Investigating the Impact of Explicitation of the Situational Context on the Quality of Qur'ān Translation into English

Safiyeh Aqel Seyek Ab[1], Ebrahim Davoudi Sharifabad[*2] iD **and Mohammad Yazdani[1]** iD

1. Department of English Language, Imam Reza International University, Mashhad, Iran
2. Department of English Language, Baqir Al-Olum University, Qom, Iran

* Corresponding author: e.davoudi@bou.ac.ir

doi https://doi.org/10.22081/ttais.2025.70546.1048

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Situational context plays a crucial role in translation studies. In Qur'ān translation, understanding Asbāb al-Nuzūl (occasions of revelation) is essential, as misinterpretations may arise without it. This qualitative study explores the impact of situational context explicitation on the quality of English translations of the Qur'ān. Four Shia translations, Nasr, Shakir, Saffarzadeh, and Mir, were selected due to their shared exegetical sources. Klaudy's (2008) explicitation typology provided the framework for classifying types of explicitation. Analysis of 100 randomly selected verses revealed that explicitation of situational context, particularly the occasions of revelation, is present in all four translations. Pragmatic explicitation was the predominant type observed. The findings suggest that incorporating situational context into translations enhances readers' comprehension of the Qur'ān's meaning.

1. Introduction

The Holy Qur'ān, as one of the sacred texts, continues to attract a growing number of readers among both Muslims and non-Muslims worldwide. It is read in its original Arabic form as well as through translations of its meanings into various languages. Revealed to the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him and his family) over a period of 23 years, this divine book possesses remarkable linguistic, stylistic, rhetorical, and textual features that distinguish it from other scriptures, elevating it as a timeless miracle intended to guide humanity across all eras. Like other sacred texts, the Holy Qur'ān addresses both specific and general audiences. The specific audience refers to the Arab communities during the Prophet's lifetime, while the general audience encompasses all of humanity from the time of revelation until the Day of Judgment. Many members of this latter group — non-Arabs with diverse languages and cultures — often face challenges in fully understanding the meaning of the Qur'ān.

Translators of the Qur'ān have long sought to produce accurate renditions of its meanings. However, due to the text's unique linguistic, rhetorical, and cultural features, no translation can fully substitute for the original Arabic. As Islam spread beyond the Arabian Peninsula and attracted non-Arabic speakers, the need for translation became inevitable. Early translations often relied on a word-for-word approach, which frequently failed to convey the intended meanings effectively. While previous studies on Qur'ān translation have primarily concentrated on lexical choices and semantic equivalence, they have paid comparatively less attention to the situational context in which the verses were revealed. Although some research has examined aspects of Qur'ānic discourse, the role of explicitation in enhancing translation quality remains underexplored. This study addresses that gap by investigating how the explicitation of situational context—particularly through the inclusion of Asbāb al-Nuzūl (occasions of revelation)—affects the quality and comprehensibility of English translations of the Qur'ān. By analyzing four Shia translations through the lens of Klaudy's explicitation typology, this research offers new insights into the role of pragmatic explicitation in making the Qur'ān more accessible to non-Arabic-speaking audiences. The findings contribute to translation quality assessment frameworks and offer practical guidance for future Qur'ān translators.

This study offers valuable insights for translators seeking a more accurate understanding of Qur'ānic meanings by highlighting the importance of explicating situational context in translation. By addressing this aspect, the study helps to dispel ambiguity and bridge the informational gap often caused by word-for-word translation methods, thereby facilitating better comprehension for non-Arabic readers. An additional contribution of this research is its emphasis on raising translators' awareness of potential errors and misunderstandings that may arise from neglecting contextual factors. More significantly, the study engages with translation quality assessment (TQA) theories within the field of Qur'ān translation, offering a foundation for future research aimed at developing a comprehensive model for evaluating translation quality. The application of a TQA model in this study serves as a guide for other assessors, encouraging the use of objective theoretical frameworks rather than relying on subjective opinions when evaluating translated texts. Ultimately, this research aims to conduct a thorough analysis of how situational context explicitation can enhance the quality of English translations of the Qur'ān, grounded in established translation assessment theories.

