Explicitation and Implicitation in Arabic- English Translation of Institutional Academic Correspondence

DOI: https://doi.org/10.33806/ijaes.v25i1.678

Nada Mohamed Alhammadi, Sane Mo Yagi and Shehdeh Fareh
University of Sharjah, UAE

Received: 10.9.2023 Accepted: 11.6.2024 Published Online: 14.6.2024

Abstract: Within the context of university communication, the choice of translation strategies can significantly impact the clarity and effectiveness of academic correspondence. This study investigates the role of explicitation and implicitation in translating from English (source language) to Arabic (target language). We explore how these strategies manifest in institutional academic correspondence (circulars and memos) and determine which strategy is more prevalent. Skopos Theory serves as the theoretical framework for this research. The study analyzed a corpus of 196 academic documents issued by the University of Sharjah between 2014 and 2020. An extended version of Klaudy's (2009) classification model was employed to identify instances of explicitation and implicitation across various linguistic levels (syntactic, semantic, stylistic, textual, and pragmatic). Our findings reveal a preference for implicitation in the English source texts compared to the Arabic translations. Furthermore, the analysis identified diverse manifestations of both strategies across different linguistic levels. The study concludes that explicitation and implicitation are both utilized in academic correspondence translation, but with varying frequencies.

Keywords: Arabic-English translation, correspondence, explicitation, implicitation

1. Introduction

Translation can be defined as a decision-making and problem-solving process which translators engage in consciously or subconsciously, as they translate from a source language (SL) to a target language (TL) (Hatim, 2020). The choice of translation strategy or strategies perhaps emphasizes the decision-making aspect of translation. This can be seen when translators find themselves choosing a strategy or opting for another either consciously or subconsciously, as they attempt to transcend the boundaries of languages and cultures and overcome the challenges that they may face while doing so. Two such translation strategies that translators may opt for to produce an idiomatic translation are explicitation and implicitation. In Translation Studies (TS), explicitation and implicitation have been used to refer to strategies, tactics, and solutions, as noted by Gambier (2009, 2010). When viewed as strategies, explicitation and implicitation are considered to be processes that entail making decisions which are, possibly, influenced and determined by the translation's skopos or the brief commissioned by the client. Such a view of explicitation and implicitation can be safely assumed as one that emphasizes the intentionality of translation and acknowledges the role played by audience preferences in informing the translator's choice of explicitation or implicitation. This may explain why explicitation and implicitation have attracted the attention of

linguists and translation studies scholars alike. Thus, in an attempt to contribute to the existing literature, we aim to investigate the use of these two strategies in translating computer-mediated correspondence in an academic setting, focusing on correspondence translated at the University of Sharjah.

2. Significance of the study

The importance of this study stems from its potential contribution to enriching literature on an under-researched area in the Arab world within the fields of contrastive linguistics and textology. The findings of this study are expected to highlight a number of stylistic, textual, and structural differences between Arabic and English, which are major concern of contrastive linguistics and textology. They are also expected to contribute to the theory and practice of Translation Studies (TS) since the findings may lead to a better understanding of how explicitation and implicitation are used as translation strategies to interpret meaning. In addition, our study is expected to shed light on the role played by cultural variables in the process of decision making which also entails the choice of translation strategy. The findings of our study may also contribute to TS theory by providing evidence that may support or refute existing approaches that view explicitation and implicitation as universal translation strategies.

Bridging an existing research gap demonstrates the significance of our study since we examine the use of explicitation and implicitation in the genre of institutional academic correspondence which has not received adequate research attention in the Arab world. Moreover, such a study is warranted since its findings may help identify patterns and trends across languages and genres.

3. Definitions of key terms

3.1 Explicitation and implicitation

The concept of explicitation was first proposed by Vinay and Darbelnet (1958:342) in their seminal work titled Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation. They define it as a procedure in which implicit elements in the source language (SL) that are retrievable from the context are made explicit in the target language (TL). Examples that Vinay and Darbelnet use to illustrate explicitation demonstrate that this strategy entails considering such variables as linguistic elements, extralinguistic elements, the cognitive context of TT producers (i.e., writers or translators), TT users, and pragmatic meanings. Unlike Vinay and Darbelnet (1958), Nida (2003) does not use the term 'explicitation' but uses instead the term 'addition'. Nida (1964: 227) explains that additions made to TTs may be of a grammatical nature. Perhaps, this is best illustrated in cases where translators may opt for the addition of ellipted expressions or use classifiers and connectives to change structure. He also introduces another kind of addition “amplification from implicit to explicit status” that entails making retrievable meaning from context explicit by relying on the socio-cultural context as a preventive measure to avoid any breakdowns in communication caused by ambiguity. For example, a translator may add words and expressions that are not explicitly stated in the ST for the benefit of the text receiver. This is because a ST

may include a notion that requires extra explanation or additional information. One example to illustrate this is translating التراويح /ʔal-taɾaːwiːħ/ in Arabic to "Taraweeh Prayer" in English.

Blum-Kulka (1986) examines how the need for cohesion and coherence at the text level can lead to increased explicitness in translated texts. Specifically, she focuses on lexical additions that might create redundancy in the target language. She proposes the "Explicitation Hypothesis" (Blum-Kulka, 1986:300), which suggests that translated texts tend to be more explicit than source texts, regardless of inherent differences between the two languages involved. Olohan and Baker (2000) build on Blum-Kulka's work, acknowledging the limitation of defining explicitation solely as a hypothesis. They propose a definition that emphasizes the process itself: explicitation, to them, is the act of adding extra information to make implicit meaning in the source language more explicit in the target language (Olohan and Baker, 2000:142).

