

Writing the Unsaid: Brevity, Readerly Co-Production, and Affective Intensity in Lydia Davis's "Spring Spleen" and "The Visitor"

كتابة المسكوت عنه : الإيجاز، والمشاركة القرائية في إنتاج المعنى،
والكثافة الوجدانية في « كآبة الربيع » و « الزائر » لليديا ديفيس

Écrire le non-dit: brièveté, coproduction du sens et intensité affective dans «Spring Spleen» et «The Visitor» de Lydia Davis

AMINA SAIL

University of Algiers 2

2, rue Djamel Eddine El Afghani, 16000, Bouzaréah, Alger, Algérie

amina.sail@univ-alger2.dz

<https://orcid.org/0009-0000-5032-6744>

Date de réception	Publication numérique	Archivage ASJP
07/06/2026	15/08/2026	20/09/2026

Référence électronique

Amina SAIL, « Writing the Unsaid: Brevity, Readerly Co-Production, and Affective Intensity in Lydia Davis's 'Spring Spleen' and 'The Visitor' », Aleph [En ligne], Vol 13 (4) | 2026, mis en ligne le 15 août 2026, consulté le 15 octobre 2026. URL : <https://aleph.edinum.org/18188>

Référence papier (archivage Asjp)

Amina SAIL, « Writing the Unsaid: Brevity, Readerly Co-Production, and Affective Intensity in Lydia Davis's 'Spring Spleen' and 'The Visitor' », Aleph, Vol 13 (4) | 2026, 645-662.

Abstract

This article examines how Lydia Davis converts extreme brevity into a productive structure of interpretation in “Spring Spleen” and “The Visitor.” Rather than treating flash fiction as a merely shortened narrative form, it asks how omission, lexical precision, delayed identification, and affective compression redistribute interpretive work between text and reader. The study uses comparative close reading and microstylistic analysis, focusing on titles, syntactic balance, semantic withholding, temporal organisation, and endings. Its theoretical framework combines Roland Barthes’s distinction between readerly and writerly textuality, Wolfgang Iser’s account of blanks and indeterminacy, and Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari’s concept of the bloc of sensations; these approaches are treated as complementary but not interchangeable. The analysis shows that “Spring Spleen” generates complexity through a twenty-word structure in which seasonal pleasure and social irritation coexist without resolution, while “The Visitor” uses deferred reference, analogy, and life-course reversibility to make the identity of the expected guest retrospectively legible. In both texts, brevity does not simply remove narrative material: it organises the conditions under which readers infer, revise, and affectively inhabit what remains unstated. The article therefore argues that Davis’s minimalism is best understood as an economy of strategic incompleteness whose force depends on the formal precision of what is retained.

Keywords

Keywords: flash fiction; Lydia Davis; reader-response; textual gaps; minimalism; affect

الملخص

يحلل هذا المقال الكيفية التي تحوّل بها ليديا ديفيس الإيجاز الشديد إلى بنية منتجة للتأويل في نصّيه «كأبة الربيع» و«الزائر». وبدل النظر إلى القصة الومضة بوصفها سردًا مختصرًا فحسب، يبحث المقال في الطريقة التي تعيد بها الحذف المقصود، والدقة المعجمية، وتأجيل تعيين المرجع، والتكثيف الوجداني توزيع العمل التأويلي بين النص والقارئ. وتعتمد الدراسة قراءة مقارنة دقيقة وتحليلًا أسلوبيًا جزئيًا يركز على العنوان، والتوازن التركيبي، وحجب المعلومات، والتنظيم الزمني، وآليات الإغلاق. ويجمع إطارها النظري بين تمييز رولان بارت بين النص المقروء والنص القابل للكتابة، وتصور فولفغانغ إيزر للفراغات واللاتحديد، ومفهوم «كتلة الأحاسيس» عند جيل دولوز وفليكس غتاري، مع الحفاظ على اختلاف مستويات هذه المقاربات. يبين التحليل أن «كأبة الربيع» تبني تعقيدها داخل عشرين كلمة فقط، حيث يتجاوز الابتهاج الموسمي والانزعاج الاجتماعي من غير حسم، بينما يعتمد «الزائر» على الإرجاء المرجعي والقياس وقابلية أعمار الحياة للانعكاس، بحيث لا تتضح هوية الزائر المنتظر إلا بأثر

رجعي. وتخلص الدراسة إلى أن إيجاز ديفيس ليس حذقًا فقيرًا للمادة السردية، بل اقتصادًا في «الالتزام الاستراتيجي» يفَعِّل الاستدلال والمراجعة والمشاركة الوجدانية لدى القارئ.

