

Conversational Implicatures Performed By The Major Characters In Miller Earnest Hemingways ‘*The Sun Also Rises*’

Marsuki¹, Nurwakhid Mulyono²

¹Department of English Language Education,

² Department of Indonesian Language and Art Education of Teachers’ Training College Budi Utomo Malang
East Java Indonesia

Corresponding Author: Marsuki

Abstract: Conversational implicature as the most frequently discussed topic in Pragmatics is the implication as an implied meaning conveyed indirectly, and understood implicitly without ever being explicitly stated. The purpose of the research is to describe how the conversational implicatures are conveyed by the major characters within their communication and what types of implicatures are found in their utterances in the novel *The Sun Also Rises*. To support this study, the theoretical framework from Grice developed by Gazdar and Levinson was used to focus the analysis. In addition, the content analysis study with qualitative approach was conducted to analyse the content of the major characters’ utterances as the data of the study in Hemingway’s *The Sun Also Rises*. Based on the data analysis, it was found that the three major characters, Jake, Brett, and Cohn productively and actively implicated their utterances aiming at informing, convincing, advising or recommending, asking or requesting, accusing, believing, rejecting, forcing, telling a lie, forbidding, and mocking their hearers. The conversational implicatures uttered by major characters covered particularized and generalized conversational implicatures consisting of scalar and clausal implicatures which are compatible with theories of Grice developed by Gazdar and Levinson while they were conversing with their hearers.

Keywords: conversational implicatures, particularized, generalized, major characters, Pragmatics

Date of Submission: 23-09-2017

Date of acceptance: 18-10-2017

I. Introduction

Language is a part of human cultures containing communication or information system, the functions of which might be transactional and interactional. The common systems which the human beings communicate in language involve three main aspects: sound, meaning, and function which are interrelated among each other to transfer their thoughts, feelings, and needs in their communication. Therefore, the use of a language for people does not get rid of context and situation. It is Pragmatics as the study of the use and meaning of utterances to their situation which nowadays has become more and more important concern today.

The most salient issue in pragmatics which most people are talking about and is frequently found in daily conversation is conversational implicature which is defined as an implied meaning conveyed indirectly or through hints, and understood implicitly without ever being explicitly stated (Grundy, 2000, Davis, 2010, Mustafa (2010) and Wang, 2011). In addition, Crystal (1997) completed the concept of conversational implicature as the implication which can be deduced from the form of an utterance on the basis of certain cooperative which governs the efficiency and normal acceptability of conversation. For example, when the sentence or utterance *There’s some chalk on the floor* can be interpreted to mean ‘*you ought to pick it up*’, which depends on the context. Another example is an utterance conveyed by a low-motivated student who is attending a lecture in the classroom. What he said was such as *I looked at my watch after two hours and realised that only twenty minutes had passed*. Although the student did not say explicitly that the lecture was boring or made him sleepy, someone will understand on the basis of the context.

The concept of conversational implicatures which consist of particularized and generalized ones originated from Grice’s theory of cooperative principles elaborating maxims of conversation through which the conversational implicatures could be developed. Therefore, it seems obvious that nowadays the conversational implicature belong to an interesting topic and issue to discuss through the scientific forums of either local or global levels. Moreover, it has made a lot of people eager to conduct researches to know how it is described and distributed through human utterances, conversation, dialog, and speech found in real lives, novels, printed, and electronic media. Some researches having conducted in accordance with conversational implicatures are those conducted by Wang (2011) towards the students’ competence of conversational implicatures through listening, Abdelhavez (2016) to investigate the effect of instruction of conversational implicature to the students’ English

proficiency. In addition, Inayati, et al (2016) and Mustafa (2010) researched conversational implicatures towards drama serial entitled 'Gilmore Girls' and some journalist texts respectively. In this research, to describe the conversational implicatures within the interactional language communicated, the study involves the outstanding classic novel *The Sun Also Rises* as one of Hemingway's big novel which is linguistically and literarily chosen as the object of the study on the basis of considerations.

On the basis of the descriptive analysis above, the purpose of the study is to describe (1) how the conversational implicatures are uttered or conveyed by the major characters within their communication with someone else and (2) What types of implicatures are found in their utterances in the novel *The Sun Also Rises*. The results of the study are expected to be beneficial to study pragmatics and semantics more holistically generally in any language in the world and specifically in English language either in linguistic, literary, or education programs at university. Besides, it is expected that the study can enrich linguistics as the scientific study of language especially at the levels of meaning and function of languages.

II. Theoretical Review

2.1 Conversational Implicatures

The section covers definition or concept and advantages or functions of conversational implicatures performed during communicating a language either in spoken and written communication. The description of both might be as follows.

2.1.1 Definition of Conversational Implicatures

The notion of conversational implicature is one of the single most important ideas in pragmatics as the study of how the language is used in the right context. As explained above, there have been a lot of concepts defined by linguists and pragmaticists which principally refer to the same point of view. For examples, conversational implicature is defined as an implied meaning conveyed indirectly or through hints, and understood implicitly without ever being explicitly stated (Grundy, 2000). Meanwhile, Grice (1975) said that conversational implicature is what a participant can imply, suggest, mean, etc. as distinct what a participant literally says. Besides, Crystal (1997) strengthens Grice's idea by defining implicature as the implication which can be deduced from the form of an utterance on the basis of certain cooperative principle which govern the efficiency and normal acceptability of conversation. Also, Wang (2011) and Davis (2010) restricted conversational implicature as something which is implied in conversation, that is, something which is left implicit in actual language use. It is a special case of situations in which the perceived meaning extends beyond the literal meaning. In this case, the conversational implicature is the use of utterance to imply meaning during a conversation which can be perceived through the context. There are at least three types of contexts to be considered to help understand conversational implicature, namely deictic context, speech act context, and implicature context. In the case of deixis, the context helps hearer to resolve matters of reference, and in the case of speech acts to determine the speaker's intention. In the case of implicature, the context helps hearer to determine what is implicitly conveyed but not explicitly stated by the speaker.

