THE IMPLICITNESS OF WORD-COMBINATIONS AND UTTERANCES WITH MISSING LOGICAL PARTS (BASED ON TATAR FICTION EXAMPLES AND THEIR TRANSLATIONS)

Diana Faridovna Khakimzyanova[1], Farida Bizyanovna Sitdikova[2], Rimma Nailevna Sabirova[3]

[1]Kazan Federal University,Institute of Foreign Relations, History and Oriental Studies, Kazan, Russia.

[2] Kazan Federal University,Institute of Foreign Relations, History and Oriental Studies, Kazan, Russia. E-mail: farida7777@yandex.ru.

[3]Kazan Federal University, Institute of Foreign Relations, History and Oriental Studies, Kazan, Russia.

ABSTRACT

The article presents a research in the field of cognitive linguistics and deals with the phenomenon called implicitness. Our research confirms that there are two main kinds of implicitness – the first depends on the context and situation, the second is linked with the language system. Implicitness exists in languages in different forms: presuppositions, specific contextual meaning and implicatures. The article describes a special kind of implicitness called logical. In most cases recipients can draw the implicit meaning of such utterances due to the context, situation and the background knowledge. The main results of the article are: 1) describing word-combinations and utterances with missing logical links; 2) giving some statistics on logical implicitness; 3) contributing into the implicitness classification and submitting statistics relating to contextual and language system implicitness.

Keywords: language, linguistics, translation, implicitness, contextual implicitness, language system implicitness, logical implicitness, presupposition, specific contextual meaning, implicature.

INTRODUCTION

Nowadays linguistics tends to be focused on the semantic side of language phenomena, it is no accident, therefore, that semantic syntax and cognitive linguistics have made great progress within recent decades. In particular, the studies of implicitness and means of implicit information transfer are of great interest.

The term **implicit** means capable of being understood from something else though unexpressed [1].

By i**mplicitness** we mean the ontological feature of all natural languages which reflects the ability of language units to transfer not only information by expressing it verbally, but also some additional information, not expressed verbally but which can be understood by recipients from the background knowledge, language context and situation.

Implicitness in general is characterized by the asymmetry between the language sign's terms of content and the terms of expression, which means that the content of the idea turns to be a lot wider than its realization in language units [2]. We shall further use this asymmetry principle as the criteria for detecting the implicitness presence.

TERMS, MATERIALS AND METHODS

The objectives of our research was to consider the cases of implicitness when an utterance or word-combination have some missing logical parts, and also to specify the implicitness classification.

In spite of a great number of research related to implicitness, there is no single opinion about the range of language phenomena that can be comprised by the concept of implicitness. Our interpretation of implicitness is rather wide, we suppose that implicitness permeates the whole language system at all levels, beginning from the word level and finishing with the text one.

We distinguish between the two main types of implicitness: 1) implicitness based on the contextual links of the expressed content; 2) implicitness which is not connected with language context, and the communicants can understand the implied meaning, without any relation to the context and the situation. The same conclusion is made by most linguists who deal with without any relation, though they use different terms for marking these two types. We use the term **contextual implicitness** for the first type (some researchers call it speech or contextual-situative implicitness), and the term **general communicative implicitness** for the second type, it is also called by researches as structural, semantic – syntactical or language system related implicitness.

Our research deals with the cases of implicitness when an utterance or word-combination have some missing logical parts, but nevertheless the communicants can understand the right meaning due to the background knowledge, the situation and the context (We should mention that we did not consider the text level, having restricted ourselves to word-combinations and utterances levels).

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. Also we have used comparative and statistical **methods** to find out the frequency of particular implicitness cases.

To start with, we have to introduce a few terms. 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** [3], [4].

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…" [5]. 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 [6].

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
As we know, implicitness is present at all language levels. In this article we are considering two levels: of word-combinations and utterances without touching texts. Logical implicitness can be detected, starting with some kinds of word-combinations with missing logical parts which can be noticed when analyzing these word-combinations.