Several scholars, including Vinay and Darbelnet (1958), Nida (1964, 2003), Blum-Kulka (1986), and Olohan and Baker (2000), have explored the concept of explicitation. While their views share some similarities, differences also emerge in how they explain and differentiate it. A common thread is their understanding of explicitation as a translation strategy that makes implicit contextual elements in ST explicit in TT. Additionally, they all seem to base explicitation on the recoverability of meaning from context. They view it as a strategy leading to a gain in meaning or increased informativeness for the target reader. However, two key distinctions emerge. First, unlike Vinay and Darbelnet (1958), Nida (1964, 2003) does not see explicitation as a strategy solely focused on liberating the TT reader from the ST. Second, Vinay and Darbelnet (1958) limit explicitation to the levels of meaning and text, whereas Nida expands it to include the grammatical level as well. Implicitation, the opposite of explicitation, involves omitting elements present in the source text. While explicitation can add meaning (e.g., translating "uncle" to "maternal uncle"), implicitation can sometimes lead to a loss as in the case of the Hungarian pronoun gender (Klaudy, 2009). For Klaudy and Károly (2005), explicitation occurs in various ways: replacing general source language terms with more specific ones in the target language (a hypernym with a hyponym), distributing the meaning of a single source term across multiple target language units, introducing new elements for clarity, dividing source language sentences, or expanding source language phrases into clauses in the target language.

As Murtisari (2016) observes, explicitation and implicitation can be best described as elusive concepts. This is because there is no mutually agreed-upon exact definition of what explicitation and implicitation are. This may be attributed to the different approaches that each theorist relies on. However, despite the differences in their focal points, the definitions cited above seem to agree that explicitation and implicitation are translation strategies involving addition that may lead to a gain of meaning or omission to disambiguate the context and avoid loss of meaning.

4. Theoretical and conceptual frameworks

4.1 Working definitions

Having reviewed the definitions provided for explicitation, we adopt the definition offered by Klaudy and Károly (2005). This definition is more inclusive and representative of the micro and macro levels of language in which explicitation may occur. Klaudy and Károly's (2005) definition does not seem to restrict explicitation to specific linguistic levels since it does not only occur at the syntactic and semantic levels; it can also occur at the stylistic, textual, and pragmatic levels of the TL. However, we introduce modifications to their definition to create a working definition. The modifications we made include: (A) Adding the phrase "a translation strategy," since explicitation and implicitation are examined as translation strategies; (B) Specifying the translation units by adding "words, phrases, sentences, paragraphs, and texts"; (C) Specifying the different levels of language in which it may occur by adding "the semantic, syntactic, textual, or pragmatic levels"; (D) Adding the verbs "modified, replaced, or elevated" to indicate the processes that may take place; and (E) Adding the phrase "obligatory or optional constraints" to allow the rationalization of changes due to the use of explicitation as a translation strategy. Accordingly, we define explicitation as "a translation strategy by which the translation units of the ST (i.e., words, phrases, sentences, paragraphs, and texts) are modified, replaced, or elevated at different levels of language, including the semantic, syntactic, textual, or pragmatic levels of the TL due to obligatory or optional constraints arising from differences between the SL and the TL."

As for implicitation, we maintained a relatively similar definition structure but added the verbs "omitted, replaced, or reduced." Thus, we define implicitation as "a translation strategy by which the translation units of the ST (i.e., words, phrases, sentences, paragraphs, and texts) are omitted, replaced, or reduced to elements operating at different levels of language, including the semantic, syntactic, textual, or pragmatic levels of the TL due to obligatory or optional constraints arising from differences between the SL and the TL."

4.2 Classifications of explicitation

Klaudy (2009) proposes a comprehensive framework for explicitation types, acknowledging the absence of a universally agreed-upon system. Her framework categorizes explicitation as optional, obligatory, pragmatic, or translation inherent. Optional explicitation stems from stylistic or text-building differences between languages. Obligatory explicitation arises due to syntactic or semantic mismatches. Pragmatic explicitation bridges cultural gaps, and translation-inherent explicitation is a byproduct of the translation process itself. Klaudy's classification highlights the pervasiveness of explicitation across various linguistic levels, including syntax, semantics, discourse, stylistics, and pragmatics. This suggests that both explicitation and, to some extent, implicitation are likely unavoidable aspects of translation across all linguistic domains.

Baumgarten Meyer and Özçetin (2008) propose a broader categorization of explicitation, dividing it into obligatory and optional types. Pym (2005) elaborates on this, suggesting that obligatory explicitation clarifies implicit elements in the

source text (ST) due to grammatical differences between the source and target language (TL). Optional explicitation, on the other hand, arises from cultural variations and communication conventions specific to each language community. Unlike obligatory explicitation, where the need for clarification is more clear-cut, optional explicitation involves less consistent or evident differences.

Two conclusions can be drawn from the cited classifications. First, explicitation can be either optional or obligatory. Second, explicitation is not limited to a micro or macro level of language.

4.3 Explication, implicitation and Skopos theory

Translation is not merely a mechanical act of transferring words between languages; it is a purposeful action with clear intentions. As such, various theoretical frameworks have emerged to explain and guide the decision-making processes involved. One prominent approach is Skopos Theory, developed by Vermeer (1989) and centered on the concept of skopos, which refers to the aim or function of the TT. Skopos Theory rests on five key concepts (Nord, 2001):

Theory of Action: This concept underscores the intentional nature of translation, where translators act with a specific goal in mind. When two or more agents (sender, receiver, translator) are involved, this intentional action becomes an interaction (Nord, 2001:16). For translators, this interaction involves interpreting the ST and producing a TT that fulfills the intended purpose for the target audience.

Skopos, Aim, Purpose, Intention, and Function: These interrelated concepts all contribute to understanding the TT's objective. Vermeer (1987) uses them interchangeably, while Nord (2001) differentiates them for clarity. Skopos refers to the overall purpose of the TT, while aim is the desired outcome, and purpose is a provisional stage towards achieving that aim. Function relates to the meaning the TT conveys to the target reader, and intention reflects the sender's goal for the ST. Notably, translators play a dual role: first as receivers of the ST, understanding its message, and then as producers of the TT, employing various strategies to achieve the skopos. (Reiss and Vermeer, 1984, 2013)

Intratextual and Intertextual Coherence: Nord (2001) explains that intertextual coherence depends on the translator's interpretation of the ST and the skopos. However, it is ultimately subordinate to intratextual coherence, which ensures the TT's message is clear and cohesive for the target reader within their cultural and communicative context (Reiss and Vermeer, 1984, 2013).

Culture and Culture Specificity: Vermeer (1987) defines culture as the shared norms and conventions that shape individuals' understanding of themselves and others. These cultural norms significantly influence translation decisions by dictating appropriate translation strategies and ensuring that the TT adheres to the sociocultural constraints of the target audience (Nord, 2001). Translators must possess knowledge of both ST and TT cultures to effectively bridge cultural gaps and produce a TT that resonates with the target audience.