الكلمات المفتاحية

القصة الومضة؛ ليديا ديفيس؛ جمالية التلقي؛ الفراغات النصية؛ الحد الأدنى السردى؛ الوجدان

Résumé

Cet article analyse la manière dont Lydia Davis transforme l'extrême brièveté en une structure productive d'interprétation dans « Spring Spleen » et « The Visitor ». Plutôt que de considérer la flash fiction comme un récit simplement raccourci, l'étude interroge la façon dont l'omission, la précision lexicale, l'identification différée et la compression affective redistribuent le travail interprétatif entre le texte et le lecteur. La méthode repose sur une lecture rapprochée comparative et une analyse microstylistique portant sur les titres, l'équilibre syntaxique, la rétention d'information, l'organisation temporelle et les effets de clôture. Le cadre théorique articule la distinction de Roland Barthes entre lisible et scriptible, la théorie des blancs et de l'indétermination de Wolfgang Iser et le concept de bloc de sensations chez Gilles Deleuze et Félix Guattari, sans confondre leurs niveaux d'analyse. « Spring Spleen » produit sa complexité par une architecture de vingt mots où le plaisir saisonnier et l'irritation sociale demeurent simultanément actifs. « The Visitor » repose, quant à lui, sur la référence différée, l'analogie et la réversibilité des âges de la vie, qui rendent progressivement lisible l'identité du visiteur attendu. La brièveté apparaît ainsi non comme une privation, mais comme une économie de l'incomplétude stratégique, dont l'efficacité dépend de la précision formelle de ce que le texte choisit de conserver.

Mots-clés

flash fiction ; Lydia Davis ; esthétique de la réception ; blancs textuels ; minimalisme ; affect

Introduction

Contemporary fiction is often discussed through the languages of expansion: world-building, seriality, accumulation, documentary density, and the long-form architectures of the novel. Lydia Davis's short prose repeatedly tests the opposite proposition. Across texts that may occupy several pages, a paragraph, a sentence, or only a handful of words, Davis asks how little verbal material a narrative situation requires before it begins to exceed its own visible dimensions. Her brevity is therefore not simply reduction. It is a compositional practice in which omission, precision, rhythm, and inference are organised so that what is absent remains structurally active.

Davis has herself described the very short form as a liberation from the demands of longer, more conventional stories. That statement is useful because it shifts the critical vocabulary away from deficiency: brevity becomes a way of entering imaginative and emotional material rapidly rather than a failure to elaborate it. Scholarship on Davis similarly stresses terseness, omission, implication, and formal experiment. Clark (2020), for example, situates her work in relation to literary minimalism while emphasising that her fiction frequently makes processes of thought, rather than external action, the principal site of narrative pressure. Flash-fiction scholarship more broadly has underlined the form's dependence on undernarration, fragmentation, rereading, and cognitive participation (Al-Sharqi & Abbasi, 2015; McDonald, 2018; Stopel, 2024).

This article focuses on two texts that occupy markedly different positions on the scale of brevity. "Spring Spleen," collected in *Samuel Johnson Is Indignant* (2001) and later in *The Collected Stories of Lydia Davis* (2009), consists of twenty words. "The Visitor," collected in *Can't and Won't* (2014), extends to a few hundred words. The length difference is analytically useful: it permits comparison of two modes of withholding. In the first, the entire narrative situation is compressed into a two-sentence structure whose title and final clause retroactively reorganise its emotional meaning. In the second, withholding is distributed across a more developed sequence: the text delays the identification of its central referent, surrounds that referent with analogical portraits, and makes the reader continually revise the category to which the visitor belongs.

