CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter consists of many important aspects concerning the theoretical framework and the related studies.

2.1 Pragmatics

Levinson (1983: 376) states that pragmatics has potential application to all fields with a stake in how utterances are understood. Misunderstanding often occurs in communication, whether it is spoken (chatting, speaking) or written (letter). The mistake may come from the sender information or the recipient that influenced by some reasons such certain context in a situation, participant's expectation also their knowledge to create an interpretation and assumption. Moreover, mistakes or fruitfulness of a conversation in this field cannot be determined just by grammar rules, as Leech (1983:1) sketch "pragmatics differs from grammar in that it is essentially goal-directed and evaluative".

Moreover, Levinson (2001:1) states in his articles entitled "Pragmatic", within the theory of meaning pragmatics is especially concerned with implicit meaning, with inference and the unsaid, and the way in which language structure trades on this background of the presumed and the inferred. In short, it describes meaning behind sentence sometimes purposes to things outside of sentence, and usually that mean intended by speaker. For clearer let's check example given by Milal (2011:44) "in the context of classroom, where a ceiling fan is available in that room bit still off, the teacher says to the learners,

(1) It's hot right?

Toward this simple question sentence Milal shows us a pragmatic perspective by implicit meaning, then attach possible context so that creates assumption in the hearer's mind (learners) to do a compatible act that can coherence with the utterance.

For adding, Yule (1996:3) explain that pragmatics "requires a consideration of how speakers organize what they want to say in accordance with who they're talking to, where, when, and under what circumstances". From the example, this notion show us the way speaker utter his felling as speaker in place and circumstance that support his purpose, clearly in pragmatic the sentence (1) is not just tells speaker's feeling expression about condition but also need responsive act from audience (learners).

2.2 Context

Term context as Findlay (1998:37) states, it refers to the circumstances or conditions in which an utterance (a statement or question) is situated. According to Milal (2001:45) Context is so significant in determining the meaning of a discourse that one may never be able to comprehend the meaning of the discourse unless by reference to it. Those important context parts create an interaction by certain purpose in the communication process. This notion relates to Woffitt's (2005:64) explanation "Context is a relevant issue for the participants. During interaction speakers orient to, and display to each other in the design of their turns, what they understand to be the salient features of their context". Imagine when a group of people do conversation without clear context each other there will a possibility in fail communication, whether it informal chat or not context always need as guiding in information exchange.

Stalnaker (1999:4) says *pragmatics* is the study of the relation between linguistic expressions and their context of use. In his explanation relate to interaction between context and content in pragmatics he mentions,

"First, context influences content, since the expressions used to say something are often context-dependent: what they are used to say is a function, not only of the meaning of the expression, but also of facts about the situations in which they are used. But second, the contents that are expressed influence the context: speech acts affect the situations in which they are performed".

Due to context play important role in communicating activity Levinson (1983:11) sketch some requirements that should be possessed by context. For a feature of the context to be linguistically encoded,

(a) it must be intentionally communicated, (b) it must be conventionally associated with the linguistic form in question, (c) the encoding form must be a member of a contrast set, the other members of which encode different features, (d) the linguistic form must be subject to regular grammatical processes.

Based on characteristics mentioned above in shaping context word that utters must be understood by speaker and hearer in other to participants can focusing their mind to choose appropriate vocabulary as their concern.. However, to describe communication purpose of participants we cannot merely concern to word that used, as Stalnaker (1999:36) say "The meaning of sentences, or rules determining truth values directly from contexts, cannot plausibly represent these objects". Which means the appearance word is insufficient to reveal the truth speaker intention. Event though in prior he assume "both contexts and possible worlds are partial determinants of the truth-value of what is expressed by a given sentence" (1999:31). The term possible worlds can inference as circumstance under speaker condition such their emotion, curious, or knowledge.

The importance of understanding context can describes when we are in certain circumstance we get clear speaker intention. It can help us to get correct interpretation so that supporting part of communication can detect easier. Therefore Stalnaker (2002:720) assume "If we understand contexts, and the speech acts made in contexts, in terms of the speakers' beliefs and intentions, we have a better chance of giving simpler and more transparent explanations of linguistic behavior".

