International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies
ISSN: 2308-5460

A Concise Review of the Principles and Procedures of 'Explicitation' as a Translation Universal

[PP: 50-59]

Dr. Mohammad Amin Hawamdeh
Department of English, Faculty of Arts, Jerash University
Jordan

Dr. Khaled Saleem Alzu'bi
Department of English, Faculty of Arts, Jerash University
Jordan
Email: khaledphd2017@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to concisely review the concept of explicitation as a translation universal in terms of both principles and procedures. In three main sections, it presents the related theories from Nida (1964) to Becher (2010) along with a number of previous studies and discusses how explicitation occurs in the form of textual additions in parentheses (TAiPs) in translating a Quranic text (cf. Hawamdeh, 2017). Explicitation is said to be a translation strategy used to achieve the intended SL meanings and secure their appropriate interpretations in the TL as translation is not merely to substitute original codes with other equivalent ones. Many implicit, connotative, pragmatic, cultural, stylistic and associative meanings require a variety of techniques if the translator really seeks natural or appropriate equivalents. Explicitation can best appear as an addition on both levels of cohesion and coherence; it simply means making a text to be rendered clearer and more intelligible for its potential receptors. For the purpose of taming the SL text, Nida rationalizes nine explicitation norms, Toury (1995) mentions two types of translational shifts and Newmark (1988) argues that adding new information depends on the text-type and needs of the TL audience. Explicitation can be concluded to be the translating process itself or at least a technique for improving or adapting the TL text. The implicatures encountered in the language of religion, for instance, are almost explicitated into such a completely different language as English by means of various types of TAiPs.

Keywords: *Explicitation, Textual Addition, Translation Universals, Quranic Text, Arabic-English*

ARTICLE INFO	The paper received on	Reviewed on	Accepted after revisions on
	21/11/2020	**20/12/2020**	**15/01/2021**

Suggested citation:
Hawamdeh, M. & Alzu'bi, K. (2020). A Concise Review of the Principles and Procedures of 'Explicitation' as a Translation Universal. *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*. 8*(4). 50-59.*

1. Introduction

In planning a translation strategy, the translator is to make a new (not one-time) decision for each unmatched element or any of its uses. Having analyzed and carefully studied the SL text and determined the equivalents, the translator may use a variety of procedures. Such strategies or procedures vary in importance according to the SL/TL textual elements and contextual factors. In fact, to translate is to perform a highly complicated blend of actions (e.g. replacing SL lexical units by TL lexical ones, restructuring phrases or clauses, changing the word order, omitting certain elements and adding others). Definitely, languages are of different equipment for expressing the same extralinguistic contents and "important semantic elements carried implicitly […] may require explicit identification in the receptor language" (Nida, 1964: 277). An equal effect on the TL audience is certainly to be taken into account for producing the same message in the TL text intended by the SL author.

Translators generally omit, add or substitute for preserving or reproducing the semantic and stylistic features of the SL text. To effectively translate is to retain "the factual information contained in the SL text" (Meethan and Hudson, 1969: 242) and to ensure both "the linguistic cohesion and conceptual coherence" of the SL text (Hatim and Munday, 2004: 48). Now, how efficiently translation might be defined is still a common question tackled by too many scholars and researchers in their books and studies. Translation has been considered to be an operation for:

a) "conveying the same meaning of a spoken/written utterance taking place in one language into another language" (Rabin, 1958, p. 123);

b) "replacing textual material in one language with an equivalent textual material in another language" (Catford, 1965, p. 1, p. 20);
c) "reproducing in the TL the closest natural equivalent of the SL message in terms of meaning and […] style" (Nida and Taber 1969, p. 12);
d) "expressing in another language of what is expressed in another, by preserving semantic/stylistic equivalences" (Dubois, 1973, cited in Bell, 1991, p. 5);
e) "referring to the transfer of thoughts and ideas from one (source) language to another (target) language" (Brislin, 1976, p. 1);
f) "rendering the meaning of a text into another language in the way the author intended the text" (Newmark, 1988, p. 5);
g) "rendering what is expressed in one language or a set of symbols by means of another language" (Snell-Hornby, 1988, p. 39);
h) "replacing a representation of a SL text in one language by a representation of an equivalent TL text in another" (Hartmann and Stork: 1972, cited in Bell, 1991, p. 7);
i) "changing an original written text in the original verbal language into a written text […] in a different verbal language" (Munday, 2001, p. 5);

