

The Role of Context to Detect Conflict Expression in Text

Philippe Herr and Nada Matta

LIST3N, University of Technology of Troyes, 12 Rue Marie Curie, 42060 10004 Troyes Cedex, France

Keywords: Textual Semantics, Text, Context, Ambiguity, Conflict, Hermeneutics, Knowledge, NLP.

Abstract: The notion of context, present since Antiquity, has gained increasing importance across various fields such as linguistic semantics, cognitive psychology, artificial intelligence (AI), and natural language processing (NLP) since the 1980s. In text analysis, a distinction is made between “internal context” (textual elements surrounding a linguistic item) and “external context” (circumstances surrounding the production of a fact or process). Context is thus crucial both for determining the meaning of linguistic signs and for interpreting texts. Although NLP and generative AI systems simulate linguistic exchanges, they often lack explicit internal representations of contextualization processes. This paper aims to shed light on what is meant by “context,” with a particular focus on “cultural context.” It specifically investigates the expression of conflictual elements that can be identified in texts through the activation of context.

1 INTRODUCTION

The concept or idea of context, which emerged implicitly as early as Antiquity, has attracted growing interest in various fields of knowledge since the 1980s, notably in linguistic semantics, cognitive psychology, artificial intelligence (AI), and natural language processing (NLP) (Rastier, 2001). In the field of text analysis, it is necessary to distinguish between “internal context,” meaning the textual elements surrounding the linguistic item under consideration, and “external context,” referring to the set of circumstances in which a fact or process is produced (Hassler et al., 2024).

While NLP and generative AI systems today make it possible to simulate linguistic exchanges in human-machine interactions in a convincingly realistic way, they do not provide an explicit representation of how linguistic elements are combined across the different levels of text analysis (Gastaldi et al., 2024). It is therefore of interest to ask how potentially active contexts can be identified and how they operate to generate meaning for a textual element. First and foremost, we must better define what is meant by “context,” with particular emphasis on the notion of “cultural context.”

Our research focuses on written texts. We approach written texts as structured objects organized into various levels, whose complex interactions generate semantic perceptions in the reader-

interpreter (Rastier, 2010). More specifically, we examine how context enables the identification and characterization of textual elements that express conflict. The texts considered span all types of discourse: legal, religious, scientific popularization, etc.; private, public; normative, playful; explanatory, argumentative, etc. (Bronckart, 2008), and all genres: narrative (fictional or real stories, e.g., novels), theatrical, poetic, or “literature of ideas” (defined primarily by its defense or refutation of a thesis). Our hypothesis is that any type and genre of text may contain points of conflict, whether in specific parts or as a whole.

Our specific interest in the expression of conflict stems from a preliminary study (Matta No. et al., 2024). The connection between context and elements of conflict. To identify linguistic segments expressing conflict and uncover conflictual dimensions, the reader-interpreter had to engage the identification of contextual explication, relying not only on their linguistic knowledge (linguistic competence) but also on their knowledge of the natural and cultural world.

In the first part of this article, we provide a conceptual framework for understanding “context” and “cultural context.” The second part focuses on the notion or concept of conflict, ultimately preferred over confrontation. The third part analyzes a text example by activating only the linguistic context and considers the limitations of such approach in identifying conflictual tensions.

2 CONTEXT vs. CULTURAL CONTEXT

The notion of context is relevant to numerous disciplines, including linguistics, semantics, pragmatics Austin J. (1970). Bazire and Brézillon (2005) highlight the challenges associated with understanding context by identifying its main components through an analysis of definitions across cognitive science domains. They trace the evolution of explicit uses of context in industrial applications. In knowledge engineering, Bachimont (2005) emphasizes that the definition of an ontology is linked to “the meaning given in context” (2005, p. 343). Chuntao and Caiying (2019) underline the importance of contextual relevance for textual coherence and assert that language production and comprehension cannot be separated from context. Condamines (2005) questions whether it is possible to decontextualize linguistic phenomena, emphasizing the interdependence between linguistic features and the situation in which they are produced.

