# ON ADVERB FORMATION IN ROMANIAN

**Daria Protopopescu**

**Abstract**: The current paper discusses adverb formation in Romanian starting from the treatment of Spanish *-mente* adverbs in a recent paper by Torner (2005) who introduces the notion of phrasal affix in his treatment of Spanish *-mente* adverbs. The analysis of the morphology of Romanian adverbs starts from the three suffixes by means of which the language derives its adverbs (*-(a)mente, -(ic)eşte, -iş* (*-îş)*) as well as a bounty of adverbs that have been argued (Forăscu 2002) to be adjectival or participial forms. My proposal is that Romanian (manner) adverbs are derived by means of inflectional affixation, with the above mentioned suffixes, or a silent suffix –Ø – the case of those adverbs that have an identical form to that of the masculine singular adjectives, a suffix that encodes the property (in *X* manner).

**Keywords**: phrasal affix, *-mente* adverbs, silent affix, partly adverbial languages

## 1. Aim of the paper

The current paper explores the nature of the morphology of Romanian adverbs starting from the treatment of Spanish *-mente* adverbs in a recent paper by Torner (2005). This paper tries to give an account of the two theories available for the morphological status of *-mente* adverbs in Spanish, namely the compound theory and the derivation theory treating them as the result of suffixation. (Torner 2005) introduces the notion of phrasal affix in his treatment of Spanish *-mente* adverbs. The morphology of Romanian adverbs, on the other hand has received little attention so far. At this point, it is worth mentioning that Romanian has at least three suffixes by means of which it derives its adverbs as well as a bounty of adverbs that have been argued (Forăscu 2002) to be adjectival or participial forms. My proposal is that Romanian (manner) adverbs are derived by means of inflectional affixation, with the suffixes: *-(a)mente* (mainly sentence adverbs and adjectival modifiers), *-(ic)eşte* (developing as will be shown a mainly subject-oriented reading), *-iş* (*-îş)* (mainly with adverbs that occur in frozen structures, idioms), or a silent suffix –Ø – the case of those adverbs that have an identical form to that of the masculine singular adjectives, a suffix that encodes the property (in *X* manner). Furthermore, I shall argue that at its present stage, Romanian is a partly adverbial language in the sense of Swan (1997) with a probable evolution into a non-adverbial language.

## 2. Introducing the data

Little has been said so far on the nature of the morphology of manner adverbs and adverbs in general, in Romanian. The studies existing so far, have mainly focused on the semantic interpretation of adverbs (see Pană-Dindelegan 1991, 1992) and on the synchronic / diachronic treatment of adverbs (see Ciompec 1985) The normative grammar of Romanian (Gramatica Academiei 1963, 2005) says little about the morphology of adverbs. (GA 1963) gives a classification of manner adverbs by dividing them into sub classes as follows and as can be seen, Romanian does not have a regular formation of adverbs:

manner adverbs proper / core manner adverbs:
*aievea, alene, altfel, anevoie, aşa, bine, degeaba, degrabă, împreună, razna*, etc.

BDD-A9811 © 2009 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:16 UTC)

All adverbs that are identical in form to adjectives as well as adverbs derived with the suffixes:

*-eşte* (*băneşte, bărbăteşte, câineşte, ciobăneşte culturaliceşte, frăţeşte, mânzeşte, mişeleşte, milităreşte, mocăneşte, moraliceşte, prieteneşte, prosteşte, românеşte, spiritualiceşte, sufleteşte*)
*-iş* (*îş*) (*câş, chiorîş, cruciş, făţiş, grăpiş, morţiş, pieptiş*)

(1) I- a spus **făţiş** tot ce avea de spus.
him-cl has-3sg.told **openly** everything what had-3sg DE say.
'He told him frankly everything he had to tell him.'

(2) Aceste imperii nu se consideră obligate să îşi asume **făţiş** obligaţii…[1]
'These empires do not consider themselves obliged in openly assuming obligations...'