2. Review of the literature

2.1. The notion of equivalence

Equivalence is considered a central concept in translation theory. However, translation scholars have yet to reach a unified, clear, and universally accepted definition of this notion within Translation Studies. As Catford (1965, p. 21) stated, "the basic problem of the translation process is to find equivalents, and the important task of translation theory is defining the nature and conditions to reach the equivalence in translation".

Since the mid-twentieth century, the concept of equivalence has been a central concern in the work of many translation theorists. Among the prominent scholars who have explored this notion are Nida, Catford, Vinay and Darbelnet, House, Baker, and others. Roman Jakobson is often credited as the first theorist to introduce the term equivalence in a translation context, in his 1959 work. Scholars commonly use the term to distinguish between literal and free translation. Various perspectives have emerged regarding the complex nature of translation. Some scholars view it primarily as a linguistic process, where concepts in one language are directly rendered into another. This view aligns equivalence with literal translation of words and concepts. In contrast, other theorists emphasize the importance of cultural context, arguing that effective translation must convey the intended meaning rather than just the words. From this perspective, equivalence is about meaning rather than form. Furthermore, some specialists caution against using the term equivalence altogether, asserting that absolute equivalence is unattainable and that, at best, translation can only approximate the original meaning.

According to House (1997, p. 35), a translation should perform the same function in the target language as the source text does in the source language; thus, functional equivalence serves as the primary criterion for assessing translation quality. She also argued that covert translation—a type of translation that adapts the text naturally into the target culture—can help achieve functional equivalence. House emphasized that equivalence should not be confused with absolute sameness, asserting that full equivalence is unattainable. Instead, she proposed the notion of relative equivalence, which is influenced by various factors such as lexical, structural, and macro-linguistic differences between languages. Similarly, Newmark (1991) contended that ideal or perfect equivalence is an illusion, viewing translation equivalence as, at best, an approximation. Other scholars, such as Abdul-Raof (2001), have echoed this sentiment, stating that absolute equivalence at the lexical or textual level is improbable, and the pursuit of such equivalence is ultimately a mirage. Despite ongoing debates and theoretical challenges surrounding the concept of equivalence, translators often encounter instances of non-equivalence, or even untranslatability, particularly in complex areas such as syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic features across languages. This issue becomes especially pronounced in the translation of the Qur'ān, where the sacred and multifaceted nature of the text adds further complexity to the quest for equivalence.

2.2. Qur'ān translation quality assessment

In spite of advancements in the field of TQA and translation theories, there is still no specific, inclusive, and clear theory for evaluating the quality of Qur'ān translations. Most translation theories are not applicable or effective in the case of the Qur'ān, as the Holy Qur'ān is not comparable to other sacred texts. In Bible translation, communicative and dynamic approaches can be effectively applied, since the Bible is considered the Bible in any language—the primary goal being to convey the meaning. However, in the case of

Qur'ān translation, conveying meaning is crucial, but preserving the form is equally important.

Some scholars insist on the non-translatability of the Qur'ān, yet this raises the question: how can the meaning be conveyed without translation? In response to this challenge, translators have employed various methods to render the meaning of the Qur'ān. Some have adopted a literal approach, aiming to reflect the equivalence of the original Arabic source text, while others have preferred to paraphrase the verses to ensure a clearer understanding and more accurate conveyance of meaning—resulting in freer translations. But how can the quality of these translations be assessed, especially when no translator of the Qur'ān has claimed to provide a fully accurate translation? And what criteria should be used to evaluate Qur'ān translations? To date, these translations have not been comprehensively evaluated within a consistent theoretical framework. The unit of assessment is often limited to a verse, phrase, expression, or even a single word. In such cases, translation theories may be applicable.

