



Clinical Pragmatics as a domain for intra and interpersonal functional Interaction between Linguistics, Cognitive and Neurophysiological Systems

By

Kareem Ashoush Mahdi,

A PhD. Student

GUJARAT UNIVERSITY

School of Languages

AHMEDABAD-380009

(INDIA)

Abstract

Since it is a branch of general pragmatics, clinical pragmatics that deals with identifying, evaluating and treating speech impairment is supported by the principles and theories of the general pragmatics such as speech acts and relevance theory as a domain or framework within which many researchers can build their concepts to distinguish different groups of language disorders. Since communication is the ability to send and received information, express and understand feelings and thoughts, any barrier prevents people to socialize verbal or nonverbal cues impairs or break down the process of communication. In case meaning that is conventionally encoded in the used linguistic form is disordered or not understood, turns during conversation can't be taken correctly and joining verbal communication with nonverbal techniques is difficult, pragmatics is disordered.

Introduction

In its general meaning, pragmatics, the trajectory of linguistics, is the domain in which new information is raised from the interaction between intra and interpersonal cognitive, linguistic, temporal and semantic context through which speech acts are performed in appropriate social situation. In cognitive context, there is

a system that defines what to communicate, the reason, the time, the place and the way to symbolize what is communicated so acts of speech may not be symbolized by the convention or semantic meaning of the language, but by a conventional implicature in a specific context which is the pragmatic meaning as a result pragmatics is the source from which a piece of information is emitted and understood due to such interaction (Cummings, 2007). Clinical pragmatics, the track of linguistic pragmatics, deals with the pragmatic speech and language disorders, their properties, evaluation and their treatment. Clinical pragmatics is supported by general pragmatics especially the concept of speech act and relevance theory as domain for analysing collection of disorders that stand as an obstacle to meaningful communication (Cumming, L. 2017). Understanding pragmatics passes through the interpretation of pragmatic notions such as implicature. Deixis and presupposition that can be realized through recovering the communicative intentions or the mental state, the basic part of cognitive processes, in the speaker's utterance by putting inferences from recognition of those intentions (Cummings, 2013). These communicative intentions that are in the temporal cortex as concepts are transmitted to Broca's Area to be encoded linguistically, after that the motor cortex holds these linguistic meaningful codes to the articulators to be addressed to the hearer. If any centre of the brain, its neuro- pathways or mechanisms associated with them are disrupted, damaged or stopped, communication is disordered either **in expressive or receptive language**.

Implicature

Passing through the following piece of information,

Student: Mam, can I come to see you today? I need your advice for analysing some phonological phenomena.

Supervisor: I am in a leave with my family out of the city. Make it next Monday. The supervisor implicates that she doesn't want to accept her student's request and the student can realize this implicature when he recovered the communicative intention in the utterance of his supervisor. Since the contextual details of the supervisor's utterance is invested pragmatically, it means that there is another comparable context of her utterance in which no similar details, the refusal, are mentioned though the supervisor's utterance shows thorough hypothesis (Recanati, F. 2004).

Deixis,

The grammatical category, plays a vital role in learning and understanding a language. Since its meaning needs a relationship between its linguistic structure and the context in which it is used, deixis is pragmatic. Deixical sign whether it is special such as 'this, that, these, those, here, there, in, on' that assigns the space of the speaker and the hearer, temporal that is represented by time or tense such as 'yesterday, now, tomorrow, last, next, in the future, in the morning, at night, on time' localizes the point of time at which the social event takes place, personal such as singular or plural, nominative or accusative pronouns that position the existence of the participants whether they narrating or non-narrating in relation to their place, social as in expressions of greetings, insults, gratitude that are linguistically fixed in the social identity of speaker and hearer or

discoursal such as ‘ later, earlier, in the following, in the preceding, in the next, during the next’ , the linguistic referential phrases and expressions that guide the participants during their situational conversation to a previous or later events. All these signs must correlate with its referential object through a situational context as a domain for sufficient interpretation of its semantic reference as this type of signs has linguistic descriptive characteristics and situational variables (Levinson, S. 2004 and Stapleton, A. 2017).

Presupposition

Presupposition, the pragmatic notion, is a hidden presumption about the previous ideas related to the contextual utterance whose truth is a must in the speech. Even if the utterance is presented in a way of declaration, denial or inquiry, presumption stays very important. Lexical terms and expressions that hold presumption such as definites and factive verbs are called assumption stimuli or triggers. The distinguishing characteristics are 1- projection by which negative and additive particles are used such as ‘Jack bought a bike, too.’

