"Context-Based Analysis in Interpreting Meaning and Identifying Sentence Structure in Fitzgerald's The Great Gatsby Using Utterance/ Force Techniques"

Hussein Hameed Ma'yuuf, *English Department, College of Education for Human Sciences, Babylon University, Iraq*, *husm56@gmail.com*

Abdul-Haq Abdul-Kareem Abdullah Al-Sahlani, *English Department, College of Education for Human Sciences, Babylon University, Iraq*, *s.savu77@yahoo.com*

Abstract. Digging up the significance of the context of an utterance, one should know that 'Utterance' is a small subpart of discourse shared by speaker and hearer, and indicates facts about the topic of the conversation in which it occurs, not to mention that there are also facts about the situation in which the conversation takes in the first place. Having an integrated background among pragmatics, syntax and social role of context, this study attempts at interpreting meaning and how context affects the structure of a sentence.

Two hypotheses, however, have been included in this regard. First, context might limit the range of possible interpretations. Second, the information provided by context maybe in contrast with the grammatical explicitness of the sentence structure, i.e., the more information a contexts holds, the less explicit the grammatical structures are, and vice-versa.

Using Thomas' techniques (1995), utterance/ force, the researcher has analyzed Fitzgerald's novel, entitled 'The Great Gatsby', to find out the interpreted meaning. Taking Green's (1996:133-35) account into consideration, the identification of sentence structures can be clearly shown. Hence, such an American novel is chosen here because of its richness of meaning multiplicity and its contingency of sentence structures affected by the context.

As for the results, it has been seen that *context*, in all its types, limits the range of possible interpretations, that is, without context it is impossible to reach the intended meaning of the addresser/addressee. Another result is that the relationship between grammatical explicitness and the information provided by the context is often contrary. To this end, the more information a context presents, the less explicit the grammatical structures are.

Keywords: Pragmatics, Syntax, Utterance, Force , Context & Abstract Meaning.

INTRODUCTION

This paper is fundamentally concerned with the syntactic, pragmatic and social role of context in linguistics (i.e., a very widely used term in linguistics which refers to either that which comes before and / or after something, or to the situation in which utterances take place).

Speakers and writers give language specific meanings and structures within specific situations. Highlighting the major focus of this paper, it is constituted to deal with how context in all its aspects helps in detecting meaning/ and how it determines the structure used by speakers and writers.

Language is not interpreted in a vacuum because of the ambiguity of its nature. One may use his/her knowledge of the actors, objects, and situation to determine more specific interpretations of any sentence. Thus, the problem the researcher aims to tackle might be formed in terms of the following basic questions:

1. Does the use of a linguistic form identify a range of meanings?
2. Are some words meaningful or meaningless regarding different speech communities?
3. Can one structurally encounter sentences presented in incomplete or different structures from the ones that they should be presented in?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Language scholars have recognized that there are correlations between the order of syntactic constituents in a sentence and the discourse role of the information which a particular constituent represents. In general, and all other things being equal, the first phrase in a sentence tends to be intended to denote familiar (topical, given, old, presupposed, predictable, or thematic) material, while phrases toward the end of the sentence tend to denote new (or asserted, or rhematic) material. Other things are not always equal, however, sentence stress or intonational accent also correlates with information being treated as new information may be expressed in phrases that occur toward or at the beginning of a sentence if they bear the main sentence stress, Horn & Ward (2008: 416), as in *John* ate the cookies.

However, as Prince (1981: 223-256) demonstrates, *familiar, predictable, given, old, theme*, and *sentence topic* do not denote interchangeable notions, and different writers have used the same term to refer to rather different categories. Yet the various writers seem to have been trying to get at the same point, summarized by Horn's (1986) observation that the initial slot in a sentence tends to be reserved for material taken to refer to the discourse theme or sentence topic (i.e., what the sentence is about).

