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5.1 Observations
It emerges from the discussion above that implicatures occupy significant position in the communicative activity. These cross-sections of the novels illustrate several of the claims concerning the nature and the role of conversation in communicative activity made in the earlier chapters. If we assume that the conversations in 3.2.1 (i.e. cluster one in Chapter III) represent the general trend concerning the occurrence of conversations in this novel, or in fiction in general, we can make certain generalisations about the use and role of conversations in fiction. This unit represents the entire conversational activity as it occurs in section 1.1 of Vikram Seth’s novel A Suitable Boy. If we consider this opening section of the novel as representative of general trend in fiction, it becomes evident that conversational interaction occupies a considerable portion of almost every novel. For, of the total number of 1148 words in the actual passage, 730 words (i.e. 63.59 per cent of the total number of words) occur in the form of conversational interaction. Secondly, The conversations in cluster one illustrate how conversations, in general, are opportunistic rather than deterministic in nature; and how, despite the appearance of being diffused, unfocused and casual, a conversational interaction nonetheless is a purposive, goal directed, problem-solving activity. It illustrates how in face-to-face conversational interaction, several linguistic, non-linguistic and paralinguistic features (like the role and status of co-locutors, their mutual relations, shared cultural and contextual knowledge, world view, beliefs, understanding; parameters like time, place and surroundings, etc) play significant role in determining the course of conversation.

The conversation cluster 3.2.1 exhibits several typical features of face-to-face interaction, such as how the conversational goals may or may not be fixed right at the beginning of the interaction, how they might emerge opportunistically from the ongoing interaction. It reveals that a conversational interaction is an
interesting game in which participants may or may not adopt each other’s goals, or each one may be oriented to his/her own goal and strategically plan to prevent the other from dominating and imposing his/her goals against one’s own will. Again it shows how it is not necessary for a conversation to lead the issues being discussed to their final conclusion. The issues may be resolved or given up as untenable, or they maybe left open-ended for further resolution at an appropriate time. The strategies used for doing these things may include not responding at all, or giving casual responses, ignoring, diverting conversation to other contextually relevant issues, pointing out facts or making observations that might lead to change of topic, or simply joking about it and laugh the issue away, etc. This phenomenon allows for several insertions or insertion sequences. Certain issues tend to recur and dominate the conversation. These recurring issues mark the primary concerns of the interlocutors. Reactions to these are also peculiar and taken together they help the reader to build his impressions of the concerned characters and their interrelationships. Depending upon the urgency of the individual conversational goals and on the judgment concerning the feasibility or appropriacy of these goals, the interlocutors may return to the issues (goals) taken up earlier and try to assess the possibility of their progress towards the fulfilment of these goals. The recurrence of certain issues also exhibits the deeper motivations of characters. Here, for example, we see Mrs Rupa Mehra pursuing the issue of Lata marrying a boy of her choice to the last moment.

Just as the units in 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 present the domestic life in Indian families, units in 3.2.4 highlight the activities in the university circles. They depict the world of the academicians- their wishes and ambitions, concerns and apprehensions, rank-consciousness, rivalry, power politics, etc. This creates an illusion of an insider's view of the academic profile of the university education system with all its strengths and limitations. The general impression it leaves on the reader is that of a very unhealthy scenario of higher education. For here we come across the petty-mindedness of Professor Mishra and the other members of the Syllabus Committee opposing Pran’s proposal for inclusion of James Joyce
on the syllabus. It reveals the selfishness of the members manifesting in upholding and supporting the higher authorities in order to protect or safeguard their own personal or professional vested interests; despotism evident in the subtle pressurising and suppressive techniques Professor Mishra employs during and after the meeting; manipulative strategies employed by both the parties for gaining the support of the majority, Professor Mishra's so-called high regard for moral values and concern for the effect of the supposedly unhealthy writing on the minds of young and impressionable youth taking education there; his professed strict adherence to norms and criteria, etc. All this is loaded with oblique suggestions of essential hollowness of the whole system.