This comparison addresses a specific question: under what formal conditions does omission become generative rather than merely incomplete? The question requires a distinction between brevity as quantity and brevity as organisation.

A short text is not necessarily dense, and a gap is not automatically meaningful. Omission acquires literary force when the surviving cues are sufficiently precise to activate inference while remaining open enough to sustain more than one temporally or affectively relevant possibility. The argument developed here is that Davis's flash fiction produces such force through strategic incompleteness: information is withheld, but the withholding is patterned by titles, lexical selections, syntactic symmetries, temporal shifts, and endings that compel retrospective rereading.

Three theoretical perspectives clarify different aspects of this process. Barthes's distinction between readerly and writerly textuality provides a vocabulary for redistributing interpretive agency. Iser's phenomenology of reading explains how blanks and indeterminacies prompt acts of ideation and revision. Deleuze and Guattari's account of art as a bloc of sensations shifts the emphasis from information to affective composition: what matters is not only what the reader infers but the intensity preserved by a highly concentrated arrangement of percepts and affects. These frameworks do not describe the same phenomenon and should not be collapsed into a single theory. Their value lies in their different scales: textual productivity, readerly actualisation, and affective composition.

Methodologically, the article proceeds through comparative close reading and microstylistic analysis. It examines titles, lexical oppositions, syntax, referential delay, temporal organisation, analogical structure, and closure. It does not claim to measure actual reader responses empirically; references to readerly activity designate interpretive operations solicited by textual form. This distinction matters, especially when using reception theory: the analysis identifies affordances and constraints within the texts rather than reporting how a sampled population of readers demonstrably reacted.

1. Flash Fiction and the Poetics of Strategic Incompleteness

Flash fiction is difficult to define exclusively by word count because publishing practices use different numerical thresholds. Its more durable critical features concern compression, undernarration, formal concentration, and a high ratio between explicit statement and inferential demand. McDonald (2018) situates the contemporary form within a longer history of very short prose and emphasises the productive instability of a mode that can approach

anecdote, prose poem, aphorism, parable, sketch, or miniature narrative without becoming identical to any of them. Al-Sharqi and Abbasi (2015) similarly describe flash fiction as a form in which writer and reader cooperate unusually intensely because omitted details must be supplied or tested during reading. More recent work by Stopel (2024) develops this point through cognitive and affective engagement, arguing that undernarration and fragmentation can increase rather than diminish interpretive and emotional demand.

This account is especially pertinent to Davis because her short texts often turn apparent thinness into a problem of categorisation. The reader must decide whether a sentence is anecdote, observation, miniature plot, philosophical proposition, joke, confession, or some unstable combination of these. Othman's (2023) study of *Varieties of Disturbance* shows how irony can produce surprisingly complex plot effects in very short narratives. The present study extends the question from irony alone to the relation between withholding and readerly reconfiguration: how a text can force a reader to revisit an earlier word, category, or assumption once a later cue alters the structure of relevance.

The term strategic incompleteness marks this difference between mere absence and organised omission. Incomplete information is strategic when the text supplies enough constraints to orient interpretation but not enough to close it prematurely. Such a structure can operate locally, through a missing referent or an ambiguous pronoun, and globally, through an ending that changes the status of everything preceding it. The result is not interpretive freedom without limits. Davis's minimalism is exacting precisely because a small number of cues do considerable work: each lexical choice narrows some possibilities while preserving others.

1.1. Barthes: from consumption to production

In *S/Z*, Barthes (1974) opposes the readerly text, which tends to present meaning as consumable and already organised, to the writerly text, which places the reader within the production of signification. The distinction is not a simple hierarchy between conventional and experimental works; it describes degrees of textual openness and the activity reading demands. Davis's flash fictions are particularly amenable to this perspective because they repeatedly refuse to provide the explanatory transitions, motivations, backgrounds, and closures on which conventional narrative intelligibility often depends.

To call these texts writerly does not mean that they are infinitely indeterminate. “Spring Spleen” and “The Visitor” are highly controlled. Their writerliness arises from the need to assemble relations among sparse cues. In Davis, economy is therefore not the opposite of structure. It is a structure that makes interpretation visible as labour: the reader notices the moment of inference because the text does not disguise the inferential leap beneath expository continuity.