Typically, this is material that the speaker (reflexively) assumes to be familiar to the addressee, and preferentially, it is material which is either salient (assumed by the speaker to be in the addressee's consciousness) or presupposed (taken as noncontroversial), Horn (1986:171). It is not surprising, then, that syntactic rules of languages provide for numerous alternative constructions which differ in the order of phrases while preserving truth-conditional semantics and illocutionary force depending on context.

Pragmatics & Context

The ways in which contextual features determine sentence interpretation are undertaken by pragmatics. Wales (2014: 335) states that pragmatics is a term taken from the Greek word 'pragma' to mean 'deed'. It was used in questioning of meaning. According to Morris (1938:6) cited in Kecskes (2014: 21) , pragmatics is ''the study of the relation of signs to interpreters''. In this definition, he limits the study of pragmatics to the relation of signs only to interpreters which would make it vague.

Later on, he gives this definition a generalization by changing the word '' interpreters '' to 'users' to become ''the relation of signs to their users'' (ibid). The latter seems to be more logical than the former, since the word 'interpreters' may refer only to hearers or addressees and not to speakers or addressers while the word 'users' may refer to both.

Taking a different perspective, Crystal (2003:364), traditionally speaking, sees pragmatics as a term used to refer to one of the three divisions of semiotics: pragmatics, syntax and semantics. Following the contribution of modern linguistics, pragmatics has to be applied ''to the study of language from the point of view of the users, especially of the choices they make, the constrains they encounter in using language in social interaction and the effects their use of language has on the other participants in an act of communication'' (ibid). He further explains that pragmatics is integrated in terms of "semantics, sociolinguistics and extra linguistic context; but the boundaries with these other domains are yet incapable of precise definition'' (ibid).

Knowing what a context exactly is, the word 'context' itself is a metaphor derived from the Latin 'texere', meaning 'to weave'. In the fourth century C.E. the Latin noun contextio described the text surrounding a given passage. In the Middle Ages, contextio came to mean "literary composition," but an interest in what is called "context," especially in biblical exegesis, was expressed through the term circumstantiae. In the ninth century, Sedulius Scotus enunciated the rule of "seven circumstances"—person, fact, cause, time, place, mode, and topic.

It was in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, especially in Italian, French, English, and German, that the term 'context' (contesto, contexture, Kontext) begins to be used with frequency. From the sentences before and after the passage to be interpreted, 'context' comes to refer to the coherence of a text, the relation of the parts to the whole (Burke: 17, 2006).

To know what is meant by context, one needs to distinguish between actual situations of utterance in all their multiplicity of features, and the selection of just those features that are culturally and linguistically relevant to the production and interpretation of utterance (Levinson, 1983: 22-23). Still, there is a great need to know what such features are likely to be. Lyons (1977:547), in this sense, lists the following features of context:

a. knowledge of role and status (where role covers both role in the speech event, as speakers or addresses, and social role, and status covers notions of relative social standing);
b. knowledge of spatial and temporal location;
c. knowledge of formality level;
d. knowledge of the medium (roughly the code or a style appropriate to a channel, like the distinction between written and spoken varieties of a language);
e. knowledge of appropriate subject matter, and
f. knowledge of province (or domain determining the register of a language).

   Ochs (1979:1) assures that "the scope of context is not easy to define… one must consider the social and psychological world in which the language user operates at any given time" (emphasis mine), moreover "it includes minimally, language users' beliefs and assumptions about temporal, spatial and social settings; prior, ongoing, and further actions (verbal, and non-verbal), and the state of knowledge and alternativeness of those participating in the social interaction in hand" (ibid: 5).

   Accordingly, both Lyons and Ochs stress that context must not be understood to exclude linguistic features, since such features often invoke the relevant contextual assumptions (a point made nicely by Gumperz who calls such linguistic features *contextualization cues*), cited in Levinson (1983: 23).

   Besides, Firth's concern is to embed the utterance in the 'social context' and to generalize across meanings an approach to the principled description of such contexts:

   My view was, and still is, that 'context of situation' is best used as a suitable schematic construct to apply to language events… A context of situation for linguistic work brings into relation the following categories:
A. The relevant features of participants.
(i) The verbal action of participants.
(ii) The non-verbal action of participants.
B. The relevant objects
C. The effect of the verbal action. (Firth, 1957:182, cited in Illés, 2020: I).

