

# Readers' Interpretation and Recontextualization of Fitzgerald's *The Great Gatsby*

M. Amir P.

Doctoral Programme of Linguistics, Faculty of Letters Hasanuddin University, Makassar - Indonesia

## ABSTRACT

*Readers' Interpretation and Recontextualization of Fitzgerald's The Great Gatsby.* The objectives of the study are to know Daisy's love to Tom and Gatsby through readers' interpretation and recontextualization of *The Great Gatsby* in order to reveal the construction of the interactional positioning of the readers.

The method employed is field work by observing the students' interpretation of the topic. The main theme is taken from the novel which is then formulated in the questions to be discussed by 5 (five) out of twenty students or respondents of the novel text. The result is the production of a number of utterances to interpret the textual data of the novel. It is these utterances or the talk of the students that are taken to be the sources of data. The utterances produced are analyzed and reinterpreted.

The results of the analysis are that there occurs indexical effect of the novel on the real readers, or in the interactional positionings of the readers. Using functional semiotics to analyze the readers' utterances, the data are considered analyzed at three distinct but interconnected textual levels: denotational text, mediational text, and interactional text. Through this analysis, it is found that the novel has an indexical effect on grouping the readers into two. The social relations that are constructed in the novel between Daisy and Gatsby and Tom, for example, is transferred into the social relations between real readers symbolized by pure love vs. fake love. This is the creation of interactional positioning.

Key words: Reader response, interpretation, indexical semiotic, denotational text, mediational text and interactional text.

## 1. Introduction

The researches focus on the objective structure of the novel and literary text have been done by many researchers, while the research focuses on the readers are still limited. The research focuses on the reader's response is important due to the meaning of literary work produced by the readers' interpretation.

The readers give meaning to a literary work based on their knowledge, experience and their cultural background. Literary work is a creation of the author who has been entrusted with a meaning, but readers often create their own meaning different from the meaning given by the author, even among the readers themselves are often producing different meanings. Iser (1972) says that reader response focuses on the readers' interaction with the text. Iser's readers are implied readers. It is the readers who have been schematized by the author in the work, so the readers are expected to know the meaning of the novel provided by author. This kind of readers has also been proposed by Wolff that he calls "intended reader" and Fish with his "inform reader." These type of readers interact with the text to produce literary meaning.

The present research focuses on the reader response, the researcher analyzes readers' response instead of the text of the novel. This research aims to get information about the readers' interpretation and recontextualization of the novel, *The Great Gatsby*, in order to reveal the construction of the interactional positioning of the readers.

Some scholars have practiced such kind of the research. Segers (1978) in his research entitled *The Evaluation of Literary Texts*, conducted experimental research at Yale University. Pradopo (2007) in his book, *Beberapa Teori Sastra, Metode Kritik dan Penerapannya (Some Literary Theory, Criticism Methods and Its Application)* observes Chairil Anwar's poems using reception theory and employs a diachronic method research. Lewis in Mustafa (2007) wrote an article entitled, *The Social Drama of Literature Discussions in a fifth/sixth Grade Classroom*. Lewis assessed the context and the social interaction of students in a multi-age classroom while reading and discussing a literary work.

The three researchers above produced and analyzed meaning of literary works which are based on the denotational level. The denotational text is the analysis to answer the question "what is being said?" The present

research is further extended the analysis to the interctional position of the characters of the novel which is transfered into the interactional positiong of the real readers. The last is mediational texts or we call indexical semiotic which relate between the denotational texts and interactional texts.

## 2. Theories

### 2.1 Reader response Thory

Reader Response theory views literary work as an aesthetic and artefac works. instead of artefac one which implies that literary work has meaning when it is read. Therefore the reader becomes an important factor in the meaning of a work.

Rosenblatt (1995) proposed a concept on the reader response theory which is called a reciprocal relationship between the reader and the text. The reader brings his or her cultural background and socialialization to the text. The meaning, therefore, the reader creates from the text which is synthesized with the text and the life context the reader brings to text. Rosenblatt also introduces Transactional Theory which explains that text is only an object of paper and ink until a reader responds to the marks on the page as verbal symbols, and a written work does not have the same meaning for all readers, because each reader brings his/her individual background knowledge, beliefs, values, cultural expectattions etc.(Rosenblatt, 1991)

Iser (1972) argues that the literary text is an artistic endeavour that is re-experienced by the consciounes of the reader in an act of convergence with the text. The text provides ‘the materials and determines the boundaries for the creative act of reading.’ According to Iser the convergence of text and the reader brings the literary work into existence. He also states that this convergence can never be precisely pinpointed, but always remains virtual as it is not identified through the reality of the text or through the individual disposition of the reader” (Iser,1974: 275). Therefore the meaning of literary work is not static but it is dynamic. The meaning depends on the period, place, knowledge and condititon of readers. Iser actually adopted Ingarden’s concept which is called concretization. It is a concept used in the reader response theory where readers are assigned to fill in the blank provided in a literary work.