2.1.2 Advantages of Conversational Implicatures

The concept of conversational implicature contributes and provides some advantages in recent work of pragmatics in the following ways. First, implicature stands as a paradigmatic example of the nature and power of pragmatic explanation of linguistic phenomena. The sources of this species of pragmatic inference can be shown to lie outside the organisation of language, in some general principles for cooperative interaction, and yet these principles have a pervasive effect upon the structure of language.

Second, implicature provides some explicit account of how it is possible to mean more than what is actually said. Consider the following examples:

Postmaster : It's a nice morning, isn't it?
John : not bad
Postmaster : It'll be better at one o'clock.

The last utterance conveyed by the postmaster may implicate the certain meaning through the context available. Since the post office closes at one in the afternoon, the utterance implies that the postmaster will be happier if his office is closed and he may go home. Another example is an utterance conveyed by a low-motivated student who is attending a lecture in the classroom. Thus, the notion of implicature promises to bridge the gap, by giving some account of how at least the utterances above are effectively conveyed.

To get more deeply comprehensible notion of implicature in verbal communication, the sample of utterance as also quoted in *The Sun Also Rises* such as *Wasn't the town nice at night* (Hemingway, 1926:8) has different conversational implicature. If someone says this utterance to his friend who has him leave the town, it

may count as a way of excusing that the speaker likes to stay a lot in that town, namely Paris as the capital of France. On the other hand, if the utterance is spoken to his friend who dislikes to stay in the town, it might signify that the speaker persuades his obstinate friend not to go anywhere else because the town can give a lot of joy and comfort or perhaps can be interpreted as a hint that the hearer is a stupid man of poor experience because the hearer hates the town.

Also the utterance above implicates irony which is clearly opposite to the literal or real meaning. To interpret the example of the utterance above, someone does not only use syntax and semantics which are associated to the analysis of the relationship among the linguistic elements such as sentences, clauses, phrases as well as their meanings but also really requires pragmatics as one of the linguistic branches explaining how the language is used by context. Therefore, the example of utterance above gives the fact that speakers and hearers involving in communicative events need to know how to use the language in the right context. In addition, they should have communicative competencies in which communicative events occur.

Third, implicature seems to be simply essential if various basic facts about language are to be accounted for properly. For example, particles like *well, anyway, by the way* require some meaning specification in a theory of meaning just like all the other words in English. Therefore, the meaning of those particles might be found by referring to the pragmatic mechanism that produce implicatures (Levinson, 1983:100).

2.2 Theory of Conversational Implicatures

The original ideas of conversational implicature were proposed by the linguistic philosopher Paul Grice in the William James lectures delivered at Harvard in 1967 (Levinson, 1983: 100). Grice at first distinguished between what he calls *natural meaning*, and *non-natural meaning* or *meaning-*nn**. Further, these natural meaning is developed and become sentence meaning and entailment which means what is literally said or entailed. Conversely, the non-natural meaning then becomes speaker meaning and implicature which means what is conversationally implicated. To strengthen his theory, Grice (in Levinson,1985:16) gives the following characterization of *meaning-*nn**.

S meant –*nn z* by uttering *U* if and only if:

(1) *S* intended *U* to cause some effects *z* in recipient *H*

(2) *S* intended (1) to be achieved simply by *H* recognizing that intention (1)

Here, *S* stands for speaker; *H* for hearer, or more accurately, the intended recipient; uttering *U* for utterance of linguistic token, namely a sentence part, sentence, or string of sentences or sentence parts and *z* for some belief or volition invoked in *H*.

It is concluded that communication consists of speaker intending to cause the hearer to think or to do something, just by getting the hearer to recognize that the speaker is trying to cause that thought or action.

An example of both natural and non-natural meanings might be shown in the following utterance: *Do you really have to go?* This utterance can be interpreted as the natural meaning in the sense that the speaker asks if the hearer really leaves the town (Paris) or not. This kind of meaning is called natural meaning, sentence meaning or entailment :a meaning that is present on every occasion when an expression occurs. Unlike the previous meaning, the non-natural meaning is variable and on different occasion, an utterance *Do you really have to go?* could convey the meaning that the hearer still become an obstinate and stupid man. This kind of meaning is categorised into non-natural meaning, speaker meaning or implicature: any meaning that is implied, namely conveyed indirectly or through hints, and understood implicitly without ever being explicitly stated.

2.3 Types of Conversational Implicatures

As said above, the origin of conversational implicature originated Paul Grice through his theory of cooperative principle, in which the conversational implicature was developed at the time. He identified as guidelines of this sort four basic maxims of conversation or general principles underlying the efficient cooperative use of language, which jointly express a general cooperative principle (CP) containing the maxims of quality, quantity, relevance, and manner. To advocate the theory, Grice also made a distinction between types of conversational implicature to be particularized and generalized conversational implicatures. He defined particularized conversational implicatures as those that require specific context and generalized implicatures as those arise irrespective of the context in which they occur (without any particular context or special scenario being necessary).