(3) În acest context, şansele de a-şi asigura succesul şi expansiunea revin imperiilor care nu contestă **făţiş** aceste principii…[2]
'In this context, the chances of securing success and expansion belong to the empires which do not openly challenge these principles'

(4) Agitatorii acţionează **tot mai făţiş** şi **tot mai impertinent**, nejenându-se să ceară **făţiş** o dictatură a minorităţii şi revenirea la structuri anacronice, de mult depăşite de istorie.[3]
'The agitators act ever more openly and more impertinently, without being embarrassed to openly ask for a dictatorship of the minority and a return to anachronic structures, long outlived by history.'

*-(a)mente* (*absolutamente, completamente, eminamente, legalmente, literalmente, moralmente, realmente, spiritualmente, totalmente*)

The suffix -(*ic*)*eşte* was productive during the 18th century and first half of the 19th century. These adverbs are usually distributed as obligatory constituents alongside verbs expressing attitude (Nica 1988): *a râde mânzeşte* 'to grin like a horse', *a se purta* 'to behave', *a se comporta* 'to act', *a reacţiona* 'to react', *a proceda* 'to proceed', *a trata* 'to treat' *câineşte* 'like a dog', *frăţeşte* 'like a brother', *milităreşte* 'in a military way', *omeneşte* 'humanly', *prieteneşte* 'friendly', *prosteşte* 'stupidly'.

(5) Stă prost **băneşte**.
stay-3sg. PRES badly moneywise.
'He has got money problems.'

(6) Este mulţumit **sufleteşte**.
is-3sg. PRES pleased spiritually.
'He is content spiritually.'

The adverbs in *-is (îş)* are usually selected by verbs expressing ways of looking: *a privi/ a se uita* (*câş, cruciş, chiorâş, pieziş*).

[1] http://www.sferapoliticii.ro/sfera/116-117/art8-antonescu.html.
[2] http://www.sferapoliticii.ro/sfera/116-117/art8-antonescu.html.
[3] < http://www.romanialibera.ro/a89756c15424/presedintele-maghiar-primit-cu-un-steag-istoric-al-ungariei.html>.

BDD-A9811 © 2009 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:16 UTC)

(7) Am început să mă uit **cruciş**…
have-1sg started-PERF să-SUBJUNCTIVE I-ACC look cross-eyed-ADV
'I started to squint...' (S. Agopian – *Tache de catifea*)

The adverbs in *-mente* are also reduced in number the suffix was not as productive in Romanian as opposed to other Romance languages and few of them are actually actively used.

(8) A greşit **totalmente**.
Has-3sg. been wrong-PERF totally
'He was **totally** wrong.'
(9) **Realmente** nu suport linguşirile.
really not stand-1sg. PRES flattery-pl
'I **really** can't stand flattery.'

It is worth mentioning that these adverbs are not very well-spread and Romanian prefers using adverbs derived directly from adjectives having the same form as the qualifying adjectives. This could also be one problem with Romanian manner adverbs because if so many adjectives are also used as adverbs there may be problems in identifying them as either adjectives or adverbs. 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', *cinstit* 'honest(ly)', *cumplit* 'terrible / terribly', *discret* 'discreet(ly)', *disprețuitor* 'scornful(ly)', *domol* 'slow(ly)', *dureros* 'painful(ly)', *elegant* 'elegant(ly)', *elocvent* 'eloquent(ly)', *excesiv* 'excessive(ly)', *fățiş* 'open(ly)', *gata* 'ready', *groaznic* 'horrible / horribly', *integral* 'full(ly) / total(ly)', *încrezător* 'confident(ly)', *întâmplător* 'accidental(ly)', *lacom* 'greedy / greedily', *minunat* 'wonderful(ly)', *năpraznic* 'sudden(ly)', *nemaipomenit* 'extraordinary / extraordinarily', *nervos* 'nervous(ly)', *perfect* 'perfect(ly)', *personal* 'personal(ly)', *prost* 'stupid(ly)', *relativ* 'relative(ly)', *sever* 'severe(ly)', *simplu* 'simple / simply', *special* 'special(ly)', *spontan* 'spontaneous(ly)', *stupid* 'stupid(ly)', *subit* 'sudden(ly)', *subtil* 'subtle / subtly', *superficial* 'superficial(ly)', *surprinzător* 'surprising(ly)', *tainic* 'secret(ly)', *teribil* 'terrible / terribly', *universal* 'universal(ly)', *veşnic* 'eternal(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.

