

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW & THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Literature Review

This chapter discusses some of the research that has been done by others. There are five research studies that researchers take out based on the same research about presupposition, but with different data sources.

The first research is “*An Analysis of Presupposition Used in Encanto Movie Script*” by Dhea Arning Pramesti and Novita Al Ihyak Dieni (2023). This research focused on analyzing presuppositions used, and the researcher used a descriptive research method. This research focused on the dialogue between characters in the movie with the purpose of analyzing presuppositions found in the movie, classifying them into various types of presuppositions. The result of this research was six presuppositions, specifically five existential, fourteen factive, one non-factive, three lexical, 235 structural, and five counterfactual.

The second research is “*Presuposisi dalam Film Beauty and the Beast*” by Ticoh Glorivia Hillary (2019). The purpose of this research was to identify the type and meaning of “*Presupposition in the film Beauty and the Beast*”. The types of presupposition found in this film are: five existential presupposition utterances, six factive presupposition utterances, five non- factive presupposition utterances, nine utterances lexical presupposition utterances, thirty structural presupposition utterances of structural presuppositions, and there are no types of counterfactual presuppositions in this film.

The third research is “*An Analysis Of Presuppositions Used By Surabayan Teenager Netizens In Twitter*” by Alyvia Fahdina Maulida Rahma and Ruri Fadhilah Kurniati (2023). The target of the research is teenagers from *Surabaya* that is using *Twitter*. The data were obtained through text transcription of ‘netizen’ tweets in the non-formal context on *Twitter*. The analysis of data for achieving the purpose of the researcher to find the most presupposed factor found in ‘*Surabayan*’ teenagers. The results showed that all types of presupposition, namely existential, factive, non- factive, lexical, structural, and counterfactual. Among the six types, non-factive presuppositions were used most dominantly by the ‘*Surabayan*’ teenager netizens.

The fourth is “*An Analysis of Presupposition on Brad Cohen’s Character in front of the Class Movie*” by Kenedi Wahyu Saputra, M. Bahri Arifin, Setya Ariani (2021). This research was a qualitative study applying a descriptive-qualitative method. The purpose of this research was to identify and describe the types of presuppositions and utterances found by the main character in the movie. The findings were existential presupposition, factive presupposition, non- factive presupposition, lexical presupposition, structural presupposition, and counterfactual presupposition.

The fifth research is “*An Analysis of Presupposition on the Main Characters of Frozen Movie Script*” by Maratu Solehah, Anita, Tatu Siti Rohbiah (2022). This research used qualitative research while applying content analysis in analyzing the movie. The purpose of this research was to investigate kinds and the meaning of presuppositions that occur by using a pragmatic approach, and to

analyze the conditions of presupposition in every utterance found in the movie. The findings of this research were fifty of data found, fifteen of existential presuppositions, four of factive presuppositions, two of non-factive presuppositions, nine of lexical presuppositions, seventeen of structural presuppositions, and three of counterfactual presuppositions.

The previous five studies discussed presupposition. The researcher has similar topics but different movies, and any theory used about meaning. The data that the researcher uses in this research is *Pokémon Detective Pikachu Movie*. The researcher assumes that this research, *An Analysis of Presupposition Found in Pokémon Detective Pikachu Movie*, has never been observed before.

2.2 Theoretical Framework

In this research, the researcher applied theories related to several valid sources. The researcher will combined and will took several sources and interconnected with the research. Here the explanations.

2.2.1 Pragmatics

Pragmatics is the study of indirect meaning, that knows what is meant when it isn't actually said and depends on a lot of shared assumptions (Yule, 2010, p.127). It makes the delivery of meaning more complete because not only is the basic meaning expressed, but also the meaning of the indirect delivery according to the utterance.

Based on the study, pragmatics is categorized as a linguistic scope that is related to. The four areas that pragmatics is concerned with to understand that way and briefly review the relationship with another area of linguistics analysis there

are (Yule, 1996, p.26) pragmatics, in philosophy and linguistics, the study of how linguistic utterances are typically used to communicate propositions, intentions, attitudes, or other aspects of meaning that are not wholly expressed in the literal meanings and grammatical structures of spoken words and sentences (J. L. Austin 1962, p.14).

Based on the explanation above, there are several understandings about pragmatics that are interesting to learn from the meaning aspects. If it is associated with presupposition, it will become an interesting reference to simplify the meaning in a conversation or reading.

