

THE PRESUPPOSITION ANALYSIS IN “OPPENHEIMER” MOVIE : PRAGMATIC STUDY

Muhammad Rifki Fabian S.^{1*}, Heri Heryono²

¹Widyatama University, rifki.fabian@widyatama.ac.id

²Widyatama University, heri.heryono@widyatama.ac.id

Artikel Info

Received :28 Feb 2024
Reviwe :12 Maret 2024
Accepted :28 April 2024
Published :30 April 2024

Abstrak

This study purposes to analyze the pragmatic theories of Oppenheimer movie. This research aims to conduct a pragmatic analysis of presuppositions in the film "Oppenheimer." Presuppositions are implicit assumptions conveyed through language that shape the audience's understanding of the narrative. The study employs tools from pragmatics to investigate how presuppositions are employed in the movie, specifically focusing on their role in shaping character relationships, plot development, and overall discourse. The research methodology involves a close examination of the linguistic and contextual elements within the movie's dialogue and narrative structure. Finding the presuppositions of said movie, categorizes the presupposition theories. Gather all the data and reach a conclusion of the movie. The findings of this study are expected to provide insights into the pragmatic strategies employed by the filmmakers to convey information and evoke specific emotional responses from the audience. Additionally, the research contributes to the broader understanding of presupposition analysis in cinematic discourse, offering a nuanced perspective on how language is used to convey meaning beyond explicit statements. This investigation is particularly relevant in the context of *Oppenheimer*, a film known for its historical and intellectual depth. By exploring presuppositions in this cinematic context, the study contributes to the interdisciplinary dialogue between linguistics and film studies, shedding light on the intricate ways in which language shapes narrative comprehension in the medium of film.

Keywords: presumption, factive, lexical, structural, existential

A. INTRODUCTION

Presuppositions are about what is true or factual and it's quite important to understand this movie as we can get a clearer picture of the father of the atomic bomb and understand the psychology of the man himself. Presuppositions, within the realm of linguistics and pragmatics, refer to the implicit assumptions or background information embedded in language. They play a essential role in shaping communication by influencing how information is conveyed and interpreted. In the cinematic context, presuppositions extend beyond mere dialogue, encompassing visual cues, narrative structure, and character interactions, all contributing to the audience's comprehension and emotional engagement. *Oppenheimer* known for its portrayal of historical events and the enigmatic figure of J. Robert Oppenheimer, provides an intriguing canvas for exploring presuppositions within cinematic discourse (Kifer, Andy 2023). This study seeks to employ pragmatic theories and analytical tools to unravel the implicit layers woven throughout the film's narrative. By examining the linguistic intricacies and contextual cues, this analysis aims to elucidate how presuppositions operate within the movie, impacting character relationships, plot development, and thematic elements.

Furthermore, this investigation contributes to the broader understanding of cinematic language and narrative comprehension. By unraveling the presuppositions within "Oppenheimer," it aims to shed light on the intentional use of implicit communication strategies by filmmakers to evoke specific audience responses and enhance the storytelling experience. In advanced, this study endeavors to bridge the realms of linguistics and film studies, exploring the intricate

interplay between language, context, and meaning within the cinematic landscape of "Oppenheimer." Through this exploration, a deeper understanding of the pragmatic nuances inherent in cinematic discourse emerges, offering insights into how presuppositions enrich narrative comprehension and emotional resonance within the realm of film.

Oppenheimer is a biological thriller movie directed and written by Christopher Nolan based on the 2005 biography *American Prometheus* by Kai Bird and Martin J. Sherwin. The film is about an American theoretical physicist J. Robert Oppenheimer. The film focuses on Oppenheimer development on the atomic bomb and the court hearing on Oppenheimer suspicions of being an allegedly being a communist and being a threat of the state on the peak of the cold war against the Russians and the United State. The movie is about regret, as it was shown that Oppenheimer has been regretting his decisions on making an Atom bomb as to stop all war until he realizes that humanity will retaliate to make a bigger bomb, because of that the plot focuses on Oppenheimer to try to redeem himself by stopping any weapon development on the atomic bombs after he seen the outcome of Fat Man and Little Boy that detonated on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. As a way we try to understand the movie with the way it sends the message we need to understand the concept of linguistics

