



Martin Hummel / Graz

## THE THIRD WAY

### Prepositional Adverbials in the Diachrony of Romance

#### (Second and Last Part)<sup>9</sup>

##### 7. Fr. *vrai*, *pour vrai*, *pour de vrai*, *pour le vrai*, *à vrai*

The diachrony of adverbials using the French epistemic adjective *vrai* or its older form *voir* shows crucial similarities with the case of Sp. *fijo*, except for the fact that *vrai* is directly epistemic and, consequently, more basic and frequent than *fijo*, whose epistemic functions presuppose metaphorical transposition. The long adverb *vraiment* (OFr. *voirement*) is highly grammaticalized and pragmaticalized, e. g., as an intensifier in *vraiment grand* ›really big‹ or *Il a vraiment dit ça?* ›Did he really say that?‹. Given the complexity of diachrony, I will leave aside the long adverb *vraiment* in order to focus on the adverbial use of *vrai* and its PA-patterns. In fact, the long adverb seems to rather independently follow its diachronic path, while the division of labor between adverbial *vrai* and its PA variants is closely related.

According to the database of the *Dictionnaire historique de l'adjectif adverbe* (Hummel/Gazdik, in preparation), the verb phrase ›verb + *vrai*‹ is realized from the very beginnings of documentation with *verba dicendi* meaning ›to truly say‹ (102):

- (102) Cil respudent: »Sire, vus *dites veir*«. (12th c., La chanson de Roland)  
(103) – Essayé, vous *dites vrai*, mais il ne l'a pas fait! (1997, Rambaud)

As shown in (103), this variant is still in use, albeit not frequent because the so-called adverbialized adjectives are not easily accepted in standard (Hummel 2018a).

Since the first documents of the French language, PA-patterns are used to convey discourse functions whereby speakers evaluate the epistemic

<sup>9</sup> Part 1, cf. RF 131 (2019), 145–185. Paper financially supported by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF), project number P 30751-G30: ›The third way: prepositional adverbials from Latin to Romance‹.

value of a proposition. This means that the preposition is needed to transform the simple verb modification in *dire vrai* into a discourse marker. The PA-patterns using *verba dicendi* clearly evolve from the PV-pattern in (102). The first examples of *à vrai dire/parler* are attested in the 14th century, later followed by *pour vrai dire*:

- (104) Et en tant que sa bonne renommée appetisseroit, à *vous dire vray*, il m'en desplairoit; mais, au fort, elle s'en passera comme fist Helène; si faites tant seulement voustre desir soit accomply. (14th c., Roman de Troïluse)
- (105) Seez tu don't vient ton mal, à *vray parler*? (1400, Charles d'Orléans)
- (106) Et *pour dire vrai* il m'eust fasché que tant de livres indignes et pernitieux [...] eussent eu plus de credit et de vogue. (1566, André de Rivaudeau)
- (107) *A dire vrai*, elle n'avait guère besoin de l'amour de son mari. (1937, Henry de Montherlant)
- (108) *Pour dire vrai*, il n'y passait jamais personne et le vieux chat n'avait à signaler que quelque commandeau de renards, voire un épisodique mitigne de belettes. (1982, Antoine Blondin)

As shown by (107) and (108), this PA-pattern is still in use and fully accepted in standard, especially the lexicalized adverbial locution *à vrai dire*. These facts confirm the close functional and cognitive relation between Type A and Type C adverbials. In principle, no Type B adverb would be needed. While Type A is used as an epistemic adverb of manner ›to truly say‹, Type C conveys the speaker's point of view, which is, as I have argued above, a kind of circumstantial modification.

Regarding the hypothesis of Type C being crucial for the Latin-Romance transition (Claim B), the above data suggests, rather, a later development during the French language period. However, the criteria used for the *Dictionnaire historique de l'adjectif-adverbe* only consider the use of *vrai* inside VP. In the following table from Féron (2001: 66), *pour voir* is attested as early as in 1130, closely followed by the PN-pattern *pour vérité* and also *pour certain* (read ›[year of first attestation ... year of last attestation]‹; *hors hexagone* means ›outside France‹):

	Français médiéval	XVI <sup>e</sup> –XVIII <sup>e</sup> s.	XIX <sup>e</sup> –XXI <sup>e</sup> s.
<i>pour certain</i>	[1320–24 <sup>20</sup> ]	1679]	(XIX <sup>e</sup> –XX <sup>e</sup> : hors hexagone)
<i>pour sûr</i>		[1550	
<i>pour vérité</i>	[1170–1466]		
<i>pour voir</i>	[1130	1530]	
<i>pour vrai</i>	[1350	1610 <sup>21</sup> ]	(XX <sup>e</sup> : hors hexagone)

Table 1

Importantly, no verb is needed inside the adverbial, as illustrated by (109) to (111):

- (109) Ne cuident pas que il ne soient  
Tuit de contes et de rois fil  
Et *por voir* si estoient il (1176, Cligès)<sup>10</sup>
- (110) *Et pour vrai*, honnesteté de vie et meureté sont fort requises ou docteur  
et moult proufient es auditeurs [...]. (1360–1380, Daudin)
- (111) *mais pour vrai* les ans ne donnent jamais droit de mal faire, ains agrandissent l'injure [...]. (1549, La Boétie)

These discourse functions coexisted from the beginning with its use as epistemic modifier of the verb (112) (Féron 2001: 64):

- (112) N'amoit il tant com il faisoit  
Moi seulement; *pour vrai disoit* (1200–1202, Escoufle)

For the same function, Tobler/Lommatzsch (s. v. *verai*: 245) cite also the variants *dire au vrai* and *dire de vrai*.

It is noteworthy that Féron (2001: 69) insists on the role of analogy for the diachrony of the paradigm in Table 1, a fact that I have also observed for Sp. *fijo* in Section 6. In 4.2 it has been shown that the 56 Spanish PA-patterns can be described as members of different paradigms. Gerhalter (2018: 20, 39–40) also alludes to »paradigmatic effects«, e. g., the analogy in Sp. *al justo, al cabal, al cabo de*. Consequently, there can be no doubt that paradigmaticization is a strong and general tendency in the domain of adverbial circumstantiality, especially with regard to discourse functions. According to Féron, *pour voir* is the principal pivot for analogy in Table 1.

Discussing productivity vs. lexicalization (»adverbial locution«) of the PA-pattern, Féron (2001: 66–69) analyzes »*pour* + epistemic adjective« as a linguistic model with already limited productivity in Middle French rather than as a lexicalized adverbial locution, while in Modern French it is seen as the result of diachronic selection, with only one surviving group, *pour sûr* »for sure«, which is scarcely used and classified as »archaic«. As shown in Table 1, *pour voir/vrai* stops being used in France around the beginning of the 17th century (except for the adverbial locution *pour vrai dire*). *Pour vrai dire* shows that there is more variation than represented in the table, and that there are more surviving variants if we take into account closely related patterns with a *verb* or the preposition *de* (*pour de vrai*). However, there can be no doubt that most of the variants have disappeared in modern standard French.

<sup>10</sup> I am grateful to Katharina Jost who retrieved the data.

Tobler/Lommatzsch (s. v. *verai* and *voir*) provide many attestations for the following variants in Old French which are out of use at present, except for *au vrai*: *dire/savoir au vrai*, *dire/savoir de vrai*, *mettre en vrai*, *a voir*, *de voir*, *en voir*, *por voir*, *dire le voir*, *a la voire*. These variants recall those we have observed for Sp. *de fijo*, *por fijo*, *en fija*, *a la fija*. Interestingly, the FEW (s. v. *verus*) mentions the Old Spanish variants *de veras*, *por veras*, *en veras*, *a veras*, which should be added to the list in Annex 1 (remember that this list only contains the variants that have been detected in the rather small corpus used for Company Company's *Sintaxis histórica*).<sup>11</sup> Hence, the same rules underlie the two morphosyntactic series in French and Spanish, producing analogous structural variants. All this clearly supports the assumption of a shared tradition of Romance providing very similar patterns regarding the following three morphosyntactic features: the prepositions used, plural and feminine inflection, the feminine definite article (in plural or singular). The FEW does not mention *a las veras*, which figures however in Annex 1.

In 6.4, I have discussed *en forma fija* > *en fija* as a possible diachronic path, but the systematic use of »en + ADJ« in Romance supports that *en fija* could have developed independently, by simple analogy. While the case of Fr. *vrai* shows that the same variants as in Spanish were widespread as early as in the 12th century, Sp. *fijo* provides evidence for ongoing productivity since many variants appear in Modern Spanish, and some of them, such as *de fijo que*, only appear in very recent texts. In sum, restricted productivity and reduction to lexicalized locutions is a tendency of standard, while informal language apparently conserves plain productivity. This also means that the fact that the American Spanish variant *a la fija* appears in geographically separated regions, e. g., Argentina and Costa Rica, does not necessarily entail the conclusion that this can only be explained by a common tradition tracing back to Peninsular Spanish, as I have assumed above, since the variants may appear everywhere at any time in informal registers. However, it would be correct to conclude that the underlying productive rules which generate such variants trace back not only to oral Peninsular Spanish, but also to spoken Romance and Latin in general.

According to our own research in Frantext, *pour vrai* is progressively replaced in diachrony by *pour de vrai* ›really, in fact‹:

- (113) je me sens fatigué *pour de vrai* [...]. (1865, George Sand)  
 (114) elle a été mariée *pour de vrai* [...]. (1881, Huysmans)

<sup>11</sup> A broader empirical basis would bring to light the triplet *justo*, *justamente*, *al justo* (Gerhalter 2018: 77–78).

