

## Explication and Implication Strategies Used in the Translation of *Aleph*

Amal Al-Shunnaq \*

Department of English / Translation, University of Petra, Jordan

Received on: 20-8-2024

Accepted on: 26-12-2024

### Abstract

This study aims at contributing to the literature written on explication and implication in Translation Studies. It discusses the use of explication and implication in the translation of the novel, *Aleph*, by Paulo Coelho, and also it tackles the main reasons behind using them. The importance of this study relies on the scarcity of works carried out on how the differences between English and Arabic might sometimes force the translator to explicate and implicate. To attain this, the translation of the first chapter of the novel *Aleph* by Al-Saify (2014) was read in order to identify examples of explication and implication shifts. The study showed that the sort of difference between the two languages determines which strategy to use, and it revealed that such strategies might be sometimes utilized to naturalize the text and to produce *natural translation*. Such conclusions might help translators in deciding when and why to explicate and implicate.

**Keywords:** Explication, Implication, Translation shifts, and Translation strategies.

### 1. Introduction

This study focuses on two of the most frequently used translation strategies in the field of *Translation Studies*: namely explication and implication. These are among the many methods used by translators in order to produce what might be seen as optimal translation. There are a number of reasons behind using the strategies of explication and implication in translation practice. One of these is the need to retain the meaning of the source language text in the case that literal translation does not produce readable translation. Another reason might be to clarify terms that are unknown to the target language audience. Moreover, it might be due to the difficulties that could be encountered by translator in his attempt to translate a given text, leading him to choose these from the available translation strategies in the field of *Translation Studies* according to the translation problem encountered. It could be safely argued that translation is not simply a matter of transferring the words of one language into words of another, but that it is rather a matter of transforming the meaning of the text written in one language into another text written in the other language by using numerous translation strategies to produce an idiomatic translation. In order to succeed in what might seem a difficult task, a translator needs to employ

---

© 2025 JJMLL Publishers/Yarmouk University. All Rights Reserved,

\* Doi: <https://doi.org/10.47012/jjml.17.4.9>

\* Corresponding Author: [aalshunnaq@uop.edu.jo](mailto:aalshunnaq@uop.edu.jo)

more than one strategy in his translation in order to produce a translation that sounds natural and is faithful at the same time to the source text.

Explicitation and implicitation as translation concepts were first introduced by Vinay and Darbelnet (1958). They have been discussed and examined by other researchers. For instance, explicitation is considered by Nida (1964), Blum-Kulka (1986), Baker (1993, 1995, 1996), Olohan and Baker (2000), Papai (2004), Saldanha (2008), Becher (2010a, 2010b), Heltai (2005), Klaudy (1996, 1998, 2001, 2003), Pym (2005), Farghal and Samateh (2016), Murtisari (2016), De Metsenaere and Vandepitte (2017), Zang et al. (2020), Mansor (2021), Kotait (2024), and Sattar and Mahmood (2024). In contrast, implicitation has been further discussed by Nida (*ibid.*), Séguinot (1985), Klaudy and Karoly (2005), Kamenická (2007) and Dósa (2009).

In order to fulfil the aims and objectives of this study, the Arabic translation of the first chapter of the novel *Aleph* by Paulo Coelho will be studied in order to detect examples of the implicitation and explicitation shifts by the translator Rana Al-Saify (the fourth edition: 2014). The type of the explicitation shift is determined according to Klaudy's model of explicitation (1996), and the type of implicitation shift is determined according to different theorists who have viewed implicitation from different perspectives such as Nida (*ibid.*), and Dósa (*ibid.*). Following from the identification of the explicitation and implicitation shift and categorisation of its type, the reasons behind explicating and implicitating will be given in order to show how differences among languages force translators to explicitate and/or to implicate; translators sometimes resort to explicitation and/or implicitation for the sake of naturalizing the text.

### *1.1. The Aims and Objectives of the Study*

This study is designed to fulfil the following aims and objectives:

- 1) To understand the main reasons behind using the strategies of explicitation and implicitation in the translation of the first chapter of the novel *Aleph*.
- 2) To highlight the grammatical, semantic and cultural differences between English and Arabic and how such differences might force translators to explicitate and/or implicate.
- 3) To manifest that explicitation and implicitation are sometimes used to naturalise the translated text and to improve the quality of the translation product which can be seen as an indicator of the translator's competence in this case.

### *1.2. The Rationale of the Study*

The importance of the study stems from the need to problematize the interrelationship between explicitation and implicitation with reference to the differences between the source language and the target language in terms of syntax, semantics, and pragmatics and also the interrelationship between explicitation and implicitation with the numerous translation problems faced by translators in translation practice and their solutions. Such interrelationship needs to be further investigated particularly in literary texts by translation theorists and researchers alike, because of the figurative style of the literary genre. Moreover, this study can serve as a link between translation theory and translation practice in which

translation theory can serve as a medium to improve the quality of translation by showing how the strategies of explicitation and implication can resolve the numerous translation problems that are due to the differences among languages. Such problems might be encountered particularly in rendering literary texts. In addition to that, it might be argued that the importance of the current study relies on highlighting the differences between English and Arabic and how such differences might oblige the translator to explicitate and/or implicitate, and in identifying the contexts or the specific contextual features for the application of explicitation and implication. Another importance of the study is that there is a need to clarify the reasons and motivations behind using the strategies of explicitation and implication in rendering literary texts.

### 1.3. Research Questions

The study aims to answer the following questions:

- 1) What are the main reasons behind using the strategies of explicitation and implication in the translation of the first chapter of the novel *Aleph*?
- 2) How can the sort of difference between the source language and the target language impact the choice between explicitation and implication?
- 3) Is explicitation used more than implication in the translation of the first chapter of the novel *Aleph*?
- 4) Does the use of explicitation and implication impact the meaning?
- 5) Can explicitation and implication be used by translators to naturalise the text and to improve the quality of translation?

