

Semantic and Stylistic Aspects of the Category of Implicitness in the Titles of Literary Texts

Madina Mirjalilova Jamshid qizi

English teacher, Uzbekistan state world Language University

Palvannazirova Zilola Mansurbek qizi

Master of Uzbekistan state world Language University

Article Information

Received: January 26, 2023

Accepted: February 27, 2023

Published: March 28, 2023

Keywords: literary text, semantic structure, communicative blocks, zones of compression and dispersion, nominative chains, theme and rheme.

ABSTRACT

Every text has its own shape and substance, making it possible to analyze it from a structural and semantic standpoint. There are various ways to assess the literary text's semantic structure. Incorporating techniques from Morokhovsky (1981) (communicative blocks) and Bukhbinder (1978); the latter enables the identification of so-called zones of compression, or information overload, and zones of dispersion, or information minima, in the text. The third method relies on topical or nominative chains, which can be created by designating several things. (Domashnev 1989). Identifying the theme and rheme in the text highlights the logical connections between phrases and provides an image of the text's structure. These techniques are used to analyze R. Bradbury's short stories.

Introduction

The paper covers the text linguistics semantic trend, whose proponents introduced several text analysis techniques. According to Morokhovsky, a text model is a specific system, or the entire collection of communicative blocks (C-blocks) bound together by specific relations and used to accomplish a specific set of functions. According to Морочовски (1981:8), C-blocks differ in how they relate to one another and the overall text model. Using this technique, we can separate the text into various semantic pieces. Zones of compression and dispersion (Bukhbinder's words) have a close relationship to a text category known as information value. Nominative chains display the text's vertical context. The idea of thematic progression, which is related to deep and surface text structure, was first articulated by Dane (1974). It provides the chance to discuss the text's functional nature and demonstrates the relationships between its subjects and predicates. In order to better grasp the text's semantic structure, the author of the piece combines many approaches to short story analysis.

Literary text and methods

Throughout history, literary writings have drawn linguists' interest as the subject of study (Barthes 1975; de Beagrande and Dressler 1981; Chilton 2009; алерин 2007; Panasenko 2012; Panasenko and Baatarkhuu 2010; Panasenko and Zolichová 2011; алерин 2007;}

The text is examined from various angles, including its content, reader perception quirks, syntactic and semantic structure, communication orientation, spatial and temporal structure, categories, and

others. Despite this, there are still a lot of unanswered questions in text theory related to various study methodologies and unique approaches as well as its analysis and interpretation. Let's start with the book's definitions, methods of analysis, and structure since the text itself serves as the foundation for all conceivable interpretations. According to Galperin (1977:524), a text is a concrete work that has a headline and is finished in relation to the content of the headline; this work is made up of connected components and is goal-directed and pragmatic in nature.

Text can be examined as a cultural entity by looking at the sequence of indications that the native speakers of the given language largely see invariantly (Укин 1999:147). The research was focused on identifying and categorizing different text structure types, with text being defined as a unit larger than the sentence (Carter, Malmkjær 2004:541).

Additionally, we must keep in mind that the text can be analyzed from a variety of perspectives and that the attitude of the reader may affect how the text is seen. According to Lotman, the text can serve as a starting point for discussions of historical, social-economic, or philosophical issues as well as a source of information on the way of life, legal, and ethical norms of the time (Отман 1970).

There are many different approaches to texts, including historical, cultural, psychological, sociological, ethnological, aesthetic, structural, and many others. This is because there are so many different types of writings. According to Selivanova (2008:485, 490), the following developments in text linguistics stand out:

