Morphological and periphrastic evaluatives in Philippine languages

Ricardo Ma. Duran Nolasco
University of the Philippines-Diliman
rnolascoupdiliman@gmail.com, rmadnolasco@gmail.com

Abstract

This essay discusses two kinds of evaluative constructions in Philippine-type languages: morphological and periphrastic. Morphological evaluatives exhibit two patterns: an intransitive Type 1 pattern and a Type 2 transitive pattern. The Type 1 intransitive pattern is characterized by an absolutive evaluator (S) and an oblique stimulus (OBL). Its verb is based on an adjective root and occurs with or without the stem-forming affix *ka-* meaning lack of control. It is usually marked by the voice affix *-an* and on occasion by *-on ~ -en*. The Type 2 transitive pattern contains an ergative evaluator (A) and an absolutive stimulus (O). Its verb is usually based on a limited set of adjective roots. It is marked by a transitive *-on ~ -en* and may occur with a stem-forming affix meaning 'to put an x value.' Most Philippine languages included in this study exhibit Type 1 patterns and rarely Type 2. Type 1 formations frequently display modalities consistent with effortlessness, lack of control, and absence of intentionality. Type 2 patterns convey more intense, more conscious, and more purposive meanings. Some language communities do not appear to have morphological evaluatives. They accomplish this function periphrastically through simple descriptive clauses (with exclamative or emotive particles), complementation, and adjunction.

Keywords: *transitivity, modality, grammaticization, exaptation, mixed patterns*

1. Introduction

Evaluative constructions in Philippine languages are those that express the meaning "X considers/finds Y to be Z."[*] A close equivalent of this construction type in English is "to strike someone as something" as illustrated in "He didn't strike me as the jealous type." They have also been called "estimative" and "tropative" in other studies. According to Jacques (2013), the term "tropative" is "borrowed from Arabic linguistics, where it is applied to a particular verbal pattern in examples such as *ħasuna* 'be good' → *istaħsana* 'deem to be good'." Jacques may be talking here exclusively about morphological evaluatives. I have retained the term *evaluative* in this essay but the reader can mentally substitute it with *estimative* or *tropative*.

2. Types of evaluative constructions

Philippine evaluatives may be expressed in two ways: morphologically (through affixation) or periphrastically (through the use of separate words rather than through inflection and/or derivation). An example of a morphological evaluative in a Philippine language is given in (1),

---

[*] In writing this paper I profited from many helpful comments from Joel Manuel, Melchor Orpilla, Resty Cena, Tom Payne, and Myfel Paluga.

that of a periphrastic in (2). The first line represents the example in the working orthography except for the symbol (:), which indicates length; the second, division into morphemes; the third, a morpheme-by-morpheme annotation, and the fourth, the English translation.

(1) Tagalog morphological evaluative

    Nagandahan   ako   sa kanya.
     n-ka-ganda-han=ako[1]   sa=kanya.
     REAL-*no.control-beautiful*=1ABS 3OBL
     'I found her attractive.'

(2) Kankanaey periphrastic evaluative (Anna Cris Langaoan, speaker)

    Napintas   kanu si Maria,   kanan Pedro.[2]
    n-ka-pintas   kanu si=Maria,   kana=n=Pedro
    STAT-*have-beautiful* HRSY PERS.ABS=Maria   *said*=PERS.GEN=Pedro
    'Maria is reportedly pretty, said Pedro, or according to Pedro.'

       Morphological evaluatives in Philippine languages are of two types. The first type is an intransitive construction with the following features: (a) a verb, like *nagandahan* `found to be pretty', that represents the judgment or evaluation of a certain person, thing or event; (b) a referential phrase in the absolutive case representing the dual role of both evaluator (albeit a passive one) and patient like *ako* `I' in (1); (c) a referential phrase in the oblique case (like *sa kanya* `to him/her') that assumes the semantic role of stimulus or evaluee. The verbal predicate is made up of (a) an adjectival or stative root, like *ganda* `beauty' in Tagalog, serving as the semantic center; (b) an optional modal affix (e.g., *ka-*) contributing the meaning `lack of control' or `non-intentional' (but whose absence signifies the opposite); (c) a temporal affix, e.g., *n-* in (1); and (d) the transitive voice affix *-an.* Only adjective roots occur in this construction type, which provides proof that roots in Philippine languages are not pre-categorial as claimed by some linguists.[3] Examples of Type 1 evaluatives from other Philippine languages are given below.

(3) Meranaw Type 1 evaluative (Latifa Sor Ly, speaker)

    Kiyataidan   ako   rekanian
     <iy>-ka-taid-an=ako   rekanian
     <REAL>-*no.control-beautiful*-TR2 *(-an)*=1ABS   3OBL

---

[1] Many of the *na-* verbs are analyzed in the second tier as consisting of the *n-* realis (replacive) affix and the *ka* stem-forming affix, in which the *n-* replaces the *k-.*

[2] This example was elicited from Ms. Langaoan, a Kankanaey speaker from Buguias, Benguet province. She avers that a morphological evaluative akin to Tagalog or Ilokano is not available in Kankanaey. One reviewer expressed doubt that example (2) can qualify as an evaluative, and readily offers an alternative view that it is simply a clause with "an adjectival predicate, with a hearsay particle and a quote margin." I stand by my original position on this matter.