### 3. Historical evidence and the rise of Romanian adverbs

We cannot embark upon a historical discussion of adverb formation unless we take a look at the adjectives they are derived from. Romanian has lost the neuter and most of the

BDD-A9811 © 2009 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:16 UTC)

case system of Latin. Thus, adjectives derived from the Latin *bonus, -a, -um* type are inflected for masculine/feminine and singular/plural: *bun/bună – buni/bune* 'good'. Those adjectives that survived from the Latin third declension are not inflected for gender: *repede* (sg)/ *repezi* (pl) 'fast', dulce (sg.) / dulci (pl) 'sweet'. It is to be noted that in Latin, adverbs were marked by an ending in -e/-er: e.g. *bene* 'well'. In Romanian, the adverb generally corresponds to the masculine singular.

(10) Vorbeşte **frumos**!
speak-3sg.PRES beautifully
'He speaks beautifully!'

However, ambiguity may arise in a pair of sentences like the ones below.

(11) a. Copiii merg **liniştiți** 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 (11a) 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 (11b) 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.[4]

Karlsson (1981:130) argues that, historically, Romanian does not have a regular formation of adverbs in *-mente*. Thus, the only *-mente* adverbs in Romanian are *altminteri* with the variants *al(t)mint(e)re(a)*, *al(t)minre(le)a*, *al(t)minter(le)a* and *aimint(e)re(a)*, *aimint(e)ri(lea)*, *aimintre(le)* 'otherwise'. They are derived from ALTERA / ALIA MENTER, most likely with a blending of the two. This goes along the lines of Torner (2005) who argues for the possibility of deriving Spanish *-mente* adverbs from the Latin noun *mens, mentis* 'mind'. The similarity is obvious, since the Romanian noun *minte* (mind) is the descendant of the Latin word. Karlsson (1981) explains the absence of *-mente* adverbs in Romanian by the loss of Dacia by the Roman Empire in the 3rd century. This lack has also been used to help establish that the formation of *-mente* adverbs is a late development in the language. According to Karlsson (1981: 131), "*aimintre* recalls *in alia mente* of the Salic Law, but ALIA MENTE does not survive in the other Romance languages, where one finds rather reflexes of ALTERA MENTE. If *aimintre* survives from before the loss of Dacia, this would be evidence for a very early formation of *-mente* adverbs. If it is a later borrowing, this would be evidence for contact between these speakers and parts of the Empire, most likely an area which had –MENTER adverbs, perhaps the Veneto." Menter adverbs could be a late

[4] 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 (Forăscu 2002):

(i) *Copii *noi* născuți
Children new-masc. pl. born-masc. pl.
'Newly born children'
(ii) *Musafiri *proaspeți* sosiți
Guests fresh-masc. pl. arrived-masc.pl.
'Newly arrived guests'

BDD-A9811 © 2009 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:16 UTC)

formation, by analogy with other *-er* adverbs. So these adverbs originate in literary Latin and do not survive in vulgar Latin, hence they were not preserved in Romance languages.

