

Open
AccessCheck for
updates

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Section: *Literature, Linguistics & Criticism***The impact of emotional aspects on the construction of syntactic structures: Semantic transformations and prospects for pragmatic investment**

Amr Khater Abd Elghany Wahdan¹, Mohammed Nadi Farghaly Mohammed^{1,2}, AbdUlmalik Ahmed Essayed Shetewy^{1,3}, Khaled Hilal Nasser Alabri¹, Kawthar Saeed Eltom Ali¹, Gomaa Elsayed Abd Elmaksoud Ibraheem¹, Mohamed Abd Eldayim Elbagoury¹, Mohamed Ibraheem Hasanen¹ & Mohamed Taha Abd Alkhaleek Alagiri^{1*}

¹College of Education and Arts, Sohar University, Sultanate of Oman

²College of Arts, New Valley University, Egypt

³College of Arabic Language, Al-Azhar University, Mansoura, Egypt

*Correspondence: malagiri@su.edu.om

ABSTRACT

The core problem of this study stems from the distinct role psychological factors play in shaping grammatical structures, significantly impacting both surface and deep structures. Achieving mutual understanding is the ultimate goal of structural formation, as the linguistic system was inherently created to convey meaning based on the mental ordering of concepts—words being the vessels for these thoughts. The study's significance centers on exploring the impact of emotional states on syntactic construction and leveraging this understanding to enhance linguistic engagement across diverse contexts. Mastery of linguistic structures implies a deep comprehension of the communicative goals within the underlying emotional framework, alongside the attendant shifts in meaning and semantics, given that the primary objective of linguistic inquiry is to uncover the speaker's intended meaning. Accordingly, this paper seeks to elucidate this dimension and highlight its grammatical relevance across classical and contemporary perspectives. The study establishes two foundational principles: the emotional traits of the linguistic event shared between discourse participants, and semantic cues—such as expressions of joy, sorrow, and anger—that trigger structural transformations. Through these principles, the research demonstrates the functional value of emotional attributes in syntactic construction and variation, viewing them as reflections of the psychological attitudes and feelings of both the speaker and the listener. Consequently, the appropriate syntactic form is determined by the specific emotional state, prompting the integration of non-linguistic contextual indicators (emotions and sensations) embedded within the structural capacity of the language. To address these dynamics, the study evaluates tools from various linguistic research paradigms, adopting a descriptive approach to yield qualitative rather than purely quantitative insights. The research

Research Journal in Advanced Humanities

Volume 7, Issue 4, 2026

ISSN: 2708-5945 (Print)

ISSN: 2708-5953 (Online)

ARTICLE HISTORY

Submitted: 11 July 2026

Accepted: 10 August 2026

Published: 02 October 2026

HOW TO CITE

Wahdan, A. K. A. E., Mohammed, M. N. F., Shetewy, A. A. E., Alabri, K. H. N., Eltom Ali, K. S., Ibraheem, G. E. A. E., Elbagoury, M. A. E., Hasanen, M. I., & Alagiri, M. T. A. A. (2026). The impact of emotional aspects on the construction of syntactic structures: Semantic transformations and prospects for pragmatic investment. *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities*, 7(4). <https://doi.org/10.58256/3m57ey77>

Published in Nairobi, Kenya by Royallite Global, an imprint of Royallite Publishers Limited

© 2026 The Author(s). This is an open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.



aims to align with the objectives of applied pragmatics, whose primary focus is enabling the addressee to grasp the speaker's implicit meaning beyond the surface-level utterance through direct engagement with the communicative function of language. Furthermore, the study proposes a theoretical framework paired with examples from natural language to illustrate how speaker intent governs grammatical and semantic judgments-reaffirming that the speaker's purpose remains the ultimate yield of structural analysis. Finally, it highlights the emotional impact on the listener, compelling them to recognize the semantic behavior and intended meaning of the utterance, a core pursuit of linguistics to ensure effective communication.

KEYWORDS: emotional aspect, grammatical structures, meaning, pragmatics

Introduction

Sociolinguistics is one of the major branches of linguistics that examines the social and semantic dimensions manifested through linguistic structures. It investigates language as a social phenomenon that cannot be understood independently of its speaker, its hearer, and the circumstances in which it is produced. Accordingly, it seeks to identify the social norms governing linguistic behavior in the construction of syntactic structures.

Since language emerged primarily to communicate and deliver meaning within communicative events, and since language consists of structured syntactic patterns, meaning constitutes the foundation upon which syntactic structures are built. Meaning is both the purpose and the value of language; therefore, it determines the particular form and organization of syntactic constructions according to the speaker's communicative intention.

Both the speaker and the hearer strive to achieve mutual understanding and successful communication. The diversity of syntactic structures ultimately serves this communicative goal, as language is designed to convey speakers' intentions to their audiences through the mental organization of meanings. Thus, syntactic ordering operates primarily at the level of meanings rather than words themselves, since words merely function as containers for meaning.

The significance of this study lies in demonstrating the substantial role played by emotional dimensions within their social context in shaping syntactic structures at both the surface and deep levels, thereby facilitating successful communication. The study seeks to elucidate this phenomenon and emphasize its grammatical significance.

Furthermore, the study aims to contribute to applied pragmatics, whose principal concern is enabling the hearer to infer the speaker's intended implicit meaning beyond the literal meaning of the utterance, thereby highlighting the communicative function of language.

From an applied perspective, the study provides a descriptive account of syntactic structures influenced by situational emotions, illustrating how speakers' gestures, movements, emotional states, and psychological orientations interact in constructing meaningful communicative events.

