

Al-Liheibi, M. M. (2000) *Ellipsis in Arabic grammatical and rhetorical thought*, PhD Thesis. University of Durham.

Owens, J. (1988) *The Foundations of Grammar: An introduction to medieval Arabic grammatical theory* (1st ed.). John Benjamins Publishing: Amsterdam.

Ibn Hisham. (vol. 1 and 2). *Mughni 'al-labib an kutub 'al-'acarib*. Dar 'Iya At-turath 'al- 'arabi.

Ibn Jinni, A. A. (2001) *Al-khasa' I*, (1st ed.). Beirut: Dar al-kutub al-ilmiah.

English is not satisfactorily defined, as it involves a wide range of phenomena, such as syntax, lexical semantics, discourse, prosody, semantics, and stylistics. However, it is nature of Arabic to use ellipsis. Unlike English, Arabic displays a particular ellipsis (named 'qasr') which allows a deletion of a number of sentences at a time in a text, namely the Holy Qura'n, with no effect on meaning. But omission of Arabic sentences can occur outside the context of Qur'an, mainly in constructions that are answer to a question, constructions of نعم وبئس (ni ima and bi 'sa: verbs of praise and blame).

7. Conclusion

The studies that investigate ellipsis are conducted in either English or Arabic. Other contrastive English and Arabic studies are researched from translation point of view. This study, however, concerns itself with the clausal ellipsis in both English and Arabic. To show how English and Arabic are similar and different in their presentation of ellipsis, the two languages are compared and contrasted in terms of principle of ellipsis, purposes of ellipsis, and types of elliptical clauses. The analysis shows that the same principle of ellipsis, nothing can be omitted unless it is recoverable from the context, is used both English and Arabic. The study also shows that ellipsis occurs in English and Arabic to achieve brevity, rhetoric, and cohesion, among other things. Another main finding of the study is that one element or a whole clause can be omitted in both English and Arabic. Clausal ellipsis also occurs at different levels in the two languages. It is also attested that the two languages treat some constructions as elliptical although there is no missing information. In English paratactic clauses with different subjects, presupposition is applied to the first paratactic clause only. The study also demonstrates that applying ellipsis to some English reported speech sentences results in ambiguity.

Despite these similarities, English and Arabic differ in their presentation of ellipsis. For example, definition of ellipsis in English is still a dispute. This is because ellipsis involves syntax, lexical semantics, discourse, semantics, and stylistics. In Arabic, and unlike English, several clauses can be ellipted at a time. This is very common in the Qur'an.

8. Recommendations for further research

Based on the fact that this paper is limited to the study of English and Arabic clausal ellipsis, it is suggested that further study is to be conducted on the Qur'anic context to broadly investigate the ellipsis of a number of clauses at a time. The ellipsis of the reported speech constructions that yield ambiguity is also another area of investigation. Ellipsis in English can also be further researched from a rhetorical perspective.

References

English References

- Al-Hilfy, G. N. R.** (2104) *Rhetorical and Phonetic Function of Elision and Ellipsis in the Quran with Some Reference to English*. Research on Humanities and Social Sciences, Vol. 4, 20.
- Baker, M.** (1992) *In Other Words* (1st ed.). Routledge: London and New York.
- Carter, R. and McCarthy, M.** (2006) *Cambridge Grammar of English* (1st ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bloor, T. and Bloor, M.** (2004) *The Functional Analysis of English* (2nd ed.). Hodder Arnold: London.
- Bohas, G., Guillaume, J., and Kouloughli, D.** (2006) *The Arabic Linguistic Tradition* (4th ed.). Georgetown University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. and Hasan, R.** (1976) *Cohesion in English* (1st ed.). England: Pearson Education Limited.
- Hassan, F. H. and Taqi, J. S. M.** (2011) *Nominal Ellipsis in English & Arabic and its Influence on the Translation of the Meanings of Some Selected Qur'anic Verses*. Journal of College of Education For Women, Vol. 22, No. 3.
- Jackendoff, R. S.** *Gapping and Related Rules*. Linguistic Inquiry, Vol. 2, 1, pp. 21-35.
- Lobeck, A. (1995) *Ellipsis; Functional Heads, Licensing, and Identification* (1st ed.). Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- McShane, M. J.** (2005) *A Theory of Ellipsis* (1st ed.). Oxford University Press: New York.
- Thorne, S.** (1997) *Mastering Advanced English Language* (1st ed.). Pelgrave: New York.
- Ott, D. and Struckmeier S.** (2016) *Deletion in Clausal Ellipsis: Remnants in the Middle Field*. University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics, Vol. 22, 1.
- Ross, J.** (1970). *Gapping and the order of constructions*. Progress in Linguistics. 249 -259.
- Wilson, P.** (2000). *Mind the Gap: Ellipsis and Stylistic Variation in Spoken and Written English*. First ed, Pearson Education Limited: England.

Arabic References

- Abbas, F. H.** (2005). *Al-Balaġhah fununiha wa 'afnaniha: ilm al-ma'ani* (10th ed.). Amman: Dar al-Furqan.
- Al-Hashimi, A. A.** (2005) *Jawahir al- Balaġah* (1st ed.). Cairo: Al- Mukhtasar.
- Al-Jurjani, A.** (11th century - 2004) *Dala'il al-icjaz* (5th ed.). Cairo: Maktabat al-khanji.

Table 4. English and Arabic main criteria of analysis

	Principle of ellipsis	Purposes of ellipsis	Extent of clausal ellipsis	Types of elliptical clauses (grammatical and semantic ellipsis)
English	a. Recoverability of meaning b. But it is not necessary that meaning is recoverable through the same expression.	a. Brevity b. Rhetoric c. Emphasis d. a means of textual cohesion.	a. An element b. Part of a clause c. A whole clause	a. A statement b. A question c. Yes/no and wh clauses d. Ellipsis occurs at any position in a clause. e. semantic ellipsis: no information is missing in some clauses, yet they are considered elliptical constructions.
Arabic	a. Recoverability of meaning b. But it is not necessary that meaning is recoverable through the same expression.	a. Brevity (nature of Arabic) b. Rhetoric c. Emphasis d. Eloquence e. a means of textual cohesion.	a. An element b. Part of a clause c. A whole clause d. Several clauses deleted at a time.	a. A statement b. A question c. Yes/no and wh clauses d. Ellipsis occurs at any position in a clause. e. semantic ellipsis: no information is missing in some clauses, yet they are considered elliptical constructions.

As the table above shows, the main principle of ellipsis in both English and Arabic is that nothing can be omitted unless it is recoverable from the context. If omission of an element results in misunderstanding or loss of meaning, ellipsis must not take place in Arabic. There must be sufficient information about the elided item in terms of meaning or grammatical form. Ellipsis in English and Arabic occurs when the elided items have no effect on meaning when they are deleted. Thus, the limiting condition of ellipsis is the recoverability of meaning.

In addition to brevity, ellipsis is also used for rhetorical purposes in both languages. But this phenomenon occurs very often in Arabic. Eloquence is achieved by the use of ellipsis in Arabic.

The analysis also shows that English and Arabic have constructions where there is no missing information, yet they are considered elliptical constructions. Such constructions are not signaled by syntactic ellipsis, but rather by semantic ellipsis. In Arabic, intonation is viewed as a means of verbal identification of elided items in speech. Pausing, parsing, one's own judgment and reasoning, and the use of grammatical rules are used to recognize elided items, by assuming it and without postulating a new sentence. In addition to syntactic operations used in writing, English and Arabic display verbal identification of elided items in speech.

As far as clausal ellipsis is concerned, an item or a whole clause can be omitted in English and Arabic, as indicated by the table above. Ellipsis occurs at different types of clauses (e.g., statements, and yes/no and wh questions) in both English and Arabic. It can occur at

different positions in a clause in both languages. In English, clausal ellipsis occurs at two main structures, Modal element (the subject and the finite element in the verbal group) and Propositional element (the remainder of the verbal group and any complements and adjuncts).

Similarly, two main types of ellipsis are attested in Arabic: word ellipsis and clausal ellipsis. The study shows that the elliptical elements in Arabic include the two major constituents of a sentence, the predicand and the predicate. Other elements can also be ellipsed, such as verb, subject, object, annexation, prepositional phrase, modified elements, and conditionals. Though omission of an object is common in Arabic, this is not possible in some constructions with metaphorical meaning. Arabic also displays omission of adjectives, though not frequently used.

The study shows that there needs to be elements which identify elided items in a clause in both languages. The fact that it is not necessary that the meaning is recoverable through the same expression is attested in both languages.

