

Application of Levinson's Generalized Conversational Implicature Theory in the Conversation of Bangla Language

Sabiha Al Humaiara Momy*

Abstract: This paper deals with the generalized conversational implicatures (GCIs) which usually occur in the conversation of Bangla language. The aim of this study is to look into the applicability and potentiality of Levinson's GCI theory (2000) in Bangla conversation. Conversations from different fields, such as daily life, talk-shows, social media, and literature, have been analyzed with the help of GCI by adhering to some specified inclusion criteria. Results reveal that GCI is applicable for analyzing the conversations of Bangla language by maintaining a covert layer along with a casual setting. Furthermore, three principles (Q-principle, I-principle, and M-principle) of this theory work very well in a certain lexical distribution of utterances.

Keywords: Conversation; Generalized conversational implicature; Implicature; Utterance

1. Introduction

In communication, conversation is a fruitful approach where speakers and hearers interact with one another. Throughout the conversation, sometimes what a speaker implies, is distinct from what the speaker literally says. Therefore, the hearer has to discover the implied meaning that is uttered by the speaker and this is referred to as conversational implicature. Speakers of Bangla language use implicature in conversational interaction as well. Quite often, they use a kind of conversational implicature that does not need any special knowledge in its interpretation, which is called generalized conversational implicature (henceforth, GCI). Grice (1975) came up with this concept, but Levinson (2000) studied the

* Lecturer (Adjunct), General Education Department, University of Liberal Arts Bangladesh

properties of GCI and proposed the 'Generalized Conversational Implicature Theory' (GCI Theory). GCI theory is connected with some basic pragmatic principles or heuristics as well as with utterance-type meaning. In daily conversation of Bangla, the speaker and hearer exchange utterances having an implied meaning and this implied meaning of utterance is the concern of Levinson's GCI. Therefore, Levinson's GCI theory can be applied when discussing utterances with implicit meaning and this is what this study has chased.

The aim of this study is to check the applicability as well as the potentiality of GCI in Bangla conversations. In other word, it is an important area of research to investigate how GCI theory actually works in the case of the Bangla language. Besides, this paper has focused on the effectiveness of GCI theory by showing how this theory adds more value than other theories in pragmatistical analysis. Till now, no research is available on the applicability of GCI in Bangla conversations. As a result, this present study can fill an important gap in the literature of GCI as a first study on GCI from the context of the Bangla language.

2. The Foundation of GCI

The cooperative principle, proposed by the British philosopher Grice (1975), consists of four maxims which he interprets as social rules or norms. These maxims are- Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner. Later, based on Gricean maxims, Levinson (2000) has provided the 'GCI Theory' and proposed that GCI can be accounted for three principles which he calls the Q-principle, the I-principle, and the M-Principle. The first and second principles have derived from Grice's maxim of Quantity and the third from his maxim of Manner. In addition, Levinson's view treats the Gricean maxims, not as norms of conversation, but as inferential principles that guide conversational behavior (Saul, 2010).

Levinson's main interest is in GCIs which he regards as the central class of 'presumptive meanings.' The term 'presumptive meanings' stands for 'default' or 'preferred' interpretations which are carried by the structure of utterances (Kasmirli, 2016:137).

2.1 Revisiting Levinson's GCI

In the Gricean pragmatic tradition, pragmatically inferred meaning is usually associated with context-dependence and with maxims or principles which are used to convey the speaker's intended meaning (Carston, 2004: 25). But Jaszczolt & Katarzyna (2018) assert that unlike Grice's GCIs, Levinson's presumptive meanings seem to be the hearer's meanings. The study of Burton (2005) sees implicature derivation as context driven, whereas Aameedi (2013), in favor of Levinson's theory, considers implicature derivation as default inferencing which is not linked to the context of utterance. I would consider the following example of Aameedi (2013: 54) to refute this context driven notion.

Nike: Did you meet Audy and Ray tonight?

Shela: I met Audy.

In the example above, Shela's reply implicates a default inferencing that she did not meet Ray. Here, no special knowledge of context is involved in Shela's statement. So, this is GCI which occurs without any reference to particular features of the context.

Based on Grice's complex set of maxims, Horn (2004) has developed a pragmatic theory in which two pragmatic principles (principle-Q & principle-R) are used. The relationship between Levinson's Q-and I-principles and Horn's Q-and R-principles are nearly identical. Only these two principles, according to Horn (2004), are enough to fulfill the task of Quantity, Relation, and Manner maxims. This is where Horn's theory contradicts Levinson's as he suggests the presence of an 'extra' principle (M- principle) concerned with manner in GCI theory. By following GCI theory, a series of recent studies (Huang, 2007; Maiska, 2013) have indicated that the requisite for understanding the atypical or a marked situation must necessitate Manner principle. For instance, Maiska's discussion (2013:31) of Indonesian advertisement also shows the use of the M-principle in case of marked situation.

Headman: Bagaimana pidato saya? (How was my speech?)

Boys: Aman, Pak. (It is Safe, sir).