### 2.2 Functional Semiotic

In analysing the data, a functional semiotic approach applied. According to Sandarupa (2013) language is analyzed as text and the emphasis is on the relation between text and context. The text, as he believes, consists of three levels, they are : 1) denotational text; 2) interactional text; and 3) mediational text. In analysing the data the researcher applies indexical semiotic of Peirce. (Peirce in Sandarupa, 2013)

The notion of index is further developed by Silverstein into the structure of indexicality, which is sometimes called poetic structure or emergent structure. It is this that constitutes the text that indexes context (Sandarupa, 2013)

This research is expected to get description on how the readers’ response theory produces meaning and how functional semiotic used to elaborate the relationship between text and the contex.

## 3. Method of Research

### 3.1 Research Location

The research was conducted at Hasanuddin University or more specifically at the English Department of Faculty of Letters. This place is deliberately chosen due to the materials are written in English and the focus of this research is that the readers-response. Another reason is that the students of English Department have capability of English and literature therefore it is believed that the students have already had insights of English literture. The choice of this place is expected the researcher gathers accurate data.

### 3.2 The Source of Data

The data source of this research is the readers’ response about *The Great Gatsby* by Fitzgerald which has been read and discussed by the students. The discussion was recorded and transcribed. The transcribed utterances are called the source of data. The utterances are expressed in Indonesian language and therefore they were translated into English in order the non-Indonesian speakers can undertand the meaning of the utterances.

The reader response theory treats the readers as important as the literary works, because the meaning of literery works is a result of the interaction between the works and the reader. In this research it is called real readers (Iser, 1978)

### 3.3 Technique of Collecting Data

There are two kinds of collecting data, recording and noting. The data gained from the discussion.

The discussion starts with the reading of the guided topic, *Bagaimanakah cinta Daisy pada Gatsby dan Tom? (How is Daisy's love to Tom and Gatsby)*, then the students debate to express their ideas. The readers were asked to give their comments which constitute their interpretation about the topic.

The students who participate in the discussion are called performers because they are involved in the speech event of discussion. The event of interpretation involves 5 (five) speakers who participate in the discussion. The speakers who participate in the discussion are labeled "R" (Reader). The speaker is labeled based on his/her spontaneous participation or the appearance of the speaker, for example R.1 to R5 refers to Reader one to Reader five).

The other data were gathered from other resources, such as printed material (books, journals ) internet etc. that we called secondary data. The secondary data were gained by noting some important information from those resources which were used to support the primary data.

### 3.4 Techniques of Data Analysis

The gathering data are presented based on the reader's performance (such as reader one to reader five). The analysis applies functional semiotic or more specifically, indexical semiotic which is developed by Silverstein into emergent structures or poetic chunks.

The talks are numbered based on the sentence that contains one or more ideas. This is intended to make it easier to know the structure of the conversation, such as the opening text, content, and closing text. Further analysis is to identify the devices of language used by the speaker as a hint of what will be the speaker or what the meaning is contained in the text of his speech. This is what we call denotational text. The next analysis is to examine the interaction between the characters of the novel and the interaction between readers or the interaction between the characters of the novel which is transferred into the interaction between the readers. This is what we call interactional text. The last is that the connection between denotational text and interactional text with a number of language devices. This is what we call mediational texts where we use indexical semiotic.

The analysis of the data is mainly conducted through three levels of analysis: denotational text analysis, interactional texts analysis and mediational text analysis. Denotational text analysis focuses the analysis on structure of utterance that we call a text sentence. Interactional text analysis focuses the analysis on "the feature related to the social relations of interlocutor which involved in speech event". and mediational text analysis or semiotic mediation text is the analysis focuses on how to relate the denotational text and the interactional text.

## 4. Data and Analysis

The following is the students' textual response analyzed from the denotational text point of view.

### 4.1 Denotational Meaning

These utterances are the students' responses taken from their discussion. These students' responses become the source of data in this research.

#### R1 (Reader one)

01. E... menurut (saya) cinta Daisy kepada Tom itu hanya didasarkan harta kakayaan saja. (E.... in my opinion Daisy's love to Tom is only based on the wealth)
02. karena menurut rumor latar belakangnya Tom adalah Tom berasal dari keluarga yang sangat kaya (Because, according to rumour the background of Tom is that Tom from wealth family)
03. dan e.... ketika e... Gatsby e... Gatsby yang tidak diketahui keadaannya pergi e.... ke e.. ke medan perang, (And e.... when e.... Gatsby e.... Gatsby who was not known his condition went e.....to war.)
04. akhirnya e... e.. Daisy e.... menjadi bimbang e... tentang e... bagaimana caranya dia untuk meneruskan kehidupannya (Eventually, e ... e.... daisy e.... became worried...about e... how does she continue her life.)
05. sehingga e....e... dengan e...dengan terpaksa dia memilih antara cinta, uang e... dan kedudukan. (So that e.....e.... with e.... forcedly she choose between love and money e.... and position.)

