REMARKS ON TRANSPARENT ADVERBS

Daria Protopopescu

Abstract. The paper explores the contrast arising between subject/object oriented depictives and manner adverbs. We adopt Geuder's (2004) label of "transparent" adverbs and embark upon a comparison between this particular class and manner adverbs in English and Romanian, with a look at depictive constructions as well. The problem discussed here is the ambiguity arising in Romanian where most such adverbs seem to overlap their corresponding adjectival forms. Tests will show where they have to be adjoined and the possible readings which they are attached.

1. Preliminaries

The current paper discusses the difference between two almost minimal pairs of sentences in English and Romanian where there arises a contrast between VP-adjoined adjectives (the so-called depictives) and adverbial forms.

(1) a. John$_i$ left Mary **sad**$_i$. subject depictive
b. John left Mary$_j$ **sad**$_j$. object depictive
c. John$_i$ left Mary$_k$ **sadly**$_{i/*k}$.

In example (1a) *sad* is a subject depictive, and the sentence has the reading where John was sad while leaving Mary. In example (1b) *sad* is an object depictive and the sentence has the reading where Mary was sad while being left by John.

Geuder (2004) showed that for German (a language with no adverbial morphology) it is difficult to tell the two forms of adjuncts apart. He suggests that the two types of adjuncts are even more closely related to each other than previously thought due to the existence of what he calls a class of "transparent" adverbs. He distinguishes them from manner adverbs insofar as these adverbs share with depictives the property of denoting states and predicating of an individual.

For Romanian, the distinction is not so easy to make out since, like in German, there is little adverbial morphology. Most Romanian adverbs are derived from the masculine singular form of the corresponding adjective; therefore, the difference can be clearly captured in case of plural or feminine contexts.

(2) a. Copiii merg **liniştiţi** la şcoală.
children-THE walk calm-ADJ masc.pl. to school
'The children walk to school calmly.'
b. Copiii merg **liniştit** la şcoală.
children-THE walk calm-ADV to school
'The children walk to school calmly.'

As can be seen in example (2a) there is agreement with the subject. Therefore, the interpretation of the sentence is that the children were calm as they were walking to school, whereas in the (2b) example there is no agreement, *liniştit* 'calmly' clearly being a manner adverb and the interpretation is that the event of walking to school is performed in a calm manner. Such pairs of examples frequently arise in Romanian. This is what has probably triggered the ungrammatical use of adverbs with agreement features by some speakers in case adverbs appear as modifying other adjectives (as noticed by Forăscu 2002):

BDD-A9762 © 2007 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:09:44 UTC)

(3) a. *Copii **noi** născuți
children new-masc. pl. born-masc. pl.
'Newly born children'
b. Copii **nou** născuți
children new-masc. pl. born-masc. pl.
'Newly born children'
c. *Musafiri **proaspeți** sosiți
guests fresh-masc. pl. arrived-masc.pl.
'Newly arrived guests'
d. Musafiri **proaspăt** sosiți
guests fresh-masc. pl. arrived-masc.pl.
'Newly arrived guests'

The distinction between the examples in (1) can be rendered as follows (Geuder 2004: 132):

(4) a. leave Mary sad
leave (e,x, Mary) & sad (x) (depictive)
b. leave Mary sadly
leave (e, x, Mary) & sad (e) (adverb)

The representation of the adverb in (4b) can be taken to be the correct one for a manner adverb. However, manner adverbs are not the only case under consideration for an analysis of a distinction between depictives and adverbs. Geuder (2000) is the first to label a rarely recognized class in the literature, namely that of "transparent" adverbs, which differ from manner adverbs but resemble depictives in that they refer to a state of an individual.

To this end, the second section of this paper attempts a semantic discussion of depictives in order to prove that the event variable introduced by the main verb of a clause is needed to anchor them. This is an essential property they seem to share with adverbial constructions, i.e. they make reference to an event.

The third section of this paper discusses the existence of the class of "transparent" adverbs, which are according to Geuder (2000) more than simply predicates of events – as manner adverbs are. They denote states of their own and predicate of an individual – which is the holder of the state.