This theoretical overview highlights the variety, complexity of the concept of context. Is it even possible to identify the relevant contexts in a text, to measure their degree of relevance and their interactions in order to construct coherent and explainable interpretive paths? For Adam (2012) the text possesses a structural cohesion that must be accounted for as completely as possible, based on the linguistic elements functioning in each of its segments (word, phrase, sentence...) and levels (e.g., the clause – considered the first hermeneutic level by Rastier – the paragraph, the whole text). In response to Schmoll’s (1996) straightforward question: “Is the notion of context operative?” – which interrogates its theoretical validity – we can at least say that textual cohesion is matched by textual coherence, an interpretive phenomenon that goes beyond the text’s internal structure and thus justifies maintaining the hypothesis of an operative external context, at least heuristically.

Relying on Lichao (2010), Matta et al, (2023), and Beyssade (2024), we propose a minimal and abstract initial definition of context as: the set of information that enables the identification and characterization of an element. Every act of discourse is a text made concrete, that is, anchored in a situation. In the same way, since reading is a situated act, a text read by a reader–interpreter becomes actualized as discourse (an internal discourse). Our minimal and abstract definition of context is not sufficient here. In discourse, both spoken and written, we distinguish between the strictly linguistic context (words deriving

meaning from one another based on the language system) and the extralinguistic situational context (who is speaking, to whom, under what circumstances, where, when, how, with what intentions, etc.), which conditions the interpretation of utterances – this is the domain of pragmatics Austin J, (1970). In the individual reading of a written text, the immediate situational extralinguistic context appears less decisive: the reader is in solitary interaction with the text – at least, this is our current assumption. So, what constitutes the extralinguistic, or more precisely, extratextual context? It consists of the representations activated or activatable in the reader’s memory (or mind?), enabling them to actualize the text into a coherent discourse – coherent, that is, for them. This actualization of the text into discourse depends on cognitive processes of semantic, pragmatic, encyclopedic, and cultural orders, some of which are conscious, others not. These include encyclopedic knowledge, social representations, cultural frames of reference, and genre – and discourse-type-related expectations. A minimal interpretive context is activated as a global “horizon of expectation” upon approaching the text, then progressively enriched and refined throughout the reading process, as the reader builds mental configurations and hypotheses of meaning according to their interpretive competence (Rastier, 2010). The context encoded linguistically and textually (the left–right linear context of a linguistic element, as well as the top–bottom typographic context, including paratext and headlines) activates an interpretive cognitive context aimed at overall coherence. A global discursive configuration progressively unfolds in this “dialogue” with the text. In addition to linguistic competence (the language code), reading mobilizes textual competence (a “grammar of text,” an acquired understanding of textual structures), pragmatic competence (relevant here to interpret interlocution situations represented in the text), shared presupposition knowledge (what Stalnaker, 1998, calls the Common Ground), encyclopedic knowledge about the real world and fictional worlds (Beyssade, 2024; Adam, 2012).

Our goal is to better understand what is encompassed by the notion of “cultural context,” which at this stage remains a working hypothesis. Related to these studies, a definition may be formulated as follows: Cultural context encompasses the structured set of knowledge, beliefs, norms, conventions, values, representations, practices, and symbolic references shared by a community at a given time, which shape the production, circulation, and reception of discourse. Cultural context thus

constitutes a collective memory that guides – and may even condition – the interpretation of texts by activating implicit frames of understanding. Cultural context influences both the production and the interpretation of texts, helping to actualize them into coherent discourses (Hoskovec, 2010; Lichao, 2010; Beyssade, 2024). As we stated before, we aim to detect conflict in text using context. So, let-us define the notion of conflict.

3 THE CONCEPT OF CONFLICT

The choice of term – “conflict” or “confrontation” – to designate the central concept was not made without debate. Gauducheau & Marcoccia (Gauducheau & Marcoccia, 2023) point out that conflict can be expressed indirectly, implicitly, or managed through discursive avoidance strategies, and thus without confrontation. Conversely, pure confrontation can occur without conflict – as in the case of comparing testimonies in a legal inquiry, which doesn’t necessarily involve emotional escalation or hostility, hence no conflict. Similarly, a conflict may exist – such as over water resource allocation – without direct confrontation between farmers and local authorities.