Having read up the definitions above, one can conclude that translation is to explain, explicate or *explicitate* a given text in another linguistic system and cultural background. The concept of explicitation was first introduced by Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/1995) as "the process of introducing information into the TL which is present only implicitly in the SL, but which can be derived from the context or the situation" (p. 8). As a universal feature. It was also developed by many others (e.g. Nida, 1964; Blum-Kulka, 1986; Baker, 1993; Klaudy, 1998, 2008; Pym, 2005; Heltai, 2005; Saldanha, 2008). Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/1995: 342) add it as "a stylistic technique which consists of making explicit in the target language what remains implicit in the source language because it is apparent from the context or the situation." It was also seen as inherent in the process of translation "regardless of the increase traceable to differences between the two […] systems involved" (Blum-Kulka, 1986: 19).

This universal feature of translation was, however, denied by others for being vague or elusive (e.g. Becher, 2010: 1; House, 2004: 193). It can be a very generic term to include additions, footnotes or commentaries somewhere in the text (cf. Nida, 1964). Baker (2001: 81) defines explicitation as "the broader concept that encompasses the more specific concept of addition." In actual fact, both (textual) addition and explicitation can be synonymously handled (e.g. Alcaraz and Hughes, 2002: 183-185) depending on the kinds of things one may accept as explicitation (Pym, 2005: 2). In one way or another, the strategy of addition is customarily discussed in relation to explicitation as just omission is to implicitation. As a reader and writer at the same time, the translator's explanations may be included, implicatures spelled out and connectives added so as to help enlarge the given text's readability. It is a phenomenon that "frequently leads to stating SL information in a more explicit form than the original" (Shuttleworth and Cowie, 1997: 55).

Explicitation is one of the translation universals by which the implicit status of a text is amplified. Addition can appear as one of its typical manifestations or a rise in the TL text's level of explicitness (e.g. Baker, 1992; Laviosa, 1998). It is a transfer operation (Blum-Kulka, 1986: 21; Heltai, 2005: 45) that can have several types according to the nature of the given text (e.g. literary or religious). The textual additions in parentheses (TAiPs) are one of these types (cf. Hawamdeh, 2017). The translator may add to the SL text yet in a positive and constructive manner (cf. Nida, 1964) but has to show respect to the language into which he/she translates as much as to the original one (Hatim and Mason, 1990: 9-10). It is a matter of linguistic and cultural conciliation between such two completely different languages and cultures as Arabic and English. Thus, the present study:

a) Concisely reviews the related theories and previous studies on explicitation and
b) Discusses the nature of TAiPs as a form of explicitation in translating a Quranic text.

2. Related Theories

In his analysis of dynamic-equivalence, Nida (1964) identifies three techniques of adjustment in the translating process. Concerned with *what* (not with *why*) the translator does for dynamically rendering the SL text, such techniques are addition, subtraction and alteration for adjusting the SL text and finding the closest natural equivalent. In other words, the text is adjusted for correct equivalents not for tempering its SL message. It is "to permit the adjustment of the form of the SL message to the requirements of the [TL] structure, produce semantically equivalent structures, provide equivalent stylistic appropriateness and carry an equivalent communication load" (Nida, 1964: 226). Minor changes are necessary; however, the changes could be sometimes radical as a close equivalent is utterly meaningless or carries a wrong meaning. The technique of addition in particular depends on the audience for whom the translation is designed; it may be reflected in the text or by marginal notes (p. 227).

Nine types of addition in translation are detailed by Nida (1964) in his book *Toward a Science of Translating*. The first four of them can be explicitatively considered as features or macro-explicitative norms while the last five ones as devices or micro-explicitative norms:

1. Macro-explicitative norms:

a) Fitting out elliptical expressions as ellipses might be omitted in one language but not permitted in another on the basis of parallel/nonparallel structures.
b) Obligatory specification as there is no obvious determined indication or there are multiple indications, particularly the deictic units of speech (e.g. pronouns).
c) Amplifications from implicit to explicit status as "important semantic elements carried implicitly in the [SL] text may require explicit identification" (p. 228).
d) Answers to rhetorical questions as they mustn't be expanded by any appending questions unless the former ones are answered in some place of the text.