[3] Two other Tagalog constructions accept only adjectival stems. One is the similative (e.g., *Ganoon siya kalakas.* `He is that strong.'). The other is the comparative (e.g., *Kasinglakas niya si Juan* `He is as strong as Juan'.)

'I found her beautiful/attractive.'

(4) Mandaya Type 1 evaluative (Norma M. Gonos, speaker)

Kiyakal'layowan ak   ng pa:naw
<iy>-ka-ka-layo-an=ak   ng=pa:naw
<REAL>-CONT~*no.control-distant*-TR2 *(-an)*=1ABS GEN=*trip*
 'I find the trip long and tiring.'

(5) Romblomanon Type 1 evaluative (Manilyn Roni, speaker)

Nanami:tan ako   sa i:ya   nga lu:to'
n-ka-nami:t-an=ako   sa=i:ya   nga lu:to'
REAL-*no.control-tasteful*-TR2=1ABS OBL=3PREP.GEN LKR *cooking*
'I found her cooking agreeable/pleasantly tasteful.'

(6) Oasnen Type 1 evaluative (Lynn Reoveros Prilles, speaker)

Nasiraman ako   sa luto'
n-ka-siram-an=ako   sa=luto'
REAL-*no.control-tasteful*-TR2=1ABS OBL=*cooking*
'I found (her) cooking delicious.'

   Type 1 evaluative verbs may also take bare roots as stems. Below are some examples of evaluatives with and without the *ka-* stem-forming affix.

(7) Cebuano/Bisaya Type 1 *ka-* based and root-based evaluatives (Myfel Paluga, speaker)

 a. Nagwapa:han ko   (ka)ni:ya.
   n-ka-gwapa-han=ko   (ka)ni:ya
   REAL-*no.control-good.looking*=TR2=1ABS 3OBL
   'She impressed me as good looking/pretty.' 'I find her good looking/pretty.'
   (The judgment came naturally, effortlessly.)

 b. Gigwapa:han ko   (ka)ni:ya
   gi-gwapa-han=ko   (ka)ni:ya
   REAL-*good.looking*-TR2=1ABS 3OBL
   'I realized that she was indeed good looking/pretty.'

(8) Rinconada Bicol Type 1 *ka-* based and root-based evaluatives (Vince Balilla, speaker)

 a. Nasiraman ako   ku luto'
   n-ka-siram-an=ako   ku=luto'
   REAL-*no.control-delicious*-TR2=1ABS OBL-*cooking/cooked.item*
   'I found the food agreeable/delicious.'

b. Siniraman   ako   ku luto'
    \<in\>-siram-an=ako   ku=luto'
    \<REAL\>-*delicious*-TR2=1ABS   OBL=*cooking/cooked.item*
    'I was overwhelmed by the deliciousness of the food.'

(9) Surigaonon Type 1 *ka-* based and root-based evaluatives (Francis Tom Paredes, speaker)

a. Nalajuan   ako   sa biyahe
    n-ka-laju-an=ako   sa=biyahe
    REAL-*no.control-far*-TR2=1ABS   OBL=*trip*
    'I found the trip rather long.'

b. Taglajuan   ako   sa biyahe.
    tag-laju'-an=ako   sa=biyahe
    REAL-*far*-TR2=1ABS   OBL=*trip*
    'I found the trip very long and very challenging.'

(10) Miraya Type 1 *ka-* based and root-based evaluatives (Reashiela Kahn, speaker)

a. Nabataan   ako   sa orig
    n-ka-bata'-an=ako   sa=orig
    REAL-*no.control-stink*-TR2=1ABS   OBL=*pig*
    'I found the pig rather smelly/stinky.'

b. Bi:bataan   ako   sa orig
    bi:~bata'an=ako   sa=orig.
    REAL-*stink*-TR2=1ABS   OBL=*pig*
    'I was greatly affected by the pig's foul smell.'

(11) Asi-Bantoanon Type 1 root-based -*an and* -*on* evaluatives (Abner Faminiano, speaker)

a. Agandahan   ka   sa i:da
    a-ganda-han=ka   sa=i:da
    FUT-*beauty*-TR2 (-*an*)=2ABS 3OBL
    'You will find her attractive.'

b. Agandahon   ka   sa i:da
    a-ganda-hon=ka   sa=i:da
    FUT-*beauty*-TR1(-*on*)=2ABS 3OBL
    'You will be astonished by her beauty.'

An examination of the above pairs reveals that root-based forms convey modal meanings of increased intensity, controllability, effortfulness, and a higher degree of affectedness compared to *ka-* based evaluatives. The Asi-Bantoanon examples in (11) are exceptional in that both the -*on* and -*an* affixes are allowed to occur in the evaluative verb. Here, it is the -*on* affix that signals

intentionality and intensity while it is the *-an* verb that expresses unintentional action and happenstance.