Section I: Syntactic Structure and the Speaker's Emotional States

Discourse is a form of social behavior; through this behavior, the linguistic reality of grammatical structures is analyzed as a mutual interaction rather than a mere sequence of events, thereby inducing structural shifts. Language serves as an active medium for expressing feelings and emotions, and occasionally for narrating social events. The speaker utilizes language to vent inner feelings—whether by revealing or concealing them—making it a mirror reflecting their emotions, feelings, and psychological inclinations. Consequently, the syntactic structure is shaped to suit the speaker's emotional state. This linguistic behavior can be categorized within its social framework by distinguishing between two types of positive interaction between the participants of the linguistic event, starting with the speaker.

The speaker evokes non-linguistic contextual indicators—emotions and feelings—within the linguistic event, which are dimensions yielded by the potential of the linguistic structure. Since discourse does not always proceed according to standard transmission patterns, its analysis relies primarily on the speaker and their condition, based on their emotional aspects. This aligns with the objectives of Pragmatics, as it pertains to non-linguistic outcomes (van Dijk, 2000). Emotional intentionality (*al-qaṣḍiyyah al-shu'ūriyyah*) is one of the pragmatic premises and a fundamental principle of analysis, “because intention lies at the very heart of felicity conditions, the illocutionary force, the concept of autonomous action, and the pragmatic theory of semantics” (Blanchet, 2007).

The speaker resorts to ellipsis (omission) because their psychological state necessitates such abbreviation.

This is evident in the context of prohibition used for warning, »As when you say: (Al-asada al-asad! Al-jidāra al-jidār! Al-ṣabiyya al-ṣabiyy!) [Watch out for the lion! The wall! The child!]. (the lion, the lion, the wall the wall, the boy the boy) You are forbidding them from approaching a dangerous (leaning) wall, getting near a lion, or trampling a child. If the speaker wishes, they may explicitly state the underlying verb. Similarly, in the phrase: (Al-ṭarīqa al-ṭarīq!) [Make way!], one may say: (Khalli al-ṭarīq) [Clear the way] or (Tanahḥa ‘an al-ṭarīq) [Step aside].” (Sibawayh, 1988)

The speaker omits an element of the syntactic structure due to the observed situational state for the sake of brevity; the situation demands immediate performance and urgency to warn against imminent danger threatening the hearer or addressee. Thus, certain elements are dropped while retaining their intended meaning. “Warning against a feared object aims to prevent its occurrence; it is a moment of urgency that cannot tolerate prolonged speech, lest the danger befall the addressee before the utterance is completed” (Al-Suyūṭī, 1975).

This transformation manifests the speaker’s state, revealing the psychological contexts underlying the shift. The speaker’s psychological motivation to prevent the addressee from harm via the shortest means cannot be ignored. Consequently, the structure moves from its deep structure to its surface structure, as prolongation might defeat this communicative purpose, especially when the situational context (al-ḥāl wa-al-maqām) clearly indicates the omitted element.

Another form of ellipsis driven by the speaker’s psychological state—manifesting the surface structure—occurs when warning oneself (Taḥdhīr Iyyāka): You say: (Iyyāka naḥḥi, iyyāka bā‘id, iyyāka ittaqi) [Keep yourself away, avoid, beware], and the like. The verb was omitted due to frequent usage in speech, acting as a substitute for the verb, omitting it just as they omit in such contexts now.” (Sibawayh, 1988). Due to the frequent usage of “Iyyāka” among Arabs and the speaker’s intent to convey warning, the governing verb was omitted to rely solely on the pronoun (Ibn Ya‘īsh, n.d.). The omission of the governing agent (‘āmil) with “Iyyāka”—driven by emotional state—appears in two patterns:

Un-coordinated (Single): It was reported that some say: (Iyyāka) [Beware], and the response is: (Iyyāya) [I take care/beware of myself], as if saying: (Iyyāya aḥfaẓu wa-uḥādhir).” (Sibawayh, 1988)

Coordinated »: You say: (Iyyāka wa-al-asada) [Beware of the lion!], as if saying: (Iyyāka fa-ittaqini wa-al-asada) [Protect yourself and beware of the lion].” (Sibawayh, 1988). Thus, “Iyyāka” is accusative by the implied verb because both the speaker/addressee and the lion are objects to be guarded against (Al-Mubarrad, 2010).

Similarly, the accusative governing agent is omitted in warning contexts without “Iyyāka” when it is coordinated with another accusative noun following the wāw of accompaniment (wāw al-ma‘iyyah and), such as: (Ra’sahu wa-al-ḥā’iṭa) [Mind his head and the wall!] (Sibawayh, 1988), or (Ahla-ka wa-al-layla) [Reach your family before nightfall!] (Al-Zamakhsharī, 1993). It also occurs with repeated verbal nouns (maṣḍar) functioning as substitutes for the verbal utterance, such as: (Al-ḥadhara al-ḥadhar! Al-najā’a al-najā’a! Ḍarban ḍarban!) [Caution! Safety! Strike!] (Sibawayh, 1988).

Here, the speaker relies on altering structures between high frequency of usage and situational context; the context is one of warning, fear, and dread, making the omission of the verb preferable for rapid communication. Arabs omit “the verb in these instances when doubled due to frequency in speech, relying on visual cues from the situation and previous context. The first object thus substitutes for the explicit verb, becoming akin to Iyyāka when speech lengthens and becomes frequent” (Sibawayh, 1988).

Driven by emotional urgency, the speaker reduces the temporal duration of the warning phrase relative to the situation. They recognize that a word isolated from its activity or situational context becomes an empty container devoid of meaning; the essence of a word lies not in isolation, but within its embedded context. This structural transformation according to the speaker’s emotional state serves as a governing rule for conversational condensation. While language offers the flexibility to transition between levels or alter grammatical relations beyond customary norms, such deviations are justified primarily by varying psychological states, relying on the addressee’s shared knowledge (Ḥamāsah, 2006).