Among the works in this area, one can refer to Evaluating English Qur'ān Translation by Sajadi and Manafi Anari (2008), which assesses the quality of rendering material and mental verbs in several English translations of the Qur'ān. Although the study discusses various approaches to TQA, it is not clear which specific theory is actually employed. Another relevant study is Assessing the Translation Quality of Qur'ānic Lexical Synonymy by Al-Ghazali (2015), which is based on an equivalence-based model of TQA. In this research, the unit of evaluation is lexical items, and the applied method focuses on establishing equivalence.

A valuable contribution in this field is Situational Context and Its Function in Qur'ān Translations by Motaveri and Masudi Sadr (2016), which draws on Halliday's theory of register and situational context. The authors illustrate their approach through practical examples within the Qur'ānic context. They also address Asbāb al-Nuzūl as a component of the situational context and incorporate the viewpoints of Qur'ānic scholars regarding its significance for both translation quality and accurate interpretation. However, this study primarily explores cultural factors and their role in translation quality from the perspective of situational context, rather than treating Asbāb al-Nuzūl as its main focus.

2.3. Context of situation

One of the key terms in this study is context of situation. This concept has been examined by various linguists from different perspectives, primarily within the fields of pragmatics and systemic functional linguistics. Halliday's approach to this concept is particularly useful in Translation Studies. Within his framework, context is classified into three categories: context of culture, context of situation, and co-text (Halliday, 1999, as cited in Hu, 2010). The first two categories encompass aspects outside the language, while co-text, also referred to as linguistic context, pertains to elements within the language itself (Hu, 2010).

Context is shaped by language choices, creating an interdependent relationship between the two (Hu, 2010). Language, through its lexical items and grammatical structures, is closely tied to cultural context, while a specific text and its components are connected to situational context. In this framework, cultural context corresponds to genre, situational context to register, and co-text to discourse. Situational context consists of three elements: field, tenor, and mode. Field refers to what is happening—the nature of the social action taking place. Tenor relates to the participants involved, including their status and social roles

within the interaction. Mode concerns the role of language itself and the participants' expectations regarding how language is used in a given situation. These three dimensions together define what is known as register (Hu, 2010).

In translation, analyzing the linguistic features of a text allows us to identify its register, and consequently, its situational context. Once the situational context is established, appropriate words and expressions can be selected to produce the target text, thereby reestablishing a corresponding situational context in the translation. Equivalence is not limited to a single aspect of meaning; rather, achieving equivalence involves recreating the situational context of the source text in the target language. Since languages differ to varying degrees, some loss is inevitable in the process of translation. Therefore, translators must carefully consider register variables and avoid making arbitrary or subjective choices. The concept of register brings new insight to the ongoing debate over translation approaches. It provides translators with a systematic framework that can guide their decisions and serve as a method for producing more contextually faithful translations.

2.4. Explicitation

Vinay and Darbelnet first introduced the concept of explicitation in 1958, describing it as "a process of introducing into the target language information that is only implicit in the source text but can be inferred from context or situation" (Pym, 2005). The concept was later developed by Blum-Kulka in 1986 and became known as the Explicitation Hypothesis, which focuses on the use of cohesion markers. The redundancy that arises from the translator's interpretation of the source text—resulting in a more explicit and redundant target text—is attributed to an increase in cohesive explicitness in the translated version. This phenomenon, where translations tend to be more explicit than their source texts, is what the Explicitation Hypothesis seeks to explain (Pym, 2001).

Explicitation is often considered inherent to the process of translation, and attention must be paid to the linguistic quality of both the source and target texts. However, Pym (2005) criticizes Blum-Kulka's Explicitation Hypothesis, arguing that it is based primarily on statistical analysis of textual occurrences rather than on cognitive processes of interpretation. In other words, cohesive explicitness does not account for all aspects of language use—particularly those that extend beyond the text itself, such as cultural references and context-dependent meanings (Pym, 2005).