1.2. Iser: blanks, indeterminacy, and revision

Iser’s account of reading is even more directly useful for analysing withheld information. Literary texts contain blanks and places of indeterminacy that require acts of ideation; the reader forms provisional connections, tests them against subsequent information, and revises them when the emerging configuration no longer holds (Iser, 1972, 1978). What matters is not simply that something is missing, but that the sequence of the text turns the missing element into a relation to be produced.

Flash fiction intensifies this mechanism because the proportion of unstated information is high and the space for explanatory repair is low. Yet Davis’s practice also qualifies as a simplistic version of gap-filling. The reader does not merely insert absent facts until the story becomes complete. Often the blank remains productive because it cannot be filled definitively. The word “almost” at the end of “The Visitor,” for instance, opens an ethical remainder rather than an informational puzzle with a single answer. Iser’s framework is therefore most useful when the gap is understood as a dynamic relation between anticipation, retrospection, and suspended alternatives.

1.3. Deleuze and Guattari: compression and affective composition

Deleuze and Guattari’s *What Is Philosophy?* (1994) approaches art from a different direction. Their concept of the bloc of sensations designates a compound of percepts and affects that is preserved by the work rather than reducible to a message about experience. Applied carefully to Davis, this concept helps explain why extreme verbal economy need not entail affective thinness. A concentrated arrangement can preserve tensions that are more powerful because explanatory commentary does not discharge them.

This perspective should not be confused with reader-response theory. Barthes and Iser foreground the production or actualisation of meaning;

Deleuze and Guattari foreground the autonomous composition of sensation. The three approaches become complementary when the analysis asks how a small textual object can both constrain readerly operations and preserve an affective configuration that resists paraphrase. Davis's brevity is particularly revealing at this junction: inference is necessary, yet the emotional force of the text cannot be exhausted by stating what the reader has inferred.

2. Corpus and Analytical Procedure

The corpus is deliberately small and contrastive. "Spring Spleen" represents radical compression: two sentences and twenty words. "The Visitor" is several times longer and permits a more extended manipulation of temporality and analogy. The aim is not to generalise from two texts to the entirety of Davis's work or to flash fiction as a whole. Rather, the paired reading tests whether similar theoretical claims about omission remain useful across two very different scales of brevity.

The analysis follows five recurrent questions. First, what information is explicitly supplied and what is withheld? Second, which lexical or syntactic cues guide the reader toward provisional inferences? Third, where does the text require retrospective revision? Fourth, how does the title or ending reorganise earlier material? Fifth, what affective configuration persists after the informational problem has been provisionally resolved? These questions keep the three theoretical frameworks anchored in textual evidence.

The primary texts are read in their authorised collections wherever possible. Online republications and interviews are used only as supplementary evidence. This bibliographic hierarchy corrects a weakness common in discussions of very short contemporary fiction, where readily accessible web reproductions can displace the primary edition. It also prevents a secondary commentator's interpretation from being treated as if it were part of Davis's text.

3. "Spring Spleen": Twenty Words and the Architecture of Ambivalence

"Spring Spleen" approaches the lower limit at which narrative, lyric, observation, and aphorism remain distinguishable. Its two sentences are syntactically plain, but their relation is not. The first registers pleasure in the rapid growth of leaves; the second reveals a practical and faintly comic reason for that

pleasure: the foliage will soon screen the neighbour and a screaming child from view. The seasonal scene is therefore doubled. Spring is apprehended as natural renewal and as a material device for social withdrawal.

The title is the first mechanism of compression. “Spleen” imports a literary and affective history of melancholy, ennui, irritation, and psychic heaviness into a text whose diction is otherwise almost aggressively ordinary. The gap between the title’s elevated affective resonance and the situation’s domestic pettiness produces tonal instability. The speaker’s happiness is genuine, but it is not innocent pastoral delight. The leaves are valued both aesthetically and instrumentally, as foliage and as screen. The title prevents the reader from reducing the second sentence to a simple joke, while the joke prevents “spleen” from becoming solemn melancholy.