*Pour de vrai* is generally prosodically integrated into the sentence, but there are some attestations of external use in terms of prosody (parenthetical use) or syntax (presentative):

- (115) L'idée serait bonne, dit ma sœur, qui nous écoutait, si, *pour de vrai*, Joseph avait le talent [...]. (1865, George Sand)  
 (116) Moi j'aime Jacques et Jacques c'est *pour de vrai*. (1930, Albert Cohen)

According to Grevisse/Goosse (2008: § 966b), *pour de vrai* was first »populaire« (»folk language«) before it became simply »familier« (»informal, colloquial«).

Frantext also attests 55 instances of the variant *pour le vrai* between 1553 and 1998.

- (117) *Pour le vrai*, j'ai eu froid, répondit le marquis [...]. (1858, George Sand)

This variant apparently develops from its nominalized use, as in (118):

- (118) et *pour le vrai* je ne pren que le vuide. (1553, Ronsard)

The fact that (115) and (117) stem from George Sand, a metropolitan author who integrated rural French in her novels, is a premonitory sign for the restriction of these variants to rural language (cf. Hummel/Kröll 2015 on Fr. *vitement*). As shown by Table 1, the PA-patterns undergo marginalization in metropolitan French, while some of them survive overseas. This situation is characteristic and systematic of the differences between Canadian French varieties, on the one hand, and standard metropolitan French, on the other. The systematic difference basically reflects the continuation of spoken traditions in regional varieties that are not or less affected by the standardization process in metropolitan France. In other words, the examples from George Sand and the Canadian examples share the same oral rural tradition.

While the PA-patterns disappear in France, at least according to the available corpora, they are still in use in Canada. The Canadian French corpus Lexiquum (L) contains 29 occurrences of *pour vrai* in present-day language, and in particular in the collocation *se passer pour vrai*:

- (119) on rembourse notre dette et quand on la rembourse *pour vrai*, bien, année après année, on paie moins d'intérêt. (L)  
 (120) mais, quand vient le temps d'agir *pour vrai*, pour l'intérêt des Québécoises et des Québécois (L)  
 (121) la véritable réalité, les faits, ce qui se passe *pour vrai*. (L)  
 (122) ce qui se passe *pour vrai*, c'est ce qu'on fait *pour vrai*. (L)

The variant *pour le vrai* provides two hits; witness (123):

- (123) le pays va être dans le trouble *pour le vrai*. Consolerez-vous, c'est quasi impossible. (L)

The *Corpus de français parlé au Québec* (CFPQ), a corpus that registers informal interactive discourse, provides 56 occurrences of *pour vrai*, e. g.:

- (124) ah ouai :s/ *pour vrai* ↑ ah oui en tout cas ça j'aimerais ça euh comprendre ce que tu fais vraiment là (CFPQ, sous-corpus 18)  
 (125) ah *pour vrai*:/ mon doux pauvre toi (CFPQ, sous-corpus 30)  
 (126) tu vas payer pas mal pour tes fruits et légumes pis pour tout ce qui est bio là *pour vrai* là. (CFPQ, sous-corpus 10)  
 (127) et Gabriel m'a répondu [...] je l'aime *pour vrai* (CFPQ, sous-corpus 26)  
 (128) moi je pensais que: j'allais être comme [...] non mais *pour vrai* ça m'a fait grossir un peu d'ici là mais euh (CFPQ, sous-corpus 10)

The variant *pour le vrai* has two attestations, e. g.:

- (129) HEIN/ *pour le vrai* ↑ (CFPQ, sous-corpus 24)

The data in the Canadian corpora provide clear evidence for continued metropolitan traditions that underwent marginalization in standard metropolitan French. As in Old French, Canadian French *pour (le) vrai* is used as a discourse marker, and the epistemic adverbial continues to be combined with a wide range of verbs, e. g., *aimer pour vrai*. In Modern French, the combination with verbs is practically reduced to copular *tenir pour vrai* from 1800 on (Frantext), except for the locution *à vrai dire* and some instances of *à vrai parler*. This situation provides strong evidence for *pour (le) vrai* being used in spoken French in the 17th century, that is, when emigration to present-day Canada started. In addition, the Canadian examples clearly match with Old French, providing evidence for a long oral tradition.

In France, the purification of the language in the 17th century and the subsequent standardization included a selection process where both Type A and Type C were disfavored (Hummel 2018a). The following citation concerning the PN-pattern gives an idea of the normative spirit at that time:

*Fin*, ne se met point seul pour *enfin*: à la *fin*, à la *parfin*, est vulgaire: *en fin*: *en fin finale*, antique: *sur la fin*, *finale*ment: *finable*ment antique & hors d'usage (Oudin 1972 [1632]: 278).

The example shows that in the 17th century the liberal coexistence of large series of variants was a fact. The proliferation of variants was previously favored by attempts to increase the linguistic richness of French in order

to achieve the same level as Latin and Greek (Hummel 2018a). It seems that even the use of the noun *fin* with adverbial functions was possible. Oudin bans the major part of the variants using the stem *fin*. Hence, purism tried to eliminate most variants in order to leave the best for the *bon usage* of French.

Since the assumption of normative recommendations influencing real usage is a very polemic topic in the French linguistic discussion, I would wish to add that more than having a real effect, except for a few happy readers, the recommendation cited above reflects the spirit of the time. This spirit animated speakers keen to write good French to use the best forms and to avoid risky choices, whatever the best and bad ones were. Hence, the spirit engages a typical »invisible hand« process in diachrony whereby individual paths develop to mainstream tendencies (Keller 2014). At any rate, it is a fact that the criticized alternatives have disappeared: adverbial *fin* (noun), *à la parfin*, *finablement*, *en fin finale*, the latter at least in standard. Unlike Spanish, where Latinization in the spirit of Renaissance was a relevant metalinguistic attitude, the French purism of the 17th century reacted against Latinization, favoring a »national« way.

In the 18th century, grammatical rationalism, searching for a clear and logical language, favored the usage of prepositions. Importantly, these differences in linguistic culture belong to the period of modern language. Since the colonization of the New World was prior, it comes as no surprise that the old oral traditions survive in this part of the World, which was not or was less influenced by the metalinguistic attitudes of Modern Europe. In the present paper, I focus on the old tradition of using the PA-pattern. Regarding this, the case study provides evidence for the existence of a long spoken tradition, independently of what modern standard language may have come to.

Following Féron (2001: 74), we can add that Type A (*dire vrai*) and Type C (the PA-patterns *pour vrai dire*, *à vrai dire*, *pour vrai*, etc.) coexisted from the beginnings of the documentation of the French language. This might call into question traditional paths of grammaticalization leading from intrapropositional *dire vrai* to extrapropositional use. However, the more important fact is that we cannot observe the grammaticalization process because it obviously occurred before the 12th century. For the purpose of this paper, this supports the hypothesis that the PA-patterns follow an old tradition tracing back to informal spoken Latin. Given the fact that they are only scarcely attested in the available written Latin texts, this supports the idea of an underlying, almost invisible oral tradition of using PA-patterns (Claim B).

## 8. Results and discussion

### 8.1 Claim A: PA-patterns as *systematic alternatives* for Types A and B

Claim A, which posits the PA-pattern as a systematic alternative to Type A and Type B adverbs in Romance, has to be specified insofar as the systematic use of the PA-pattern tends to be restricted to circumstantial modification, a domain that includes, in a broad sense, all discourse functions used by speakers to situate the propositional contents of a text. Given the fact that the number of discourse markers and sentential adverbs is never exceedingly high in a language, the documentation of 56 triplets (Type A,B,C) in Spanish points to a relevant role of PA-patterns in this domain. As shown in 5.2 and Annex 1, systematicity holds also in the pan-Romanic perspective. Moreover, 4.2 provides evidence that the 56 PA-patterns in Spanish belong to seven functional domains, such as the epistemic domain for the units under scrutiny. Not surprisingly, according to both case studies, analogy between members of the same paradigm plays a relevant role in diachrony. Once Sp. *fijo* had acquired epistemic meanings, the existence of epistemic adverbials such as *de cierto*, *de seguro* made it easier to create *de fijo*.

### 8.2 Claims B, F: The PA-pattern is crucial for the *genuine oral tradition* and *colloquialization*

According to Claim B, PA-patterns belong to the oral Latin-Romance tradition. The spot check in 5.1 has shown that there were more PA-patterns, especially in Late Latin, than assumed in the bibliography. However, the data provide evidence for a split tradition, some PA-patterns belonging to the language of the educated, others to oral folk tradition. As far as oral use is concerned, two scenarios appeared. According to the first scenario, some PA-patterns belong to the genuine informal oral tradition. According to the second, units belonging to the discourse of the educated underwent colloquialization, probably already in the familiar registers of the educated, e. g., the variant *a la continua* < *continuo* (adv.) (Claim F).