In the first utterance, the headman asks the boys about his speech. Then the boys answer it by using the sentence 'aman Pak' which means 'it is safe Sir' in English. As we know, the word 'safe' denotes there is no danger. The boys respond in an unusual way about the speech, because the usual way to respond will be 'good' or 'bad'. The word 'safe' is usually used to express that it is good as there is no possibility of danger. Therefore, the utterance 'aman Pak' has an intended message 'it is good, you do not have to be worried sir'. And based on GCI theory, it is known as the M-principle. It is thus an evident that the M-principle is necessary and Horn fails to claim it.

Recent works of Wilson & Sperber (2004) and Carston & Powell (2006) hold that there are no general inferential principles involved in the derivation of implicatures and no distinction between generalized and particularized implicatures; hence all implicatures are particularized. This view totally contrasts with that of Levinson's GCI theory. Based on Gricean Maxims, Levinson has clearly provided three principles (discussed in 2.3) which are concerned with the derivation of implicature. The PCI depends on the context, whereas it has previously been stated that the GCI arises across contexts (Huang 2007; Grundy, 2008, Ariel, 2008).

2.2 Use of GCI in Previous Studies

Some of the prior studies have considered the motivations of using GCI in case of conversational interaction and analysis. The study of Maiska (2013) deals with the GCI which occur in the Indonesian Kartu As advertisement. The aim of this study is to find out the GCIs in the utterances, and also to identify the most frequent GCIs which occur in the conversation of the speakers in the advertisements. By using the approach of Levinson (2000), 6 advertisements of Kartu As have been analyzed where 4 GCIs have been found out of 110 utterances. Cook (2014) has focused on the communicated meaning of the English scalar expression 'good' in various contexts and examined that deriving a scalar implicature from 'good' depends on the degree to which the listener is sensitive to and the use of 'good', which is understood to induce scalar implicature, can frequently result in I-inference.

Although some work has been done, yet the number of GCI-based discussions in different languages is relatively low. The majority of earlier literatures (Pouscoulous et al., 2007; Escandell, 2006; Chevallier et al., 2010;), related to GCI, repeatedly discussed about the derivation of Levinson's heuristics based on Gricean maxims. Some of them (Huang, 2007, 2015; Degen, 2015) have presented the GCI theory in just the same way that Levinson has and the core examples of Levinson have also been presented exactly. Therefore, application of Levinson's idea in different aspects of conversational uses in different languages is still an unexplored area. However, in the following section a short description has been provided on Levinson's GCI theory (2000) to know how it actually works in conversations.

2.3 Levinson's Generalized Conversational Implicature Theory (2000)

Based on Grice's Quantity and Manner maxims, Levinson's GCI theory (2000) has underpinned three heuristics or principles. The first heuristic is called Quantity principle (Q-principle), the second heuristic is called Informativeness principle (I-principle) and the last one is called Manner principle (M-principle). Each heuristic can be summarized in terms of a speaker's maxim and a recipient's corollary.

2.3.1 Q-Principle

Speaker's maxim: Do not say less than required
Recipient's corollary: What is not said, is not the case.

Q-Principle has derived from Grice's first sub-maxim of Quantity ('Make your contribution as informative as required'). The main two types of Q-principle are scalar implicature and clausal implicature. Scalar involves the use of measurable scale such as <all, most, many, some>, <hot, warm> etc. If the speaker decides to use the weakest element (like 'some') on the scale, then the hearer can assume that the speaker implicates that the strongest element ('all') is not true. For instance-

Speaker : **Some** of the boys came.

Hearer : '**Not all** of the boys came.'

In the example above, the speaker said 'some', while in a scale <all, most, many, some> it is informationally weak, so the hearer will assume that the speaker does not apply the strongest statement which is 'not all', therefore, from 'some', 'not all' can be inferred. So, in case of Bangla, utterances like '**kichu** manush khai ni' or '**jodi** se kaj ti kore, tahole ami taka dibo' etc. can also be explained with the help of Q-principle.

2.3.2 I-Principle

Speaker's maxim: Do not say more than is required

Recipient's corollary: What is said in a simple way is stereotypically exemplified.

This one has derived from Grice's second sub-maxim of Quantity ('Do not make your contribution more informative than is required'). In I-Principle, the speaker makes a statement that has minimal information than what is required, then the hearer will assume that the speaker has implicated something by using his/her world knowledge or stereotypical ideas. Let us consider the utterances below-

Speaker: Markus said 'Hello' to the **secretary** and then he smiled'

Hearer : 'Markus said "Hello" to the **female secretary** and then Marcus smiled'

In the example above, the speaker said 'secretary' which has minimal information about the gender, therefore the hearer will assume that the gender of the secretary is female, as we stereotypically know, most of the secretary are women. Hence, Bangla utterances like '**muci** amar juta selai kore dibe' or '**Soma ebong** korim bari kineche' can similarly be analyzed by Levinson's I-principle. The I-principle underpins a variety of linguistic phenomena including generality narrowing, conjunction buttressing, conditional perfection and so on.