In the literature, “conflict” is the preferred hypernym used to encompass all forms of disagreement or opposition, whether these manifest in confrontation (for clarification on conflict ontology: Greco Morasso, 2008; Dehais, 2000). Our aim is to define the conceptual domain of conflict so that it may be operational in identifying conflict expressions through explainable contextualization processes.

We aim to determine how different types of contexts contribute to identifying and interpreting expressions of conflict in texts, with special attention to the role of cultural context. This requires a clear definition of conflict, distinctions between its types, and the development of analytical methods to assess the interpretive role of context. Several challenges arise: enabling NLP to more accurately detect textual expressions of conflict, enriching linguistic and semantic theories on context, and potentially proposing a tool for text analysis.

While an ontology of conflict could be defined based on prior work (Dehais, 2000; Müller, 2000; Talmy, 2000; Greco Morasso, 2008), the main challenge lies in accounting for the complexity and diversity of contextual factors that define conflict – especially cultural context.

The expression and representation of conflict are of interest to linguistics, semantics, and knowledge

engineering. Dehais and Pasquier (2000) propose an ontology and typology of conflict in cognitive science that clarifies terminology and conceptual structure. Müller and Dieng (2000) offer a broad overview of conflict definitions, emphasizing the diverse contexts in which conflicts arise. Castelfranchi (2000) distinguishes psychological from internal conflicts, revisits Lewin’s (1948) typology, and proposes formal models for conflict detection and management. Fayol (1985) adopts an approach rooted in linguistics and cognitive psychology to analyze the construction and interpretation of conflict-driven narratives. Sauquet and Vielajus (2014) explore conflict in intercultural mediation related to social and cultural dimensions of conflict. Greco Morasso (2008) clarifies the ontology of conflict, distinguishing interpersonal hostility (emotional level) from propositional incompatibility (intellectual level), and shows that the meaning of conflict varies across cultural and social contexts.

A synthesis of these approaches allows us to propose the following definition of conflict: a discursive or interactional situation in which two or more positions, interests, values, representations, or intentions come into opposition – explicitly or implicitly – with the potential outcome being resolution, domination, or coexistence of these divergences. In texts, conflict is expressed through linguistic forms (in the language code), discursive forms (how language is used in context – pragmatics and rhetoric), or symbolic forms (codified cultural or ideological representations) that signal tension, incompatibility, or confrontation. Conflict may be explicitly expressed (e.g., through markers of direct opposition, confrontation verbs, syntactic structures, etc.) or implicitly conveyed – its interpretation then relying on the activation of encyclopedic knowledge (general world knowledge), cultural knowledge (collective socio-historical knowledge), or situational knowledge (shared assumptions presumed known or accessible to the interlocutors in a given context).

Our object of study is the written text: we do not treat conflicts as social or historical facts but as discursive representations.

In many domains, conflict primarily appeared through language. This is the case with legal conflicts (resulting in exchanges or transcripts), discursive conflicts (expressed in debates or arguments), and semantic conflicts (where lexical interpretation disagreements lead to misunderstandings). Pragmatic conflicts concern the contextual use of language, particularly through conflicting speech acts (accusations, reproaches, denials). Intertextual conflicts are constructed in the relationship between

texts that contradict, respond to, or refute each other through citations or allusions. Finally, ideological conflicts involve opposing value systems that underpin discourse.

The Relevance of Cultural Context in Identifying Conflicts

The specific importance of cultural context – compared to linguistic context (the left-to-right sequence of language units) and situational context (the immediate conditions of enunciation) – lies in its interpretive depth: it determines the axiological frameworks through which speakers perceive and categorize utterances. It thus guides the recognition of conflict markers, forms of disagreement, and implicit normative systems embedded in discourse. Conflict itself is a cultural construct. What constitutes a manifestation of conflict in one cultural setting may be interpreted elsewhere as a simple disagreement or a normative interactional ritual. The use of rhetorical devices such as irony or indirect criticism varies across cultural groups and micro-cultures. Likewise, some cultures value explicit verbal confrontation, while others regard it as a violation of interactional norms. Ignoring these frameworks risks misinterpretation, whether in real-life analyses or in texts. Cultural context is often implicit in texts. Unlike linguistic context, which is observable in the text itself, it is usually inferential: it relies on shared knowledge, historical references, and implicit norms.