2.3.1 Particularized Conversational Implicatures

As having explained above, particularized conversational implicatures are those which need context to understand an utterance in language (Grice, 1975, Grundy, 2000, Davis, 2010, Kasmirli, 2016). The context can be understood in various ways which include relevant aspects of the physical or social setting of an utterance. More specifically, context is considered to be any background knowledge assumed to be shared by speaker and hearer and which contributes to hearer's interpretation of what speaker means by a given utterance (Leech,

1983:13). The context of an utterance in the form of the physical or social setting is one of the aspects of speech situation thoroughly consisting of (1) speaker and hearer, (2) context of an utterance, (3) goals of an utterance, and (4) speech act. Of the description above, it can be summed up that particularized conversational implicature is an utterance or conversation which contains an implied meaning conveyed indirectly or through hints, and understood implicitly without ever being explicitly stated with specific context.

The conversation between A and B below is an example of utterance which shows an implied meaning understood implicitly without ever being explicitly stated with specific context.

A. I am out of petrol.

B. There is a garage round the corner

Implicature: The garage is or perhaps open and sells petrol round the corner.

In the conversation above, A stands by immobilized car says to B that his car stalls because of out of petrol. The situation when A says to B with immobilized car out of petrol is obviously a physical context which gives an understanding in the fact that A wants to get any petrol or to find where the petrol station is, to make his car go. Consequently, B just says *There is a garage round the corner* which conversationally implicates that *The garage is or perhaps open and sells petrol round the corner*. The conversation between A and B above goes well because both of them as a speaker and hearer share any background knowledge which help to contribute to hearer's interpretation of what speaker means by a given utterance.

2.3.2 Generalized Conversational Implicatures

Generalized implicatures are defined as those that arise irrespective of the context in which they occur without any particular context or special scenario being necessary (Grice, 1975, Grundy, 2000, Davis, 2010, Murphy, 2013, Kasmirli, 2016). These types of context-free implicatures are usually found from quantity implicatures such as:

Some students will visit the museum tomorrow

GI: Not all students will visit the museum tomorrow

The utterance above always implicates the same generalized implicature (*some = not all*) no matter what context.

Meanwhile, Gazdar (1979) develops Grice's generalized conversational implicature into what he calls *scalar* and *clausal* implicatures. Scalar implicature is an inference which is produced through the linguistic scales which contain a set of linguistic alternates, or contrastive expressions of the same grammatical category, which can be arranged in a linear order by degree of informativeness or semantic strength (Levinson, 1983). Such a scale will have the general form of an ordered set (indicated by angled brackets) of linguistic expressions or scalar predicates, $e_1, e_2, e_3, \dots, e_n$, as in $\langle e_1, e_2, e_3, \dots, e_n \rangle$ where e_1 or e_2 , etc. are substituted in frame A, the well-formed sentences $A\langle e_1 \rangle$, $A\langle e_2 \rangle$, etc. are obtained; and where $A\langle e_1 \rangle$ entails $A\langle e_2 \rangle$, $A\langle e_2 \rangle$ entails $A\langle e_3 \rangle$, but not vice versa. For example, take the English quantifier all and some. These form an implicational scale $\langle \text{all}, \text{some} \rangle$ because any sentence like (1) entails (2), but not versa:

1. All of the students visited me
2. Some of the students visited me

Implicature: Not all the students visited me

Based on any such scale, there is a predictive rule for deriving a set of quantity implicatures, namely if a speaker asserts that a lower or weaker point (i.e. a rightwards item in the ordered set of alternates) on a scale obtains, then he implicates that a higher or stronger point (leftwards in the ordered set) does not obtain. Thus, if the speaker asserts sentence (2), one conversationally implicates that **not all the students visited me**. Gazdar (in Levinson, 1983: 133) formulates a rule for deriving scalar implicature from scalar predicates:

Scalar implicature: Given any scale of the form $\langle e_1, e_2, e_3, \dots, e_n \rangle$, if a speaker asserts $A(e_1)$, then he implicates $\sim A(e_2)$, if he asserts $A(e_3)$, then he implicates $\sim A(e_2)$ and $\sim A(e_1)$, and in general, if he asserts $A(e_n)$, then he implicates $\sim (A(e_{n-1}))$, $\sim (A(e_{n-2}))$ and so on, up to $\sim (A(e_1))$. The other scales consisting of a set of linguistic alternates are as follows:

<p>(1) <i>Entailment scales</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <all, most, many, some, few> • <and, or> • <n,...5, 4, 3, 2, 1> • <excellent, good> • <hot, warm> • <cold, cool> • <love, like> • <always, often, sometimes> 	<p>(2) <i>Negative scale</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <none, not all> 	<p>(3) <i>Non-entailment scales</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <succeed in Ving, try to V, want to V> • <necessarily p, p, possibly p> • <certain that p, probable that p, possible that p> • <must, should, may> • <yellow, red, while, blue,>
---	--	---

Table 2.3.2: A set of Linguistic Alternates of Scalar Implicature

The example of entailment scales can be indicated such as sentence *X is hot* which entails *X is warm*. Consequently the terms form a scale <*hot, warm*>. Thus to say *X is warm* conversationally *X is not hot*.