   Reminiscent of Firth's approach, Hymes (1964) sets about specifying the features of context which may be relevant to the identification of a type of context which in turn may be relevant to the identification of a type of speech event. He abstracts the role of addresser (the speaker or writer who produces the utterance) and addressee (the hearer or reader who is the recipient of the utterance). And later he distinguishes audience, since the presence of overhearers may contribute to the specification of the speech event.

   The importance of the knowledge of the addresser is that it makes it impossible to imagine what a particular person is likely to say, whereas that of addressee constrains the expectations made by the analyst even further. The other category is topic which means what is being talked about and helps in constraining the interpretation expectations. The expectations will also be further constrained, if the information about setting is available, (by setting is meant where the event is situated in time and place), and the physical interactants with respect to posture and gesture and facial expression.

   The other features of context discussed by Hymes (1964) include features like channel (the way of contact between participants whether by speech, writing, singing, smoke signals), code (what language, or dialect, or style of language is being used), message-form (what form is intended – chat, debate, sermon, fairy-tale, sonnet, love-letter, etc.) and event (the nature of the communicative event within which a genre may be embedded – thus, a sermon or prayer may be part of the larger event, a church service). He also adds other features like key (which involves evaluation – whether it is a good sermon, a pathetic explanation, etc.), and purpose (what the participants intended should come about as a result of the communicative events), cited in (Brown & Yule, 1983: 38-39).

   Moreover, Lewis (1972:173) provides a more elaborate checklist especially to provide an index of some co-ordinates which an addressee would need to have specified to determine the truth of a sentence. His interest does not lie with some general features of the communicative event like channel, code and message-form but with particular co-ordinates which constitute ' a package of relevant factors, an index' and which characterize the context against which the truth of a sentence is to be judged. The co-ordinates of the index are specified as follows:
a) Possible-world co-ordinate: this is to account for states of affair which might be, or could be supposed to be or are.
b) Time co-ordinate: to account for tensed sentences and adverbials like today or next week
c) Place co-ordinate: to account for sentences like here it is

d) Speaker co-ordinate: to account for sentences which include first person reference (I, me, we, our, etc.)
e) Audience co-ordinate: to account for sentences including you, yours, yourself, etc.
f) Indicated object co-ordinate: to account for sentences containing demonstrative phrases like the latter, the aforementioned, etc.
g) Assignment co-ordinate: an infinite series of things (sets of things, sequences of things…) cited in (Brown & Yule, 1983: 40-41).

So far the concern has been particularly on the physical context in which utterances are uttered. However, there is another kind of context known as linguistic context or co-text. The co-text of a word is the set of other words used in the same phrase or sentence. It has a strong effect on what one thinks the word means. For example, the word bank is a form with more than one meaning. Then, the question is how to know which meaning is intended in a particular sentence? This could be done, probably, on the basis of linguistic context. If the word bank is used in a sentence together with words like steep or overgrown, one may have no problem deciding which type of 'bank' is meant. Similarly, when one hears someone say that she has to get to the bank to cash a check, one knows from the linguistic context which type of 'bank' is intended, (Yule, 1996:129).

The role of co-text is to limit the range of possible interpretations for a word. It is consequently misleading to think of reference being understood solely in terms of one's ability to identify referents via the referring expression. The referring expression actually provides a range of reference, that is, a number of possible referents. For example while the phrase ' the cheese sandwich' stays the same in the examples [a] and [b] below, the different co-texts in [a.] and [b.] lead to a different type of interpretation in each case(i.e.' food' in [a.] and ' person' in [b.])
a) the cheese sandwich is made with white bread
b) the cheese sandwich left without paying.
But co-text is still part of the environment in which a referring expression is used.

Abstract Meaning & Ambiguity

Thomas (1995:2-5) states that "abstract meaning is concerned with what a word, phrase, sentence, etc. could mean (for example, the dictionary meanings of words or phrases)".