2.3.3 M-Principle

Speaker's maxim : Do not use a marked expression without reason

Recipient's corollary: What is said in an abnormal way indicates an abnormal situation

This principle is based on Grice's maxim of Manner ('Be perspicuous') and in particular to its first and third sub-maxims ('Avoid obscurity' and 'Avoid prolixity'). In M-Principle, an untypical or 'marked' expression indicates that the thing referred to is itself atypical in some way. For instance,

Speaker : 'He caused his car to stop.'

Hearer : 'He stopped his car with an unusual way'

In the example above, the speaker's utterance indicates an unusual situation of the way to stop the car. We know, the normal way to stop the car is by stepping the breaks, and the utterances will be 'he stopped his car'. On hearing 'he caused his car to stop', the hearer will assume that 'he stopped the car indirectly rather than by simply pressing the footbrake'. So, when it comes to Bangla, M-principle analysis can be used in utterances like 'ami tala **venge** ghore dhukechi', or 'tar kache amar file ta **atka poreche**' in a similar way.

Levinson's GCI is not an absolutely accepted theory, there are a number of arguments for and against it. In this study, I am supporting this theory and in the preceding part, by using examples from various languages I have explained how anti-GCI viewpoints can be refuted. So, rather than criticizing, the way in which GCI is critiqued may be revisited. In order to check the potentiality and applicability of GCI in Bangla language, three principles (Q, I, and M respectively) of GCI have been taken as parameters in this study. Therefore, based on these above remarks, section 4 has illustrated the application of GCI to understand how it works in Bangla conversations.

2.4 Applicability of GCI in Bangla Language

In case of Bangla, there are a number of substantial literatures on pragmatical analysis. One of the noteworthy studies of pragmatical

analysis regarding Bangla is Arif's (2011) discussion of Bengali Everyday Emblematic (BEE) hand gestures used in the Bengali gestural community based on Searle's (1969) 'Speech act theory' and Posner's (1993) 'Act of communicating' have been applied. Therefore, it interprets every BEE hand gesture from the perspective of speech act theory and characterizes the three basic units of speech act - locution, illocution, and perlocution which constitute nonverbal acts of communication in the Bengali community. Other work regarding speech act includes Khairunnahar's (2012) descriptive study in which Austin's (1962) speech act theory, more specifically locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts, have been discussed in the light of Bangla language. Therefore, she has analyzed the characterized function of various syntactic structures of Bangla language which are used in the specific communication environment. Kamal (2018) has also explored the notion of speech acts within the field of pragmatics. Mainly, he has highlighted the contrastive analysis of various speech act events both in English and Bangla.

As shown in the previous reviewed studies, a number of researchers have contributed in the field of Bangla pragmatics either from the perspectives of speech act or discourse analysis. However, from the aspects of GCI, no discussions have been found in Bangla so far. Therefore, this study can be considered as a first step towards a more profound understanding of GCI. So, the novelty of this study lies in its attempt to explore the application of Levinson's GCI theory in day-to-day Bangla conversations of different fields.

3. The Study

3.1 Data Collection Strategy

The aim of this study is to find out the applicability and potentiality of GCIs in the utterances which occur in the conversations of Bangla language. In order to reach the aim of this study, data has been collected not only from native speaker's experience and judgements, but also from the

conversations of different recorded talk-shows, conferences, and Facebook lives.

We know that there are numerous videos on YouTube and Facebook, but not all videos are applicable to this study. So, selection of suitable videos is an important task for this study. As a result, several inclusion criteria have been used in determining the appropriate videos in order to gather the data properly. These criteria include-

- The video has to be in Bangla.
- It must be a conversational video.
- The length of the video cannot be too long.
- Some other issues have also been observed such as whether the conversations in these videos are in standard Bangla or not and whether the daily life is being reflected or not.

For data collection, initially I have selected more than 15 recorded talk-shows from different Bangla channels on YouTube, around 5 news videos, and 10 live programs of different renown celebrities on Facebook. Finally, 3 recorded talk-shows, 2 news videos, and 3 live programs have been selected from the initial selection. Note that, as the sample of the data, only those conversations from these final videos have been taken into account which match the inclusion criteria best. Moreover, I have also taken Rabindranath Tagore's short story "Postmaster" in order to collect data. Many of the conversations in this short story were suitable for analysis, and one of them is explained in data set 5. Aforementioned, data has also been collected from the experiences and judgements of native speakers.

3.2 Analytical Framework of Data

After collecting the data, several steps have been followed in doing the analysis. These are -

- i. Presenting the transliteration of the utterances of the selected data by following the Romanized format. Besides, transcribing the data by using Leipzig Glossing Rules (LGR) to make its meaning explicit.

- ii. Describing the context and giving the general information about the selected data. In order to denote a person's name, only name initials have been used in the data analysis.
- iii. Identifying the GCIs which appear in the utterances of each conversation.
- iv. Finding the applicability of GCIs and interpreting the principles or the implied meaning of the utterances contained in the conversations.

