Explicature Vs Implicature of Ellipsis in The Glorious Qur'an with Reference to English

Assist. Prof. Ali Salman Hummadi

Dept. of English, College of Arts, University of Anbar, Iraq

Email: alialanish1977@gmail.com

2016

Abstract

This study investigates the role of pragmatic enrichment processes in the recoverability of ellipted words and expressions in selected Qur'anic Verses. In specific, this study applies processes of pragmatic enrichment (saturation, disambiguation and free enrichment) as a procedure for developing the encoded linguistic meaning of the Verse into a decoded propositional form to derive the explicated content unarticulated as a result of ellipsis. It focuses on the issue that recovery of ellipted words and expressions accounts for explicature of the utterance while unarticulation (ellipsis) of these words and expressions accounts for implicature which represents the rhetorical purpose of ellipsis. In addition, it also examines if explicatures and implicatures of ellipsis are taken into consideration in translating the Qur'anic Verses into English as the knowledge of ellipsis and its purposes should be indispensable to the translator.

1. Ellipsis in English

Carberry (1989:75) states that it is common that human beings use incomplete utterances in communication. These incomplete utterances range from sentences that are semantically incomplete to sentences that are syntactically incomplete. Basically, this phenomenon is generally known as ellipsis. Carberry (ibid) adds that the interpretability of the incomplete utterances highly rely on the established context in which the ellipted elements appear. Arguably, he also reveals that these utterances are not easily understood in isolation. So, since it is natural that humans use incomplete utterances, Hendricks (2004:133) argues that ellipsis is "a highly pervasive phenomenon in natural languages". The occurrence of ellipsis in the natural language makes it as ambiguous as it is. Hendricks (ibid) agrees with Carberry (1989:75) as to consider context as the main factor in recovering the missing words and expressions of the utterance. He points out that if a certain linguistic item or element is left unpronounced, a hearer should depend on the remaining parts of the utterance and the

contextual information in which the utterance is present to have the process of the recoverability of the ellipted elements successful.

Specifically, the phenomenon of ellipsis is widely defined by linguists. Crystal (2008: 166) defines ellipsis as "a term used in grammatical analysis to refer to a sentence where, for reasons of economy, emphasis, or style, a part of the structure has been omitted, which is recoverable from a scrutiny of the context". Ellipsis is also defined in Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English as words that "are deliberately left out of a sentence, though the meaning can still be understood". According to Biber et al (1999:156), ellipsis is "the omission of elements which are precisely recoverable from the linguistic or situational context". De Beaugrande & Dressler (1981: 49) also define ellipsis as "repeating a structure and its content but omitting some of the surface expressions". In addition, Halliday and Hasan (1976: 142, 144) see ellipsis as "substitution by zero". They tackle ellipsis as something understood where 'understood' is used in the specific sense of going without saying. They define ellipsis as "something left unsaid", where 'unsaid' "implies but understood nevertheless". Halliday and Hasan (ibid) state that "an item is elliptical if its structure doesn't express all the features that have gone into its make up". They add that ellipsis occurs when something that is structurally necessary is left unsaid; there is a sense of incompleteness associated with it. It is useful to recognize that the essential characteristic of ellipsis is that something "which is present in the selection of underlying (systematic) options is omitted in the structure" (ibid).

Halliday and Matthiessen (2014: 635) state that ellipsis involves the presupposition of something via what is left out. Halliday & Hasan (1976:64) discussed that the interpretation of ellipsis depends on the presence of other elements where "the one presupposes the other, in the sense that it cannot be effectively decoded except by resource to it". Halliday and Matthiessen (2014: 635) add that ellipsis imposes a relationship which is not semantic only but it is a lexicogrammatical one, "a relation in the wording rather than directly in the meaning".

From the different definitions of ellipsis presented above, this study adopts Halliday and Hasan's (1976) definition as it coincides with the main aim of the study.

Thus, in the light of the research problem addressed, this study is oriented by the following aims:

1. Examining the role of the relevance theoretic notion in the recovery of ellipted words and expressions in The Qur'anic Verses.
2. Applying processes of pragmatic enrichment as a procedure for developing the logical form of The Qur'anic Verse into a decoded propositional form (explicature).

3. Investigating explicature and implicature of ellipsis existing in The Qur'anic Verses.
4. Investigating if the English version of the Verse translated accounts for the encoded logical form or the decoded propositional form of the Verse and if there is reference to the implicature of ellipsis taking place.

2. Ellipsis in Arabic and The Glorious Qur'an

Ellipsis, in Arabic, is one of the common and widely used phenomena. All forms of communication, written or spoken, that utilize this specific phenomenon are stamped with the features of economy, conciseness, compactness and aesthetics that are regarded to be the underlying causes or purposes of leaving out or discarding linguistic words and expressions. Thus, most of the writings in Arabic prefer brevity to prolixity. Ellipsis is widely defined and discussed by Arab rhetoricians and grammarians. For rhetoricians, ellipsis is defined by Ibin Hisham (Cited in Mahmood, 1990: 1)

"اسقاط جزء من الكلام، او كله لدليل، وهو خلاف الاصل"

where the above utterance is translated by Al-Hilfy (2014: 61) as "making mention of the word is the rule while leaving it out or dropping it is the exception" adding that "ellipsis must have a wise reason hiding eloquence behind it". Ellipsis is defined by Al-Jurjani (٢٠٠٤:١٢١) as

"باب دقيق المسلك، لطيف المأخذ، عجيب الامر، شبيه بالسحر، فانك ترى به ترك الذكر افصح من الذكر والصمت عن الافادة ازيد للافادة، وتجدك انطق ما تكون اذا لم تنطق، واتم بيانا اذا لم تبن"

This utterance above is also translated by Al-Hilfy (2014:61) stating that "ellipsis represents an adequate method, nice undertaking, wonderful affair closer to magic because through it one finds that leaving out (something) is of more eloquence than making mention of that thing".

Al-Jurjani (Cited in Mahmood, 1990: 1) also says

"ما من اسم او فعل تجده قد حذف، ثم اصيب به موقعه، وحذف في الحال التي ينبغي ان يحذف فيها، الا وانت تجد في حذفه هناك احسن من ذكره، وترى اضماره في النفس اولى وانس من النطق به"

Where the above utterance is translated and discussed by Al-Liheibi (1999:276) as "wherever a noun or a verb has been ellipted, and the indication of its position has been gauged correctly and it has been ellipted in a situation where it should be ellipted, you will find that its ellipsis in that situation is better than its being mentioned". Al-Jurjani (Cited in Al-Liheibi, ibid) "considers sentences from which a certain element has been ellipted as more eloquent and more expressive of the required meaning if this is in agreement with the circumstances in which the sentence was said, irrespective of its grammatical function".

