



GRAMMATICAL ELLIPSIS IN (JAMI' AL-DURUS AL-ARABIYYA) BY AL-GHULAYNI AND (MA'ANI AL-NAHW) BY AL-SAMARRAI; A STANDARDIZED STUDY

Asmaa Hassan Ajad

Assistant Lecturer, University of Misan/

College of Basic Education / Department of Arabic Language

asmaa.hasan@uomisan.edu.iq

Abstract

This study examines the phenomenon of grammatical ellipsis in *Jāmi' al-Durūs al-'Arabiyya* by Muṣṭafā al-Ghalāyīnī and *Ma'ānī all-nighter* by Fāḍil al-Sāmarrā'ī. It adopts a comparative approach that combines theoretical grounding with practical analysis. The study proceeds from the premise that ellipsis is one of the structural phenomena involving the omission of an element of the sentence—whether a particle, noun, or verb while retaining a verbal or contextual indicator that points to the omitted element. Its principal causes include the hearer's awareness of the omitted element, frequent usage, excessive length of expression, and poetic necessity.

The study aims to identify and examine the instances of ellipsis addressed in the two works, clarify their types and conditions, and compare al-Ghalāyīnī's pedagogical and procedural approach with al-Sāmarrā'ī's semantic and analytical approach to this phenomenon. The study concludes that the two works converge in their treatment of several fundamental grammatical contexts, most notably the ellipsis of the direct object, the apodosis of a conditional sentence, the response to an oath, the vocative particle, and the negative particle *lā* in the response to an oath. Nevertheless, they differ in their analytical perspectives: al-Ghalāyīnī presents ellipsis as a rule-governed grammatical phenomenon, whereas al-Sāmarrā'ī approaches it as a semantic and rhetorical phenomenon that serves meaning and concision.



Keywords: grammatical ellipsis; al-Ghalāyīnī; al-Sāmarrā'ī; Jāmi' al-Durūs al-
'Arabiyya; Ma'ānī al-Naḥw.

Introduction

Ellipsis is a grammatical phenomenon involving the omission of a word or part of one without disrupting the syntactic structure, while retaining a contextual cue that leaves an impression on the listener. The Arabic language abounds with various forms and manifestations of this phenomenon, a fact clearly exemplified in **Al-Kitāb** (by Sībawayh) and **Al-Kitāb** (by Ibn Jinnī) two of the most significant works on Arabic grammar. The Arabic sentence operates according to a linguistic system consistent with the speech and syntactic structures of the Arabs. Grammarians have detailed this system in their works by analyzing the language of the Arabs and deriving the rules that govern the organization of speech into coherent structures. However, this linguistic structure may undergo certain alterations known as "structural contingencies" (*'awāriḍ al-tarkīb*). One such contingency affecting the construction of the Arabic sentence is ellipsis; an element may be omitted from the sentence when the remaining structure or the broader context sufficiently indicates the missing part. It is against this backdrop that the present study examines ellipsis bridging theory and practice within these two seminal texts. Both works feature a wide array of grammatical ellipsis forms that significantly impact meaning, a matter that will be elucidated throughout the course of this research.

The importance of the research:

The importance of this research lies in its treatment of the phenomenon of grammatical ellipsis, as it is considered one of the most prominent features of syntactic structure in the Arabic language and closely tied to meaning and rhetoric. This is done through a comparative study between two grammatical sources differing in methodology and purpose: the book 'Jamia' al-Durus al-Arabiyya' by Mustafa al-Ghulayini, as a foundational educational reference, and the book 'Ma'ani al-Nahw' by Fadil al-Samarrai, as an analytical reference concerned with collecting and discussing grammarians' opinions. The importance of this comparison lies in revealing the points of agreement and difference



between the educational and analytical schools in addressing a single phenomenon, and in contributing to enriching comparative studies among modern grammatical works, benefiting researchers and students in understanding the mechanisms of ellipsis, its causes, and its implications.

Research Goals:

1. Define the linguistic and terminological concept of syntactic omission and distinguish it from what might be confused with it (like 'non-mention' according to Al-Samarrai).
2. Investigate the main instances of omission mentioned in the books 'Jami' al-Drus al-Arabiyya' and 'Ma'ani al-Nahw' and classify them (omission of particles, essential elements, additional elements).
3. Compare the approaches of Al-Ghalayini and Al-Samarrai in addressing the phenomenon of omission in terms of comprehensiveness, application, and rhetorical purpose.
4. Identify the common and differing instances of omission in the two books, and explain the reasons for these similarities or differences.
5. Highlight the impact of context and verbal/current evidence in determining the possibility of omission according to each author.

Research Questions

What are the similarities and differences between the books *Jami' al-Durus al-Arabiyya* by al-Ghulayini and *Ma'ani al-Nahw* by al-Samurai in addressing the phenomenon of grammatical ellipsis, both theoretically and practically?

Sub-questions:

1. What is the concept of ellipsis in language and terminology, and what is the difference between it and 'non-mention' as distinguished by al-Samurai?
2. What are the main reasons for grammatical ellipsis (frequent usage, long speech, poetic necessity), and how did each author use them in their analysis?
3. What are the types of ellipsis mentioned in *Jami' al-Durus al-Arabiyya* (particles, subject, object, conditional answer), and how did al-Ghulayini handle them methodologically?



4. What are the types of ellipsis mentioned in *Ma'ani al-Nahw* (relative pronoun, connecting word, absolute object, oath response, possessee, possessor, adjective), and how did al-Samurai approach them semantically?
5. What are the common points between the two books in dealing with ellipsis, and what is the scientific significance of this overlap?
6. To what extent does the methodological difference between the two books (educational versus analytical) reflect a difference in the depth of coverage and the range of examples of the ellipsis phenomenon?

Study Method:

The nature of the topic being studied must determine the appropriate method. Since the nature of this study is theoretical grammar, aiming to track and examine topics of ellipsis in the two books, we mainly used the comparative method, because I approached it as a descriptive study of ellipsis in the two books.

Difficulty of the Study:

One of the main difficulties we faced in this study is conducting a comparative study between two books with different approaches. The book 'Jami' al-Durus al-'Arabiyya' by Mustafa al-Ghilayini is purely educational, created to teach students of knowledge, while the book 'Ma'ani al-Nahw' by Fadil al-Samarrai compiles the opinions of grammarians on various topics. Both books have three parts, and their topics differ fundamentally in terms of methodology and organization, making it difficult to conduct a comparative study that would be considered significant in the field of grammar, due to the many opinions and disagreements between them because they belong to different schools.

Previous Studies

Although the scope of studies addressing the phenomenon of grammatical omission is wide, standardized studies specifically comparing the "Jamia' al-Durus al-'Arabiyya" with grammatical meanings are rare, which gives this research a sense of novelty. Some of the most notable studies related to the topic of omission in general include:



-
- Khalil, Atef Fadl Muhammad (2013). "The Phenomenon of Object Omission: A Descriptive, Statistical, Analytical Study - Examples from the Holy Quran," The Jordanian Journal of Arabic Language and Literature, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 273-302. This study was limited to one type of omission in a single source, unlike our research which broadens the scope to include all types of omission in two different grammatical books.
 - Brijieh, Muhammad Ahmad Hasan (Al-Quds University). "The Phenomenon of Omission in the Mufaddaliyat: A Grammatical and Semantic Study," Master's Thesis. This study examined omission in a heritage poetry collection from a semantic perspective, unlike our modern grammatical compilation.
 - Ghanem, Sarah Al-Sayyid Ibrahim (2011). "Grammatical Omission in Sentence Patterns and Forms in the Poetry of Muhammad Salih Al-Khulani," Journal of Scientific Research in Literature, Ain Shams University, Vol. 12, Part 1, pp. 61-90. A practical study on the poetry of one contemporary poet, unlike the predominantly theoretical and rule-based nature of our sources.
 - Dih, Hanadi Rashid (1998). "The Relationship Between Frequency and Omission in Sibawayh's Book," Master's Thesis, American University of Beirut. This study focused on a single classical source, looking only at the relationship between omission and frequency of use.
 - Al-Tuwaisi, Alaa Mazen. "Patterns of Omission in the Book of Examples of Explanation and Correction by Ibn Malik al-Andalusi: A Grammatical Study," Journal of Al-Balqa Applied University. This study also dealt with a single classical source without a comparative analysis between two references.
- From the above, it is clear that these studies, despite their variety in sources and methodologies, all looked at omission through a single source or a specific phenomenon within it. None of them attempted a systematic comparison between two modern grammatical references representing different schools in grammatical composition (descriptive and analytical), which gives the current research its added scientific value and positions it uniquely among these studies.