Another term referring to the same case is 'linguistic meaning' which Akmajian et al (1997: 215-218) define as "the linguistic meaning of an expression is simply the meaning or meanings of that expression in the language". A speaker can produce linguistic or abstract meaning if he or she speaks literally.

Words can have more than one abstract meaning, and usually one of the meanings is common while the others are specified to some limited fields of discourse. That words have more than one abstract meaning is one of the reasons that lead to ambiguity. But, when in a known domain of discourse or when the social roles of the interactants are known there will be little difficulty in assigning the correct sense to an ambiguous lexical item. For example, *handout* refers to lecture notes when asked by a student, whereas it refers to money, food, clothes, etc., when asked by a tramp (Thomas: 1995: 2-4).

The term *abstract meaning* can also be applied to phrases or sentences and not only to words. For example, suppose someone were in a party and heard someone saying "the Pearsons are on coke" if they check the dictionary they see that *coke* could refer to Coca-Cola, cocaine or a coal derivative. Therefore, at least the expression could have one of the three meanings: to be drinking Coca-Cola, to use cocaine, or to have solid-fuel heating. "what words actually mean on the occasion in question could only be determined in context" (ibid).

Holding a background of what *ambiguity* is, a large word, phrase, sentence, or other communication is called ambiguous if it can be reasonably interpreted in more than one way. The simplest case is a single word with more than one sense: The word "bank", for example, can mean "financial institution", "edge of a river", or other things. Sometimes this is not a serious problem because a word that is ambiguous in isolation is often clear in context.

Someone who says *'I deposited $100 in the bank'* is unlikely to mean that he buried the money beside a river. More problematic are words whose senses express closely related concepts. "Good", for example, can mean 'useful' or 'functional' (That's a good hammer), "exemplary" (She's a good student), "pleasing" (This is good soup), "moral" (He is a good person), and probably other similar things. "I have a good daughter" isn't clear about which sense is intended. Ambiguity should not be confused with vagueness, in which a word or phrase has one meaning whose boundaries are not sharply defined (Corr, 2005: 6).

In addition to words with multiple senses, ambiguity can be caused by syntax. 'He ate the cookies on the couch', for example, could mean that he ate those cookies which were on the couch (as opposed to those that were on the table), or it could mean that he was sitting on the couch when he ate the cookies. Spoken language can also contain lexical ambiguities, where there is more than one way to break up a set of sounds into words, for example 'ice cream' and 'I scream'. This is rarely a problem due to the use of context (ibid).

Linguists spend a lot of time and effort searching for and removing ambiguity in arguments, because it can lead to incorrect conclusions and can be used to deliberately conceal bad arguments. For example, a politician might say 'I oppose taxes which hinder economic growth'. Some will think he opposes taxes in general because they hinder economic growth; others will think he opposes only those taxes that he believes will hinder economic growth. The politician hopes that each will interpret the statement in the way he wants, and both will think the politician is on his side. In literature and rhetoric, on the other hand, ambiguity can be a useful tool. Groucho Marx's classic joke depends on a grammatical ambiguity for its humor, for example: Last night I shot an elephant in my pajamas. What he was doing in my pajamas I'll never know. Songs and poetry often rely on ambiguous words for artistic effect, as in the song title "Don't It Make My Brown Eyes Blue" (where "blue" can refer to the color or to sadness) (debatepedia.idebate.org).

Utterance and Force Techniques

The major concern here is about the two terms presented by Thomas (1995). Those two techniques are very important in that they are the model of analysis of this study. However, The speaker's meaning is usually a compound of utterance and force. In certain cases, force can be derived from utterance meaning, sometimes by the application of paralinguistic features (such as intonation and tone of voice) or non-linguistic features (such as gestures) in order to reach the intended force. If the utterance meaning is not understood, one might not understand the force or if it is agreed on utterance meaning, it is unlikely to be able to agree as to the intended force. Therefore, the relationship between utterance meaning and force is so closely related but not inseparable.

