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Abstract
The topic of assuming the genitive by reason of adjacency is one of the most important topics in Arabic grammar and Arabic language in general. The topic is multi-dimensional and has roots and examples in grammar, morphology and rhetoric, and early Arab grammarians made no separation among all these fields; rather they were all dealt with under the heading "Assuming Adjacency or Contingency". It may also be worth noting that preference in translation is given to the term "adjacency" because of frequent use in modern linguistic studies in English, though it relates only to one type which is the morphological; whereas in Arabic, it includes all the linguistic levels, lexical, phonological, morphological and syntactic levels. This may be of utmost importance to contemporary non-Arab grammarians, especially those who are still going around the "orphan" morphological level.

1.0. Introduction:
The principle of adjacency in Arabic may reveal striking conclusions for other grammars especially when we take into consideration that Arabic is an inflected language in the sense that a grammatical category is not decided only by word order as it is in English, but also by inflection affecting the last letter of the word. There can be no word in an Arabic sentence that is not bearing a diacritic or inflectional letters even for words that are supposed to be indeclinable or structured: they must bear an inflectional sign.

Greek certainly is an inflectional language which could be traced back to the influence of the Phoenician grammar before reversing the Phoenician alphabet in a way that the researcher may prove one day as hasty and lacking in comprehending the special internal structure of the Phoenician words which lead the Greek linguistic heritage alongside the heritage of all alphabets descended from Greek to be deprived of natural rhythm at the very lexical level. This has affected dramatically the phonetic aspect until today. The researcher hopes to devote in the near future an article dealing with this "fertile" subject if researchers ponder over it.

1.1. Types of adjacency in Arabic
The paper will present the following types:

a. Phonetic Adjacency
b. Morphological Adjacency
c. Syntactic Adjacency

The paper will discuss all the linguistic level for Arabic adjacency. More emphasis will be allotted so syntactic level because it raises many arguments that may be of use especially when it relates to the structural ambiguity of sentences as detailed in Chomsky(2002).

1.1.1. Phonetic Adjacency
The phonetic adjacency has no equivalence in English except sporadic hints that are made into it but without in-depth studies. As far as the phonetic or phonological level is concerned, adjacency requires in Arabic that the internal structure of the word be changed into fatihah (-----) kasrah (-----) damah(-----) and sukun (-----). Some Arabists overlook the last sign and treat it as no vowel. Actually, it does the function of an" implicit vowel through its being an absence of a vowel " This may seem contradictory but it is certainly not and its main function affects the inflection of verbs in particular in addition to some indeclinable words especially adverbs and particles.

An example is found in the classical speech of the Arabs in the expression:

جاء بالصباح والبرح
Transliteration: fa’a bid-dhi war-rhi (He has brought the sun and the wind)
The word *ḏīḥi* with long "I" was originally *diḥu* with short "i" after the "d." The word has assumed the long vowel "I" in order to agree with the adjacent word after it, namely, *rīḥi* ( Ibn Manzūr,1956, article ضحح ).

Another interesting example narrated by Ibn Jinni, the renowned morphologist,( Ibn Jinni,1966,1,37f), is the a portion from the Qur'an, Chapter 1, verse 1: مَنْ أَصَابَ الْحَمْدَ اللَّهُ الَّذِي أَخْلَصَ أَنفُسَهُمْ , where the word *amah* is in the nominative for its being the predicate noun and to be assigned the same nominative case. Instead, it has become *al-hamdu lillahi*.

1.1.2. Morphological adjacency

English deals mainly with the morphological rule for adjacency as introduced by (Siegel,1977) and taken up by (Allen,1978). One may also state here for the sake of comparison that "Adjacency Condition" and "Adjacency Principle" are lacking in an in-depth interpretation since they deal with a simple rule when compared to early Arab grammarians "sophisticated" augment.

Examples of this type of adjacency in Arabic are taken mainly from the "unṭall verb lit. "sick, ailing" (unsound or imperfect verb).

The first example is سَوْمَمُ "v.to fast". This word was original سَوْمٌ where the "waw "ū" has been converted into یَذَّ(ی)ُ for its being the predicate noun and to agree with the first word ending by reason of adjacency. However, this anomalous reading, though, not heard by the current Quranic reciters, is supposed to be correct in its being an old Arabic dialect.

### 1.1.3. Appositives

Syntactic adjacency may present rich grammatical material for English and even non-English grammarians especially the generativists.