It operates regardless of the type of discourse – legal, religious, scientific, or literary. It enables the identification of conflicting value systems, culturally anchored discursive strategies, and the interpretive frameworks needed to detect expressions of conflict.

4 DETECTING CONFLICT THROUGH ACTIVATION OF INTERNAL CUES

Ultimately, our objective is to demonstrate that taking cultural context into account is necessary to identify and characterize certain conflictual tensions within a text. However, as a first step, let us examine how the expression of conflict can be detected through cues that do not require reference to cultural context.

Our previous analysis of the notion of conflict leads us to identify several types of cues. Some explicitly indicate conflict; others are implicit but may suggest the presence of conflict. More often than not, only the combination of cues enables the detection of a conflictual dimension.

The table of types of indices for identifying conflict tensions is based on knowledge of French grammar (Rigel M. et al., 2014), semantics (Lyons J., 1980) and more broadly language sciences (Ducrot O. & Schaeffer J.-M., 1999)." This list is incomplete and will be gradually expanded and refined.

Table 1: Table of Indices Types for Detecting Conflictual Tension.

Type of Indices	Definition	Examples
Lexical	Lexemes or nominal/verbal phrases whose meaning includes antagonism, refusal, or confrontation—directly or indirectly signaling a conflictual or intersubjective tension.	"contest," "refuse," "to oppose," "internal tensions," "to come into conflict with," "to reject outright"
Grammatical	Pertains to grammatical morphology: agreement, tense, mood, negation, determiners, pronouns, conjugations... e.g., morphemes or structures that mark negation or distancing.	"He does not want to yield" (negation); "He might have lied" (enunciative distancing)
Syntactic	Related to sentence structure, syntactic roles (subject, object...), constituent order, coordination, subordination, or propositional structure (e.g., conditional clauses).	"He wanted to come, but she refused"; "Although he's right, we must go"; "If you keep this up..."
Pragmatic	Speech acts (actions performed by speaking, with clearly identifiable intent) or implicatures (suggested meaning) expressing communicative tension.	"Shut up now" (explicit threat); "I suggest you be careful..." (implicit threat); "You always do that, don't you?" (implicit reproach)
Enunciative	Marks of the speaker's subjective positioning toward their own statement, showing involvement, distance, judgment, or attitude—modulating the intensity of conflict expression.	"It seems he cheated"; "In my opinion, this is unacceptable"; "I fear he sabotaged the project" (emotional modalization + implicit accusation); "He allegedly ignored the instructions"
Referential	References to entities, groups, or events presented as opposed or in tension; may imply latent or explicit conflict.	"The protesters and the police..."; "Two worldviews are clashing on the TV set"
Discursive	Indicators tied to discourse structure (dialogue or monologue) that express opposition, disagreement, or argumentative tension via adversative links, rebuttals, or refutations.	"Granted... but..." (concession); "- You wanted this. - No, you did." (conflictual reply / direct refutation); "While some applauded, others walked out."
Symbolic	Linguistic elements (metaphors, imagery,	"Fire and ice stood face to face"; "Between them, it

Type of Indices	Definition	Examples
	mentioned objects) that figuratively or allegorically evoke separation, confrontation, or incompatibility, implying implicit conflict.	<i>was a minefield</i> " (The conflict presupposes a relationship, shown here by " <i>stood face to face</i> " and " <i>between them</i> ")
Stylistic / Rhetorical	Formal devices (figures of speech) that produce contrast, contradiction, or reversal, suggesting or reflecting a conflictual tension.	" <i>Deafening silence</i> " (oxymoron); " <i>I live, I die</i> " (antithesis)
Prosodic / Typographic punctuation	Graphic or rhythmic markers in writing that mimic or transpose effects of intonation, rhythm, volume, or emphasis—signaling enunciative tension or affective intensity.	Expressive punctuation: " <i>You lied to me again... Again!</i> " (ellipsis + exclamation = emotional intensity + accusatory insistence); Repetition: " <i>No, no, no, I don't believe you.</i> " (effect of stubborn refusal, growing tension)

It is worth noting that so-called "symbolic" indicators raise questions. For example, fire vs. ice, or minefield, are allegorical and metaphorical images that are only activated as such within a given cultural context - not necessarily in another. At the very least, it is a matter of identifying some indicators as being potentially interpretable as symbols of something, without necessarily specifying what they symbolize.