Furthermore, Karlsson (1981) suggests that the absence of *-mente* adverbs from Romanian may be due not to the loss of Dacia, but rather to the Slavic influence. It appears that in modern Slavic languages the adverbs is morphologically a form of the adjective, and the similar treatment of Romanian may be a result of that. Thus, the formation of *-mente* adverbs, of which *altminteri* and *aimintre* are mere vestiges, was almost completely dropped in favour of the Slavic solution which had parallels in Latin and other Romance languages, such as the dialects of Southern Italy (the Abruzzi dialect, Karlsson 1981: 124) which exhibits a similar absence of *-mente* adverbs. The explanation for the absence of *-mente* adverbs in that region had to do with the loss of the feeling for adverbs as separate entities in the Greek spoken in Magna Grecia. This stems from the disappearance of the difference between long and short *o* as in *kalos* ('good/well') so that the identity of the adjective and the adverb was carried over into their Latin. Latin itself provided a model for the use of the adjective and Romance languages continue to use many short common adjectives as adverbs.

On the other hand, Romanian seems to preserve other vestiges of the Latin adverbial system. Following Karlsson (1981: 131), adjectives in *-esc* (<-ISCU) form the adverbs derived in *-eşte* (<-ISCE): bărbat 'man': bărbătesc 'manly': bărbăteşte 'in a manly way' (see the list above for more adverbs derived with *-eşte*). This also goes along with the idea the Romance languages are split into two groups as far as adverb formation is concerned. Clearly Italian, Spanish and French exhibit *-mente* formation which comes from vulgar Latin, a compound of an adjective, in the Ablative case which conveys a manner reading + *mente* (e.g. adjective in the ablative *rapida+mente* = *rapidamente* – with a quick mind, quick-mindedly). Other Romance languages, Romanian amongst them, did not inherit the *-mente* suffix, or have it in few words of later borrowing.

## 4. Theories of adverb formation

In what follows, we shall present some theories of adverb formation and attempt to give a unifying account for adverb formation in Romanian.

### 4.1 Compounding

The most frequently quoted arguments in favour of the compounding theory in the formation of *-mente* adverbs is given for Spanish among others by Zagona (1990). Thus, *-mente* adverbs are formed by means of compounding because it appears that *-mente* can be elided in all the members of a coordination except the last.

(12) Lo hice *rapida* y *cuidadosamente* (Torner 2005: 117)
it did-1sg quick and carefully
'I did it quickly and carefully'

It appears that in Spanish one cannot elide affixes whatever their type may be. In addition to that, some types of compounds exhibit the same behaviour as *-mente* adverbs with respect to elision. The same phenomenon is visible with disjunctive coordination and within comparatives.

The main drawback of the compound hypothesis is that *-mente* is not an independent word in the language. It originates from the Latin noun *mens*, *mentis* 'mind' Therefore, from a synchronic point of view *-mente* (Spanish) and *-minte* (Romanian) are not the same word and

BDD-A9811 © 2009 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:16 UTC)

the meaning of *-mente* in case there is one has no relation to that of the noun. In any case, Romanian adverbs in *-mente* are a later borrowing the only true *-mente* type adverb is *altminteri* and its variants. (cf. Karlsson 1981). Thus, *-mente, -(ic)eşte*, mainly intervene in the formation of manner adverbs *in X way*, (X being the meaning of the adjective that enters their formation). For Romanian, domain adverbs whose meaning is (from an X point of view) also enter this structure e.g. *politiceşte*, *spiritualiceşte*, etc. Given the different readings that arise, it is difficult to establish a unitary meaning of *-mente, -(ic)eşte* adverbs. Following this compounding hypothesis, *-mente, -(ic)eşte* should be treated as the head of the adverb. This implies that it determines both distributional and semantic properties of the word. So, these adverbs should be compound nouns, with a similar distribution to that of the noun that intervenes in their formation. Neither of these two things happens, so if *-mente, -(ic)eşte* adverbs are compounds they cannot be endocentric compounds, because the noun, the element elided in the coordination (cf. Zagona 1990) does not form the head from either a syntactic or a semnatic point of view. The adjective would tend to be the head of the compound, and the noun, if indeed we are talking about a noun in Spanish, is an object argument. Clearly Romanian is not a good candidate for this particular hypothesis since *-mente* adverbs are a later borrowing, and the other adverb forming suffix *-(ic)eşte* cannot be viewed as a noun or any other word for that matter because following Karlsson (1981: 131), adjectives in *-esc* (<-ISCU) form the adverbs derived in *-eşte* (<-ISCE).