4. Data Analysis

4.1 Data set 1

Data set 1 has been taken based on native speaker's experience and judgements; that is, what Bengali speakers usually talk about listening a music in their daily lives. So, it has been assumed here that this conversation has been taken place between two friends and the context of this conversation is 'listening music'. The conversation is in the following:

Speaker 1 : kemon achis? ki koris?
 how are what do
 'How are you?' 'What are you doing?'

Speaker 2 : hmm, valo. Gan shuni.
 hmm good music listen
 'Hmm, good.' 'I am listening music'

Speaker 1 : tor ki **Nazrul** shona hoy?
 you do Nazrul listen
 'Do you listen Nazrul ?'\

Speaker 2 : haa, Nazrul er **kichu** gan shunechi.
 yes Nazrul of some song listen
 'Yes, I have listened some of Nazrul's song'

The utterance that can be considered as GCI using I-principle analysis is 'Nazrul'. Speaker 1 has given minimal information when saying the utterance to speaker 2, that is to say Speaker 1 has not given any information about what speaker 2 listens related to

'Nazrul' by his/her question. As the conversation has taken place while speaker 2 was listening to music, so he/she can assume that speaker 1 has talked about the 'songs of Nazrul'. As a result, the utterance 'Nazrul' implicates 'the songs of Nazrul'.

On the other hand, the utterance of speaker 2 'kichu', which means 'some' in English, can be taken into account as the Q-principle. When speaker 2 says 'kichu', from the scale of Bangla quantifiers <sob 'all', odhikangsho 'most', kichu 'some' >, we can clearly see that kichu 'some' is the weakest term because there is a stronger term than 'kichu' in the scale of quantifiers which is sob 'all'. So, speaker 2 decides to use the weakest element of the scale, it is because he considers that the strongest element is not true; therefore based on the sentence of speaker 2 "haa, Nazrul er kichu gan shunechi," speaker 1 can infer that "speaker 2 Nazrul er sob gan shone ni" ("speaker 2 did not listen to all the songs of Nazrul").

Note that if speaker 2 says '**odhikangsho** gan shunechi' (I have listened most of the Nazrul's song) instead of '**kichu** gan shunechi', this statement will also form a measurable scale <sob 'all', odhikangsho 'most'> and therefore, 'Nazrul er odhikangsho gan shunechi' will obviously implicate 'Nazrul er sob gan shuni ni' that is odhikangsho 'most' +> sob noy 'not all'. Moreover, if speaker 2 says 'Nazrul er **kichu kichu** shunechi' (I have listened some of Nazrul), we can ultimately presume by I-principle that speaker 2 is talking about the music of Nazrul though he/she has not mentioned it.

4.2 Data set 2

Data set 2 has also been designed based on native speaker's experience and judgements. The normal conversations that occur between the customer and the storekeeper while visiting a store have been taken into account for the construction of this data set. There are two speakers in this conversation: the storekeeper and the customer who wants to buy brushes.

Store keeper : sir, kivabe apna k sahajjo korte pari?
 sir how you help can
 'Sir, how can I help you?'

Customer : vai, ama k **dui ta** brush din.
 brother me two brush give
 'Brother, give me two brushes.'

Store keeper : sir, tin ta nin. **tin ta nile ekta free.**
 sir three buy three buy one free
 'Sir, buy three. Buy three get one free'

Customer : accha thik ache, ama k tin tai din
 okay fine me three give
 'Okay fine, give me three'

The utterance of the customer 'dui' (two) can be regarded as Q-principle, more specifically the scalar implicature. When the customer says 'ama k dui ta brush din', which means 'give me two brushes' in English, he/she wants to say that he wants exactly two brushes to buy. From the scale of number in Bangla < ১, ২, ৩, ৪ ... >, dui (২) 'two' is a weak term because there are stronger terms than dui 'two' in the scale of number. According to the scalar implicatures analysis, the storekeeper as a hearer can assume that the customer has said dui 'two' because the stronger terms of dui 'two' are not true as they are not needed (the customer wants exactly two, not three or four or five). Therefore, the utterance 'ama k dui ta brush din' implicates to 'ama k dui tai brush din, er beshi noy' ('give me exactly two brushes, not more than that'). Besides, if we look at the lexical distribution of the customer and storekeeper's utterances, it can be seen that the Q-principle works very well in presence of Bangla classifiers ('ta' in 'duita', 'tinta').

After that, the utterance of the storekeeper 'tin ta nile ekta free', can be rendered as GCI using I-principle analysis. By saying 'tin ta nile ekta free' ('buy three, get one free'), he/she has given minimal information to the customer. That is, he/she has not given any information about what the customer has to buy to get one free and what the customer gets as free. As the conversation takes place in a store so the customer can assume that the store keeper has talked about the brush. Therefore, the utterance 'tin ta nile ekta free' can be implicated by the customer as '**tin ta brush** nile ar **ekta brush** free' ('buy three brushes, get one more brush free').