By contrast, clausal implicature, that is to say, the implicature which derives from the complex sentence containing the main clause (*P* means that the speaker doesn't know) and embedded sentence or sub-clause (*p/q* means whether *p* or *q* is true or not). In line with this clausal implicature, Gazdar says that if speaker (*S*) asserts some complex expression *p* which contains embedded sentences *q*, and *p* neither entails or presupposes *q*, then by asserting *p*, the speaker (*S*) implicates that he doesn't know (*P*) whether *q* is true or false, i.e. he implicates [*Pq, P ~ q*]. Consider the example below:

I believe John will get married.

Clausal implicature: I don't know whether John will get married or won't (John may get married or may not get married).

To identify the clausal implicature, Gazdar (in Levinson,1983:137) makes the construction of the stronger and weaker forms as follows:

(a) <i>stronger form</i>	(b). <i>weaker form</i>	(c) <i>implicature of (b)</i>
'p and q'	'p or q'	[Pp, P ~ p, Pq, P ~ q]
'since p, q'	'if p then q'	[Pp, P ~ p, Pq, P ~ q]
'a knows p'	'a believes p'	[Pp, P ~ p]
'a realized p'	'a thought p'	[Pp, P ~ p]
'a revealed p'	'a said p'	[Pp, P ~ p]
'necessarily p'	'possibly p'	[Pp, P ~ p]

Note:

- P : main clause (meaning "the speaker doesn't know that p)
- p/q : the proposition
- ~ : Not

Sometimes, the utterance can have both scalar and clausal implicature such as in the following utterance:

Possibly, the president is away

SI : Not necessarily, the president is away

CI : (I don't know) the president may be away or the president may not

III. Method of the Study

This study is categorized into a *content analysis study* which analyses the content of the existing corpus of the major characters' utterances in Hemingway's *The Sun Also Rises* in accordance with the conversational implicatures within an interactional language communication by the major characters. On the basis of the approach, this study belongs to a *qualitative research* since it refers to the meanings, concepts, definitions, characteristics, metaphors, symbols, and description of things (Berg, 1988:2). The analysis of the major characters' utterances in novel *The Sun Also Rises* is specifically focussed on Gricean theory of conversational implicatures which then were developed by Gazdar (1979) especially in generalized conversational implicatures.

The data of this study are the major characters' utterances which were analysed on the basis of the conversational implicatures uttered by the major characters in one of Earnest Miller Hemingway's outstanding novels *The Sun Also Rises*. The characters of the study are focused on three major characters in *The Sun Also Rises* namely, (1) *Jake Barnes*, an American veteran of World War I, a narrator and protagonist of the novel, (2) *Lady Brett Ashley*, a beautiful British socialite who drank heavily, (3) *Robert Cohn*, a wealthy American writer living in Paris.

The key instruments of the study are the researchers which spent a lot of time reading and understanding the novel, collecting the major characters' utterances, and then identifying, analysing, and interpreting the data based on the research problems. When the data were collected, they then were analysed by using Mile's and Huberman's data analysis the components of which involve data reduction, data display, data analysis and conclusion (drawing/verifying). There are nineteen chapters in *The Sun Also Rises*. To make the data analysis easy, the data codification is taken in the study. For example, the code of [VIII/5-10/J/C] means that it is chapter VIII from utterances 5 to 10 spoken by the major characters Jake Barnes (J) and Robert Cohn (C).

IV. Result and Discussion of the Study

Based on the data analysis, the section exposes the results one after the other in accordance with the problems of the study which involve the description of (1) conversational implicatures uttered or conveyed by the major characters, and (2) types of implicatures found in the major characters in the novel *The Sun Also Rises*. The findings or results are exposed by showing the data containing conversations or utterances performed by the major characters and then finally discussed in detailed on the basis of the theoretical frameworks of the conversational implicatures.

4.1 The Conversational Implicatures Uttered by the Major Characters

Through the detailed analysis, there are a lot of conversational implicatures performed by the major characters as the implication which can be deduced from the form of an utterance, on the basis of certain cooperative which governs the efficiency and normal acceptability of conversation. The three major characters, (1) Jake Barnes (Jake), an American veteran of World War I, a narrator and protagonist of the novel, (2) Lady Brett Ashley, a beautiful British socialite who drank heavily, and (3) Robert Cohn (Cohn), a wealthy American writer living in Paris while communicating or conversing among each other used utterances to imply certain meaning during a conversation. The conversational implicatures uttered by the major characters aimed at (1) informing, (2) convincing, (3) advising or recommending, (4) asking or requesting, (5) accusing, (6) believing, (7) rejecting, (8) forcing, (9) telling a lie, (10) forbidding, and (11) mocking as shown in the following ways.

