

Al-Zarkashī on Ellipsis in the Qur'ān: A Translation & Critical Synopsis

Afnan H. Fatani
King Abdul-aziz University

Abstract

The phenomenon of ellipsis (*Haḏf*) in the Qur'ān has been the subject of much scholarly discussion by Arab and Western scholars alike. Sībawayhi and other Arab philologists like Ibn Jinnī, Abū 'Ubayda, Ibn Qutayba, Abū Ḥayyān, Ibn Hishām, Al-Zamakhsharī, Al-Zarkashī, Al-Jurjānī, and Al-Suyūṭī among others, have devoted many pages to the analysis of this device, extensively outlining its benefits, causes, conditions and categories. Badr Al-Dīn Al-Zarkashī (d. 794/1391) in his encyclopaedic *Al-Burhān fī 'Ulūm Al-Qur'ān* provides extensive treatment of this phenomenon, presenting us with a detailed account of what had been said previously by early Arab scholars and including over 1000 instances of its occurrence in the Qur'ān. This paper provides a synopsis of Al-Zarkashī's treatment of ellipsis and a brief critique of his methodology and analysis. By delineating Al-Zarkashī's method of lexical recoverability which encompasses the tripartite processes of *taqdīr* 'reconstruction', *dalīl* 'proof' and *taḥyīn* 'designation', this study hopes to reveal the complex mechanics of the grammatical phenomenon of *Haḏf* and the sophisticated nature of medieval Arab philology. It is also hoped that this partial translation will provide us with the necessary tools for assessing Al-Zarkashī's contribution to the field of linguistics and perhaps sharpen our perception of the relationships that exist between Arab philologists, whose views Al-Zarkashī synthesized in his treatise, and Western linguists and scholarship on the topic.

Introduction

Haḏf 'ellipsis' in the Qur'ān has been the subject of much discussion by Arab and Western scholars alike. Sībawayhi (d. 180/793) in his famous *Kitāb* (chapters on *Haḏf* termed *ḥad' mār* 1:252-298; 2:350-384), and Medieval Arab philologists like Abū 'Ubayda (d. 210/825) in *Majāz Al-Qur'ān* (chapter on *Haḏf* pp. 8-16), Ibn Qutayba (d. 276/889) in *Ta'wīl Mushkil Al-Qur'ān* (chapters on *Haḏf* and *ḥxtis'ār* 'concision/abbreviation' pp. 210-231), Ibn Jinnī (d. 392/1002) in *Al-Khaṣā'is* (chapter on *Haḏf* 2:360-381) Al-'Askarī (d. 395/1005) in his *Kitāb Al-Ṣinā'atayn* (chapter on *Haḏf* pp. 181-214), Al-Jurjānī (d. 471/1078) in *Dalā'il Al-'Ijāz* (chapter on *Haḏf*

pp. 177-235), Al-Sulamī (d. 660/1262) in his *Magāz Al-Qur'ān* (chapter on *Haḏf* pp. 92-142), Ibn Hishām Al-Anṣārī (d. 761/1359) in *Mughnī Al-Labīb 'an Kutub Al-A'arīb* (chapter on *Haḏf* pp. 786-853), and Al-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505) in *Al-Itqān fī 'Ulūm Al-Qur'ān* (chapter on *Haḏf* pp. 588-607) among others, have devoted many pages to the analysis of this device. It can also be found in fragmented form scattered in various exegeses of individual chapters of the Qur'ān such as Al-Farrā' (d. 207/822) in *Ma'ānī Al-Qur'ān* (a fairly technical work which explains the difficult points of grammar and follows the Qur'ānic order), Al-Akhfash (d. 215/830) in *Ma'ānī Al-Qur'ān*¹ (chapter on *Haḏf* pp. 786-853: another technical work which follows the Qur'ānic order and attempts to provide a grammatical exegesis of all chapters of the Qur'ān through parsing of all *ḥāyahs* and identification of all grammatical tools *al-ḥadawāt al-naḥwīyyah*, such as *law* 'if', *lām al-ḥamr* 'imperative *lām*', *ḥā'if* 'if', *ḥaw* 'or', *al-kāf* etc., and cites more than 87 instances of *Haḏf* in the Qur'ān and in classical poetry and prose) and Al-Zamakhsharī (d. 538/1143) in *Al-Kashshāf 'an Ḥaqā'iq Al-Tanzīl* and Abū Ḥayyān (d. 745/1355) in *Al-Baḥr Al-Muḥīṭ*. In his encyclopaedic *Al-Burhān fī 'Ulūm Al-Qur'ān*, Badr Al-Dīn Al-Zarkashī (d. 794/1391) devotes an extensive treatment to this phenomenon, summarizing and elaborating on the views of Arab grammarians and rhetoricians including over 1000 instances of its occurrence in the Qur'ān. Al-Zarkashī's discussion is interesting, because it shows clearly the interaction between grammar and the neighboring disciplines of rhetoric and exegesis. It is also interesting, because it reveals Al-Zarkashī's preoccupation with the proper formulation of *Haḏf* as a set of well-defined and properly functional *ḥurūf* 'conditions', *dalīl* 'proof' and *taqdīr* 'reconstruction'. In addition to providing us with a comprehensive coverage of methodology, Al-Zarkashī also insists on investigating cases of inconsistencies and circularity. It is worth noting at the outset that Western scholars (Bell 1939, 1991; Wansbrough 1970) have been baffled by this grammatical phenomenon which has given rise to many instances of gross misunderstandings and mistranslations of the Qur'ān (for controversy over Qur'ānic ellipsis, see Ali 1994; Johns 1995).

This paper provides an in-depth investigation of ellipsis as delineated by Al-Zarkashī in *Al-Burhān*, one of the most well-known works in its field, and part of any syllabus on the history of Qur'ānic studies in Arab universities. Although esteemed in its own right, the book gained greater popularity with the advent of Suyūṭī in his *Al-Itqān fī 'Ulūm Al-Qur'ān* who commended the treatise, stating that he had based his own book on that of Al-Zarkashī's. Investigating this

¹According to Qur'āh, the editor of the 1990 edition of Al-Akhshaf's *Ma'ānī*, both Al-Kisā'ī and Al-Farrā' base their books by the same title on Al-Akhshaf's treatise. She lists 317 verbatim grammatical quotes from Al-Akhfash found in Al-Ṭabarī's *tafsīr* of the Qur'ān which is attributed to "some Baṣran grammarians" *baḥḍ naḥwīyy al-baṣrah* (Al-Khānjy 1990: 7, 647-701). She also faults Al-Fāyiz's 1979 edition of *Ma'ānī* for distorting the original manuscript by rearranging the order of the *sūrah*s so as to conform to the Qur'ānic order. Qur'āh's edition is a more scholarly attempt than Al-Fāyiz's earlier edition, since it allows easy access to grammatical concepts including *Haḏf* as well as provides comprehensive indexes of grammatical concepts, grammatical tools, and poetry citations, names of scholars and titles of books.

treatise on *Haḏf* will undoubtedly serve to underline Al-Zarkashī's significance for our understanding of the syntactico-semantic elements at that time. In addition, it is believed that the methods of lexical recoverability delineated by Al-Zarkashī which encompass the tripartite process of *taqdīr* 'reconstruction', *dalīl* 'proof', and *taṣyīn* 'designation' will reveal the sophisticated nature of early Arab philology and perhaps resolve the controversy over Qur'ānic ellipsis by illustrating the underlying mechanisms of this grammatical phenomenon as illustrated by Medieval Arab grammarians.

In essence, this translation and study of Al-Zarkashī's treatise on *Haḏf* arises from a basic need to explore the insights and achievements of Arabic grammatical theory and to help promote a meaningful comparison between Arabic and Western grammatical traditions. It is an attempt to enhance our understanding of the modernity and uniqueness of Arabic grammar in the context of modern linguistic theory. Although the notion of *Haḏf* 'ellipsis' or 'deletion' is a central concept in Arabic intellectual tradition as evidenced by the pivotal role it plays in grammar, theology, jurisprudence and rhetoric, it has largely been neglected by contemporary Arab and Western scholars alike. To date there has been no book-length studies of *Haḏf* in Arabic, especially in a major Western language such as English. What is more telling is the fact that *Haḏf* is completely missing from the list of research topics which Versteegh (1995) mentions as worthy of future attention in a paper entitled 'Western Studies on the History of Arabic Grammar (1969-1994)'. The basic aim of this study is thus to make the linguistic theories of the Arabs on *Haḏf* understandable to the contemporary reader, making it possible to show how fundamentally different theories and methods can explain the same facts. A basic premise of this study is that Al-Zarkashī's scholastic study of *Haḏf* is not only crucial for developing a fuller understanding of Arabic linguistic thinking but is also equally relevant to a better understanding of what is referred to as 'Islamic sciences'. It is hoped that this study will contribute to broadening the basis upon which any attempt at comparative studies between different grammatical traditions can be constructed.

Significance of Al-Zarkashī's study of ellipsis

Al-Zarkashī was born in Cairo in 745/1344 and studied under, amongst others, the famous Qur'ānic scholar Ibn Kathīr. He became a professor of Qur'ānic exegesis at an early age and wrote many works on Islamic sciences. Unfortunately only a handful of students and researchers had access to his works and he did not achieve widespread acclaim until long after his death in 794/1393 at the age of forty-nine. Al-Zarkashī's encyclopedic volume *Al-Burhān fī 'Ulūm Al-Qur'ān*, on which the popular book *Al-Itqān fī 'Ulūm Al-Dīn* by Suyūṭī is based, is considered one of the most comprehensive investigations of ellipsis. Although it undoubtedly represents a great contribution to Arabic linguistic thought, not enough space has been devoted to translating and analyzing Zarkashī's commentary on the linguistic aspects of the Qur'ān. It is useful to signal at this stage that Al-Suyūṭī not only used the same format of dividing Qur'ānic sciences into 47 different kinds, but also copied whole chapters verbatim and summarized others. It is clear from the extent to which Al-Suyūṭī incorporated many of Al-Zarkashī's ideas that he regarded him as a

major contributor to Arabic grammar and Islamic sciences. What Al-Zarkashī did was not only to piece together much of what had been said previously, but he also clarified and elaborated on these views.

There are four key factors which can be stipulated when considering the significance of Al-Zarkashī's contribution. These are as follows:

1) Al-Zarkashī's concern throughout his study of ellipsis is not with *al-ḥrāb* 'declinability', i.e. with mood and case markers. Although it is grammatical in nature, his investigation assumes wider syntactic and semantic implications in that it focuses on the important processes of *taqdīr* 'reconstruction', *dalīl* 'proof', *taḥyīn* 'designation' and *tad'īmīn* 'implication'. Al-Zarkashī sets out to demonstrate the inextricable link between *ḥaḍf* and all these major grammatical concepts. This is significant since as many scholars have noted (see Gully 1995:207) when the early grammarians discussed *taqdīr* for example, i.e. when they reconstructed an ellipsed item, they were not providing any new information about the meaning of the sentence which is clear from the surface structure. Al-Zarkashī on the other hand was concerned with demonstrating that there was much more substance to the twin processes of *taqdīr* and *dalīl* than many of his predecessors had identified. His main objective was to clarify complex issues which he believed were not properly understood by grammarians and commentators. What he did was bringing together various related aspects of syntax and semantics which were apparently overlooked in the studies of his predecessors since it was generally held to be the business of the exegetes or rhetoricians. There is thus a kind of convergence of syntactic and semantic elements in his detailed discussion of *ḥaḍf*. He presents a long and detailed exposition of all the various types of grammatical constituents that can be ellipsed, such as the agent, object, first and second terms of nominal sentences, and the first and second terms of the construct noun, the qualified noun, and so on.

2) Many of Al-Zarkashī's Qur'ānic examples of *ḥaḍf* do occur in the mainstream grammatical tradition. However access to these examples can only be gained through the navigation of numerous exegeses of the Qur'ān where there are no clear divisions of *ḥaḍf*, only frequent references and discussions in different parts. Controversial issues which Al-Zarkashī discusses in detail would be equally hard to discern and synthesize from the works of scholars. It must also be remembered that *ḥaḍf* is a basic concept in Arabic grammar found in fairly technical books that aim at a complete description of the language such as Ibn Hishām's *Mughnī Al-Labīb* and Ibn Jinnī's *Al-Khaṣā'is*, and that most examples of *ḥaḍf* are generally drawn from classical poetry and prose or informal utterances in *fuṣḥā* Arabic. Al-Zarkashī is the first to provide us with a comprehensive exposition of the reasons, conditions, proofs and divisions of *ḥaḍf* previously scattered in various treatises of grammar, listing and detailing numerous examples from the Qur'ān for illustration, and expanding on some issues so as to make them specifically geared to the Qur'ānic text. There is no attempt by him to discuss grammatical concepts per se such as *taqdīr*, or *dalīl*, for example, since this is viewed as a given. Al-Zarkashī simply applies the grammatical concepts to as many Qur'ānic examples as possible and provides numerous examples to illustrate the workings of all the well-documented divisions of *ḥaḍf*. His methodology in *Al-Burhān* is to extract general rules of declinability and *taqdīr* from many sources, to cite examples to illustrate the operation of the rule, and then to explore the grammatical reasons and justifications. In essence, the significance of Al-Zarkashī's *Burhān* is

that it provides us with a literature review of *ḥaḍf*, citing much debated issues, classifying previously cited examples into their appropriate grammatical divisions whether *ḥaḍf* of nouns, verbs, particles or sentences, and expanding and developing these grammatical divisions of *ḥaḍf* developed by grammarians such as Ibn Hishām and others by organizing them into 8 basic classes, with the last class termed *al-ḥiṭṭā* containing the three types of *ḥaḍf* commonly referred to by all grammarians, i.e. ellipsis of *ḥiṣm* 'noun', *fiʿl* 'verb' and *ḥarf* 'particle'. It is this latter classification into divisions or *ḥaḍf* which is perhaps Al-Zarkashī's most important contribution since he succeeds in bringing order and systemizing an otherwise random classification. For example, the ellipsis of all letters of a word except for the first letter (a common technique in Arabic poetry and prose) is now termed *ḥiṭṭā* and listed as the first division of *ḥaḍf* whereas previously it had either been ignored by grammarians or else placed in an isolated section of its own.

3) Much of the terminology employed by Medieval Arabic grammarians over the centuries to interpret their science remained constant (Gulley 1995: 9). In Sībawayhi's *Kitāb* one can readily find such terms as *ḥaḍf* 'ellipsis', *ḥaḍf* 'base/ root' and *taqdīr* 'reconstruction' which are used by all grammarians through to Al-Zarkashī and beyond, though with different purposes and aims. In addition, there is a tendency to use different but congruent terms to refer to what is essentially the same concept. This should in no way imply that there were inconsistencies in his categorizations and one must keep in mind that it was common for early Arab philologists, as Kinberg (1996:19) concludes, to use a variety of synonyms for the same technical term. Al-Zarkashī, however, makes a conscious effort to distinguish between a number of these inter-related terms. In the introductory section (pp. 685-686), he tries to systemize the discussion of ellipsis by first distinguishing between *ḥaḍf* 'ellipsis', *ḥiṭṭā* 'suppression', *ḥiṭṭā* 'concision', *ḥiṭṭā* 'restriction', *magāz* 'metaphoric use' and *ḥaḍf* 'base/root'. Al-Zarkashī's usage of these terms is not for stylistic variety but rather for technical precision.

4) Al-Zarkashī's distinction between the allied notions of *ḥaḍf*, *ḥaḍf*, *dalīl* and *taqdīr* is important because of the high potential for distortion of the unalterable text of the Qur'ān as a result of the speculative or non-empirical application of these grammatical concepts. What adds greater poignancy to Al-Zarkashī's study is the fact that Ibn Maḍā' Al-Qurṭubī (d. 593/1196) singled out the treatise and vehemently criticized Al-Zarkashī's applications of these notions since in his view it resulted in the insertion of extraneous materials in the text of the Qur'ān, materials which were not part of the fixed corpus of divinely inspired utterances. According to Ibn Maḍā' in *Kitāb Al-Radd 'alā Al-Nuḥāt*² (quoted in Suleiman 1999:147; Wolfe 1984: 161-2) insertions of this type amount to tampering with the word of God which warrants severe chastisement by God: "Whoever makes additions to the Qur'ān, whether by word or meaning, is mistaken and his falsity will be apparent. He will have spoken against the Qur'ān without knowledge and the promised punishment will be directed against him".

²Ibn Maḍā' Al-Qurṭubī, *Kitāb Al-Radd 'alā Al-Nuḥāt*, pp. 81-82.

As our translation of Al-Zarkashī's treatise will show, the concept of *dalīl* 'proof' emerges as a requisite component of the theory of ellipsis. Al-Zarkashī begins by defining the very nature of *dalīl*, starting with the lexical meaning of the term then moving to its technical sense as a priori accepted evidential base in terms of which ellipted items can be postulated. Broadly speaking, in setting out these proofs, Al-Zarkashī followed a deductive strategy by means of which he unpacked the content of each proof. He clearly states that *Haḏf* only occurs when contextual indications are present to demonstrate the ellipted item; in the absence of such an indication, there can be no occurrence of *Haḏf*. He then goes on to list the various types of contextual indications which range from *al-ḥaql* 'reasoning' and *al-ḥādah al-farḥiyyah* 'common religious precepts', to *ḥādath al-nāṣ* 'shared human knowledge', *al-luḡah* 'language', and *ḥāṣṣat al-nuzūl* 'occasion of revelation'. This classification of *dalīl* makes it clear that certain elements of *Haḏf* are to be interpreted on a structural level, while others rely firmly on semantic considerations. In his analysis of the various instances of *Haḏf* in the Qur'ān, Al-Zarkashī brings together many types of 'proofs' and in the process underlines how the two notions of *Haḏf* and *taqdīr* go very much hand in hand. The second notion, *taqdīr* 'reconstruction' is clearly presented as the process of restoration and actual *taḥyīn* 'designation' of ellipted items, i.e. the process of providing a reconstruction of the underlying structure. *Dalīl*, on the other hand, is the evidence that indicates clearly the presence of *Haḏf*. We can see from Al-Zarkashī's introductory exposition of the concept that *Haḏf* involves *qat'f* 'cutting out' of an item not its *ḥidmār* 'suppression'. What this means is that the *ḥaṣl* 'base/root' or underlying representation of an ellipted construction includes all items. The *Haḏf* is interpreted as a kind of transformation from underlying structure to surface structure. The reader must therefore first identify the underlying presence of ellipsis and then attempt to 'recover' or 'reconstruct' the latent value assigned to the deleted item (for a thorough discussion of these processes, *Haḏf* and *taqdīr*, see Mackay 1991; Gully 1995; Rahman 2000). According to Wansbrough (1970:247) *taqdīr*, or what he terms 'textual restoration', was earlier called *magāz* and basically evolved from the vague description of an exegetical practice to the 'reasoned description' of several phenomena found in scripture (for a critique of Wansbrough's argument see Almagor 1979). The process of *taqdīr* has also been described by modern scholars (Baalbaki 1979:7) in more simplistic terms as the process of inserting terms into the verse.

Although Al-Zarkashī examines the concept of *ḥidmār* 'suppression', a prominent feature of the studies of the earliest grammarians in particular, he does not clearly distinguish between it and *Haḏf* nor does he provide an illustration of the differences between the two concepts. According to Carter (1991:123, n.7) who contrasted these two processes: *ḥidmār* is the mental act of suppressing the agent, while the latter denotes the physical cutting out of the agent morphemes from the verb". Carter also notes an especially important point made by Cuvalay that *ḥidmār* occurs at a much deeper level than *Haḏf* on the basis that the latter 'can only really occur once the phonological form of the utterance has been determined, whereas the former would seem to belong to a stage before any syntactic categories at all are elected.' In Sībawayhi's *Al-Kitāb* the terms *ḥidmār* and *mudmar* are used in two senses. As Versteegh (1993: 149) explains:

‘on the one hand, they indicate the ellipted elements that are needed to explain the surface form of the sentence (e.g. *fīl mud‘mar*), and on the other, the anaphoric pronouns that are called *al-ʔasmā ʔallatī hiya ʕalā ma li l-mud‘mar* or simply *al-mud‘mar*.’

From the onset of his analysis, Al-Zarkashī distinguishes between the notions of *Haḏf* (ellipsis) and *ʔaṣl* 'base/root' which he states are often erroneously treated as synonymous terms by many grammarians. Although these two concepts are closely related since the presence of *Haḏf* indicates a transformation in the *ʔaṣl* or underlying base of the sentence in question, according to Al-Zarkashī *Haḏf* is actually the opposite of *ʔaṣl*. The underlying structure or *ʔaṣl* is always a complete expression. *Haḏf* should be considered only as a last resort. In cases where there is not sufficient proof, one always opts for *ʕadam al-taḡyīr* 'non-change'. In light of this opposition, it becomes clear that Al-Zarkashī's criteria for reaching decisions on *Haḏf* are based on the economy of restored elements; in other words, the fewer the better (to quote the famous rule *al-balāgha fī l-ijāz* 'Rhetoric is in concision'), and the fact that the excellence of *Haḏf* is when the ellipted item is known immediately at the point of reconstruction (see Gully (1995:226). An example of this is the famous *wa sʔali l-qaryata* 'Ask the village' example in which the word *ahl* 'people' is understood to come before the word village.

Al-Zarkashī and Ibn Hishām

Although a comparison between Al-Zarkashī's model of *haḏf* and Ibn Hishām's in *Mughnī Al-Labīb* lies outside the scope of this paper, a quick comparison of the two reveals a number of substantial differences in methodology.³ First, Ibn Hishām's conditions are all technical in nature with the existence of 'proof' or *dalīl* being the first and foremost condition of *haḏf*. Al-Zarkashī, on the other hand, separates the existence of proofs *ʔadillah* from the other conditions and has a separate section for *ʔadillat al-haḏf*. Stating the general rule that *haḏf* can never occur without the presence of proof he goes on to list eight types of proofs which appear to be a fusion of grammatical and logical elements that are specifically geared to the exegesis of the Qur'ānic text: 1) *al-ʕaql* 'reasoning', 2) *al-ʕādah al-farʕiyyah* 'common religious precepts', 3) *al-ʕaql* as proof of both *haḏf* and *al-taʕyīn* 'designation', 4) *al-ʕaql* as proof of *haḏf* with *ʕādat al-nās* 'shared human knowledge' as designator of *al-maḥḏūf* 'the ellipted item', 5) *lafḏ* 'linguistic form' as proof of ellipsis with *al-furūʕ fī l-fīl* 'the initiation in the verb as indicative of *taʕyīn*, 6) *al-luyah* 'language', 7) inter-textual proof from other *ʔayahs*, and 8) *sabab al-nuzūl* 'the occasion of revelation'. How much of the material in this section on proof is original and can be attributed to Al-Zarkashī is hard to determine without an extensive investigation. Second, although Al-Zarkashī mentions some of Ibn Hishām's more general conditions of *haḏf* such as the existence of *lafḏ* 'linguistic form,' he further develops these conditions by citing cases where multiple proofs are present and multiple *taqdīrs* need to be reconstructed accordingly. He also deduces general conditions from more specific grammatical rules designated by earlier grammarians such as the prevention of *al-labs* 'ambiguity', a condition stipulated by Ibn Mālik for the deletion of *al-gārr* 'the preposition'. Third, in contrast to Ibn Hishām, Al-Zarkashī synthesizes the views of various rhetoricians and provides us with a list of functional reasons for the usage of *haḏf* with

³Such a comparison is being considered for future publication.

numerous examples drawn from the Qur'ān including *al-ḥiṣṣa* 'abbreviation', *al-taḥḥīm* 'embellishment', *al-taḥfīf* 'lightness', observance of *al-fās'ilah* 'ʾāyah-ending', and *dalālat al-ḥāl* 'contextual implication'. Fourth, Al-Zarkashī elaborates on many of the examples very briefly cited by Ibn Hishām such as, for example, Q 12:32: *faḍālikunna l-laḍī lumtunnānī fīhi* 'This is what you have blamed me for'. Although this verse is listed in Ibn Hishām as an example of ellipsis of *al-ḥiṣṣa* 'first element of construct noun', Al-Zarkashī cites it as an example of one of the more complex types of *dalīl*, when *al-ḥaql* 'reason' indicates the *ḥaḍf* while *ḥādāt al-nās* 'shared human knowledge' leads us to the designation of 'the ellipted element'.

The structure of *Al-Burhān*

Al-Zarkashī's *Al-Burhān* is a comprehensive treatise covering all the different sciences of the Qur'ān. Ellipsis represents a subdivision of a more general branch of science termed the "Styles of the Qur'ān and its Rhetorical Arts" *ḥasānāt al-Qur'ān wa funūnuhu al-Balāghiyah*. This is listed as field number 46 and includes two major *ḥasānāt* 'styles', *taḥkīd* 'emphasis' and *ḥaḍf* 'ellipsis'. The field also covers all figurative or rhetorical usage which include among other things *ḥiṣṣa* 'metaphor', *taḥfīf* 'simile/comparison', and *qalb* 'inversion'. Interestingly, Al-Zarkashī classifies *magāz* as a separate branch of science which he terms *bayān ḥaqīqatīhi wa-magāzīhi* 'Identification of its literal meaning and its figurative meaning'. It is also important to note that *ḥiṣṣa* 'brevity' is seen as but one type of *ḥaḍf*. However these two terms do not effectively mean the same thing to Al-Zarkashī since he includes *ḥiṣṣa* in a separate section of the chapter, defines it as a category of ellipsis *qism min al-ḥaḍf*, and provides numerous examples to explain its basic characteristics. In examining instances of *ḥaḍf*, Zarkashī summarizes the views of many scholars including Sībawayhi, Al-Kisā'ī, Al-Zajjājī, Ibn Jinnī, Abu Ḥayyān, Ibn Mālik, Al-Zamakhsharī, Ibn Al-Shajarī, Al-Sakākī, Al-Qazwīnī, Al-Farrā', Ibn al-Naḥwī, Al-Jazarī, Al-Fārisī, Ibn 'Aṭīyah and Abū Al-Faḥḥ. In some instances specific titles are cited but in general views of authors are paraphrased or quoted verbatim with no indication of which work is being referred to, such as the "unidentified" Abū Al-Faḥḥ (see Rippen 2001:247; however it would be tempting simply to say that Abu Al-Faḥḥ is here a reference to Ibn Jinnī by first name), Al-Imām Fakhr Al-Dīn referring to Al-Rāzī, and Al-Sheikh 'Izz Al-Dīn referring to Al-'Izz Ibn 'Abd Al-Salām Al-Sulamī, but with no mention of the particular books cited; while in other instances titles are mentioned without the names of their authors, e.g. *sāhib al-Talkhīs* 'the author of *Al-Talkhīs*' to refer to Al-Qazwīnī's *Al-Talkhīs fī 'Ulūm al-Balaghah*. In some instances, only the first name of the author is used, as in the use of Abū Al-Ḥasan to refer to Al-Akhfash (d. 215/830). For the convenience of the reader, all authors and titles identified by the editors of *Al-Burhān* or *Al-Itqān* have been included in the footnotes of the translated text.

Another basic feature of *Al-Burhān* is the presence of two important sections entitled *tanbīhāt* 'important notes' and *fawā'id* 'useful notes' in which Al-Zarkashī points out the various

erroneous views held by certain grammarians on linguistic matters of *Haḏf*, discusses controversial issues, outlines exceptional cases and clarifies inconsistencies and ambiguous constructions. These sections are particularly useful since they clearly reveal that some present-day controversial instances of ellipsis were in fact considered grammatically unambiguous up to Al-Zarkashī's age, a fact which suggests that many of these controversies were based on later more rigid theological considerations rather than on newly perceived grammatical inconsistencies. For example, in Q 38:32 *Hatta tawārat bil-Higāb*

﴿ حَتَّىٰ تَوَارَتْ بِالْحِجَابِ ﴾ 'until (it) receded in the veil', Al-Zarkashī clearly states the ellipsis of the phrase *al-fams* 'the sun' after the verb *tawārat Hatta tawārat (al-famsu) bi-l-Higāb* –'until (the sun) receded-^{3rd.f. Sing} in the veil'. Obviously the alternate interpretation that *tawārat* refers to the receding of *al-sāfināt* 'the horses' rather than to *al-fams* has to do with the stringent theological viewpoint that it was impossible for a prophet like Solomon to forget his evening prayers. To erase this theological anomaly the verse was reinterpreted and *al-sāfināt* 'the horses' were designated as the entities that recede into the veil and not the setting sun.

Al-Zarkashī distinguishes five major factors in *Haḏf*; (a) *fawā'id al-Haḏf* 'benefits of ellipsis'; (b) *ʿasbāb al-Haḏf* 'causes of ellipsis'; (c) *ʿadillat al-Haḏf* 'proofs of ellipsis'; (d) *ṣurūʿ al-Haḏf* 'conditions of ellipsis'; and (e) *ʿaqsām al-Haḏf* 'divisions of ellipsis'. The last factor, divisions of ellipsis, is further classified into eight kinds: *al-ʿiqtitʿāf* 'severance', *al-ʿiktifāʿ* 'sufficiency', *al-dʿamīr wa al-tamṮīl* 'suppression and analogy', *ʿan yustadalla bi l-fiʿli li fayʿayni wa huwa li ʿaHadihimā* 'when a verb is made to indicate two items whereas it refers to only one', *ʿan yaqtadʿi al-kalāmu fayʿayni fa yuqtasʿaru ʿalā ʿaHadihimā* 'when the speech requires two things but it is confined to only one', *ʿan yuḏkara fayʿāni ʿumma yaʿūdu al-dʿamīr ʿila ʿaHadihimā dūna al-ʿāḫar* 'when two things are mentioned but the pronoun is made to refer back to only one', *al-Haḏf al-muqābilī* 'symmetrical ellipsis', and *al-ʿixtizāl* 'reduction'. The last division *al-ʿixtizāl* 'reduction' is further divided into three sub-categories, ellipsis of *ʿism* 'noun', *fiʿl* 'verb' or *ḥarf* 'particle'. Al-Zarkashī succeeds in doing away with the ellipsis of smaller particles of grammar, such as the ellipsis of *fā al-gawāb* 'fā of request', *qad, lā al-nāfiyah* 'lā of negation', *mā al-nāfiyah* 'mā of negation', *lā al-tʿalab* 'lā of request' etc., found in Ibn Hishām and other scholarly treatments of *Hurūf*, subsuming them under larger categories within the class eight or *al-ʿixtizāl* division. Al-Zarkashī further succeeds in untangling a discrepancy in the literature of ellipsis by adding a separate section for *Al-ʿigāz* 'concision/brevity'. This term, often confused with *Haḏf*, is classified as a separate apparently more different division of *Haḏf* which according to Al-Zarkashī is divided by grammarians into two basic types: *wagīz bi-lafḏ* 'concise by word' and *wagīz bi-Haḏf* 'concise by ellipsis'. By far the largest division is the ellipsis of *ʿism* 'nouns' which includes more than 23 different subdivisions, such as ellipsis of both the *mubtadaʿ* 'topic/first element of a nominal sentence' and *al-ḫabar* 'comment/second element of a nominal sentence, ellipsis of *al-fāʿil* 'agent', *al-mafʿūl* 'object', *al-mudʿāf* 'first element of annexation structure' and *al-mudʿāf ʿilayh* 'second element of annexation', *al-gārr wa al-magrūr* 'the prepositional phrase', *al-sʿifah* 'adjectives', *al-maḥʿūf* 'coordinated nouns', *al-munādā* 'vocative', *al-fart* 'conditional clause', *gawāb al-fart* 'answer/apodose to conditional

clause', *gawāb al-qasam* 'answer/apodosis to oath, and *al-gumlah* 'ellipsis of whole a sentence'. In many sections, Al-Zarkashī limits himself to enumerating various instances of each category without commenting on the proof of ellipsis or providing us with the *al-taqdīr* 'the restored text'.