4.3 Data set 3

The following conversation has been taken from a well-known talk-show namely 'Tritiyo Matra' of Channel i. The context of this conversation is 'Padma bridge' and the number of speakers is two: the host and the guest respectively. Note that this conversation is a four-minute short clip from the episode 6729.

Host : Padma setu niye nanan bitorko, alocona o somalocona royeche. tobe, padma bridge about various debate discussion and criticisms are but

dokkhanancoler koti koti manusher vaggo bodlabe ei Padma setu. apni ki mone koren?

south millions people fortunes change this padma bridge you what think

'There are various debates, discussion and criticisms about the Padma Bridge. But this Padma Bridge will change the fortunes of millions of people in the south. What do you think?

Guest : apna k dhonnobad. amra jani j sorkar birodhi dol shuru thekei padma setur you thank we know that opposition party beginning from padma bridge

bipokkhe **kotha bole jache.** kintu eta sotti j ai setur dara ekushti jelar against talked and talked but it true that this bridge by twenty-one districts

manush upokrito hobe. echarao, khub druto **Padma Setu Rail Link Prokolpo** people benefit moreover very soon padma bridge rail link project

sesh hobe ebong train chalu hobe.....
complete and train launch

'Thank you. We know that the opposition party talked and talked against Padma bridge from the beginning. But it is true that people of twenty-one districts will be benefitted by this bridge. Moreover, Padma Bridge Rail Link Project (PBRLP) will be completed very soon and the train will be launched.'

[https://youtu.be/_2VI5CC2XwM]

The guest's utterance '**kotha bolei jacche**' (talked and talked) can be considered as GCI by M- principle analysis. By using this long-winded expression ('kotha bolei jacche'), the guest, as a speaker, indicates that there is something unusual about the thing described. Therefore, the host, as a hearer, understands that the opposition party has talked against the Padma bridge at an unusual extent for a long time. So, the guest's statement 'sorkar birodhi dol shuru thekei padma setur bipokkhe kotha bolei jacche' (the opposition party talked and talked against Padma bridge from the beginning) has an intended message that is 'sorkar birodhi dol osavabikvabe dirgho somoy dhore padma setur bipokkhe kotha bolei jacche' (the opposition party talked and talked against Padma bridge in an unusual extent for a long time). So, it is noticeable that such kind of prolix expressions are found in Bangla conversation and thus it can be classified to Levinson's M-Principle. Here, 'bolei jacche' is a serial verb of Bangla language which is a prolonged expression too. There are some other serial verbs in Bangla language (like- 'korei jacche', 'bokei coleche', 'kheyai jacche') which are also long-winded expressions and therefore they can easily be explained by the M-principle of GCI theory.

Another utterance 'Padma Setu Rail Link Prokolpo sesh hobe **ebong** train chalu hobe' by the guest can be included under the I-principle analysis. According to Levinson (2000: 37), the I-principle is a powerful one, which underpins a variety of linguistic phenomena. Among which '*conjunction buttressing*' is noteworthy. Conjunction buttressing is a phenomenon where a conjunction is interpreted as indicating temporal or causal sequence. Here, 'ebong' (and) in the guest's utterance can be interpreted for both temporal and causal sequence. Consider the following implied meanings of 'ebong' under the conjunction buttressing process of I-principle.

Temporal sequence

In case of temporal sequence, we get the the meaning of the conjunction which is related to 'time'. Therefore, 'Padma Setu Rail Link Prokolpo sesh hobe **ebong** train chalu hobe' (Padma Bridge Rail Link Project will be completed **and** the train will be launched) +>

'Padma Setu Rail Link Prokolpo sesh hobe **ebong tarpor** train chalu hobe' (Padma Bridge Rail Link Project will be completed **and then** the train will be launched.)

Causal sequence

In case of causal sequence, a conjunction functions as a 'causal conjunction' where it expresses or indicates a cause. Therefore, from 'Padma Setu Rail Link Prokolpo sesh hobe **ebong** train chalu hobe' (Padma Bridge Rail Link Project will be completed and the train will be launched), we can implicate 'Padma Setu Rail Link Prokolper somapti train calu korabe' (The completion of Padma Setu Rail Link Project will cause the train launching). So, here these rubrics (temporal and causal sequence) have allowed us to analyze a minimal expression or utterance of a Bangla conversation to get the maximal information under the I- principle of GCI theory.

4.4 Data set 4

Two distinct sub data sets (i & ii) from two distinct contexts have been analyzed in data set 4 where each of them is connected to cricket and cricket personalities. In (i), the data has been collected from a press conference of BCB which has been telecasted in television news. In a conversation with the press, the running president of BCB has talked about the World Cup and has given a statement on player 'S' (name initial).

- i. President of BCB: ami **bisshas kori** 'S' bisshokape netritto debe.

I believe S in world cup lead
'I believe 'S' will lead the World Cup.'