The speaker’s reliance on both linguistic and non-linguistic elements within the dual structural aspects balances syntax and semantics. Consequently, verbal interaction between communicative parties functions as a social system where utterances are selected according to socially recognized criteria, making linguistic phenomena analyzable across both linguistic and social contexts.

This mutual understanding of deep structure between the participants of a linguistic event is referred

to as Completion in Pragmatics. It relies on preventing ambiguity despite omitted elements, guided by fixed contextual indicators (Swan, 2007). Pragmatics examines such incomplete, routinely used sentences to achieve successful and clear communication (Robert, 2002).

Depending on their psychological state (ranging from conjecture, certainty, inattention, or slackness), the speaker employs vocative particles—either expressing or omitting them—to achieve attention, emphasis, or clarity (Sibawayh, 1988).

The situational clue (*qarīnat al-ḥāl*) serves as the primary justification for omitting the vocative particle. Grammarians note that the particle may be omitted due to an emotional state shared between speaker and addressee. Sibawayh writes under the chapter titled (Chapter on particles used to alert the called party): If you wish, you may omit them all for brevity, as in saying: (*Ḥārī bin Ka‘b*) [O Ḥārith son of Ka‘b]. This treats them as someone directly facing and being addressed by you.” (Sibawayh, 1988). However, omitting the vocative particle is inadmissible in certain contexts where the speaker’s emotional state requires its presence to avoid disrupting the linguistic system. An example is calling out in lamentation/grief (*al-nujbah*), which strictly mandates using vocative particles like (*Wā*) or (*Yā*) alongside the lamented noun. The elongated Alif of lamentation (*Alif al-nujbah*) is appended to extend and raise the voice, matching the grief over the lost one. Though called upon, the lamented is not expected to respond (Sibawayh, n.d.); the purpose is not to draw attention, “because lamentation aims to express grief and extend the sound, signaling that the speaker has suffered a major calamity” (Al-Mubarrad, 2010).

In this emotional state, the speaker does not expect the lamented to approach or attend; rather, suffering a severe misfortune, they raise and extend their voice to convey grief and distress to those present. Conversely, when addressing an attentive listener directly, the speaker retains the vocative particle for emphasis: “As one says to someone facing and listening intently: ‘Such was the matter, O Father of so-and-so’, for emphasis.” (Sibawayh, 1988)

Thus, omission or explicit mention of the vocative particle depends on the speaker’s emotional stance toward the addressee’s attentiveness. If addressing an inattentive party, the particle is required: (*Yā fulān*) [O so-and-so]. If the addressee is already facing and listening, the particle may be dropped. Sibawayh notes under the chapter (Inflection of Ruwayd) «Saying: (*Yā fulān*) to a man until he turns to you, versus omitting it—like omitting *Kāf* in (*Ruwaydan*) when saying: ‘You do so’—is done when he is already facing you, dispensing with (*Yā fulān*) due to his direct attention.” (Sibawayh, 1988)

In emergency appeals (*al-istighāthah*), assistance is sought by attaching the *Lām* of appeal to the called party alongside the indispensable vocative particle, driven by the speaker’s psychological need to extend the sound. The speaker calls out not merely for attention, but to demand rescue and support (Sibawayh, 1988).

Vocatives are also utilized to express exclamatory surprise (*al-ta‘ajjub*), where an open *Lām* attaches to the exclamation object alongside the fixed particle (*Yā*), denoting a grand event. Sibawayh states under (Chapter on vocative addition via preposition): They said: (*Yā la-al-‘ajab! Yā la-al-mā’!*) [Oh, what a wonder! Oh, what abundance of water!] upon seeing something extraordinary or vast water, as if saying: ‘Come, O Wonder, or Come, O Water, for this is your time.’” (Sibawayh, 1988)

Furthermore, vocatives express threats and warnings (*al-tahdīd wa-al-wa‘īd*), retaining the particle (*Yā*) with the prefixed *Lām*, as in the verse by Muḥalhil (Diwan Muḥalhil, n.d.):

Yā la-Bakrīn anshirū lī Kulayban ... Yā la-Bakrīn ayna ayna al-firāru?

(O Bakr, resurrect Kulayb for me! ... O Bakr, where, where can you flee?)

He appealed to them to resurrect Kulayb as a threat. His statement: ‘O Bakr, where can you flee?’ was an appeal turned against them—meaning, ‘Why do you flee?’—expressed as intimidation and threat.” (Sibawayh, 1988)

Here, two structures exist: a condensed surface structure matching the speaker’s emotional state, and an underlying deep structure assumed in intent. If explicit, the deep structure would strip the aesthetic value from the exclamatory or threatening purpose; hence, the structure was condensed.

I contend that the estimated deep structure differs from the surface structure in that the latter connects directly to the immediate linguistic situation, belonging to a specific contextual setting analyzed via the language’s syntactic system. The former represents the pre-assumed condition of this situation, serving to clarify the internal workings of the linguistic system and its communicative potential (Moore, Terrence & Carling, Christine, 1998).

The speaker would not condense the structure without certainty in the addressee's ability to bridge these communicative gaps and comprehend the intended meaning—such as calling for wonder rather than physical presence, or issuing a threat in the poet's verse.

