ri wuj)
4. **cannot appear in pseudo-cleft (NA? ri xub'an Xwan ja ri xuq'etej ri k'wal vs. ri rub'anon/xub'an Xwan ja ri ruq'eten ri k'wal)**

From Q'anjob'al, Mateo-Toledo:

1. states not compatible with adverbs of simple duration (not reliable)
2. adverbs of completion 'in a moment'/'in two hours (not reliable)
3. aspectual verbs of termination (NA, because take a nominal complement in Kaq.)
4. imperatives (NA, see above)

—> in Q'anjob'al, states are compatible with specification of duration, but don't allow specification of termination because they are atelic.

Wasow argues for a split between adjectival passive participles and verbal passive participles. Both others Lundquist argue that it's not a valid categorical difference.

1. ability to appear in attributive position (YES BOTH)
2. ability to participate in raising constructions (NA)
3. remain: only statives can follow 'remain'  
xkanaj kan warnaq ronojel q'ij  
xkanaj kan petenaq ronojel ri tiqaq'ij  
xkanaj kan jaqinaq ri ruchi' jay ronojel ri nimaq'a'  
xkanaj kan ya'irnaq ronojel q'ij  
ri achin xukanaj kan rutikon ri ixim ronojel ri tiqaq'ij  
xkanaj kan muqunaq ri pwaq  
xkanaj kan muqun ri pwaq  
xkanaj kan hcojmitajnaq ri ch'ich'  
Ja ri ixoq xukanaj kan ch'ajayon ri tzyaq

(random passives handout)

1. Adjectives take degree words:
  1. the restrictions were \*too/\*very relaxed
  2. the meeting was very/too relaxed  
yalan/janila ti'ojirnaq ri achin  
yalan/janila kosnaq ri ak'wal  
yalan/janila b'enaq ri xtan  
yalan/janila b'anatajnaq ri k'ayewal  
yalan/janila k'ayinaq ri xkoya'  
  
ri ala' yalan/janila ruq'eten ri ti xtan  
yalan/janila tikon ri kinaq'  
ja ri xtan yalan/janila oj q'eteyon  
  
ri ala' yalan/janila nunaq ri rana'
2. adjectives can follow seem, look, and remain (see above)
3. can be prefixed by -un (NA)
4. adjectival participles are always stative; verbal passive may be eventive or stative (if this means lexical statives, then NO to the first, YES to the second (what the examples imply); but if it's interpretation, then YES to both)
5. by phrases are available with verbal passives, but are available with adjectival passives only with stative verbs (YES to the first part, NO to the second part)

Bruhn de Garavito 2009 adjectival vs. verbal passives in Spanish

1. Verbal passives take a by-phrase, but not adjectival (YES)
2. default aspect: verbal is perterite/past perfect, stative is imperfect (NA. see flexibility of termination)
3. subjects of verbal passives can be generic, while subjects of the adjectival passives can't (BOTH FAIL)
4. addition of -in, which is possible with the adjectival passive (NA)

Kratzer 2000 : 3 types of participles: eventive, and 2 types of stative: target and resultant.

\*Also frequently the case like in English that the verbal passive is more productive with transitive roots than the stative passive.

Kennedy and McNally 2005: stative passives can be comparative:

mas k'aton ri nuway chwach rat  
mas k'atinaq nuway chwach rat  
mas chojmin re ch'ich' re'  
mas chojminaq re ch'ich' re'

Can 'still' take a by phrase?

k'a jab'in na ri ixim pa b'ey roma ri achin  
k'a poron na ri si' roma ri q'aq'