

## The peculiar features of the literary text

Umedova Zulaykho Shuhrat qizi  
[zuzzigafurova@gmail.com](mailto:zuzzigafurova@gmail.com)

Master student

Uzbekistan State World Languages University

**Annotation:** *The article explores the fundamental features that define a literary text, emphasizing its distinct separation from non-literary forms. It highlights the literary text's aesthetic purpose, which engages both intellect and emotions, creating a unique form of communication that transcends information delivery. The notion of an independent literary language, distinct from standard language, is also emphasized, showing how literary works construct a vivid, imaginative world closely tied to reality. Key concepts include the double activity of creation and reception, with the reader playing an active role in interpreting layered meanings. The principles of anthropocentrism reveal the deep intertwining of human experience and fictional narratives. Attention is drawn to the multilayered structure of texts, where explicit surface details coexist with implicit depths requiring cognitive interpretation. Emphasis is placed on emotiveness as a vital stylistic category that influences the reader's emotional engagement. Furthermore, implicitness is presented as a crucial mechanism whereby hidden meanings enhance the depth and richness of literary works. The article culminates with practical analysis, showing how everyday details within a story can reflect broader social and emotional realities. Altogether, the study portrays literary text as a multilayered, human-centered creation demanding active, emotionally charged interpretation. Using Alfred Coppard's "Cherry Tree" as an example, the analysis demonstrates how surface events hint at deeper social and emotional realities. Thus, the article offers a methodologically robust and interpretatively rich account of literary communication, showcasing literature as a dynamic co-creation between author and reader. This investigation not only maps the layered complexity of fiction but also highlights the human-centered essence of literary art.*

**Keywords:** *Implicitness, literary text, poetic details, deep layer, surface layer, cognitive linguistics, stylistics, pragmatics, interpretation*

## Своеобразные черты литературного текста

Умедова Зулайхо Шухрат кизи  
[zuzzigafurova@gmail.com](mailto:zuzzigafurova@gmail.com)

Магистрант

Узбекский государственный университет мировых языков

**Аннотация:** *Статья исследует основные признаки, определяющие литературный текст и отличающие его от нелитературных форм. Особое внимание уделено эстетической функции, объединяющей интеллектуальное и эмоциональное восприятие, благодаря чему текст становится особой формой общения, выходящей за рамки обычной информации. Подчеркивается наличие самостоятельного поэтического языка, отличного от стандартного, а также создание образного мира, приближенного к реальности. Рассматривается двойная активность автора и читателя, где интерпретация скрытых смыслов становится важнейшим элементом восприятия. Антропоцентризм выявляет глубокую связь человеческого опыта и художественного вымысла. Многоуровневая структура текста позволяет сочетать явные факты с неявными концепциями, требующими осмысления. Эмоциональность представлена как важнейшая стилистическая категория, влияющая на вовлеченность читателя. Имплицитность рассматривается как механизм углубления смыслового содержания. Статья на практике показывает, как внешние детали*

рассказа могут раскрывать широкие социальные и эмоциональные контексты. В итоге литературный текст представлен как многослойное, ориентированное на человека явление, требующее активного и эмоционального восприятия. На примере рассказа Альфреда Коппарда «Вишневое дерево» анализируется, как внешние события отражают глубинные социальные и эмоциональные процессы. Таким образом, статья демонстрирует методологически выверенный и интерпретативно богатый подход к изучению художественной коммуникации, подчеркивая динамическую природу литературного искусства и его гуманистическую сущность.

**Ключевые слова:** Имплицитность, художественный текст, поэтические детали, глубинный уровень, поверхностный уровень, когнитивная лингвистика, стилистика, прагматика, интерпретация

### **Adabiy matnning o'ziga xos xususiyatlari**

Umedova Zulayxo Shuhrat qizi

[zuzigafurova@gmail.com](mailto:zuzigafurova@gmail.com)