Pragmatics is based from (Istvan Keckes,2013) where the context of a language leads to the meaning of it. In which the speakers implied what they meant and the listener understanding the implication of the speakers, which it also leads to study such as implicature, utterance, ambiguity and finally presuppositions. Before presuppositions it's best to understand the other theories that

involved Presupposition To make it brief. An utterance is a bit of spoken language. It could be anything from "Ugh!" to a full sentence. To utter means "to say." So when you're saying something, you're making utterances. (Romoli J, & Sauerland U, 2017). Presupposition and accommodation In (Barron A, Gu Y, & Steen G, 2017) Ambiguity refers to unclear or confusing, or it can be understood in more than one way. Implicature can be determined by sentence meaning or by conversational context, and can be conventional (in different senses) or unconventional. Presuppositions are a word or a concept that you assume to be true especially something which you must assume it's true in order continue what you are saying or thinking. While the movie is focus on Robert J. Oppenheimer more specifically his point of view we can't take anything what he said in face values as there are times where it changes perspective to someone else so that we can get a clear picture for us to perceive what's true for the both of us, Presuppositions is something that can be shared by others or not as a movie like this has a lot of open ended questions each Presupposition can be different from variety of people. And so, the researcher shall be looking the presuppositions on the movie *Oppenheimer* and the types of it on this following research report. First is about what has the most and least Presuppositions on the movie; and the second is what Type of Presuppositions are there and what's the definition of it.

As of way this linguistic theory overlaps with the film theories that are made by Stanley Cavell. In which he stated to mirror aspects of the activity of Wittgenstein's own philosophizing (e.g. Wittgenstein's thought experiments) as films are viewed capable of engaging the audience in a therapeutic process of 'dialogue' and even investigate the absurd and the limits of thought. Cavell's

framework is seen as a distinctive way of approaching film and philosophy since question of style - the finding of words adequate to our aesthetic experience - is central to the understanding of the meaning of films.

Presupposition is about an assumption about an utterance that they believed it's the truth and nothing but the truth. For example, as when someone said to the other person *have you eaten yet?* it assumed that they had eaten before they asked this question. Presupposition must be known by the speaker or the addressee to be in context of the utterance. It will generally remain a necessary assumption whether the utterance is placed in the form of an assertion, denial, or question, and can be associated with a specific lexical item or grammatical feature (presupposition trigger) in the utterance. For example, the president was assassinated entails that The president is dead, but if the expression is negated, the entailment is not necessarily true

If Presupposition on the sentence that are not quite consistent with the actual context of a sentence, such as the sentence of I owned a multi-millionaire house and I didn't owned a multi-millionaire house despite the fact that no one ever owned a multi-millionaire house then the 2 sentences are both the sentence and its negation are false and Strawson's approach.

"I owned a multi-millionaire house" and *"I didn't owned a multi-millionaire house"* use a wrong presupposition (i.e. that there exists a referent which can be described with the noun phrase my wife) and therefore cannot be assigned truth values. In presuppositions almost exclusively revolved around definite descriptions, which are said to presuppose the existence of a unique referent (Schwarz F, 2015) . A problem arises when a definite description, like the King of France, fails to refer. Russell claimed that sentences like *"The King of France is bald"* are false

because the logical form of definite descriptions contains a false existential claim. However, Strawson famously argued against Russell's theory by proposing that when a definite description fails to refer, the result can be a sentence which lacks a truth value; thus, presuppositions are understood as defined-ness conditions, necessary requirements for an expression to have a meaning.

It stated that pragmatics might be defined as the study of language in context. It can be said that in pragmatics, the context of the conversation or utterance are needed to know the meaning, because pragmatics competence is generally implicit. In pragmatics, there is one studies called presupposition (Birner, 2013). A presupposition of a sentence must normally be part of the common ground of the utterance context (the shared knowledge of the interlocutors) in order for the sentence to be felicitous. Sometimes, however, sentences may carry presuppositions that are not part of the common ground and nevertheless be felicitous For example, I can, upon being introduced to someone, out of the blue explain that my wife is a dentist, this without my addressee having ever heard, or having any reason to believe that I have a wife. In order to be able to interpret my utterance, the addressee must assume that I have a wife. This process of an addressee assuming that a presupposition is true, even in the absence of explicit information that it is, is usually called presupposition accommodation . Perl C. 2020)

We have just seen that presupposition triggers like my wife (definite descriptions) allow for such accommodation. In "Presupposition and Anaphora: Remarks on the Formulation of the Projection Problem" the philosopher Saul Kripke noted that some presupposition triggers do not seem to permit such accommodation. An example of

that is the presupposition trigger too. This word triggers the presupposition that, roughly, something parallel to what is stated has happened. For example, if pronounced with emphasis on John, the following sentence triggers the presupposition that somebody other than John had dinner in New York last night (Muho, H.A. and Bakir, 2014).