06. sehingga akhirnya dia memutuskan untuk memilih Tom sebagai suaminya yang yang terkenal dari keluarga kaya. (So that she, eventually decide to choose Tom as her husband who who was known from wealth family).
07. sedangkan cinta e... Ge Gatsby eh cinta Daisy kepada Gatsby a.. pad awalnya e... memang e.... awalnya memang se.. seakan murni. (While love e... of Ga Gatsby e....love of Daisy to Gatsby a... of course initially pure.)
08. e.... e.. karena dia mencintai Gatsby. (E...e.... because she loved Gatsby)
09. tetapi karena e.... menurut keadaan Gatsby yang akhirnya e..... diketahui bahwa Gatsby ternyata orang yang e... tidak mampu.(But because e... according to situation, Gatsby who eventually e... was known that Gatsby was actually not a wealth person)
10. sehingga e..... akhirnya e.... Daisy tidak bisa e... menikahi atau e. Menikahi Gatsby karena keadaan ekonominya. (So that e..... eventually e... Daisy e.... could not married or e... married Gatsby due to the economic condition.)
11. e.... oleh karena itu e.. akhirnya pada suatu hari ketika Gets Gatsby kembali e..... dengan e...dengan penuh uang dan harta kekayaan. (E... therefore e.... eventually one day when Gats Gatsby came back e... with e... with full of money and property wealth.)
12. akhirnya Gatsby, Daisy pun kembali mencintai e.. Gatsby yang e...karena e.. karena harta dan kekayaan e.. Gatsby tersebut. (Eventually Gatsby, Daisy thought returned to love e... Gatsby who e.... because e..... because properties and weath e....of Gatsby).

The speech is constructed in narrative form which is divided into two narrative events, the narrating event and the narrated event. The narrating event is the event occurring in the speaking framework. In line 01, R.1 narrates the events by the use of the expression, *menurut saya.....*, “in my opinion” (line 1). In semiotic theory this is called the metapragmatic descriptor or *verbum discendi* which describes instances of language use. It characterizes someone’s own way of saying and someone else’s way of saying (Silverstein in Sandarupa, 2013:12). So, the expression *menurut saya.....* “in my opinion” says something in the certain way, that is according to his own perspective and that signals the instance of speaking or narrating and his interpretation of the text segment.

Another examples of metapragmatic descriptor are *menurut rumor....* ‘according to the rumour.’, .... *menurut keadaan* “according to the situation. These are special ways of saying something for example untrue story.

The narrating and the narrated events are characterized by the use of linguistic features such as metapragmatic descriptor or *verbum discendi* such as *menurut saya* “in my opinion,” *dia menolak* “she/he refuses;” deictics such as I, she/he etc; conjunction such as *dan* “and”, *tetapi* “but” etc.; frameworks, lexical terms and indexical evaluation. Another important features are frameworks. In lines 11 to 12 the speaker uses the time frame, *pada suatu hari* ‘one day’ which implies that Gatsby would come back with the amount of money and had become a rich man. The phrase ‘one day’ is uncertain time but it might be accused. Eventually, Gatsby became a rich man and Daisy returned to love him due to his wealth

Lexical term is also the characteristic of narrating and narrated events, such as the expression of the speaker, *Daisy e.... menjadi **bimbang** .....* *bagaimana caranya dia untuk meneruskan kehidupannya* “Daisy became undecided how she could continue her life? (line 04).

The word *bimbang* ‘indecisive’ is the interpretation of the speaker. Daisy was in a difficult position because she was just receiving a letter from Gatsby whom she really loved, but she was about to get married with Tom, Daisy had to choose one of them.

The other lexical term in this utterance is the word *terpaksa* “being forced (line 6).” It is the speaker’s choice based on her interpretation of Daisy’s condition. *Terpaksa* “being forced” means there is no other alternative choice, except getting marriage with Tom.

Indexical evaluation is the use of word, *hanya* ‘merely,’ on the sentence, *cinta Daisy kepada Tom itu hanya didasarkan harta kekayaan saja* “Daisy’s love to Tom is only based on the wealth. The word *hanya* “only” or “merely” is called evaluative indexical, which is indicative of particular non text interpretation or objective structure interpretation. As the main content the evaluative indexical consists of his own evaluation about the textual meaning, this is also a characteristic of narrating and narrated event.

The narrated event is the event that takes place when the reader’s speech is based on the segment of the novel. The narrated event starts in lines 03 - 12. R1, in line 03, begins to talk about the content of the novel. The narration of the talk was discussed in narration which is marked by the word *ketika* ‘when’ (line 03) followed by

a serious consequential event, *sehingga* (lines 05, 06, 10) and followed by the final event, *akhirnya* ‘finally’ (line 12).

## R.2 (Reader two)

13. Menurut saya yang saya bisa maklumi dari Gatsby e pada dasarnya Daisy itu seorang wanita yang matrealistis (In my mind I can undertand from Gatsby e .. basically Daisy is a materialise woman)
14. e disamping Daisy istilahnya sekarang galau , karena ditinggalkan e Gatsby yang pergi berperang e (e... beside Daisy is now uncertainty, because she was left e... by Gatsby who went to war)
15. karena adanya kehadirannya Tom yang kebetulan saat itu kaya, (because the present of Tom who was rich at that time)
16. e jadi Daisy juga untuk menghilangkan kegaluannya (e... so Daisy also lost his uncertainty)
17. dia juga akhirnya menerima e cintanya Tom (she eventually accept e.... Tom’s love.
18. dan memiliki satu orang anak, (and got one child)
19. tetapi e perasaannya juga kepada Gatsby e muncul kembali rasa cintanya  
(but e... her feeling also went to Gatsby e.. her love feeling appear again)
20. ketika Gatsby kembali kepada Daisy setelah Gatsby kaya ketika kaya (when Gatsby returned back to Daisy after becoming rich)
21. e.... setelah memperlihatkan kastil dan kekayaannya kepada Daisy, (e... after showing the castle and wealth to Daisy),
22. akhirnya Daisy lagi jatuh cinta kembali kepada Gatsby (eventually, Daisy feel in love again to Gatsby).

