



Explicitation in Translating English Argumentative Texts into Arabic

T.I. Fannoush¹ S. Y. Fathi²

¹Department of Translation, College of Arts, Mosul University, Mosul, 41012, Iraq,

² Department of Translation, College of Arts, Mosul University, Mosul, 41012, Iraq.

Article information

Article history:

Received: 22 June 2025

Revised: 23 July 2025

Accepted: 3 August 2025

Keywords:

Clarity,
Cohesion,
Obligatory,
Pragmatic.

Correspondence:

Tariq I. Fannoush

tariq.fannoush@uod.ac

Abstract

This research investigates the phenomenon of explicitation in translating argumentative texts from English into Arabic, focusing on how translators employ various types of explicitation to enhance clarity and cohesion, with particular attention to how meaning is clarified, emphasized, or culturally adapted during translation. Based on **Klaudy's (1998) typology**, which distinguishes between obligatory, optional, pragmatic, and translation-inherent explicitations, and **Hatim and Mason's (1990) text-type model**, the research explores how translators intervene in resolving ambiguity in rendering political persuasive content. The data draws on one text-typological focus of argumentative text taken from Time magazine article issued in the year (2024) translated by three M.A. holders from the department of translation, college of Arts and University of Mosul. The analysis identifies and classifies representative cases of explicitation, categorizing them by type and appropriateness. The findings reveal that explicitation largely occurs to accommodate **syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic mismatches** between English and Arabic and favours the obligatory type of explicitation in argumentative text-types. In addition, translators make mindful decisions to enhance coherence, readability and persuasive forces for target audiences. It also serves not merely as a default strategy but as a deliberate tool to support the above-mentioned processes. It concludes that explicitation is a purposeful process that shapes meaning, style, and cultural accessibility in translation.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.69513/jnhf.v4.i1.a5> ©Authors, 2025, College of Education, Alnoor University.

This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

الإيضاح في ترجمة النصوص الجدلية الإنكليزية إلى العربية

طارق إبراهيم فنوش¹ سالم يحيى فتحي²

¹قسم الترجمة، كلية الآداب، جامعة الموصل، الموصل، العراق، ²قسم الترجمة، كلية الآداب، جامعة الموصل، الموصل، العراق.

المستخلص:

يستقصي هذا البحث ظاهرة الإيضاح في ترجمة النصوص الجدلية من اللغة الإنكليزية إلى اللغة العربية، مركزاً على كيفية توظيف المترجمين لأنواع متعددة من الإيضاح لتعزيز الوضوح والترابط النصي، مع اهتمام خاص بكيفية توضيح المعنى وتوكيده وتكييفه ثقافياً خلال عملية الترجمة. وبالاستناد إلى تصنيف كلاودي (1998) الذي يميز بين الإيضاح الإلزامي والاختياري والتداولي والمُتَّصِل في الترجمة، وكذلك نموذج نوع النص لحاتم ومابسون (1990)، يستكشف البحث تدخلات المترجمين في معالجة الغموض عند نقل المحتوى السياسي الإقناعي. وقد استندت بيانات البحث على نوع نصي واحد يتمثل في النص الجدلي، باستخدام مقال من مجلة *تايم* الصادرة في عام (2024)، والذي ترجمه ثلاثة من حملة شهادة الماجستير من قسم الترجمة، كلية الآداب، جامعة الموصل. حيث يقوم البحث بتحليل وتصنيف الحالات الممثلة للإيضاح وتبويبها وفقاً لنوعها ومدى ملاءمتها. وقد أظهرت النتائج أن الإيضاح يحدث بدرجة كبيرة من أجل موازنة الفوارق النحوية والدلالية والتداولية بين اللغتين، مع تفضيل النوع

الإنشائي من الإيضاح في النصوص الجدلية. كما يتخذ المترجمون قرارات مدروسة لتحسين الاتساق النصي وسهولة القراءة والقوة الإقناعية للجمهور المستهدف. ولا يُعتمد الإيضاح كاستراتيجية افتراضية فحسب، بل يُوظف كأداة واعية لدعم العمليات المذكورة آنفاً. وتُخلص الدراسة إلى أن الإيضاح هو عملية هادفة تساهم في تشكيل المعنى والأسلوب وإمكانية الوصول الثقافي في الترجمة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الوضوح، الترابط النصي، الإنشائي، التداولي.

1. Introduction

Translation is basically a decision-making and a problem-solving process wherein translators navigate linguistic, cultural and rhetorical mismatches to come up with coherent and context sensitive renderings from the (SL) to the (TL) in which the two languages may be completely different (Hatim, 2020, p.6). Translators choose different strategies to solve the problems that they encounter while translating in attempt to produce a natural text as a final product of their translation (Ali & Qassim, 2025). Among those different procedures that translators can use is explicitation. So, explicitation is considered a central problem in translation. This procedure is particularly pronounced in argumentative texts, where the effectiveness of rhetorical persuasion often hinges on coherence, emphasis, and cultural intelligibility. Translating such texts from English into Arabic poses unique challenges, as syntactic flexibility in English and high-context rhetorical norms in Arabic create a space where explicitation becomes both a linguistic necessity and a strategic choice. This phenomenon has been studied extensively in the literature and it became known in the field of translation as one of the translation universals as discussed by many scholars (Amer & Al-Badrany, 2024). The present research puts explicitation within Klaudy's (1998) typology, which categorizes it into obligatory, optional, pragmatic, and translation-inherent types, and examines its application in the translation of argumentative discourse, drawing on Hatim and Mason's (1990) text-type model. Many researchers have tackled explicitation strategies in different languages because this phenomenon can affect the acceptability, intentionality, smoothness and clarity of any translated text. Therefore, the significance of investigating the difficulties that may arise because of this phenomenon and clarifying the strategies used in dealing with such an issue have attracted the attention of linguists, translators and the researcher as well.