Finally, we shall look into the minimal semantic difference between a depictive and an adverbial form. We shall also investigate the means by which we can decide upon their choice, something that appears to be quite difficult in Romanian, given the lack of morphological difference between depictives and their adverbial counterparts, which in turn may give rise to confusion.

2. Depictive constructions

To start, we need to take a look at the description and properties of depictives as opposed to individual level predicates. Thus, depictives have traditionally been treated as predicates of individuals. They have to be anchored to the event variable of the clause. They cannot just be predicates of individuals because individual level adjectives are in most cases excluded from depictive constructions. They do not fit the standard picture of event predication as found with manner adverbs. Depictives appear in a syntactic position and receive a temporal

BDD-A9762 © 2007 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:09:44 UTC)

interpretation betraying a dependence on the event argument. Syntactically, they are always adjoined at the VP level, where we also find event adverbs.

Individual level adjectives, on the other hand, undeniably show a tendency to enter into predication structures that only concern the individual (with unselective binders such as *usually*: *Cats are usually intelligent*). They are excluded from depictive constructions.

In both English and Romanian, depictive constructions occur in postverbal position invariably. In English, they have to follow resultative adjectives and subject depictives follow object depictives (examples from Geuder 2004: 135)

(5) John kicked the door **open tired**. (resultative < subject depictive)
(6) Murphy hammered the coin **flat hot**. (resultative < object depictive)
(7) John ate the meat **raw tired**. (object depictive < subject depictive)
(8) a. Diana [...] îi privi **cercetătoare**.
Diana […] them-CL-ACC looked inquisitive-FEM.sg.
'Diana looked at them inquisitive.'
(Ştefan Agopian – Tache de catifea: 78)

b. … gândea **curajos**, urca **hotărât**
… think-3sg.IMPF. courageously climb-3sg. IMPF. decidedly
pe baricade … desfiinţa **ironic** situaţii şi idoli …
on barricades ... suppress-3sg.IMPF. ironically situations and idols
'… he was thinking bravely, decidedly climbing the barricades … ironically suppressing situations and idols…'
(Ion D. Sîrbu – Compartiment: 12)

(9) a. Studenţii l -au privit **iscoditori**.
Students-THE him-CL-ACC -have looked inquiring-MASC.pl.
'The students looked at him inquiring.'

b. Studenţii l -au privit **iscoditor**.
Students-THE him-CL-ACC -have looked inquiringly.
'The students looked at him inquiringly.'

The adjectives in (8a) and (9a) are both subject depictives the meaning of both sentences being (8a) 'Diana looked at them and she was inquisitive' and (9a) 'The students looked at him and they were inquiring' whereas (9b) means that 'The students looked at him in an inquiring manner'.

The ordering in both languages shows that subject and object depictives have to be right-adjoined. The question arises as to where exactly it is that these subject depictives are adjoined in these two languages. The following tests show that they must be attached at the VP-level.

Pseudo-clefting

(10) a. Ceea ce au făcut studenţii a fost
What have done students-the has been
să -l privească **iscoditori** / **iscoditor**.
să-subjunctive him-CL-ACC look inquiring-MASC.-pl / inquiringly.
'What the students have done was to look at him inquiring / inquiringly.'

b. ??Ceea ce studenţii au făcut **iscoditori**
What students-the have done inquiring-MASC.-pl

BDD-A9762 © 2007 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:09:44 UTC)

a fost să -l privească.
has been să-subjunctive him-CL-ACC look.
'What the inquiring/inquiringly students have done was to look at him.'

c. ?Ceea ce au făcut studenții **iscoditor** a fost
What have done students-the inquiringly has been
să -l privească.
să-subjunctive him-CL-ACC look.
'What the inquiringly students have done was to look at him.'

The fact that (10b & c) are unnatural means that both the adjective and the adverb are not inside the VP but rather they are VP-adjoined.

