

Chapter 32: Adverbs

Chapter 32 covers the following: the formation and comparison of adverbs; the irregular verbs *volo* (“wish”), *nolo* (“not wish”) and *malo* (“prefer”); and at the end of the lesson we’ll review the vocabulary which you should memorize in this chapter.

There are two important rules to remember in this chapter: (1) Like adjectives, Latin adverbs have three degrees — positive, comparative, superlative — which are created by adding the following endings to an adjective base. To form the positive adverb, Latin uses *-ē* (in first/second declension) or *-iter* (in third declension) — this is the equivalent of adding “-ly” to an adjective base in English. To form the comparative adverb, Latin uses *-ius*, the counterpart of “more [adjective]-ly” in English. To form the superlative adverb, it uses *-issimē* where English has “most [adjective]-ly.” Note that irregular comparative and superlative adjectives produce comparable irregular comparative and superlative adverbs. So, for instance, a superlative adjective ending in *-limus* or *-rimus* will create a superlative adverb ending *-limē* or *-rimē*. (2) The irregular verbs *volo*, *nolo*, and *malo* are the product of composite conjugation and contain “athematic” forms.

There’s really no part of speech easier to learn in all of Latin than adverbs. Three degrees and that’s all! No declining! No conjugating! No tenses, sequences, moods and absolutely no relative time! Oh yeah! The positive adverb is formed in Latin by appending *-ē* to the end of a first/second-declension adjective base — *certē* (“certainly”), for instance — or *-iter* to a third-declension adjective base like *celer-*, producing *celeriter* (“swiftly”). Note that the long mark on a form like *certē* is mandatory! It distinguishes the adverb from the vocative singular masculine which has a short *ĕ* ending. All regular comparative adverbs, no matter the declension of the adjective, use the ending *-ius*, creating forms such as *celerius* (“more swiftly”). Finally, superlative adverbs use the ending *-issimē*, as in *certissimē* (“most certainly”). That’s if the adjective forms a regular superlative. If not, it will look like whatever the irregular form is, *celerrimē*, for instance (“most swiftly”). That long *ē* is also mandatory. So, with regular forms, all you have to do is learn *-ē/-iter*, *-ius*, *-issimē*. And done!

Let’s do a quick survey of Latin adverbs in their three degrees. You’re responsible for knowing all the following forms. Fortunately, you already know most of them. *Longē, longius, longissimē*: “far, farther, furthest.” Note the *-ē* in the positive. For a third-declension base, that will be *-iter* — or sometimes just *-ter*, as in *sapienter, sapientius, sapientissimē*: “wisely, more wisely, most wisely.” Third-declension bases that end *-nt-* like *sapient-* use only *-ter* (not *-iter*). Other third-declension bases, such as *facil-* (“easy”), don’t use *-iter* at all but have a positive adverb *facile* which looks like the neuter nominative of the adjective — we’ll talk more about that in a moment — then, *facilius, facillimē*: “easily, more easily, most easily.” Note that the irregular superlative adverb *facillimē* is based on the irregular superlative adjective *facillimus*. And, of course, the seven deadly adjectives that exhibit wildly irregular comparison (*bonus, magnus, malus, multus, parvus, [pro], superus*) — we covered those in Chapter 27 — all have adverbs that follow their deviant adjective counterparts, for instance, *bene, melius, optimē*: “well, better, best”; *male, peius, pessimē*: “badly, worse, worst”; *multum, plus, plurimum*: “much, more, most”; *magnopere, magis, maximē*: “greatly, more (greatly), most (greatly, i.e. especially).” Note two things here. First *magnopere* is a combination of *magn-* “great” and *opere* “with effort.” The

expected form **magnē* doesn't exist in Latin. Second, *magis* replaces *maius* (the neuter comparative adjective) which is not used as an adverb. Next, *parum* — where the adjective base *parv-*, “little,” has been pared down to *par-* — *minus*, *minimē*: “(a) little, less, least”; and [*pro*] — remember there is no positive of *prior* — *prius*, *primo/primum*: “[in front], before/earlier, at first.” And finally, one stand-alone adverb *diu*, *diutius*, *diutissimē*: “long/for a long time, longer/for a longer time, longest/for the longest time.”