Mahmood (199٠: 2) declares that ellipsis is more eloquent than mentioning because it will have the door open to provide alternative intentions for words and expressions ellipted, as it is shown below.

''الحذف ابلغ من الذكر، لان النفس تذهب كل مذهب في القصد من الجواب، لو ذكر الجواب لقصر على الوجه الذي تضمنه البيان''

It is also defined by Al-Hashmi (Cited in Alam Al-Din, n.d.:26) as being a part of the structure is omitted without effecting the meaning, which is recoverable from a scrutiny of the linguistic context or co-text as he says below.

"يكون بحذف شيء من العبارة لا يخل بالفهم، عند وجود ما يدل على المحذوف من قرينة لفظية او معنوية".

Examples:

- **تَاللَّهِ تَفْتَأُ تَذْكُرُ يُوسُفَ (يوسف: ٨٥)**

- **By Allah, thou wilt not cease talking of Joseph (Ali, 2004: 272).**

- **الاولاد الى المدرسة**

  - **Boys to school.**

Alam Al-Din (ibid) states that, in the first example, the word (not) has been ellipted in the Arabic version of The Verse for the purpose of brevity, and in the second example the whole clause has been ellipted (**Send the boys to school**) for the purpose of brevity where the meaning is clear and recoverable from the context as this is stated below.

''ففي الجملة الاولى تم حذف كلمة (لا) على انه ايجاز حذف وفي الجملة (الاولاد الى المدرسة) تم حذف جملة باكملها على انه ايجاز حذف هي (ارسلوا ...) والمعنى واضح من سياق الكلام.

In the Arabic language, the term 'ellipsis' involves different processes and influences various dimensions: the syntactic and semantic dimensions (e.g. gapping, implicitness and ellipsis), and the morphological and phonological dimensions. One of the purposes of ellipsis is conciseness, "the use of as few words as possible to give the necessary information" (Darir, 2007:7).

In The Glorious Qur'an, ellipsis is one of the prominent styles and features that stamp it. Since Arabic is the language of The Glorious Qur'an, ellipsis is defined by Al-Hashmi (Cited in Alam Al-Din, n.d.:17) as the production of the multiple meanings and propositions with few suitable words and expressions as stated below.

''وضع المعاني الكثيرة في الفاظ اقل منها كانه بحر واسع المعاني وعميق المقاصد في كاس صغير من الالفاظ ''

Amir (Cited in Ganawi and Al-Qarkhi, ٢٠١٠:545) states that, in The Glorious Qur'an, a noun, verb or preposition might be ellipted. It might be mentioned in one place and ellipted in another with identical contexts. In Glorious Qur'an, no word or expression is mentioned unless it is required by the structure and context, and no word or expression is ellipted unless its ellipsis is suitable and of more eloquence and cohesiveness. It is presented in Arabic by Ganawi and Al-Qarkhi (ibid) as follows.

"والحذف قد يقع في الاسم والفعل والحرف، وقد يذكر في مكان ويحذف في اخر مشابه له من حيث السياق، وتطلبها النظم ولا تحذف كلمة الا وحذفها ابلغ وانسب، واكثر ترابطا في الاسلوب، واحكم للصياغة الفنية المعجزة".

Ganawi and Al-Qarkhi (٢٠١٠:545) elaborate more when they quote Al-Zamalakani's saying below where illusion is removed when the ellipted words appear in the text, and ambiguity resulting from ellipsis casts self-excitement to the readers to know what is implicitly intended.

"الا ترى ان المحذوف اذا ظهر في اللفظ زال ما كان يعترضك من الوهم وخلص للمذكور جزما وكذلك فان الابهام ولو على احتمال مرجوح يلقي في النفس تشوقا الى ما هو المراد ويعظم لتكثير الموارد الوهمية ويعلقه الوهم معرضا عن المذكور بما لم يذكر تعليقا وهميا من غير ان يخلصه لمعين ذهني او خارجي فيرجع الذهن متفاخرا عن ادراكه عاجزا عن مرام صيده بشباكه وايسا عن اعتلافه باشراكه، فعند ذلك يعظم شانه ويعلو في النفس مكانه".

Alam Al-Din (n.d.:52) concludes that there are types of ellipsis in The Glorious Qur'an. Each individual is able to recover the ellipted words, in terms of his knowledge and thought, in a special manner different from those followed by others where he states this in the following way.

"لقد جئت على قصدي ان الحذف له الوان مختلفة، فكل يستطيع ان يقدره حسب علمه وفكره ويلونه حسب لون نظارته الفكرية والفنية الى حد ما: هذا يقدر محذوفا فيعني به السماء والاخر يقدر لفظا اخر فيعني به الارض وكذلك تكون عملية التقدير للمحذوف".

3. Aspects of Utterance Meaning: Explicature/ Implicature Distinction

Haugh (2002: 119) pictures Sperber & Wilson's introduction of the notion of explicature as being considered a complement of the Grecian notion of implicature. He argues that by introducing explicature, they try to indicate that pragmatic inferences take part not only to what is implicated but, as well, to what is explicated.

Within the relevance-theoretic account, to best understand the utterance meaning, there should be two central distinctions. The first one is between the linguistically decoded meaning and pragmatically inferred meaning. The second one, which is the focus of this paper, is between the two types of propositions communicated by the speaker: "explicature and implicature". Sperber & Wilson (Cited in Carston, 2004: 4) define explicature and implicature as follows:

13

- "An assumption communicated by an utterance U is explicit [hence an 'explicature'] if and only if it is a development of a logical form encoded by U".

- "An assumption communicated by U which is not explicit is implicit" [hence an 'implicature"].

Carston (Cited in Haugh, 2002: 120) expand definitions of explicature and implicature through displaying that explicature

> is a propositional form communicated by an utterance which is pragmatically constructed on the basis of the propositional schema or template (logical form) that the utterance encodes; its content is an amalgam of linguistically decoded material and pragmatically inferred material,

and implicature is

> any other propositional form communicated by an utterance, its content consists of wholly pragmatically inferred matter.

Let's consider a simple example (adopted from Carston, 2008: 36, 47)
1.
Max: how was the party? Did it go well?
Amy: There wasn't enough drink and everyone left early.

2.
There wasn't enough **alcoholic** drink **to satisfy the people at** [the party] and **so** everyone **who came to** [the party] left [the party] early.