4.1.1 Data [II/40-44/C/J]

Cohn : "Well, I want to go to South America."(40)

Jake : "Listen, Robert, going to another country doesn't make any difference. I've tried all that. You can get away from yourself by moving from one place to another. There's nothing to that".(41)

Cohn : "But you've never been to South America."(42)

Jake : "South America hell! If you went there the way you feel now it would be exactly the same. This is a good town. Why don't you start living your life in Paris?"(43)

Cohn : "I'm sick of Paris, and I'm sick of Quarter."(44)

Cohn's Implicature (40 : *I don't tell you a lie, Jake that I intend to go to South America. and 42)*

Jake's Implicature (41 : *I believe that your going anywhere will give no change in your life and profession because a new place will not cure your boredom and disillusion. You won't get good success and real happiness by moving from one place to another).*

The conversation fraction above took place between two major characters: Jake Barnes, a narrator and protagonist and Robert Cohn, an antagonist of the story who was biographically born to a wealthy Jewish family in New York. Cohn was married very soon after his graduation on the rebound from his unhappy college experience, and after five years, his wife left him. After the divorce, he moved to California and then began spending time with a literary crowd soon backing a magazine. During in California, Cohn became get involved with Frances Clyne, a manipulative status seeker. When his magazine failed, Frances convinced him to take her to Paris to join the post-war crowd of expatriate. During his time in Paris, Cohn has a few friends, one of whom is Jake, takes up his writing, and finishes a novel.

Of the story, Cohn just came from New York and brought a lot of success from the city. Having a lot of money, he forced himself and insisted on going to South America, consequently. The utterance (40) above indicates that Cohn's going to South America was a serious and real statement which went out of his conscience without any pretence although in some ways his going for a trip to South America had some certain purposes to achieve. So Cohn's utterance above implicates that he really informed and did not pretend that he intended to go to South America (**Cohn's implicature**: *I don't tell you a lie, Jake that I intend to go to South America*).

Jake's answering Cohn's statement to go to South America was principally based upon his belief, experience, and knowledge. Consequently, Jake in an implicit way implicates that Cohn's going to South America would be useless meaning that it wouldn't get success overthere. In this case, Jake's implication was to advice, forbid, and convince Cohn not to go to South America because Cohn's going would be useless. In addition, Jake mocked Cohn because he was an obstinate man (**Jake's implicature**: *I believe that your going anywhere will give no change in your life and profession because a new place will not cure your boredom and disillusion. You won't get good success and real happiness by moving from one place to another*). Jake's remark gave some wise suggestion to Cohn with adequate evidence, fact, and logical reasons through his utterance (41) above. It seems obvious that Jake so really knew who Cohn was and what he wanted to go to South America. In fact, the reasons why Cohn intended to go South America are based on the following: (1) He has written a book and found a publisher there, (2) He had sufficient money to finance the trip, (3) He was getting bored staying in Paris and curious about another continent making a date with beautiful girls and forgetting his girl friend, Frances easily.

4.1.2 Data [III/68-74/B/J]

- Brett : "What possessed you to bring her?"(68)
Jake : "I don't know, I just brought her."(69)
Brett : "You're getting dammed romantic."(70)
Jake : "No, bored."(71)
Brett : "Now?"(72)
Jake : "No, not now."(73)
Brett : "Let's get out of here. She's well taken care of."(74)
Brett's Implicature (68) : *I don't really know and ask you what has made you get involved with her , Jake*
Brett's Implicature (70) : *I'm sure you really are enjoying something with Georgette, Jake.*
Jake's Implicature (73) : *I really say that I am not getting bored anymore when I have met you now, darling*

The quotation of conversation above was uttered by two major characters, Jake Barnes and Brett Ashley. Jake was a young American expatriate working in a Paris newspaper as a journalist. He was a veteran of World War I and had an injury which made him impotent. He loved Brett, with whom he developed a relationship in the hospital during the war, but unfortunately he could not have her because of his physical condition. Meanwhile, Lady Brett Ashley was a thirty-four-year-old English woman who was beautiful and emotionally scarred. She had an innocent love affair when she was a volunteer nurse in the war, but ever since her young soldier died, and consequently had drifted from one worthless man to another. Her husband, a British Lord from whom she was separated, gave her title, but also finally made her sleep on the floor and more than once threatened her with a gun. Both Jake and Brett were two of the lost generations since they became psychologically, physically, and morally lost of the war.

The conversation fraction above is taking place in the club where a lot of people and their friends were having a good time drinking and dancing together. To begin with, a prostitute named Georgette walked past and caught Jake, and then joined him when Jake was taking a seat in a café of club. They were getting into talking about something in terms of their life and experience. When Georgette was invited by a certain group of people to dance, Brett in a few minutes came up to the bar approaching Jake and then dancing together. They finally passed close to Georgette dancing with another one of them.

Of the conversation above Brett implicated that she didn't really know and finally asked Jake what had made him get involved with Georgette (**Brett's implicature**: *I don't really know and ask you what has made you get involved with her , Jake*). Jake's response on the utterance (69) above implies that his taking Georgette in the bar was just for fun, made friends with her, and cured his boredom and loneliness as such. This reason can be looked at on his utterance (71) which answers that Jake was getting bored when Brett hinted at Jake sarcastically on the utterance (70). Thus, the utterance above implicates that Brett did not know exactly and that is why she asked Jake whether he was still getting bored after his meeting her at that time (**Brett's implicature**: *I'm sure you really are enjoying something with Georgette, Jake.*). In the same way, the utterance (73) is a serious response which implicates that Jake was not getting bored anymore at that time (**Jake's implicature**: *I really say that I am not getting bored anymore when I have met you now, darling*).

Of the conversational implicatures implied above through the context, it is obvious that Brett aimed at asking by accusing and suspecting Jake that he had love affair with Georgette. Nevertheless, Jake really rejected Brett's accusation and suspect to Jake and said he really love Brett.