I. Word-combinations with missing logical parts. At this level implicitness can manifest itself in the form of semantically complete, but formally compressed phrases or expressions which are quite understandable but have some missing logical parts. For example, when we say "after tea", we certainly mean: "after **having** tea". Normally such word-combinations do not feel like incomplete, but when analyzing them, we can reveal some meanings which are not expressed verbally. Such word-combinations in Russian linguistics were given the name of semantic ellipsis. This term implies omission (or eliminating) some language signs which does not lead to breaking formal connections between words and structural parts, but logical connections might be broken [7]. Further on we are giving more examples of such word-combinations.

Such word-combinations with missing logical parts in Russian linquistics have been examined by N.S. Vlasova, S.E. Nikitina, G.G. Pocheptzov, N.M. Yencheva etc. The expressions like "the road to the forest" (the road **leading** to the forest), "cream for freckles" (cream **helping to get rid of** freckles) are considered to contain implicit meanings because they contain some hidden (implicit) meaning, and more words can be added to them to make more complete phrases (It should be noted that the translation of the examples might not sound English because it was simple replication from Russian). The ability to omit some components in word-combinations can be explained by the fact that they are compatible with strictly limited number of lexemes. According to G.G. Pocheptzov, "it is compulsory-distributive relations between two or more elements that make it possible to omit some of them" [8].

We have collected some language examples in Tatar (explications in translations are underlined):

– Мин **тугәрәкнең планын** төзедем, Вәсилә туташ [9].

– Я составил **план (работы) кружка**, Василя туташ.

– I have drawn up the **club's (work) plan**.

The word-combination **club's plan** might not sound well in English, but it is quite normal in Tatar and Russian. It can be expanded to **club's work plan** by adding a missing logical part.

One more example:

–   Син, матурым, **зачетыңа утыр** [10].

–   Ты, красавица, **садись к зачету готовиться** (досл. Садись за свой зачет).

–   And you, sweetie, **take a sit to prepare for a test.** In this example we also have a missing logical part in Tatar: **зачетыңа утыр = зачетка әзерләнергә утыр**, but when translated into Russian and English, it needs additional verbalization.

Considering word-combinations with missing logical parts, we came to conclusion that they can be of different types: 1) the ones that are clear without any context (that is, **general communicative implicitness**); they are also called by some researchers as **semantic- syntactical implicitness** [11].

2) the ones that can be understood from the language context and the situation (**contextual implicitness**). The last type can be illustrated by the following example. The Tatar word-combination in bold type would not be understandable without the preceding context. When translated into Russian and English, it needed explication (explicated part is underlined):

  Директор Шәмсетдиновны квартирга узенә алган, ә инспектор Хәмитовны «көнлеккә» салып чират төзегән иде. Хәкимҗанга беренче көн, аннан Хушиятләрдә, Рушадта... Бәлкыйс, авыз кырые белән елмаеп, **чират кәгазен** егетләргә курсәтте [12].

  Директор взял Шамсутдинова на квартиру к себе, а инспектор Хамитов будет ночевать по очереди - у Хакимджана, потом у Хушията, у Рушата ... Балькис, улыбаясь уголками рта, показала молодым людям **лист бумаги со списком очередников**.

  The headmaster invited Shamsutdinov to stay at his flat, as for Inspector Khamitov, he was to spend the night first at Khakimjan's, then at Khushiyat's, at Rushat's… Balkis, with a hidden smile, showed the young people **a piece of paper with the waiting list (**literally: **queue paper).**

It should be mentioned that such compressed word-combinations are common in all languages and the reason for their existance is obviously the same – it is omitting the less informative parts due to the law of economical use of linguistic means. It takes no effort to understand the implicit meaning, but when translated into other languages, such word-combinations most frequently require explication.

II. Utterances with missing logical parts. According to scientists who study the correlation between language and thinking, "in natural languages there exist stable, regular models and stereotypes of sentences which reflect in their semantic- syntactical structure this special pattern of a human thinking – the ability to eliminate some intermediate thoughts that mirror the most common provisions. The speaker (or writer), forming a logican statement in natural language, makes it only in a contracted form, in a form of enthymemes" [13].