2. Micro-explicitative norms:

a) Classifiers as convenient devices for building meaningful redundancy into an overloaded text, particularly for proper names and borrowed terms.
b) Connectives as transitions consisting of the repetition of segments of a preceding text and only increasing the total volume of the text not adding information.
c) TL categories as the translator must judge where the absence of such categories is stylistically noticeable and where they add aspects to the narration in the TL.
d) Doublets as two semantically supplement expressions in place of one (e.g. answering, said) to be almost obligatory in some languages in certain contexts.

It has been also proposed that the frequency of explicitation is related to the degree of the translator's experience. In this respect, Levý (1965) assumes that explicitation is a hallmark of translator's style with limited experience whereas Blum-Kulka (1986) gives evidence of explicitation from professional translators as well (Englund-Dimitrova 2005: 22). On a related topic, the nature and frequency of explicitations can help decide the adequacy and/or acceptability of a translation. In actual fact, a translation to be adequate is the one that "realizes in the target language the textual relationships of a source text with no breach of its own [basic] linguistic system" (Even-Zohar, 1975, cited in Toury, 1995: 56). In this respect, Toury (1995) also argues that "the most adequacy-oriented translation involves such shifts [i.e. explicitations] from the source text" (p. 57). He differentiates between two types of shifts in relation to his notion of translational norms:

1. obligatory shifts as language-pair-dependent dictated by the syntactic and semantic differences in languages, and
2. Non-obligatory shifts as norm-dependent and initiated by literary, cultural or ideological considerations.

The notion of textual addition in translation is also addressed by Newmark (1988). To add information is either to i) culturally account for the difference between the SL and TL cultures, ii) technically relate to the topic itself or iii) linguistically explain the wayward use of a word. Any addition must depend on the requirements of the TL readership and the type of text whether it is expressive, vocative …etc. (p. 91). The additional information within a text is (procedurally) of various forms: additions can be made in round brackets including material as part of the translation or in square brackets making corrections of the given material. Newmark also emphasizes that the translator may have to add information as an alternative to the translated word, adjectival clause, noun in apposition, participial group, in brackets often for a literal translation of a transferred word, in parentheses as the longest form of addition and lastly a classifier (p. 92).

What is more, Pym (2005) shifts explicitation into the terminology of risk management (or hypothetical risk aversion). He stresses that "where there are greater risks; there are greater opportunities for risk minimization" (p. 10). The elements are there: prudence, Gricean cooperation, relevance to a new reception situation, the ethics of service, damage control or remedy. For all of these things, a translator could have reasons to be risk-averse; otherwise, he/she is given to minimizing risks or does not want to take risks in his/her own name. This hypothesis was accepted by some researchers (e.g. Seguinot, 1988; Pym, 2005) but rejected by others (e.g. House, 2004; Puurtinen, 2004; Dosa, 2009). Except for the idea that explicitness only means redundancy, Séguinot (1988: 106) agreed that that a translation entails a process of explicitation. It is "[a] technique of making explicit in the TL information what is implicit in the SL text" (Klaudy, 1996: 99). Actually, to explicitate is to go beyond cohesive explicitness.

A newer definition by Pápai (cited in Becher, 2010) that explicitation is brought about by filling out a SL text based on the translator's conscious desire to explain the meaning to a TL reader. It reads that explicitation is "a technique of resolving ambiguity, improving and increasing cohesiveness of the [source text] and also of adding linguistic and extralinguistic information" (p. 6). In actual fact, the strategies of explicitation exist in cohesion by means of clause connecting devices. Some sorts of explicitation appear to be linked with markers of cohesion as knitting the TL text together and other expansions show an addition of lexical units of language in the TL because of explaining a potential information deficit on the translator's part or are related to the addition of recurrent specialized terms. A range of factors seem to influence the choice of explicitation:

1. the translator's view of the suitable relation between a proto- and meta-text and
2. the allowable amount of freedom and intrinsic features in the process of translating.

3. Previous Research

Based on the related theories above, explicitation obviously has a purpose in translation. On the translator's part, an addition should coherently appear part of the text; otherwise, it is a type of translational error or an over-translation. Several purposes for textual addition have been set in translation as necessitated by the requirements of the SL/TL genre, text-type or culture as devices or processes followed by a translator in converting a SL text into a TL one (cf. Nida, 1964). Additions in the translated product are considered as the result of expressing explicitly the implicit meanings of the SL text; such grammatical additions are due to missing categories and categories being of more than one function (Vaseva, 1980, cited in Klaudy, 1996). Generally speaking, a textual addition can take several forms (roles) in translation; it can be an explicit statement of some information merely implied or hinted at in the SL text.