The study also demonstrates that clausal ellipsis in Arabic is more common in Qur'an than any other context. This is because omission of a sentence may result in a misunderstanding in meaning. In English, if two or more paratactic clauses have a different subject, only the first paratactic clause constitutes the domain of the presupposition. English shows instances of ambiguity when ellipsis is applied to some reported speech sequences.

Another area of similarity between the two languages is that ellipsis can be a means of textual cohesion.

Despite these similarities, the analyses of the two languages display some differences. For example, ellipsis in

'So he watered for them, then he turned back shade, and said: "My lord! Truly, I am in need of whatever good that you bestow on me". Then there came to him one of the two women, walking shyly. She said: "Verily, my father calls you that he may reward you for having watered for us".'

In this Qur'anic verse some sentences have been omitted at various points after the clause (فسقى لها) (so he watered for them). Yet, the context is very coherent. The elided clauses can be interpreted as follows (Abbas, 2005: 486):

فذهبتا إلى أبيهما، فأخبرتاه الخبر، فأرسل إحداهما تدعوه، وأخبرته، فسار معها إلى أبيها.

The two women went to their father and told him that a man had brought them some water from the well. At her father's request, one woman came to the man and told him that her father wanted to see him. The man agreed to go with the woman.

Although omission of a sentence is very common in Qur'ān, Ibn Hisham (vol. 2) identifies constructions where a sentence is omitted outside the context of Qur'ān. These include an answer to a question, constructions of *نعم وبئس* (ni ima and bi 'sa: verbs of praise and blame), after the conditional *إن* (inna: even though), etc. (Ibn Hisham, vol. 2: 648 - 49). Examples of elided sentences in an answer to a question and after the conditional *إن* (inna) are given respectively below.

A: أقام زيد؟

Did Zaid stand up?

B: نعم.

Yes.

The sentence (نعم زيد قام) (Yes, Zaid stood up) is elided in B.

Another example is the following (adapted from Ibn Hisham, ibid: 649):

A: وإن كان فقيرًا

Even though he is poor!

B: وإن

In B, the whole sentence *وإن كان فقيرًا* (Even though he is poor) is omitted.

Unlike the above types of ellipsis which are introduced by Ibn Hisham (vol. 2) and Abbas (2005), Almat'ani (1992) suggests four main types of ellipsis in Qur'an: ellipsis of a particle, a lexical item, a phrase, and a sentence. Like Al-Jurjani, Ibn Jinni, Ibn Hisham, and Abbas, Almat'ani stresses the fact that ellipsis should not result in misunderstanding or loss of meaning, and what is elipted should be contextually understood.

6. Analysis and findings

The analysis of data of English and Arabic reveals that both languages display ellipsis. However, the analysis shows similarities and differences between the two languages. English and Arabic distinguish what counts as ellipsis and what

does not. The two languages also distinguish ellipsis-like terms, and display various types of ellipsis. Table four below shows the main criteria used for identifying the similarities and differences between the two languages.

This can be found in constructions such as (لأخرجن) (I swear that I will leave.) which is an elliptical form of والله (لأخرجن) (I swear by Allah, God, that I will leave).

k. Ellipsis of exceptive items

An example of the omission of an exceptive item is the following (Ibn Hisham, vol. 2: 634; cf. Sibawayh, vol. 2: 344):

قبضت عشرة ليس إلا

You gave me only ten.

The exceptive item ذلك (this money) which is assumed to follow إلا (only) is omitted in the example above. It can also be elided in constructions like: ليس غير

Nothing more.

Here the exceptive item (ذلك) (this money) that comes after (غير) (more) is omitted.

l. Ellipsis of the suffixed 'n□n' of the dual and plural forms.

This is illustrated in the following example (ibid.: 643).

الضاربين زيداً

Those (two) who hit Zaid

الضاربين عمرواً

Those who hit Amr.

The suffix نون (n□n) in both (الضاربين) (those two who hit) and (الضاربون) (those who hit) in the above examples is omitted.

5.3.2 Clausal ellipsis

Ellipsis of complete sentences usually occur in Qura'n, as Abbas says:

فإن هذا القسم - أعني حذف الجمل - لا تكاد تجده إلا في كتاب الله تبارك وتعالى، ذلك أن الجملة ذات فائدة مستقلة، وحينها نحذف فإن ذلك سيحدث خللاً في المعنى.

(Abbas, 2005: 483)

Omission of sentences is hardly found in a context other than Qur'an. This is because an omission of a sentence from its context will result in misunderstanding.

One example of ellipsis of sentences is the following Quranic verse:

(فسقى لها ثم تولى إلى الظل فقال رب إني لما أنزلت إلي من خير فقير، فجاءته أحدهما تمشي على استحياء قالت إن أبي يدعوك ليجزيك أجر ما سقيت لنا).

(Qur'an, Chapter 28: 24 and 25)

Word ellipsis also involves omission of annexed elements in a sentence. This is illustrated by the following Quranic verse:

(لله الأمر من قبل ومن بعد) (Qur'ān, Chapter 30: 3)

‘The decision of the matter before and after is only with Allah.’

The complete form of the above Quranic verse is *لله الأمر من قبل ذلك ومن بعده*. Here the annexed items *ذلك* (these events) and *هـ* (ha: an attached pronoun) are omitted.

f. Ellipsis of prepositional phrase

An example of the omission of a prepositional phrase is:

(ولذكرُ الله أكبر) (Qur'ān, Chapter 29: 45)

‘And the praising of Allah is greater indeed.’

The prepositional phrase *من كل شيء* (from everything) which comes after *(أكبر)* (greater) is ellipted.

g. Ellipsis of a head element in a head-modifier structure

This is illustrated by the following example:

(وعندهم قصرات الطرف) (Qur'ān, Chapter 38: 52)

And beside them will be chaste females restraining their glances only for their husbands.’

Here the head item *(حور)* which precedes *(قصرات)* (restraining) is omitted.

h. Ellipsis of adjectives

Omission of adjectives is not as frequent as the omission of head items, according to Abbas (ibid: 482). An example of an elided adjective is the following:

(الذي أطعمهم من جوع وآمنهم من خوف) (Qur'an, Chapter 106: 4)

‘(He) who has fed them against hunger, and has made them safe from fear.’

The two adjectives *(شديد)* (extreme) and *(عظيم)* (biggest) which follow *(جوع)* (hunger) and *(خوف)* (fear) respectively, are omitted.

i. Ellipsis of conditionals

The following example demonstrates this type of ellipsis.

(فاتبعوني يُحببكم الله) (Qur'ān: Chapter 3: 31)

‘If you really love Allah, follow me. Allah will love you and forgive your sins.’

In this example, *(فاتبعوني)* (follow me) is an elliptical form of the if-clause *(فإن تتبعوني)* (if you follow me).

j. Ellipsis of an oath

لو شاء علي لحضر

If Ali had wanted to come, he would have come.

The complete form of the above sentence is *لو شاء علي الحضور لحضر*. Here the object *الحضور* (coming) is deleted, as it occurs after *شاء* (want).

An object can also be omitted after the negation of 'verbs of realization', such as *(يعلم)* (know), *يبيصر* (realize), etc. This is clarified by the following Quranic verse:

(ألا إنهم هم السفهاء ولكن لا يعلمون) (Qur'ān, Chapter 1: 13)

'Verily, they are the fools, but they know not.'

Here *إنهم سفهاء* (verily, they are fools), which occurs after the verb *يعلمون* (know) is omitted.

According to Abbas, the object is omitted in a sentence for particular reasons. These include the following (Abbas, 2005: 287-96):

1. to avoid ambiguity, as in this example:

سهرنا إلى الفجر

We stayed up late until dawn.

If the object (*الليل*: night) in the sentence above were kept, this would yield a different meaning *سهرنا أكثر الليل* (we stayed up late at night).

2. to achieve generalization. An example is:

(والله يدعو إلى دار السلام) (Qur'ān, Chapter 10: 25)

'Allah calls to the home of peace.'

The verb *يدعوا* (calls) in this Quranic verse implies *يدعو كل واحد* (call every one), but *كل واحد* (every one) is omitted, as it is understood contextually.

In some constructions, however, omission of an object is not possible. In fact, an object is kept in a sentence in order to achieve particular purposes, as in the following example provided by Al-Jurjani (2004: 164):

لو شئت بكيت دمًا

Even if you cry bitterly

A metaphorical meaning is expressed by the use of the object (*دمًا*) (bitterly) in the above example. This meaning would not be achieved if the object were omitted.

e. Ellipsis of 'annexation

b. Ellipsis of predicate

A predicate can be ellipted, as in the following example:

(أَكْلُهَا دَائِمٌ وَظِلُّهَا) (Qur'ān, chapter 13: 35)

'its provision is eternal and so its shade'

Here the second 'دائم' (eternal), which functions as the predicate of ظلُّها (shade), is omitted.

c. Ellipsis of verb

A verb can be omitted in an answer to a question, according to Ibn Hisham (ibid.). It is also frequently omitted after القول (say), as in the following example:

(والملائكة يدخلون عليهم من كل باب سلام عليكم) (Qur'ān, chapter 13: 23 and 24)

'And angels shall enter unto them from every gate. Peace be upon you.'