The syntax reinforces this doubleness. The first sentence appears complete as a seasonal observation; the second retroactively changes what “happy” means. This is a miniature instance of Iserian revision. The reader initially constructs one horizon of expectation—pleasure in spring—then revises it when the causal or motivational field changes. Nothing in the first sentence becomes false. Instead, its semantic range widens. Davis thus shows that rereading can occur within twenty words: the second sentence sends the reader back to the first and alters the value of its apparently transparent emotion.

Barthes’s writerly model is useful here because the text does not explain the speaker’s relation to the neighbour, the duration of the irritation, the moral legitimacy of the annoyance, or the degree of comic exaggeration. Yet these are not arbitrary absences. The specific phrase about the screaming child activates a social scene without narrating it. The reader can infer proximity, recurrence, and irritation, but the text withholds enough context to prevent judgment from stabilising. The speaker may seem misanthropic, exhausted, comic, honest, or all of these at once.

The story’s affective power also exceeds its paraphrasable proposition. To say that a person likes leaves because they block an annoying neighbour is to state the informational content, but not the tonal compound preserved by the text. The perceptual freshness of enlarging leaves coexists with irritation, relief, humour, and a slight embarrassment about relief. In Deleuze and Guattari’s terms, the text preserves a compact affective compound. Its brevity matters because explanation would risk separating these forces into a sequence of reasons, whereas the twenty-word form keeps them simultaneous.

This simultaneity clarifies why the text should not be described as simply lacking setting, character, or plot. It has a minimally indicated setting, a speaking consciousness, neighbouring figures, temporal change, and a prospective event. What it lacks is elaboration. The difference is crucial. Davis does not erase narrative components; she compresses them until their relations carry more weight than their description. The result is a story in which the smallest temporal movement—leaves growing large enough to obstruct a view—becomes both event and emotional mechanism.

4. “The Visitor”: Deferred Reference and the Reversibility of the Life Course

If “Spring Spleen” works by rapid retrospective revision, “The Visitor” extends that process across several paragraphs. The opening announces a future arrival while withholding the visitor’s identity. The expected guest is described through a cluster of properties—baldness, incontinence, speechlessness, dependence—that can be mapped onto more than one stage or condition of life. The lexical field strongly invites an age-related inference, but it does not determine which end of the life course is at issue. Davis exploits this categorical ambiguity without falsifying any individual detail.

The important point is that the story does not simply trick the reader and then reveal a hidden answer in a conventional twist. The visitor is never ceremonially named in a final formula. Rather, the text makes one identification increasingly compelling: the future resident can be read as an expected baby whose helplessness resembles, in bodily terms, the dependence associated with extreme old age. The identity becomes retrospectively legible through the story’s cumulative arrangement. This distinction matters because the interpretive effect depends less on surprise than on recategorisation.

The middle paragraphs deepen the recategorisation by introducing elderly men whose bodily vulnerability echoes the opening description. These episodes are not detachable anecdotes. They function as analogical relays. The reader moves from the unnamed future visitor to remembered figures at the far end of life, then back to the anticipated arrival. The structure makes infancy and old age visible through shared conditions of dependence while preserving their ethical and emotional differences. Care is the common term, but it shifts meaning with temporal direction: one body enters a life whose development is anticipated; the others are associated with decline, memory, and death.

The temporal design is therefore more complex than the label “circle of life” suggests. The story layers future, past, and present. A visitor who has not yet arrived is described with certainty; deceased or declining men are recalled through vivid details; the narrator speaks from a present already organised by prospective care. The reader must hold these temporalities together rather than arrange them in a simple chronology. Barthes’s notion of writerly textuality helps describe this density because the story’s meaning is produced by connecting temporal and bodily correspondences that the narrator never fully theorises for the reader.

Iser’s model clarifies the status of the withheld referent. At first, the visitor’s identity is a blank around which expectations form. As the story proceeds, the blank does not receive a single explicit label; instead, it is constrained by accumulating information. Reading consists of adjusting the hypothesis. The important interpretive event is therefore not merely “discovering” that the visitor is a baby but becoming aware of the categories that made the initial description sound old, ill, or socially burdensome. Davis makes dependency itself unstable as a category: the same features can evoke aversion, tenderness, obligation, fear, or love depending on the temporal and relational frame.