Magistratura talabasi

O'zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti

**Annotatsiya:** Maqola adabiy matni belgilovchi asosiy xususiyatlarni o'rganib, uni nodavriy shakllardan ajratib ko'rsatadi. Asarda estetik funksiyaga katta urg'u berilib, adabiy matn intellekt va hissiyotlarni uyg'unlashtirgan holda, oddiy axborot uzatishdan ustun aloqa shaklini yaratishi ta'kidlanadi. Standart tildan farq qiluvchi mustaqil poetik tilning mavjudligi va adabiy matn orqali real hayotga yaqin obrazli dunyo yaratilishi haqida so'z yuritiladi. Muallif va o'quvchi o'rtasidagi ikki tomonlama faoliyat, ya'ni yashirin ma'nolarni anglash jarayoni muhim jihat sifatida ko'rsatiladi. Antropotsentriзм inson tajribasi va badiiy matn o'rtasidagi uzviy bog'liqlikni ochib beradi. Matnning ko'p qatlamli tuzilmasi ochiq va yashirin ma'lumotlarning uyg'unligini ta'minlaydi. Emotsionallik esa o'quvchining hissiy jalb qilinishini kuchaytiradigan asosiy uslubiy kategoriya sifatida beriladi. Implitsitlik – yashirin ma'nolarni ochish orqali adabiy matnning mazmunini chuqurlashtirish usuli sifatida ko'rsatib beriladi. Maqola oddiy tafsilotlar orqali kengroq ijtimoiy va emotsional mazmunni qanday ochib berish mumkinligini amaliy misollar bilan ko'rsatadi. Natijada adabiy matn inson markazidagi, ko'p qatlamli va faol qabulni talab qiluvchi fenomen sifatida namoyon etiladi. Alfred Coppardning «Olcha daraxti» hikoyasi misolida, yuzaki voqealar ortida yotgan chuqur ijtimoiy va emotsional ma'nolar ochib beriladi. Ushbu maqola adabiy aloqa jarayonining murakkabligini ko'rsatib, adabiyotning inson markazidagi mohiyatini va muallif hamda o'quvchi o'rtasidagi ijodiy muloqotni yuksak darajada tasvirlab beradi.

**Kalit so'zlar:** Implitsitlik, badiiy matn, poetik tafsilotlar, chuqur qatlam, yuzaki qatlam, kognitiv tilshunoslik, stilistika, pragmatika, talqin

The literary text by far has been the central research object for a plethora of outstanding scholars who made their invaluable contribution in the way to reveal peculiar distinctive features of the fiction. Delving into the essence of fiction, it will be worth mentioning philologists as Yu.M. Lotman, M.M. Bakhtin, V.V. Vinogradov, Arnold, B.R. Yakobson, I.R. Galperin, Bolotnova, Molchanova, Z.Ya. Turaeva, Kukharenko, D.U. Ashurova.

One of the main problems of the theory of literary text is its peculiar distinctive features which differentiate literary text and non-literary text. The survey of the linguistic literature made it possible to outline the peculiar features of literary text such as anthropocentrism, aesthetic function, stylistic categories (imagery, emotiveness, expressiveness, intertextuality, linguacreativity and implicitness. The aim of the article is to substantiate the peculiar distinctive features of the literary text consisting

of aesthetic function, anthropocentrism, stylistic categories as emotiveness, implicitness, multilayer structure, surface layer and the deep layer.

In the description of literary text, there has been made one more invaluable observation by Jan Mukarovsky in his 'Language and Poetic Language', where he compared differences of the standard and poetic language. The author is discussing the complex relationship between standard language and poetic language. He explains that poetic language is not merely a variation of standard language, but an independent form with its own unique characteristics, such as figurative language and the blending of different language phases. While it often violates the norms of standard language for aesthetic purposes, it is still deeply connected to the standard.

The entity of the literary text in Ashurova's book "Stylistics of literary text" is conveyed as a special type of communication conditioned by the *aesthetic and communicative function*. It is outlined that, communicative approach to literary text reveals its feature of double activity: the author, who produces the text and the reader should perceive, understand and interpret the fiction. It means that, multifaced nature of literary text makes it a complicated and at the same time attracting tool for observation from different angles (Ashurova, 2013).

First and foremost, the fictional text reveals not real word as states Ashurova, but the imaginary world that has analogy to a real world and is true-to-life. Regarding this, it should be noted that literary text is based on to the principle of "constructiveness" discussed by T.A. van Dijk with respect to literary communication. T van Dijk in his accounts into "Text and context" highlights the importance of pragmatic functions of the literary text to appeal the reader by the selection of needed description which serves to fulfill one of the main features of the literary text named as *its aesthetic function*. So distinguishing feature of the literary text is its aesthetic function. The aesthetic function presupposes a certain impact on the reader called forth both by the beauty of a linguistic form and the conceptual significance of its content. The aesthetic information is aimed at arousing aesthetic feelings, i.e. the feelings of pleasure and beauty on the part of the reader. Aesthetics of the text is closely interlinked with the categories of imagery, evaluation, emotiveness.