Due to the constraints of this study, only two of the three subdivisions of *al-ḥixtizāl* will be selected for discussion, namely ellipsis of *ḥism* 'noun' and ellipsis of *fiʿl* 'verb'. The third category, ellipsis of *Ḥarf* which includes ellipsis of conjunctions such as *wā* 'and' *ʔaw* 'or' and *fa* 'so' will not be dealt with here. In addition, only eleven of the twenty three categories listed in the ellipsis of nouns will be investigated. By and large this selection includes the deletion of the more basic constituents of a sentence such as ellipsis of *fāʿil* 'agent', *fiʿl* 'verb', *mafʿūl bihi* 'object', *mubtadaʾ* 'topic/first element of a nominal sentence', *ḫabar* 'comment/second element of a nominal sentence' and *mudʿāf* 'construct noun' rather than the more complex constituents such as *al-fartʿ* 'conditional clause', *al-ḥagwibah* 'answers/apodoses' and *al-gumlah* 'whole sentence'.

The translation of Al-Zarkashī's text offered in these sections is kept as close to the Arabic as possible. As stated above, Al-Zarkashī, for example, uses a number of synonymous Arabic terms for the word *Ḥaḏf*, rendered here as "ellipsis" or "deletion". Instead of using these two words throughout the translation, I have tried to provide various synonyms in English that capture the nuances of each of the different Arabic terms used. It is important to note that what is offered here is not a full translation of the text but a synopsis of the original. Hence a lot of details and examples provided by Al-Zarkashī have been omitted. The examples I have selected here are based on the lucidity of the explications as well as on the significance of the examples cited from the Qur'ān. My comments on the source text have been kept to a minimum. In cases where an elaboration is deemed necessary, this is set apart from the direct quotes and translations within square brackets. To facilitate reference, the exact pages of the original are included in the subheadings. As stated above, Al-Zarkashī limits himself to enumerating various instances of each subtype without commenting or providing us with the actual deleted word or so called *al-muqaddar* 'the restored text'. Only in cases where the ellipsis is controversial, are we given more detailed analysis. Hence understanding the Arabic text requires a great deal of processing on the part of the reader. Because of the huge number of instances cited (over 1000 cases), we will limit our exposition to the most significant and well-known instances of Qur'ānic ellipsis. It is important to note at the outset that no single published translation of the Qur'ān can answer the purpose of an article such as this; the only solution is to make a fresh translation for the occasion where the ellipsis can be clearly indicated. I have tried to make the translations of Qur'ānic Arabic as close as possible to the original verses. For ease of reference, transliteration glosses (using IPA symbols) of the examples cited by Al-Zarkashī are provided in addition to the translation glosses. Case endings are fully indicated; however, the definite article *al-* is always transcribed as such regardless of whether or not [l] is assimilated by the following consonant. Names of Arabic authors and titles of Arabic works are transliterated rather than transcribed using the most commonly-used publication symbols. Finally, a glossary of major Arabic technical terms used in the source text is provided at the end.

Al-Burhān fī 'Ulūm Al-Qur'ān

by Badr Al-Dīn Al-Zarkashī

The 46th kind: On the styles of the Qur'ān and its rhetorical arts -- The second style: *al-Haḏf 'ellipsis'*

(P. 685 L. 1) In terms of language, *Haḏf* is *ḥisqāf* 'omission'. It is similarly used in poetry; you elipt poetry, if you take from it. In terms of terminology, it is 'the omission of a part of speech or all of speech but with the existence of proof/evidence. Regarding what the grammarians described as *Haḏf* without the presence of proof, called *al-ḥiqṭis'ār* 'restriction'⁴, this cannot be documented since no *Haḏf* at all is entailed as we will demonstrate in its confusion with *al-ḥid'mār* 'suppression' and *al-ḥigāz* 'concision/brevity'.

The difference between *Haḏf* and *ḥigāz* 'concision/brevity' is that a condition of *Haḏf* is the existence of a reconstructed word or text, as in Q 12:82 *wa s'ali l-qaryata* 'Ask the village', in contrast to *al-ḥigāz* 'concision' which involves packing many meanings within a small number of words.

The difference between *Haḏf* and *ḥid'mār* 'suppression' is that a condition of *ḥid'mār* is that some trace/remnant of this *muqaddar* must remain in 'the linguistic form', as in Q 76:31 *yudḥilu man yafālu fī raḥmatihī wa l-ḥ'ālīmīna ḥaḥadda lahum ḥaḏḏābān ḥalīmā* 'He enters whom He wills unto His mercy, and for evil-doers He has prepared a painful doom'; and

Q 33:24 *wa yuḥaḏḏiba l-munāfiqīna* 'and He may punish the hypocrites'; and

Q 4:171 *ḥintahū ḥayrān lakum* 'Finish. This is better for you' - that is to say *ḥ'ḥū ḥamran ḥayran lakum* 'Come to a decision which is better for you'. This condition is not required in *Haḏf*. What indicates that *ḥid'mār* requires the observance of the *muqaddir* 'reconstructor' is *bāb al-ḥ'fiqāq* 'the class of derivations' since when you suppress an item, you hide it.

البرهان في علوم القرآن

تأليف الإمام بدر الدين الزركشي

النوع السادس والأربعون: في ذكر أساليب القرآن وفنونه البليغة -- الأسلوب الثاني: الحذف

(ص. ٦٨٥ . س. ١) وهو لغة: الإسقاط، ومنه حذفت الشعر إذا أخذت منه. واصطلاحاً: إسقاط جزء الكلام أو كله لدليل. أما قول النحويين: الحذف لغير دليل، ويسمى اقتصاراً، فلا تحرير فيه، لأنه لا حذف فيه بالكلية كما سنبينه فيما يلتبس به الإضمار والإيجاز.

والفرق بينهما: أن شرط الحذف والإيجاز أن يكون في الحذف تمّ مقدّر، نحو ﴿وَسَلِّ الْقَرْيَةَ﴾ (يوسف: ٨٢) بخلاف الإيجاز، فإنه عبارة عن اللفظ القليل الجامع للمعاني الجمّة بنفسه.

والفرق بينه وبين الإضمار: أن شرط المضمّر بقاء أثر المقدّر في اللفظ نحو ﴿يُدْخِلُ مَنْ يَشَاءُ فِي رَحْمَتِهِ وَالظَّالِمِينَ أَعَدَّ لَهُمْ عَذَابًا أَلِيمًا﴾ (الإنسان: ٣١)

﴿وَيُعَذِّبُ الْمُنَافِقِينَ﴾ (الأحزاب: ٢٤)

﴿إِنْتَهُوا خَيْرًا لَكُمْ﴾ (النساء: ١٧١) أي انتوا أمراً خيراً لكم، وهذا لا يشترط في الحذف، ويدلّ على أنه لا بدّ في الإضمار من ملاحظة المقدّر باب الاشتقاق، فإنه من أضمرت الشيء، أخفيته.

⁴According to Ibn Hishām in *Mughnī Al-Labīb* [2:61] grammarians called the ellipsis of the object *ḥisqāf* 'brevity/abbreviation' and *ḥiqṭis'ār* 'restriction'. He goes on to explain that abbreviation was intended when a contextual indication was present to denote the ellipted term, while restriction was employed in the absence of such an indication (see Gully 1995: 212-213 for discussion of Ibn Hishām's analysis of *Haḏf* and related terminology).

<p>(Line 11) However in <i>Ha ḏf</i>, if you delete an item, you consciously 'cut it' in contrast to <i>ʔidʿmār</i>. That is why it is said that <i>ʔanna</i> erects /makes accusative an obvious, suppressed item.</p> <p>Ibn Maymūn has refuted the claims of the grammarians that the agent is ellipted in the class of gerunds/participial nouns, and argued that the correct statement is to say: it is suppressed <i>yudʿmar</i> not <i>yuhḏaf</i> 'ellipted', because it is an essential constituent in the discourse'.</p> <p>According to Ibn Al-Jinnī in his book <i>Khāṭirāt</i>, the link between the agent and the verb can be seen in the fact that you suppress the agent in a linguistic form if you recognize it [the agent] as in <i>qum</i> 'Stand', rather than deleting it as you delete the <i>mubtadaʔ</i> 'topic of the sentence/first element in nominal sentence'. For this reason we find it unacceptable what Al-Kisāʔī has argued in <i>dʿarabani wa dʿarabtu qawmaka</i> 'He hit me, and I hit your people'.</p> <p>Section on the widespread notion that ellipsis is but one type of <i>magāz</i> 'metaphoric use'</p> <p>What is widespread is that ellipsis is <i>magāz</i> 'metaphoric use'. Imām Al-Ḥaramayn in his book <i>Al-Talkhīṣ</i>⁵ citing some grammarians states that <i>Ha ḏf</i> is not <i>magāz</i> since it [<i>magāz</i>] is the use of a linguistic form in a displaced location, while no such displacement occurs in <i>Ha ḏf</i>.</p> <p>(P. 686. Line 1) Ibn ʿAṭīyyah⁶ states in his exegesis of Q 12:82 that the <i>Ha ḏf</i> of the first construct noun is the essence of <i>magāz</i> or most of it. This is the same view held by Sībawayhi and other people of intellect. But not every <i>Ha ḏf</i> is an instance of <i>magāz</i>. End of quote.</p>	<p>(س. ١١) وأما الحذف فمن حذف الشيء قطعه، وهو يُشعر بالطرح، بخلاف الإضمار، ولهذا قالوا: "أن تتصب ظاهرة مضمرة</p> <p>وردّ ابن ميمون قول النحاة: إن الفاعل يُحذف في باب المصدر، وقال: الصواب أن يقال: يُضمر ولا يُحذف، لأنه عمدة في الكلام.</p> <p>وقال ابن جني في "خاطراته": من اتصال الفاعل بالفعل أنك تضمه في لفظ إذا عرفته نحو قم، ولا تحذفه كحذف المبتدأ ولهذا لم يجز عندنا ما ذهب إليه الكسائي في "ضربني، وضربت قومك".</p> <p>فصل: في أن الحذف نوع من أنواع المجاز على المشهور</p> <p>المشهور أن الحذف مجاز، وحكى إمام الحرمين في "التلخيص" عن بعضهم: أن الحذف ليس بمجاز، إذ هو استعمال اللفظ في غير موضعه، والحذف ليس كذلك.</p> <p>(ص. ٦٨٦. س. ١) وقال ابن عطية في تفسير سورة يوسف: وحذف المضاف هو عين المجاز أو معظمه، وهذا مذهب سيبويه وغيره من أهل النظر، وليس كل حذف مجازاً. انتهى.</p>
--	---

⁵According to the editor of *Al-Burhān*, Al-Dimyāʔī (2006), he is Abū Al-Maʿālī ʿAbd Al-Malik Ibn ʿAbd Allāh Ibn Yūsuf Al-Juwīnī Al-Shafʿī also known as Imām Al-Ḥaramayn (d. 478). His book entitled *Talkhīṣ Al-Taqrīb* is mentioned by Ibn Khallikān 1/487. The book is assumed to be one of the first books written by Al-Juwīnī and is basically a summary of Al-Bāqillānī book *Al-Taqrīb wa-l-Irshād*.

⁶Ibn ʿAṭīyyah, *Al-Muḥarrir Al-Wagīz*, 3:218. ʿAbd Al-Salām Shāfi (ed.). Beirut: Dar Al-Kutub Al-ʿIslāmiyyah.

Al-Zanjānī in *Al-Mi ṣyār*⁷ states that *magāz* can only exist if a *Hukm* 'a grammatical rule' is changed because of it. If no such change occurs such as in the utterance *zaidun muntʿaliquun wa ṣamrun [muntʿaliquun]* 'Zaid is going and Amr [is going]', where there is a deletion of the *ḫabar* 'comment'. No *magāz* is possible without a change in the *Hukm* of what remains of the discourse.

In certainty, if by *magāz* we mean the use of a word in a displaced location, then *al-maḥḏūf* 'the ellipsed item' is not so since it is not employed. But if by *magāz* we mean attributing the verb to another, which is the 'logical' type of *magāz*, then *maḥḏūf* is the same as this.

Section on ellipsis being the opposite of *ḥaṣḥ* 'base/root'

Ellipsis is the opposite of *ḥaṣḥ* 'base/root'. In the light of this opposition, two different subsidiaries are based. First, if the issue concerns choosing between ellipsis and its absence, the more prior *ḥaml* 'inducement' is to opt for its absence because the *ḥaṣḥ* is non-change. Second, if the issue concerns choosing between scarcity of ellipsis and its abundance, the more prior inducement is to opt for its scarcity.

Facets of Ellipsis

Discussion of ellipsis falls into five facets: its benefits, its causes, its proofs, its conditions and its divisions.

Benefits of Ellipsis

The first facet is its benefits.

These include: embellishment and exaltation. This is because of the ambiguity that is involved, because the mind is in every doctrine and yearning to arrive at the intended meaning, but forced to return short of cognition. At that moment, its status becomes exalted, and its place in the psyche is raised.

وقال الزنجاني في "المعيار": إنما يكون مجازاً إذا تغيّر بسببه حكم، فأما إذا لم يتغير به حكم، كقولك: زيد منطلق وعمرو، بحذف الخبر، فلا يكون مجازاً إذا لم يتغير حكم ما بقي من الكلام.

والتحقيق أنه إن أريد بالمجاز استعمال اللفظ في غير موضعه فالمحذوف ليس كذلك، لعدم استعماله، وإن أريد بالمجاز إسناد الفعل إلى غيره - وهو المجاز العقلي - فالحذف كذلك.

فصل: في أن الحذف خلاف الأصل

والحذف خلاف الأصل، وعليه يبنى فرعان: أحدهما: إذا دار الأمر بين الحذف وعدمه كان الحمل على عدمه أولى، لأن الأصل عدم التغيير. والثاني: إذا دار الأمر بين قلة المحذوف وكثرت، كان الحمل على قلته أولى.

أوجه الكلام على الحذف

ويقع الكلام في الحذف من خمسة أوجه: في فائدته، وفي أسبابه، ثم في أدلته، ثم في شروطه، ثم في أقسامه.

فوائد الحذف

الوجه الأول في فوائده:

فمنها: التفتيح والإعظام، لما فيه من الإبهام، لذهاب الذهن في كلّ مذهب، وتشوّقه إلى ماهو المراد، فيرجع قاصراً عن إدراكه، فعند ذلك يعظم شأنه، ويعلو في النفس مكانه،

⁷*Mi ṣyār Al-Nuẓẓār fī 'Ulūm Al-Ash'ār* by 'Izz Al-Dīn Abī Al-Ma'ālī 'Abd Al-Wahāb Ibn Ibrāhīm Al-Zanjānī. A hand-written copy of the text exists in Dār Al-Kutub Al-Maṣriyyah under number 136 classification 'mim' adab.

<p>Do you not see that when the ellipted item appears in the linguistic form, the turmoil that was once stirring in the mind over the intended meaning disappears and the reader's attention is now transferred to the mentioned item?</p> <p>And they include: the increase in pleasure involved when the mind infers the ellipted item: the more difficult the search for a deleted item becomes, the stronger and more pleasurable the experience.</p> <p>(P. 687. Line 1) And they include: the increase in reward because of the added effort involved in contrast to the undeleted items as we say in instances of inferred cause and textual cause.</p> <p>And they include: for the sake of concision and brevity, and the packing of many meanings in a few words.</p> <p>And they include: the encouragement of speech, what Ibn Jinnī⁸ calls 'the bravery of Arabic'.</p> <p>And they include: its impact on the soul and on memory. That is why according to the sheik of the two styles 'Abd Al-Qāhir Al-Jurjānī⁹ : 'Never has a noun been ellipted in instances where it is necessary for it to be ellipted without its ellipsis being better than its mentioning'.</p> <p>(L. 9.) Causes of Ellipsis The second facet is of its causes. These include: mere brevity and the avoidance of redundancy based on the overt form. For example, <i>al-hilāl wa l-lāh</i> 'the crescent O Allah'; that is, <i>haḍā</i> 'this is'. The <i>mubtadaʿ</i> is here deleted and we are content instead with the contextual implications. If it had been mentioned despite this, it would have been nonsensical/redundant speech.</p> <p>And they include: noting that time can fail to recover the ellipted item and that focusing on mentioning it</p>	<p>ألا ترى أن المحذوف إذا ظهر في اللفظ زال ما كان يختلج في الوهم من المراد، وخلص للمذكور؟</p> <p>ومنها: زيادة لذة بسبب استنباط الذهن للمحذوف، وكلما كان الشعور بالمحذوف أعمس كان الالتذاذ به أشدّ وأحسن.</p> <p>(ص. ٦٨٧. س. ١) ومنها: زيادة الأجر بسبب الاجتهاد في ذلك، بخلاف غير المحذوف، كما تقول في العلة المستنبطة والمنصوصة.</p> <p>ومنها: طلب الإيجاز والاختصار، وتحصيل المعنى الكثير في اللفظ القليل.</p> <p>ومنها: التشجيع على الكلام، ومن ثم سماه ابن جني: "شجاعة العربية".</p> <p>ومنها: موقعه في النفس في موقعه على الذكر، ولهذا قال شيخ الصنائع عبد القاهر الجرجاني: ما من اسم حُذف في الحالة التي ينبغي أن يحذف فيها إلا وحذفه أحسن من ذكره.</p> <p>(س. ٩) أسباب الحذف الثاني في أسبابه.</p> <p>ومنها: مجرد الاختصار والاحتراز عن العبث ببناء على الظاهر، نحو: الهلال والله، أي: هذا. فحذف المبتدأ استغناء عنه بقرينة شهادة الحال، إذ لو ذكره مع ذلك لكان عبثاً من القول.</p> <p>ومنها: التنبيه على أن الزمان يتقاصر عن الإتيان بالمحذوف، وأن الاشتغال بذكره</p>
---	---

⁸Ibn Jinnī, *Al-Khaṣāʾiṣ*, 2:360-381. *Haḍf* is viewed as part of the more complex mechanics of Arabic or *ṣagāʿat al-ʿarabiyyah* which includes 5 other units: *al-ziyādah* 'addition', *al-taqdīm* 'fronting', *al-taʿxīr* 'postponement', *al-haml ʔalā l-maʿnā* 'carrying over of meaning' and *al-tahrīf* 'distortion'.

⁹Al-Jurjānī, *Dalāʾil Al-ʿjāz*, 183.

can result in neglecting the important issues. This is the benefit of the class of warnings, for example *ʔhyāka wa l-farr* – 'Beware of evil', and *al-ʔarīq al-ʔarīq* 'make way, make way', and *ʔal-laha ʔal-laha* 'Allah Allah'. And it is also the benefit of the class of inducement which requires the existence of something to be praised. Both classes combine in the verse Q 91:13 *nāqata llāhi wa suqyāhā* 'The she-camel of allah and its drinking'; warning is present, that is beware of the she-camel and do not come near her. The phrase *suqyāha* 'its drinking' is an inducement and the *taqdīr* is: adhere to (the drinking of) God's she-camel.

And they include: embellishment and exaltation. Hāzim¹⁰ states in his *Minhāj Al-bulayḡāʔ* that ellipsis is preferred when meaning does not need to be constructed since it is already powerfully indicated; or when it is meant to refer to a listing of things and so enumerating them would lead to lengthiness and boredom. It is thus deleted and the contextual implication becomes sufficient. We therefore let ourselves wander in these items in which the context is sufficient to mentioning them. He said that this is why it is preferred in situations where the element of amazement and hyperbole is desired such as in the description of the people of paradise in Q 39:73 *Hattā ʔāḡā gāʔūhā wa futūhat ʔabwābuhā* 'Till they reach it and its gates are opened'. Here the answer/apodosis is deleted since the description of what they could find and experience at that time is infinite. The ellipsis becomes evidence of the limitation of words to describe what they witness. The souls are left to reconstruct its status (P. 688. L. 1) and yet can never reach the essence of what is therein as evidenced by the Ḥadīth of the Prophet: 'What no eye has seen, and no ear has heard, and never crossed the heart of a human'.

And I said: this includes Q 20:78 *fa ʔaʔfīyahum mina l-yammī mā ʔaʔfīyahum* 'Then there covered them of the sea that which did cover them'.

يُفْضِي إِلَى تَقْوِيَةِ الْمَهْمِ، وَهَذِهِ هِيَ فَائِدَةُ بَابِ التَّحْذِيرِ نَحْوُ: إِيَّاكَ وَالشَّرَّ، وَالطَّرِيقَ الطَّرِيقَ، [و] اللهُ اللهُ، وَبَابِ الْإِعْرَاءِ هُوَ لَزُومُ أَمْرٍ يَحْمَدُ بِهِ، وَقَدْ اجْتَمَعَ فِي قَوْلِهِ تَعَالَى: ﴿نَاقَةَ اللَّهِ وَسُقْيَاهَا﴾ [الشمس: ١٣] عَلَى التَّحْذِيرِ أَيْ: احْذَرُوا نَاقَةَ اللَّهِ فَلَا تَقْرَبُوهَا، وَ"سُقْيَاهَا" إِعْرَاءٌ بِتَقْدِيرِ الزُّمُومِ نَاقَةَ اللَّهِ.

ومنها: التّفخيم والإعظام، قال حازم في "منهاج البلغاء" إنما يحسن الحذف ما لم يُشكّل به المعنى لقوة الدلالة عليه، أو يقصد به تعديد أشياء، فيكون في تعدادها طول وسامة، فيُحذف ويُكتفى بدلالة الحال عليه، وتترك النفس تجول في الأشياء المكتفى بالحال عن ذكرها على الحال. قال: وبهذا القصد يؤثر في المواضع التي يراد بها التعجب والتهويل على النفوس، ومنه قوله تعالى في وصف أهل الجنة:

﴿حَتَّىٰ إِذَا جَاءُوهَا وَفُتِحَتْ أَبْوَابُهَا﴾ [الزمر: ٧٣]

فحذف الجواب إذ كان وصف ما يجدونه ويلقونه عند ذلك لا ينتهي، فجعل الحذف دليلاً على ضيق الكلام عن وصف ما يشاهدونه، وتركت النفوس تقدر ما شأنه، (ص. ٦٨٨ س. ١) ولا يبلغ مع ذلك كنه ما هنالك، لقوله عليه الصلاة والسلام: "لا عين رأت ولا أذن سمعت، ولا خطر على قلب بشر".

قلت: ومنه: ﴿فَعَشِيَهُمْ مِنَ النَّيْمِ مَا غَشِيَهُمْ﴾ [طه: ٧٨]

¹⁰ Al-Zarkashī's various references to grammatical concepts by Hāzim are from the lost first section of *al-Minhāj*. Scholars have predicted from various citations by Al-Zarkashī and other scholars that this section dealt with the grammar of words and parts of expressions. The book we have available starts with a section dealing with meaning and the 3rd and 4th parts deal with style and morphology. The 1986 edition of *al-Minhāj* lists in the index all nine references to the book found in *Al-Burhān* (pp. 388-393).

None but God knows the essence of this. Al-Zamakhsharī¹¹ has said: This is for the sake of abbreviation, and the packing of words that are few but loaded with many meanings.

And they include: lightness because of its abundance in speech such as the ellipsis of the vocative particle *ya* in:

Q 12:29 *yūsufu ṭaḥridḥan hāḍā* 'Yusuf refrain from this' and other instances. According to Sībawayhī¹²: The Arabs say *la ṭadr* 'I don't know' and they delete the [ṭ] and the proper phrasing is *la ṭadrī* because it is *rufiḥa* raised/in the nominative case. And they say *lam ṭubl* and delete the *alif* while the proper phrasing is *lam ṭubāli*, and they say *lam yaku* and they delete the [n]. All of this they do for the sake of lightness because of its abundance in their speech.

And they include: the ellipsis of the *nūn* of the dual and plural whilst its trace still remains such as *al-d'āribā[n]* *Zaydan* and *al-d'āribū[n]* *Zaydan* 'The hitters^{dual} of Zayd' and 'The hitters^{plural} of Zayd'. Those who recite Q 22:35 *wa l-muqīmī l-s'alāti* 'and those who establish prayers' as if the *nūn* is affirmed. They did so because of the lengthening of the bond of conjunction as in Q 89:4 *wa l-layli ṭiḍā yasr* 'And the night when it passes'. The *yāḍ* is here deleted for the sake of lightness.

It is transmitted from Al-Akhfash that Mu'arrij Al-Sadūsī asked him about that and he said: 'I will not answer you till you sleep on my doorstep for one night. And so he did. And he said to him:

'It is the custom of the Arabs that if you change the meaning of something, its letters are shortened. And the 'night' since it does not pass *lā yasrī* but someone passes within it *yusrā fihī*, one letter is shortened from it as in Q 19:28 *wa mā kānat ḥummukī baḥyān* 'nor was thy mother a harlot'. The original word is *baḥyāyah* but when it was transformed and 'transmitted by a doer/subject', one of its letters was shortened. End of quote.

And they include: observance of *ṭāyah*-ending such as in Q 93:3 *mā waddaḥaka rabuka wa mā qalā* 'Your Lord did not leave you nor did He abandon'.

ما لا يعلم كنهه إلا الله، قال الزمخشري: وهذا من باب الاختصار، ومن جوامع الكلم المتحملة مع قلتها للمعاني الكثيرة.

ومنها: التخفيف، لكثرة دورانه في كلامهم، كما في حذف حرف النداء، في نحو:

﴿يُوسُفُ أُعْرِضْ عَنْ هَذَا﴾ [يوسف: ٢٩] وغيره. قال سيبويه: العرب تقول لا أدري، فيحذفون الياء، والوجه "لا أدري" لأنه رفع، وتقول: "لم أبل" فيحذفون الألف، والوجه "لم أبال". ويقولون "لم يك" فيحذفون النون، كل ذلك يفعلونه استخفافاً لكثرتة في كلامهم.

ومنها: حذف نون التثنية والجمع وأثرها باق، نحو "الضاربا زيدا" و "الضاربون زيدا" وقراءة من قرأ: ﴿وَالْمُقِيمِي الصَّلَاةِ﴾ [الحج: ٣٥] كأن النون ثابتة، فعلوا ذلك لاستطالة الموصول في الصلاة، نحو: ﴿وَاللَّيْلِ إِذَا يَسْرُ﴾ [الفجر: ٤] حذفت الياء للتخفيف.

ويحكى عن الاخفش أن المؤرج السدوسي سأله: عن ذلك فقال: لا أجيبك حتى تمام على بابي ليلة، ففعل، فقال له:

إن عادة العرب إذا عدلت بالشئ عن معناه نقصت حروفه، والليل لما كان لا يسري، وإنما يسرى فيه، نقص منه حرف، كما في قوله تعالى: ﴿وَمَا كَانَتْ أُمُّكَ بَغِيًّا﴾ [مريم: ٢٨]، الأصل "بغية" فلما حول ونقل عن فاعل نقص منه حرف. انتهى.

ومنها: رعاية الفاصلة، نحو: ﴿مَا وَدَّعَكَ رَبُّكَ وَمَا قَلَى﴾ [الضحى: ٣]

¹¹Al-Zamakhsharī, *Al-Kashshāf*, 3:78.

¹²Sībawayhī, *Al-Kitāb*, 1:25.

Q 89:4 *wa l-layli ʔiḏā yasr* 'And the night when it passes', and other instances. According to Al-Rummāni, the *yāʔ* is deleted at the *ʔāyah*-endings since there is an intent to stop and thus it resembles the verse-endings in poetry where you cannot pause at these endings except with the *yāʔ*.

(P. 689. L. 1) And they include: when it [the deleted item] is suitable only for Him, e.g. Q 23:92 *ʔālimi l-ʔaybi wa l-ʔahādati* 'Knower of the invisible and the visible'; and Q 85:16: *fa ʔʔālun limā yurīd* 'Doer of what He wills'.

And they include: the popularity [of the ellipted item] such that its inclusion or absence is the same. According to Al-Zamakhsharī, it is a kind of contextual implication which is more effective than the formal/textual construction. According to Ruʔbah, if one says *ʔayr* 'Fine' in answer to the question *kaʔfa ʔasʔbaHta?* 'How are you?', then one is deleting the preposition. This is what induces Ḥamza's reading of Q 4:1 *wa ʔattaqū llāha l-la ʔī tatasā ʔalūna bihi wa l-ʔarḥāma* 'and fear God through whom you demand and the wombs', because this location is known for the recurrence of the preposition and thus fame takes the place of inclusion.

And hence Al-Fārisī,¹³ dispensing with the non-repetition of the preposition in instances of conjoint phrases coordinated by genitive pronouns, states: It [the conjoint phrase] is in the genitive because of a reconstructed preposition; that is to say, *wa bi l-ʔarḥāmi*. It [i.e. the preposition *bi*] was deleted and dispensed with in the preceding suppressed genitive.

And if you say: this *muqaddar* shifts the problem: because it shifts from coordination of prepositional phrases to become on a par with it [i.e. the *muqaddar*]!

Then I say: repetition of the preposition is a condition for the accuracy of the coordination; and not meant for its own sake.

Proofs of Ellipsis

The third facet is its proofs.

Since ellipsis must always be accompanied by existence of proof/evidence, one needs to mention the various types of evidence.

﴿وَاللَّيْلِ إِذَا يَسْر﴾ [الفجر: ٤] ونحوه. وقال الرماني: إنما حذفت الياء في الفواصل لأنها على نية الوقف، وهي في ذلك كالقوافي التي لا يوقف عليها بغير ياء.

(ص. ٦٨٩ س. ١) ومنها: كونه لا يصلح إلا له، كقوله تعالى: ﴿عَالِمِ الْغَيْبِ وَالشَّهَادَةِ﴾ [المؤمنون: ٩٢] ﴿فَعَالٍ لِمَا يُرِيدُ﴾ [البروج: ١٦].

ومنها: شهرته حتى يكون ذكره وعدمه سواء، قال الزمخشري: وهو نوع من دلالة الحال التي لسانها أنطق من لسان المقال، كقول رؤبة: خير، جواب من قال: كيف أصبحت؟ فحذف الجار، وعليه حملت قراءة حمزة: ﴿وَاتَّقُوا اللَّهَ الَّذِي تَتَسَاءَلُونَ بِهِ وَالْأَرْحَامَ﴾ [النساء: ١] لأن هذا مكان شهر بتكرير الجار، فقامت الشهرة مقام الذكر.

وكذا قال الفارسي متخلصاً من عدم إعادة حرف الجر في المعطوف على الضمير المجرور: إنه مجرور بالجار المقدر، أي "وبالأرحام" وإنما حذف استغناء به في المضمير المجرور قبله.

فان قلت: هذا المقدر يحيل المسألة، لأنه يصير من عطف الجار والمجرور على مثله!

قلت: إعادة الجار شرط لصحة العطف، لا أنه مقصود لذاته.

أدلة الحذف

الوجه الثالث في أدلته:

ولما كان الحذف لا يجوز إلا لدليل احتيج إلى ذكر دليله.

¹³Al-Fārisī, *Al-Hujjah*, 3:121-122.

And proof can sometimes point to *maḥḍūf mutlaq* 'a general/absolute ellipsis' and at other times to a *maḥḍūf muḥayyan* 'a particular ellipsis'.