2. Theoretical Background

Explicitation, in its simplest form, involves addition. Klaudy (1998) discusses the results of this process in terms of gain in meaning and provides an example of how this process works in the two words (عم) and (خال) in Arabic and uncle in English. Klaudy states that while translating (خال أو عم) into English, the translator has to make a distinction by modifying the generic word uncle and adding maternal or paternal features to reflect the meaning of the Arabic term to make it explicit. The gain in this scenario is evident in the Arabic words as they are more specialized, whereas the English equivalent does not

make the same distinction as Arabic does, i.e., maternal or paternal, thus, it leads to a loss in meaning (Al Hammadi et al, 2024). Despite the differences and disagreement in terms of defining what "explicitation" is, it is obvious that all the definitions provided below agree that they are all processes that involve addition to disambiguate the context.

Explicitation was first defined by Vinay and Darbelnet in (1958) as "the process of introducing information into the target language which is present only implicitly in the source language, but which can be derived from the context or the situation". Mounin (1963) identified explicitation as part of the general "over-translating" as something that happens when translators know no better (as cited in Pym, 2005, p.22). Nida (1964, p. 228) describes "explicitation" as additions being part of the techniques of adjustments in the process of translating. Blum-Kulka (1986) formulated the controversial idea of "Explicitation Hypothesis", which "broadly" states that a translation will be more explicit than a corresponding non-translation, which may be either the source text or a parallel text in the target language. Baker (1996, p.180) defines "explicitation" as "an overall tendency to spell things out rather than leave them implicit". Shuttleworth and Cowie (1997) define "explicitation" as "the phenomenon which frequently leads to (TT) stating (ST) information in a more explicit form than the original, in the form of the addition of the explanatory phrases and connectives and the spelling out of implicatures". De Lise et al. (1999) elaborate on the notion of "explicitation" saying that it is "the introduction of precise semantic details into the target text, either for clarification or because of the constraints of the target language". Olohan (2001, p.424) views "explicitation" as referring to "the spelling out in the target text of information which only implicit in a source text". Pápai (2004) defines "explicitation" as "a technique of resolving ambiguity, improving and increasing cohesiveness of the [source text] and also of adding linguistic and extralinguistic information". Klaudy & Károly (2005, p.15) defines "explicitation" broadly as a "a strategy by which the textual units of the (ST) i.e., words, phrases, sentences including metaphors, similes, idioms or phrasal verbs, and paragraphs, are paraphrased, modified, replaced or elevated at different levels of language, including the semantic, syntactic, textual or pragmatic levels of the (TL) that can result from obligatory or optional constraints due to the differences between the (SL) and the (TL) or disambiguating lexical and syntactic ambiguities in the (TT)". Liashchenko (2008, p.1)

also defines "explicitation" as the translation process of making either implied elements or the elements intentionally hidden by the author in (SL) explicit in the (TL). Becher (2010, p.8) adopts the view which oppose giving "explicitation" a universal characteristic saying that "sometimes it occurs, sometimes it does not, and when it occurs it is more often than not "explicitation" triggered by the communicative conventions and stylistic norms of the target language community rather than being inherent", (i.e. beyond the control of the translator) in the process of translation.

In short, the researcher believes that there is a consensus among the provided definitions that "explicitation" entails a process encompassing the inclusion of elements to elucidate the context or situation, typically leading to enhancement of meaning.

3. Types of Explicitation

Generally speaking, there are several types of explicitation that translators may employ in order to ensure that the translated text accurately conveys the intended meaning of the original text. These types of explicitation can help to clarify ambiguous or unclear sections of the text, as well as to provide additional information that may be necessary for a full understanding of the content. Nida (1964) proposed two types of additions (i.e. explicitations) taking on two shapes. Obligatory additions which are caused by grammatical differences between the two languages and optional additions that are the outcome of culturally specific world knowledge in the source and target language communities and differences in communicative conventions between these two communities. Despite the fact that there is no agreed upon classification of the major types of explicitation, a general classification has been suggested by Klaudy (1998) in which she divides explicitation into four main types; obligatory that is dictated by syntactic and semantic differences, optional that is ascribed to stylistic preferences, pragmatic that is necessitated by differences between cultures and translation-inherent attributed to the nature of the translation process. In addition, Séguinot (1988, p.108) talks about three forms of explicitation in translation as follows: "something is expressed in the translation which was not in the original, something which was implied or understood through presupposition in the source text is overtly expressed in the translation, or an element in the source text is given greater importance in the translation through focus, emphasis, or lexical choice". According to House (2004) explicitation can have three forms elaboration, extension and enhancement. Moreover, Pápai (2004) identifies four levels of text explicitation: logical-visual, lexico-grammatical, syntactic, textual and extra-linguistic relations. The logical-visual relations are manifested in the addition of punctuation marks, while the lexico-grammatical level of explicitation is revealed

by the use of lexical repetitions. As for the syntactic level of explicitation, it is shown in the addition of conjunctions. Finally, textual and extra-linguistic levels of text explicitation are established by using discourse organizing items. Some other studies have focused on semantic explicitation type such as Puurtinen (2004), who zooms in connectives to identify the type of semantic relation that is conveyed. Øverås (1998, p.5) includes in her study both grammatical and lexical explicitation types, but the former has primarily been the objective of a handful of studies on translations of literary texts (e.g. Olohan and Baker, 2000)

Having reviewed the typologies of explicitation, the researcher can make two conclusions. The first of which is that explicitation can be "obligatory", necessary or positive, or "optional", redundant or negative ones. While the former is indispensable to getting to a translation that would sound natural, the second is labeled as a mistranslation. In this sense, House (2008, p.16) maintains "if evidence of a necessary intervention is absent, and the translator nevertheless intervenes and manipulates the function of the text, we are no longer dealing with a translation but a version". The second conclusion is that explicitation is not limited to the micro or macro levels of language since it operates at different linguistic levels.

