

## Presupposition in Fitzgerald's

### "The Rough Crossing"

Assistant Instructor Nawal Fadhil Abbas\*

Date of Acceptance 15/2/2005

#### Abstract:

The term "presupposition" is used in two different senses in the literature; semantic and pragmatic. As for the semantic sense, linguists have isolated some constructions as sources of presupposition by making lists of presupposition trigger and Levinson (1983) mentions some of these triggers. Concerning the pragmatic sense, Keenan uses the term pragmatic presupposition to refer to a class of pragmatic inferences, which are, in fact, the relation between a speaker and the appropriateness of a sentence in a context.

The central sense of presupposition is a proposition which remains constant under negation and interrogation.

The method of analysis used is in line with the aspect outlined in Short (1981). The principal question which should be answered in this study is how much does literary discourse lend itself to such a framework of analysis, which is basically meant for naturally occurring discourse?" Therefore, the aims of the study can be stated as follows:

- 1- Conducting an analysis of Scott Fitzgerald's "The Rough Crossing".
- 2- Showing how Fitzgerald uses the presupposition aspect to contrast his characters in terms of their strategies, assumptions and the relation between them.

In the light of the analysis, we get to know that the study of pragmatic as well as semantic presupposition proves to be very important for a thorough understanding of both Aderian and Eva, the main characters, and their plans and assumptions.

#### Introduction:

Van Dijk (1981:51) states that:

It might be argued that, historically, the notion of presupposition was introduced in philosophy, logic and linguistics in order to account for certain properties of texts and contexts which could not be solved in terms of traditional sentence grammars alone.

The usual definitions of presuppositions, taken as a relation between sentences or propositions (with their interpretation), either belong to semantics or to pragmatics. In the first case it is given in terms of logical consequence or necessitation relations.

In the second case it is based on condition for the appropriate use of altered sentences.

In the last decade, the notion of presupposition has been applied to a multifarious collection of phenomena: necessary conditions for truth valuation

\* English dept. - College of Education for Women - Baghdad University

(Lackoff, 1972) felicity conditions of SAs (Fillmore, 1971), shared information (Jackendoff, 1972) and conditions necessary for an utterance to be meaningful (Muraki, 1972). Though widely utilized presupposition has been rarely scrutinized in linguistics<sup>1</sup> (Bach and Harnish, 1979:155).

In other words, the term 'presupposition' is used in different senses in literature including semantic and pragmatic senses. The central sense of presupposition is a proposition, which remains constant under negation and interrogation.<sup>2</sup> Thus, the first three sentences below suppose the fourth one:

1. The king of France is bald.
2. The King of France is not bald.
3. Is the King of France bald?
4. There is a king of France (Abdulla, 1989:13)

In fact, sentence 1 above has been a source of controversy. Russell (cited in Kempson, 1945:47) suggests that this sentence asserts both that there is a king of France and that he is bald; and therefore, the sentence must be false if there is no king of France. He also points out that the relation between the two assertions is that of entailment.

To Crystal (1991:276), the term presupposition can be analysed as a certain type of logical relationship between statements, contrasting with entailment. Some linguists have come to use the term in a narrower sense, in a two-part analysis of sentences which contrasts the information assumed (or "presupposed") by the speaker, and that which is at the centre of the speaker's communicative interest; in this sense, 'presupposition' is opposed to focus. For example, in one

interpretation of this notion, the sentence "Where is the salt?" is said to presuppose that the salt is not present to the speaker, that there is someone whom the speaker thinks might know where the salt is, and so on.

## 1.2 Types of Presupposition

### 1.2.1 Existential Presupposition:

Short (1981:185) states that the notion of existential presupposition was first developed by Strawson (1952) to cope with the philosophical question as to whether a statement like:

The King of France is wise.

could be deemed to be true or false. He claims that such a sentence presupposes that the king of France exists and therefore could only have a truth value when the presupposition is true.

In fiction, there are of course many sentences, which have false presuppositions; while we experience such fictions we conventionally assume that such presuppositions are true, and it is this convention among others that allows us to "enter into" the world of the novel or play. Thus, when a sentence like:

Shall I make spirits fetch me what I please?

is uttered, we conventionally enter into a world where a spirit exists, in spite of the fact that we may not believe in such things at all.