The case study on Sp. *fijo* has examined the diachrony of a unit borrowed from Classical Latin by the educated. Together with the striking fact that all PA variants realized epistemic adverbial functions from their first occurrence, the data clearly show that *de fijo*, *en fija*, and *a la fija*

appear in citations that come close to informal orality, being part of a colloquialization process (Claims F, G). By contrast, *fijamente* is mainly found in narrative discourse. There is also one PA-pattern, *por fiyo*, which was probably created for formal use. The occurrence of *en fija* and *a la fija* in American rural dialects indicates their belonging to old oral traditions. This does not mean that these variants are particularly old. The major fact is that the same old formation rules are productive still today in standard registers.<sup>12</sup>

The second case study on Fr. *vrai* has brought to light striking structural analogies with the Spanish example: use of the same prepositions, the same inflection patterns, the use of the feminine definite article. In the case of Fr. *vrai*, intrapropositional epistemic adverbial functions and extrapropositional discourse functions coexisted from the first documents in the 12th century. The fact that a complex polyfunctionality was in use at that time provides evidence for an old tradition of using these discourse functions. Since this tradition cannot be retrieved in written Latin, this must have been a hidden oral tradition. If we bear in mind the development of polyfunctional *fijo*, which spanned the period from the 15th to the late 19th century, we could argue that the polyfunctionality of Fr. *vrai* traces back some centuries before the 12th century. This is obviously a speculation, but future research might discover some traces of this or another case in Latin texts.

### 8.3 Claim E: Marginalization in standard

Claim E deals with the impact of normative tendencies, which first favored the expansion of linguistic forms, until the 17th century, before purism started to reduce the variants. This set of forces driving change was rein-

<sup>12</sup> Type B > Type A is another productive path of colloquialization, as, e. g., in Engl. *really good* > *real good* (Hummel 2013), or Fr. *sérieusement* > *sérieux*, such as in *sérieusement malade* > *sérieux malade* ›serious(ly) ill‹ and *Sérieux/sérieusement, elle t'a dit ça?* ›Serious/seriously, she said that?‹ (Hummel 2018b). Álvarez-Prendes (2018) observes that the sentential functions of Fr. *sérieusement* and Sp. *en serio*, which convey the speaker's attitude ›Let's speak seriously/get serious‹, both diachronically start from equivalent manner modification of the verb. It is interesting to note that Fr. *sérieusement* developed this function while Sp. *seriamente* left it to *en serio*. This suggests three things: (i) their possible original equivalence in the origins, (ii) a tendency of PA to develop sentential functions and (iii) that, possibly, the expansion of Fr. adverbs in *-ment* to take on sentential functions was particularly strong.

forced and definitively implemented by written standard. In fact, both case studies provide evidence for the marginalization of the PA-patterns to regional rural language, with special persistence in American varieties. The patterns were ruled out by standard, where some of them have survived as lexicalized adverbial locutions. Obviously, these normative tendencies only directly impacted a minority, at least until schooling was generalized. This is exactly why the tradition of using PA-patterns could continue in informal registers, while the educated ceased to retain them in their discourse. The interruption of this tradition in standard becomes particularly salient in metropolitan French, where most century-old PA-patterns with *vrai* disappeared.

#### 8.4 Claim D: PA-patterns for *Sprachausbau*

Claim D argues that the diversification of PA-patterns has to be placed inside the period of transition from Old Romance to Modern Romance. This process is driven by both the internal necessity of developing the adequate structures for a complex use language (*Sprachausbau*) and normative claims of »linguistic enrichment« in order to approach the ideal of the classical languages, Greek and Latin. The fact that PA structures are indeed richly documented during the first centuries of linguistic documentation in Romance, while they are rare in Late Latin, shows that the written language has been elaborated and enriched in this domain. However, some PA structures might have simply surfaced from oral use. Claim D therefore requires a more fine-tuned analysis of this period.

#### 8.5 Claim G: Colloquialization and discourse functions

According to Claim G, PA-patterns can be relevant for the development of discourse functions finally realized by Type A or Type B in the Modern language epoch. From the functional point of view, the circumstantial properties of PA-patterns allow their direct use for sentential and discourse functions. The two case studies have shown that diachrony depends more on conceptual and functional networks than on linear paths. Thus, the adjective *fijo* underwent an abstraction process that prepared it for epistemic functions. However, the high frequency of Sp. *de fijo*, as well as the fact that its syntactic, pragmatic, conceptual, and functional properties were adopted in clear analogy by the discourse marker *fijo*, which rose in

the 20th century as *de fiyo* decayed, provide evidence for a linear path that emerges out of a more complex network. Therefore, *de fiyo* can be considered the primary predecessor of the discourse marker *fiyo* in Peninsular Spanish. I do not claim that this analysis can be extended to other cases in Annex 1. It is a possibility that may occur. It cannot be theoretically claimed, but only empirically shown.

### 8.6 Claim C: PA-patterns and analyticization in the Latin-Romance transition

Claim C argues that PA-patterns are part of the major process that transforms Latin to Romance via analyticization. This is apparently the case, if we focus on PX-patterns. However, according to Ledgeway (2012: 24), the description in terms of analyticization »offers no explanation« because it remains superficial. In Romance languages, synthetic Latin is not typologically replaced by analytic Romance, inasmuch as inflection is basically conserved, e. g., in the verbal and nominal domains. Consequently, analyticization is, at best, a diachronic tendency or drive in Romance. Given the fact that the development of analytic structures exists alongside the rise of new synthetic structures (e. g., future tense, adverbs in *-mente*), each case has to be studied separately (Ledgeway 2012: 15). However, considering single constructions can be misleading.

The present study has clearly shown that variation plays a major role in language. The diachrony of adverbial functions can only be adequately explained if the competition of Types A, B, and C – which are only the main types – is taken into account. Analysis therefore has to observe *functional domains*. In fact, in the adverbial domain synthetic adverbs in *-mente* rise together with analytic PX-patterns, sharing the same stem in the case of PA adverbials. Moreover, adverbial adjectives such as *parler clair* ›to speak clear‹ renounce taking on either analytic or synthetic marking, since the adverbial function is basically fine-tuned by the position of the adjective in syntax. Both grammaticalization theory, which is often illustrated with adverbs in *-mente*, and analyticization, if illustrated with PX-patterns, see only one side of the coin, or, to put it more correctly, one side of the multi-sided object of investigation.

All three major variants – adverbial adjectives (Type A), adverbs in *-mente* (Type B), PX adverbials (Type C) – can be dislocated to the left periphery of the sentence in order to convey discourse modification or organization. The three variants thus all follow the tendency of modern

Romance to use syntax to mark discourse functions, with a clear peak of frequency in the period from the second half of the 19th century to the first decades of the 20th, at a time where standardization was completed. Consequently, there is no specific correlation between syntactic marking, on the one hand, and the synthetic/analytic/unchanged morphosyntax of the corresponding Type A/B/C adverbials on the other.

The use of syntactic positions for marking functions in sentence and discourse thus appears to be a rather independent development in Romance. Indeed, »configurationality« is pointed out by Ledgeway (2012: 31) as a major trend in Romance:

the transition from Latin to Romance is to be sought in the move away from a non-configurational syntax, in which the relationships between individual linguistic items is signalled through the forms of the items themselves (case inflections, agreement), towards an increasingly configurational syntax, in which the relationships between related linguistic items is encoded by their fixed positions relative to each other [...].

He thereby adds the development of hierarchically structured syntactic groups (»phrases«) to the well-known establishment of word or phrase order. The marking of the adverbial functions of morphologically unmarked (= masc. sg.) adjectives by forming a group with the modified unit (Type A) and the use of sentential adverbials in the left periphery of a »sentence«, which thus behaves as a group of groups, confirm this tendency. Ledgeway (2012: 15) further refers to Coseriu regarding a new split of external and internal marking:

Thus, the real change in the passage from Latin to Romance is not to be seen as a move from syntheticity to analyticity, but is to be identified with the emergence of a new formative principle of mapping relational and non-relational functions respectively onto externally and internally determined structures, as consistently and uniformly attested [...].

Modifiers that function inside a group, e. g., adjectives modifying a noun, are considered instances of internal modification. The use of prepositions in PX-patterns, dislocations to the periphery, and parenthetical »distance« from groups or sentences may be termed external relations. These are relational functions to the extent that they explicitly (prepositions) or inferentially (periphery, parenthesis) mediate between two poles of discourse. We have indeed seen that PA-patterns, although they may show synonymy with »internally« modifying adverbial adjectives and adverbs in *-mente* (*saber cierto/ciertamente/de cierto*), especially at earlier stages of develop-

ment, tend to convey in the long-term what I have roughly called *circumstantial modification*. Circumstantial modification and discourse functions can be considered as relational functions rather than internally determined modification via adjectives or adverbs of manner.

PA-patterns are functionally marked by their propositional head. Now, »a rich system of head-marking in Romance should *a priori* lead us to expect a similar degree of freedom in word order« (Ledgeway 2012: 310). Consequently, rigid word order in Romance cannot be explained in this way. On the contrary, syntactic mobility and availability for internal and external modification is characteristic of all types of modification (Type A, B, C), even if there may be differences in terms of tendency. The major fact is that mobility consistently goes hand in hand with functional differentiation, with possible effects of lexicalization, especially in the case of PX-patterns. Lexicalization as »adverbial locutions« thus provides additional evidence for the claim that functional differentiation is particularly likely to occur when prepositions are used for marking.

