ISSN: 1994-4217 (Print) 2518-5586(online)

Journal of College of Education

Available online at: https://eduj.uowasit.edu.iq

[1]Prof. Nareeman Jabbar Rashid

University of Baghdad / College of Languages

[*2]Ass. Prof. Dr. Rana H. Al-Bahrani

University of Baghdad / College of Education for Women

Al-Kut University

Email:
nareeman.j@coeduw.uobaghdad.edu.iq
rana.hameed@coeduw.uobaghdad.edu.iq

Keywords:

Cognitive linguistics, context, contextual confluence, linguistic meaning

CC BY

A r t i c l e i n f o

Article history:
Received 20. Mar.2026
Accepted 5. Jul.2026
Published 10. Nov.2026

Towards a Contextual Confluence Framework for Linguistic Meaning: A Conceptual and Integrative Review

A B S T R A C T

The present work is a conceptual integrative review of the concept of linguistic meaning and the different frameworks adopted by scholars in this regard. The review clearly demonstrates scholars' shift of attention from the word and sentential level of meaning (i.e., the traditional view) to a wider scope of context, exceeding the co-text and physical context. To meet this objective, the researchers selected a number of (13) articles that address the concept of linguistic meaning differently using different frameworks. The review is limited to two focal points, the concept of linguistic meaning and the various frameworks adopted. The study has revealed that the traditional view of words and sentences as containers of meaning is no more valid. This is because meaning is seen to be a product resulted from the interplay of different types of contexts, such as the linguistic, physical, social, cultural, and conceptual context. Moreover, meaning is not limited to the verbal mode of language, but rather, it can be extended to include the non-verbal mode as well. More so, the diverse frameworks adopted imply the changeable, dynamic, collective, communicative, conceptual, inferential, encyclopedic and multimodal nature of language in general and meaning in particular. Finally, the study has revealed that it is the mental context that controls both the linguistic meaning and the contextual factors, creating ultimately this mental leap.

© 2026 EDUJ, College of Education for Human Science, Wasit University

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31185/eduj.Vol65.Iss1.5195

نحو إطار عمل للتداخل السياقي للمعنى اللغوي: مراجعة مفاهيمية وتكاملية

أ.د نريمان جبار رشيد[١] أ.م.د. رنا حميد البحراني[٢*]
جامعة بغداد / كلية اللغات ـ جامعة بغداد / كلية التربية للبنات

المستخلص

يُقدّم هذا العمل مراجعةً مفاهيميةً تكامليةً لمفهوم المعنى اللغوي والأطر المختلفة التي اعتمدتها الباحثتان في هذا الشأن. تُظهر المراجعة بوضوح تحوّل اهتمام الباحثين من مستوى الكلمة والجملة في المعنى (أي الرؤية التقليدية) إلى نطاق أوسع من السياق، يتجاوز السياقات النصية والمادية. ولتحقيق هذا الهدف، اختارت الباحثتان ١٣ مقالة تتناول مفهوم المعنى اللغوي من زوايا مختلفة باستخدام أطر متنوعة. واقتصرت المراجعة على محورين رئيسيين هما مفهوم المعنى اللغوي والأطر المختلفة المعتمدة. وقد كشفت الدراسة أن الرؤية التقليدية للكلمات والجمل كحاويات للمعنى لم تعد صالحة. ذلك لأن المعنى يُنظر إليه على أنه نتاج تفاعل أنواع مختلفة من السياقات، كالسياق اللغوي والمادي والاجتماعي والثقافي والمفاهيمي. علاوة على ذلك، لا يقتصر المعنى على اللغة اللفظية، بل يمكن توسيعه ليشتمل على اللغة غير اللفظية أيضًا. فضلا عن ذلك، خلصت الدراسة إلى أن الأطر المتنوعة المعتمدة تشير إلى الطبيعة المتغيرة والديناميكية والجماعية والتواصلية والمفاهيمية والاستدلالية والموسوعية والمتعددة الوسائط للغة بشكل عام وللمعنى بشكل خاص. وأخيرًا، كشفت الدراسة أن السياق الذهني هو الذي يتحكم في كل من المعنى اللغوي والعوامل السياقية، مولدا في نهاية المطاف هذه القفزة الذهنية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: علم المعنى المعرفي– الادراكي، السياق، التقاء السياق، مفهوم المعنى اللغوي

1. Introduction

Linguistic meaning plays a very important role in examining how contextual variables influence any form of communication. It contrasts with the conventional linguistic methods that tend to give more attention to the syntactic and semantic dimensions separately. It focuses on the interactive relationship of language usage, contextual situations, and the communicative intentions. The sense is considered in this case dynamic and is made up of a number of contextual factors (Sperber & Wilson, 1995). In this vein, Saeed (2003, p. 11) elaborated that contextual influences are crucial to the development of the linguistic meaning, including the physical environments, social processes, cultural constructs, and time. The fact has always been in research that even the same sentence will have different interpretations depending on the contextual factors. For example:

1. "**It's cold in here**" (may simply be an observation in one context, and a request to close a window in another).