The narrating event is marked by the use of metapragmatic descriptor, deictic and conjunction. R2 perfoms the text which is characterized by the use of metaparagmatic descriptor, deitic, and conjunction. R2 starts her expression by using the phrase, *menurut saya* “in my opinion” (line 13) metapragmatic descriptor which implies that the speaker is speaking to other people at the time of speaking.

R2 also uses the deictic first singular person, *saya* “I” which characterizes Daisy as a materialistic woman (line 13). In line 14, R2 uses deictic of time *sekarang* “now” this indicates that the reader is close to other reader. The word “*galau*” (upset) is the reader’s expressson which indexes Daisy’s condition. The expression marks the narrating event when the reader is speaking.

The narrated event is characterized by the use of conjunction, *karena* “because” (line15) and followed by the time frame, *saat itu* “at that time”(line 15) which indicates that the reader brings us to the narration of Tom who comes with his wealth. Tom offers his marrital proposal to Daisy and Daisy received his marrital proposal. Gatsby came back from war who was finally becoming rich or wealthy, Daisy fell in love again with Gatsby (lines 21-22)

## R.3 (Reader three)

23. Saya mau sanggah sedikit pernyataannya Ningsi tadi,(I want to respond Ningsi’s statment before.)
24. karena menurut saya Daisy orangnya tidak matrealistis toh, (becuse in my opinion Daisy is not materialise)
25. karena dia sebenarnya sangat suka sangat cinta sama Gatsby, (because she actually loves Gatsby very much)
26. dia rela menunggu Gatsby selama berperang, (she please to wait for Gatsby during the war)
27. tapi pada e saat Gatsby pergi berperang itu (but when Gatsby went to war)
28. kemukemudian keluarganya yang menjodohkan sama Tom ini seorang kaya, (then her family married her with tom,a rich man)
29. dan se se se sebenarnya dia tau kalau dijodohkan sama Tom, (and actually she knew if she was married with tom)
30. sebenarnya dia menolak untuk pinangannya tapi karena waktu saya menonton filmnya itu, (actually she refuses the marrytal proposal but because when I watched the film)
31. ada adegan dimana dia e cabut itu kalung pemberiannya Tom sampai terburai, itu mutiaranya artinya itu dia tidak setuju kalau dirinya dinikahkan sama Tom hanya karena hartanya, (there was event where she put out her necklace given by Tom wich symbolize as a refusal to marry Tom because of his wealth)

32. tapi apa apa apa dayanya Daisy, dia hanya bisa menerima keadaannya pada saat itu memang e keluarganya yang menjodohkannya dia sama Tom, (but what could Daisy do she only accepted the situation at the time her family married her to Tom)
33. dan kebe kebetulan Gatsby juga waktu itu masih itu tengah berperang, (and unfortunately Gatsby also still in war)
34. jadi hanya diterima pinangannya Tom, (so she only the marrytal proposal of Tom)
35. saya kurang setuju kalau misalnya disebut bahwa Daisy itu matrealistis.

(I don't agree if Daisy was called materialise)

The narrating event is characterized by the use of metapragmatic descriptor, deictic and conjunction. In line 23 R3 starts her respond by using metapragmatic descriptor, *Saya mau sanggah* "I wants to response" (line 23) and *menurut saya* "in my opinion" (line24). and *saya kurang setuju* "I do not really agree" (line 35) which imply that the R3 uses the narrating event when she is speaking. The interpretation is also characterized by the use of the pronoun *dia* or Daisy is pleased to wait for Gatsby who came back from the war, because she loved him, but her family forced her to get marriage.

The narrated event is characterized by the use of time frame, indexical eveluation, conjunction and deictic. The expression is marked with the phrase, *waktu itu* "that time," (line 32) *pada saat itu* " at that time" (line 33). It is also characterized by the use of evaluative indexical *sebenarnya* "surely" (line 42), *hanya* "only", (line 32). The word, *ini* "this" (line 29) and *itu* "that" (line 32) are deictic demonstrative ponoun. There is also the third person, *dia* "she" (32) and conjunction such as *tapi* "but" (line 27), *karena* "because" (line 38).

#### R.4 (Reader four)

36. E ... di Di novel tersebut bisa di lihat di Chapter 7 halaman 112 yang dimana bukti bahwa e Daisy itu adalah seorang wanita yang matre matrealistis (e.... in the novel it can be seen in chapter 7 page 112 which proves that Daisy is matrealist woman)
37. ada ada salah satu bagian di ka di beberapa paragraf di halaman tersebut yang mengatakan bahwa Daisy adalah the Golden girl (there is a part in some paragraphs says that Daisy is a golden girl.)
38. yang dimana ada salah satu salah satu kalimat di paragraf tersebut ada satu kalimat yang bilang e "*her her mouth is full of money*" dia dia dia mengucapkan segala sesuatu itu berdasarkan berdasarkan uang (where there is a sentence in that paragraph say "*her mouth is full of money*", *she said everything based on money*)
39. jadi di situ apa, e di kalimat itu pula dijelaskan bahwa cintanya Daisy kepada Gatsby kepada Gatsby hanya berdasarkan uang bisa dilihat sendiri di chapter 7. (so in thet sintence also explained that Daisy's love to Getsby.. to Gatsby only based on money it can be seen at chapter 7)

In line 36 the reader turns to the certain page of the novel which explains that Daisy is really materialistic. The reader believes that the page of the novel supports his idea. In the novel it is explained, "her mouth is full of money". This expression also marks the narrated event which implies the quotation and this quotation refers to the novel. The third person singular *dia* refers to Daisy (line 38), indexical evaluation, *hanya berdasarkan uang* "only because of money" (line 39), which implies that the narration becomes clear.