Once the world of the novel or play is established, we expect to see and hear things consistent with that novel. Inconsistencies produce a jarring which the critic is likely to explain either by ascribing demerit to the work or by changing his mind as to the kind of work in front of him. (Short, 1981:186)

In theoretical terms, existential presupposition is probably best treated as a subset of linguistic (semantic) presuppositions and they are treated as

<sup>1</sup> for more information see Kempson (1975).

<sup>2</sup> for more information see Palmer (1981).

a separate category because of their interesting role in the establishment of fiction.

### 1.2.2 Semantic Presupposition:

The semantic or logical (or even linguistic in Short, 1981) presupposition is treated as a relation between propositions within a sentence defined in terms of their truth and falsehood. Thus, the sentence:

The man that I met yesterday is ill.

contains two propositions (i) I met a man yesterday and (ii) the man I met yesterday is ill. The sentence presupposes (i) and asserts (ii). These clauses or phrases, which are embedded sentences in this manner, may be said to contain linguistic presuppositions. There are of course other presuppositions in the sentence besides "I met a man yesterday". For instance we have "The man exists" (ibid.).

But Bates (1976:20) states that information available in a given sentence can be divided into three types: asserted meaning; entailed meaning and presupposed meaning. These three types of information differ in so far they have different truth conditions. Now let's consider the following sentence:

Jack has a sister.

1. The asserted meaning is: Jack has a female sibling.
2. The entailed meaning is: Jack's parents have more than one child.
3. The presupposed meaning is: Jack exists.

The existential meaning here, in this example, is treated as a subclass of linguistic presupposition rather than a separate category.

### 1.2.2.1 Presupposition Triggers:

Levinson (1983:181) states that presuppositions, unlike conversational implicature<sup>3</sup>, are semantic inferences that are based on the actual linguistic structure of sentences. They are tied to particular words (aspect of surface structure). The presupposition generating items are called "presupposition Triggers", noting that the symbol ">>" stands for presupposes.

Levinson (ibid.) provides us with the following examples:

1. Definite description:  
John saw/ didn't see the man with two heads  
>> There exists a man with two heads.
2. Factive verbs:  
Martha regrets/ doesn't regret drinking John's home brew.  
>> Martha drank John's home brew
3. Implicative verbs:  
John managed/ didn't manage to open the door.  
>> John tried to open the door.
4. Change of state verbs:  
John stopped / didn't stop beating his wife.  
>> John had been beating his wife.
5. Iteratives:  
The flying saucer came / didn't come again.  
>> The flying saucer came before
6. Verbs of judging:  
Agatha accused / didn't accuse Ian of plagiarism.  
>> (Agatha thinks) plagiarism is bad.
7. Temporal clause:  
Before Strawson was even born, Frege noticed / didn't notice presupposition.  
>> Strawson was born
8. Cleft sentences:

<sup>3</sup> - for more information about conversational implicature, you can see Paul Grice's article, pp 41-59, in ( Cole & Morgan, 1975).

It was Henry that kissed Rossie.

>> Someone kissed Rossie.

9. Implicit cleft with stressed constituents:

John did /didn't compete in the Olympics.

>>John did compete somewhere (It was/ wasn't in the Olympics that John compete).

10. Comparisons and contrasts:

Carol is/ isn't a better linguist than Barbara.

>> Barbara is a linguist.

11. Non-restrictive relative clauses:

The Proto-Harrapans, who flourished 2300-2650 B.C., were/weren't great temple builders.

>> The Proto-Harrapans flourished 2800-2650 B.C.

12. Counterfactual conditionals:

If Hannibal had only twelve more elephant, the Romance language would/ wouldn't this day exist.

>> Hannibal didn't have twelve more elephants.

13. Questions:

Who is the professor of linguistics at MIT?

>> Someone is the professor of linguistics at MIT.

The above list contains perhaps the core of the phenomena that are generally considered presuppositional. However, it is important to bear in mind that any such list is crucially dependent on one's definition of presupposition (ibid.: 184).