The meaning that is linguistically encoded (logical form – Amy's utterance) is considered a schema for the pragmatically development of the much richer content in (2) which represents the assumption she directly intended (explicitly communicated - explicature).

Haugh (2002: 120) states that theorists such as Carston and Sperber & Wilson working in relevance theory emphasize that "conceptual content of implicatures must be wholly inferred", and others as Sperber & Wilson and Papafragou add that for implicatures to be inferred, "they must be intended by the speaker, and understood by the hearer as intended".

Let's consider another example (adopted from Carston, 2004: 4):

3.

X: How is Mary feeling after her first year at university?
Y: She didn't get enough units and can't continue.

In this specific example, Carston (ibid: 5) discusses that X wants Y to communicate the following assumptions:

4.

a. Mary didn't pass enough university course units to qualify for admission to second year study and, as a result, Mary can't continue with university study.

b. Mary is not feeling very happy.

According to the definitions mentioned above, it is obvious that (4a) is the explicit content of Y's utterance. The encoded linguistic form of Y's utterance is still visible in the decoded logical form of Y's utterance (4a) which is regarded as a schema for the "development of a propositional form" (explicature). (4b) seen as an independent implicit assumption inferred from the propositional form (4a) which is a logical development of Y's utterance is implicature (Carston, 2004: 5). What discussion there in the example is a development of the encoded meaning of the sentence "she didn't get enough units and can't continue". It is logically developed into (4a) which is more specific and elaborated than the encoded form of the sentence. This process of logical development consisted of assigning a referent to the pronoun (she) as being Mary. The words 'get' and 'units' have been given meanings specific than they really encoded in the logical form, extra constituents and items have been inserted and supplied as explanations for 'enough' and 'continue', and a cause-effect relation is considered to justify the connection between the conjuncts (Carston, ibid).

Within relevance theory, Carston (2004: 2) argues that for best utterance understanding, pragmatic processes play an important role on the two sides of the distinction: explicature and implicature. Carston (ibid) adds that human cognitive architecture views the relevance theory as being rooted where, on the basis of this fact, "linguistic semantics is the output of a modular linguistic decoding system and serves as input to a pragmatic processor". The decoded linguistic form represents the logical form which "is not fully propositional" but works as "a schema or template for the pragmatic construction of propositional form". The pragmatic system functions as a system of inferring the intended communicated interpretation where it represents a group of "propositional conceptual representations" which, some of them are considered "developments" of the linguistically decoded template or form, and others are not. The linguistically developed or decoded forms or interpretations are called "explicatures", while the propositional forms, which are pragmatically inferred, are called "implicatures". Carston (ibid: 2-3) also illustrates that "pragmatic inference

15

may contribute to the explicated assumptions (explicatures), at the conception of implicated assumption (implicatures) that follows from this".

4. Pragmatic Aspects of Explicature

Carston (ibid: 6) and Haugh (2002: 120) agree that the pragmatic processes which are involved in the derivation of explicature include 'disambiguation' or 'strengthening' in Recanati's terms (Cited in Ibáñez, 1999: 5), "saturation (including reference assignment) and free enrichment" (including unarticulated constituents). Ibáñez (ibid: 3) also adds that the application of these three processes leads to developing the utterance to what is so called 'explicature' (an explicitly stated assumption). These three processes will be discussed in detail below.

4.1. Saturation

Ibáñez (ibid: 5) points out that saturation is the process of filling slots set up in the meaning of an incomplete sentence with the assistance of the context. For example, the sentence ***He is not good enough*** requires to be saturated as in the following developed or expanded version ***He is not good enough for Marry to marry him***. Thus, Ibáñez (ibid) reveals that it is possible to assign different status to the incomplete version of an utterance in the light of what is said vs. what is communicated. Similarly, and according to Carston (2008: 15), saturation means to find the intended item or content for a variable or slot that is linguistically shown as when identifying a specific female person for the pronoun 'she' in a given syntactic position of an utterance in order to develop the propositional understanding.

Carston (2004: 15, 2008: 7) views saturation as "a much more widely manifest process than simply finding values for overt indexicals". Saturation, in addition, contributes in the pragmatic development of decoded versions of the utterances below (Carston 2004: 15) where it supplies answers to the questions between brackets:

5.

a. Parcetol is better	**(than what?).**
b. It is the same	**(as what?)**
c. He is too young	**(for what?)**
d. It's hot enough	**(to what?)**
e. I like Sally's portrait	**(Portrait in what relation to Sally?)**

What is noted in the above utterances is that there is implicit argument existing in the logical forms of the utterances that marks the saturation demand which makes this process of 'completion' (ibid) obligatory in the communicative use of these types of utterances. For these utterances, Carston (ibid) claims that "there is a slot in their

logical form, a kind of covert indexical" which demands saturation and "the lexical items 'better', 'same', 'too', and 'enough' carry these imperceptible elements with them as a part of their linguistic structure".

4.2. Disambiguation

Disambiguation or, in Recanati's terms, strengthening (Cited in Ibáñez, 1999: 5) can be explained by the expression *Some time* in Sperber & Wilson's example (adopted from Ibáñez, ibid: 3) of *It will take some time to repair your watch* where they argue that repairing a watch is an activity that requires time longer than expected (say, by an individual at the jeweler's). They insist that this situation is solved by relevance theory stating that "the logical form of an utterance is an assumption schema which may be in need of completion; when completion is required, this is indicated by the presence of semantically incomplete or manifestly vague terms" (ibid). Thus, the expression *Some time* in the utterance above may be *a second*, *an hour*, *a week*, and so on. Ibáñez (ibid: 5) elaborates on the same example writing that a rather ambiguous element requires to become a more specific one in a way that the more specific which is richer entails the ambiguous one. He makes the difference between saturation and strengthening clear when he states that

> *in cases of saturation the information which will complete the intended thought is to be found in the context (whether this is the previous discourse, the present situation or the knowledge shared by speaker and addressee); in cases of strengthening, on the other hand, making the available information specific enough to satisfy our communicative needs (i.e. making it 'relevant' in Sperber & Wilson's sense) is not a matter of retrieving complementary information from the context but of adding information which is prompted by the linguistic expression itself. In this sense, we are entitled to relate strengthening to linguistic conventionalization and to speak of semantic or conceptual motivation for this specific form of enrichment (ibid).*

4.3. Free Enrichment

The third type of pragmatic process involved in the logical development of the utterance is free enrichment. Carston (2008: 15) explains why it is free through arguing that this process refers to the pragmatic enrichment of the decoded linguistic form in the absence of any linguistic indication (overt and covert) in the logical form of the utterance that is required. Likewise, Carston (2004: 9) states that in some cases pragmatics takes part in the proposition or assumption explicitly stated by an

utterance with no linguistic item indicating that a contextual value is necessary. He goes further to write that in these cases "there is no overt indexical, nor is there any compelling reason to suppose there is a covert element in the logical form of the utterance, and yet a contextually supplied constituent appears in the explicature". Consider the following utterances which, their interpretation in different contexts, would involve the bracketed elements that are made possible on pragmatic bases alone (Carston, 2008: 16).