Chapter One:

Introduction to Grammatical Ellipsis

Ellipsis in Language

Ellipsis in language refers to the dropping or removing of a part of something. It was originally used to indicate the physical aspect, but over time its use expanded to include the abstract or conceptual aspect. Ibn Manzur said, 'To delete something is to remove it entirely from one of its ends.' (Ibn Manzur, 1990, vol. 9, p. 40). Al-Jawhari (d. 393 AH) said in Al-Sihah: 'To delete something means to drop it. For example, I deleted part of my poetry and part of the donkey's tail; that is, I took it away.' (Al-Jawhari, 1999, vol. 4, p. 134).

Elision Terminologically

As for the term technically, it is close to its meaning in language. Al-Zarkashi defines it as: "Part or all of the speech is omitted due to the presence of evidence or an indication that suggests it" (Al-Zarkashi, 1980: 102). In dictionaries, it is defined as the omission of a word from a sentence, and this word may be fundamental in the sentence, such as the subject, predicate, or even the agent. The omission can be a letter, or it can be an entire phrase. One contemporary Arab scholar provided a definition of elision, stating that it is "the omission of words within a syntactic text in a language. These forms that are omitted from speech are assumed to exist in grammar, so that the structures become easier and correct, according to grammatical rules. These words are present or could be present in other linguistic contexts" (Abu Al-Makarim, 2008, 200).

Grammatical Omission

Omission in language means cutting off. Ibn Manzur said, 'To omit something is to cut it off as if severed from its end.' One of its other meanings is also 'dropping' or 'leaving out,' as Al-Askari mentioned in his distinctions, saying: 'Omission is the dropping of something from speech.' This means that a part of the speech is cut out or removed from the structure for some reason, to achieve a specific goal. Omission is one of the structural phenomena and not of independent lexical forms, because it is specific to parts and components of a sentence, whether the component is a letter or a word. Grammarians have paid great attention to the



phenomenon of omission, describing it as a scholarly topic to solve issues raised by linguistic texts, without doubting their compliance with standards of eloquence and Arabic (Abu Al-Makarim: 209).

Abd al-Qahir al-Jurjani viewed omission as a means of expression that deepens meaning, enriches significance, and restores the pulse, spirit, and literary quality of the language. Therefore, he devoted major attention to it because it is a subtle, delicate, and intriguing matter, almost like magic (Al-Jurjani, n.d., p. 125). He was followed by Al-Zamakhshari, who studied under him and adopted his approach. Al-Zamakhshari was more comprehensive than his teacher and made significant contributions in the field of omission, such as omitting the object in a sentence or omitting the conditional response sentences starting with 'if' or 'had' (Al-Zamakhshari, vol. 3, p. 318).

Grammatical omission is an incidental feature in speech, as the norm is that speech occurs without any omission. Sibawayh says: 'Know that there are words which are omitted even though their original form in speech is otherwise, and they are omitted and replaced, and people rely on one thing instead of another, so that it becomes dropped. So, what is omitted and originally different in speech is neither known nor certain.' In this text, Sibawayh touches on three issues: the issue of reliance, the issue of substitution, and the issue of primary versus secondary. The primary is the fixed, continuous element with no addition, while the secondary is the primary with an addition, meaning with some kind of transformation. Transformation can be by addition or by reduction, and omission is transformation by reduction. A part of a word may be dropped, and omission can also be specific to structure, meaning that one of the components of speech—noun, verb, or particle—may be dropped, provided that the meaning is not affected and there is evidence for the omission. This is what he calls grammatical omission because it occurs at the level of structures (Jama'i, 2016, p.27).

Ellipsis is a technique used in grammatical interpretation, and it is one of the methods grammarians used to justify the differences between actual language usage and grammatical rules (Abu al-Makarem: 204). It was a way for them to resolve the contradictions that arise from such differences. Grammarians have mentioned reasons for the phenomenon of ellipsis in language, which help explain why it happens and how it occurs in speech. These reasons can be divided



into two types: the first relates to structure and word form only, without meaning (Hammouda: 73), and the second has a clear and evident impact on the meaning and implications of the structure. We will mention the three most important reasons, as the purpose of the research is not to delve into all the details, but rather to focus on the types.

First: Frequent Use

It is permissible to omit the whole word or part of it if it is frequently used and commonly spoken by people. Frequent use is a valid reason for omission, as Sibawayh stated when he talked about omitting the predicate after (lola), saying: '(A section) from the beginning in which what is inferred from the beginning is implied,' as in saying: 'Lola Abdullah, it would have been such and such.' As for 'it would have been such and such,' it is a statement connected to 'lola'... but this is an omission that happens when it is frequently used in speech. Al-Mubarrad also mentioned this, saying: '(Omission exists in everything they use frequently)' (Al-Mubarrad, n.d., Vol. 2, p. 146). Other grammarians also mentioned it.

Secondly: Length of speech

Sometimes the meaning of something may require a longer construction, and in that case, the speaker can omit what can be omitted to lighten it. Omission can even be more beautiful and impressive, as Sibawayh mentioned, saying: 'When speech is long, omission is more beautiful.' (Al-Usul fi al-Nahw: 2|396)

Thirdly: Poetic necessity

Grammarians considered poetic necessity one of the reasons for omission, in addition to other linguistic phenomena in construction that a poet is compelled to use that no other speaker would resort to. (Sharh al-Kitab by al-Sirafi: 1|189).

Types of Grammatical Ellipsis:

The types of grammatical ellipsis vary according to their classifications. Some classify it based on the sentence, distinguishing between omitting a single sentence or multiple sentences, while others link it to parts of speech, as follows:

- 1- Omission of nouns: This is one of the most common types of ellipsis. It



frequently appears in the Qur'an, the Prophet's sayings, poetry, and prose. Most of these omissions serve a rhetorical purpose—some become clear through reflection and aesthetic judgment, while others are understood by studying the context in which they occur.

Omitting verbs: This includes past, present, and imperative verbs. Al-Sakkaki says about omitting them: 'As for the situation that necessitates leaving out the verb, it is when the context clues suffice without mentioning it.' The intended or inferred meaning from his words is leaving a clue that points to the omitted verb, and through these clues, we arrive at the intended meaning. Omission is a deviation from the usual practice of mentioning the verb, but it's not just any deviation—it's one that enriches the meaning and has an effect on the reader that normal phrasing doesn't have. Verbs are omitted in cases where the sentence remains grammatically correct after implying the verb. This omission is acceptable as long as there's a linguistic or situational clue indicating what is omitted. Sibawayh expressed it by saying: 'This is the chapter where the verb that is used has its manifestation implied.'

Omitting sounds and letters: Some letters and sounds may be omitted from word structures in specific places in the Qur'an. The purpose of this omission could be for the suitability of a pause, or it might be for aesthetic or semantic reasons. One of the wonders of the miraculous Qur'anic eloquence is that it might omit a letter from some words in one place and mention it in another. This omission isn't random or arbitrary; every word and every letter in His book has a purpose. This kind of omission also includes part of the word, as happens with letters that convey meanings.

Section Two: Grammatical Ellipsis in 'Jami' al-Durus al-Arabiyya wa Ma'ani al-Nahw'

If we look back at the concept of ellipsis, specifically at Al-Zarkashi's definition, we find that he defines it as the omission of part of speech or all of it. This means that ellipsis includes letters, words, sentences, and their likes, and multiple sentences are counted.



Section Two:

Grammatical Ellipsis in 'Jami' al-Durus al-Arabiyya wa Ma'ani al-Nahw'
If we look back at the concept of ellipsis, specifically at Al-Zarkashi's definition, we find that he defines it as the omission of part of speech or all of it. This means that ellipsis includes letters, words, sentences, and their likes, and multiple sentences are counted.

Dropping Letters

A- Dropping the preposition by analogy

Mustafa Al-Ghalayini mentioned in his book 'Jami' al-Durus al-Arabiyya' some cases in which the preposition is dropped by analogy in six instances:
1- Before 'an', as in the Almighty's words: "And they were amazed that there came to them a warner from themselves" meaning "because there came to them", and His words: "Or are you amazed that there has come to you a reminder from your Lord through a man among you?"