Equivalence vs. Adequacy: Skopos Theory departs from the notion of strict equivalence, where the TT must replicate the exact information and wording of the ST. Instead, it emphasizes adequacy, which ensures the TT fulfills the skopos by

considering the knowledge, needs, and cultural background of the target readers (Nord, 2001). Adequacy represents the relationship between the means employed (translation strategies) and the purpose of the translation (achieving the skopos), as described by Reiss (1983).

Our adoption of Vermeer's (1989) Skopos Theory is grounded in its alignment with this understanding of translation as a purposeful act. Here is why Skopos Theory is a compelling choice for us to use:

1. Skopos Theory acknowledges the translator's agency in the translation process, highlighting the importance of strategic decision-making, which includes selecting appropriate translation methods.
2. By prioritizing the function that the TT serves within the target culture, Skopos Theory underscores the communicative nature of translation and its goal-oriented nature as a process.
3. Skopos Theory recognizes the multifaceted role of translators, who act as both receivers of the ST and producers of the TT to achieve the skopos.

5. Review of related literature

While explicitation and implicitation have been extensively studied in translation studies, their application in Arabic-to-English translation remains a relatively under-researched area, particularly within the Arab world. Existing studies offer valuable insights but often focus on specific genres or aspects of the phenomena.

Genre and explicitation/implicitation: Several studies have investigated explicitation and implicitation in the context of literary translation. Aziz (1998) examined how pragmatic meaning in the source text (Arabic) influences translation strategies, concluding that English translations tend to favor understatement compared to the more explicit nature of the Arabic source text. Conversely, Obeidat (1998) compared stylistic patterns in translated Arabic novels, arguing for a greater level of implicitness in Arabic prose compared to English. This potential contradiction highlights the influence of genre on explicitation and implicitation choices.

Levels of explicitation and text genre: El-Nashar (2016) explored explicitation in translating institutional documents, finding that explicative paraphrase was the most frequent strategy. This study challenged the notion that explicitation is more prevalent in literary translation and suggested a need to distinguish between "necessary" and "redundant" explicitation based on genre and purpose.

Discourse markers and explicitation: Farghal and Samateh (2017) investigated the correspondence between explicitation in the target text and implicitation in the source text, focusing on discourse markers in a novel translation. Their findings suggest that structural differences between languages (e.g., asyndetic vs. syndetic nature) can influence the use of explicitation for discourse markers.

Types and functions of explicitation: Al-Anbaqi (2009) conducted a contrastive analysis of two Arabic translations of a literary text, identifying four main types of explicitation (lexical, syntactic, pragmatic, textual) and four sub-

techniques (lexicalization, expansion, addition, specification). This analysis highlights the translator's agency in choosing explicitation sub-techniques based on functions such as avoiding ambiguity or clarifying cultural specificities.

This review demonstrates the valuable insights gained from existing research on explicitation and implicitation in Arabic-to-English translation. However, a gap exists regarding the application of these concepts to non-literary genres. Our study aims to address this gap by investigating the use of explicitation and implicitation in a different data type: institutional correspondence. Unlike previous studies that focused on specific aspects or genres, our research will examine types of explicitation and implicitation across all language levels, offering a more comprehensive analysis of these phenomena in Arabic-to-English translation. Additionally, our focus on institutional correspondence expands the scope of research in this area within the Arab world.

6. Methodology

6.1 Data collection

Our data consisted of internal institutional academic correspondence sent via email by the Office of the Chancellor at the University of Sharjah to all faculty members, students, and staff from 2014 to 2020. The circulars analyzed totaled 196 and can be broadly classified into seven categories: Administrative Affairs (60), Academic and Scientific Research Affairs (46), COVID-19 Related (15), Appointments and Formation of Task Forces (14), Congratulatory and Appreciation Correspondence (12), and Any Other Business (49). Some of the correspondence analyzed consisted of a single page, while others ranged from two to three pages. All correspondence was originally written in Arabic and translated into English by two professional translators: a male translator and a female translator, both working at the University of Sharjah Chancellor's Office, each with over 10 years of experience in translation and interpreting.

6.2 Analysis procedure

1. Building a parallel corpus: Using Sketch Engine, we built a parallel corpus to identify cases of explicitation and implicitation in the translation of circulars and academic correspondence letters from Arabic (SL) into English (TL).
2. Classifying manifestations: We identified the various manifestations of explicitation and implicitation and classified them according to Klaudy's (2009) classification.
3. Identifying linguistic levels: We identified the linguistic levels at which cases of explicitation and/or implicitation occur.
4. Calculating total occurrences: We calculated the total number of occurrences of explicitation and implicitation.
5. Calculating percentages: We calculated the percentage of each type of explicitation and implicitation case identified.
6. Interpreting data: We interpreted the numbers and percentages calculated in steps 4 and 5 and rationalized these figures.
7. Providing recommendations: We provided some recommendations for translation teachers and translator trainers.

6.3 Analysis tool

As a corpus building and text management software, Sketch Engine has been used due to its ease of use and the features it offers. It aids in building bilingual corpora in which all ST and TT segments are aligned. Sketch Engine offers a feature for looking up translation examples and seeing how a word works in a SL context and how it is translated in the TL. Moreover, Sketch Engine allows its users by means of the Terminology Extraction feature to extract automatically bilingual and monolingual key words and multiword terms from texts based on frequency and linguistic criteria, which can be used in exercising quality assurance. Sketch Engine can also be described as an asset for corpus-based studies such as ours as it offers a feature called n-grams that allows generating frequency lists of multi word expressions that facilitate conducting qualitative analysis.

6.4 Analysis model

To provide a clear and a comprehensive classification for the manifestations of explicitation and implicitation, we adopted Klaudy's (2009) taxonomy.

7. Data analysis and findings

Data analysis confirmed the presence of both explicitation and implicitation in the translation of academic correspondence from Arabic into English. Tables 1 and 2 illustrate the types of explicitation and implicitation detected in our sample as well as their percentages of occurrence. This facilitates conducting a comparative qualitative analysis and responding to the first and second objectives of our study.