#### R.5 (Reader five)

40. Yes Mungkin memang pada saat Daisy dengan Tom e Daisy denganTom menikah di sini ada juga bukti disini mengatakan bahwa e Daisy itu dikatakan bisa dikatakan matrealistis (yes it was probably when daisy and Tom e Daisy got married with Tom, here there was a prove said that Daisy can be said materialise.
41. tetapi saya tidak tidak saya kurang setuju jika dikatakan mutlak itu Daisyter adalah matrealistis, (but I don't agree if it is said that Daisy was absolutely materialise)
42. karena ketika kita melihat kembali (because when we see back)
43. ketika Daisy me e menjalin hubungan dengan Gatsby yang belum memiliki apa-apa.(when Daisy and Gatsby has a relationship before he had things)
44. Saat itu kan Daisy juga tau keadaan Gatsby yang memang tidak memiliki sesuatupun (at the time Daisy also knew Gatsby's condition that he had nothing)
45. tetapi dia murni mencintai Gatsby dengan kekurangannya dengan segala sesuatu yang dia tidak punya, (but she purely loves Gatsby with his lack of things)

46. kemudian kemudian karena karena permintaan tugas waktu itu waktu Gatsby dikirim dalam berperang (than than because because the assign of gatsby to go to war)
47. akhirnya e mengapa dikatakan e Daisy menikah dengan Tom (eventually Daisy was assumed to get married with Tom)
48. karena itu juga karena faktor e keluarga, keluarga dan memang juga ada ekonomi (because due to the family factor and economic)
49. tetapi saya juga kurang setuju bahwa Daisy itu mutlak matrealistis adapun pendukung-pendukung yang dikatakan (but I also don't agree that Daisy absolutely materialise, the prove has been stated)
50. tetapi kita juga melihat kembali e kepada kehidupan Daisy sebelum sebelum Gatsby menjadi kaya dan itu juga, (but we also see again Daisy's life before Gatsby became arich man)
51. itu hanya merupakan mungkin unsur pendukung bagi e Daisy untuk memilih Tom dan e Gatsby. (that's only be probabely a reason of Daisy to choose tom and gatsby).

In line 53 the speaker begins her expression with the word,  *mungkin* “probably” which implies that the reader is not fully sure whether her opponent’s statement is right or wrong. However, R5 in line 41 is characterized by the use metapragmatic descriptor,  *saya kurang setuju jika dikatakan mutlak itu Daisy adalah matrealistis* , “I disagree if it is said that Daisy is absolutely materialist.” The reader believes that Daisy’s love to Tom and Gatsby is “*murni*” or pure. The word  *cinta murni*  is not because of her love due to money but Daisy’s love to Gatsby is without any requirement.

In line 44 the reader uses the adverb of time “*saat itu*” (at that time) to mark the narrated event which implies the quotation of the novel. Gatsby does not have anything but Daisy still loves him. Therefore the reader does not agree if Daisy is assumed to be a materialist.

#### 4.2 Topicalization: Constructing the Text

The denotational text tries to answer the question, ‘what is being said?’ To answer this question one important thing to discuss is how the topic develop into topicalization that shows active participation of readers in the construction of meaning of the novel. The following is the analysis of the topics where the students discussed it during the interaction.

The topic is not difficult to find because it has already been chosen for the student interpreters. For example, in this section the guided topic is  *bagaimana cinta Daisy pada Gatsby dan Tom?*  “how is Daisy’s love to Gatsby and Tom?” This topic actually contains two themes, one is ‘Daisy’s love to Gatsby’ and the other is ‘Daisy’s love to Tom’. The student interpreters seem to discuss these two themes. In this discussion the observation is focused on the semiotic analysis of the interaction and find out the contextuality and coherence of the speech interaction. The method is by using the semiotic functional analysis I first make a thorough analysis of R1’s presentation and make the hypothesis of the topic. The next determining factor of the topic is the subsequent responses from other readers.

In response to the topic given, R1 immediately comments on ‘Dasy’s love to Gatsby’ by playing on time dimension. As she said at the beginning Daisy’s love to Gatsby is  *seakan murni* , ‘pure love’ (Line 7) but in the end that love is based on  *harta dan kekayaan* , ‘riches and wealth’ (Line 12). So R1 interprets Daisy’s love to Gatsby as founded not on ‘pure love’ but on ‘riches and wealth’. In a similar way, Daisy’s love to Tom is only based on riches and wealth (Line 1).