**4.2. Morphological derivation by means of a phrasal affix**

Another approach to adverb formation is that of derivation by means of suffixation, where *-mente* and *-(ic)eşte* are derivational affixes joined to adjective bases to form adverbs. This seems to be in agreement with some aspects of their behaviour. Moreover, the word internal syntactic and semantic relation between the adjective and *-mente, -(ic)eşte* resembles that of affixation, not compounding. At most compounding could have a historical explanation if we accept that for Spanish, the adjective that combines with mente is a vestige of the Latin Ablative case rather than feminine as suggested by Torner and others. To this extent we could speak of a compound adverbial meaning, where the *mente* Ablative noun fuses and is seen as an affix productive because it generates a pattern of such forms that did not appear as much in vulgar Latin.

(13) $[[\text{rapida}]_{\text{Ablative adjective}} + [\text{mente}]_{\text{Ablative noun}}] \rightarrow [\text{rapidamente}]_{\text{Adverb}}$
(Adverbial meaning is compound)

Evidence of two types:

a) categorical: affixes frequently select a base of a specific grammatical category (e.g. *-ity* attaches to adjectives, *-ble* attaches to verbal bases) Therefore we can clearly state that *-mente* and *-(ic)eşte* attach to adjectives.

b) contextual: some affixes take into consideration the argument structure of the base they attach to (e.g. adjectival suffix *-ble* selects transitive verbal bases, or more infrequently, ergative verbal bases, but not intransitive ones.) The relation of the affix to the argument structure of its base is evident because some affixes inherit part of this argument structure (e.g. *destruction of the city*).

*-Mente and -(ic)eşte* adverbs show a behaviour similar to affixes. Torner (2005) argues that for Spanish if an adjective has an argument expressed by a PP this same argument may appear with the adverb:

BDD-A9811 © 2009 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:16 UTC)

(14) contrario a lo esperado (adjective)
contrary to the expected
contrariamente a lo esperado (adverb)
contrary(Adv) to the expected

This is the strongest argument against the compounding hypothesis because the lexical element which is not the head (i.e. the adjective) is not able to project any of its combinatorial properties to the lexical item that contains it.

Seeing that most Romanian adverbs have the same form with their corresponding adjectives, we would like to propose the existence of a null derivational phrasal affix that turns them into adverbs, alongside the already existing *-mente* and *-(ic)eşte*.

(15) $[X]_{Adj} + [Ø\ affix]_{Adv} = [X+Ø]_{Adv}$
$[corect]_{Adj} + [Ø\ affix]_{Adv} = [corect]_{Adv}$
$[prost]_{Adj} + [eşte]_{Adv} = [prosteşte]_{Adv}$

The advantage of this proposal is that they are morphological affixes combining with words or phrases instead of morphological bases to form phrases. To state that all of them are derivational affixes solves the problem of accounting for the problem of category resulting from the process of formation. They are derivational affixes because they derive adverbs from adjectives.

**4.3 Conversion. The case of *poate***

The adverb *poate* should be treated apart as a case of conversion from the verb *a putea*. It is derived from the 3rd person singular of the present tense of the indicative of that verb, it shows epistemic possibility (cf. Hill 2006) and should be placed alongside modal (epistemic) adverbs. According to Cinque (1997), there are several Mood heads bearing a feature that corresponds to the respective sentence adverb subclass: "speech act" mood with pragmatic adverbs, evaluative mood with evaluative adverbs, epistemic mood with epistemic adverbs, irrealis mood with *poate*.