Before 'anna' (أَنَّ), like in His saying, the Exalted: ﷻ 'Allah has witnessed that there is no deity except Him' ﷻ, meaning He witnessed that there is. (Al-Ghalayini, Vol. 3, p. 193) And know that it is permissible to omit the preposition before 'an/anna' only if there is no risk of confusion from its omission. If there is a risk, it is not allowed to omit it. For example, one should not say 'I desired to do it' ('rghibtu an af'ala') because it would cause ambiguity about the intended meaning after omission; the listener might not know if you desire to do the action or to avoid it. Therefore, the particle should be mentioned to clarify the meaning, unless the ambiguity is intended for the listener.

3- Before 'kay' (كَیْ) which governs the subjunctive, like in His saying: ﷻ 'So We returned him to his mother so that her eye might be comforted' ﷻ, meaning 'so that her eye might be comforted.' And note that the verbal noun following 'an/anna/kay' is, if the preposition is omitted, grammatically considered in the genitive position, according to the most correct view. Some scholars, however, say it is in the accusative by stripping the lowering particle.
4- Before the word of divine majesty in oaths, like in 'By Allah, I will serve the nation with sincere service' ('Allah li'akhidhan-n al-ummah khidmah sadiqah'), meaning 'By Allah.'



5-Before the distinctive question word 'kam,' if a preposition precedes it, like in 'Bikam dirham ishtarayta hatha al-kitab?' meaning 'With how many dirhams did you buy this book?' The correct classical form is to put it in the accusative, as mentioned earlier in the section on specification, like 'Bikam dirhaman ishtaraytahu?'.
6- After a phrase containing a similar preposition, there are five cases:

The first: After an answer to a question, you say 'Mimman akhathhta al-kitab?' and the reply is 'Khalidin,' meaning 'from Khalid.'

The second: After a question word, you might say 'Marartu bi-Khalidin,' and one asks, 'Akhalid ibn Saidin?' meaning 'Do you mean Khalid ibn Saeed?'

The third: After the conditional 'in,' you might say 'Izhhab biman shi'ta, in Khalil, wa in Hasan,' meaning 'Go with whoever you want, whether it's Khalil or Hasan.'

The fourth: After 'hala,' you could say 'Tasadqata bi-dirhamin,' and someone replies 'Hala dinar,' meaning 'Why not give a dinar?'

The fifth: After a conjunction, which can be repeated if it could form a sentence if the missing conjunction were included, like saying 'Likhāliḍi darun, wa Sa'idin bustanun,' meaning 'for Khalid there is a house, and for Saeed a garden,' as the poet said.

No lover has the courage to abandon, and no beloved has the mercy to mend.

And from His words, the Exalted: 'And in your creation and in the creatures He disperses are signs for people who are certain, and [in] the alternation of night and day and what Allah sends down from the sky of provision, He revives the earth with it after its death, and the directing of the winds—there are signs for people who understand.' (Vol. 3, p. 195)

Omitting the preposition orally

The preposition may be omitted when spoken, causing the noun that would normally follow it to be in the accusative case, similar to an object. It is also called the noun in the accusative due to the removal of the lowering, meaning the noun that becomes accusative as a result of the preposition being omitted, like in the verse: 'Indeed, Thamud disbelieved in their Lord,' meaning in their Lord, and in the verse: 'And Moses chose forty men from his people,' meaning from his people, and as the poet said:



You pass through the homes and your words haven't bent towards me, then your words are forbidden.

As you pass through the houses, and the saying of the other:

I ask God's forgiveness for a sin I cannot count; Lord of the servants, to Him is the direction and the action.

I seek forgiveness from God for a sin.

This practice is called omission and connection, meaning omitting the preposition and connecting the verb directly to the object itself without an intermediary. Some say it's analogical, while the majority say it's based on tradition. It is rare for the noun to remain in the genitive case after the preposition is omitted, except in cases where its omission is established by analogy. For example, some Arabs, when asked 'How are you?' would say 'Fine, God willing,' meaning 'All is well.' (Al-Ghalayni, vol. 3, p. 196)

Fadel Al-Samarrai mentioned in his book **Meanings of Grammar** some cases where letters are either mentioned or omitted. He mentioned two cases: The first case: when the expression can imply more than one letter, it may be omitted to expand the meaning. For example, in the verse: 'But if you turn away, I ask you not for any reward; My reward is only with Allah, and I am commanded to be among the Muslims,' it's possible that the omitted letter is the 'bā' because usually an imperative is accompanied by 'bā' (I am commanded **bā** to...). It could also involve the letter 'lām' (I am commanded **lām** to be among the first Muslims) since 'lām' expands the meaning more than 'bā'. The second case: when the expression can only imply one letter, it is used for emphasis. For instance, in the verses: 'That He may hold him joyfully, so the people held joy alike; and these days We alternate among people; and Allah may know those who believe, taking witnesses from among you, and Allah does not like the wrongdoers; and Allah may purify those who believe and destroy the disbelievers,' we see that the 'lām' is present in 'May Allah know those who believe' but omitted in 'taking witnesses from among you.' The verse 'May Allah know those who believe' has a general purpose, covering all believers in their steadfastness, whereas 'taking witnesses from among you' doesn't have that broad purpose—the witnesses are part of the believers, not all of them. (Al-Samarrai, n.d., Vol. 3, p. 36)



-Omitting the conjunction

The conjunction may be omitted for indicating meaning, as in (I went to the market and bought bread, meat, fruit), meaning: I bought bread, meat, and fruit. It's also possible to interpret the meat and fruit as examples of 'alternates,' meaning: I bought bread, or rather meat, or rather fruit. So the bread and meat are like things left unsaid—it's possible he bought them, or it's possible he didn't. It's a kind of expression that allows for multiple interpretations, and context may clarify one meaning over the other. For example, saying (I'm sitting with Muhammad, Saad, Ibrahim) can mean: I'm sitting with Muhammad or Saad or Ibrahim, implying permission for any of them. It can also be understood as listing alternates. When the context specifies, the meaning becomes clear even if the conjunction isn't mentioned. Without context, the expression remains general, open to more than one meaning.

As mentioned in Al-Mughni: 'Abu Zaid narrated: (I ate bread, meat, dates), which was interpreted either as omitting the "and" or as alternates. Abu Al-Hassan narrated: (Give him one, two, then three dirhams), which also implies missing ("or") and can be considered the intended meaning.' (Al-Samarrai, vol. 3, p. 269). Al-Ghalayini's Position (Jamia' al-Durus al-Arabiyya) — Comparative Note: Al-Ghalayini addresses the conjunction letters under the section on followers, and in his discussion on the deletion of prepositions, he mentions the case of deleting a conjunction letter that is preceded by a similar preposition (the fifth type of deletion based on hearing). He does not dedicate a separate chapter titled 'Deletion of the Conjunction Letter' as Al-Samarrai did; rather, he limits his treatment to the requirements of conciseness in the section on prepositions. This reflects Al-Samarrai's superiority in giving semantic attention to this particular issue compared to Al-Ghalayini's incidental treatment of it.

-Omitting the negation 'la' from the answer sentence

It is permissible to omit the negation 'la' from the oath's answer by analogy if the verb is in the present tense. You say: 'By God, I desire not from you,' meaning 'I do not desire from you.' If affirmation is intended, the 'lam' is used, and it is necessary because an oath cannot be received in affirmation without 'lam.' If 'lam' is not mentioned, it is known that it is necessarily negation. Allah says: 'By God,



you continue to mention Yusuf?' (Yusuf: 85), meaning 'you do not cease to mention him.' If affirmation had been intended, it would have been said 'you will continue in the future' or 'you continue' if referring to the present. (Al-Samarrai, Vol. 3, 178)

Al-Ghalayini's Position (Jamia' al-Durus al-Arabiyya) — Comparative Note:

Al-Ghalayini discusses this topic in the chapter on oaths when talking about the rules for responding to oaths. He mentions that a affirmed present tense verb used in response to an oath is emphasized with 'lam' and 'nun,' while a negated present tense verb can have the 'la' omitted because the absence of 'lam' is a sufficient clue for negation. He cites the same verse that al-Samarrai used as evidence: 'By God, you continuously remember Joseph.' This is one of the clearest points of complete agreement between the two books: the rule is the same, and the Quranic evidence is the same.

