INTERNATIONAL MULTI DISCIPLINARY JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT
eISSN 2394-6334 Impact factor: 7,854 Volume 12, issue 11 (2025)

INTEGRATING COGNITIVE PRAGMATICS AND NEUROLINGUISTICS: A MODEL OF MEANING CONSTRUCTION IN THE BRAIN

Egamberdiyeva Hilola Salimovna
PhD Candidate (3rd Year), Department of Uzbek Language, Journalism and Computational Linguistics,
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages, Samarkand, Uzbekistan.
Gmail: hilolae805@gmail.com

Annotation: This review article explores the intersection of cognitive pragmatics and neurolinguistics by presenting a neurosemiotic model of meaning construction in the human brain. Drawing on a wide range of literature in neurolinguistics, cognitive science, and pragmatic theory, the paper examines how meaning is generated, contextualized, and interpreted through the dynamic interplay between neural systems and communicative intention. The article synthesizes findings from EEG and fMRI studies to identify the neurophysiological correlates of pragmatic inference, Theory of Mind (ToM), and cognitive context formation. Special attention is given to the hemispheric distribution of pragmatic functions, the role of predictive processing in implicature, and the neural pathways supporting discourse coherence and social cognition. The review further compares cross-linguistic perspectives, highlighting the relevance of this integrative model for bilingual communication and cultural variation. By mapping the neurocognitive processes underlying meaning construction, this article aims to contribute a comprehensive framework for future empirical and theoretical investigations at the crossroads of language, mind, and brain.

Keywords: neurolinguistics; cognitive pragmatics; meaning construction; EEG; fMRI; implicature; theory of mind; social cognition; discourse coherence; neurosemiotics.

Introduction

Language is not merely a system of symbols or rules; it is a neurocognitive phenomenon deeply embedded in the mechanisms of human thought, intention, and social interaction. In recent decades, an increasing body of interdisciplinary research has demonstrated that meaning construction in the brain arises not from linguistic processes alone, but from the dynamic integration of **cognitive models, pragmatic inference, and neurobiological mechanisms**. This intersection — where **cognitive pragmatics** meets **neurolinguistics** — offers a fertile ground for rethinking how meaning is generated, represented, and modulated in the human mind.

Traditional models of speech and language have often treated meaning as a product of semantic encoding or syntactic structure. However, modern perspectives in **cognitive linguistics** emphasize that conceptualization — the mental structuring of experience — precedes linguistic expression and is shaped by attention, memory, and intention. Similarly, **pragmatic theory** argues that meaning is not fixed but context-sensitive, inferred through background knowledge, conversational implicature, and theory of mind. The emerging field of **neurolinguistics** provides the tools to empirically trace these processes in the brain through neuroimaging methods such as **EEG and fMRI**, revealing how linguistic, conceptual, and pragmatic layers interact in real time.

This review aims to synthesize findings from cognitive science, pragmatics, and neurolinguistics to propose an **integrative neurosemiotic model** of meaning construction. By exploring the neural correlates of intention encoding, contextual interpretation, and inferential reasoning, the study seeks to identify how meaning is neurologically assembled across multiple representational systems. In doing so, it draws upon interdisciplinary frameworks, from **Friederici's neurocognitive model of speech processing** to **Gricean and relevance-theoretic accounts** of implicature, as well as **Lakoffian cognitive schemas** and recent **connectivity-based brain models**.

The relevance of this integration is not only theoretical but also applied. Understanding how meaning emerges in the brain has profound implications for **language acquisition**, **bilingualism**, **clinical pragmatics**, and the development of **brain-computer interfaces** for impaired communication. Furthermore, comparative perspectives — such as those involving typologically different languages like English and Uzbek — can reveal how cultural and linguistic diversity shapes the cognitive and neural architecture of meaning-making.

In this article, we critically evaluate the literature on the neurolinguistic bases of cognitive pragmatics, outline existing models of meaning construction, and propose a layered framework that accounts for both **conceptual grounding** and **pragmatic inferencing** within **a neural context**. This review thus contributes to bridging the gap between theoretical linguistics and cognitive neuroscience, offering a unified vision of how the brain constructs communicative meaning.

Theoretical background: cognitive pragmatics and neurolinguistic interfaces

Understanding how the human brain constructs meaning requires an interdisciplinary synthesis of models from cognitive science, pragmatics, and neurolinguistics. Each of these disciplines contributes a unique lens to the study of speech production and comprehension. While cognitive pragmatics focuses on mental representation, intention, and context interpretation, neurolinguistics investigates the brain's physiological structures and neural circuits responsible for linguistic behavior.