Utterance Technique

Getting a contextual meaning or utterance meaning is done by moving from abstract meaning, to what the speaker means by these words on a particular occasion. Therefore, Gazdar (1979: 19), cited in Thomas (2014: 16), defines utterance meaning as a sentence-context pairing, and he regards it to be the first component of speaker meaning. The importance of the utterance meaning is that people in normal life do not usually level their interpretative faculties trying to determine sense and reference.

Force Technique

Force as a technique is used in pragmatics to refer to the speaker's communicative intention. The term force was first introduced by J. L. Austin. It is the second component of the speaker meaning. Suppose that someone asks you '*is that your car*?' and there are no ambiguities of sense or reference, the word *that* indicates a unique entity (your car) and *your* refers to you. In this case, although there are no problems in understanding the utterance meaning (the first level of speaker meaning), you may not understand the force behind the question whether it is admiration or scorn, a complaint, a request, etc. (ibid).

Syntax & Context

Depending on context and the way in which something is said reflects speakers' attitudes and beliefs about the topics and referents of an ongoing discourse. This is due to how users vary in their use of sentences. The aspect of how something is said which we will focus on is the choice of a syntactic construction from among the many which the grammar of a language makes available for the proposition to be expressed.

In other words it is about first treating syntactic devices which reflect the speaker's assumptions about the structure of the discourse, second examining some constructions which differ from their truth-conditionally equivalent counterparts in various other ways. Some differ in rhetorical function (i.e. in what gets asserted and what is presupposed), but most reflect different beliefs about or attitudes toward referents of linguistic expressions that are part of the utterance, third dealing with syntactic constructions which enable a speaker to compensate for (perceived) difficulties in producing or parsing a complex utterance. Many of the constructions have more than one use or function, and show up in more than one category. Therefore, the researcher adopts Green's (1996:133-35) model in identifying the syntactic forms which

provide numerous alternative constructions. These constructions differ in the order of phrases while preserving truth-conditional semantics and illocutionary force depending on context.

METHODOLOGY

As far as pragmatics is concerned, the analysis is implicated on some extracts taken from a literary text, *Fitzgerald's The great Gatsby* using Thomas's techniques (1995): *utterance* and *force*. Adopting Green's (1996:133-35) model, the researcher is going to identify the syntactic structures in *The great Gatsby*.

Data Collection & Reliability Source

Collecting the required data, the researcher has collected the data from the most reliable websites, such as britannica.com & theguardian.com. Choosing such a novel is done on the basis of: first, its richness of meaning multiplicity and secondly, its contingency of sentence structures affected by the context.

Data Summary, Analysis & Results

The novel is set on Long Island, in the fictional West Egg and East Egg Villages, based on, respectively, Great Neck, New York (where Fitzgerald lived while writing the novel) and Port Washington, New York.

Jay Gatsby, the title character, is a young millionaire living in West Egg with a mysterious and somewhat notorious past. No one quite knows how he made his fortune; some believe he is a bootlegger. Rumors circulate of him "killing a man", or being a German spy during the Great War and the possibility of him being a cousin of contemporaneous German ruler Kaiser Wilhelm. He is famous for throwing glamorous parties attended by high society, with their countless gatecrashers whom he generously tolerates.

However, Gatsby has no ties to the society of the rich in which he circulates, and is a lonely man. All he really wants is to "repeat the past" – to be reunited with the love of his life and golden girl, Daisy. It is revealed that Daisy is the primary reason he pursued a life of money, the other being that he wanted to escape from the life of his father, a farmer. But Daisy is now Daisy Buchanan, married to the staid, relatively respectable millionaire Tom Buchanan, and the couple now has a young child. For Gatsby, though, Daisy's new status as mother and wife hardly constitutes an obstacle in regaining her love; and Daisy, feeling trapped and bored in her marriage with the unfaithful Tom, is flattered by the return of Gatsby's attention.