Table1. Types and percentages of explicitation cases

Cases of explicitation detected in the sample		Percentage
Type of explicitation	Number of cases	
Obligatory Syntactic Explicitation	81	35
Textual Explicitation	72	31.2
Pragmatic Explicitation	45	19.5
Optional Stylistic Explicitation	28	12.2
Obligatory Semantic Explicitation	5	2.2
Total 231 cases		

Table 1 demonstrates that Obligatory Syntactic Explicitation was the most frequent type of explicitation, representing 81 cases. The large number of obligatory syntactic explicitation cases can be attributed to the syntactic requirements of the TL. These shifts were implemented to prevent breakdowns in communication due to ungrammaticality, which can cause awkwardness and vagueness. The table also

indicates that Textual Explicitation was the second most frequent type, with 72 cases. This may be attributed to the translator's attempt to produce a text that satisfies the standards of textuality, i.e., cohesion and coherence. The third most frequent type of explicitation was Pragmatic Explicitation, representing 45 cases. This may be attributed to what Klaudy (2009) referred to as an attempt to bridge the cultural gap between the SL and the TL. In other words, since the community of the University of Sharjah is cosmopolitan, the translator may have opted for this type of explicitation to produce a translation that is culturally appropriate. Optional Stylistic Explicitation was the fourth most common type of explicitation, with 28 cases identified. Compared to the previous three types of explicitation, Optional Stylistic Explicitation was less common. This may be attributed to its optional nature and the differences in text-building strategies and stylistic preferences between the two languages, as noted by Klaudy (2009). Only 5 cases of Semantic Explicitation were identified, making it the least common type of explicitation. This relatively low frequency may be attributed to the nature of the text genre itself, which requires clarity to disambiguate the context and produce inclusive texts addressing all staff and faculty at the University of Sharjah.

Table 2. Types and percentages of implicitation cases

Cases of implicitation detected in the sample		Percentage
Type of implicitation	Number of cases	
Textual Implicitation	88	35.4
Pragmatic Implicitation	42	16.9
Obligatory Semantic Implicitation	38	15.3
Optional Stylistic Implicitation	29	11.6
Obligatory Syntactic Implicitation	1	0.4
Total 249 cases		

Table 2 indicates that Textual Implicitation, which represents 88 cases, was the most common type of implicitation in our study sample. This may be attributed to the translator’s attempt to produce a cohesive and coherent text by avoiding redundancy caused by repetition and elucidating statements. The second most common type of implicitation was Pragmatic Implicitation, representing 42 cases. This can be due to the translator’s attempt to produce a more culturally inclusive text since the rendition of some of the culturally specific expressions used in the ST may require adding further explanations, which, in turn, may lead to redundancy or ambiguity. Table 2 demonstrates that the third most common type of implicitation was Obligatory Semantic Implicitation, representing 38 cases. This can be justified as an attempt to reduce redundancy by omitting words that do not add new meaning

or information to the context. Compared to the previously mentioned three types, a less common type of implicitation was Optional Stylistic Implicitation, which represented 29 cases. From the cases identified involving the omission of Arabic connectives and the addition of punctuation marks, it seems that English prefers implicitation to explicitation compared to Arabic. Obligatory Syntactic Implicitation was the least common type of implicitation, with only 1 case identified. This low frequency may be due to the significance of clarity and directness, i.e., explicitness, in the current genre. In other words, since institutional correspondence is initiated to inform, instruct, and regulate academic and administrative affairs at the university, it is important for such correspondence to be direct and clear.

Tables 1 and 2 clearly demonstrate that the frequency of implicitation was minimally higher than that of explicitation (35.4% versus 35%, respectively). In light of this slight difference (0.4%), it can be observed that when translating from Arabic into English, the current text genre seems to prefer implicitation over explicitation. The two tables also reveal variations in the manifestations of both explicitation and implicitation. For example, in Table 1, the most frequent manifestation of explicitation was Obligatory Syntactic Explicitation, representing 35% of the attested cases. Textual Explicitation was the second most frequent type of explicitation, representing 31.2% of the total number of cases. The relatively high frequency of these two types indicates the significance of grammaticality, accuracy, and clarity. This can be seen in observing the syntactic rules and relying on correct text-building rules and norms to produce an acceptable text, especially since the correspondences analyzed are not only to inform but also to instruct. Less frequent manifestations of explicitation were Pragmatic Explicitation, Optional Stylistic Explicitation, and Obligatory Semantic Explicitation, representing 19.5%, 12.2%, and 2.2%, respectively.

Table 2 indicates that Textual Implicitation, representing 35.4% of the attested cases, was the most common type of implicitation in our sample. The relatively high percentage of textual implicitation can be attributed to the nature of the TL and its textual norms that seem to prefer implicitness in cases where explicitness may lead to awkwardness, verbosity, or increased miscommunication. Pragmatic Implicitation, representing 16.9%, was the second most common type of implicitation. Despite the slight difference, it demonstrates the significance of producing a culturally appropriate TT in the current context of communication to ensure a successful interpretation of the intended meaning by taking the necessary actions or adhering to the stated instructions, rules, and regulations. Unlike Textual Implicitation and Pragmatic Implicitation, Obligatory Semantic Implicitation and Optional Stylistic Implicitation were less frequent, representing 15.3% and 11.6%, respectively. Compared to Optional Stylistic and Obligatory Semantic Explicitation, this relatively low percentage illustrates that being obligatory or optional does not seem to affect the frequency. Despite being obligatory, Semantic Implicitation was lower in frequency compared to Semantic Explicitation. Additionally, within the analyzed text genre, implicit meaning does not seem to be preferable since implicitness may lead to misinterpretation and, thus,

misunderstanding. Interestingly, Obligatory Syntactic Implicitation was the least common, which can be attributed to the current genre's preference for clarity and directness.

7.1 Types of explicitation

7.1.1 Syntactic explicitation

Obligatory Syntactic Explicitation instances included word order shifts, the addition of a verb to maintain grammaticality, and subject raising. Consider the following example:

ST:

" لأسباب قد تكون غير تطويرية قامت بعض الكليات بإجراء تعديلات بعضها كان كبيراً على الخطط الدراسية العامة للكلية ....."