These include: When reasoning is proof of it since the accuracy of discourse is logically impossible without the reconstruction of an ellipted item, as in Q 12: 82: *wa sʾali l-qaryata* 'And ask the town'. Here it is impossible to reason that a 'place' can talk except by a miracle.

And they include: When it [ellipsis] is evidenced by common religious precepts such as in verse Q 16:115: *ʾinnamā ḥarrama ḥalaykumu l-maytata* 'Forbidden unto you are carrion'. Here entities cannot religiously be described as being lawful or forbidden. These are characteristics of actions that befall entities. We therefore recognize that what is ellipted is the act of eating but that when this word was deleted and carrion substituted in its place, the verb was attributed to it whereas the verb itself was severed from sight. For this reason the verb *ḥarrama* is made feminine in some instances as in Q 5:3: *ḥurrimat ḥalaykumu l-maytatu* 'Forbidden unto you are carrion'. According to the author of *Al-Talkhiṣ*¹⁴, this *ḥayyah* cannot be subsumed under proof of reason because reason cannot recognize what is lawful and what is forbidden. That is why we make it an example of common religious precept.

(P. 690. L.1) And they include: when reason is proof of both: that is of ellipsis and designation as in Q 89:22: *wa gāʾa rabbuka* 'When your Lord comes'. That is to say [what came is] his command or punishment or angels, because reason points us to the underlying ellipsis and to the impossibility of God's arrival logically since this is a characteristic of physical happenings or events. Reason also indicates the designation which is the command or some other similar word. According to Al-Zamakhsharī¹⁵ there is no evidence of ellipsis whatsoever here since this *ḥayyah* is an analogy, the state of the Almighty in this instance is dramatized in terms of the state of a king upon his arrival in person.

والدليل تارة يدلّ على محذوف مطلق، وتارة على محذوف معيّن.

فمنها: أن يدلّ عليه العقل حيث تستحيل صحة الكلام عقلاً إلا بتقدير محذوف، كقوله تعالى: ﴿وَسئَلِ الْقَرْيَةَ﴾ [يوسف: ٨٢]، فإنه يستحيل عقلاً تكلم الأمكنة إلا معجزة.

ومنها: أن تدلّ عليه العادة الشرعية، كقوله تعالى: ﴿إِنَّمَا حَرَّمَ عَلَيْكُمُ الْمَيْتَةَ﴾ [النحل: ١١٥]، فإن الذات لا تتصف بالحلّ والحرم شرعاً، وإنما هما من صفات الأفعال الواقعة على الذوات، فَعَلِمَ أن المحذوف التناول، ولكنه لما حذف وأقيمت الميتة مقامه أسند إليها الفعل، وقطع النظر عنه، فذلك أنث الفعل في بعض الصور، كقوله تعالى:

﴿حُرِّمَتْ عَلَيْكُمُ الْمَيْتَةُ﴾ [المائدة: ٣]، وقول صاحب التلخيص: إن هذه الآية من باب دلالة العقل ممنوع، لأن العقل لا يدرك محلّ الحلّ ولا الحرمة فلهذا جعلناه من دلالة العادة الشرعية.

(ص. ٦٩٠ . س. ١) ومنها: أن يدلّ العقل عليهما، أي على الحذف والتعيين، كقوله تعالى:

﴿وَجَاءَ رَبُّكَ﴾ [الفجر: ٢٢]، أي أمره أو عذابه أو ملائكته، لأن العقل دلّ على أصل الحذف، ولاستحالة مجيء الباري عقلاً، لأن المجيء من سمات الحدوث. ودلّ العقل أيضاً على التعيين، وهو الأمر ونحوه، وكلام الزمخشريّ يقتضي أنه لا حذف البتة، فإنه قال: هذه الآية الكريمة تمثيلٌ مُثَلَّتْ حاله سبحانه وتعالى في ذلك بحال الملك إذا حضر بنفسه.

¹⁴According to the editor of *Al-Burhān*, the title is *Talkhīṣ Al-Miftāḥ* by Al-Qazwīnī p. 124. Also known as *Al-Talkhīṣ fī 'Ulūm Al-Balāghah*.

¹⁵Al-Zamakhsharī, *Al-Khashshāf*, 4:751.

(L. 9.) And they include: when reason indicates the *ḥasīl* 'base' or underlying structure of ellipsis while shared human knowledge leads us to the designation of the ellipted item as the saying of the Most High:

Q 12:32: *fa ḍālikunna l-laḍī lumtunnanī fīhi* 'This is what you have blamed me for'. Here we understand that Joseph himself cannot be the locative of their rebuke and so we must search for an alternative referent. Reasoning points us to the underlying structure of ellipsis. The locative of their blame could be her love for him as evidenced by

Q 12:30 *saḥafahā ḥubban* 'Love for him consumed her heart', or it could be her seduction suggested by *turāwidu fatāhā* 'she seduced her slave'. Reason, however, cannot designate any of these alternatives, and it is, in fact, shared knowledge that tells us that the deleted item is the second option since we know that love is an involuntary action that overpowers and subjugates, and its victims cannot be blamed for something not in their power to control. Blame requires choice and seduction is a matter of choice since one is capable of rejecting it.

And they include: when shared knowledge can indicate the designation of the ellipted item as in Q 3:167: *law naḥamu qitālan* 'If we knew battle', that is to say *makān qitāl* 'a location for battle'. What is intended is a good location for fighting. Since they were most adept in the art of warfare, shared knowledge prevents the meaning: if we knew the reality of fighting. That is why Mujāhid reconstructed it as 'a location for fighting'.

It has also been said that the designation of the ellipted item is here signified by the context and not by shared knowledge.

And they include: when the linguistic form indicates the ellipsis while the initiation inherent in the verb indicates the designation of the ellipted item. For example in *bismi llāhi* 'In the name of God', the linguistic form signals the presence of ellipsis since the preposition cannot occur by itself and must have a syntactico-semantic connector.¹⁶ What points to the designation of the ellipsis is the initiation, which is the verb that the *ḥayāh* was placed in front of, whether of reading or drinking or some similar activity, and for each context an appropriate word must be reconstructed. So for reading the verb is 'I read in the name of God' and for eating it becomes 'I eat in the name of God' etc.

There is disagreement about this issue. Should the verb be reconstructed or the noun? If the former,

(س. ٩) ومنها: أن يدلّ العقل على أصل الحذف، وتدلّ عادة الناس على تعيين المحذوف، كقوله تعالى: ﴿فَذَلِكُنَّ الَّذِي لُمْتُنَّنِي فِيهِ﴾ [يوسف: ٣٢]، فإن يوسف عليه السلام ليس ظرفاً للؤمهنّ، فتعيّن أن يكون غيره، فقد دلّ العقل على أصل الحذف. ثم يجوز أن يكون الظرف حبّه، بدليل: ﴿شَغَفَهَا حُبًّا﴾ أو مراودته بدليل: ﴿تُرَاوِدُ فَتَاهَا﴾ [يوسف: ٣٠]، ولكن العقل لا يعيّن واحداً منها، بل العادة دلّت على أن المحذوف هو الثاني، فإن الحبّ لا يلام عليه صاحبه، لأنه يقهره ويغلبه، وإنما اللوم فيما للنفس فيه اختيار، وهو المراودة، لقدرته على دفعها.

ومنها: أن تدلّ العادة على تعيين المحذوف، كقوله تعالى: ﴿لَوْ نَعْلَمُ قِتَالًا﴾ [آل عمران: ١٦٧]، أي مكان قتال، والمراد مكاناً صالحاً للقتال، لأنهم كانوا أخبر الناس بالقتال، والعادة تمنع أن يريدوا: لو نعلم حقيقة القتال؛ فلذلك قدره مجاهد: "مكان قتال".

وقيل: إن تعيين المحذوف هنا من دلالة السياق لا العادة.

ومنها: أن يدلّ اللفظ على الحذف، والشروع في الفعل على تعيين المحذوف كقوله: ﴿بِسْمِ اللَّهِ﴾ [الفتاححة: ١]، فإن اللفظ يدلّ أن فيه حذفاً، لأن حرف الجر لا بدّ له من متعلق، ودلّ الشروع على تعيينه، وهو الفعل الذي جعلت التسمية في مبدئه، من قراءة أو أكل أو شرب ونحوه، ويقدر في كل موضع ما يليق، ففي القراءة: أقرأ، وفي الأكل: أكل، ونحوه.

وقد اختلف: هل يقدر الفعل أو الاسم؟ وعلى الأول،

¹⁶For an analysis of the concept of *taḥalluq* see Gully (1995:99-103).

should it be general such as commencement or specific like the above mentioned verbs?

And they include: when it is indicated by language as in *dʿarabtu* 'I hit'. Language stipulates that transitive verbs must have a direct object. Indeed, language points to the underlying event not to its designation. The same is true of the ellipsis of the topic and comment.

(P. 691. L. 1) And they include: when proof of the ellipted word and the content of its context is offered elsewhere.

For example in Q 179 *wa ʿabṣ ʿir fasawfa yubṣ ʿirūna* 'And watch and they shall see'; and in Q38:75 *mā manaʿaka ʿan tasguda* 'What prevents you from prostrating yourself'; and in Q 7:12 *mā manaʿaka ʿallā tasguda* 'What prevents you that you do not prostrate yourself'; and in Q 46:35: *lam yalbaṯū ʿillā sāʿatan min nahārin balāḡun* 'They lingered no more than an hour of a day warning'. That is to say, [*hāḏā*] *balāḡun* '[This is] a warning'. This is substantiated by proof of its mention in various verses such as in Q 14:52: *hāḏā balāḡun lil nāsi* 'This is a warning to the people'. And other similar examples.

And they include: when it is supported by the occasion of revelation. For example in Q 5:6: *ʿāḏā qumtum ʿilla l-ṣʿalāti* 'When you arise for prayers'. Here there must be a reconstruction. According to Zayd Ibn 'Aslam, it is *qumtum min al-madʿāgiḥ* 'you arise from beds', meaning *nawm* 'sleep'¹⁷. Others have said that it means 'if you arise having nullified your state of ablution'¹⁸ *qumtum muHdiṯm*. Zayd's analysis is supported by the fact that this *ʿāyah* was revealed because Aisha had lost her necklace and hence they were forced to put off their departure until the break of day. Upon awakening from sleep they looked for water but could not find any. Hence God revealed this *ʿāyah*.

What is also favored by way of reasoning is that the first events mentioned after *ʿāḏā qumtum* could be taken to mean something other than the nullification of ablution because of its increased communicative meaning. The *ʿāyah* thus combines the occurrence of the nullification as well as the cause of this occurrence, since sleeping is not in itself an act that nullifies oblution but a cause for the annulment.

فهل يقدر عام كالابتداء أو خاص كما ذكرنا؟

ومنها اللغة ، كضربت، فان اللغة قاضية أن الفعل المتعدى لا بد له من مفعول، نعم هي تدل على أصل الحدث لا تعيينه. وكذلك حذف المبتدأ والخبر.

(ص. ٦٩١ س. ١) ومنها: تقدم ما يدل على

المحذوف وما في سياقه، كقوله: ﴿وَأَبْصِرْ فَسَوْفَ يُبْصِرُونَ﴾ [الصفات: ١٧٩]، وفي موضع آخر

نحو: ﴿مَا مَنَعَكَ أَنْ تَسْجُدَ﴾ [ص: ٧٥]. وفي موضع

﴿مَا مَنَعَكَ إِلَّا تَسْجُدَ﴾ [الأعراف: ١٢] وكقوله: ﴿لَمْ

يَلْبِثُوا إِلَّا سَاعَةً مِنْ نَهَارٍ بَلَاغَ﴾ [الأحقاف: ٣٥] أي:

هذا، بدليل ظهوره في سورة إبراهيم فقال تعالى: ﴿هَذَا

بَلَاغٌ لِلنَّاسِ﴾ [إبراهيم: ٥٢]، ونظائره.

ومنها: اعتضاده بسبب النزول؛ كما في قوله تعالى:

﴿إِذَا قُمْتُمْ إِلَى الصَّلَاةِ﴾ [المائدة: ٦]؛ فإنه لا بد فيه

من تقدير فقال زيد بن أسلم: أي: قمتم من المضاجع

— يعني النوم — وقال غيره: إنما يعني إذا قمتم

مُحْدِثِينَ. واحتجّ لزيد بأن هذه الآية إنما نزلت بسبب

فقدان عائشة رضي الله عنها عقدها، فأخروا الرحيل

إلى أن أضاء الصبح، فطلبوا الماء عند قيامهم من

نومهم فلم يجدوه؛ فأنزل الله هذه الآية.

وبما رجح من طريق النظر بأن الأحداث المذكورة

بعد قوله: ﴿إِذَا قُمْتُمْ﴾ الأولى أن يحمل قوله: ﴿إِذَا

قُمْتُمْ﴾ معنى غير الحدث لما فيه من زيادة الفائدة،

فتكون الآية جامعة للحدث ولسبب الحدث؛ فإن النوم

ليس بحدث بل سبب للحدث.

¹⁷Hadith Ṣaḥīḥ in Ibn Jarīr, *Jāmi' Al-Bayān*, 6:72.

¹⁸The word *Hadaṯ* and its derivative *muHdiṯm* is a general term that literally means 'occurrence' or 'event' and refers to the occurrence of any act that nullifies the state of ablution such as breaking wind, urinating, or other natural emissions as well as sleep and unconsciousness.

<p>Conditions of Ellipsis The fourth facet is of its conditions.</p> <p>They include: that there must be in the the mentioned text some proof of the deleted item, either in a linguistic form or in the context. If no such proof exists, we will not be able to identify it and the expression disrupts understanding and the discourse thus becomes an enigma and departs from eloquence. This is the meaning of the statement:</p> <p><i>Lā budda lan yakūna fimā ḥubqiya daīlun ʕala ma ḥulqiya</i> - 'There must be in what was left proof of what has been removed'.</p> <p>This proof can be either textual or situational. Textual proof can occur from the declinability of an expression. For example, if a word is in the accusative case, it is understood that there must be an assigner of accusative case, and if it [assigner of accusative case] is not overtly present in the structure, it must be reconstructed. For example in the expression <i>ahlan</i> 'welcome', <i>wa sahlān</i> 'and ease' and <i>marḥaban</i> 'and generosity'; that is to say, <i>wagadta ahlan</i> 'You found family' and <i>salakta sahlān</i> 'You traveled in ease', and <i>sādafta rahban</i> 'You encountered generosity'.</p> <p>Similarly in Q1: 2: <i>al-Ḥamda li-llāhi</i> 'Praise be to God' when read in the accusative.¹⁹ And also in Q 4:1 <i>wa ttaqū allāha l-laḍī tatasā ḥalūna bihi wa l-ḥarḥāma</i> 'Fear Allah through whom you demand (your rights of one another) and the wombs'. The reconstruction is: <i>ḥamadū al-Ḥamda</i> 'praise the praise' and <i>ḥafḍū l-ḥarḥām</i> 'maintain the wombs'.</p> <p>(P.692. L.1) Situational proof can be found by looking at the general meaning and realizing it cannot be complete without the existence of an ellipted item. This type is more agreeable than the first type since it is much more general in scope. For example, in the expression <i>yaḥill wa yarbut</i> 'He loosens and binds', we mean to say that he loosens 'issues' and binds them; i.e., that he is a man of competence and sound decision.</p> <p>And it is also possible for the grammatical construction to indicate the reconstruction. For example in Q75:1 <i>lā ḥuṣimu bi-yawmi l-qiyāmah</i> 'I do not swear by the day of resurrection'.</p>	<p>شروط الحذف</p> <p>الوجه الرابع في شروطه:</p> <p>فمنها: أن تكون في المذكور دلالة على المحذوف؛ إما من لفظه أو من سياقه، وإلا لم يُتَمَكَّن من معرفته، فيصير اللفظ مُخَلَّلاً بالفهم. ولئلا يصير الكلام لغزاً فيَهَجَّن في الفصاحة، وهو معنى قولهم: لا بد أن يكون فيما أُبقي دليل على ما أُلقي.</p> <p>وتلك الدلالة مقالية وحالية. فالمقالية قد تحصل من إعراب اللفظ، وذلك كما إذا كان منصوباً، فيُعلم أنه لا بد له من ناصب، وإذا لم يكن ظاهراً لم يكن بُدٌّ من أن يكون مقدرًا، نحو: أهلاً وسهلاً ومرحباً، أي وجدت أهلاً، وسلكت سهلاً، وصادفت رحباً.</p> <p>ومنه قوله تعالى: ﴿الْحَمْدَ لِلَّهِ﴾ [الفاحة: ٢] على قراءة النصب. وكذلك قوله: ﴿وَاتَّقُوا اللَّهَ الَّذِي تَتَسَاءَلُونَ بِهِ وَالْأَرْحَامَ﴾ [النساء: ١] والتقدير: احمدا الله واحفظوا الأرحام.</p> <p>(ص. ٦٩٢ . س. ١) والحالية قد تحصل من النظر إلى المعنى والنظر العلم؛ فإنه لا يتم إلا بمحذوف، وهذا يكون أحسن حالاً من النظم الأول لزيادة عمومته، كما في قولهم: فلان يحلّ ويربط، أي يحلّ الأمور ويربطها، أي ذو تصرف.</p> <p>وقد تدلّ الصناعة النحوية على التقدير؛ كقولهم في: ﴿لَا أُقْسِمُ بِيَوْمِ الْقِيَامَةِ﴾ [القيامة: ١]:</p>
--	--

¹⁹According to Al-Qurtubī in *Al-Jāmi' li Aḥkām Al-Qur'ān* (1/135) it can also be read as *al-Ḥamda li-llāhi*. The accusative case is read when we postulate the suppression of a verb. The nominative reading *al-Ḥamdu* is the reading of *al-qurrāʾ al-sabʿah* 'the seven readers' as well as the majority of people.

Here the reconstruction is for *ʔana ʔuqsim* 'Indeed I do swear' because the circumstantial verb cannot be sworn upon. Also in Q 12: 85: *tafta ʔu taʔkuru yūsufa* 'You will cease remembering Joseph'. The reconstruction is *lā tafta ʔu* 'You will never cease' because if the answer had been in the affirmative, the letter *lam* and the letter *nun* would have been inserted as in:

Q 64:7 *balā wa rabbī latub ʔa ʔunna* 'Yes by my Lord you will indeed be raised'.

All this is when only one proof exists. There are cases, however, when multiple proofs are present and multiple *taqdīrs* thus need to be reconstructed accordingly. For example in Q 35:8 *ʔafaman zuyyina lahu sū ʔu ʔamalīhi ʔara ʔahu Ḥasanan* 'Is the one whose evil deed is beautified for him so that he sees it as good', there are three possibilities here:

First: *kaman lam yuzayyan lahu sū ʔu ʔamalīhi* 'Like the one whose evil deed is not beautified for him'. And the meaning is: Is the one whose evil deed is beautified for him so that he sees it as good such as the two groups that have just been mentioned, like the one whose deed has not been beautified for him. When it was asked this of the prophet Mohammad, he said: No. And the next verse is a reply to this negation: *ʔa ʔinna llāha yud ʔillu man ya ʔa ʔu wa ya ḥdī man ya ʔa ʔu ʔalā ta ʔhab nafsuka ʔalayhim Ḥasarātin* 'And God sets astray who He wills and guides who He wills. So do not waste yourself in sorrow for them'.

Second: reconstruction of *ʔahabt nafsuka ʔalayyihim Ḥasarātin* 'You have wasted yourself in sorrow for them'. This is the *ḫabar* that has been deleted as indicated by the subsequent statement: *ʔalā ta ʔhab nafsuka ʔalayyihim Ḥasarātin* 'Do not waste your self in sorrow for them'.

Third: reconstruction of *kaman ḥadāhu Allāh* 'Like the one who has been guided by God' which has been deleted as evidenced by: Q 35:8 *ʔa ʔinna llāha yud ʔillu man ya ʔa ʔu wa ya ḥdī man ya ʔa ʔu* 'And verily God sets astray who He wills and guides who he wills'.

And know that this condition is needed when the ellipted item is a whole sentence as in Q 11:69 *qālū salāman* 'They said peace'; that is to say, *sallamnā salāman* 'We greeted a greeting'; or one of the constituents of the sentence, for example Q 51:25: *qāla salāmun qawmun munkarūn* 'He said: Peace, a people unknown to me'. That is to say, *salāmun ʔalaykum ʔantum qawmun munkarūn* 'Peace upon you. You are a people unknown to me'. Here the topic of the first constituent and the comment of the second constituent are both deleted.

إن التقدير: لأننا أقسم لأن فعل الحال لا يقسم عليه. وقوله تعالى: ﴿تَفْتَأُ تَذَكُرُ يُوسُفُ﴾ [يوسف: ٨٥]، التقدير: لا تفتأ؛ لأنه لو كان الجواب مثبتاً لدخلت اللام والنون، كقوله:

﴿بَلَىٰ وَرَبِّي لَتُبْعِنَنَّ﴾ [التغابن: ٧].

وهذا كله عند قيام دليل واحد، وقد يكون هناك أدلته يتعدّد التقدير بحسبها، كما في قوله تعالى: ﴿أَفَمَنْ زُيِّنَ لَهُ سُوءُ عَمَلِهِ فَرَآهُ حَسَنًا﴾ [فاطر: ٨]، فإنه يحتمل ثلاثة أمور:

أحدهما: كمن لم يزيّن له سوء عمله، والمعنى: أفمن زين له سوء عمله فراه حسنا من الفريقين اللذين تقدم ذكرهما، كمن لم يزيّن له؟ ثم كأن النبيّ لما قيل له ذلك، قال: لا، فقيل: ﴿فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ يُضِلُّ مَنْ يَشَاءُ وَيَهْدِي مَنْ يَشَاءُ فَلَا تَذْهَبْ نَفْسُكَ عَلَيْهِمْ حَسْرَاتٍ﴾ [فاطر: ٨].

ثانيها: تقدير: ذهبت نفسك عليهم حسرات، فحذف الخبر لدلالة ﴿فَلَا تَذْهَبْ نَفْسُكَ عَلَيْهِمْ حَسْرَاتٍ﴾ [فاطر: ٨].

ثالثها: تقدير: "كمن هداه الله"، فحذف لدلالة: ﴿فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ يُضِلُّ مَنْ يَشَاءُ وَيَهْدِي مَنْ يَشَاءُ﴾ [فاطر: ٨].

واعلم أن هذا الشرط إنما يُحتاج إليه إذا كان المحذوف الجملة بأسرها؛ نحو: ﴿قَالُوا سَلَامًا﴾ [هود: ٦٩]، أي سلمنا سلاما، أو احد ركنيها نحو: ﴿قَالَ سَلَامٌ قَوْمٍ مُنْكَرُونَ﴾ [الذاريات: ٢٥]. أي "سلام عليكم انتم قوم منكرون" فحذف خبر الأولى ومبتدأ الثانية.

However, if the deleted item is an expansion/supplement, it does not require proof for its ellipsis. But it is necessary that its ellipsis does not bring about a disruption in meaning or expression as in the ellipsis of an antecedent in the accusative case and similar constructions.

Ibn Mālik stipulates another condition for the deletion of the preposition which is the prevention of ambiguity. He prohibited ellipsis in cases such as *raḡibta lan tafʿal* 'You wanted to do' or [*raḡibta*] *lan tafʿal* 'You did not want to do' because of the ambiguity of what is intended after the ellipsis.

(P. 693. L. 7) The ellipted item can also be indicated when it is mentioned in other locations:

This includes as one of its strongest example Q 6: 158: *hal yanḏurūna ʾillā lan taḡiyahumu l-malāʾikatu law yaḡiya rabbuka* 'Are they waiting for the very angels to come to them or your Lord to come'. That is to say: *lamruhu* 'his judgment' as evidenced by Q 16: 33: *law yaḡiya lamru rabbika* 'Or for your Lord's judgment to come'.

Another example is Q 3:133 *wa gannatin ʿarduhā l-samāwātu wa l-ʿardu* 'And a paradise whose width is the Heavens and the Earth'. What is missing is the phrase *ka-ʿard* 'as the width of' as indicated by the parallel verse in Q 57:21 where the missing expression is overtly mentioned. Here there is eloquent brevity since if the width is such, what would its length possibly be? As in Q 55:54 *batāʾimuhā min ḡstabraq* 'its lining made of silk brocade'.

(L. 16.) And they include: that the verb itself does not require it [i.e. the ellipted item]. If it does, then its ellipsis is prohibited like the subject and the the object if its subject has not been named, and the subject of *kanā* [verb to be] and its sisters. It is not ellipted because of the reversal/violation of intended meaning.

And they include: according to Abū Al-Faḥ Ibn Jinnī²⁰, it is right that ellipsis should be in the periphery not in the center because the edge of a thing is weaker than its core or middle.

وأما إذا كان المحذوف فضلة فلا يشترط لحذفه دليل، ولكن يشترط ألا يكون في حذفه إخلال بالمعنى أو اللفظ، كما في حذف العائد المنصوب ونحوه.

وشرط ابن مالك في حذف الجار أيضاً أمن اللبس، ومنع الحذف في نحو: رغبت أن تفعل، أو عن أن تفعل، لإشكال المراد بعد الحذف.

(ص. ٦٩٣ . س. ٧) ويقدم يدل على المحذوف ذكره في مواضع آخر:

منها— وهو أقواها قوله: ﴿هَلْ يَنْظُرُونَ إِلَّا أَنْ تَأْتِيَهُمُ الْمَلَائِكَةُ أَوْ يَأْتِيَ رَبُّكَ﴾ [الأنعام: ١٥٨] أي أمره بدليل قوله: ﴿أَوْ يَأْتِيَ أَمْرُ رَبِّكَ﴾ [النحل: ٣٣].

وقوله في آل عمران: ﴿وَجَنَّةٍ عَرْضُهَا السَّمَاوَاتُ وَالْأَرْضُ﴾ أي: كعرض بدليل التصريح به في آية الحديد. وفيه إيجاز بليغ؛ فانه إذا كان العرض كذلك، فما ظنك بالطول؟ كقوله: ﴿بِطَائِنِهَا مِنْ إِسْتَبْرَقٍ﴾ [الرحمن: ٥٤].

(س. ١٦) ومنها: إلا يكون الفعل طالبا له بنفسه، فإن كان امتنع حذفه كالفاعل، ومفعول ما لم يسم فاعله، واسم كان وأخواتها، وإنما لم يحذف لما في ذلك من نقض الغرض.

ومنها: قال أبو الفتح بن جني: ومن حق الحذف أن يكون في الأطراف لا في الوسط، لأن طرف الشيء أضعف من قلبه ووسطه.

²⁰Ibn Jinnī, *Al-Khaṣāʾiṣ*, 2:166.

(P. 694. L. 4.) Important Notes

First: It is possible for the grammatical construction to require reconstruction even though the meaning does not depend on it. For example in the expression *la ʔilāha ʔilla llāh* 'No God but Allāh', the comment of this nominal sentence is deleted and grammarians have reconstructed it as *mawgūd* 'exists' or *lanā* 'for us' [i.e., No God but Allāh exists/for us].

This [reconstruction] has been rejected by Al-Imām Fakhr Al-Dīn who argues that this speech does not require reconstruction and that their reconstruction is invalid because negating an absolute truth is more general than negating a restricted truth. For if it is negated absolutely, this would be proof of cancelling the essence along with the restriction. And if it is negated while being restricted with a specific restriction, it would not be necessary to negate it with another restriction.

However, there is no reason for this rejection. The reconstruction *fi al-wugūd* 'in existence' necessitates the complete negation of every god except Allāh. There is nothing to discuss about non-existence. It is in truth an absolute rather than a restricted negation of truth. In addition, there must be a reconstructed comment since it is impossible for a topic to exist without a comment, whether overt or reconstructed. Grammarians reconstruct in order to give grammar its due, even if the meaning is understood. Their reconstruction here or elsewhere is simply to envision the shape of the construction in terms of the linguistic form and not in terms of meaning. They have two kinds of reconstruction: a declensional one which is what Fakhr Al-Dīn is not aware of, and a semantic reconstruction which he makes obligatory while in actual fact it is not. Also invalid in this is the analysis of Ibn Al-Ṭarāwah: that the comment is *ʔilla llāh* 'except God'. How can a topic be indefinite and a comment be definite?

Second: According to Abū Al-Ḥasan²¹, there should be gradual progression in ellipsis whenever possible. In Q 2: 48: *wa ttaqū yawman lā tagzī nafsun ʔan nafsin ʔayṯan* 'Fear a Day when a soul shall not avail another soul whatsoever'.

The *ʔasʔl* 'base' of the speech is 'A day when it shall not avail in it' where the preposition *fi* 'in' is ellipted to become *tagzi-hi* 'avails it' and then the pronoun is deleted to become *tagzī*.

(ص. ٦٩٤ س. ٤) تنبيهات

الأول: قد توجب صناعة النحو التقدير، وإن كان المعنى غير متوقف عليه، كما في قوله "لا إله إلا الله" فإن الخبر محذوف، وقدره النحاة بـ"موجود" أو "لنا".

وأنكره الإمام فخر الدين، وقال: هذا كلام لا يحتاج إلى تقدير، وتقديرهم فاسد، لأن نفي الحقيقة مطلقة أعم من نفيها مقيدة، فإنها إذا انتفت مطلقة كان ذلك دليلاً على سلب الماهية مع القيد، وإذا انتفت مقيدة بقيد مخصوص لم يلزم نفيها مع قيد آخر.

ولا معنى لهذا الإنكار، فإن تقدير "في الوجود"، يستلزم نفي كل إله غير الله قطعاً، فإن عدم لا كلام فيه، فهو في الحقيقة نفي للحقيقة مطلقة لا مقيدة.

ثم لا بدّ من تقدير خبر لاستحالة مبتدا بلا خبر، ظاهراً أو مقدرأ، وإنما يقدر النحوي القواعد حقها وإن كان المعنى مفهوماً، وتقديرهم هنا أو غيره ليروا صورة التركيب من حيث اللفظ مثلاً، لا من حيث المعنى، ولهم تقديران: إعرابي، وهو الذي خفي على المعترض، ومعنوي وهو الذي ألزمه، وهو غير لازم. ومن المنكر في هذا أيضاً قول ابن الطراوة: إن الخبر في هذا "إلا الله" وكيف يكون المبتداً نكرة والخبر معرفة؟

الثاني: اعتبر أبو الحسن في الحذف التدرج حيث أمكن، ولهذا قال في قوله تعالى: ﴿وَاتَّقُوا يَوْمًا لَا تَجْزِي نَفْسٌ عَنْ نَفْسٍ شَيْئًا﴾ [البقرة: ٤٨]:

إن أصل الكلام: "يوماً لا تجزي فيه" فحذف حرف الجرّ، فصار "تجزيه" ثم حذف الضمير فصار "تجزّي".

²¹Abū Ḥasan Al-Akhfash, *Ma ʔān Al-Qur ʔān*, 1:92:94.

This is a kind of agreeableness in grammatical construction. Sībawayhi believes that [the two] ellipsed items should occur altogether at the same time.

According to Abū Al-Faṭḥ in *Al-Muḥtasab*²², Abū Al-Ḥasan's commentary is more credible and more acceptable to us than the deletion of two items at the same time.

Third: a popular reading of Q 2: 60 *fānfagarat minhu* 'and from it gushed forth' is that it is coordinated to a whole ellipted sentence whose reconstruction is: *fadʿaraba fānfagarat* 'and he struck and from it gushed forth'. The verb *fānfagarat* 'gushed forth' is proof of the ellipsis since it is understood from the eruption that he had struck the rock.