Although all these facts support the hypothesis of an independent development of linear and hierarchical syntactic marking, the relation between oral and written language is generally overlooked or under-estimated in the discussion. If we look at current transcriptions of informal communication in present-day language, sentential syntax in terms of complete sentences, linearity and hierarchy is anything but evident. Hence, it may well be that the apparent independent development of a specific type of syntax holds in the first place for writing. Now, writing is a linguistic and cultural fact that strongly relates with standardization, at least in Romance. The very fact of using »complete sentences« is a matter of writing. Consequently, syntactic structures of sentences are likely to be related to cultures of writing. It would probably be a worthwhile undertaking to look at Creole languages. Creole languages lexified with Romance use simple adverbs and adverbs in *-ment(e)*. The interesting thing is that innovation in the adverbial domains might be preferentially realized with prepositions. Consequently, PX-patterns could be a universal or highly probable development in languages that undergo »restructuration« to use a more neutral term than creolization. Hence, PX-patterns could, eventually, be situated in this tradition. Now, what may be called »restructuration« in orality, can be associated with *Sprachausbau* in the written tradition. Work on Old Spanish consistently shows that the PX-pattern was (i) new and (ii) very productive. It was clearly used to provide a new array of functions for writing. The question of how far the dynamic development of PX-patterns, taken as a rule-guided schema, relies on spoken language or

on *Sprachausbau* for writing, is an open one. Token frequency points to *Sprachausbau*, but this does not necessarily mean that the baseline schema does not stem from the genuine oral tradition.

## 9. Conclusion

Generally, Romance is said to be privileged as compared to Germanic for diachronic studies because there is considerable language documentation over more than 2000 years from Latin to Romance. The case studied here is particular, insofar as it is not documentation but the lack of documentation that indirectly supports the argumentation. Negative evidence in written Latin texts helps reconstruct the diachrony of speaking. The general rise of PA-patterns in the early centuries of Romance, that is, when writing brought written Latin closer to its spoken traditions, and the existence of a differentiated polyfunctionality in the case of Fr. *vrai* as early as in the 12th century, provide convincing evidence for a strong mainstream of using PA-patterns in the informal oral tradition of Latin. Romance languages follow this tradition and enrich their inventory during the centuries of linguistic elaboration, before purism and standardization proceed to a radical selection that seriously affects the PA-patterns from the 17th century onwards. The case studies have shown, however, that the genuine oral tradition continues to be productive in the informal spoken varieties and registers, more particularly in rural varieties which have been conserved in America. In sum, the paper provides partial but converging evidence supporting the seven claims mentioned in the Introduction.

Obviously, this first examination of the topic leaves a lot to verify. One might think of taking into account all PX-patterns, e. g., PN adverbials, which could have catalyzed the usage of PA adverbials even within the written tradition (e. g., *a punto fijo*). The complex transition from Latin to Romance at the interfaces of literacy and orality requires thorough studies including translations. In the same vein, the process of linguistic elaboration until the 16th century has to be analyzed with more data, taking into account the ongoing contact of Romance with Latin. As shown in the case studies, more dialect studies are needed in order to single out the major features of oral traditions and synchronic productivity. Finally, the historical-comparative analysis of Romance is a task whose complexity is only looming in the data collected so far.

In general terms, the genuine Indo-European tradition of using Type A adverbs in spoken language progressively surfaced as Classical Latin de-

cayed. Several independent studies have corroborated this point. New is the idea that, in a historical context favoring analytic structures, this process went hand in hand with the development of solutions that combined Type A with prepositions. Prepositions could be used either to syntactically mark the adverbial functions of an adjective, e. g., producing (initially) equivalent Sp. *seguramente*, *de seguro*, *seguro*, or to add a circumstantial semantic component (e. g., Sp. *por lo seguro*). This bumped a dynamic that favored long-term conceptual and functional differentiation and lexicalization. In parallel, the innovative Romance Type B adverbs ending in *-mente* were implemented, primarily as a correlate of efforts made to elaborate the written and the educated spoken language. Although cognitively related in terms of alternative expressions, at least in the mind of the educated, the relation between Type A/C, on one hand, and Type B, on the other, was not simply functional in nature (different functions), but filtered or affected by register and code, Type A/C being preferred in the informal oral language, Type B in the formal and correct written and spoken language. In sum, I hypothesize that Type A/C belong to a common oral tradition that comes to light during the Latin-Romance transition, while Type B largely behaves as an educated superstratum.

## 10. References

- Aguilar Ruiz, M.J. (2010): »Fuentes bibliográficas para el estudio de las locuciones desde una perspectiva histórica: elaboración de corpus e inserción en diccionarios«, *Res diachronicae* 8, 123–135.
- Albelda, M. (2002): »La intensificación de la actitud: el caso de *fijo*«, in: A. Bernabé et al. (ed.), *Presente y futuro de la lingüística en España. La Sociedad de Lingüística, 30 años después*. Actas del II Congreso de la Sociedad Española de Lingüística (Madrid, 11–15 de diciembre de 2000), vol. 2, Madrid: Sociedad Española de Lingüística, 506–513.
- Álvarez-Prendes, E. (2018): »Polyfonctionnalité adverbiale, grammaticalisation et subjectivation: le cas de *sérieusement*, *seriamente* et *en serio*«, *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie* 134,2, 471–486.
- Badia Margarit, A. (1975): *Gramática catalana*, vol. 2, Madrid: Gredos.
- BADIP = *Banca dati dell'italiano parlato*, <<http://badip.uni-graz.at/it>> (data retrieved in July/August 2017).
- Bauer, B. (2001): »Syntactic Innovation in Latin Poetry? The Origins of the Romance Adverbial Formation in *-ment(e)*«, in: A. P. Orbán/M. G. M

- van der Poel, *Ad litteras. Latin studies in honour of J. H. Brouwers*, Nijmegen: Nijmegen University Press, 29–43.
- Bauer, B. (2003): »The Adverbial Formation in *mente* in Vulgar and Late Latin. A Problem in Grammaticalization«, in: H. Solin et al. (ed.), *Latin vulgaire – latin tardif VI*, Hildesheim, etc.: Olms-Weidmann, 439–457.
- Bauer, B. (2010): »Forerunners of Romance *-mente* adverbs in Latin Prose and Poetry«, in: E. Dickey/A. Chahoud (ed.), *Colloquial and Literary Latin*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 339–353.
- BMF = *Banque de français médiéval*, <<http://txm.bfm-corpus.org/?command=documentation&path=/BFM2016>> (data retrieved in July 2017).
- Bosque, I. (2007): »Procesos de abstracción en los paradigmas léxicos abiertos«, *Pandora: Revue d'études hispaniques* 7, 189–198.
- CDH = *Corpus del diccionario histórico*, <[www.rae.es/recursos/banco-datos/cdh](http://www.rae.es/recursos/banco-datos/cdh)>.
- Chircu, A. (2007): »Locuțiunile adverbiale de tipul: *de-a lungul, de-a gata, de-a binelea*«, in: G. Pană Dindelegan (ed.), *Limba română – stadiul actual al cercetării*, Actele celui de-al 6-lea Colocviu al Catedrei de limba română (29–30 November 2006), București: Editura Universității din București, 67–75.
- Chircu, A. (2008): *L'adverbe dans les langues romanes*, Cluj Napoca: Casa Cărții de Știință.
- Chircu, A. (2015a): »Un tipar locuțional adverbial în limba română veche: *pre larg, pre scurt, pre lesne*«, in: R. Zafiu/I. Nedelcu (ed.), *Variația lingvistică: probleme actuale*, Actele celui de-al 14-lea Colocviu Internațional al Departamentului de lingvistică »lingvistică: Probleme actuale«, București, 28–29 November 2014, vol. I: *Gramatică, Istoria limbii române, filologie, dialectologie*, București: Editura Universității din București, 11–19.
- Chircu, A. (2015b): »Observații asupra locuțiunilor adverbiale de tipul: *la nimereală, din greșeală, la repezeală*«, in: M. Sala et al. (ed.), *Lucrările celui de-al cincilea Simpozion Internațional de lingvistică* (București, 27–28 November 2013), București: Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold, 446–460.
- Codita, V. (2016): *La conformación y el uso de las locuciones prepositivas en castellano medieval*, Frankfurt a. M., etc.: Peter Lang.
- Company Company, C. (2004): »Gramaticalización por subjetivización como prescindibilidad de la sintaxis«, *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica* 52, 1–27.
- Company Company, C. (2012): »Condicionamientos textuales en la evolución de los adverbios en *-mente*«, *Revista de Filología Española* 92, 9–42.