/liʔasbaːbin qad takuːnu ɣajɾa tatˤwiːɾijjatin qaːmat baʕdˤu ʔalkullijjaːti biʔidʒɾaːʔi taʕdiːlaːtin baʕduhaː kaːna kabiːɾan ʕalaː ʔal-xutati ʔal-diɾaːsijjati ʔal-ʕaːmmati li-ʔal-kullijjati/

TT:

"For perhaps non-developmental purposes, some colleges took measures to make modifications (some of which were significant) to the general study plans of the colleges."

Example B shows that the translator shifted the word order of the SL statement. Word order in Arabic normally follows the pattern 'VSO'; however, this is not the case in English where the 'SVO' pattern is more frequent. Thus, to avoid producing an awkward expression to the TL audience i.e., English, and to maintain the grammaticality of the statement, the translator started the TT sentence with "some colleges took measures" instead of "took measures some colleges."

7.1.2 Textual explicitation

Another common type of explicitation was Textual explicitation. Dividing ST sentences and adding pronouns and demonstratives were two of the most common ways textual explicitation is manifested. Consider the following:

ST:

" ثم يعملون على تعويض هذه المحاضرات التي تغيبوا عنها بمحاضرات بديلة الأمر الذي يشكل قصوراً .... هاماً جداً ..... "

/θumma jaʕmaluːna ʕalaː taʕwiːdi haðihi ʔalmuħaːdaɾaːti ʔal-latiː taɣajjabuː ʕanhaː bimuħaːdaɾaːtin badiːlatin ʔal-ʔamɾu ʔal-laðiː juʃakkilu qusˤuːɾan haːmman dʒiddan/

TT:

"…. , then provide an alternative lecture to make up for the lecture/s they missed. This action constitutes an important shortfall …… "

In this example, the TT sentence is divided into two, with the demonstrative pronoun "this" and the noun "action" introduced as the subject of the second sentence. This may be interpreted as an attempt to maintain cohesion and grammaticality.

7.1.3 Pragmatic explicitation

Another frequent type of explicitation was Pragmatic Explicitation. 45 cases were detected. Consider the following examples:

Example A:

ST:

" وكل عام والأمهات بخير وفضل من الله تعالى. "

/wakullu ʕaːmin wa-ʔal-ʔummahaːtu bixajɾin wafadlin min ʔal-lahi taʕaːlaː/

TT:

"Wishing all mothers *a Happy Mother's Day*!".

This example illustrates the omission of the culture-specific expression "بخيروفضل من الله تعالى" in favor of the more inclusive phrase "a Happy Mother's Day!" This renders the translation as more culturally acceptable and appropriate, especially since it is more inclusive of non- Arabs and non- Muslims.

Example B:

ST:

" والله ولي الأمر والتوفيق."

/wa-aːallahu walijju ʔal-ʔamɾi wa-ʔal-tawfiːqi/

TT:

"Wishing you all success"

The translator substituted the religious and culture-specific expression " والله ولي الأمر والتوفيق" with "Wishing you all success," which is more appropriate for a non-Arab and non-Muslim audience.

7.1.4 Stylistic explicitation

Stylistic Explicitation was a less frequent type of explicitation since only 28 cases were identified. Consider the following example:

ST:

"خلال أول اجتماع لها، تضع اللجنة آلية وخطة عمل تنفيذية ..... "

/xilaːla ʔawwali aːʤtimaːʕin laha: tadaʕu ʔal-laʤnatu ʔaːlajt waxuttata ʕamalin tanfiːðijjatan/

TT:

"The committee shall draft an action plan …. during its first meeting."

The phrase "during its first meeting" is placed at the end of the TT sentence. While time phrases can be placed at the beginning for emphasis, it disrupts the flow here.

7.1.5 Semantic explicitation

The least common type of explicitation was Obligatory Semantic explicitation since only 5 cases were detected in our sample. The following are examples of these five cases:

Example A:

ST:

"يحق للجامعة اتخاذ الاجراء التأديبي المناسب وفي حال عدم الامتثال لهذه السياسات والمبادئ التوجيهية ".

/jaħiqqu li-ʔal-ʤaːmaʕit aːttixaːðu ʔalʔiʤɾiaːaʔ ʔal-taʔdiːbijji ʔal-munaːsibi wafiː ħaːli ʕadami ʔaliaːmtiθaːli lihaðihi ʔalsijaːsaːti wa-ʔal-mabaːdiʔi ʔal-tawʤiːhijjati/

TT:

"The University has the right to take the right disciplinary action reinforced by the Chancellor in the case on non-compliance with this policy and guidelines."

Example A shows the addition of the prepositional phrase "by the Chancellor" in the TL (target language). This clarifies the subject (the university) and emphasizes the Chancellor of UOS as the one performing the action.

Example B:

ST:

" ولأن الجامعة تعتبر الطالب هو محور العملية التعليمية وهو الهدف الأساسي لعملها وعمل كل عضو من أعضاء الهيئة التدريسية فإنها ترفض من حيث المبدأ تغيب عضو الهيئة التدريسية عن محاضراته ... "

/waliʔanna ʔal-ʤaːmiʕata taʕtabiɾu ʔal-taːliba huwa miħwaɾu ʔal-ʕamalijjati ʔal-taʕliːmijjati wahuwa ʔal-hadafu ʔal-ʔasaːsijju liʕamaliha: waʕamali kulli ʕudwin min ʔaʕdaːʔi ʔal-hajʔati ʔal-tadɾiːsijjati faʔinnaha: taɾfudu min ħajθu ʔal-mabdaʔu taɣajjuba ʕudwi ʔal-hajʔati ʔal-tadɾiːsijjati ʕan muħaːdaɾaːtihi/

TT:

"The University considers students to be the focus of the educational process, which is the main objective of the University and each faculty member. The University therefore rejects the notion that faculty members be absent from their lectures….. "

In Example B, the phrase "عضو الهيئة التدريسية" (faculty member), which is singular in the source language, is pluralized in the TL (target language). This likely reflects the translator's intent to maintain a general meaning, as the circular is directed towards all faculty members.