Olohan and Baker (2000) argued that explicitation refers to the spelling out, in a target text, information that is implicit in a source text; in other words, it was seen as the introduction of extra information occurring by the use of supplementary explanatory phrases in translation and the expansion of condensed passages. In this sense, to explicitate was found as a distinctive feature of the translation product, so justifying why translations are longer than their originals. In point of fact, textual addition (or explicitation) in translation being a procedure comprising explication, explanation, compensation and amplification, textual addition is mostly obligatory in nature so that the TL would sound grammatical or semantically significant. Additions can sometimes come in the form of connectives or (cohesive) links between two ideas, sentences, words or phrases and answers to rhetorical questions.

Considered as the difference to be deliberately or instinctively created between the SL and TL texts, explicitation can be identified as the discrepancies or the gaps that often distinguish SL texts from TL texts. It is a stylistic and strategic technique of translation by which adjustments are made and the SL meaning is specified as the structural, stylistic and rhetorical differences between such two languages as Arabic and English are compensated. In contrary to implicitation, Klaudy and Károly (2003 cited in Pym, 2005) stressed that explicitation should occur as either:

a) a SL unit of a more general meaning replaced by a TL unit of a more special meaning,
b) the complex meaning of a SL word distributed over several words in the TL text,
c) one sentence in the SL divided into two or several sentences in the TL or
d) SL phrases extended or elevated into clauses in the TL …etc.

For the relationship between explicitation and (textual) addition, it would appear that explicitation is simply the insertion of additional words or morphemes. According to Heltai (2005) to explicitate is to replace morphemes with less phonological substance and/or lexical meaning(s) with morphemes having more phonological substance and/or lexical meaning" (p. 46). On the other hand, he considered addition as the addition of extra words (free morphemes) in the TL text, but it could be regarded as involving bound morphemes. Accordingly, explicitation could be a strategy by which information not linguistically coded in the SL is expressed by a linguistically coded form in the TL text, or it could be the case of "increasing the level of linguistic coding" (p. 49). Heltai concluded that addition does not always lead to explicitation but explicitation leads to addition as the latter cannot automatically lead to easier processing and less ambiguity.

Informativeness as a pragmatic-cognitive principle can also have a role in explicitating implicature in translation. In this respect, Espunya (2007) investigated a corpus of connectives used in translating complex sentences (containing V-ing free adjuncts) from English into Catalan. In fact, the relationship between the propositional contents of a free adjunct and the matrix clause in a complex sentence was not linguistically specified but ought to be inferred. Espunya focused on any connecting words making inter-clausal discourse relationships explicit in broad genre categories (e.g. popular fiction). This principle was of less significant application than such principles as explicitation as a general translational tendency. In addition to condition-concession, these relationships could be: temporal (in the form of simultaneity, anteriority and posteriority) or causal (in the form of reason, result, purpose, manner and instrument).

For patterns of explicitation as occurring between the SL and TL texts, Hansen-Schirra, et al (2007) investigated explicitness/implicitness and related phenomena of translated texts on the level of cohesion. Hansen-Schirra et al argued that the cohesive features had been the object of research in Translation Studies as indicators of explicitation. The texts arising from explicitation were found to be more explicit than their counterparts in terms of their lexico-grammatical and cohesive properties. The study was based on Halliday and Hasan's (1976) indicators of cohesive explicitness in English to its German texts as follows:

a) reference, denoting the cohesive ties where the same referential meaning is represented,
b) substitution and ellipsis, replacing one item by a weaker one or even by zero,
c) conjunction, specifying the way in which what is to follow is systematically connected to what has gone before, and
d) lexical cohesion, replacing a lexical item with a general one, (near-) synonym, hyponym… etc.

As a broad term in translation, explicitation was also identified by Klaudy (2008) as a technique of making explicit in the TL text information what is implicit in the SL one. She provides four types as follows:

a) Required by the syntactic and semantic structures of languages, obligatory explicitation is necessary for grammatical and meaningful TL sentences.
b) Explicitation can be also optional wherever caused by the differences in the text-building strategies and stylistic preferences between languages.
c) However, the differences of culture or shared knowledge between languages cause pragmatic explicitation; implicit information needs to be made explicit.
d) Lastly, explicitation is caused by the nature of the translating process and, thus, translations are often longer than the originals.