Tough-movement (for English)

(11) a. Though John left the room **happy**, he was not applauded.
b. ?**Happy** though John left the room, he was not applauded.

Therefore, depictives cannot be stranded by processes that affect VPs. They also go with the main verb under negation. If they had not, we would have expected them to attach higher at the IP-level.

(12) Bill didn't leave **angry** at John.

The example in (12) can only be interpreted as 'Bill wasn't angry when he left John' not as, 'Bill, being angry at John, didn't leave'. Therefore, unlike other right-adjoined elements which are ambiguous in that they can be interpreted inside or outside the scope of interpretation, depictives can only go with the main verb under negation.

Ernst (2002: 286) notices that manner adverbs can in principle follow depictives, although they are somewhat marginal and in need of contextual support (e.g. speaking about work in a painter's studio):

(13) Al sits clothed **quietly**, but is often agitated when he has to be nude.

Manner adverbs cannot be adjoined higher than the VP when they are on a left branch, so it is assumed that **quietly**, is also a VP-adjunct, therefore the depictive must also be a VP-adjunct.

3. Manner adverbs and transparent adverbs

This section looks at those adverbs which contrast depictive constructions. A particular lexical class of adjectives causes the problem of minimal contrasts: adverbs that are derived from stative predicates of individuals like *sad, angry*, etc.

Adjectives that directly qualify properties of events by virtue of their underlying lexical meaning, such as *quick* do not occur in depictive constructions.

For adjectives such as *sad* and *angry*, the distinction between depictive and manner uses is usually quite sharp because manner adverbs of this type involve a lexical shift from individual to event predication. Saying that the manner of some action is "angry" is not the same as ascribing this state to an individual in the event.

BDD-A9762 © 2007 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:09:44 UTC)

(14) How did you manage to make them believe you were a real officer?
Well, I kept shouting at them all the time real **angrily**.

The second sentence in (14) contains a manner adverb *angrily* which says that John's shouting is marked with anger. The context however, leads one to expect that the predicate *angry* is not true of John in this situation. The assertion of the manner adverb concerns a different thing: namely the type of shouting which was angry – a true property of the event itself.

The manner reading is opaque in general with respect to the property of individuals denoted by the underlying adjective.

(15) a. Ea e **inteligentă**.
She is intelligent-fem.sg.
'She is intelligent.'

b. Ea a rezolvat problema **inteligent**.
She has solved problem-the intelligently.
'She has solved the problem intelligently.'

c. *Ea a rezlovat problema **inteligentă**.
She has solved problem-the intelligent-fem.sg..
'She has solved the problem intelligent.'

It is worth mentioning that Romanian prefers using adverbs derived directly from such adjectives. This could also account for the problem mentioned at the beginning of this paper because if so many adjectives are also used as adverbs people easily confuse them yielding such ungrammatical results as the ones in (3a and b). Mihai (1963) proposes a classification of adjectives that are also used as manner adverbs.

a. Words that qualify as both adjectives and adverbs: absolut 'absolute(ly)', anume 'certain', asemenea 'alike', chiar 'right', contrar 'contrary', deosebit 'special(ly)', deplin 'full(y)', direct 'direct(ly)', drept 'right, straight', exact 'exact(ly)', exclusiv 'exclusive(ly)', frumos 'beautiful(ly)', greu 'difficult/heavy', gros 'thick', încet 'slow(ly)', legat 'tied', lung 'long', mult 'much', puțin 'little', repede 'quick(ly)', scurt 'short', serios 'serious(ly)', sigur 'certain(ly)', strâmb 'crooked', strâns 'tight(ly)', tare 'strong(ly)/loud(ly)', uşor 'light(ly)', etc.

b. Words that function primarily as adjectives but may occur as adverbs as well. This class is much more numerous: adânc 'deep(ly)', atent 'careful(ly)', automat 'automatic(ally)', bucuros 'happy / happily', cercetător 'inquisitive(ly)', cinstit 'honest(ly)', cumplit 'terrible/ terribly', discret 'discreet(ly)', disprețuitor 'scornful(ly)', domol 'slow(ly)', dureros 'painful(ly)', elegant 'elegant(ly)', elocvent 'eloquent(ly)', iscoditor 'inquiring(ly)', încrezător 'confident(ly)', lacom 'greedy/greedily', năpraznic 'sudden(ly)', nervos 'nervous(ly)', sever 'severe(ly)', surprinzător 'surprising(ly)', tainic 'secret(ly)', etc.