Comparative and superlative adverbs use and expect the same constructions their adjective counterparts do. Comparative adverbs can be and often are followed by either of the “than” constructions employed with adjectives: *quam* + same case, or the ablative of comparison, for instance, *clarius quam sol*, “brighter than the sun,” as in “The fire burned brighter (i.e. more brightly) than the sun.” Or Latin could say the same thing by omitting *quam* and putting *sol* in the ablative case (*sole*). And just as with superlative adjectives, *quam* lends superlative adverbs a sense of “as [whatever the adverb is] as possible,” for instance, *quam clarissimē*, “as brightly as possible.”

From the historical perspective, adverbs offer a fascinating glimpse into how Indo-European languages evolved. Proto-Indo-European didn't have adverbs at all. So, as the invention of forms which could modify verbs in the same way adjectives modify nouns began to spread around, its daughter languages had to invent their own set of adverbial forms. The ablative proved one popular choice — at least in Latin it did — where its natural “with” sense, as in “with speed,” was already one way of qualifying the action of a verb. So one type of Latin adverb developed out of the ablative, seen, for instance, in the fifth-declension-looking ending *-ē*, which for some reason was applied mostly to first/second-declension forms. Elsewhere, a form that looked like a fourth-declension ablative ending was used here and there, producing, for instance, *diu* (“for a long time”), based on the ablative of a now-lost fourth-declension word for “day,” **dius*, *diūs*. [Can't say which I like less: **dius* or *dies*.] Likewise, *primo* (“at first”) recalls its ablative origin.

Neuter accusatives proved another way to concoct adverbs, resulting in forms like the comparative adverb ending *-ius*, originally the neuter accusative of the adjective. That's why those forms are identical. Into this category can also be put *facile* (the neuter accusative of the positive adjective *facilis*), and even *tam*, *umquam*, *numquam* and *parum* — all of which were at one time first/second-declension accusative forms. These accusative-based adverbs were originally substantive adjectives functioning as direct objects, as in “he achieved much.” How is “much” functioning in that sentence? Is it the direct object of “achieved,” or is it modifying the verb? In other words, is it a noun or an adverb (a verbal modifier)? It's both really, which made the transition from accusative adjective to adverb all the easier. All in all, I say this only to show you why you'll see a lot of adverbs that look like accusatives or ablatives. That's where they came from.

Now let's look at three closely-related irregular verbs: *volo*, *nolo* and *malo*. All are built around a base *vol-* that means “wish,” seen in its simplest form in *volo*, “wish, be willing.” *Nolo* represents the negative, “not wish, be unwilling,” a compound of the negating prefix *ne-*, plus *volo*. *Malo* means “prefer” and is a compound of the comparative root *mag-*, seen in the comparative adverb *magis* (“more”), blended into the *vol-* base. So literally it means “wish more.” All three of these verbs expect a complementary infinitive, “wish to, wish not to, prefer to,” but they are also all

defective. That is, they lack some basic forms. For instance, only two of them have participles: *volens*, *nolens*. In other words, there was no **malens*. If Romans wanted to say “preferring,” they had to use another verb. Only *nolo* has an imperative, *noli/nolite* (“be unwilling!” singular/plural), which was used almost exclusively with a complementary infinitive to express a polite command: *Noli tolerare stultos!* (“Please don’t tolerate fools!”). And none of them have passive forms. “Be be willing-ed”? Be unwilling to go there!

Once you’re past the present, things are as clear as day. No irregular forms whatsoever, outside of the perfect base. For *volo* that’s *volu-*, producing *volui*, *voluisti*, *voluit*, ... (“I have wished, you have wished, he/she/it has wished” and so on). The perfect of *nolo* is *nolui* (“I have not wished”), and of *malo* is *malui* (“I have preferred”). And so it’s only the present-tense system that requires your attention at all. There, these verbs include the same sort of irregularities we saw in *fero*, but far fewer. There are a couple of athematic forms, and one that’s the product of composite conjugation, but that’s all. The athematic forms — remember that that means the form has no thematic vowel — are *vult*, *vultis* (cf. *fert*, *fertis*), but by the classical age the Romans had all but completed the process of regularizing *volo*, *nolo* and *malo* and adding in thematic vowels. And like *fero*, these three “wish”-verbs were being subsumed into third conjugation, meaning the Romans used *-i-* or *-u-* as thematic vowel, and *-e-* in the imperfect, as we’ll soon see, following exactly the pattern you’d expect from a third-conjugation verb in the imperfect like *ducebam*.