As Ashurova states, when considering the problem of linguistic functionalism, it is impossible not to mention the function of aestheticism, based on the fact that, firstly, it is fundamental to such a vast area of communication as literary communication, and secondly, the aesthetic function manifests, to one degree or another, in other types of communication, but in a secondary role. The essence of the aesthetic function lies in its impact on the spiritual structure of a person, their feelings, intellect, worldview, and imagination, exerting a formative influence on them (Ashurova, 2022).

Likewise, N.S. Bolotnova notes, the aesthetic function "involves an impact on the recipient through both the beauty and appropriateness of the poetic form and the conceptual nature of the content, which can 'infect' the reader with empathy, evoking emotion" Bolotnova 2009: 199).

Another important property of the fiction its tendency to *anthropocentrism*, as it presupposed to be one of the key issues of modern linguistics. The abovementioned approach to investigation of literary text suggests its core feature of connectiveness with human factor, as fiction stores the linguistic personality of the author from one side and of the character from another, that as we have discussed already creates a special type of internal communication. Principles of anthropocentrism were laid and cultivated in the works by V. Humboldt, A.A. Potebnya, E. Bcnvenist, E. Sapir, B. Worf and others. Discussing anthropocentric paradigm from the views of Maslova, it is the core focus of all existing spheres in modern situation, so relation of human factor is the main principle for exploring and learning the essence of literary world too, as it is done from the scope of the author who, in turns, tries to share his or her imaginary characters reflected by his individual world picture. So, the current paradigm of anthropocentrism, according to Maslova, has given rise to trends as communicative linguistics, cognitive linguistics, text linguistics (Maslova, 2009).

The diversity and enriched nature of the art, one of the outstanding components of which is literary work, is elevated in Bakhtin's book by describing its close correlation with human factor, that, in turns may be considered as one of the initial steps towards revealing the current paradigm of

anthropocentrism. The author tactfully conveys the mechanical, superficial, inauthentic whole as the irresponsibility of the author to combine its linguistic personality within its real personality in life. And Bakhtin infers, that once two worlds of the creator of the fictional text are collided into a single whole, the completed context of human culture consisting of “science, art, and life” is achieved (Bakhtin, 1979:86). The author emphasizes that true unity between art and life, as well as between the individual and their activities, can only be achieved through the unity of responsibility. We must take responsibility for what we have experienced and understood in art, and this should manifest in our lives. Responsibility for life and art also includes mutual guilt: the poet is responsible for art that doesn’t always reflect the reality of life, and the person in life is responsible for not being able to seriously engage with art. The individual must be whole and responsibly connect all their elements (Bakhtin, 1979-86). The above-mentioned belief by Bakhtin can be seen from the scope of stylistic category of ‘Imagery’, where according to wide approach to the notion of ‘image-bearing’, any fictional text should be true to life. In this case, if the writer integrates the authentic state of himself with that described in his literary work, it can be presupposed to have a closer link to be more complete piece of art.

M.P. Brandes identifies compositional, emotive, and psychological levels in literary texts (1971), while Z.L. Khovanskaya proposes a three-level structure: aesthetic, compositional, and linguistic (1975). Some researchers also highlight the pragmatic level (Kamenksaya, 1992; Bolotnova, 2009), which focuses on how the author’s intentions, communication strategies, and aesthetic views evoke an aesthetic effect. Often, this level overlaps with the stylistic one. N.S. Bolotnova, for example, links pragmatics to elements like expressiveness, imagery, and implicitness. However, the concept of text pragmatics is broader, encompassing factors such as understanding, appropriateness, and the social, ethnic, and individual traits of communicators.

Stylistic factors are crucial to literary texts, and the stylistic level is significant, with sublevels like emotive, image-bearing, and evaluative. Analyzing the stylistic level involves examining stylistic categories (e.g., emotiveness, imagery, modality, intertextuality), expressive means, and stylistic devices and their functions. This analysis also includes foregrounding (highlighting key words, stylistic devices, contrasts) and exploring the individual style of the author reflected in content and language choices.

