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In this paper we show that the voice affixes /-in/ and /-an/ in Tagalog not only determine the choice of the subject, but also the (aspeckual) interpretation of the verb. In the first part we discuss the complex phenomena the voice suffixes are involved in. In the second part we suggest that in order to do justice to the cited data and in order to adequately capture the event-structure-related function of /-in/ and /-an/, a dynamic event semantics may be the appropriate framework.

Introduction

In traditional analyses, Tagalog voice affixes are said to determine the semantic role of the subject-phrase (Constantino 1965, Naylor 1975): /-in/ is said to identify the argument associated with the thematic role Goal (GV: Goal Voice) and /-an/ is said to identify the argument associated with the thematic role Location (LV: Locative Voice) as the subject of the sentence. A prototypical example is cited in (1), where the respective subject of the sentence is underlined:

1. a. Kun-in mo sa kaniya ang lapis!
   Take-GV Gen:you Dat he Nom pencil
   'Get the pencil from him!'

   b. Kun-an mo siya ng lapis!
   Take-LV Gen:you Nom:he Gen pencil
   'Get a pencil from him!'

While the above mentioned characterization of the voice suffixes in terms of thematic roles seems to work fairly well for ditransitive transfer verbs, it poses problems for various transitive verbs. The examples in (2) and (3) show that /-in/ and /-an/ identify the same thematic role, here location, with the verb stem akyat 'to go up, rise'. Instead of a contrast regarding subject choice, we get a difference

---

1 This paper grew out of research in the project B9 ‘Verb Structures’ and the project D3 ‘Verb Meanings’ of the Sonderforschungsbereich 282 ‘Theorie des Lexiks’.

2 For reasons of simplicity, all the examples given are imperatives. Imperatives happen to be the only verbs in Tagalog that consist only of the verb stem and a voice affix.
with respect to the verb's valency and meaning. Suffixing /-an/ to the verb stem akyat ‘to go up’ induces a direct causative reading, ‘to make go up’.

2. Akyat-in mo ang kanya-ng kuwarto.
   Go-up GV Gen:you Nom Dat:the-LK room
   ‘Go up (upstairs) to his room.’

3. Akyat-an mo ang kanya-ng kuwarto ng mga libro.
   Go-up-LV Gen:you Nom Dat:the-LK room Gen Pl book
   ‘Bring the books up (upstairs) to his room.’

Verbs with incremental themes like kain ‘to eat’ exhibit a similar problem for the thematic role analysis. Once again /-in/ and /-an/ identify the same argument as the subject of the sentence, but affixing /-in/ to the verb stem yields the reading that the object has to be consumed in its entirety, while affixing /-an/ to the same verb stem yields a partitive reading.

   Eat-GV Gen:you Nom fish
   ‘Eat the fish up.’

5. K(a)n-an mo ang isda.
   Eat-LV Gen:you Nom fish
   ‘Eat some/a part of the fish.’

A similar phenomenon can be observed with the verb stem lakad ‘to walk’. Both suffixes pick out the argument denoting the path. While affixing /-in/ yields the reading that a complete path has to be traversed, affixing /-an/ yields no such implication.

   Walk-GV Gen:you Nom Luneta/ Nom all LK way
   ‘Walk up to Luneta/all the way.’

7. Lakar-an mo ang mabato-ng kalye.
   Walk-LV Gen:you Nom stony-LK street
   ‘Walk on the stony street.’

Example (8) finally shows a verb that is compatible with only one of the suffixes, namely /-an/. Once again, this fact does not seem to be accounted for by referring to the thematic role Location.

8. Asa-han mo ang tulong ng Diyos.
   Hope-LV Gen:you Nom help Gen God
   ‘Rely on the help of God.’
Examples like the ones cited above have led linguists like Lemaréchal (1991) and Himmelmann (1987) to propose that the affixes should be analyzed in terms of degrees of affectedness. The basic idea is that /-in/ contributes the information that the argument determined is directly affected, while /-an/ contributes the information that the argument determined is not directly affected. Neither author provides a formal definition of the notion ‘affectedness’. Still, if an intuitive understanding of the notion of affectedness is accepted, a number of verb-suffix combinations seem to be accounted for. On the basis of verb semantics, it is to be expected that patay ‘to kill’ takes /-in/ (9) and sunod ‘to follow’ takes /-an/ (10).

   Kill-GV Gen:you Nom:he
   ‘Kill him.’