According to Klaudy (2003, as cited in Pym, 2005), explicitation occurs when a source language unit with a general meaning is replaced by a target language unit with a more specific meaning. In other words, the complex meaning of a single word in the source language may be rendered as multiple words in the target language. As a result, the target text may introduce new meaningful elements, and a single sentence in the source text may be expanded into two or more sentences in the translation. Explicitation can also occur when phrases in the source language are expanded or elevated into full clauses in the target language. This process may be carried out through choices that are either conscious or automatic, and either obligatory or optional.

Klaudy's formulation of explicitation is highly praised by Pym (2005) for its comprehensive scope, as it allows for the observation of explicitation across multiple linguistic levels and its applicability to a wide range of language pairs. However, Pym (2005) also introduces his own model of explicitation, aiming to offer a more rational explanation for the occurrence of this phenomenon. He introduces the concept of risk in the translation

process, framing explicitation as a strategy to manage potential undesirable outcomes. Pym (2005) argues that the presence of multiple translation alternatives for a given sentence influences subsequent choices in the text and determines the degree of risk, whether low-risk or high-risk. He illustrates how translators may move from implicit to explicit information to reduce ambiguity, often by inserting specific interpretive elements into the target text. According to Pym (2005), explicitation may coexist with other so-called translation universals, such as normalization and simplification, even if these processes sometimes appear to contradict one another. Their coexistence reflects the complexity and variability inherent in the act of translation.

In her concept of partial explicitation, Blum-Kulka (2001) distinguishes between reader-based explicitation and text-based explicitation. In the former, the translator anticipates potential misunderstandings or interpretive challenges in the target language and applies appropriate strategies to minimize these risks. In the latter, the translator addresses issues by closely analyzing and clarifying the source text itself, selecting suitable treatments to manage these challenges (Blum-Kulka, 2005).

In his book, Becher (2011) reviews various approaches to explicitation, critiques some scholars' views on its use, and proposes his own perspective. He argues that the most effective way to investigate explicitation is through examining lexico-grammatical and pragmatic differences between the source and target languages to identify where explicitation is likely to occur. Becher emphasizes the importance of a contrastive linguistic approach in studying explicitation, drawing on the work of translation scholars Julian House (1991) and Doherty (2001). While House focuses on pragmatic differences, Doherty highlights syntactic differences between languages. Becher underscores that adopting a contrastive linguistic perspective is essential for describing and explaining occurrences of explicitation (House, 1991; Doherty, 2001, as cited in Becher, 2011).

Becher (2011) considers Vinay and Darbelnet's definition of explicitation somewhat vague and believes it leaves certain questions unanswered. To clarify, he initially defines explicitness as "the verbalization of information that the addressee might be able to infer if it is not verbalized" (p. 17). Building on this, he proposes his own definition of explicitation as occurring when a target text is more explicit than its corresponding source text (Becher, 2011). However, he acknowledges that this is primarily a product-based definition and does not explain how the degree of explicitness in the target text relates to the translation process. Contrary to Becher's critique, he also questions the validity of Blum-Kulka's studies on the Explicitation Hypothesis.

Although Becher criticized many studies supporting Blum-Kulka's hypothesis for methodological weaknesses and called for a more nuanced approach to explicitation, he was unable to propose a fully comprehensive definition of the concept (Murtisari, 2014). In his article (2010a), Becher described Blum-Kulka's hypothesis as vaguely formulated and insufficiently precise, arguing that explicitation may occur due to factors such as simplification or normalization—not solely as a result of the translator's interpretive process applied to the source text (Murtisari, 2014).

In Klaudy's typologies of explicitation shifts, she distinguishes between obligatory and optional, pragmatic and translation inherent explicitation (2008, p. 107):

- Obligatory explicitation is the result of lexico-grammatical differences between the source and the target language.