The contextual factors therefore contribute to both catalyzing and limiting the interpretation making the situational environment to be central to language use.

Recent theories, such as the "*Theory of Mind and Relevance Theory*", have offered a way in which the interaction between linguistic expressions and context can be viewed. An example of such theories is the "Relevance Theory", which assumes that the communicative acts are driven by a desire to achieve an optimal relevance, enabling the listeners to decode

utterances based on the application of context-based cognitive efficiency mechanism. Likewise, the "Theory of Mind" (the capacity to project the different mental states) is a crucial factor for determining the communicative intent of a person after knowing his or her motivations and emotional conditions. The said theories are applicable to non-verbal messages, including gestures and facial expressions that add more meaning to the meaning generated through linguistic expressions. Cognitive linguistics asserts that speakers and hearers collaborate through these multimodal components to build up a communal understanding. To mention a few, tone and situation provide crucial contributions to the understanding of a literal or figurative meaning of an expression. These kinds of interactions indicate that linguistic meaning is context-responsive in nature (Sperber & Wilson, 1995).

Accordingly, the present work is a conceptual integrative review paper that is designed to review and examine a number of (13) articles, addressing the concept of linguistic meaning from various angles. Thus, the objective of the study is to examine the concept of linguistic meaning and the different frameworks adopted to that effect. Accordingly, the research question will be as such: What is the concept of linguistic meaning and how has it been recently approach by the scholars?

The context-sensitive nature of this approach has important implications to linguistics, psychology, artificial intelligence, discoursal, and communication studies. The identification of the role of context leads to new possibilities in comprehending the process of negotiating meaning in real-time communications as a socially situated phenomenon. Such acknowledgment has been criticized against reductionist styles that do not take into account the intricacies of human communication. Promoting the study of language in its entirety, the situational contexts, and the communicative intent, cognitive pragmatics advances not only the theoretical, but also the practical implications and hence the communication in various situations (Hymes,1972).

2. Theoretical Background

2.1 Recent Frameworks Addressing the Concept of Linguistic Meaning

To address the concept of linguistic meaning, many scholars majored or interested in cognitive linguistics or in studies on meaning used different frameworks to highlight various related issues. For instance, Yin and Pickering (2026) did an experimental study entitled, "*Predicting words across languages depends on language context: Evidence from visual world eye-tracking*". The objectives of the study were to examine the way English-mandarin bilinguals predict the linguistic meaning, and to investigate the possibility of activating mandarin-phonologically related words while hearing English sentences, i.e., when the context is manipulated. To fulfill these objectives, they adopted two psycholinguistic techniques, "Visual World Paradigm" (VWP) and "Eye-Tracking". These techniques involve measuring implicitly the eye movements per milliseconds during the unconscious inferring process; a process that does not require the participants to utter their predictions. The participants were asked to listen to spoken English sentences and at the same time they were displayed with four pictures on the computer. The eye tracker, or the online measure of prediction, had to measure the gaze position before anticipating the missing or unsaid word;

i.e., what they are looking at before responding. The study revealed that meaning is incrementally inferred during comprehension based on both the bilingual knowledge and on the contextual factors.

Sardinha (2024) did an empirical corpus-linguistic study under the title, "*AI-generated vs. Human-authored Texts: A Multidimensional Comparison*". The objective of the study was to comparatively examine the linguistic patterns in AI-generated and human-authored texts using a Multidimensional Analysis (MDA) by Douglas Biber. The study concluded that AI-generated texts differ from the human-generated ones in terms of the use of individual words, grammatical structures, and in their overall linguistic features.

Spiess (2024) did a qualitative cognitive discourse study entitled, *"Metapragmatic Markers and the Instantiation of Pragmatic Frames: A Cognitive-Linguistic Approach to the Problem of Current Discourse*". The purpose of the study was to examine the way speakers invest the linguistic input in constructing, signaling, and negotiating pragmatic frames within discourse. To meet this objective, the researcher adopted Fillmore's Frame Semantics theory on authentic utterances from natural discourse.