The narrator of the novel is 29-year-old Nick Carraway, an apprentice Wall Street trader in the rising financial markets of the early 1920s, who is also Daisy's cousin. Carraway has moved into a small bungalow next to the enormous mansion (a "factual imitation of some Hotel de Ville in Normandy") of millionaire Gatsby. Eventually, Carraway cynically realizes that the rich, as respectable as they may seem superficially, are indeed "careless people," and Tom and Daisy are no exception. Tom has a mistress, Myrtle Wilson, the wife of the gas station owner in the wasteland of ashes around present day Flushing, Queens, New York, between the fabulous mansions on Long Island and New York City.

Nick meets and quickly befriends Gatsby though, and becomes his liaison with Daisy. One afternoon, after a confrontation between Tom and Gatsby over Daisy, Daisy runs over Myrtle while driving back from the city. Tom misleads Myrtle's heartbroken husband George, implying that the accident was Gatsby's fault, though it is not clear if it was intentional.

In a fit of blinding vengeance, Gatsby is consequently shot by George Wilson; Wilson commits suicide immediately afterward. Hardly anyone, not even Daisy, goes to Gatsby's funeral, and Nick, Gatsby's sole remaining friend, attends it with Gatsby's father, a poor farmer. Only one guest shows up, one of Gatsby's previous party-goers who was amazed with Gatsby's incredible library. Gatsby is buried with the same mystery in which he suddenly appeared. (blog.prepscholar.com, 2020).

DATA ANALYSIS & RESULTS

1. "Why they came east I don't know"
(Chapter 1, P. 12, Line 16)
Here Nick (the first-person narrator) talks about Tom and Daisy. He uses proposing for the purpose of emphasis.
2. "The front was broken by a line of French windows…"
(Chapter 1, P. 13, Lines 1-2)

Nick describes the house of two old friends of his in this extract. Because he is ignorant of the doer/agent, he uses the passive voice construction.

3. "We talked for a few minutes on the sunny porch. 'I've got a nice place here,' he said, his eyes flashing about restlessly."
(Chapter 1, P. 13, Lines 30-32)
Nick is talking to Tom whose utterance meaning shows that the place is his and it is nice, while the force of this utterance gives Nick the impression about Tom's self-engrossed brutality, as if he were saying 'I am arrogant and of forced postures.'

4. " 'We'll go inside' "
(Chapter 1, P. 14, Line 6)
This utterance is said by Tom to Nick. Although the statement is about a future activity, its utterance meaning as well as its force, derived from the physical context, shows an order that Nick needs to go inside together with Tom.

5. "The other girl, Daisy, made an attempt to rise – she leaned slightly forward with a conscientious expression- then she laughed, an absurd, charming little laugh, and I laughed too and came forward into the room. 'I'm p-paralysed with happiness' "
(Chapter 1, P. 15, Lines 4-8)
This extract shows how Nick meets Daisy after a long time of separation. In her expression 'I'm p-paralysed with happiness' the word 'paralyze' cannot be given the sense of paralysis, because that would be too far from the interpretation of the utterance. Again derived from the physical context, the utterance meaning and force show that she is extremely happy to see Nick and that is very clear also from the linguistic context that follows this utterance in the original text. So, the word 'paralyze' is used figuratively in this extract and cannot be interpreted at all without the physical, or at least linguistic, context.

6. " 'What you doing, Nick?' "
(Chapter 1, P. 16, Line 22)
Tom in his question to Nick uses ellipsis. The auxiliary 'are' is omitted and can be understood out of context. The whole utterance is one example of the different registers speakers use in their talk where they, registers, depend on the familiarity of the participants.

7. " 'Never heard of them,' he remarked decisively."
(Chapter 1, P. 16, Line 26)
Again, Tom eliptted the subject from his utterance to be understood from the context of the utterance. This shows the relationship between the grammatical explicitness and the information provided by context.

8. " 'I'd be a God damned fool to live anywhere else.' "
(Chapter 1, P. 16, Lines 32-33)
Tom is speaking to Nick. His utterance meaning is that Tom likes the east, while the force tells Nick that Tom is not going to move anywhere else, he will stay in the east. Here, both the utterance and force are understood.