A study of conversational interaction in a novel can thus throw light on the nature of life depicted in the novel. Implicature analysis of a few selected passages here amply illustrates how the speaker-intended meaning finds expression in direct as well as indirect illocutions. In case of the indirect illocutions highlighted in the data for analyses, interactants are seen to bring their awareness of the general conversational principles and the expectations they generate and the interactional consequences they produce to bear upon their contextual knowledge of the speech situations and produce and interpret the indirectly communicated meaning without much of a problem. Such meaning could be effectively accounted for in terms of implicatures. In fact, a majority of utterances in almost every conversation taken up as data here are loaded with implicatures. It shows how these utterances carry much more meaning than what the sentences used as the vehicle entail or presuppose. This meaning can be deciphered only by means of implicature analysis. The assumptions, observations, and discoveries emerging from the different disciplines and their several approaches play a crucial role in this kind of analysis. They provide the analyst not only with insights and clues but also with effective tools and methods for implicature analysis.

The analyses of the randomly chosen conversational interactions scattered in the novel, reflecting parts of certain episodes reveal that much that occurs in the novel, as in real life situations, is expressed in conversations by way of
implicatures. The observations on the basis of the analysis of conversational interactions in chapter III and IV, to cite only a few instances, reveals the following facts about conversational interaction in fiction:

Implicatures in novelistic discourse come about in several ways, and could be classified as belonging to the different types specified in the analysis itself. And as stated in the theoretical framework, the speakers resort to different strategies of following, violating or flouting the various maxims and sub-maxims of the conversational principles depending upon the requirements of their goals. They are seen to exhibit explicit or tacit awareness of these principles and their maxims and sub-maxims by orienting their behaviour to them, and choosing their strategies that in their opinion best suit their purposes. They use these principles rationally to cope with the interactive situations - to adopt stances and adjust their positions with respect to each other.

It was found that in several cases a single utterance conveys a whole range of propositions. These propositions could be captured into the Gricean categories of (i) 'what is said', and (ii) 'what is implicated'. In implicature analysis 'what is said' serves as the vehicle, whereas the latter is the target meaning. For in linguistic communication in general, what is ultimately important is the speaker intended meaning. It was also found that in several cases the speaker's meaning is overtly encoded in the utterance itself. In such cases the process of utterance interpretation stops with the proposition derived by way of 'explicature'. In other words, the speaker-intended meaning in such utterances is identical with 'what is said'. However, in most utterances the speaker-intended meaning is at variance with 'what is said'. In such cases the implicated meaning is deciphered by making use of the conversational principles and the other apparatus required for the purpose of implicature analysis. In other words, it is derived by relating 'what is said' to the different maxims of the conversational principles using the context of the utterance as the link for developing propositions which serve as premises required for the reasoning process by means of heuristic analysis. The meaning so derived could be said to consist of a single proposition (often accompanied by an overlay of a number of other propositions) or of several
distinct and different propositions. Often it was found that whether the speaker meant the one or the other was not clear. Implicature analysis was, thus, a challenging activity, the challenge lying in giving a precise account of something that is very imprecise. For speakers’ intentions do range from very specific to the very vague propositions, and it was the latter type that posed problems for the analyses.