The list is much more extensive and very productive and it can go up to some more 700 adjectives that can function as adverbs as well.

Ernst (2002) makes the distinction in terms of "state reading" of "mental attitude adverbs", while Geuder (2004) calls them "transparent adverbs" a term that we have adopted for our analysis as well.

Ernst (2002: 67) captures the difference in entailments between (16a) and (16b).

BDD-A9762 © 2007 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:09:44 UTC)

(16) a. Though her emotions were in a turmoil she managed to leave the room **calmly**.
b. Though her emotions were in a turmoil she **calmly** had left the room.

Example (16a) shows the opaqueness of manner adverbs with respect to their adjectival base: the manner adverb *calmly* serves to pick out that manner of the event that is typically connected with calmness on the part of the agent – but not the preverbal occurrence of *calmly* from (16b). This is similar to the traditional distinction of manner versus subject-oriented reading of adverbs, where the interpretation of ***calmly*** in (16b) is subject-oriented that is the adverb is taken to assert the state of calm of an individual.

This difference in the readings is correlated with a difference in syntactic position. However, one cannot simply claim that manner adverbs are the ones in postverbal position while transparent adverbs are those in preverbal position. Manner adverbs can, in principle, precede the verb as well (17b) if there is enough heavy material following the verb or if the verb is passive, although they preferentially go into the postverbal position.

(17) a. She walked **carefully** on the ice.
b. She **carefully** walked on the ice.
c. She walked **carefully**.
d. ?She **carefully** walked.

4. Differences between depictive adjectives and transparent adverbs

Ernst's (2002) classification into "State" and "Intentional" adverbs roughly corresponds to Geuder's (2004) "transparent" adverbs.

(18) a. *Manner:* ADV (e) = e [manifests] adj (x), with x = Agent (e)
b. *State:* ADV (e) = e [is accompanied by] ADJ (x), with x = Agent (e)
c. *Intentional*: ADV (e) = e [is intended with] ADJ (x), with x = Agent (e)
Ernst (2002: 63-66)

The problem with Ernst's analysis is that he does not assume a semantic difference between depictives and those adverbial forms he subsumes under "state" in (16b); he explicitly states (Ernst 2002:67) that he considers depictives to have the same representation. However, since depictives and transparent adverbs cannot be used interchangeably there is a serious shortcoming.

The existence of a meaning difference between depictives and transparent adverbs can be easily established considering minimal pairs in which only one of them is permitted. The fact that in certain cases the depictive is not allowed prompts us to the conclusion that there must be an interplay between the meaning of the verb and the adjective type which decides on the acceptability of depictive constructions. To this end, consider the minimal pairs with stage-level adjectives below:

(19) a. He left **angry**. (Geuder's 2004 examples:148)
b. He read the review of this book {$^{?}$**angry** / ^{ok} **angrily**}

(20) a. S- a întors foarte **tristă.**
s-3sg.refl has-3sg. returned very sad-ADJ fem.sg
'She returned very sad from the meeting.'
b. S- a întors foarte **tristă/* trist(ADV)**
s-3sg.refl has-3sg. returned very sad-ADJ fem.sg/sadly

BDD-A9762 © 2007 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:09:44 UTC)

de la şedinţă.
from meeting.
'She returned very sad from the meeting.'

c. Ne- a arătat pozele **mândră/**
us-1pl.- has-3sg. shown pictures-the proud-fem sg./
cu mândrie/[??]**mândru**.
with pride/proud-ADV.
'She showed us the pictures {proud/with pride/[??]proudly}.'