## 2. Theoretical Background of the Study

Translation has been defined as the process of transforming the meaning from one language into another by many translation theorists such as Nida (1964), Catford (1965), Nida and Taber (1982), Larson (1984), Hatim and Mason (1990), Bell (1991), Hatim and Munday (2004), Ghazala (2008) among others. In order to attain this, many translational methods have been introduced, suggested, and utilised in translation practice. Among the many translational techniques proposed by translation theorists are deletion, addition, explication, implication, explicitation, adaptation, cultural substitution, and cultural approximation, transliteration, Arabicization, among others. One of the greatest difficulties that might be encountered by translators is in selecting the right strategy, if total equivalence cannot be established.

As has been mentioned earlier, this study focuses on two of the most frequently used translational strategies available: explicitation and implication. One approach to trace these two phenomena in translation might be to discuss explicitation first followed by a discussion of implication. In doing this, the term explicitation is defined and previous studies related to this translation concept are discussed and evaluated, followed by a similar discussion of implication. Implication is discussed by defining it and tracing and evaluating the literature related to this phenomenon.

Explicitation looks to be firstly defined by Vinay and Darbelnet in their pioneering work: *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais: Méthode de traduction* (1958, 9) in which explicitation was defined as "procédé qui consiste à introduire dans LA des précisions qui restent implicites dans LD, mais qui se

dégagent du contexte ou de la situation." This book was translated into English by Sager and Hamer (1995) where their definition of explicitation has been rendered into "a stylistic translation technique which consists of making explicit in the target language what remains implicit in the source language because it is apparent from either the context or situation" (1995, 342). Subsequently the term was used by Nida (1964), but he referred to it by using the term addition rather than explicitation. It might be worth mentioning that the term addition is sometimes confused with explicitation, but Heltai (2005) resolves this ambiguity by differentiating between them by arguing that addition means adding extra words in the translation and it does not necessarily produce a more easily comprehended translated text. It might happen that explicitation does not require addition, but it makes the translated text easier to process. Addition, in contrast, makes the translated text longer but it does not always result in easier processing.

Explicitation has been developed further by Blum-Kulka's pioneering work (1986) in which the explicitation hypothesis was proposed. It postulates that it is "an observed cohesive explicitness from SL to TL texts regardless of the increase traceable to differences between the two linguistic and textual systems involved" (*ibid.* 19). It could be argued that her taxonomy of explicitation is only related to cohesive explicitness that has to do with *optional explicitation*. In other words, it is related to optional shifts in translation that are concerned with stylistic preferences among languages. We can argue that Blum Kulka's study is the first organised systematic study on explicitation in which the effects of cohesive shifts are examined as text feature named cohesion. In her study, she traced the impact of examples at the text level. The outcome of the investigation was *the explicitation hypothesis*. The main contribution of the study is that the process of translation results in a redundant text and the outcome of using such a translational method is a redundant text (cohesive explicitness) in the translated text. On the contrary, (Klaudy 1996, 99) identifies explicitation as a broad term that goes beyond cohesive explicitness and involves more than one type defined as *obligatory, optional, pragmatic* and *translation-proper explicitations*.

Explicitation shifts have been dramatically changed after Blum-Kulka's explicitation hypothesis at the end of the 1980s. From that study, a large number of further studies were produced and explicitation came to be considered as a translation universal by many scholars. For further clarification, different studies have showed that explicitation is universal and inherent in the process of translation. These include those of Blum-Kulka (*ibid.*), Baker (1993 and 1996), Olohan and Baker (2000), Klaudy (2001), Pym (2005), Papai (2004), Heltai (*ibid.*), Kamenická (2007), and Laviosa (2009) among others. In contrast, other scholars such as House (2004), Puurtinen (2004), Dósa (2009), Al-Shunnaq (2014) reject its validity, while some scholars like Séguinot (1988) and Pym (*ibid.*) argued that the explicitation hypothesis is valid but explicitation is not only restricted to redundancy.

Klaudy centred her 1996 study on the typology of explicitation. For her *optional* and *obligatory* explicitation are used by translators for the sake of simplification. In contrast, Englund Dimitrova (2005) differentiates between two types of explicitation. The first one is named norm-based, and the second one named strategic transfer operations. Later, an attempt was made by Klaudy (2001) to develop *the explicitation hypothesis* in a more systematic way, resulting in her proposal of *the asymmetry hypothesis* in which she examined explicitation and implicitation operations and claimed that translators, if they have

the choice between explicitation and implication would opt for explicitation and this would in turn result in an explicit text. The outcome of her examination was *the asymmetry hypothesis* which says "explicitations in the L1→L2 direction are not counterbalanced by implication in the L2→L1 direction because translators, if they have a choice- prefer to use operations involving explicitation, and often fail to perform optional implication". (Klaudy 2001, 14)

After having introduced, discussed, and examined the concept of explicitation, we will discuss the concept of implication. It is worth to pointing out in this respect that studies on explicitation in translation literature are more numerous than those on implication. This might be because explicitation as a translation strategy is used more frequently than implication, and generally speaking, translators tend to explicitate more than to implicate.

In fact, different scholars such as Séguinot (1985) and Dósa (2009) view implication differently. To illustrate this further, Séguinot considers that some implications are a consequence of the use of language, while others are raised by conversation. For her, implication can be analysed at four levels: source, nature, intent and effect. She also differentiated between two types of implication: collocational and textual implications. In contrast, for Dósa, implication often comes from generalisations. For her, it gives a profound insight into the grammatical differences among languages.

The concept of implication as the concept of explicitation was firstly introduced by Vinay and Darbelnet (1958) and developed by other scholars such as Nida (*ibid.*), Séguinot (1985), Klaudy and Károly (2005), and Dósa (2009). Vinay and Darbelnet define it as "[a] stylistic translation technique which consists of making what is explicit in the source language implicit in target language, relying on the context or the situation for conveying the meaning" (1995, 342).