7.2 Types of implicitation

7.2.1 Textual implicitation

Textual Implicitation is the most frequent type of implicitation found in the analysis. This type manifests in two ways: substituting full noun phrases with pronouns and omitting connectives. Consider the following examples:

Example A:

ST:

"ترفع اللجنة توصيتها إلى نائب مدير الجامعة للشؤون المالية والإدارية ليقوم بدوره بالتوصية بما يراه إلى مدير الجامعة."

/taɾfaʕu ʔal-laʤnatu tawsijataha: ʔilaː naːʔibi mudiːɾi ʔal-ʤaːmiʕati li-ʔal-ʃuʔuːni ʔal-maːlijjati wa-ʔal-ʔidaːɾijjati lijaquːma bidawɾihi bi-ʔal-tawsijati bimaː jaɾaːhu ʔilaː mudiːɾi ʔal-ʤaːmiʕati/

TT:

"It shall then forward its recommendations to the Vice Chancellor of Financial and Administrative Affairs who shall provide his recommendation to the Chancellor."

This example demonstrates Textual Implicitation. The Arabic noun "اللجنة" (committee), originally the subject, is replaced by the pronoun "it" in the target language.

Example B:
ST:
"أما الهدف من حسابات جامعة الشارقة على وسائل التواصل الاجتماعي الرئيسية فيتجلى بإشراك أسرة الجامعة والمجتمع. حيث تهدف للترويج للفعاليات والنشاطات وتعزيز مكانة الجامعة والعلاقة الوثيقة بها. إن المحتوى من مجالات أخرى من الجامعة هو موضع ترحيب وتشجيع ... "
/ʔamma: ʔal-hadafu min ħisa:ba:ti ʤa:miʕati ʔal-ʃa:ɾiqati ʕala: wasa:ʔili ʔal-tawa:suli ʔal-ia:ʤtima:ʕijji ʔal-ɾaʔi:sijjati fajataʤalla: biʔiʃɾa:ki ʔusɾati ʔal-ʤa:miʕati wa-ʔal-muʤtamaʕi ħajθu tahdufu li-ʔal-taɾwi:ʤi li-ʔal-fiʕa:lajʔit wa-ʔal-nuʃua:ta:ti wataʕzi:zi maka:nati ʔal-ʤa:miʕati wa-ʔal-ʕala:qati ʔal-waθi:qati biha: ʔinna ʔalmuħtaw min maʤa:la:tin ʔuxɾa: mina ʔal-ʤa:miʕati huwa mawdiʕu taɾħi:bin wataʃʤi:ʕin/
TT:
“The role of the primary social media accounts for the University of Sharjah is to engage the students and the community. It aims to promote events and activities, celebrate outcomes, and boost the reputation and affinity of the university. Content from other areas of the University is welcome and encouraged ……. “

Example B showcases Textual Implicitation. The Arabic connectives " حيث ، إن" (where, that) are omitted in the English translation. This likely aimed to improve readability by avoiding a potentially awkward and verbose sentence.

7.2.2 Pragmatic implicitation

The second most frequent implicitation type was Pragmatic Implicitation. This involves omitting words or expressions to make the English translation culturally appropriate. Consider the following examples:
Example A:
ST:
" تقرر أن تكون إجازة عيد الفطر السعيد أعاده الله علينا وعليكم وعلى الأمة العربية والإسلامية بالخير واليمن والبركات اعتباراً من .... "
/taqaɾɾaɾa ʔan taku:na ʔiʤa:zatu ʕi:di ʔal-fitɾi ʔal-saʕi:di ʔaʕa:dahu ʔal-lahu ʕalajna: waʕalajkum waʕala: ʔal-ʔummati ʔal-ʕaɾabijjati wa-ʔal-ʔisla:mijjati bi-ʔal-xajɾi wa-ʔal-jamani wa-ʔal-baɾaka:ti a:ʕtiba:ɾan min/
TT:
“On the occasion of Eid al Fitr, please be informed that …… “

The Arabic phrase " أعاده الله علينا وعليكم وعلى الأمة العربية والإسلامية بالخير واليمن والبركات" (May God bring it back to us and to you and to the Arab and Islamic nation with goodness, good fortune, and blessings) is a common and respectful way to express congratulations in formal Arabic discourse. However, in English, translating this phrase directly might sound awkward or out of place. Therefore, the translator chose to omit it to maintain the natural flow and cultural appropriateness of the English translation.
Example B:
ST:
" السادة الزملاء عمداء الكليات "
/ʔal-sa:datu ʔalzumala:ʔu ʕumuda:ʔu ʔalkullijja:ti/

TT:
"College Deans "

Arabic uses honorifics like "السادة الزملاء" (respected colleagues) for politeness, whereas English prefers direct address. The translator omitted it for cultural appropriateness.

7.2.3 Obligatory semantic implicitation

Obligatory semantic implicitation, the third most common type, involves two main features: combining similar Arabic words into a single term in English to avoid redundancy; and omitting interjections from the translation. The following are illustrative examples:

Example A:
ST:
" عضو هيئة التدريس مسؤول عن تأمين المواد والمستهلكات التي يحتاجها لبحثه إذا لزم الأمر."
/ʕudwu hajʔati ʔal-tadɾiːsi masʔuːlun ʕan taʔmiːni ʔal-mawaːddi wa-ʔal-mustahlikaːti ʔal-lati: jaħtaːdʒuha: libaħθihi ʔiða: lazima ʔal-ʔamɾu/
TT:
"A faculty member is responsible for securing consumables if needed for his/her research."

This example demonstrates obligatory semantic implicitation. The Arabic word "المواد" (materials) is not translated because "consumables" (as used here) already encompasses both tools and substances, making a direct translation redundant.

Example B:
ST:
" .... إلا أن بعض الزميلات والزملاء من أعضاء الهيئة التدريسية ، لم يتمكنوا (وللأسف) في إعطاء الأمر حقه من الاهتمام والرعاية ... "
/ʔilla: ʔanna baʕda ʔalzamiːlaːti wa-ʔal-zamliaːaʔ min ʔaʕdaːʔi ʔal-hajʔati ʔal-tudɾijjasiːt ،lam jatamakkanu: wa-li-ʔal-ʔasfa fi: ʔiʕtaːʔi ʔal-ʔamɾi ħaqqahu mina ʔalʔihtimaːmi wa-ʔal-ɾiʕaːjati/
TT:
"Nevertheless, some of our colleagues from faculty members have failed to adequately observe such statements. …. "

The Arabic interjection "وللأسف" is omitted in Example B. This is a case of obligatory semantic implicitation, where a formal tone in English is achieved by omitting the interjection.