4. Explicitation Strategies

Generally, translators choose different strategies to resolve the issues they encounter while translating in attempt to produce a natural text as a final product of their translation. Among those different strategies that translators can employ is explicitation which is not a universal strategy inherent in the process of language mediation, but rather one strategy among many. In this respect, some studies have explored explicitation such as Klaudy and Károly (2005) and Becher (2011), etc. These studies have shown that translators normally prefer explicitation strategies in different types of domains, such as legal, scientific and literary translations. Hence, explicitation is a technique of making explicit in the target text information what is implicit in the source text. Explicitation strategies are generally discussed together with addition (Vinay and Darbelnet, 1958). Some scholars regard "addition" the more generic and "explicitation" the more specific concept (Nida, 1964), while others interpret "explicitation" as the broader concept which incorporates the more specific concept of "addition" (Seguinot, 1988). The two are handled as synonyms by Englund Dimitrova (1993) who uses the terms "addition and explicitation". Gumul (2006), relying on the studies carried out by such scholars as Blum-Kulka (1986), Klaudy (1996), Puurtinen (2003), Pápai (2004), and others, presents a comprehensive list of explicitation strategies. The following table includes the most frequent strategy types of explicitation as collected by Gumul:

Table (1) Strategy Types of Explicitation as Collected by Gumul (2006: 174)

No.	Strategy Type
1.	Adding connectives. Adding modifiers and qualifiers. Adding a proper name to a generic name. Including additional explanatory remarks.
2.	- Categorial shifts (i.e. from vaguely cohesive to more explicitly cohesive). - Shifts from referential cohesion to lexical cohesion (i.e. lexicalization of pro-forms). - Shifts from reiteration in the form of paraphrase to reiteration in the form of identical and partial repetition. - Shifts from reiteration in the form of paraphrase to reiteration in the form of identical and partial repetition.
3.	- Filling out elliptical constructions.
4.	- Lexical specification (i.e., substituting a word with general meaning by a word with more specific meaning).
5.	- Distributing the meaning of a (ST) unit over several units in the (TT).
6.	- Replacing nominalization with verb phrases.
7.	- Disambiguating metaphors or replacing metaphors with similes.
8.	- Inserting hedges and discourse organizing items in order to structure discourse or soften statements such as perhaps, "firstly" etc.
9.	- Providing full forms for abbreviations and explanatory remarks i.e., expanding acronyms or adding brief explanations to aid comprehension.

5. Reasons for Explicitation

The occurrence of explicating shifts is uniquely determined by lexico-grammatical and pragmatic variables. The values of these variables are determined by the translation situation at hand. Lexico-grammatical variables are the lexical inventory of the target language and its syntactic properties. While, pragmatic variables are the translator's willingness to take risks, his perception of his role as a cultural mediator, the communicative norms of the source and target language register (Becher, 2011, p.219). In this respect, Saldanha (2008,p.20) raises an important inquiry saying "if we are to fully understand the phenomenon of explicitation in translation, we need to go beyond mere descriptions and dig deeper into the translator's motivations for using them" (Abdulwahab, 2012). From the point of view of the huge studies conducted on the phenomena of explicitation, it has become quite clear that translators, e.g. due to their common tendency to avoid risk, seem to follow a general rule which says: (When in doubt, be explicit!). Therefore, translators explicitate for many different reasons. They tend to explicitate:

1. If they feel that a co-reference relation implicitly given in the source text is not easily inferable in the target text.

2. If they feel that the antecedent of a co-referential expression is not easy to identify.

3. If the target language offers a lexical item that suits the context at hand but is not available in the source language.

4. If the target language offers a syntactic slot unavailable in the source language that lends itself to being filled (e.g. by a connective).

5. In order to comply with typical communicative preferences of target language readers.

6. Following a general strategy of maximizing explicitness in order to minimize the risk of misunderstanding.

In fact, the tendency of translators to explicitate is nothing mysterious; as it is not due to "subconscious processes" (Olohan and Baker, 2000) , but rather the result of a number of conscious or subconscious attempts of translators to compensate for the cultural expansion characteristic of translation as a specific communication scenario (cf. Saldanha (2008,p. 28) , who stresses the dependence of explicitation on "translators' " assumptions about their readership and about their role as literary and cultural mediators.

6. Hatim and Mason's (1990) Text – Typology

Hatim and Mason (1990, p.140) defined text-types as a conceptual framework which enables us to classify texts in terms of communicative intentions serving an overall rhetorical purpose. They account for the existence of blends of various text-types, which they refer to as "hybridization", emphasizing the need for translators to be aware of this phenomenon. Hatim and Mason (1990) present three main text-types namely expository, instructional and argumentative. In the argumentative text-type under-research, evaluativeness is the main dominator element. It is realized by cohesive devices that are mentioned by de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) such as recurrence, parallelism and paraphrasing. The main function of an argumentative text is to steer or manage the situation and guide the readers in a manner preferred by the text producer's goals. In this kind of text, the writer attempts to influence the reader's attitude and behavior since he expects that the sender will show some reactions after reading or hearing the text. Hatim and Mason identify two types of argumentative texts; through-argumentation text which is initiated by stating a point of view to be argued through; and counter-argumentation which is initiated by selecting someone else's point of view then following it with a counter- claim and a substantiation showing the reasons of the opposition, and finally presenting a conclusion.