In a diachronic survey of adverbs Ciompec (1985) claims that *poate* is attested as a modal adverb starting with the 18th century:

(16) Şi ***poate*** ave şi pizmă.
And maybe have also envy
'He may have also been envious.'

However, below there are two examples from Grigore Ureche's *Letopiseţul Ţării Moldovei* (=The Chronicle of the Moldavian Country) going back to the 17th century which make use of *poate* as a modal epistemic adverb.

(17) ... căci că poate să fie adevărat, că nu părteneşte
... for that maybe SUBJ be true, that not share
cronicarul Bielschi a lor săi, ce scrie poticala
chronicler-the Bielschi to his folk, what writes thing-the
ce au petrecut Ştefan vodă cu ajutoriul lor, de
that have3rdpl. happened to Ştefan vodă with help-the their, that
au perit cu toţii.
have perished with all.

(Grigore Ureche – *Letopiseţul Ţării Moldovei*)

BDD-A9811 © 2009 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:16 UTC)

(18) Iară noi n- am vrut să lăsăm să nu
and we not have wanted SUBJ let-1stpl. SUBJ not
pomenim de războaiele acestor doi fraţi,
mention DE wars-the these-Gen.pl. two brothers,
căci că poate fi adevăratu, de vreme ce au fost având atâta
for that maybe be true, as long as have been having such
vrajbă întru dânşii.
feud between them

(Grigore Ureche – *Letopiseţul Ţării Moldovei*)

(19) Semnele sau tocmelele şi lucruri, câte
signs-the or haggling-the and things, how many
s- au făcut în ţară, nu le arată toate că
REFL-have3rd pl. done in country, not them-Cl. show all that
poate fi că n- au ştiut de toate cronicarul
perhaps be that not- have3rd.pl. known of all chronicler- cel
latinesc să le scrie.
the Latin SUBJ them-Cl. write.

(Grigore Ureche – *Letopiseţul Ţării Moldovei*)

In the first two contexts above (17) and (18), *poate* 'maybe'is preceded by *căci că* which may be an indication for the fact that at this stage of the language the entire structure *căci că poate* may have been a construction used as introductory for a subordinate clause. The example in (20) on the other hand shows a structure of the type *poate* 'maybe' + *a fi* 'to be'in the infinitive + *că* 'that', again introducing a subordinate clause. As was the case with other sentence adverbs (*bineînţeles că, fireşte că* in Protopopescu 2006a, 2006b, 2007a, 2007b) that may optionally select *că*, poate may appear in structures without a *că* domain following (20 a and b). The examples in (20) express lack of certainty, whereas examples in (17)-(19) express possibility.

(20) a. O fi fost vreun sfânt picat din cer o dată cu ploaia dimineţii – ori ***poate*** un strigoi fătat de bezna pământului şi rătăcit acolo în soare ca un huhurez.
'It may have been some saint fallen from the sky along the morning dew – or maybe some ghost spawn by the darkness of the earth wandering there in the sun as a bat.'

b. Înţelese la urmă că, nu de multă vreme, trebuie să fi trecut prin partea locului o turmă de mioare.
'Ori ***poate***, niscai capre...,' cugetă el, încruntat.
'In the end he understood that, not long before, there must have passed by a flock of sheep.
'Or maybe, some goats…' he pondered, frowning.'

(George Topârceanu – *Minunile sfântului Sisoie*)

**4.4 Incorporation**

The optionality of *că* 'that' selection by the adverb may have its roots in an attempt of the language to develop some sort of incorporated complementizer within a verb or some other part of speech yielding as a result a sentence adverb. Relevant examples to this extent would be adverbs such as (*cică* = se zice că / allegedly, *parcă* = se pare că / apparently), or a regional attempt of incorporating the complementizer into (*pesemne* = *pisînică* / apparently).