- Optional explicitation caused by differences in stylistic options preferences between the source and target language.

- Pragmatic explicitation comes from differences in cultural and universal knowledge shared among the source and target language members.

- Translation-inherent explicitation is motivated by "the name of translation process itself

Types 1 to 3 are caused or motivated between the source and target language, these types are predictable and have to be existed. It is obvious that there exist lexico-grammatical, stylistic and cultural differences among every possible language pairs. While translation-inherent explicitation is not predictable and in fact is postulated to be exist (Becher, 2011).

It is also worth mentioning that implicitation contrasts with explicitation. According to Klaudy (2005, p. 15), implicitation occurs when a source text unit with a specific meaning is replaced by a target text unit with a more general meaning. In fact, blending several source language words into a single target language word can serve as an example of implicitation.

One of the main objectives of this study is to draw translators' attention to the critical role of exegesis in Qur'ān translation. Specifically, it will examine the importance of using authentic historical and exegetical references to accurately determine the occasions of revelation, which ultimately leads to a proper understanding of the meaning. The study also aims to identify translators' slips and errors in rendering verses related to these occasions, thereby highlighting the significance of extratextual elements in the translation process. This investigation will serve as a testing ground for applying translation quality assessment theories to Qur'ān translation and will evaluate how effectively these theories can be employed when dealing with a sacred text.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research design and corpus

Since this study is primarily descriptive and based on library research, a brief explanation of this methodology is warranted. Descriptive research aims to systematically describe the characteristics of a population or phenomenon under investigation. Given that this study focuses on English translations of the Qur'ān, four English translations were selected from the available versions to form the corpus. Certain criteria guided this selection process, which will be detailed below. The chosen translations are *Study of the Qur'ān* by Seyyed Hossein Nasr, *The Qur'ān* by Tahereh Saffarzadeh, *The Holy Qur'ān* by Mohammad Ali Habib Shakir, and *The Qur'ān* by Seyyed Mir Ahmed Ali. Therefore, the study focuses on four Shia translations: Nasr, Shakir, Saffarzadeh, and Mir. The corpus consists of 100 verses randomly selected from *Asbāb al-Nuzūl* sources (Mohaqiq, 1971) to ensure the presence of situational context. These verses were analyzed to determine the extent and type of explicitation applied by each translator.

The criteria and factors considered in selecting these four versions among all available English translations are as follows. First, these translations are from among popular and well-known translations. Their frequent publishing acknowledges this matter. Second, they have been selected among the latest and recent versions and include both commentary translation and non-commentary types. Finally, the last criterion but the most important one

is that they have been chosen among Shia translation of the Holy Qur'ān. Due to analyzing situational context in this study, regardless the ideological presuppositions, the research required to follow a united and unanimous, interpretation based on authentic exegetical sources. Since there is oftn some diversity of opinions between Shia and Sunni scholars in different subject matters and finding common accounts was too difficult, it was determined to select one of the branches of Islam as the basis of analysis. According to the mentioned reason, the researcher has used Shia references because of their accessibility.

3.2. Data analysis

This section outlines the methodological approach employed in analyzing explicitation of the situational context in selected Qur'ān translations.

The first step involved selecting four English translations of the Qur'ān based on specific criteria previously mentioned. Next, the focus shifted to identifying and selecting verses that include occasions of revelation. Several factors guided this selection, including the number of verses, the method of selection, and the use of an exegetical source to serve as a foundation for reports on occasions of revelation.

After reviewing various references, two well-known and authentic Shia sources were chosen. The first, *Asbāb al-Nuzūl*, compiled by Muhammad Hojati (1992), presents interpretations from both Shia and Sunni perspectives. However, due to its limited coverage of verses, a second source was also selected: *Nemuneh Bayenat Dar Sha'ne Nuzule Ay'at*, compiled by Mohaqeq (1971). This collection is based on Sheikh Tousi's *Tafsir* and systematically lists all verses assumed to have an occasion of revelation, organized by the chapters of the Qur'ān. Sheikh Tousi's commentary work, *Tebyan*, identifies 436 such verses. From these, 100 verses—also included in Mohaqeq's compilation—were randomly selected for analysis. This source further references additional exegetical works, enhancing the depth of the analysis.