3. Type 2 evaluatives

The second type of evaluative is an ergative transitive construction, as exemplified in Ilocano:

(12) Ilocano Type 2 evaluative (Joel Manuel, speaker)

Tinagipintasko   isu:na
<in>-tagi-pintas-0=ko   isu:na
<REAL>-*put.value-beauty*-TR1*(-en)*=1ERG   3ABS
'I consider/find her (to be) attractive.'

(13) Ilocano Type 2 evaluative (Joel Manuel, speaker)

Tinagibassitna   ti naarami:dak.
<in>-tagi-bassit-0=na   ti=n-ka-arami:d-an-k(o)
<REAL>-*put.value-little*-TR1=3ERG   ABS=REAL-*do*-TR2-1GEN
'He belittled what I had accomplished.'

(14) Ilocano Type 2 evaluative (Joel Manuel, speaker)

Tinagikua:na   ti la:pisko.
<in>-tagi-kua:-0=na   ti=la:pis=ko
<REAL>-*put.value-property*-TR1=3ERG   ABS=*pencil*=1GEN
'He appropriated my pencil for himself.'

Each of the examples in (12), (13), and (14) contain (a) an evaluator referent in the genitive or ergative case, e.g., *–na* `he/she', *-ko* `I'; (b) a stimulus or evaluee referent in the absolutive case (e.g., *isu:na* `he/she', *ti naarami:dak* `what I did,' *ti la:pisko* `my pencil'); and (c) a verb made up of (i.) a stative root (e.g., *bassit* `small'), (ii.) a modal affix *tagi* `put a value to', (iii.) a temporal affix, e.g., *-in-* `real, past,' and (iv.) the *-en* (patient) voice affix. The neutral form of *tinagipintas* is *tagipinta:sen.* The *-en* gets zeroed when the verb inflects for the perfective realis form.

Rubino (2000) in his Ilocano Dictionary and Grammar classifies *tagi-* as a prefix "used to form substantives indicating a close relationship with the entity denoted by the root" (p. 587). There is also an entry *tagi-…-en* in the dictionary, which is defined as "(an) affix used with adjectival roots meaning: to consider something to be the quality expressed by the root" (p. 588). It is unclear to me whether word classes other than adjectives can be used in this construction.

There is also a transitive construction in Tagalog that can qualify as a Type 2 evaluative. It is derived from attaching the voice affix *-in* to a small set of quality adjectives like *maliit* `small,' *masama'* `bad', *mabuti* `kind', *matamis* `sweet,' and *magaling* `good.` The combination produces neutral and real forms such as *maliitin/minaliit* `belittle(d),' *masamain/minasama'* `consider(ed) as bad,' *mabuti:hin/minabu:ti* `consider(ed) as good', *matamisin/minatamis* `to prefer/to favor', and *magalingin/minagaling* `accept(ed) as good.' Only a few adjectives or stative roots occur in

this Tagalog construction.[4] As in Ilokano, the Tagalog Type 2 evaluative contains an evaluator in the genitive case. The stimulus comes in the form of an absolute nominal (15) or a complement clause (16). Examples are given below:

(15) Tagalog Type 2 evaluatives

    Minasama'=niya   ang a:king   pagtu:long.
    <in>-masama'-0=niya   ang=a:kin=ng   pag-tu:long
    <REAL>-*bad*-TR1(-*in*)=3GEN   ABS=PREP.1GEN=LKR   NOM-*help*
    'He resented my assistance.'

(16) Tagalog Type 2 evaluatives

    Ma:matamisin ko   pang   mamatay   kaysa magtaksil.[5]
    ma-matamis-in=ko   pa=ng   m-(k)a-matay   kaysa m-(p)ag-taksil
    FUT-*sweet*-TR1=1GEN PRT=LKR NEUT-*no.control-die* OBL   NEUT-STEM-*traitor*
    'I would rather die than turn traitor.'

     It is possible for a Philippine language to have Type 1 and Type 2 evaluatives, as evidenced in Ilocano.

(17) Ilocano Type 1 intransitive evaluative with -*an* (Joel Manuel, speaker)

    Nabassitanak   iti intedda.
    n-ka-bassit-an=ak   iti=<n>-ited-0=da
    REAL-*no.control-small*-TR2=1ABS   OBL=<REAL>-*give*-(TR1)=3PL.GEN
    'The amount they gave me (to my mind) was unexpectedly small.'

(18) Ilocano Type 2 evaluative with -*en* (Joel Manuel, speaker)

    Tinagibassitko   ti intedna.
    <in>-tagi-bassit-0=ko   ti=<n>-ited-0=da
    <REAL>-*to.value-small*-TR1(-en)=1GEN ABS=<REAL>-*give*-(TR1)=3PL.GEN
    'I regard the amount they gave me as really small.'

---

[4] A handful of Tagalog adjectival forms, like *malaki* `big' and *mataas* `high' take both the *mag-* intransitive affix and *i-* transitive affix to form verbs with specialized meanings (e.g., *magmalaki/ipagmalaki* `to take pride in something', and *magmataas/ipagmataas* `to act proudly/haughtily (over something).' This study does not consider them to be evaluatives.