One of the major characteristics of literary texts is its Multilayer structure. Based on the synthesis of current scholarship, the structure of a literary text can be described as comprising the following interrelated layers:

1. Informative level – Includes both linguistic sublevels (phonetic, morphological, lexical, syntactic) and extralinguistic sublevels (denotative, thematic, compositional). The thematic sublevel presents life experiences filtered through the author’s perspective.
2. Compositional level – Refers to the structural organization of the text, typically comprising elements such as the title, exposition, plot, climax, and resolution, though variations exist.
3. Semantic level – Focuses on the contextual meanings of textual units, particularly how lexical elements contribute to the overall semantic field of the work.
4. Stylistic level – Includes imagery, emotiveness, modality, and stylistic devices that characterize the author’s individual style.
5. Pragmatic level – Analyzes the impact of linguistic means on the reader, including how the author engages the reader in the co-creative process.
6. Cognitive level – uncovers the author’s worldview, exploring the mental processes involved in the construction and interpretation of literary meaning.
7. Cultural level – Reveals historical, social, and national values as encoded in the language and narrative, influenced by cultural and ideological systems (Kazarina, 2004; Alefirenko, 2010).

This multilayered framework not only enhances our understanding of how meaning is structured in literary texts but also underscores the interdisciplinary nature of literary analysis – one that merges linguistics, cultural studies, semiotics, and cognitive science.

The interpretation of a literary text, following the perspective of Ashurova (2013), is a cognitively driven process directed at uncovering its conceptual depth. This interpretive act entails forming hypotheses about the underlying meaning of the text, often generating multiple readings due to its inherent ambiguity and connotative richness. However, interpretation is not an entirely subjective endeavor – it must remain textually grounded. It is guided by internal linguistic cues such as key words, stylistic devices, and contextual markers that direct the reader toward acceptable interpretive outcomes (Ashurova, 2013).

Given the multifaceted and multilayered nature of literary texts, scholars emphasize the necessity of a comprehensive, multilateral, and staged analytical approach. This perspective integrates both linguistic and extralinguistic dimensions, accounting for the stylistic, communicative, pragmatic, cultural, cognitive, and aesthetic layers that shape the literary work's semantic structure and interpretive potential (Ashurova, 2013).

As mentioned above, literary texts are characterized by several unique communicative features: anthropocentrism, the creation of an imaginary world, and the embodiment of cultural and aesthetic values. These features are expressed through a text's interconnected structural levels – informative, semantic, stylistic, pragmatic, cultural, and cognitive – each of which emerges from the interaction of internal linguistic patterns and external cultural, psychological, or historical contexts (Ashurova, 2013).

Among these dimensions, emotiveness stands out due to its interdisciplinary relevance and interpretive power. Emotionality, as a concept, has been explored across diverse academic fields including philosophy, psychology, biology, sociology, culturology, and linguistics. Philosophers regard emotionality as a fundamental ontological category, while psychologists conceptualize it as a spectrum encompassing mood, emotions, affects, and passions. In linguistic analysis, emotionality is operationalized as emotiveness – the ability of language to express affective states through specific lexical and syntactic structures.

The linguistic study of **emotiveness** can be traced to early scholars such as A. A. Potebnya, F. F. Fortunatov, A. A. Shakhmatov, and A. M. Peshkovskiy. Contemporary theorists – including A. Wierzbicka, V. I. Shakhovskiy, G. Lakoff, A. Ortony, A. Collins, and M. Johnson – have further developed the field. Their work spans diverse methodological approaches, including the psycholinguistic (Shakhnarovich & Vitt), stylistic (Aznaurova & Bolotov), communicative (Shakhovskiy, Bolotnova), linguocultural (Wierzbicka, Vorkachyov), and cognitive (Baranov, Knipkens) dimensions of emotiveness.

In linguistics, emotiveness is recognized as a systemic language category, manifesting at all structural levels: phonetic, morphological, lexical, and syntactic. A pivotal contribution in this area was made by V. I. Shakhovskiy, who developed a detailed classification of emotive units, addressing issues such as emotive meanings, components of lexical meaning, emotion categorization within the lexico-semantic system of English, emotive derivation, and phraseology.

Despite the breadth of work on emotiveness as a linguistic category, its treatment as a textual phenomenon remains relatively underexplored. This is a notable oversight, considering that emotions are predominantly realized and interpreted within the textual framework. Ashurova (2013) emphasizes the need to understand textual emotiveness as a category encompassing both linguistic and extralinguistic factors that reflect various dimensions of human emotionality.