[<https://youtu.be/1nNePMYb9xU>]

The utterance 'bisshas kori' (believe) can be analyzed by one of the main types of Q-principle which is *clausal implicature*. We know, in case of clausal implicature, a sentence contains an embedded clause and by choosing an expression, the speaker implicates that he/she does not know whether or not the embedded clause is true. So, the sentence here contains an embedded clause ('S' bisshokape

netritto debe) and the expression 'bisshas kori' does not entail the truth of the embedded clause. If he said 'ami jani 'S' bisshokape netritto debe' (I know 'S' will lead the World Cup) instead of 'ami bisshas kori' (I believe), then it could entail the truth of the embedded clause. However, from his utterance 'ami bisshas kori 'S' bisshokape netritto debe' ('I believe 'S' will lead the World Cup'), it is implicated that 'uni janen na 'S' bisshokape netritto debe ki na, eta purupuri tar nijossho bisshas j 'S' bisshokape netritto debe' (He does not know whether or not 'S' will lead the World Cup, it is totally his belief that 'S' will lead the World Cup'). Here, a contrast set has also been formed- {jana 'know', bisshas kora 'believe'}

This following data in (ii) has been taken from a live program of Facebook namely "Daraz Presents Cricfrenzy Exclusive Live with 'M'". In the conversation of that live program, 'M' has given the following statement while talking about the future of BCB.

- ii. 'M': ami **jodi** BCB er sovapoti hobar sujog pai tahole ami BCB
er itihaser
I if BCB of president to be chance get then
I BCB of history
sera hote parbo.
best be can

'If I get a chance to be the President of BCB then I can be the best in the history of BCB'.

[<https://fb.watch/8rJ2ksp2Om/>]

There are two utterances that are considered as I-principle, they are 'jodi' 'if' and 'sera hote parbo' 'can be the best'. Aforementioned, the I-principle governs a wide range of linguistic processes. Among those, '*conditional perfection*' is a process in which a conditional is read as a biconditional. In this case, 'if' (conditional) is read as 'if and only if' (biconditional).

So, the first utterance 'jodi', which is a conditional, can be rendered as biconditional. From 'M's utterance, we can infer that he can only be the best if and only if he gets the chance to be the president of BCB. Here, his utterance is strengthening the conditional to biconditional. Therefore, by saying 'ami **jodi** BCB er sovapoti hobar

sujog pai, tahole ami BCB er itihaser sera hote parbo (If I get a chance to be the President of BCB, then I can be the best in the history of BCB'), he is actually implicating 'ami **jodi ebong kebol jodi** BCB er sovapoti hobar sujog pai, taholei ami BCB er itihaser sera hote parbo (**if and only if** I get a chance to be the President of BCB then I can be the best in the history of BCB').

The second utterance sera hote parbo 'can be the best' can be considered as GCI under the I-

principle analysis. Here, 'M' has not given the information in what he can be the best. Since the

conversation was about the future of BCB and he was talking about a chance to be the president of BCB, so the organizer and the audience as hearer can literally assume that he has talked to be the best president in the history of BCB. Therefore, the utterance 'BCB er itihaser **sera hote parbo**' implicates to 'BCB er itihaser **sera president hote parbo**'. Thus, the I-principle of GCI has been applied in a Bangla conversation where an expression (sera hote parbo) has prompted the organizer and the audience to fill in the details (sera president hote parbo) according to the appropriate background knowledge.

4.5 Data set 5

This data has been taken from Rabindranath Tagore's short story "Postmaster". The conversation has occurred between two speakers: a promising character 'Ratan' and the postmaster himself. In this short story, Ratan was an orphan village girl who used to work for the postmaster. Later, she fell in love with the postmaster and at the same time, the postmaster was transferred to Kolkata. So, in that context, the following conversation took place.

Ratan : dadababu, ama k tomader bari niye jabe?
 dadababu me your house take
 "Dadababu, will you take me to your house?"
 Dadababu: **se ki kore hobe?**
 it how possible
 "How is it possible?"

This conversation can be analyzed by applying the M-principle of GCI theory. The utterance 'se ki kore hobe' (how is it possible) has been uttered when Ratan asks the postmaster to take her with him. But by saying 'se ki kore hobe' (how is it possible?), the postmaster has responded in an unusual way because the usual way to respond is 'ha, ami toke niye jabo' ('yes, I will take you to my house') or 'na, ami toke niye jabona' ('no, I will not take you to my house'). So, from 'se ki kore hobe', we can infer the intended message that 'postmaster Ratan k niye jete onicchuk ebong eta kora tar jonne osommanjonok jehetu Ratan tar kajer meye' ('The postmaster is reluctant to take Ratan and it is disgraceful for him to do so as Ratan is his maidservant'). This is how the unusual utterances of Bangla conversation can be explained with the help of M-principle of GCI theory. **5. Discussion and Findings**