5 CASE STUDY

The example of text analyzed comes from Chapter 19 of *Candide*, a philosophical tale by Voltaire published in 1759 in France: The original text, in French: "Quand nous travaillons aux sucreries, et que la meule nous attrape le doigt, on nous coupe la main ; quand nous voulons nous enfuir, on nous coupe la jambe : je me suis trouvé dans les deux cas. C'est à ce prix que vous mangez du sucre en Europe." The Literary translation can be¹: "When we labor in the sugar works, and the mill happens to snatch hold of a finger, they instantly chop off our hand; and when we attempt to run away, they cut off a leg. Both these cases have happened to me, and it is at this expense that you eat sugar in Europe."

This block of this text displays features of cohesion (grammatical) and coherence (semantic, logical, enunciative, argumentative, narrative) that allows for a preliminary interpretation. The objective is to interpret the part based only on the clues it contains – that is, internally – seeking to identify

conflictual tensions (regardless of their type or level), without relying on surrounding textual context or extra-textual knowledge. On this basis, our interpretive process, guided only by the types of indices listed in 0 and linguistics analysis principles (ADAM, 2012), followed the steps below:

5.1 Interpretive Steps

1. Identify WHAT is being discussed: Establish the "world" in question—considered a preliminary "domain of definition" with heuristic value. This can be linked to referential Category.
2. Identify WHO is involved: Determine which entities are present (real persons, narrators, characters), and what kind of physical or discursive relationships they have. What linguistic elements refer to them?
3. Identify the verbs: What semantic relationships exist among them (synonymy, antonymy, hypernymy, etc.)? What lexical or semantic fields do they belong to?
4. Analyze the syntactic structures: Look for recurring structures (e.g., parataxis, coordination, subordination), structural parallelisms, or contrasts.
5. Identify temporal elements: Are there expressions of anteriority, posteriority, simultaneity, etc.? It can be expressed through grammatical and syntactical indices.
6. Identify logical relationships: Detect explicit or implicit cause-effect relations, conditions, or hypothetical constructs.
7. Map relationships between entities: Identify named entities and pronouns. If any entity is implicit, try to infer its identity. Clarify who does what to whom and how.
8. Pragmatic approach: Identify and interpret speech acts Austin J., (1962) and their discursive roles (e.g., indirect accusations).

ChatGPT 4 has been used to check if this type of generative AI algorithm can be used to detect conflict in text. Firstly the description of Cultural context and conflicts noted in sections (2, 3) has been given to the algorithm as same as the table of indices (0) and the interpretative steps we defined (5.1.) Then the following prompt has been submitted:

"Here is the example to be analyzed: [EXAMPLE]. The goal is to identify and detect conflictual tensions or conflicts (of any type or level) within the text. Analyze the example without using

¹ https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Candide/Chapter_19

textual context (i.e., the rest of the text) or any encyclopedic or cultural knowledge. Rely on the types of indicators listed in the table (0) . Follow interpretative steps (5.1). The first column presents each interpretive step. The second column provides an analysis based only on internal elements of the text. The third column identifies oppositions or conflicts revealed through the analysis. At the end of the table, suggest additional internal indicators relevant to conflict detection, and their interpretation. Then produce a written synthesis of your table”.

5.2 Result Generated by the ChatGPT4

0 presents an analysis strictly based on the text itself, without drawing on any external encyclopedism or cultural knowledge. It relies only on linguistic, syntactic, and semantic cues internal to the text.

Table 2: Internal textual analysis table with detection of oppositions and conflicts (without contextual data).