The R.2 describes Daisy as a  *materialis*  meaning ‘riches and wealth’ (Line 13). He asserts that Daisy’s love to Tom is merely based on  *kaya*  riches and wealth (Line 15) and further says that even though Daisy has already married Tom, she finally wants to marry Gatsby because he is already rich (Lines 20-22).

R3, on the other hand, has a different idea. She maintains that Daisy is not materialist (Lines 23 and 32). Instead she describes her as someone who has pure love with the reason stated in (Lines 25-34).

R4 explains that there is fear by Tom that Daisy returns to Gatsby. R5 is of the idea that Daisy’s love to Gatsby is only based on money (Line 39). She does not say anything about Daisy’s love to Tom. She seems to imply that Daisy’s love to Tom is similarly based on money. For her, Daisy’s love is impure love (Line 36).

R5 is of the idea that Daisy is not materialist because when she fell in love with Gatsby, he was still not rich (Lines 43-45). That proves that Daisy’s love is not based on riches and wealth (Line 54). She describes Daisy’s love to Tom as something not purely based on money but on family matters (Line 49). She insists that such

evaluation of Daisy's love to Gatsby and Tom can be explained by many factors. One of them is money (Line 51) but it is not the main factor. We can conclude then Daisy's love to both men is pure love.

The topic has been found in the discussion and this will be further discussed to construct text. The topic of this talks is Daisy's love to Gatsby and Tom.

The reader of topic (R1-R5) above discusses the topic on Daisy's love to Gatsby and Tom. Based on the analysis of the topics being discussed we can classify them into two groups. First, the kind of readers who considers Daisy's love as based on riches and wealth, hence, *materialis*. In this analysis, they are categorized as the kind of readers who interpret Daisy's love to both men as based on pure love. This type of readers consists of R3 and R5. Another kind of readers interprets Daisy's love to both men as impure supported by the idea of wealth, money, and other material things. This type of readers consists of R1, R2, and R4.

Based on this we now can formulate what Silverstein (in Sandarupa, 2015: ) called poetic chunks or emergent structure which is R3 and R5 : R1, R2, R3, and R4 :: pure love: fake love. This is what is called a text.

### 4.3 Interactional Position : Text and Context Relationship

The interactional text answers the question of 'what is really happening?' The interactional text poses the question of what context is, which must be indexed by text. The interactional text is the text of social relations, which is deconstructed in the denotation analysis which is determined by the social aspects of language. Language is the relation between man to man, and enables them to participate in a number of daily activities in various domains of social life such as identity, gender, class, family, respect status, and hierarchy (Agha, 2007 in Sandarupa 2015)).

The denotational text constructs the social interactional relations as a component of meaning. So the text does not generally only means the expression of the complete human thought, but also the awareness of people as a social creature. The competence of talk is the competence of establishing social relationships (Sandarupa, 2013: 13) which means that the text indexes the social relation among kinds of participants.

In the discussion above we found the emergent structure or poetic chunks which is constructed as the text. The constructed text has been discussed,

The emergent structures or poetic chunks happen in the topic which is constructed into pure love vs. fake love, These events index the interactional positionings of the readers.

Several points can now be considered as evidence of the language use and its association with the type of readers. The opposite group of readers, the use of complicated deictics first person and place, and the dialectical between entextualization and contextulization.

Having observed these evidences we can say that readers of the topic (R3 and R5) represent to the type of readers who are associated with the pure love as opposed to readers of topic (R1, R2, and R4), who are associated with the fake love.

The type of readers who uttered pure love have the following words: sincere, unconditional, always giving, never given, understand what to do, never ask, emerging from the heart, love for what it is etc., The type of readers who uttered fake love have the following words: wealth, money, position, handsome, beautiful, fancy dress etc.

### 4.4 Discussion

The approach adopted in this writing is semiotic functional. This theory focuses on the interpretive process by using semiotics. It works as follows: in the act of speaking, a speaker continues to use various signs to point to or to index features of context that provide us with interpretive process. It is these signs that we call the indexical cues. It is believed that these cues are the bases of interpretation that the interpreter uses.

The concept of index is derived from Peirce. Its main aspect is the dynamical connection between a sign and the object signaled.



‘a sign or representation, which refers to its object not so much because of any similarity or analogy with it, nor because it is associated with general characters which that object happens to possess, as because it is in dynamical (including spatial) connection both with the individual object, on the one hand, and with the senses or memory of the person for whom it serves as a sign, on the other hand’ (see Sandarupa 2014, p. 107).

An index then is the sign-object relation based on contiguity, causality, and co-existence. It is important to note here the coexistence between an index and its object at the same time and place. Hanks points out ‘because of the dynamical relation, indexes direct the attention of the interpreters as if by blind compulsion. At the token level, indexes are as direct as the door bell is to the visitor’ (Hanks 1996). He further notes that ‘the token level is especially weighted toward the index because of its focus on dynamical relations of coexistence. It is this index that is used as cues to create features that become the basis of interpretive framework.

In this writing, the method employed to collect the data is the students’ interpretation about the selected topics. The main theme is taken from the novel which is then formulated in the questions to be discussed by sixteen out of twenty students. The result is the production of a number of utterances to interpret the textual data of the novel. It is these utterances or the talk of the students that are taken to be the sources of data. The utterances produced are analyzed or reinterpreted.