BDD-A9811 © 2009 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:16 UTC)

## 5. Concluding remarks

Given the data discussed so far and following both diachronic and synchronic evidence, I would like to propose the following classification of languages following their behaviour with respect to adverb formation (Swan 1988, 1997), which also triggers a clear split within the Romance family of languages as well, to extent that Spanish, Italian and French pattern as adverbial languages just like English.

| **Adverbial languages: English** | **Non-adverbial languages: German** | **Partly adverbial languages: Romanian** |
|---|---|---|
| a. Present and past participles are used as verbal forms as well as having adjectival uses. Suffixation normal for adverbial uses. | a. Present and past participles have adjectival and adverbial functions. | a. Past participles have adjectival and adverbial functions. |
| b. There are few zero forms; adverbs and adjectives are normally strictly distinguished. | b. There are numerous adjective-adverbs, i.e. zero forms which may be used both as adjectives and adverbs | b.<br>i. There are numerous adjective-adverbs.<br>ii. The masculine singular form of the adjective is used as an adverb. |
| c. There is one dominant adverb suffix. | c. There is no one dominant adverb suffix. | c. There are several adverb suffixes, often determined by class of adverbial (-(*ic*)*eşte, -mente, -iş (îş)*) |

Daria Protopopescu
Department of English
Faculty of Foreign Languages
University of Bucharest
dariaprotopopescu@yahoo.com

## Corpus

Topîrceanu
Ureche

## References

Cinque, G. 1997. Adverbs and functional heads. A cross-linguistic perspective. *Working Papers in Linguistics* 7 (1-2): 1-264.

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

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

GA 1963. *Gramatica limbii române*. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.

GALR 2005. *Gramatica limbii române,* vol. I, *Cuvântul*. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.

Hill, V. 2006. The faces of speech acts. Talk at the Annual Conference of the English Department, Faculty of Foreign Languages and Literatures, University of Bucharest, June 2006.

Karlsson, K. E. 1981. *Syntax and Affixation: The Evolution of –MENTE in Latin and Romance*, Niemeyer: Tübingen.

BDD-A9811 © 2009 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:16 UTC)

Mihai, C. 1963. Valoarea adverbială a adjectivelor în limba română contemporană. *Studii şi cercetări lingvistice* XIV (2): 209-218.
Nica, D. 1988. *Teoria părţilor de vorbire. Aplicaţii la adverb*. Iaşi: Editura Junimea.
Pană-Dindelegan, G. 1992. *Sintaxă şi semantică. Clase de cuvinte şi forme gramaticale cu dublă natură (adjectivul, adverbul, prepoziţia, forme verbale nepersonale)*. Bucharest: Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti
Pană-Dindelegan, G. 2003. *Elemente de gramatică. Dificultăţi, controverse, noi interpretări*. Bucharest: Editura Humanitas Educaţional.
Protopopescu, D. 2006a. Sentence adverbs at the left periphery. *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics* VIII (1): 94-102.
Protopopescu, D. 2006b. Adverbe propoziţionale în limba română. *Studii şi cercetări lingvistice* LVII (2): 303-313.
Protopopescu, D. 2007a. Mapping positions to interpretation: Sentence adverbs in Romanian. *British and American Studies* 13: 287-298.
Protopopescu, D. 2007b. On the syntax and interpretation of sentence adverbs in Romanian. In G. Alboiu, A. A. Avram, L. Avram and D. Isac (eds.), *Pitar Moş: A Building with a View. Papers in Honour of Alexandra Cornilescu*, 559-577. Bucharest: Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti
Swan, T. 1988. The development of sentence adverbs in English. *Studia Linguistica* 42 (1): 1-18.
Swan, T. 1997. From manner to subject modification: Adverbialization in English. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 20: 179-195
Torner, S. 2005. On the morphological nature of Spanish adverbs ending in *-mente*. *Probus* 17: 115-144.
Zagona, K. 1990. *-Mente* adverbs, compound interpretation and the projection principle. *Probus* 2 :1-30.

**BDD-A9811 © 2009 Universitatea din Bucureşti**
**Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:43:16 UTC)**