**Examples of this type of adjacency in Arabic are taken mainly from the "unṭall verb lit. "sick, ailing" (unsound or imperfect verb).**
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We have two nouns and an adjective as follows:

\( r\IMathu \): subject in the nominative (wind)

\( yawmin \): noun in the genitive after a preposition (day)

\( \text{\'asfin} \): adjective in the genitive (stormy)

The adjective \( \text{\'asfin} \) is supposed to be in the nominative since it modifies \( r\IMathu(n) \); nevertheless it is put in the genitive as though it modified \( yawmin \). As a matter of fact, it is not a process of modification; rather a process of adjacency. (al-Far\u00d4, 1983, 2,73)

1.1.3.2. Contest or conflict in domination

This grammatical category or topic is unique to Arabic and we suspect it exists in other language though it relates almost wholly to word order. Contest is based on the famous theory in Arabic grammar known as \( \text{\'amil} \), (regent or operative or as defined by Hans Vehr (Vehr, 1974, article (work) as "word governing another in syntactical regimen, regent")

Contest or conflict means that two regents or operatives are claiming the right to dominate the contested noun or the accusative. This is motivated mostly by semantic considerations. The example below is a sentence with two (uncoordinated) verbs and there is only one regent: (al-\u0128abban, 1974, 2,142) "(NB: Arabic is written from right to left like Phoenician and early Greek language!):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{\'ātūnī} & \quad \text{\'ufrigh} \\
1 & \quad 2 & \quad 3
\end{align*}
\]

Transliteration: \( \text{\'ūtrūnī} \) \( \text{\'ufrigh} \)

Literal: (bring me) \( \) pour \( \) thereon \( \) (molten cooper)/ object

Translation: Bring me molten copper to pour thereon.

In this cited verse, the second verb \( \text{\'ufrigh} \) 'pour', is the operative in which case \( \text{qiṭran} \) is put in the accusative as an object. The Basrans elaborate further by stating that if the first verb \( \text{\'ātūnī} \,"\) bring me \( \) had to be the operative, then the second verb would be \( \text{\'ufrīghhu} \) "pouring it". As for analogy, they argue that the second is more deserving to be the operative because it is the nearest to the governed noun in addition to its being confirmed by the principle of adjacency upon which many of the predicaments of the second noun are assigned to the first and that of the first to the second (Sibawah, n.d., 1,73-74).

As for the Kufans, they hold the opposite view and they also support their argument with examples from classical Arabic and analogy (al-\u0128ukbari, 1986, 254).

This debate between the Kufans and the Basran relates directly to the principle of adjacency which is employed to support the argument of one party against the other. (Ibid, 254).

2. Adjacency and structural ambiguity

According to Crystal (2003,438) "a structural ambiguity is a term used in linguistics to refer to a construction with more than one grammatical interpretation in terms of constituent analysis….A much used example is \( \text{old men and women} \), which is structurally ambiguous. …. In generative grammar, this phenomenon is sometimes referred to as 'constructional homonymity'."

This what applies to Arabic syntactic and even non-syntactic adjacency.

By reason of the established grammatical norms, the word in focus agrees in case with the word it modifies; by reason of adjacency the same word in focus modifies the most adjacent word, mostly if not compulsorily, in the genitive case.

Similar examples can be found in many Quranic chapters and verses:

3. Adjacency restricted to specific grammatical cases

Adjacency has been restricted by the overwhelming majority of grammarians to the genitive case as far as nouns are concerned. It is inadmissible in the nominative case. There are only two grammarians, al-\u0128as\u0167i and Ibn qutaiba, who present a single example from Arabic poetry in which they try to prove that adjacency is also applicable to the nominative. (al-Baghdādī, 1976, 5,101): ft. 6
Example:
مشى الهالوك عليها الخيل الفضيل
Transliteration:
mashya al-halūki ‘alayha al-khay’alu al- fuḍulu
we have here three words as follows:
1. al-halūki: in the genitive (shameless, insolent)
2. al-khay’alu: in the nominative (sleeveless garment)
3. al-fuḍulu: in the nominative (single or modest garment)

According to Arabic grammar norms, an adjective should agree with the noun it modifies. It may be
worth noting for the sake of reasonable attention of non-Arabic researchers that the adjective in Arabic follows
the noun similar to French and contrary to English.

Let us analyse this line of poetry to see how we can assign two grammatical descriptions to it:
al-halūki is in the genitive because it is the governed noun in the genitive construct, the first one
being the construct state, Ar.