The interpretative activity, which is quick and spontaneous in actual communication, was seen here in slow motion, as it were. And it was found that this arguably helps to understand the process of communication. The ultimate aim of implicature analysis is to arrive at the communicative value of utterances used in communication. But the communicative value of utterances is a vast, multi-dimensional and slippery domain. For it covers propositions stating what is said as well as propositions containing a representation of what is communicated as distinct from what is said. Implicated meaning may arise from the use of expressions conventionally carrying some additional meaning apart from their strict logical sense. Mrs Mehra’s utterance at T-4 position in conversation 3.2.1.3, for example, contains expressions that carry such conventional implicatures. The words ‘but’ and ‘already’ here are loaded with conventional implicatures. The word ‘but’, for example, carries the conventional implicature of adverseness of the propositions expressing her wish and her inability to allow Aparna to stay with her. Similarly, the word ‘already’ in ‘She is so late already’ carries the conventional implicature that the situation at the time of the utterance should have been as it was expected by the speaker, viz. that the bride and the groom should have by now been ready for performing the marriage rites. However apart from such routinely implicated propositions, conversationalists also convey a large number of non-conventional implicatures as well. In the above said interaction, for example, Mrs Mehra’s utterance at T-8 position - ‘What is good enough for your sister is good enough for you’ seems to convey by way of non-conventional implicature a meaning that is not directly related to the expression proper. Mrs Mehra seems to suggest here that Savita followed her advice in the matter of marital alliance, and it was good for her; and
by the same logic she implicates that Lata also must allow her to choose a suitable husband for her and that it will be in her best interest. Such non-conventionally implicated propositions, since they arise from the interaction between what is said and the maxims of the conversational principles, are called as conversational implicatures. Lata laughs the suggestion away by deliberately overlooking the implicated proposition and taking it at its literal value, and thereby suggesting that it was impossible for both the sisters to marry the same man. This shows that a conversational interaction is a dynamic process involving generation and transfer of meaning at different levels. The entailed, presupposed, or conventionally implicated meanings do form a significant portion of the communicational content of a conversational interaction, but then more important and more challenging is the domain of meaning beyond this--the meaning conveyed by way of conversational implicatures. Such meaning is encoded and deciphered fairly accurately by interactants by bringing the context of the utterance and the expectations arising from generally observed rationality oriented principles of standard conversational interaction to bear upon what is actually said. The theoretical framework given in chapter two and three accounts for how this happens. The application of the implicature analyses model suggested therein is tested for its applicability for analysing conversations in chapter four and five. The analyses shows how implicated meaning is generated and retrieved by conversationalists using the pragmatic apparatus stated here.

The conversational interactions taken up for analyses reflect several features of conversation organisation discussed in the preceding chapters. They illustrate how conversation is a purposive, goal directed, problem-solving activity. The interactants use the framework of conversation to get things done. They communicate their feelings, thoughts, beliefs, opinions, and intentions by formulating their utterances such as they think appropriate to the given speech situation and thereby make the speech events serve their purposes. They adopt strategies like directness, indirectness, evasion, circumlocution, etc. as per the demands of the situations. They choose to cooperate, or withdraw from the cooperative principle. They adopt politeness strategies or use vituperative
language to achieve their goals. They perform Face saving, Face enhancing or Face threatening acts directly or indirectly for achieving the desired effects as they think would contribute to the fulfilment of their goals. A good deal of the conversational contribution is phatic in nature, and yet it significantly contributes to the maintaining of the fabric of amicable social relations for the speakers. They take turns - responding at appropriate junctures to the cues at relevant turn transition places, give preferred or dispreferred responses as they think they think necessary for the fulfilment of their cherished goals, ratifying or rectifying the understanding or interpretations of their co-locutors, and arrive at shared understandings of purported mutual perspectives, goals and intentions. The sequential organisation of these acts contribute in different ways and to different extents to the understanding and interpretation of their utterances.

The analyses reveal that participants in a conversation choose to follow or to violate the maxims of the conversational principles in view of their goals. Normally they abide by the dictates of the CP, but there are occasions where they are not keen on following the maxims. Conversation 4.2.9.1, for example, is an instance of Michael violating the second principle of the CP, viz. ‘Do not say that which you know or believe to be not true’. It marks a deliberate violation of the cooperative principle on the part of Michael. The woman on the telephone has got him on a wrong number. Michael fools her around for a long time till it dawns upon her that it might not after all be the party that she trying to get in touch with. After the realisation dawns upon her they quarrel about it. All that Michael seems to implicate here is that he wants the woman calling him to shut up her nonsense and not call him again on this number.