This presupposition of linguistic competence constitutes a communicative implicature dictated by the speaker's psychological state, transforming the structure into the marked pattern intended. Just as vocative particles are expressed or omitted based on emotion, so is the suffixation of *Kāf* in (Ruwaydaka) in place of an imperative verb—preventing ambiguity—as well as in (*Hā'aka*) and (*Ḥayyahalaka*): Saying: (Ruwaydaka Zaydan) [Slow down / Give time to Zayd]. The *Kāf* attached to Ruwayda serves to specify the addressee, as Ruwayda applies broadly to singular, plural, masculine, and feminine. The *Kāf* was added for fear of confusing the intended listener. It was omitted initially relying on the listener's awareness... This resembles the usage of (*Hā'a* / *Hā'aka*) and (*Ḥayyahala* / *Ḥayyahalaka*). This *Kāf* is not an implicit subject pronoun—which would be grammatically incorrect here as subjects require *Wāw* as in (*If'alū*)—but was introduced for emphasis and specification.” (Sibawayh, 1988)

Similarly, appending the prepositional phrase (*Laka*) after the verbal noun (*Saqyan*) [May rain water you] serves to specify supplication or emphasis. The speaker may omit (*Laka*) when confident the recipient is known :Their inclusion of (*Laka*) after (*Saqyan*) clarifies the intent of supplication. It may be omitted if the supplicant knows the recipient is obvious, or retained for explicit emphasis.” (Sibawayh, 1988)

Evidently, grasping the intended meaning in these texts requires identifying the speaker's intent, supported by psychological cues, emotional states, and contextual circumstances. Structural transformation relies on two factors:

Non-linguistic: The speaker's emotion, psychological state, and inner thoughts.

Linguistic: Explicit spoken form whose primary meaning aligns with contextual semantics.

In its communicative function, the Arabic language conveys intent through two core mechanisms:

Explicit Manifestation (*Al-Izhār wa-al-Taṣrīḥ*): An informative communicative purpose.

Implicit Concealment (*Al-Iḍmār wa-al-Ikḥfā'*): Lexical and semantic condensation driven by speaker intent.

Both mechanisms stem from the speaker's psychological state. If a speaker asks about something unknown, the interrogation is literal. If asking while knowing the answer, that knowledge blocks literal interpretation, rendering the interrogation figurative/rhetorical (*majāzī*), thereby altering the structure.

This shift reflects a psychological state of hesitation or rhetorical strategy, altering the syntactic structure between literal and figurative dimensions. It acts as a non-linguistic indicator of semantic transformation: “A person asking about a matter may already know it, yet their outward questioning aims at other underlying purposes” (Ibn Jinnī, 2011).

In saying: (*A-'Amrun qā'imun?*) [Is Amr standing?], “it occurred to your mind that it might or might not be so, so you inquired based on your internal uncertainty. One only asks about something when both its affirmative and negative possibilities are plausible to them” (Ibn al-Sarrāj, 1999). The syntactic structure of such an inquiry hesitates between negation and affirmation depending on the speaker's mind, making it a literal question.

Conversely, an interrogative structure shifts from literal to figurative when the speaker has settled the fact (affirmative or negative) and intends to compel the addressee to acknowledge it:» Do you not see a person asking another: ‘Is happiness more desirable to you than misery?’ while knowing full well that happiness is preferred and that the addressee will answer ‘Happiness’? He simply intends to enlighten and instruct him.” (Sibawayh, 1988)

Interrogative structures frequently shift in negative contexts to yield affirmation and acknowledgment (*al-ithbāt wa-al-taqrīr*), such as: (*Amā aḥsantu ilayka? Alam ukrimka? Alasta khayran min Zayd?*) [Have I not treated you well? Have I not honored you? Are you not better than Zayd?]. The speaker leads the listener to affirm what was established in mind to stimulate thought and elicit self-acknowledgment. Abū ‘Alī al-Fārisī notes:»The resemblance between acknowledgment (*taqrīr*) and questioning lies in the fact that the speaker already knows the matter, yet seeks an answer from the addressees so that the proof is established by their own

words—just as an inquirer expects an answer. Due to this resemblance, it takes its grammatical form.” (Al-Fārisī, 2004)

Furthermore, an interrogative structure may shift to express rebuke and disapproval (al-inkār wa-al-tawbīkh) based on intent. Al-Mubarrad writes:

«This is a chapter on verbal nouns in interrogative form used for rebuke. As in saying: (A-qiyāman wa-qad qa‘ada al-nās?) [Standing while everyone else has sat down?]. You did not say this to ask a question, but to rebuke and disapprove of their action.” (Al-Mubarrad, 2010). Similarly, Al-‘Ajjāj states:

A-ṭaraban wa-anta qinnisriyyū? (Al-‘Ajjāj, 1971)

Do you yield to youthful emotion when you are advanced in age?)

The poet disapproves of his own emotional stirrings given his age; he does not genuinely inquire about the cause of his emotion, as he already knows...

That he was overjoyed [or overcome with emotion]: “For you might say to a man: ‘Are you in a state of ecstasy?’ while knowing full well that he is indeed in that state, in order to rebuke him and make him confess.” (Sibawayh, 1988).

Hence, the speaker’s emotional state regarding the subject of inquiry serves as the contextual clue (qarīnah) that prevents the interrogative structure from carrying its literal meaning. It functions as a non-linguistic criterion that simultaneously propels the utterance forward and significantly shapes its linguistic form. Thus, an illocutionary bond is established between the speaker’s inner state on one hand, and the meaning and realization of the utterances on the other.

Accordingly, we emphasize that language is a form of social behavior; it does not strictly yield to the rigid prescriptive rules frequently reiterated by traditional grammarians. Communicative competence is therefore defined as “...the ability to use language within a social interaction, harmonizing utterances, intentions, and the communicative context. Communicative competence is not built solely on the components of grammatical knowledge, but rather on recognizing the social and situational appropriateness of linguistic events” (Al-Abd, 2005). This is because appropriate discourse (al-maqāl) cannot exist without diction tailored to the social context (al-maqām) in which the speech occurs. From this stems the concept of the “register” in sociolinguistics, which is based on establishing a specialized vocabulary suited to the specific situation and subject matter (Hudson, 1990).

Section Two: Syntactic Structure and the Hearer’s Emotional States

The grammatical construction of any sentence is intrinsically linked to linguistic reality through the social and cultural frameworks to which people are accustomed. Grammatical analysis does not restrict structural construction to surface or underlying (posited) representations; rather, it examines structure through its pragmatic conditions of use, which are inseparable from it. This constitutes the external framework in which language—with its diverse structures—is realized, including the emotional state of one of the discourse participants, namely the hearer (al-mukhāṭab).