A grand total of one form in each of these verbs is the result of composite conjugation, i.e. two different verbs being combined into one, *vis* (“you wish”), *non vis* (“you do not wish”) and *mavis* (“you prefer”). Otherwise, all the forms use a different but similar-looking base *vol-*. Note that the clash of different verbs here is far less pervasive than in *fero* where a *tul-* or *lat-* form shows up in half the conjugation. Here is the first of these “wish”-verbs, *volo*, in the present-tense system. Its present indicative is *volo*, *vis*, *vult*, *volumus*, *vultis*, *volunt*. Note the irregular thematic vowel *-u-* in first-person and third-person plural. Note also that two of these forms are athematic: *vult* and *vultis* (“he wishes” and “y’all wish”). The second-person singular *vis* uses a different base, making it the last surviving remnant of composite conjugation. Be careful not to confuse this form with its identical twin, the noun *vis* (“force, power, violence”). It’s usually not too hard to tell a verb from a noun in Latin. If you’ve got *vis* and you need a verb, then it’s probably a verb, “you wish.”

The imperfect is completely predictable and regular: *volebam*, *volebas*, and so on, as is the future if you expect, as you should, third-conjugation forms: *volam*, *voles*, *volet*, etc. And if you remember *sim*, *sis*, *sit* (the present subjunctive of *esse*), then *velim*, *velis*, *velit* and company will come as no real surprise. Here’s the present infinitive *velle*. It’s athematic, the product of *vel-* + *-se* (the original infinitive ending), which means the imperfect subjunctive will take after it: *vellem*, *velles*, *vellet*, ... well, well, well, look at the present participle, *volens*, “wishing,” the only other form we have to address on this chart since *volo* has no passive. So there’s no perfect passive participle and no imperative either. If you want to say “Wish me luck!” in Latin, you’ll have to find another verb.

Here’s the negative of *volo*, *nolo*. In the present indicative it’s *nolo*, *non vis*, *non vult*, *nolumus*, *non vultis*, *nolunt*. From *volumus* and *volunt*, you’d expect *nolumus* and *nolunt* (“we do not wish” and “they do not wish”), but *non vis*, *non vult*, and *non vultis* are a bit of a surprise. I guess

**nis*, **nult* and **nultis* were not to the Romans' liking. [But they're okay with *amaremini*? Never mind.] Let's see. What else can we check off as regular here, or at least predictably irregular? Imperfect: *nolebam*, *nolebas*, ... Check! Future: *nolam*, *noles*, ... Check! Subjunctive: *nolim*, *nolis*, ... Check (minus)! Infinitive: *nolle* ... Check (half-minus)! Imperfect subjunctive: *nollem* ... Well, if it's *nolle* in the infinitive, check! Participle: *nolens* ... Check! Imperative: *noli* (singular) and *nolite* (plural). Big check! No, I take it back. Check minus. And that's all there is to *nolo*!

The third verb in this throng of Latin wannabes is *malo*. Wheelock doesn't formally introduce this verb in Chapter 32, though he does include it in the back of the book (see pages 392-394). Add it to your vocabulary, please. You see it often enough in real Latin to make it worth learning. Plus, if you know *volo* and *nolo*, learning *malo*'s no problem. The present active indicative is *malo*, *mavis* — not Mavis! — *mavult*; *malumus*, *mavultis*, *malunt* — as we noted before, it's a contraction of *magis* ("more") and *volo* ("wish"). "Wish more" meant "prefer" to the Romans. By now, you should be expecting the *-u-* thematic vowel in the first- and third-person plural. Nor should it come as any shock to find irregular forms in the third-person singular and both second-persons. *Mavult* and *mavultis* are athematic, and *mavis* the product of composite conjugation. You could probably also have guessed that the imperfect is *malebam*, *malebas* and so on, and the future: *malam*, *males*, and the like. The subjunctive's *malim*, the infinitive's *malle*, thus, the imperfect subjunctive's *mallem*. No participle, no imperative. No problem. Right?

Let's see. I'll give you some forms of *volo*, *nolo* or *malo*; you tell me what they mean. [Like in the last chapter, pause this presentation and take what time you need in between each form to figure out its translation for yourself.] First form, *non vis*? What does it mean? "You do not wish, you are unwilling." Next, *volebamus*? "We wished, we were unwilling." *Malent*? "They will prefer." *Velit*? "He wishes (S)." *Malles*? "You preferred (S)." *Nolueritis*? "Y'all will not have wished." Or, "Y'all have not wished (S)." *Nolim*? "I do not wish, I am unwilling (S)." *Noli*? "Be unwilling (to...)! please don't ...!" *Volentes*? "(Those) wishing, willing (nominative/accusative)."