-Dropping the Hamza

It is permissible to drop the question mark hamza if there is a clear indication of it, as in the words of Umar ibn Abi Rabi'ah:

By God, I don't know if I should throw seven coals or eight.

That is: He threw glowing coals. And from this is what Allah says: "They said, 'Indeed, we will have a reward if we are the victors.' He said, 'Yes, and indeed, you will be among those brought near [to Me].'" (Al-A'raf: 113–114) meaning: 'Indeed, we will have a reward.' And He made the hamza explicit in another place, saying: "They said to Pharaoh, 'Shall we have a reward if we are the victors?'" He said, 'Yes, and indeed, you will be among those brought near [to Me].'" (Ash-Shu'ara: 41–42). You might ask: why was the hamza omitted in the verse from Al-A'raf but mentioned in the verse from Ash-Shu'ara? The answer is that the context of each surah requires what was done, and it is common in the Quran for the expression to follow what suits the context. Here's an explanation: the situation in Surah Ash-Shu'ara is one of great challenge and a long, intense argument, much more so than in Surah Al-A'raf. Pharaoh asked Musa about the Lord of the worlds, and he received a lengthy answer, after which Pharaoh accused Musa of being mad, saying: "Indeed, your messenger who was sent to you is mad." (Ash-Shu'ara: 27), and threatened him with imprisonment, saying:



“If you take a deity besides me, I will surely place you among the imprisoned.” (Ash-Shu'ara: 29). This is not the case in Surah Al-A'raf.

Al-Ghalayini's Position (Jami' al-Durus al-'Arabiyya) — Comparative Note: Al-Ghalayini mentions in the section on interrogation that the interrogative hamza (question mark) can be omitted if it is indicated by contextual or semantic evidence, which is one of the standard cases found in educational grammar books. However, Al-Samarai goes further by providing a rhetorical and contextual explanation for its omission in one place (Surah Al-A'raf) and its inclusion in a similar place (Surah Ash-Shu'ara), linking this to the context of each surah and its tone of challenge. This kind of comparative semantic reasoning is missing from Al-Ghalayini's purely grammatical approach.

-Omitting the Vocative Particle

Al-Ghalayini goes into detail in the chapter on the vocative, explaining when it's permissible to omit the vocative particle and when it must be mentioned. It can be omitted with proper names, for example: 'Yusuf, turn away from this' and 'Work, O family of David, with gratitude' (these are the same examples cited by Al-Samarra'i). It must be mentioned with the name of God 'Allah', with common nouns (whether intended to be definite or not), with demonstrative pronouns, and in cases of calling for help, lamenting, or expressing amazement. Both books agree on the basic ruling and the examples, but Al-Ghalayini is more comprehensive, providing a full rule (when it can be omitted and when it must be mentioned), which fits well with the instructional and practical nature of his book. It is permissible to omit the vocative particle, as in the saying of Allah Almighty: 'Joseph, turn away from this' (Yusuf: 29), and His saying: 'Work, O family of David, with gratitude' (Saba: 13). However, the vocative particle must be mentioned with Allah, with a common noun—whether definite or indefinite—and with a demonstrative pronoun. For example, when calling Allah, you say, 'O Allah,' and similarly with a common noun or a demonstrative pronoun, like 'O man' or 'O this.' You cannot omit the vocative particle. There are exceptions in expressions like 'O night' (meaning O night), 'O strangle' (meaning O suffocated), and 'O krawan' (calling a bird), where the particle is shortened. The particle is



also necessary in calls for help, exclamations, and lamentations, like 'O Eternal One,' 'O horror,' and 'O Muhammad.' (Al-Samarra'i, Vol. 4, p. 22)

It seems that deletion has purposes, especially in artistic speech, such as:
1 - Delete for the sake of haste, and hasten with the intention of finishing the speech quickly, towards your saying (Khaled, be careful and as you say (Ahmed Ahmed, pay attention)

2 – The omission may be for the sake of brevity, because the maqam may be a maqam of brevity and brevity, not a maqam of simplification and lengthening, as the Almighty said: "Ibn um said, 'The people weakened me and almost killed me' (al-A'raf: 150).

The omission may occur due to the closeness of the person being called to the caller, whether that closeness is physical or metaphorical, as if the caller doesn't need an intermediary to call them. Even if there is a vocative particle, like when you say to someone you're calling who is near you: 'Khalid, do you know what happened to so-and-so?' And similarly, Allah says: 'May Allah's mercy and blessings be upon you, O People of the House' (Hud: 73), and 'Indeed, Allah only intends to remove from you impurity, O People of the House, and purify you thoroughly' (Al-Ahzab: 33), and 'Work, O family of Dawud, with gratitude' (Saba: 13). This is for metaphorical closeness, unlike His statement: 'O People of the Scripture, do you argue about Ibrahim?' (Al Imran: 65) (Al-Samarra'i, Vol. 4, p. 325).

A call to Allah Almighty without mentioning 'O'; Allah says: 'Say: O Allah, Owner of Sovereignty' (Al Imran: 26).

Omission in language includes the word with its two parts: the essential and the extra.

A. Omission of the essential, including:

- Omission of the subject

The omission of the subject is mentioned in Al-Ghalayini's book *Jami' al-Durus al-Arabiya*, and it is necessary to omit it in four situations:

1. When it indicates an absolute attribute, meaning one that indicates a general existence. This occurs in two cases: the first is when it is linked to an adverb or a prepositional phrase, like 'Paradise is under the feet of the mothers' and 'Knowledge is in the hearts.' The second is when it comes after 'لَا' or 'لuma,' like



'If it weren't for religion, people would perish,' and 'If it weren't for writing, most knowledge would be lost.' If it is a specific attribute (meaning it indicates a particular existence, like walking, sitting, riding, eating, drinking, etc.), it must be mentioned unless there is evidence for it, as in 'If not for the enemy, we would be safe' and 'Khalid writes in his house, and the bird is perched on the branch.' From this comes the hadith: 'If your people were newly committed to disbelief, I would have built the Kaaba on Ibrahim's foundations.' If there is evidence for it, it may be omitted or mentioned, like 'If it weren't for his supporters, he would have perished,' or 'If it weren't for his protectors, he would have perished,' and like 'Ali is on his horse' or 'Ali is riding on his horse.'

It should be a predicate for an explicit subject in the clause, like 'By your life, I will surely do it,' or 'By God's right hand, I will surely strive.' The poet said:

By your life, a person is nothing but a child of his day... shaped by how his day appears, not by the yesterday that has passed. And there's no pride in mighty bones, really... true pride is for the one who seeks pride in himself.

If the subject is not explicit in a statement (meaning it is used for swearing and other purposes), it is permissible to omit its predicate and affirm it. For example, you can say, 'By God's covenant, I will tell the truth, and by God's covenant on me, I will tell the truth.'

1. The subject can be a verbal noun, or a comparative noun added to a verbal noun, followed by a circumstantial phrase that cannot serve as a predicate but can fill in for the predicate by indicating it. For example, 'disciplining the boy' (Al-Ghlaini, 1994, Vol. 1, p. 343).

2. After a specific 'waaw' (و), it can mean 'with,' for example, 'Every person and what he did,' meaning 'with his action.' If it is not specifically meant to mean 'with,' it is permissible to affirm it, as the poet says.

Wish me the death that the boy craves... and everyone meets death at some point The possibility of its multiplicity, with the subject being singular, like 'Khalil is a writer, poet, or speaker.' The basic rule is that it should follow the subject, but it can sometimes come before it, either permissibly or necessarily (this will be discussed later).



Omission of the predicate, including:

Among the modern scholars is Dr. Fadel Al-Samarrai, who said: 'Omission refers to what is originally supposed to be mentioned but is not, like omitting the subject or omitting the predicate... and omitting the object, which should be mentioned; for example, if it refers to a relative pronoun, such as (this is the one I honored), meaning: I honored him. And if it is not something that should be mentioned or related to the purpose, then it does not count as omission' (Al-Samarrai, n.d., vol. 2, p. 37).

It seems that Dr. Al-Samarrai, by what he mentioned, sets a limit on omission in addition to it being something originally meant to be mentioned, by saying that it must be necessary to mention it in the speech; otherwise, it is not considered omission but rather simply not mentioning it.