9. " 'How you ever get anything done is beyond me.' I looked at Miss Baker, wondering what it was she 'got done' "
(Chapter 1, P. 17, Lines 15-18)
This extract is very important. It shows the case where the utterance meaning is understood but the force is not. It was not 'how you ever get anything done is beyond me' what caused Nick problems but what is meant by this utterance, in other words, Nick is able to understand the utterance meaning but not the force.

10. " 'We ought to plan something,' yawned Miss Baker, sitting down at the table as if she were getting into bed. 'All right,' said Daisy. 'What'll we plan?' She turned to me helplessly: 'What do people plan?'
(Chapter 1, P. 18, Line 14-17)
This is another example about understanding the utterance but not the force of meaning. Here Daisy could understand Miss Baker's words but could understand exactly what she means by this utterance. Her misunderstanding the intended meaning is very clear from the lines that follow in the original text, i.e., from its linguistic context.

11. " 'Civilization's going to pieces,' broke out tom vio-lently. ''I've gotten to be a terrible pessimist about things. Have you read The Rise of the Coloured Empires by this man Goddared?' 'Why, no,' I answered... "
(Chapter 1, P. 19, Lines 14-18)

This extract clarifies the case where the utterance meaning is not understood while the force is. Nick could not know exactly what 'The Rise of the Coloured Empires' is, but he could understand that it is something to read and the force whether he has read this piece of writing before or not. What Nick could not understand is clarified further from the lines that follow this extract in the original text. The last point made here shows the importance of the linguistic context in interpreting meaning.

12. " 'When are you going to sell me that car?' 'Next week; I've got my man working on it now.' 'Works pretty slow, don't he?' "
(Chapter 2, P. 31, Lines 12-14)
Here, Wilson talks to Tom. In 'works pretty slow, don't he' the subject is ellipted where it can be understood from the physical context, and also from the linguistic context "don't he" where it shows that the ellipted subject is 'he'. In addition, 'don't he' shows the different types of registers used by speakers depending on how familiar with the hearers they are.

13. " 'Get some chairs, why don't you, so somebody can sit down.' "
 (Chapter 2, P. 32, Lines 1-2)
In this extract Myrtal talks to her husband, Wilson. Her utterance meaning shows that their guests need to set down so he should bring some chairs, but in fact the force of the utterance is that she wants her husband to be away from them so that she can talk freely to her lover.

14. " 'It does her good to get away.' 'Doesn't her husband object?' "
(Chapter 2, P. 32, Lines 21-22)
Tom talks to Ekleburg. Tom's utterance meaning is clear, i.e. she has a sister who lives in New York and her husband thinks she goes to visit her. But the force of this utterance is that her husband does not know anything about what is going on.

Getting around the results, one of the findings is that context, in all its types, limits the range of possible interpretations, that is, without context it is impossible to reach the intended meaning of the addresser/addressee. Another result of the study is that the relationship between grammatical explicitness and the information provided by the context is often contrary, that is, the more information a context presents, the less explicit the grammatical structures are.

CONCLUSIONS

Rounding off this study, the conclusions are appeared in what follows:
1. Context can be divided into three types: Physical (the actual place and time in which an utterance takes place), linguistic (the set of other words used in the same phrase or sentence where its basic role is to limit the range of possible interpretations of a word), and social (this depends on some social factors that determine the speaker's language choice).
2. Speakers and writers give language specific meanings and structures within specific situations, i.e. a change of context leads to a change of meaning.
3. Words are neither stable nor general, rather they have multiple and ever-changing meanings created for and adapted to specific contexts of use.
4. Meaning is the result of interaction between abstract meaning, the speaker, the hearer, and the context.
5. The process of interpretation by hearers/readers undergoes the following steps:
    a. Assigning sense to words in context.
    b. Assigning reference to words in context.
    c. After assigning both sense and reference to words in context, it is reached at the utterance meaning, then comes the force.
6. After the processes mentioned in a, b, and c, the hearers'/readers' interpretations would be one of the followings:
    a. They understand both utterance and force of meaning. (Very common).
    b. They understand utterance but not force. (Less common than the case in a.)
    c. They understand force but not utterance. (Very rare).
    d. They understand neither utterance nor force. (It usually takes place when users are not in their original community, i.e. when finding themselves in a place in which their mother tongue is spoken but different accents as well as the use of slangs).
7. The above cases show that speakers' meanings are of two levels which are force, and utterance.