6.

a. She has a brain.   **[a high-functioning brain]**
b. It's going to take time for these wounds to heal.   **[considerable time]**
c. I've had a shower.   **[today]**
d. It's snowing.   **[in location x]**
e. Mary gave John a pen and he wrote down her address. [and then] [with the pen Mary gave him]

As for disambiguation and saturation, Carston (2008:16) argues that they would indicate a proposition with no constituents added between brackets. For (6a), this utterance would refer to a trivial fact (every individual owns a brain as part of his anatomical formation, and for (6b), any process or activity requires a period of time) where these utterances can be obviously false by changing them into negatives. As for (6c) and (6d), they are vague and general and it is not clear what a speaker wants to communicate; they are irrelevant and uninformative. Carston (2004: 16) reveals that when these utterances may be uttered in many contexts, "clear cases of implicatures of the utterance would depend on the enriched proposition". For example, in (6a) the implicature is that *she is a suitable nominee for an academic job*; in (6b) the implicature is that *what is assigned by the pronoun (I) is not in need to have a shower at this specific time*. Carston (2008: 10) states that "it is the enriched propositions that are communicated as explicatures and which function as premises in the derivation of implicatures".

Carston (2004: 16-17) says that there are to be two types of free enrichment: the first type exists in cases just discussed "where pragmatically supplied constituents of the explicature have no presence in the linguistic form used, so are known as unarticulated constituents". The second type occurs in "cases where the pragmatic processes don't supply a whole new constituent of content but adjust and modulate an existing element of linguistic meaning" (ibid). The meaning of the following utterances is represented by the italicized words (Carston, 2008: 17)

7.

a. Boris is a *man*.

18

b. Buying a house is easy if you have got *money*.
c. Let's get rid of the *empty* bottles.
d. This policy will *bankrupt* the farmers.

To reach the intended meaning of (7a) and (7b) requires an optional pragmatic process of 'concept narrowing'. In many contexts, the interpretation that "Boris is an adult male person is trivially right and it is uninformative, thus the lexically encoded word (Man) is likely to be pragmatically strengthened to (Ideal or Typical Man); the same thing applies to (7b) as it is definitely false that buying a house will be done by any sum of money. Carston (ibid) states that "in these cases, the communicated concept picks out a subset of the denotation of the lexical concept" (ibid). Arguably, (7c) and (7d) demand an adjustment or modulation in their encoded logical form where "although bankrupt could be taken literally, in certain contexts it would be understood as a loose use of the concept or even as a hyperbole, conveying that, as a result of the government's policy, the farmers will be substantially poorer than might have been expected or desired". On the opposite direction of the above cases, the encoded element or concept requires broadening where in this example the denotation or meaning of the communicated concept or element is broader than (and so includes) the denotation or meaning of the concept encoded. Theorists and contextualists working in relevance theory (particularly Recanati and Travis) have an opinion that some degree of modulation or adjustment of word meaning in different contexts is required in almost all utterances and is "essential in deriving the intended truth-conditional context" (i.e. the explicit proposition of the utterance) (Carston, 2008: 17).

5. Data Analysis and Discussion

As stated before, ellipsis refers to the omission of some parts of a sentence which can be understood either from the surrounding text or the situation itself. In general, traditional arguments of ellipsis in Arabic and in the Glorious Qur'ān claim that it falls into two broad types: the structurally motivated ellipsis and the contextually motivated ellipsis, or in Ibin Hisham's terms (Cited in Darir, 2007:5) ellipsis falls into "grammatical ellipsis whose postulation is required primarily by the grammatical descriptive framework (i.e. ellipsis is dependent on linguistic context) and ellipsis whose postulation is required for the semantic or pragmatic completeness or comprehension of meaning" (i.e. ellipsis is dependent on pragmatic context). In addition, Arab grammarians and rhetoricians argue that under the term ellipsis, there are several types that are all related in understanding this common and widely used phenomenon The Glorious Qur'an. Thus, Arab linguists distinguish these types of ellipsis as follows:

1. Phonetic ellipsis (elision)
2. Syntactic ellipsis

3. Semantic (lexical) ellipsis
4. Rhetorical ellipsis

Again under the syntactic ellipsis, there are also several types. It should be mentioned here that, in the Glorious Qur'an, most Arab linguists agree that each of these types of ellipsis expresses a rhetorical function for which an ellipsis takes place or appears. As far as The Qur'anic style is concerned, "no phonetic or syntactic technique is used in the Qur'an without a function in confirmation of its inimitability" (Al-Hilfy, 2014:61). In other words, all types of ellipsis appear in utterances to serve rhetorical functions or what is so called rhetorical ellipsis which is the aim and focus of this paper in question. Rhetorical ellipsis, in Darir's (2007:5) words, means "rhetorically motivated ellipsis, i.e. cases where sentence elements have been omitted by the speaker or the writer to achieve a certain rhetorical effect besides conciseness". He (ibid) also goes further to state that "the elements may or may not be required by rules of syntactic sentence completion" (saturation). He also adds that the recoverability of these elements depends on the intention of the speaker in making narrowing, generalization or modulation, deliberately leaving an element vague, irony, etc. Darir (ibid: 4) argues that one of the rhetorical aspects of Qur'anic inimitability is the feature of conciseness. Conciseness is syntactically embodied by ellipsis which may overlap semantically with specific propositions and pragmatically with independent assumptions for which ellipsis occurs. In other words, although conciseness is one of the purposes behind ellipsis, ellipsis appears in the utterance to fulfill rhetorical purposes represented by implicitly communicated contents or assumptions of utterances (implicatures). Thus, this paper focuses on identifying the rhetorical aspects of ellipsis represented by implicatures regardless to the type/types of ellipsis utilized in the utterance. Recovering the ellipted elements (structurally and semantically motivated ellipsis – explicatures, or pragmatically motivated ellipsis – implicatures) calls in rhetorical potentials, and as far as translating the ellipted words and expressions and their contribution in deriving (explicatures and implicatures) is part of the statement of the problem of this research, rhetorical ellipsis is taken care of by contrastive rhetoric and is so related to translation abilities.