2.2.2 Presupposition

Presupposition is what the speaker or researcher assumes is true or known by the listener or reader (Yule, 2010, p.127). The connection between speaker and listener makes the listener seem to know the meaning without asking the words spoken by the speaker. For example:

“The King of Sweden”

In this context, the presupposition can be assumed based on the *King of England*. This shows if the speaker says about this, for those who have sufficient information, they can assume the answer and the meaning of the question immediately, which means there is a king from *Sweden* and some people knew it.

2.2.2.1 Types of presupposition

There are six types of presupposition: existential presupposition, factive presupposition, non-factive presupposition, lexical presupposition, structural presupposition, and counterfactual presupposition (Yule, 1996).

a. Existential Presupposition

Existential presupposition is not only assumed that **something exists** in present in possessive constructions, but it is in any definite **noun phrase** more generally (Yule, 1996). It means the speaker assumes the existence of something the entities are named. Example:

“The girls next door”

In this context, the presupposition can be assumed based on *the girls next door*. This show if the speaker says this for those who have sufficient information, they can assumed the answer and the meaning of the question immediately. It means the existence of *the girls next door* that are immediately known by the listener based the speaker's information.

b. Factive Presupposition

Factive presupposition is around **expecting something genuine**, which is taken after by a few verbs such as *know*, *realize*, *regret* (Yule, 1996). Factive implied that something that happened but the speaker did not realize it, and it moreover might be genuine. For example:

“He didn't realize he was ill”

From the context above, we can infer that the presupposition is about “*he was ill*”, which it can be true depend on how the speaker know condition is like if

he was ill or not. The conclusion is that the listener knows “*he was ill*” based on the speaker information.

c. Non Factive Presupposition

Non-factive presupposition is about accepting **something as not genuine**. It implied that the suspicion by the speaker isn't genuine, but they still expect something (Yule, 1996). This presupposition is taken after by a few verbs, such as dream or envision that not genuine. Non-factive presupposition moreover, can be called as accepting in nonexistent. For example:

“I dreamed that I was rich”

From the context above, we can infer that the presupposition shows how the speaker imagines that the speaker said “*I was rich*” in fact, it’s not, from the context, we can also found how people infer the information is based on the condition and environment.

d. Lexical Presupposition

Lexical presupposition is when a speaker uses a **particular expression** that **presupposes another concept**, which means that the speaker can act as if another meaning or word is understood (Yule, 1996). For example:

(A): *“He sold his house last month”*

(B): *“So why did he sell his house?”*

From the context above, we can infer that when the speaker talks about the information, the presupposition will bring a different meaning depending on how people interpreted it. Some will think that He used to have a house but sold it because of a problem or other reasons.

e. Structural presupposition

Structural presuppositions, rather than issue-preemptive prepositions, **can lead hearers to believe** that the information presented is true (Yule, 1996). This kind of presupposition is only designed to get people to believe what the speaker says, based on the statement, not the question. For example:

(A): *“It’s done, just a little tweak and this car will move again”*

(B): *“Have you finished repairing your car?”*

From the context above, we can infer that this presupposition is aimed at leading others to believe about something that is uncertain. The speaker on the context above was trying to make the hearer believe what it says, even though its credibility is unknown.

f. Counterfactual presupposition

The meaning of the counterfactual **premise** was the **opposite** of that of the **actual premise**: it meant that what was believed was the opposite of true (Yule, 1996). This premise assumes the information in the if-clause. For example:

(A): *“If I was rich”*

(B): *“Don’t dream too much”*

Form the context above, this type of presupposition is about assuming something that is the opposite of the spoken. The speaker above said if He was rich, from the context we can assumes that the speaker is not a rich person or even poor depend on how people interpreted it.

2.2.3 The Meaning

The meaning sometimes does not only come from sentences or words that are written or spoken. Speakers frequently mean much more than their words actually say (Thomas, 2013, p.16). Based on the words spoken, people understand them with the related context, for example:

"It's hot in here"

The meaning could be *"Please open the window!"* or *"Is it all right if I open the window?"* or *"You're wasting electricity"*, depending on the context and the situation. The connection between pragmatics and meaning itself is very closely related and is the basis of the theory itself. The most common definitions of pragmatics were: meaning in use or meaning in context (Thomas, 2013, p.16).

2.3 Conceptual Mapping