Step	Analysis (based on internal textual elements)	Oppositions / Conflicts Revealed
0.	The text forms a structured whole. It presents two similar situations (introduced by "when") leading to a punitive consequence. A conclusion results in the form of a generalization addressed to a recipient ("you").	Structural: repetition + final rupture → tension between a cyclic logic (recurrent violence) and a final revelation or denunciation.
1.	It concerns an activity (let's work), an incident (the mill catches our finger), an attempt to flee (we want to escape), corporal punishments (our hand/leg is cut off), and consumption (you eat sugar).	Semantic: opposition between local physical action and distant consumption; tension between production and consumption.
2.	- we: group including the speaker. - I: the speaker himself, included in we. - they (« on » in French): indefinite agent acting upon us. - you: designated recipient at the end. Relations: they (« on » in French) acts on us, I confirm the experience, you receive an indirect effect.	Enunciative and relational: conflict between we/I (suffering) and they (« on » in Fr.) (inflicting), and between I/we and you (beneficiaries not involved in the suffering).
3.	Main verbs: work, catch, cut, want, flee, found myself, eat. - Oppositions: work (productive action) ↔ cut (punitive action). - Semantic fields: action, will, pain, consumption. - Logical grouping: activity verbs → sanction verbs → consequence verbs.	Lexical / semantic: tension between positive active verbs (work, want) and violent passive verbs (cut); opposition between individual will and brutal sanction.
4.	- Structural repetition: two sentences beginning with "when we..." followed by they	Syntactic: contrast between the mechanical regularity of the first structures and the

Step	Analysis (based on internal textual elements)	Oppositions / Conflicts Revealed
	cut off our... . - Binary structure: initial condition → violent result. - Rupture: the last sentence breaks the previous pattern and directly addresses a "you".	uniqueness of the last → conflict between violent routine and awareness.
5.	When: simultaneity or recurrent condition. - I found myself: past perfect, personal moment. - You eat: present, generalizing and current.	Temporal: opposition between lived past (I found myself) vs present ("you eat") → tension between memory of experience and ignorance of the present.
6.	- Implicit causal relations: when A, then B. - Last sentence makes explicit a logical relation: "It is at this price that..." → consequence of the previous narrative.	Logical and moral: cause-effect relation between pain and consumption; implicit moral conflict between banal act (eating) and its hidden consequence.
7.	- we perform two actions (work, want to flee) and suffer two actions (they cut off our...). - I am affected by both events. - you eat, linked to the price of the recounted events.	Pragmatic / interactional: conflict of positions and effects: we suffer what you indirectly cause; implicit hierarchy among actors.
8.	- we: homogeneous group in discourse. - I: emphasis on personal experience within the group. - you: external position, indirectly but explicitly concerned. This creates a confrontation effect between I/we and you.	Enunciative and axiological: opposition between inclusion (we) and distancing (you); conflict of perspectives between lived suffering and implicit comfort.
9.	- Repetition of constructions "when... they cut off our... " → confinement, lack of choice. - Use of the pronoun " they " (" on " in Fr.) without specification → impersonal threat. - Implicit opposition I/we ↔ you. - Last sentence begins with "It is at this price": expression of a paradoxical equivalence between pain and consumption.	Structural / symbolic: repetition = confinement; they (« on » in Fr.) = impersonal threat; you = unnamed complicit addressee; "at this price" = conflict of values.

5.3 Discussions of the ChatGPT4 Results

In this example, conflicts emerge through clearly structured formal oppositions. Personal pronouns establish a power dynamic: we (workers, the speaker group) and I (individual experience) are opposed to they (an anonymous punitive force) and you (the consumer audience). This enunciative opposition reveals a relational and moral conflict between those who suffer physical violence and those who benefit from it, whether knowingly or unknowingly. The repetitive syntactic structure in the first two sentences ("when... they cut...") creates a mechanical, inescapable pattern that reinforces the idea of

systemic conflict based on domination. The contrast between verb tenses (narrative present and past perfect) and the generalized present in “you eat” reflects a temporal tension between lived experience and ongoing consumption. Finally, logical structures such as the conditional clause “It is at this price that...” point to a cause–effect relationship between suffering and comfort, revealing an implicit moral conflict regarding the conditions of commodity production. These various indicators suggest a conflict of axiological, social, and political nature, rooted in the invisibilities of real violence within consumption systems.