The primary purpose of this study is to look into the applicability and potentiality of Levinson's GCI theory in Bangla conversation. The analysis proves that the application of Levinson's GCI theory is usual in Bangla language. There has been a lot of pragmatical work in Bangla language most of which are on speech act (Arif, 2011; Khairunnahar, 2012; Kamal, 2018). Like speech act, pragmatical analysis of utterances can also be done with the help of Levinson's GCI. Even in terms of pragmatical importance or potentiality, GCI is indeed a better approach than of speech act. For justification, consider the following example -

Employee : sir, amake maf kore den
 sir me forgive
 'Sir, forgive me'

Boss : ami tomake **dekhe nibo**.
 I you see
 'I will see you'

According to the Speech Act Theory (Austin, 1962), speech act is an utterance that performs an action (like apology, greetings, invitation etc.) in communication. If we consider the above examples, the utterance of the employee depicts an action of 'apology' whereas the boss's utterance denotes an action of 'threat'. Therefore, the

'Speech Act Theory' will regard the former one as 'expressive act' and the latter one as 'commissive act'. However, GCI will infer the same meaning by dint of GCI's I-principle too. But, utterances, which are marked or told in an unusual way, cannot be explained by the Speech Act Theory.

Here, 'dekhe nibo' is a marked expression which has been told in an unusual way by the Boss. The usual way to respond is *maf kore dibo* 'I will forgive you' or *maf korbo na* 'I will not forgive you'. So, the utterance 'ami tomake dekhe nibo' (I will see you) has an intended message 'ami tomake maf korbona borong ekta uchit sikkha diye charbo' ('I will not forgive you, rather I will teach you a proper lesson'). And based on Levinson's principles (2000), this discussion is classified to M-Principle. So, this is the potentiality of GCI theory where Speech Act Theory delimits as M-principle of GCI has that potential to describe the marked or unusual expression effectively. Besides, it is an important finding that if there are serial verbs in the distribution of Bangla conversational utterances, then the M-principle is applicable in analyzing their implicit meanings.

However, some problems are also there relating to the principles of GCI. For instance,

Speaker 1 : tor ki **Nazrul** shona hoy?
 you do Nazrul listen
 'Do you listen Nazrul?'

Speaker 2: (i) haa, Nazrul er **kichu** gan shunechi.
 yes Nazrul of some song listen
 'Yes, I have listened some of Nazrul's song'

Or

Nazrul amar **nittosongi**
Nazrul my daily companion
'Nazrul is my daily companion'

Here, the utterance 'Nazrul' of speaker 1 has been considered as GCI under I- principle as 'Nazrul' implicates to 'Nazruler gan' ('songs of Nazrul'). But I-principle will no longer be yielded if the speaker 1 asks 'tor ki **Nazrul er gan** shona hoy' ('Do you listen the songs of

Nazrul?') instead of 'tor ki **Nazrul** shona hoy' ('Do you listen Nazrul?'). In the same way, if the speaker 2 replies 'Nazrul er sob gan shuni ni' ('I have not listened all of Nazrul's song') rather than 'Nazrul er **kichu** gan shunechi' ('I have listened some of Nazrul's song') then there is nothing to analyse under Q-principle as well because the speaker has already mentioned the strongest element sob 'all'. So, it is a promising finding of this research to mention that these principles work only when the speakers use a covert layer.

In this study, I have tried to find out the applicability of Q-, I-, and M-principles in a literal approach. But in a non-literal approach, it is also possible that the word structure of language can covert the applicability of these principles. For instance, if the speaker 2 gives the answer (ii) to speaker 1's question that '**Nazrul amar nittosongi**' (Nazrul is my daily companion), then a linguistic metaphor 'nittosongi' ('daily companion') emerges here. By I-principle analysis, we can easily understand that 'Nazrul' implicates 'Nazrul er kaj' ('Nazrul's work') therefore it is implied that Nazrul's work is his daily companion. But, in the same way, by following this I-principle, if we use our stereotypical knowledge, we will see that the term 'nittosongi' 'daily companion' is usually used in the case of humans or animates. But here the speaker has used it to imply Nazrul's works (songs or poems) as daily companion which is of course not the same thing. As a result, a contrasting situation has been evolved where the I-principle is no longer clear to explain which one is acceptable. So, when the utterances of conversation are in the literal approach (like Nazrul +> Nazrul er kaj) that is they are used in their usual or most basic sense without metaphor, the principle's applicability or the point of explanation is quite easy. But when we use figurative approaches like metaphor, simile or irony and when a different layer of meaning is accommodated, the principles work differently. So, another finding of this study includes the casual or literal approach of utterances in which the principles function effectively.

We liven up our conversation with figures of speech. Metaphor in particular makes speech more interesting and insightful by engaging our imagination. But the discussion regarding figures of speech by

Levinson's theory did not go too far. Although, this is the first article in Bangla language regarding the applicability of Levinson's GCI theory, further research can also be done to highlight those areas of discussion.