7.2.4 Optional stylistic implicitation

Optional Stylistic Implicitation is the fourth most common type. It involves substituting Arabic connectives (like "wa" and "faqad") with punctuation (e.g., commas) for stylistic effect in the English translation. Consider the following example:

ST:
"مع تعاظم الدور التنويري الذي تؤديه على المستوى المحلي والإقليمي، فقد قل عدد المكاتب التي كانت تخصص لأعضاء الهيئة التدريسية" .

/maʕa taʕaːðumi ʔal-dawɾi ʔal-tanwiːɾijji ʔal-laðiː tuʔaddiːhi ʕalaː ʔalmustaw ʔal-maħallijji wa-ʔal-ʔiqliːmijji faqad qalla ʕadadu ʔal-makaːtibi ʔal-latiː kaːnat tuxassasu liʔaʕdaːʔi ʔal-hajʔati ʔal-tudɾijjasiːt/

TT:

"… along with the increasing educational role that UOS plays at the local and regional levels, *the* number of offices allocated to faculty was decreased… "

In this example, the translator chose to omit the Arabic connector and replace it with a comma to avoid producing an awkward sentence since it does not add new meaning to the TT.

In this example, the translator chose to omit the Arabic connector and replace it with a comma to avoid producing an awkward sentence since it does not add new meaning to the TT. The preference for replacing connectives with commas in English, as seen in this study, can be attributed to the differences in stylistic preferences between English and Arabic. English seems to favour this approach for reasons of economy and to avoid redundancy, as supported by the work of Hamdan and Fareh (1999).

7.2.5 Obligatory syntactic implicitation

Obligatory syntactic implicitation was the least common type of implicitation, as only 1 case was detected. It manifested in a shift from the active voice to the passive one. For example:

ST:

" وعليه أدعوكم للاجتماع الأول لمجلس العمداء في العام الأكاديمي: 2017/2016، الذي يعقد في الساعة الثانية من يوم الاثنين الموافق: 2016/08/29 بقاعة (M9)"

/wʕljh ʔadʕuːkum li-ʔal-iaːʤtimaːʕi ʔal-ʔawwali limaʤlisi ʔalʕmdaːʔ fiː ʔalʕaːmi ʔal-ʔakaːdiːmijji 2016/2017 ʔal-laðiː jʕqd fiː ʔal-saːʕati ʔal-θaːnjt min jawmi ʔal-aːθnajni ʔal-muwaːfiqi 29/08/2016 bqaːʕt (M9)/

TT:

"In view of the above, you are requested to attend the first meeting of the Deans Council in the academic year 2016 / 2017 which will be held at 2 p.m. on Monday 29/8/2016 at (M9) Hall."

In this example, the ST sentence was written in the active voice where the verb أدعوكم was used. However, when translated into the TL, the passive voice form was used whereby "you are requested" was employed. This shift from active to passive may have taken place due to the fact that the subject, i.e., the Chancellor, is known since all circulars are signed by the Chancellor himself.

Based on the analysis above, and in response to the first objective of our study, explicitation and implicitation were present at different levels of language, including the syntactic, semantic, textual, stylistic, and pragmatic levels, and in various forms. Such forms included shifting word order to maintain sentence grammaticality, using plural forms instead of singular forms, adding verbs to maintain structural parallelism, adding words to disambiguate the context, preposing and postposing elements in sentences, raising objects to the subject position, active-to-passive shifts, substituting and/or omitting culture-specific expressions, splitting relatively long sentences, and omitting connectives and

replacing them with suitable punctuation marks such as commas or semicolons. This variation in manifestations can be understood in light of the second concept of Skopos Theory: Aim, purpose, intentionality, and functionality. This is because the TT was initiated to establish a bilingual channel of communication between the administration, i.e., the Chancellor, and all UoS administrative and academic staff. Consequently, it is expected to perform a function within the institution, i.e., inform and instruct them.

As for the use of explicitation and/or implicitation, the third, fourth, and fifth concepts of Skopos Theory—Intratextual and intertextual coherence, Culture, and Adequacy and Equivalence—can be used to interpret the translator's choice of one strategy over the other. The reasons that may have prompted such a choice are those provided by Al-Anbaqi (2009): avoidance of ambiguity, addition of extra explicitness, explication of logical relations, and explication of language-specific and culture-specific features, which led to providing an adequate text for the TT readers and end users. In response to the second objective of the study, while translating from Arabic into English, institutional academic correspondence seems to prefer implicitation to explicitation. This finding corroborates Aziz's (1998: 121) conclusion that Arabic prefers explicitation, whereas English favors implicitation, although both studies focused on different genres. However, the same finding contradicts El-Nashar's (2016), who concluded that in terms of frequency and based on the tool he used in his analysis, explicative paraphrase was the most frequent in this genre, followed by conjunction and reference. This finding also contradicts Obeidat's (1998), who argued that Arabic is more implicit than English in the genre of prose.

8. Conclusion

We conclude that English favors implicitation when translating institutional academic correspondence from Arabic into English, as the number of cases of implicitation attested in the analysis was larger than that of explicitation. Moreover, explicitation and implicitation were not limited to a specific linguistic level as they were present at the syntactic, semantic, stylistic, textual, and pragmatic levels of language.

We conclude that English favors implicitation when translating institutional academic correspondence from Arabic, as the number of cases of implicitation attested in the analysis was larger than that of explicitation. Moreover, explicitation and implicitation were not limited to a specific linguistic level as they were present at the syntactic, semantic, stylistic, textual, and pragmatic levels of language.

Based on our findings, we recommend the following for teaching translation and training translators:

1. Course designers and trainers may include specific chapters in their course syllabi on the nature of explicitation and implicitation. This will enhance trainees' understanding of these concepts and their practical applications in translation tasks.
2. Translator trainers may train translators on how to use different corpus building applications, including Sketch Engine, to improve their analytical

skills and familiarize them with the practical tools available for translation quality assurance.