4.1.3 Data [III/113-118/C/B/J]

- Cohn : “Will you dance this with me, Lady Brett?” (113)
Brett : “I’ve promised to dance this with Jacob.(laughing) You’ve a hell of a biblical name, Jake.” (114)
Cohn : “How about the next?” (115)
Brett : “We’re going. We’ve a date up at Montmartre.” (116)
Jake : “You’ve made a new one there.” (117)
Brett : “Don’t talk about it. Poor chap. I never knew it till just now.” (118)
Brett’s Implicature : *I wouldn’t like to dance with you, Cohn* (114)
Cohn’s Implicature : *I still want to dance with you Brett eventhough you have danced with Jake* (115)
Brett’s Implicature : *I still wouldn’t like to dance with you, Cohn* (116)
Jake’s Implicature : *You tell a lie Brett that you have a new boy friend* (117)
Brett’s Implicature : *You may not talk about dancing with Cohn, Jake* (118)

The conversation fraction above was taking place where Jake, Brett, Cohn, and her friends were dancing in the club. The club was hot and crowded. Lady Brett Ashley arrived with a crowd of callow young men wearing a slipover jersey sweater and tweed shirt, and her hair was brushed back like a boy’s. Cohn asked Jake to go for a drink, and Brett joined them. Cohn immediately became infatuated with her, and tried successfully to persuade her to dance with him. Brett’s saying that she promised to dance with Jake as a matter of fact was her polite refusal to Cohn because both Brett and Jake didn’t make a promise before, although she finally danced with Jake as well. Based on the analysis, the first utterance (114) implicates that Brett wouldn’t like to dance with Cohn. In this way, Brett implicated to reject Cohn to dance with her (**Brett’s implicature: I wouldn’t like to dance with you, Cohn**). The implicature may be understood from the context when Brett smiles at Cohn saying her second utterance (114) laughing at Jake as the signal of her ironical statement to Cohn because she had exploited her utterance with a sense of ironical statement (litotes), namely “You’ve a hell of a Biblical name, Jake. This utterance literally implies “you’ve a very good Biblical name, Jake. But this ironical understatement (litotes) which emphasizes the contrary in effect refers to Cohn to whom Brett is very cynical. As a result, Brett implicated that Jake had a funny or strange friend (**Brett’s implicature: “You have a funny (strange) friend, Jake**).

Nevertheles, seen of the context of utterance (115), Cohn seemed to still force himself so as to dance with Brett after she had danced with Jake because Cohn really fell in love with Brett. Of the utterance of 115, Cohn implicated that he still wanted to dance with Brett eventhough she had danced with Jake (**Cohn’s implicature: I still want to dance with you Brett eventhough you have danced with Jake**). Unfortunately, of the utterance of 116, Brett did refuse Cohn’s request to dance with her by telling a lie that she had a date with someone (**Brett’s implicature: I still wouldn’t like to dance with you, Cohn**). Brett’s telling a lie proved true of Jake’s utterance (118) which implicated that Brett told a lie that she had new boyfriend (**Jake implicature: You tell a lie Brett that you have a new boy friend**). In this case, through the utterance of 118, Brett had Jake not to talk about dancing with Cohn because she didn’t like it very much (**Brett’s implicature: You may not talk about dancing with Cohn, Jake**).

The conversational implicatures uttered by the three major characters of novel *The Sun Also Rises* as shown of the data above contain meanings implied in what they said. In other words, their utterances have implied meanings conveyed indirectly or through hints, and understood implicitly without ever being explicitly stated (Grundy, 2000). Also, Wang (2011) and Davis (2010) restricted conversational implicature as something which is implied in conversation, that is, something which is left implicit in actual language use. It is a special case of situations in which the perceived meaning extends beyond the literal meaning As Grice (1975) originally defined conversational implicature as what a participant can imply, suggest, mean, etc. as distinct what a participant literally says, it is found that the three major characters, Jake, Cohn, and Brett in the novel implicated their utterances to (1) inform, (2) convince, (3) advice or recommend, (4) ask or request, (5) accuse, (6) believe, (7) reject, (8) force, (9) tell a lie, (10) forbid, and (11) mock.

Based on the description above, the conversational implicatures are also found in novel *The Sun Also Rises* productively uttered and implied by the major characters in this research. The major characters as the speakers implicated their utterances with various purposes and functions as found above to communicate with their hearers. These findings also confirm that novels can be objects or data sources to research in terms of conversational implicatures as the previous researches carried out by Wang (2011) towards the students’

competence of conversational implicatures through listening, Abdelhavez (2016) to prove the effect of instruction of conversational implicature to the students' English proficiency. In addition, Inayati, et al (2016) and Mustafa (2010) researched conversational implicatures towards drama sereal entitled 'Gilmore Girls' and some journalist texts respectively.

4.2 Types of Implicatures Uttered by the Major Characters

Based on the data analysis, It is found there are two conversational implicatures uttered by the three major characters in *The Sun Also Rises* which are exposed in this study as the findings. The conversational implicatures cover (1) particularized conversational implicatures which are also called particularized and (2) generalized conversational implicatures which are classified as generalized scalar (S), and clausal (C) implicatures. The types of implicatures are shown in the following ways.

