

(For reference: transitive roots found to be allowed or disallowed with -inaq:)

POSSIBLE:

k'atinaq  
chupunaq  
tixinaq  
chojminaq  
pitz'inaq  
choxinaq  
jab'inaq  
t'atinaq  
k'ayinaq  
tzijonaq  
(paxnaq)  
(sachnaq)  
xupunaq  
tzolinaq  
ch'ajnaq  
jaqinaq  
k'isinaq  
—ch'ayinaq

IMPOSSIBLE:

chapinaq  
mich'inaq  
ch'elenaq  
kanunaq  
kamisanaq  
to'onaq  
ilinaq  
wuxunaq  
k'ilinaq  
b'a'inaq  
piskolinaq  
k'aminaq  
t'isinaq  
rochonaq  
tikmayinaq  
—ch'ayinaq  
tz'etenaq  
tikinaq  
q'etenaq  
elesanaq  
oyob'enaq  
mestanaq  
su'naq  
chajinaq  
k'aqinaq  
yoq'inaq  
naqinaq

etamanaq  
etanaq  
tz'ub'anaq  
jok'onaq  
tz'apinaq  
sik'inaq  
ak'axanaq  
loq'onaq  
tz'etanaq  
tzu'naq  
ajo'naq  
kusanaq  
sipanaq  
pitz'inaq  
nimnaq  
b'ananaq  
ilnaq  
k'wanaq  
solnaq  
ximinaq  
oyonaq

\*Each test needs to be done with :

- trans on
- intrans naq
- passive on
- passive/stative naq
- (normal antipassives)
- AF
- (tajnaq passive)
- (-irnaq)

...always testing verbs from both of the above lists, when possible.

Test 1: General aspect. Typically, the perfect is bounded, while states are unbounded. Not sure how to test this. However, both still hold at the topic time or the time interval about when the utterance makes the assertion. states hypothetically could exist with any time reference, maybe favor present orientations. Perfects should reject past interpretations. Because these are NVPs, TAM will have to be conveyed adverbially.

Present time: wakamin

Future time: chwaq

past time: iwir

(please feel free to improve on these examples. this is mostly a framework/list of necessary conditions)

- a. ruchojmin ri ch'ich' wakamin.
- b. ruchojmin ri ch'ich' chwaq. [will have fixed]
- c. ruchojmin ri ch'ich' iwir.
- d. rutikon ri kinaq' wakamin.
- e. rutikon ri kinaq' chwaq.
- f. rutikon ri kinaq' iwir.

- a. in kosnaq wakamin
- b. in kosnaq chwaq
- c. in kosnaq iwir.

- a. chupun ri q'aq' wakamin.
- b. chupun ri q'aq' chwaq. [will have been put out]  
(maybe better: too xkatoqa chwaq, chupun (yan) ri q'aq'. if this works better, use it for all subsequent examples)
- c. chupun ri q'aq' iwir.
- d. loq'on ri xkoya' wakamin
- e. loq'on ri xkoya' chwaq
- f. loq'on ri xkoya' iwir

- a. tixnaq ri ya' wakamin
- b. tixnaq ri ya' chwaq
- c. tixnaq ri ya' iwir

- a. b'anatajnaq wakamin
- b. b'anataqnaq chwaq
- c. b'anatajnaq iwir

- a. ya'irnaq ri ke'en wakamin
- b. ya'irnaq ri ke'en chwaq
- c. ya'irnaq ri ke'en iwir

Test 2: Telicity. In English, for two hours vs. in two hours. For Q'anjob'al, 'for two hours was conveyed simply by starting the sentence with 'two hours'. I'm not sure how well that would work for Kaq, but it could be tried. Another way might be richin, but that also sounds a bit weird. 'Richin' would also have to be accompanied by something other than 'two hours', because 'richin ka'i' ramaj' could easily be interpreted as 'for 2pm', which is definitely not an acceptable interpretation. As for 'in', chupam might be a bit too much like for, but pa might work, even with it's interpretation of "at 2pm". maybe use a duration of minutes, to block am/pm interpretation? Substitute whatever you think captures the distinction with the following examples:

- a. ruk'ayin ichaj richin kab'aljuj ch'uti ramaj
- b. ruk'ayin ichaj pa kab'lajuj ch'uti ramaj
- c. ruchajin ri ak'wal richin wolajuj ch'uti ramaj
- d. ruchajin ri k'wal pa wolajuj ch'uti ramaj

- a. wartinaq ri ne'y richin wowinaq ch'uti ramaj
- b. wartinaq ri ne'y pa wowinaq ch'uti ramaj

- a. wuxun ri xkoya' richin ka'i' q'ij
- b. wuxun ri xkoya' pa ka'i' q'ij
- c. k'aton ri way richin ka'i' ch'uti ramaj
- d. k'aton ri way pa ka'i' ch'uti ramsj

- a. k'atinaq ri way richin ka'i' ch'uti ramsj
- b. k'atinaq ri way pa ka'i' ch'uti ramaj

- a. chojmitajnaq ri ch'ich' richin kawinaq ch'uti ramaj
- b. chojmitajnaq ri ch'ich' pa kawinaq ch'uti ramaj

- a. nimarnaq ri kaxlan way richin lajuj ch'uti ramaj
- b. nimarnaq ri kaxlan way pa lajuj chute ramaj

If this isn't a relevant test, we can also use the "imperfective paradox" test, which is maybe is also how you get at endpoint: [if the answer is yes, then the verb is atelic. If no, it's atelic.] Really we need to do this test with every single verb in the list, and see if there is any difference between those in the 'not possible' section and those in the 'possible' section as well.

- a. [ri ixoq] ruch'ajon ri jay. Toq nupa'b'a' ri' ["when she stop it"], la xuch'aj yan?
- b. [ri potz'] rukamisan ri achin. Toq nupa'b'a' ri', la xukamisaj yan?
- c. petenaq ri ala'. Toq nupa'b'a' ri', la xpe yan?

- a. k'ayin ri tra's [roma ri achin]. Toq nupa'b'a' ri', la xuk'ayij yan?
- b. jok'on ri ke'en [roma ri ixoq]. Toq nupa'b'a' ri', la xujok' yan?
- c. k'ayinaq ri tra's [roma ri achin]. Toq nupa'b'a' ri', la xuk'ayij yan?

- a. chojmitajnaq ri jay [roma ri achin]. Toq nupa'b'a' ri', la xuchojmij yan?
- b. winaqirnaq ri ala'. Toq nupa'b'a' ri', la xwinaqir yan?