2.2.1 Common Ground

In presupposition development Stalnaker introduces a term, namely *common ground*. When speakers produce an utterance to the audience they already made

concept in their mind called presupposition according to Stalnaker (2002:701) "To presuppose something is to take it for granted, or at least to act as if one takes it for granted, as background information – as *common ground* among the participants in the conversation"

The common ground in participant mind will persuade them to get information by conversation activity, because "the information presupposed at a particular point in a conversation is often represented simply with a given set of possible worlds labeled the *context set*. In this case when participant rises their desirability to communicate in same time they expect the background knowledge mutually shared, Stalnaker (2002:704) assume "this idea leads naturally to a notion of common ground – the mutually recognized shared information in a situation in which an act of trying to communicate takes place".

However, Stalnaker (2002:704) also clarify that

"the common ground is just common or mutual belief, and what a speaker presupposes is what she believes to be common or mutual belief." While "common belief is the model for common ground, but discussions of speaker presupposition have emphasized from the start a number of ways in which what is presupposed may diverge from what is mutually known or believed".

Means a notion that participant took as their knowledge can change as their interest and intention. The changes usually triggered by mistakes in organize knowledge or uttered, as stated by Stalnaker (2002:707)

"When one is mistaken about the common ground, one may presuppose things that are not actually common belief, but it is a logical truth that anything that is actually common belief will be believed to be common belief by all members of the group."

When all participants in communication can make correct assumption and inference we can follow Stalnaker (1999, pp.716-719) statement such "Successful communication is compatible with presuppositions that are recognized to be false, but the information that they are being presupposed must be actually available, and not just assumed or pretended to be available." In addition he also stated that "There is no stronger proposition that we can tell must be presupposed, and so one might be tempted to conclude that the sentence will be acceptable in any context in which that proposition is common ground."

2.3 Presupposition

One of linguistics phenomena where speaker creates believed in his mind that hearer is understood with his idea although he does not explain his whole idea called presupposition, as Stalnaker (1999:38) states "To presuppose a proposition in the pragmatic sense is to take its truth for granted, and to assume that others involved in the context do the same". So when a speaker made presupposition in his mind at the time he determine context for guide his intention.

Stalnaker, (1999:39) also explain "There is no point in expressing a presupposition unless it distinguishes among the possible worlds which as considered live options in the context". Means that presupposition is something intuitive detected, or we should consider that sometimes in an utterance there is more than one presupposition. Hence Presupposition, of course, need not be true.

When they turn out false, sometimes the whole point of the inquiry, deliberation, lecture, debate, command or promise is destroyed, but at other times it does not matter much at all. Stalnaker (1999:39) gives the reason of why it happens as follow,

"Since the presupposition play such a large part in determining what is going on in a linguistic situation, it is important that the participants in a single context have the same set of presuppositions if misunderstanding is to be avoided. This is why presupposition involves not only taking the truth of something for granted, but also assuming that others do the same".

Often speaker does presupposition to people who he/she never known before such ask information in a place to people around there without general trigger question. Regarding speaker presupposition and utterance that represents it, Levinson (1973:6)ikut 2001 assumes "The relevance to pragmatics is that presupposition clearly implies that natural languages are built to trade on, and signal, the dependency of utterances on propositions already taken for granted".

Moreover, Stalnaker offers another view about relation among *pragmatics*, *semantics* and *presupposition*. *Semantics* concept tends to talk about structure of a sentence whether it in form of utterance by orally or written. *Semantically* a good sentence must be grammatically, informative, and acceptable. In order to presupposition according to semantic role as describe by Stalnaker (1999:38) "P presupposes a proposition Q if and only if Q is necessitated both by P and by *not*-P. That is, in every model in which P is either true or false, Q is true." Whereas,

based on Stalnalker's remarks, he stated that the notion of presupposition he was promoting applies to an attitude of speakers in particular context, then suggested that one might define as

"a notion of presupposition *requirement* such sentence S presupposes that P if and only if the use of S would be inappropriate in a context in which the speaker was not presupposing that P" (Stalnaker, 1999:8).

With a consideration an utterance may be odd, deviant, uninformative, and impolite as long as the utterance implies in same context then it still has communication value.

Meanwhile, the application that he proposed is different; he introduces propositional concepts for the purpose of describing a certain kind of epistemic situation. That is a situation where background knowledge is known by both speaker and interlocutor. For instance when the speaker utter a topic then the interlocutor try to interpret content of the utterance, in this part there is possibility for interlocutor does mistakes, ignorance or oppose the utterance's content. As Stalnaker (1999:9) state we can represent such a person's knowledge or ignorance, beliefs or doubts about the content of the utterance by saying what the content is in each of the possible situation compatible with his/her knowledge or beliefs, or with the presupposition she or he is making.