In contrast, Nida (*ibid.*) considers implication as one of the techniques of adjustments used in translation named *subtractions*. He states "subtractions are neither so numerous nor varied as additions, they are nevertheless highly important in the process of adjustment" (*ibid.*, 231), while Séguinot (1985) considers implication as a synonym for inference. According to her, "the term *inference* is used to refer to meanings that go beyond information that is specifically stated in the text." Laer Klaudy and Károly define implication as the case "when a SL unit with a specific meaning is replaced by a target language unit with a more general meaning; when translators combine the meanings of several SL words in one target language word; when meaningful lexical elements of the SL text are dropped in the TL text; when two or more sentences in the ST are conjoined into one sentence in the TT; or when ST clauses are reduced to phrases in the TT, etc" (2005, 15)

Based on the narrow range of literature on implication, the following kinds of implication are found: *subtractions* (Nida, 1964), and *syntactic implication* (Dósa, 2009) in addition to the proposal of two types of implication that are *semantic and pragmatic implications* based on Klaudy's typology of explicitation (1996).

### 3. Methodology

The aim of this part of research is to display an overview of the corpus, the corpus selection criteria in addition to the methodological approach that will be used in the current study. In order to attain this, an

overview of the corpus, the corpus selection criteria and the methodological framework utilised are discussed and explained.

### 3.1. *The Corpus*

The parallel corpus of the study (the first chapter of the novel *Aleph* by Paulo Coelho alongside with its translation into Arabic) is a literary text type that exhibits some problematic features from a translational point of view in respect to the differences between the source language and the target language), and how such mismatches might force the translator to explicitate and/or to implicitate. It is worth mentioning that *Aleph* was written in Paulo Coelho's native language: Portuguese. He is the author of many best-selling novels and his books have been translated into many languages. The translated Arabic version has been translated from its English translation and not from its original Portuguese, signifying that it has been translated through an intermediate language<sup>1</sup> not as normal translation in which the translation is made directly from the original text<sup>2</sup>.

The selection of any corpus demands corpus selection criteria to justify its choice. One of the main criteria behind choosing the novel *Aleph* is that it represents a contemporary work of fiction, and it could be argued that translation studies would benefit more from contemporary works than from older ones and they are more representative of the current demand on translators. Another criterion is that *Aleph* is one of the best-selling novels which means that there is a demand for this by readers of all cultures. The last criterion behind choosing this corpus is that its genre can be seen a good vehicle for the current study since it is not easy to translate literary texts and total equivalence cannot always be established. For further illustration, in order for the translator to figure out the meaning of the original text, he needs to employ many translation strategies in contrast to other text-types, since the meaning is not only the denotative meaning but also the connotative meaning (other shades of meaning other than the dictionary meaning), and this is why translators might implicitate and/or explicitate in order to avoid what can be considered as incongruence and inequivalence in the translation product.

After having introduced the corpus of the study, an overview of the corpus, and the corpus selection criteria, the time is ripe now to introduce the methodological approach that will be used in order to investigate the identified examples of explicitation and implicitation

### 3.2. *Research Methodology*

The aim of this section is to introduce the methodological approach used to investigate the explicitation and implicitation shifts detected in the translation of the first chapter of the novel *Aleph*, and to illustrate the analytical procedures used to discuss and explain the detected shifts. In order to attain this, the analytical procedures are discussed drawing on the theoretical framework.

A number of analytical procedures will be used to establish a sound basis for the analysis, to propose the main reasons behind using the techniques of explicitation and implicitation, and to show how differences between the language of the translation and the language of the non-translation oblige translators to explicitate and/or to implicitate. In other words, the method of this study is mainly designed to detect some of the explicitation and implicitation shifts in the translation of the first chapter of the

novel *Aleph*. In order to attain this, the identified examples of explicitation are classified and categorized according to Klaudy's typology of explicitation (Klaudy's model of explicitation, 1996) and the detected examples of implication are classified and categorized drawing on Nida (1964), Dosa (2007) and Klaudy's model of explicitation (1996). In order to attain this, the translation of the first chapter of the novel *Aleph* into Arabic will be studied in order to identify examples of explicitation and implication shifts, and the original examples will be compared and contrasted with their translations with special reference to the reason and motivations behind using these strategies. The aim of such analytical procedure is to explain the translational shift, to discuss the main reasons and motivations behind using the strategies of explicitation and implication, and finally to categorize the type of explicitation and implication shift according to the methodological framework of this study.

After having discussed the corpus of this study by giving an overview of the corpus and mentioning the corpus selection criteria in addition to the analytical procedures used to fulfil the aims and objectives of the present study, we now arrive at the discussion of the explicitation and implication shifts discovered in the translation of the first chapter of the novel *Aleph* with reference to the main reasons and motivations behind using these two strategies, and how they can be used to naturalize the target text in order to look like a non-translated text.

#### 4. Data Analysis

##### Example One:

**OT:** Oh no, not another ritual! Not another invocation intended to make the invisible forces manifest in the visible world!

**TT:** بالله لا، طقس آخر؟! استحضر آخر لجعل القوى اللامرئية تتجلى في العالم المرئي؟!

One of the translational strategies that has been used in rendering the above instance is the strategy of explicitation in which the translator translates "Oh no" into "بالله" as a kind of explicitation. This kind of can be seen as a *pragmatic explicitation*. Such a strategy is carried out as a sort of cultural approximation. This is because the majority of Arab readers are Muslims. When Muslims are in trouble, they ask Allah for help by using expressions like *يا ربّي يا الله* and similar phrases. It could be argued that such translational strategies can be seen as an attempt at adaptation on the part of the translator for the sake of explicitation, and naturalization.

##### Example Two:

**OT:** In fact, I seem to be further from achieving that than ever. I'm not at peace; now and then I go through periods of inner conflict that can persist for months; and the times when I immerse myself in some magical reality last only seconds, just long enough to know that another world exists and long enough to leave me frustrated because I can't absorb everything I learn.

**TT:** في الواقع، أبدو وكأنني أبعد من تحقيق ذلك أكثر من أي وقت مضى. لست في سلام؛ أحياناً، أدخل فتراتٍ من الصراع الداخلي يدوم أشهراً؛ وعندما استغرق في واقع سحري، يدوم ذلك للحظات، وإلى حدٍ يكفي لأعرف أنّ عالماً آخر يكون، إلى حدٍ يكفي الأصاب بالإحباط فأنا أعجز من أن أستوعب كل ما أتعلّم.