10. Sund-an mo siya.
    Follow-LV Gen:you Nom:he
    ‘Follow him.’

Apart from the fact that it seems to be difficult to formalize the intuitive notion of affectedness, there are various data that even on an intuitive basis are hard to capture. For example, why should the door be more directly affected by the knocking event (11) than the dirty clothes by the event of washing (12)?

    Knock-GV Gen:you Nom door
    ‘Knock on the door.’

12. Lab-han mo ang marumi-ng damit.
    Wash-LV Gen:you Nom dirty-LK clothes
    ‘Wash the dirty clothes.’

While the above-mentioned analyses give invaluable insights into predominant tendencies in Tagalog, they offer a description of a set of surface data rather than an explanation of the fundamental functions associated with the affixes in the lexicon. In this paper, we will not pursue any of the traditional approaches further, but offer a solution in a completely new framework. Three observations need to be accounted for:

(i) in the case of ditransitive verbs, /-in/ and /-an/ identify different arguments as the subject of the sentence;
(ii) in the case of transitive verbs with an incremental theme, both affixes identify the theme argument, but lead to different aspectual interpretations of the verb;
(iii) with most transitive verbs without incremental theme, only one of the affixes is possible.
From the fact that voice affixes determine the aspectual interpretation of some transitive verbs, it can be concluded that a characterization in terms of event semantics might be insightful. The basic idea is that each (subcategorized) argument must or can satisfy one (possibly two) conditions during an event, and that the voice affixes /-in/ and /-an/ refer to these different properties of events (by implying conditions that must be satisfied during an event). The idea will become clearer in the next section, where we introduce our view of events and event-related conditions.\footnote{A formalization of the theory developed in the following sections will appear in the Proceedings of the 6th Meeting of the Association for Mathematics of Language (1999), Orlando, (Florida) under the title 'A dynamic event semantics for the analysis of verbs and verb affixes in Tagalog.'}

1.0. Events and Conditions

Following Naumann (1999) we assume that non-stative verbs express or at least presuppose changes. The intuitive notion of change comprises two perspectives that are complementary to each other: (i) something (an object: event, action) which brings about the change (a view generally held in Event Semantics), (ii) something (a result) that is brought about by the change which did not hold before the change occurred (a view generally held in Dynamic Logic). It should be clear that in (i) 'change' refers to the sense captured in (ii), i.e. change as the result, whereas in (ii) 'change' refers to the sense captured in (i), i.e. change as an object.

For the verb phrase 'eat an apple', change as an object is the event of type eating and change as a transformation is a state in which there is a complete apple transformed into a state where the apple no longer exists. For the activity verb 'run', change as an object is the event of type running and change as a transformation is a state s transformed into a state s' relative to which someone has traversed a non-empty path.

The relation between the two perspectives can be described in terms of Moens and Steedmans (1988) nucleus-structure. The execution sequence (run-time) of an event can be split into a beginning point (inception point) s at which a certain property \( \phi \) does not hold, an end-point (culmination point) s' at which the property \( \phi \) holds and a development portion on which the event occurs (13).

\begin{align*}
\text{e} & \\
\hline
\text{s} & \text{s'} & \text{\textbf{\(-\phi\)}} & \text{\( \phi \)} & \text{IP} & \text{DP} & \text{CP} & \text{Moens & Steedman}\n\end{align*}
\[ \alpha (e) = s \] beginning-point of \( e \) (Inception Point: IP)
\[ \omega (e) = s' \] end-point of \( e \) (Culmination Point: CP)
\[ \tau (e) = (s, s') \] execution sequence of \( e \), (Development Portion: DP),
\[ [\tau (e) = \{s'' | s \leq s'' \leq s'\}] \]

1.1. The Relation between changes as objects and changes as transformations of states

The relation between changes as objects and changes as transformations of states is in general not one-to-one, but one-to-many, i.e. an event brings about different results and therefore corresponds to different transformations of states. In the case of an event \( e \) of type ‘John eats a fish’ we can distinguish between:

(i) the results brought about by the initial actions by John, e.g. his opening the mouth which does not yet count as an eating-event in itself, but which constitutes a necessary initial phase of each eating event,
(ii) the results brought about by John’s swallowing a part of the fish,
(iii) the results corresponding to the partial decrease in the mass of the fish,
(iv) the total decrease in the mass of the fish (the mass equals zero).