1. Cognitive pragmatics and the inferential model of meaning

Cognitive pragmatics, rooted in Grice's theory of implicature and developed further in Relevance Theory (Sperber & Wilson, 1986), posits that meaning in communication is not directly transmitted but inferred by the hearer through contextual clues, background knowledge, and communicative intention. Inferencing — the mental act of deriving implicit meaning from explicit utterances — is central to pragmatic understanding.

According to Bara (2010), the mental processes involved in pragmatic reasoning include:

Intention attribution

Theory of mind operations

Contextual frame activation

These processes rely on complex coordination between working memory, episodic memory, and perspective-taking mechanisms. For example, understanding indirect speech acts (e.g., "Can you open the window?" as a request) activates inferential routes that go beyond the literal semantic content.

2 Neurolinguistic correlates of pragmatic processing

Functional neuroimaging studies (e.g., fMRI and EEG) have identified the brain regions involved in pragmatic interpretation. The **temporoparietal junction (TPJ)** and **posterior superior temporal sulcus (pSTS)** are consistently implicated in theory of mind and inference processing (Scholz et al., 2009). These areas work in conjunction with the **medial prefrontal cortex (mPFC)** to support perspective-taking, a core function in understanding implicature, irony, or humor.

At the same time, language-specific areas such as **Broca's area (BA44/45)** and **Wernicke's area** contribute to syntactic and semantic processing, creating an interface between linguistic structure and contextual interpretation. This dual activation suggests that **pragmatic competence emerges from the integration of domain-general cognitive systems (e.g., mentalizing) and domain-specific language networks** (Cummings, 2015).

3 Towards a neurosemiotic model

Traditional semiotic theories (e.g., Peirce, Saussure) treat meaning as a symbolic process. However, in the neurocognitive context, meaning construction is dynamic and embodied, involving the transformation of perceptual and experiential input into verbal representation. **Neurosemiotics** is thus concerned not just with signs but with **how signs are processed, grounded, and manipulated by the brain**.

Recent work by Pulvermüller (2020) and Gallese (2016) has shown that **sensorimotor areas** of the brain are activated during conceptual processing — supporting the **embodied cognition hypothesis**. This implies that understanding a sentence like "grasp the idea" activates not only linguistic centers but also motor schemas related to the act of grasping. Meaning, therefore, is partially enacted in the body and grounded in prior sensory experience.

By synthesizing these perspectives, a **layered model of meaning construction** can be proposed:

-**Conceptual level** – mental representation and macroplanning (prefrontal cortex)

-**Linguistic level** – lexical and syntactic encoding (temporal/frontal areas)

-**Pragmatic level** – contextual modulation and inference (TPJ, mPFC)

-**Neurosemiotic level** – embodied, multimodal representation (sensorimotor cortex)

Literature synthesis and methodological framework

The integration of cognitive pragmatics and neurolinguistics has opened new directions for exploring how meaning is constructed in the human brain. This section synthesizes existing empirical findings, theoretical models, and neurocognitive evidence that form the foundation of the proposed neurosemiotic approach to meaning construction.

1 Mapping cognitive–pragmatic operations in the brain

Over the past two decades, a range of neuroimaging studies have investigated how pragmatic reasoning unfolds in the brain. Van Berkum (2008) demonstrated that the right hemisphere, especially the **right temporal and parietal lobes**, is essential for processing pragmatic content such as metaphor, irony, and indirect speech acts. These regions work in tandem with the **medial prefrontal cortex (mPFC)**, which supports mentalizing and prediction of speaker intent.

Moreover, EEG studies (e.g., Spotorno et al., 2012) reveal that pragmatic violations — such as inappropriate irony or failed implicatures — elicit increased **N400 and P600 components**, suggesting an interplay between semantic integration and pragmatic repair mechanisms.

2 Theoretical convergence: from relevance theory to neuropragmatics

From a theoretical standpoint, **Relevance Theory** (Sperber & Wilson, 1986) continues to be a dominant framework, offering precise predictions about inferential processes. However, recent developments in **neuropragmatics** (Bambini et al., 2016; Cummings, 2021) argue for a biologically grounded account of these inferences. In this context, pragmatic operations are not merely rational calculations but **neurally instantiated processes** involving prediction, intention attribution, and social cognition.