A conceptual study by Rashid and Latif (2024) titled, "*A Cognitive Study of Humor: A Pragmatic and Sociocultural Approach*" reviewed the existing theories that address humor from the cognitive linguistic, pragmatic, communication, psychology, and sociocultural studies. The researchers adopted the theory of frame semantics by Charles Fillmore on some jokes, everyday funny conversations, and humorous utterances.

Naghizadeh (2024) did a qualitative cognitive-semantic discoursal study "*Context and Metaphorical Creativity: Application of Pressure of Coherence in Metaphor Diversity in Persian Journalistic Texts from a Cognitive-Semantic Point of View"*. The purpose of the study was to investigate the role of context in motivating the process of metaphorical creativity. Accordingly, the researcher applied the cognitive principle "the pressure of coherence" on Persian journalistic discourse. For Naghizadeh, the ability to create a metaphor is not arbitrary; it is highly limited by contextual and discoursal coherence and by the readers' conceptual background knowledge.

Rahardi and Firdaus (2024) conducted a qualitative discourse-analytic study entitled, "*Pragmatic Meanings of Visual Socio-Political Multimodal Discourse in the Perspective of Critical Pragmatics*". The aim of the study was to investigate the way the pragmatic meaning is constructed in visual socio-political multimodal discourse using a Critical Pragmatic approach.

Eragamreddy (2024) worked on "*Presuppositions: The hidden force shaping everyday conversations*". The study was a mixed mode approach; it aimed to examine the function of presuppositions in communication from the discoursal perspective. To do the objective of the study, the researcher collected examples from everyday conversations, interviews, public speeches, newspaper and magazine articles, and from literary texts using Yule, Levinson, and Stalnaker's classifications of presupposition triggers, such as: (existential presuppositions, reactive presuppositions, lexical presuppositions, structural presuppositions, non-factive presuppositions, counterfactual presuppositions).

Purpura and Oh (2024) did a conceptual and analytical study under the title, "Assessing the linguistic resources of meaningful communication". The study aimed to assess a number of existing approaches to language assessment, such as: grammar, vocabulary, communicative language testing, test-based, and pragmatic assessments to see how people use linguistic inputs in their communications. The study helped to shift the attention from language as a set of forms to as a resource of making meaning.

Jodłowiec and Piskorska (2024) did a study entitled, "*Dynamism of Context: A Case of Joke Interpretation* is a theoretical cognitive-pragmatic study" to investigate the way the contextual information develops or is dynamically changed while interpreting jokes. To meet this objective, the researcher adopted the cognitive pragmatic approach, particularly the "Relevance Theory" by Sperber and Wilson and applied it on a number of jokes. They concluded that humor is the result of the dynamic processes of context construction and revision, rather than of merely applying the pre-existing contextual knowledge. They further refuted the traditional assumption that context is fixed when analysing humor.

Clark (1996), one the pioneers in cognitive pragmatics, psycholinguistics, and cognitive linguistics, published a book entitled, *"Using Language*" in which he re-shaped language as a "collaborative cognitive activity". He developed an analytical, conceptual, and interdisciplinary cognitive-theoretical model about language to examine the main purposes behind using language. For him, language is not a mere grammatical system, rather, it represents a means for joint human action. Thus, meaning is not located in words and is transmitted from one person to another. Through the conceptual analysis of communications, reference markers, conversation, speech acts, meaning, and collaboration, Clark observed that meaning is collaboratively negotiated, and is inferred among the participants, taking into account both context and shared knowledge.

Another study by Clark and Carlson (1982) titled, "*Hearers and Speech Acts*" was purely theoretical in nature, relying mainly on hypothetical constructions. It aimed to examine the role of inference, common ground, and collaborative communication on hearers understanding of speech acts. To meet the objective of the study, the researchers constructed and invented examples from their own. For instance, the sentences:

2. "Can you open the door?; and

3. "Can you pass the salt?"

can refer to one's physical ability or to a request. Similarly, the sentence,

4. "It is cold in here."

can be a statement, a complaint, an indirect request to close the door or switch on the heater. Thus, the emphasis of cognitive pragmatics is on the hearer's cognition (inferring process), or "mental reasoning" in deciphering the speaker's point. They further adopted Austin (1962) and Searle's (1969) classifications of speech acts in data analysis. However, the point of

difference was that Austin and Searle focused on the speaker, whereas Clark and Carlson's point of emphasis was on the hearer.

