

REASSESSING THE EXISTENCE OF A PART OF SPEECH (WORTART) TERMED ADJECTIVE¹

Elke HAYASHI-MÄHNER², Sophia Universität Tokyo/ Japan

Contact: hayas-mh(ad)sophia.ac.jp

1. Foreword

The pertinent literature on the topic of the adjective/adverb shows that the well-established standard classification of these both concepts – up to now defined as parts of speech – contains illogical elements. Essential for their coming into being – according to the author’s considerations – may be the inconsequential commixture of grammatical/-structural and semantic components, which is used as an explanation in those cases where a need is felt for an explanation that goes further. This is pointed at by concepts such as “adverbialer Gebrauch des Adjektivs“[adverbial usage of the adjective] (Wermke et.al. 2009: 340) or ”Adjektiveadverbien“[adjective-adverbs]

¹ The following is a translation of the German original published with Sophia University in 2013.

Hayashi-Mähner, Elke (2013): Überdenken der Existenz einer Wortart Adjektiv – Überlegungen zu einer neuen Abgrenzung von „Adverb“ und „Adjektiv“. In: *Sophia European Studies Series*: Vol. 6, Feb. 2013, S. 23-40.

² Due to cross-cultural considerations the author makes it her custom to capitalize the family names of female authors entirely (SUGITA) while, on the other hand, to capitalize only the initials of the family names of male authors (Sugita).

As for the surname of the author: In everyday life she uses only the Japanese family name (HAYASHI), as there is no custom of double-name in Japan, where she lives with her Japanese husband.

(Helbig/Buscha 2001: 310). Moreover, this commixture in turn is based on an inconsequential translation from the Latin as will be shown later.

Already Chomsky in his transformational-generative grammar and his supporters as well as Renate STEINITZ at a later time advocated idea to think of a sentence as a two-tiered entity, i.e. to divide it into a noun phrase and a verb phrase with the adverbs/adverbials being part of the verb phrase (BARTSCH 1972: 327). This idea, however, has not been consistently pursued later on. In her "Bezugswort-Theorie"[word relation theory] (HAYASHI-MÄHNER 2011, see below), the author follows up this idea and concludes that the existence of a part of speech termed "adjective" should be negated. She backs up the relevance of this theory for the German language and at the same time proves that adverbial and adjective usage is not universal. By doing this, she confirms Hoffmann (2007: 08) who repudiates universal postulates in philology as frequently being not applicable.

2. Defining concepts "Adjective" and "Adverb" – a Problem of Translation?

Explanations and/or translations from the source language of the two concepts "adjective" and "adverb", Latin, are rendered as the adverb being an ad-verb, i.e. an addition and/or a reference to the verb. In this connection, heavily relying on semantics has a long tradition. Already Phillip Melanchthon (1527) states in his *Grammatica Latina*, published in 1525 for the first time, one would call "[ein solches Wort] Adverb, das dem Verb Umstände hinzufügt." "[such a word] adverb that adds circumstances to the verb] (quoted according to Kärnä/Matthaios 2007: 168). Moreover, a few decades later, Albertus says in his *Teutsch Grammatick oder Sprach-Kunst* "Adverbien werden den Verben hinzugefügt, damit sie die Umstände ihrer Bedeutungen zum Ausdruck bringen." "[adverbs are added to the verbs in order to express the circumstances of their meanings] (quoted according to Kärnä/Matthaios 2007: 174).