4.2.1 Particularized Conversational Implicatures

Particularized conversational implicature is an implicature which require specific context (context-bound). Of the data analysis, it is found that particularized conversational implicatures were productively conveyed by the major characters (Jake, Cohn and Brett) which may be looked at in the following data:

4.2.1.1 Data [VII/46-57/J/B]

- Jake : "Couldn't we live together, Brett? Couldn't we just live together?"(46)
Brett : "I don't think so. I'd just tromper you with everybody. You couldn't stand it"(47)
Jake : "I stand it now"(48)
Brett : "That would be different. It's my fault, Jake. It's the way I'm made."(49)
Jake : "Couldn't we go off in the country for a while."(50)
Brett : "It wouldn't be any good. I'll go if you like. But I couldn't live quietly in the country. Not with my own true love."(51)
Jake's implicature (46) : *I can live together with you, Brett although I lose my ability to have sex.*
Brett's implicature (47) : *I don't love you, Jake because you are impotent (you lose your ability to have sex)*
Brett's implicature (51) : *I don't like to go out with someone that I don't really love, Jake*

Types of Conversational Implicatures : Particularized conversational implicatures

The data [VII/46-57/J/B] contain particularized implicatures or particularized inferences which are implicitly expressed or conveyed by both Jake and Brett. These particularized implicatures are found on utterances 46, 47, 49, 51, and 57. These utterances which contain particularized implicatures can be shown as follows. The utterance (46) implicates that Jake can live together with Brett although he loses his ability to have sex (**Jake's implicature**: *I can live together with you, Brett although I lose my ability to have sex*). Besides, Brett utterances (47 and 49) implicates that she doesn't love Jake because he is impotent (**Brett's implicature**: *I don't love you, Jake because you are impotent (you lose your ability to have sex)*). While the utterance (51) implicates that she doesn't like to go out with someone that she doesn't really love (**Brett's implicature**: *I don't like to go out with someone that I don't really love, Jake*).

The particularized conversational implicatures conveyed by Jake has implied meaning in the fact that Jake eagerly requested and forced Brett to live together with him because Jake really love him very much. Unfortunately, Brett rejected Jake's love politely because as one of the factors Jake was impotent. Of the analysis result, it was found that *The Sun Also Rises* contains a lot of productive particularized conversational implicatures. As described above, to identify this implicature to get the thorough understanding of the stories that occurred in the novel is the language use by context because somehow any particularized conversational implicatures identified in any sources are context-bound as the typical characteristic of the implicature (Grice, 1975, Grundy, 2000, Davis, 2010, Kasmirli, 2016). All particularized conversational implicatures exposed as the findings of the research are on the basis of the context which cover relevant aspects of the physical or social setting of an utterance in speech situation comprehensively involving (1) speaker and hearer, (2) context of an utterance, (3) goals of an utterance, and (4) speech act (Leech, 1983:13). The findings in the research confirm that particularized conversational implicatures can be found in the written conversation or discourses such as novels and support and strengthen the previous researches or studies which Inayati, et al (2016) conducted towards drama sereal entitled 'Gilmore Girls' and Mustafa (2010) towards some journalist texts.

4.2.2 Generalized Conversational Implicatures

As opposed to particularized conversational implicature, generalized conversational implicature is an implicature which arises irrespective of the context in which it occurs (without any particular context or special scenario being necessary). Based on the data analysis, it is found that generalized conversational implicatures that were conveyed by the three major characters (Jake, Cohn and Brett) involve two generalized conversational implicatures, namely (1) scalar implicature (SI) and (2) clausal implicature (CL). These types of implicatures can be seen through their utterances in the following data or discourse fractions:

4.2.2.1 [III/1-5/J/C]

- Jake : “Hello, Robert. Did you come in to cheer **me** up?”(1)
Cohn : “Would you like to go to South America, Jake?”(2)
Jake : “No.”(3)
Cohn : “Why not?”(4)
Jake : “**I don’t know**. I never wanted to go. Too expensive. You can see **all** the South Americas you want in Paris anyway.”(5)
Jake’s implicature (1) : “Hello, Robert. Did you come in to cheer *only me not someone else* up?” (**Generalized Scalar Implicature**)
Jake’s implicature (5) : “I don’t know (*I don’t have information in my mind* = **Clausal Implicature**). I never wanted to go. Too expensive. You can see *not some/ not parts* the South Americas you want in Paris anyway.” (*not some/ not parts* = **Generalized Scalar Implicature**)
Types of Conversational Implicatures : **Generalized Scalar and Calusal Implicatures**

If seen the data above, the utterance (1) has scalar implicature on the pronoun ‘**me**’. The word is classified into scalar implicature because it is produced through the linguistic scales which contain a set of linguistic alternates, or contrastive expressions of the same grammatical category, which can be arranged in a linear order by degree of informativeness or semantic strength (Levinson, 1983). The linguistic scale intended here refers to scale for pronoun <me, you, him, them, one,...>. This kind of scale is categorized into entailment scale Gazdar (Levinson, 1983). This implicature is context-free to make one understand.

By contrast, on the utterance (5), it is the main clause ‘**I don’t know**’ as a clausal implicature because the sense of implicature is connected with a clause. As defined above, clausal implicature is one which derives from the complex sentence containing the main clause (*P* means that the speaker doesn’t know) and embedded sentence or sub-clause (*p/q* means whether *p* or *q* is true or not). In this way, ‘**I don’t know**’ which means *I don’t have information in my mind* also signifies ‘**whether Jake can go with Cohn or not**’. It means that the clausal implicature tends to be weaker form because it doesn’t provide certainty (Levinson, 1983). The novel *The Sun Also Rises* contains a lot of scalar and clausal implicatures as generalized conversational implicatures which are alike.