As was shown in the introduction, the difference between the minimal result (‘partial decrease in the mass of the fish’) and the maximal results (‘mass of the fish = zero’) is expressed in Tagalog via voice suffix choice: suffixing ‘-an’ to the verb stem ‘to eat’ always yields the partitive reading, while suffixing ‘-in’ yields the reading that the mass of the object has been consumed in its entirety. The different types of results thus seem to be of immediate interest to our classification of voice suffixes. In order to be able to make predictions about the occurrence of the affixes and the readings they yield, a formal definition of the various types of results is needed. The results in (i) will be called \( s(\text{trongly})\)-\textit{minimal}, the results in (ii) and (iii) \( w(\text{eastly})\)-\textit{minimal} and the result in (iv) \textit{maximal} in the rest of the paper. We suggest that the difference between minimal and maximal results can be described with respect to the \textit{way the result is brought about}. While maximal results only hold at the end-point of an event, minimal results hold at intermediate points of the execution sequence. The difference between strongly-minimal and weakly-minimal results can be captured by referring to the basic type of the event. Weakly-minimal results hold at all points of the execution sequence that are end-points of subevents that are of the same basic event type as the verb. Subevents that are not of the same basic type as the event of ‘eating’ are for example ‘\( x \) is opening his mouth’ and ‘\( x \) is putting food in his mouth’— the whole preparatory phase of the eating event that in itself cannot be classified as constituting an event of type eating, but that still constitutes a
necessary part of each eating event.\footnote{Evidence for the fact that weakly-minimal results and preparatory phases that cannot yet be classified as being of the basic event type might be important, comes from Dell (1983), who points out that Tagalog verbs can be used in the meaning "try to do (but fail)."} The notion of strong minimality differs from weak minimality in comprising this preparatory phase. A strongly minimal result thus holds even at intermediate points of the execution sequence that are not of the same basic type as the predicate that denotes the event. The table in (14) sums up the definitions of the three types of results given in this section.

| **Maximal:** | The result holds only at the end-point of the execution sequence, if it holds at all. |
| **Minimal:** | The result holds at intermediate points of the execution sequence. |
| **Strongly-minimal:** | If the result holds at some state \( s \), it also holds at all points before \( s \). |
| **Weakly-minimal:** | The result holds at all states of the execution-sequence that are end-points of subevents that are of the basic type \( P_x \). |

### 1.2. Different types of events and the evaluation of results

In this section we want to distinguish two main types of events, *atomic events* and *non-atomic events*, in order to give the basis for a taxonomy of Tagalog verbs. Atomic events can be further subdivided into *instantaneous events* and *\( P \)-atomic events*. The execution sequence of atomic instantaneous events, denoted by point verbs and achievement verbs, consists of a singleton, \( \alpha(e) = \omega(e) \) (the beginning-point equals the end-point). They do not have proper parts and they (often) presuppose the existence of another event of which they are a boundary. Examples are the point verb ‘knock’ (15) and the achievement verb ‘arrive’ (16). For ‘knock’, the result (‘sound produced by hitting against something’) holds at the only point of the execution sequence. This result can only be evaluated with respect to the execution sequence of the presupposed event, e.g. ‘the moving of the hand towards the door’. As the event of type knocking constitutes the end-point of the presupposed moving event, the result holding at this point has to be classified as the maximal result.

(T0) T-in-awag ko si Ben, pero wala-nya lamabasa salita sa bibig ko.  
Call-recalls Gen:1 Nom but no-LK com out LK word Dut mouth Gen:1  
"I tried to call Ben, but no word came out of my mouth."  
(The suffix /-in/ is not overt, whenever the realls prefix /fin-/ appears.)
15. *katok* 'to knock'

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\text{event presupposed} & \text{e} \\
\hline
\ \ & = s' \\
\ \ & \neg\phi \\
\ \ & \phi \\
\ \ & \neg\phi
\end{array}
\]

Achievement verbs like 'arrive' differ from point verbs in that they imply the result to be valid even after the event has taken place. Concerning the evaluation of the result, however, they are comparable to point verbs. For ‘arrive’, the result (‘x is located at y’) holds as well at the only point of the corresponding execution-sequence and once again, this result can only be evaluated with respect to the presupposed event, e.g. the moving of x towards y. The result has thus to be classified as the maximal result.