In the final step, each selected verse, alongside its occasion of revelation and its four English translations, was analyzed and discussed to address the research questions. This analysis was conducted through the lens of relevant translation theories, with comparisons drawn in relation to the study's primary objectives.

The analytical framework for investigating and categorizing cases of explicitation was based on Kinga Klaudy's typology of explicitation (2008), as noted earlier. Since translation-inherent explicitation is not applicable to Qur'ān translation, this study focused on the remaining three types:

- Obligatory explicitation, arising from structural differences between Arabic and English.

- Optional explicitation, resulting from stylistic preferences in translation.

- Pragmatic explicitation, derived from cultural and contextual clarifications added by the translator.

Each translation was assessed to identify occurrences of explicitation, and quantitative data were collected to compare their frequency.

The selected verses were analyzed in their original Arabic alongside their four English translations. Each instance of explicitation was coded according to the following criteria:

- Presence of explicitation (yes/no)

- type of explicitation (obligatory, optional, or pragmatic)

- position in the translation (within the text, footnote, or commentary)

The categorized data were then quantitatively analyzed to determine which type of explicitation was most prevalent across the translations.

5. Results and discussion

This section presents the findings of the study and discusses how explicitation of situational context has been applied in the selected Qur'ān translations. The results are first summarized in a quantitative analysis, followed by detailed examples to illustrate different types of explicitation observed in the translations.

5.1. Quantitative analysis

The frequency of explicitation types across the four translations was systematically analyzed, revealing notable differences in how each translator approached the process. Nasr's translation exhibited 20 cases of obligatory explicitation, 15 of optional explicitation, and 45 of pragmatic explicitation, totaling 80 instances. Shakir's translation showed the least use of explicitation, with 10 obligatory, 5 optional, and 20 pragmatic cases, amounting to 35 in total. Saffarzadeh's version contained 18 obligatory, 12 optional, and 40 pragmatic explicitation cases, summing to 70. Finally, Mir's translation demonstrated the highest frequency, with 22 obligatory, 17 optional, and 50 pragmatic explicitation instances, culminating in 89 cases overall. This distribution highlights the varying strategies translators employ regarding explicitation to clarify the Qur'ān's meaning. Therefore, pragmatic explicitation was the most frequent type, indicating that translators often added contextual clarifications to aid understanding. Among the four translators, Nasr and Mir employed explicitation more extensively, whereas Shakir used it the least, favoring a more literal translation approach. Optional explicitation appeared least frequently, suggesting that translators generally prioritized accuracy over stylistic modifications in their renderings.

5.2. Examples of explicitation in translations

The following examples demonstrate the application of explicitation in various Qur'ān translations:

Example 1: Surah Al-Baqarah (2:104)

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا لَا تَقُولُوا رَاعِنَا وَقُولُوا انْظُرْنَا وَاسْمَعُوا وَلِلْكَافِرِينَ عَذَابٌ أَلِيمٌ

Context of Revelation:

The term *Ra'ina* was originally used by Muslims as a respectful request for the Prophet's attention. However, opponents of Islam, particularly some Jewish groups, deliberately distorted its pronunciation to turn it into an insult. This verse instructs Muslims to use the

alternative term *Unzurna* ("look at us") instead, thereby avoiding any potential misuse or offense.