3. Translators and researchers may explore academic correspondence written in other institutions in the Arab world where English is the source language (SL) and Arabic is the target language (TL). This can help in understanding the dynamics of translation between these languages in similar institutional contexts.

Researchers may also explore other language pairs within the same genre. Investigating how explicitation and implicitation manifest in translations of academic correspondence between different language pairs can provide broader insight into the translation strategies employed in various linguistic and cultural contexts.

Nada Mohamed Alhammadi – Corresponding author
Lecturer- PhD student in Linguistics and Translation
Department of Foreign Languages
University of Sharjah, Sharjah, UAE
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-1693-3855
Email: nalhamadi@sharjah.ac.ae

Sane Mo Yagi
Professor of Linguistics
University of Sharjah, Sharjah, UAE
ORCID Number: 0000-0002-0594-3230
Email: syagi@sharjah.ac.ae

Shehdeh Fareh
Professor of Linguistics
University of Sharjah, Sharjah, UAE
ORCID Number: 0000-0002-1196-9250
Email: shfareh@sharjah.ac.ae

References

Al-Anbaqi, Nada. (2009). The role of explicitation strategies in Arabic. Unpublished MA Dissertation, Middle East University for Graduate Studies, Amman, Jordan. https://meu.edu.jo/libraryTheses/586cbc4960045_1.pdf

Aziz, Yowell Y. (1998). 'Translation and pragmatic meaning'. In Abdullah Shunnaq, Cay Dollerup and Mohammed Saraireh (eds.) *Issues in Translation*, 279-282. Deanship of Scientific Research, Irbid National University and Jordanian Translators' Association.

Baumgarten, Nicole, Bernd Meyer and Demet Özçetin. (2008). 'Explicitness in translation and interpreting: a critical review and some empirical evidence (of an Elusive Concept)'. *Across Languages and Cultures*, 9(2): 177–203. https://doi.org/10.1556/acr.9.2008.2.2

Blum-Kulka, Shoshana. (1986). Shifts in cohesion and coherence in translation. In Lawrence Venuti (ed.) *The Translation Studies Reader*, 293-313. London and New York, NY: Routledge.

El-Nashar, Mohamed M. (2016). 'Explicitation techniques in English -Arabic translation: A linguistic corpus-based study'. *Arab World English Journal*, 7(3): 317–335. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol7no3.23

Farghal, Mohammed and Abdullah Samateh. (2017). 'Explicitation vs. implicitation: Discourse markers in English-into-Arabic translation'. *Al-Balqa Journal for Research and Studies*, 19(2):21-36. https://doi.org/10.35875/1105-019-002-006

Gambier, Yves. (2009). Stratégies et tactiques en traduction et interpretation. In Gyde Hansen, Andrew Chesterman and Heidrun Gerzymisch-Arbogast (eds.), *Efforts and Models in Interpreting and Translation Research*, 63–82. Amsterdam, Netherlands and Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.80

Gambier, Yves. (2010). Translation strategies and tactics. In Yves Gambier, and Luc Van Doorslaer (eds.), *Handbook of Translation Studies*. Vol.1., 412-418. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.1

Hamdan, Jihad and Shehdeh Fareh. (1999). 'The translation of Arabic wa into English: Some problems and implications'. *Dirasat: Human and Social Sciences*, 26(2):590-601.

Hatim, Basil. (2020). *Communication Across Cultures: Translation Theory and Contrastive Text Linguistics*. Exeter, UK: University of Exeter Press.

Klaudy, Kinga. (2009). Explicitation. In Mona Baker (ed.) *Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies*. 104-108. London and New York, NY: Routledge.

Klaudy, Kinga and Krisztina Károly. (2005). 'Implicitation in translation: Empirical evidence for operational asymmetry in translation'. *Across Languages and Cultures*, 6(1): 13–28. https://doi.org/10.1556/acr.6.2005.1.2

Murtisari, Elisabet T. (2016). 'Explicitation in translation studies: the journey of an elusive concept'. *The International Journal of Translation and Interpreting Research*, 8(2): 64-81. https://doi.org/10.12807/ti.108202.2016.a05

Nida, Eugene. (1964). *Toward a Science of Translating: With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures involved in Bible Translating*. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill.

Nida, Eugene. (2003). *Toward a Science of Translating: With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating* (2nd ed). Leiden, Netherlands: Brill Academic Publishers.

Nord, Christiane. (2001). *Translating As a Purposeful Activity, Functionalist Approaches Explained*. Shanghai, China: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

Obeidat, Hussein A. (1998). 'Stylistic aspects in Arabic and English translated literary texts: A contrastive study'. *Meta: Journal Des Traducteurs*, 43(3): 462-467. https://doi.org/10.7202/003753ar

Olohan, Maeve and Mona Baker. (2000). 'Reporting that in translated English. Evidence for subconscious processes of explicitation?' *Across Languages and Cultures*, 1(2): 141–158. https://doi.org/10.1556/acr.1.2000.2.1

Pym, Anothony. (2005). Explaining Explicitation. In Krisztina Károly and Ágata Fóris (eds.), *New Trends in Translation Studies: In Honour of Kinga Klaudy*, 29-34. Budapest, Hungary: Akadémia Kiadó.

Reiss, Katharina and Hans J. Vermeer. (1984/2013). *Towards a General Theory of Translational Action: Skopos Theory Explained*, (C. Nord, Trans.). London, UK, and New York, NY: Routledge.

Reiss, Katharina. (1983). 'Adequacy and equivalence in translation'. *The Bible Translator* (Technical Papers), 34(3): 301–308. https://doi.org/10.1177/026009358303400301

Vinay, Jean-Paul and Jean Darbelnet. (1958). Comparative stylistics of French and English: A methodology for translation. (J. Sage and M. K. Hamel, Trans.). In Lawrence Venuti (Ed.), *Translation Studies Reader*. Amsterdam, Netherlands and Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Vermeer, Hans J. (1987). 'What does it mean to translate?'. *Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13(2): 25–33.

Vermeer, Hans J. (1989). Skopos and commission in translation action. In Lawrence Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader*. London, UK, and New York, NY: Routledge.