8. To reach at the right interpretation, addressers/addressees must not construct a context larger than necessary in order to get an accurate interpretation, while that of analogy gives a framework for the interpretation and for the analyst.
9. It is consequently misleading to think of reference being understood solely in terms of our ability to identify referents via the referring expression.
10. The speaker is the one who refers, i.e. the process of referring is not done by the expression itself, rather, by the speaker using that expression to do.
11. Deictic expressions form the most problematic issue in assigning reference to words.
12. Users vary their use of sentences depending on context.
13. The relationship that holds between context and the grammatical explicitness is contrary, that is, the more information a context can provide, the less explicit the grammatical structures are.
14. Inversion and preposing constructions are basically used as stylistic devices just in the case of emphasizing, especially focused new information, is needed.
15. Passive voice must be used in the following cases:
    a. When the performer of the action is unknown. This proves that lacking information in context affects the structure of the sentence.
    b. When it is advisable or preferable not to mention the performer.
16. Ellipting constituents from a sentence is resulted from or dependent on the information that can be recoverable from its context of situation especially in the spoken language depending on the users' familiarity which is a matter of grammatical competence.

REFERENCES

Akmajian, A. Richard A. Demers, Annk. Farmer and Robert M. Harnish (1997): *Linguistics: An Introduction to Language and Communication*. London: The MIT Press.

Brown, G., & George Yule (1983): *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Burke, P. (2006): *New Dictionary of History of Ideas*. Chicago FindArticles.

Corr, M. (2005). *Identification and Avoidance of Critical Ambiguity.* An unpublished paper: CSLL.

Crystal , D. (2003): *A dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fitzgerald, F. Scott. The Great Gatsby. New York: Scribner's, 1925. Print.

Green, M. Georgia (1996): *Natural Language Understanding*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Horn, Laurence. (1986): 'Presupposition, theme and variations.' In Anne M. Farley, Peter Farley, & Karl-Erik McCullough (Eds.), *Parasession on pragmatics and grammatical theory, 22nd Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* (pp. 168-192). Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

_____, & Ward, G. (eds.) (2008). The Handbook of Pragmatics. UK: Blackwell Publishing.

Illés, E. (2020). *Understanding Context in Language Use and Teaching: An ELF Perspective.* London & New York: Routledge.

Kecskes, I. (2014). *Intercultural Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Levinson, S. C. (1983): *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lewis, D. (1972): 'General semantics'. in D. Davisdon & G. H. Harman (eds.). *Semantics of natural language*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Lyons, J. (1977): Semantics. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Ochs, E. (1979): 'Planned and Unplanned Discourse' London: Twayne Co. Ltd..

Prince Ellen. (1981). 'Toward a taxonomy of given-new information.' In Peter Cole (Ed.), *Radical pragmatics* (pp. 223-256). New York: Academic Press.

Schmerling Susan F. (1976): *Aspects of English sentence stress*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction*: *An Introduction to Pragmatics*. London: Longman Group Ltd.

_____, (2014). *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. London & New York: Routledge.

Wales, Katie (2014). *A Dictionary of Stylistics*. London. Longman Group Ltd.

Yule, George (1996): *The Study of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

http://debatepedia.idebate.org/en/index.php/Ambiguity

https://blog.prepscholar.com/the-great-gatsby-summary

https://www.britannica.com/topic/The-Great-Gatsby

https://www.theguardian.com/childrens-bookssite/2015/may/25/review-f-scott-fitzgerald-the-great-gatsby

" Context-Based Analysis In Interpreting Meaning And Identifying Sentence Structure In Fitzgerald's The Great Gatsby Using Utterance/ Force Techniques"