The interaction 4.2.2.1 illustrates how when the norms of politeness and cooperative interaction fail, interactants may refuse to cooperate and withdraw from the conversational activity altogether. Julia’s mother here refuses to talk to Michael on the telephone. She withdraws and hands over the phone to her husband. Even Julia’s father answers only a few of his queries out of politeness and courtesy. But then he also puts down the receiver, thereby implicating that he doesn’t want anything to do with Michael whatsoever and that Michael
should understand it and not phone him again. This clearly is a case of opting out of the CP. The interactants here avoid talking about the unpleasant subject of abortive love affair between Michael and Julia by implicating their desire to close the subject.

The analyses thus reveal how politeness principle plays important role in conversational interaction. The conversation 4.2.2.3.1 reveals how speakers use politeness strategies in face-to-face interaction. Politeness demands that the speaker be polite to the other who is present on the occasion rather than to the third person who is absent. While introducing the topic of his attachment to a woman Michael seems to place Julia above that woman in his estimate of the two. He could be paying her a face-enhancing compliment. Julia understands its implication and promptly suggests that Michael should not speak like that.

Conversation 4.2.2.3.2, however, illustrates how the initial polite exchange of information (in A above) gradually gives way to the expression of genuine feelings of grudge against each other. When politeness strategies fail to pay off and yield desired results, the interactants opt out of them in the interest of the fulfilment of their goals. Michael and Julia bear serious grudge against each other. Each holds the other to be responsible for the unfortunate turn of events in the past. Now that they are meeting after ten long years, they try to be polite to each other but since politeness forbids the use of face threatening acts like accusing and blaming, they soon opt out of it and start blaming and accusing each other and finally arrive at an understanding of mistakes on both sides and of the sufferings each has undergone due to serious misgivings. Both Michael and Julia seem to use assertive statements for implicating their rage and disapproval of the other’s behaviour.

Conversation 4.2.1.2.2 illustrates how the interactants express their feelings and views at the level of implicatures. and how implicitness helps them in avoiding bitterness and establishing rapport and amiable relationship. The suggestions, hints and insinuations are understood perfectly well by the target audience. and they arrive at a proper understanding without much offence to each other. The
subtle strategic use of implicatures here serves the function of minimising probable discord and encouraging mutual understanding.

Conversation 4.2.3.3.1 shows the growing tension in the teacher-student relationship between Michael and Virginie. They are cross with each other and express their crossness at the level of implicatures. Michael expressing his smouldering anger by way of his brief curt responses, and Virginie by way of feigned innocence about his feelings. She thus tries to avoid a probable hiatus. Similarly, conversation 4.2.3.3.2 illustrates how emotion management in day-to-day life of the characters in a novel effectively takes place at the level of implicatures. The characters here express their vexations and pacifications subtly using the indirect speech acts. The co-locutors realise that what is being said is said with an ulterior motive to achieve a different effect.

Similarly, Conversation 3.2.1.3 shows that Aparna's gestures at T-1 position and the gesture of annoyance on the part of Mrs Mehra at T-6 position, for example, illustrate how gestures form a meaningful part conversational interaction, and could be analysed and explained in terms of implicatures. As Grice observed, nothing might actually be said and yet the speaker makes as if to say and thereby implicate his intended meaning.

Similarly, conversation 3.2.8.2 illustrates how non-linguistic and paralinguistic cues accompanying the utterances serve to generate implicatures contrary to what is said. Here the two friends speak very little, and what they speak is not really very significant. But the depth of their feelings and their concern for each other, each one's misery for the other's suffering is effectively communicated by their acts, verbal or otherwise. And of course, as 3.2.8.4 shows Silence speaks more than words can express. Silence, by way marked absence of due forthcoming verbal response, expresses the awkwardness of the situation and thereby implicates the speaker's awareness of the dispreferred nature of the response and undertaking of the resulting consequences.