The strategy of impication is used in the translation of “*I’m not at peace.*” into “*أنا لست في سلام*”. This kind of impication can be seen as *syntactic impication*. The translator could simply say “*أنا لست في سلام*”, but she did not translate it in this way because in Arabic, we have what is called the implied pronoun “*ضمير مستتر*” that refers to the speaker. In other words, the translator employed this aspect and phenomenon in Arabic in her translation to produce a rhetorical translation which can be seen as a sort of adaptation, and as a tool to naturalize the translated text.

**Example Three:**

**OT:** J. says a Sufi prayer.

**TT:** يتلو ج. صلاة صوفية.

The strategy of explicitation is used in the translation of “*say*” into “*يتلو*” in the aforementioned example. This sort of explicitation can be seen as *pragmatic explicitation*. In fact, the literal translation of the word *say* (يقول) is not interchangeable with صلاة صوفية. For further illustration, يتلو and يقول in Arabic and in all contexts do not share the exact same meaning and they are not interchangeable in all contexts. However, the meaning of يتلو in the context of the translation is reading the Holy Quran and praying. In contrast, somebody can say anything which shows that the meaning of say is more general than the meaning of يتلو. It could be argued that the translator opts for “*يتلو*” not “*يقول*” because the word “*يتلو*” not “*يقول*” is the one that collocates with “*صلاة صوفية*”, and it is also used for the sake of naturalness.

**Example Four:**

**OT:** ‘O God, when I listen to the voices of animals, the sounds of trees, the murmurings of water, the singing of birds, the whistling of the wind or the boom of thunder, I see in them evidence of Your unity; I feel that You are supreme power, omniscience, supreme knowledge and supreme justice.

**TT:** "الله، عندما أصغي إلى أصوات الحيوانات، وحفيف الشجر، وتمتمات المياه، وإنشاد العصافير، وصفير الرياح أو هدير الرعد، أرى فيها دليلاً على وحدانيتك؛ أشعر أنك القوة العُلَيَا، كَلِيَّة المعرفة، المعرفة النهائية، العدالة القصوى.

In the aforementioned example, we can easily recognise that “*O God*” is translated into “*الله*” as a sort of explicitation. This kind of explicitation can be seen as *pragmatic explicitation*. The translator can simply translate it into الرب, but he has not chosen this option. This is because in Christianity, Christians worship God, whereas in Islam, Muslims worship Allah. In addition to that the reference is not the same. To illustrate this further, the concept of God in Christianity is three in one or a Trinity (God the Father, Jesus Christ the Son, and the Holy Spirit). In contrast, Allah in Islam and in the Quran is just One (there is no God but Allah and Mohammad is the messenger of Allah). It could be safely argued that this strategy is mainly applied to naturalize the translated text, and as a sort of cultural approximation. We can argue that the translator resorted to this strategy, because she is Muslim, and most of the readers who buy and read the translated novel are Muslims as well.

**Example Five:**

**OT:** 'I recognise You, O God, in the trials I am going through. May your pleasure be my pleasure too. May I be Your joy, the joy that a Father feels for a son. And may I think of You calmly and with determination, even when I find it hard to say I love You.'

**TT:** "أدركك، يا الله، في المِحَن التي أمرَ بها. ليكنِ سروركَ سروري. لأن فرحك، فرح أب تجاه ابن. لأفكر فيك بهدوءٍ وعزم، حتى متى صعبَ عليّ قول أحبك."

In the above example, "*I love you*" is translated into "*أحبك*". In the original text the subject is explicit and the object is as well. In the translation both the subject and the object are made implicit. In other words, they are implied but recoverable from the context. Such kind of implication can be seen as *syntactic implication*. In this case, it might be worth mentioning that this sort of implication is utilized because of the syntactic difference between English and Arabic in the sentence structure as a sort of naturalization which is mainly used to bridge the grammatical gap between English and Arabic.

**Example Six:**

**OT:** Usually, at this point, I would feel - for only a fraction of second, but that's always enough- the One Presence that moves the Sun and the Earth and ensures that the stars remain in their places. But I don't feel like talking to the Universe today, I just want the man at my side to give me the answers I need.

**TT:** في العادة، عند هذه المرحلة، قد أشعر - لجزءٍ من الثانية فقط، وحسبي هذا- بالحضور الأوحد الذي يحرك الشمس النجوم أمكنتها. لكني لا أرغب في التحدث إلى الكون اليوم. أريد فقط أن أحصل على الإجابات والأرض، ويحرص أن تلازم التي أبغيها من الرجل الذي إلى جانبي.

The translation of "*point*" into "*مرحلة*" can be seen as an attempt of explicitation, because the literal meaning (dictionary meaning) of "*point*" does not provide the right meaning. This is why the translator translated it in the way he has chosen. In the OT context, the word *point* means *مرحلة*. It could be argued that the translator explicates what the word *point* means because the literal translation will not provide the right meaning. Such an attempt at explicitation can be seen as a *translation-proper explicitation*. The translator provided a kind of explicitation in order to produce correct translation. In this way, he manages to provide *idiomatic translation*.

Another attempt at explicitation in the above instance is the translation of "*but that's always an enough*" into "*وحسبي هذا*" which can be seen as a sort of *translation-proper explicitation*. The translator resorts to the strategy of explicitation for the sake of naturalness which is to some extent at the expense of meaning.

The translation of "*One presence*" into "*الحضور الأوحد*" can be seen as an attempt of explicitation. The translator explicates what "*One presence*" meant in his translation because the literal translation would not provide the right meaning, and in this case the translator translates "*One presence*" into what it refers to (its referent). Such sort of explicitation can be seen as *pragmatic explicitation*. It could be argued that in this instance the literal meaning will not provide the idiomatic translation, and this is why the

strategy of explicitation is employed by the translator to retain the meaning and to produce faithful translation.

The translator also explicated the meaning of “*I don't feel like*” into “*وأني لا أرغب*”. The translator explicated the meaning of “*I don't feel like*” in her translation, because the literal rendition will not provide the exact meaning. This sort of explicitation can be classified under the type named *translation-proper explicitation*. It might be worth mentioning that in English the words sometimes acquire their meaning from the context not as defined in the dictionary, and this is the main reason why the dictionary meaning does not always provide the correct meaning. We could argue that this strategy is used to retain the meaning of the original text.