[5] There is a parallel construction in Ilokano involving the root *sam-it* `sweet,' as shown in this example given by Mr. Joel Manuel and Mr. Melchor Orpilla:

    sam-itek   ti matay   para kenka
    sam'it-en-ko   ti matay   para ken-ka
    sweet-TR1-1GEN   ABS-*to die*   *for*=2OBL
    'I consider it an honor to die for you.'

4. Factors motivating speaker's choice of Type 1 and Type 2 evaluatives

What factors motivate the choice between Type 1 and Type 2 constructions? The answer is Modality. Transitives are associated with activities that are depicted as effortful, intentional, deliberate and controlled. The opposites of these qualities are associated with intransitives. As the reader may have realized, these are the same semantic factors that trigger choice between the use of *ka-* stems and plain roots in Type 1 constructions. This may partly explain why certain languages do not have Type 2 evaluatives.

It may be timely at this point to clarify how transitivity is defined in this paper. Case marking in Philippine languages is ergative-absolutive. The single core argument (S) of an intransitive clause is marked similarly as the more patientive argument (O) of the transitive, with the more agentive argument (A) differently marked. Basically, there are three transitive voice affixes in Philippine languages, namely, (i) *-in ~ -en ~-on*, (ii.) *-an* and (iii.) *i-*. Transitive clauses typically have an ergative/genitive agent (A) and an affected entity in the absolutive (O). The absolutive O is coindexed to one of the three transitive voice affixes. Type 2 evaluatives follow this transitive pattern and are therefore classified as transitive.

By contrast, intransitive constructions have one absolutive core argument (S) that can be accompanied by non-core elements. If the predicate is a verb, the S is correlated to what is called an `actor focus' verb (e.g., Tagalog *-um-* forms, Ilocano *–um-/-imm-* forms and Binisaya *mu-/ni-* forms.) I do not subscribe however to the analysis that these affixes mark voice. I believe that they are pure temporal markers, although I will not pursue this point any further. I consider Type 1 evaluatives as intransitive because of the presence of an absolutive evaluator and an oblique stimulus or evaluee. Type 1 constructions as in all intransitives cannot have an ergative or genitive agent.

Actually, the Type 1 examples above display a mixed pattern. Each verb is marked by a transitive affix (*-an*) and yet only one core argument (S) accompanies it. There is also a necessary oblique stimulus. In short, I make the claim that these verb forms are formally transitive, but its argument structure is intransitive. They exhibit both transitive and intransitive properties. I treat this as an instance of exaptation in which a transitive affix has been co-opted or recruited for this special function. Exaptation is a term proposed by Stephen Jay Gould and Elizabeth Vrba (1982) to describe a biological trait that has been co-opted for a use other than the one for which it was naturally built for. This process seems to apply squarely to the formation of morphological evaluatives where speakers combine an existing transitive verb with intransitive syntax instead of inventing new structures.

5. An intransitive *–an* voice affix?

In this section, we attempt to prove that the affix *-an* in a morphological evaluative is the same *-an* that is found in ordinary transitive constructions. Our Waray and Asi-Bantoanan data support this conclusion. For instance, the transitive *-an* affix in these two languages regularly changes into its allomorph *-i* in imperative settings, as seen in (19) and (21). The same permutation occurs in the Waray evaluative when it is negated (19b). This also happens in Bantoanon-Asi when its oblique stimulus is pre-posed (21b). These facts reinforce my claim that the *-an* affix in evaluatives is indeed identical to the *-an* in ordinary transitives.

(19) Waray –*an/-i* transitive imperative constructions (Voltaire Oyzon, speaker)

    a) Harukan mo   hiya
        haruk-an=mo   hiya
        kiss-TR2=2ERG   3ABS
        'You kiss him/her.'

    b) Haruki   hiya
        haruk-i=0   hiya
        kiss-IMP.TR2=(2ERG) 3ABS
        'Kiss him/her.'

(20) Waray –*an/-i* intransitive evaluative (Voltaire Oyzon, speaker)

    a) Nahusa:y*an*   ako   ha iya.
        n-ka-hu:say-an=ako   ha-i:ya
        REAL-*no.control-beauty*=TR2=1ABS 3OBL
        'I find/found her attractive.'

    b) Waray ako   kahusa:yi   ha i:ya.
        waray=ako ka-hu:say-i   ha=i:ya
        NEG=1ABS *no.control-beauty*-TR2 3OBL
        'I didn't find her attractive.'

(21) Asi-Bantoanon transitive –*an/-i* constructions (Abner Faminiano, speaker)

    a) Atupihan=mo   si:da
        a-tupi-(h)an=mo   si:da
        FUT-*cut.hair*-TR2=2ERG   3ABS
        'You will give him/her a haircut.'

    b) Tupihi   si:da
        tupi=(h)i=0   si:da
        cut.hair-TR2=(2ERG)   3ABS
        'Give him/her a haircut.' (imperative)

(22) Asi-Bantoanon –*an/-i* intransitive evaluatives (Abner Faminiano, speaker)

    a) Nagandahan=ako   sa=i:da
        n-ka-ganda-han=ako   sa=i:da
        REAL-*no.control-beauty*=TR2=1ABS 3OBL
        'I find/found her attractive.'

b) Sa ida   ako   nagandahi
   sa=ida ako   n-ka-ganda-hi
   3OBL   1ABS REAL-*no.control-beauty*-TR2
   'It's her that I found attractive'

Surigaonon also furnishes evidence on the dual nature of morphological evaluatives. Example (9) is repeated here and renumbered as (23). Observe that the realis perfective form of the root-based evaluative (23b) is marked by *tag-*, the same perfective form of the transitive *-an* (24) and transitive *-on* (25) forms in that language.