(P. 695. L. 1) Similarly in Q 26: 63: *ʾani dʿrib biṣasʿāka l-baḥra fānfalaqa* 'And strike with your rod the sea and so it split asunder', it is not possible for the eruption and the splitting to occur without the striking.

According to Ibn ʿUṣfūr, the particle of coordination *fa* conjoined to the first coordinate phrase is the one that was originally with the second coordinate phrase and what is deleted is actually the second coordinate phrase while the particle of coordination was deleted from the the first coordinate phrase. The *fa* in *fānfalaqa* is the *fa* of the deleted verb which is *dʿaraba* and so its *fa* is mentioned but the verb of that *fa* is deleted. The verb *fānfalaqa* is mentioned but its *fa* is deleted so that what is mentioned becomes proof of what is deleted. But we find this to be a very strange maneuver.

Divisions of Ellipsis

The fifth facet is of its divisions.

The first type: *al-ʾiqitʿāʿ* 'severance' is when one letter of a word is mentioned and the rest is dropped.

(L. 11) The author of *Al-Mathal Al-Sāʿir*²³ has denied the existence of this type of ellipsis in the Qurʾān; however, this is not so.

وهذا ملاطفة في الصناعة، ومذهب سيبويه أنه حذف فيه دفعة واحدة.

وقال أبو الفتح في "المحتسب": وقول أبي الحسن أوثق في النفس وأنس من أن يحذف الحرفان معاً في وقت واحد.

الثالث: المشهور في قوله تعالى: ﴿فَانْفَجَرَتْ مِنْهُ﴾ [البقرة: ٦٠]، انه معطوف على جملة محذوفة، التقدير: "فضرب فانفجرت"، ودلّ "انفجرت" على المحذوف، لأنه يُعلم من الانفجار أنه قد ضرب.

(ص. ٦٩٥ . س. ١) وكذا: ﴿أَنْ اضْرِبْ بِعَصَاكَ الْبَحْرَ فَيَنْفَلِقَ﴾ [الشعراء: ٦٣]، إذ لا جائز أن يحصل الانفجار والانفلاق دون ضرب.

وابن عصفور يقول في مثل هذا: إن حرف العطف المذكور مع المعطوف هو الذي كان مع المعطوف عليه، وإن المحذوف هو المعطوف عليه، وحذف حرف العطف من المعطوف، فالفاء في "انفلق" هو فاء الفعل المحذوف وهو "ضرب" فذكرت فاءه وحذف فعلها وذكر فعل "انفلق" وحذفت فاءه ليبدل المذكور على المحذوف، وهو تحيل غريب.

أقسام الحذف

الخامس في أقسامه:

الأول: الاقتطاع، وهو ذكر حرف من الكلمة وإسقاط الباقي.

(س. ١١) وأنكر صاحب "المثل السائر" ورود هذا النوع في القرآن العظيم، وليس كما قال.

²²Abū Al-Faṭḥ ʿUṭmān Ibn Jinnī, *Al-Muḥtasab*, published by Al-Majlis Al-Aʿlā li-l Shuʿūn Al-Islāmiyyah, Egypt.

²³Ibn Al-ʾAthīr, *Al-Mathal Al-Sāʿir*, 2:113.

Some scholars have postulated that *fawātiḥ al-suwar* 'the abbreviated letters of the Qur'ān' are examples of this type of ellipsis since each letter denotes one of the names of God as stated by Ibn 'Abbās that 'alm' means: *lanā allāhu ḷaḷam wa ḷarā*, and 'alms' *lanā allāhu ḷaḷam wa ḷafs'il*, and so on for the rest.

It has also been said that in Q 5:6: *wa msaḥū biruḥisikum* 'and wipe with your heads', the letter *ba* refers to the first letter of the word *baḥā* 'some' and that the rest of the word is omitted. This is similar to the verse:

qultu lahā qiflanā qālat qāf
'I told her to stand for us and she said qāf'²⁴

Here the *qāf* is short for *waqafu* 'I stood'. Another example occurs in the popular Ḥadīth *kafa bi-l-sayfi ḷā*²⁵ 'Suffice the sword as witness' where *ḷā* is short for *ḷāḥḷan* 'witness'.

(P. 696. L. 1) The second type: *al-ḷktifā*? 'sufficiency' is when the context requires the mention of two things that are linked by correlation and relatedness but one thing is deemed sufficient enough for the other: This is most often a feature of relatedness by coordination; since relatedness is of five types: *wujūdi* 'existential', *luḷūmi* 'obligatory', *ḷabari* declarative', *gawabi* 'responsive/apodosis' and *ḷat'fi* 'coordinative'.

And it must also be noted that what is intended is not sufficiency at random but rather because there is an aspect in it that requires this restriction.

The most popular example of this is Q 16:81 *sarābīla taqīkumu l-ḷarra* 'garments to protect you from the heat', that is to say *wa l-bard* 'and from the cold'. This is how they have reconstructed it. Some have asked about the wisdom of specifying only the heat. The answer is said to be that this speech is addressed to the Arabs and their countries are hot and therefore protection from the heat is more important for them than the cold since it is more severe than the cold. However, the truth is that this *ḷayah* is not of this category because gratitude for the protection from the cold is mentioned explicitly in Q 16:80 *wa min ḷas'wāfihā wa ḷawbārihā wa ḷafḷārihā* 'and from their wool, fur and hair', and also mentioned at the onset of the sūrah Q 16:5 *wa l-ḷanḷāma ḷalaqahā lakum fiḷā difḷun* 'And he has created the cattle for you and in them there is warmth'.

وقد جعل منه بعضهم فواتح السور؛ لأن كل حرف منها يدل على اسم من أسماء الله تعالى، كما روى ابن عباس "الم" معناه: "أنا الله أعلم وأرى" و"المص" أنا الله أعلم وأفضل، وكذا الباقي.

وقيل في قوله: ﴿وَأَمْسَحُوا بِرُءُوسِكُمْ﴾ [المائدة: ٦]: إن الباء هنا أول كلمة "بعض" ثم حذف الباقي، كقوله:

قلت لها قفي لنا قالت قاف

أي وقفت، وفي الحديث: "كفى بالسيف شا" أي شاهداً.

(ص. ٦٩٦ . س. ١) الثاني: الاكتفاء وهو أن يقتضي المقام ذكر شيئين بينهما تلازم وارتباط، فيكتفى بأحدهما عن الآخر، ويخص بالارتباط العطف غالباً، فإن الارتباط خمسة أنواع: وجودي، ولزومي، وخبري، وجوابي، وعطف.

ثم ليس المراد الاكتفاء بأحدهما كيف اتفق، بل لأنه فيه نكتة تقتضي الاقتصار عليه.

والمشهور في مثال هذا النوع قوله تعالى: ﴿سَرَابِيلٌ تَقِيكُمُ الْحَرَّ﴾ [النحل: ٨١] أي والبرد، هكذا قدروه. ووردوا عليه سؤال الحكمة من تخصيص الحر بالذكر. وأجابوا بأن الخطاب للعرب، وبلادهم حارة، والوقاية عندهم من الحر أهم، لأنه أشد من البرد عندهم. والحق أن الآية ليست من هذا القسم، فإن البرد ذكر الامتتان بوقايته قبل ذلك صريحاً في قوله: ﴿وَمِنْ أَصْوَابِهَا وَأُوبَارِهَا وَأَشْعَارِهَا﴾ [النحل: ٨٠] وقوله في صدر السورة: ﴿وَالْأَنْعَامَ خَلَقَهَا لَكُمْ فِيهَا دِفْءٌ﴾ [النحل: ٥].

²⁴Poem by Al-Walīd Ibn 'Uqbah.

²⁵Ḥadīth in ḷāḷḷih Muslim, number 1690; Abū Dāwūd, number 4415.

And if it is said: what is the wisdom of mentioning these two forms of protection after verse Q 16:81 *wa llāhu gaḥala lakum mim mā ḫalaqa ḏ'ilālān* 'And God has made shade for you out of what he created', and indeed this refers to protection from the sun, while the next verse Q 16:81 *wa gaḥala lakum mina l-gibāli ḥaknānā* 'and he has made places of refuge for you out of the mountains' refers to the protection from the cold as accustomed by Arabs? It is said [i.e. in response]: because what precedes concerns housing, and this concerns clothing. Al-Suhaylī does not mention Q 16:81 *wa gaḥala lakum mina l-gibāli ḥaknānā*, and in it the answers to the two previous questions can be found.

Examples of this category are numerous. For example Q 6:13: *wa lahu mā sakana fī l-layli wa l-nahāri* 'And to Him belongs all that rests by night and by day'. And the meaning is *wa mā taḥarraka* 'and what moves'. However, stasis is preferred to be mentioned since it is the more common condition of all creation whether animals or objects, and because the static is more numerous than the moving, or because every mobile entity eventually becomes still, or because stasis is primary whereas movement is extrinsic.

(P. 697. L. 1) Another example is Q 2:3 *al-laḏīna yuḥminūna bil-ḡaybi* 'those who believe in the Unseen'. That is to say, 'and the Seen', because belief in both of them is obligatory but the 'Unseen' is preferred because it is more eloquent and because it requires belief in the 'Seen' and not vice versa.

(L. 5.) Another example is Q 2:20 *yakādu al-barqu yaḫi'afu ḥabs'ārahum* 'Lightning almost snatches away their sight'. Here the Almighty mentions first the darkness, the thunder and the lightning while the rest is omitted.

Another example is Q 17:67 *wa ḥiḏā massakumu l-d'urru fī l-baḥri* 'And if misfortune seizes you at sea'. That is to say, 'and on land' but *al-baḥr* is preferred to be mentioned because its affliction is more severe.

Another example is Q 37:5: *wa mā baynahumā wa rabbu l-maḥāriq* 'And what is between them and the Lord of the Easts'. That is to say, 'and the Wests'.

(L. 24.) Another example is Q 57: 10 *lā yastawī minkum man ḥanfāqa min qabli l-fatḥi wa qātala* 'They are not equal among you, those who spent freely before the victory and fought'. That is to say, 'and those who spent freely after' [the victory] *wa man ḥanfāqa baḥduhu* (P. 696. L 1) 'and faught',

فإن قيل: فما الحكمة في ذكر الوقائتين بعد قوله: ﴿وَاللَّهُ جَعَلَ لَكُمْ مِمَّا خَلَقَ ظِلَالًا﴾ [النحل: ٨١]؛ فإن هذه وقاية الحر، ثم قال: ﴿وَجَعَلَ لَكُمْ مِنَ الْجِبَالِ أَكْنَانًا﴾ [النحل: ٨١] فهذه وقاية البرد على عادة العرب؟ قيل: لأن ماتقدم بالنسبة إلى المساكن، وهذه إلى الملابس، وقوله: ﴿وَجَعَلَ لَكُمْ مِنَ الْجِبَالِ أَكْنَانًا﴾ [النحل: ٨١] لم يذكره السهيلي، وفيه الجوابان السابقان.

وأمثلة هذا القسم كثيرة، كقوله تعالى: ﴿وَلَهُ مَا سَكَنَ فِي اللَّيْلِ وَالنَّهَارِ﴾ [الأنعام: ١٣] فإنه قيل: المراد: "وما تحرك"، وإنما أثر ذكر السكون لأنه أغلب الحالين على المخلوق من الحيوان والجماد، ولأن الساكن أكثر عددا من المتحرك، أو لأن كل متحرك يصير إلى السكون، ولأن السكون هو الأصل، والحركة طارئة.

(ص. ٦٩٧ . س. ١) وقوله: ﴿الَّذِينَ يُؤْمِنُونَ بِالْغَيْبِ﴾ [البقرة: ٣] أي والشهادة، لأن الإيمان بكلّ منما واجب، وأثر الغيب لأنه أبدع ولأنه يستلزم الإيمان بالشهادة من غير العكس.

(س. ٥) وقوله: ﴿يَكَادُ الْبَرْقُ يَخْطَفُ أَبْصَارَهُمْ﴾ [البقرة: ٢٠] فإنه سبحانه ذكر أولا الظلمات والرعد والبرق وطوى الباقي.

ومنه قوله تعالى: ﴿وَإِذَا مَسَّكُمُ الضُّرُّ فِي الْبَحْرِ﴾ [الإسراء: ٦٧] أي: والبر وإثنا أثر ذكر البحر، لأن ضرره أشد.

وقوله: ﴿وَمَا بَيْنَهُمَا رَبُّ الْمَشَارِقِ﴾ [الصافات: ٥] أي والمغرب.

(س. ٢٤) وقوله: ﴿لَا يَسْتَوِي مِنْكُمْ مَنْ أَنْفَقَ مِنْ قَبْلِ الْفَتْحِ وَقَاتِلْ﴾ [الحديد: ١٠]، أي: ومن أنفق بعده (ص. ٦٩٨ . س. ١) وقاتل،

because equivalency requires two things and therefore the coordinated item is deleted because the discourse signifies it. Do you not see what is said in the subsequent verse: *lūlā ḥika ḥaḥḍāmu daragatan mina l-laḏīna ḥanfaqū min baḥḍu wa qātālū* 'These are higher in rank than those who spent and fought afterwards'.

(L. 8) Another example is Q 26:22: *wa tilka niḥmatun tamunnuhā ḥalayya ḥan ḥabbadta banī ḥisrā ḥila* 'And is this the favor you reproach me with, that you have enslaved the children of Israel'. That is to say, *wa lam tuḥabbidni* 'and you have not enslaved me'.

Another example is Q 4:176 *ḥin imruḥun ḥalaka laysa lahu waladun* 'If a man dies and he has no child'. That is to say, *wa lā walidun* 'and no father' as evidenced by the fact that it is made obligatory for the sister to be given half [of his inheritance] and this can only occur if the father is dead; the existence of the father would exclude her [from inheriting].

(L. 25) Another example is Q 2:187: *ḥatta yatabayyana lakumu l-ḥayḥu l-ḥabyadḥu mina l-ḥayḥi l-ḥaswadi mina l-fagri* 'Until you can distinguish the white thread from the black thread of dawn'. If it is said that the dawn has no black thread and that the black refers to the night.

(P. 699, L. 1) I answer that the expression *mina l-fagri* 'of dawn' is actually attached to *al-ḥayḥu l-ḥabyadḥu* 'the white thread' and the meaning is 'until you can distinguish the white thread of dawn from the black thread of night'. But here *mina l-layli* 'of night' is deleted due to fact that it is implied by the context and the fact that 'the dawn' occupies its position at the end of the sentence. It would be erroneous for 'the dawn' to be attached to the black thread, and if *mina l-fagri* 'of dawn' had occurred in its conventional position adjacent to 'the white thread', the proof of the ellipsis would have been diminished. The phrase *mina l-layli* 'of night' is therefore deleted for brevity and the phrase *mina l-fagri* 'of dawn' is postponed in order to indicate the ellipsis *mina l-layli* 'of night'.

The third type: One type of this division is called *al-dāḥimī wa al-tamōl* 'suppression and analogy'. By suppression, I mean suppressing part of the neighboring discourse since one of its constituents has already been revealed. For example when a jurisprudent says: 'wine is intoxicating and therefore prohibited', he is suppressing 'And everything that intoxicates is prohibited'. A case of *al-qiyās al-ḥstiḥānāḥ* 'deduction by exclusional analogy' is (L. 11) Q 3:159: *wa law kunta faḥḥān ḥalīḥa l-qalbi lanfad ḥdḥū min ḥawlika* 'Had you been harsh or hard-hearted, they would have dispersed from around you'.

لأن الاستواء يطلب اثنين، وحذف المعطوف لدلالة الكلام عليه ، ألا تراه قال بعده: ﴿أُولَئِكَ أَعْظَمَ دَرَجَةً مِنَ الَّذِينَ أَنْفَقُوا مِنْ بَعْدُ وَقَاتَلُوا﴾ [الحديد: ١٠].

(س. ٨) وقوله: ﴿وَتِلْكَ نِعْمَةٌ تَمُنُّهَا عَلَيَّ أَنْ عَبَّدتَّ بَنِي إِسْرَائِيلَ﴾ [الشعراء: ٢٢]، أي: ولم تعبدني.

وقوله: ﴿إِنْ أَمْرُو هَٰلِكَ لَيْسَ لَهُ وَلَدٌ﴾ [النساء: ١٧٦] أي: ولا والد؛ بدليل أنه أوجب للأخت النصف؛ وإنما يكون ذلك مع فقد الأب؛ فإن الأب يسقطها. (س. ٢٥)

وقوله: ﴿حَتَّىٰ يَتَبَيَّنَ لَكُمُ الْخَيْطُ الْأَبْيَضُ مِنَ الْخَيْطِ الْأَسْوَدِ مِنَ الْفَجْرِ﴾ [البقرة: ١٨٧].
فإن قيل: ليس للفجر خيط أسود، إنما الأسود من الليل.

(ص. ٦٩٩. س. ١) فأجيب: إن ﴿مِنَ الْفَجْرِ﴾ متصل بقوله: ﴿الْخَيْطُ الْأَبْيَضُ﴾ والمعنى حتى يتبين لكم الخيط الأبيض من الفجر ، من الخيط الأسود من الليل؛ لكن حذف "من الليل" لدلالة الكلام عليه ولوقوع الفجر في موضعه؛ لأنه لا يصح أن يكون ﴿مِنَ الْفَجْرِ﴾ متعلقا بالخيط الأسود؛ ولو وقع ﴿مِنَ الْفَجْرِ﴾ في موضعه متصلا بالخيط الأبيض، لضعفت الدلالة على المحذوف؛ وهو "من الليل" فحذف "من الليل" للاختصار، وآخر "من الفجر" للدلالة عليه.

الثالث: من هذا قسم يسمى الضمير والتمثيل؛ وأعني بالضمير أن يضم من القول المجاور لبيان أحد جزأيه؛ كقول الفقيه: النبيذ مسكر فهو حرام، فإنه أضر "وكل مسكر حرام". ويكون في القياس الاستثنائي كقوله: (س. ١١)

﴿وَلَوْ كُنْتَ فَظًا غَلِيظَ الْقَلْبِ لَأَنْفَضُوا مِنْ حَوْلِكَ﴾ [آل عمران: ١٥٩] ،

Since everyone is witness to the fact that they never dispersed from around him, which is the statement that is suppressed here, the second statement is therefore negated and it is denied that the prophet is harsh and hard-hearted.

(L. 16) The fourth type: when a verb is made to indicate two items when in fact it is indicative of only one; thus a verb appropriate to the second item is suppressed. For example Q 59:9 *wa l-laḏīna tabawwawū l-dāra wa l-ḥimāna* 'And those who had settled the home and faith'. That is to say *wa ḥaqadū l-ḥimān* 'and they adopted the faith'.

Another example is: Q 25:12: *samiḥū lahā taḥayyudhān wa zafīrā* 'They will hear its fury and its breath'. That is to say, *fammū lahā zafīrā* 'they also smelt its breath'.

Another example is: Q 22:40: *lahuddimat sʿawāmiḥu wa biyaḥun wa sʿalawātun* 'there surely would have been destroyed monasteries, churches and prayers'. Since prayers cannot be destroyed, the *taqdīr* is: *la-turikat al-sʿalawāt* 'prayers would have been abandoned'.

(L. 23) In Q 10:71 *faḥgmiḥū ḥamrakum wa surakāḥakum* 'So gather your plans and your partners'. Ibn Fāris²⁶ has transmitted from the Kufan and Baṣran grammarians that the *waw* here means *maʿ* 'with'; that is, 'with your partners' just as it is said *law turikat al-nāqata wa faḥlaha la-radʿaḥaḥa* 'if a baby she-camel is left and its male family member, he would feed her'. That is to say, *maḥa faḥlaha* 'with its male family-member'.

(P. 700. L. 1) Others have said: *ḥagmiḥū ḥamrakum wa dḥu surakāḥakum* 'gather your plans and summon your partners' in accordance with Q 13:13 *wa dḥu manistatʿaḥum* 'And summon whoever you can'.

And know that reconstructing a deleted verb in the second coordinate noun phrase in order for the coordination to be accurate is the view of Al-Fārsī, Al-Farrā' and a group of Baṣran and Kufan grammarians because of the impossibility of the coordination. Abū 'Ubayda, Al-Asmaʿī, Al-Yazīdī and others have argued that these are cases of coordination of single elements, and implicating the operator with meanings that are suitable for both 'the 1st and 2nd coordinated items. So, the preferred verb for *al-dār* and *al-ḥimān* 'The House and the faith' (Q 59:9) must be reconstructed. What remains to be answered is: Which is *ḥawlā* 'is given more priority'?

وقد شهد الحسنّ والعيان أنهم ما انفضوا من حوله؛ وهي المضمرّة؛ وانتفى عنه صلى الله عليه وسلم أنه فظ غليظ القلب.

(س. ١٦) الرابع: أن يستدل بالفعل لشيئين وهو في الحقيقة لأحدهما فيضمّر للآخر فعل يناسبه؛ كقوله تعالى: ﴿وَالَّذِينَ تَبَوَّأُوا الدَّارَ وَالْإِيمَانَ﴾ [الحشر: ٩] أي: واعتقدوا الإيمان.

وقوله تعالى: ﴿سَمِعُوا لَهَا تَغِيظًا وَزَفِيرًا﴾ [الفرقان: ١٢] أي وشموا لها زفيراً.

وقوله تعالى: ﴿لَهَدَمْتُ صَوَامِعَ وَبَيْعٍ وَصَلَوَاتٍ﴾ [الحج: ٤٠]، والصلوات لا تهدم فالتقدير: ولتركت صلوات.

(س. ٢٣) وأما قوله تعالى: ﴿فَأَجْمِعُوا أَمْرَكُمْ وَشُرَكَاءَكُمْ﴾ [يونس: ٧١]، فنقل ابن فارس عن البصريين أن الواو بمعنى "مع" أي: شركائكم كما يقال: لو تركت الناقة وفصيلها لرضعها؛ أي: مع فصيلها.

(ص. ٧٠٠. س. ١) وقال الآخرون: أجمعوا أمركم وادعوا شهداءكم، اعتباراً بقوله تعالى: ﴿وَادْعُوا مَنْ اسْتَطَعْتُمْ﴾ [هود: ١٣].

واعلم أن تقدير فعل محذوف للثاني ليصح العطف هو قول الفارسي والفراء وجماعة من البصريين والكوفيين لتعذر العطف. وذهب أبو عبيدة والأصمعي واليزيدي وغيرهم إلى أن ذلك من عطف المفردات، وتضمن العامل معنى ينتظم المعطوف والمعطوف عليه جميعاً؛ فيقدّر آثروا الدار والإيمان ويبقى النظر في أنه أيهما أولى؟

²⁶Ibn Fāris, *Al-Ṣāhibī fī Fiqh Al-Lughah*, 152.

Should we favor *al-tad'īmār* 'suppression' or *al-tad'īmān* 'implication'?

Abū Ḥayyān has provided a good explanation: If the first operator can accurately be related to the noun that follows it, then the 2nd is most probably suppression because it is more than implication such as for example in *yagdaḥ allāhu ḥanfahu wa ḥaynayhi* 'God will cut off his nose and his eyes'; that is to say, *wa yafqaḥ ḥaynayhi* 'and pop out his eyes'. The cutting off is here accurately associated with the nose, and if it had not been appropriate, then the action would have implicated a meaning that is not acceptable for it to be linked to, because suppression is not possible.

(L. 12) Ibn Mālik included within this division Q 2:35 *ḥuskun ḥanta wa zawguka l-gannata* 'Settle you and your wife paradise'. This is because the second person imperative verb does not operate on the surface level. Its intended meaning is *ḥuskun ḥanta wa l-taskun zawguk* 'Settle you and let your wife settle' because a basic condition for the first coordinated item to be accurate is that it must operate on the second coordinated item just as it operates on the first. And this is not possible in this instance because we cannot say *ḥuskun zawguk*.

Another example is Q 2:233 *lā tud'ārra walidatun bi-waladīhā wa lā mawlūdun lahu* 'No mother shall be harmed on account of her child and no father'. Here it is unacceptable for the word *mawlūdun* to be coordinated to *walidatun* because of the *ta-* of the imperfect verb or the imperative. It is therefore obligatory here to reconstruct another nominative word from the same gender as the mentioned item. That is to say, *lā yud'ārra mawlūdun lahu* 'and no father shall be harmed'.

Another example is Q 34:10 *wa l-t'ayra* 'and the birds'. According to al-Farrā'²⁷, the *taqdīr* is *wa saḫḫarnā lahu l-t'ayra* 'and we subjugated the birds to him' since it is coordinated to the word *fad'lan* 'grace' which is also a direct object. Those who view the word as in the nominative case argue that it follows a suppressed verb *ḥātā* 'bestow'. This is acceptable because of the lengthening of the discourse by the word *maḥahu* 'with him'. It is also said that it is [nominative] by the suppression of another verb:

ترجيح الإضمار أو التضمين؟

واختار الشيخ أبو حيان تفصيلاً حسناً وهو: إن كان العامل الأول تصح نسبته إلى الاسم الذي يليه حقيقة كان الثاني محمولاً على الإضمار؛ لأنه أكثر من التضمين؛ نحو: "يبدع الله أنفه وعينه"، أي ويفقأ عينيه فنسبة الجذع إلى الأنف حقيقة؛ وإن كان لا يصح فيه ذلك كان العامل مضمناً معنى ما يصح نسبته إليه؛ لأنه لا يمكن الإضمار.

(س. ١٢) وجعل ابن مالك من هذا القبيل قوله تعالى: ﴿اسْكُنْ أَنْتَ وَزَوْجُكَ الْجَنَّةَ﴾ [البقرة: ٣٥] قال: لأن فعل أمر المخاطب لا يعمل في الظاهر، فهو على معنى: "اسكن أنت ولتسكن زوجك" لأن شرط المعطوف أن يكون صالحاً لأن يعمل فيه ما عمل في المعطوف عليه وهذا متعذر هنا لأنه لا يقال: "اسكن زوجك".

ومنه قوله تعالى: ﴿لَا تُضَارَّ وَالِدَةٌ بِوَلَدِهَا وَلَا مَوْلُودٌ لَهُ﴾ [البقرة: ٢٣٣] ولا يصح أن يكون "مولود" معطوفاً على "والدة" لأجل تاء المضارعة أو للأمر فالواجب في ذلك أن تقدر مرفوعاً بمقدر من جنس المذكور أي ولا يضار مولود له.

وقوله تعالى: ﴿وَالطَّيْرُ﴾ [سبأ: ١٠] قال الفراء: التقدير: "وسخرنا له الطير" عطفاً على قوله:

﴿فَضْلاً﴾ وقيل: هو مفعول معه، ومن رفعه فقيل: على المضممر في "أتى"، وجاز ذلك لطول الكلام بقوله: ﴿معه﴾، وقيل: بإضمار فعل أي:

²⁷Al-Farrā', *Maḥānī Al-Qur'ān*, 2/355-356.

<p><i>wa li-tuḥawwiba ma ḥahu l-ʿayru</i> 'and the birds praise the Lord with him'.</p> <p>The fifth type: when the discourse requires two things but it is confined to only one because it is the one intended. For example in Pharaoh's question: Q 20:49: <i>faman rabbukumā yā Mūsa</i> 'And who is this Lord of yours O Moses'. According to Ibn ʿAṭīyah²⁸, he does not say <i>wa ḥārūn</i> 'and Aaron' since Moses is the one bearing the burden of the message.</p> <p>Al-Zamakhsharī²⁹ went further than this and surmises that Pharaoh wanted to complete his words and say 'and Aaron' but he refrained from (P. 701. L. 1) addressing Aaron because he wished to avoid his eloquence, his decisiveness of response and the impact of his speech, since eloquence restrains one opponent from another in argumentation and prevents him from disagreeing with him.</p> <p>The sixth type: when two things are mentioned but the pronoun is made to refer back to only one without the other. For example in Q 62:11 <i>wa ḥāḍa raḥaw tigāratan ḥaw lahwanī nfaḍḍū ḥalayhā</i> 'And when they see some merchandise or amusement they disperse headlong towards it'. According to Al-Zamakhsharī³⁰, the reconstruction is: if they see merchandise they disperse to it, or amusement they disperse to it. One is deleted since what is mentioned is proof of it. One other question remains to be asked: why is merchandise preferred to be mentioned? And why is amusement not preferred?</p> <p>The answer is supplied by Al-Rāghib in his exegesis of sūrah <i>Al-Baqarah</i>: The pronoun is made to refer back to merchandise since it was the cause of the dispersal of those people for whom this sūrah was specifically revealed, and also because merchandise can distract from prayers much more than amusement can.</p> <p>Some verses remain controversial. For example Q 9:34: <i>wa l-laḥna yaknizūna l-ḥahaba wa l-fidḍata wa lā yunfiqūnahā fī sabīli llāhi</i> 'And those who hoard gold and silver and do not spend it in God's cause'. Here gold and silver are mentioned but the attached pronoun <i>yunfiqūnahā</i> refers only to silver because it is the nearest to the pronoun</p>	<p>ولتؤوب معه الطيرُ.</p> <p>الخامس: أن يقتضي الكلام شيئين فيقتصر على أحدهما لأنه المقصود، كقوله تعالى حكاية عن فرعون: ﴿فَمَنْ رَبُّكُمْ يَا مُوسَى﴾ [طه : ٤٩] ولم يقل: "وهارون" لأن موسى المقصود المتحمل أعباء الرسالة كذا قاله ابن عطية.</p> <p>وغاص الزمخشري فقال: أراد أن يتم الكلام فيقول: "وهارون" ولكنه نكّل عن (ص. ٧٠١. س. ١) خطاب هارون توقياً لفصاحته وحدة جوابه ووقع خطابه إذ الفصاحة تنكّل الخصم عن الخصم للجدل وتكّبه عن معارضته.</p> <p>السادس: أن يذكر شيئين ثم يعود الضمير إلى أحدهما دون الآخر، كقوله تعالى: ﴿وَإِذَا رَأَوْا تِجَارَةً أَوْ لَهْوًا انفَضُّوا إِلَيْهَا﴾ قال الزمخشري: تقديره: إذا رأوا تجارة انفضوا إليها أو لهما انفضوا إليه، فحذف أحدهما لدلالة المذكور عليه. ويبقى عليه سؤال: وهو أنه: لم أوتر ذكر التجارة؟ وهلاً أوتر اللهو؟ وجوابه ما قال الراغب في تفسير سورة البقرة: إن التجارة لما كانت سبب انفضاض الذين نزلت فيهم هذه الآية أعيد الضمير إليها. ولأنه قد تشغل التجارة عن العبادة ما لا يشغله اللهو.</p> <p>واختلف في مواضع: منها قوله تعالى: ﴿وَالَّذِينَ يَكْنِزُونَ الذَّهَبَ وَالْفِضَّةَ وَلَا يَنْفِقُونَهَا فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ﴾ [التوبة: ٣٤] فإنه سبحانه ذكر الذهب والفضة وأعاد الضمير على الفضة وحدها، لأنها أقرب المذكورين</p>
--	--

²⁸Ibn ʿAṭīyah, *Al-Muḥarrir Al-Wāḥid*, 4:36.

²⁹Al-Zamakhsharī, *Al-Kashshāf*, 3:67.

³⁰*Al-Kashshāf*, 4/537.

and because silver is more readily available to people and the need for it is more urgent and hence hoarding it is greater. It has also been said that the pronoun is correlated to the meaning of another word since the hoarded items are coins and dirhams and money.