16. *dating* 'to arrive'

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\text{event presupposed} & \text{e} \\
\hline
\ \ & = s' \\
\ \ & \neg\phi \\
\ \ & \phi
\end{array}
\]

P-atomic events denoted by transfer verbs like 'give' and 'take' are not necessarily instantaneous, although an instantaneous reading is perfectly compatible with their meaning. Regardless of the question whether they denote instantaneous events or events with an extended run-time, they can be characterized as events of type P that do not have proper initial stages of the same basic type. This means that, if we assume the two results, ‘x is not (no longer) at y’ and ‘x is at z’ to be associated with an event of type ‘giving’, both properties need to be valid, for an event to be able to classify as a transfer event. If only ‘x is not at y’ is valid, y might simply have lost x, and if only ‘x is at z’ is valid, z might simply have found x, neither result in itself is enough to qualify for a transfer. Both results seem thus to be maximal results. They differ, however, in one respect: while the result ‘x is at z’ implies the result ‘x is not at y’, the result ‘x is not at y’ does not imply the result ‘x is at z’. This implication hierarchy can be taken as a basis to distinguish the two kinds of results which will indeed be necessary to account for the Tagalog data, as the next section will show.

In contrast, non-atomic events, denoted by accomplishment verbs and activity verbs, are events of a certain type P that do have initial stages of the same basic type P. In the case of the activity verb ‘run’, the result (‘non-empty path traversed’) holds at intermediate points of the execution-sequence of an event of this type. The result has thus to be classified as a minimal result. (The negative evaluation of the result at the beginning of the execution sequence refers to the preparatory phase of the running event, e.g. bending the knees, lifting one foot etc.)
17. *takbo* 'to run':

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
 & e & s & s' & \neg \phi & \neg \phi & \phi & \phi \\
\end{array}
\]

As above, for accomplishment verbs like 'eat', two results have to be evaluated, the result 'partial decrease in the mass of an object' and the result 'mass of the object equals zero'. While the first result holds at intermediate points of the execution sequence and qualifies thus as a minimal result, the second result only holds at the end-point and qualifies thus as a maximal result.

18. *kain* 'to eat'

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
 & e & s & s' & \neg \phi & \neg \phi & \phi & \phi & \phi \\
\end{array}
\]

\begin{array}{cccccc}
minimal result & \phi & \phi & \phi & \phi \\
maximal result & \phi & \phi & \phi & \phi \\
\end{array}

In (19) we give a summary of the above mentioned facts.

\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{type of event} & \textbf{minimal result} & \textbf{maximal result} \\
\hline
\textit{Atomic:} & & \\
Point & no & yes \\
Achievement & no & yes \\
Transfer & no & yes (2) \\
\hline
\textit{Non-atomic:} & & \\
Activity & yes & no \\
Accomplishment & yes & yes \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Our claim was that each of the two suffixes corresponds to one of the results, namely /-in/ to the maximal result and /-an/ to the minimal result. Transfer verbs like *kuha* 'to take' and *bigay* 'to give' are a challenge to this claim as they exhibit two different results that both have to be classified as maximal results. In the next section, we will first show how this slightly simplified characterization works for the transitive verbs given in the introduction. Then, we will turn to the seemingly intricate transfer verbs and suggest a slightly more complex and more precise characterization of the function associated with the voice affixes.
2. Characterization of the voice affixes (first version)

Our thesis is that the voice affixes in Tagalog determine two parameters:
(i) the result brought about (⇒ aspeuctal restrictions)
(ii) the grammaticalized topic/subject.

The characterization of the voice suffixes regarding these two parameters is shown in (20).

20.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voice suffix</th>
<th>the result brought about</th>
<th>subject choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/-in/</td>
<td>maximal result</td>
<td>the object d participating in the event that is assigned the maximal results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/-an/</td>
<td>w-minimal, but not s-minimal result</td>
<td>the object d participating in the event that is assigned the w-minimal results, but not the s-minimal results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the characterization of /-in/ needs no further explanation — it determines the maximal results and the participant in the event that is assigned the maximal results — the characterization of /-an/ is a bit more complex. In order to ensure that /-an/ always determines a non-actor argument as the subject of the sentence, it is necessary to state that the result brought about by the voice suffix /-an/ is not the s-minimal result. As section 1.1 has shown, for an accomplishment verb like ‘to eat’, there are always two w-minimal results, one concerning the actor ((i) ‘John’s swallowing a part of an object’) and one concerning the undergoer ((ii) ‘the partial decrease in the mass of an object’). To exclude that the actor is chosen as subject, we have thus to refer to the notion of s-minimality, as only the actor is assigned all of the s-minimal results of the preparatory phase, e.g. ‘x is opening his mouth’.