Because Halliday and Hasan's (1976: 142, 144) definition of ellipsis as "something left unsaid", where 'unsaid' "implies but understood nevertheless" is a functional one, this study, as was stated earlier, adopts this definition as it coincides with the aim of the study to identify the rhetorical purposes of ellipses in a text that are represented by the implicatures of the 'unsaid'. As for the recoverability of the ellipted words and expressions serving the rhetorical function (grammatically or semantically motivated ellipsis - explicatures, or pragmatically or contextually motivated ellipsis – implicatures), the study adopts the contextual-pragmatist view on the explicit/implicit distinction which is the one argued and developed within the cognitive framework of Relevance Theory by (Carston 2004, 2008). For the translation of The Qur'anic verses

into English and the comparison between the Arabic and the English versions, the study adopts Ali (n.d.) and Ali (2004). The following section reveals the application of the processes of pragmatic enrichment on the selected Qur'anic Verses.

5.1. The Pragmatic Process of Saturation

١ . لِلْفُقَرَاءِ الَّذِينَ أُحْصِرُوا فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ لَا يَسْتَطِيعُونَ ضَرْبًا فِي الْأَرْضِ يَحْسَبُهُمُ الْجَاهِلُ أَغْنِيَاءَ مِنَ التَّعَفُّفِ تَعْرِفُهُمْ بِسِيمَاهُمْ لَا يَسْأَلُونَ النَّاسَ إِلْحَافًا وَمَا تُنْفِقُوا مِنْ خَيْرٍ فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ بِهِ عَلِيمٌ (البقرة: ٢٧٣).

Ali, Abdullah Yusuf (n.d.)	"(Charity is) for those in need, who, in Allah's cause are restricted (from travel), and cannot move about in the land, seeking (For trade or work): the ignorant man thinks, because of their modesty, that they are free from want. Thou shalt know them by their (Unfailing) mark: They beg not importunately from all the sundry. And whatever of good ye give, be assured Allah know it well".
Ali, Maulawi Sher (2004)	"These alms are for the poor who are detained in the cause of Allah and are unable to move about in the land. The ignorant man thinks them to be free from want because of their abstaining from begging. Thou shalt know them by their appearance; they do not beg of men with importunity. And whatever of wealth you spend, surely, Allah has perfect knowledge thereof".

Because the pragmatic process of saturation is one way of accommodating the utterance to meet the communicative use and the contextual requirement, it is evident that the above Qur'anic Verse needs to be grammatically complete and semantically determinate through recovering the elliptical words or expressions to produce a full proposition. Actually, the assumed elliptical word or expression in The Qur'anic Verse above, according to Abo Shami (n.d.: 44) is (Charity or alms – صدقاتكم) to have its expanded or pragmatically developed version as below.

(صدقاتكم) لِلْفُقَرَاءِ الَّذِينَ أُحْصِرُوا فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ ...

What is noted in the above utterance is that there is an implicit argument exited in the logical form of The Qur'anic Verse that requires saturation or what is so called grammatical completion. The resulting development or expansion of the encoded linguistic proposition by means of one of the pragmatic processes, saturation, is what Sperber and Wilson (Cited in Ibáñez, 1999: 3) call it explicature (an explicitly stated assumption). The meaning of the linguistically decoded utterance (the development of the logical form- explicature) is considered a scheme for the independent implicit

assumption (implicature) which is the main purpose of ellipsis taking place, beside brevity. So, the propositional implicit form which is pragmatically inferred (implicature of ellipsis) from the explicature (the expanded version of the utterance) is to save face of those specific poor people who are hidden through their abstaining begging people and their being free from want because of their infinite modesty. as it is shown in Abo Shami (ibid). Thus, the ignorant man thinks that they are in no need for charity as it is shown in Abo Shami (ibid) when he states this in the following way.

"الجار والمجرور متعلق بمحذوف مبتدا والتقدير: صدقاتكم للفقراء الذين احصروا وحذف لتقدم ذكره في ايات سابقة ولانه يتحدث في هذه الاية الكريمة عن فقراء مخصوصين. لا يسالون الناس. يحسبهم الجاهل اغنياء من التعفف فناسب اضمار الصدقات حالهم هذه".

Basically, hiding the linguistic word (charity or alms) and not mentioning it is considered proper in this specific context as it goes in line with the nature of this group of people who are hiding themselves to avoid being humiliated or being face threatened by "acts of the so called charity which are condemned as they do more harm than good" Ali (n.d.: 196). Arguably recovering the elliptical words or expressions of the utterance by means of applying pragmatic processes of enrichment accounts for the explicature aspect of the utterance while ellipsis accounts for the implicitly stated communicative use (implicature) of the utterance.

As far as translating the Qur'anic Verse, rhetorical ellipsis and explicature and implicature of ellipsis is concerned, the translator will realize that the structure of the above Verse misses what is called in Arabic مبتدا (**subject of a nominal sentence -** صدقاتكم). Both Ali (n.d) and Ali (2004) were successful in translating the utterance when they recovered the elliptical part of the Verse taking into consideration, consciously or unconsciously, the implicature behind ellipsis. This is evidenced when Ali (n.d) bracketed the recovered elliptical word and Ali (2004) wrote the recovered element in italics to show the full propositional form of the utterance and to distinguish the encoded logical form from the decoded one (the one after applying pragmatic processes). Thus, recovering this omission and assigning it with brackets or italics will leave the English translation exemplary and will open the door to assign the communicative use of ellipsis (implicature).

٢. أَفَمَنْ كَانَ عَلَىٰ بَيِّنَةٍ مِنْ رَبِّهِ وَيَتْلُوهُ شَاهِدٌ مِنْهُ وَمِنْ قَبْلِهِ كِتَابُ مُوسَىٰ إِمَامًا وَرَحْمَةً أُولَٰئِكَ يُؤْمِنُونَ بِهِ وَمَنْ يَكْفُرْ بِهِ مِنَ الْأَحْزَابِ فَالنَّارُ مَوْعِدُهُ فَلَا تَكُ فِي مِرْيَةٍ مِنْهُ إِنَّهُ الْحَقُّ مِنْ رَبِّكَ وَلَٰكِنَّ أَكْثَرَ النَّاسِ لَا يُؤْمِنُونَ (هود: ١٧)

Ali, Abdullah Yusuf	"Can they be (like) those who accept a Clear (Sign) from their Lord, and whom a witness from Himself doth teach, as did the Book of Moses before it,- a guide and a mercy? They believe therein; but those of the Sects that reject it,- the Fire will be their promised meeting-place. Be not then in doubt

	thereon: for it is the truth from thy Lord: yet many among men do not believe"!
Ali, Maulawi Sher	"Can he, then, who possesses clear proof from his Lord, and *to testify to whose truth* a witness from Him shall follow him, and who was preceded by the Book of Moses, a guide and a mercy, *be an imposter*".