7. Klaudy's (1998) Model

In the analysis of explicitation as a general translation procedure, the researcher adopted Klaudy's (1998) typology as a model of analysis. Here, explicitation can be classified into optional explicitation, obligatory, pragmatic, or translation-

inherent type. These types are explained briefly as follows:

1. Obligatory Explicitation: This type of explicitation is caused by the syntactic and semantic differences between the two language systems involved in the translation. i.e. without it target-language sentences would be ungrammatical. In these cases, the translator has no choice but to resort to explicitation.

2. Optional Explicitation: This type of explicitation is the product of the differences in the text-building strategies and stylistic preferences between languages. These explicitations are optional in the sense that their inclusion or omission results in grammatically correct sentences, even when the text as a whole might be unnatural.

3. Pragmatic Explicitation: This type of explicitation arises from differences in the cultural or world knowledge shared by the audiences of the source and target texts. In these cases, the translator needs to add content to explicitate what the sender of the source text assumed was implicit knowledge for the source audience.

4. Translation-Inherent Explicitation: This is the only type of explicitation that can be attributed to the nature of the translation process itself i.e., it is a must that it happens in translation.

8. The Present Research

In the present research, the researcher tries to investigate the strategy of explicitation in the process of translation from English into Arabic with reference to Hatim and Mason's (1990) argumentative text-type. The rationale behind choosing argumentative text rather than other text types is that argumentative text by its nature loaded with explicitation phenomena. This research addresses the problem of comprehending vague instances of translated texts by Arab readers. Séguinot (1988, p.108) confines the instances that involve real explicitation to the ones in which the text is vague and less precise to the (TT) reader". The main problem with explicitation is that how is it possible for the translator to decide what to explicitate and what to leave out as he encounters different types of information in a single text? This problem concerns syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic information. It is hypothesized that explicitation in transferring information among two languages is not a universal phenomenon; and that explicitation is a mindful process that translators intentionally resort to for the sake of clarification. Furthermore, the phenomenon of explicitation is so diverse and includes different classifications. The present research is confined to studying the translation of the classification of explicitation suggested by Klaudy (1998) from English into Arabic of argumentative text. A full discussion of the translation of the four types of explicitation will be provided.

The data for analysis of the present research consists of one text-type viz., argumentative extracted from the Time magazine. Other text-types

are beyond the scope of the present research. The text is expected to contain items for which explicitation in the process of translation may take place. Three subjects took part in the study. They are all (M.A.) degree holders specialized in linguistics and translation and having about decade teaching experience in translation at the University of Mosul, College of Arts, Department of Translation. Of course, the subjects did not know anything about the objective of the research in order not to affect their decision-making process. As it was referred to above, this research follows Klaudy's (1998) classification of explicitation which assumes that "what is regarded to be general information in one language direction might be culturally specific in others". The data were collected based on comparisons of the source text and target text to extract and categorize representative instances of explicitation. The methodology adopted in the present study distinguishes between four types of explicitation namely, obligatory, optional, pragmatic and translation-inherent following the above - stated typology of Klaudy (1998). It is to be noted that this study adopted qualitative approach rather than quantitative one.

9. Data Analysis and Discussion

In order to test the hypotheses of the present research, an argumentative text was translated by three (M.A.) holders from the Department of Translation, College of Arts, University of Mosul. The analysis includes the following steps:

1. Identifying representative cases of explicitation of the concerned text-type.
2. Classifying the cases according to the model adopted Klaudy's (1998) viz., optional, obligatory, pragmatic and translation-inherent ones.
3. Explaining why translators opted for explicitation.
4. Proposing an appropriate rendering for each inappropriate representative case.

1st Translator

Table (2): Representative cases of explicitation in argumentative text

No.	Source Text	Target Text	Explicit Type	Appro (+), Inappro (-)
1.	Donald Trump strutted on stage in a	اعتلى دونالد ترامب منصة قاعة فلوريدا	Obligatory Explicit	

	Florida ballroom.	للمناسبات.		
2.	and already America's choice can be traced to some key decisions.	كما يعزى الاختيار الأمريكي لبعض القرارات الرئيسية.	Optional Explicit	—
3.	Starting out at a sea of supporters sporting red MAGA hats.	وهنا بدأ حشد المؤيدين يرتدون قبعات حمراء تحمل شعار "اجعل أمريكا عظيمة مرة أخرى.	Optional Explicit.	+
4.	Most of all, the outcome can be credited to a singular figure.	والأكثر من ذلك فإن النتيجة يمكن أن تحسم التي طالما كانت عودته إلى البيت الأبيض تعزى إلى القوس السياسي.	Trans-Inherent Explicit	—

Discussion:

In the first representative case above table (2), the translator has done explicitation by translating the words "Florida ballroom" into "قاعة فلوريدا للمناسبات" because the Arabic sentence structure requires explicitation for clarity which is an obligatory explicitation. In addition, the researcher argues that the translator has captured the basic meaning in his rendering of the English phrase "Donald Trump strutted on stage in a Florida ballroom" but missed some key nuances of the original English phrase, for example, the use of the verb "اعتلى" suggests a formal act of stepping onto a stage, but it does not capture the confident, possibly boastful manner implied by "strutted". Therefore, the researcher believes that the translation is inappropriate and proposes a more vivid translation as follows:

"دخل دونالد ترامب المسرح متبختراً في قاعة فلوريدا الفاخرة"

In the second case, the translator has added the idea of specific "key decisions" "القرارات الرئيسية" that were only implied in the English version which is optionally explicitated by the translator. The translation is close in meaning but the researcher would like to refine it for better accuracy considering it inappropriate. For example, in the phrase "كما يعزى", using "كما" is unnecessary in this context. A more natural translation would be "يمكن إرجاع الخيار الأمريكي إلى بعض القرارات الحاسمة" in which "القرارات الحاسمة" might better reflect the weight of the original phrase. This would keep the meaning intact while improving clarity and accuracy.