In the Qur'anic verse above, the word (قائلين) which has the function of the verb (say) and is placed immediately after (من) (من كل باب) (from every gate), is omitted.

Another type of sentential ellipsis involves the omission of a verb while the subject of the sentence is kept (Ibn Jinni, 2004: 156). This is illustrated by the following example provided by Ibn Jinni (ibid.):

زيداً ضربته

I hit Zaid

Here the assumed omitted verb is (ضربت). This can be seen clearly in the following interpretation:

(ضربت) زيداً ضربته

I hit Zaid.

Thus, (زيداً) takes the accusative form, because of the influence of the elided verb (ضربت) (cf. Owens, 1988: 188).

d. Ellipsis of subject

Elliptical subject is illustrated in the following example provided by Abbas (2005: 478):

أرسلت المطر

It rained.

The subject (السما) (sky) in the above example is deleted (أرسلت السماء المطر) lit. 'the sky sent down the rain'.

e. Ellipsis of object

Omission of an object often occurs after لو شئت (want), according to Ibn Hisham (Vol 2: 633). An example is:

Ellipsis in this example occurs for rhetorical purpose. If يُعطي ويمنع (He (God) gives and prevents) occurred in its complete form يُعطي ما يشاء ويمنع ما يشاء (He (God) gives and prevents whatever He wants), the aesthetic meaning would be lost (ibid.):

ولكن لا سبيل إلى إظهار ذلك المحذوف، ولو أنت أظهرته زالت البهجة، وضاع ذلك الرونق.

(Al-Hashimi, ibid.)

If the omitted items ما يشاء (whatever He wants) were kept in the sentence, the aesthetic meaning would be lost.

Abbas (2005) suggests two types for ellipsis: word ellipsis and sentence ellipsis (2005: 478). The two main types of ellipsis introduced by Abbas and Almat'ani (1992) will be discussed in some details below.

As just indicated, Abbas distinguishes two main types of ellipsis, word ellipsis and sentence ellipsis (Abbas 2005: 478). These are discussed below.

5.3.1 Word ellipsis

Elliptical elements of this type include predicand, predicate, verb, subject, object, annexation, prepositional phrase, modified elements, adjectives, conditionals, oaths, exceptive items, and the suffixed 'n□n' of the dual and plural forms. The discussion of ellipsis of these subtypes is mainly based on Abbas (2005: 478-83) and Ibn Hisham (vol. 2: 634, 643).

a. Ellipsis of predicand

According to Ibn Hisham, an elliptical predicand frequently occurs in an answer to a question. The predicand can also be omitted in other constructions. For example, the predicand is elided in a conditional apodosis (main clause) which begins with the particle ف (fa). An elliptical predicand also occurs after القول (say) (Ibn Hisham, Vol 2: 629-30). These types of ellipsis are illustrated respectively in the following examples:

(ما أصحاب اليمين، في سدر مخضود) (Qur'an, chapter 56: 28)

'And those on the right hand - who will be those on the right hand? Among thornless lote trees.'

The predicand 'هُم' (they) in the second part of the Quranic verse above is omitted. Similarly, the predicands فعله (fa amaluhu: his right deed) and فإساءته (fa isa'atuh: his evil deed) are deleted in the following sentence:

(من عمل صالحًا فلنفسه، ومن أساء فعليها)

(Qur'an, chapter 41: 46)

'Whosoever does righteous good deeds, it is for his ownself; and whosoever does evil, it is against his ownself.'

The predicand (هذا) (this) in the example below is omitted, as it occurs after 'said':

(فقالوا ساحر كذاب) (Qura'n, chapter 40: 24)

'But they called : "A sorcerer, a liar!"'

According to the Kufans, the subject in the sentence above is not *هندٌ* Hind', but rather the elided assumed *أحدٌ* (one). Thus, the example above is an elliptical form for:

ما خرج أحدٌ إلا هندٌ

No one left except Hind.

The Kufans support their argument by the fact that if *هند* (Hind) were the subject, the *ت* (ta) would be suffixed to the verb *خرج* (left) to become *خرجت* (left).

The Basrans, on the other hand, argue that *أحدٌ* (one) is to be assumed in this sentence, rather than in grammar.

As indicated by the examples above, the Kufans and the Basrans have different perspectives on ellipsis. The two schools treat the 'assumed' structures differently.

5.3 Types of Ellipsis

According to Al-Hashimi, ellipsis is of two types:

الحذف خلاف الأصل. وهو قسمان: قسم يظهر فيه المحذوف عند الإعراب وقسم لا يظهر فيه المحذوف بالإعراب، وإنما تعلم مكانه إذا تصفحت المعنى ووجدته لا يقع إلا بمراعاته.

(Al-Hashimi, 2005: 101)

Ellipsis, opposite of occurrence (of omitted items), is of two types. The first involves omitted items which are recoverable by 'i rāb' (case or mood endings). In the second type, however, elided items are not recovered by 'i rāb' (case or mood endings), and are usually deleted for particular reasons, such as rhetorical purposes.

Examples of the two types of ellipsis just mentioned are given below (ibid.).

أهلاً وسهلاً

You are welcome

The omitted items in *أهلاً وسهلاً* (You are welcome) can be recovered by 'i rāb' (case or mood endings).

Here *أهلاً وسهلاً* are in an accusative case, because of their 'governing' words, which are assumed, as follows:

جئت أهلاً ونزلت مكاناً سهلاً

Lit: You came to your people and arrived at an easy place (You are welcome).

A further example provided by Al-Hashimi is:

يُعطي ويمنع

He (God) gives and prevents.

ضربت زيداً ضربته

I hit Zaid.

Here transformational grammar begins with a complete original sentence when considering ellipsis. But Arabic theory, Owens points out, starts with the final structure, and then explains how 'Zaydan' is in the accusative case. The initial verb is omitted because it is contextually understood, as in:

زيداً ضربته

I hit Zaid.

Owens goes on to comment that ellipsis in Arabic is 'applied by speakers in the course of speaking' (Owens, *ibid.*: 197- 98). In other words, deleting an item is not organized in a formal rule (e.g., V NP → V), when the (understood) object does not occur in a sentence (*ibid.*).

Theory of government (Amal) is used to identify elided items. Though 'Awāmil' (governing words, such as verbs and particular particles) are omitted, their grammatical effects remain in the context, according to the Arabic grammarians (Al-Liheibi, 2000: 172; cf. also Owens, 1988: 195). For example, if a person shouts الأسد (al-'asad: the lion!) to draw the attention of other person or people to the sudden presence of such an animal, he or she means 'احذر الأسد' (ihthar al-'asad: Beware of the lion!). Here the governing word احذر (beware of), which causes the word الأسد (lion) to be in an accusative case, is omitted (*ibid.*: 173).

When ellipsis does not take place in a sentence, the term ذِكر 'thikr' (non-ellipsis) is used. The general rule is that an item must not be elided if there is nothing in a sentence that refers to the omitted item (qarā'in), as mentioned above. But there are other reasons for not ellipting an item. For example, المسند إليه (al-musnad ilyhi: theme) must not be elided from a sentence if it is difficult to refer to it when omitted. The theme also must occur in a sentence when there is a need to convey the message precisely. In some constructions, theme occurs in a sentence for a particular deliberate purpose, such as a rhetorical purpose (Abbas, 2005: 257-59).

According to Bohas et al. (2006), the analysis of utterances in Arabic involves two approaches. In the first approach, utterances are analysed in terms of the formal relation between their items. In the second approach, which is adopted by Sibawayh, the analysis of utterances is based on the operations which are uttered by the speaker to attain a particular effect on the listener (Bohas et al. 2006: 38). Here utterances are analysed in sequence, rather than in isolation to make clear their 'basic' similarities and dissimilarities which are explained in terms of what Bohas et al. call 'enunciative operations' performed at different levels: أعمال ('Amal) and الغاء (cancelation) (*ibid.*: 39).

The Kufan and the Basran, the two traditional grammar schools, have different viewpoints in terms of ellipsis. This is illustrated by the following example (Al-Liheibi, 2000: 211):

ما طعمتك أكل إلا زيدٌ

The one who ate your food was Zaid.