Et vos volentes, procedamus ad verba vocabularia! Okay, that's not a Latin word, but this is ... *divitiae*, *divitiarum*, f., meaning "riches, wealth." It's a first-declension feminine noun, that's attested only in the plural. After all, can anyone be called rich who has only one "rich"?

And how did lots of Romans get their riches? With an *exercitus*, *exercitūs*, m., meaning "army." It's a fourth-declension masculine noun. Literally, it means "a thing that fends (*-arc-*, here *-erc-*) off (*ex-*)." So, what does an *exercitus* "fend off"? *Hostes*, "the enemy," of course! And what English word do we get from *exercitus*? "Exercise," which fends off something else just as bad as the enemy, doesn't it? What's the genitive plural of this word? [Fourth-declension! Fine. What are the endings? *-us*, *-ūs*, *-ui*, *-um*, *-u*; plural: *-ūs*, ... *-uum*, ... *-ibus*, *ūs*, *-ibus*]. So... *exercituum*.

The next word is *honor*, *honoris*, m., meaning "honor, esteem, public office." It's a third-declension noun, and it's not *i*-stem. The basic meaning of *honor* is the last one, "public office," seen in the phrase *cursus honorum*, "the path of public offices," the series of official duties

Roman citizens followed on their way to the supreme executive office, the consulship. Basically, a Roman man who wanted political power had to be an aedile before he could be a quaestor, and a quaestor before being a praetor, and a praetor before becoming consul. That was the “path of offices,” the *cursus honorum* all ambitious Romans had to follow. Only later did the sense “honor, esteem” evolve, from the prestige accorded those elected to these offices.

Next on the vocabulary list are the adverb forms listed on pages 151 and 152. Please memorize these in all three degrees.

Next up is a verb: *amitto, amittere, amisi, amissum*, meaning “lose, let go.” It’s third-conjugation. *Amitto* is a compound of forms you already know: *ab-* “away from,” plus *mitto* (“send”). To “send away” implied to the Romans “to let go, lose.” How would Latin say “they will lose”? [What conjugation? Third. And what’s the tense sign for the future tense in third? *-e-*, so...] *amittent*. And how about “to be lost”? The infinitive. Good, *amitti*.

Next, *volo, velle, volui*, meaning “wish, want, be willing, ... will.” It’s third-conjugation if anything. “Will”? No! That sounds future, which is not right. This verb does not convey a sense of futurity as such. Wheelock is alluding to an old meaning of “will,” meaning “wish” as in the “will of God,” but we don’t use that meaning very much today, and when we do, “will” is more often a noun than a verb, so forget this definition. Stick to “wish, want, be willing.”

The negative of *volo* is *nolo, nolle, nolui*, meaning “not wish, be unwilling.” Like *volo*, it’s third-conjugation if anything. And to this list add *malo, malle, malui*, meaning “prefer.” Conjugation-wise it’s “third-ish” like its brethren. All three of these “wish”-verbs take complementary infinitives.

The next word is *custodia, custodiae, f.*, meaning “custody,” a first-declension feminine noun. The plural of this word, *custodiae*, implied to the Romans “guards,” i.e. people who guard you. So the singular *custodia* refers to an abstract principle (“custody”), the plural *custodiae* to the people who deploy it (“the guards”).

Following this word is *lex, legis, f.*, meaning “law, statute,” a third-declension feminine noun which is not *i*-stem. There’s only one consonant at the end of the base. A *lex* was to the Romans a regulation stipulated through law, as opposed to a *ius* which was a basic right like free speech. This distinction between what the state can control and what one’s humanity grants by nature underlies many Western judicial systems including our own. It’s one of the great legacies of Rome. What’s the ablative singular of *lex*? Good, *lege*. It’s not *i*-stem.

Next is *scientia, scientiae, f.*, meaning “knowledge,” a first-declension noun, representing the abstract quality of knowing (*scio*).