In the third case, explicitation occurs when the translator adds conjunctions or clarifies implicit relationships. The phrase "starting out at a sea of supporters sporting red MAGA hats" has been translated into:

"وهنا بدأ حشد المؤيدين يرتدون قبعات حمراء تحمل شعار "اجعل أمريكا عظيمة مرة أخرى"

Here, the translator has adjusted sentence flow where meaning is made more explicit and this is due to Arabic sentence structure which often requires additional conjunctions and sequencing markers for smooth discourse flow. The Arabic version explicitly adds "وهنا" to establish a clear transition and sequence of actions, whereas English relies on implicit sequencing. This would enhance readability for Arabic audience by structuring events more explicitly. In short, this case of optional explicitation was done on the part of the translator to reinforce discourse clarity and temporal progression. Therefore, the researcher in this case agrees with the translator i.e., the translation is appropriate which generally captures the meaning.

In the fourth case, the translator has extensively clarified the original (SL) English sentence in his rendering making it more explicit when he translated it into the following:

والأكثر من ذلك فإن النتيجة يمكن أن تحسم التي طالما كانت عودته إلى البيت الأبيض تعزى إلى القوس السياسي"

In the above case, the Arabic version emphasizes that "يمكن أن تحسم" in a way that is not explicitly stated in the English version which is a case of translation-inherent explicitation. The researcher, here, believes that the translation is inappropriate in such a way that it contains structural and semantic issues that affect clarity. For example, the word "تحسم" does not accurately reflect "credited to", which means "يُنسب" التي طالما كانت عودته "الفضل في". In addition, the phrase "إلى البيت الأبيض تعزى إلى" is unclear and does not reflect the original meaning, while, "القوس السياسي" is an unusual phrase in Arabic and does not convey the intended meaning of "a singular figure". Therefore, the researcher proposes the following rendering which preserves the emphasis, improves accuracy and keeps the meaning intact:

"وقبل كل شيء، يُنسب الفضل في النتيجة إلى شخصية واحدة"

2nd Translator

Table (3): Representative Cases of Explicitation in Argumentative Text

No.	Source Text	Target Text	Explicit. Type	Appr. (+), Inappr. (-)
1.	Donald Trump strutted on stage in a Florida ballroom.	تبختر ترامب على مسرح مرقص فلوريدا.	Optional Explicit.	—
2.	and already America's choice can be traced to some key decisions.	القرار والخيار الأمريكي لرسم القرارات الرئيسية.	Obligatory Explicit.	—
3.	Starting	فقد انطلق هذا الحشد الهائل		

	out at a sea of supporters sporting red MAGA hats.	من المؤيدين وهو يرتدي القبعات الرياضية الحمراء التي تحمل علامة (أجعل أمريكا عظيمة مرة أخرى).	Obligatory Explicit	+
4.	Most of all, the outcome can be credited to a singular figure.	وأكثرها ان النتيجة كانت تعزى الى شخصية واحدة.	Optional Explicit	—

Discussion:

In the first representative case above table (3), the translator has done explicitation by translating the word "ballroom" into "مرقص". In English, "ballroom" refers to a large hall used for formal events, while "مرقص" explicitly conveys the idea of a dance hall. The Arabic translation makes the nature of the location more specific adding a cultural nuance that the source text left implicit. Since Arabic offers alternatives like "قاعة احتفالات", this shift is optional rather than obligatory. In addition, the choice of the word "تبخرت" for "strutted" enhances the expressive nature of the verb, adding a stylistic nuance that emphasizes Trump's movement in a slightly exaggerated way. While "strutted" implies confidence or arrogance, the Arabic term strongly reinforces a boastful demeanor, making the action more vivid. This is an optional stylistic choice rather than a necessary grammatical shift. Here, the researcher agrees with the translation of the verb "strutted" into "تبخرت" because it captures the movement implied by the verb, but disagree with the phrase "مرقص فلوريدا" which does not accurately reflect the meaning of "ballroom" in this context and somewhat misleading. Therefore, the rendering is considered inappropriate. As it was proposed earlier in the process of analysis concerning the same first case of the first translator, the researcher suggests the same rendering too which is more precise as follows:

"دخل دونالد ترامب المسرح متبخترأ في قاعة فلوريدا الفاخرة"

In the second case, the translator has translated the phrase "can be traced to" into "الرسم القرارات الرئيسية" in which the (SL) phrase implies causality, but the (TL) version renders it explicitly as "الرسم القرارات الرئيسية". This changes an implicit reference into a direct statement about the impact of these decisions, making it an obligatory explicitation due to linguistic differences. The researcher, in this case, disagrees with the rendering due to its unsuitability to the context making it an inappropriate one. For example, the phrase "القرار والخيار" is redundant in which the word "choice" in English implies a decision, so using both words together is unnecessary. In addition, "الرسم" does not accurately reflect "can be traced to", which means "يمكن إرجاع". While, "القرارات الرئيسية" is fine, but "some key decisions" implies specific important choices, so "بعض القرارات الحاسمة" would be more precise. As a result, the researcher proposes the following rendering which fits the meaning and improves clarity:

"يمكن إرجاع الخيار الأمريكي إلى بعض القرارات الحاسمة"