Similarly, implicatures due to hedged expressions serve to express awkward dispreferred responses. The implicature of Lata's utterance at T-13 in Conversation 3.2.5.4 shows how expresses her awareness that her implicating
that she was not in a position to give a preferred response at the moment is an awkward situation. It serves to avert the hiatus, by expressing her awareness of what the expected response should have been and her token desire to accord with it. For the interactants do laugh away the awkwardness of the suspended proposal in playful manner. Here directness would have had embittering consequences. She indefinitely postpones the decision to a future time without causing serious damage to their relationship.

The conversation 3.2.1.3 shows how unintentional transfer of meaning influences the course or direction of conversation. It also illustrates how vituperative strategies like scolding, bullying, commanding, forcing obedience, or imposing one's views, opinions or choices on others, etc are used to generate implicatures.

The interaction 3.2.3.3 illustrates how knowledge of context and cultural background plays important role in communication and how it is used by interactants for planning and interpretation of their utterances. It presents two different attitudes to keeping fasts cherished by persons with shared cultural background (incidentally, by two members of the same family). This accounts for the infinite variety of possible responses to one single thing, happening or event within the in-group members of one cultural entity.

Conversation 4.2.1.1 between Michael and the woman at the counter of a shop illustrates how the features of textual as well as extra-textual context interact in communicating the implied meaning. This interaction also illustrates how the failure to work out the speaker-intended meaning may result in miscommunication or communication gap.

As in Conversation 3.2.6.4, implicatures serve to express the speaker's psychological mindset and inward tensions. Haresh’s failure to decipher or infer the meaning implicated by Lata’s utterance at T-10 position results in serious miscommunication and leads to a hiatus threatening breakdown of further communication.

Conversation 3.2.1.3 may be said to exemplify how conversational activity proceeds both at the levels of direct and indirect speech acts, and how the direct
and indirect speech acts could in fact be better explained by using the framework of implicature analysis. Similarly, in Conversation 3.2.3.1 the direct speech acts from T-3 to T-6 positions could be explained in terms of explicatures which represent what in Grice’s framework is called as ‘what is said’, whereas the indirect speech acts in T-1 and T-2 positions could be explained in terms of implicated propositions. Incidentally, this also illustrates how features of conversational structure play important role in understanding and interpretation of utterances.

Conversation 3.2.7.1 shows how a great deal of communicational content is conveyed by way of hints and insinuations. Such insinuations are by nature what Grice called particularised implicatures. Such implicatures dwell heavily upon shared background knowledge. The interaction 3.2.2.2, on the contrary shows that in conversation it is possible that interlocutors may try to hide certain information from each other. And it is possible that interlocutors may pretend ignorance about the secret information their conversational partners do not wish them to know. Lata, here, may have some idea of what passed between Maan and his father just before they started talking. But she does not give out even the slightest clue about it.

The conversation 3.2.5.1, on the other hand, shows how generalised implicatures do not require as essential condition any foreknowledge of the circumstances. The generalised scalar implicature arising from Lata’s choice of the expression ‘thought’ rather than ‘knew’ implicates the change of state highlighting the contrast between the speaker postulated expectations and the new born knowledge of the actual state of affairs. It implicates what she had imagined to be the case was no longer true: that she no longer thinks that Kabir ever loved her intensely, and perhaps that now she knows that that never was, nor is, the case. The implicature becomes here a powerful vehicle for the expression of the speaker’s sense of frustration.

Where explicit statements would involve undertaking unwanted commitments and exposure to risks, implicatures seem to set the speaker free of such risks. Conversation 3.2.7.2, for example, shows how the courtesan Saeeda Bai
achieves the desired goal of alluring, influencing, and enchanting her admirers without undertaking any encumbering commitment on her part. Similarly, in conversation 3.2.6.3, speakers resort to strategic use of implicatures to avoid commitment to the implicated propositions.