Textual additions as a form of explicitation have roles or purposes as they adapt the translated text to the TL readership. By analyzing a few English translations of Surah Yasin, Khan (2008) ascertained four common stylistic features, among which was addition. Khan stressed that any addition in translation leads to filling out elliptical expressions, obligatory specification, grammatical restructuring and amplification from implicit to explicit status, connectives and categories of the reader's language. As a literal translation is ambiguous to the TL reader, a competent translator could add "footnotes or marginal notes or short explanatory notes" (p. 99). In translating the Quran, such notes help overcome linguistic and cultural discrepancies of both Arabic and English and add useful information for better and easy understanding of the message.

Baleghizadeh & Sharifi (2010) studied the explicitation of implicit logical links between sentences and clauses in translation from Persian into English. They found that (i) different junctives in the TL sentential structures to explicitate different (additive, adversative, causal and temporal) types of logical relations between the SL sentences and clauses; and (ii) cohesive ties added between the TL sentences for making explicit different types of logical (additive, adversative and causal) relations between the SL sentences and clauses. Such junctives and cohesive ties were to connect two sentences creating texture and signal the coherence relations in the TL text. Among the potential causes behind the explicitation of implicit logical relations between sentences and clauses were:

a) the structural differences and text-building strategies between the two languages and
b) the translator's endeavor to make the text cooperative to the TL reader by using natural cohesive patterns and providing more communicative clues.

Almost rejecting the fact that translators need to follow a universal strategy of explicitation, Becher (2011) tested Klaudy's (2009) Asymmetry Hypothesis in that an explicitation in a SL-TL direction is not always counterbalanced by an implicitation in a TL-SL direction. In point of fact, a translator would prefer using explicitations and often fails to perform optional implicitations. The motivations for which the translators usually insist on adding (or even omitting) information are highly reasonable. Becher found that translators add/omit connectives in order to comply with the communicative norms of the TL community, exploit specific features of the TL system, deal with specific restrictions of the TL system, avoid stylistically marked ways of expression and optimize the cohesion of the TL text. He found 'explicitation' to have implied subjects, cohesion and coherence and grammatical meanings.

In reference to the translation of religious texts, Sharifabad and Hazbavi (2011) stressed that a large proportion of the Quran consists of implied meanings and conversational implicatures (CIs); namely, those chapters narrating conversations. Comparatively analyzing three English translations of Surah Yusuf in light of some useful exegeses of the Quran, they firstly analyzed the CIs and their related maxims: quality, quantity, relation, manner (cf. Grice, 1975) and then investigated the mechanisms and strategies of translating the same. They found hidden information for which the translators' knowledge could help make clear the implicated meaning(s) and, hence, produce an appropriate translation of the Quran. The CIs and maxims were eventually found to be well-explicated in some verses by either the use of footnotes or parentheses.

4. Translating the Quranic Text as a Special Case of Explicitation

A formal correspondent cannot be always the true choice particularly in a religious context. In translating the Quran, Hawamdeh (2017) developed a model of textual additions in parentheses (TAiPs) to either continue or interrupt the TL reader's flow of attention based on Nida's (1964) two types of addition: filling out ellipses and giving specification. The continuative TAiPs fill out elliptical expressions in the form of automatic additions or ready adjustments as no problems exist in determining the exact words to be added and ellipses are formulaic even if non-evident. For the interruptive TAiPs, on the other hand, they appear due to the essential need for avoiding ambiguity in the TL formations or the fact that greater specificity may be required so as to avoid misleading reference. They can be based on parallel or non-parallel structures; if parallel, they are evident enough to determine the number and/or nature of an addition.

In this respect, a TAiP to be functional is considered in terms of two criteria: continuing the flow of attention and being kept up in parentheses. In rendering into English such a claimed-to-be holy text as the Quran, the TAiPs in the Hilali and Khan Translation (HKT) for instance—as officially approved yet severely criticized for its too many insertions—could be processed by being either excluded at all from the translated text, parenthetically included as just encountered in the text, included into the text but out of parentheses or let merely replace its corresponding SL unit of language (cf. Hawamdeh, 2018). The first two ways seem to be formal or conservative whereas the last two ones seem to be conversely dynamic or alternative. For further details on this binary model of processing as to the translation of a Quranic text, let us see the following quartette considering both types of TAiPs in such verses as contained in the HKT:

1. "and truly I am one of the Muslims (*submitting to your Will*)" (Quran, 41:33).