In reproative/reprehensive interrogatives (al-istifhām al-inkārī al-tawbīkhī), the speaker relies on the situational context of the hearer (ḥāl al-mukhāṭab), having observed the hearer’s inconsistency and instability. The speaker intends to rebuke him for this behavior rather than inquire about something unknown—even if an interrogative form is employed. This is because the actions have already transpired, and the speaker is fully aware of the hearer’s condition prior to the question: “This is like saying: ‘A Tamīmī at one time, and a Qaysī at another?’ You say this only when you see a man in a state of fluctuation and instability, so you say: ‘A Tamīmī at one time, and a Qaysī at another?’... as if you were saying: ‘Do you shift to being a Tamīmī once, and a Qaysī another time?’... In this state, you are establishing this fact against him while observing his shifting condition. You are not asking as a seeker of guidance about an unknown matter to understand or be informed of it; rather, you are rebuking him for it.” (Sibawayh, 1988).

At times, the hearer may hesitate regarding claims he once asserted and held as a firm conviction. When the contrary becomes evident to the speaker, he engages the hearer in dialogue, omitting the verb due to the contextual situation (ḥāl), such that the utterance functions as a proverb reflecting the psychological state. This is exemplified in the expression: "...HADHA WA-LA ZA'AMATUKA, meaning: 'I do not entertain your claims'" (Sibawayh, 1988). The speaker omits the verb by inferring from the hearer's psychological state that he is forbidding him from making such claims. The underlying meaning is that the hearer was making false assertions; when the truth to the contrary emerged, the speaker said to him: This is the truth, not your claims, omitting the verb due to the indication of the situational context.

Furthermore, the hearer may experience misconception or mental distraction—a psychological state that occurs when a structure contains ellipsis (omission) or fronting and backing (hyperbaton), departing from the canonical norm. Grammarians were keen to eliminate the misconception arising from overlapping linguistic contexts in their discussion of moral/semantic emphasis (al-tawkīd al-ma'nawī). This was aimed at removing doubt or heedlessness during meaning generation, securing the intended meaning in the hearer's mind, and preventing ambiguity or misinterpretation when there is fear of the hearer's misapprehension, weak intuition, or mental wandering. It also serves to negate any potential figurative interpretation (majāz) that might arise due to this psychological state, thereby establishing the literal truth (ḥaqīqah) and ruling out unintended specificity (Ibn Kharūf, 1997). Hence, Al-Jāḥiẓ states: "It suffices for the requirement of eloquence that the listener is not misled by the speaker's poor expression... nor is the speaker misunderstood due to the listener's poor comprehension." (Al-Jāḥiẓ, 1985).

One method of clearing mental distraction in the hearer is the insertion of the separating pronoun (ḍamīr al-faṣl) to eliminate ambiguity, as dictated by its function between the subject and predicate. Sibawayh states: "This is the chapter concerning cases where (he, you, I, we, and their counterparts) function as separating pronouns. Know that they act as separating pronouns only in verbal structures, and they do so across all verbs. The noun following it retains its status as if it were in an initial topic position, and its need for what follows is identical to its need in an initial topic position. This was permitted in these verbs whose following nouns retain their initial status as an indication that the noun has been separated, and that it pertains to what the listener (hearer) is anticipating and expecting—which the speaker must mention to the listener. For when you initiate a noun, you do so for the sake of what follows it; once initiated, a subsequent predicate becomes obligatory, without which the speech becomes corrupt and inadmissible. It is as if 'he' was mentioned so that the listener infers that what follows the noun resolves the structural requirement and is distinct from it. This is the explanation of Al-Khalīl, may Allah have mercy on him. And since these words function as separating pronouns in their proper position in Arabic speech, treat them as the Arabs treated them." (Sibawayh, 1988).

Sibawayh, citing his teacher, justified the insertion of the separating pronoun into the linguistic situation through a pragmatic principle that plays a clear role in successful communication by protecting the hearer from ambiguity and mental wandering, thereby achieving the communicative utility of this structural insertion. Thus, the linguistic system does not leave the hearer at the mercy of misinterpretation or confusion regarding the ambiguous status of the noun following the topic—whether it functions as a predicate (khabar) or an adjective (ṣifah)—nor does it leave him waiting for the predicate to appear without bringing forth the separating pronoun (Al-Astarābādhi, 1996).

This is precisely what this research paper elucidates: the hearer's attainment of these meanings by relying on background knowledge, shared assumptions with the speaker, and the perception of the contrast between direct and indirect textual data to comprehend the semantic outcomes of informative utterances. This mental faculty is designated in pragmatic linguistics as Pragmatic Competence—that is, the ability to use language effectively within the contexts in which it is manifested (Naḥlah, 2011).

Section Three: The Semantic Clue of the Linguistic Event and its Participants

This refers to a conversational-acoustic clue consisting of rising and falling intonational sequences linked to the speaker's emotional states—such as joy, happiness, sadness, anger, and disapproval—during the act of speech. It influences grammatical structures because it performs an expressive and communicative function, as well as disambiguating sentence meaning.

Although oaths (al-qasam) are conventionally recognized as a means of emphasis, Sibawayh pointed

out that an oath may also express exclamatory wonder (al-ta‘ajjub), depending on the speaker’s intention. In a chapter titled “This is the Chapter on Prepositions Used for Swearing and Their Omission,” he states: “You may say: ‘(Tallāhi) By God!’, carrying the sense of wonder. Some Arabs say in this context: ‘(Lillāhi) To God!’, using the preposition Lām, which is only used when it conveys the sense of wonder.” (Sibawayh, 1988). This structural shift is produced uniquely by vocal intonation (al-tanghīm al-ṣawṭī), based on the speaker’s deliberate selection of specific meanings.