Next comes an adjective *dives, divitis/ditis*, meaning “rich,” a one-termination, third-declension adjective, but it’s irregular. It’s not *i*-stem. It works like *potens*, or any present active participle. Don’t confuse this word — *dives* refers to people — with the one you just learned above, *divitiae* (“riches”) which are things. A *dives* has *divitias*. The base is either *divit-* or *dit-* because the Romans during the classical age were in the process of dropping certain *w*-sounds, especially

those that were intervocalic (i.e. “between vowels”). Remember how the perfect active of *iuvo* (“help”) shrinks from what ought to be **iuvavi* to *iuvi*? Well, obviously not all intervocalic *w*-sounds were lost in Latin but enough that it’s worth noting the pattern. From this base comes one of the names for the Roman god of the underworld Dis, otherwise known as Hades or Pluto. As Dis, he’s literally “the rich one.” Underground is, after all, where all that gold is found. But Rich? There’s a death god named Richard? If I were a death god, I’d want a scarier name. Like Mark.

The next word is *pauper*, *pauperis*, meaning “poor, of small means.” It’s a one-termination, third-declension adjective, and, like *dives*, it’s not *i*-stem. We’ve seen one of the bases that underlies this word *pau-* (“little, not much”) in *pauci* (the Latin word for “few”). Take *pauci* and change */p/* to */f/* as English did via Grimm’s Law, and you get “few,” the same way *pater* and “father” are connected. The other base in *pauper* is *-per*, meaning “bear,” as in “bear a child.” So when the Romans said *pauper*, they meant “having few offspring, being infertile,” which is probably another agricultural metaphor at heart.

The next word, yet another one-termination third-declension adjective, *par*, *paris* means “equal, like.” *Par* naturally expects a dative after it: “equal (to...), like (unto...)” How would Latin form the neuter nominative/accusative plural of this adjective? [That’s right. It’s *i*-stem, so ...] *paria*.

And quickly onto *celeriter*, meaning “swiftly, quickly.” It’s the adverb of *celer*. Add it to the list of adverbs you should memorize on pages 151-2. Why Mr. Wheelock didn’t put it there in the first place, I have no idea.

Here’s a verb: *pateo*, *patere*, *patui*, meaning “lie, lie open, be accessible, be evident.” It’s second-conjugation. Note the absence of a fourth principal part. From that, you’ve probably already guessed that *pateo* has no passive. “Be be opened”? *Noli ibi te conferre!* The Latin base *pat-* is cognate with Greek *pet-* which shows up in our Greek derivative “petal,” the part of a flower that “opens.” And following the rule cited just above, what should the */p/* at the front of this base turn into in English? That’s right: */f/*. And the */t/*? Think “father.” If *pater* goes to “father,” then *pat-* should go to ... fath-, as in “fathom,” a way of measuring the depth of the water you’re sailing in. Originally, a fathom was determined by the furthest length you could hold your hands apart as you reeled in a sounding rope or chain, something that went all the way to the bottom. Then you pulled it up, measuring the depth of the water in the number of “open-arm” lengths. How would Latin say “it was open (subjunctively)”? [There are two ways to do this, aren’t there? Imperfect and perfect. How would you form the imperfect subjunctive? Present infinitive plus endings. So the imperfect will be ...] *pateret*, the form used to show contemporaneous action in secondary sequence, one of the imperfect subjunctive’s major uses, as in “Yesterday I asked you (in secondary sequence) why the gate *was open* (contemporaneous action).” But what if you make *pateret* perfect? What do you add onto the perfect base to make an active verb subjunctive? *-eri-*! So, ... *patuerit*, the form used to show prior action in primary sequence as in “I’m asking you right now (primary sequence) why the gate *was open* yesterday (prior action).”

And the last word on this vocabulary list is *prohibeo, prohibere, prohibui, prohibitum*, meaning “keep, keep back, prevent, hinder, restrain, prohibit.” It’s second-conjugation. Latin idiom calls for an accusative and an infinitive after this verb, when you want to “prevent or keep someone (accusative) from doing (infinitive) something.” Wheelock discusses this on page 153, footnote 6. Literally, the Latin says “prevent somebody to do something,” which, if you think about it, is perfectly logical, or at least grammatical. English, however, has chosen to stress the idea of separation innate in “prevent,” but that sense of separation is there naturally in any verb that means “prevent, prohibit,” whether you choose to stress it or not. So Latin doesn’t. It’s just a matter of cultural choice.

Do the rules that were cited at the beginning of this chapter now make sense to you? If not, please review this presentation. If so, please proceed to the next slide.

For the next class meeting, please bring in a copy of the P&R sentences for Chapter 32. You’ll find them on page 154.

Quam dulcissimē vitam agite, O minores sapientes!