Stalnaker also provide description a situation when a person produce false presupposition in an utterance may the actual truth of the utterance does not arise. But sometimes this person succeeds in determine the truth of his/ her assumption in making a claim. Situation above show intuitive reason that incompatible to explain by *semantic* concept, because pragmatics presupposition relate to speaker rather than sentence.

2.3.1 Types of Presupposition

Presupposition is association between language and speaker's mind to convey purpose of utterance by following rule of context for sure. To identify how those features associates Yule characterize presupposition in six types known as *potential presupposition*. As Yule (1996:27-29) explains they are:

- 1. Existential presupposition where speaker is committed to the existence of the entities named.
- 2. Factive presupposition where there is certain verbs/construction indicates that something is a fact.
- 3. Lexical presupposition in using one word, the speaker can act as if another meaning (word) is understood.
- 4. Structural presupposition is is the assumption associated with the use of certain words and phrases.
- 5. Non-factive presupposition is one that is assumed not to be true.
- 6. Counter factual presupposition where meaning that what is presupposed is not only not true, but is the opposite of what is true.

By classifying presupposition linguistics meaning become explainable. Moreover detail characterization can show accuration in determines meaning of a presupposition.

2.4 Related studies

Some studies have been using pragmatics presupposition in analyzing text or conversation by different object, below are their summary.

- 1. In 2004, MuhimatulAzizah was conduct a thesis entitled *The Presupposition Of Carolina Radio Station Recipes Broadcasting*. In this research she concerned with pragmatics theory form Brown & Yule as part of Discourse analysis. While the focus is in describing what are presupposition form that contain between recipes sender and the radio station's announcer in giving the recipes. She found that announcer tends get the presupposition of the sender rather than radio's listener since the announcer more familiar with those material. However she concludes that whether announcer or listeners can achieve the message that has been meant by the sender recipes.
- 2. In 2012, (Zare', et. All) was conducted a research published on international journal of linguistics entitled *Presupposition Trigger-A Comparative Analysis of Broadcast New Discourse*. This research comparing presupposition style between two English news channels in America and Persian. By analyzing the script news they identified kind of presupposition trigger and found the frequency of existential presupposition is higher than others. Then concluded that in oral

discourse lexical presupposition is more frequent than in written form of news.

- 3. While, student from State University of Padang, Rico (2012) was conducted a paper entitled *An Analysis of Presupposition Used in Novel Harry Potter and The Deathly Hallows*. His aim was to show from six kinds of presupposition trigger there are only five kinds that found in fifty samples they are *Existential, factive, stuctural, lexical, counterfactual*. Then he concluded that the most frequent presupposition which used on the novel was structural presupposition.
- 4. Whereas, LeepingGe (2011) was conduct an article entitled *Pragmatic Functions of Presupposition in Advertising English*. Different from previous had mentioned, this research tends to discuss presupposition from function side. The object was English Advertisement that shows several functions such as *Conciseness function* which use pragmatics presupposition in imperative sentence for instance. *Interestingness function* presupposes information combines with asserted information, which creates reader's involvement and humor in advertising language. *Enlargement function* presupposition can enlarge the amount of advertising information because presupposition information hardly appears solely. *Emphasis function* presupposition determines the content and position of information focus of an advertisement.

Euphemism function plays politeness strategy in advertising in order to make communication successful. *Concealment function* shows that sometimes advertiser conceals specific advertising information deliberately to achieve certain effect and presupposition hence is employed. *Persuasion function* presupposition information contained in an utterance has the function of persuasion in an easy and a concealable way. Last is,*Self-protection function* presupposition can downgrade the degree of the laudatory word, phrases and expressions and make the advertisement at least appear to be objective.

The studies about presupposition above mainly have found kinds of presupposition triggers and its function in some objects whether in written or spoken. However the distinctions of this study first is explain the context of the utterance and not solely talk about the meaning behind it. Second, sense of pragmatic presupposition catch naturally by using the movie as an object, which aims to reveal and explain the intuitive side of the dialogue does by one of the important characters. Nevertheless the subject is same but it gives different nuance in presupposition discussion.