Ibn Jinnī was among the most perceptive regarding the impact of intonation on structural transformation. He posited that the rising and falling of pitch serves as an indicator of an omitted adjective (ṣifah). He notes: “An adjective may be omitted when the situational context points to it, as in the expression reported by the author of the Book [Sibawayh]: ‘(Sīra ‘alayhi laylun) A night was traveled through,’ meaning: a long night. It is as though the adjective was omitted here because the situational context indicated its place; you can sense in the speaker’s utterance a degree of lengthening, drawling, emphasis, and magnification that stands in place of saying ‘long’ or the like. You can feel this within yourself upon reflection.” (Ibn Jinnī, 2011).

Thus, in Ibn Jinnī’s text, intonation functions as a substitute for structural components. He states: “They say: ‘(Sīra ‘alayhi laylun)’, meaning a long night. This is understood from them through the lengthening of the vowel, as they say: ‘(Sīra ‘alayhi lay---lun)’, where the duration stands in place of the adjective.” (Ibn Jinnī, 2009). “However, if it lacks verbal or situational indicators, its omission is impermissible.” (Ibn Jinnī, 2009).

Ibn Jinnī did not limit himself to this formulation to demonstrate the effect of intonational clues on structural transformation; he further confirmed its role in indicating omitted elements through another intonational context, stating: “That is when you are praising a person and extolling him, so you say: ‘(Kāna wallāhi rajulan!) By God, he was a man!’ You increase the phonetic force of the utterance through the word ‘Allah’, drawing out the sound of the Lām and lengthening the pitch over it, meaning: (a virtuous, courageous, or generous man, or the like). Similarly, you might say: ‘(Sa’alnāhu sa’alnāhu fa-wajadnāhu insānan?) We asked him and asked him, and we found him to be a human being!’, sustaining and emphasizing the sound on ‘human being’, thereby dispensing with describing him as (a generous or noble human being, or the like). Likewise, if you disparage him and describe him as narrow-minded, you say: ‘(Sa’alnāhu fa-kāna insānan!) We asked him, and he was a mere human being!’, while grimacing and frowning your face, which dispenses with saying: a mean, stingy, or miserly human being.” (Ibn Jinnī, 2011).

Ibn Jinnī thus expressed the modes of structural transformation through intonation and its relationship to stress (al-nabr) to elucidate the speaker’s intent. We can observe this transformation in his description of acoustic structures using terms such as: (lengthening, drawling, emphasis, magnification, increasing phonetic force, stretching, and duration). Furthermore, he emphasized the synergy between non-linguistic clues and intonation, describing facial expressions and body language (“grimacing and frowning your face”) to decode many structures that are identical in wording yet distinct in delivery.

Avicenna (Ibn Sīnā) also highlighted intonation within the framework of stress (al-nabr) and its relationship to the speaker’s intent and psychological state, stating: “Among the properties of melody are stress accents (al-nabarāt), which are melodic, non-segmental features that may occur at the beginning, middle, or end of utterances. They may occur frequently or sparingly in speech, carrying indications toward specific intents. Sometimes they are fully saturated, used to mark pauses, to hold the listener’s attention for visualization, or to magnify the speech. These stress accents, through variations in pitch and weight, may assume forms that signify other states of the speaker—such as being bewildered or angry—or they may serve to influence the interlocutor through threat, entreaty, or otherwise. Consequently, meanings may vary as these accents vary; for instance, a stress accent may turn a statement into a question, or a question into an expression of wonder, among other shifts.” (Ibn Sīnā, 1958).

The speaker utilizes the intonational clue to resolve potential ambiguity in the minds of the hearers. We observe this when the interrogative particle is omitted in the poet’s verse: (Al-Kumayt, 2000). I was filled with longing, though not out of yearning for fair women do I long, Nor out of playfulness—for does a grey-haired man play?

On a declarative intonation, the verse would imply that the speaker considers playful behavior from a grey-haired elder to be customary and expected. However, the poet intended the opposite of this apparent meaning regarding the elder: the interrogative intonation—with its omitted particle—serves to express the

speaker's disapproval (al-inkār) of an elder engaging in play, as it is unbecoming of someone advanced in age. Another instance of resolving structural ambiguity to inform the hearer via intonation occurs in the interpretation of the structure: (MĀ ATĀKA RAJULUN). Here, the word (RAJULUN) appears as an indefinite noun in a negative context, yielding multiple meanings depending on the speaker's intent, guided phonetically in the simplest manner. Sibawayh states in a chapter titled "This is the Chapter in Which You Inform with an Indefinite Noun About an Indefinite Noun": "A man says: '(Atānī rajulun) A man came to me,' intending 'one' in number, not two. So it is said: '(Mā atāka rajulun) Not a single man came to you,' meaning: more than that came to you. Or he says: '(Atānī rajulun lā imra'ah) A man came to me, not a woman,' so it is said: '(Mā atāka rajulun)', meaning: a woman came to you, not a man. Or he says: '(Atānī al-yawma rajulun) A true man came to me today,' referring to his strength and decisiveness, so you say: '(Mā atāka rajulun)', meaning: weaklings came to you." (Sibawayh, 1988).

Although Sibawayh did not explicitly name intonation as the distinguishing clue for the speaker's intent, distinguishing between number, gender, and quality in this context cannot be achieved except through the intonation with which the structure is uttered. Relying on intonation, the speaker employs a pragmatic mechanism: broadening/expansion (al-tawsī'), projecting an omitted element at the semantic level rather than the structural level to achieve a meaning broader than its literal sense through situational cues. There are presuppositions utilized by the speaker and analyzed by the hearer. If the speaker intends "number" by man, the meaning is: more than one came to you. If he intends the "gender" of man, the meaning is: a woman came to you, not a man. Thus, in each instance, the speaker expands his intended meaning based on the presupposition that the speech carries a communicative meaning recoverable through intonation by the hearer.