6. Conclusion

Several pragmatic studies have been carried out by different scholars (such as Arif, 2011; Khairunnahar, 2012; Kamal, 2018) in Bangla language but there has been no discussion about GCI theory so far. So, prioritizing the knowledge gap, I have tried to show the first discussion of this theory based on Bangla language. The aims of this study have shed light on how the principles of GCI theory can be applied in Bangla language and how effective this theory is to extract the underlying meaning of the utterances. The finding of this study shows that GCIs occur most frequently in the conversations of all fields such as in daily life, in talk-shows & social media, and even in the conversations of literature. As a result, this ultimately proves the fact that GCI theory has its application in Bangla language. Furthermore, the finding includes that these principles work clearly only when the speakers maintain a covert layer along with a casual setting. Besides, the principles are more effective when specific lexical distributions are present in the utterances. It has been found that GCI theory is potential because the Q-principle, I-principle, and M-principle of this theory have shown that they are more effective in explaining the implicature of utterances in more details than other theories like speech act.

However, there are enormous opportunities for the further study on GCI in case of Bangla Language. Future studies could fruitfully explore different issues of GCI in Bangla language like using GCI for figurative meaning of utterances, for intrusive constructions like negations, disjunctions, and comparatives of utterances, for the discussion of GCI-PCI distinction and so on. So, further research is needed relating to different aspects of GCI and with this study I wish to fill an important gap in the literature of Bangla pragmatics.

References

- Arif, H. (2011). Bengali Everyday Emblematic (BEE) hand gestures as communication acts: A pragmatic approach. An Unpublished PhD thesis. Berlin Technical University (TU, Berlin)
- Ameedi, R. A. (2013). Generalized Conversational Implicature in English and Arabic Religious Texts : A Contrastive Study. University of Babylon
- Ariel, J. (2008). *How Linguistics Matters to Philosophy: Presupposition, Truth, and Meaning*". MIT Press
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Betty, B. & Gregory, W. (2006). *Drawing the Boundaries of Meaning*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company
- Burton, R. (2005). 'Robyn Carston on semantics, pragmatics and "encoding"'. *Journal of Linguistics* 41: 398–407
- Carston, R. (2004). [Review of the book Presumptive Meanings: The theory of generalized conversational implicature, by Levinson, S. C.]. *Journal of Linguistics / Volume 40 / Issue 01 /March 2004*, pp 181 - 186 DOI: 10.1017/S0022226703272364
- Carston, R. & Powell, G. (2006). '*Relevance theory: new directions and developments*'. Oxford
- Chevallier, C., Wilson, D., Happé, F., and Noveck, I. (2010). *Scalar inferences in autism spectrum disorders*. *J. Autism Dev. Disord.* 40, 1104–1117.doi: 10.1007/s10803-0100960-8
- Cook, L. (2014). *Computing Scalar Implicatures*. University of Massachusetts Amherst
- Degen, J.(2015). Processing scalar implicature: a constraintbased approach. *Cogn. Sci.* 39
- Escandell, M. V. (2006). *Introducción a la Pragmática*, 2nd Edn. Barcelona:Ariel
- Grice, P. (1975)
- Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J.L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics: Speech acts* (pp..41-58). New York: Academic Press
- Grice, P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. In Cole, P. and Morgan, J. (eds.) *Syntax and Semantics*, Vol 3. New York: Academic Press
- Grundy, P. (2008). *Doing Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Horn, L. R. (2004). *Implicature*. Oxford: Blackwell
- Huang, Y. (2007). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Jaszczolt, M. & Katarzyna, P. (2018). "Defaults in Semantics and Pragmatics." In Edward N (Ed.) *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University

- Kamal, S. M. (2018). Contrastive Analysis of Various Speech Acts Events in English and Bangla. *The Millennium University Journal*,.www.themillenniumuniversity.edu.bd/ journal
- Kasmirli, M. (2016). *CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE : RE-ASSESSING THE GRICEAN FRAMEWORK*. The University of Sheffield
- Khairunnahar, K. (2012). Speech act theory of Austin: The nature of Bangla. *Arts Faculty Journal*, Dhaka University, 5(7): 77-88
- Levinson, S.C. (2000). *Presumptive Meanings the Theory of Generalized Conversational Implicature*. Cambridge. MA: MFF Press
- Maiska, K.P. (2013). *The Generalized Conversational Implicatures Analysis in Kartu As Advertisement*. Boston: Richard D. Irwin Inc.
- Pouscoulous, N., Noveck, I. A., Politzer, G., and Bastide, A. (2007). A developmental investigation of processing costs in implicature production. *Lang. Acquis.* 14, 347–375
- Posner, R. (1993). Humans as signs: Iconic and indexical. Papers from the Symposium on "Indexikala Tecken". University of Göteborg
- Saul, J. (2010). *Speaker-meaning, conversational implicature and calculability*. London
- Searle, J.R. (1969). *Speech Acts: an essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge:Cambridge University press
- Wilson, D. & Sperber, D. (2004). "Relevance Theory". In Horn and Ward 2004: 606–632. doi:10.1002/9780470756959.ch27