- Company Company, C. (ed.) (2014): *Sintaxis histórica de la lengua española*, Tercera parte, 3 vols., México: UNAM – Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Company Company, C. (2014a): »Adverbios en *-mente*«, in: C. Company Company (ed.), 457–611.
- Company Company, C. (2014b): »Principios teóricos vs. datos de corpus: ¿Dialogo o enfrentamiento? Los adverbios en *-mente* como marcadores de discurso«, in: M.M. García Negroni (ed.), *Marcadores del discurso: perspectivas y contrastes*, Buenos Aires: Santiago Arcos, 13–33.
- CFPQ = *Corpus de français parlé au Québec*, <<https://recherche.flsh.usherbrooke.ca/cfpq/index.php/site/afficher/corpusmulti>> (data retrieved in June 2017).
- CORDE = *Corpus diacrónico del español*, <[www.rae.es/recursos/banco-de-datos/corde](http://www.rae.es/recursos/banco-de-datos/corde)>.
- Corpus do Português*, <[www.corpusdoportugues.org](http://www.corpusdoportugues.org)> (data retrieved in July/August 2017).
- CREA = *Corpus de referencia del español actual*, <[www.rae.es/recursos/banco-de-datos/crea](http://www.rae.es/recursos/banco-de-datos/crea)>.
- Cruschina, Silvio/E.-M. Remberger (2017): »Before the Complementizer. Adverb Types and Root Clause Modification«, in: M. Hummel/S. Valera (ed.), 81–109.
- Cupaiuolo, F. (1967): *La formazione degli avverbi in latino*, Napoli: Libreria scientifica.
- Dardano, M. et al. (paper): »Gli avverbiali di »certezza« in italiano antico: Sintassi e funzioni pragmatico-discorsive«, paper read at the 28th Congress CILPR, Roma (18–23/7/2016).
- Diémoz, F. (2016): »*Monter en haut et descendre en bas*: les verbes de déplacement dans les parlers francoprovençaux et dans les langues romanes voisines«, in: J.-P. Chauveau et al. (ed.), *Actes du 27<sup>e</sup> CILPR. Section 8: Linguistique variationnelle, dialectologie et sociolinguistique*, Nancy: ATILF, <[www.atilf.fr/cilpr2013/actes/section-8.html](http://www.atilf.fr/cilpr2013/actes/section-8.html)>.
- DLE = Real Academia Española (2014).
- DMF = R. Martin (ed.): *Dictionnaire du moyen français (DMF) 1330–1500*, version of 2012, <[www.atilf.fr/dmf](http://www.atilf.fr/dmf)>.
- Eberenz, R. (2005): »Cambios morfosintácticos en la baja Edad Media«, in: R. Cano (ed.), *Historia de la lengua española*, Barcelona: Ariel, 613–641.
- Echenique Elizondo, M. T. (2008a): »Algunas notas sobre latín y romance en la fraseología hispánica medieval«, in: R. Wright (ed.), *Latin vulgaire – latin tardif VII*, Hildesheim, etc.: Olms-Weidmann, 540–547.

- Echenique Elizondo, M. T. (2008b): »Notas de sintaxis histórica en el marco del corpus de diacronía fraseológica del español (DIAFRAES)«, in: E. Stark et al. (ed.), *Romanische Syntax im Wandel*, Tübingen: Narr, 387–397.
- Espinosa Elorza, R. M. (2010): *Procesos de formación y cambio en las llamadas ›palabras gramaticales‹*, San Millán de la Cogolla: Cilengua.
- Espinosa Elorza, R. M. (2012): »Cambios sintácticos en el siglo XIX«, in: J. L. Ramírez Luengo (ed.), *Por sendas ignoradas. Estudios sobre el español en el siglo XIX*, Lugo: Axac, 61–74.
- Féron, C. (2001): »Pour vrai, pour certain, pour sûr... : formation et évolution d'adverbiaux en pour«, *Langue française* 156, 61–75.
- FEW = Wartburg, W. v. (1911–2002): *Französisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch. Eine Darstellung des galloromanischen Sprachschatzes*, 25 vols, Leipzig, etc.: Teubner etc.
- Fortson IV, B. W. (2011): »The Historical Background to Latin within the Indo-European Language Family«, in: J. Clackson (ed.), *A Companion to the Latin Language*, Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 199–219.
- Frantext, <www.frantext.fr>.
- Fuentes Rodríguez, C. (2009): *Diccionario de conectores y operadores del español*, Madrid: Arco Libros.
- García Calvo, A. (1964): »La feminidad del camino«, *Emerita* 32, 49–56.
- García Valle, A. (2010a): »Locuciones adverbiales de ámbito jurídico: de los fueros medievales a su consolidación en la lengua«, *Revista de Filología Española* 90,1, 137–171.
- García Valle, A. (2010b): »Las locuciones adverbiales en la documentación notarial medieval«, in: C. Company Company/J. G. Moreno de Alba (ed.), *Actas del VII Congreso Internacional de Historia de la Lengua Española*, Madrid: Arco Libros, 593–611.
- García-Page Sánchez, M. (2008): *Introducción a la fraseología española. Estudio de las locuciones*, Barcelona: Anthropos.
- García-Page Sánchez, M. (2014): »Relaciones entre la morfología y la fraseología«, in: V. Durante (ed.), *Fraseología y paremiología: enfoques y aplicaciones*, Madrid: Instituto Cervantes, 11–22.
- Gerhalter, K. (2018): *Paradigmas y polifuncionalidad. La diacronía de preciso/precisamente, justo/justamente, exacto/exactamente y cabal/cabalmente*, PhD thesis, Graz: University of Graz.
- Giegerich, H. J. (2012): »The Morphology of -ly and the Categorical Status of ›Adverbs‹ in English«, *English Language and Linguistics* 16, 3, 341–359.
- González García, L. (1997): *El adverbio en español*, A Coruña: Universidade da Coruña.

- Grevisse, M./A. Goosse (2008): *Le bon usage*, 14th edition, Brussels: De Boeck & Duculot.
- Hengeveld, Kees (1992): *Non-Verbal Predication. Theory, Typology, Diachrony*, Berlin/New York: De Gruyter.
- Hummel, M. (2012): *Polifuncionalidad, polisemia y estrategia retórica. Los signos discursivos con base atributiva entre oralidad y escritura. Acerca de esp. bueno, claro, total, realmente, etc.*, Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.
- Hummel, M. (2013): »Attribution in Romance: Reconstructing the Oral and Written Tradition«, *Folia Linguistica Historica* 34, 1–42.
- Hummel, M. (2014a): »The Adjective-Adverb Interface in Romance and English«, in: P. Sleeman (ed.), *Adjectives in Germanic and Romance*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 35–71.
- Hummel, M. (2014b): »Los adjetivos adverbiales«, in: C. Company Company (ed.), 613–731.
- Hummel, M. (2015): »Los adverbios flexionados«, in: C. Galán Rodríguez et al. (ed.), *El discurso de la gramática. Estudios ofrecidos a José Manuel González Calvo*, Cáceres: Universidad de Extremadura, 205–233.
- Hummel, M. (2017a): »Adjectives with Adverbial Functions in Romance«, in: M. Hummel/S. Valera (ed.), 13–46.
- Hummel, M. (2017b): »L'accord adverbial en français«, in: G. Dostie (ed.), *Cadrage sur la variation, le changement lexical et le changement grammatical en français actuel*, *Revue de sémantique et pragmatique* 41–42, 181–205.
- Hummel, M. (2018a): »Éléments d'une diachronie grammaticographique et normative de l'adverbe français accompagnés de trois méthodes pour mesurer l'effet du discours normatif sur l'usage«, *Romanische Forschungen* 130, 3–35.
- Hummel, M. (2018b): »Romance sentence adverbs in *-mente*: Epistemic mitigation in synchrony and diachrony«, in: A.-M. de Cesare/A. Albom/D. Cimmino/M. Lupica Spagnolo (ed.), *Formal and functional perspectives on sentence adverbials in the Romance languages and beyond*, *Linguistik online* 92,5, 111–144, <<http://dx.doi.org/10.13092/lo.92.4507>>.
- Hummel, M./A. Kröll (2015): »*Vite et vitement*. Etude diachronique variationnelle d'une exception«, *Revue de Linguistique Romane* 79, 39–91.
- Hummel, M./A. Gazdik (in preparation): *Dictionnaire historique de l'adjectif-adverbe*. The database can be accessed at <<https://adjective-adverb.uni-graz.at>>.
- Hummel, M./S. Valera (ed.) (2017): *Adjective Adverb Interfaces in Romance*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kabatek, J. (2005): *Die Bolognesische Renaissance und der Ausbau der romanischen Sprachen*, Tübingen: Niemeyer.

- Kany, Ch. E. (1970): *Sintaxis hispanoamericana*, Madrid: Gredos.
- Keller, R. (2014): *Sprachwandel. Von der unsichtbaren Hand in der Sprache*, 4th edition, Tübingen: Francke.
- Kocher, Anna (2017): »From Verum to Epistemic Modality and Evidentiality. On the Emergence of the Spanish Adv + C Construction«, in: S. Cruschina/E.-M. Remberger (ed.), *The Rise and Development of Evidential and Epistemic Markers, Journal of Historical Linguistics* 7, 1–2, special issue, 77–110
- Kruisinga, E. (1927): »On the History of Conversion in English«, *English Studies* 9, 103–108.
- Lapesa, R. (2000): »Sintaxis histórica del adjetivo calificativo no atributivo«, in: Lapesa, R., *Estudios de morfosintaxis histórica del español*, vol. 1, Madrid: Gredos, 235–271.
- Lausberg, H. (1972): *Romanische Sprachwissenschaft*, vol. 3: *Formenlehre*, Berlin/New York: De Gruyter.
- Lavale-Ortiz, R. M. (in print a): »A Cognitive Approach to the Grammaticalization of the Epistemic Marker *fijo*«, in: J. Fernández Jaén/H. Provencio Garrigós (ed.), *Historical linguistics. Current Theories and Applications*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Lavale-Ortiz, R. M. (in print b): »Las variantes de *fijo* en español como marcas epistémicas: distribución y uso«.
- Ledgeway, A. (2012): *From Latin to Romance. Morphosyntactic Typology and Change*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ledgeway, A. (2017): »Parameters in Romance Adverb Agreement«, in: M. Hummel/S. Valera (ed.), 46–80.
- Lexiquum*. Concordancier Québécois, < <http://rali.iro.umontreal.ca/rali/?q=fr/lexiquum> > (data retrieved in June 2017).
- Löfstedt, B. (1967): »Bemerkungen zum Adverb im Lateinischen«, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 72, 79–109.
- López, Á./R. Morant (2008): »L'adverbi«, in: J. Solà (ed.), 1797–1852.
- Maas, U. (2010): »Literat und orat. Grundbegriffe der Analyse geschriebener und gesprochener Sprache«, *Grazer Linguistische Studien* 73, 21–150.
- Mariner, S. (1968): »El femenino de indeterminación«, in: A. Quilis (ed.), *Actas del XI Congreso Internacional de Lingüística y Filología Románicas, Revista de Filología Española, Anejo 86*, vol. 3, 1297–1313.
- Martelotta, M. E. (2012): »Advérbio – conceito e tendências de ordenação«, in: M. Rios de Oliveira/M. M. Cezario (ed.), *Adverbiais. Aspectos gramaticais e pressões discursivas*, Niterói: UFF, 13–96.
- Mayans y Siscar, G. (1991) [= 1723]: *Abecé español*, new edition by M. J. Martínez Alcalde, Madrid: Arco Libros.