Moreover, those presuppositions, as stated, are completely trivial, given what we know about New York. Several million people had dinner in New York last night, and that in itself doesn't satisfy the presupposition of the sentence. What is needed for the sentence to be felicitous is really that somebody relevant to the interlocutors had dinner in New York last night, and that this has been mentioned in the previous discourse, or that this information can be recovered from it. Presupposition triggers that disallow accommodation are called anaphoric presupposition triggers. Presupposition is something that the speaker assumes as the case prior to utter an utterance The definition was supported by on (Peter, C. A, Mukuthuria, M., Muriungi, 2016), he said that presupposition is one of linguistics element that found in speech. It is refer to the assumption about the world or the background of belief which related to utterances. In short, it could be said that presupposition is one of linguistics element that assuming something in making an utterance where the utterance can be found in speech

For that reason The Presupposition that will be used is going to be the 6 main factors are as Follows: a) Existential Presupposition, a Presupposition that within the sentence is the assumption of the existence of the entities named by the speaker ala. : Johnny owned this car. Factive Presupposition (Schwarz F,& Tiemann S 2017). A

Presupposition that something is true due to the presence of know, realize ala : He know where you live. b) Lexical Presupposition, a Presupposition that is unstated by a concept and related to past tense with the adverb of : Was, Were ala : They were here 10 minutes ago. c) Non-factive Presupposition, A Presupposition is the assumption that's not true with the sentence with the word *dream*, *image*, *pretend*. Ala: Pretend you're winning this game. d) Structural Presupposition, a Presupposition is the assumption associated with the use of certain words and phrase and assumed to be true, for example, For Example with the Wh-Question Structures. d) Counterfactual Presupposition, a Presupposition is the arises when there is an assumption that what is presupposed opposite of the truth or contradictory to the facts. Typically, this is signaled by the inclusion of an if-clause.

A. METHOD

In this research, the researcher are going to use the qualitative descriptive method by observing the data in the script, collecting the data which contain all six type of presupposition from (Yule, 2014). This study was directed toward describing those aspects. The data was taken from a movie "Oppenheimer" according to (Sudayarto, 2023). Qualitative research is defined as research that prevents descriptive data in descriptive qualitative research is needed to solve and explore a problem. The research is then described in an analysis and the data obtained are valid so conclusion are obtained returning to the objectives

Now in here the researcher is going to be focuses on Oppenheimer presupposition pragmatics here, as it's established in this research report presupposition on Pragmatic is what considered to be true/factual and this movie mainly focus on the man himself,

Like an Autobiography of Robert J Oppenheimer.

As written at the start of this chapter, The Researcher going to use the qualitative descriptive method, More specifically the first step of this is to Observe the movie and trying to understand it myself what's this movie is all about, Secondly The Researcher will try to understand the theory of pragmatic Theories that's the most Relevant in the movie Thirdly The Researcher try to find the script of the movie that I'm watching and reread it again to see and find any sentence that's part of the presupposition Category that's (Yule,2014) made, Fourthly as the Researcher gather enough data The Researcher will check if the categories that The researcher's presenting is the most relevant at all or the one that's the most interesting on the subject, and finally once it's over The Researcher will gather the amount of data that has the most and the least presupposition categories and The researcher try to explain why they have more or less.

A descriptive method for presupposition analysis in *Oppenheimer* movie involves providing a detailed account of the presuppositions found in the movie without necessarily aiming to quantify or measure them. The research began with watching the entire movie and identifying instances where presuppositions are likely to occur. Focus on linguistic markers, implicit information, and contextual elements. Next step is documenting each identified presupposition in detail. Include the specific dialogue or visual element that carries the presupposition and note the surrounding context to capture the nuances of its occurrence. After the documentation, the data are grouped into the identified presuppositions into categories based on their nature. This may include categories

such as existential presuppositions, presupposition triggers, and those related to character relationships, historical context, or plot development. Next step is analyzing the linguistic aspects of presuppositions, paying attention to the choice of words, expressions, and any linguistic cues that signal the presence of presuppositions. Extend the analysis to visual elements, describing how cinematography, symbolism, and *mise-en-scène* contribute to conveying presuppositions. Note any non-verbal cues, expressions, or actions that imply background assumptions.

Those steps provide a thorough exploration of the contextual factors surrounding each presupposition. Examine how historical events, character motivations, and thematic elements contribute to the presuppositions within the narrative. Dedicate a section to analyzing how presuppositions shape and reflect character relationships in the movie. Explore how implicit assumptions influence character interactions and contribute to the overall development of the storyline. Final step is to discuss how presuppositions contribute to the coherence of the narrative. Examine whether they enhance or challenge the audience's understanding of the plot and characters. Summarize the findings and engage in a detailed discussion of how presuppositions contribute to the overall pragmatic elements of the "Oppenheimer" movie. Discuss their impact on audience interpretation and the film's artistic and communicative goals. This descriptive method aims to offer a rich and detailed account of presuppositions within the movie, providing a qualitative understanding of their role in shaping the narrative and audience perception.

B. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis revealed a multitude of presuppositions throughout the *Oppenheimer* movie, spanning linguistic and visual elements. These were categorized into various types, including existential presuppositions, presupposition triggers, and those related to historical context, character relationships, and plot development.

1. Existential Presuppositions

Oppenheimer: "No. of course (I start reading). Members of the security board, the so called derogatory information in your indictment of me cannot be fairly understood except in the context of my life and work; this answer of my life in more or less chronological order."

From the statement above, it's the beginning of the movie where Oppenheimer is considered an enemy of the state, Right now Oppenheimer has prepared to defend him by retelling his version of the truth. From the word Derogatory information it can be referred that Oppenheimer has received some scathing accusations that jeopardize his entire life work with just this accusation alone and Oppenheimer is prepared to retell his entire life work to tell them that he's not a threat to the state

The Existential presupposition in this statement is actually two here "Your Indictment" and "My life and work" as there's a lot of truth and lying that Oppenheimer wanted to tell the truth and nothing but the truth by retelling his life, In addition whether he absolutely tell the truth or the judge believe the accusation that the masses made we can interpret that Oppenheimer is telling truthfully while the other masses could be lying.

2 Factive Presuppositions

Tatloc: That's not what either of us is talking about.

Oppenheimer: Jean you asked me to come. And I'm glad I did. But I can't come again.

From the sentence above, Oppenheimer was actually cheating with his wife and right now he's talking to his fling right now, He's being stressing out about the creation of atomic bomb so he really went to a secret place to meet his fling, While it is true that the fact that he's happy that they meet again unfortunately this will be the last time he's going to see her as Oppenheimer feeling guilty for doing this as he's a married man and want to just out from this.

The factive presupposition is what Oppenheimer said as He really did happy that they meet for the last time as due to the stress from the process of creating of an atomic bomb and the fact that he's cheating to his current wife

3 Lexical Presupposition

Robb: When did you see her after that?

Oppenheimer: I never saw her again

From the sentence above, to give more context this sentence is said in the court hearing as Oppenheimer talk about his infidelity with Jean, As The last time he ever talk to Jean ever again; on the movie scene there was a moment of a flashback where it Implied that jean commit suicide but the scene also on Oppenheimer imagination so that the viewer can't tell whether that it's real or not

The lexical presupposition on this one is on the part that Oppenheimer never saw Jean again after that last meeting and we know that Jean did died after that but it can interpreted based on Oppenheimer imagination that she either died out of suicide or she died because of someone as of the scene there was a brief shot of a

masked hand suffocating her by stuffing her head to the bathtub filled with water, Drowning her.

4 Non-Factive Presuppositions

Oppenheimer : we're theorists- we can imagine a future, and our imaginings horrify us. But they won't fear it until they understand it, And they won't understand it until they've used it. When the world learns the terrible secret of Los Alamos, Our work will ensure a peace mankind has never seen. A peace based on the kind of international cooperation that Roosevelt always envies.

From the sentence above Oppenheimer talk about the future where the scientist tells about the consequences of creating an atomic bomb and revealed it to the world. They have been imagining thing such as the end of mankind as it destroy the world as every state and country would use an atomic bomb to destroy something, But the scientists and Oppenheimer is feeling optimistic that this won't happened as the creation of the atomic bomb will guaranteed an end to all war and usher an eternal peace to all state, Which by the end of the movie Oppenheimer is starting to doubt this notion and regretting the fact that he created the atomic bomb.

The non-factive presupposition on this one is that he imagine the future where the world never learn the dark secret of los Alamos on how the creation on atomic bomb, On his mind he think that the process of creating the atomic bomb should be revealed to the whole world as he think that might an end to all war, Which

unfortunately as history says otherwise the creation of an atomic bomb leads the long and brutal Cold War of the big giant of the world at that time, The Russians and the United State of America.

5 Structural Presupposition

Heisenberg : If I inspire anything else, let me know. We could publish together.

Oppenheimer : I have to go back to America.

Heisenberg : Why? There's no one there taking quantum mechanics seriously

Oppenheimer : That's Exactly why.