Enthymemes are a sort of deductions with missing minor premise. In all languages it is quite common when a speaker omits the minor premise because everybody knows it, and the recepient can restore the missing information without any effort. Take this example:

Абый, син армиядә булдыңмы?

– Нишләп булмасын? **Моряклыкта булган бит ул!** [14].

– Абый, ты в армии был?

– Как же не был? **Он же в моряках служил!**

– Bro, have you been to the army?

– What are you talking about? **He's been with the Marines!**

In utterances with implicitly expressed concequence very often the major premise and conclusion can be omitted, also the minor premise and conclusion, and also conclusion can be omitted. In the example above it is clear that the utterance in bold type contains the positive answer to the question. Logical conclusion can be made with the help of implication:

The person in the example is ex-Marine (major premise). The Marines are a part of the Army (minor premise which is omitted because it is common knowledge). —> Consequently, the person has been enlisted in the Army (the conclusion is omitted).

Take another example:

– Милициягә хәбәр иттегезме?

– **Монда телефонны өзгәннәр** [15].

– В милицию сообщили?

– **Здесь телефонный провод перерезали**.

– Have you reported to the police?

– **The cable has been cut here.**

In the example above the second sentence contains the negative reply to the question. To make a call to the police, the phone connection is necessary (it is the major premise which is omitted). The telephone cable has been cut (minor premise). —> Consequently, the second speaker could not call to the police (the conclusion is omitted).

One more example with omitted one of the premises and the logical conclusion. It is the conversation of the husband and the wife who cannot cook.

– Син моны башта суда пешердеңме?

– Аны алдан пешерәләрме? [16].

– Ты ее <вермишель> сначала отварила в воде?

– **А разве ее сначала варят?**

– Have you first boiled it (pasta)?

– **Was I supposed to boil it?**

To understand that the statement in bold type contains the negative answer to the question, we need to use implication method: Pasta is normally boiled in water (it is the major premise which is omitted). The wife does not know about it (minor premise) —> Consequently, she did not boil it.

Utterances with missing logical parts are often used in fiction and folklore (particularly in anecdotes) to create humorous effects. Take an example of an anecdote:

In Russian roulette for sysadmins a blond girl is used instead of a gun: they make her sit at their personal computers giving her full access to the system. To understand the hidden meaning of the anecdote, the implication is necessary: It is a stereotype that blonds are bad at computers because of the low intellect (minor premise which is omitted) —> Consequently, each computer within her reach is subject to mortal danger.

It is supposed that communicants (participants of the speech act) are able to draw a logical implicature from the utterance that contains missing logical part. But this is not always the case. We did not manage to find the example in Tatar fiction, so here is the dialogue from the film:

– Ты что, Шумахер, с ума сошел?!

– **Не ругайся, пожалуйста!**

– Да я не ругаюсь, это гонщик такой известный (фильм «Примадонна», 2005 г.)

– Are you crazy, Schumacher?!

– **Please, don't use swear words!**

– I'm not swearing, it's a famous racer ("Primadonna" movie, 2005)

In the case above we can see that the background knowledge of the comminicants did not coincide, therefore the recipient takes the racer name as a swear word.

Drawing implicatures from an utterance depends on the ability of the recipient to interpret the meaning, as well as sharing common background knowledge with the speaker. The knowledge which are components of the cognitive environment can be divided into: 1) common human; 2) specific national; 3) special; 4) specific individual. Thus, background knowledge can be distinguished by the degree of the awareness to communicants, and the conclusion – by the degree of accessability. For representatives of different cultures the same objects and phenomena might have different associations and logical connections. Due to such differences, the implicatures that can be easily drawn by the readers of the original text, are not clear to the readers of the translation without explication or explanation. Take an example:

Имчәген чыгарып каргаган Зөхрәбану бит ул [17]. Ведь это не кто иной, а та самая Зухрабану, которая **прокляла ее на своей груди** [18]. (Сноска переводчика: Проклиная, женщина-

мусульманка обнажает одну грудь). This was no other than Zuhrabanu who **cursed her on her breast** (Translator's note: When cursing, a Muslim woman exposes one breast).