- Meyer-Lübke, W. (1972) [= 1899]: *Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen*, vol. 3: Romanische Syntax, Hildesheim/New York: Olms.
- MIDIA = *Morfologia dell'italiano in diacronia*, <[www.corpusmidia.unito.it](http://www.corpusmidia.unito.it)> (data retrieved in July/August 2017).
- Mohrmann, Ch. (1965): *Die altchristliche Sondersprache in den Sermones des hl. Augustin*, Amsterdam: Hakkert.
- Moreno de Alba, J. G. (2009): »El adverbio«, in: C. Hernández Alonso (ed.), *Estudios lingüísticos del español hablado en América*, vol. 2: *El sintagma verbal*, Madrid: Visor, 565–642.
- NDHE = *Nuevo diccionario histórico del español*, in preparation, see <[www.rae.es/recursos/diccionarios/nuevo-diccionario-historico](http://www.rae.es/recursos/diccionarios/nuevo-diccionario-historico)>.
- Neves, M. H. de Moura (1999): *Gramática de usos do português*, São Paulo: UNESP.
- Ocampo, F. (2006a): »Movement towards Discourse is not Grammaticalization: The Evolution of *claro* from Adjective to Discourse Particle in Spoken Spanish«, in: N. Sagarra/A. J. Toribio, *Selected proceedings of the 9th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*, Somerville (MA), 308–319.
- Ocampo, F. (2006b): »La evolución de *bueno* de adjetivo a partícula discursiva. Un proceso de discursivización«, *Oralia* 9, 231–257.
- Octavio de Toledo y Huerta, Á. (2016): *Los relacionantes locativos en la historia del español*, Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.
- Optimot*. Llengua catalana, <<http://aplicacions.llengua.gencat.cat/llc/AppJava/index.html>> (data retrieved in November 2017).
- Ortiz Ciscomani, R. M. (2014): »Locuciones adverbiales con *a* y base lexica en *-as*«, in: C. Company Company (ed.), 1117–1192.
- Ortiz Ciscomani, R. M. (2017): »From Adjective to Adverbial Modal Locutions in Spanish«, in: M. Hummel/S. Valera (ed.), 305–327.
- Oudin, A. (1972) [= 1632/1640]: *Grammaire française rapportée au langage du temps*, Genève: Slatkine.
- OVI = *Banca dati dell'italiano antico*, <[www.oivi.cnr.it](http://www.oivi.cnr.it)> (data retrieved in July/August 2017).
- Pato, E. (2017): »Mero no es un mero adjetivo«, *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie* 133,3, 748–765.
- Pavón Lucero, M. V. (1999): »Clases de partículas: preposición, conjunción y adverbio«, in: I. Bosque/V. Demonte, *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, vol. 1, Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 565–655.
- Pecoraro, W./Ch. Pisacane (1984): *L'avverbio*, Bologna: Zanichelli.
- Penadés Martínez, I. (2005): *Diccionario de locuciones adverbiales para la enseñanza del español*, Madrid: Arco Libros.

- Penadés Martínez, I. (2012): *Gramática y semántica de las locuciones*, Alcalá de Henares: Universidad de Alcalá.
- Pinkster, H. (1972): *On Latin Adverbs*, Amsterdam/London: North-Holland.
- Queirazza, G. G. (1970): »Note storiche sulla formazione del tipo avverbiale latino-volgare AGG. + -mente«, in: *Actes du XII<sup>e</sup> Congrès International de Linguistique et de Philologie Romanes*, vol. 1, Bukarest: Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti, 109–113.
- RAE-ASALE = Real Academia Española/Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española (2009): *Nueva gramática de la lengua española*, vol. 2, Madrid: Espasa Libros.
- Raposo, E. Buzaglo Paiva et al. (2013): *Gramática do português*, vol. 2, Lisboa: Gulbenkian.
- Real Academia Española (2014): *Diccionario de la lengua española* [DEL], 23rd edition, 2 vol., Madrid: Espasa Calpe. (<[www.rae.es/obras-academicas/diccionarios/diccionario-de-la-lengua-espanola](http://www.rae.es/obras-academicas/diccionarios/diccionario-de-la-lengua-espanola)>).
- REDES = (2004): *Diccionario combinatorio del español contemporáneo*, I. Bosque (ed.), Madrid: SM.
- Renzi, L. et al. (2001): *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione*, vol. 2, Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Rheinfelder, H. (1967): *Altfranzösische Grammatik*, vol. 2: *Formenlehre*, München: Hueber.
- Ricca, D. (2010): »Adverbs«, in: Ph. Baldi/P. Cuzzolin (ed.), *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax*, vol. 2: *Constituent Syntax, Adverbial Phrases, Adverbs, Mood, Tense*, Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 109–191.
- Ricós Vidal, A. (2008a): »De locuciones coordinadas a sintagmas complejos. A propósito de *a diestro y siniestro, a tuerto o a derecho, a tontas y a locas*«, in: I. Olza Moreno et al. (ed.), *Actas del 37 Simposio Internacional de la SEL*, Pamplona: Universidad de Navarra, 707–717.
- Ricós Vidal, A. (2008b): »Locuciones adverbiales con preposición *a* y adjetivo en el español y el portugués del siglo XVI. Estudio histórico«, in: C. Company Company/J. G. Moreno de Alba (ed.), *Actas del VII Congreso Internacional de Historia de la Lengua Española*, vol. 1, Madrid: Arco Libros, 1035–1054.
- Ricós Vidal, A. (2012): »*A reculas, a hotas, a sabiendas, a la deshilada, a la callada, a la sorda*: más sobre locuciones adverbiales«, in: A. García Valle et al. (ed.), *Fablar bien e tan mesurado*, Valencia: Tirant Humanidades, 63–86.
- Rodríguez Molina, J. (2014): »Adverbios y locuciones adverbiales de manera«, in: C. Company Company (ed.), 733–937.

- Rohlf, G. (1969): *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti*, vol. 3: *Sintassi e formazione delle parole*, Torino: Einaudi.
- Salazar García, V. (2007): »Flexibilidad categorial y adverbios de manera en español: un enfoque funcional«, in: P. Barros García et al. (ed.), *Estudios lingüísticos, literarios e históricos. Homenaje a Juan Martínez Marín*, Granada: Universidad de Granada, 309–326.
- Salvi, G./L. Renzi (ed.) (2010): *Grammatica dell'italiano antico*, 2 vol., Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Sancho Cremades, P. (2008): »La preposició i el sintagma preposicional«, in: J. Solà (ed.), 1689–1795.
- Sandmann, M. (1956): »Zur Frage des neutralen Femininum im Spanischen«, *Vox Romanica* 15, 54–82.
- Solà, J. (ed.) (2008): *Gramàtica del català contemporani*, 3 vol., Barcelona: Empuries.
- Sonntag, E. (2005): *Lexeme, Morpheme und Kategoreme. Die Wortkategorie Adverb und die adverbialen Wortklassen des Französischen und Spanischen*, Aachen: Shaker.
- Spitzer, L. (1941): »La feminización del neutro«, *Revista de Filología Hispánica* 3, 339–371.
- Tarriño Ruiz, E. (2009): »Adverbios y partículas«, in: J. M. Baños Baños (ed.), *Sintaxis del latín clásico*, Madrid: Liceus, 349–374.
- Thompson, S.A./A. Mulac (1991): »A Quantitative Perspective on the Grammaticization of Epistemic Parentheticals in English«, in: E. C. Traugott/B. Heine (ed.), *Approaches to grammaticalization*, vol. 2: *Focus on types of grammatical markers*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 313–329.
- TLL = *Thesaurus linguae latinae online* (2009), Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter <[www.degruyter.com/view/db/tll](http://www.degruyter.com/view/db/tll)> (data retrieved in December 2017).
- Tobler, A./E. Lommatzsch (1925–2002): *Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch*, 11 vol., different places and editors.
- Torrego, M. E. (2002): »Statim, paulatim, repente/subito: scope and lexical aspect«, in: A. M. Bolkestein et al. (ed.), *Theory and description in Latin linguistics*, Amsterdam: Gieben, 379–392.
- Väänänen, V. (1951): »*Il est venu comme ambassadeur, il agit en soldat* et locutions analogues en latin, français, italien et espagnol«, Helsinki: Société de Littérature Finnoise.
- Vasile, C. (2013): *Adverbul românesc între continuitate latină, specific balcanic și evoluție internă*, Bukarest: Editura Muzeului Național al Literaturii Române.