An analogous explanation or even translation for the adjective concept obviously has not been taken into consideration up to now. Instead of that, concepts with a synonymous ring are used for defining; in the DUDEN etymological dictionary for instance "Eigenschaftswort, Beiwort" (KLOSA et.al. 1997: 22, Drosdowski 1989: 22). This means that the same concept is defined both on the semantic level and as an element in the sentence worthy to be complemented, without any limitations regarding parts of speech relevant as reference. KLOSA et.al. (1997: 22), too, only on the semantic level, point to the etymology to the Latin verb *iacere* without referring to a concrete part of speech. In the DUDEN reference grammar of 1997, in addition to the term *Eigenschaftswort* mentioned above, another concept is used for defining, namely the *Artwort* (Drosdowski et.al. 1997: 31). The traditional term *adjective* is explained as "zum Beifügen geeignet, beigefügt"[suitable for adding, added] (Drosdowski et.al. 1989 and 1997: 31). Here, too, again we find the fact of deliberately forgoing the concrete naming of the referent type. The most recent DUDEN reference grammar (Wermke 2009: 338) uses all three terms; "Andere Bezeichnungen für die Wortart Adjektiv sind: Eigenschaftswort, Artwort, Wiewort." [Other designations for the adjective part of speech are "Eigenschaftswort", "Artwort", "Wiewort".]

Kluge (1989: 10), on the other hand, specifies only a single concept, namely that of the "Eigenschaftswort". In his *Ethymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache* [etymological dictionary of the German language] published by de Gruyter one finds in addition, among other things, the concepts of the object and the subject, but exclusively as etymologically related concepts (Kluge 1989: 10f). MUSAN discusses it in her *Satzgliedanalyse* [analysis of sentence elements] saying "dass es nicht nur Objekte zu Verben gibt, sondern auch Objekte zu Adjektiven"[that there are not only objects of verbs but also objects of adjectives] (MUSAN 2009: 49). Unfortunately, she does not derive this from the Latin concept of adjective and thus possibly does not draw any consequences whatsoever from it for a delineation to adverbs.

The author would like to make a new suggestion for translating and explaining the concept used previously for the adjective part of speech: Ad-Objekt[ad-object]. In this respect, the object should not be considered in a grammatical sense (object in a compound sentence/hypo taxis) but

as an object in the original sense of the word, i.e. materially (thing, object/item) and therefore in terms of grammar in the sense of a concrete or an abstract noun (substantive).

She considers herself confirmed by a definition from the year 1969 by Köster who, on the one hand, explains an adjective as “Eigenschaftswort” or “Beiwort” (see above), however, on the other hand, using a more concise explanation, which obviously has not been used later on, defines the adjective concept as: ”Gramm. Wort, das einen [im Satz genannten] materiellen od. gedachten Gegenstand (Substantiv), ein Geschehen (Verb), eine Eigenschaft (Adjektiv) od. einen Umstand (Adverb) als mit einer bestimmten Eigenschaft versehen bezeichnet; [...].“ (Köster 1969: 32). [grammatical word that denotes a material or imagined object (noun) [mentioned in the sentence], a process (verb), an attribute (adjective), or a circumstance (adverb) as possessing a specific quality] Again in this case, following the traditional procedure, the focus is less on a translation of the concept of adjective, in other words not an allocation to a specific part of speech, but on a semantic explanation.

As a direct consequence, for instance, such an approach leads to direct consequences regarding the space in works on grammar allocated to the terms in question. Thus, *Duden Grammatik* (Drosdowski 1995) deals with the adjective on 51 pages reaching from page 253 to 304. Only 15 pages, however, are dedicated to the adverb reaching from page 354 to 369. Seen from the viewpoint of mere volume, these are 36 fewer pages, which means that the explanations concerning the adjective exceed those about the adverb by 3.4 times in quantity. This may seem amazing since LEE, as result of her thesis on valency of the adjective in German for instance, states ”daß die Valenz des Adjektivs in vergleichbarer Weise wie die des Verbs beschrieben werden kann“ [that the valency of the adjective can be described in a similar manner as that of the verb] (LEE 1992: 389) meaning that this topic hadn't been paid enough attention to till then.

3. Adjectival or Adverbial Function?

The above-mentioned definition by Köster (1969) – explaining the concept of the adjective based on diverse etymologically related concepts – may be criticized for its too excessive semantic reference to attribute as well as expanding the frame of reference even encompassing the relations to the verb; for which reason no sufficient discrimination to the adverb is possible when further elaborating. Although semantics partly prescribes a close relation to the verb, for instance with the verbs that mandatorily require an adverbial, such as *stattfinden*[to take place], *beginnen*[to begin], or *passieren*[to occur] (BARTSCH 1972: 331 based on STEINITZ et al.).