**Example Seven:**

**OT:** He removes his hands from the tree trunk, and I do the same. He smiles at me, and I return his smile. We make our way, in silence, unhurriedly, back to my house, where we sit on the verandah and drink coffee, still without talking.

**TT:** يرفع يده عن جذع الشجرة، وأرفعها أيضاً. يبتسم لي، وأردّ الابتسامة. نشقّ طريقنا، بصمتٍ، بلا استعجال، عاندين إلى منزلي حيث نجلس على الشرفة ونحتسي القهوة، ولا يزال الصمتُ مخيماً.

In the above example the translation of “*I do the same*” into “*وأردّ الابتسامة*” can be seen as an attempt of *translation-proper explicitation*. It could be argued that in this translation the translator explicated what *I do the same* means as a sort of explicitation which has to do with the nature of the process of translation as there is a general tendency to explicitate rather than to implicate in translation. Such an attempt is carried out by the translator to naturalise the text as a way to produce clear and accurate translation.

The strategy of implicitation is used in the translation of “*He smiles to me, and I return his smile*” into “*يبتسم لي وأردّ الابتسامة*”. To illustrate this further, in “*يبتسم لي*”, the subject is not stated directly (explicitly), but is implied (i.e., it refers to him), whereas in “*وأردّ الابتسامة*” the subject is implied as well but refers to the speaker. Such kind of implicitation can be seen as *syntactic implicitation*. This sort of implicitation is resorted to by translators to produce grammatical translation which is one of the requirements of *idiomatic translation*.

The translation of “*still without talking*” into “*ولا يزال الصمتُ مخيماً*” can be seen as a sort of explicitation. It can be classified as *translation-proper explicitation*. We can argue that the translator explicated what is meant by still without talking in a more figurative way in its translation into “*ولا يزال*” than it was in the origin. It could be argued that this strategy is opted for the sake of naturalness because if translated literally it will not provide the figurative meaning that was intended in the original text as “*ولا يزال الصمتُ مخيماً*” did. We can argue that the strategy of explicitation is carried out for the sake of producing a translation that is *idiomatic*.

**Example Eight:**

**OT:** 'I can't evolve any further,' I say, falling, as always, into the trap of being the first to speak. "I think I've reached my limit.'

'That's funny. I've been trying my life to find out what my limits are and have never reached them yet. But then, my universe doesn't really help, it keeps expanding and won't allow me to know it entirely.'

Says J. provocatively.

He's being ironic, but I keep talking.

**TT:** أقول وأقنعاً كالعادة في شرك استهلال الحديث: "لا يسعني النماء أكثر. أظن أنني بلغت حدودي."

يقول ج. استفزازاً: "مُضِحِك. حاولتُ طول حياتي أن أكتشف حدودي ولم يسعني بلوغها بعد. لكن كوني لا يُعيني تماماً،

يواصل توسّعه ولن يتيح لي معرفته كلياً.

إنه يتهمكم، لكني أوصل الكلام.

The strategy of implication is used in the translation of "I think I've reached my limit." into "أظن أنني" particularly when it comes to the rendition of "limit" into "حدودي" instead of حد. It could be easily argued that the singular form of the word limit was explicit in the original text, whereas it becomes implicit in the translation. This sort of *syntactic implication* is resorted to because in English they say *I've reached my limit* to mean that *I've reached my breaking point* whereas in Arabic they say *I've reached my limits* to mean the same thing. Such a difference forces the translator to implicate the singular form of the word limit by replacing it with the plural form of the word (limits). The aim of using this strategy is to naturalise the text, and to produce *idiomatic translation*.

Another attempt at implication was made in the translation of "say J. provocatively" into "يقول ج." "استفزازاً". This kind of implication can be seen as *semantic implication*. To illustrate this further, the word provocatively was implicitly translated into أستفزازاً instead of بشكل مستفز because أستفزازاً means بشكل مستفز. Such a phenomenon has to do with the eloquence of the Arabic language that cannot be found in any other language, and such a strategy is used to fulfil *idiomatic translation*.

In contrast, the strategy of explicitation is used in the translation of "I have never reached them yet into "لم يسعني بلوغها بعد". It can be argued that the translator can translate it without any sort of explicitation (i.e., to translate it literally). However, the strategy of explicitation is used in spite of the fact that the translator can translate it literally as لم يصل اليها بعد. This might be because the translator felt that the semantic translation (لم يسعني بلوغها بعد) produces a figurative style. This is because in Arabic بلوغ الشيء means reaching it. We have a lexical gap since in English reaching something means بلوغ الشيء or الوصول اليه, and the two translations produce the same meaning. This kind of explicitation can be seen as *translation-proper explicitation*. It could be argued that this strategy is adopted to produce *functional translation* which is an indicator of *idiomatic translation*.

The strategy of implicitation is used in the translation of "he is being ironic" into "إنه يتهم". Such sort of implicitation can be seen as *syntactic implicitation*. This strategy has been resorted to because Arabic doesn't have the present progressive tense, unlike English. As a result, the present progressive tense is implicit in the translation and is rendered into a different tense, whereas it is explicit in the original text. Such a shift results in a different meaning. This is because the absence of the present progressive tense in Arabic results in a grammatical gap. The translator tries to bridge this gap through translating the present progressive in simple present, with the resulting loss of meaning. To illustrate this further, *being ironic* in the original text means he is not always ironic, but for the time being he is, while in the translation he is ironic all the time. This can be seen as a serious meaning shift in the translated version.

**Example Nine:**

**OT:** 'Why did you come here today? To try and convince me that I'm wrong, as usual? You can say what you like, but words won't change anything. I'm not happy.'

**TT:** "لماذا جئت إلى هنا اليوم؟ لتحاول إقناعي كالعادة بانني على خطأ؟ لك أن تقول ما تشاء، لكن الكلمات لن تغير شيئاً. لست سعيداً."