- Vester, E. (1983): *Instrument and Manner Expressions in Latin*, Dissertation: University of Amsterdam.
- Vicente Llavata, S. (2011): *Estudio de las locuciones en la obra literaria de Don Íñigo López de Mendoza (Marqués de Santillana). Hacia una fraseología histórica del español*, Valencia: Universitat de València.
- Wartburg, v. FEW.

ANNEX 1:  
THE PATTERN »PREP. + ADJ« (PA-PATTERN)  
IN ROMANCE

The following list includes morphosyntactic equivalents for the 56 Spanish PA-patterns that are onomasiologically listed in 4.2. This list only concerns those PA-patterns (e. g., Sp. *de seguro*) that also have a Type A (e. g., *seguro* (adverbial)) and a Type B (e. g., *seguramente*) counterpart. The list would be longer without this criterion. I am greatly indebted to the collaborators and colleagues who helped me. The French, Italian, and Portuguese data have been retrieved by Julia Höfferer and Pascal Striedner from the following corpora: BMF, DMF, Frantext, MIDIA, BADIP, OVI, Corpus do Português. This set of data includes equivalents with etymologically related stems in synchrony and diachrony. The data on the other Romance languages have been provided by native speakers and include equivalents with other stems. The diachronic and synchronic data on Romanian have been collected by Adrian Chircu. The present-day data on Catalan stem from Maria-Josep Cuenca who has checked the data in Optimot. Luca Melchior was in charge of the Friulian data and cross-checked the Italian patterns. Noemi Piredda has provided the Sardinian equivalents. [Cast = Castilianism, Ital = Italianism, OIt = Old Italian, ORom = Old Romanian, RomDial = Romanian dialect]

Prep. + ADJ SPANISH	Prep. + ADJ FRENCH	Prep. + ADJ ITALIAN	Prep. + ADJ PORTUGUESE	Prep. + ADJ ROMANIAN	Prep. + ADJ CATALAN	Prep. + ADJ FRIULAN	Prep. + ADJ SARDINIAN
<i>en alto</i>	<i>en haut</i>	<i>in alto</i>	<i>em alto</i>	<i>înaltu</i> (ORom)	<i>en alt</i>	<i>addalt</i>	<i>in altu</i>
<i>en breve</i>	<i>en bref</i>	<i>in breve</i>	<i>em breve</i>	<i>în scurt</i> <i>întru scurt</i> (ORom)	<i>en breu</i>	<i>in alt</i> ( <i>in curt</i> )	<i>in arttu</i> <i>in cultza</i>
<i>por bueno</i> <i>a la buena</i> <i>a las buenas</i>	<i>pour de bon</i> <i>à bon</i>	<i>per buono</i>	<i>por bom</i>	<i>pe scurt</i> (ORom) <i>din scurt</i> <i>cu dulce, cu buna</i> <i>per bo</i> <i>cu blând</i> <i>a les bones</i> <i>cu lin, cu linul</i> (ORom)	<i>par bon</i>	<i>pro bonu</i>	
<i>a ciegas</i>	<i>à l'aveuglette</i> <i>en aveugle</i>	<i>alla cieca</i>	<i>às cegas</i>	<i>cu frumosul</i> <i>cu frumuselel</i> ORom. <i>cu orbiu</i> <i>a cegues</i> <i>pe orbecâte, pe</i> <i>băjbâte</i> <i>pe dibuite</i>	<i>a la vuarbe</i>	<i>a sa zega</i>	
<i>de cierto</i> <i>por cierto</i>	<i>de certain</i> <i>pour certain</i>	<i>di certo</i> <i>por certo</i>	<i>de certo</i>	<i>cu drept</i> (ORom) <i>del cert</i> <i>cu d(e)reptul</i> <i>per cert</i> <i>pe adevărat</i> (ORom) <i>de-adevărat(ela)</i> <i>cu adevărat</i> <i>pe drept</i>	<i>dal ciert</i>	<i>de zertu</i>	

<i>en claro</i> <i>a la clara</i> <i>a las claras</i>	<i>en clair</i> <i>à clair</i>	<i>em claro</i> <i>de claro</i>	<i>in clar</i> <i>pe curat</i> <i>pre curat</i> (ORom)	<i>a la clara</i>	<i>in giaru</i>
<i>por completo</i>	<i>au complet</i>	<i>por completo</i>	<i>pe de-a-ntrregul</i> <i>cu totul</i>	<i>per complet</i>	<i>pro tottu</i>
<i>en confuso</i> <i>de confino</i> <i>de continuo</i> <i>a la continua</i>	<i>en confus</i> <i>en continu</i>	<i>in confuse</i> (OIt) <i>em confuso</i> <i>de continuo</i>	<i>la nesfârșit</i> <i>incontinuu</i>	<i>de continu</i>	<i>de continu</i>
<i>a cubierto</i> <i>a derecho</i> <i>a derechas</i>	<i>à couvert</i> <i>à droite</i>	<i>al coperto</i> <i>a destra</i>	<i>in ascuns,</i> <i>pe ascuns</i> <i>de-a dreptul</i> <i>la dreapta</i> <i>pe neocolite</i>	<i>a dret</i> <i>a drete</i> <i>a diestre</i> <i>de dret en dret</i> <i>de diari</i>	<i>in copertu</i> <i>a dereta</i>
<i>de diario</i> <i>a diario</i> <i>por entero</i>	<i>per intero</i>	<i>por inteiro</i>	<i>p(r)e deplin</i> <i>pe (de)-(a)-</i> <i>ntrreg(ul)</i> <i>pe întreg, de</i> <i>întreg</i>	<i>par întir</i>	<i>pro intreu</i>
<i>en especial</i> <i>en extremo</i> <i>en extremo</i>	<i>en spécial</i> <i>à l'extrême</i>	<i>em especial</i> <i>em extremo</i>	<i>in special</i> <i>in (mod) extrem</i>	<i>en especial</i>	

Prep. + ADJ SPANISH	Prep. + ADJ FRENCH	Prep. + ADJ ITALIAN	Prep. + ADJ PORTUGUESE	Prep. + ADJ ROMANIAN	Prep. + ADJ CATALAN	Prep. + ADJ FRIULAN	Prep. + ADJ SARDINIAN
<i>de fácil</i>			<i>de fácil</i>	<i>cu (i) ușor</i> (ORom) <i>p(r)e ușor</i> (ORom) <i>pre lesne</i> (ORom) <i>din ușor</i> (ORom) <i>cu ușorul</i> <i>pe ușorul</i> (ORom) <i>în ușor</i> (ORom) <i>pre strâmb</i> (ORom) <i>cu strâmb (ul)</i> (ORom) <i>pe nemîscate</i>		<i>de faziile</i>	
<i>en falso</i>	<i>en faux</i>	<i>nel falso</i>	<i>em falso</i>		<i>en fals</i>		<i>in su falsu</i>
<i>de fijo</i> <i>por fijo</i> <i>en fijo</i> <i>en fija</i> <i>a la fija</i> <i>en general</i>		<i>di fiso</i>			<i>de fit a fit</i>		<i>de fissu</i>
	<i>en général</i>	<i>in generale</i>	<i>em geral</i>	<i>în mare</i> <i>în general</i> <i>p(r)e larg</i> (ORom) <i>cu larg</i> (ORom) <i>din gros</i> (ORom) <i>cu gros</i> (ORom)	<i>en general</i>	<i>in gjeneral</i>	<i>in genere</i>
<i>en grueso</i>	<i>en gros</i>	<i>al digrosso</i> ( <i>di grosso</i> )	<i>em grosso</i>		<i>en gros</i>		<i>si grossu</i>

<i>de improviso</i>	<i>à l'improviste</i>	<i>d'improvviso</i>	<i>de improviso</i>	<i>d'improvvis</i>	<i>de improvisu</i>
<i>de immediato</i>	<i>d'immediat</i>	–	<i>de immediato</i>	<i>pe neașteptate</i>	
<i>de largo</i>	<i>dans l'immediat</i>			<i>pe nepregătite</i>	
<i>por largo</i>	<i>de large</i>	<i>di largo</i>	<i>de largo</i>	<i>în curând</i>	<i>in longu pro longu</i>
<i>a largo</i>	<i>à large</i>	<i>per largo</i>	<i>ao largo</i>	<i>peste puțin</i>	<i>in largu/pro largu</i>
	<i>en large</i>	<i>in largo</i>	<i>em largo</i>	<i>p(τ)e larg</i>	<i>pro largu</i>
<i>a la larga</i>	<i>de large en long</i>	<i>per largo</i>		<i>în lung,</i>	<i>in largu</i>
	<i>de long en long</i>	<i>per lungo et</i>		<i>de-a lung(ul)</i>	
<i>de largo en largo</i>	<i>de long en large</i>	<i>per largo (OIt)</i>		<i>în lung</i>	<i>a lunc e a larc</i>
<i>de lieve</i>	<i>à la longue</i>	<i>in lungo et largo</i>	<i>por largo</i>	<i>p(τ)e lung</i>	<i>di lunc e di larc</i>
<i>de leve</i>	<i>à la légère</i>	<i>di lieve</i>	<i>de leve</i>	<i>de-a lungul și</i>	<i>a lunc e a larc</i>
				<i>de-a latul</i>	
				<i>în lung și în lat</i>	
				<i>cu ușor (ORom)</i>	<i>de lezeru</i>
				<i>cu lin</i>	
				<i>p(τ)e (i)ușor</i>	
				<i>(ORom)</i>	
				<i>p(τ)e lesne</i>	
				<i>(ORom)</i>	
				<i>din ușor (ORom)</i>	
				<i>cu ușurelul</i>	
				<i>cu ușor (ORom)</i>	
<i>de leggero</i>		<i>di leggero</i>	<i>à leggero</i>	<i>cu / p(re) lesne</i>	
		<i>di leggero</i>	<i>de leggero</i>	<i>(ORom)</i>	
		<i>di leggeri</i>			