### 1.2.3 Pragmatic Presupposition:

The term "pragmatic" is usually reserved for presupposition relating to immediate context and immediate social relations. Hence a command like:

Shut the door

presupposes that the speaker is in a social relation to the hearer such that he is able to order him to do things.<sup>4</sup>

Leech (1983: 287) states that in a pragmatic view of presupposition a distinction is usually drawn not between presupposition, and entailment but between presupposition and assertion, where supposition is that part of the content of an utterance which is treated as if unfamiliar, new or informative. Often the distinction corresponds to the traditional distinction between subject and predicate. Now consider the following:

The Prime Minister's son drives fast cars.

In this example, the presupposition can be roughly expressed as follows:

a. There is an X such that X is son of the Prime Minister; [subject]

and the assertion can be expressed as follows:

b. X drives fast cars (ibid.)

[predicate]

Keenan (1971) points that the utterance of a sentence refers to an actual act of speaking; a space-time event. The context of an utterance refers to those individuals involved in the SA, as well or, the physical and cultural settings of the SA. He adds that certain - culturally defined conditions or contexts should be satisfied in order for an utterance of that sentence to be understood. These conditions are called "presuppositions" of the sentences and if they are not satisfied, then the utterance will not be understood or is understood in a non-literal way- an insult or a jest for example. More precisely these conditions include:

a. Status and kind of the relations among the participant mentioned.

<sup>4</sup> - for more information you can see Mey (1993).

b. Age, sex, and generation relation between participants mentioned in the sentence.

He concludes by stating that the general definition of pragmatic presupposition: "An utterance of a sentence pragmatically presupposes that its context is appropriate."

### 1.3 The Analysis of the Story:

Scott Fitzgerald's "The Rough Crossing" is a story that deals with what is called "ill-matched marriage". Adrian Smith is one of the celebrities who has just escaped with his wife, Eva, and his children and they are off now for France. Illmatchedness is reflected in different places in the story and it can be a little bit noticed from the very beginning when Adrian cries saying:

1 We've escaped. They can't get us now.

The negative modal auxiliary presupposes that people are following them and are interrupting their privacy and, therefore, they, the Smiths, are trying to get off. The factual verb "escape" presupposes that the two are criminals. Eva, herself, thinks that they are criminals and this presupposition is also triggered in the following utterance:

4 you make me think we really have committed crimes.

What is interesting in this example is that the presupposition is suspended simply because of the use of the non-factive verb 'think', which doesn't presuppose the truth of its complement. Therefore, she conceals the presupposition altogether, i.e. they are not criminals.

The reader of the story should pay attention to the fact that their escape is not from the people they are living with but they have escaped from each other. People usually when travel, they

get closer to each other, forgetting all bad memories and starting a new life together. But the Smiths deviate from this rule. On the ship each one of them starts to find another partner to spend time with. Adrian succeeds in finding Miss D'Amido and Eva, on her part, finds Butterworth. If we examine the following exchange:

14 Tell me more, About us ----  
what a good time we'll have,  
and how we'll be much  
better and happier, and  
very close always.

15 How could we be any closer?

16 But I meant never ever quarrel  
any more about silly things. You  
know I made up my mind when you  
gave me my birthday present last  
week that I'd try never to say a mean  
thing to you again.

we can find the following triggers:

1. The iterative 'more' which presupposes that Aderian has already told Eva something and she is asking for more.
2. The quantifier 'much' which presupposes that they are good and happy.
3. The quantifier 'very' which presupposes that they are not that close.
4. The definite description 'how' which presupposes that he is waiting for the clue to be closer. 'Any' in the same move is used to neutralize the factuality of the quantifying predictions on the part of Aderian. This question is positively-oriented and it presupposes that the address is able to clarify the way of being 'any closer'. It doesn't presuppose a possible negative answer, whereas the speaker in a 'yes-no' question does presuppose such a possibility.
5. The quantifier 'anymore' presupposes that Eva used to quarrel about silly things.



6. The factive verbs 'know'<sup>5</sup> presupposes the truth of its complement.

7. The temporal subordinate clause starting with 'when' presupposes that Adrian gave Eva a present in her birthday party.

8. The iterative 'again' presupposes that Eva has already said mean things to Aderian.

The pragmatic presupposition of the previous exchange is that the Smiths are trying to remind each other of the pitfalls of their marriage in the hope of putting an end to their problems and bridging the gap that has started to show up. This is why they want to be alone and close to each other and this is why they look at the people as being rather awful and dreary. This is clear in the following exchange:

- 18           Most of the people look  
              rather awful. Americans didn't  
              use to look like that
- 19           They look dreary, let's  
              not get to know anybody  
              but just stay together.