In this Qur'anic Verse, the explicature or the development of the logical form encoded by the utterance is represented in the recovery of the elliptical words or expressions to have the following full propositional form.

أَفَمَنْ كَانَ عَلَىٰ بَيِّنَةٍ مِنْ رَبِّهِ (كمن على ضلالة من ربه) وَيَتْلُوهُ شَاهِدٌ مِنْهُ وَمِنْ قَبْلِهِ كِتَابُ مُوسَىٰ إِمَامًا وَرَحْمَةً ...

أَفَمَنْ كَانَ عَلَىٰ بَيِّنَةٍ مِنْ رَبِّهِ وَيَتْلُوهُ شَاهِدٌ مِنْهُ وَمِنْ قَبْلِهِ كِتَابُ مُوسَىٰ إِمَامًا وَرَحْمَةً (كمن على ضلالة من ربه)...

The assumed elliptical words or expressions in this Qur'anic Verse is the predicate (الخبر) which is syntactically and semantically required كمن على ضلالة (equal to the one who doesn't possess a clear proof) as it is stated by Abo Shami (n.d.: 54) when he says **"لم يذكر الخبر: والتقدير كمن على ضلالة".**

So, the expanded version of this Qur'anic Verse accounts for the explicature communicated by the utterance which is pragmatically developed and expanded on the basis of the encoded logical form of the utterance. Beside the explicature (much richer content) of the ellipsis that is pragmatically constructed on the basis of the logical form of the Verse, ellipsis also communicates an independent implicit assumption (implicature) represented by the communicative intention of disdaining the disbeliever who doesn't possess a clear proof. In other words, the purpose of not mentioning the disbeliever who doesn't accept a clear proof is to belittle and contempt him and glorify the believer since he doesn't worth mentioning and this is evidenced by Abo Shami (ibid) when he says

" فحذف الخبر ازدراءا به وتحقيرا لشانه".

Exploring the translation of The Qur'anic Verse carefully, it seems that both of the translators didn't pay attention to what is grammatically required to complete the utterance كمن على ضلالة (equal to the one who doesn't possess a clear proof). In other words, their translations lack the explicit argument that can be stated if they recover the presumably elliptical words. The idea of comparison, argued in the utterance, is not captured by the translations though it is captured in translation of a similar

Qur'anic Verse as below where the two translations accounts for the explicature and implicature of ellipsis.

٣. أَفَمَنْ زُيِّنَ لَهُ سُوءُ عَمَلِهِ فَرَآهُ حَسَنًا فَإِنَّ اللهَ يُضِلُّ مَنْ يَشَاءُ وَيَهْدِي مَنْ يَشَاءُ فَلَا تَذْهَبْ نَفْسُكَ عَلَيْهِمْ حَسَرَاتٍ إِنَّ اللهَ عَلِيمٌ بِمَا يَصْنَعُونَ (فاطر – ٨).

In this Verse, the ellipted words or expressions have been recovered and explicitly stated between brackets in Ali's (n.d.) translation and in italics in Ali's (2004) translation.

أَفَمَنْ زُيِّنَ لَهُ سُوءُ عَمَلِهِ فَرَآهُ حَسَنًا (كمن هداه الله) فَإِنَّ اللهَ يُضِلُّ مَنْ يَشَاءُ وَيَهْدِي مَنْ يَشَاءُ فَلَا تَذْهَبْ نَفْسُكَ عَلَيْهِمْ حَسَرَاتٍ إِنَّ اللهَ عَلِيمٌ بِمَا يَصْنَعُونَ

Ali, Abdullah Yusuf	"Is he, then, to whom the evil of his conduct is made alluring, so that he looks upon it as good, (equal to one who is rightly guided)? For Allah leaves to stray whom He wills, and guides whom He wills. So let not thy soul go out in (vainly) sighing after them: for Allah knows well all that they do"!
Ali, Maulawi Sher	"Is he, then, to whom the evil of his deed is made to appear pleasing, so that he looks upon it as good, *like him who believes and does good deeds*? Allah adjudges astray whom He will and guides whom He will. So let not thy soul waste away in the sighing for them. Surely Allah knows what they do.

Thus, without postulating the assumed omitted words or expressions (explicature of ellipsis) makes the translation grammatically incomplete and semantically unexemplary for readers.

5.2. The Pragmatic Process of Disambiguation

٤. وَلَقَدْ كُنْتُمْ تَمَنَّوْنَ الْمَوْتَ مِنْ قَبْلِ أَنْ تَلْقَوْهُ فَقَدْ رَأَيْتُمُوهُ وَأَنْتُمْ تَنْظُرُونَ (ال عمران- ١٤٣)

Ali, Abdullah Yusuf	"Ye did indeed wish for death before ye met him: Now ye have seen him with your own eyes, (And ye flinch!)"
Ali, Maulawi Sher	"And you used to wish for this death before you met it; now you have seen it while you were *actually* looking for *it*".

Contrary to saturation which requires information to complete the intended thought and to be derived on the basis of context, disambiguation involves the disambiguation

24

of the available linguistic element through making it specific to a given extent to satisfy the communicative need of the utterance. In this Qur'anic Verse, what is ellipted information that should be recovered and explicitly stated to remove disambiguation is stated in the following pragmatic development of the encoded linguistic form of the Verse (You did wish for (the causes of) death (and you did see them)) and argued by Abo Shami (n.d.: 73) in the following statement.

"والتقدير (من حذف المضاف): تمنون اسباب الموت فقد رايتموه".

Actually, what is argued in the expanded version of the encoded linguistic form of the Verse is the decoded linguistic form or what is so called explicature. Thus, re-mentioning what has intentionally been ellipted accounts for the explicitly communicated information. What is noted in the logical development of the utterance above is not recovering complementary information but adding an element which is linguistically prompted by the expression itself in question. Basically, the explicature of the ellipsis that is linguistically decoded through the development of the logical form of the utterance is considered a template from which another propositional form is pragmatically inferred. Thus, the pragmatically inferred form represents the implicature or the implicit communicative need that is triggered by the intentional ellipsis of words and expressions in the questionnaire above. So, the implicature of the ellipted words or expressions (You did wish for (the causes of) death (and you did see them)) - تمنون اسباب الموت فلقد رايتموه) is to make disbelievers feel the great power of the causes of the death that they saw. In other words, causes of death have been compared to death itself because of the disbelievers' experience of their existence as they were death itself. It is necessary for the elliptical words or expressions to be estimated as it is shown above since seeing death prevents seeing other things and this is argued by Abo Shami (ibid: 73) in the following statement.