Al-Bahrani (2018) did a qualitative study titled, "*A Cognitive Linguistic Study of Silence/Pause-Based Incongruities in Selected Instances from Mind Your Language's Sitcom Series".* The study aimed to examine the role of silence and pauses in generating humours incongruities in selected British sitcom episodes from televised discourse, known as: "*Mind Your Language***"**. The researcher adopted Attardo's theory of humor.

Similarily, Tariq and Al-Bahrani (2019) did a descriptive, and analytical study titled, "*The Applicability of Attardo's "*Set-up, Incongruity, Resolution*"* Model on Unintentional Incongruities. *They aimed to investigate the feasibility of using* Attardo's (SIR) Model *on unintentional incongruities*. Thus, the researchers selected some instances taken from selected episodes of the "*Mind you language*" British sitcom series.

The various diversity of frameworks and approaches adopted by the selected scholars reflect the fact that meaning is a unified, collective, conceptual, and interactive phenomenon. It does not anchor on the linguistic expressions alone; however, it implies taking all the possible and available resources in its construction.

2.2 The Concept of Linguistic Meaning

Out of all the thirteen articles reviewed, it has been observed that the concept of linguistic meaning implies diverse construes, as shown by the following scholars. For example, Yin and Pickering (2026) stated that cognitive linguistics focuses on issues related to: The role of manipulating context in meaning prediction, the brain's incremental processing of spoken language while production, the collective and dynamic process of meaning generation (i.e., participants do not wait until the sentence ends to start their decoding or prediction. Their predication is based on bundle of facts, like: the lexical words used, the linguistic context, one's schema, expectation, previous discourse, visual information, and on the pragmatic assumption), the online construction of meaning during listening (i.e., the participants are active predictors, reflecting ultimately the fact that meaning in cognitive pragmatics is inferential and anticipatory), linguistic context as an empirically measurable cognitive variable. In brief, cognitive linguistics is not concerned with the pragmatic meaning, or whether the participants have understood the meaning or not. Instead, it focuses on what the participants are thinking of while processing the sentences incrementally. Yin and Pickering (2026) claimed that contextual variability is a phenomenon in which individuals do not just possess a distant source of past experiences, but also generalize applicable knowledge or potential experiences with areas that they share with others to eliminate ambiguities. The phenomenon of engagement is also influenced by the contextual factors explored, illuminating the phenomenon of communication devices. The cooperative principle by Grice (1975) depicts the way speakers and listeners establish a common background to deduce meaning and the way the listeners have to participate in the meaning-making process of utterances. This framework was criticized and constructed by Yin and Pickering, suggesting the association of implicature with the situation.

Eragamreddy's (2024) point of emphasis was to examine the role of presuppositions as fundamental mechanisms through which speakers communicate meanings that remain implicit rather than explicitly stated. The author emphasized the point that meaning is interactive by nature depending heavily on speakers' assumptions about what the listeners know. The article further stated that grammar is not only a system of rules, but a tool for encoding implicit assumptions, and that economic language helps to carry a number of coherent, polite, persuasive, conversational, and interpersonal presuppositions that in return activate other potential meanings. To put it differently, meaning is not literal; it combines both the explicit and implicit sides of it. For example,

5. "**John's brother has arrived**."

Semantically, this example indicates someone's brother has arrived. However, pragmatically, it presupposes that John has a brother, who was away. This shows how meaning can be derived from the context, shared experiences, cultural knowledge, and from the inferential conversational expectations to ultimately reach the speaker's intended meaning. Eragamreddy (2024) further raised presupposition aspects that relate to the use of contextual and time indicators. For example, presuppositions can be affected by social dynamics: Power relations, social distance, and cultural expectations. The communities that use a high context culture are more likely to use presuppositions as opposed to low-context cultures. Such interactions demonstrate that assumptions are not only linguistic processes, but also sociocultural processes which govern the communication processes.