As the writer has presented above, the interesting findings are the students’ interpretation about the textual data of the novel. By analyzing and paying attention to topicalization, the metapragmatic descriptors, and other indexical cues, the writer has shown that students’ interpretations are imbued with their personal opinions or cultural backgrounds. This idea is not new because this is similar to the findings proposed by Iser and Rosanblatt. According to Iser, literature is a form of communication for those who read literary works. That is why Iser focuses his attention on the readers’s activities instead of the role of the reader. In his theory, Aesthetic Response, Iser discusses the dialectic relationship between the text, the readers and their interpretation (Iser,1978:x). However, Iser pays more attention on the individual relationship between the text and the reader. Iser occupies the type of reader what he calls implied reader, it is the reader who assumed the role of the reader as proposed by the text. So, the approach examines in terms of text *wirkung* directing the reader by the text, which carry the potential meanings according to the competence of the reader (Teew, 1988: 203). It can be assumed that Iser has done interpretation on how reader interact with the text to create meaning.

Rosanblatt has also practiced Reader Response theory by emphasizing on areciprocal relationship between reader and the text. She believes that in reading the text the readers bring their own culture and socializing to the text. So the meaning is synthesizezing between the text and the context of the reders’ life. So both Iser and Rosamblaat have done reader response reaseach, their analysis is mainly on the relationship of the the text and the readers or the author’s meaning of the text.

However, in this dissertation the writer continues to develop such idea that in interpreting a novel, it is not merely the work of interpreting author’s meanings or a combined of author’s meaning and reader’s meaning. Using Silverstein’s theory, so far the aspect of readers’ texts that are analyzed is the denotational text of ‘what is being said’. Since the students constitute a community of readers the writer further explores the second level of textuality, that is, the interactional text of what is happening in the process of interpreting. The writer has found that in the process of interpretation, the readers group themselves into two. These are the interactional positioning that readers take to interpret the novel.

In short, in the readers’ response theory is not merely a matter of discussing meanings but also of the interaction in which readers position themselves vis a vis the others. In other words, it is not just the reinterpretation of meanings but also a recontextualization of social relations in the novel into a social relation of real readers. The social relation events are presented with the poetic chunks or emergent structure which are presented through the text, pure love vs fake love..

The social relations are mainly presented by characters: Daisy vs. Tom, or Daisy vs. Gatsby, Myrtle vs. Wilson, and Myrtle vs. Tom. The relations among the real readers have shown to have the pattern following the pattern of social relations in the novel. This is indexed by the text-context relation as has been shown above.

## 5. Conclusion and Suggestion

### 5.1 Conclusion

In theory of reader’s response, one basic principle that needs to be paid attention to, that is, the objective structure of the novel. It is this that becomes the focus of the analysis. It is about triangle love between Daisy and

Gatsby and Tom. Gatsby realized that Daisy got married with Tom Buchanan because of his wealth. The Gatsby made efforts to rich his dream which he eventually got. Therefore Gatsby has shown his dedication to woman, who did not merit his passion. Gatsby ended his life on his swimming pool from Wilson's shot and Daisy disappeared.

The previous research mainly paid attention to the denotational aspect of the textual meaning of the novel. In this level of text the writer has shown the dialectic interaction between the narrating event and the narrated event the readers performed in interpreting the meaning of the text. The narrating event is the event of interpreting and in doing so they base it in the objective structure of the novel. The objective structure of the novel is, therefore, recontextualized in the present moment of interpreting. The present and the past mingles in the present. For example: the use of metapragmatic descriptor when the speaker expresses *menurut saya* "according to me" (line 01/R1/ Topic1), *menurut rumor* "according to rumour", *menurut keadaan* "according situation." Another example is that the use of deictic first personal person, and deictic of demonstrative pronoun.

The important finding is that the social relationships that originally happened between Daisy and Tom and Gatsby in the novel is now transformed into the social relationships among readers. In this analysis the writer finally arrives at the definition of text through the analysis of topicalization. It is this text that indexes the context, that is, the social relationships among the readers who have different voice. The concept voice helps constructing types of interpreters into two categories. Those who voice the pure love of Daisy to Gatsby and those who voice the impure love or love based on wealth to Tom.

## 5.2 Suggestion

It is suggested that similar study be conducted in the future. Readers' response theory need developing. The study of literature using Peirce's indexical semiotic can lead to the esier process of analysis especially of any kinds of literary work that loads with different characteristics of human behaviour, thoughts and feelings. Therefore it is suggested to those who want to extend their knowledge or conduct resarch on literature to use semiotic of Peirce that has been developed by Silverstain.

Reader response theory that produces meanings of literary works and indexical semiotic extended by Silverstein studies how such meaning, elaborated from denotational text to recontextualization. It is recomended strategy to have an insightful outcome of the planned study or research.