An overemphasis of semantics also has an impact on the explanations in reference works on grammar and textbooks thus conflicting with the intended learner friendliness. Adverbs will be, for instance, subsumed under “Partikel“[particle] and the following is stated: “Man kann das Adverb *grammatisch* nicht näher über die Tatsache hinaus beschreiben, daß es nicht flektierbar ist. Man kann die Adverbien nur aufzählen.“[One cannot *grammatically* describe the adverb in greater detail than stating the fact that it is non-flectional. Adverbs can only be listed.] (Schoebe 1982: 38; emphasis same as in the original.).

Sommerfeld/Schreiber (1983: 12, in: LEE 1992: 60) say: “Das Adjektiv bezeichnet Erscheinungen der objektiven Realität, die in unserem Bewußtsein als Eigenschaften [...] widergespiegelt sind.“[The adjective denotes phenomena of the objective reality that are reflected as attributes in our conscious mind] And “Der verallgemeinerte grammatische Bedeutungsgehalt des Adjektivs ist das Merkmal oder, genauer, die Eigenschaft, und dabei eine solche Eigenschaft, die einem Ding anhaftet.“[The generalized grammatical purport of the adjective is the distinguishing mark or, more precisely, the characteristic and at the same time such a characteristic that is inherent in an object] (Sommerfeld/ Schreiber 1983: 143, in: LEE 1992: 60), added in parentheses “Denn eine Eigenschaft kann auch einem Verlauf anhaften, was zum Teil den Bedeutungsgehalt des Adverbs ausmacht.“[For a characteristic can also adhere to a process thus constituting partially the purport of the adverb.] (Sommerfeld/ Schreiber 1983: 143, in: LEE 1992: 60). Once more, we find the indirectly stipulated impossibility of discriminating clearly adjective from adverb.

The current 2009 version of DUDEN Grammatik says explicitly: “Einige Wörter erscheinen auch im adverbialen Gebrauch; die grammatische Einordnung ist daher besonders schwierig.“[Some words will also be used adverbially; therefore the grammatical classification is particularly difficult.] (Wermke 2009: 360). Nevertheless, Altmann/HAHNEMANN describe the adjective as “Durch die morphologischen Eigenschaften gut abgrenzbare Kategorie mit weitgehend stabilen Eigenschaften.“[well definable category due to morphological characteristics having mostly stable characteristics.] (Altmann/HAHNEMANN 2010: 34). If, however, the concept of adjective in analogy to that of the adverb is translated using the term ”ad-Objekt”[ad-object] as suggested above, then at the same time one determines the direct relation to the noun part of speech. Doing this, one decides against recognizing all of the other relations that, up to now, have been subsumed not only under the concept of adjective, but also under the adjective part of speech.

Consequently, phenomena such as

(1) Der Tisch ist groß.[The table is big] und

(2) Die Erde ist rund.[The earth is round]

cannot be called adjectives any longer, nor predicatives, for the relation is as follows:

not (1a) Tisch groß[table big] but (1b) groß sein[to be big]

and not (2a) Erde rund[earth round] but (2b) rund sein[to be round]

The relation to the verb, on the other hand, from time immemorial has always been recognized in sentences as the following one:

(3) Das Kind läuft schnell.[The child runs fast.]

(4) Paul tanzt göttlich.[Paul dances divinely]

(5) Das Flugzeug landet sicher.[The airplane touches down safely]

Once again the relation is not

(3a) Kind schnell[child fast] but (3b) schnell laufen[to run fast]

Likewise not

(4a) Paul hervorragend[Paul excellent] but (4b) hervorragend tanzen[to dance excellently]

And neither

(5a) Flugzeug sicher[airplane safe] but (5b) sicher landen[to touch down safely]

Whereas in the examples (1) and (2), by using the verb *sein*[to be] equalization on the contentual level is realized, an incorrectly assumed relation in the sentences (3) through (5) leads to completely false isotopy results. That is to say, sentence (3) is not about a fast thinking or fast talking child, but about one that runs fast.