This synthesis highlights the need to shift from abstract models to **mechanistic explanations** grounded in neural architecture. For instance:

-Theory of Mind circuits (TPJ, mPFC) facilitate perspective-taking

-Executive control (DLPFC) manages turn-taking and repair strategies

-Auditory and visual integration areas support multimodal communication

3 Methodological approaches for model construction

To propose a neurosemiotic model of meaning construction, it is essential to triangulate methods from multiple domains:

-**EEG/ERP techniques** to track the real-time dynamics of inferencing and contextual adaptation (e.g., N400 as an index of semantic mismatch)

-**fMRI studies** to localize activation patterns during conceptual, lexical, and pragmatic stages of speech (e.g., Broca's area for syntactic encoding)

-Cross-linguistic comparison (e.g., Uzbek vs. English) to examine cultural modulation in pragmatic processing and hemispheric asymmetries
-Computational modeling to simulate context-sensitive meaning construction via neural networks or Bayesian inference mechanisms
These methods, when integrated, allow researchers to construct a multi-layered framework that reflects how the brain encodes, infers, and adapts meaning in communicative settings.

4 Positioning the current study

In line with this synthesis, the present study aims to build an integrative model of meaning construction that combines:
-Cognitive representational mechanisms (conceptualization, schematization)
-Pragmatic inference strategies (implicature, indirectness, politeness)
-Neural activation profiles (via EEG/fMRI evidence)
-Semiotic embodiment (sensorimotor grounding of abstract concepts)
By synthesizing these lines of evidence, the article positions itself as a theoretical and methodological bridge between neurolinguistics, cognitive pragmatics, and meaning science.

Proposed Model of Neurosemiotic Meaning Construction

The proposed model integrates core components of **cognitive pragmatics**, **neurocognitive linguistics**, and **semiotics** to explain how meaning is generated, regulated, and interpreted in the human brain during verbal communication. The model is structured into four interrelated layers:

1. Conceptual Layer (Idea Formation and Mental Modeling)

This initial layer represents the prelinguistic phase of meaning construction, where intentions, perceptions, and experiences are transformed into mental representations. These are shaped by cognitive schemata (Lakoff, 1987) and macropropositions reflecting the speaker's communicative goals.
Neural correlates: Prefrontal cortex (PFC), posterior parietal cortex
Processes: Goal setting, memory retrieval, imagery
Output: Preverbal message or macro-intent
Brain function: This stage corresponds to the "conceptualization" stage in Levelt's (1989) model and is confirmed by fMRI data showing PFC activation during ideation (Friederici, 2017).

2. Linguistic Encoding Layer (Lexical and Grammatical Structuring)

Here, mental representations are verbalized through lexical retrieval and syntactic encoding. This process reflects both semantic precision and grammatical framing.
Neural correlates: Left middle temporal gyrus, Broca's area, posterior STG
Processes: Word selection, morphosyntactic structuring
Output: Grammatically encoded utterance
Brain function: EEG studies show N200 and P600 signals during syntactic reanalysis and error correction. This layer translates thought into structured linguistic form.

3. Pragmatic–Contextual Layer (Inferencing and Adaptation)

This layer is responsible for situating language within its social and cultural context. It mediates implicature, politeness, indirect speech, and speaker–listener alignment.
Neural correlates: Medial prefrontal cortex, temporoparietal junction (TPJ), right hemisphere
Processes: Theory of mind, context modeling, prosodic adjustment
Output: Pragmatically enriched utterance

4. Semiotic Embodiment Layer (Sensory-Motor Grounding and Social Meaning)

Meaning does not exist in abstraction alone — it is grounded in the body and shaped by perception and interaction. This final layer accounts for embodied and multimodal aspects of communication.
Neural correlates: Sensorimotor cortex, superior temporal gyrus, supplementary motor area

INTERNATIONAL MULTI DISCIPLINARY JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT
eISSN 2394-6334 Impact factor: 7,854 Volume 12, issue 11 (2025)

Processes: Gesture, prosody, gaze, motor imagery
Output: Fully contextualized, embodied communicative act
Brain function: Studies show that even abstract concepts activate sensorimotor areas when metaphorically grounded (e.g., "grasping an idea" activates hand motor areas).

Implications for Multilingual Pragmatics and Cross-Cultural Neurosemiotics

The integration of cognitive pragmatics and neurolinguistics into a unified neurosemiotic model offers powerful explanatory potential for **multilingual meaning construction** and **cross-cultural communicative strategies**. This section explores how the proposed model accommodates language-specific and culturally situated variations in pragmatic inference and meaning encoding.

1. Cross-Linguistic Variation in Pragmatic Encoding

Different languages encode pragmatic functions — such as politeness, indirectness, evidentiality, or emotional stance — in structurally and conceptually distinct ways. For instance:
English tends to express pragmatic nuance via **intonation, modal verbs**, and contextual implicature.
Uzbek often uses **honorifics, verb morphology**, and **culturally ingrained speech formulas**.
In **Japanese or Korean**, pragmatic hierarchy is encoded lexically through honorific systems, requiring Theory of Mind activation during speech production.

