Integral Parts of Utterance Implicit Meaning and Ways of Transferring Implicit Information in Tatar -Russian Fiction Translations

Farida Bizyanovna Sitdikova, Senior lecturer,
Diana Faridovna Khakimzyanova, Associate professor,
The Institute of Foreign Relations, History and Oriental Studies
Kazan Federal University, Kazan, Russia
E-mail: farida7777@yandex.ru
Phone: + 7 (905) 025 5766
Address: Kazan, Kazan Federal University, Kremliovskaya str, 18,
420008, Kazan, Russian Federation

Abstract

The article presents a research in the field of translation studies and deals with the problem of transferring implicit meanings from the original language to the target language. The presence of implicit meanings in all languages is one of the most important features of the verbal communication process. By implicit meaning we understand the meaning of an utterance that is not expressed in a verbal way, but can be drawn by the recipient on the basis of the context, situation or background knowledge. Our research considers the integral parts of the utterance implicit meaning (that is, presuppositions, specific contextual meaning and statement implicature). We also consider the ways of transferring them in translation from Tatar into Russian. The main approach to this research was a cognitive one which is widely used nowadays in studying linguistic phenomena. The main results of the article are: 1) describing the ways of transferring implicit information from Tatar into Russian; 2) collecting statistics of the different kinds of implicitness occurrence.

Keywords: implicit meaning, implicitness, presupposition, specific contextual meaning, implicature, approach.

INTRODUCTION

Our research deals with the implicit meaning of an utterance. The term **implicit** means capable of being understood from something else though unexpressed [1]. In all languages the meaning of an utterance is formed both from explicitly expressed components and also unexpressed, but implied ones. By **implicit meaning** in general we understand different kinds of implicit information (that is, presupposition, contextual meaning, implicature, subtext) which have been interpreted by different authors in different way [2]. By **implicit meaning of an utterance** we understand the meaning that is not expressed in a verbal way, but is created from the interaction of language units with the cognitive sphere of the utterance recipient.

Forming an utterance meaning has been studied both by linguists and psychologists. According to relevance theory [3, 4] of English psychologists D.Sperber and D.Wilson, forming and understanding an utterance meaning is the interpretation process. The interpretation includes several steps each of them involves subaudition. So we can view an utterance like a verbal stimulus which draws appropriate knowledge from the cognitive sphere.

Transferring implicit meanings from original language into target language has always remained an acute problem for translators because the correlation of implicitness and explicitness in languages differs. Each language uses its own forms, which allow a certain part of information to be left implicit. "When translating from one language into another, translators have to keep a certain balance between the explicit and implicit information" [5]. That is why in original and target languages the methods of presenting information are different and it is the translator who is to make a decision which method to choose.

TERMS, MATERIALS and METHODS

The objective of our research was to consider the integral parts forming altogether the implicit meaning of an utterance and the way they are translated from the original into target language. As the **material** of our research we have used some fiction works by Tatar writers and their translations into Russian made by professional translators. In our research we have used cognitive approach which is common nowadays for studying linguistic phenomena. We followed the technique used by A.V. Kashichkin in his paper where he considered English-Russian translations. [6]. Also we have used statistical and comparative analysis **methods** to show the ways of transferring implicit meaning from Tatar into Russian.

According to modern approach, the implicit meaning of an utterance is referred to as a complicated multilevel semantic formation, which is assembled from **presuppositions, specific contextual meaning** and **statement's implicature**.

Presuppositions are defined in Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy as follows: "We discuss presupposition, the phenomenon whereby speakers mark linguistically the information that is presupposed or taken for granted…" [7]. In other words, they can be called background knowledge or elements of the communicants' cognitive sphere which are necessary for making and understanding the statement.

The specific contextual meaning of an utterance is formed when the utterance is associated with specific situation and the context. For example, the phrase *Drop me a line* can mean: *Write to me, Call me or Visit me*, according to the context.

Many utterances allow to draw some additional implicit meanings which is not expressed directly but can be understood by the recipient on the basis of background knowledge and situation. This meaning (or several meanings) is called an **implicature**. Let us consider the dialogue:
  – *Did the children supper camp go well?*
  – *Some of them got stomack 'flu.*

From the last utterance we can draw an implicature: *Not all of the children got stomach 'flu.*
Sometimes one utterance can have several implicatures, or different people can draw different implicatures from the same utterance, depending upon their background knowledge, context and situation, for example: *The summer camp didn't go as well as hoped.* [8].