According to the Kufans, the sentence above is ungrammatical, as زيدٌ (Zaid) is not the subject of the verb أكل (ate). For them, in constructions like the previous one, a sentence has to have an assumed subject, as in this sentence:

ما خرج إلا هندٌ

No one left except Hind.

نحن نحذف ما نحذف، إذن حينها نجد المحذوف لا يزيدنا شيئاً من حيث المعنى، بل نجد فيه خفة واختصاراً من حيث اللفظ، وفائدة ذات أثر بياني من حيث المعنى. (Abbas, ibid.: 270)

Items are elided in a sentence provided that they add nothing to meaning.

Ellipsis can indeed yield a precise and short message. Furthermore, it can convey rhetorical purposes.

But Abbas points out that an item is omitted if it can be contextually recovered:

كل كلمة أو جملة يمكن أن يُفهم المعنى بدونها، لوجود قرائن تدل على الحذف حري بها أن تُحذف.

(Abbas, ibid.: 255)

A word or a sentence can be omitted if what is elided is contextually understood.

There may be other reasons for ellipsis, but the main reason is that the omitted items add nothing to the meaning, as indicated above (ibid.: 271).

The main principle of ellipsis in Arabic is that nothing can be omitted unless it is recoverable from the context (Ibn Jinni, 2004: 140, also cf. Owens, 1988: 186). Ibn Jinni says that:

حذفت العرب الجملة، والمفرد، والحرف، والحركة، وليس شيء من ذلك إلا وله دليل، وإلا كان فيه ضرب من تكليف علم الغيب .

(Ibn Jinni, 2004: 140)

For the speakers of Classical Arabic, ellipsis involves the omission of a particle, a lexical item, a case or mood ending, or a sentence. If there is nothing that refers to the elided items in the context, reconstruction of the elided elements will involve a form of speculation.

A similar argument is provided by Al-Hashimi (2005). For him, alhathf (ellipsis) involves omission of an element from a sentence, but this should not lead to loss of meaning, and there has to be something in the sentence which refers to the elided items:

إيجاز الحذف يكون بحذف شيء من العبارة لا يخلُّ بالفهم، مع قرينة تُعيِّن المحذوف.

(Al-Hashimi, 2005: 187)

Ellipsis is the omission of an item from a sentence. But this omission should not result in misunderstanding; there has to be something through which the elided item is identified.

Based on the above arguments, there needs to be قرائن (qarā'in), or elements which identify elided items in a sentence. These 'qarā'in' can be contextual or situational. For example, intonation is viewed as a means of 'qarā'in lafdiyyah, or verbal identification of elided items in speech. Pausing and parsing are also used to recognize elided items in Arabic (cf. Al-Liheibi, 2000: 175-181). In this respect, Abbas (2005) identifies specific 'qarā'in' by which the elided items can be recognized. For example, ellipsis can also be recognized by العقل (al- aql: using one's own judgment and reasoning. Use of grammatical rules is also one means of identifying omitted items (Abbas, 2005: 475-77). An example of this is the use of the theory of government (called 'Amal' in Arabic), which is briefly discussed below.

According to Owens, an elided item in Arabic can be identified by assuming it, without postulating a new sentence (Owens: 1988: 195-96). One important approach to doing this is the theory of government. Emphasis is given to the restructuring of the elided items in Arabic. But the theory of transformational grammar, for example, concerns itself with decomposing the deleted items (ibid.). The example used previously will be repeated here for convenience.

أحبُّ أبي

I love my father.

Here the covert first person أنا ('ana: I) is omitted or assumed (taqdīr).

Ibn Hisham points out that emphasis and ellipsis cannot occur in one construction, as ellipsis aims at shortening the sentence (vol. 2: 608). For instance, it is not acceptable to modify the omitted object pronoun (هُوَ—hu) with the emphasizer (نَفْسَهُ 'nafsahu') in the example below) (ibid.).

الذي ضربتُ نفسه زيدٌ*

The one I hit was Zaid.

But one can say:

الذي ضربتهُ نفسه زيدٌ

The one I hit was Zaid

Although the previous example is emphasized, it does not involve ellipsis. The object pronoun (هُوَ -hu) is suffixed to the verb ضربتهُ (arabtuh: I hit him).

Another term involved in this context is 'ijaz'(concision), which is of two types: athf (ellipsis) and 'qasr' (stating precisely and briefly) (Abbas, 2005: 475). In 'athf' (ellipsis), a word or even a sentence is omitted, but the meaning is understood without the elided items. However, there has to be something which refers to the omitted items. In 'qasr'(stating precisely and briefly), by contrast, no item is omitted. But meanings of 'qasr' constructions can imply some kind of semantic omission. Instances of these constructions are frequently found in Qur'an. Abbas defines 'qasr' as follows:

وهو تضمين الألفاظ القليلة معاني كثيرة من غير حذف، فهو الذي لا يمكن أن نعبر عن معانيه بألفاظ مساوية لتلك الألفاظ التي عبّر بها عن هذه المعاني.

(Abbas, ibid.: 487)

'Al-qasr' involves constructions in which one single item conveys precisely more than one meaning. These meanings cannot be expressed exactly in the same way they occur in the context, as each implies many meanings.

A good example of 'al-qasr' is the following (ibid.: 488):

(ألا له الخلق والأمر) (Qur'an, Chapter 7 : 54)

'Surely, He is the Creation and the Commandment.'

In this Quranic verse the words الخلق (al-khalq: Creation) and الأمر (al-amr: Commandment) imply two different meanings; their meanings cannot be expressed by one single word.

Ellipsis in Arabic occurs when the elided items have no effect on meaning when they are deleted. In fact, omission can carry particular rhetorical purposes, as Abbas points out:

5. Ellipsis in Arabic ⁽¹⁾

5.1 Definition of the term

The phenomenon of ellipsis has been productively studied in Arabic. For example, the Arabic Linguistic Traditions (ALT) recognizes two types of ellipsis: ‘ \square athf’ (deletion) and ‘ $i\square$ mār’ (Owens, 1988: 186). Although ‘ \square athf’ and ‘ $i\square$ mār’ both involve omission, Ibrahim (1975) distinguishes the two terms:

الحذف لغة: إسقاط شيء من الكلام، اسمًا أو فعلًا أو حرفًا أو جملةً

وإذا أسقط شيء من الكلام وبقي أثره سُمِّي إضمارًا.

(Ibrahim, 1975: 1; quoted in Al-Liheibi, 2000: 170)

‘ \square athf’ (ellipsis) means omission of an element (a particle, a verb, or a clause) in a sentence. If the elided element is assumed in the sentence, it is called ‘ $i\square$ mār’.

Thus, according to this definition, *أقبل* (aqbala: the arrival of somebody) in the example below is \square athf (Al-Hashimi, 2005: 101):

أقبل

He is coming.

Another extended definition of ellipsis is provided by Al-Jurjani. Here ellipsis is defined rhetorically:

هو باب دقيق المسلك، لطيف المأخذ، عجيب الأمر، شبيه بالسحر، فإنك ترى به ترك الذكر أفصح من الذكر، والصمت عن الإفادة أزيد للإفادة، وتجذك أنطق ما تكون إذا لم تنطق، وأتمّ ما تكون إذا لم تُبِن.

(Al-Jurjāni, 11th century - 2004: 146)

Ellipsis requires caution for its investigation, as it is peculiar and has a magical quality. Omission can convey the message more precisely than the occurrence of the elided items. One can be very eloquent when using ellipsis.

5.2 Ellipsis and other relevant terms

Another term that describes deleted items is $I\square$ mār. In the example below $I\square$ mār is expressed by the third person masculine *هو* (huwa), which refers to the elided noun *العدل* (al-adl) (ibid.: 107):

(إعدلوا هو أقرب للتقوى) (Qur’an, chapter: 5: 9)

‘Be just: that is the nearer to piety’

The term ‘*taqdīr*’ (literally means an assumed element) is also used to describe omitted items on the basis of grammatical or semantic factors: (Owens, 1988: 186). A good example is the following sentence provided by Al-Liheibi (2000: 172):

⁽¹⁾ One column is used starting from this page due to printing purposes (editor in chief).

من هذه النقطة نهر واحد حتى لا يتداخل العربي بالإنجليزي (رئيس التحرير).

- a. Everything's just as it was.
Of course it is.

- b. Don't let me hear the name again!
I won't indeed!

Ellipsis is also found in the following examples of assent, where 'yes' and 'no' are the only rejoinders; the remainder of the clause is elided (ibid.: 216):

- a. It's cold.
Yes.
- b. We're not late.
No.

This applies to constructions involving commands. But the modal element needs to be added if 'yes' occurs after the negative command which suggests refusal, as in the following instance (ibid.):

- A: Don't tell anyone what you saw!
B: Yes, I will.