The closing qualification “almost anything” is a second kind of blank. By this point the central identity is largely inferable, but the ethical limit of sacrifice is not. The adverb prevents sentimental closure. Without it, the final declaration would risk becoming an absolute statement of parental devotion. With it, the text preserves a boundary that is at once rational, comic, troubling, and humane. What would not be sacrificed? The story gives no answer, and the ending’s force depends on not supplying one. The remaining gap is not informational but ethical.

Deleuze and Guattari’s account of affect is useful at precisely this point. The story’s force does not lie only in the proposition that infancy and old age share bodily dependence. That proposition can be paraphrased easily. What the story preserves is the affective friction generated by placing anticipation beside decline, love beside burden, and devotion beside the word “almost.” Material details—rooms, bodies, gestures, smoke, trembling, night-time care—prevent the analogy from becoming abstract. They create perceptual anchors through which the life-course comparison is felt rather than merely understood.

The result is a form of narrative economy that is different from “Spring Spleen” but governed by the same principle of strategic incompleteness. “The

Visitor” supplies more narrative material, yet it withholds the naming that would stabilise the reading too early. Its greater length is used not to explain but to multiply analogies. Brevity here does not mean the fewest possible words; it means refusing any sentence that would discharge the tension before the structure has completed its work.

5. Comparative Discussion: Two Scales of Withholding

Read together, the two texts demonstrate that flash fiction cannot be reduced to a single technique of omission. “Spring Spleen” concentrates its effect in a near-instantaneous reversal of motive: a seasonal pleasure is recoded by a social irritation. “The Visitor” distributes withholding across a longer sequence in which a referent is progressively constrained through analogy. One text turns on the relation between two sentences; the other on the relation among temporal layers and human stages. What they share is not simply shortness but a high degree of dependency among their parts. Removing or explaining one element would change the entire configuration.

This comparison also refines the claim that readers “complete” flash fiction. Completion can suggest that the text is a puzzle with missing pieces and that the reader’s task is to restore a whole that already exists. Davis’s texts are more demanding. The reader supplies hypotheses, but those hypotheses remain revisable; some gaps are never closed; affective consequences exceed informational solutions. Readerly co-production is therefore better described as constrained actualisation. The text directs attention through specific cues while leaving certain relations open enough to sustain rereading.

Barthes, Iser, and Deleuze and Guattari illuminate different moments in this process. Barthes helps explain why interpretive labour becomes visible rather than hidden by conventional exposition. Iser models the sequence of anticipation, ideation, and retrospective adjustment. Deleuze and Guattari explain why the outcome cannot be reduced to a decoded meaning: once the referential puzzle has been resolved, the affective compound persists. The theories converge only at the level of the analytical problem, not at the level of philosophical identity.

The comparison further shows why lexical economy must be distinguished from semantic poverty. A brief text can be semantically thin if its remaining cues do little work. Davis’s minimalism works because lexical and structural

precision creates relations disproportionate to verbal extent. Titles function as interpretive operators; temporal adverbs establish horizons; apparently ordinary adjectives support competing classifications; final qualifiers reopen what an ending seems ready to close. This is why the common critical phrase that “every word counts” is more than praise in Davis’s case: it is a description of a compositional economy in which local choices have global consequences.

There are nevertheless limits to the present argument. A two-text close reading cannot establish how all readers respond, nor can it define the whole of Davis’s heterogeneous oeuvre. The analysis also relies on theoretical frameworks developed for broader questions of textuality, reception, and art rather than specifically for flash fiction. Its contribution is therefore interpretive: it shows how these frameworks become more precise when anchored in the microstructures of two contrasting stories, and how flash-fiction scholarship can benefit from distinguishing quantitative brevity from formally organised incompleteness.