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Transferring implicit meanings from original language into target language has always remained an acute problem for translators because the correlation of implicitness and explicitness in languages differs. A good professional always tries to achieve the right balance between explicit and implicit information. To get the author's message across to the translation readers as closely as possible, translators apply different techniques. After analyzing about 200 language examples the following cases have been revealed: **1) retaining the implicit meaning of an utterance or phrase; 2) explication; 3) replacement; 4) loss of the implicit meaning** or **5) overtranslation.**

At the presupposition level we can come across the differences which can be explained by differences in the cognitive sphere of different languages speakers (extra-linguistic presuppositions). For instance, when some cultural environment terms or geographical realities are mentioned in the original text, very often explication is necessary. (We have supplied language examples from Tatar fiction, corresponding Russian translations and also English version for other language-speakers):
*Чирәм өстендә генү чиләктән бер беребезгә су коеп юыныл алдык. Күңелгә: " **Комганнары** да юк, күрәсең", – дигән уй килде [9]. Мы умылись тут же, во дворе, поливая друг другу. Невольно подумалось, что у хозяев нет даже **кумгана, который столь привычно видеть в каждом доме** [10]. We had a wash right here, in the yard, pouring water to each other. I couldn't help thinking that our hosts even do not have a **kumgan** which is common in each house.*
In our research **in 70% of cases** explication method has been used to make the translated text clear to its readers.

As for specific contextual meaning (SCM), it is drawn by the recipient from the explicit meaning of the utterance, the situation and the context, as we already mentioned. Quite often SCM is retained in the translated text and does not require explication or replacement:
– *Казан еракмы соң?*
– *Ерак түгел! Ике сәгатьтән анда булабыз!*
– *Ике сәгать?*
– *Аннан да алда барып булмый. Расписание.[11].*
– *А далеко до Казани?*
– *Часа через два будем.*
– *Два часа?*
– *Раньше никак. Расписание. [12].*
– *Is it far from here to Kazan?*
– *Not at all. We'll arrive in two hours.*
– *Two hours?*
– *Not possible ahead of time. Time-schedule.*
In the example given above readers of all languages can easily get the meaning of the highlighted sentence: *It is not possible to arrive ahead of the time because of the schedule.* In one third of cases the SCM is retained and does not require explication or replacement.

Explication and replacement were used by translators were used when it was required by differences in background knowledge or language norms. Among our language examples the SCM was retained in 30% of all cases, was explicated in 35%, and in 35% replacement took place.

If the target text contains some phraseological units, then SCM might be very far from word for word translation. We need to remind that we consider phraseological units as language structures containing implicit meanings.

Here is an example of replacement:

- *Җаныкаемны күрәләтә рәнҗеткәндә **авыз йомып торыйммы**? [13].*
- *Мою девушку обижают, а я должен **воды в рот набрать**? [14].*
- *My girl's feelings have been hurt, why should I **shut up like a clam**?*

When considering the language examples with implicatures, we came to the conclusion that in most cases (73%) translators have retained the implicatures of the original text and their impicitness, for example:

- *Милициягә хәбәр иттегезме?*
- ***Монда телефонны өзгәннәр** [15].*
- *В милицию сообщили?*
- ***Здесь телефонный провод перерезали**. [16].*
- *Have you phoned to the police?*
- ***The telephone wire has been cut.***

In this example it is clear for every language speaker from the common background knowledge that it was not possible to phone the police, so they could not do it. So the implicitness of the original utterance has been retained.

In 10 % of language examples the original implicatures were explicated, in 13% replaced. We also noticed some rare cases then the implicatures in the original text were lost by the translators. Sometimes it can be explained by the translator's inability to transfer the implicit meaning, see the following example:

- *Кара менә бу атны! **Эченнән инә үтәрлек**. Моның белән ничек сабан сөрмәк кирәк тә, ничек ашлык ташымак кирәк! [17].*
- *Ну погляди на этого коня! Как пахать на нем, как на нем хлеб возить, а?[18].*
- *Just look at this horse! **All skin and bone**. How shall we plough the land with it?*

In the highlighted sentence the Tatar-Russian translator should have given some phraseological equivalent or use replacement, but the translator did not do anything, so the implicit meaning was lost.