(23) Surigaonon Type 1 *ka-* based and root-based evaluatives (Francis Tom Paredes, speaker)

    a.   Nalajuan   ako   sa biyahe
         n-ka-laju-an=ako   sa=biyahe
        REAL-*no.control-far*-TR2=1ABS   OBL=*trip*
        'I found the trip rather long.'

    b.   Taglajuan   ako   sa biyahe.
        tag-laju'-an=ako   sa=biyahe
        REAL-*far*-TR2=1ABS   OBL=*trip*
        'I found the trip very long and very challenging.'

(24) Surigaonon transitive *-an* construction (Francis Tom Paredes, speaker)

    Taglajuan ko   sija.
    tag-laju-an=ko   sija
    REAL-*far*-TR2=1ERG   3ABS
    'I kept my distance from him/her.'

(25) Surigaonon transitive *-on* construction (Francis Tom Paredes, speaker)

    Tagpatay   ko   sija.
    tag-patay-0=ko   sija
    REAL-*kill*-TR1=1ERG   3ABS
    'I killed him'

6. A more nuanced discussion on evaluative constructions

An evaluative construction typically means that X considers/finds Y to be Z, where X is the evaluator, Y the stimulus, and Z as the evaluation itself. This construction can be conceived as containing two conceptual propositions: first, that a particular entity (Y) is construed as having a particular attribute or property (Z), and second, that this construal is being made by an overt evaluator (X). As indicated above, Type 1 evaluative constructions encode the X (evaluator) in the absolutive case and the Y (stimulus or evaluee) in the oblique case. Semantically, a Type 1 morphological evaluative means that X simultaneously acts as the source of the (evaluative) action and as the most affected entity. The term "most affected entity" connotes that there may be other

referents in the clause that can be said to undergo the effects of a particular activity or state. In a Type 1 intransitive evaluative, that other undergoer is the stimulus (Y). The status of most affected entity however belongs to X because it is the principal locus of the effects of the action and is formally encoded in the absolutive case. The oblique marking of the stimulus prevents it from being interpreted as the main recipient of the effects of the evaluative action.

The coding assignment in a Type 2 evaluative is completely different. X (evaluator) is assigned the ergative case while Y (stimulus) receives the absolutive case. Here it is the Y that occupies the status of most affected entity by virtue of its absolutive marking. Compared to the evaluator in Type 1 evaluatives, the evaluator (X) in Type 2 forms is portrayed as a more active participant instead of being a passive recipient of a qualitative impression of the stimulus (Y). Here, the source of the action (the evaluator) becomes formally distinct and separate from the most affected entity (stimulus). In both types, the evaluation is codified in the verb with the *–en* or *–an* voice affix. The voice affix functions to co-index and identify the absolutive argument as the most affected entity.

Past studies on evaluatives used a traditional grammar framework and accounted for them in terms of subject and topic, active and passive. John Wolff (1966) describes them as a "local passive", which means that the subject is "indirectly affected by the verb" (p. 307) and "the subject considers the goal to have the quality of the adjective" (p. 308). Schachter and Otanes (1972) categorized them as pseudo-transitive clauses with an obligatory adjunct and distinguished them from simple transitives. Mintz and Britanico (1985) believe that the agent here is marked as "the locus or experiencer of particular adjectival qualities" (p. 381).

Tom Payne and Voltaire Oyzon (2022) state that morphological evaluatives in Waray and possibly in other Philippine languages are non-canonical applicatives. According to them, said clauses may be considered "(somewhat) transitive" because they "involve a starting point (the evaluee) and an endpoint (the evaluator) in the absolutive case" (p. 358). They add that "a possible functional motivation for the non-ergative expression of the evaluee is that this participant is not agentive" and that "it is the locus, or starting point of the property described by the root, but does not actively control the situation" (p. 358).

I invoke the same line of reasoning in classifying this construction type as intransitive. To me, a prototypical intransitive in Philippine type languages is one where the source of the action (the argument in whose absence the activity would not have taken place) is also the most affected entity (the argument that primarily undergoes the effects of the activity). Most earlier studies of intransitive clauses like *Tumakbo ang bata* `The child ran' focus on the fact that the child is the doer of the action. These studies conveniently ignore the crucial idea that by running, the child also affects itself (i.e., it undergoes the running state.) It is the depiction of the child as having undergone the effects of walking that licenses its absolutive marking. In Philippine languages, the basis for absolutive marking in both intransitive and transitive constructions is patient or undergoer primacy, not subject or agent primacy. Unlike in English where the starting point relation is primary, it is the most affected entity status that constitutes the primary relation in Philippine languages (See Cena, 1977).