The meaning of the word relations with respect to adjectival and adverbial functions will be particularly distinctive when translating the sentences into a language that structurally differs from German.

4. Considering Other Languages

Various voices, time and time again, have demanded to take into consideration other languages (e.g. LEE 1991: 390 referring to Götze 1976: 274). In the following, this will be implemented – even if within a minor scope, i.e. for two other languages.

This consideration of other languages will not result from looking at English as it is usual for German grammar, because, for instance, within the scope of adverbial usage "im Inventar der zur Verfügung stehenden Ausdrücke, in den Bedingungen für ihre Verwendung und in den Strategien, die zum Ausdruck bestimmter Inhalte verwendet werden,"[in the inventory of available terms, in the conditions for their application, and in the strategies used to express specific contents] (König et al. 1990: 1) there are "große Unterschiede"[major differences] (König u.a. 1990: 1) compared to German. Instead reference will be made to languages structurally unlike German, to Japanese

and Turkish, being the languages in which the author obtained her translator’s certificate. Using these languages, the relation mechanics of the concept named adjective and adverb in the traditional German grammar will be shown. The sentences used are identical in meaning in all three languages.

German

(1) Er isst *schnell*[he eats *fast*]. (nominative, verb, primary word)

(2) Das ist ein *schnelles* Essen.[this is a *fast* meal] (nominative, verb, nominative)

In this case, in the German sentence

(1) the primary word *schnell* won’t be inflected, in sentence

(2) on the other hand it will be inflected.

Japanese

(3) Kare wa/ga *hayaku* taberu. (nominative, subj-marker, primary word, verb)

(4) *Hayai* ryōri (da). (primary word, nominative, (copula))

Japanese inflects in sentence (3), but not in sentence (4).

Turkish

(5) O *çabuk* yiyor. (nominative, primary word, verb)

(6) Bu *çabuk* bir yemek(-tir). (demonstrative in nom., primary word, indef. art., nom. (-copula))

Thus, in Turkish there is another variant in which the primary word isn’t inflected neither in sentence (5) nor in sentence (6).

Summarized in form of a table the following rule ensues:

Language	Referring to verb (adverbial usage)	Referring to substantive (adjectival usage)
German	no flection	mandatory flection
Japanese	mandatory flection	no flection
Turkish	no flection ³	no flection

Table 1: Using flection for adverbial and/or adjectival relations. (HAYASHI-MÄHNER 2013)

³ Turkish knows suffixes such as –ce, which, however, depending on the expression, won’t be used tied to a related word.

Whereas Turkish shows no flexion both German and Japanese know mandatory flexion in the areas at issue. Interestingly enough, these two languages behave contrariwise regarding the issue which relation stipulates a mandatory flexion.

5. The traditional “Adjectives“ versus “Bezugswort-Theorie“

The rule established above now needs to be checked for the German language. By now, there are a number of grammar reference works dealing with the German present-day language. A comprehensive listing can be found, for instance, in Altmann/HAHNEMANN (2010: 22ff). For clarifying her notions, the author uses the DUDEN reference grammar of 1995, because it reflects the common understanding in terms of the traditional adjectives and because the Duden ”vielfach als die Instanz in allen Sprachfragen betrachtet wird.“[in many cases is considered the authority for all linguistic issues.] (MUSAN 2009: VI). The key words under which one finds our primary word in the Duden reference grammar are adjective and adverb.

Under the global header of WORTARTEN[PARTS OF SPEECH] you can find the group named *Die Flektierbaren*[flexional words]. Verbs, nouns, adjectives, articles, and pronouns fall into this category. Opposed are the *Unflektierbaren*[non-flexional words], i.e. the adverbs, particles, prepositions, and conjunctions.

