**Ways of translating Utterances containing Implicit Meanings (Based on Tatar -
Russian Fiction Translations)**

Sitdikova Farida Bizyanovna[1], Khakimzyanova Diana Faridovna[2]

1 Kazan Federal University

2 The Institute of Foreign Relations, History and Oriental Studies.

Kazan Federal University , farida7777@yandex.ru

 ABSTRACT

The article deals with the problem of transferring implicit meanings from the original language to the target language. 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 of the utterance on the basis of the context, situation or background knowledge. According to the modern approach, the integral parts of the utterance implicit meaning are presuppositions, specific contextual meaning and the implicature. We also consider these parts and also the ways the implicit meanings are transferred in fiction translations from Tatar into Russian by professional translators. 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.

1.   INTRODUCTION

Our article considers the implicit meaning of an utterance and its integral parts. The term **implicit** means capable of being understood from something else though verbally unexpressed (Merriam-Webster Dictionary :http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/implicit (accessed in September, 2017)). By **implicitness** we mean the quality of all human languages to carry implicit meanings at all levels – words, word-combinations, sentences and utterances ant texts.

According to modern approach, 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 (Umerova,2010). By **implicit meaning of an utterance** we understand the composite meaning that is created from the interaction of language units with the cognitive sphere of the utterance recipient. It includes information that was expressed in verbal way, and also information "between the lines" that the recipient can understand using the context, situation, their background knowledge and logical thinking. The way humans understand an utterance meaning has been studied both by linguists and psychologists. It is a complicated process which requires mental activities from the utterance recipient. According to relevance theory (Sperber & Wilson; , Wilson & Sperber,2003) of English psychologists D.Sperber and D.Wilson, understanding an utterance meaning is the interpretation process. The interpretation includes several steps and also the analyses of context, situation and background knowledge. So we can view an utterance like a verbal stimulus which draws appropriate knowledge from the cognitive sphere.

Translating implicit meanings in a proper way and transferring implicit meanings from original language into target language has always remained an important problem for translators. Each language uses their own methods and ways, which allow a 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" (Mildred,1984). This is the main reason why in original and target

languages the ways of presenting information are different. The task of the translator is to make a right decision which method to choose.

2. METHODS

The objective of the given 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. (Kashichkin,2003). We have also used statistical and comparative analysis **methods** to show the ways of transferring implicit meaning from Tatar into Russian.

According to present-day 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…" (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/presupposition/   (accessed in September, 2017)). In other words, they can be called background knowledge or elements of the communicants' cognitive sphere which are essential for making and understanding the statement.

The specific contextual meaning of an utterance is formed when the utterance is associated with certain 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 imply 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 on their background knowledge, context and situation, for example: The summer camp didn't go as well as hoped. (Stephen,2000).

3. RESULTS

Transferring implicit meanings from source language into target language has always been an acute problem for translators since the correlation of implicitness and explicitness in languages differs. A really good expert always tries to keep the right balance between explicit and implicit information. There are various techniques that translators use to get the author's message to readers as closely as possible. 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 example, when some cultural environment terms or geographical realities are mentioned in the original text, in most cases 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 юынып алдык. Күңелгә: " **Комганнары** да юк, күрәсең", – дигән уй килде (Yeniki,2002). Мы умылись тут же, во дворе, поливая друг другу. Невольно подумалось, что у хозяев нет даже **кумгана, который столь привычно видеть в каждом доме** (Yenikeyev,1974). 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 was 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 have mentioned above.

Quite often SCM is kept in the object 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**.(Gilyazov,1982).

– А далеко до Казани?

– Часа через два будем.

– Два часа?

– Раньше никак. **Расписание.** (Gilyazov,1987).

– 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 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. It should be reminded that we consider phraseological units as language structures containing implicit meanings.

Here is an example of replacement:

– Җаныкаемны күрәләтә рәнҗеткәндә **авыз йомып торыйммы**? (Gimatdinova,2003).

Мою девушку обижают, а я должен **воды в рот набрать?** (Gimatdinova,2005).

My girl's feelings have been hurt, why should I **shut up like a clam?**

All statistic results can be seen in the table at the end of the paper.

4. DISCUSSION

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 instance:

– Милициягә хәбәр иттегезме?

– **Монда телефонны өзгәннәр** (Galiullin,1997).

– В милицию сообщили?

– **Здесь телефонный провод перерезали**. (Galiullin,1999).

– Have you phoned to the police?

– **The telephone wire has been cut.**

In this example for any language speaker from the common background knowledge it will be clear that it was not possible to call 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 came across some rare cases when the implicatures in the original text were lost by the translators. Sometimes (like in the following example) it can be explained by the translator's inability to transfer the implicit meaning,:

– Кара менә бу атны! **Эченнән инә үтәрлек**. Моның белән ничек сабан сөрмәк кирәк тә, ничек ашлык ташымак кирәк! (Bashirov,1951).

 Ну погляди на этого коня! Как пахать на нем, как на нем хлеб возить, а?(Bashirov,1988).

– 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 used some extra verbalization. Such phenomenon can be explained by the translator's intention to make the text completely clear to the target text readers. Consider the following example:

– Кунмыйсыңмыни?

– Кунмыйм, рәхмәт, – диде Бибинур. <…>

– Төн...

Төн кайгылы кешегә кулай юлдаш кына ул. Курыкмыйм. (Gilyazov,1982)

Заночуешь?

Нет, – опять отказалась Бибинур. <…>

Ночь…

Ночь как раз для горемыки: **слез никто не увидит…** Нет, правда, не боюсь я

(Gilyazov,1987).

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 what languages are used.

5. SUMMARY

The relevance of the article is beyond question, it reflects the interest of modern
linguistics to the semantic side of language phenomena. There has been no research so
far in the Tatar language studies that would analyze language in the implicitness aspect,
and also consider translating implicit structures into another language.

Analyzing the language examples from Tatar fiction, we came to the following
conclusions:

1. We completely agree with the opinion of modern psycholinguists that the integral
utterance meaning is composed from the following parts: presuppositions, specific
contextual meaning and implicatures.

2. There are several ways of transferring implicit meanings while translating text from
source language into target one: **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**.

3. The actions listed above can be caused by objective and subjective reasons. Objective reasons include language and cognitive factors, and subjective reasons relate to the translator's abilities for adequate translations and to the ability of the readers of the target text to draw the implicit meaning correctly.

4. We have collected some statistics that shows the rate of each case.

6. CONCLUSIONS

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	Number	Methods used by fiction translators				
		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

7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

8. REFERENCES

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

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

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

Gilyazov A.1987.. Och arshin jir. Moscow, P. 136.

Gimatdinova N.2003.. Parly yalgiz. Kazan,   P. 107.

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

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

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

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

Gilyazov A.1987. Och arshin jir.   Moscow, P. 236.

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

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

Merriam-Webster Dictionary , http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/implicit
        (accessed in September, 2017)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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