Concerning the third case, in the English phrase, "Starting out at a sea of supporters sporting red MAGA hats" there is no explicit conjunction linking ideas. It is an implicit sequential relationship. In the Arabic translation, however, "فقد انطلق هذا الحشد الهائل من المؤيدين" uses "فقد" which functions as an explicit conjunctive marker adding emphasis and clarity to the sequential action. This is a classic case of explicitation where the implicit logical connection in English is made explicit in Arabic. Additionally, the phrase "وهو يرتدي" introduces "و" further reinforcing the connection between the action of "setting out" and "wearing the hats" which was not explicit in the English source. This aligns well with Klaudy's typology of explicitation (1998), where Arabic translations tend to add conjunctions for logical clarity and flow. According to Klaudy's typology, this case exemplifies obligatory explicitation because in the source English phrase, the logical connection between "starting out" and "sporting red MAGA hats" is implicit in which English allows such paratactic structures without explicit conjunctions. Arabic, however, requires a more explicit connection for clarity and flow. The use of "فقد" and "وهو" in the translation ensures coherence and readability. Since Arabic grammar and discourse conventions necessitate these additions for proper comprehension, this qualifies as obligatory explicitation which is a change driven by 3rd Translator

syntactic and linguistic requirements rather

than the translator's stylistic choices. The researcher, here, agrees with the translation as being close in meaning to the (SL) phrase.

No.	Source Text	Target Text	Explicit. Type	Appro. (+), Inappro. (-)
1.	Donald Trump strutted on stage in a Florida ballroom.	صعد المرشح الرئاسي دونالد ترامب على مسرح قاعة فلوريدا.	Obligatory Explicitation	—
2.	and already America's choice can be traced to some key decisions.	ويمكن حالياً تتبع اختيار أميركا إلى بعض القرارات الرئيسية.	Obligatory Explicitation	—
3.	Starting out at a sea of supporters sporting red MAGA hats.	امام موج من المؤيدين الذين يرتدون قبعات رياضية حمراء تحمل شعار (أجعل أمريكا عظيمة مرة أخرى).	Obligatory and Pragmatic Explicitation	—
4.	Most of all, the outcome can be credited to a singular figure.	والأهم من ذلك، تعود هذه النتيجة إلى شخصية فريدة.	Pragmatic Explicitation	—

In the fourth case, the translator has done optional explicitation in translating the English phrase "can be credited to a singular figure" into "شخصية واحدة" in which "A singular figure" implies uniqueness, yet the Arabic rendering "شخصية واحدة" highlights numerical singularity rather than distinctive leadership. In this case, the translation captures part of the meaning, yet it needs some refinement for accuracy and fluency. For example, the phrase "وأكثرها" is unclear in this context. A better equivalent for "Most of all" would be "وقبل كل شيء" to emphasize the primary factor. In addition, the phrase "كانت تعزى إلى" is structurally correct, but "يُنسب الفضل" would sound more natural. Therefore, the rendering is inappropriate on the part of the researcher who proposes the following rendering which keeps the meaning intact and clarity improved.

"وقبل كل شيء، يُنسب الفضل في النتيجة إلى شخصية واحدة"

Discussion:

In the first case table (4) above, the translation presents a clear case of explicitation based on Klaudy's (1998) model which is an obligatory one. The translator has added contextual information in rendering the (SL) phrase as follows:

The SL: "Donald Trump strutted on stage in a Florida ballroom"

The TL:

"صعد المرشح الرئاسي دونالد ترامب على مسرح قاعة فلوريدا"

Here, the Arabic translation explicitly introduces "المرشح الرئاسي" which was implicit in the English text. This adds clarity for Arabic readers who may not immediately associate Trump's actions with his candidacy. In addition, the word "ballroom" was translated into "قاعة فلوريدا" which does not specify the type of hall (ballroom), but generalizes it as "قاعة" (hall). While this is not strictly considered an explicitation, but could be refined to "قاعة فلوريدا" to better preserve the intended original Table (4): Representative cases of explicitation in argumentative text

setting. Also, the English phrase "strutted on stage" was translated into "صعد على مسرح" in which the Arabic translation uses "صعد" which conveys movement but reduces the rhetorical nuance of strutted which implies confidence and self-assuredness. The researcher believes that the translation captures part of the meaning yet it is inappropriate. For example, the above-mentioned verb "صعد" is neutral, but "تبختر" would better convey the meaning of "strutted". Also, the phrase "قاعة فلوريدا" is vague whereas "ballroom" is a large elegant hall used for formal events. So, a better translation would be "قاعة فلوريدا الفاخرة". Hence, the researcher proposes the following rendering:

"دخل دونالد ترامب المسرح متبخترًا في قاعة فلوريدا الفاخرة."

In the second case, the translation presents a case of explicitation as it introduces additional clarity that was implicit in the original English sentence which aligns with Klaudy's (1998) obligatory type of explicitation. The (SL) phrase "already America's choice can be traced to some key decisions" explicitly restructures the sentence by introducing

ويمكن حاليًا تتبع اختيار أميركا إلى بعض القرارات "الرئيسية" in which the addition of "حاليًا" makes the timing of the tracing process explicit. However, in English, the word "already" implies that the event has occurred, but the Arabic version further clarifies it with a present-time marker. In addition, the verb "can be traced" is translated into "يمكن تتبع" which is an explicit structure. While, English relies on passive construction, Arabic often prefers a direct verb form making the process of tracing clearer. The researcher argues that the translation is close in meaning but it needs refinement for accuracy.