In the example above the omitted major premise relates to specific national background knowledge, so Russian or English-speaking readers cannot draw the right logical implicature without the translator's help.

In terms of quantity, implicatures that are linked with logical implication are quite numerous. Our research based on the examples from Tatar fiction has shown that the percentage of logical implicatures was 28%.

CONCLUSION
1. Implicitness which is the most important ontological feature of all natural languages reveals itself on all language levels. The novelty is due to the fact that there have been no any research in Tatar linguistics so far that considered language phenomena systematically in the implicitness aspect.

2. The results of our research confirm the fact that implicitness can be divided into two main types: contextual implicitness and general communicative implicitness. According to our research, contextual implicitness dominates in terms of quantity. Out of 200 implicatures from Tatar fiction 73% were contextual and only 27% related to general communicative implicitness.

3. Word-combinations and utterances with missing logical parts are common to all natural languages. We share the view that the reason for their emergence is the same – omitting the less informative parts due to the law of ecomomical use of linguistic means.

According to the research, in utterances with missing logical parts 1) the major premise and conclusion can often be omitted, 2) the minor premise and conclusion, and 3) also conclusion can be omitted.

5. Drawing implicatures from an utterance depends on the ability of the recipient to interpret the meaning, as well as sharing common background knowledge with the speaker. In case of recipient's inability to draw the implicature or divergence of backgound knowledge the implicature fails to be drawn.

6. Our research shows that logical implicitness can be often met in speech. According to our results, the percentage of logical implicatures in Tatar fiction was 28%.

REFERENCES
Merriam-Webster Dictionary. http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/implicit (accessed in February, 2017).
Kolyadko L.G. Ob implitzitnom kharaktere vyskazivaniya // Grammatika, leksikokogiya I stilistika romanskih I germanskih yazikov: sb.nauchn.statey. – Minsk: Min.gos.ped. in-t inostr.yazikov, 1980. – P. 34.
Kashichkin A.V. Implitzitnost v kontexte perevoda.: dis. ... kand. filol. nauk: 10.02.20: Moscow. 2003.

Kornilova L.A., Sitdikova F.B. Ways of Transferring Implicit information in English-Russian Fiction Translations // The Social Sciences 10 (6): CCCC, 2015, ISSN: 1818-5800, Medwell Journals, 2015.

Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/presupposition/ (accessed in February, 2017).

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

Kolosova T.A. Vopros ob assimetrii yazikovih znakov // Russkiye slozhniye predlozheniya asimmetrichnoy strukturi. – Voronezh, 1980. – P. 29.

Pocheptzov G.G. Konstuktivkiy analiz strukturi predlozheniya. – Kiev: Vishcha shloka, 1971. – P. 171.

Gimatdinova N. Parly yalgiz. – Kazan: 2003. – P. 113.

Galiullin T. Taybe. – Kazan, 1997. – P. 156.

Kashichkin A.V. Implitzitnost v kontexte perevoda.: dis. ... kand. filol. nauk: 10.02.20: Москва. 2003. – P. 70.

Mahdiev M. Sailanma eserler. 3 tomda. – Kazan: Tatarstan kitap nashriaty, 1996. – 2 t. Frontoviklar. – P. 98.

Krivonosov A.G. Myshleniye – bez yazika? Economiya yazikovoy materii – zakon processa myshleniya // Voprosy yazikoznaniya. – 1992. – № 2. – P. 69.

Mahdiev M. Sailanma eserler. 3 tomda. – Kazan: Tatarstan kitap nashriaty, 1996. – 2 t. Frontoviklar. – P. 132.

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

Mahdiev M. Sailanma eserler. 3 tomda. – Kazan: Tatarstan kitap nashriaty, 1996. – 2 t. Frontoviklar. – P. 210.

Gilyazov A.M. Jomga ken, kich belen. – Kazan, 1982. – P. 138.

Gilyazov A. Tri arshina zemli: Povesti. – M.: Sov.pisatel, 1987. – P. 251.