5.1. Readerly Desire, Closure, and the Discipline of Delay

The source manuscript’s phrase “readerly desire” can be retained as an analytical intuition if desire is defined more precisely. The relevant desire is not a psychological trait attributed to actual readers but a structural pull toward completion: the tendency of narrative cues to generate expectations about identity, motive, causality, and closure. Flash fiction can intensify this pull because it often ends before explanatory conventions have fully discharged it. The important point, however, is that Davis does not simply frustrate a desire for answers. She modulates it. Some questions become sufficiently resolved for the text to cohere, while others are deliberately left active after the final sentence.

In “Spring Spleen,” the initial desire is small but immediate: why is the speaker happy that the leaves are growing so quickly? The second sentence supplies an answer, yet that answer produces a new interpretive problem. The practical motive—visual concealment—does not exhaust the speaker’s emotion; it complicates it. Closure at the causal level therefore opens indeterminacy at the ethical and tonal levels. The reader can identify a reason without being able to stabilise the speaker as merely comic, cruel, weary, private, or aesthetically attentive. The text satisfies one form of curiosity while generating another.

“The Visitor” operates through a longer discipline of delay. The opening description invites categorisation, the middle sections reframe the semantic field through old age and bodily dependence, and the ending makes the child-reading increasingly compelling. Yet the conclusion refuses absolute closure through the qualifier “almost.” In both stories, desire is thus redistributed rather than simply denied. The text gives enough to make rereading productive, but not enough to eliminate the residue that makes rereading worthwhile.

This distinction helps avoid a common romanticisation of ambiguity. An unresolved text is not automatically complex. Productive delay requires calibration: the reader must have a reason to anticipate, sufficient evidence to revise, and a remaining uncertainty that matters to the text’s affective or ethical stakes. Davis’s craft lies in maintaining that calibration with unusually little verbal material.

5.2. Lexical Vigilance, Translation, and the Weight of the Small Unit

Davis’s well-known work as a translator is relevant to this poetics, but it should not be used as a deterministic biographical explanation. Translating Proust and Flaubert does not by itself “cause” her minimalism. What can be said more cautiously is that translation foregrounds decisions at the level of syntax, cadence, lexical equivalence, and semantic residue—the same scale at which her shortest fictions operate. The affinity is methodological rather than causal: both practices make visible how much can depend on a small verbal choice.

That affinity is especially clear in the titles. “Spring Spleen” compresses an affective tradition into two words before the story begins. The Latinate and literary resonance of “spleen” sits beside the ordinary diction of leaves, neighbours, and a child, producing a register clash that no longer needs exposition once the title has done its work. “The Visitor,” by contrast, uses a generic social noun. A visitor is temporary, external to the household, and normally self-sufficient. Applying that label to the expected dependent guest creates estrangement before the reader processes the first descriptive detail. The title is therefore not a label placed above the story; it is part of the story’s inferential machinery.

The same principle applies to small qualifiers and temporal markers. Words such as “soon,” “will,” “not yet,” and “almost” organise prospective time

and incomplete knowledge. In longer narrative, such items may be absorbed into a large descriptive field. In Davis's compressed structures, they become load-bearing. They determine when an inference becomes available, whether it can be revised, and how strongly the ending closes. Microstylistic analysis is therefore not decorative close reading here; it is the level at which the narrative mechanism becomes observable.

5.3. From Gap to Configuration: Why Absence Alone Is Not Enough

The comparative reading also suggests refining the critical vocabulary of the gap. Discussions of flash fiction often make absence itself sound intrinsically generative. Yet a blank has no literary force independently of the elements around it. What matters is configuration: a missing specification, omitted explanation, or deferred referent becomes meaningful because other signs point toward it, constrain it, or make its absence noticeable. The analytic unit is therefore not the gap in isolation but the relation between omission and cue.

This is visible in the different roles of silence in the two stories. "Spring Spleen" does not withhold the speaker's immediate motive forever; it discloses it quickly. What remains unsaid concerns duration, social history, and moral evaluation. "The Visitor" withholds identity for longer, but gives the reader a dense cluster of bodily and temporal clues. The two forms of incompleteness are not interchangeable. One produces tonal ambiguity after causal clarification; the other produces referential recategorisation followed by ethical ambiguity.