‘Jack did not buy a bike, too.

When stimuli is denied or not projected, presumption is cancelled. If true or false, negated or not negated sentence presupposes another one, the second sentence will be true the reason that makes the presumption definite so participants can presuppose utterances in case they made mutual conversational environment between them (Kadmon, N, 2001 and Paul, R. Kroeger. 2018).

Pragmatic disability

Through speech act, we can communicate more than that of the surface meaning of the lexical word, the linguistic signs used in a context, and transmit the vertical meaning, the non- linguistic signs, in implied way. This depends on the cues of the social context represented in the speaker’s mental states and intentions. Being so, such communication is pragmatic due to the way the two signs interact. When social communication or interpersonal interaction is disordered by limiting the rank of usable tools for symbolizing and interpreting meaning, pragmatic is impaired linguistically, non-linguistically or both of them. This kind of impairment is due to certain causes one of which is the cognitive disability to encode or decode the social situations stimulated by the need to communicate, their execution, attention and memory, process of inference and the cognitive knowledge of concepts. The second reason is that the sensorimotor and the linguistic system fail to function very well due to accidents or illnesses. Finally, such impairment can be attributed to phonological, morphological or hearing disorders so pragmatic disorder is not a matter of separate reason, but an interaction between cognitive, linguistic and sensorimotor disorders (Windsor, F, Kelly, M. L, Hewlett, N. 2002)

Brain – Pragmatic correlation

Mental activities can be exhibited through the verbal use of discourse, the linguistic form through which knowledge of communication, beliefs, opinion and actions are interacting in social context. Neurologically, speakers with problems in the frontal lobe of the right hemisphere can’t connect between the linguistic competence he has and the impaired performance as a result some executive functions such as function of working memory, mechanisms of control, attention, emotion and inhibition are disordered. In accordance

with graded salience hypothesis (Giora, 2003), salient meaning that is specified by conventionality, frequency, familiarity and prototypically is dealt with initially whether it is literal or contextual. The hypothesis chooses the right hemisphere in processing non-literal salience so right hemisphere symbolizes and activates broader meaning as well as distinguishes distant relations. The inferior frontal and parietal lobes are responsible for selecting and activating semantics whereas the temporal is responsible for integrating semantics. Idioms and metaphors are different from ordinary lexical items that are formed by grammatical rules. They are manifested as heterogeneous forms with specific properties that affect the way they are stored and processed (Huang, Y. 2013). The prefrontal lobe of the right hemisphere is responsible for interpreting sarcasm, the most frequent form of irony that is used to show hidden criticism about person or situational context. In case it is damaged by illnesses or accident, a speaker can't interpret sarcasm (MacDonald, 2000)

Conclusion

Pragmatics is differently explained by linguists as the meaning of the language in social context. When it is impaired by illnesses or accidents in all ages from infants to adults, pragmatic elements of communication are in danger. Since it is cognitive, clinical pragmatics uncovers that the impaired person has a difficulty in interpreting what is perceived and produced in a certain context due to the incapability of connecting his own mental states to his mind and the mind of others. This shows the functional relationship between neurosensory, cognitive and linguistic systems in intra and inter-persons within the domain of clinical pragmatics.

References

- Cumming, L. 2007. Clinical Pragmatics: A field in search of phenomena. *Language and communication* 27, 396-432.
- , 2013. Pragmatics Disorders. The Hong Kong Polytechnic University
- , 2017. Clinical pragmatics. Nottingham Trent University, UK
- Giora, R. 2003. On Our mind: Salience, Context, and Figurative Language.
- Huang, Y. 2013. The Oxford Handbook of Pragmatics. Oxford University Press.
- Kadmon, N. 2001. Formal Pragmatics: Semantics, Pragmatics, Presupposition and Focus. Blackwell publisher Inc.
- Levinson, S.C. 2004. Deixis and Pragmatics for handbooks of pragmatics. Max Plank Institute for psycholinguistics.
- MacDonald, S. 2000. Neuropsychological Studies of Sarcasm, metaphor and symbol.
- Paul, R. Kroeger. 2008. Analysing Meaning: An introduction to semantics and pragmatics. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Recatani, F. 2004. Literal Meaning. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.
- Stapleton, A. 2017. Deixis in Modern Linguistics. *Essex Student Journal*, (1).

Windsor, F, Kelly, M. L, and Hewlett, N. 2002. Investigations in Clinical phonetics and Linguistics. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