2. "if you turn away (*from the obedience to Allah*), He will exchange..." (Quran, 47:38).
3. "the revelation of the Book (*this Qur'an*) is from Allah..." (Quran, 45:02).
4. "thereafter either for generosity (*free them without ransom*) or..." (Quran, 47:04).

Table: 1 Types of TAiPs in some verses as contained in the HKT

Major Types	Minor Types	Verses as Adjusted by TAiPs
Formal/Conservative Translation:	Hesitantly, the TAiPs are entirely kept out of the translated text of the Quran for both the continuative and interruptive types of TAiPs.	1. "and truly I am one of the Muslims." 2. "if you turn away, He will exchange you." 3. "the revelation of the Book is from Allah, the all-Mighty." 4. "thereafter either for generosity or ransom."
	Cautiously, the TAiPs are kept into the translated text but in parentheses for both the continuative and interruptive types of TAiPs.	1. "and truly I am one of the Muslims (*submitting to your Will*)." 2. "if you turn away (*from the obedience to Allah*), He will..." 3. "the revelation of the Book (*this Qur'an*) is from Allah,..." 4. "thereafter either for generosity (*free them without ransom*) or..."
Dynamic/Alternative Translation:	Decisively, the TAiPs are kept with no parentheses. A continuative TAiP is only inserted while an interruptive one is merged with the preceding units.	1. "and truly I am one of the Muslims *submitting to your Will*." 2. "if you turn away *from the obedience to Allah*, He will..." 3. "the revelation of *this Qur'an* is from Allah, the all-Mighty." 4. "thereafter either for gener*ously free-ing them without ransom* or..."
	Recklessly, the TAiPs replace the preceding unit(s) of language. Either continuative or interruptive, a TAiP must preserve the TL structure.	1. "and truly I *submit to your Will*." 2. "if you *disobey/do not obey Allah*, He will exchange you." 3. "*this Qur'an* is from Allah, the all-Mighty." 4. "thereafter either for *free-ing them without ransom* or ransom."

As a binary pattern, the classification above represents the literal-liberal disparity in translation as referred to by almost all the approaches to equivalence. The translation of the Quranic text, however, as observed in the related literature (e.g. Siddiek, 2012) has been of only three types: *literal translation* as a word is replaced with an equivalent word(s) keeping the structure, *translation of meaning* as a word is replaced with an equivalent word(s) being far from the SL features and *free translation* as the Quranic message is dynamically rendered by an interpretation. Being form- or meaning-based, translation is also proposed by Larson (1984) to be of four levels. The first two are literal, word-for-word sounding like nonsense with a little communication value while the other two are idiomatic, sense-for-sense to reproduce the SL meaning in a more adequate or acceptable manner. Actually, a second type in a triplet can be divided into two aspects as one belongs to the first and the other to the third.

Rather than any specific differences between two given languages, explicitation is seen as the process of translating itself. According to Séguinot (1988), it can "take three forms in a translation: something expressed in the translation not in the original, something implied or understood through presupposition in the source text overtly expressed in the translation, or an element in the source text given greater importance in the translation by focus, emphasis, or lexical choice" (p. 108). In fact, the harder the SL text is, the harder the translators work but the more likely they make their renditions explicit (Pym, 2005). One might admit that translators use explicitation for introducing accurate semantic details into the TL text, for either clarification or due to the constraints of the TL itself. Being a sort of over-translation if it is excessive (cf. Gutt, 1991), more communicative clues are provided by translators than non-translators as their TL audiences have fewer shared cultural references (cf. Pym, 2005).

Being inherent in translation, TAiPs overlap with explicitation and such other terms as ellipsis and redundancy. The translation of a Quranic text is two major phases. One is primary to explicitate the SL text and textualize the TL one; this process interlingually occurs from Arabic into English and intralingually within the resultant text. The secondary phase is intersemiotic; to translate is to communicate the effect from its SL setting to the potential TL readership. In other words, the translator is an explicitator, textualizer and communicator. Eventually, 'translationality' shall put forward such a collective concept of faithfulness as per which a TAiP is something expressed in the translation not in the SL text, something implied or understood through presupposition in the SL text overtly expressed in the translation or something in the SL Text given greater importance in the translation by focus, emphasis or lexical choice.