## 6. References

- Abrams, M.H. 1979. *The Mirror and the Lamps: Romantic theoryand the critical Tradition*. Oxford University Press: U.S.
- Agha. Asif. 2007. *Language and social relation.*: Cambridge University Perss. Cambridge.
- Anderson, Mary.2012. *Reader-Response Theory and Life Narrative* ([Http://Lib.athachan.ca](http://Lib.athachan.ca)). Assessed on April 29, 2014.
- Bakhtin, M.1981 [1935]. *The dialogicnimagination*. C.E.M Holquist, Austin: Universitas of Texas Press.
- Barthes, Roland. 1974. *S/Z*. Hill and Wang. New York.
- Bauman, Richard.1984 [1977]. *Verbal art as performance*. *Prospect Hights*, Waveland Press, Inc. Illinois:
- Becker, Ruth R.1999. *Reader Response: Students develop text understanding*. University of Wisconsin-Parkside: Kenosha
- Briggs, Charles L, and Richard Bauman.1992. *Genre, Intertextuality, and Social Power*. *Linguistic Antropology* 2(2): 131-172.
- Buchler,Justus. 1955. *Filosophycal Writing of Peirce*: Selected. Dover Publications,Inc: New York.
- Davis, Todd F. And Kenneth Womack. 2002. *Formalist Critism and Reader- Response Theory*. Palgrave Macmilan.New York
- Derrida, Jacques.1982 [1972]. *Signature event context*. In *Margins of philosophy*. A. Bass, ed.: University of Chicago Press. Chicago.
- Fitzgerald, F. Scott.1925. *The Great Gatsby*.Charles Scribner's Son Inc. New York
- Gumperz, J.1982. *Discourse strategises*. Cambridge University: Press. Cambridge
- Halliday, M.A.K. 1978. *Language and Social Semiotic: The Social Interaction of language and meaning.* : University Park Press. Baltimore, MA
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1989. *Language, Context, and text: Aspects of Language in a social- Semiotic perspective*. Deakin University: Victoria.
- Iser, Wolfgang. 1978 [1987]. *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Johns Hopkins University Press: London.

- \_\_\_\_\_. [1972]1974. *Implied Reader: Patern of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Backet*. John Hopkins University Press. Baltimore and London
- Jakobson, Roman.1960. *Closing statement: Linguistic and poetics*. In *Style in language*. T. Sebeok, ed. Cambridg, MA: MIT Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1971[1957] *Shifters, verbal categories, and the Russian verb*. In *Selected writings II: word and language*. Pp. 130-47. The Hague: Mouton.
- Jauss, Hans Robert.1981. *Toward an Aesthetic Reception*.The University of Minnesota Press: U.S.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1982. *Aesthetic Experience and Literary Hermeneutics*.University of Minnesota Press. Minneapolis.
- Junus, Umar. 1985. *Resepsi Sastra: Sebuah Pengantar*. PT Gramedia: Jakarta.
- Mustafa, Bachruddin. 2008. *Teori dan Praktek Sastra Dalam Penelitian dan Pengajaran*. Kerja sama Sekolah Pascasarjana UPI Bandung dengan New Concept English Education Centre. Jakarta
- Peirce, C.S. 1940[1955]. *Philosophical writings of Peirce*. Dover: New York.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1955 [1940]. *Logic as semiotic: the theory of signs*. In *Philosophical writings of Peirce*. J. Buchler, ed.: Dover Publications, INC. New York
- Pradopo, Rahmat Djoko.1995. *Beberapa Teori Sastra, Metode Kritis dan Penerapannya*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Riffaterre, Michael.1984. *Semiotics of Poetry*.Manufactured: U.S.A.
- Rosenblatt, L. M.1986. *The aesthetic transaction*. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 20, 122-138.
- Sandarupa, Stanislaus.2004. *The exemplary center: poetics and politics in the kingly death ritual in Toraja south Sulawesi Indonesia*.Dissertation,TheUniversity of Chicago. Chicago.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2013. *The voice of a child: Constructing the Moral Society through The Retteng Poetic Argumentation in Toraja, Sulawesi, Indonesia*. This paper is presented in The 3<sup>rd</sup> International Conference on Language Education 2013 at Makassar Phinisi UNM Makassar on 6-7 Desember 2013
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1 September 2010. *Implicit metatalk and collaborative creativity in performance: Torajan poetics and performance*.
- Segers, Rien T. 1978. *The Evaluation of Literary Text.*: The Peter De Ridder Press. Nederland
- Silverstein, Michael.1976. *Shifters, linguistic categories, and cultural descriptions*. In *Meaning in anthropology*. K.H. Basso and H.A. Selby, eds. Pp. 11-55. Albuquerque: Mexico Press. University of New
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1993 *Metapragmatic discourse and metapragmatic function In Reflexive language: reported speech and metapragmatics*.J.A. Lucy, ed.: Cambridge University Press. New York
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2003. *Indexical order and the dialectics of Sociolinguistic*. Street Chicago: USA
- Teeuw, A.1984 /1988..*Sastra dan Ilmu Sastra: Pengantar Teori Sastra*.Pustaka Jaya: Jakarta.

The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open-Access hosting service and academic event management. The aim of the firm is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the firm can be found on the homepage:

<http://www.iiste.org>

### CALL FOR JOURNAL PAPERS

There are more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals hosted under the hosting platform.

**Prospective authors of journals can find the submission instruction on the following page:** <http://www.iiste.org/journals/> All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Paper version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

### MORE RESOURCES

Book publication information: <http://www.iiste.org/book/>

Academic conference: <http://www.iiste.org/conference/upcoming-conferences-call-for-paper/>

### IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digital Library, NewJour, Google Scholar