Implicatures play an important role in the management of Face work. The face threatening acts on the part of Arun and The face saving acts of Haresh in Conversation 3.2.6.2 take place at the level of implicatures rather than at the level of obvious comments or overt statements.

Conversation 3.2.6.1 shows the speakers making very subtle use of implicatures for the purposes of Face-work. Interactants here choose to project or suppress information to generate implicatures that serve to perform the intended face-work. They try to achieve their goals by strategic use of Face threatening, Face saving or Face enhancing acts. Speakers generally resort to strategic use of implicatures for doing face work. In the conversational interaction 3.2.4.2, for example, Implicatures are effectively used for performing FTAs. On formal occasions speakers generally use implicatures for the purpose of conveying their opposition to the proposals or suggestions made by others, especially when the norms of social behaviour including level of formality required on the occasion, role and status relationship, etc demand politeness. The conversational interaction 3.2.4.4 shows how power politics manifests in more sophisticated or refined ways of speaking on formal occasions. It illustrates how subtle hints are conveyed, and are properly understood by the target audience, at the level of implicatures. Implicatures thus serve a very significant purpose in communication.

Similarly, conversation 4.2.1.2.1 also illustrates how conversationalists use their tacit knowledge of Face-work for performing Face Threatening Acts or Face-Saving or Face Enhancing Acts as appropriate to the occasion. The manoeuvre of Face-work here takes place at the level of implicatures.

Implicatures also serve an important role where the speaker is faced with a problem of expressing multi-dimensional, multi-faceted and complex meaning.
It is especially for this reason that literary artists are often tempted to use figurative language. Figurative language, by virtue of its very nature, is liberated from the fixed, static semantic core. It allows for, and in fact encourages, infinite speculation concerning associative meanings of the expressions used as vehicle. This makes such expressions richly suggestive along the desired dimensions. In conversation 3.2.5.2 Amit effectively expresses his highly complex experience of the creative act of writing a novel by using metaphors of the ‘banyan tree’ and the ‘Ganges’. He seems to implicate by way of the figurative expressions something highly complex about his own experiences of writing a novel. Incidentally, this conversation has the semblance of a direct interaction between the author and the reader where Amit seems to play the role of the author’s mouthpiece.

At a more remote level, the novelist uses implicating strategy for projecting the major issues, themes and leitmotifs in the novel. In 3.2.1, for example, we see the parents and children asserting their individuality independently by implicating in subtle ways their attitudes and aspirations. The parents, in their turn, adopt strategies to assert parental authority and to impose their views and choices on the children. Conversation 3.2.1.1 shows how interactants project and push forward their personal goals by implicating rather than explicitly stating them. Assertion of the personal goals in the face of opposition, or of the latent possibility of opposition, from the other side is effectively communicated by means of implicatures here. A similar interaction between the father and the son given in 3.2.2.1, and Mrs Mehra’s repeated remarks admonishing Lata and Varun to be guided by her choice in choosing the spouse taken together highlight the central concern of the main plot- parental concern and apprehensions for their children. The recurrent phenomenon of parents trying to impose their views and decisions on their children here illustrates how the novelist makes conscious and careful use of conversations for artistic purposes. The repetitive treatment of the theme brings it to the foreground as the leitmotif of the novel announced in the title of the novel. Mrs Rupa Mehra’s repeated insistence at T-4 in 3.2.1.2 that Lata obey her dictates and Lata’s successive attempts to avoid the maternal
imperative and to evade discussion on unwanted and undesirable subject at 1-5 position illustrate some of the common evasive strategies adopted by interlocutors in day-to-day conversations. Lata's utterance at 1-9 position here illustrates how a speaker may laugh an issue away. The interaction given in 3.2.2.2 shows the tendency on the part of Maan and Lata for not being bothered too much by the nagging of parents. It exemplifies the existence of certain general patterns of human behaviour. Here we have pairs of characters exhibiting same traits of behaviour. The elderly persons - Mrs Mehra and Mr Kapoor are vexed about the unruly behaviour of their children. Maan and Lata, on the other hand, tend to take their advice lightly. The reproaches of their parents do not seem to have much effect on them.