What I took from Dr. Al-Samarrai's words is that he considers a word that drops out of a sentence not because it's required by the context or the flow of speech; it's not really omission but rather (just not mentioning it). This is clear from his saying: 'And among the cases of not mentioning is what is called omission, for example, God Almighty says: "Why do you worship what neither hears nor sees nor benefits you at all?" (Maryam 42). This is not really omission; because the intent isn't to attach hearing and seeing to a specific object, but the intent is: Why do you worship what does not have the attributes of hearing and seeing? So these two actions don't have a direct object implied. This is a case of not mentioning, not of omission.' (Al-Samarrai, n.d., Vol.2, p.37)

-Omitting the relative pronoun:

In the book **Meanings of Grammar** by Fadel Al-Samarrai, it is mentioned that it is permissible to omit the relative pronoun if its meaning is clear, especially when it is conjoined with something similar. For example, in the verse: **'We believed in what was sent down to us and sent down to you'** (Al-Ankabut: 46), meaning **'and what was sent down to you'**, because what was sent to us is not what was sent to them. Similarly, in the verses: **'But to Him belongs whatever is in the heavens and the earth; all are submissive to Him'** (Al-Baqarah: 116), and **'And to Allah prostrates whoever is in the heavens and the earth'** (Ar-Ra'd: 15),



where the relative pronoun is implied because those in the heavens are different from those on the earth.

Sometimes, the relative pronoun can be repeated, such as in the verses: *'And to Allah prostrates whatever is in the heavens and whatever is on the earth'* (An-Nahl: 49), and *'Whatever is in the heavens and whatever is on the earth glorifies Allah'* (Al-Jumu'ah: 1).

Not every instance of a conjunction without mentioning a relative pronoun means that the pronoun is omitted. Rather, it depends on the intended meaning. For example, in the verse: "A guidance for the righteous, who believe in the unseen and establish prayer" (Al-Baqarah: 2–3), there is no omitted relative pronoun because those who believe in the unseen and establish prayer are considered one group, not two. Similarly, in the verse: "Will You place therein one who will corrupt it and shed blood" (Al-Baqarah: 30), there is no omission here either, because the one who corrupts the earth and sheds blood is the same entity, namely, humans. (Al-Samarii, Vol. 1, p.142)

The meaning is what determines whether something was first omitted, so if the correctness of the meaning is impossible without the implied estimate, then an implied estimate must exist. From this, it becomes clear that it is permissible to mention a relative pronoun and omit it if there is evidence for its omission. The Qur'an has mentioned the relative pronoun in some places and omitted it in others. For example, it says once: 'To Him belongs whatever is in the heavens and whatever is on the earth' (Ta-Ha: 6), and another time: 'To Him belongs whatever is in the heavens and the earth' (Al-Baqarah: 116). It also says once: 'And Allah knows what is in the heavens and what is on the earth' (Al-Hujurat: 16), and another time: 'He knows what is in the heavens and the earth' (Al-Ankabut: 52). It says once: 'Everything in the heavens and the earth glorifies Allah' (Al-Hashr: 1), and another time: 'Everything in the heavens and the earth glorifies Allah' (Al-Hadid: 1). This leads us to question the reason behind mentioning what is mentioned and omitting what is omitted, as it is known that in eloquent speech there must be a reason for inclusion and omission. (Al-Samarrai, Vol.1, p.143)

Al-Ghalayini's Position (Jamia' al-Durus al-Arabiyya) — Comparative Note: Al-Ghalayini does not dedicate a separate section to the omission of the relative pronoun; he treats it as an inherent, built-in element connected to its antecedent,



only omitted in rare cases or for poetic necessity, so he mentions it briefly without going into detail. This is one of the areas where Al-Samarrai stands out with a detailed approach, and this is attributed to the difference in purpose: a teaching book focused on establishing the basic rule versus an analytical book that observes all the forms used by the Arabs.

-Omitting the connection

It is sometimes permissible to omit the connection if it is known or if the intention is to create ambiguity. For example, in the first statement: 'We are the ones they turned to, then they gathered their pride and turned to us' Meaning, we are the ones recognized for courage and their disregard of their enemies.

And the statement:

'So if I call upon those who are among people who lost them, I do not call upon the one who'

That is, I mean I should attack these weak women whom men have ruined, not attack the men who ruined them and blame them for their actions. And by 'after the disaster' they mean after the catastrophe that reached such a level of greatness that it cannot be explained, and the phrase falls short of its meaning. 'The disaster' is the great catastrophe. It's allowed to omit the relative pronoun if you want to leave it ambiguous for the listener, so the mind can go in any direction, or because you claim the pronoun, due to its greatness and grandeur, doesn't fit into clear expression and words can't fully encompass it. (Al-Samarrai, Vol. 1, p.148) Al-Ghallayini's stance (Jami' al-Durus al-Arabiya) — comparative note: Al-Ghallayini requires that a relative pronoun have a complete connection to the antecedent to be correct, and he notes that omitting the antecedent is allowed in specific cases more than omitting the entire pronoun connection. So, there's partial overlap regarding 'omitting the antecedent' (which is part of the connection), but omitting the entire connection is something almost unique to Al-Samarrai.



- Delete the object

The places in which the effective omission is mentioned in the two books are as follows:

In the book *Jami' al-Daroos al-Arabiya* by Mustafa al-Ghalayini, he mentioned that it is permissible to omit it for evidence, such as "shepherding cattle", and it is said, "Have you seen a friend?" The Almighty said, "Your Lord did not say goodbye to you and what He said", and He said: "We have not sent down the Qur'an to you so that you may be discouraged, but as a reminder to those who fear." The transgressor may be reduced to the status of necessary because a purpose is not attached to the object, so that he is not mentioned with an effect and cannot be appreciated, as the Almighty says: "Are those who know equal to those who do not know?" If two of the actions of the heart are omitted, it is permissible to omit both of them together, and to omit one of them for the sake of evidence. Whoever omits one of them is the saying of 'Antara.

And indeed you have descended, so do not think anyone else from me holds the status of the honored beloved.

So do not imagine anything else to be real. And when both are omitted, like in the saying of Allah the Exalted: 'Where are my partners that you used to claim?' meaning you claim them as my partners. And similarly, in their saying 'Whoever hears, hears truly,' meaning he really hears what he hears. It is permissible for the verb to be omitted when there is evidence, like His Almighty saying: 'What has your Lord sent down?' They said: 'Good,' meaning He sent down good. And it is also said 'Whom do I honor?' and you would reply 'the scholars,' meaning honor the scholars. (Al-Ghalayini, 1994, vol. 3, p. 398)

It should be omitted in proverbs and similar expressions where the omission of the verb is common, like 'The dogs on the cows,' meaning 'send the dogs,' or 'Do your mourners,' not 'do your jokers,' meaning attend and accept, and 'Everything, but no insult to a free man,' meaning 'take everything, but do not insult a free man,' or 'Welcome and easy,' meaning 'you have come welcome and lodged easy.' In Fadil Al-Samurai's book **Meanings of Grammar**, regarding the verse: 'As for he who gives and fears [Allah]' (Al-Lail: 5), he states that the object is omitted here for the purpose of allowing the action to apply to everything suitable for it. We didn't find Al-Samurai calling this an omission due to not mentioning it;



rather, he presented it in the context of omission and its purposes. He didn't say the object is omitted because the speaker didn't intend to mention it; he said it's omitted to make the event general and not restricted to a specific object.