"ولابد من هذا التقدير لان من راى الموت لم ير شيئا فحذف المضاف اعتمادا على شهادة العقل والحذف يوحي بقوة الاسباب التي راوها".

As far as the translation of rhetorical ellipsis is concerned, both Ali (n.d.) and Ali (2004) have transformed the Arabic Qur'anic Verse into English without considering what explicatures and implicatures intended by ellipsis. To put it in another way, the encoded linguistic form of The Qur'anic Verse above has not been decoded in a way to show the recovery of the ellipted linguistic elements (causes of the death) and (you did see them). As a result of not applying the pragmatic processes of enrichment or recovering the explicature of the ellipsis in translating, the implicitly stated content (implicature) of ellipsis is not easily to be inferred by readers and this will leave the translation of the logical form of the Verse unexemplary.

5.3. The Pragmatic Process of Free Enrichment

٥. قَالَ بَصُرْتُ بِمَا لَمْ يَبْصُرُوا بِهِ فَقَبَضْتُ قَبْضَةً مِنْ أَثَرِ الرَّسُولِ فَنَبَذْتُهَا وَكَذَٰلِكَ سَوَّلَتْ لِي نَفْسِي (طه ـ ٩٦)

Ali, Abdullah Yusuf	"He replied: "I saw what they saw not: so I took a handful (of dust) from the footprint of the Messenger, and threw it (into the calf): thus did my soul suggest to me"."
Ali, Maulawi Sher	"He said, 'I perceived what they perceived not. I *only* partly received the impress of the messenger, but that *too* I cast away. Thus, It is that my mind commended to me".

In this Qur'anic Verse, "pragmatically supplied constituents of the explicature have no presence in the linguistic form used, so are known as unarticulated constituents" (Carston, 2008: 17). By applying processes of free enrichment to develop the explicature of the utterance, the unarticulated constituents that are contextually supplied can be estimated or assumed as below (Abo Shami, n .d.: 70).

قَالَ بَصُرْتُ بِمَا لَمْ يَبْصُرُوا بِهِ فَقَبَضْتُ قَبْضَةً مِنْ أَثَرِ (حافر فرس) الرَّسُولِ فَنَبَذْتُهَا وَكَذَٰلِكَ سَوَّلَتْ لِي نَفْسِي

Thus, the development of the logical form of the Verse above through applying the free pragmatic enrichment process comprises the enriched proposition that is communicated as explicature of the utterance. The assumed elliptical words or expressions (حافر فرس - **the hoof of the horse**) that are recovered through investigating the explicature of The Verse function as a step, with the explicature itself, in the derivation of the implicature of ellipsis. In other words, what propositional form that is pragmatically inferred (implicature) from ellipsis occurring is that this handful in specific doesn't obtain its great power and effect from the hoof (حافر) as a hoof or from the horse as a horse, it did obtain power and glory because it is a handful of dust from the footprint of the hoof of the Messenger's horse. However, the expression (of dust from the footprint of the hoof of the Messenger's horse) has been ellipted or unarticulated to implicitly communicate that this handful is Glorious and Great as it is directly related and coordinated to the word (Messenger) as it is evidenced in Abo Shami (ibid) when he declares the following.

"والتقدير (من حذف المضاف): من اثر تراب حافر الرسول فحذفت هذه الاضافات ايجازا ودلالة على ان هذه القبضة لم تكتسب قوتها من الحافر كحافر او من الفرس كفرس ولكن لانه فرس الرسول فاضيف الاثر اليه مباشرة".

So, the recovery of the elliptical words and expressions accounts for the explicature of the Verse while the ellipsis and its recovery in the utterance accounts for the implicature.

As for the translation of The Qur'anic Verse in question, Ali (n.d.) was more aware of the explicature of ellipsis than Ali (2004). Ali (n.d.) was successful in translating

26

the Verse when he expanded the logical linguistic form of the utterance to include the unarticulated constituents leaving the door open for readers to investigate the communicative need intended from ellipsis. On the contrary, Ali (2004) appears to stick himself to the encoded logical form of The Verse neglecting the recovery of the elliptical words and expressions. Without postulating what is unarticulated will not motivate readers to imagine what is implicitly communicated and pragmatically inferred according to contextual-relevance theorists. Thus Ali's (2004) translation doesn't involve the explicature argued in The Verse.

٦. حَتَّىٰ إِذَا فُتِحَتْ يَأْجُوجُ وَمَأْجُوجُ وَهُمْ مِنْ كُلِّ حَدَبٍ يَنْسِلُونَ (الانبياء – ٩٦)

| Ali, Abdullah Yusuf | "Until the Gog and Magog (people) are let through (their barrier), and they swiftly swarm from every hill. |
| Ali, Maulawi Sher | *It shall be so* even when Gog and Magog are let loose and they shall hasten forth from every height". |

Reaching the intended interpretation of The Qur'anic Verse above does involve applying one kind of free enrichment pragmatic processes of 'concept narrowing' (Carston, 2008: 17). In a context other than The Qur'anic Verse, Mog and Mogog are "two groups of Turks, descended from Yafith (Japheth)" (Cited in, www.islamawareness.net/Yajuj/gog.html) is trivially true, so the lexically encoded words or concepts (Mog and Mogog) are likely to be enriched to (Mog and Mogog's barrier) to recover what is ellipted and to meet the communicative value of the Qur'anic Verse. What has happened is actually a development of the logical form encoded by the Verse above where the developed or expanded version represents "an explicit assumption (explicature) communicated by the utterance" (Haugh, 2002: 20). So, the derivation of explicature of ellipsis is triggered as a result of recovering the ellipted word or expression as it is assumed by Abo Shami (n.d.: 79) as below.

حَتَّىٰ إِذَا فُتِحَتْ (سد) يَأْجُوجُ وَمَأْجُوجُ وَهُمْ مِنْ كُلِّ حَدَبٍ يَنْسِلُون

As it has already been stated that re-mentioning what has been ellipted accounts for the explicit assumption or proposition communicated by The Qur'anic Verse (explicature) while ellipsis, with explicature resulting, accounts for the pragmatically inferred communicative value (implicature) which can be attributed, in this specific Verse, to the large number of Mog and Mogog's people who will surge forth when the wall which imprisons Mog and Mogog will be broken. In other words, the word (barrier) has been unarticulated to have Mog and Mogog stand alone to implicitly communicate the sense of frightening and horrifying the Verse intends to convey when Mog and Mogog are let loose to rush down every hill where this is shown by Abo Shami (ibid) when he says the following.