Sardinha's (2024) focal points ere the linguistic variation and communicative style between AI and humans. This involved examining many linguistic features, such as: lexical diversity, the frequency of words, the grammatical structures and syntactic complexities, the use of pronouns, the used tense, aspect, modifiers, conjunctions, discourse markers, and nominaliations. Thus, the linguistic meaning generated from both parties is said to be functional, communicative, patterned-based, context-and genre-proper, probabilistic, and conceptual. The choice of words or structures helps to reflect a particular conceptual and communicative purpose. According to Sardinha (2024), human writers have an innate understanding of contextual variables that determine their writing, including audience knowledge and situational structures. This understanding helps them to produce very cohesive and coherent texts. This is because some writers might deliberately omit information, assuming the reader's understanding owing to having a shared cultural background. Thus, the writer feels that s/he is capable of understanding the meanings based on the information presented to him or her. That is, the interplay of language and context makes it possible to have a complex degree of interpretation in human thinking.

Meaning for Purpura and Oh (2024) is resulted from the conceptual integration of a number of elements, such as: lexical words, grammar, discourse, pragmatic strategies, interactional management and contextual adaptation. They rejected the idea that meaning is merely grammatical; a grammatical sentence does it necessarily be semantically and pragmatically proper. Meaning, for them, is dynamic, conceptual, inferential, contextual, discoursal, functional, and communicative. This is because a word might activate conceptual

knowledge that is not located in the word itself, but is associated with it and is recalled contextually based on the stored background knowledge. Considering the specificities of the context, the metaphorical language presupposes one's knowledge of a speaker's intentions together with his/her sociocultural context, and situational awareness. Typically, it can be seen that writers distinguish between immediate contextual factors and general social contexts, such as common knowledge and cultural norms. The differences in meaning brought about by the influence of the involvement layer cannot be readily identified by surface-level analysis. Contextual awareness was stressed in the intercultural communications as a result of the different contextual assumptions and misconceptions.

Spiess' (2024) article accentuated the role of words or grammatical structures, pragmatic frames and discourse context altogether in constructing the linguistic meaning. Meaning is thus dynamic, context-proper and frame-based; it requires more than the process of labeling speech acts. This further indicates that a given utterance activates multiple frames regarding one's background knowledge, his/her social expectations, and his/her knowledge about the interactional conventions. For him, the linguistic meaning is reached through passing into several stages, as in: Stage 1➔ identifying metapragmatic markers (as *"*frankly*,* to be honest*,* let me clarify*,* I mean*,* so to speak*,* in other words"; such markers do not basically contribute to building the propositional meaning or content. Instead, they convey to the hearers pieces of information about: the speaker attitude, intended interpretation, communicative purpose, and about discourse organization) within the discourse, Stage 2➔ examining the linguistic context (i.e., studying what precedes and follows the marker, and its communicative function), Stage 3➔ reconstructing the pragmatic frame activated by the marker (this means highlighting expectations about the speaker roles, hearer roles, communicative goals, interactional norms, and about appropriate interpretations), Stage 4➔ instantiating frames (meaning realizing or activating the actual frames within the discourse rather than highlighting the existing frames in one's cognition), and Stage 5➔ interpreting the construction of meaning (i.e., mapping the linguistic meaning through anchoring on several elements, such as: {lexical words, discoursal context, pragmatic frames, speaker intentions, and hearer inference}).

The principal point that Naghizadeh (2024) highlighted was that the success of generating novel metaphor is constrained by one's cognitive coherence and his/her unrestricted imagination. The linguistic meaning is thus conceptual, context-proper, encyclopedic communicative, and cultural. This is because the same metaphorical expression can trigger diverse meanings in different contexts and cultures. Meaning is thus an interplay between novelty and coherence. The metaphorical creativity studied by Naghizadeh (2024) showed the high position of coherence pressures in the dynamic metaphors used in the news texts. Journalists choose and change metaphors in a way that would make them transparent and evocative, considering the knowledge and feelings of their readers. Focusing on the role of cognitive processing, such methods offer some lessons on the interaction between the creative application of metaphor and the contextual factors. As a result, a particular metaphor can create specificities varied meanings in various communicative contexts- once again indicating how language can react with situational context and how it can interact with the communicative intentions as well.

For Rahardi and Firdaus (2024), the linguistic meaning does not depend on the linguistic expressions alone. It is a result of mapping a number of interactive factors, such as: linguistic signs, visual signs, sociocultural context, political ideology, and pragmatic inference. Meaning is constructed through passing into the following stages: Stage 1➔ selecting multi-model data, Stage 2➔ identifying the semiotic components (the linguistic-words, slogans, headlines, captions, and written statements- and visual ones-photographs, gestures, facial expressions, colours, objects, positioning, composition), Stage 3➔ specifying the pragmatic function, Stage 4➔ pinpointing the contextual interpretation (political, cultural, historical, social, and ideological circumstances), and Stage 5➔ focusing on the critical aspect of meaning (power, public opinion, ideological positions, social identities, and legitimate viewpoints). Consequently, meaning is not autonomous; it does not reside in words alone or in images alone; it is conceptual, contextual, multimodal, socially-situated, and inferential; meaning is cognitively constructed from a myriad of communicative resources.