Fadhil Al-Samarrai also said: The omission of the object in a phrase while intending it in meaning and inference has another purpose besides conciseness; it is to make the action general, given that there is evidence for its omission. For example, the verse: 'And Pharaoh misled his people, and did not guide' (Taha: 79), meaning 'and He did not guide them.' The purpose of the omission here, beyond conciseness, is to render the verb in a general sense by dropping its object, indicating that Pharaoh was completely devoid of guidance. If it were said, 'and He did not guide them,' the lack of guidance would relate specifically to his people, implying he might have guided others. But it says, 'and did not guide,' meaning 'He guided no one.' (Al-Samarrai, n.d., Vol.2, p.82)

Al-Samarrai adds further discussion to support the idea that the noun in question can be omitted, and the object is understood; he says: Speech may not require having evidence for a specific omitted element in it—it's enough that the speech indicates there is an omission, whether the omitted part is specified or not. That's why grammarians have differed on identifying the omitted element and its place, depending on what reasoned thinking leads to. For example, when we say: 'I was at Khalid's, so I saw,' or 'I was hiding, so I heard,' the object is omitted here intentionally to create ambiguity, allowing the mind to go in any direction. (Al-Samarrai, n.d., Vol. 2, p. 84)

-Omitting the Absolute Object

In the book **Meanings of Grammar** by Fadel Al-Samarrai, when it comes to the verb of the infinitive that indicates type and number, omission is permissible, based on either the current or spoken evidence. For example, one might say: 'Didn't the negligent one disrespect?' and you could respond: 'Yes, a serious insult' or 'multiple insults.' Likewise, you could say to someone intending to travel: 'traveling with intent,' to someone who arrived: 'a blessed arrival,' or to someone who returned from pilgrimage: 'a accepted pilgrimage,' and so forth (Al-Samarrai, Vol. 2, p. 165)



Al-Ghilayini's Position (Jami' al-Durus al-Arabiya) — A Comparative Note: Al-Ghilayini, in the section on the absolute object, discusses the source acting on behalf of its deleted verb necessarily in contexts of command, supplication, and warning, giving typical examples like 'Sabran Jamilan' (beautiful patience) and 'Sama'an wa Taatan' (listening and obedience). He mentions that the deletion of the verb here is obligatory, not optional, because the source fully stands in for it in these auditory expressions. The two books agree on the grammatical rule but differ in their perspective: Al-Ghilayini presents it as a fixed grammatical rule, while Al-Samra'i presents it as a semantic phenomenon serving the purpose of emphasis and rhetorical conciseness.

- Omitting the Answer to an Oath

In the book **Meanings of Grammar** by Fadel Al-Samarrai, the answer to an oath can be omitted both obligatorily and permissibly. It must be omitted if the oath comes after something that indicates it, or if something surrounding it implies it. For example, on the one hand, you might say: 'You are sincere, by God,' and on the other hand: 'By God, you are sincere.' In both cases, the preceding part covers the need for the answer. Speech can also be structured initially without the oath, and the oath can be added at the end afterward.

In the second case, the oath appears in the middle of the sentence. The statement is built initially without the oath, and then you decide to swear during the sentence. Here, the oath doesn't need an answer because in both scenarios, the intended meaning doesn't rely on it. The meaning is already clear from what came before the oath or from what surrounds it. This is similar to omitting the answer to a conditional statement if it has already been indicated.

However, if the oath comes at the beginning, it must have an explicit or implied answer because the meaning of the sentence depends on it. The answer can be omitted permissibly if the context already makes it clear, such as when someone asks: 'Did you go to him?' you could respond: 'Yes, by God,' or 'No, by God,' meaning 'Yes, by God, I did go to him,' or 'No, by God, I didn't go to him.'

A response (Jawab) can also be omitted if what comes after it indicates it, like in what Allah says: 'By those who extract with violence, And those who gently draw out, And those who glide along, And those who race each other, And those who



arrange [each] matter, On the Day the blast [of the Horn] will convulse' (An-Nazi'at: 1–6). The meaning intended here is understood from what follows. Sometimes, the reason for omitting the response is that it doesn't refer to a specific answer, but rather to any answer that the context or situation may allow. Other times, the response is meant specifically, like in what Allah says: 'So by your Lord, We will surely gather them and the devils' (Maryam: 68). In other cases, it isn't meant specifically, but can encompass all the possible responses a situation allows, leaving the mind free to consider different interpretations. All these meanings are either intended or potentially intended, so the meaning expands with the omission and covers aspects that wouldn't have been included if explicitly mentioned. Thus, the purpose of stating something is to indicate a specific response, while omission might aim for brevity, or it might intend to broaden the meaning and allow the mind to explore various interpretations, and Allah knows best.

Al-Ghalayini's Position (Jam' al-Durus al-'Arabiyya) — Comparative Note: Al-Ghalayini addresses the response to the oath in the chapter on oaths, and mentions that the response is omitted if it is preceded or followed by something that indicates it, such as when it is preceded or followed by a conditional answer that makes it unnecessary; in that case, one of the responses suffices for the other. This point is originally included in the research results as an example of complete agreement between the two books (with the omission of the conditional response and the omission of the object).

- Omitting the Conditional Response

Omitting the response to a condition according to Al-Ghalayini in his book *Jami' al-Durus al-'Arabiyya*: The response to a conditional statement is omitted if it is indicated by evidence, provided the condition is in the past tense verbally, such as "You will succeed if you studied," or in the present tense accompanied by 'lam,' like "You will fail if you did not study." (It is not allowed to say "You will succeed if you study," because the condition is neither in the past tense nor accompanied by 'lam'.)

The omission can be either optional or obligatory. It is optional if there is nothing in the speech suitable to serve as a response, either because the condition itself



implies the response, such as "If you are able to seek a canal on the land or a ladder in the sky," meaning "If you are able, then do it," or because the condition serves as a response to someone else's speech, for example, if someone asks "Will you honor Sa'id?" you can answer "If he works hard," meaning "If he works hard, I will honor him."

It is obligatory to omit if the meaning providing the response is already indicated. There is no difference whether the part indicating the conditional response comes before it, like "You will succeed if you studied," or after it, as when the condition is in the middle of the clause, like "By God, if you get up, I will not get up," or it surrounds it, such as when the condition comes between the parts indicating the response, like "You, if you studied, are successful." (Al-Ghalayini, 1994, Vol. 2, pp. 297-298)

As for the book 'Meanings of Grammar' by Fadil Al-Samarrai, he mentioned the omission of the conditional answer: he stated that it is obligatory to omit the conditional answer in cases where something indicating it comes before or surrounds it, and the conditional verb is in the past tense, such as 'I will visit you if you visit me,' or 'You are successful if you are truthful,' and 'You, if you are truthful, are successful.' As Allah Almighty said: 'And I, if Allah wills, am among the guided.' (Al-Baqara 70). According to the Kufis, the conditional answer is the preceding part, so in examples like 'I will visit you if you visit me,' ('I will visit you') is considered the answer according to them. The Basrans, however, rejected this idea, saying that if the answer were the preceding part, then the jussive would apply if it's a verb, and it would require the conjunction 'fa' if it were a nominal sentence. (Al-Samarrai, n.d., Vol. 2, p. 497). Therefore, it is correct to say 'I will visit you if you visit me' and 'So you are successful if you are truthful.'

It may be omitted in certain cases, and there are two types: The first is that it can be omitted as a form of abbreviation, like in the verse: 'They said, "Your bird is with you, if only you had mentioned it; rather, you are an excessive people"' (Yaseen 19), meaning 'you have divined,' as evidenced by the verse 'They said, "We have divined".' And another example is: 'And when it is said to them, "Fear what is before you and what is behind you, perhaps you will be shown mercy"' (Yaseen 45), meaning 'they turned away.' (Al-Samarrai, n.d., Vol. 4, p.123)



Second: To indicate emphasis and magnification. It is mentioned in Al-Burhan: 'They said: The response can be omitted in places of emphasis and magnification, and it can be omitted because the addressee already knows it. It is only omitted to enhance the listener's perception to the utmost extent, making the mind wander in all directions. If the response were explicitly stated, the mind would stop at what is explicitly mentioned, and it wouldn't have that effect. Therefore, it is not appropriate to interpret the response specifically unless the context is known.' (Al-Samarrai, undated, vol. 4, p. 124)

-Omission of the Genitive

In the Samaritan dialect, the genitive is often omitted in speech when context makes it clear. There may even be two genitives in a sentence, and the second one is omitted because the first one is enough. For example, they say, 'Not every black date, nor every white fat,' which is as if you said, 'nor every white fat.' Here, 'white' is in a genitive relationship with an omitted word. Similarly, they say, 'Not like Abdullah says that, nor his brother,' and 'Not like your father, nor your brother says that.'