2.1. Application of the approach to transitive verbs

As has already been thoroughly discussed, accomplishment verbs like kain ‘to eat’ (see also lakad in (6) and (7) for a comparable analysis) have two results, a minimal result (‘decrease in the mass of an object’) and a maximal result (‘the mass of the object is zero’). As the data in (3) and (4) show (here repeated as (21) and (22)), /-an/ yields the partitive reading, as is to be expected due to its above mentioned characterization, and picks out the argument denoting the object that is assigned the minimal result, namely the fish. /-in/ on the other hand, yields the reading that all of the fish has to be eaten and picks out the argument that is assigned the maximal result, which happens to be once again the fish.
   Eat-GV Gen:you Nom fish
   'Eat the fish (completely).'

22. K(a)in-an mo ang isda.
   Eat-LV Gen:you Nom fish
   'Eat some/a part of the fish.'

On the basis of the given characterization of the voice affixes, it is to be expected that activity verbs like *laba* ‘to wash’ that do not have an inherent maximal result, but only a minimal result ('treatment of an object with water') are only compatible with the voice suffix */-an/.* The data in (12) (here repeated as (23)) confirm this prediction.

23. Lab-han mo ang marumi-ng damit.
   Wash-LV Gen:you Nom dirty-LK clothes
   'Wash the dirty clothes.'

24. Lab-hin mo ang marumi-ng damit.
   Wash-GV Gen:you Nom dirty-LK clothes
   'Wash the dirty clothes.'

For point verbs like *katok* ‘to knock’, on the other hand, that denote a single time point that constitutes the end-point of a presupposed event (e.g. 'movement of the hand towards a door'), we would expect only the voice suffix */-in/.* to be compatible. The same prediction would be made for verbs like *patay* ‘to kill’ that denote P-atomic events. In section 1.2, we argued that P-atomic events have no inherent w-minimal results that hold at intermediate points of the execution sequence that are already of the same basic type as the predicate, thus the choice of the voice suffix */-an/.* cannot be an option. Once again, the data in (11) and (9) (here repeated as (25) and (27)) confirm our analysis.

    Knock-GV Gen:you Nom door
    'Knock on the door.'

    Knock-LV Gen:you Nom door
    'Knock on the door.'

27. Patay-in mo siya.
    Kill-GV Gen:you Nom:he
    'Kill him.'
28.* Patay-an mo siya.
   Kill-LV Gen:you Nom:he
   ‘Kill him.’

In the case of direction of motion verbs like *sunod ‘to follow’, we expect only the
voice suffix /-an/ to appear on the verb stem. While this is true, for the usage of
/sunod/ in the sense of ‘to follow’, there is a second meaning to this stem ‘to obey’
that is rather to be classified as denoting a P-atomic or an instantaneous event than a
mere activity. The prediction would be that the activity reading is yielded by affixing
/-an/ and the atomic reading by affixing /-ini/. The prediction turns out to be correct
as the data in (29) and (30) show.

29. Sund-an mo siya.
    Follow-LV Gen:you Nom:he
    ‘Follow him.’
30. Sund-in mo siya.
    Follow-GV Gen:you Nom:he
    ‘Obey him.’

In the next section, we will show that in order to account for the affix choice of
ditransitive verbs, a minor modification of the above mentioned characterization of
the voice affixes is necessary.

2.2. Application of the approach to ditransitive verbs

As has been pointed out in previous sections, for ditransitive verbs like *kuha ‘to
take’, the two objects, source and Goal, cannot be distinguished on the basis of
minimal and maximal result.

31. Kun-in mo sa kaniya ang lapis!
    Take-OV Gen:you Dat he Nom pencil
    ‘Get the pencil from him!’
32. Kun-an mo siya ng lapis!
    Take-LV Gen:you Nom:he Gen pencil
    ‘Get a pencil from him!’