Later, both *adjective* and *adverb* are explained in detail as autonomous parts of speech once again. In this context as essential points of the classification for the adjective the following ones are mentioned: attributive, predicative, and adverbial usages, the adjective as a ”Gleichsetzungsglied“[equalization item]; adjectives with and without complement; usage and formation of the number adjectives and similar terms; the adjective declension (divided into attributive and nominalized adjectives); comparative forms.

Subsequently, the reference grammar deals once more with the *adjective* seen from the perspective of word formation. Here, the first topic mentioned is the adjective derivation,

followed by: adjective plus verb type; verbs formed from adjectives ("de-adjectival" type); adjective composition; verb plus adjective (participle); noun plus adjective (participle); adjective plus adjective (participle); Addition of prefixes and semi-prefixes; adjective derivation types; semantic modification ("de-adjectival"); Transformation into another part of speech by means of suffixes and semi-suffixes.

The following major classification items refer to the adverb: subclasses of the adverb; locative adverbs; temporal adverbs; modal adverbs; conjunctive adverbs; comment adverbs, pronominal adverbs and, especially, adverb groups.

Regarding the adverb, adding to the explanations above and under the header of word formation the following is dealt with: formation of adverbs by composition, inversion and conversion; adverb derivation by means of suffixes; the sentence: adverbial accusative, adverbial genitive.

The author would like to suggest to establish the distinction following a single classification, namely the one according to the part of speech of the related word mentioned above. To deal with each and every item of the DUDEN classification would exceed the scope of this paper. Therefore, here we will only turn to some essential topics wherein to date, for deciding on adjective or adverb, the verb has not been used as a decision criterium in the sense of related word, i.e. sentences such as (1), (2), etc.

For this purpose, I would like to go in greater detail into the "Bezugswort-Theorie" (HAYASHI-MÄHNER 2011), which, when translating concepts derived from Latin into German, requires to strictly follow the lexical meaning of the terms ad-verb and ad-jective (ad-object). An ad-jective is thus a word referring to an object in the broadest sense of the word, we think of the material sense, i.e. the object as a thing. Therefore, a relation to a nominative, genitive, dative, or accusative complement in the sentence is predetermined. And in German such a complement can be a noun exclusively. An ad-verb, vice versa, is a word or expression that refers to the verb. HAYASHI-MÄHNER (2011: 38) also suggests to call such words that can be used both with respect to the verb and to a noun "Grundwörter in mehr als einer Funktion" "[primary words in more than one

function] and to point to this dual usage optically, for instance by means of place holders such as groß_, blau_, neu_[big_, blue_, new_] et cetera.

Thus, the relations are as follows

- | | |
|---|----------------------|
| (7) Das Haus <i>ist groß</i> [the house <i>is big</i>]. | Relates to the verb. |
| (8) Das ist ein <i>großes</i> Haus.[this is a <i>big house</i>] | Relates to the noun |
| (9) Das ist das <i>zwölfte</i> Kilogramm.[this is the <i>twelfth</i> kilogram] | Relates to the noun |
| (10) Das Haus ist <i>größer</i> , als ich gedacht hatte.[the house is <i>bigger</i> than I had thought] | Relates to the verb |
| (11) Das ist ein <i>größeres</i> Haus als das alte.
[this is a <i>bigger</i> house than the old one] | Relates to the noun |

DUDEN mentions another characteristic, the uninflected adjective accompanying a noun. However, this is followed by the explanation that it would be about "eine altertümliche oder eine volkstümliche Redeweise"[an archaic or a popular parlance]. And in this manner the DUDEN addresses the area of suffix-reduction, which is also common in other areas, e.g. "ich gehe/ich geh", "einmal/mal", etc.