Language relies on intonation to categorize structures into declarative (ikhbār) and non-declarative (inshā'); it is the decisive factor in identifying structural types when an interrogative particle is absent. This stylistic subtlety appears in the variant readings (ĀMANTUM) as both a declaration and a question (Al-Fārisī, 1993) in the Qur'anic verse: {Pharaoh said, "Have you believed in him before I gave you permission? Indeed, this is a conspiracy you conspired in the city to drive out its people, but you are going to know"} [Al-A'rāf: 123]. The declarative reading signifies rebuke and reprimand for their faith in Moses (peace be upon him). Subsequently, the Qur'anic discourse intensifies the meaning to vividly evoke their situation through the disapproving interrogative reading, emphasizing the gravity of their act in Pharaoh's eyes (Al-Fārisī, 1993).

Intonation in this verse fulfills two functions: a grammatical-semantic function, seen in categorizing the Qur'anic structure into two distinct modes—affirmation/reprimand and interrogation—based on the overall intent; and an expressive function, manifested in Pharaoh's agitation, regret, and outrage at the sorcerers' faith. The transformation of the Qur'anic structure in this manner relies on the hearers' realization that a simple statement offers them no new information, as they are already aware of it. Instead, the structure shifts to an interrogative form to instill more deeply in their minds that they face imminent execution, as indicated by the contextual clue: {but you are going to know}. Thus, intonation was more impactful on the hearers and more effective in capturing their attention.

A similar dynamic governs the reading (A'INNAKA) (Ibn Mujāhid, 1988, 351) in the Almighty's saying: {They said, "Are you indeed Joseph?" He said, "I am Joseph, and this is my brother"} [Yūsuf: 90]. The declarative reading—with a single glottal stop and a level intonation—corresponds to a matter already settled and known to them. Conversely, the reading with two glottal stops in an interrogative tone was not meant to inquire about something unknown, but to confirm what they correctly suspected by way of astonishment and realization (Makkī, 1974).

Therefore, I affirm that intonation (via the vocal stress on the glottal stop) in both preceding contexts fulfilled an explanatory function that actively converted the structure from interrogative to declarative (or vice versa). Al-Suyūṭī notes: "Vowel lengthenings (maddāt) in the Qur'an serve ten aspects... including the lengthening of distinction (madd al-farq), as in (Āl-'āna); because it distinguishes between interrogation and declaration..." (Al-Suyūṭī, 1997).

It has also been observed that variations in the function of a particle within its structure induce a corresponding shift in the grammatical-semantic dependent without straying from the core meaning. This is evident in the intonation of the particle (MĀ) in the Almighty's saying: {May the hands of Abū Lahab be ruined, and ruined is he. His wealth will not avail him or that which he gained} [Al-Masad: 1-2]. The first (MĀ) is

negative, while the second is relative (*mawṣūlah*) or infinitive (*maṣḍarīyah*), meaning: “His inherited wealth from his ancestors did not avail him, nor did what he earned himself, his livestock, or his profits” (Abū Ḥayyān, 1993).

Alternatively, the first (*MĀ*) may be interrogative in the accusative position, where intonation shifts its function to disapproval and rhetorical affirmation—meaning: What good will his wealth do him? Under this analysis, the second (*MĀ*) may retain the previous meanings or also function as an interrogative—meaning: What has he gained?—yielding the overall sense: He has gained nothing.

Intonation varies with rising and falling contours in accordance with the speaker’s intent, thereby altering the functional meaning of (*MĀ*) in the verse. Consequently, the structure transforms and its stylistic patterns are delineated within the text, contributing to its cohesion and coherence.

Conclusion

Following this exploration, the main findings of the study can be summarized as follows:

- Invoking non-linguistic contextual cues —specifically emotions and sensations—within a linguistic event plays a pivotal role in selecting the syntactic structures best suited to the communicative context.
- The omission of a structural element often yields a more poignant semantic impact, as verbosity and explicit mention can undermine the intended communicative purpose of the syntactic build.
- Syntactic completion serves to avert semantic ambiguity arising from an omitted element, relying directly on stable contextual indicators.
- Resorting to structural economy (reduction) hinges on the addressee’s ability to bridge structural gaps and deduce meaning.
- Creating a “contextual register”—akin to frameworks in sociolinguistics—is essential for developing a specialized lexicon tailored to the specific context of situation (context of situation).
- Resolving confusion caused by overlapping linguistic situations relies on non-linguistic cues, which are summoned particularly when the addressee experiences cognitive distraction or momentary loss of focus.
- Intonation functions as an acoustic, communicative, and semantic cue intricately linked to the speaker’s emotional states—such as joy, pleasure, sadness, anger, and disapproval—during speech. It shapes syntactic composition and performs both an expressive and an informative function to resolve ambiguity.
- Presenting a theoretical framework grounded in natural everyday language to elucidate the speaker’s intent in shaping grammatical and semantic rulings.
- Highlighting the emotional impact on the listener to embody the semantic behavior of the structure as intended by the speaker, along with the underlying meanings—a core domain of pragmatic linguistics.
- Providing a description of emotion-based grammatical structures, mapping the speaker’s kinesic and gestural cues to their psychological states, feelings, and attitudes during the construction of the linguistic discourse.