The translation of "I'm not happy" into "لست سعيداً" can be seen as an attempt of implicitation. This kind of implicitation can be seen as *syntactic implicitation*. The translator resorted to this strategy, because, sometimes, in Arabic, the subject is not mentioned explicitly but is implied. This phenomenon exists in Arabic (the language of rhetoric). We can argue that if the translator translates the aforementioned sentence into "أنا لست سعيداً", it causes unnecessary repetition which is not grammatical and rhetorical in Arabic. The aim of using this strategy is to naturalize the text, and to achieve grammatical translation.

**Example Ten:**

**OT:** My questions go deeper than that; they are doubts about my faith. I have only one certainty: there exists a parallel spiritual universe that impinges on the world in which we live. Apart from that, everything else seems absurd to me - sacred books, revelations, guides, manuals, ceremonies... And, what is worse, they appear to have no lasting effects.

**TT:** أسألتي أعمق من ذلك، هي شكوك بإيماني. يقيني واحد فقط: ثمة كونٌ روحاني مواز يرتطم بالعالم الذي نحياه. عدا منطق- الكتب المقدسه، التجليات، المرشدون، الكتيبات، الطقوس... والأسوأ، أن تأثيراتها هذا، كل امر آخر يبدو لي بلا تبدو إلى زوال.

One can easily argue that the translation of "they appear to have no lasting effects" into "أن تأثيراتها" can be seen as an attempt of explicitation. This sort of explicitation can be classified as *translation-proper explicitation*. The translator resorted to this strategy simply because the literal rendition will not provide the right meaning and as a consequence will not produce an idiomatic translation. This is why what might be figurative in one language might not be figurative in the other, and

also the literal rendition does not produce a correct translation in every case. This is because of the differences that exist among languages, particularly those remote from each other such as is the case in this study of English rendered into Arabic. This strategy might be utilized to attain natural translation.

**Example Eleven:**

**OT:** 'I made mistakes then that I can't put right now. And you told me never to go back again, because it would only increase my sense of guilt. Travelling to past lives is like making a hole in the floor and letting the flames of the fire in the apartment below scorch and burn the present.'

**TT:** "أرتكبتُ أخطاء حينها لا يسعني تصويبها الآن. وقلتُ لي ألا أعود مجدداً، لأنّ ذلك سيزيد من إحساسي بالذنب. الارتحال الى حيواتٍ ماضيةٍ أشبه بحفر حفرة في الأرضيه وترك ألسنة النار في الشقّة أدناه تحرق الحاضر وتُشعله."

The translation of "I made mistakes" into "أرتكبتُ أخطاء" can be seen as an attempt of explicitation. This mode of explicitation can be seen as *translation-proper explicitation*. To illustrate this further, the translator doesn't opt for literal translation because in doing so, natural translation will not be the outcome of the process of translation. The main reason behind that is that the word "make" collocates with "mistakes". However, its literal rendition into "يعمل" or "يقوم" does not collocate with "أخطاء" in Arabic, and this is why the translator explicated its meaning into "أرتكبتُ" because the latter is the one that collocates with "أخطاء" in Arabic. This strategy is employed in the translation mainly to naturalize the text and to achieve *idiomatic translation*.

**Example Twelve:**

**OT:** J. throws what remains of his pear to the birds in the garden and looks at me with some irritation.

**TT:** يرمي ج. ما تبقى من الإجاصه إلى العصافير في الحديقته ويرمقني بنظرة غضبي.

The translation of "with some irritation" into "غضبي" can be seen as an attempt of implication. This kind of implication can be classified as *subtraction* because the word some has not been translated and consequently the translation produced does not retain the proper meaning. To illustrate this further, the meaning in the OT is that J. looked at the author with some anger, whereas in the translation it is that he (J) looked at him angrily. This might be due to the fact that there is no word in Arabic that has the meaning of some irritation. However, the translator could manage and say بنظرة فيها بعض الغضب (my own translation). One can easily argue that this translation is natural, but it is to some extent at the expense of meaning. In this case, we can point out that naturalness is at the expense of faithfulness.

**5. Findings**

After having analyzed a number of explicitation and implication shifts detected in the translation of the first chapter of the novel, *Aleph*, the analysis yields the following results:

The most frequent pattern of explicitation that was identified in the translation of the first chapter of *Aleph* is *translation-proper explicitation* (8 examples out of 11) followed by *pragmatic explicitation* (3 examples out of 11). Examples of optional and obligatory explicitations were not detected.

In contrast, the most frequent pattern of implicitation that was identified in the translation of the first chapter of *Aleph* is *syntactic implicitation* (6 examples out of 8) followed by *subtraction* (1 example out of eight) and *semantic implicitation* (1 example out of 8). *Pragmatic implicitation* was not detected.

The two tables below summarize the explicitation and implicitation shifts detected in the translation of the first chapter of the novel *Aleph*.

**Table 1:** Examples of Explicitation Shifts

Explicitation type	No. of examples
Obligatory explicitation	None
Optional explicitation	None
Pragmatic explicitation	<b>3</b>
Translation-proper explicitation	<b>8</b>

**Table 2:** Examples of Implicitation Shifts

Implicitation type	No. of examples
Subtraction	1
Syntactic implicitation	6
Semantic implicitation	1
Pragmatic implicitation	None

## 6. Conclusions

After having examined a number of explicitation and implicitation shifts in the translation of the novel *Aleph*, the following conclusions that have to do with the use of explicitation and implicitation in the translation of the first chapter of the novel *Aleph* are drawn. The aim of providing the research conclusions is to ensure that its questions are answered and its hypotheses are supported. The following points cover the main conclusions of the study.

1. It could be safely argued that linguistic and cultural differences between the source language and the target language are the main reasons behind explicating and implicating in translation practice. We can point out that in this respect the sort of difference determines which strategy to use: explicitation or implicitation. In this case, they are used to produce an idiomatic translation (see examples 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12).
2. In some cases, the translators might explicitate and/or implicite in order to naturalize the text and to produce optimal translation (see examples 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 12). We can argue that they can be used to improve the quality of translation in such cases.
3. In the translation of the translation of the novel *Aleph*, explicitation is more frequently used than implicitation. This might be because, in translation practice, there is a general tendency to explicitate rather than to implicite. To justify this, 11 examples of explicitation shifts were discovered, while 8 examples of implicitation were revealed.
4. Explicitation and implicitation might be employed by translators to improve the quality of translation and to bridge the linguistic and cultural gaps between the language of translation and the language of non-translation (see examples 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12).
5. Explicitation and implicitation might be at the expense of meaning in some few cases (see examples 6, and 8).