According to Shakhovskiy (as cited in Ashurova, 2013) textual emotiveness is a complex and layered phenomenon composed of:

- ✓ Linguistic markers: emotive lexicon and phraseology, syntactic structures, phonetic and prosodic devices, and stylistic elements such as epithets, irony, oxymoron, hyperbole, litotes, gradation, rhetorical questions, parallel constructions, repetition, and represented speech.
- ✓ Non-linguistic components: emotional contexts, presuppositions, communicative intentions, and the emotional states of the participants.
- ✓ Key insights into textual emotiveness include:

- ✓ It is an inherent property of literary discourse, shaped by both linguistic tools and the emotional dynamics of communication.
- ✓ It emerges not from isolated signals, but from the cumulative effect of emotive elements that together form an integrated emotional space within the text.
- ✓ Irony plays a central role, functioning as one of the most powerful mechanisms for emotional engagement by operating on contrast, analogy, and opposition (Shakhovskiy, as cited in Ashurova, 2013).

Through this lens, emotiveness is not simply a stylistic embellishment but a fundamental communicative and cognitive tool in the literary text, essential to the reader's aesthetic experience and interpretive engagement.

One of the most important for literary text is the theory of the surface and the deep layer of the text. According to Turaeva, the surface level is the verbalized level of the text, it is explicit and expresses facts, events, actions, personages (Turaeva, 1986) The surface layer includes the verbal explication of the literary text consisting of words, sentences, phraseological units. It denotes that the plot of the literary text is given on the surface layer, which is limited by factual information of the literary work.

However, the conceptually significant information is revealed in the deep layer. It means that deep layer embodies implicit information which should be decoded in the process of literary text interpretation.

As presented by G.G. Molchanova the category of implicitness in literary texts is analyzed as a fundamental feature of literary discourse, one that activates interpretive engagement and constructs meaning beyond the surface structure. The study defines implicates as semantic nodes of hidden content, classifies their types and mechanisms, and illustrates their use with literary examples. Ultimately, it presents a model of literary communication as a two-level structure, inviting readers into co-creation and semantic enrichment.

**The Concept of Implicitness:** Implicitness refers to the text's ability to encode meaning indirectly – through subtext rather than overt articulation – prompting the reader to intellectually "decode" the concealed message. Molchanova identifies implicitness as one of the **primary goals of literary communication**.

Violating the "law of the sign," which traditionally links form and content directly, implicitness functions through linguistic economy and semantic depth. In essence:

- ✓ The **explicit** serves as the "tip of the iceberg";
- ✓ The **implicit** is the concealed depth beneath the surface.

Implicitness, or the ability of language to convey unspoken meanings, is a core feature of literary discourse. While the primary function of language is to express, literature often thrives on what is not said. Both Molchanova (Molchanova, 2003) and Ashurova (Ashurova, 2005) emphasize that implicitness arises naturally from the tension between the cognitive economy of language and its expressive richness.

Implicitness, therefore, becomes not a failure of clarity but an intentional strategy for meaning-making – a central device in literary communication. Molchanova identifies this phenomenon as a defining structural element of literary texts, while Ashurova explores its communicative nature through the lens of textual semantics and presupposition theory.

Implicitness and the Two-Level Structure of text according to both scholars is explained that the literary text consists of two semantic layers:

- The explicit level (surface structure), where content is directly articulated.
- The implicit level (deep structure), where hidden meanings reside.

Molchanova frames this duality through the concept of implicates – units of implicit meaning composed of an antecedent (explicitly stated) and a consequent (implied inference). Ashurova

similarly supports this view, stressing that the decoding of implicates depends on the reader's presuppositional knowledge and their implicational perspective.

Moreover, Molchanova proposes the notion of implicates as the Semantic microstructures of implicitness, she defines implicates as structural-semantic micro-units of the implicit layer. They are logically represented as:

$A \rightarrow B$ , where A is the explicit component and B the implied interpretation.

It is worth mentioning about Ashurova's ideas on the role of the reader to interpret implicit information given on the surface layer. She points on a law of the addressee, stating that the success of implicit communication depends on the degree of alignment between the author's and reader's background knowledge and interpretive stance and introduces two key terms:

- Implicational capacity – the set of all potential implications of a given expression.
- Implicational perspective – the specific part of this capacity realized in a given context.