Conversation 3.2.6.3 reveals that in matters of great personal interest where things are uncertain and responses ambiguous, people strategically resort to implicatures for expressing their communicative import so that the target party gets the message and yet, due to the ambiguity of the expressions used, it accords the speaker a freedom from explicit commitment to the feelings expressed. Implicatures are the handy tool at the disposal of the speakers, as in 3.2.8.1, when it comes to the expression of fears and apprehensions.

The implicated propositions need not necessarily be the real beliefs of the speakers. The hearer may mistake them for the real ones because there is no way to verify the sincerity of the speaker's thoughts, feelings, beliefs or opinions other than what he purportedly implicates. Conversations 3.2.7.3 and 3.2.8.3 show how speakers may indicate by way of implicatures the propositions which they know, or at least believe, to be false, and yet may succeed in convincing the target audience that these were the speaker's real beliefs. Firoz's statement in the court as the chief witness in Maan versus Firoz case, for example, convinces the judge that the speaker implicated proposition is his true opinion, while at least the actual witnesses know it to be patent falsehood. Here even the judge, after examinations and cross-examinations, arrives at a conclusion which is only a speaker purported fact. It thus illustrates an important fact about implicatures which points at the limitations of implicature analysis. For in conversations it is
the speaker purported beliefs, and not the speaker’s real ones, that the hearer or the analyst arrives at as the implicated propositions. And there is no way to know what the speaker’s real feelings are. The interactants and the analyst, therefore, have to confine themselves to the speaker-implicated propositions. Conversation 3.2.6.1 shows how participants orient their behaviour to the conversational principles and the various maxims and sub-maxims for generating implicatures. The interaction 3.2.3.2, however, illustrates how interactants may at times adopt vituperative strategies to achieve their goals. It also illustrates how statements based on inadequate evidence may give rise to misconceptions or lead to misunderstandings. However such misunderstandings are cleared in the course of the ongoing interaction. This is made possible by virtue of the intersubjective architecture of understanding, which is a characteristic feature of face-to-face interaction.

The conversation 3.2.4.1 illustrates how Professor Mishra, with his outwardly polite and agreeable utterances, very subtly and shrewdly implicates his inclinations by apparently showing his consideration for Pran’s proposal. Sometimes, especially in the event of a possible unfavourable outcome, interactants do away with the garb of politeness and enter into arguments. When their patience gives out they may even withdraw from the CP and refuse to carry on the interaction. Conversation 4.2.3.4, for example, shows how interactants judge the situations and adjust their respective positions by drawing further inferences on the basis of what is implicated. Being suspicious, Virginie is here on a look out for evidence of the suspected fact of Michael’s relationship with some other woman. Michael’s evasive strategies provide Virginie with a probable ground to develop this evidence and lead her into inferring more than is probably implicated. She infers what is not supposed to be known and it hampers their relationship. In conversation 4.2.3.5, avoiding all the delicacy of implicitness, the pangs and agony of a broken heart manifest here in a direct talk. The conversation is in the nature of adjacency pairs of accusation and confession of guilt, giving rise to curses and apology and then the final breakdown - the severing of all ties between the interlocutors. The face threatening acts and the
face loss show themselves in their naked form here. The consequences are only too obvious.

Similarly, conversation 4.2.7.1 shows how emotional outrage on the part of Michael and Julia is expressed by words and acts carrying implicatures to that effect. Michael’s cold, cunning, scornful tone at T-2 position at once strikes as ironical and implicates his hatred for the other world of Julia’s preoccupation. It convinces her that he intends a serious harm to it. His crime is, therefore, unforgivable. It brings home the realisation that she cannot satisfy the demands of both the worlds. She must choose only one of them. And her behaviour after this incidence clearly shows that she has chosen the other.