6. We can argue that translators leave their traces on the translated product when using the strategies of explicitation and implication which would in turn show the translator's proficiency in translation. (See the discussed examples: 1-12)

**Notes:**

- 1) It could be argued that the translation has been translated through an intermediate language even if the original text is available because we do not have translators in the Arab world who master both Portuguese and Arabic, but we have those who master Arabic and English. Thus the translation agency opts for translating the translated version. It might be worth mentioning that much of the world literature has been translated through intermediate languages such as French and English.

For more information on intermediate translation, refer to Al-Shunnaq (2006).

**استراتيجيات التصريح والتضمين المستخدمة في ترجمة رواية (ألف)**

**أمل الشناق**

قسم اللغة الإنجليزية / الترجمة، جامعة البتراء، الأردن

**الملخص**

يهدف هذا البحث إلى إثراء الدراسات بالتصريح والتضمين، في تخصص دراسات الترجمة. ويذهب البحث إلى مناقشة مضامين استخدام التصريح والتضمين في ترجمة رواية (ألف) للروائي باولو كويلو، وأسباب استخدامها، مع الإشارة - بشكل خاص - إلى الفوارق اللغوية والثقافية ما بين اللغتين. إذ إن مثل هذه الفوارق، تدفع بالمترجم إلى استخدام هاتين الاستراتيجيتين. وتنبع أهمية الدراسة، من ندرة الدراسات بخصوص هذا الموضوع. وتتبع هذه الدراسة التصريح والتضمين في ترجمة الفصل الأول من الرواية، إذ إن الفروق بين اللغتين هي التي تحدد الاستراتيجية التي بُنيت عليها الترجمة. كما أنه يمكن استخدام التضمين والتصريح لتطبيع النص، وتحسين نوعية الترجمة لإنتاج ترجمة اصطلاحية، مما يعين المترجم على اتخاذ القرار الخاص بتحديد أي استراتيجية تستخدم؟

**الكلمات المفتاحية:** التصريح، والتضمين، وتحولات الترجمة، واستراتيجيات الترجمة.

## References

- Al-Shunnaq, A. 2006. Aspects of Translating from Intermediate Languages. MA. Thesis, Yarmouk University, Jordan
- Al-Shunnaq, A. 2014. Meaning and Back Translation. PhD diss., University of Salford.
- Baker, Mona. 1993. Corpus Linguistics and Translation Studies. Implication and Explicitation. In *Text and Technology. In Honour of John Sinclair*, eds. Mona Baker, Gill Francis, Elena Tognini-Bonelli, 233-250. Philadelphia\Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Baker, Mona. 1995. Corpora in translation studies: An overview and some suggestions for future research. *Target* 7(2): 223-43.
- Baker, Mona. 1996. Corpus-Based Translation Studies: The challenges that lie ahead. In *Terminology, LSP and Translation Studies in language engineering in honour of Juan C. Sager*, ed. Harold Somers, 175-186. Amsterdam\ Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Becher, Viktor. 2010a. Abandoning the Notion of "Translation-Inherent" Explicitation against a Dogma of Translation Studies. *Across Languages and Cultures* 11(1): 1-28.
- Becher, Viktor. 2010b. Towards a More Rigorous Treatment of the Explicitation Hypothesis in Translation Studies. *trans-kom* 3(1): 1-25. <https://d-nb.info/1003050980/34> (accessed August 8, 2023)
- Bell, Roger Thomas. 1998. "Psychological\cognitive approaches". In *Routledge encyclopaedia of translation studies*, ed. Mona Baker, London and New York: Routledge.
- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana. 1986. Shifts of Cohesion and Coherence in Translation. In *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication. Discourse and Cognition in Translation and Second Language Acquisition*, eds. Juliane House and Shoshana Blum-Kulka, 17-35. Tübingen: Günter Narr.
- Coelho, Paulo. 2011. *Aleph*. India: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Coelho, Paulo. 2014. *Aleph*, translated by Rana Al-Saifi. Beirut: Printing Company for Distribution and Publication.
- Dósa, Ilidikó. 2009. About Explicitation and Implication in Translation of Accounting Texts. In *SKASE Journal of Translation and Interpreting [online]* 2009 4(1): 25-32. [http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTI04/pdf\\_doc/02.pdf](http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTI04/pdf_doc/02.pdf) (accessed August 8, 2024)
- De Metsenaere, Hinde. and Vandepitte, Sonia. 2017. Towards a Theoretical Foundation for Explicitation and Implication. *trans-kom* 10 (3): 385-419. [https://www.trans-kom.eu/bd10nr03/trans\\_kom\\_10\\_03\\_07\\_De\\_Metsenaere\\_Vandepitte\\_Explicitation.20171221.pdf](https://www.trans-kom.eu/bd10nr03/trans_kom_10_03_07_De_Metsenaere_Vandepitte_Explicitation.20171221.pdf) (accessed August 8, 2024)
- Englund Dimitrova, Birgitta. 2005. *Expertise and Explicitation in the Translation Process*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamin's Publishing.
- Farghal, Mohammed, and Abdullah Shunnaq. 2011. *Translation with Reference to English and Arabic: A Practical Guide*. Irbid: Dar Al-Hilal for Translation.
- Farghal, Mohammad, and Abdullah Samateh. 2016. Explicitation vs. Implication: Discourse Markers in English into Arabic Translation. *Al-Balqa Journal for Research and Studies البلقاء للبحوث والدراسات* 19 (2): Article 5. <https://digitalcommons.aaru.edu.jo/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1097&context=albalqa>

## Explicitation and Implication Strategies Used in the Translation of *Aleph*

(accessed August 8, 2024)