From the sentence above is when Oppenheimer Met Heisenberg on Zurich when Heisenberg starting his lecture. After his Lecture he personally meets Oppenheimer to talk to him as of right now this is young Oppenheimer who has incredible potential of being a magnificent scientist in the future, In the conversation Heisenberg want to work together with Oppenheimer to make some breakthrough discovery together but Oppenheimer refuses as he stated he wanted to back to America to teach quantum mechanics there, as shown that both of them they know that quantum mechanics can be a considered laughable theory back then but Oppenheimer is dedicated to teach the quantum mechanics so that they can take those theory seriously.

The structural presupposition on this one is that they both know that America don't take Quantum mechanics theory doesn't taken seriously and that's a fact, But Oppenheimer on the other hands want to teach quantum mechanics there to educate people the importance of the quantum mechanics and also a bit of foreshadowing for the upcoming future that this movie will hold with the relation of the atomic bombs.

6 Counterfactual Presupposition

Oppenheimer: If that's how you treat a lieutenant colonel, I'd hate to see you a treat a humble physicist.

Groves: If I ever met one I'll let you know.

From the sentence above is that Colonel Groves he forces his lieutenant colonel to take care of his coat as he throw it at him in which the lieutenant sadly comply, Oppenheimer jokingly says if he treat his underling like that I wonder how he treat a physicist I.E himself, in which Groves reply that if he ever met one he'll be the first one to know which Oppenheimer offend a bit because in Groves eyes he doesn't see Oppenheimer as one.

The counterfactual presupposition is the both sentence which as we learned in the movie isn't the truth, Oppenheimer at this point of the movie is already a brilliant scientist on the united state and not a humble physicist, as Groves surprisingly despite treating his underling like hot garbage he's actually quite reasonable to Oppenheimer as even in the court hearing that Oppenheimer he actually defended him and reasonable as well, Leading to Oppenheimer defended himself at the court.

D.CONCLUSION

From the data that the Researcher gather as it's quite appropriate that the most data that is Structural Presupposition as a reminder Structural Presupposition is the Presupposition that's to be assumed be the true more specifically with WH Question, What it really means as this movie is based on the life of Robert J Oppenheimer and specifically the court hearing, There's going to be a lot of questioning and answering on the movie and a lot of it can be the assumption if it's true or not and the least presuppositions on this movie is Counterfactual Presuppositions which is the Presupposition that's not only false but

instead the exact opposite of the sentence they're saying, In the term of this movie it's quite rare for any character in this movie start lying as the main subject of this movie is telling the truth and based on the Point of view of the main protagonist so I assume that's the reason why it has less counterfactual. As the final research question that I added in this journal Is why presuppositions in this movie is important? Is because to understand what's considered factual in this movie, To recap this movie is about the Struggle of making an atomic

bomb and the court hearing to clear his name, Why's this relevant is because there are times that in term of literature there are times when the word get ambiguous that is muddle the truth, What The researcher like that this movie resonate from me is that the main conflict is more of a conflicting idea and sometimes argument which one is the actual truth. That's the reason why The Researcher picked this movie and that's why the importance to see what's the actually true.

REFERENCES

- Yule, George (2014) *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press
- CA Peter, M Mukuthuria, P Muriungi (2016) *people* 7 (24)
- Sudayarto (2015) *Metode Dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa : Pengantar Penelitian Wahana Kebudayaan Secara Linguistik*. Yogyakarta: Duta Wacana University Press.
- Birner, B. J. (2013). *Introduction to pragmatics*. United Kingdom: WileyBlackwell.
- Istvan Keckes (2013). *Current Pragmatic Theories* 21-41
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199892655.003.0002>
- Kifer, Andy (2023) "Behind 'Oppenheimer,' a Prizewinning Biography 25 Years in the Making". *The New York Times*.
- Birner, B. J. (2013). *Introduction to pragmatics*. United Kingdom: Wiley Blackwell
- Schwarz F, & Tiemann S (2017). *Presupposition projection in online processing*. *Journal of Semantics*, 34(1), 61–106.
- Perl, C., 2020. *Presuppositions, attitudes, and why they matter.. Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, pp. 363-381
- Muho, H.A. and Bakir, S.N, 2014. *Taboo Words and Expressions in English.. Zanco Journal of Humanity Sciences*, 18(5), pp. 189-200.
- Schwarz F (2015). *Presuppositions vs. asserted content in online processing In Experimental perspectives on presuppositions* (pp. 89–108):
- Romoli J, & Sauerland U (2017). *Presupposition and accommodation In Barron A, Gu Y, & Steen G (Eds.), The Routledge Handbook of*

Pragmatics (pp. 257–256). Milton Park, Oxon, UK: Routledge.

Barron A, Gu Y, & Steen G (2017.), *The Routledge Handbook of Pragmatics* (pp. 257–256).