The analysis of translations and explicitation reveals diverse approaches to the term Ra'ina. Naser translates it as, "Do not say, 'Attend to us,' but say, 'Regard us,' and listen!" This pragmatic explicitation replaces the original term with an English alternative, supplemented by commentary on its historical context. Shakir, however, uses direct transliteration, rendering the phrase as "Do not say: 'Raena,' but say: 'Unzurna,'" without further explanation. Saffarzade employs pragmatic explicitation, translating as "Do not say: 'Raena' [to the Messenger], but say: 'Unzurna,'" and includes a concise footnote clarifying Ra'ina's meaning. Mir's translation, "Say not: 'Ra'ina,' but say: 'Unzorna,'" is paired with detailed commentary exploring phonetic variations and cultural implications, exemplifying robust pragmatic explicitation.

Example 2: Surah Ali 'Imran (3:100)

<div dir="rtl">

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا إِنْ تُطِيعُوا فَرِيقًا مِنَ الَّذِينَ أُوتُوا الْكِتَابَ يَرُدُّوكُمْ بَعْدَ إِيمَانِكُمْ

</div>

Context of Revelation:

This verse addresses the attempts by Jewish leaders to sow discord among the Muslim community by manipulating two prominent Arab tribes, Aws and Khazraj. By invoking memories of past conflicts, these leaders sought to weaken the unity of Muslims and undermine their faith.

The translations and explicitation analysis of the verse demonstrate different translator approaches. Naser translates it as, "If you obey a group among those who were given the Book, they will render you disbelievers after you having believed," accompanied by pragmatic explicitation with commentary clarifying that the verse refers to Jewish leaders inciting division. Shakir provides a more literal translation, "If you obey a party from among those who have been given the Book, they will turn you back as unbelievers after you have believed," without adding any contextual explanation. Saffarzade's translation, "if you follow a group those who were given the scripture, they would indeed turn you disbelievers, after you have believed," also includes pragmatic explicitation, supported by a footnote explaining the role of Jewish leaders. Mir's version, "If you obey a group among those who have been given the Book, they will turn you back into infidels after your believing," similarly uses pragmatic explicitation and is supplemented by a detailed commentary describing the historical events related to the verse.

Example 3: Surah Al-Kawthar (108:3)

<div dir="rtl">

إِنَّ شَانِئَكَ هُوَ الْأَبْتَرُ

</div>

Context of Revelation:

This verse serves as a response to the Prophet Muhammad's adversaries, who insulted him by calling him *Abtar*—a term meaning "cut off," implying that he would have no descendants or lasting legacy.

The translations and explicitation analysis reveal various interpretations of the phrase involving the term "Abtar." Naser translates it as, "Indeed, your enemy is the one cut off," accompanied by pragmatic explicitation, with a footnote explaining that "Abtar" was an insult used against the Prophet. Shakir offers an obligatory explicitation with the translation, "Surely your enemy is the one who shall be without posterity," where "without posterity" serves as a direct English equivalent of "Abtar." Saffarzade's translation, "Indeed your enemy is truly cut off from any goodness," employs pragmatic explicitation that broadens the meaning to imply a wider social loss. Lastly, Mir translates it as, "Verily he who hates thee shall be childless and cut off," supported by pragmatic explicitation, with commentary explaining the insult and its cultural significance.

6. Conclusion

This study examined the role of explicitation of situational context in the quality of English translations of the Qur'ān. By analyzing 100 selected verses from four Shia translations—Nasr, Shakir, Saffarzadeh, and Mir—the findings reveal that pragmatic explicitation was the most frequently employed type, especially in instances where cultural, historical, and contextual clarifications were essential for comprehension.

- Pragmatic explicitation predominated, particularly when historical or cultural context was necessary.

- Nasr and Mir's translations were the most explicit, often supplemented by footnotes or commentaries.

- Shakir's translation was the most literal, with minimal use of explicitation.

The study demonstrated that explicitation significantly enhances reader understanding, particularly for verses containing historical references.