1. **Grammatical and structural.** The focus of research is on formal types and text integrity, as well as compositional principles for text structures; in particular, problems with anaphora, various repetition kinds, interphrasal logical linkages, implication, presupposition, and text division into paragraphs are being studied.
2. **Semantic.** Initially, this method kept the linearity and logical structure of text grammar, but over time, it has changed its focus to emphasize the principles of global, multilayer, multidimensional text semantic content. Cohesion, hypothetical text structure, context, semantic text categories, and semantic bases of understanding are among the issues that this method is attempting to solve (E. Agricola, I. Arnold, R. de Beaugrande, A. Bohusawski, Bukhbinder, W. Dressler, I. Galperin, V. Kukhareno, V. Lukin, O. Padutcheva, A. Papina, T. Nikolayeva, Z. Turayeva).
3. **pragmatic and communicative.** At the expense of communicative categories like text addresser, addressee, modality, interactivity, etc., it supported the development of communicative text models and the widening of the text category spectrum. Its representatives considered text in the discourse system as the sign moderator between the author and the reader (N. Arutiunova, H. Harnisch, H. Isenberg, I. Kolegayeva, J. Kořenský, V. Odintsov, G. Pocheptsov, W. Schmidt, Ye. Selivanova, I. Seriakova, I. Susov, O. Vorobyova, D. Viehweger).
4. **Semiotic.** According to R. Barthes, Yu. Kristeva, Yu. Lotman and his school, M. Riffaterre, and Yu. Stepanov, the primary issues with this tendency are the consideration of text sign correlation and its denotation with real words, of text itself and the semiosphere, and the semiotic cultural universe. There are modern research facets of this trend related to linguistic cultural studies and ethnolinguistics. (I. Golubovskaya, V. Karasik, M. Pimenova, V. Shakhovskiy, A. Vasilyeva).
5. **Mindfulness.** In the past, text prototypes, mental models and spaces, frames, propositions, etc. have all been modelled using the macrostructures that represent discourse themes and microstructures introduced by T. Van Dyck and W. Kintsch (G. Fauconnier, Ch. Fillmore, F. Johnson-Laird, Ye. Ognieva, L. Petrova, R. Shank). Later, cognitive poetics (L. Bieliakhova, V. Nikonova, P. Stockwell, R. Tsur, and M. Turner) emerged as a new movement in text linguistics.
6. **Applied.** The design of computer systems for text creation and comprehension sets this trend apart from others (Yu. Apresian, N. Leontyeva, I. Melchuk, G. Scragg, R. Shank). The aforementioned classifications demonstrate that there are currently an excessive number of methods for text analysis. According to Zavel'skaya, contemporary approaches to texts offer

researchers not only a vast field of study but also brand-new challenges when evaluating the characteristics of a piece of art. Finding precise standards for interpreting this or that textual fragment is one of these challenges.

In a specific key, for example, as a literary device, a symbol, a sign, a mythological connotation, etc. (авелска et al.). The essential idea of a literary work is not, as we all know, directly stated by the author but rather communicated to the reader through a system of images, or more specifically, through tangible images of human life (Scholz 1981:17). I believe that text semantic categories, which make up text semantic structure, represent the fundamental notion the most vividly.

Traditionally, the structure and content of a text are taken into consideration. This fundamental divide serves as the foundation for various text categories. Let's concentrate on the various interpretations of text content as that is the subject of my research. In his book *Psychosemantics of Consciousness*, Petrenko defines semantic space as a collection of clearly ordered signs that distinguish and describe the objects (values) in some significant area. According to this approach, word meanings are stored in the brain as collections of their semantic properties, and the closer two words are together in semantic space, the more similar their contents are. (1988:52). This is how the concept of semantic space is understood in psycholinguistics.

Language experts define text semantic space as a mental construct created by the verbal literary work itself and text interpretation by a reader during the course of his or her perception (Babenk and Kazarin 2003:52). This mental construction resulted from the author's aim and incorporates a variety of language indicators, including words, phrases, and complicated grammatical units. (virtual space). The idea of text semantic space has changed as a result of cognitive linguistics' appearance and continued advancement.

The phrase text semantic structure is also well-known among linguists. We consider these two terms to be synonymous. If we study the text while considering a text category like information value, we could uncover macro- and microthemes (Papina, 2002 terminology) that are connected by particular connections. These connections may have vertical linear coherence, be meaningful, linguistic, or nonlinguistic (аина 2002:15). Despite varying perspectives on text semantic space, all researchers agree that some text signs occupy critical positions in the system of its semantic linkages (укин 1999:84).

We shall start with the text models (Cblocks) given by Morokhovsky as we will be talking about text structure. Three distinct types of C-blocks can be distinguished in any text model: the introductory C-block, which provides background information necessary for understanding the information in the main C-block, and the final C-block, whose main purpose is to alter the addressee's emotional and/or physical state. The literary work has a more challenging structure. C-blocks like exposition, plot, conclusion, and upshot are all present in it. However, the decisive action.

All academics agree that certain text signs occupy significant positions in the system of its semantic connections, despite the fact that they have taken varied methods to the study of text semantic space (укин 1999:84).