Here, we have an invitation on the part of Aderian to be together with Eva and this is triggered by the factive verb 'let'.

The couple has left America for France to be alone, to get closer and to be together in their journey. This is what has already been planned. But the minute they are introduced to the people on the deck of the ship, the scene starts to change. Aderian starts to look for a partner and he succeeds in finding Miss D'Amido. But when Eva finds herself alone, she pretends sickness and in (43) she cries:

- 43    Oh, but I'm sick

<sup>5</sup> - According to Quirk et al (1987), the verb 'know' can be used with both a 'that clause' and (commonly in the negative and interrogative) a 'whether/if clause'.

44    Why you poor baby, why didn't  
      you tell me?

45    I was all right upstairs... oh, I'm  
      too sick to talk.

46    You'd better have dinner in bed

47    Dinner! Oh, my heavens!

The pragmatic presupposition behind these exchanges is that she wants him to pay her a little attention. She pretends sickness to get him back to her, but in vain. He tells her that he has already told the D'Amido girl he'd play with her and that's why he leaves her alone in her cabin. Before he leaves he asks her:

60    Can I do anything for you  
      before I go?

61    Where are you going?

62    Meeting those kids in the bar.  
      Can I do anything for you?

63    No

The presupposition here is triggered by the use of 'where' which presupposes that he is going somewhere, i.e., he has the intention to leave her and to get involved in another thing. Aderian, on his part, asks a yes/no question in the hope of getting an answer whether yes or no. Surprisingly, Eva doesn't give a positive or negative answer, but instead she issues another question; an open question. This question (61) is positively oriented and presupposes, as we have mentioned above, that Aderian is going somewhere. What is interesting in these two exchanges is that the addressee in a yes/no question has some freedom to answer with yes or no but in an open question the addressee has no such freedom, i.e., the open question rules out such freedom to say 'no' because it presupposes that Aderian should tell where he is going to. What is to be added here is that these two exchanges constitute an interesting example of chaining where one adjacency pair is embedded within another. The response to the first part

is suspended until the embedded pair is resolved.<sup>6</sup>

When we move a little bit further in the story, we can feel that Aderian is trying to be away from his wife. In the previous example, Eva has been in her cabin and Aderian has left her alone to go to his Mistress Miss D'Amido, while in this situation he leaves her on the deck of the ship and goes down to meet his mistress and the pretext now is that he is meeting winners in the bar:

- 71 How do you feel?  
 72 Terrible  
 73 Winner are buying a drink in the bar.  
 74 I'm going too.  
 75 You'd better stay here. I'll send you up something.

The pragmatic presupposition behind Aderian's (73) is that he is one of the celebrities and being so, he has to attend a sort of meeting that brings the winners together in the bar to celebrate their winning. Eva's response 'I'm coming too' presupposes that she is planning to accompany her husband to go downstairs to share him his happiness. The pragmatic presupposition of the same utterance is that she has become an addict of Alcohol. In other words, Eva has become an addict because of her husband's continuous absence and her being alone most of her time. Aderian's utterance (75) presupposes, pragmatically speaking, that Aderian's public manner has slightly hardened towards his wife.

The previous points can also be illustrated through the following examples: in (94) "I want another champagne cocktail", the linguistic trigger 'another' presupposes that she

has already had champagne cocktail. Aderian's (95) "you've had enough" presupposes that he is aware of the fact that she is drinking too much. Eva's "The youngest set. Oh, the youngest set. And you just having the time of your life--- with a child" presupposes a sort of bitterness on her part, i.e., her being aware of his public manner.

Aderian's impatience and the change in his public manner can be clearly shown in the following exchanges:

- 98 "...it's time to dress for the party. I'll go on up. Don't be long.  
 99 Wait for me, please, its rocking so. (no response on the part of Aderian).  
 100 You don't mind waiting, do you? I don't want to parade up there. (no response on the part of Aderian)  
 101 Ships make people feel crazy. I think they are awful.  
 102 Yes.  
 103 When it gets very hard I pretend I'm in the top of a tree, rocking to and fro. But finally I get pretending every thing, and finally I have to pretend I'm the same when I know I'm not.  
 104 If you get thinking that way you will go crazy.