Sometimes there are two genitive nouns in a sentence, and the first one is omitted because the second suffices, like 'A boy and Ali's brother came.' The original would be, 'Ali's boy and his brother came.' When the first genitive is omitted, the second one becomes an explicit noun, so 'boy' becomes a possessed noun, and the first genitive (Ali) is understood as implied. The poet also illustrates this:

O you who sees a passerby, I am delighted by him between the arms of the lion's forehead

And the estimation is "between the lion's arms and its forehead." There isn't anything like this in strong expressions, and it is better to mention both names together. (Al-Samarrai, n.d., Vol. 3, p. 213). Its omission serves important purposes, including: 1 - Allowing flexibility in speech and expansiveness in it, as in the verse: "But righteousness is [found in] one who believes in Allah and the Last Day" (Al-Baqarah: 177). According to them, the meaning is, but the righteous one is he who believes in Allah; righteousness belongs to someone who believes in Allah. They said this is because 'al-birr' (righteousness) is the subject and "who believes" is like the body, so one does not directly describe the source



itself. Similarly, in the verse: “But righteousness is [found in] one who fears [Allah]” (Al-Baqarah: 189).

The truth is that in the language, news is specifically attributed to the source, and to the source from the essence, with the aim of exaggeration and emphasis. From the first type is what we mentioned in the verse: {But righteousness is in one who fears Allah} and similar verses. The purpose is to embody meanings and turn them into living, moving figures that the eyes can see. So, when Allah says }But righteousness is in one who believes in Allah(, it implies that when righteousness takes form, it becomes a person who believes in Allah and the Last Day. Thus, righteousness is depicted as a person walking on two legs with its own traits and attributes. (Al-Samarrai, n.d., Vol. 3, p.142)

As for the second, I mean news about the essence from the source itself, as Allah says: {Indeed, he is a person of no good deeds} [Hud: 46]. Here, He informed us about Noah's son by saying (a person of no good deeds), and the purpose is to turn the essence into an event, unlike the first case. The meaning in the verse is that your son, O Noah, became an act of no good deeds, with nothing left of the element of essence. This transformation and figurative use are not achieved by estimation; if you estimate it as grammarians do (indeed, he has no good deeds) or (the one with righteousness is the believer), nothing of this meaning remains. So, there's no need for adding extra words or similar constructs, since every expression has its indication and meaning. This is illustrated in Allah's words: {And they imbued in their hearts an urge for the calf out of disbelief} (Al-Baqara: 93), meaning the love of the calf, because calves do not literally get imbibed in hearts. It's similar to what was mentioned earlier about figurative intention. The meaning is that their hearts were as if they literally drank the golden calf, so it was integrated into their structure. This meaning is not conveyed by estimating the word 'love'. And similarly, their saying (the sons of so-and-so) are trampled by the road is a mental metaphor, meaning the people of the road trample them, but the act of trampling is figuratively attributed to the road.

It was mentioned in the book: And among what was expressed extensively but briefly is His saying, Glory be to Him, 'And ask the village in which we were and the caravan in which we came' (Yusuf: 82). He only means the people of the



village, so it was shortened and the verb was applied to the village... (Al-Samarrai, n.d., Vol. 3, p. 143).

In fact, this is a figurative expression that conveys a meaning that the explicit wording doesn't, and therefore we don't see it as explicit because that would ruin the artistic purpose for which it was crafted.

Omission for brevity, which occurs when the meaning indicates it, as in their saying: "this midday or afternoon or evening," meaning they only want the prayer of that time, and "people gathered in the heat" means people gathered during the heat, including what the poet said:

Money scorns people of noble lineage, and sometimes the master of wealth is not the lord.

Any loss of money is disgraceful, and from it is your saying: 'I came at sunrise,' meaning at the time of sunrise, and 'wait for me for two rak'ahs of prayer,' meaning the amount of two rak'ahs of prayer, and it is understood from the speech.

Redundancy indicated by the mentioned additional term for what is omitted if a clue points to it, like when you say 'Abu Muhammad and Khalid are present.' The meaning here is 'Abu Muhammad and Abu Khalid are present,' as indicated by the word 'are present.' If that wasn't meant, you would say 'is present.' For example, if you said 'Abu Muhammad and Khalid is present,' it would mean that their father is present. But if you say 'are present,' it means both their fathers are present, with the plural pointing out that they are two, not one. A similar example is when you say 'the book of Saeed and Khalid are torn,' the word 'are torn' shows that they are two books, not one, meaning 'the book of Saeed and the book of Khalid.' If you said 'is torn,' it would mean a single book belonging to both of them.

And similarly, saying 'Not like your brother or your father says that'—here, you have to assume the word 'like' as well, so it would be understood as 'Not like your brother, nor like your father says that.' Because if what was meant by 'like your brother and your father' was just one person, it would have been mentioned with 'says.' So, knowing that it says 'they say,' it indicates that they are two people, not one. The mentioned possessive covers what's omitted, and the context makes it clear. (Al-Samurai, n.d., vol. 3, p. 145)



Al-Ghilayini's Position (Jam' al-Durus al-'Arabiyya) — Comparative Remark: Al-Ghilayini discusses the omission of the first term in an 'idafa (genitive construction). He mentions that the first term (the possessed) is often omitted, and the second term (the possessor) takes its grammatical role, while the meaning of the first term remains intended and implied. The famous example he gives is the Qur'anic verse, "And ask the village in which we were," meaning the people of the village. There is agreement on the basic rule and the common Qur'anic example, though depth differs: Al-Ghilayini establishes the grammatical rule, while Al-Samarrai focuses on the semantic and rhetorical effect of this omission.

- Omitting the Possessive

In the book **Meanings of Grammar** by Fadil Al-Samarrai, the possessive can be omitted while the possessed remains as it is, as if the possessor were mentioned. This mostly happens when the mentioned possessor makes the omitted one unnecessary. For example: 'I took Khalid's book and pen.' This indicates that both the book and the pen belong to Khalid. On the other hand, if you say 'I took a book and Khalid's pen,' it shows that only the pen belongs to Khalid, not the book. There are many expressions like this, such as saying 'May God cut off a hand and a man' as it is said, and phrases like 'He watered the lands with rain, the plain and its valley,' meaning the plain and its valley, or 'except Alala or Bada,' meaning Alala.

Here, we don't want to mention the fruitless debate about the position of the omitted genitive, or whether this is a case of omitting the genitive or that both nouns are added to one genitive. This disagreement is pointless because what matters is the meaning, and the meaning is the same whether you say it one way or the other. (Al-Samarrai, n.d., vol. 3, p. 145)

Al-Ghalayini's Position (Jamia' al-Durus al-Arabiya) — Comparative Note: Al-Ghalayini mentions that the genitive (the second part of an idafa) may be omitted while the first part remains in its original form. In such cases, the adverb is built with a dhamma (a grammatical case) as a compensation for the omitted part, as in the verse: 'To Allah belongs the command from before and from after.' There is complete agreement on the rule and the example, with a slight difference



in perspective: Al-Ghalayini asserts the grammatical ruling, while Al-Samarrai interprets the construction semantically as a kind of meaningful compensation.

-Omitting the adjective

It is permissible to omit the adjective if it is known, as in the words of Allah, ﴿And there was behind them a king who seized every ship by force﴾ (Al-Kahf: 79), meaning every suitable ship, so the adjective was omitted and the noun retained; if that is not understood, then there is no benefit in removing it. From this is the saying of Al-Murqish Al-Akbar:

And a man with soft cheeks, delicate and tender, with a branch and a good smell So the adjective is deleted and the noun being described is kept, like 'a dark branch' or something like that, and 'good long,' otherwise every woman has a branch and 'good' to mean the absolute branch and 'good.' So there's no point in exaggerating. The attribute can be deleted and indicated by the speaker's tone, and the vocal accent has an effect in clarifying it. It's like when you say 'he is a man,' you strengthen the word, lengthen the vowel, and emphasize it, to indicate that he is a great man, and so on. Or you say 'he has (money)' and pronounce 'money' strongly and stretch the sound to show that he has a lot of money. And if you say 'he has money' and turn your face or change the intonation, it indicates that he has only a little money, and so forth. (Al-Samarrai, Vol. 3, p. 202)

Al-Ghulayini's Position (Jami' al-Durus al-'Arabiyya) — Comparative Note: Al-Ghulayini discusses the omission of adjectives in the section on adjectives and their dependents, explaining that it is permissible to omit the adjective if there is a verbal or situational indication for it. One of his famous examples is the verse, 'And for Him are the ships made for sailing in the sea like banners,' meaning large ships with sails. Here, the adjective 'large' is omitted because the context makes it clear. There is agreement on the general permissibility and the requirement of some indication, while the approach differs: Al-Ghulayini provides a grammatical grounding, whereas Al-Samarrai offers a semantic analysis.