Such distinctions matter for a theory of brevity because they prevent the critic from treating every unstated element as evidence of the same minimalist principle. Omission can serve suspense, irony, compression, focalisation, ethical restraint, humour, or affective concentration. Davis's achievement is not simply to omit more than other writers. It is to assign different functions to different omissions and to make those functions legible through the precise organisation of what remains.

This is also why the present article avoids a purely quantitative definition of flash fiction. Word count identifies a publishing category, but it does not explain the aesthetic work of compression. A twenty-word text and a three-hundred-word text can belong to the same broad mode while producing radically different reading dynamics. The more useful comparative question is

how each text converts limited verbal space into relations among anticipation, inference, revision, and affect.

Conclusion

Lydia Davis's very short fiction does not demonstrate that less language automatically produces more meaning. Such a formula would be as reductive as the assumption it seeks to oppose. Her work shows something more exacting: under particular formal conditions, reducing explicit narrative material can intensify the relations among the elements that remain. Brevity becomes productive when omission is patterned, lexical cues are precise, temporal organisation invites revision, and closure preserves rather than exhausts affective tension.

"Spring Spleen" and "The Visitor" make this principle visible at two different scales. The first uses twenty words to superimpose seasonal pleasure, irritation, humour, and social withdrawal. The second uses deferred reference and analogical structure to make infancy and old age illuminate one another without collapsing their differences. In both cases, the reader must infer and revise, but the texts do not relinquish control. Their openness is engineered.

Barthes names the redistribution of interpretive activity; Iser explains the dynamics of blanks and retrospective adjustment; Deleuze and Guattari help account for the affective remainder that survives paraphrase. Taken together, and kept theoretically distinct, these perspectives make it possible to describe Davis's minimalism as an economy of strategic incompleteness. The space "between words" is not literally empty. It is a structured field of relations in which the reader's activity becomes part of the work's unfolding while the work retains the formal precision that makes such activity possible.

For the study of flash fiction more broadly, this conclusion suggests a methodological shift. The critical question should not be how much a very short story omits, but how its omissions are organised, constrained, and made consequential. Davis's achievement lies not in saying almost nothing. It lies in knowing exactly what must be said for what remains unsaid to continue working after the sentence ends.

Bibliography

- Al-Sharqi, L., & Abbasi, I. S. (2015). Flash fiction: A unique writer-reader partnership. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 11(1), 52–56. <https://doi.org/10.3968/7253>

- Barthes, R. (1974). *S/Z* (R. Miller, Trans.). Hill and Wang. (Original work published 1970)
- Clark, R. C. (2020). Lydia Davis's psychological minimalism. *Studies in the American Short Story*, 1(1), 38–52. <https://doi.org/10.5325/studamershorstor.1.1.0038>
- Davis, L. (2001). *Samuel Johnson Is Indignant*. McSweeney's Books.
- Davis, L. (2009). *The Collected Stories of Lydia Davis*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Davis, L. (2014). *Can't and Won't*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1994). *What Is Philosophy?* (H. Tomlinson & G. Burchell, Trans.). Columbia University Press. (Original work published 1991)
- Iser, W. (1972). The reading process: A phenomenological approach. *New Literary History*, 3(2), 279–299.
- Iser, W. (1978). *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- McDonald, P. (2018). *The Enigmas of Confinement: A History and Poetics of Flash Fiction*. Greenwich Exchange.
- Othman, A. A. M. (2023). Plot in flash fiction: A study of irony in the flashes in Lydia Davis' *Varieties of Disturbance* (2007). *International Journal of Arabic-English Studies*, 23(1), 125–144. <https://doi.org/10.33806/ijaes2000.23.1.7>
- Rohrberger, M. (2004). Origins, development, substance, and design of the short story: How I got hooked on the short story and where it led me. In P. Winther, J. Lothe, & H. H. Skei (Eds.), *The Art of Brevity: Excursions in Short Fiction Theory and Analysis* (pp. 1–13). University of South Carolina Press.
- Stopel, B. (2024). Engaging readers cognitively and affectively in flash fiction. *Transfer. Reception Studies*, 9, 85–101. <https://doi.org/10.16926/trs.2024.09.13>