A parallel example is Q 49:9 *wa ʔin tʔāʔfatāni mina l-muʔminīna qatalū* 'And if two parties of believers fall to fighting'. This is because *al-tʔāʔfah* 'a party' constitutes a group. And it is said: it is the custom of Arabs if two things that are mentioned share a common meaning then it is sufficient to repeat the pronoun of only one of them and to dispense with the other relying on the cognizance of the hearer.

(L. 19) Another example is Q 33:9 *fa ʔarsalnā ʔalayhim rīḥān wa gunūdān lam tarawhā* 'And we sent upon them a wind and soldiers you did not see'. Ibn Al-Anbārī in his book *Al-Hāʔāt* made the pronoun in *lam tarawhā* refer back to *al-gunūd* 'the soldiers'. And it has also been transmitted from Qatādah that they are *al-malāʔikah* 'the angels'.

(P. 702. L. 7) Another example is Q 2:45 *wa staʔīnū bil-ʔʔabri wa l-ʔʔalāti wa ʔannahā lakabīratun* 'And seek help in patience and prayers and truly it is hard'. It is said here that the pronoun refers to *al-ʔʔalati* 'prayers' because it is the nearest of the two mentioned nouns. And it is also said that the pronoun refers to the meaning of *al-ʔʔstīʔānah* 'the seeking of help' inherently understood from the verb *ʔʔstīʔnū*. It has further been said that the meaning refers to both items, but it is deleted from the first because the second signifies it.

(L. 20) The seventh type: *al-Ḥaʔf al-muqābil* 'symmetrical ellipsis': this occurs when two parallel or symmetrical structures converge in the same discourse. One parallel item is deleted from one of the constructions since it is already signified by the second parallelism. Examples include:

(P. 703. L. 3) An example of this is: Q 21:5 *falya ʔinā biʔāyatīn kamā ʔursila l-ʔawwalūna* 'Then let him bring us an *ʔāyah* as were sent the former'. The reconstruction is: If he is sent then let him bring us an *ʔāyah* just as the former prophets were sent and they brought an *ʔāyah*.

And in Q 33:24 *wa yuʔaḏḏiba l-munāfiqīna ʔin ʔāʔa ʔaw yatuḃa ʔalayhim* 'and punish the hypocrites if He wills or relent toward them'. According to exegetes,

ولأن الفضة أكثر وجوداً في أيدي الناس والحاجة إليها أمسّ، فيكون كنزها أكثر، وقيل أعاد الضمير على المعنى لأن المكنوز دنائير ودرهم وأموال.

ونظيره: ﴿وَإِنْ طَائِفَتَانِ مِنَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ اقْتَتَلُوا﴾ [الحجرات ٩]، لأن الطائفة جماعة. وقيل: من عادة العرب إذا ذكرت شيئين مشتركين في المعنى تكتفي بإعادة الضمير على أحدهما استغناء بذكره عن الآخر تكالاً على فهم السامع.

(س. ١٩) ومنها قوله تعالى: ﴿فَأَرْسَلْنَا عَلَيْهِمْ رِيحًا وَجُنُودًا لَمْ تَرَوْهَا﴾ [الأحزاب: ٩] وقد جعل ابن الأنباري في كتاب "الهاءات" ضمير ﴿لَمْ تَرَوْهَا﴾ راجعاً إلى الجنود. ونقل عن قتادة قال: هم الملائكة.

(ص. ٧٠٢ . س. ٧) ومنها قوله: ﴿وَاسْتَعِينُوا بِالصَّبْرِ وَالصَّلَاةِ وَإِنَّهَا لَكَبِيرَةٌ﴾ (البقرة: ٤٥) فقيل: الضمير للصلاة لأنها أقرب المذكورين. وقيل: أعاده على المعنى وهو الاستعانة المفهومة من استعينوا. وقيل: المعنى على التثنية، وحذف من الأول لدلالة الثاني عليه.

(س. ٢٠) السابع: الحذف المقابلي: وهو أن يجتمع في الكلام متقابلان، فيحذف من واحد منهما مقابلة لدلالة الآخر عليه.

(ص. ٧٠٣ . س. ٣) ومنه قوله تعالى: ﴿فَلْيَأْتِنَا بآيَةٍ كَمَا أُرْسِلَ الْأُولُونَ﴾ [الأنبياء: ٢٤] ، تقديره: إن أرسل فلْيَأْتِنَا بآيَةٍ كما أرسل الأولون فأتوا بآيَةٍ.

وقوله تعالى: ﴿وَيُعَذِّبُ الْمُنَافِقِينَ إِنْ شَاءَ أَوْ يَتُوبَ عَلَيْهِمْ﴾، تقديره كما قال المفسرون:

the reconstruction is: *wa yuḥāḏḏiba l-munāfiqīna ḷn fāḷa falā yatūba ḷalayhim ḷaw yatūba ḷalayhim falā yuḥāḏḏibahum* 'and [He may] punish the hypocrites if He wills and not relent toward them, or [He may] relent toward them and not punish them'. Hence the full meaning of His words is: relenting toward them or not relenting toward them is restricted to the duration of their worldly life.

(P. 704. L. 8) And in Q 9:102 *wa ḷāḫarūna ḫarafū biḏunūbihim ḫalatū ḫamalān s'āliḫān wa ḷāḫara sayyiḷān* 'And others who had admitted their sins, they mixed a righteous deed and another evil'. The underlying speech is: they mixed a righteous deed with an evil one, and another evil deed with a righteous one. This is because the act of mixing requires a mixed and a mixed-with. That is to say, sometimes they obeyed and they mixed their obedience with a grave sin, and sometimes they disobeyed but they corrected their disobedience by repenting.

Another example is: Q 20:123 *fa ḷimmā yaḷiyannakum minnī ḫudan...* 'But when guidance from me comes unto you and whoever follows my guidance....' The verbal segmentation of the verse necessitates the following: whoever follows the guidance, no fear or harm shall befall him and he will be in paradise; and whoever belies me, fear and sadness shall befall him and he will be in hell. From each segment is deleted what is affirmed in its counterpart in another segment.

It is said: a similar example is Q 2: 171 *wa maḫalu l-laḏīna kafarū kamaḫali l-laḏī yanḫiqu bimā lā yasmaḫu ḷillā duḫāḷan wa nidāḷan* 'The likeness of those who disbelieve is as the likeness of one who calls unto that which hears naught except calls'. Sībawayhī³¹ states in the chapter on *ḷstiḫmāl al-fiḷ fi al-laḫḏ' lā fi l-maḫnā* 'Usage of the verb in the wording not in the meaning': They were not likened to the caller *al-nāḫiq* but likened to the called-upon *al-manḫiq bihi*. The meaning is: your likeness and the likeness of the disbelievers is similar to the likeness of the caller and the called-upon who hears nothing but cries. But it was made to fit the length and brevity of the discourse because of the addressee's knowledge of the meaning. End of quote.

What obliged him to make this reconstruction is that when those who disbelieved were likened to the prophet –

and this is based on *al-nāḫiq* having the meaning of *al-dāḫī* and not someone specified, since it is permissible for it not to mean *al-daḫī* 'the caller' but to

"ويعذب المنافقين إن شاء فلا يتوب عليهم ، أو يتوب عليهم فلا يعذبهم"، عند ذلك يكون مطلق قوله: فلا يتوب عليهم أو يتوب عليهم مقيداً بمدة الحياة الدنيا.

(ص. ٧٠٤. س. ٨) ومنه قوله تعالى: ﴿وَأَخْرُونَ اعْتَرَفُوا بِذُنُوبِهِمْ خَلَطُوا عَمَلًا صَالِحًا وَآخَرَ سَيِّئًا﴾ [التوبة: ١٠٢] أصل الكلام: خلطوا عملاً صالحاً بسَيِّئاً وآخر سيئاً بصالح لأن الخلط يستدعي مخلوطاً ومخلوطاً به ، أي تارة أطاعوا وخطوا الطاعة بكبيرة وتارة عصوا وتداركوا المعصية بالتوبة.

وقوله: ﴿فَإِمَّا يَأْتِيَنَّكُمْ مِنِّي هُدًى فَمَنِ اتَّبَعَ هُدَايَ...﴾ [طه: ١٢٣] الآية، فإن مقتضى التقسيم اللفظي: من اتبع الهدى فلا خوف ولا حزن يلحقه وهو صاحب الجنة ومن كذب يلحقه الخوف والحزن وهو صاحب النار. فحذف من كل ما أثبت نظيره في الأخرى.

قيل: ومنه قوله تعالى: ﴿وَمَثَلُ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا كَمَثَلِ الَّذِي يَنْعِقُ بِمَا لَا يَسْمَعُ إِلَّا دُعَاءً وَنِدَاءً﴾ [البقرة: ١٧١]، قال سيبويه في "باب استعمال الفعل في اللفظ لا في المعنى": لم يشبهوا بالناعق وإنما شُبِّهوا بالمنعوق به ، وإنما المعنى: ومثلكم ومثل الذين كفروا كمثل الناعق والمنعوق به الذي لا يسمع إلا دعاء ، ولكنه جاء على سعة الكلام والإيجاز لعلم المخاطب بالمعنى. انتهى.

والذي أحوجه إلى هذا التقدير أنه لما شَبَّه الذين كفروا بالنبى صلى الله عليه وسلم – وهذا بناء على أن الناعق بمعنى الداعي وليس بمتعين لجواز ألا يراد به الداعي، بل

³¹ *Al-Kitāb*, 1: 212.

al-nāfiq min al-Hayawān 'the croaker from the species of animals'), he likened them in their habitude and attachment to [the attachment of] animals that croak to their owner, in that they call upon what cannot hear nor see nor understand what is wanted. Hence there exists some ellipsis.

(P. 705. L. 3) Ibn Al-Hājāj states: To me there is no ellipsis in this *ḥāyah*. The intention is to liken the disbelievers in their worship [of idols] to him who calls to what he cannot hear. It is thus an analogy between one caller and another determinate caller that contains no ellipsis. The disbelievers are accordingly callers, and they are called-upon according to the first interpretation.

(L. 19) A Useful Note

It is possible to delete from the first [parallelism] since the second signifies it, and vice versa. It is also possible for the linguistic form to contain both issues.

The first occurs for example in Q 33:56 *inna llāha wa malā'ikatuhu Yus'allūna ḥala l-nabiyyi* 'Verily Allah and his angels send blessings upon the prophet'. This is when the word *malā'ikatuhu* is read in the nominative case.

That is to say, *inna llāha yus'alli* 'Allah sends blessings' but it is deleted from the first because it is signified by the second rather than coordinated to it.

The second occurs in Q 13:39 *yamḥū llāhu mā yaḥāzu wa yu'bitu* 'Allah effaces what He wishes, and confirms'.

That is to say, *mā yaḥāzu* '[confirms] what He wishes'.

(P. 706. L. 1) Another example is Q 9:3: *inna llāha barī'ūn mina l-mufrikāna wa rasūluhu* 'God is absolved from the idolaters and his prophet'. That is to say, the prophet is *barī'ūn ḥayd'an* 'is also absolved'

And in Q 14: 48: *yawma tubaddalu l-ḥard'u ḥayra l-ḥard'i wa l-samāwātu* 'On that day the Earth will transform into a different earth and the Heavens'. That is to say, the heavens will also transform into different heavens.

(L. 5) According to Abū Al-Faḥ³², another example of this type is Q 19:38 *ḥasmi' bihim wa ḥabs'ir* 'Hear them and see'. The reconstruction is: *wa ḥabs'ir bihim* 'and see them'. However it is ellipted because it is signified by what precedes it which occurs as a *fad'lah* 'an expansion/supplement, even though it is prohibited in instances of the agent. This channelling is achieved

الناعق من الحيوان - شبههم في تألفهم وتأنيهم بما ينطق من الغنم بصاحبه، من أنهم يدعون ما لا يسمع ولا يبصر ولا يفهم ما يريده، فيكون ثم حذف.

(ص. ٧٠٥. س. ٣) وقال ابن الحجاج: عندي أنه لا حذف في الآية والقصد تشبيه الكفار في عبادتهم الأصنام بالذي ينطق بما لا يسمع، فهو تمثيل داع بداع محقق لا حذف فيه، والكفار على هذا داعون، وعلى التأويل الأول مدعوون.

(س. ١٩) فائدة

قد يحذف من الأول لدلالة الثاني عليه وقد يعكس وقد يحتمل اللفظ الأمرين.

فالأول: كقوله تعالى: ﴿إِنَّ اللَّهَ وَمَلَائِكَتَهُ يُصَلُّونَ عَلَى النَّبِيِّ﴾ في قراءة من رفع [ملائكته] أي: إن الله يصلي، فحذف من الأول لدلالة الثاني عليه وليس عطفاً عليه.

والثاني: كقوله: ﴿يَمْحُوا اللَّهُ مَا يَشَاءُ وَيُثَبِّتُ﴾، أي: ما يشاء.

(ص. ٧٠٦. س. ١) وقوله: ﴿أَنَّ اللَّهَ بَرِيءٌ مِنَ الْمُشْرِكِينَ وَرَسُولُهُ﴾ [التوبة: ٣]، أي: بريء أيضاً.

وقوله: ﴿يَوْمَ تَبْدُلُ الْأَرْضُ غَيْرَ الْأَرْضِ وَالسَّمَاوَاتُ﴾ [إبراهيم: ٤٨].

(س. ٥) وجعل منه أبو الفتح قوله تعالى: ﴿أَسْمِعْ بِهِمْ وَأَبْصِرْ﴾ [مريم: ٣٨] التقدير: وأبصر بهم، لكنه حذف لدلالة ما قبله عليه حيث كان بلفظ الفضلة، وإن كان ممتنعاً في الفاعل. وهذا التوجيه إنما يتم

³²Ibn Jinnī, *Al-Khaṣā'is*, 2:301.

only if we say: that the prepositional phrase in *ʔasmiḥ bihim wa ʔabsʔir* is in the nominative position. If we say that it is in the accusative, then it is not.

(L. 9) And in Q 39:38: *wa laʔin saʔaltahum man ḫalaqa l-samāwāti wa l-ʔardʔa layaqūlunna llāhu* 'And if you were to ask them who created the heavens and the earth they will say Allah'. The reconstruction here is: *ḫalaqahunna allah* 'God created them'. The verb *ḫalaqahunna* is deleted because of a parallel item introduced in the question.

(L. 20) The eighth type: *al-ʔixtizāl* 'reduction': it is derived from *ḫazala-hu* 'to cut or sever its center'. This was transferred to the terminology to mean ellipsis of one word or more. It can be either the ellipsis of noun, verb or particle.

First: [Ellipsis of] The Noun

Ellipsis of the Topic

This type includes the ellipsis of the topic of a nominal sentence. An example of this is Q 18:22 *ʔalāʔatun, ḫamsatun, sabʔatun* 'Three, Five, Seven'. That is to say, *hum ʔalaʔatun wa hum ḫamsatun wa hum sabʔatun* 'they are three, and they are five and they are seven'.

(P. 707. L. 3) And in Q 46:35 *balāʔun fahal yuhlaku* 'A warning but shall any be destroyed'. That is to say, *haʔḏa balāʔun* 'this is a warning'.

(L. 6) And in Q 40: 45-46: *wa Hāqqa biʔāli firʔawna Sūʔu l-ʔaḏābi {46} l-nāru* 'Pharaoh's people were engulfed by a horrible punishment {46}, the fire'. That is to say, *huwa l-nār* 'It was the fire'.

It is also possible that *al-nār* 'the fire' in the two verses functions as topic in which case the comment would be the subsequent sentence. It is also possible for *al-nār* to be a substitute for *Sūʔu l-ʔaḏābi* 'horrible punishment'.

(L. 11) And in Q 18:29 *wa quli l-Ḥaqqu min rabbikum* 'And say the truth from your Lord'. That is to say, *hāḏa al-Ḥaqqu min rabbikum* 'this truth is from your Lord'. It is not *quli l-qawla l-Ḥaqqu* 'say the truth' as some ignorant people have suggested. For if this is what was intended, the word *al-Ḥaqqu* would have been in the accusative. The intention is to confirm that the Qurʔān is true and hence the addition of *min rabbikum* 'from your Lord'.

The intention is not simply to state an absolute truth which can be found in Q 6:152

إذا قلنا: إن الجار والمجرور في "أسمع بهم وأبصر" في محل الرفع: فإن قلنا في محل النصب فلا.

(س. ٩) وقوله تعالى: ﴿وَلْتَن سَأَلْتَهُمْ مَنْ خَلَقَ السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضَ لِيَقُولُنَّ اللَّهُ﴾ [الزمر: ٣٨] والتقدير: خلقهن الله فحذف "خلقهن" لقريضة تقدمت في السؤال.

(س. ٢٠) الثامن: الاختزال، وهو الافتعال من خزله قطع وسطه ثم نقل في الإصطلاح إلى حذف كلمة أو أكثر. وهي إما اسم أو فعل أو حرف.

الأول: الإسم

حذف المبتدأ

فمنه حذف المبتدأ كقوله تعالى: ﴿ثَلَاثَةٌ﴾ و﴿خَمْسَةٌ﴾ و﴿سَبْعَةٌ﴾، أي هم ثلاثة وهم خمسة وهم سبعة.

(ص. ٧٠٧. س. ٣) وقوله: ﴿بَلَاغٌ فَهَلْ يُهْلَكُ﴾ [الأحقاف: ٣٥]، أي هذا بلاغ.

(س. ٦) وقوله: ﴿وَحَاقَ بِآلِ فِرْعَوْنَ سُوءُ الْعَذَابِ. النَّارُ﴾ أي هو النار.

ويمكن أن يكون "النار" في الآيتين مبتدأ، والخبر الجملة التي بعدها، ويمكن في الثانية أن تكون "النار" بدلا من "سوء العذاب".

(س. ١١) وقوله: ﴿وَقُلِ الْحَقُّ مِنْ رَبِّكُمْ﴾ [الكهف: ٢٩] أي: هذا الحق من ربكم، وليس هذا كما يظنه بعض الجهال أي: قل القول الحق فإنه لو أريد هذا لنصب "الحق" والمراد إثبات أن القرآن حق، ولهذا قال: ﴿مِنْ رَبِّكُمْ﴾،

وليس المراد هنا قول حق مطلق، بل هذا المعنى مذكور في قوله:

wa *lā ḏā qultum fā ḥdilū* 'And if you speak then do justice' and in Q 7:169 *ḏalam yuḥaḏ ḥalayhim mīṭāqu l-Kitābi ḏan lā yaqūlū ḥala llāhi llā l-ḥaqqā* 'Was not the covenant of the book taken from them that they would not ascribe to God anything but the truth'.

And in Q 24:1 *sūratun ḏanzalnāhā* 'A surah We have revealed'. That is to say, *haḏihi sūrah* 'This is a sūrah'.

And in Q 41:46 *man ḥamila s'āliḥan falinafsihi wa man ḥasāḥa fa ḥalayhā* 'whoever does a good deed then for himself and whoever sins then against it'. That is to say, 'his work is for himself and his sins are against himself'.

(L. 18) And in Q 104:5-6 *wa mā ḏadrāka mā l-ḥuṭ'amah/nāru llāhi l-mūqadah* 'And what do you know of the kindled fire of God'. That is to say, *wa al-ḥuṭ'amah nāru llāhi* 'And *al-ḥuṭ'amah* is God's fire'.

And in Q 77:32 *ḏinnahā tarmī bi-sararin kalqas'ri* 'It throws sparks like a fort'. That is to say, each spark is like a fort. This is similar to Q 24:4 *faḡlidūhum Ḑamānīna ḡaldatan* 'Then whip them eighty whips'. That is to say, each one of them. What favors this is the fact that it is impossible for all the sparks to be like one single fort.

(L. 26) And in Q 4:171 *wa lā taqūlū ḐalāḐatun* 'And do not say three'. It is said that *ḐalāḐatun* 'three' here is the comment of an ellipted topic whose reconstruction is *ḏalihatunā ḐalāḐatun* 'Our gods are three'.

(P. 709. L. 3) Ellipsis of the Comment

As in Q 13:35 *ḏukuluhā dāḏmun wa ḏ'illuhā* 'Its food is everlasting and its shade'. That is to say, *dāḏm* 'is [also] everlasting'.

Another example occurs in sūrat *s'ād* after mentioning a selection of prophets, He says: Q 38: 49 *hāḏā ḏikrun* 'This is a reminder', and then when it is mentioned that they are destined to be in Heaven and what has been prepared for them of Paradise, He says: Q 38: 55-56 *hāḏā wa ḏinna li l-i'āḡina lafarra maḏābin {56} ḡahannama yas'lawnahā fabiḏsa l-mihādu* 'This, and for the transgressors an evil journey's end'. {55} 'Hell, they will burn therein, a wretched resting-place'. The *ḏāyah* has already pointed out to what has become of the transgressors and from this is understood the comment/second element of nominal sentence'.

﴿وَإِذَا قُلْتُمْ فَاعْدُوا﴾ [الانعام: ١٥٢]، وقوله: ﴿الْمَ يُؤْخَذُ عَلَيْهِمْ مِيثَاقُ الْكِتَابِ أَنْ لَا يَقُولُوا عَلَى اللَّهِ إِلَّا الْحَقَّ﴾ [الاعراف: ١٦٩].

وقوله: ﴿سورة أنزلناها﴾ أي: هذه سورة.

وقوله: ﴿مَنْ عَمِلَ صَالِحًا فَلِنَفْسِهِ وَمَنْ أَسَاءَ فَعَلَيْهَا﴾ [فصلت: ٤٦]، أي فعلمه لنفسه وإساءته عليها.

(س. ١٨) ﴿وَمَا أَدْرَاكَ مَا الْحُطْمَةُ﴾ (٥) نَارُ اللَّهِ الْمَوْقَدَةُ﴾ [الهمزة: ٥-٦] أي: والحطمة نار الله.

﴿إِنَّهَا تَرْمِي بِشَرَرٍ كَالْقَصْرِ﴾ [المرسلات: ٣٢]، أي: كل واحدة منها كالقصر، فيكون من باب قوله: ﴿فَاجِدُوهُمْ ثَمَانِينَ جُودَةً﴾ [النور: ٤]، أي كل واحد منهم والمحوج إلى ذلك أنه لا يجوز أن يكون الشرر كله كقصر واحد.

(س. ٢٦) وأما قوله: ﴿وَلَا تَقُولُوا ثَلَاثَةً﴾ [النساء: ١٧١] فقول: إن "ثلاثة" خبر مبتدأ محذوف تقديره: "ألهتنا ثلاثة".

(ص. ٧٠٩. س. ٣) حذف الخبر

نحو: ﴿أَكْلُهَا دَائِمٌ وَظِلُّهَا﴾ [الرعد: ٣٥] أي: دائم.

وقوله في سورة [ص] بعد ذكر من اختص ذكره من الأنبياء فقال: ﴿هَذَا ذِكْرٌ﴾ ثم لما ذكر مصيرهم إلى الجنة وما أعد فيها من النعيم قال: ﴿هَذَا وَإِنَّ لِلطَّاعِينَ لَشَرًّا مَّابٍ﴾ ﴿جَهَنَّمَ يَصَلَوْنَهَا فَبئسَ الْمِهَادُ﴾ [ص: ٥٥-٥٦] قد أشارت الآية إلى مآل أمر الطاعين ومنه يفهم الخبر.

(L. 8) And in Q 39:22 *ʔafaman ʔaraḥa llāhu ʔadrahu lil-ʔislāmi fahuwa ʔalā nūrin min rabbihi* 'Is he whose bosom God has expanded for Islam so that he follows a light from his Lord'. That is to say, 'Is this better or the one whose bosom has been made closed and narrow and his heart hardened. This is elliped and the proof can be found in the subsequent verse *fawaylun lil-qāsiyati qulūbuhum* 'So woe to those whose hearts are hardened againt remembrance of God'.

(L. 11) And in Q 5:38 *wa l-sāriqu wa l-sāriqatu faqtʔa ʔū* 'And the male-thief and the female-thief, then cut off'.

According to Sībawayhī³³, the comment is here ellipted. That is to say, *fīmā ʔatluḥu* 'in what I recite' *al-sāriqu* and *al-sāriqatu*. The word *faqtʔa ʔū* is made the beginning of a new sentence. This is also the case in Q 24:2 *al-zāniyatu wa l-zāni* 'the female-fornicator and the male-fornicator'; *fīmā naqusʔsʔū lakum* 'in what we narrate to you'.

Others have said that *al-sāriqu* is a topic and that *faqtʔa ʔū* is its comment. This is acceptable since the noun is general; no specific *sāriq* is intended. It therefore becomes similar to conditional nouns, and the *fa* is attached to its comment because of its generality. Sībawayhi preferred this reconstruction so as to make the comment an imperative verb *ʔamran*. If suppression is confirmed then the *fa* is in its proper place, joining two sentences. What supports the view that there is suppression is the consensus among Qurʔānic reciters that the word is in the nominative case, even though the accusative is usually selected for the imperative.

He said that some people have recited it in the accusative because it is the more frequent norm in Arabic, but the majority of people have rejected all but the nominative.

Similarly in Q 13:35 *maʔalu l-gannati llati wuʔida l-muttaqūna* 'Like the Paradise that has been promised the God-fearing', the word *miʔlu* is the comment of a deleted topic. That is to say, 'what we relate to you is like Paradise'.

(P. 710. L. 6) And in Q 41:41 *ʔinna l-laʔīma kaʔarū bi-l-ʔikri lammā gāʔahum* 'And verily those who rejected the remembrance when it came to them'. Here the comment is ellipted. That is to say, they will be punished *yūʔaʔabūn*. It is also possible for the comment to be

(س. ٨) وقوله: ﴿أَفَمَنْ شَرَحَ اللَّهُ صَدْرَهُ لِلْإِسْلَامِ فَهُوَ عَلَى نُورٍ مِنْ رَبِّهِ﴾ [الزمر: ٢٢] أي أهدا خير أمن جعل صدره ضيقاً حرجاً وقسا قلبه فحذف بدليل قوله: ﴿فَوَيْلٌ لِلْقَاسِيَةِ قُلُوبُهُمْ مِنْ ذِكْرِ اللَّهِ﴾ [الزمر: ٢٢].

(س. ١١) وقوله: ﴿وَالسَّارِقُ وَالسَّارِقَةُ فَاقْطَعُوا﴾ [المائدة: ٣٨] قال سيبويه: الخبر محذوف أي: فيما أتوه السارق والسارقة وجاء ﴿فاقطعوا﴾ جملة أخرى. وكذا قوله: ﴿الزَّانِيَةُ وَالزَّانِي﴾ فيما نقص لكم.

وقال غيره: السارق مبتدأ فاقطعوا خبره وجاز ذلك لأن الاسم عام فإنه لا يريد به سارقاً مخصوصاً، صار كأسماء الشرط تدخل الفاء في خبرها لعمومها، وإنما قدر سيبويه ذلك لجعل الخبر أمراً، وإذا ثبت الإضمار فالفاء داخلة في موضعها تربط بين الجملتين، ومما يدل على أنه على الإضمار إجماع القراء على الرفع مع أن الأمر الاختيار فيه النصب. قال: وقد قرأ ناس بالنصب ارتكاناً للوجه القوي في العربية، ولكن أبت العامة إلا الرفع.

وكذا قال في قوله تعالى: ﴿مَثَلُ الْجَنَّةِ الَّتِي وُعدَ الْمُتَّقُونَ﴾ [الرعد: ٣٥]: مثل هنا خبر مبتدأ محذوف أي: فيما نقص عليكم مثل الجنة.

(ص. ٧١٠. س. ٦) وقوله: ﴿إِنَّ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا بِالدُّكْرِ لَمَّا جَاءَهُمْ﴾ [فصلت: ٤١] الخبر محذوف، أي: يعذبون ويجوز أن يكون الخبر:

³³Sībawayhi, *Al-Kitāb*, 1:143-144.

Q 41:44 *ʔilā ʔika yunādawna min makānin baʔdin* 'those will be called from a far-off place'. And in Q 34:31 *lawlā ʔantum lakunnā muʔminīna* 'But were it not for you, we would have been believers'. The word *ʔantum* is a topic and its comment is ellipted. That is to say: *Hādʔirūn* 'attending/existing'. The ellipsis is here obligatory.

(L. 11) In Q 9:30 *wa qālātī l-yahūdu ʔuzayrun ʔibnu llāhi* 'And the Jews said Ezra is the son of Allah', if we recite it with *tanwīn* then no ellipsis exists since the word would be a topic and *ʔibnu llāhi* would be the comment in accordance with the sayings of the Jews. However if we read it with no nunnation then it is said that it is an adjective and the comment is deleted. That is to say, Ezra the son of Allah, is our God'. And it is also said that it is the topic which is deleted; that is to say, 'Our God is Ezra' and *ʔibnu llāhi* is a *ʔifāh* adjective'.

(P. 711. L. 20) Ellipsis of Agent

What is popular is that it is impermissible except in three instances:

First: In cases of *bināʔ al-fi ʔi li-l-mafʔūl* 'when the verb is built upon the object'.

Second: In cases of gerund if the agent is not overtly mentioned, it becomes ellipted and not suppressed as in Q 90:14 *ʔaw ʔitʔāmūn* 'or feeding'.

Third: If the agent is *sākinan* 'inherent' in another word. As when it is said to a group *ʔidʔribū al-qawm* 'Beat the people' or to the feminine addressee *ʔidʔribī al-qawm* 'Beat the people'.

According to Al-Kisaʔī, it is acceptable for the agent to be deleted entirely if there exists some evidence that points to it. As in Q 75:26: *kallā ʔidā balaʔati l-tarāqī* 'Nay, when it reaches the trachea'. That is to say, *balaʔati l-rūh* 'the soul reaches'.

And in Q 38:32: *Ḥattā tawārat bil-Ḥigābi* 'Until it hid in the veil'. That is to say, *[tawārat] al-fams* 'the sun [hid]'.

And in Q 37:177: *fa ʔidā nazala bisāḤatihim* 'And if it descends in their courtyard'. That is to say *al-ʔaḏāb* 'punishment'. This is evidenced by the preceding verse 176: *ʔafabi ʔaḏābinā yastaʔgilūna* 'Do they wish to speed up our punishment'.

And in Q 27: 36 *falamā gā ʔa sulaymāna* 'So when [the envoy] came unto Solomon'. The reconstruction is: *falamā gā ʔa alrasūlu sulaymāna* 'when he came unto the prophet Solomon'.

﴿أَوْلَيْكَ يُنَادُونَ مِنْ مَكَانٍ بَعِيدٍ﴾ [فصلت: ٤٤]. وقوله: ﴿لَوْلَا أَنْتُمْ لَكُنَّا مُؤْمِنِينَ﴾ [سبأ: ٣١]، فَأَنْتُمْ مَبْتَدَأُ، والخبر محذوف أي: حاضرون وهو لازم الحذف هنا.

(س. ١١) وأما قوله تعالى: ﴿وَقَالَتِ الْيَهُودُ عُزَيْرٌ ابْنُ اللَّهِ﴾ [التوبة: ٣٠]، أما على قراءة التتوين فلا حذف لأنه يجعله مبتدأ و"ابن الله" خبر حكاية عن مقالة اليهود، وأما على قراءة من لم ينون فقول: إنه صفة والخبر محذوف أي: عزيز ابن الله إلهنا، وقيل: بل المبتدأ محذوف أي إلهنا عزيز وابن صفة.

(ص. ٧١١. س. ٢٠) حذف الفاعل

المشهور امتناعه إلا في ثلاثة مواضع:

أحدها: إذا بُنِيَ الفعل للمفعول.