5.2 Pedagogical Implications
A research activity is supposed to be dispassionate query leading to the ultimate truth concerning the topic under consideration. However, it has to have practical value as well. It has to be useful to the classroom activity in terms of the teaching and learning process. Apart from its abstract ideological value, a research has to have a pedagogical function.

Since the present research is concerned with analyses of conversational implicatures in fiction, the analytical framework developed here could be useful in the teaching and learning of Novel. Conversations do reflect the world of the novel with utmost clarity and precision, and provide almost epiphanic insights into the life and blood of its characters. It reveals the intricacies of human relations far better than even the most fluent, eloquent descriptions could ever succeed in doing. The pragmatic framework given here could mould the classroom teaching of novel by creating opportunities for interactive sessions where teachers and students could jointly venture into unraveling the mystery about the events depicted by analyzing the conversations pertaining to the relevant situations.

A literary artist is often very conscious and careful about the use of language. Form and presentation are, for him, the stylistic domain: and he uses them for aesthetic purposes. Conversational interaction is introduced in the narrative
design not simply for the sake of variety in the mode of expression. The novelist makes a purposeful use of subtle conversational devices in character delineation and in building up a complex socio-cultural network of relationships between characters. One can get at the heart of this complex network of relationships by exploring the conversational implicatures in a work of art. Since conversations are part of the aesthetic structure, and as they play important role in the artistic design and communicative value of the text, a study of conversations can yield substantial insight into the text. It can add to our understanding, appreciation and enjoyment of a literary text.

A study of conversational implicatures can throw light on the hidden agenda of the characters as well as on their political, religious, socio-cultural ethos. In fact it would not be a very tall claim to say that a study of conversational implicatures in a particular novel can help us to enter the psyche of the characters in that novel as well as that of their arbiter. It can certainly help in the unravelling of the mystery of a work of art. The contention here is that such a study facilitates our understanding of the thematic and structural aspects of a novel and thus leads to better appreciation of the work. It ultimately contributes to the final impression a work of art makes on the reader. It can be of use in understanding and appreciating the aesthetic value of the text. The model evolved here could thus be fruitfully used for analysing literary texts.

5.3 Future Research Possibilities

A study of conversational implicatures can yield significant insight into the functioning of language and into the very nature of human communication. Linguistic behaviour is an important clue for the understanding of a person or character in a literary work. A careful analysis of the choice of the topic of conversation, selection of words, phrases and expressions can throw substantial light on the personality of the speaker and his relationship with others. These features can be explored by systematically analysing conversations.

As has already been stated, conversation analysis is one of the most active and fastest developing areas in the study of language and communication. A study of
conversational implicatures can yield significant insight into the functioning of language and into the very nature of human communication. Linguistic behaviour is an important clue for the understanding of a person or character in a literary work. Conversations reveal not only the nature of a character but also the character's role and significance in the novel. They reveal, for example, whether the character is central or marginal in relation to the action of the novel, and they reveal the interpersonal relations among characters, or whether and how far a character is good, morally upright, active, social or otherwise. In short, a study of conversational interactions helps to unveil the very core of the novel— the life and culture depicted therein. The present thesis could not incorporate the conversational interactions in the novel in their entirety for want of space and due to other constraints. But it would, in fact, be a highly rewarding enterprise to explore the possibility. There are several possibilities in which it could be done. A researcher could, for example, take up a thematic approach and explore the intricate workings of different plots, or he could concentrate on character study by taking up one character in a novel at a time and, allotting it central position, analyse his conversational interactions with all other characters. Such analyses would certainly be useful for revealing the mysteries about the aesthetics of a literary artefact. Such an analysis would be more scientific by virtue of the authenticity and certainty of concrete evidence.