5. Conclusion

Adding information may turn out to be an essential strategy in rendering the implicit SL elements, particularly the culture-bound ones. Depending on the type of audience, the purpose of this technique is to adjust the form to the TL requirements, produce semantically equivalent structures, provide stylistic appropriateness and carry an equivalent communication load. Considering these aims, it could be argued that no treatment possible for the unmatched elements of culture consistently exists in translation. In point of fact, no unique solution might exist for a particular text-type or a given cultural element that could be utilized by a translator each time it appears. Instead, the translator can choose from among possible strategies or techniques by considering the linguistic or referential nature of a term or concept to be cohesively/coherently rendered and the communicative nature of the translating process itself.

Illustrations (e.g. textual additions, footnotes… etc.) in translation are necessarily and consciously to be presented as part of the text. They are essential to the reader's full visualization of the SL meaning. However, the number and style of illustrations, their point of insertion and the kind of information that they convey can all determine whether such textual additions may justifiably be considered an integral part of the text (Chaparro, 2000: 23). The translator is to have a profound understanding of the etymological and idiomatic correlates between the two languages (Kasparek, 1986: 135). For appreciating the richness of the SL words and easily translating them into the TL, the associated meanings of the given SL words as obvious in the original are to be effectively grasped. In this respect, two approaches might useful:

1. The linguistic approach is relatively limited and inadequate as translating cannot be merely reduced to a linguistic exercise and the translator strictly encodes and transmits his/her thought to a reader who in turn receives and decodes the message so as to arrive at the intended meaning.
2. An effective approach applies to a religious context by which the same SL impact must be attained by the TL reader as the translator conveys as much information as needed so that the TL readership can recover the intended meaning from both what is said and the cognitive context.

In another respect, explicitation was considered as the difference to be deliberately or instinctively created between the SL and TL texts. It can be identified as the discrepancies or the gaps that often distinguish SL texts from TL texts. It is a stylistic and strategic technique of translation by which adjustments are made and the SL meaning is specified as the structural, stylistic and rhetorical differences between such two languages as Arabic and English are compensated. Pápai (2002: 488, cited in Heltai 2005) proposed that:

"[t]he higher degree of explicitness in the TT is a result of a translation operation used by translators to explicate, to bring to the surface linguistic or not linguistic information contained in the ST in a non-explicit, allusion-like or vague form, with the purpose of ensuring easier or more secure interpretation" (p. 46).

References

Alcaraz, E. V., & Hughes, B. (2002). Legal Translation Explained: Volume 4 of Translation Practices Explained. London: St. Jerome Publishers.

Baker, M. (1992). Alice Testpost: A Coursebook on Translation. London, UK: Routledge.

Baker, M. (1993). Corpus Linguistics and Translation Studies: Implications and Applications. Text and Technology: In Honour of John Sinclair, 233.

Baker, M. (2001). Norms. M. Baker (Ed) Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies, 189-193.

Baleghizadeh, S., & Sharifi, A. (2010). Explicitation of Implicit Logical Links in Persian-English Translation. Translation and Interpreting 2(2), 57-65.

Becher, V. (2011). When and Why Translators Add Connectives: A Corpus-based Study. Target, 23(1), 26-47.

Becher, V. (2010). Abandoning the Notion of Translation-inherent Explicitation. Against a Dogma of Translation Studies. Across Languages and Cultures, 11(1), 1-28.

Bell, R. T. (1991). Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice. New York and London: Longman.

Blum-Kulka, S. (1986). Shifts of Cohesion and Coherence in Translation. In House, J., & Blum-Kulka, S. (Eds.) Discourse and Cognition in Translation and Second Language Acquisition Studies, 17-35.

Brislin, R. W. (1976). Translation: Application and Research. New York: Garden Press, Inc.

Catford, J. C. (1965). A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An Essay in Applied Linguistics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chaparro, A. (2000). Translating the Untranslatable. Journal of Iberian and Latin American Studies, 6(1), 19-28.

Dósa, I. (2009). About Explicitation and Implicitation in the Translation of Accounting Texts. SKASE Journal of

Translation and Interpretation, 4(1), 25-32.

Englund-Dimitrova, B. (2005). Expertise and Explicitation in the Translation Process. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Espunya, A. (2007). Is Explicitation in Translation Cognitively Related to Linguistic Explicitness? A Study on Interclausal Relationships. Belgian Journal of Linguistics, 21(1), 67-86.