5.4 Limitations of an Analysis Without Encyclopedic or Cultural Context

Without cultural context, and using only intra-textual linguistic clues, one can detect the violence of the situation – and even infer a possible “relational and moral conflict between those subjected to physical harm and another group that benefits from it without suffering the consequences.” However, it is not possible to infer the deeper critical scope of the conflict – namely, the contrast between Enlightenment values and the colonial reality of 18th-century Europe.

Table 3 illustrates a few specific points where cultural context would be essential for interpreting the example:

Table 3: Few specific points where cultural context would be essential for interpreting the example.

Aspect analyzed	Interpretation without cultural context	Interpretation with cultural context
Interpretation of “you”	Unidentified addressee; may be an individual or collective interlocutor	Direct address to Europeans, readers complicit in the slavery system
Meaning of “at this price”	Personal cost, individual suffering	Moral and political cost of European consumption (sugar = product of slavery)
Status of the speaker	Suffering subject, witness of a brutal system	Spokesperson for the oppressed, allegorical figure of social critique
Effect produced on the reader (hypothesis)	Compassion, indignation towards violence	Moral discomfort, questioning of collective responsibility

6 CONCLUSION

The analysis in this paper has demonstrated that identifying and detecting the expression of conflict in a text cannot be accomplished without careful consideration of the textual elements forming the internal context. By integrating insights from traditional grammar, semantics, and pragmatics, we have shown that conflict can, to a certain extent, be delineated on the basis of linguistic indicators alone – that is, through an interpretation internal to the language system, without needing to appeal to extra-textual context.

Cultural context, understood as a shared memory of representations, values, and norms, plays a crucial role in activating the interpretive frameworks necessary for detecting conflictual tensions. Without activating an extra-linguistic context, some conflicts remain invisible or are poorly interpreted. Thus, cultural context is not a mere backdrop; it functions as a hermeneutic operator essential to textual interpretation.

This approach highlights the need to integrate more refined and culturally informed contextualization models. Conflict analysis cannot remain confined to the linguistic analysis of the text; it must also mobilize cultural knowledge to clarify what is implied or latent. We aim at analyzing other types of text to enrich to define a methodology that guides to integrate some elements of cultural context in text analysis and conflict detection.

This study is as first steps to identify guidelines and Patterns that help the identification of conflicts and cultural context when analyzing text using Generative AI algorithms. We aim at studying linguistics and semantic relations from one side and testing more LLMs algorithms.

REFERENCES

- Adam J-M., « Le modèle émergentiste en linguistique textuelle ». In: *L'Information Grammaticale*, N. 134, 2012. L'émergence : un concept opératoire pour les sciences du langage ? pp. 30-37. doi: <https://doi.org/10.3406/igram.2012.4211>
- Austin J., *Quand dire, c'est faire* (trad. Gilles Lane), Paris, Editions du Seuil, 1970 – traduction de (en) *How to do things with Words : The William James Lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955*, Oxford, J.O. Urmson, 1962.
- Bachimont B., « Corpus et connaissances : de l'extraction linguistique à la modélisation conceptuelle », *Sémantique et corpus*, (dir. A. CONDAMINES),