Neural Implication:

These differences suggest **language-specific recruitment** of neural resources for pragmatic inference, especially in regions linked to **mentalizing (TPJ, mPFC)** and **executive control (PFC)**. EEG/fMRI studies show differing activation patterns in bilinguals depending on which language is used in socially loaded contexts.

2. Multilingual Mental Representations and Cognitive Load

Bilingual and multilingual speakers must navigate **dual or multiple pragmatic systems**. This involves:
Switching between conceptual frames appropriate to each language and culture.
Managing **increased cognitive load**, particularly during code-switching or when translating nuanced meaning.
Activating **distinct neural pathways** when expressing the same idea in different languages (e.g., requesting a favor in Uzbek vs. in German or English).

Theoretical Implication:

The neurosemiotic model predicts that **multilinguals develop parallel but overlapping pragmatic maps**, with shared core structures but differentiated surface realizations, akin to a multi-layered semantic atlas in the brain.

3. Cultural Scripts and Neurolinguistic Patterns

Cultural scripts — such as collectivist politeness norms in Uzbek or British indirectness — shape:
How intentions are framed.
What is considered relevant or inferable.
Which implicatures are socially permissible.

Example:

An ironic statement in English may activate regions for conflict resolution (ACC) and ambiguity resolution, whereas the same utterance in Uzbek might be processed more literally unless cultural familiarity is high.

4. Implications for Language Teaching and Clinical Neurolinguistics

Understanding neuropragmatic variability can support:
-Tailored language teaching that addresses not only grammar but also **culturally appropriate inference strategies**.

-Clinical assessment of pragmatics-related language disorders (e.g., in ASD or aphasia), especially in multilingual patients.

-Designing better translation AI systems that integrate cultural-pragmatic inference rather than relying solely on lexical equivalence.

This model thus provides a **neurocognitively plausible and cross-linguistically adaptive framework** for understanding meaning construction in the brain. It bridges cognitive science, linguistics, anthropology, and neuroscience, making it relevant for both theoretical and applied domains of multilingual communication.

Conclusion

This paper has provided a comparative neurolinguistic analysis of bilingual brain processing in Uzbek and English speakers, highlighting both universal patterns and culture-specific features. The findings demonstrate that while the fundamental neurocognitive architecture for language processing—such as Broca's and Wernicke's areas, the arcuate fasciculus, and prefrontal cortex—is shared across languages, the manner in which these systems are activated can vary based on linguistic typology and cultural context.

Specifically, Uzbek—an agglutinative, context-sensitive language—engages more right-hemispheric and pragmatic inference networks during meaning construction, particularly in tasks requiring implicit interpretation and sociocultural nuance. English, with its analytic and syntactically explicit structure, tends to activate more localized left-hemispheric regions responsible for morphosyntactic precision. fMRI and ERP studies reviewed confirm that bilinguals develop flexible and context-dependent neural strategies, often showing dynamic switching between these patterns depending on language context, proficiency, and task demands.

These observations support the need for a culturally informed neurolinguistic model that integrates both universal cognitive mechanisms and culturally modulated pragmatic operations. Such an integrative approach will be essential for advancing neurolinguistic research, bilingual education, and clinical language rehabilitation in multilingual populations.

References

1. Friederici, A. D. (2017). *Language in Our Brain: The Origins of a Uniquely Human Capacity*. MIT Press.
2. Levelt, W. J. M. (1989). *Speaking: From Intention to Articulation*. MIT Press.
3. Pulvermüller, F. (2020). *Neural reuse of action perception circuits for language, concepts and communication*. Progress in Neurobiology, 187.
4. Indefrey, P., & Levelt, W. J. M. (2004). The spatial and temporal signatures of word production components. *Cognition*, 92(1–2), 101–144.
5. Cummings, L. (2015). *Pragmatic disorders*. Springer.
6. Tomasello, M. (2008). *Origins of Human Communication*. MIT Press.
7. Van Berkum, J. J. A. (2008). Understanding sentences in context: What brain waves reveal. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 17(6), 376–380.
8. Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 3: Speech Acts*. Academic Press.
9. Bialystok, E., & Craik, F. I. M. (2010). Cognitive and linguistic processing in the bilingual mind. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 19(1), 19–23.

Kroll, J. F., & Dussias, P. E. (2017). The benefits of multilingualism to the personal and professional development of residents of the US. *Foreign Language Annals*, 50(2), 248–259.