Classification of Implicates

Both authors offer parallel classifications of implicates:

By likelihood: rigid, strong-probability, weak, and negative implicates (Molchanova, 2003).

- By formation: semantic, stylistic, contextual, compositional (Molchanova, 2003); implicational focus and range (Ashurova, 2005).

- By violated maxims (Gricean framework): quantity, quality, relation, and manner.

Ashurova (2005) expands on this theory by connecting each maxim to specific stylistic phenomena:

- Quantity: repetition, alliteration, anaphora.
- Quality: metaphor, irony, hyperbole.
- Manner: disruptions in textual logic such as open endings and retrospections.

Implicitness and presupposition as Ashurova (2005) emphasizes can be seen in the role of presuppositions and background knowledge in interpreting implicitness. This includes cognitive and cultural frameworks that enable the recognition of indirect meaning. Her perspective enriches Molchanova's model by anchoring implicates in the broader communicative and aesthetic contexts of the reader's interpretive framework.

Both authors underscore that implicitness often arises from imagery, which in turn evokes emotiveness and evaluation. Thus, implicitness operates in tandem with other core categories of fiction, forming an integrated system of aesthetic meaning-making.

Mechanisms and realizations of implicitness

Implicitness manifests through various linguistic means, including:

- Implicit titles
- Poetic details
- Fictional dialogue
- Portrait descriptions
- Stylistic devices (e.g., metaphor, irony, periphrasis)

Ashurova (2005) provides a detailed linguistic example from Hemingway's "The Old Man and the Sea," showing how the portrait description reveals deeper psychological states. The character's eyes, "cheerful and undefeated," implicitly reflect his enduring spirit.

She also analyzes fictional dialogue in Galsworthy's "The Man of Property," showing how speech patterns encode emotional states, love triangles, and character psychology – often without direct mention. For example, Irene and Bosinney's language is emotionally rich, signaling mutual attraction, whereas June's and Soames's language is emotionally flat or oppositional.

The Implicational search by Molchanova (2003) is proposed as a practical framework for analyzing implicates, known as the implicational search method:

1. Identify the antecedent (explicit part).
2. Hypothesize the consequent (implicit meaning).

3. Determine the type of implicate (semantic, stylistic, etc.).
4. Evaluate the communication principle being manipulated.
5. Derive the implicit theme (implictheme) from clusters of implicates.

This theory emphasizes retrospective semantic analysis, especially when interpreting titles, character actions, or plot ambiguities. This method reveals the second dialogue between the author and reader through the hidden textual layer.

Cognitive and communicative dimensions authors link with implicates to cognitive models. Molchanova (2003) draws on intensional semantics, proposing that implicates are anchored not in external reference (denotation) but in internal conceptualization. Ashurova (2005) extends this by introducing the idea of "possible worlds of the participants in communication", highlighting the need for shared mental contexts between author and reader.

Implicitness as an aesthetic and cognitive principle in exploring the two-level structure of the literary text reflects the tension between what is said and what is meant. Implicitness is not merely a stylistic ornament but a semantic, cognitive, and communicative necessity in literary art.

By comparing and synthesizing the approaches of Molchanova (2003) and Ashurova (2005), we see that:

- Implicitness is central to artistic meaning-making.
- Implicates function as semantic catalysts.
- Interpretation is co-constructed by reader competence and textual structure.

Yermakova (2021) furthers the discussion by exploring how readers extract generalized and correlated meanings from implicit propositions through a process of artistic categorization. In her experimental analysis of Shalamov's "The Injector," she demonstrates that readers reach the implicit proposition (e.g., mistaking a mechanism for a person) through symbolic, situational, and pragmatic categorization. This supports a model where implicitness is revealed not automatically but through reader interaction with layered meaning structures.

Turaeva (1986) conceptualizes the literary text as a "secondary modeling system" – a symbolic structure that goes beyond linguistic communication. She emphasizes the paradigmatic openness of literary texts, asserting that meaning is not closed or fixed but emerges through associative links, intertextual references, and symbolic layering. This supports the idea that implicitness is not accidental but systemic – a foundational feature of literary communication.

By highlighting the semantic depth, contextual dependence, and interpretive openness of literary texts, Turaeva's theoretical framework offers a solid linguistic grounding for Yermakova's exploration of implicitness and categorization.