ثانيها: في المصدر إذا لم يذكر معه الفاعل مظهراً يكون محذوفاً ولا يكون مضمراً نحو: ﴿أَوْ اطْعَمُوا﴾.

ثالثها: إذا لاقى الفاعل ساكناً من كلمة أخرى، كقولك للجماعة: اضربوا القوم، وللمخاطبة: اضربي القوم.

وجوز الكسائي حذفه مطلقاً إذا ما وجد ما يدل عليه كقوله تعالى: ﴿كَلَّا إِذَا بَلَغَتِ النَّرَاقِي﴾ [القيامة: ٢٦] أي بلغت الروح.

وقوله: ﴿حَتَّى تَوَارَتْ بِالْحِجَابِ﴾ [ص: ٣٢] أي: الشمس.

﴿فَإِذَا نَزَلَ بِسَاحَتِهِمْ﴾ [الصافات: ١٧٧] يعني العذاب، لقوله قبله: ﴿أَفَبِعَذَابِنَا يَسْتَعْجِلُونَ﴾ [الشعراء: ٢٠٤].

﴿فَلَمَّا جَاءَ سُلَيْمَانَ﴾ [النمل: ٣٦]. تقديره: فلما جاء الرسول سليمان.

And the truth is that in all these examples there is suppression and not ellipsis. The difference between the two has already been described previously. However, in cases where it [the agent] is deleted and the direct object is inserted in its place with the verb being built upon the object, these have various causes:

Among them: when it is known as in Q 21: 37 *ḫuliqa l-ānsānu min ḥagalin* 'Man is created from haste' and Q4:28 *wa ḫuliqa l-ānsānu d'āḥīfan* 'Man is created weak'. We all know that God is man's creator.

Ibn Jinnī has stated, the basic condition or rule is that the intension must be to state the occurrence of the verb upon the object, and not for the sake of revealing who the agent is.

And among them: when it is for the sake of exaltation as in Q 12:41 *qud'īya l-ḥamru l-laḏī fīhi tastaftiyāni* 'Thus it is decreed the issue that you two are inquiring about', since what He has ordained is truly great.

(L. 27) And among them: when it is for the sake of adhering to the *ḥāyah*-endings as in Q 92:19 *wa mā li ḥaḥadin ḥindahu min niḥmatin tugza* 'And none has with him any favour for reward'. He did not say *yugzḥā*.

(P. 713. L. 5) Ellipsis of the first construct noun and establishing the second construct noun in its place

This [type] is abundant. According to Ibn Jinnī there are more than one thousand instances of this in the Qur'ān.

However, Abū Al-Ḥasan does not see it as significant and attributes it to the abundance of metaphoric use in the language, and the ellipsis of the first construct noun is metaphoric. End of quote.

Al-Mubarrad in his chapter on *Ma Ittafaqa Lafzuhu wa Ikhtalaf Ma'nāh* stipulates one basic condition for its acceptability which is the presence of a proof of the ellipted item either by reason or context. For example Q12:82 *wa s'ali l-qaryati* 'Ask the town'; that is to say, *ahlaha* 'its people'. He also said that it is not acceptable for us to say *gāḥa Zaydun* 'Zayd came' while you mean *ḫulāmu Zayd* 'the servant of Zayd'. This is because the act of coming is ascribed to him and there is no proof in such cases of the presence of an ellipted item.

والحق أنه في المذكورات مضمرة لا محذوف وقد سبق الفرق بينهما. أما حذفه وإقامة المفعول مقامه مع بناء الفعل للمفعول فله أسباب.

منها: العلم به، كقوله تعالى: ﴿خُلِقَ الْإِنْسَانُ مِنْ عَجَلٍ﴾. [الأنبياء: ٣٧] ﴿وَوَخَّلِقَ الْإِنْسَانَ ضَعِيفًا﴾ [النساء: ٢٨] ونحن نعلم أن الله خالقه.

قال ابن جنى: وضابطه أن يكون الغرض إنما هو الإعلام بوقوع الفعل بالمفعول ولا غرض في إيانة الفاعل من هو.

ومنها: تعظيمه كقوله: ﴿فُضِيَ الْأَمْرُ الَّذِي فِيهِ تَسْتَفْتِيَانِ﴾ إذ كان الذي قضاه عظيم القدر. (س. ٢٧) ومنها: مناسبة الفواصل، نحو: ﴿وَمَا لِأَحَدٍ عِنْدَهُ مِنْ نِعْمَةٍ تُجْزَى﴾ [الليل: ١٩] ولم يقل يجزيها.

(ص. ٧١٣. س. ٥) حذف المضاف وإقامة المضاف إليه مقامه

وهو كثير، قال ابن جنى: وفي القرآن منه زهاء ألف موضع. وأما أبو الحسن فلا يقيس عليه ثم رده بكثرة المجاز في اللغة وحذف المضاف مجاز. انتهى.

وشرط المبرّد في كتابه "ما اتفق لفظه واختلف معناه" لجوازه وجود دليل على المحذوف من عقل أو قرينة نحو: ﴿وَسئَلِ الْقَرْيَةَ﴾ أي أهلها قال: ولا يجوز على هذا أن نقول: جاء زيد وأنت تريد غلام زيد لأن المجيء يكون له ولا دليل في مثل هذا على المحذوف.

According to Al-Zamakhsharī in his old *Kashshāf*,³⁴ the reconstruction of deleted construct noun is not constant in all instances and one should not attempt to do so except when there is clear and unambiguous proof as in Q 12:82 'Ask the town'. Hence the claim is very weak that there is a deleted construct noun in Q 4:142 *wa huwa ḫādi fūhum* 'But it is He who deceives them'.

If you say: just as 'His arrival' is unacceptable, so too is His deception, since what drove you to reconstruct a first construct noun was the impossibility of 'His arrival', does not the impossibility of His deception also drive you to do the same? I would say: it is possible in the minds of the hypocrites to conceive of His deception. The verse is therefore ambiguous and so no reconstruction should be made. End of discussion.

An example of this is Q 33:21 *liman kāna yargū llāha wa l-yawma l-ḥāxira* 'for whoever desires God and the Day of Judgement'. That is to say, 'desires his mercy and fears His punishment'.

Another example is Q 21:96 *hatta ḥadā futi hat yāgūgu wa-māgūgu* 'Until Gog and Magog is opened'. That is to say, *sad yāgūgi wa māgūg* 'the barrier/dam of Gog and Magog'.

Another example is Q 19:4 *wa fī al-ḥala l-raḥsu sayban* 'And the head is ignited with grey'. That is: *faḥr al-raḥs* 'the hair of the head'.

Another example is Q 17:110 *wa lā taghar bis'alātika wa lā tuḫāfīt bihā* 'And do not be loud in your prayer and do not be silent in it'. That is to say, while reciting your prayers and do not make its recitation silent.

(L. 24) Another example is Q 26:72 *hal yasma ḥinakum ḥad tad ḥina* 'Do they hear you when you call'. That is to say, *yasma ḥina du ḥaḥakum* 'do they hear your prayers', as evidenced by the other *ḥāyah*.

(P. 714. L. 1) Q 35:14 *in tad ḥūhum lā yasma ḥū du ḥaḥakum* 'If you call them, they do not hear your prayers'.

وقال الزمخشري في الكشاف القديم: لا يستقيم تقدير حذف المضاف في كل موضع ولا يُقدّم عليه إلا بدليل واضح وفي غير مُلبس كقوله: ﴿وَسئَلِ الْقَرْيَةَ﴾ وضعف بذلك قول من قدر في قوله: ﴿وَهُوَ خَادِعُهُمْ﴾ أنه على حذف مضاف.

فإن قلت: كما لا يجوز مجيئه لايجوز خداعه فحين جرّك إلى تقدير المضاف امتناع مجيئه فهلاً جرّك إلى مثله امتناع خداعه!. قلت: يجوز في اعتقاد المنافقين تصور خداعه فكان الموضع ملبساً فلا يقدر. انتهى.

فمنه قوله تعالى: ﴿لَمَنْ كَانَ يَرْجُو اللَّهَ وَالْيَوْمَ الْآخِرَ﴾ [الأحزاب: ٢١] أي رحمته ويخاف عذابه.

﴿حَتَّىٰ إِذَا فُتِحَتْ يَأْجُوجُ وَمَأْجُوجُ﴾ [الأنبياء: ٩٦] أي: سد يأجوج ومأجوج.

﴿وَأَشْتَعَلَ الرَّأْسُ شَيْبًا﴾ [مريم: ٤] أي: شعر الرأس.

﴿وَلَا تَجْهَرْ بِصَلَاتِكَ وَلَا تُخَافِتْ بِهَا﴾ [الإسراء: ١١٠] أي: بقراءة صلاتك ولا تخافت بقراءتها.

(س. ٢٤) ﴿هَلْ يَسْمَعُونَكُمْ إِذْ تَدْعُونَ﴾ أي: هل يسمعون دعاءكم بدليل الآية الأخرى.

(ص. ٧١٤. س. ١) ﴿إِنْ تَدْعُوهُمْ لَا يَسْمَعُوا دُعَاءَكُمْ﴾ [فاطر: ١٤].

³⁴ From Al-Zarkashī's references to Al-Zamakhsharī's *Al-Kashshāf al-qadīm Old Kashshāf*, it is reasonable to assume that there are two versions of Al-Zamakhsharī's *Kashshāf*, especially given the fact that the grammatical concepts here attributed to Al-Zamakhsharī's *Old Kashshāf* are nowhere to be found in any edition of the book. It must also be noted that Al-Zamakhsharī himself in his introduction to the book refers to a new methodology in which he abridges material but adds more benefits and truths which can be taken to be a reference to this new edition. In all probability, he elected to remove many of the material that was viewed as controversial and generally unaccepted by the majority of scholars at the time. What seems strange is that this discrepancy has not been alluded to by modern editors of *Al-Burhān*.

<p>Another example is Q 10: 83 <i>ʕalā ʕawfin min firʕawna wa mala ʕhim</i>. That is to say, from the people of Pharaoh.</p> <p>Another example is Q 17:75 <i>ʕādan la ʕaḍāqāka d ʕi ʕfa l-ḥayāti wa d ʕi ʕfa l-mamāti</i> 'Then we would make you taste double in this life and double in death'. That is to say, <i>di ʕfa l-ʕaḍāb</i> 'double the punishment'.</p> <p>Another example is Q 2: 171 <i>wa ma ʕalu l-laḍīna kafarū kama ʕali l-laḍī yan ʕiqu</i> 'The likeness of those who disbelieve is as the likeness of one who calls'. That is to say, and the likeness of the admonisher of those who disbelieve is like the caller of cattle.</p> <p>(L. 8) Another example is Q 3:194: <i>wa ʕatīnā mā wa ʕadatanā ʕala rusulika</i> 'And give us what you have promised us through your messengers'. That is to say, <i>ʕala ʕalsinati rusulika</i> 'through the tongues of your prophets'.</p> <p>(L. 14) Another example is Q 12:82 <i>wa sʕali l-qaryata llati kunnā fihā</i> 'And ask the town that we were in'. That is to say, <i>ʕahla al-qaryati</i> 'the people of the town' and <i>ʕahla al-ʕiri</i> 'the people of the caravan'. And it is said that this has two senses. The first is that the town is meant to refer to the actual group of people. And the second sense is that it refers to the buildings themselves, because the addressee is a prophet and a man of miracles.</p> <p>(L. 18) Another example is Q 89:22 <i>wa gā ʕa rabbuka wa l-malaku</i> 'And your Lord shall come and the angels'. That is to say, <i>ʕamru allāh</i> 'the command of God'.</p> <p>Another example is Q 2:93 <i>wa ʕufribū fī qulūbihimu l-ʕigla bikufrihim</i> 'And their hearts were filled with the calf because of their faithlessness'.³⁵ That is to say, 'with the love of the calf'. Al-Rāghib³⁶ states that mentioning the calf gives a clear signal that because of their extreme love of the calf, its image in their hearts is incapable of being erased.</p> <p>Another example is Q 89:6-7 <i>ʕalam tara kayfa fa ʕala rabbuka bi-ʕād [7] ʕrama ḍāti l-ʕimād</i> 'Do you not consider how your Lord has dealt with Aad [7] 'Iram of many columns'. 'Iram is the name of a location which is in the location of a mountain.</p>	<p>﴿عَلَىٰ خَوْفٍ مِّنْ فِرْعَوْنَ وَمَلَأَهُمْ﴾ [يونس: ٨٣] أي: من آل فرعون.</p> <p>﴿إِذَا لَأَذَقْنَاكَ ضِعْفَ الْحَيَاةِ وَضِعْفَ الْمَمَاتِ﴾ [الإسراء: ٧٥] أي ضعف عذابهما.</p> <p>﴿وَمَثَلُ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا كَمَثَلِ الَّذِي يَنْعُقُ﴾ [البقرة: ١٧١] أي: ومثل واعظ الذين كفروا كناعق الأنعام.</p> <p>(س. ٨) وقوله: ﴿وَأَتَيْنَا مَا وَعَدْتَنَا عَلَىٰ رُسُلِكَ﴾ [آل عمران: ١٨٤] أي على السنة رسلك.</p> <p>(س. ١٤) ﴿وَسَلِّ الْقَرْيَةَ الَّتِي كُنَّا فِيهَا﴾ [يوسف: ٨٢] أي أهل القرية وأهل العير. وقيل: فيه وجهان: أحدهما: أن القرية يراد بها نفس الجماعة، والثاني: أن المراد الأبنية نفسها لأن المخاطب نبيّ صاحب معجزة.</p> <p>(س. ١٨) ﴿وَجَاءَ رَبُّكَ وَالْمَلَكُ﴾ [الفجر: ٢٢] أي أمر ربك.</p> <p>﴿وَأَشْرَبُوا فِي قُلُوبِهِمُ الْعِجْلَ بِكُفْرِهِمْ﴾ [البقرة: ٩٣] أي حب العجل. قال الراغب: إنه على بابه فإن في ذكر العجل تنبيهها على أنه لفرط محبتهم صار صورة العجل في قلوبهم لا تمحى.</p> <p>وقوله: ﴿أَلَمْ تَرَ كَيْفَ فَعَلَ رَبُّكَ بِعَادٍ﴾ [إرم ذات العِصَادِ] [الفجر: ٦-٧] فإرم اسم لموضع، وهو في موضع جبل</p>
--	---

³⁵ Mackay (1991:61) draws attention to the fact that Sībawayhi in his *Kitāb* identifies this passage and others in this category as examples of ellipsis at one point and of *ʕiḥtis ʕār* 'concision/abbreviation' at another. This would seem to suggest that *ʕiḥtis ʕār* 'brevity' and *ʕiḥtis ʕār* mean the same thing; both are one type of *Haḍf* 'ellipsis'.

³⁶ Al-Rāghib, *Al-Mufradāt*, 757.

However it is diptote because it is a proper noun and feminine. Its proper noun status is obvious, and its feminine status is evidenced by Q 89:7 *ḍāti l-ḥimād* 'of many columns' [i.e. the feminine particle *ḍāti*].

(P. 715. L. 8) Another example is Q 5:3 *Hurrimat ḥalaykumu l-maytatu* 'Forbidden unto you is carrion. That is to say, *tanāwuluhā* 'the eating of it'. This is because commandments are not associated with objects except through the interpretation of verbs. It has also been said that the word 'carrion' is used to express the 'eating of it and hence there is no presence of ellipsis here. And if there was a remnant of ellipsis the verb would not have been in the feminine. The compound construction is deleted only if the discourse signifies something other than the lexical signification of individual words. And it is understood from this construction that the eating is without a reconstruction, and the word is inserted to reflect it. What is popular is the impossibility of ellipsis here.

(L. 22) Another example is Q 13:17 *fasālat ṛawdiyatu biqadrihā* 'So that valleys flowed according to their measure'. That is to say, *biqadr miyāḥihā* 'according to the measure of their waters'.

Another example is Q 12:24 *wa laqad hammat bihi wa hamma bihā* 'She verily desired him and he desired her'. That is to say, *hamma bi-dafḥihā* 'He desired to push her'. That is to push her away from himself, an interpretation which aims to absolve Yūsuf from anything inappropriate to him as a prophet. This is because prophets, peace be upon them, are infallible from sin both grave and trivial. Therefore one should pause after the verse *wa laqad hammat bihi* 'She verily desired him'.

P. 717. L. 7) Ellipsis of the First and Second Construct Nouns

It is possible for a *mudʿāf* to be added to another *mudʿāf*. In this case the first and the second construct nouns would be deleted and the third would remain. For example in Q 56:82 *wa tagḥalūna rizqakum* 'And have you made it your livelihood'. That is, instead of *fukr rizqikum* 'the thankfulness of your livelihood'.³⁷

Another example is Q 33:19 *tadūru ḥayyuhum kalla ḍi yuḥḥā ḥalayhi mina l-mawti* 'Their eyes roll like one who has fainted from death'. That is to say, like 'the rolling of the eyes' of someone who has fainted from death'.

إلا أنه منع الصرف للعلمية والتأنيث أما للعلمية فواضح وأما التأنيث فلقوله: ﴿ذَاتِ الْعِمَادِ﴾.

(ص. ٧١٥. س. ٨) وقوله: ﴿حُرِّمَتْ عَلَيْكُمُ الْمَيْتَةُ﴾ [المائدة: ٣]، أي تناولها لأن الأحكام لا تتعلق بالأجرام إلا بتأويل الأفعال. وقيل: إن الميتة يعبر بها عن تناولها فلا حذف ولو كان ثم حذف لم يؤنث الفعل ولأن المركب إنما يحذف إذا كان للكلام دلالة غير الدلالة الإفرادية والمفهوم من هذا التركيب التناول من غير تقدير فيكون اللفظ موضوعاً له والمشهور في الأصول أنه من محال الحذف.

(س. ٢٢) وقوله: ﴿فَسَأَلَتْ أَوْدِيَةَ بِقَدْرِهَا﴾ [الرعد: ١٧] أي بقدر مياهها.

وقوله: ﴿وَلَقَدْ هَمَّتْ بِهِ وَهَمَّ بِهَا﴾ [يوسف: ٢٤] أي: هم بدفعها أي عن نفسه في هذا التأويل بتنزيله يوسف صلى الله عليه وسلم عما لا يليق به لأن الأنبياء صلوات الله وسلامه عليهم معصومون من الصغائر والكبائر وعليه فينبغي الوقف على قوله: ﴿لَقَدْ هَمَّتْ بِهِ﴾.

(ص. ٧١٧. س. ٧) حذف المضاف والمضاف إليه قد يضاف المضاف إلى مضاف، فيحذف الأول والثاني ويبقى الثالث كقوله تعالى: ﴿وَتَجْعَلُونَ رِزْقَكُمْ﴾ أي شكر رزقكم [الواقعة: ٨٢].

وقوله: ﴿تَدُورُ أَعْيُنُهُمْ كَالَّذِي يُغْشَى عَلَيْهِ مِنَ الْمَوْتِ﴾ [الأحزاب: ١٩] أي: كدوران عين الذي يغشى عليه من الموت.

³⁷Al-Zamakhsharī, *Al-Kashshāf*, 4:469.

It is said: *al-rizq* 'the livelihood' in the first *ṭāyah* refers to one's lot and chance and so there is no need for reconstruction. Similarly, in the second *ṭāyah*, the word *kallaḏī* is reconstructed as a specific case or example of the *hāʔ* and the *mīm* in *fi ṭaḥyunuhum* because the annexed item is *baḥd* 'part' [of a whole] and therefore no reconstruction is made.

(L. 24) Another example is Q 20: 96 *faqabadṣtu qabdṣatan min ṭaḥari l-rasūli* 'I seized a handful from the traces of the messenger'. That is to say, from the traces of the hoofs of the messenger's steed.

(P. 718. L. 1) Another example is *mā ṭaḥāṭa llāhu ṣalāḥ rasūlihi min ṭaḥli l-qurā* 'That which Allah gives as spoil unto His messenger from the people of the towns'. That is to say, from the wealth of the disbelievers of the townspeople.

Another example is Q 22: 32 *faḥinnahā min taqwā l-qulūbi* 'It is surely from the god-fearingness of the hearts'. That is to say, from the actions of those with god-fearing hearts.

(L. 19) Ellipsis of the Modified Noun

Two conditions are specified:

First, for the identification of the the modified noun to occur, the adjective must be specific to the modified noun. Whenever the adjective is general, the ellipsis of the modified noun is prevented. This is stated by Sībawayhi in the last chapter he introduced: *Hāḏā bāb magārī ṭawaḥir al-kalim al-ṣarabiyyah* 'This is the chapter of the forms of word endings in Arabic.'³⁸ It is also stipulated by Aristotle in his book *Al-Khaṭābah*.

Second, one must rely only on the adjective itself since it is [syntactico-semantically] connected with the intended meaning of the context. For example, in (P. 719. L. 1) Q 3:115 *wa llāhu ṣalīmūn bil-muttaqīn* 'And God is all-knowing of the God-fearing' and Q 2:95 *wa llāhu ṣalīmūn bil-ḏālimīn* 'And God is All-knowing of the oppressors'. Here the context of the discourse relies upon the mere adjective to convey the intention of the purpose of speech whether for praise or disparagement.

(L. 4) For example in Q 76:14 *wa dāniyatan ṣalayhim ḏilāluhā* 'And lowering over them its shades'. That is to say, *wa gannatun daniyatun* 'and a lowering garden'.

وقيل: الرزق في الآية الأولى الحظ والنصيب، فلا حاجة إلى تقدير وكذلك قدرت في الثانية "كالذي" حالاً من الهاء والميم "في أعينهم" لأن المضاف بعض فلا تقدير.

(س. ٢٤) وقوله: ﴿فَقَبَضْتُ قَبْضَةً مِنْ أَثَرِ الرَّسُولِ﴾ [طه: ٩٦] أي: من أثر حافر فرس الرسول.

(ص. ٧١٨. س. ١) وقوله: ﴿مَا أَفَاءَ اللَّهُ عَلَى رَسُولِهِ مِنْ أَهْلِ الْقُرَى﴾ [الحشر: ٧] أي: من أموال كفار أهل القرى.

وقوله: ﴿فَإِنَّهَا مِنْ تَقْوَى الْقُلُوبِ﴾ [الحج: ٣٢] أي: من أفعال ذوي تقوى القلوب.

(س. ١٩) حذف الموصوف

يشترط فيه أمران:

أدهما: كون الصفة خاصة بالموصوف حتى يحصل العلم بالموصوف، فمتى كانت الصفة عامة امتنع حذف الموصوف نص عليه سيبويه في آخر باب "هذا باب مجارى أو آخر الكلم العربية" وكذلك نص عليه أرسطاطاليس في كتابه الخطابية.

الثاني: أن يعتمد على مجرد الصفة من حيث هي لتعلق غرض السياق كقوله تعالى: (ص. ٧١٩. س. ١) ﴿وَاللَّهُ عَلِيمٌ بِالْمُتَّقِينَ﴾ [آل عمران: ١١٥] ﴿وَاللَّهُ عَلِيمٌ بِالظَّالِمِينَ﴾ [البقرة: ٩٥] فإن الاعتماد في سياق القول على مجرد الصفة لتعلق غرض القول من المدح أو الذم بها.

(س. ٤) وقوله: ﴿وَدَانِيَةً عَلَيْهِمْ ظِلَالُهَا﴾ [الإنسان: ١٤] أي: وجنة دانية.

³⁸ *Al-Kitāb*, 1:12-23.

For example Q 34:13 *wa qalīlun min ʿibādīya l-fakūr* 'A few of my servants are thankful'. That is to say, *al-ʿabd l-fakūr* 'thankful servant'.

And Q 54: 13: *wa ḥamalnāhu ʿala ʿāṭi ʾalwāḥin wa dusurin* 'And we carried him on [that] of planks and nails'.

That is to say: *safmātin ʿāṭi alwāḥin* 'a ship of planks'.

(L. 9) For example Q 34:11: *ʾani ʿmal sābiḡātin* 'Make thee metal'. That is to say, *durūʿan sābiḡātin* 'metal shields'.

(L. 13) Ellipsis of the Adjective

This is mostly used for embellishment and added majesty in indefinite constructions *al-nakirāt*. It is as if indefiniteness becomes a definite feature of it.

(L. 16) For example in Q 106:4 *al-laḏī ʾatʿamahu min gūʿīn wa ʾāmanahu min ḡawfin* 'Who has fed them from hungar and safeguarded from fear'. That is to say, from *gūʿīn ʾadīd* 'extreme hungar' and *ḡawfin ʿāḏīm* 'great fear'.

(L. 21) Another example is Q 18: 79 *yaʾXūdu Kulla safīnatin ḡasʿbān* 'who is taking every ship by force'. That is to say, *sʿāliḡah* 'good/seaworthy' And it is said that this is the reading of Ibn ʿAbbās. However there is an issue here which is that we cannot definitely assume suppression but rather *ʿāmm maʿsūs* 'a specified general'.

Another example is Q 38:51 *bifākihātin kaθīratin wa ʿarābin* 'with much fruits and drink'. That is to say, [*ʿarābin*] *kaθīr* 'much drink' as evidenced by what precedes it.

(P. 720. L. 8) Another example is Q 10:16 *faqad labiθu fīkum ʿumūrān min qablihi* 'I dwelt among you an age before it'. That is to say, I did not recite unto you at that time anything. The adjective or the circumstantial clause is here deleted. It is said: *al-ʿumr* 'the age' referred to here is forty years.

Ellipsis of the Coordinate noun

(L. 13) For example in Q 27:49 *mā ʾaḡhānā maḡlihi* 'We did not witness the destruction of his family'. That is to say 'we did not witness the destruction of his family nor his destruction. The proof of this can be found in the previous verse:

وقوله: وَقَلِيلٌ مِنْ عِبَادِيَ الشَّكُورُ ﴿سبأ: ١٣﴾ أي: العبد الشكور.

وقوله: ﴿وَحَمَلْنَاهُ عَلَى ذَاتِ أَلْوَاحٍ وَدُسُرٍ﴾ [القمر: ١٣] أي: سفينة ذات ألواح.

(س. ٩) وقوله: ﴿أَنْ اعْمَلْ سَابِغَاتٍ﴾ [سبأ: ١١] أي: دروعا سابغات.

(س. ١٣) حذف الصفة

وأكثر ما يرد للتفخيم والتعظيم في النكرات وكان التكرير حينئذ علم عليه .

(س. ١٦) كقوله تعالى: ﴿الَّذِي أَطْعَمَهُمْ مِنْ جُوعٍ وَآمَنَهُمْ مِنْ خَوْفٍ﴾ [قريش: ٤] أي: من جوع شديد وخوف عظيم.

(س. ٢١) وقوله: ﴿يَأْخُذُ كُلَّ سَفِينَةٍ غَصْبًا﴾ [الكهف: ٧٩] أي: صالحة. وقيل: إنها قراءة ابن عباس. وفيه بحث وهو أنا لا نسلّم بالإضمار بل هو عام مخصوص.

وقوله: ﴿بِفَاكِهِةٍ كَثِيرَةٍ وَسَرَابٍ﴾ أي كثير بدليل ما قبله.

(ص. ٧٢٠. س. ٨) وقوله تعالى: ﴿فَقَدْ لَبِثْتُ فِيكُمْ عُمُرًا مِنْ قَبْلِهِ﴾ [يونس: ١٦] أي: لم أتل عليكم فيه شيئاً، فحذفت الصفة أو الحال، قيل: والعمر هنا أربعون سنة.

حذف المعطوف

(س. ١٣) قوله: ﴿مَا شَهِدْنَا مَهْلِكَ أَهْلِهِ﴾ [النمل: ٤٩] أي: ما شهدنا مهلك أهله ومهلكه بدليل قوله:

Q 27:49 *lanubayyitannahu wa ḥahlahu* 'we verily will secretly attack him and his family by night'. What is related in stories is that they had determined to kill him and his family and hence their statement "And we are indeed saying the truth". However this is believed to be a lie. They only deluded people into believing that they had killed him and his family in secret without anybody noticing them. They said this statement to pretend that they were truthful while in fact they were lying. It is also possible for this to be an instance of ellipsis of the second conjoint/the coordinated upon'. That is to say: we did not witness his destruction and the destruction of his family.

(L. 24) Another example is Q 17:16 *wa ḥadā ḥaradnā ḥan nuhlika qaryatan ḥamarnā mutrafihā fafasaqū fihā* 'And when we decide to destroy a town, we command its spendthrifters and they transgress therein'. That is to say we command the spendthrifters. (P. 721. L. 1) but they disobey the command and continue to transgress. In this reconstruction, the problematics of the *ḥayah* is removed. It is not the transgression that is commanded. It is also possible that *ḥamarnā mutrafihā* 'we commanded its spendthrifters' is a modifier of the town and not an answer to the statement 'When we decide'. The reconstruction is thus 'when we decide to destroy a town the characteristic of which is that we command its spendthrifters and they transgress' in it. And in this way, no overt answer is provided in place of the context, as in Q 39:73 *ḥattā ḥadā ḡāḥūhā wa futiḥat ḥabwābuhā* 'when they reach it and its gates are opened'.

Ellipsis of the Second Element of Coordination

For example in Q 3:91 *falan yuqbalā min ḥaḥidihim mil ḥu l-ḥardḥi ḥahaban wa lawi fadā bihi* 'Never would be accepted from anyone of them as much gold as the Earth contains even if they offer it as sacrifice'. That is to say *law malakahu wa lawi fadā bihi* 'even if he possesses it and he offers it as sacrifice'.

It is also acceptable to delete it along with 'the coordinator'. For example in Q 2:184 *faman kāna minkum marīdān ḥaw ḥalā safarin faḥiddatun min ḥayyāmin ḥuḥara* 'And for anyone who is ill among you or on a journey then the prescribed number from days later'. That is to say, *fa- ḥaft ḥara fa-ḥiddatun* 'then he broke his fasting but [should do] the prescribed number [at a later time]'.
For example Q 26:63 *ḥani dḥrib biḥasḥaka l-baḥra fa-nfalaq* 'Strike with your rod the sea and it split asunder'. The reconstruction is *fa-dḥaraba fa-nfalaqa* 'and he struck and it split asunder'. The coordinated clause which is *dḥaraba* 'he struck' is deleted, as well as the coordinator which is the 'fa' attached to *ḥanfalaq*;

﴿لَنْبِيْتَهُ وَأَهْلَهُ﴾ [النمل: ٤٩]، وما روى أنهم كانوا عزموا على قتله وقتل أهله وعلى هذا فقولهم: ﴿وَأَنَا لَصَادِقُونَ﴾ [النمل: ٤٩] كذب في الإخبار وأوهموا قومهم أنهم قتلوه وأهله سرّاً ولم يشعر بهم أحد وقالوا تلك المقالة يوهمون أنهم صادقون وهم كاذبون. ويحتمل أن يكون من حذف المعطوف عليه أي ما شهدنا مهلكه ومهلك أهله.

(س. ٢٤) وقوله تعالى: ﴿وَإِذَا أَرَدْنَا أَنْ نُهْلِكَ قَرْيَةً أَمَرْنَا مُتْرَفِيهَا فَفَسَقُوا فِيهَا﴾ [الإسراء: ١٦] أي: أمرنا مترفيها. (ص. ٧٢١. س. ١) فخالفوا الأمر ففسقوا، وبهذا التقدير يزول الإشكال من الآية وأنه ليس الفسق مأموراً به. ويحتمل أن يكون ﴿أَمَرْنَا مُتْرَفِيهَا﴾ صفة للقريّة لا جواباً لقوله: ﴿وَإِذَا أَرَدْنَا﴾ التقدير وإذا أردنا أن نهلك قرية من صفتها أنا أمرنا مترفيها ففسقوا فيها، ويكون إذا على هذا لم يأت لها جواباً ظاهر استغناء بالسياق كما في قوله: ﴿حَتَّى إِذَا جَاءُوهَا فَتَحْتِ أَبْوَابَهَا﴾ [الزمر: ٧١].