Jodłowiec and Piskorska's (2024) study stressed that the meaning of a joke is derived sequentially by asking what assumptions are activated, what expectations are created, and how context helps in humor interpretation. The whole process depends on the process of generating inferences, re-mapping the newly highlighted assumption with the context of the punchline, and of activating the most relevant one. The punchline pushes readers to dynamically revise their initial interpretation and create a new contextual configuration to finally resolves the apparent incongruity. Accordingly, the humorous meaning is derived through passing through the following stages: Stage 1➔ Reading the first part of the joke, Stage 2➔ developing an initial context, Stage 3➔ Generating some expectations, Stage 4 ➔ Encountering a punchline, Stage 5 ➔Revising the context, Stage 6➔ Inferring a new piece of information, Stage 7➔ Recognizing the humorous point. In other words, context plays a dynamic background that helps re-formulating and modifying every new mental representation highlighted to finally select what suits jokes comprehension. This means the meaning again does not reside in words; the latter work as guiding cues for inferring meaning based on both context and construction. Jodowiec and Piskorska distinguished between context-dependent jokes and jokes that are more universal by indicating that universal themes or emotions usually co-occur in various circumstances. The context of a joke depends on how the joke is delivered and on the time it is delivered. Humor can be open to the emotional appeal of the audience or the social formalities. A joke can hinder a serious discussion, yet provide a relaxing advantage, highlighting once again the interaction between context and the linguistic interpretation.

Rashid and Latif (2024) stressed the point that humor is not only a linguistic product; it is rather the result of a number of interactive factors, as cognition, pragmatics, culture, social knowledge, and contextual interpretation. The study involved reviewing previous humor theories, identifying their cognitive assumptions, conducting a comparative pragmatic explanation, examining the sociocultural inferences, integrating the resulted findings, and finally proposing a detailed account about humor from the cognitive-pragmatic perspective. Humor for them lies in people's mind; it involves the listeners' ability to predict, infer, revise, activate a given conceptual knowledge, and to resolve the encountered incongruity. The same sentence could be construed differently as being funny, offensive, or meaningless based on

the communicative situation. This conclusion further accentuated the idea that linguistic meaning is not enough in understanding humor; however, the denotative meaning is its starting point. It is the context and the shared cultural background that determine whether a particular sentence is funny, serious, or others. They finally argued that humor is not just a form of entertainment, but a complicated part of social relationships, which is dependent on contextual clues and mutual understanding. The use of cognitive and sociocultural theories to analyze humor brought out the influence of personal thinking and social rules on interpreting humorous messages.

Al-Bahrani's (2018) primary point was that both silence and pauses have a cognitive meaning that actively contributes to the construction of humor. This is because these non-verbal cues play a role in developing incongruities that disrupt the listeners' expectations. The study further demonstrated the way the contextual meaning participates in highlighting unstated meanings on the audience' part. This further implies that meaning is dynamically constructed based on the interplay between language, silence, context, and cognition. Silence also represents a sort of language that is conceptually, contextually, inferentially, and culturally configured and decoded. Besides, meaning is the result of the amalgamation of multiple communicative modes.

Tariq and Al-Bahrani (2019) stressed the point that meaning is cognitively or conceptually-based; the cognitive processes participate in recognizing and resolving the encountered linguistic incongruities. Meaning is dynamic; it is based on many factors, such as: diverted expectations, contextual clues, cognitive resolution, world knowledge, inferences, etc.