The conversation above was taking place after Cohn had gone back from America and one day came into Jake’s office to take him go to South America. Unfortunately, Jake didn’t like it because he knew what Cohn was like. Based on the story, Cohn just came from New York and brought a lot of success from the city. Having a lot of money at the time, he forced himself and insisted on going to South America, consequently. Jake’s uncertainty to come with Cohn to South America was principally based upon his belief, experience, and knowledge because Cohn’s going to South America would be useless meaning that it wouldn’t get success overthere. It seems obvious that one of the reasons why Cohn intended to go South America was that he was getting bored staying in Paris and curious about another continent making a date with beautiful girls and forgetting his girl friend, Frances easily.

The findings of the generalized conversational implicatures in the study were also found by the previous study conducted by Maiska (2013) in analysing the generalized conversational implicatures in Kartu As Advertisement.

V. Conclusion

The research studied the conversational implicatures performed by the major characters in the novel *The Sun Also Rises*. Two research problems have been analysed and produced results as the findings of the research. In terms of the first problem on how the conversational implicatures are uttered or conveyed by the major characters, it is found that the utterances of the three major characters, (1) Jake Barnes (Jake), (2) Lady Brett Ashley, and (3) Robert Cohn (Cohn) mostly contain conversational implicatures to implicate certain meaning during their conversation. The conversational implicatures uttered by them principally are geared to (1)

inform, (2) convince, (3) advice or recommend, (4) ask or request, (5) accuse, (6) believe, (7) reject, (8) force, (9) tel a lie, (10) forbid, and (11) mock their hearers.

In addition, the findings for the second problem on the types of conversational implicatures uttered by the three major characters indicated that there are two types of implicatures, namely particularized and generalized conversational implicatures. The particularized ones refer to context-bound implicatures to understand. By contrast, the generalized ones are found without context (free-context) in the novel *The Sun Also Rises*. Of the analysis, it was found that generalized conversational implicatures covered scalar and clausal implicatures which are compatible with theories of Grice which was then developed by Gazdar (1979) and Levinson (1983). Based on the results of the study, it is concluded that All the major characters productively and actively implicated their utterances in both particularized and generalized conversational implicatures while they were speaking, conversing, and talking to someone else.

References

- [1]. Andelhavez, A. M.M. (2016). *The Effect of Conversational Implicature Instruction on Developing TEFL Students' Pragmatic Competence and Language Proficiency*. US-China Education Review A, Vol. 6 No. 8 pp. 451-465 August 2016. (Online) (<http://www.davidpublisher.org/Public/uploads/Contribute/57eb221b41cdb.pdf> accessed on 3rd April 2017).
- [2]. Berg, B. L. (1988). *Qualitative Research Method for the Social Sciences*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- [3]. Crystal, D. (1997). *Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics* (4th ed.). Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- [4]. Davis, W.A. (2010). *Implicature: Intention, Convention, and Principle in the Failure of Gricean Theory*. Cambridge University Press.
- [5]. Gazdar, G. (1979). *Pragmatics, Implicature, Presupposition, and Logical Form*. London: Academic Press, Inc.
- [6]. Grice, H.P. (1975). *Logic and Conversation*. In Peter Cole and Jerry L. Moran (Eds). *Syntax and semantics 3: Speech Acts* (pp. 41-58). New York: Academic Press, Inc.
- [7]. Grundy, P. (2000). *Doing Pragmatics* (2nd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- [8]. Hemingway, E. M. (1954). *The Sun Also Rises*. New York: Bantam Book.
- [9]. Inayati, A., Citraresmana, E., Mahdi, S. (2014). *Floating Maxims in Particularized Conversational Implicatures*. International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World. Vol. 6 No. 3 pp. 53-61 July 2014 (Online) (<http://www.ijlalw.org/finalversion635.pdf>) accessed on 7 August 2016).
- [10]. Kasmirli, M. (2016). *Conversational Implicature: Re-Assessing the Gricean Framework*. The University of Sheffield October 2016. (Online) (http://nbviewer.jupyter.org/github/k0711/mk_web/blob/master/Kasmirli_thesis_front%20matter.pdf accessed on 17 August 2017).
- [11]. Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman Group.
- [12]. Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [13]. Maiska, K. P. (2013). *The Generalized Conversational Implicatures Analysis in Kartu As Advertisement*. Journal Universitas Airlangga Vol. 2 No. 1 pp. 25-34.
- [14]. Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis* (2nd ed.). New York: Sage Publication.
- [15]. Murphy, J. (2013). *Generalized Conversational Implicatures (GCI) Theory*. University of Manchester, February 2nd, 2013 (Online) (<https://postgridiots.files.wordpress.com/2013/01/postgridsgcinew.pdf> accessed on 6 September 2016)
- [16]. Mustafa, M. S. (2010). *The Interpretation of Implicature: A Comparative Study Between Implicature in Linguistics and Journalism*. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, Vol 1, No. 1, pp 35-43 January 2010.
- [17]. Wang, H. (2011). *Conversational Implicatures in English Listening Comprehension*. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, Vol 2, No. 5, pp. 1162-1167 September 2011.

Marsuki. "Conversational Implicatures Performed By The Major Characters In Miller Earnest Hemingways 'The Sun Also Rises'." IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME) , vol. 7, no. 5, 2017, pp. 06–16.