Both authors affirm that:

- Meaning in fiction is not only explicit but also inferred, and
- Literary texts rely on the reader's active reconstruction of implicit propositions and macrostructures through categorical, pragmatic, symbolic, and intertextual analysis

Thus, the two-level model of literary text is not only a descriptive tool but a gateway to understanding how literature works – both as a medium of expression and as a collaborative act of cognition and imagination.

Let us consider the deep implicit content on the example of poetic details used in the story "Cherry Tree" by Alfred Coppard.

*There was uproar somewhere among the backyards of Australia Street, so alarming that people at their midday meal sat still and stared at one another. A fortnight before, murder had been done in the street, in broad daylight, with a chopper; people were nervous. An upper window was thrown open and a startled and startling head exposed.*

*but Johnny was gazing sickly at the body of a big rat slaughtered by the dogs of his friend George. The uproar was caused by the quarrelling of the dogs, possibly for honours, but more probably as is the custom of victors, for loot.*

The story begins with a vivid description of an Australian street filled with chaos and poverty. The scene includes references to violence, such as ‘*murder had been done in the street in broad daylight, with a chopper*’. If explicitly, the surface layer revealed by verbal explication just displays the happening situation, while implicitly, by the use of depicting poetic detail, the author conveys a grim atmosphere through examples like ‘children killing rats’ and the rat keeps hidden implicit information of infected, dirty environment highlighting the impoverished life of the described city. Meanwhile, the description of the street in a such way gives further insights about the probable life conditions or social state of people that area. Thus, with the help of situation described in the street we can infer many other hidden information about the area.

Discussing other examples, but another type of poetic detail which is proposed as ‘characterological’ in Aznaurova’s work (the poetic detail which helps to identify traits inherent especially to human personages in the literary works) we can take characterological details used to reveal Mrs. Knatchbole personality. She is simply the Flynn’s next-door neighbour who lives in the house adjoining Mrs. Flynn’s and is the one who shouts at young Johnny for “killing rats” and urges his widowed mother to admonish him. But the author’s choice of linguistic units to describe her charges her figure with implicit negative evaluation of the author or let’s say negative subjective modality of the author towards her given in the deep layer, that can be inferred only by the skillful interpreter.

*“It’s that young devil Johnny Flynn again! Killing rats!” shouted Mrs. Knatchbole, shaking her fist towards the Flynn’s backyard. Mrs. Knatchbole was ugly; she had a goitred neck and a sharp skinny nose with an orb shining at its end, constant as grief.*

In contrast to her character, we can take the details used to describe the members of the Flynn’s family, especially the boy, who is even if not well-educated, (as that conditioned by his family statue, life in the poverty) owns some solid characters as deep intellect love and empathy towards his family. Johny Flynn, being in the young enough years of his life, searches any feasible ways to support his family financially as well as emotionally. The effort made by the boy can be inferred from the following letter written by the boy to his sister:

*Dear Pomona,*

*Uncle Henry has got a alotment and grow veggutables. He says what makes the mold is worms. You know we puled all the worms out off our garden and chukked them over Miss Natchbols wall. Well you better get some more quick a lot ask George to help you and I bring som seeds home when I comes next week by the xcursion on Moms birthday*

*Your sincerely brother*

*John Flynn*

By writing this letter on behalf of the boy’s character, the author reveals his own attitude to the boy, which is sharply contrast to that of the Mrs. Knatchbole’s. Moreover, the grammar mistakes done by the boy, is the surface level which explicitly showing his illiteracy level, but the hidden message given on in the deep layer, is his sincere love and support to his family.

### **Conclusion**

The study of the two-level structure of the literary text reveals the intricate interplay between the surface and deep layers of meaning that define the uniqueness of literary communication. This dual structure – comprising the explicitly verbalized content and the implicit conceptual core – serves as the foundation for the interpretive richness of fiction. As demonstrated through theoretical insights from scholars such as Molchanova, Ashurova, and Turaeva, the implicit layer functions as the semantic reservoir of the text, relying on poetic details, presupposition, stylistic devices, and cognitive models to engage the reader in a process of active meaning construction.

Implicitness, far from being a secondary stylistic feature, emerges as a central organizing principle of the literary text, shaping its communicative, aesthetic, and cognitive dimensions. Through the mechanisms of implicates and implicit imagery, authors subtly encode conceptual and emotional depth that transcends literal expression. This layered complexity not only reflects the author’s

worldview but also calls for the reader's intellectual and emotional co-participation, highlighting the dialogic nature of literary discourse.