The pragmatic presupposition behind the second and the third move in utterance (98) is that Aderian is no more capable of staying with his wife even when he is to wait for her. It's Eva's right to show up with her husband on the deck of the ship just like all the other couples on the ship. And this is why she asks him to wait for her. Eva's response "...its rocking" presupposes that she suspects Aderian's going to the party with his eighteen year old lady. When Aderian gives no response to her (99), she instigates him to accept the fact that he is not bothered by his staying with her. She issues an assertion that he doesn't

<sup>6</sup> - for more information about adjacency pairs, you can see Coulthard (1977).

mind waiting for her; and therefore, she asks him a positive question to get a negative response "No, I don't". It is worth noting that Eva uses the factive verb 'mind' which presupposes the truth of its complement that he doesn't mind waiting for her. Eva on her part is quite positive that he is not willing to wait, but she drives him to accept this manner. She doesn't give him a chance to answer her own positively oriented yes/no question because it, to her and to him, is overt. She continues by telling him "I don't want..." and here the presupposition is triggered by the non factive verb 'want' which doesn't presuppose the truth of its complement. The other presupposition is triggered by the use of the non factive verb "think" which doesn't presuppose the truth of its complement. Here Eva presupposes a criticism against all people like her husband; those who get evasive and crazy when they are on ships.

Aderian's assertion in (102) urges his wife to burst out a bitter confession that revolves around the trigger 'pretend' which doesn't presuppose the truth of its complement. If we consider the counter factive verb 'pretend' in:

1. I pretend rocking to and fro.
2. I pretend every thing.
3. I pretend I'm not the same.

we get to know that Aderian is driving his wife mad out of being so inconsiderate and indifferent to his wife and to her emotions. But this is not always the case, i.e., only when things get very bad and this is triggered by the temporal subordinate clause starting with "when". In (104) Aderian uses presupposition to warn Eva. This is triggered by the noun phrase 'that way' which is embedded under the use of counter-factual conditional starting with "if".

Few days later, things get worse and worse to the extent that Eva has become unaware of what she is doing. The absence of the husband and drinking have made her in need of a bromide; this is what the doctor prescribes:

137 She needs a bromide, I've given orders that she is not to have any more to drink on this ship.

138 Why not?

139 Don't you know what happened last night.

140 Why, no, I was asleep.

141 Mrs. Smith wandered a round the boat for an hour, not knowing what she was doing. A sailor was set to follow her, and then the medical stewardess tried to get her to bed, and your wife insulted her.

The doctor's iterative "more" presupposes that Eva has already drunk enough and she is not to have any more. The demonstrative 'this' presupposes that the doctor is referring to Eva's current state with alcohol. Aderian's "why not?" presupposes his ignorance and negligence of his wife. If he had been close enough to his wife, and if he had been considerate to her emotions, he wouldn't have asked such a question; but actually he is neither close nor considerate. This is quite clear from his response (140) to the doctor's negative question (139) which presupposes that:

1- he doesn't know what happened last night

2- people seem to know more about his wife than he himself.

3- The gap between the two has been enlarged to the extent that while "he was asleep", she was "wandering around the boat" and "a sailor was set to follow her". The factive verb 'wander' presupposes that Eva has already become absent minded; and this absent mindedness also is triggered by the



doctor's comment "not knowing what she was doing". The doctor's two-move utterance presupposes, pragmatically speaking that Aderian's wife will go mad if he doesn't pay her any attention.

In the middle of the misty weather, Eva gets to know Butterworth more and more as he compensates for her husband's absence and gives her a chance to forget things that could trouble her all the time; gradually she becomes impressed by his politeness, cooperation and sense of responsibility. Such presupposition is triggered by Eva's responses to him and to her husband respectively:

154 Don't go, you look so cheerful and nice.

155 I like that young man. He was awfully nice to me last night when you'd disappeared.

The use of the noun phrase "young man" presupposes a sort of reminder to Aderian that he is not the only man who is young and as long as he is running after youth with the eighteen year old lady, Miss D'Amido, she herself is capable of finding youth with another person who can evaluate her youth and beauty more than her husband. The adverbial subordinate clause starting with "when" presupposes that he "did disappear" and "did leave" her alone and that, by itself, gave a chance to Butterworth to enter into her life even though marginally.