We have also found some cases of overtranslation (2%) when translators made explicit the ideas that were implicit in the original text and use some extra verbalization. This phenomenon can be explained by the translator's intention to make the text completely clear to the target text readers. See the following example:

- *Кунмыйсыңмыйни?*
- *Кунмыйм, рәхмәт, – диде Бибинур. <…>*
- *Төн...*
- *Төн кайгылы кешегә кулай юлдаш кына ул. Курыкмыйм. [19]*
- *Заночуешь?*
- *Нет, – опять отказалась Бибинур. <…>*
- *Ночь...*
- *Ночь как раз для горемыки: **слез никто не увидит…** Нет, правда, не боюсь я [20].*
- *Aren't you staying for a night?*
- *No, thanks, – said Bibinur.*
- *It's night, you know…*

*– Night gives a helpful hand to poor wretch like me: **nobody will see my tears**…No, I am really not scared at all.*

Thus, overtranslation is total explication of information that was implicit in the original text and adding the translator's own text. We should mention the universality of this phenomenon, no matter which languages are used.

CONCLUSIONS

First of all, we need to mention that in the Tatar language studies there has been no research analyzing language phenomena in the aspect of implicitness, and also considering implicitness in the context of translation. We share the view of modern psycholinguists that an utterance total meaning is formed by summarizing its integral parts: presuppositions, specific contextual meaning and implicatures.

To summarize the contents of the article, the ways of transferring implicit meanings while translating text from source into target language are as follows: **retaining** the implicitness of the original utterance, **explication** of the implicit meaning components, **replacement** of the explicit language units, **loss** of the implicit meaning, and also **overtranslation**. The listed above actions can be caused both for objective and subjective reasons. objective reasons include language and cognitive factors, and subjective reasons relate to the translator's abilities for adequate to provide the adequate translations and to the ability of the readers of the target text to draw the implicit meaning correctly.

The quantitative results of our research can be demonstrated in the following table:

**WAYS OF TRANSFERRING IMPLICIT INFORMATION
IN TRANSLATION FROM TATAR INTO RUSSIAN**

Different parts and kinds of implicit meaning	Methods used by fiction translators					
	Number	Retaining	Explication	Replacement	Loss	Overtranslation
Presuppositional components	80	10	56	12	1	1
Specific contextual meaning	20	6	7	7	–	1
Implicatures	100	72	10	13	3	2
Altogether	200	88	73	32	4	4

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

References

1. Merriam-Webster Dictionary
http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/implicit (accessed in April, 2016)

2. Umerova M.V. Implikatziya v semanticheskoy structure teksta.   Voprosy filologicheskih nauk. 2010. № 6. – P. 95.

3. Dan Sperber & Deirdre Wilson. Relevance: Communication and Cognition, Blackwell, 1986.

4. Wilson, D. & Sperber, D.   Relevance theory. In Horn, L. & Ward, G. (eds.), Handbook of pragmatics. Oxford: Blackwell, 2003.

5. Mildred L.Larson. Meaning-Based Translation: A Guide to Cross Language Equivalence, Lanham/New York/London: University Press of America, 1984. – P. 398.

6. Kashichkin A.V.   Implitzitnost v kontexte perevoda.: dis. ... kand. filol. nauk: 10.02.20: Москва. 2003.

7. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/presupposition/   (accessed in April, 2016)

8. Stephen C. Levinson, Presumptive meanings: the theory of generalized conversational implicature. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2000. – P. 115.

Language examples:

9. A. Yeniki. Sailanma eserler. – Kazan, Tarih, 2002.– Vol. 2. – P. 268.

10. A.Yenikeyev. Glyadya na gory:rasskazy. – Moscow: 1974.– P. 253.

11. A.M.Gilyazov. Jomga kich belen. – Kazan, 1982. – P. 8.

12. A.Gilyazov. Och arshin jir. – Moscow: 1987. – P. 136.

13. N. Gimatdinova. Parly yalgiz. – Kazan: 2003. – P. 107.

14. N. Gimatdinova. Parly yalgiz. Perevod s tatarskogo Sitdikova F. – Idel. – 2005. – №2. – P. 11.

15. T.Galiullin. Taybe – Kazan, 1997. – P. 55.

16. T.Galiullin. Petlya. Perevod s tatarskogo Sitdikova F., F.Faizov. – Kazan, 1999. – P. 59.

17. G.Bashirov. Namus. – Kazan, 1951. – P.47.

18. G.Bashirov. Chest'. – Kazan, 1988. – P.49.

19. **A.M.Gilyazov**. Jomga ken, kich belen . – Kazan, 1982. – P. 93.

20. **A.Gilyazov.** Och arshin jir. – Moscow: 1987. – P. 236.