"والتقدير: حتى اذا فتحت سد ياجوج وماجوج ... وفي حذفه واقامة المضاف اليه مقامه اشارة الى الكثرة الكاثرة التي تندفع فلا تبقى ولاتذر وقد افاد الحذف التهويل والتخويف".

Again, Ali (n.d.) captures the idea of the explicature of ellipsis and may be the implicature when he recovered the omitted word (barrier) in the English version of the Verse. In other words-, he applied what is so called the development of the logical form of The Qur'anic Verse in transforming the utterance into English. In his translation of The Verse, Ali (2004) has not made any attempt to mention the ellipted words unaware of the explicature that can be explained in recovering these ellipted words.

7. Conclusion

It may be concluded that ellipted words and expressions in The Qur'anic Verses, which account for the production of explicatures, can be recovered when developing the logical form of the Verse into a decoded propositional form through applying the suitable process of pragmatic enrichment. Processes of pragmatic processes within a relevance theoretic approach play a major role in the derivation of the explicitly stated content (explicature) and in paving the way for readers to derive or produce the pragmatically inferred propositions (implicature). In other sense, this study reached an important issue that no word or expression ellipted in The Glorious Qur'an without an implicature intended to be grasped by readers. This study also points out that Ali (n.d.) was more concise than Ali (2004) in shedding light on the unarticulated argument involved in The Qur'anic Verses through recovering, between brackets, the ellipted words and expressions urging readers to investigate the implicit communicative value intended from ellipsis. In most cases, the English versions of Ali's (2004) translations were, to a given extent, absent from the explicature of ellipsis. This study recommends that although syntactically and semantically ellipted elements have been accounted for, there should be a theory of translation which accounts for the rhetorically ellipted elements represented by implicature and the way of recovering them in translation.

References

Al-Hilfy, G. Niema (2014) "Rhetorical and Phonetic Function of Elision and Ellipsis in the Quran with Some Reference to English". *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*. 4(20): 60-68. Retrieved from file:///C:/Users/yaser/Downloads/15789-18585-1-PB%20(7).pdf

Ali, Abdullah Yusuf (n.d.) *Quran English Translation and Commentary*. Retrieved from http://www.4shared.com/get/TfXYuJtZ/17286508-Quran-Yusuf-Ali-Comme.html

Ali, Maulawi Sher (2004) *The Glorious Quran - Arabic Text and English Translation.* Surrey: Islam International Publication LTD.

Al-Liheibi, Fahd M M. (1999) *Aspects of Sentence Analysis in the Arabic Linguistic Tradition, with Particular Reference to Ellipsis.*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/1494/.

Biber, D., S. Johansson, G. Leech, S. Conrad, and E. Finegar. (1999). *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. London: Pearson Education Limited.

Carberry, Sandra (1989) "A Pragmatics-Based Approach to Ellipsis Resolution". *Computational Linguistics*. 15 (2): 75-96. Retrieved from http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=974890

Carston, Robyn. (2008) "The Explicit/Implicit Distinction In Pragmatics And The Limit Of Explicit Communication". *International Review of Pragmatics* 12/2008; 1(1):35-62. Retrieved from http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.233.1202&rep=rep1&type=pdf

………… (2004) "Relevance Theory and the Saying/Implicating Distinction", in L. Horn & G. Ward (eds) *The Handbook of Pragmatics*, Oxford: Blackwell. Retrieved from https://www.ucl.ac.uk/pals/research/linguistics/publications/wpl/01papers/carston

Crystal, David (2008) *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. 6th Edition. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Darrir, Ḥassan (2007) "Ellipsis: a Rhetorical Feature in the Quran and the Challenge of Translation", in *Sacred Texts Translation*: Proceedings of the First International Conference, Morocco.

De Beaugrande, Robert & Dressier, Wolfgang (1981) *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London: Longman Group UK Limited.

Halliday, M.A.K. & Matthiessen, Christian (2014) *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Routledge.

Halliday, M.A.K. & Hasan, Ruqaiya (1976) *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman Group Ltd.

Haugh, Michael. (2002) "The Intuitive Basis of Implicature: Relevance Theoretic Implicitness versus Grecian Implying". *Pragmatics* 12:2. 117-134.

Retrieved from http://www98.griffith.edu.au/dspace/bitstream/handle/10072/25181/33407_1.pdf;jsessionid=1C0EB56E86B70A5658B687A01246CD26?sequence=1

Hendriks, Petra (2004) "Coherence Relations, Ellipsis, and Contrastive Topics". *Journal of Semantics*. 21 (2): 133-153. Retrieved from https://jos.oxfordjournals.org/content/21/2/133.full.pdf+html.

Ibáñez, Francisco (1999) "From Semantic Underdetermination Via Metaphor And Metonymy To Conceptual Interaction". *LAUD Essen Series A: General & Theoretical Papers*. Retrieved from http://www.linse.uni-due.de/linse/laud/index.html

Procter, Paul (1978) *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*. Harlow [England]: Longman.

www.islamawareness.net/Yajuj/gog.html

المصادر العربية

ابو شامي، مصطفى عبد السلام (د. ت.) *الحذف البلاغي في القران الكريم*. مكتبة القران للطبع والنشر والتوزيع. القاهرة.

الجرجاني، عبد القاهر(٢٠٠٤) *أسرار البلاغة* :،تحقيق :ميسّر العقّاد ومصطفى الشيخ مصطفى، مؤسسة الرسالة ناشرون، بيروت، لبنان.

محمود، مرشد سعيد احمد (١٩٩٥) *الحذف والتقدير في القران الكريم*. اطروحة دكتوراه. جامعة لاهور ، بنجاب.
(http://b7oth.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/القرآن-في-التقدير-و-الحذف-دكتوراة.pdf)

علم الدين، عبد الستار (د. ت.) *ظاهرة الايجاز بالحذف في القران الكريم: دراسة سورة البقرة المفصلة في علوم البلاغة*. اطروحة دكتوراه. جامعة لاهور ، بنجاب.

غناوي، محمد علي و الكرخي، باسم كنعان (٢٠١٠). "بلاغة الحذف في القرآن الكريم". *مجلة ديالى للبحوث الانسانية*. العدد ٤٧: ٥٤٢-٥٦٢.