- | | |
|---|--|
| (12) Das sind neun.[these are nine] | Relates to a noun reduced |
| (13) ein einzig Volk[one united people] | Relates to a noun explicitly mentioned |

Certainly, one can establish the grammatical form "Das sind neune." [these are nine]. As a part of the nine-pins lingo the term "alle Neune"[all nines] is still in common use. Likewise, one can also say "ein einziges Volk"[one united people].

- | |
|---|
| (12a) Das sind neune.[these are nine] |
| (13a) ein einziges/einzigartiges Volk[one united/unique people] |

The possibility for reduction, thus, does not touch the "Bezugswort-Theorie" at all. The same is true for the poetic manner of positioning subsequent to the noun

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| (14) O Täler weit[oh valleys wide] | (14a) O weite Täler[oh wide valleys] |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|

This kind of post positioning in the vernacular

- | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| (15) Whisky pur[whisky pure] | (15a) purer Whisky[pure whisky] |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------|

The transformation to the substantive composition also fits into the “Bezugswort-Theorie”:
(16) von halb Deutschland[of half of Germany]

In these cases, the reduction is the common form. Grammatically, however, the long structure is not impossible either:

(16a) vom halben Deutschland[of half of Germany]

The same regularity, according to the “Bezugswort-Theorie”, applies to color names as well:

(17) ein rosa Landhaus[a pink country house]

In this context, the DUDEN states that these *adjectives*, that’s what they are called, have emerged from nouns as a rule. But even etymological considerations don’t affect the “Bezugswort-Theorie” for, on the semantic level, a house cannot be pink on its own accord, it will be painted in this color. Thus, again we see a reduction of the suffix that, through a complement (in this case highlighted by underlining), easily can be undone:

(17a) ein rosa gestrichenes Landhaus[a country house painted pink]

In this way, again, we have reestablished the verb relation and our *primary word*, according to the rule, won’t be inflected.

The Duden reference grammar, too, in this case relies to the phenomenon of reduction as an explanation, however, it calls it a makeshift solution: ”In der Standardsprache hilft man sich durch Zusammensetzung mit *-farben, -farbig* u.ä. oder durch ein Präpositionalgefüge, wenn man die unflektierten Formen vermeiden will.“[In the standard language one reverts to compositions using *-farben[colored], -farbig[colored]* or the like. or a prepositional phrase if one wants to avoid the uninflected forms] (Drosdowski 1995: 257).

(17b) ein *rosafarbenes* Kleid[a *pink-colored* dress]

(17c) ein Kleid *in Rosa*[a dress in pink]

Sentence (17c) doesn’t fit our template, because here a nominalisation of the source word is existent so that the relation only needs to be stipulated between preposition and noun.

The Duden reference grammar adds to it: “In der Umgangssprache wird aber oft flektiert“[the vernacular, however, inflects frequently] and gives the example

(17d) ein *rosanes* Band[a *pink* ribbon]

In this case, the direct relation to the noun was established, the word ”germanized“ and thus, according to the rules of the German language, is subject to mandatory flection.

Even for more complex expressions, frequently in the construction that traditionally has been called *attributive usage for the adjective* or as *adverbs*, the ”Bezugswort-Theorie“ retains its logic, because even then a reduction exists.

(18) Der *entsetzlich kalte* Wind wehte aus Norden.[the *horribly cold* wind blew from the north]

Thus, sentence (18) is not about a horrible wind that, on top of it, is cold as well, but a wind the degree of coldness of which is horrible. Sentence (18) is therefore not identical with

(18a) Es wehte ein *entsetzlicher kalter* Wind.[a *horrible and cold* wind was blowing]

But rather in this case a relative clause

(18b) Es wehte ein kalter Wind, dessen Kälte entsetzlich war.
[a cold wind was blowing the coldness of which was horrible]

was reduced to a form identical with a suffix-reduced primary word in adjectival usage, and this form is an adverbial phrase, which can be shown by reducing it to the state of the original relative clause.

Thus, although Wermke (2009:338) asserts: "[...] nur Adjektive [können] zwischen definitivem Artikel und Substantiv stehen." "[...] only adjectives [can] be placed between definite article and noun.] at least one exception needs to be borne in mind

(19) Das äußerst schwierige Problem gilt es noch zu lösen.