Clark (1996) emphasized the way speakers and hearers construct their mental representations to have a successful communication. For him, linguistic meaning is a unified concept; it involves passing through the following stages: Stage 1➔ Observing the communicative behaviour, Stage 2➔Identifying the communicative problem, Stage 3➔ Analyzing the way speakers solve the problem, Stage 4➔ Analyzing the way hearers interpret it, Stage 5➔ explaining the cognitive mechanisms, and Stage 6➔ developing general principles of language use. In other words, language is not a separate system; it is a unified, collaborative, communicative and social human action, and that the linguistic meaning is the result of mapping both the linguistic input with the cognitive processes. That is, meaning is "constructed, not simply retrieved"; it can be sourced from "the linguistic expressions, speaker intentions, hearer inferences, common ground, situational context, and shared conceptual knowledge. The linguistic part then represents a partial provider of meaning that is completed by the hearer. For instance, when someone says,

6. "It is cold,"

the form is fixed; however, the meaning can contextually represent a complaint, a request, an observation, an indirect command. It is the role of the cognitive processes that combines the literal meaning, context, and shared meaning to come to the intended meaning. There should be a purpose behind language use, as language after all is goal-oriented. Accordingly,

the cognitive principles accentuated by Clark are: intentionality, coordination, grounding, common attention, and cooperation.

Clark and Carlson's (1982) focal point was that the inferential meaning is anchored on the linguistic input, shred background knowledge, context, and assumptions on the speakers' intentions. That is, meaning is a joint activity or a process between any two parties; it involves the hearers to conduct a "pragmatic inference", i.e., a comparison between the "literal meaning" what is said, and the intended meaning. That is, communication in cognitive pragmatics is collaborative, dual or multi-sided. In Clark and Carlson's words, communication is like when "two people building something together"; one provides information and evidence of intention and another interprets that evidence. This article is important as far as cognitive linguistics is concerned, as it moves the attention from the sentence level to the mental process level. It summarizes theoretically the steps hearers follow in their construction of meaning. These include: Step 1➔ hearing the utterance, Step 2➔ identifying the literal meaning, Step 3➔ considering the physical and social context, Step 4➔ activating a common ground, Step 5➔ inferring the speaker's communicative intention, Step 6➔ recognizing the intended speech act, and Step 7➔ responding appropriately.

3. Conclusions

Based on the review of Contextual Confluence that has been explained above, and as an answer the research question, which reads, "**What is the concept of contemporary linguistic meaning and how has it been approach by the scholars?**, it is possible to conclude the following:

Despite the various methodologies, approaches, and theories adopted by these various scholars, there is a common point that connects all these thirteen articles together. This involves the point that linguistic meaning is conceptual, dynamic, context-sensitive, inferential, encyclopedic, communicative, and socially negotiated. This means that meaning is not confined to the linguistic containers, represented by words, sentences, and structures, the traditional viewpoint. However, this does not cancel the importance of these containers or partial signals in guiding meaning and in generating construes.

Another important joint point is that context is an indispensible factor to meaning construction. Its scope ranges from being very limited as the linguistic context or the co-text to a series of a wider scope like the situational, discoursal, social, cultural, and cognitive contexts. It is the type of expression that determines the sort of context necessary for developing meaning. In cases like metaphor, idioms, clichés, humor, the broadest scopes of context is needed.

Meaning is further inferential in nature, since it is inherent not only to the words they attached to, but also to the speakers' and hearers' activated assumptions, intentions, implications, emotions, attitudes, and cultural references. Since inferences are a cognitive mechanism, then, meaning is said to be conceptual, too. It reflects the cognitive-linguistic assumptions residing in people's mind, and so is regarded as a mental phenomenon that could be differently represented through frames, schemas, and background knowledge, etc.

An additional linking point is that meaning is socially negotiated, dynamic, interactive, communicative, and is continuously updated. It highly relies on the common background, cultural, and social knowledge between the speaker and hearer. That is, it is mostly implicit than explicit, carrying as a result an interpretive force. The use of naturally occurring data that are ecologically valid, such as: sitcom interaction series, everyday conversations, jokes, journalistic texts, socio-political discourse, corpora of real texts, is another piece of evidence that meaning is communicative.

Meaning is not only verbal; however, it extends beyond that to include other forms as visual language, non-verbal as silence and pause, ideologies, metapragmatics. That is, it is collective and multimodal. That is why, scholars varied in their methodologies and theoretical frameworks adopted, reflecting the fact that meaning is not a monotype phenomenon; rather, it is multiple and elaborated mental activity. The theoretical frameworks adopted were myriad, including, but were not limited to them, such as linguistic, psychological, cognitive, discoursal, communication studies and corpus linguistic ones. These diverse approaches have activated scholars' shift from the word and sentential layer or level to a growing preference towards a wider communicative level that connects language to the external world, where cognitive linguistics is basically dominant. The diverse approaches used are though incompatible, yet they complete one another, and accentuate the triangulation value, maintaining ultimately a high level of validity.