Clausal ellipsis also occurs in reported speech sequences. This type is related to the ellipsis of the first category of indirect responses above, the 'commentary'. The discussion below involves indirect wh-questions and indirect yes/no questions.

When the reported clause is an indirect wh-question, ellipsis is similar to that of direct questions, the wh-type interrogative clauses. Examples are (ibid.: 217):

- a. I said you would mend it for him.
I hope you didn't say when.

- b. The jewels are missing.
I wonder what else.

In (a) and (b) above, 'when' and 'what else' presuppose 'I would mend it for him' and 'is missing' respectively. The wh- item 'when' in (a) is a new element, whereas 'what' in (b) is already present in the presupposed clause, and asks for expansion.

When the reported clause is a yes/no question, ellipsis is typically zero as in (ibid.: 219):

- A: Was that an earthquake?
B: I don't know.

When the question is introduced by a verb like 'ask' in the reporting clause, the reported clause which is elided is treated as a question, regardless of the mood of the presupposed clause (ibid.), as in:

John was very disappointed by the response. You can ask him.

Here the indirect yes/no question 'whether he was or not' is elided, despite the fact that presupposed clause is not a question. When a reporting verb, such as 'tell', 'report', 'know', or 'say' introduces a statement or a yes/no question, and the reported clause is elided, there may arise an ambiguity. An example is (ibid.: 220):

- A: I think the cheque is still valid.
B: The Bank can tell them.

Two interpretations can be given here. The first is 'the Bank can tell them the check is still valid', and the second is 'the Bank can tell them whether the check is still valid or not'.

In the case of clause complexes (paratactic and hypotactic clauses), the elliptical clause may presuppose 'any clause in a complex', according to Halliday and Hasan. It can also presuppose all other clauses following it (paratactic), or all those dependent on it (hypotactic) (ibid.: 222). This general principle is illustrated by the two examples below (ibid.). The first is paratactic, and the second is hypotactic.

- a. Smith was going to take part, but somebody *telephoned and asked to see him urgently*
so he had to withdraw.
Who?
- b. I kept quiet because *Mary gets very embarrassed if anyone mentions John's name.*
I don't know why?

The first clause in each example above is not presupposed. In (a) the clause 'somebody telephoned' is presupposed. The remainder 'and asked to see him urgently so he had to withdraw' is also presupposed, as this is within the domain of the presupposition. The meaning here is 'who telephoned and asked to see him urgently so he had to withdraw'. Similarly, the meaning in (b) is 'I don't know why Mary gets very embarrassed if anyone mentions John's name'. Thus, it is possible to presuppose a paratactic clause complex by clausal ellipsis only when the other clauses which come after the presupposed clause fall within the domain of the presupposition (ibid.: 224). An example is the following (ibid.):

I left my books here and somebody came in and either borrowed them or put them back on the shelf but did not say a word to me. I wish I could find out who.

The clauses following the presupposed clause need to have at least one element (usually the subject) in common, as in the above example. There are, however, possibilities where two or more paratactic clauses have a different subject. In this case only the first paratactic clause constitutes the domain of the presupposition. The example below, though hardly accepted by Halliday and Hasan, illustrates the point (ibid.).

I left my books here and somebody complained and the librarian put them back on the shelf but did not say a word to me. I wish I could find out who.

Clauses occurring later in the complex, Halliday and Hasan point out, can lead to ambiguity, as it is not always clear which clause is being presupposed (ibid.: 223). The following example illustrates the point (ibid.):

- A: I finished writing that story, and it's going to be published.
B: When?

Here 'when' can mean either 'when did you finish writing it?', or 'when is it going to be published? There is even much ambiguity in a very complex structure, as in this example (ibid.: 224):

- A: I shall be cross if you break that vase, which was a present from my boyfriend.
B: Which?

In the example above, two elements of the second part of the sentence (takes coffee) are omitted.

The line between what is elliptical and what is not is not clear cut, according to Halliday and Hasan (ibid.: 205). They argue that modal and propositional ellipsis is clear in most cases; some constructions, however, are doubtful. Now I move on to discuss question-answer sequences and other 'rejoinder' sequences in terms of ellipsis. The categories of these sequences is discussed in some detail below.

Halliday and Hasan define 'rejoinder' as 'any utterance which immediately follows an utterance by a different speaker and is cohesively related to it' (ibid.: 206). Rejoinders are of two types, those that follow questions (called responses), and those which do not follow questions (not responses, but sequels to statements or commands) (ibid.: 206 and 214). Both types also involve specific sub-categories. These are discussed below.

A. Rejoinders which are responses

Rejoinders of this type presuppose questions. They, thus, have potentials for ellipsis. Here responses are either direct or indirect. Direct responses are those which answer yes/no questions and wh-questions, as in the following examples (ibid.: 208):

- a. Has John arrived?
Yes, he has.
- b. When did John arrive?
Yesterday.

As the examples above indicate, in the simplest forms of direct responses (to both yes/no and wh-questions) what is explicit is the information the speaker seeks ('Yes, he has' in example one and 'yesterday' in example two), the remainder being presupposed by ellipsis. The clauses 'Yes, he has arrived' and 'John arrived yesterday' in examples one and two above take elliptical forms.

Elliptical forms here can be long or partial. There can also be no ellipsis at all (ibid.: 211). Indirect responses involve three categories: 'commentary', 'disclaimer', and 'supplementary' (ibid.: 206). These are illustrated by the following examples (ibid.: 208).

- a. How did they break in?
I'll show you how. (commentary)
- b. Why didn't you tell John?
I did. (disclaimer)
- c. Did you tell John?
He wasn't there. (supplementary)

The indirect responses (commentary, disclaimer, and supplementary) are potentially elliptical. For example, the response to the commentary below is elided (ibid.: 212):
A: Why are the lights turned off?
B: I am not supposed to say why. (This is an elliptical form for 'I am not supposed to say why the lights are turned off').

A response in the disclaimer can be declarative or interrogative. These types of responses are usually elliptical, as in the following instance (ibid.: 213):

- A: What's your telephone number?
B: We're not on the phone. (declarative)
- A: When did they cancel the booking?
B: Did they? (interrogative)

The supplementary response answers a question by implication. This type is normally associated with yes/no questions, rather than wh-questions. The reason, according to Halliday and Hasan, is that it is difficult to give an answer to a wh-question by implication. Thus, a disclaimer response is the alternative (ibid.). Responses here can presuppose the whole question. A good example is (ibid.):

- A: Can you make it stand up?
B: If you keep still. (I can make it stand up if you keep still)

B. Rejoinders which are not responses

As mentioned above, rejoinders of this type are sequels to statements or commands. Rejoinders here involve the following sub-categories: 'assent' and 'contradiction' (after a statement), 'consent' and 'refusal' (after a command), and 'yes/no or wh-question' (after a statement or a command) (ibid.: 206-208). These rejoinders are illustrated by the following examples (ibid.: 208).

- a. It's going to rain. (statement)
It might. (assent)
It isn't. (contradiction)
Is it? (yes/no question)
- b. Leave me alone. (command)
I won't. (refusal)
All right, I will. (consent)
Why? (wh-question)

The examples above are rejoinders; they are not responses, as the presupposed items are not questions (ibid.). Question rejoinders act to query statements or commands which come before them. The whole clause is presupposed, and the speaker seeks confirmation (ibid.: 214-15):

- a. Peter's here.
Is he?
- b. Open that parcel.
Shall I?

In other constructions, the speaker seeks confirmation by querying one element. The rest of the clause is elided, as in the following example (ibid.: 215):

- A: John's coming to dinner.
B: John?

The query can also take the form of a wh-question. The remainder of the clause is omitted. An example is (ibid.):

- A: John's coming to dinner.
B: Who?

Other types of rejoinders (to statements or commands) involve an elliptical clause which consists of the modal element only. This is illustrated by the following examples (ibid.: 216):

55). Sentence-initial ellipsis is found commonly, but not solely, in colloquial speech. The omitted items of this subtype involve verbal operators (i.e. auxiliary items, such as ‘be’, ‘do’, etc.) and pronominal subjects or existential markers (ibid.: 56). An example is (ibid.: 57):

Any good? (*Are they any good?*)

Foreign body in there. (*There’s a foreign body in there*)

The second subtype of omitted constructions is the situational. According to Wilson, occurring in speech, ellipsis of this subtype is very common in writing, such as notices, signs, instructions on containers of products, and

manufacturer’s labels on goods (ibid.: 63).

C. Telegraphic ellipsis

The term ‘telegraphic’ refers to the abbreviated or incomplete linguistic structures which are similar to telegrams. Examples of telegraphic ellipsis include newspaper headlines, headings, titles, songs, children’s speech (e.g. ‘More milk’) (ibid.: 71, 73, and 76).