A very interesting example of presupposition is triggered by the use of "anything" which presupposes that she has already done something. She doesn't want to remember. As we have mentioned before, "want" is a non-factive verb which doesn't presuppose the truth of its complement, i.e., in saying "I want to be a sailor" it doesn't presuppose that I a sailor but when the verb "want" is already negated, it

presupposes the truth of its complement. But what is it then she doesn't want to remember? Pragmatically speaking in saying:  
156 I don't want to remember anything about last night.

there is an implicit invitation not to let her remember anything about the last night in which she threw her pearls overboard as they stand for her marriage and her life with Aderian.

Eva's mood starts to worry Aderian because she is not used to drinking too much. Eva on her part is still urging Butterworth to go for another bottle of champagne forgetting completely about the doctor's instructions. This is why Aderian objects saying:

165 We've had enough, we ought to go to bed.

The first move of Aderian's utterance presupposes that he is now aware of the fact that this is a form of revenge on Eva's part for his attention to Miss D'Amido. This is clearly emphasized by Eva's response to Aderian's second move:

166 I won't go to bed. You must be crazy! You play all you want, and then when I find somebody I -- I like, you want to put me to bed.

her first move presupposes a sort of challenge because this is the first time she objects to going to bed and to giving him a chance to meet Miss D'Amido. This is intensified by the third move in which she confronts her husband for the first time telling him that she knows about his intentions. This is triggered by the following:

1- The non-factive verb "want" which doesn't presuppose the truth of its complement.

2- The iterative "then" which presupposes that what comes next

is to be considered as a second step, i.e., there is a step before it.

3- The temporal subordinate clause starting with "when I find somebody I like" presupposes that she already found Butterworth to fill the gap in her life. Eva even succeeds in eliciting an implicit accusation that Aderian is crazy. This is triggered by the factive modal "must".

But when Aderian feels that there is no way in talking to his wife, he invites Butterworth to leave them. This is triggered by the use of "you'd better" and the reason is that Eva doesn't know what she is saying:

169 I think you'd better leave us, Butterworth. Eva doesn't know what she is saying.

The definite descriptive pronoun "what" presupposes that she is saying something; may be dangerous enough not to be heard by people like Butterworth. The factive verb "know" presupposes the truth of its complement; but since Aderian's assumption is contrary to this, i.e., the truth of its complement, he uses the verb in the negative form. Therefore, the presupposition here is suspended rather than fulfilled. Then when Eva objects to Aderian's proposition that Butterworth should leave, she comments saying that:

170 He's the only person that's been half-decent to me.

The presuppositional quantifier "only" restricts the people who have been (half) decent to Eva to Butterworth and only Butterworth. But why should Eva say such a thing or mention such a restriction in spite of the fact that other people like the doctor and the nurse have also been decent to her? The answer to this question leads to the pragmatic presupposition that Eva is trying to tell Aderian that she has been living recently in a vacuum

emotionally and socially and this is why she is trying to spend her time with certain people like Butterworth.

The dispute between the two doesn't last for so long. Towards the end of the story the couple gradually gets closer again through a very transparent conversation:

201 The real truth is that none of it happened, it was a nightmare --- -- an incredibly awful nightmare.

202 Then where are my pearls?

203 Darling, there are better pearls in Paris. I'll take the responsibility for those pearls. My real belief is that you saved the boat.

Aderian's utterance (201) presupposes an invitation to forget all about the past and to consider it as a nightmare, as an incredibly awful nightmare. Eva, on her part, refuses or objects to this. Actually, there seems to be an ellipsis in Eva's response which should read: "If what you are saying is true, then where are my pearls?" Therefore, the presupposition is triggered through the implied conditional. Then in (204), Eva is the one who issues an invitation: "Aderian, let's never get to know anyone else, but just stay together always, just we two.

Aderian Smiths' negative response to Aderian's question:

204 Who do you suppose those Aderian Smiths on the boat were?

presupposes an agreement between the two to forget the past and to start their life again. The non-factive verb 'suppose' doesn't presuppose the truth of its complement and therefore the "Aderian Smiths on the boat" were not themselves. They both confess this truth, but why? For two reasons:

1- There are many Smiths in the world, and it could happen to any.

2- They have reached an agreement, a deal to 'stay together always just they two.