A combination of AI and machine learning with cognitive linguistics might transform the understanding of the role of contextual influences on meaning. Simulations as a method of studying nuanced contextual subtleties by means of the computational models allow facilitating the systematic studies of the real-life interactions, as opposed to the reliance on the traditional approach.

In brief, linguistic meaning, in its contemporary sense, is not absolute; rather it requires all varying forms of contextual information, linguistic, physical, social, cultural and even the conceptual one. In other words, language is a means of social processes and common knowledge. It is therefore normal to find speakers relying on contextual cues in addressing ambiguous languages because they are able to infer the intended meanings that cannot be well covered by their languages. That is, the process of implicature may not be easily understood without shared knowledge about the cultures and contexts that encourage the co-construction process.

References

- Al-Bahrani, R. H.. (2018). A Cognitive Linguistic Study of Silence/Pause-Based Incongruities in Selected Instances from Mind Your Language's Sitcom Series. *Education College Journal*, *1*(30), 794-829. DOI: https://doi.org/10.31185/eduj.Vol1.Iss30.334
- Clark, H. H. & Carlson, T. B. (1982). Hearers and speech acts. *Language*, 58(2), 332-373. Retrieved from https://web.stanford.edu/~clark/1980s/Clark,%20H.H.%20_%20Carlson,%20T.B.%20_Hearers%20and%20speech%20acts_%201982.pdf
- Clark, H. H. (1996). *Using language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eragamreddy, N. (2024). Presuppositions: The hidden force shaping everyday conversations. *Premise: Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics*, *13*(3), 842–870. https://doi.org/10.24127/pj.v13i3.10121.
- Grice, H.P. (1975). Logic and conversation. Retrieved from https://lawandlogic.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/grice1975logic-and-conversation.pdf
- Hymes, D. (1972). Foundations in Sociolinguistics. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Jodłowiec, M., & Piskorska, A. (2024). *Dynamism of context: A case of joke interpretation. Intercultural Pragmatics*, *21*(3), 431–449. https://doi.org/10.1515/ip-2024-3006
- Naghizadeh, M. (2024). Context and metaphorical creativity: Application of pressure of coherence in metaphor diversity in Persian journalistic texts from a cognitive-semantic point of view. *ZABANSHENAKHT (LANGUAGE STUDIES*, *15*(1), 283–315. Retrieved from https://www.sid.ir/paper/1519132/en
- Noor, N., Rashid, A., & Latif, T. (2024). A Cognitive Study of Humor: A Pragmatic and Sociocultural Approach. *Linguistic Forum - A Journal of Linguistics*, 6(1), 16-37. DOI: 10.53057/linfo/2024.6.1.2
- Purpura, J. E., & Oh, S. (2024). Assessing the linguistic resources of meaningful communication. In A. J. Kunnan (Ed.), *The concise companion to language assessment* (pp. 181–204). Retrieved from https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=en&user=-qMp9_0AAAAJ&citation_for_view=-qMp9_0AAAAJ:LkGwnXOMwfcC
- Rahardi, R. K. & Firdaus, W. (2024). Pragmatic Meanings of Visual Socio-Political Multimodal discourse in the Perspective of Critical Pragmatics. *Kandai*, 20(2), 153-174. Retrieved from https://ojs.badanbahasa.kemendikdasmen.go.id/jurnal/index.php/kandai/article/view/6604/2326
- Saeed, J. I. (2003). Semantics. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Sardinha, T. B (2024). AI-generated vs. human-authored texts: A multidimensional comparison. *Applied Corpus Linguistics*, *4*(1). Retrieved from https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S2666799123000436?via%3Dihub
- Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1995). *Relevance: Communication and cognition* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Spiess, O. (2024). Metapragmatic markers and the instantiation of pragmatic frames: A cognitive-linguistic approach to the problem of current discourse. *Yearbook of the German Cognitive Linguistics Association 12*(1), 35-72. DOI: 10.1515/gcla-2024-0003

- Tariq, M. Z. & Al-Bahrani, R. H. (2019). The Applicability of Attardo's Set-up, Incongruity, Resolution Model on Unintentional Incongruities. *Education College Journal*, *1*(34), 571-592. Retrieved from https://eduj.uowasit.edu.iq/index.php/eduj/en/article/view/817/654
- Yin, H. & Pickering, M. J. (2026). Predicting words across languages depends on language context: Evidence from visual world eye-tracking. *Journal of Memory and Language, 146, 1-12.* https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2025.104701