Halliday and Hasan (1976) distinguishes between nominal, verbal, and clausal ellipsis.

The types of ellipsis discussed above are summarized in the table below.

Table 3: Types of ellipsis (Halliday and Hasan)

Halliday and Hasan, (1976)	Thorne, (1997)	Wilson (2000)	Carter and McCarthy, (2006)
1- Nominal 2- Verbal 3- Clausal	1-Nominal phrases 2-Verbal phrases 3- Clauses	1-Contextual: a- anaphoric and cataphoric ellipsis b- Intrasentential and intersentential 2- Situational: a- Sentence-initial b- Situational 3- Telegraphic	1-Situational 2-Textual 3-Structural

Of these types, Halliday and Hasan’s clausal ellipsis (1976) is discussed in more detail below.

4.4 Clausal ellipsis

According to Halliday and Hasan, a clause is realized by an expression of different speech functions, such as a statement, a question, a response, etc. It is of two main structures: Modal element and Propositional element (ibid.: 197). The modal element has two parts, the subject and the finite element in the verbal group. The proposition is the remainder of the verbal group (the residue) and any Complements or Adjuncts. The modal and propositional elements are illustrated by the example below (ibid.).

The Duke was (modal element) going to plant a row of poplars in the park (propositional element).

The modal ellipsis and propositional ellipsis are discussed in some detail below.

A. Modal ellipsis

Modal ellipsis takes place in response to a wh-question which asks ‘what’. Here the subject is presupposed from what has been said in the previous context (ibid.: 198). An example is:

A: What were they doing?

B: Holding hands.

B. Propositional Ellipsis

Propositional ellipsis involves constructions where the mood and polarity constitute the main components of the message (ibid.). This ellipsis is found in yes/no questions and responses to statements. Here the subject is presupposed by a reference item, as indicated in the examples below.

a. Has the plane landed?

Yes, it has.

b. The plane has landed.

Has it?

Propositional ellipsis also occurs in a response to wh-questions where the unknown element is the subject, as illustrated by the following example (ibid.):

A: Who taught you to spell?

B: Grandfather did.

The occurrence of question/answer sequences with marked polarity is ‘less usual’ in substitution, according to Halliday and Hasan (ibid.: 200). Thus, these sequences are often elliptical (ibid.):

a. Has the plane landed?

Yes, it has. (Elliptical form)

Yes, it has done. (Substitute form)

b. Who was playing the piano?

Peter was. (Elliptical form)

Peter was doing. (Substitute form).

The substitute forms in the examples above are odd.

As for ellipsis of individual elements from the clause, Halliday and Hasan point out that ‘it is not possible to omit single elements from the structure of the clause’ (ibid.: 203). For example, it is unacceptable to have the following sequence (ibid.: 202):

A: Has she taken her medicine?

B: She has taken.

Possible responses to the previous question would be ‘she has’ (elliptical form), ‘she has taken it’ (reference), ‘she has done’ (substitute form), and ‘she has taken her medicine’ (non-elliptical clause).

When an element of a clause needs to be presupposed, a reference item is used, as illustrated by the example below (ibid.: 203)

a. The Duke has planted poplars in the park.

b. He has planted poplars in the park.

c. The Duke has planted them.

Ellipsis in the above example is a presupposition *between* sentences. Single elements of clause structure can be omitted *within* sentences. This type of ellipsis is described as ‘internal branching’, as in the following example:

Sybil takes coffee very strong but Joan rather weak.

4.2 Ellipsis and other relevant terms

4.2.1 Gapping

Many scholars distinguish the terms 'ellipsis' and 'gapping' (cf. Lobeck, 1995: 21). For example, the omission of the second occurrence of 'bought' in the example below is treated under a rule of gapping in Transformational Grammar (Ross, 1970; quoted in Dick, 1980: 199).

John bought the book and Bill (bought) the record.

For Wilson (2000), there are gaps which can be described as ellipsis, while some linguistic omissions cannot be treated as such, though they share 'superficial' features with ellipsis (Wilson, 2000: 22). For example, some of these omissions are not motivated (accidental) syntactically 'and/or' situationally. Others are associated with 'contextually motivated inferences of language in use' (ibid.). These linguistic gaps, Wilson points out, are of three types: lapses in performance, nonrealization, and inferential gaps. The three types are briefly discussed below.

a. Lapses in Performance

Examples of these lapses include false starts, distractions, and shifts in attention (ibid.: 23). They are common in spoken language. Lapses in performance can also be found in unedited writing, writing of less mature writers, etc. (ibid.). Wilson goes on to argue that these lapses in performance are not ellipses: 'Lapses of performance are not describable within even the least strict definition of ellipsis' (ibid.: 26).

b. Nonrealization

Gaps also occur in constructions other than lapses in performance. These constructions are also not classified as examples of ellipsis, according to Wilson (ibid.: 28). A theory of indefinite ellipsis suggests that a sentence like 'Suraiya reads for pleasure' is a result of an omission of an indefinitely specified direct object 'Suraiya reads (some x) for pleasure' (ibid.: 27). Wilson points out that if such a theory is applied, 'the implications of what counts as ellipsis are large' (ibid.). He concludes that 'an elliptical theory of such nonrealization is unhelpful because it cannot be given a sufficiently precise definition which would exclude a wide range of vaguely inexplicit expressions' (ibid.).

Another case of nonrealization is the lack of subject in imperatives (ibid.: 29). Wilson argues that because the 'none-elliptical status' of imperatives which lack subjects is not clear, they are not to be analysed as examples of ellipsis.

c. Inferential gaps

Inferential gaps are the third type of linguistic omissions which, according to Wilson, cannot fall within an elliptical framework (ibid.: 31). An example of these constructions is the following (ibid.):

A: Are you going to the pictures?

B: That new Tarantino's on the multiplex.

When the rejoinder sequence above occurs in a complete structure, Wilson argues, it is unacceptable to include its inferential gap within an elliptical framework. This is because we will end up with an 'overgeneralized definition of ellipsis: being understood' (ibid.: 32).

4.3 Types of ellipsis

Carter and McCarthy identify three types of ellipsis: situational, textual, and structural (Carter and McCarthy, 2006: 181). These are illustrated in the following table (ibid.).

Table 1: Types of ellipsis (Carter and McCarthy)

Type of ellipsis	Example	Items elided
A. Situational ellipsis	A: Don't know what's gone wrong here. B: Oh. Need any help?	'I' in A, and 'Do you' in B.
B. Textual ellipsis	He applied and got the job.	'he'
C. Structural ellipsis	The car he was driving was stolen.	'that', though optional

Thorne (1997) points out that ellipsis occurs in nominal phrases, verbal phrases, and clauses (normally within sentences: intrasentential ellipsis), as indicated in the table below (Thorne, 1997: 45-46).

Table 2: Types of ellipsis (Thorne)

Items elided in nominal phrases	Items elided in verbal phrases	Items elided in clauses
A. The head in simple noun phrases, as in: The buttercups were bright yellow and (<i>the buttercups</i>) stretched. B. The head and any modifiers or qualifiers in complex nominal phrase, as in: The black clouds of the impending storm rose above us and (<i>the black clouds of the impending storm</i>) loomed threatening.	Repeated lexical and auxiliary verbs: a- The children ate jelly and ice-cream and the adults (ate) bread and cheese. b- They have been riding and (have been) surfing this week.	The whole clause can be elided: Q: Who was playing the clarinet last night? A: Susan was (playing the clarinet last night).

Wilson (2000) distinguishes between contextual ellipsis, situational ellipsis, and telegraphic ellipsis (Wilson: 2000: 38- 69). These are briefly discussed below.

A. Contextual ellipsis

Contextual ellipsis is categorized into two subtypes. The first involves anaphoric and cataphoric ellipsis. The second consists of intrasentential ellipsis and intersentential ellipsis (ibid.: 38). In an intersentential ellipsis, Wilson focuses on 'fragmented replies' and responses found in dialogue. Wilson points out that 'utterance fragments' (incomplete utterances) which are found in lapses in performance are different from sentence fragments (incomplete sentences). The first cannot be elliptical, whereas the second can. Anaphoric and cataphoric ellipsis is illustrated by the example below.

Brian won't do the dishes, so you'll have to. (Anaphoric ellipsis)

Since Brian won't, I expect I'll have to do the dishes. (Cataphoric ellipsis).

According to Wilson, the majority of contextual elliptical constructions are anaphoric (ibid.). In such constructions a clue is given to what will be ellipted.