[The extremely difficult problem still needs to be solved.]

The word "äußerst"[extremely] is of course no adjective, but a complement to a primaryword in adjectival usage.

(19a) Das Problem war äußerst schwierig.[the problem was extremely difficult]

When cumulating words in adjectival usage, these words consequently refer parallelly to the noun. With words in adverbial usage this is different. Here an example to illustrate the indirect relation to the verb for words on a lower level regarding relation:

(20) Das sagte er gestern möglicherweise gar nicht ernsthaft.

[This he said yesterday possibly not in earnest at all.]

In this connection, the sequence of the words used adverbially is as follows, first, the direct relation

to the verb (20a) ernsthaft sagen[to say in earnest]

It follows the negation used adverbially (20b) nicht [ernsthaft] sagen[to not say [in earnest]]

with its emphasis (20c) gar nicht [ernsthaft sagen]

[not [to say in earnest] at all]

moreover, the mode of probability is added:

(20d) möglicherweise gar nicht [ernsthaft sagen]

[possibly not [to say in earnest] at all]

and finally a temporal restrictive is included

(20e) gestern möglicherweise gar nicht [ernsthaft sagen] [yesterday, possibly not [to say in earnest] at all]

In sentence (20e) no fewer than three parallel relations are allocated to the time measurement “gestern“[yesterday]: gestern – möglich[yesterday – possible], gestern – gar nicht[yesterday – not at all], gestern – sagen[yesterday – to say]. Only the latter use comprises a direct relation to the verb. The two other usages each refer to a word that through a further one refers to the verb; thus, these usages constitute an indirect adverbial use.

6. Conclusion

Summarizing the above statements leads to a novel classification of the phrases that traditionally are called adjectives and adverbs as follows whereupon the concept of ”Wortart Adjektiv“[adjective part of speech] cannot be maintained for the German language any longer:

Adverbally applicable words/expressions		
Unmodifiable “absolute“ adverbs Words being used exclusively adverbially (heute, oft, neben, dort, vielleicht)[today, often, beside(s), there, perhaps]	Primary word with two functions (schön_, billig_, alt_, gelb_, heute_, gleich_, eben_, gesagt_)[beautiful_, cheap_, old_, yellow_, contemporary_, equal_, even_, said_]	
	Adverbial relation: (schön sein, schön sprechen; schnell sein, schnell lesen)[to be beautiful, to talk beautifully, to be fast, to read fast]	Adjectival relation: (ein schönes Haus, ein schnelles Flugzeug)[a beautiful house, a fast airplane]

Table 2: Schematic presentation of adverbial and adjectival relations in German. HAYASHI-MÄHNER 2013.

Thus, contrary to every traditional grammar, we no longer treat adjectives as a part of speech, but as one of the two functions (usages) of a primary word with the other function being the adverbial one, i.e. the one clarifying the verb relation. Although there are absolute adverbs (vielleicht, morgen, super)[perhaps, tomorrow, super], which – in contemporary German – in principle are not modifiable and therefore cannot be used adjectivally, there is, on the other hand, in the sense of “Bezugswort-Theorie” (HAYASHI-MÄHNER 2011) no equivalent for the concept traditionally termed the adjective part of speech. For the modifiable forms can only be modified, because they relate to the noun. When deciding whether a relation to the verb exists, semantic considerations will not be permitted, which means that even the verb *sein*[to be] and the verbs denoting perception, etc, for which traditionally an adjectival usage has been assumed, will be considered verbs that permit a relation by means of a primary word. When listing words, which refer to the same word, it should be pointed out that in case of adjectival usage, a parallel listing is done, while each suffix owes its existence to the direct relation to the noun; for adverbial usage, however, the semantic level will play a part, which purports the sequence of usage with the final adverbial ranking highest. To what extent the word order in the sentence may be able to support the “Bezugsworttheorie“ could not yet be assessed within the scope of this paper.