Prep. + ADJ SPANISH	Prep. + ADJ FRENCH	Prep. + ADJ ITALIAN	Prep. + ADJ PORTUGUESE	Prep. + ADJ ROMANIAN	Prep. + ADJ CATALAN	Prep. + ADJ FRIULAN	Prep. + ADJ SARDINIAN
<i>en limpiu</i>	<i>en propre</i>	–	–	<i>pe cinstite</i> <i>în limpede</i>	<i>en net</i>		<i>limpiu</i>
<i>de lleno</i>	<i>au propre</i> <i>de plein</i>	<i>a pieno</i>	<i>de cheito</i>	<i>pe curat</i> <i>(a)-nreg(ul)</i>	<i>de ple a ple</i>	<i>a plen</i>	<i>a pienu</i>
<i>de lueñe</i>	<i>à plein</i>	<i>in pieno</i>		<i>din plin</i>	<i>de ple</i>	<i>ad in plen</i>	<i>in pienu</i>
<i>a malas</i>	<i>de loin</i>	<i>da lontano</i>	<i>de mal</i>	<i>(in)(de)lung</i>	<i>a les males</i>	<i>di lontan</i>	<i>dae lontanu</i>
<i>a las malas</i>	–	<i>a male</i>		<i>cu rău</i>	<i>a malas</i>	<i>di mâl</i>	<i>a su malu</i>
<i>a medias</i>	<i>à demi</i>	<i>a mezzo</i>	<i>a medias</i>	<i>cu greu</i>	<i>a malas (Cast)</i>		
<i>a menudo</i>	<i>petit à petit</i>	–	<i>amilde</i>	<i>cu rele</i>	<i>a mişes</i>	<i>a mieç</i>	<i>a mesu</i>
				<i>în miez</i>			
				<i>p(r)e larg</i>			
				<i>p(r)e mârunt</i>			
				<i>în/p(r)e</i>			
				<i>amânunt</i>			
				<i>cu amânunt</i>			
<i>a la mera</i>	<i>à pur et à plat</i>	–	<i>à mera</i>	<i>pur şi simplu</i>			
<i>de mero</i>	–	–	<i>a mero</i>				
<i>a mero</i>			<i>por mero</i>				
<i>por mero</i>			<i>de mero</i>				
<i>de mucho</i>	<i>de beaucoup</i>	<i>di molto</i>	<i>de muito</i>	<i>de mult</i>	<i>de / amb molt</i>		<i>de meda</i>
<i>en mucho</i>			<i>ao muito</i>	<i>cu mult(ul)</i>	<i>com a molt</i>		
<i>a lo mucho</i>			<i>en muito</i>				
<i>en mucho</i>							

<i>de nuevo</i>	<i>de nouveau</i>	<i>di nuovo</i>	<i>de novo</i>	<i>din nou</i> <i>de nou (ORom)</i>	<i>de (bell) nou</i> <i>de nou en nou</i> <i>de cap i de nou</i>	<i>di gnúf</i>	<i>de nou</i>
<i>de ordinario</i> <i>a oscuras</i> <i>as ascuras</i>	<i>d'ordinaire</i> <i>en obscur</i>	<i>di ordinario</i> —	<i>de ordinario</i> <i>às escuras</i>	<i>pe orbecăite</i>	<i>d'ordinari</i> <i>a fosques</i> <i>a les fosques</i> <i>a les enfosques</i>		<i>de ordinariu</i> <i>in s'iscuro</i>
<i>en particular</i> <i>de plano</i>	<i>en particulier</i> <i>de plat</i>	<i>in particolare</i> <i>di piatto</i>	<i>em particular</i> <i>de plano</i>	<i>in particular</i> <i>din plin</i>	<i>en particular</i> <i>de pla</i>	<i>in particular</i> <i>cu plac</i> <i>di plac</i>	<i>de pianu</i>
<i>en poco</i>		<i>in poco (di)</i>	—	<i>cu puţin</i> <i>pe puţin</i>	<i>de poc</i> <i>en poc</i>		<i>de pagu</i> <i>in pagu</i>
<i>de primero</i>	<i>de premier</i>	<i>in primo-</i>	<i>de primeiro</i>	<i>de-a primă</i> (ORom/ RomDial)	<i>de primera (Cast)</i> <i>in prin</i>		<i>in primu</i>
<i>de pronto</i> <i>por lo pronto</i> <i>al pronto</i> <i>de recio</i>		—	<i>de pronto</i>	<i>din prima</i> <i>pe repede</i>	<i>sul prin</i>		
<i>en ridiculo</i>	<i>de fort</i> <i>de fort en fort</i> <i>en ridicule</i>	—	<i>de forte</i>	<i>cu tare</i>			
<i>a salvo</i>	<i>en sauf</i> <i>à sauf</i> <i>à sec</i>	<i>in ridicolo</i>	<i>em ridicolo</i>		<i>en ridiculo</i>	<i>in ridicul</i> (Ital) <i>in sauf</i> (Ital)	<i>in risulano</i>
<i>a secas</i>		<i>in salvo</i>	<i>a salvo</i>	<i>pe sec</i>	<i>a seques</i>	<i>a sec (a sut)</i>	<i>a siccu</i>

Prep. + ADJ SPANISH	Prep. + ADJ FRENCH	Prep. + ADJ ITALIAN	Prep. + ADJ PORTUGUESE	Prep. + ADJ ROMANIAN	Prep. + ADJ CATALAN	Prep. + ADJ FRIULAN	Prep. + ADJ SARDINIAN
<i>en seco</i>	<i>en sec</i>	<i>in secco</i>	<i>em seco</i>	<i>in sec</i>	<i>en sec</i>	<i>in siccu</i>	<i>in siccu</i>
<i>en secreto</i>	<i>en secret</i>	<i>in segreto</i>	<i>em secreto</i>	<i>in secret</i>	<i>a les seques</i>	<i>in segret</i>	<i>in segretu</i>
<i>en seguida</i>	<i>en suite</i> ( <i>tout</i> ) <i>de suite</i>	<i>in seguito</i> <i>di seguito</i>	<i>em seguida</i>	<i>pe urmăriţapoi</i>	<i>de seguida</i>	<i>apustis</i>	<i>de pustis</i>
<i>de seguido</i>							
<i>de seguida</i>	<i>de sûr</i>	<i>di sicuro</i>	<i>de seguida</i> <i>de seguro</i>	<i>desigur</i>	<i>de (ben) segur</i>	<i>di sigûr</i>	<i>de siguru</i>
<i>sobre seguro</i>	<i>pour sûr</i>		<i>sobre seguro</i>	<i>pe sigur (ORom)</i> <i>la sigur</i>		<i>di un sigûr</i> <i>dal sigûr</i> <i>par sigûr</i>	
<i>por separado</i>	–		<i>por separado</i>	<i>in serio</i>	<i>per separat</i>	<i>a sa seria</i>	
<i>en serio</i>	<i>en sérieux</i>	<i>sul serio</i>	<i>em sério</i>	<i>pe bune</i>	<i>sul seri</i>		
<i>por lo serio</i>	<i>au sérieux</i>		<i>ao sério</i>	<i>de unul singur</i>	<i>a soles</i>	<i>da solu</i>	
<i>a solas</i>	<i>seul à seul</i>	<i>da solo a solo(a)</i> <i>solo a solo</i>					
<i>a mis / sus solas</i>				<i>pe neaşteptate</i> <i>pe nepreğăţite</i> <i>cu repedea</i>	<i>de sobre</i>	<i>a solu</i> ( <i>coitende</i> )	
<i>de súbito</i>	<i>de subit</i>	<i>di subito</i>	<i>de súbito</i>	<i>pe nechriste</i> <i>cu strămb (ul)</i> (ORom)	<i>a tort (i a dret)</i>	<i>a tuart</i>	<i>a tortu</i>
<i>a tuerto</i>	<i>en borgne</i>	<i>a torto</i>	<i>a torto</i>				

<i>en vano</i>	<i>en vain</i>	<i>in vano / inuano</i>	<i>em vão</i>	<i>in van</i> [noun] <i>p(r)le désert</i>	<i>en va</i>	<i>inuanu</i>
<i>de veras</i> <i>a las veras</i>	<i>de vrai</i> <i>pour de vrai</i> <i>pour le vrai</i>	<i>di vero (OIt)</i> <i>invero</i>	<i>deveras</i>	<i>in désert</i> <i>de-adevărat(e)lea</i>	<i>de veres</i> <i>de bon de veres</i> <i>de debò</i>	<i>deabberu</i>
<i>en vilo</i>	<i>en suspense</i>	<i>in sospeso</i>	—	<i>in suspans</i>	<i>en joli</i> <i>en suspens</i>	
<i>al vivo</i>	<i>à vif</i>	<i>al vivo</i>		<i>pe viu</i> <i>de viu</i>	<i>en viu</i>	<i>biu</i>
					<i>de viu en viu</i> <i>en vivo</i> (Cast)	