For example, the above – mentioned word "حاليًا" is not necessary. Again, the phrase "اختيار أميركا" is correct, but "الخيار الأمريكي" might sound more natural depending on the context. Also, the phrase "إلى بعض القرارات الرئيسية" is accurate, but "إلى بعض القرارات الحاسمة" might better reflect the weight of the original phrase. So, the researcher proposes the following rendering which keeps the meaning intact while improving clarity and accuracy: "يمكن إرجاع الخيار الأمريكي إلى بعض القرارات الحاسمة"

In the third case, the translation presents multiple explicitation cases generally represented in obligatory and pragmatic ones, where additional detail is introduced to enhance clarity for Arab readers. For example, the word "امام" functions as an explicit connector clarifying the spatial relationship between the subject and the supporters. This is an explicitation, making the scene clearer in Arabic than in the English source. While conjunctions like "و" are not introduced, the Arabic translation makes implicit spatial and relational links more explicit which aligns with explicitation strategies. Also, the phrase "sea of supporters" is rendered as "موج من المؤيدين" explicitly linking the metaphor to "waves" which reinforces the visual intensity of the crowd. The English version relies on an abstract metaphor "sea", while Arabic makes it more concrete through "موج". The phrase "الذين يرتدون" introduces a relative clause that explicitly connects "المؤيدين" to the description of their "hats" reinforcing clarity. In addition, the Arabic translation explicitly spells out the "MAGA" slogan (اجعل أمريكا عظيمة مرة أخرى), which was implicit in the English version. In English, "MAGA" hats assume audience familiarity with the slogan, whereas the Arabic version clarifies the meaning for readers who may not recognize the acronym. Also, the Arabic translation adds the adjective "رياضية" specifying the type of "hat". The English phrase does not explicitly define "MAGA" hats as sports caps, but the Arabic version makes this detail explicit.

Hence, the researcher argues that the translation captures part of the meaning but could be refined for better accuracy and fluency. For instance, the word "موج" is understandable, but "بحر من المؤيدين" (a sea of supporters) better reflects the metaphor. The phrase "قبعات رياضية" is unnecessary. The original phrase refers to MAGA hats which are political symbols not general sportswear. As a result, preserving the metaphor present in the original phrase and improving accuracy requires the researcher to propose the following rendering:

وسط بحر من المؤيدين الذين يرتدون قبعات حمراء تحمل شعار "اجعل أمريكا عظيمة مرة أخرى"

" which strengthens the logical progression of ideas. The English version and communicative impact while adapting it to the Arabic's stylistic expectations.

emphasis more explicit. In addition, the Arabic translation adds explicit reference to " هذه النتيجة " which was implicit in the English text. The phrase "the outcome" is translated with added explicitation as a strategic translation procedure in specification ensuring clarity. The above example best illustrates the importance of considering English argumentative texts into Arabic. pragmatic explicitation because it is driven by cultural and rhetorical norms in which Arabic tends to favor more formal and rhetorically structured expressions especially in evaluative argumentative texts. Hence, the translation is somewhat close to the original meaning but it needs to be refined for better accuracy and fluency. For example, the verb "تعود" is understandable but "الفضل في" would be more precise. The phrase "شخصية فريدة" might better reflect the idea of coherence, and bridge cultural gaps. The findings singular decisive influence. Therefore, the researcher proposes the following rendering which better serve the example:

10. Findings

This research has revealed some significant patterns in the use of explicitation across translations of argumentative texts, analyzed within Klaudy's typology (1998) and the framework proposed by Hatim and Mason (1990). The findings highlight:

- The strategic interplay between linguistic necessity and rhetorical enhancement. For example, obligatory explicitation dominated across all translator outputs, driven primarily by the syntactic structure and cohesive demands of Arabic. This was especially evident in the insertion of conjunctions and reformulation of passive structures to achieve clarity and flow.
- The first translator maintained structural fidelity but occasionally obscured rhetorical nuance, particularly in instances of translation-inherent explicitation.
- The second translator demonstrated rhetorical awareness through expressive lexical choices such as "تبختر", yet introduced semantic ambiguity and redundancy.
- The third translator exhibited strong pragmatic adaptation balancing informative precision and stylistic clarity, though sometimes at the cost of metaphor preservation.

The translators often employed explicitation to reinforce the persuasive functions characteristic of argumentative texts such as the phrase " المرشح " الرئاسي which reveals sensitivity to audience awareness. Also, the use of explicit connectors such as "والأهم من ذلك", "فقد", and intensifiers provided readers with clear evaluative cues reflecting Arabic's rhetorical preferences. In addition, the lexical expansions such as defining "MAGA" or adjusting metaphors often reflected pragmatic explicitation, showing the translators' intent to maximize reader accessibility and emotional resonance. Inappropriate translations were frequently due to overgeneralization or semantic misalignment. For instance, the word "مرقص" versus "ballroom" underscore the tension between cultural specificity and linguistic accuracy. Hence, the researcher's proposed renderings favor preserving the original's

11. Conclusions

This research paper has examined the role of explicitation as a strategic translation procedure in considering English argumentative texts into Arabic. By applying Klaudy's (1998) typology and situating the analysis within Hatim and Mason's (1990) text-type framework, the research has demonstrated that explicitation is not merely a default or subconscious process, but rather a linguistic response and a rhetorical strategy in English-Arabic translation made by translators to manage ambiguity, enhance coherence, and bridge cultural gaps. The findings from the analysis across three Arabic translations of a Time magazine article reveal diverse applications of obligatory, optional, pragmatic, and translation-inherent explicitations. These shifts often respond to structural demands, cultural expectations, or stylistic conventions in Arabic, ultimately shaping the persuasive force of the translated text. The present research concludes with the following points:

1. English prefers obligatory explicitation when argumentative texts are translated from English into Arabic since the cases found for this specific type were more in comparison to other types of Klaudy's typology (1998).
2. This phenomenon does not seem to restrict itself to a specific linguistic level. It shows variation in terms of the cases found for this text-type i.e., there are other levels such as syntactic, semantic, stylistic, textual and pragmatic ones.
3. The cases of optional and pragmatic explicitations manifested in the renderings reflect the translator's interpretive ability and understanding of the target audience and often guided by stylistic norms and text-type demands.
4. In argumentative texts, explicitation serves a strategic translational tool for managing structural asymmetries and discourse conventions between English and Arabic i.e., it ensures clarity, strengthens persuasive intent and bridges cultural gaps.
4. Effective explicitation enhances communicative equivalence, but misapplied strategies may result in semantic distortion or rhetorical weakening.