Bibliographic References

- Altmann, Hans u. HAHNEMANN, Suzan (2010): *Prüfungswissen Syntax*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- BARTSCH, Renate (1972): *Adverbialsemantik. Die Konstitution logisch-semantischer Repräsentationen von Adverbialkonstruktionen*. Frankfurt/ Main: Athenäum Verlag.
- Drosdowski, Günther et. al. (1997) (Hg.): *Duden Fremdwörterbuch*. Mannheim, Leipzig, Wien, Zürich: Dudenverlag.
- Drosdowski, Günther et. al. (1989) (Hg.): *DUDEN Etymologie. Herkunftswörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. Mannheim, Leipzig, Wien, Zürich: Dudenverlag.

- Götze, Lutz: „Grundstrukturen“ und „Satzbaupläne“ im Unterricht „Deutsch als Fremdsprache“. In: Schumacher, H. (1976) (Hg.): *Untersuchungen zur Verbvalenz*. (Forschungsberichte des Instituts für deutsche Sprache 30). Tübingen, S. 259-280.
- HAYASHI-MÄHNER, Elke (2013): Überdenken der Existenz einer Wortart Adjektiv – Überlegungen zu einer neuen Abgrenzung von „Adverb“ und „Adjektiv“. In: *Sophia European Studies Series*. Vol. 6, Feb. 2013, p. 23-40.
- HAYASHI-MÄHNER (2011): Vermittlung von Satzstrukturen im DaF-Unterricht – Adjektive und Adverb. In: *LINGUA* (Periodical des Zentrums Fremdsprachenausbildung für Hörer aller Fakultäten der Sophia Universität Tokyo No. 22). Tokyo: Sophia University Press, S. 25-41.
- Helbig, Gerhard u. Buscha, Joachim (2001): *Deutsche Grammatik. Ein Handbuch für den Ausländerunterricht*. Berlin u.a.: Langenscheidt.
- Hoffmann, Ludger (2007): Einleitung: Wortarten. In: Hoffmann, Ludger (Hg.): *Handbuch der Wortarten*. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Kärnä, Aino u. Matthaios, Stephanos (2007): *Das Adverb in der Grammatikographie*. Teil I. (Reihe: Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft.) Münster: Nodus Publikationen.
- KLOSA, Annette et. al. (1997) (Hg.): *DUDEN Etymologie. Herkunftswörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. Mannheim, Leipzig, Wien, Zürich: Dudenverlag.
- Kluge, Friedrich (1989) (Hg.): *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.
- König, Ekkehard; Stark, Detlef; REQUARDT, Susanne (1990): *Adverbien und Partikeln: ein deutsch-englisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Julius Groos Verlag.
- Köster, Rudolf et. al. (1969) (Hg.): *Ullstein Lexikon der deutschen Sprache*. Frankfurt, Berlin: Verlag Ullstein.
- LEE, Sun-Muk (1994): *Untersuchungen zur Valenz des Adjektivs in der deutschen Gegenwartssprache. Die morphosyntaktische und logisch-semantische Bestimmung der Ergänzungen zum Adjektiv*. (Reihe: Europäische Hochschulschriften. Reihe I Deutsche Sprache und Literatur. Bd./Vol. 1429.) Frankfurt/Main u.a.: Peter Lang Europäischer Verlag der Wissenschaften.

MUSAN, Renate (2009): *Satzgliedanalyse*. Zweite, aktualisierte Auflage. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.

Schoebe, Gerhard (1982): *Deutsche Kurzgrammatik*. München: R. Oldenbourg.

Sommerfeld, K.-E. u. Schreiber, H. (1979): Zum Verhältnis von semantischer und syntaktischer Valenz. In: *Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung* No 32., S. 312-319.

Wermke, Matthias et. al. (Hg.) (2009): *Duden. Die Grammatik*. 8. Auflage. Mannheim, Wien, Zürich: Dudenverlag.