- Ghazala, Hasan. 2008. *Translation as Problems and Solutions: A Textbook for University Students and Trainee Translators*. Beirut: DAR EL-ILM LILMALAYIN.
- Hatim, Basil, and Ian Mason. 1990. *Discourse and the translator*. London and New York: Longman.
- Hatim, Basi, and Jeremy Munday. 2004. *Translation: An Advanced source book*. London: Routledge.
- Heltai, Pál. 2005. "Explicitation, Redundancy, Ellipsis and Translation". In *New Trends in Translation Studies. In Honour of Kinga Klaudy*, eds. Kristina Károly and Ágota Fóris, 45-74. Akadémiai Kiadó: Budapest.
- House, Juliane. 2004. Explicitness in discourse across languages. In *New Perspektiven in der Übersetzungs- und Dolmetschwissenschaft 185-208*, eds. Juliane House, Werner Koller and Klaus Schubert. Bochum: AKS.
- Kamenická, Renata. 2007. Defining explicitation in Translation. *Brono studies in English* 33 (1): 45-57 [https://digilib.phil.muni.cz/\\_flysystem/fedora/pdf/104439.pdf](https://digilib.phil.muni.cz/_flysystem/fedora/pdf/104439.pdf) (accessed August 8, 2024)
- Klaudy, Kinga. 1996. Back Translation as a Tool for Detecting Explicitation Strategies in Translation. In *Translation Studies in Hungary*, eds. Kinga Klaudy, José Lambert and Anikó Sohár. Budapest: Scholastica.
- Klaudy, Kinga. 1998. "Explicitation". In *Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies*, ed. Mona Baker, 80-85. London: Routledge.
- Klaudy, Kinga. 2001. The Asymmetry Hypothesis. Testing the Asymmetric Relationship between Explicitations and Implications. Paper presented at the Third International Congress of the European Society for Translation Studies, Claims, Changes and Challenges in Translation Studies, 30 August – 1 September 2001, Copenhagen.
- Klaudy, Kinga. 2003. *Languages in translation. Lectures on the Theory, Teaching and Practice of Translation with Illustrations in English, French, German, Russian and Hungarian*. Budapest. Scholastica.
- Klaudy, Kinga, and Krisztina Károly. 2005. Implication in Translation: Empirical Evidence for Operational Asymmetry in Translation. *Across Languages and Cultures* 6(1): 13-28.
- Kotait, Radwa Mohammad Mohammad. 2024. Explicitation & implication revisited: Towards a more defined cognitive relevance-theoretic model. *Across Languages and Cultures* 25(1): 130-148.
- Larson, Mildred. L. 1984 *Meaning-Based Translation: A Guide to Cross-Language Equivalence*. University Press of America, Lanham, MD.
- Laviosa, Sara. 2004. Corpus-based translation studies: Where does it come from? Where is it going? *Language Matters* 35 (1), 6-27.
- Mansor, Idris. 2021. Explicitation in the Intercultural Communication of technical Culture in Arabic-Malay Translation of Rihlat Ibn Buttuta. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*. 50 (6): 556-70. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17475759.2021.1884891> (accessed August 8, 2024)
- De Metsenaere, Hinde, and Sonia Vandepitte. 2017. Towards a Theoretical Foundation for Explicitation and Implication. *trans-kom* 10 (3): 385-419. [https://www.trans-kom.eu/bd10nr03/trans-kom\\_10\\_03\\_07\\_De\\_Metsenaere\\_Vandepitte\\_Explicitation.20171221.pdf](https://www.trans-kom.eu/bd10nr03/trans-kom_10_03_07_De_Metsenaere_Vandepitte_Explicitation.20171221.pdf) (accessed August 8,

- 2024)
- Murtisari, Elisabet. 2016. Explication in Translation Studies: The journey of an elusive concept. *The International Journal for translation and interpreting* 8 (2): 64-81.
- Nida, Eugene. 1964. *Towards a Science of Translating with Special References to Principles and Procedures involved in Bible Translation*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Nida, Eugene. A. and Taber, Charles Russell. 1982. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. E.J. Brill, Leiden.
- Olohan, Maeve, and Mona Baker. 2000. Reporting That in Translated English. Evidence for Subconscious Process of Explication? *Across Languages and Cultures* 1(2): 141-158.
- Papai, Vilma. 2004. Explication: A Universal of a Translated Text? In *Translation Universals. Do They Exist?*, eds. Anna Mauranen. & Pekka Kujamäki. Amsterdam\ Philadelphia: John Benjamin's Publishing Company, 143-164.
- Puurtinen, Tiina. 2004. Explication of Clausal Relations: A corpus-based analysis of clause connectives in translated and non-translated Finnish children's literature. In *Translation Universals. Do They Exist?* eds. Anna Mauranen, and Pekka Kujamäki. Amsterdam\ Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company, 165-176.
- Pym, Anthony. 2005. Defining Explication. In *New Trends in Translation Studies. In Honour of Kinga Klauudy*, eds. Kristina Károly, Ágota Fóris, 29-43. Akadémiai Kiadó: Budapest.
- Saldanha, Gabriela. 2008. Explication Revisited: Bringing the Reader into the Picture. In *trans-kom*, 1 (1): 20-35. <https://d-nb.info/999838504/34> (accessed August 8, 2024)
- Sattar, Ansa, and Mohammad Asim Mahmood. 2024. Explication in Others' translations: A Corpus Based Study of Pakistani Literary TEXT. *Jahan-e-Tahqeeq* 7(2): 860-874.
- Séguinot, Candace. 1985. Translating Implication. *Meta: Translators' Journal* 30(3): 295-298.
- Séguinot, Candace. 1988. Pragmatics and the Explication Hypothesis. *TTR: traduction terminologie, rédaction* 1(2): 106-113.
- Vinay, Jean-Paul, and Jean Darbelnet. 1958. *Stylique Comparée du français et de l'anglais*. Paris: Didier.
- Vinay, Jean-Paul, and Jean Darbelnet. 1995. *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A methodology for translation*, translated and edited by Juan.C. Sager & M.- J Hamel. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Zhang, Xiaomin, Haidee Kotze and Fang, Jing. 2020. Explication in children's literature translated from English to Chinese: a corpus-based study of personal pronouns. *Perspectives* 28(5): 717-736.