حذف المعطوف عليه

قوله تعالى: ﴿فَلَنْ يُقْبَلَ مِنْ أَحَدِهِمْ مِلءُ الْأَرْضِ ذَهَبًا وَلَوْ افْتَدَى بِهِ﴾ [آل عمران: ٩١] أي: لو ملكه ولو افتدى به.

ويجوز حذفه مع حرف العطف كقوله: ﴿فَمَنْ كَانَ مِنْكُمْ مَرِيضًا أَوْ عَلَى سَفَرٍ فَعِدَّةٌ مِنْ أَيَّامٍ أُخَرَ﴾ [البقرة: ١٨٤] أي: فأفطر فعدة.

وقوله: ﴿أَنْ اضْرِبْ بِعَصَاكَ الْبَحْرَ فَانْفَلِقْ﴾ [الشعراء: ٦٣] التقدير: فاضرب فانفلق فحذف المعطوف عليه وهو "ضرب" وحرف العطف وهو الفاء المتصلة بـ "انفلق"،

hence we are left with *fanfalaqa*. The *fa* annexed to *ʔanfalaqa* is the same *fa* that was attached to *dʿaraba* while the one attached to *ʔanfalaq* is deleted. This is according to the claims of Ibn ʿUṣfūr and Al-ʿUbbadhiyy³⁹ who said: the proof of this is that the coordinator is meant to make the first participate in the second. If one of the nouns, that is to say the first or second coordinate, is deleted, it must not be mentioned so that it does not erase what it was introduced for. Ibn Al-Dāʿi has said: this is not a case of ellipsis but a case of establishing *al-maʿūf* in place of the *maʿūf ṣalayhi* because it is the cause of it. And it is quite common for the cause to be inserted in place of its causer; and what follows it is not coordinated to the answer/apodosis but rather it itself becomes the answer. Proof of this can be found in Q 7:160 *fanbagasat* 'And out of it gushed', which is itself the answer of the imperative.

(P. 724. L. 4) Ellipsis of the Direct Object

This is of two kinds:

The first Kind

When it is meant to be ellipted and hence undertaken because of the existence of proof. And in each instance, an appropriate reconstruction is provided. For example in Q 85:16 *fa ʔʔalun limā yurīd* 'Doer of all that [He] wills. That is to say, *yurīdu-hu* 'what He wills'.

(L. 22) And some include as an example of this type Q 23:33 *wa yaʔrabu mim mā taʔrabūna* 'and he drinks of that you drink'. But this is inaccurate because *ʔariba* 'he drinks' *yataʔadda bi-naʔsihi* is inherently transitive.

In such instances, **the purpose behind the ellipsis** includes many issues:

Among them: for the sake of brevity when the context is evident.

(P. 725. L. 11) An example is Q 32:14 *fa ʔūqū bimā nasītum liqāʔa yawmikum hā ʔā* 'So taste for what you have forgotten of your meeting this day'. That is to say, *fa ʔūqu l-ʔāb* 'so taste the punishments'.

Another example is Q 14:37 *rabbānā ʔnnī ʔaskantu min ʔurriyyatī* 'Our Lord! I have settled some of my posterity'. That is to say, members or groups.

فصار: ﴿فانفلق﴾ فالفاء الداخلة على "انفلق" هي الفاء التي كانت متصلة بـ ﴿ضرب﴾ وأما المتصلة بـ "انفلق" فمحذوفة. كذا زعم ابن عصفور والأبدي، قالوا: والذي دلّ على ذلك أن حرف العطف إنما نوي به مشاركة الأول للثاني، فإذا حذف أحد اللفظين - أعني لفظ المعطوف أو المعطوف عليه - ينبغي ألا يوتى به ليزول ما أتى به من أجله. وقال ابن الصائغ: ليس هذا من الحذف بل من إقامة المعطوف مقام المعطوف عليه، لأنه سببه، ويقام السبب كثيراً مقام مسببه، وليس ما بعدها معطوفاً على الجواب بل صار هو الجواب بدليل: ﴿فانبجست﴾ هو جواب الأمر.

(ص. ٧٢٤. س. ٤) حذف المفعول

وهو ضربان:

أحدهما: أن يكون مقصوداً مع الحذف فينوي لدليل ويقدر في كل موضع ما يليق به، كقوله تعالى:

﴿فَعَالٌ لِمَا يُرِيدُ﴾ [هود: ١٠٧] أي يريد.

(س. ٢٢) وجعل بعضهم منه قوله تعالى: ﴿وَيَشْرَبُ مِمَّا تَشْرَبُونَ﴾ [المؤمنون: ٣٣] وهو فاسد، لأن "شرب" يتعدى بنفسه.

والغرض حينئذ بالحذف أمور:

منها: قصد الاختصار عند قيام القرائن.

(ص. ٧٢٥. س. ١١) ومنه قوله: ﴿فَذُوقُوا بِمَا نَسِيتُمْ لِقَاءَ يَوْمِكُمْ هَذَا﴾ [السجدة: ١٤] أي ذوقوا العذاب.

وقوله: ﴿رَبَّنَا إِنِّي أَسْكَنْتُ مِنْ ذُرِّيَّتِي﴾ [إبراهيم: ٣٧] أي ناساً أو فريقاً.

³⁹See Suyūfī, *Bughya* II, 367 for full name and works. According to Al Suyūfī there are two known grammarians with the same tribal/family name. An older grammarian, Abū Al-Ḥasan Al-Kitāmiyy who was Abū Ḥayyān's teacher, and a later grammarian closer to Al- Al Suyūfī's era of which no works are known.

Another example is Q 2:61 *fa-dʿū lanā rabbaka yuḫriḡ lanā* 'So pray your lord for us that He brings forth'. That is to say, [yuḫriḡu] *ʃayʔan* '[He brings forth] something'.

(L. 19) And among them: for the purpose of debasement. For example in Q 58:21 *kataba llāhu laʔayḡibanna ʔana wa rusulī* 'God has decreed: Verily I and my messengers shall defeat'. That is, *al-kuffār* 'the disbelievers'.

(P. 726. L. 21) And among them: when a similar item is present in the linguistic form. For example Q 13: 39 *yamḡū llāhu mā yaʔāʔu wa yuḡbitu* 'And Allah erases what he wishes and confirms'. That is, and confirms what he wishes. When the second object has the same linguistic form as the first in its generality and in its need of a link or conjunction, it is acceptable to ellip it because it is signified by what is mentioned, as for example Q 23:96 *ʔadfaʔ bi-laʔi hiya ʔaḡṣanu l-sayyiʔata naḡnu ʔaḡlamu* 'Repel with that which is better the evil; we are best aware'.

(P. 727. L. 14) Among them: in order to abide by the *ʔāyah*-ending or pause. For example in Q 93:1-3 *wa l-dʿuḡā {1} wa l-layli ʔiḡā sagā {2} mā waddaʔaka rabbuka wa mā qalā* 'By the morning hours' – 'By the night when it becomes still' 'Your Lord did not leave you nor did he abandon'. That is to say, *qalāka* 'abandoned you'. The object [pronoun] is here deleted because the *ʔāyah* endings are all *ʔalif*.

(L. 18) It is also used for the purpose of clarification after an ambiguity as in instances of *maʔḡūl al-maʔḡāḡ wa al-ʔrādah* 'the direct object of wish and volition' which is hardly ever mentioned. For example in Q 2:20 *wa law ʔāʔa llāhu laʔāḡaba bisamʔihim wa ʔabsʔārihim* 'And if God willed, He would take away their hearing and their sight'. (L. 25) And the reconstruction [in all such instance of devine wish and volition] is: *law ʔāʔ allāhu ʔan yaʔʔala ʔālika la-ʔaʔala* 'If God wills to do this, he will do it'. (P. 728. L. 1) Ibn Al-Naḡwiyyah has stipulated one condition in the case of object ellipsis which is the introduction of *ʔadātu ʔart* 'a conditional particle'.

(P. 732. L. 20) The Second Kind:

The direct object must not be originaly intended. Thus the transitive or active verb is given the status of *al-qāʔsʔir* 'an incomplete or defective verb'. This occurs when we want only the same verb to occur and the direct object to be completely obliterated from memory similar to instances where the subject is forgotten in passive constructions. The object is here not mentioned nor is it reconstructed. However it is necessarily

وقوله: ﴿فَادْعُ لَنَا رَبَّكَ يُخْرِجْ لَنَا﴾ [البقرة: ٦١] أي شيئاً.

(س. ١٩) ومنها لقصد الاحتقار كقوله: ﴿كَتَبَ اللَّهُ لَأَغْلِبَنَّ أَنَا وَرُسُلِي﴾ [المجادلة: ٢١] أي الكفار.

(ص. ٧٢٦. س. ٢١) ومنها: تقدّم مثله في اللفظ كقوله تعالى: ﴿يَمْحُوا اللَّهُ مَا يَشَاءُ وَيُثَبِّتُ﴾ [الرعد: ٣٩] أي ويثبت ما يشاء. فلما كان المفعول الثاني بلفظ الأول في عمومته واحتياجه إلى صلة جاز حذفه، لدلالة ما ذكر عليه كقوله: ﴿ادْفَعْ بِالَّتِي هِيَ أَحْسَنُ السَّيِّئَةَ نَحْنُ أَعْلَمُ﴾ [المؤمنون: ٩٦].

(ص. ٧٢٧. س. ١٤) ومنها رعاية الفاصلة نحو ﴿وَالضُّحَى﴾ ﴿وَاللَّيْلِ إِذَا سَجَى﴾ ﴿مَا وَدَّعَكَ رَبُّكَ وَمَا قَلَى﴾ [الضحى: ١-٣] أي: ما فلاك فحذف المفعول، لأن فواصل الآي على الألف.

(س. ١٨) ومنها البيان بعد الإبهام كما في مفعول المشيئة والإرادة، فإنهم لا يكادون يذكرونه كقوله تعالى: ﴿وَلَوْ شَاءَ اللَّهُ لَذَهَبَ بِسَمْعِهِمْ وَأَبْصَارِهِمْ﴾ [البقرة: ٢٠] (س. ٢٥) والتقدير لو شاء الله أن يفعل ذلك لفعل. وشرط ابن النحوية في حذفه دخول أداة الشرط عليه.

(ص. ٧٣٢. س. ٢٠) الضرب الثاني
ألا يكون المفعول مقصوداً أصلاً وينزل الفعل المتعدّي منزلة القاصر، وذلك عند إرادة وقوع نفس الفعل فقط وجعل المحذوف نسياً منسياً، كما ينسى الفاعل عند بناء الفعل فلا يذكر المفعول، ولا يقدر غير أنه لازم

confirmed by reason in every transitive verb, because the verb does not know its designation. In this way we know that not every correlated item in the topic of the discourse has to be reconstructed, as in Q 2:24 *fa-ān lam tafsalū wa lan tafsalū* 'And if you do it not - and you can never do it'.

(P. 733. L. 1) For example in Q 2:60 *kulū wa šrabū* 'Eat and drink'. This is because what is intended is not a specific food but rather the occurrence of both these verbs.

(P. 735. L. 3) Ellipsis of Circumstantial Clause

For example in Q 13:23-24 *wa l-malā'ikatu yadḫulūna ṣalayhim min kulli bābin* {23} *salāmun ṣalayku* 'And the angels enter upon them from every gate {23} peace upon you'. That is to say *qā'ālīna salāmun ṣalaykum* 'saying peace upon you'.

Ibn Abī al-Rabī' has said: The Arabs may delete *al-Hāl* if it is signified by the gerund. For example in Q 12:47 *tazra'ūna sabḥa sinīna daḥaban* 'You will sow for seven years diligently'. The word *daḥaban* 'diligently' is reconstructed by the verb and its reconstruction is *tadḥabūn* 'you will sow diligently' functioning as circumstantial clause.

Abu 'Aliyy has said: there is no disagreement between Sībawayhi and Abi Al-'Abbās [Al-Mubarrad] on the ellipted *Hāl* which makes the gerund accusative. The difference, however, between them is in the analogy. Sībawayhi prefers to go by *samaḥ* 'attestation by speech' and does not use analogy [here], whereas Al-'Akhfash and Al-Mubarrad do.

(P. 748. L. 1) [Second:] Ellipsis of the Verb

This is divided into two kinds, general and particular.

The Particular:

The particular is when the phrase *ḥamī* 'I mean' is suppressed. The direct object is in the accusative case in instances of praise. For example in Q 2:177 *wa l-sābirīna fī l-baḥsā'īna wa l-d'arrā'īna* 'And those who are patient in suffering and adversity'; and in Q 4:162 *wa l-muqīmīna l-s'ālata wa l-muḥitūna l-zakāta* 'And those who establish prayers and those who pay alms'. That is to say, *ḥamdu* 'I praise'.

And know that if the qualified/described is specified,

الثبوت عقلاً لموضوع كل فعل متعد، لأن الفعل لا يدري تعيينه. وبهذا يعلم أنه ليس كل ما هو لازم من موضوع الكلام مقدرًا فيه، كقوله تعالى: ﴿فَإِنْ لَمْ تَفْعَلُوا وَلَنْ تَفْعَلُوا﴾ [البقرة: ٢٤].

(ص. ٧٣٣. س. ١) وقوله: ﴿كُلُوا وَاشْرَبُوا﴾ [البقرة: ٦٠] لأنه لم يرد الأكل من معيّن، وإنما أراد وقوع هذين الفعلين.

(ص. ٧٣٥. س. ٣) حذف الحال

كقوله تعالى: ﴿وَالْمَلَائِكَةُ يَدْخُلُونَ عَلَيْهِمْ مِنْ كُلِّ بَابٍ﴾ ﴿سَلَامٌ عَلَيْهِمْ﴾ [الرعد: ٢٣-٢٤] أي قائلين سلام عليكم.

قال ابن أبي الربيع: اعلم أن العرب قد تحذف الحال إذا كانت بالفعل، لدلالة مصدر الفعل عليه، فتقول: ﴿تَزْرَعُونَ سَبْعَ سِنِينَ دَأْبًا﴾ [يوسف: ٤٧] فدأبًا يقدر بالفعل، تقديره "تدأبون" في موضع الحال.

قال أبو علي: لا خلاف بين سيبويه وأبي العباس في الحال المحذوف، الذي المصدر منصوب به، وإنما الخلاف بينهما في القياس، فسيبويه يذهب الي السماع ولا يقيس، والآخرش والمبرد يقيسان.

(ص. ٧٤٨. س. ١) حذف الفعل

وينقسم إلى عام وخاص
الخاص:

فالخاص نحو: أعنى مضمراً وينتصب المفعول به في المدح نحو: ﴿وَالصَّابِرِينَ فِي الْبَأْسَاءِ وَالضَّرَّاءِ﴾، وقوله: ﴿وَالْمُقِيمِينَ الصَّلَاةَ وَالْمُؤْتُونَ الزَّكَاةَ﴾ أي أمدح.

واعلم أنه إذا كان المنعوت متعياً

it is not permissible to reconstruct the phrase *ḥamīd* 'I mean' as the accusative assigner of its modifier as in *al-Hamdu li-l-lāhī al-Hamīd*; rather only what is constructed in it and in other similar cases the phrases *ḥamīd* 'I say' or *ḥamdaHu* 'I praise'. And in instances of *al-ḥam* 'disparagement' as in:

Q 111:4 *wa mraḥatuhu Hammālata l-Hat'ab* "And his wife the bearer of wood", when it is read in the accusative case⁴⁰. Al-Akhfash makes instances of praise accusative by using the phrase *ḥamdaHu* 'I praise' and in instances of *ḥam*, he uses *ḥamīmu* 'I disparage'.

And know that the intention of the praiser is to differentiate the praised from others, and this necessitates differentiating its declinability from others so that the wording can indicate the intended meaning. It is permissible for it to be accusative through the reconstruction of *ḥamdaHu*, and to be nominative by means of *huwa* 'he is'. They do not appear on the surface structure so as not to assume the status of comment. In instances where no praise is present, then the abbreviation *ḥamīzāl* of the operator *al-ḥamīl* is obligatory. For example, the abbreviation in *wa llāhi la-ḥafsalanna* 'By Allah, I shall indeed do'. If one were to say *ḥamīfu bi-l-lāhi* 'I swear by Allah', this would be an example of *ḥaddah* 'preparatory statement' not *qasam* 'an oath'.

The General

The general type is every accusative term indicated by the verb whether through linguistic form, or through meaning, or through reconstruction. **It is ellipited for several reasons:**

First: when the verb is an interpretive verb as in Q 84:1 *ḥadā l-samānu ḥinfaqqat* 'When the heaven is split asunder';

Q2:40 *wa ḥayāya fārhabūni* 'And fear me'.

Other examples include: Q 54:244 *ḥa-baḥasan minnā wāḥidan nattabiḥuh* 'Is it one mortal man among us that we are to follow?'; Q 55:7 *wa l-samāna rafaḥahā* "And the sky He has raised"; Q 81:1 *ḥadā l-samsu kūwwirat* 'When the sun is overthrown'; Q 9:6 *wa ḥin ḥaḥadun mina l-mufrikīna stagāraka* 'And if anyone of the polytheists seeks your protection';

لم يجز تقديره ناصب نعته بأعني نحو الحمد لله الحميد بل المقدر فيه وفي نحوه أذكر أو أمدح فأعرف ذلك، والذم نحو قوله تعالى:

﴿وَأَمْرَأْتُهُ حَمَّالَةَ الْحَطَبِ﴾ في قراءة النصب والأخفش ينصب في المدح بأمدح وفي الذم بأذم.

وأعلم أن مراد المادح إبانة الممدوح من غيره فلا بدّ من إبانة إعرابه عن غيره ليبدل اللفظ على المعنى المقصود ويجوز فيه النصب بتقدير أمدح والرفع على معنى "هو" ولا يظهران لئلا يصيرا بمنزلة الخبر. والذي لا مدح فيه فاخترال العامل فيه واجب كاختراله في والله لأفعلن إذ لو قيل: "أحلف بالله" لكان عُدّة لا قسماً.

العام:

والعام كلّ منصوب دلّ عليه الفعل لفظاً أو معنى أو تقديراً ويحذف لأسباب:

أحدها: أن يكون مفسراً، كقوله تعالى:

﴿إِذَا السَّمَاءُ انشَقَّتْ﴾ [الانشقاق: ١]

﴿وَأَيَّايَ فَارْهَبُونَ﴾ [البقرة: ٤٠]

ومنه: ﴿أَبَشْرًا مِّنَّا وَاحِدًا نَّتَّبِعُهُ﴾ [القمر: ٢٤]

﴿وَالسَّمَاءَ رَفَعَهَا﴾ [الرحمن: ٧]

﴿إِذَا الشَّمْسُ كُوِّرَتْ﴾ [التكوير: ١]

﴿وَإِن أَحَدًا مِّنَ الْمُشْرِكِينَ اسْتَجَارَكَ﴾ [التوبة: ٦]

⁴⁰According to the reading of 'Āṣim [*wa amraḥatuhu Hammālata l-Hat'abi*] in the accusative case. The rest of Quran reciters read in the nominative case [*Hammālatu l-Hat'abi*].

Q 49:9 *wa lān t'ā'āfatāni* 'And if two parties'. Here it [t'ā'āfatāni] is assigned the nominative case by the reconstruction of [the verb] *āqtatal*.

(P. 749. L.1) They have said: and it is not permissible to delete the verb with any operative particles of condition except *lān* because it is the basic one. Ibn Al-Zamlakānī has made this part of the ongoing dispute between ellipsis and mentioning. Indeed the interpretive verb is in effect like a dominant upon the mentioned item but it cannot be designated except after the occurrence of an ambiguity'. The presence of suppression might further increase this ambiguity, if the suppressed item is not of the same class as the mentioned item', as:

Q 76:31 *wa l-ḏ'ālimīna ḥaḥadda lahum ḥaḏābān ḥalīmān* 'And the oppressors he has prepared for them painful torment.' The mentioned item here is in effect like textual evidence of the reconstructed expression and is hence relegated to the class of orthography, and the reconstruction is: *yuḥaḏḏibu l-ḏ'ālimīna liḥannahu ḥaḥadda lahum ḥaḏābān ḥalīmān* 'He torments the oppressors because he has prepared for them a painful torment.

The Second [Reason]: when there is a preposition as in *bismi llāhi l-raḥmāni l-raḥīm* 'In the name of God the all-merciful the all-compassionate'. This indicates that the intention is 'In the name of God, I read or stand or sit or whatever the verb may be.

And know that the grammarians have agreed that *bismi llāhi* is part of a sentence. But they also disagreed. The Basrans say that it is a nominal sentence; that is, *ḥbtidāḡḡ bismi llāhi* 'my beginning is with the name of God'. The Kufans, on the other hand, say it is a verbal sentence. Al-Zamakhsharī followed them in reconstructing the sentence as a verbal sentence, but he disagreed with them on two issues. First, they reconstruct the verb beforehand whereas he reconstructs it afterwards. The second is that they reconstruct it as a verb of *al-bidāyah* 'commencement', whereas he reconstructs it according to context. So if the one who is about to slaughter an animal says *bismi llāhi* then the reconstruction is 'In the name of God I slaughter', and if a reader then the reconstruction is 'In the name of God, I read'. And what he [Al-Zamakhsharī] has said is better, because adhering to the occasion is *ḥawla* 'given priority' over neglecting it, and because the name of God is more important than the verb and so the priority is to

﴿وَإِنْ طَائِفَتَانِ مِنَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ﴾ [الحجرات: ٩] فإنه ارتفع بـ "اقتتل" مقدراً.

(ص. ٧٤٩. س. ١) قالوا: ولا يجوز حذف الفعل مع شيء من حروف الشرط العاملة سوى "إن" لأنها الأصل. وجعل ابن الزمكاني هذا مما هو دائر بين الحذف والذكر فإن الفعل المفسر كالمستلطف على المذكور ولكن لا يتعين إلا بعد تقدم إبهام ولقد يزيده الإضمار إبهاماً إذا لم يكن المضمرة من جنس الملفوظ به نحو:

﴿وَالظَّالِمِينَ أَعَدَّ لَهُمْ عَذَابًا أَلِيمًا﴾ [الانسان: ٣١]. [إذ المذكور في حكم الشاهد للمقدر فيلحق بباب الكتابة والتقدير يعذب الظالمين لأنه أعد لهم عذاباً أليماً]

الثاني: أن يكون هناك حرف جر نحو: ﴿بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ﴾ فإنه يفيد أن المراد: بسم الله أقرأ أو أقوم أو أقعد عند القراءة، وعند الشروع في القيام أو القعود أي فعل كان.

واعلم أن النحاة اتفقوا على أن "بسم الله" بعض جملة واختلفوا. فقال البصريون: الجملة اسمية أي ابتدائي باسم الله. وقال الكوفيون: الجملة فعلية. وتابعهم الزمخشري في تقدير الجملة فعلية ولكن خالفهم في موضعين: أحدهما: أنهم يقدرون الفعل مقدماً وهو يقدره مؤخراً. والثاني: أنهم يقدرونه فعل البداية وهو يقدره في كل موضع بحسبه، فإذا قال الذابح: بسم الله كان التقدير: بسم الله أذبح وإذا قال القارئ: بسم الله فالتقدير: بسم الله أقرأ. وما قال أجود مما قالوا لأن مراعاة المناسبة أولى من إهمالها ولأن اسم الله أهم من الفعل فكان أولى

front it. Proof of this can be seen in [the Ḥadīth] *bismika rabbī wadʿa ʿālu ganbī*⁴¹ 'In the name of God, I lay down my side', where the name of God is prepositioned, and then the preposition, before the related verb which is *wadʿa ʿālu*.

The Third [Reason]: when it is a *gawāb* 'answer/apodosis' to a stated question. For example Q 31:25: *wa laʿīn saʿaltahum man ʿalāqa l-samāwāt wa l-ʿarḍa layaqūlunna llāhu* 'If you ask them who created the Heavens and the Earth, they will say God'.

Also Q 2:135: *kūnū hūdān ʿaw nas ʿārā tahtadū qul bal millata ʿabrāhīma* 'Be Jews or Christians and you will be guided; say nay, the creed of Abraham'. That is, *bal natabi ʿālu millata* 'nay we follow the creed'.

Or when it is an answer to a reconstructed question. For example in Q 24:36-37 *yusabbi ʿālu lahu fīhā bil-ʿūdūwwi wa l-ʿāsʿāli* {37} *rigālun* 'He is glorified in them in the morning and evening {37} men', when it is read as a passive verb⁴². The *taqdir* is hence *yusabbi ʿālu [fīhā] rigālun* 'Men glorify Him [in them]'.

(P. 750. L. 1) There are benefits to this; among them is the repetition of the verb twice and transforming *al-fadʿah* 'a superfluous item' into *ʿumdah* 'an essential structural constituent'. And among them [benefits], the agent is only interpreted after some despair at finding it, as if one finds a lost one after much despair. It is also possible for the verb to be *yusabbi ʿālu* instead of *yuʿkar*, and for *lahu fīhā* 'to Him in them' to be the comment of the topic which is *rigālun*.

(P. 751. L. 13) The Fourth Reason: If it is indicated by the overt or obvious meaning of the verb. As in, for example Q 4:171 *ʿintahu ʿayran lakum* 'Finish. This is better for you'. That is to say *ʿiṭtū ʿamran ʿayran lakum*. 'Come to a decision/conclusion which is better for you'. According to Sibawayhi the word *ʿayran* is made accusative by suppression of *ʿiṭt* because when he is prohibited it is known that he is being commanded to do something good. It is as if He said: *wa ʿiṭtū ʿayran* 'Come to something good'.⁴³

بالتقديم ومما يدل على ذلك قوله صلى الله عليه وسلم: "باسمك ربي وضعت جنبي"، فقدم اسم الله على الفعل المتعلق ثم الجار وهو "وضعت".

الثالث: أن يكون جواباً لسؤال وقع، كقوله تعالى: ﴿وَلَئِن سَأَلْتَهُمْ مَنْ خَلَقَ السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضَ لَيَقُولُنَّ اللَّهُ﴾ [لقمان: ٢٥]

وقوله: ﴿كُونُوا هُودًا أَوْ نَصَارَى تَهْتَدُوا قُلْ بَلْ مِلَّةَ إِبْرَاهِيمَ﴾ [البقرة: ١٣٥] أي بل نتبع.

أو جواباً لسؤال مقدر كقراءة: ﴿يُسَبِّحُ لَهُ فِيهَا بِالْغُدُوِّ وَالْآصَالِ﴾ [رجال] [النور: ٣٦] ببناء الفعل للمفعول فإن التقدير: يسبحه [فيها] رجال.

(ص. ٧٥٠. س. ١) وفيه فوائد: منها: الإخبار بالفعل مرتين. ومنها جعل الفضلة عمدة. ومنها: أن الفاعل فسر بعد اليأس منه كضالة وجددها بعد اليأس، ويصح أن يكون "يُسَبِّحُ" بدل من "يُذَكَّرُ" على طريقة: ﴿سَبِّحْ اسْمَ رَبِّكَ الْأَعْلَى﴾ و"له فيها" خبر مبتدأ هو "رجال".

(ص. ٧٥١. س. ١١) الرابع: أن يدل عليه معنى الفعل الظاهر، كقوله تعالى: ﴿انْتَهُوا خَيْرًا لَكُمْ﴾ [النساء: ١٧١]، أي وائتوا أمراً خيراً لكم؛ فعند سيبويه أن "خيراً" انتصب بإضمار "انت" لأنه لما نهاه علم أنه يأمره بما هو خير؛ فكأنه قال: "وائتوا خيراً"؛

⁴¹In Al-Bukhāri, Ḥadīth number 7393; Muslim, Ḥadīth number 2714.

⁴²Al-Zamakhsharī in *Al-Mufaṣṣal fi Ṣanʿati l-l ʿrāb* [258-259] defines the passive verb 'built upon the object' as a verb whose subject is dispensed with and substituted by the object which takes its place and is hence attributed to it but in an altered morphological form from *fa ʿāla* to *fu ʿāla*.

⁴³Sibawayhi, *Al-Kitāb*, 1:282.

This is because forbidding something is commanding its opposite, and since forbiddance is a commandment and commanding non-existence is impossible because it is not feasible, it is therefore proven that the commandment is associated with an existential matter that negates what he is being prohibited from, which is contrariness.

According to Al-Kisā'ī it is an instance of suppression of *kāna* 'verb to be'. That is to say: *yakun al-ʔintihāʔ ʔayran lakum* 'Finishing would be better for you'. However, he is prevented from suppressing *kāna* since it is not usually suppressed in all locations, and also in terms of meaning since whoever renounces/forsakes what he is prohibited from is absolved of guilt. It is also known that renouncing something prohibited is better than committing it. Hence there is no benefit in his (Al-Kisā'ī's) statement: *ʔayran*. According to Al-Farrā' it is a modifier of a deleted *masʕdar* 'gerund/verbal noun'. That is to say: *ʔantahū ʔintihāʔan ʔayran lakum* 'Finish a (complete) finishing which is better for you'. He also added that this *Haḍf* does not occur except in cases of *ʔaffal* 'preference'. For example: *ʔayr laka* 'good for you' and *ʔaffal* 'more preferable/better'.⁴⁴

(P. 752. L. 2) Another example is Q 10:71 *fa-ʔagmiʔū ʔamrakum wa furakāʔakum* 'So decide your action and your partners' if it is not made a coordinated object. That is to say, *wa dʔū furakāʔakum* 'And summon your partners'. It is read with an overt *ʔudʔū* 'summon^{2nd person plural}' by 'Ubbay, and it is also documented as such in the *MusʔHaf* of Ibn Masʕūd.

Another example is Q37:93 *farā ʔa ʔalayhim dʔarbān bi l-yamīn* 'Then he attacked them, striking with his right hand'. According to Ibn Al-Shajariyy it means: *māla ʔalayhim yad ʔribuhum dʔarbān* 'He bent upon them striking them a striking.' It is also possible to make it accusative as a circumstantial clause like for example: *ʔataytuhu mafyan* 'I came to him walking'. That is, to say *māʔiyān*. And also Q2:260 *oemma dʔuhunna yaʔtīnaka saʔyān* 'and call to them, they will come to you speeding'. That is to say, *sāʔyāt*. His saying *bi l-yamīn* could mean either 'hand' or 'force'.

(P. 752. L. 11) The Fifth [Reason]: when the ellipted verb is indicated by reason. For example: Q 2:60 *fa-qulnā dʔrib bi ʔasʔaka l-Hagara fa-nfagarat* 'And we said: strike with your rod the rock and it burst forth'. That is to say, so he stuck and it burst forth.

لأن النهي عن الشيء أمر بضده ؛ ولأن النهي تكليف، وتكليف العدم محال ؛ لأنه ليس مقدوراً، فثبت أن متعلق التكليف أمر وجودي، يناقي المنهى عنه وهو الضد.

وحمله الكسائي على إضمار "كان" أي يكن الانتهاء خيراً لكم، ويمنعه إضمار كان، ولا تضمير في كل موضع، ومن جهة المعنى إذ من ترك ما نهى عنه فقد سقط عنه اللوم وعلم أن ترك المنهي عنه خير من فعله، فلا فائدة في قوله "خيراً". وحمله الفراء على أنه صفة لمصدر محذوف، أي انتهوا انتهاء خيراً لكم. وقال: إن هذا الحذف لم يأت إلا فيما كان أفعال، نحو: خير لك، وأفعل.