In conclusion, the two-level model is not only a descriptive framework but also a methodological key to understanding the multilayered semantics of literary texts. It underscores the interdependence between form and meaning, text and context, author and reader. By focusing on implicitness and its realization through stylistic and cognitive means, the present research affirms the central role of interpretive engagement in literary analysis and offers a comprehensive approach for exploring the semantic depth and communicative potential of fiction.

### References:

1. Alefirenko, N.F. (2010). *Cultural linguistics and meaning construction*. Voronezh: VSU Press.
2. Arnold, I.V. (1973). *The English word*. Moscow: Vischaya Shkola.
3. Arnold, I.V. (2004). *Stylistics: Modern approach*. Moscow: Flinta.
4. Ashurova, D. (2020). Informativity of fictional text. *Bulletin of Science and Practice*, 6(6), 386–391.
5. Ashurova, D.U. (2013). Linguocultural aspect of literary text. In *Hozirgi zamon tilshunosligida kognitiv, lingvomadaniyatshunoslik va gender tilshunosligi yo 'nalishlariga doir masalalar: Respublika ilmiy-amaliy konferensiyasi maqolalari to 'plami* (pp. 61–62). Tashkent.
6. Ashurova, D.U. (2018). Imagery as a stylistic and cultural category. In *Lingvistika, tarjimashunoslik, dingvodidaktika: Xalqaro ilmiy anjuman materiallar to 'plami* (Vol. 1, pp. 52–57). Tashkent: O'zMU.
7. Ashurova, D.U. (2022). Functional model of fictional text. *Foreign Philology and Teaching Methods*, (pp. 65–78). Tashkent.
8. Ashurova, D.U., & Galieva, M. R. (2016). *Stylistics of literary text* (272 pp.). Tashkent: Turon-Iqbol.
9. Ashurova, D.U., & Galieva, M. R. (2016). *Text linguistics* (324 pp.). Tashkent: Turon-Iqbol.
10. Ashurova, D.U., & Galieva, M. R. (2018). *Cognitive linguistics*. Tashkent: VneshInvestProm.
11. Bakhtin, M.M. (1979–1986). *Esthetics of verbal creativity*. Moscow: Iskustvo.
12. Bolotnova, N.S. (2009). *Text and its communicative-aesthetic nature*. Tomsk: Tomsk State University.
13. Galperin, I.R. (1981). *Stylistics*. Moscow: Higher School Press.
14. Grice, H.P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics* (Vol. 3, pp. 41–58). New York: Academic Press.
15. Khovanskaya, Z.L. (1975). *Poetics and levels of text*. Leningrad: Nauka.
16. Kukhareno, V.A. (1988). *A book of practice in stylistics*. Moscow: Higher School Press.
17. Lotman, Y.M. (1990). *Universe of the mind: A semiotic theory of culture*. London: I. B. Tauris.
18. Maslova, V.A. (2009). *Cognitive linguistics*. Minsk: TetraSystems.
19. Molchanova, G.G. (2003). *Implicature and implicitness in literary discourse*. Moscow: MGU.
20. Mukarovskiy, J. (1977). *Aesthetic function, norm and value as social facts*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
21. Potebnya, A.A. (1892). *Thought and language*. Kharkov: Printing House of M. P. Fedorov.
22. Sapir, E. (1921). *Language: An introduction to the study of speech*. New York: Harcourt.
23. Shakhovskiy, V.I. (2008). *Emotiveness in language and speech*. Volgograd: Peremena.
24. Turaeva, Z.Y. (1986). *The language of fiction and its structure*. Tashkent: Fan.

25. van Dijk, T.A. (1977). *Text and context: Explorations in the semantics and pragmatics of discourse*. London: Longman.
26. Vinogradov, V.V. (1963). *Style of the writer and Russian literary language*. Moscow: Nauka.
27. Vorkachyov, S.G. (2001). *Linguocultural concept and its reflection in language*. Moscow: Nauka.
28. Wierzbicka, A. (1999). *Emotions across languages and cultures: Diversity and universals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
29. Jakobson, R.O. (1960). Linguistics and poetics. In T. A. Sebeok (Ed.), *Style in language* (pp. 350–377). Cambridge: MIT Press.
30. Yermakova, E.V. (2021). *Artistic categorization and implicature in literary communication*. Moscow: Moscow Linguistic Society.