Since we're talking about text structure, we'll start with Morokhovsky's suggested text models (Cblocks). Any text model can be broken down into three distinct types of C-blocks: the introductory C-block, which serves to provide background information necessary for understanding the information in the main C-block, and the final C-block, whose main purpose is to alter the addressee's emotional and/or physical state. The literary text's structure is more challenging. Exposition, plot, conclusion, and upshot are some of the C-blocks present. But the final purpose is executed not by final C-blocks, but by the text on the whole (Morokhovsky 1981:7–8).

These viewpoints demonstrate how the text might be organized differently depending on how valuable the information is. There are both horizontal and vertical relationships between the text's constituent parts. Vertical lines depict relationships between lexical components and create "nominative chains," which are made up of words and word combinations that refer to the same

subject of relationships between things. Conclusions

Conclusion

Text linguistics is a subfield of linguistics that draws on the theoretical underpinnings of many other branches of linguistics, including stylistics, lexicology, hermeneutics, pragmatics, semantics, and many more. One could say that each new scientific advancement offers a unique perspective on the world, a different way to acquire knowledge, a different way to display that knowledge, and new techniques for text analysis. Text linguistics had made a significant intellectual impact on science by the 20th century's conclusion and was regarded as one of the dominant ideas at the time (Ураева 1999:17). Like Turayeva. Text has evolved into an argument and a tool for the recipient to use to alter their perspective of the world. We can employ a variety of approaches and strategies in text analysis since text linguistics actively interacts with other studies. My analysis's combination of methodologies clearly demonstrates how occasionally crucial information is conveyed indirectly by being tucked away in a thematic cluster of words. Semantic analysis makes it easier to comprehend the author's intention. I imagine that such an approach to text semantic structure is creative and aids the reader in understanding literary texts in a more accurate and precise manner.

References

1. Babenko, A.G. and Yu.V. Kazarin. (Бабенко А.Г., Казарин Ю.В.) 2003.
2. *Philological Analysis of the Text. Practical Work.* Moscow: Academicheskiiy proyekt – Yekaterinburg: Delovaya kniga. (in Russian).
3. Barthes, R. 1975. *The Pleasure of the Text.* Hill and Wang: New York.
4. Bohusławski, A. 1977. *Problems of Thematic-Rhematic Structure of Sentences.* Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
5. Bukhbinder, W.A. (Бухбиндер В.А.) 1978. “On some theoretical and applied aspects of text linguistics” [in:] *Text Linguistics and Foreign Languages Teaching.* Kiev: Vyšča škola. 30–38. (in Russian).
6. Carter, R.A. and K. Malmkjær. 2004. “Text linguistics” [in:] *The Linguistic Encyclopedia.* 2nd edition. Malmkjær, K. (ed.). London and New York: Routledge. Taylor and Francis Group. 540–551.
7. Chilton, P. 2009. “Text linguistics” [in:] J. Culperer, F. Katamba, P. Kerswill et al. (eds). *English Language. Description, Variation and Context.* Palgrave Macmillan: Lancaster University. 170–185.
8. Daneš, F. 1974. “Functional sentence perspective and the organization of the text” [in:] Daneš, F. (ed.).
9. *Papers on Functional Sentence Perspective.* Prague: Academia/The Hague: Mouton. 106–128.
10. Domashnev, A.I. (Домашнев А.И.). 1989. *Literary Text Interpretation: German.* Moscow: Prosveščeniye. (in Russian).
11. Galperin, I.R. (Гальперин И.Р.). 1977. “Text grammatical categories. (An experiment of generalization)” [in:] *Proceedings of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Series of Language and Literature.* 39/6. 522–532. (in Russian).
12. Galperin, I.R. (Гальперин И.Р.). 2007. *Text as the Object of Linguistic Research.* Moscow: Com Kniga. (in Russian).
13. Kovtunova, I.I. (Ковтунова И.И.). 1979. “Literary text structure and new information” [in:] *Text Syntax.* Moscow: Nauka. 262–275.
14. Lotman, Yu.V. (Лотман Ю.М.). 1970. *Literary Text Structure.* Moscow: Iskusstvo. (in Russian).

16. Lukin, V.A. (Лукин В.А.). 1999. *Literary Text: Basics of Linguistic Theory and Elements of Analysis*. Moscow: Publishing house "Os'-89". (in Russian).
17. Morokhovskiy, A.N. (Мороховский А.Н.) 1981. "Some basic notions of stylistics and text linguistics" [in:] *Text Linguistics and Foreign Languages Teaching. A Collection of Scholar Papers*. Kiev: Vyšča škola. 6–18. (in Russian)