Acknowledgments:

The authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to Sohar University for funding this research.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- Abd Al-Latif, M. H. (2006). Grammar and Semantics: An Introduction to the Study of Grammatical-Semantic Meaning (2nd ed.). Dar Ghareeb. <https://ebook.univeyes.com/10699>
- Abu Ali Al-Farisi, A. (1993). Al-Hujjah lil-Qurra' al-Sab'ah (Eds. B. Qahwaji & B. Juwairati; 2nd ed.). Damascus.
- Abu Ali Al-Farisi, A. (2004). Al-Masa'il al-Manthurah (Ed. S. A. Al-Najjar; 1st ed.). Dar Ammar for Publishing and Distribution.
- Abu Hayyan Al-Andalusi. (1993). Al-Bahr al-Muhit (Eds. A. Abd al-Maujud, A. Mu'awwad, et al.; 1st ed.). Dar Al-Kotob Al-Ilmiyah.
- Abu Hayyan Al-Andalusi. (n.d.). Irtishaf al-Dharab min Lisan al-Arab (Ed. R. O. Muhammad; 1st ed.). Maktabat al-Khanji.
- Al-Abd, M. (2005). Text, Discourse, and Communication (1st ed.). Modern Academy for University Books. <https://books.google.com.om/books>
- Al-Asadi, A. (2000). Diwan Al-Kumait ibn Zaid Al-Asadi (Ed. M. N. Tarifi; 1st ed.). Dar Sader.
- Al-Astarabadhi, R. M. (1996). Sharh al-Kafiya (Ed. Y. Omar; 2nd ed.). Garyounis University Publications.
- Al-Jahiz, A ibn B. (1985). Al-Bayan wa al-Tabyin (Ed. A. Harun; 5th ed.). Maktabat al-Khanji.
- Al-Suyuti, J. (1975). Al-Ashbah wa al-Naza'ir fi al-Nahw (Ed. T. A. Saad; 1st ed.). Maktabat al-Kulliyat al-Azhariyyah.
- Al-Suyuti, J. (1997). Al-Itqan fi 'Ulum al-Qur'an (Ed. M. A. Al-Ibrahim; 1st ed.). Al-Maktabah Al-Asriyyah.
- Al-Taghlibi, M ibn (Al-Zir Salim). (n.d.). Diwan Muhalhil ibn Rabi'ah (Comm. T. Harb; 1st ed.). Al-Dar Al-Alamiyyah.
- Bach, K. Speech Acts and Pragmatics, In: Michael, D. and Richard, H, (Philosophy of Language) Blackwell Publishing, USA, 2006. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/227981229_Speech_Acts_and_Pragmatics
- Blanchet, P. (2007). Pragmatics from Austin to Goffman [La Pragmatique d'Austin à Goffman] (Trans. S. Habacha; 1st ed.). Dar Al-Jiwar for Publishing and Distribution. <https://archive.org/details/20231118>
- Hudson, R.A. (1990). Sociolinguistics (Trans. M. Ayyad; 2nd ed.). Alam Al-Kutub. https://archive.org/details/20240512_20240512_0034
- Ibn al-Sarraj, A. (1999). Al-Usul fi al-Nahw (4th ed.). Al-Resalah Foundation.
- Ibn Jinni, A. (2009). Al-Muhtasab fi Tabyin Wujuh Shawadh al-Qira'at wa al-Idah 'Anha (Eds. A. N. Nasef, M. A. Al-Najjar, & A. Shalabi; 4th ed.). Supreme Council for Islamic Affairs.
- Ibn Jinni, A. (2011). Al-Khasa'is (Ed. M. A. Al-Najjar; 5th ed.). General Egyptian Book Organization.
- Ibn Khalawayh, A. (2007). Al-Hujjah fi al-Qira'at al-Sab' (Ed. A. S. Makram; 1st ed.). Alam Al-Kutub.
- Ibn Kharuf, A. (1997 [1418 AH]). Sharh Jumal al-Zajjaji (Ed. S. M. Arab; 1st ed.). Umm Al-Qura University Publications.
- Ibn Mujahid, A. (1988). Al-Sab'ah fi al-Qira'at (Ed. S. Dayf; 2nd ed.). Dar Al-Ma'aref.
- Ibn Sina (Avicenna). (1958). Al-Shifa' (Ed. A. F. Al-Ahwani). Al-Matba'ah al-Amiriyyah.
- Ibn Ya'ish, M. (n.d.). Sharh al-Mufasssal (1st ed.). Al-Matba'ah al-Muniriyyah.
- Makki ibn Abi Talib Al-Qaisi. (1974). Al-Kashf 'an Wujuh al-Qira'at al-Sab' wa 'Ilaliha (Ed. M. Ramadan; 1st ed.). Press of the Arab Language Academy.
- Moore, T, & Carling, C. (1998). Understanding Language: Towards a Post-Chomskyan Linguistics (Trans. H. H. Al-Hajjaj; 1st ed.). House of General Cultural Affairs, Iraqi Ministry of Culture and Information. <https://archive.org/details/AAlexandrina-477719>
- Nahla, M. A. (2011). New Horizons in Contemporary Linguistic Research (1st ed.). Maktabat al-Adab. <https://ebook.univeyes.com/8518>
- Robert, C. Context in Dynamic Interpretation, In: Horn and Ward, the Handbook of Pragmatics, Blackwell Publishing, 2002. <https://www.ling.ohiostate.edu/~croberts/context.pdf>
- Robert, J. The Pragmatics of Non-sentences, In: Laurence, R. and Gregory. W. the Handbook of Pragmatics, Blackwell Publishing, 2002. <https://robertstainton.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/fulltext-6.pdf>
- Sibawayh, A. (1988). Al-Kitab (Ed. A. Harun; 3rd ed.). Maktabat al-Khanji.
- Swan, M., Grammar, Meaning and Pragmatics: Sorting out the Muddle, (Tesla – EJ, September), 2007. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1064996> (<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1064996>)
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2000). Text and Context: Explorations in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse (Trans. A. Qanini; 1st ed.). Dar Afrique Orient. <https://archive.org/details/Nassiyak>