فَلِيُّ lit. “added (p.p.)”. This

فَلِيُّ is dominated by what precedes it and it stands
like any other noun. The second is always subjected to the genitive case wherever it falls.

We are expecting, therefore, that al-halūki is modified by an adjective in the genitive. This adjective is
al-fuḍulu which has assumed the J@Tḍammah of the nominative. When we discover that al-khay’alu is the most
the adjacent word to al-fuḍulu in the nominative as well, then we realise that adjacency has “overcome” the
norms of Arabic grammar.

However, this type of adjacency is extremely rare and anomalous and may be negligible. What
supports this opinion is that this example is the only evidence in support of this nominative and the second
evidence is that not a single example has been picked from the Quran.

4. Morphologica Adjacency in English
There is no doubt that the principle of adjacency or adjacency condition in English relates to the
morphological component of the language.
The adjacency conditions is defined by its major advocates, i.e. (Allen,1878:49) and (Siegel,1978) as follows:
"The Adjacency Condition: No WFR (word-formation rule) can involve X and Y, unless Y is uniquely contained
in three cycle adjacent to X"

Crystal’s Dictionary, (Crysta,2003,11) defines adjacency principle as follows,” A principle in government –
binding theory which provides for the order of complements It requires that compliments capable of being case-
marked precede those compliments which are not, and thus to be adjacent to the head of the phrase in question.
In English, for instance, the principle ensures that no constituent intervenes between a verb and its object noun
phrase, e.g. John read a book yesterday vs. *John read yesterday a book."

If we trace the history of adjacency further, we discover that it is a condition on words formation rules proposed
in Siegel(1977) and taken up by Allen(1978). It states that an affixation rule can be made sensitive to the context
of an embedded morpheme only if that morpheme is the one most recently attached by a morphological rule.
Thus far, the initiators of this principle have not revised it in view of what other languages, such as Arabic,
present.

Though Arabic presents comprehensive adjacency models or types, yet there are studies which resemble to some
extent the syntactic adjacency in Arabic in an apparent departure from Siegel -Allen morphological adjacency.
A study conducted by Mark C. Baker (Baker 2011) from Rutgers University entitled " On the Syntax of Surface-
Adjacency: The Case of Pseudo Noun Incorporation," reveals strongly something similar to Arabic. The researcher has made reference to Turkish
(Öztürk 2005) and Spanish and other Asian languages. Needless to say that Turkish, which was one day written
in the Arabic script, is greatly influenced by Arabic while Spanish is also influenced through hundreds of years.

Let us have a look at some extensive examples and comments by the researcher:
"Direct objects of this sort need not be next to the verb, since these languages allow some variation in
word order, presumably due to scrambling. For example, the object can easily be separated from the verb by an
adverb or by a PP/dative NP, as shown in (2). It can also scramble to before the subject in both languages, deriving OSV orders.
(2) a. Masha salamaat-y türgennik sie-te. (Sakha)
Masha porridge-ACC quickly eat-PAST.3sS
‘Masha ate the porridge quickly.’
b. Min kinige-ni Masha-qa bier-di-m. (Sakha)
I book-ACC Masha-DAT give-PAST-1sS
‘I gave the book to Masha.’
c. Maala anda pustagatt-e veegamaa padji-cc-aa. (Tamil)
Mala the book quickly read-PAST-3fS
‘Mala read the book quickly.’
d. Naan oru pustagatt-e anda pombale-kiitte kuɖu-tt-een. (Tamil)
I a book-ACC the woman-LOC give-PAST-1sS
‘I gave a book to the woman.’

He continues by saying that "objects that are interpreted as nonspecific indefinites can omit the accusative case marker, showing up as caseless nominals (not distinct from nominative case in these languages"

After many examples Baker comes to conclude that "This makes sense if the PNIed nominal and the verb are indeed separate words, with a boundary between them. So we seem to have syntactic juxtaposition of an NP and a V, not union of an N and V into a single word on the surface" (Emphasis is mine)

The researcher has also produced evidence from Spanish and Romance languages. He mentions that some researchers have found that "in Romance languages, the verb itself undergoes head movement, breaking the adjacency between the verb and the object, even if the object is a bare NP.” “As a result, bare singulars can be separated from the verb by an adverb on the edge of the VP"

He gives the following example from Spanish.

Juan tiene todavía casa en su ciudad natal. (Spanish)
Juan has still house in his village home
‘Juan still has [a] house in his home village.’