Result

This standard study concluded that the phenomenon of omission is present extensively in both books under study, though the degree of attention to it and the method of presenting it vary. Al-Ghallayini's approach to omission in "Jami' al-Durus al-Arabiyya" is educational and procedural, focusing on regulating the grammatical rule and precisely identifying where omission is permissible, mandatory, or prohibited, in line with the educational purpose of the book. On the other hand, Al-Samarrai's approach in "Ma'ani al-Nahw" is analytical and semantic, concerned more with the semantic and rhetorical effects of omission than with strictly regulating grammatical rules.

The detailed comparison between the two books has shown an agreement on several key grammatical points that goes beyond the initial assumption (simply omitting the object and the answer to the conditional), to include other points like omitting the negating 'la' in the oath response, omitting the vocative particle, omitting the interrogative hamza, omitting the absolute object along with its verb, omitting the answer to the oath, and omitting the annexed noun, its annex, and the adjective. It also turns out that there are points uniquely detailed by Al-Samrawi but not by Al-Ghalayini, most notably the omission of the relative pronoun and the omission of the relative clause, and one point (omitting the conjunction) where Al-Samrawi provides an independent semantic analysis, whereas Al-Ghalayini only mentions it in passing, reflecting the broader analytical scope of the book in observing phenomena that might not be directly necessary for immediate educational purposes.

The study recommends carrying out a detailed statistical survey of the number of instances of each type of omission in the two books, which would allow for quantitative measurement alongside the qualitative assessment used in this research. It also suggests expanding the scope of comparative studies to include other modern grammatical sources (like Abbas Hassan's 'Al-Nahw Al-Wafi') to enrich this field of research.



References

The Holy Quran

1. Ibn al-Athir, Diya' al-Din Nasrallah ibn Muhammad (n.d.), **Al-Mathal al-Sa'ir fi Adab al-Sha'ir wa al-Katib** [The Current Proverb in the Literature of the Poet and the Writer], edited by Badawi Tabana and Ahmad al-Hufi, Nahdat Misr Library, Cairo.
2. Ibn al-Shajari, Hibat Allah ibn Ali Abu al-Sa'adat (n.d.), **Amali Ibn al-Shajari** [The Dictations of Ibn al-Shajari], edited by Mahmoud al-Tanahi, Al-Khanji Library, Cairo.
3. Ibn Jinni, Abu al-Fath Uthman al-Mawsili (1985), **Sirr Sina'at al-I'rab** [The Secret of the Art of Grammatical Inflection], edited by Hassan al-Hindawi, Dar al-Qalam, Damascus.
4. Ibn 'Usfur, Ali ibn Mu'min ibn Muhammad (1980), **Sharh Jumal al-Zajjaj: Al-Sharh al-Kabir** [Commentary on Al-Zajjaj's **Al-Jumal**: The Great Commentary], edited by Sahib Abu Janah, University of Mosul / Dar al-Kutub Foundation for Printing and Publishing.
5. Ibn Manzur, Muhammad ibn Mukarram (1990), **Lisan al-Arab** [The Tongue of the Arabs], Dar Sader, Beirut.
6. Abu Makarem, Ali (2008), **Al-Hadhf wa al-Taqdir** [Ellipsis and Implied Meaning], Master's Thesis, Faculty of Dar al-Ulum, Cairo.
7. Al-Astarabadhi, Muhammad ibn al-Hasan al-Radi (1982), **Sharh Shafiyat Ibn al-Hajib** [Commentary on Ibn al-Hajib's **Al-Shafiya**] (with a commentary on the illustrative verses by the eminent scholar Abd al-Qadir al-Baghdadi), edited by Muhammad Nur al-Hasan, Muhammad Zaqrif, and Muhammad Muhyi al-Din Abd al-Hamid, Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyya, Beirut.
8. Al-Jurjani, Abd al-Qahir ibn Abd al-Rahman ibn Muhammad (1977), **Dala'il al-I'jaz** [The Signs of Inimitability], edited by Muhammad Abd al-Mun'im al-Khafaji, Al-Qahira Library.
9. Al-Jawhari, Isma'il ibn Hammad (1984), **Taj al-Lugha wa Sihah al-Arabiyya** [The Crown of Language and the Sound Arabic Lexicon], edited by Ahmad Abd al-Ghafur, Beirut.
10. Al-Zarkashi, Muhammad ibn Abd Allah (1980), **Al-Burhan fi 'Uloom al-Qur'an** [The Proof Regarding the Sciences of the Quran], edited by



-
- Muhammad Abu al-Fadl Ibrahim, Dar Ihya' al-Kutub, Cairo. 11- Al-Zamakhshari, Mahmud ibn Umar ibn Muhammad (1985), **Asas al-Balagha** [The Foundations of Rhetoric], edited by Muhammad Basil 'Uyun al-Sud, General Egyptian Book Organization – Cairo.
11. Al-Samarrai, Fadhil Salih (n.d.), **Ma'ani al-Nahw** [The Meanings of Grammar], Al-Atiq Company for Book Manufacturing – Cairo.
 12. Abd al-Latif, Muhammad Hamasa (1996), **Bina' al-Jumla al-Arabiyya** [The Structure of the Arabic Sentence], Dar Al-Shorouk – Cairo.
 13. Al-'Ukbari, 'Abd Allah ibn al-Husayn ibn 'Abd Allah (1995), **Al-Lubab fi 'Ilal al-Bina' wa al-I'rab** [The Essence of the Reasons for Invariability and Declension], edited by Ghazi Mukhtar Tulaymat, Dar Al-Fikr – Damascus.
 14. Al-Ghalayini, Mustafa Muhammad Salim (1994), **Jami' al-Durus al-Arabiyya** [A Comprehensive Collection of Arabic Grammar Lessons], reviewed and revised by 'Abd al-Mun'im al-Khafaji, Al-Maktaba al-Asriyya Publications, Sidon–Beirut, 30th ed.
 15. Al-Maydani (d. 518 AH), Abu al-Fadl Ahmad ibn Muhammad ibn Ibrahim al-Maydani al-Naysaburi (1982), **Majma' al-Amthal** [The Compendium of Proverbs], edited by Muhammad Muhyi al-Din 'Abd al-Hamid, Dar Al-Ma'rifa – Beirut, Lebanon.
 16. Burayjiyya, Muhammad Ahmad Hasan, **Zahirat al-Hadhf fi al-Mufaddaliyyat: Dirasa Nahwiyya Dalaliyya** [The Phenomenon of Ellipsis in **Al-Mufaddaliyyat**: A Grammatical-Semantic Study], Master's thesis, Al-Quds University.
 17. Khalil, 'Atif Fadl Muhammad (2013), **Zahirat Hadhf al-Maf'ul bihi: Dirasa Wasfiyya Ihsa'iyya Tahliliyya – Namadhij min al-Qur'an al-Karim** [The Phenomenon of Omitting the Direct Object: A Descriptive, Statistical, and Analytical Study – Examples from the Holy Quran], **Jordan Journal of Arabic Language and Literature**, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 273–302.
 18. Dih, Hanadi Rashid (1998), **Al-'Alaqa bayna al-Kathra wa al-Hadhf fi Kitab Sibawayh** [The Relationship between Frequency and Ellipsis in Sibawayh's **Kitab**], Master's thesis, American University of Beirut.
-



***Modern American Journal of Linguistics,
Education, and Pedagogy***

ISSN (E): 3067-7874

Volume 2, Issue 10, October, 2026

Website: usajournals.org

***This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution
4.0 International License.***

-
19. Al-Tawisi, Alaa Mazen, Patterns of Ellipsis in *Shawahid al-Tawdih wa al-Tashih* by Ibn Malik al-Andalusi: A Grammatical Study, *Journal of Al-Balqa Applied University*.
 20. Ghanem, Sarah El-Sayed Ibrahim (2011), Grammatical Ellipsis in Sentence Patterns and Forms in the Poetry of Muhammad Salih al-Khawlani, *Journal of Scientific Research in Arts*, Ain Shams University, Issue 12, Vol. 1, pp. 61–90.