7. Disambiguating homophonous forms

Certain evaluative verbs may be mistaken for non-evaluatives, and vice-versa, because of their homophonous morphological shape. For example, the word *nasarapan* in Tagalog can be interpreted as an evaluative (`to be overcome by a sentiment that something is tastefully pleasant')

or non-evaluative (`to be able or happen to make something tastefully pleasant'). These two verbs can be distinguished from each other by looking at the case assignment of its constituents, as seen below. While both constructions contain the transitive affix –*an,* it is only in the transitive clause in (27) where we have a responsible agent in the ergative and a completely affected patient in the absolutive. It is noteworthy that the *ka-* affix in the evaluative (26) signifies lack of control while the *ka-* affix in the transitive construction means ability or happenstance.

(26) Tagalog Type 1 intransitive evaluative

    Nasarapan   ako   sa lu:to niya.
    n-ka-sarap-an=ako   sa=lu:to=niya.
    REAL-*no.control-delicious*-TR2=1ABS   OBL=*cooking*=3GEN
    'I found her cooking delicious.' (or I was affected by her cooking in a delicious way.'

(27) Tagalog abilitative transitive construction

    Nasarapan   ko   ang lu:to ko.
    n-ka-sarap-an=ko   ang=lu:to=ko.
    REAL-ABIL-*delicious*-TR2=1ERG   ABS=cooking=1GEN
    'I was able to make my cooking more delicious.'

       Accentual contrast is another means for disambiguating the meanings of homophonous forms, as exemplified in the South Sorsogon examples below. In (28), *nahuhugakan* is an evaluative verb which means `to consider as lazy.' By contrast, *nahuhuga:kan* in (29) and *ginhuhuga:kan* in (30) are both experiencer verbs meaning `to feel lazy'. Notice that the verb in (28) has a short second to the last syllable, while the verbs in both (29) and (30) have long penults.[6]

(28) South Sorsogon Type 1 intransitive evaluative (Jah-nissi S. Galarosa, speaker)

    Nahuhugakan   ako   sa kanya.
    n-ka-hu-hugak=an=ako   sa=kanya
    REAL-*no.control-lazy*=TR2=1ABS   3OBL
    'I found him (to be) lazy.'

(29) South Sorsogon experiencer verb (intransitive, less intense) (Jah-nissi S. Galarosa, speaker)

    Nahuhuga:kan   ako   sa pag-a:dal.
    n-ka-hu-hugak-an=ako   sa=pag-a:dal.
    REAL-*no.control*-CONT-*lazy*-TR2 =1ABS OBL=NOM-*study*.
    'I am feeling somewhat lazy in my studies.'

---

[6] Schachter and Otanes (1972) differentiate evaluative verbs from "experience" verbs. For example, two senses can be extracted from the verbs *maini:tan* and *malamigan* in *Naiinitan/nalalamigan ako sa kuwarto mo*. The first sense is evaluative, meaning `Based on my standards, I would consider your room (the evaluee) hot/cold.' The second sense is experiential, meaning `I feel hot/cold whenever I am in your room.' Schachter and Otanes classifies the evaluative verb as a pseudo-transitive verb with an obligatory adjunct and the experience verb as a simple intransitive.

(30) South Sorsogon experiencer verb (intransitive, more intense) (Jah-nissi S. Galarosa, speaker)

Ginhuhuga:kan   ako   sa pag-a:dal
gin-hu-hugak-an=ako   sa=pag-a:dal
REAL-CONT-*lazy*-TR2=1ABS   OBL=NOM=*study*
'I feel lazy to a high degree in my studies.'

8. Evaluatives vs. adversatives

Morphological evaluatives bear an uncanny resemblance in structure to what has been referred to as adversatives. Both evaluative and adversative clauses can be said to undergo a process of sentence organization by which a peripheral or new argument is promoted to core status. Of course, it is possible for a speaker to simply state that a certain attribute is predicated on a particular participant and leave it at that (e.g., *Maria is intelligent*). Many languages, however, do not stop here. From this predication (*Maria is intelligent*), speakers, if their language allows it, can create a new construction by overtly mentioning the source of said predication (e.g., *I find Maria intelligent*). An adversative construction is produced in the same way. Consider the following examples of patientive and adversative constructions in Tagalog. Note how the possessor arguments in (31) and (33), namely, *niya* `his/her' and *nila* `their', are promoted to absolutive core status in (32) and (34). Meanwhile, the possessed items (e.g., *aso* `dog', *ba:hay* `house') in the original clauses are demoted to oblique status. What is noteworthy is that both the possessor and possessee roles are retained by the original arguments despite the change in formal markings. The above account lends strong credence to Payne and Oyzon's analysis of evaluatives and adversatives as applicative constructions.

(31) Tagalog patientive intransitive verb

Namatay   ang a:so niya.
n-ka-matay   ang=a:so=niya.
REAL-*no.control-die*   ABS=*dog*=3GEN
'is/her dog died.'