Another most promising study in this direction is conducted by the Spanish researcher Jose Luis Gonzalez Escribano from the Catedratico de Filologia Inglesa, Universidad de Oviedo, España which is entitled "English compounds and the theory of abstract case". This study may be the most explicit study that call for the involvement of syntax in accounting for English compounds. (Escribano 2004)

These clear cases supported by concrete examples prove that morphological adjacency in English has become "old-fashioned" and "outdated". These cases may be verified even further by the fact that what was raised by Williams (Williams 1981a) is considered to be a replacement for Siegel's Condition (Siegel 1977) which is renamed by Williams as Atom Condition. This terminological "confusion" is not in favour of promulgating any theory or principle. I am suggesting therefore that a "rich" adjacency should be searched for in inflectional languages where cases are attached to words in a way different from when attached to words in a "lifeless" word order system as in English."

Conclusion
The research has dealt with a very rare linguistic phenomenon which has been totally absent from the analysis of English grammarians, generativists and non-generativists alike. Adjacency principle or whatever term one gives it, remains incomplete as long as it deals with an indeclinable systems such as that in English. Arabic has given the most comprehensive evidence that adjacency is multi-dimensional and accounts for rare linguistic phenomena. Some studies have revealed such a multi-dimensionality with evidence from other languages such as Turkish and Spanish which were one day part of the Arabic writing system at least.
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**ABSTRACT**

يتناول البحث الحُمل على الجوار كظاهرة تميز بها النحو العربي ولا تكاد نجد لها نظيريَّا في اللغة الإنجليزية بل لأي غيرها من نُغات الارض. وكون العربية نُغة استثنائيَّة ومعنى أن تراكيب النحوية تتحكم بها ما يتلقحها من حركات في آخر الكلمة فإنَّا نقف بانتهاء أمام هذه الظاهرة العقولية المستعده من السهيلة حيث يتم خروج القواعد التقليدية للحُمل وتتقسم الكلمة حركة النحو مهما كانت موضوعها الإعرابي ولكن في الخلف فقط وهي تقع في الإسماء حصرًا. وليس هناك من حمل على الجوار لغير الخلف إلا في حالة نذرية بل في بيت شعر واحد فقط جاء به الأنسميَّة وابن قتيبة لإلبات وفق الرفع في حقل الحُمل على الجوار. وفي ضوء نظرية الشاهد وكونه الوحيد فإنه يكون مهماً. ويكاد ذلك خلو القرآن الكريم من مثل هذا اللون الذي اتفق النحو الأول على شذوذ وندرته. يفاقمهن الفعل.

**ملخص**

يُتَّناول البحث الحُمل على الجوار كظاهرة تميز بها النحو العربي ولا نكاد نجد لها نظيرًا في اللغة الإنجليزية بل لأي غيرها من اللغات الأرض. وكون العربية لغة استثنائية ومعنى أن تراكيب النحوية تتحكم بها ما يتلقحها من حركات في آخر الكلمة فإننا نقف بانتهاء أمام هذه الظاهرة العقولية المستعدة من السهيلة حيث يتم خروج القواعد التقليدية للحُمل وتتقسم الكلمة حركة النحو مهما كانت موضوعها الإعرابي ولكن في الخلف فقط وهي تقع في الإسماء حصرًا. وليس هناك من حمل على الجوار لغير الخلف إلا في حالة نذرية بل في بيت شعر واحد فقط جاء به الأنسميَّة وابن قتيبة لإلبات وفق الرفع في حقل الحُمل على الجوار. وفي ضوء نظرية الشاهد وكونه الوحيد فإنه يكون مهماً. ويكاد ذلك خلو القرآن الكريم من مثل هذا اللون الذي اتفق النحو الأول على شذوذ وندرته. يفاقمهن الفعل.

**Resumen**

Se analiza el caso de la proyección verbal en el árabe y no lo encontramos en la lengua inglesa ni en el resto de las lenguas. El árabe es una lengua excepcional por lo que el caso de la proyección verbal se encuentra limitado a una situación de proyección verbal en el siglo de los nombres del clamor en la poesía. Esto se presenta en la línea de la teoría de la oración, donde se encuentra la relación entre el tema y la oración. El libro presenta una revisión de los casos de la proyección verbal en el árabe y la oración en la poesía. El libro ofrece una visión sistemática de la proyección verbal en el árabe y la oración en la poesía.
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