The result associated with the Goal ‘pen’, ‘pen is located at x’, and the result
associated with the source ‘he’, ‘he is not the location of the pen’, are both maximal
results. They cannot be distinguished on a temporal basis. They differ, however, in
that the result associated with the Goal ‘y is at x’ implies the result ‘z is not the
location of y’, whereas the result ‘z is not the location of y’ does not imply the
result y is at x’. Thus the maximal result related to the Goal is in a way more
'maximal' than the maximal result related to the source. The fact that results cannot only be distinguished on the basis of a temporal relationship, but also on the basis of an implication hierarchy needs to be integrated in our characterization of the voice affixes as well as the additional insights regarding subject determination with ditransitive verbs denoting atomic events. The claim that /-an/ only determines w-minimal results apparently cannot be maintained, as /-an/ also determines implicated maximal results. In the following, we will distinguish two kinds of minimality: a temporal one and an implicational one. There is a relationship between the two kinds of minimality. For transitive verbs like kain 'to eat', it can also be stated that the maximal result implies the minimal result, because the result that the mass of the apple is zero implies the result that there is a partial decrease in the mass of the apple. As a matter of consequence, the characterization of the function of the suffix /-an/ must be slightly modified: It requires that at least one minimal result in the above sense is determined. The table in (33) gives the new and more precise characterization of the voice affixes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voice suffix</th>
<th>the result brought about</th>
<th>subject choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/-in/</td>
<td>maximal result</td>
<td>the object d participating in the event that is assigned the maximum of the maximal results (and no s-minimal result)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/-an/</td>
<td>The set of non-s-minimal results $Q$, s.t. (i) $Q$ is w-minimal or (ii) $Q$ is implicational minimal</td>
<td>the object d participating in the event that is assigned the minimal result.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For /-an/, the participant denoted by the subject is the participant to which the w-minimal result is assigned. For (incremental) verb stems like kain, the w-minimal result is assigned to the argument denoting the thing that is eaten. For verb stems of sort activity like laba, the subject is again the object to which the w-minimal result is assigned, the thing to be washed. The difference between the two verb stems is that for the former, but not for the latter, a maximal result is determined. For that reason, the voice suffix /-in/ is admissible for kain, but not for laba. Transfer verbs determine a minimal result in the second sense, so that /-an/ is admissible for the corresponding stems like kula, too. The participant that is determined as the subject is the source from which something is taken, because it is assigned the minimal

---

4 The definition of implicational minimality is as follows: Let $M$ be the set of maximal results assigned to an event belonging to $P$. A maximal result $Q$ is minimal, if its truth at a state $s$ does not imply the truth of each result $Q'$ that is an element of $M$. 
result in the second sense. Point verbs like *katok* and achievement verbs like *patay* determine neither a w-minimal nor a minimal result in the second sense. Therefore, */-an/* is not admissible.

A partitive interpretation is possible if there are two results assigned to e that are not s-minimal such that e can bring about one without bringing about the other. This is the case for an event of type *kain* that determines for each of its elements both a w-minimal (part of the object is eaten) and a maximal result (the mass of the object eaten is zero). The condition is not satisfied for the other verb stems discussed in this paper. Activity verbs like *laba* determine only a w-minimal result, and the remaining event-types of sort transfer, point and achievement determine only results that only hold at the end-point of an event.

The characterization proposed here for the verb affixes can be extended to account for direction of motion verbs like *akyat* 'to rise' that can either be transitive or ditransitive. The relevant data discussed in the introduction in (2) and (3) are repeated here as (34) and (35).

34. Akyat-**in** mo ang kanya-ng kuwarto.
   go-up-GV Gen:you Nom Dat:he-LK room
   'Go up (upstairs) to his room.'

35. Akyat-**an** mo ang kanya-ng kuwarto ng mga libro.
   go-up-LV Gen:you Nom Dat:he-LK room Gen Pl book
   'Bring the books up (upstairs) to his room.'

It is perfectly compatible with the above given characterization of the voice affixes that suffixing */-in/* to the verb stem *akyat* yields the reading that a path has to be completely traversed. Our characterization in terms of the implication hierarchy can also explain why the suffix */-an/* determines the argument denoting the room and not the argument denoting the object carried as the subject of the sentence, if we assume that the ditransitive variant of *akyat* meaning 'to bring s.th. up to s.o.' resembles 'take'- and 'give'-verbs. However, our characterization does not provide an explanation of why suffixing */-in/* only yields the transitive form and suffixing */-an/* only the ditransitive form. Why is it not possible to form sentences like the following ones?

36. *Akyat-**an** mo ang stairways.
   go-up-LV Gen:you Nom stairways
   'Go up (upstairs) the stairways.'
This question as well as the questions about how the third non-actor suffix /-i/ is to be analyzed and distinguished from the two suffixes discussed here and how the theory introduced can be applied to static verbs has to be left to future research.
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5 The correct sentence is:

35. I-ayat mo sa kanya-ng kwarto ang mga libro.
   BV-go-up Gen-you Dat-he-LK room Nom Pl book
   "Bring the books up (upstairs) to his room."
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