The verbs in the (19, 20a) examples, *leave, return* seem to be well-suited for depictive adjuncts; they have a presentational effect, namely a quality of the subject becomes visible at a certain point. There is no further interaction between the state and the event. In the (19, 20b) cases, it is easy for one to assume that there is some kind of connection between the reading of the review and the anger of the reader, or the showing of the pictures and the pride of the agent doing that. The fact that in (20b) Romanian prefers the PP indicating the manner in which the showing occurred is indicative of the fact that it is this kind of inference (Geuder 2004: 148) that makes depictives unacceptable in these contexts.

So far, a safe conclusion would be that the context favouring these transparent adverbs is that given by the emotional state of the event, and cases which suggest that the action is brought about by the emotional state:

(21) a. I **angrily** forwarded the letter to my solicitor.

b. Am deschis **înfometat(ă)/cu înfometare**
have-1.sg. opened hungry(ă-fem.sg.) ADJ/with hunger
frigiderul.
fridge-the.
'I opened the fridge hungry/with hunger.'

Another difference between depictives and transparent adverbs is the fact that depictives can be predicated of both subject and object, whereas transparent adverbs can only be predicated of the agent, as in example (1c). This difference can be tracked back to that part in their semantics that distinguishes them: the presence of a dependency relation between state and event. Moreover, in case the verb is a state the transparent adverb is no longer allowed. (22b)

(22) a. Şedeau **trişti** pe bancă.
sit-3pl. sad-ADJ masc.pl. on bench.
"They were sitting sad on the bench."

b. *?Şedeau **trist** pe bancă.
sit-3pl. sad-ADV on bench.
'They were sitting on the bench sadly.'

5. Conclusions

To sum up, both transparent adverbs and depictives are subject to restrictions that relate to their interpretation. The difference is that the adverbs seem to have access to an argument via thematic role information while depictives select the target of predication not according to information from event concepts, but rather according to functional conditions.

BDD-A9762 © 2007 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:09:44 UTC)

There is a distinction to be made between manner adverbs and transparent ones to the extent that the first are adjuncts which are predicates of events, while the latter are adjuncts which denote states of their own. In English, the distinction is between adjuncts that are closely related to the event (whether they denote separate states or just manners) and adjuncts without any type of event-dependence (depictives).

Romanian is more ambiguous in this respect since it is more similar to German because it exhibits poor morphological distinction between its depictives and transparent adverbs. Therefore, there might be no real need to impose the categorization of adjuncts found in English due to the lack of support by morphological distinctions. Transparent adverbs and depictives may be in principle members of a single, undifferentiated semantic category.

Daria Protopopescu
University of Bucharest
dariaprotopopescu@yahoo.com

References

Ciompec, G. (1985). *Morfosintaxa adverbului românesc – sincronie şi diacronie***.** Bucureşti: Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică.

Forăscu, N. (2002). *Dificultăţi gramaticale ale limbii române* [Available online: <http://www.unibuc.ro/eBooks/filologie/NForascu-DGLR/adverb.htm]>.

GALR (2005). *Gramatica limbii române*, vol. I *Cuvântul,* Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Române.

Ernst, T. (2002). *The Syntax of Adjuncts*.Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Geuder, W. (2004). Depictives and transparent adverbs. In J. Austin, S. Engelberg, G. Rauh (eds.), *Adverbials. The Interplay between Meaning, Context, and Syntactic Structure*, 131-166. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Geuder, W. (2000). Oriented Adverbs. Issues in the Lexical Semantics of Event Adverbs. PhD dissertation, Universität Tübingen, [Available online: <http://w210.ub.uni-tuebingen.de/dbt/volltexte/2002/546]>.

Mihai, C. (1963). Valoarea adverbială a adjectivelor în limba română contemporană. *Studii şi cercetări lingvistice* XIV (2): 209-218.

Wyner, A. (1998). Subject-oriented adverbs are thematically dependent. In S. Rothstein (ed.), *Events and Grammar*, 333-348. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

BDD-A9762 © 2007 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:09:44 UTC)