(32) Tagalog adversative intransitive verb

Namatayan   siya   ng aso.
n-ka-matay-an=siya   ng a:so.
REAL-*no.control-die*-TR2=3ABS GEN=*dog*
'He was adversely affected by his dog's death.'

(33) Tagalog patientive intransitive verb

Nasu:nog   ang bahay nila.
n-ka-sunog   ang=bahay=nila
REAL-*no.control-fire*   ABS=*house*=3PL.GEN
'Their house burned down.

(34) Tagalog adversative intransitive verb

    Nasunugan   sila   ng bahay.
    n-ka-sunog-an=sila   ng=ba:hay
    REAL-*no.control-fire*-TR2=3PL.ABS   GEN=*house*
    'They were adversely affected by the burning of their house.'

9. Philippine languages with no morphological evaluatives

Some Philippine languages show little evidence of a grammaticized evaluative. Many attempts at eliciting forms that follow the Tagalog pattern have been met with utter rejection or polite refusal from speakers. They claim that evaluatives in their languages are expressible only periphrastically. They reason out that "more direct means" in their language are available for the evaluative function. Some of these "more direct means" are given below.

  (a) A simple clause with a predicative adjective and introduced by an exclamative or emotive particle. The speaker may precede his/her compliment or comment with an emotive expression like *aye* or *numan*.

(35) I-besao periphrastic evaluative with emotive particle (Bernice See, speaker)

    Ayeee pay   di amay mo!
    Aye=pay   di=amay=mo
    word.of.admiration   ABS=*beauty*=2GEN
    'How beautiful you are!'

(36) Kankanaey periphrastic evaluative with emotive particle (Anna Cris Langaoan, speaker)

    Ayeee, naimas   din inu:tom   ya
    aye, n-ka-imas   din=<in>-uto=m=PRT
    word. of.compliment   3ABS=<REAL>-*cook*-0=2GEN=PRT
    'Wow, your cooking is really superb.'

(37) Ibaloi periphrastic evaluative with expressive particle (Shakira Herman, speaker)

    Mamapteng ngay numan   si Maria.
    ma-mapteng=ngay=numan   si=Maria
    STAT-*pretty*=PRT=PRT.*sincere*   PERS.ABS=*Maria*
    'Maria is indeed pretty.'

  (b) complementation which involves the union of a matrix clause referencing the evaluator and a complement clause indicating his/her evaluation. In (38), the matrix clause is *kunada* `they said' while in (39), it is *laylaydena* `she likes x.' The complement in (38) is a full clause *napintas kanu si Maria.* `Maria is reportedly beautiful,' while in (39) it is a nominalized clause *di panag-ut-utok* `my cooking.'

(38) Kankanaey complementation expressing evaluation (Anna Cris Langaoan, speaker)

Kuna:da,	napintas kanu	si Maria.
kuna=da	na-pintas=kanu	si Maria.
say=3PL.GEN	STAT-*beauty*=HRSY	PERS.ABS=*Maria*

'They say that Maria is reportedly beautiful.'

(39) Kankanaey complementation with a nominalized clause (Anna Cris Langaoan, speaker)

Laylayde:na	(kanu)	di panag-ut-u:tok
Lay-layad-en=na	(kanu)	di=panag-ut-uto=ko
CONT-*like*-TR1=3GEN	(HRSY)	ABS=NOM-RED-*cook*=1GEN

'She likes my cooking.'

(c) adjunction where the predicate adjective is accompanied by an adjunct phrase pointing to the person making the evaluation (40). A reportive particle (*kanu*) is inserted for good measure to signify that the statement came from a source other than the speaker;

(40) Kankanaey adjunction (Anna Cris Langaoan, speaker)

Napintas kanu	si Maria	si pangilada
na-pintas=kanu	si=Maria,	si pangila=da
STATE-*beauty*=HRSY	PERS.ABS=*Maria*	OBL=*eyes*=3PL.GEN

'Maria is pretty in the eyes of Pedro.'

10. The Pangasinan evaluative

Pangasinan has a special device for converting a periphrastic evaluative into a grammatical one. It is clear that this language has a Type 1 evaluative as in (41). It also has a periphrastic evaluative as seen in (42). What is exceptional is that Pangasinan speakers are allowed by their grammar to delete the 1st person evaluator adjunct in (42) and attach a corresponding evaluator clitic *ko* `I, me' to the predicate *malimgas* to form (43). To my knowledge, this strategy has not been found in any other Philippine language. The new construction (43) now bears the trappings of a transitive clause considering that the oblique evaluator is now encoded in the genitive. Mr. Melchor Orpilla agrees that the evaluation made in (43) is more forceful and resolute compared to (40) and (41).

(41) Pangasinan Type 1 evaluative (Melchor Orpilla, speaker)

Alimgasan ak	ed sikato
a-limgas-an=ak	ed=sikato
REAL.HAP-*attractive*-TR2=1ABS	OBL=3ABS

'I found her attractive.'

(42) Pangasinan periphrastic evaluative (Melchor Orpilla, speaker)

Malimgas	si Maria	para ed say siyak
m-ka-limgas	si=Maria	para=ed=say=siyak
STAT- EXIST-*attractive*	PER.ABS=*Maria*	*for*=OBL=ABS=1ABS

'Maria is beautiful in my opinion.'