B. Situational ellipsis

Ellipsis of this category, which occurs both in speech and writing, needs to be related to its situational context. Language and its environment interact in this context, according to Wilson (ibid.: 65). Two main types of ellipsis are identified here: sentence-initial and situational (ibid.:

phenomenon. She uses data from Russian, Polish and English languages. It is an integrated approach of some aspects of linguistics (syntax, semantics, morphology, pragmatics, and stylistics) with the study of reference attempted to broadly explain the phenomenon of ellipsis.

On the basis of the studies above, one can conclude that ellipsis is used for various purposes. The studies reviewed also show that linguistic deletion is distinguished from other similar phenomena.

4. Ellipsis in English

4.1 Definition of the term

Although ellipsis is a universal phenomenon, but it has not received the attention it deserves, according to McShane (McShane, 2005: 3). Ellipsis is 'a universal property of natural language...ellipsis studies are relatively undeveloped or, at least, lack breadth and depth of coverage' (ibid.).

Wilson (2000) argues that it is 'probably impossible to achieve a satisfactory unitary definition of ellipsis' (Wilson, 2000: 17). This is because ellipsis involves a wide range of phenomena; it contributes to various spoken and written styles (ibid.: 8).

McShane (2005) points out that the term 'ellipsis' is a broader and complex phenomenon; ellipsis requires reference to syntax, lexical semantics, discourse, prosody, semantics, and stylistics (McShane, 2005: 3).

Many definitions have been given for ellipsis, as it is a controversial issue. For example, ellipsis is simply defined as 'substitution by zero' (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 142).

Carter and McCarthy view ellipsis as 'the absence of elements normally required by the grammar (e.g. subject before a tensed verb form)' (Carter and McCarthy, 2006: 181). The elliptical messages, Carter and McCarthy argue, do not have anything missing in reality, as what they contain is sufficient to achieve communication (ibid.).

Another definition of ellipsis is also given by Thorne (1997): 'in ellipsis, part of a sentence is left out'. She goes on to argue that 'it must be clear what the omitted words are, so that the sentence remains meaningful' (Thorne, 1997: 45).

For Bloor and Bloor, ellipsis is a 'systematic omission of a word, group or clause where the meaning can be recovered from the context' (Bloor and Bloor, 2004: 281).

A more precise definition is provided by Wilson. He defines ellipsis as 'structural gaps that can be related to (a) omitted elements recoverable from the linguistic context, (b) other potential syntactic forms (a potential sentence which make their meaning more explicit), (c) the situational context' (Wilson, 2000: 18). Contextually recoverable elements are placed first in the definition above because many ellipses (e.g. contextual rejoinders) belong to this category, according to Wilson (ibid.).

For Halliday and Hasan, referring ellipsis to 'something left unsaid' is an 'over-simplification' (1976: 144). This is because there are structural possibilities where there is nothing left unsaid. A good example is the following sentence (ibid.: 142):

Hardly anyone left the country before the war.

The sentence just mentioned does not indicate that there is something left out. But, 'country' in the above example, Halliday and Hasan argue, can be interpreted as 'rural area', or 'national unit'. The same thing can be said about 'left'. It can mean 'emigrated' or 'went abroad on holiday'. Similarly, 'hardly anyone' can mean 'the whole nation', or 'a given social group'. Thus, Halliday and Hasan refer ellipsis to: sentences, clauses, etc. whose structure is such

as to presuppose some preceding item, which then serves as the source of the missing information. An elliptical item is one which, as it were, leaves specific structural slots to be filled from elsewhere (ibid.: 143).

According to Halliday and Hasan, the relation in ellipsis and substitution is between words, groups, or clauses. In reference, however, the relation is between meanings. Here it is not necessary, Halliday and Hasan point out, that the meaning is recoverable through the same word (ibid.: 145). Thus, substitution and ellipsis involve presupposition at the level of words and structures, whereas reference involves presupposition at the semantic level (ibid.). The following examples illustrate the difference between reference, substitution, and ellipsis (ibid.: 146).

- a. This is a fine hall you have here. I'm proud to be lecturing in it.
- b. This is a fine hall you have here. I've never lectured in a finer one.
- c. This is a fine hall you have here. I've never lectured in a finer.

The construction in (a) is reference; 'it' refers to 'hall'. Example (b) is substitution, as 'one' replaces 'hall'. Example (c) is ellipsis.

Although substitution involves presupposition similar to that of ellipsis, there is a difference between the two in that in substitution 'an explicit 'counter' is used, e.g. 'one' or 'do', as a place marker for what is presupposed' (ibid.). This makes ellipsis a 'substitution by zero', as indicated earlier.

But the difference between reference, substitution, and ellipsis is not clear cut, according to Baker (1992: 187). This is illustrated by the example below taken from Hoey (1991, quoted in ibid.).

Does Agatha sing in the bath?

- a. No, but I do. (Substitution)
- b. Yes, she does. (Ellipsis)
- c. Yes, she does it to annoy us, I think. (Reference)

The three answers above are identified as substitution, ellipsis, and reference respectively. The second answer (b) represents ellipsis because 'does' cannot substitute for 'sing' (ibid.).

Unlike other linguists, Toolan (1998) does not distinguish substitution and ellipsis; he uses 'partial ellipsis' and 'full ellipsis' instead. Toolan defines 'partial' ellipsis as follows: 'Very often the ellipsis is not total; instead, some 'abridged' or condensed structure is used, to stand in for the full sequence. This is known as partial ellipsis or substitution, and is very common' (Toolan, 1998: 26; quoted in Wilson, 2000: 40).

The second type of ellipsis involves 'full omission of a second mention of items which can be 'understood' as implicit, because they are retrievable in a given context' (Toolan, 1998: 27; quoted in ibid.). These two types, the partial and full ellipses, are illustrated respectively by the following examples given by Toolan (quoted in ibid.).

Kimberley: Can I look at your watch?

Martin: Sorry, I'm not wearing one. (Partial ellipsis)

Alan: Don't forget next Monday's public holiday.

Brain: I know. (Full ellipsis)

But for Halliday and Hasan (1976), the use of 'one' in the first example is a case of substitution not ellipsis. Similarly, Wilson (2000) strongly rejects this example of 'partial' ellipsis when he points out that 'Indeed, to call this 'partial ellipsis' is misleading, since there is no obvious structural gap' (Wilson, 2000: 40).

1. Aims

Many studies investigate the phenomenon of ellipsis in either English or Arabic. Other works study ellipsis in terms of translation. This paper, however, aims to investigate clausal ellipsis in both English and Arabic. Cases of missing sentential materials from English and Arabic will be presented and examined. The study attempts to answer the following questions.

- a. Do English and Arabic apply same principle (s) and purpose (s) of ellipsis?
- b. Do English and Arabic display same presentation of clausal ellipsis?
- c. To what extent do the two languages differ in their use of clausal ellipsis?

2. Method

Ellipsis will be first discussed in respect of English. The discussion will be based mainly on Halliday and Hasan's approach, because this approach, I believe, provides logical, and well-developed argument on ellipsis. Most importantly, the approach serves the purpose of this paper.

The discussion of ellipsis in Arabic will be based on Abbas's (2005) who provides a detailed discussion, which is particularly well suited for the goal of this paper. The two languages will then be compared and contrasted on the basis of (a) principle of ellipsis, (b) purposes of ellipsis, (d) types of elliptical clauses. A clause is defined here as an expression of different speech functions, such as a statement, a question, a response, etc (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 197).

The discussion of ellipsis in each language will include the following sections. The term ellipsis will be first defined. The distinction between ellipsis and other terms will be discussed in both languages. This will be followed by a discussion of types of ellipsis. English and Arabic will then be compared and contrasted in terms of their presentation of ellipsis.

3. Background

This section discusses some studies conducted on ellipsis in English and Arabic.

In a study of Arabic ellipsis, Almat'ani (1992) argues that ellipsis is used for aesthetic purposes. He categorizes ellipsis into four main types: ellipsis of a particle, a word, part of a sentence, and a sentence. What characterizes ellipsis in Qura'n, according to Almat'ani, is the fact that it occurs when the content of the elided element is recoverable and the context dictates brevity.

The fact that elements in a sentence are elided to achieve brevity is supported by Hassan and Taqi (2011) who examine the influence of ellipsis, namely nominal ellipsis, on the translation of some of the meanings of the Holy Qur'an. In addition to brevity, economy and emphasis are also other aims of ellipsis, according to Hassan and Taqi. These aims are found in both English and Arabic. The study finds that elided noun takes different forms. It also shows that when a noun is ellipted, this does not result in any change in the meaning of a sentence. The study also displays that translations of the meanings of the Holy Qur'an do not fully elaborate on the intended meanings of the examined Qur'anic verses. It concludes that ellipsis should not lead to ambiguity in both English and Arabic. As for ellipsis of English nominal groups, the head of the nominal group is elided and is replaced by another word. In Arabic, however, a word is elided and nothing replaces it. Another finding is that context suggests the meaning of the elided element in different syntactic function.