Specifically, Nasr and Mir applied explicitation more extensively, providing detailed footnotes and commentaries to elucidate meaning. Shakir, in contrast, adhered closely to a literal translation style with limited explicitation, while Saffarzadeh employed a moderate approach, occasionally incorporating brief footnotes to aid comprehension. These results underscore the critical role of explicitation in conveying the deeper meanings of Qur'ānic verses to non-Arabic audiences, ensuring that important historical and cultural contexts are preserved in translation.

Furthermore, the study highlights limitations in current translation quality assessment models, such as Klaudy's explicitation typology. Although Klaudy's framework effectively categorizes different types of explicitation, it does not adequately address the historical, exegetical, and theological complexities intrinsic to sacred texts like the Qur'ān. Therefore, there is a clear need for an expanded model that explicitly incorporates religious and exegetical explicitation as distinct and essential categories in Qur'ānic translation.

References

Abdul-Rauf, H. (2001). *Quran translation: Discourse, texture and exegesis*. Routledge.

Al-Ghazali, M. (2015). Translation assessment of Qur'anic lexical synonymy into English. *International Journal of English Language and Linguistics Research, 3*(2), 28–45.

Barghout, M. A. M. (1991). *An application of a rhetorical model of translation quality assessment* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Salford.

Becher, V. (2011). *Explicitation and implicitation in translation* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Hamburg.

Blum-Kulka, S. (2001). Shifts of cohesion and coherence in translation. In J. House & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Intercultural communication, discourse and cognition in translation and second language acquisition* (pp. 17–35). Narr. (Original work published 1986)

Catford, J. C. (1965). *A linguistic theory of translation*. Oxford University Press.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1999). The notion of context in language education. John Benjamins Publishing.

Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1990). *Discourse and the translator*. Longman.

Hojati, M. B. (1992). *Asbāb al-Nuzūl (Occasions of revelation)*. Islamic Culture Publishing Office.

Hu, S. (2010). Context of situation in translation. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 1*(3), 324–326. https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.1.3.324-326

Klaudy, K. (2008). Explicitation. In M. Baker & G. Saldanha (Eds.), *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies* (pp. 104–108). Routledge.

Mir Ahmad Ali, S. V. (1995). *The Holy Qur'ān: A commentary on the Holy Qur'ān*. Tahrike Tarsile.

Mohammad, K. (2005). Assessing English translations of the Qur'ān. *The Middle East Quarterly, 12*(2), 58–71.

Mohaqeq, M. B. (1980). *A selection of Bayyinat on the context of revelation of verses according to Sheikh Tusi and other Sunni and Shia commentators*. Islamic Publishing House.

Motouri, A., & Masoudi, H. (2016). The context of situation and its role in the translation of the Quran. *Quarterly Journal of Quranic Studies, 7*(62).

Munday, J. (2001). *Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications*. Routledge.

Nasr, S. H. (2015). *The study Quran: A new translation and commentary*. Harper.

Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation*. Prentice Hall.

Nida, E. A. (1964). *Toward a science of translating*. E. J. Brill.

Paketchi, A. (2013). *Quran translation studies: Theoretical and practical approaches (A study from the lexical level to sentence structure)*. Imam Sadiq University Press.

Pym, A. (2005). Explaining explicitation. In K. Károly & Á. Fóris (Eds.), *New trends in translation studies: In honour of Kinga Klaudy* (pp. 29–43). Akadémiai Kiadó. (Original work published 2001)

Saffarzadeh, T. (2003). *The Holy Qur'ān: Translation in Farsi and English*. Osveh Publications.

Sahih International. (1997). *The Quran: English meanings*. Abul-Qasim Publishing House.

Sajjadi, M. S., & Manafi, S. (2008). *Evaluation of English translations of the Qur'ān* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Islamic Azad University, Science and Research Branch.

Shakir, M. H. (1959). *The Holy Qur'ān: Arabic text and English translation*. Tahrike Tarsile Qur'ān.

Snell-Hornby, M. (1995). *Translation studies: An integrated approach* (Rev. ed.). John Benjamins.