(43) Pangasinan periphrastic evaluative after adjunct deletion (Melchor Orpilla, speaker)

Malimgas ko'y	Maria ~~para ed say siak~~.
m-ka-limgas=ko=y	Maria (*si* becomes *i-/-y* following a vowel)
STAT-EXIST-*attractive*=1GEN	PER.ABS=Maria

'Maria is beautiful, as far as I'm concerned.'

11. Concluding thoughts

In summary, the evaluative function in Philippine languages can be expressed morphologically or periphrastically. Morphological evaluatives exhibit two patterns: a) an intransitive Type 1 template characterized by an absolutive evaluator (S) and an oblique stimulus (OBL); and b) a transitive Type 2 pattern whose arguments consist of an ergative evaluator (A) and an absolutive stimulus (O). Most Philippine languages exhibit Type 1 patterns and rarely Type 2. Type 1 constructions usually display modalities consistent with effortlessness, lack of control and absence of intentionality, although the use of root-based forms instead of *ka-* stems can somewhat neutralize such modalities. Type 2 patterns express more intense, more conscious and more purposive action. Some language communities only have periphrastic or lexical evaluatives. They accomplish this function through complementation, adjunction, and adjectival predication preceded by an exclamative or emotive particle. Morphological evaluatives are applicative clauses where a peripheral or new argument (the evaluator) is promoted to core status.

It is natural for speakers of any living language to develop linguistic structures for the expression of ideas that are important to their culture. A language that relies on purely lexical means to express the evaluative function suffers no communicative or cognitive disadvantage compared to those that have grammaticized the same function in their morphology. Speakers can even borrow linguistic features from their neighbors if they find it efficient to do so. As pointed out by Mithun (1991), "Understanding the processes of grammaticization involves not only discovering which categories tend to be grammaticized in languages, but also why these are not grammaticized in every language" (p. 159).[7] The examples in this study are not exhaustive. Doubtless, a more in depth investigation will lead us to the discovery of newer morpho-syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic features and properties of this construction.

---

[7] One likely reason as to why the evaluative function has not been grammaticized in some speech varieties is the current shape of their grammars. For instance, Rhodessa Galao, an Ibaloi speaker, tried very hard to find a natural equivalent of "Maria found my cooking delicious" in their language. At first, she came up with (?)*Nay-amisan si Maria nodta indutok*, but changed her mind, because this verb is usually found in cases where the absolutive plays the role of pure involuntary experiencer as instantiated in "*Nay-amisan ni u:gip si Maria*," `Maria slept soundly/Maria had a good night sleep.' Here Maria has no influence over the quality of her sleep and no evaluator role for her can be inferred. "*A:mis*" in Ibaloi means good.

References

Cena, R. M. (1977). *Patient primacy in Tagalog*. Paper read at the Linguistic Society of America Winter Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.

Gould, S. J., & Vrba, E. 1982. Exaptation—a missing term in the science of form. *Paleobiology, 8*(1), 4–15

Jacques, G. (2013). Applicative and tropative derivations in Japhug Rgyalrong. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area, 36*(2), 1-13.

Mintz, M. W., & del Rosario Britanico, J. (1985). *Bikol-English dictionary*. New Day Publishers.

Mithun, M. (1991). The role of motivation in the emergence of grammatical categories: The grammaticization of subjects. In E. Traugott, & B. Heine (Eds.), *Approaches to grammaticalization*, Vol II (pp. 159-184). John Benjamins.

Payne, T. E., & Oyzon, V Q. (2022). Canonical and non-canonical applicatives in Waray. In S. Pacchiarotti, F. Zuniga (Eds.), *Applicative morphology: Neglected syntactic and non-syntactic functions* (*Trends in linguistic studies and monographs 373*). De Gruyter.

Rubino, C. 2000. *Ilocano grammar and dictionary*. University of Hawaii Press.

Schachter, P., & Otanes, F. 1972. *Tagalog reference grammar*. University of California Press.

Shibatani, M. (Ed.). (1988). *Passive and voice (Typological studies in language 16)*. John Benjamins.

Wolff, J. U. (1966). *Beginning Cebuano, parts one and two*. Yale University Press.

Symbols and abbreviations used

-	morpheme boundary	LKR	linker
~	morpheme variant	NEG	negation
< >	infix	NEUT	neutral aspect
=	clitic boundary	NOM	nominalization
1	first person	O	the more patientive argument of a transitive clause
2	second person		
3	third person	OBL	oblique
A	the more agentive argument of a transitive clause	PERS	personal
		PL	plural
ABIL	abilitative	PREP	preposed
ABS	absolutive case	PRT	particle
CONT	continuing aspect	REAL	realis
ERG	ergative case	RED	reduplication
EXIST	existential	S	the single core argument of an intransitive clause
FUT	future		
GEN	genitive case	SG	singular
HAP	happenstance	STAT	stative/adjectival affix
HRSY	heresay	STEM	stem forming affix
IMP	imperative	TR1	transitive affix *-in* ~ *-en* ~ *-on*
		TR2	transitive affix *-an*