A similar study is conducted by Al-Hilfy (2014), who studies the rhetorical function of elision and ellipsis in Arabic and the Holy Qur'an with reference to English. Al-Hilfy distinguishes between elision and ellipsis. Elision concerns the deletion of sounds and single letters whether in isolation or one-letter particle. Ellipsis, however, refers to the deletion of parts of speech and complete sentences to 'enhance the inimitability and sublime style of the Qur'an' Al-Hilfy (2014: 1). According to Al-Hilfy, elision and ellipsis in Quran are used to maintain inimitability of the Quranic style. In English, however, the use of elision has nothing to do with eloquence.

Fayud (2008) argues that ellipsis in Arabic can occur in a word or part of it and a sentence. At the word (lexical) level, ellipsis can take different forms, such as ellipsis of a particle, a thematic or rhematic element, idhafa-structure, an adjective, etc. Almat'ani (1992) study is supported by Fayud's study. Fayud (2008) argues that for ellipsis to be possible, two conditions must be met: there should be a need to delete an element from a sentence, and what is elided should be contextually understood (Fayud, 2008: 397). The sentential ellipsis, Fayud points out, occurs frequently in the Holy Qura'n, particularly stories of the prophets (ibid: 403).

In addition to its linguistic properties, ellipsis also has stylistic features in both spoken and written genres. Wilson (2000) systematically analyses ellipsis in both spoken and written English and literary and non-literary texts, and explains the different linguistic and situational contexts and their stylistic effects. According to Wilson, different types of ellipsis interact within texts to produce different stylistic effects' (ibid.). He distinguishes between ellipsis and what is not ellipsis (e.g., a gap). In this regard, Wilson makes a clear difference between ellipsis and gap (Wilson, 2000: 8 and 9). Some linguistic omissions cannot be treated as ellipsis, but rather gaps, such as unedited writing and lack of subject in imperatives.

Jackendoff (1971) draws a clear line between ellipsis and gapping by introducing some rules that distinguish the two notions. Conventionally, Jackendoff classifies these rules into two types. The first type is related to clauses connected by conjunctions, and the second concerns the structure and the deletions that occurs in the gapped clause. According to Jackenoff, a gap occurs in coordinate rather than subordinate clauses, does not precede its antecedent, does not need to be a phrase, does not occur if auxiliaries are different, and is affected by material to the right of the verb (Jackendoff 1971: 22- 26).

In a study that involves English and German, Ott and Struckmeier (2016) investigate clausal ellipsis. They contrast the two approaches of ellipsis; the first approach views ellipsis as a form of prosodic reduction (deletion of distressed material) the second considers ellipsis as syntactic operation (Move-and-Delete approach). Ott and Struckmeier argue that the distribution of particles in clausal ellipsis poses a challenge for Move-and-Delete approach.

Unlike other previous works on ellipsis, McShane (2005) introduces a theory that does not limit itself to what can be elided, but also it explains in what way elements would or would not be elided in a sentence. She argues that the term 'ellipsis' in English is a broad term and cannot be reserved only for the missing of syntactic structures in a sentence but can occur at the semantic level as well. Thus, McShane introduces an extensive descriptive computational approach that describes and analyses ellipsis. In her theory, McShane discusses ellipsis as a cross-disciplinary linguistic

حذف الجملة في اللغة الإنجليزية واللغة العربية

ناصر رداد حامد الحارثي

أستاذ اللسانيات المساعد بقسم اللغات الأجنبية، جامعة الطائف

(قدم للنشر في ٢٩/١/١٤٤٠هـ؛ وقبل في ١١/٥/١٤٤٠هـ)

الكلمات المفتاحية: الحذف في اللغة الإنجليزية، الحذف في اللغة العربية، البنية التركيبية للجملة الإنجليزية، البنية التركيبية للجملة العربية، التنوع اللغوي، النحو.

ملخص البحث: إن العديد من الدراسات التي بحثت في موضوع الحذف كانت باللغة الإنجليزية أو اللغة العربية. كما قارنت دراسات أخرى ظاهرة الحذف بين اللغتين؛ لكن من منظور الترجمة، في حين تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى بحث أوجه التشابه والاختلاف بين اللغة الإنجليزية واللغة العربية عند حذف الجملة، وذلك بدراسة المعايير الأساسية للحذف في اللغتين وأغراض الحذف ونطاق الحذف في الجملة بأنواعه وصوره المتعددة. وقد استخدم الباحث المنهج التحليلي المقارن لاستخلاص أوجه التشابه والاختلاف، وخلص إلى عدد من النتائج، من أهمها ما يلي: يتسم مفهوم الحذف وتمييزه عن المصطلحات الأخرى المشابهة بالوضوح في اللغة العربية مقارنةً باللغة الإنجليزية، غير أن عملية الحذف في اللغة الإنجليزية واللغة العربية لا تقع إلا إذا كان هناك أثر يدل على المحذوف. كما بينت الدراسة أن الحذف يستعمل في اللغتين لتحقيق الإيجاز والبلاغة والتماسك البنائي الخارجي (الحبك). غير أن الحذف أكثر شيوعاً في اللغة العربية، بل هو من طبيعتها، ودلت الدراسة أيضاً على أن حذف الجملة الإنجليزية والعربية يقع بصور مختلفة. كما أن العناصر النحوية التي تُحذف في الجملة متعددة في اللغتين. وأظهرت الدراسة وجود تراكيب لغوية متكاملة العناصر إلا أنها اتخذت صفة الحذف في اللغتين. كما أوضحت الدراسة أن الحذف يكون بإسقاط عنصر واحد أو أكثر أو حتى جملة كاملة في اللغتين. بيد أن اللغة العربية تميّزت عن اللغة الإنجليزية بخصوصية حذف عدد من الجمل في سياق واحد دون الإخلال بالمعنى العام، وباتساق تام يحصل ذلك لا سيما في القرآن الكريم.

King Saud University

College of Arts

Journal of Arts

ISSN 1018-3620



جامعة الملك سعود

كلية الآداب

مجلة الآداب

ردمك ١٠١٨-٣٦٢٠

مجلة الآداب، م ٣١، ع ٢، ص ص ١٣-٣٤، جامعة الملك سعود، الرياض (٢٠١٩ / ١٤٤٠هـ)
Journal of Arts, Vol. 31 (2), pp. 13-34, © King Saud University, Riyadh (2019 /1440H.)

Clausal Ellipsis in English and Arabic: A Contrastive Study

Nasir Raddad Alharthi

Assistant Professor of Linguistics, Department of Foreign Languages, Taif University

(Received 29/1/1440H; Accepted for publication 11/5/1440H)

Keywords: Ellipsis in English, Ellipsis in Arabic, Structure of English and Arabic Sentence, Cross-linguistic variation, syntax.

Abstract: This paper aims to investigate the extent and ways in which English and Arabic are similar and different in their presentation of clausal ellipsis. The English and Arabic data are analyzed on the basis of Halliday and Hasan (1976) and Abbas (2005) respectively. The two languages are then compared and contrasted, among other things, in terms of principle of ellipsis, purposes of ellipsis, extent of clausal ellipsis, and types of elliptical clauses. The analysis shows that both English and Arabic apply the same principle for ellipsis: nothing can be omitted unless it is recoverable from the context. However, it is not necessary that meaning should be recovered through the same expression in both languages. It is also attested that ellipsis is used for brevity, rhetorical, and cohesion purposes in both languages. Ellipsis in Arabic, however, is very common; it is the nature of Arabic. Ellipsis is also frequently used to achieve eloquence in Arabic. As far as clausal ellipsis is concerned, the analysis shows that one element or a whole clause can be omitted in both English and Arabic. English and Arabic have constructions where there is no missing information, yet they are considered elliptical constructions. Such constructions are not signaled by syntactic ellipsis, but rather by semantic ellipsis. Both English and Arabic display verbal identification of elided items in speech. Another major finding is that when two or more English paratactic clauses have different subjects, only the first paratactic clause constitutes the domain of the presupposition. In some reported speech sequences, instances of ambiguity are attested in English. Despite these similarities, the analysis reveals some differences between English and Arabic. Unlike Arabic, ellipsis is not satisfactorily defined in English because it involves phenomena such as syntax, lexical semantics, discourse, semantics, and stylistics. But it is nature of Arabic to use ellipsis as indicated above. Unlike English, several clauses can be ellipted at a time in Arabic, namely in the Qur'anic context with no effect on meaning.