To sum up, we can say that one of the problems in assessing the nature of presupposition in linguistics is that there is not one concept of presupposition, but several different concepts, all of which have been related to the word presupposition. To overcome such a problem, Keenan relates these concepts to two main different notions: semantic and pragmatic presuppositions. However presupposition is generally defined as that which the speaker assumes to be true (in that they are part of the content) as apposed to what he asserts to be true. The central sense of presupposition is a proposition, which remains constant under negation and interrogation. The study of pragmatic as well as semantic presupposition proves to be very important for a thorough understanding of the characters' plans and assumptions. Although the method we have used in the analysis of the text is open to discussion, it has provided us with many insights into the way the characters think and into the nature of the interaction in the story.

### Bibliography

- Abdulla, H.I. (1989) A pragmatic Analysis of Two Excerpts from Robert's Bolt's A Man for All Seasons. Unpublished Dissertation. University of Lancaster.
- Abdul-Razak, Foud Al-Muttalibi, A. (1991) A Book of Short Stories. Baghdad: Baghdad University Press.
- Bach, K. and Harnish, R.M. (1979) Linguistic Communication and Speech Acts. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Bates, G. (1976) Language and Context: The Acquisition of Pragmatics. New York: Academic Press.
- Coulthard, M. (1985) An Introduction to Discourse Analysis. London: Longman Group Ltd.
- Crystal, D. (1991) A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics. 2nd. ed. London: Black Well.
- Keenan, E. (1971) "Two Kinds of Presupposition in Natural Language". In C.J. Fillmore and D.T. Langendoen (eds.), Studies in Linguistic Semantics. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, pp. 45-54.
- Kempson, R.M. (1975) Presupposition and the Delimitation of Semantics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levinson, S.C. (1983) Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mey, J. L. (1993) Pragmatics: An Introduction. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- Palmer, F.R. (1981) Semantics. 2nd. ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Quirk, R., et al (1985) A Comprehensive Grammar of English Language. London: Longman.
- Short, M. (1981) "Discourse Analysis and the Analysis of Drama". In Applied Linguistics, Vol. 2, pp. 180-202.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (1976) Pragmatics of Language and Literature. Vol. II. Amsterdam: North Holland Publishing Co.

## الافتراض المسبق في قصة فتزجيرالد " العبور الصعب "

نوال فاضل عباس

قسم الإنكليزي - كلية التربية للبنات - جامعة بغداد

### المستخلص:

يستخدم مصطلح "الافتراض المسبق" بمعنيين، دلالي وتداولي. فيما يتعلق بالافتراض المسبق الدلالي، فإن اللغويين قد عزلوا بعض التراكيب كمصادر للافتراض المسبق من خلال أعداد قوائم لما يسمى "بادوات الافتراض المسبق" وإن لفنسن (1983) قد ذكر بعضاً من هذه الأدوات. أما بخصوص المعنى التداولي فإن كينان (1971) قد استخدم مصطلح "الافتراض التداولي المسبق" للإشارة إلى فئة من الاستنتاجات والتي في الحقيقة تعتبر رابطة بين المتكلم ومدى ملائمة الجملة للسياق العام.

يمثل المعنى المحوري للافتراض المسبق عرضاً يبقى ثابتاً في حالتي النفسي والسؤال. تتماشى طريقة التحليل المستخدمة في هذه الدراسة مع تلك المستخدمة من قبل شورت (1981). السؤال الرئيسي المطروح هو كم يمكن للخطاب الأدبي أن يصلح لمثل هذا الإطار التحليلي، الذي أعد أصلاً للخطاب الحقيقي الشفوي؟ لذلك فإن أهداف الدراسة تشمل:

- 1- إجراء تحليل لقصة سكوت فتزجيرالد "العبور الصعب"
- 2- ابضاح كيف أن الكاتب فتزجيرالد يستخدم الافتراض المسبق لإيجاد الفرق بين شخصين قصته من قبيل الاستنتاجيات، الافتراضات والعلاقة بينهم.

في ضوء التحليل، نلاحظ أن الافتراض الدلالي والتداولي المسبق برهن أنه مهم لتحقيق فهم أعمق لكل من دريان وإيفاء، الشخصيتان الرئيسيتان، وكذلك خططهم وافتراضاتهم.