- ouvrage de la série Cognition et traitement de l'information. Lavoisier-Hermès, 2005, pp. 319-346.
- Bazire M., et Brezillon P. (2005) « Understanding Context Before Using It ». In : Dey A., Kokinov B., Leake D., Turner R. (eds) Modeling and Using Context. CONTEXT 2005. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 3554. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- Beyssade C., « Signification et mises à jour du contexte », Le contexte en question. Série : Les concepts fondateurs de la philosophie du langage, volume 10 (Chapitre 13). Sous la direction de Gerda Hassler. ISTE éditions, pp. 269-293, 2024.
- Bronckart, J-P., « Genres de textes, types de discours, et « degrés » de langue ». In: *Texte !*, 2008, vol. 13, n° 1. <https://archive-ouverte.unige.ch/unige:37287>
- Castelfranchi C., « Conflict ontology ». Computational conflicts : conflict modelling for distributed intelligent systems, ed. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2000 . pp. 21-40.
- Chuntao Li, Caiying Han Caiying. « Contextual Relevance: The Basic Condition for Textual Coherence ». *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*. Vol. 7, No. 1, 2019, pp. 42-49. doi: 10.11648/j.ijll.20190701.16
- Condamines A. (dir.), *Sémantique et traitement de l'information*. Lavoisier-Hermès, 2005.
- Dehais F. et Pasquier Ph., « Conflit : vers une définition générique ». In: *Acte de l'Interférence Homme Machine* (Biarritz, France), 2000. pp.1-13. hal-04531115
- Ducrot O., Schaeffer J.-M., *Nouveau dictionnaire encyclopédique des sciences du langage*, Points Essais. Paris, 1999
- Fayol M., *Le récit et sa construction : une approche de psychologie cognitive*, Delachaux & Niestlé, coll. Actualités pédagogiques et psychologiques, 1985
- Gastaldi J. L., Moot R., Retore Ch., « Le contexte en traitement automatique des langues », *Le contexte en question. Série : Les concepts fondateurs de la philosophie du langage, volume 10 (Chapitre 14)*. Sous la direction de Gerda Hassler. ISTE éditions, pp. 295-323, 2024. (hal-04008967)
- Gauducheau N., Marcoccia M., « La violence verbale dans un forum de discussion pour les 18-25 ans : Comment les jeunes jugent-ils les messages ? ». *La haine en ligne, Réseaux*, 2023/5 N°241, La Découverte.
- Greco Morasso S., « The ontology of conflict ». *Pragmatics & Cognition* 16 (3), 2008, pp. 540-567.
- Hassler G. (Dir.), *Le contexte en question. Série : Les concepts fondateurs de la philosophie du langage, volume 10 (Chapitre 14)*. Sous la direction de Gerda Hassler. ISTE éditions, pp. 295-323, 2024.
- Hoskovec T., « La linguistique textuelle et le programme de philologie englobante », *Verbum* XXXII, n°2, 2010.
- Lichao S., « The Role of Context in Discourse Analysis », *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, Vol. 1, No. 6, pp. 876-879, November 2010, ACADEMY PUBLISHER, Manufactured in Finland ; doi:10.4304/jltr.1.6.876-879
- Lyons J., *Sémantique linguistique*, Larousse, 1980 (traduction de : *Semantics*, vol. 2, London : Cambridge University Press, 1977)
- Matta No., Matta N. and Herr Ph. (2024). « Importance of Context Awareness in NLP ». In *Proceedings of the 16th International Joint Conference on Knowledge Discovery, Knowledge Engineering and Knowledge Management - Volume 3: KMIS, 2024* ; ISBN 978-989-758-716-0, SciTePress, pages 280-286. DOI: 10.5220/0012994700003838
- Müller H.J. and Dieng R., « On Conflicts in General and their Use in AI in Particular ». *Computational conflicts : conflict modelling for distributed intelligent systems*, ed. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2000. pp. 1-20
- Rastier F., *Arts et sciences du texte*, Paris, PUF, 2001
- Rastier F., *Sémantique et recherches cognitives*, Paris, PUF, coll. *Formes sémiotiques*, 2010.
- Rigel M., Pellat J-Ch., Rioul R., *Grammaire méthodique du français*, PUF, Paris, 2014 (5e édition)
- Sauquet M., Vielajus M., « Le désaccord et le conflit : entre affrontement et évitement ». Chapitre 11 de l'ouvrage collectif : *L'intelligence interculturelle : 15 thèmes à explorer pour travailler au contact d'autres cultures*. Essai n°205. Editions Charles Leopold Mayer, Paris, 2014
- Schmoll P., « Production et interprétation du sens : la notion de contexte est-elle opératoire ? », *Contexte(s), Scolia [sciences cognitives, linguistique et intelligence artificielle / revue de linguistique]*, 1996, 6, pp.235-255. Halshs-02071397
- Talmy L., *Toward a Cognitive Semantics*. Cambridge, MIT Press, 2000.