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. Cole, P., & Morgan, J. L. (Eds.) Syntax and Semantics (3): Speech Acts, 41-58.

Gutt, E. A. (1991). Translation and Relevance: Cognition and Context. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Halliday, M. A. K. & Hasan, R. (1976). Cohesion in English. London, UK: Longman.

Hansen-Schirra, S., Neumann, S., & Steiner, E. (2007). Cohesive Explicitness and Explicitation in an English-German Translation Corpus. Languages in Contrast, 7(2), 241-265.

Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1990). Discourse and the Translator. London, UK: Longman.

Hatim, B., & Munday, J. (2004). Translation: An Advanced Resource Book. London, UK: Psychology Press.

Hawamdeh, M. A. (2017). An Analysis of the Textual Addition in Parentheses Strategy in the Translation of a Quranic Text. A Doctoral Dissertation, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

Hawamdeh, M. A. (2018). Explicitation by Textual Addition in Parentheses in Translating the Quranic Text into English. International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature, 7(7), 202-208.

Heltai, P. (2005). Explicitation, Redundancy, Ellipsis and Translation. In Károly, K., & Fóris, Á. (Eds.) New Trends in Translation Studies, 45-74.

Hilali, M. T., & Khan, M. M. (1977). The Noble Quran in the English Language. Riyadh, Saudi Arabia: Darul Salam Bookstore.

House, J. (2004). Explicitness in Discourse across Languages. Juliane House, Werner Koller, Klaus Schubert (Eds.): Bochum: AKSVerlag, 185-207.

Kasparek, C. (1983). The Translator's Endless Toil. The Polish Review, 28(2), 83-87.

Khan, M. (2008). Stylistic and Communicative Dimensions in Translations of Sūrah Yāsīn into English. A Doctoral Dissertation, National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad.

Klaudy, K. (2008). Explicitation. In Baker, M., & Saldanha, G. (Eds.), Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies, 104-108.

Klaudy, K. (1998). Explicitation. In Baker, M. (Ed.) Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies, 80-85.

Klaudy, K. (1996). Back-translation as a Tool for Detecting Explicitation Strategies in Translation. Translation Studies in Hungary. Scholastica, 99-114.

Larson, M. L. (1984). Meaning-based Translation: A Guide to Cross-language Equivalence. Vol. 366. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Laviosa-Braithwaite, S. (1998). Universals of Translation. Baker, M. (Ed.) Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies, 288-291.

Levý, J. (1965). Will Translation Theory Be of Use to Translators? Italiaander, R. (Ed.), 77-82.

Meethan, A., & Hudson, R. (1969). Encyclopedia in Linguistics, Information and Control. Oxford, UK: Pergamon.

Munday, J. (2001). Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications. London: Routledge.

Newmark, P. (1988). A Textbook of Translation. New York: Prentice Hall Press.

Nida, E. A., & Taber, C. R. (1982). The Theory and Practice of Translation. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Nida, E. A. (1964). Towards a Science of Translating: With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Olohan, M., & Baker, M. (2000). Evidence for Subconscious Processes of Explicitation? Across Languages and Cultures, 1(2), 141-158.

Puurtinen, T. (2004). Explicitation of Clausal Relations. Translation Universals: Do Exist, 48, 165.

Pym, A. (2005). Defining Explicitation. In Károly, K., & Foris, Á. (Eds.) New Trends in Translation Studies, 29-43.

Rabin, C. (1958). Linguistic Comments on the Problems of Translating SY Agnon. Kuval Shay, Ramat Gan: Bar Ilan University Press.

Saldanha, G. (2008). Explicitation Revisited: Bringing the Reader into the Picture. Trans-kom, 1(1), 20-35.

Séguinot, C. (1988), Pragmatics and the Explicitation Hypothesis. TTR Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction, 1(2), 106-114.

Sharifabad, E., & Hazbavi, A. (2011). The Quran Translators' Explicitation Procedures in Chapter Yusuf. International Conference on Language, Literature and Linguistics. IPED, 26, 376-383.

Shuttleworth, M., & Cowie, M. (1997). Dictionary of Translation Studies. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome.

Siddiek, A. G. (2012). Viewpoints in the Translation of the Holy Quran. International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature, 1(2), 18-25.

Snell-Hornby, M. (1988). Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Toury, G. (1995). Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Vinay, J., & Darbelnet, J. (1995). Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation. Trans. (1958) by Sager, J. C., & Hamel, J. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.