(ص. ٧٥٢. س. ٢) وقوله: ﴿فَأَجْمِعُوا أَمْرَكُمْ وَشُرَكَاءَكُمْ﴾ [يونس : ٧١] إن لم يجعل مفعولاً معه، أي وادعوا شركاءكم، وبإظهار "ادعوا" قرأ أبي، وكذلك هو مثبت في مصحف ابن مسعود.

وقوله تعالى: ﴿فَرَاغَ عَلَيْهِمْ ضَرْبًا بِالْيَمِينِ﴾ [الصافات: ٩٣]، قال ابن الشجري: معناه مال عليهم بضربهم ضرباً. ويجوز نصبه على الحال، نحو: أتيته مشيأ، أي ماشياً. ﴿ثُمَّ ادْعُهُنَّ يَأْتِينَكَ سَعْيًا﴾ [البقرة : ٢٦٠] أي ساعيات. وقوله: "باليمين" إما اليد أو القوة.

(ص. ٧٥٢. س. ١١) الخامس: أن يدل عليه العقل كقوله تعالى: ﴿فَقُلْنَا اضْرِبْ بِعَصَاكَ الْحَجَرَ فَانْفَجَرَتْ﴾ [البقرة: ٦٠] أي فضرب فانفجرت.

⁴⁴Al-Farrā', *Maʔānī Al-Qurʔān*, 1:295.

For example Q 54:10-11 *fadaṣā rabbahu ṣannī ma ḡlūbun fa-ntasʿir* {11} *fa-fataḥnā ṣabwāba l-samāʾi* 'And he prayed to his lord: I am defeated so aid me with victory. Then we opened the gates of Heaven'. According to al-Naḥḥās the reconstruction is *fa-nasʿarnāhu fa-fataḥnā abwāba l-samāʾi* 'so we helped him and we opened the doors of Heaven', because the context points to what is ellipted.

(L. 17) Similarly in Q 2:242 *faqāla lahumu llāhu mūtū ʾumma ṣaḥyāhum* 'And God said to them: Die, and then He brought them back to life'. His statement: *ʾumma ṣaḥyāhum* 'then he brought them back to life' is coordinated to an ellipted verb whose reconstruction is: 'and they died and then he brought them back to life'. It is erroneous to coordinate *ʾumma ṣaḥyāhum* 'then he brought them back to life' to *mūtū* 'Die' because the latter is an imperative verb and imperatives cannot be coordinated to past tense verbs.

Another example is Q 2:213 *kāna l-nāsu ḡmmatan wāḥidatan fabaṣaṯa llāhu l-nabiyyīna* 'People were once one nation and then God sent the prophets'. That is to say, *fa-ḡtalafū fa-baṣaṯa* 'they disagreed and so He sent'. The deletion is evidenced by [the succeeding line] *liyaḥkuma bayna l-nāsi fīmā ḡtalafū fīhi* 'to judge between people in what they disagreed'.

(P. 753. L. 10) The Sixth [Reason]: when the ellipsis is indicated by its presence in another location. For example in Q 2:72 *wa ṣad qataltum naḥsān* 'And when you slew a man'. Al-Wāḥidī states: here there is suppression of *ṣadkur* 'I mention' and for this reason the particle *ṣad* was not given a response. A similar example is Q 11:61 *wa ṣalā ʾamūda ṣaḥāhum ṣāliḥan* 'And to Thamud their brother ṣāliḥ'. There is no previous item here that would make *ṣāliḥ* in the accusative case. However, it is understood from the mention of the prophet and those he was sent to that there is suppression of *ṣarsalnā* 'we sent'.

(P. 754. L. 19) Important Note

It is possible for there to be ambiguity concerning the existence of ellipsis or its absence because we are unable to discern the meaning of the verb such as is said concerning Q 17:110 *quli dḥū llāha ṣawi dḥū l-raḥmāna ṣayyā mā tadḥū falahu l-ṣamāʾu l-ḥusnā* 'Say: call upon Allah or call upon the All-merciful, by whatever name you call, to Him belong the most beautiful names'. One may think that calling *al-duḥāʾ* is used in the sense of

وقوله: ﴿فَدَعَا رَبَّهُ أَنِّي مَغْلُوبٌ فَانْتَصِرُ﴾ ﴿فَفَتَحْنَا﴾ [القمر: ١٠ - ١١] قال النحاس: التقدير فنصرناه ففتحننا أبواب السماء لأن ما ظهر من الكلام يدل على ما حذف.

(س. ١٧) وقوله: ﴿فَقَالَ لَهُمُ اللَّهُ مُوتُوا ثُمَّ أَحْيَاهُمْ﴾ [البقرة: ٢٤٣]. فقوله: "ثم أحياهم" معطوف على فعل محذوف تقديره فماتوا ثم أحياهم ولا يصح عطف قوله: "ثم أحياهم" على قوله: "موتوا" لأنه أمر وفعل الأمر لا يعطف على الماضي.

وقوله: ﴿كَانَ النَّاسُ أُمَّةً وَاحِدَةً فَبَعَثَ اللَّهُ النَّبِيِّينَ﴾ [البقرة: ٢١٣] أي: فاختلّفوا فبعث وحذف لدلالة قوله: ﴿لِيَحْكُمَ بَيْنَ النَّاسِ فِيمَا اخْتَلَفُوا فِيهِ﴾ [البقرة: ٢١٣] وهي في قراءة عبد الله كذلك.

(ص. ٧٥٣. س. ١٠) السادس: أن يدلّ عليه ذكره في موضع آخر، كقوله: ﴿وَإِذِ قَتَلْتُمْ نَفْسًا﴾ [البقرة: ٧٢]، قال الواحدي: هو بإضمار "أذكر" ولهذا لم يأت لإذ بجواب. ومثله قوله تعالى: ﴿وَأِلَىٰ ثَمُودَ أَخَاهُمْ صَالِحًا﴾ [الأعراف: ٧٣] وليس شيء قبله تراه ناصباً لـ "صالحاً"، بل عُلم بذكر النبي والمرسل إليه أن فيه إضمار "أرسلنا".

(ص. ٧٥٤. س. ١٩) تنبيه:

قد يشتبه الحال في أمر المحذوف وعدمه لعدم تحصيل معنى الفعل كما قالوا في قوله تعالى: ﴿قُلِ ادْعُوا اللَّهَ أَوْ ادْعُوا الرَّحْمَنَ أَيًّا مَا تَدْعُوا فَلَهُ الْأَسْمَاءُ الْحُسْنَى﴾ [الإسراء: ١١٠] فإنه قد يظن أن الدعاء فيه بمعنى

al-nidāʾ? so no ellipsis is reconstructed. But the case is not so or else this would necessitate association if both [these terms] were dissimilar [in meaning] or if one item was coordinated to itself. In essence, calling here is used in the sense of *al-tasmiyyah* 'naming' which is transitive and takes two direct objects. That is to say, 'name Him Allah or al-Rahmān'. Ambiguity could also occur in the designation of the ellipped because of the presence of two parallel contexts. For example Q 75:4 *balā qādirīna ḥalā lan nusawwiya banānah* 'Yes we are able to restore his very fingers'. Sībawayhi⁴⁵ reconstructed it as (P. 755. L. 1) *balā nagmaḥūhā qādirīn* 'Indeed to assemble it we are able'. The phrase *qādirīna* is a circumstantial clause and the verb is ellipped because it is signified by Q 75:3 *lan lan Najmaḥā* 'We shall not assemble'. In contrast, Al-Farrā'⁴⁶ has reconstructed it as *naḥsabū* 'We think' because it is signified by Q 75:3 *layaḥsabū l-ḥnsānu* 'Does man think', that is to say, *balā naḥsabūna qādirīn* 'Yes we think we are able'. Sībawayhi's construction is more valid because *balā* is not an answer/apodosis to *yaḥsab* but rather it is an answer to *lan lan nagmaḥ* 'that we shall not assemble'. It is also said that it is in the accusative case because it occurs in the position of the verb. But this is invalid because a noun cannot be construed as accusative simply because it occurs in the position of the verb.

Another Important Note

Ellipsis is of two kinds. First, when no word is established in place of the ellipped as stated in the above [note]. Second, when a word that signifies it is established in its place. For example in Q 11:57 *faḥn tawallaw faqad ḥablaḥtukum mā ḥursiltu bihi ḥlaykum* 'And if you turn away then I have informed you of that which I was sent with unto you'. It is not the act of informing that is the answer because it prepositions their statement. The reconstruction is: 'If you reject this then no blame befalls me, because I have informed you'. Another example is Q 35:4 *wa ḥn yukaḥḥibūka faqad kuḥḥibat rusulun min qablīka* 'And if they belie you, messengers were belied before you'. Therefore *fa-la taḥzan wa sḥbir* 'do not grieve and be patient'. Another example is Q 8:38 *wa ḥn yaḥūdū faqad madḥat sunnatu l-ḥawwālīna* 'And if they return, then the example of the former people has already passed'. That is to say, they will suffer the same fate as others before them have suffered.

النداء فلا يقدّر في الكلام حذف، وليس كذلك وإلا لزم الاشتراك إن كانا متفاوتين أو عطف الشيء على نفسه، وإنما الدعاء هنا بمعنى التسمية التي تتعدى لمفعولين أي سمّوه الله أو الرحمن. وقد يشتبّه في تعيين المحذوف لقيام قرينتين كقوله تعالى: ﴿بَلَى قَادِرِينَ﴾ قدره سيبويه (ص. ٧٥٥. س. ١) بـ "بلى" نجمعها قادرين، فقادرين حال وحذف الفعل لدلالة: ﴿أَلَنْ نَجْمَعَ عِظَامَهُ﴾ [القيامة: ٣] عليه، وقدره الفراء "تحسب" لدلالة ﴿أَيَحْسَبُ الْإِنْسَانُ﴾ أي بلى نحسبنا قادرين. وتقدير سيبويه أولى لأن "بلى" ليس جواباً لـ "يحسب" إنما هو جوابٌ لـ "أَلَنْ نَجْمَعَ" وقدره بعضهم: بلى نقدر قادرين. وقيل: منصوب لوقوعه موقع الفعل وهو باطل لأنه ليس من نواصب الاسم وقوعه موقع الفعل.

تنبيه آخر:

إن الحذف على ضربين: أحدهما: ألاّ يقام شيء مقام المحذوف كما سبق والثاني: أن يقام مقامه ما يدل عليه كقوله تعالى: ﴿فَإِنْ تَوَلَّوْا فَقَدْ أَبْلَغْتُكُمْ مَا أُرْسِلْتُ بِهِ إِلَيْكُمْ﴾ [هود: ٥٧] ليس الإبلاغ هو الجواب لتقدّمه على قولهم، فالتقدير: فإن تولّوا فلا ملام عليّ لأنّي قد أبلغتكم. وقوله: ﴿وَإِنْ يَكْذِبُوا فَقَدْ كَذَّبَتْ رُسُلٌ مِنْ قَبْلِكَ﴾ [فاطر: ٤] فلا تحزن واصبر.

وقوله: ﴿وَإِنْ يَعُودُوا فَقَدْ مَضَتْ سُنَّتُ الْأَوَّلِينَ﴾ [الأنفال: ٣٨] أي يصيبهم ما أصاب الأولين.

⁴⁵Sībawayhi, *Al-Kitāb*, 1:346.

⁴⁶Al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī Al-Qur'ān*, 3:208.

References

- Abū Ḥayyān, al-Gharnāṭī. *Tafsīr Al-Baḥr Al-Muḥīṭ*. Beirut: Dār Al-Fikr. N.D.
- Abū 'Ubayda, Ma'mar Ibn al-Muthannā. 1954. *Majāz Al-Qur'ān*. Fu'ād Sezgin (ed.). Cairo: Maktabat Al-Khānjī.
- Al-Akhfash, Abū al-Ḥassan Sa'īd Ibn Mas'adah al-Baṣrī. 1989. *Ma'ānī Al-Qur'ān* (2nd ed.). Fāyiz Fāris al-Ḥamad (ed.). Beirut: Dār al-Bashīr.
- Al-Akhfash, Abū al-Ḥassan Sa'īd Ibn Mas'adah al-Baṣrī. 1990. *Ma'ānī Al-Qur'ān* (Vols. 1-5). (2nd ed.). Huda Muhammad Qurā'ah. (ed.). Cairo: Maktabat al-Khānjī.
- Ali, S. S. 1994. "Misrepresentation of some ellipted structures in the translation of the Qur'an by A.Y. Ali. & M.M. Pickthall". *Hamdard Islamicus* 17. 27-33.
- Almagor, E. 1979. "The early meaning of Magāz and the nature of Abū 'Ubayda's exegesis". In Andrew Rippen (ed.) *The Qur'ān: Formative interpretation*, 263-326. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Al-'Askarī, Abū Hilāl al-Ḥasan. 1971. *Kitāb al-Ṣinā'atayn*. 'Ali Muḥammad Al-Bijawī and Muḥammad Abū al-Faḍl Ibrāhīm (eds.). Cairo: Dār Iḥyā' al-Kutub al-'Arabiyyah.
- Baalbaki, R. 1979. "Some aspects of harmony and hierarchy in Sībawayhi's grammatical analysis." *Zeitschrift für Arabische Linguistik* 2. 7-22.
- Bell, R. 1939. *The Qur'ān translated with a critical re-arrangement of the sūrahs*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Bell, R. 1991. *A commentary on the Qur'ān*. Manchester: University of Manchester.
- Boullata, I. J. 2000. *Literary structures of religious meaning in the Quran*. Surrey: Curzon Press.
- Carter, G. 1973. "An Arab grammarian of the eighth century". *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 93. 146-57.
- Carter, G. 1980. "Sībawayhi and modern linguistics". *Histoire Épistémologie Langage* 2:1.21-26.
- Carter, G. 1991. "Elision". In Kinga Dévényi & Tamas Iványi (eds.) *Proceedings of the Colloquium on Arabic Grammar: The Arabist: Budapest Studies in Arabic* 3-4, 121-33. Budapest.
- Gully, A. 1995. *Grammar and semantics in medieval Arabic*. Surrey: Curzon Press.
- Al-Fārisī, Abū 'Alī al-Ḥasan Ibn 'Abd al-Ghaffār. 1984. *Al-Ḥujjah fī 'Ilal Al-Qurrā' Al-Sab'*. Badr al-Dīn Qahwājī & Bashīr Ḥuwījānī (eds.). Damascus: Dār Al-Ma'mūn Lil Turāth.
- Al-Farrā', Yaḥyā Ibn Ziyād. 1983. *Ma'ānī Al-Qur'ān* (Vols. 1-3). Muḥammad 'Ali Al-Najjār and Aḥmad Yūsuf Najātī (eds.). Beirut: 'Ālam Al-Kutub.
- Ḥāzim, Abū al-Ḥasan al-Qarṭājānī. 1986. *Minḥāj Al-Bulaghā'*. Muḥammad Al-Ḥabīb Ibn Al-Khoujah. Beirut: Dār Al-Gharb Al-'Islāmiyyah.
- Ibn Al-'Athīr, Ḍiyā' Al-Dīn Naṣr Allah Ibn Muḥammad. 1960. *Al-Mathal Al-Sā'ir*. Aḥmad Al-Ḥūfī & Badawī Ṭabānah (eds.). Dār Nahḍat Miṣr li l-Ṭibā'ah.
- Ibn 'Aṭīyyah. 1413 H. *Al-Muḥarrir Al-Wagīz*. 'Abd Al-Salām Shāfi (ed.). Beirut: Dār Al-Kutub Al-'Islāmiyyah.
- Ibn Fāris. *Al-Sāhibī fī Fiqh Al-Lughah*. 1997. Aḥmad Ḥasan Basaj (ed.). Beirut: Dār Al-Kutub Al-'Ilmiyyah.
- Ibn Hishām, Jamāl al-Dīn al-Anṣārī. 1972. *Mughnī l-Labīb 'an Kutub al-A'arīb*. Māzin Al-Mubārak & Muḥammad Ḥamd-allah (eds.). Damascus: Dār Al-Fikr.
- Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī. 1969. *Tafsīr Al-Ṭabarī (Jāmi' Al-Bayān)* (Vols. 1-16). Maḥmūd Muḥammad Shākīr. (ed.). Cairo: Dār Al-Ma'ārif.
- Ibn Jinnī, Abū Al-Faḥḥ 'Uthmān. 1957. *Al-Khaṣā'is* (Vols. 1-3). Muḥammad Ali Al-Najjār (ed.). Beirut: Dār Al-Kutub Al-Maṣriyyah.

- Ibn Jinnī, Abū Al-Faṭḥ ‘Uthmān. 1994. *Al-Muḥtasab fī Tabyeen Wujūh Shawādh al-Qirā’āt*. ‘Ali Al-Najdī Nāṣif, ‘Abd Al-Ḥalīm Al-Najjār & ‘Abd al-Fattāḥ Shalabī (eds.). Cairo: Al-Majlis Al-‘A’lā li- l-Shu’ūn Al-‘Islāmiyyah.
- Ibn Jinnī, Abū Al-Faṭḥ ‘Uthmān. *Al-Masā’il Al-Khāṭiriyyāt*. NP, ND.
- Ibn Maḍā al-Qurtubī, Aḥmad Ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān. 1982. *Kitāb Al-Radd ‘alā Al-nuḥāt*. Shawqī Ḍayf (ed.). Cairo: Dār Al-Ma’rifah.
- Ibn Qutayba, ‘Abdallāh Ibn Muslim al-Dīnawārī. 1973. *Ta’wīl Mushkil al-Qur’ān*. Al-Sayyid Aḥmad Ṣaqr (ed.). Cairo: Dār Al-Turāth.
- Al-Jurjānī, ‘Abd Al-Qāhir. 2000. *Dalā’il Al-I’jāz fī ‘Ilm Al-Ma’ānī*. Yāsīn Al-Ayyūbī (ed.). Beirut: Al-Maktabah Al-‘Aṣriyyah. pp. 177-235.
- Johns, A. H. 1995. "Ellipsis in the Qur’ān: a response to Salah Salim Ali". *Hamdard Islamicus* 18, 15-23.
- Al-Juwayni, Abū Al-Ma’ālī ‘Abdallāh Ibn Yusuf (known as Imām Al-Ḥaramayn). 2007. *Talkhīṣ al-Taqrīb*. ‘Abdullāh Al-Nībālī & Shubeir Al-‘Omarī (eds.). Beirut: Dār Al-Bashā’ir Al-‘Islāmiyyah.
- Kinberg, N. 1996. *A lexicon of Al-Farrā’s terminology in his Qur’ān commentary*, Leiden: Brill.
- Larcher, P. 1980. "Éléments pragmatiques dans la théorie grammaticale arabe post-classique". In M. Carter & K. Versteegh (eds.) *Studies in the History of Arabic Grammar II*, 195-214. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Larcher, P. 1992. "La particule *lakinna* vue par un grammairien arabe". *Historiographia Linguistica* 19. 1-24.
- Mackay, F. 1991. "Ibn Qutayba's understanding of Quranic brevity." MA Thesis. McGill University.
- Al-Naḥḥās, Abū Ja’far. 1988. *I’rāb Al-Qur’ān*. Zuhayr Ghāzī Zāhid (ed.). Beirut: ‘Ālam Al-Kutub.
- Owens, J. 1988. *The foundations of grammar: An introduction to medieval Arabic grammatical theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Al-Qazwīnī, Muḥammad Ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān. 1938. *Talkhīṣ Al-Miftāḥ fī l-Ma’ānī wa- l-Bayān wa- l-Badī’*. Cairo: Muṣṭafā Al-Bābī Al-Ḥalabī.
- Al-Rāghib, al-Aṣḥāhānī. *Al-Mufradāt*. Muḥammad Sayyid Kaylānī (ed.). Beirut: Dār Al-Ma’rifah, N.D.
- Rahman, Y. 2000. "Ellipsis in the Quran: A study of Ibn Qutayba's *Ta’wīl Mushkil Al-Qur’ān*". In Issa J. Boullata (ed.) *Literary structures of religious meaning in the Quran*, 277-291. Surrey: Curzon Press.
- Sībawayhi, ‘Amr Ibn ‘Uthmān. 1988. *Kitāb Sībawayhi* (Vols. 1-5). (3rd ed.). ‘Abd Al-Salām Harūn (ed.). Cairo: Maktabat Al-Khānjī.
- Suleiman, Y. 1999. *The Arabic grammatical tradition*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press
- Al-Sulamī, ‘Izz Al-Dīn ‘Abd Al-‘Azīz Ibn ‘Abd al-Salām. 1992. *Magāz Al-Qur’ān*. M. Muṣṭafā Al-Ḥājj (ed.). Tripoli: Manshūrāt Kulliyat Al-Da’wa Al-‘Islāmiyya.
- Al-Suyūfī, Jalāl al-Dīn. 2003. *Al-Itqān fī ‘Ulūm al-Qur’ān*. Fawwāz Zamarlī (ed.). Beirut: Dār Al-Kitāb Al-‘Arabī.
- Al-Suyūfī, Jalāl al-Dīn. 1979. *Bughyat al-wu’āt fī tabaqāt al-lughawiyin*. (2nd ed.). Muḥammad Abū al-Fadhl Ibrāhīm (ed.). Cairo: Dār Al-Fikr.
- Versteegh, K. 1995. "Western studies on the history of Arabic grammar 1969-1994". In *Proceedings of the colloquium on Arabic linguistics*, Part One, Bucharest, 29 August to 2 September 1994, 9-27. Bucharest: University of Bucharest.

- Versteegh, K. 1993. *Arabic grammar and Qur'ānic exegesis in early Islam*. Leiden and New York: Brill.
- Wansborough, J. 1970. "Majāz al-Qur'ān: Periphrastic exegesis". *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 33, 247-66.
- Wansborough, J. 1977. *Qur'ānic studies: Sources and methods of scriptural interpretation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wolfe, R. G. 1984. *Ibn Maḍā' Al-Qurṭubī and the 'Book in refutation of the grammarians.'* University of Indiana: Unpublished Ph.D dissertation.
- Al-Zajjājī, 'Abd al-Rahmān Ibn Ishāq. 1982. *Al-Īdāḥ fī 'Ilal Al-Naḥw*. M. Al-Mubārak (ed.). Beirut: Dār Al-Nafā'īs.
- Al-Zamakhsharī, Maḥmūd Ibn 'Umar. 1966. *Al-Kashshāf 'an Ḥaqā'iq Al-Tanzīl*. Aḥmad Muḥammad Al-Ḥūfī (ed.). Beirut: Dār Al-Fikr Al-'Arabī.
- Al-Zamakhsharī, Maḥmūd Ibn 'Umar. 1999. *Al-Mufaṣṣal fī ṣan'at al-I'rāb*. Amīl Ya'qūb (ed.). Beirut: Dār Al-Kutub Al-'Ilmiyyah.
- Al-Zanjānī, 'Izz al-Dīn Abū al-Ma'ālī 'Abd Al-Wahhāb. *Mi'yār al-Nūzzār fī 'Ulūm al-Ash'ār*. Handwritten copy existing in Dār Al-Kutub Al-Maṣriyyah numbered 136 'm' 'Adab.
- Al-Zarkashī, Badr al-Dīn. 2006. *Al-Burhān fī 'Ulūm Al-Qur'ān*. Abū Al-Faḍl Al-Dimyātī (ed.). Cairo: Dār Al-Ḥadīth.

Glossary

ʔadāt ʔartʕ	Conditional particle
ʔadawāt naḥwiyyah	Grammatical tools
ʔadillat al-Ḥaḍf	Proofs of ellipsis
ʔaḌar	Trace
ʔasbāb al-nuzūl	Occasions of revelation
ʔasālīb	Styles
ʔasʕl	Base/root
ʔasmaʔ al-ʔartʕ	Conditional nouns
ʔabhām	Ambiguity
ʔadʕāʔah	Construct noun
ʔadʕmār	Suppression
ʔagāz	Concision/brevity
ʔgṭihād	Endeavor
ʔktifāʔ	Sufficiency
ʔḥḍām	Exaltation
ʔḥrāb	Parsing/declinability
ʔḥrāʔ	Inducement
ʔḥiqāq	Derivation
ʔḥiqār	Debasement
ʔiqṭisʕar	Restriction
ʔqṭiʕʕāʔ	Cutting out/severance
ʔrtibātʕ	Relatedness
ʔrtibātʕ ʔatʕfi	Relatedness by coordination

<i>ʔism</i>	Noun
<i>ʔisqātʕ</i>	Omission
<i>ʔisti ʕārah</i>	Metaphor
<i>ʔistinbātʕ</i>	Inference
<i>ʔstiiʕālat al-mawsʕūl fi al-sʕilla</i>	lengthening of the bond of conjunction
<i>ʔXtisʕār</i>	Concision/abbreviation
<i>ʔxtizāl</i>	Reduction
<i>balāḡah</i>	Rhetoric
<i>bināʔ alfi ʔ li l-mafʕūl</i>	Passive/verb built upon the object
<i>dalālah</i>	Signification
<i>dalīl</i>	Proof/evidence
<i>fā ʕil</i>	Agent
<i>fāʔ al-gawāb</i>	<i>fā</i> of request
<i>fadʕlah</i>	Expansion/supplement
<i>fāsʕilah</i>	<i>ʔāyah</i> ending
<i>fi ʔ al-Hāl</i>	Circumstantial verb
<i>fi ʔ mudʕariʕ</i>	Imperfect verb
<i>fi ʔ mufassir</i>	Interpretive verb
<i>fi ʔ muta ʕaddī</i>	Transitive verb
<i>fi ʔ qās ʕir</i>	Incomplete verb
<i>furūʕ</i>	Subsidiaries
<i>gārr</i>	Preposition
<i>gawāb</i>	Apodosis
<i>gawāb al-fartʕ</i>	Answer/apodosis to conditional clause
<i>gumlah</i>	Sentence
<i>gumlah ʔsmiyyah</i>	Nominal sentence
<i>gumlah fi ʔiyyah</i>	Verbal sentence
<i>Hāl</i>	Circumstantial clause
<i>haml</i>	Inducement
<i>haml ʕalā l-ma ʕna</i>	Carrying over of meaning
<i>Haḍf</i>	Ellipsis
<i>Haḍf al-muqābilī</i>	Symmetrical ellipsis
<i>Haqīqah</i>	Literal meaning
<i>Harakah</i>	Vocalization/vowel
<i>Harf</i>	letter
<i>Harf garr</i>	Preposition
<i>Harf ʕatʕf</i>	Coordinator
<i>hurūf al-fartʕ al-ʔāmilah</i>	Operative particles of condition
<i>Hukm</i>	Grammatical rule
<i>lā al-nāfiyah</i>	<i>lā</i> of negation
<i>lā al-tʕalab</i>	<i>lā</i> of request
<i>labs</i>	Confusion/ambiguity
<i>lafḍʕ</i>	Linguistic form

<i>luḡah</i>	Language
<i>luzūmī</i>	Obligatory
<i>ṣabaθ</i>	Redundancy
<i>ṣādah farḥiyyah</i>	Common religious precept
<i>ṣādat al-nās</i>	Shared human knowledge
<i>ṣādam al-taḡyīri</i>	Non-change
<i>ṣāmil</i>	Operator
<i>al-ṣaql</i>	Reason/logic
<i>ṣatʿf</i>	Coordination
<i>ṣatʿf al-mufradah</i>	Coordination of a single element
<i>al-ṣāʾid</i>	Antecedent
<i>ṣillah</i>	Cause
<i>ṣillah mustanbatʿah</i>	Inferred cause
<i>ṣillah mansūṣah</i>	Textual cause
<i>ṣuddah</i>	Preparatory statment
<i>ṣumdah</i>	Indispensible structural constituent
<i>mā al-nāfiyah</i>	<i>mā</i> of negation
<i>mafʿūl</i>	Direct object
<i>mafʿūl Ṫānī</i>	Second object
<i>maḤḌūf</i>	Ellipted
<i>maḤḌūf mutʿlaq</i>	Absolute ellipsis
<i>maḥnā</i>	Meaning
<i>maḥnūt</i>	Described/modified
<i>maḥūf</i>	First coordinate phrase
<i>maḥūf ṣalayhi</i>	Coordinated upon/second item of a coordination
<i>madḤ</i>	Praise
<i>magāz</i>	Metaphoric Use
<i>magrūr</i>	Marked for the genitive case
<i>maḍkūr</i>	Mentioned/verbalized
<i>maḥawī</i>	Semantic
<i>mamnū ʿ min al-sʿarf</i>	Diptote/Prohibited from variation
<i>mansūb</i>	Marked for the accusative case
<i>masʿdar</i>	Gerund/verbal noun
<i>marfūʿ</i>	Marked for the nominative case
<i>mawsūf</i>	Modified/qualified noun
<i>mawsūl</i>	Conjoined
<i>mubtadaʿ</i>	Topic/first element of the nominal sentence
<i>muṪabbat</i>	Affirmative/assertive
<i>mudʿāf</i>	First Construct noun/First element of annexation
<i>mudʿāf ḥlayh</i>	Second construct noun
<i>mudʿmar</i>	Suppressed
<i>mufrādāt</i>	Single constituents

<i>mulāt^ṣafah</i>	Agreeableness
<i>munādā</i>	Called upon
<i>murād</i>	Intended meaning
<i>murakkab</i>	Compound construction
<i>muta Ṣalliq</i>	Syntactico-semantically connected
<i>muqaddar</i>	Restored item
<i>na ʔ</i>	Description/modification
<i>naqd^ṣ al-ḡarad^ṣ</i>	Reversal/violation of intended meaning
<i>nās^ṣib</i>	Assigner of Accusative case
<i>nidāʔ</i>	Vocative
<i>qalb</i>	Inversion
<i>qarīnah</i>	context
<i>qat ʔ</i>	Severance
<i>qawāfi</i>	Verse endings in poetry
<i>qiyās</i>	Analogy
<i>sama ʔ</i>	Attestation by speech
<i>s^ṣifah</i>	Adjective
<i>s^ṣilah</i>	linkage
<i>s^ṣiyāq</i>	Context
<i>s^ṣināṣah na ḥwiyyah</i>	Grammatical construction
<i>al-fart^ṣ</i>	Conditional clause
<i>ṣahādat al-ḥāl</i>	Contextual implication
<i>ṣurūt^ṣ</i>	Conditions
<i>ṣurū ʔ</i>	Commencement
<i>tad^ṣ mīn</i>	Implication
<i>taḤḍīr</i>	Warning
<i>tahwīl</i>	Hyperbole/exaggeration
<i>talāzum</i>	Correlation
<i>tam Ḍīl</i>	Analogy/comparison
<i>taqdīm</i>	Fronting
<i>taqdīr</i>	Reconstruction
<i>ta Ṣḍ ṣim</i>	Exaltation
<i>ta ṣbīh</i>	Similie
<i>ta ṣyīn</i>	Designation
<i>ta ṣkīd/tawkīd</i>	Emphasis
<i>ta ṣxīr</i>	Postponement
<i>taḥrīf</i>	Distortion
<i>taḫfīf</i>	Lightness
<i>ḍ^ṣāhir</i>	Overt/verbal form
<i>wagīz bi-Ḥaḍf</i>	Concise by ellipsis
<i>wagīz bi-lafḍ^ṣ</i>	Concise by word
<i>waqf</i>	Pause
<i>Xabar</i>	Comment/second element of nominal sentence
<i>ziyādah</i>	Addition