References

- Ali, A. M., & Qassim, R. S. (2025). Lexical borrowing in English-Arabic translation: A case study of Iraqi EFL learners' translational strategies. *Al-Noor Journal for Humanities (NJH)*, 3(3), 165–171.
- Amer, M., & Al-Badrany, Y. Y. (2024). The misconception of translating the term "free verse" into Arabic. *Al-Noor Journal for Humanities (NJH)*, 2(4), 16–23.
- Hatim, B. *Communication across cultures: translation theory and contrastive text linguistics*. University Of Exeter Press; (2020). Cop. 6
- Klaudy, K. Explicitation. In M. Baker & G. Saldhana (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*; (1998). (pp. 80-85). London: Routledge.
- Hatim, B. & Mason, I., *Discourse and the translator*. London, Longman; (1990).
- Al Hammadi, N. M., Yagi, S. M., & Fareh, S. Explicitation and implicitation in Arabic-English translation of institutional academic correspondence. *International Journal of Arabic-English Studies*. (2024).

- Vinay, J., & Darbelnet, J. *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais*. Paris: Didier; (1958).
- Mounin, G. *Les Problèmes théoriques de la traduction*. Paris: Gallimard (1963).
- Pym, Anthony. Explaining explicitation. In K. Karoly and Á. Fóris (eds.) *New Trends in Translation Studies*. In Honour of Kinga Klaudy. Budapest: Akadémia Kiadó. (2005); 29–34.
- Nida, Eugene A. *Toward a science of translating*. Leiden: E. J. Brill; (1964).
- Blum-Kulka, S. *Shifts of cohesion and coherence in translation*. Interlingual and intercultural communication: Discourse and cognition in translation and second language acquisition studies; (1986). 272, 17.
- Baker, Mona. Corpus-based translation studies: the challenges that lie ahead. In Harold Somers (ed.), *Terminology, LSP and translation*. *Studies in language engineering*. (1996);175–186.
- Shuttleworth, S., & Cowie, M. *Dictionary of translation studies*. Manchester: M239HH, UK; (1997).
- Delisle, J., Lee-Jahnke, H., Cormier, M. C. and Albrecht, J. *Translating terminology*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins; (1999).
- Olohan, M. Spelling out the optional in translation: A corpus study. *UCREL technical papers*. (2001);13, 423-432.
- Pápai, V. Explicitation: A universal of translated text? In A. Mauranen., & P. Kujamäki (eds.), *Translation Universals: Do They Exist?* (2004); (pp.143–164). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Klaudy, K. & Károly, K. Implication in translation: empirical evidence for operational asymmetry in translation, *Across Languages and Cultures*. (2005); 6 [1]: 13-28.
- Liashchenko, O. The bottom of the iceberg: the explicitation of the implicit in English-Ukrainian -English translation. *Translation Journal*. (2008); 12,1-4.
- Becher, V. Abandoning the notion of "translation-inherent" explicitation: against a dogma of translation studies. *Across Languages and Cultures*. (2010); 11(1), 1-28.
- Séguinot, C. *Pragmatics and the Explicitation Hypothesis*. TTR: Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction. (1988); 1(2): 106-114.
- Puurtinen, T. Explicitating and implicating source text ideology. *Across Languages and Cultures*. (2003); 4(1), 53-62.
- House, J. Explicitness in Discourse Across Languages. In: House, J., Koller. W. & Schubert, K. (eds.) *Neue Perspektiven in der Übersetzungs- und Dolmetschwissenschaft*. Bochum: AKS. (2004);185–208.
- Øverås, L. In search of the third code: An investigation of norms in literary translation. *Meta*. (1998); 43(4), 557–570.
- Olohan, M., & Baker, M. Reporting 'that' in translated English: evidence for subconscious processes of explicitation? *Across Languages and Cultures*. (2000); 1 [2]: 141-158.
- House, J. Beyond intervention: universals in translation? *Trans-kom*. (2008);1(1), 6-19.
- Becher, V. Explicitation and Implication in Translation. *A Corpus-based Study of English-German and German-English Translations of Business Texts*. [PhD dissertation]. Hamburg: Universität Hamburg, Fakultät für Geisteswissenschaften; (2011).
- Gumul, E. Explicitation in simultaneous interpreting: a strategy or a by-product of language mediation? *Across Languages and Cultures*. (2006); 7, 171-190.
- Englund Dimitrova, B. Semantic change in translation: a cognitive perspective. *Translation and Knowledge*; (1993).285-296.
- Klaudy, K. *Back-translation as a tool for detecting explicitation strategies in translation*. Translation Studies in Hungary. Budapest: Scholastica; (1996). 99-114.
- Saldanha, G. Explicitation revisited: bringing the reader into the picture. *Trans-kom*. (2008); PP: 20-35. Seite 20.
- Abdulwahab, A. A. Necessities of pragmatic explicitation in translating English short stories into Arabic. *Adab Al-Rafidayn Journal*. (2012); 61, 1-34.
- de Beaugrande, R. and Dressler, W. *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. New York: Longman; (1981).