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Abstract  
This study investigates how implicit organizational meaning is translated from English into Arabic by analyzing (Obama’s speech "State of the Union Address” 2015) including the English version and the Arabic translations according to Larson’s model (1984). Translating implicitness is based on exploring Implicit organizational meaning which is the meaning that results from leaving some referential information that occur in the semantic structure i.e. grammar implicit, so that to indicate old information, to add cohesion, or in some cases to mark theme or focus. For instance, passive constructions is used by some languages to indicate focus, and by using such construction, part of the meaning must be left implicit since the agent is not indicated.  
The study aims at exploring the most appropriate translation for the implicit organizational meaning from English into Arabic in the presidential speech (Obama’s 2015 State of the Union Address), to see how they have been realized grammatically and lexically. The analysis goes with line of Larson (1984) which has been adopted as model in the analysis of the presidential speech. The study comes out that implicit organizational meaning is widely used in Obama presidential speech because of the common use of political deictic pronouns.
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1. What is Implicit Meaning?

Larson (1984) indicates that the implicit meaning is a meaning that is not shown but it is the part of the conversation or intention to convey by the speaker.

In translating process, translating implicit meaning can be a demanding task due to the fact that implicit meaning is not overtly seen. Therefore, implicit meaning needs to be treated appropriately because it has the implied information which the reader may not know. To make it clear, it has to be stated by the translator, i.e. the translator should make the implicit information in the ST explicit when rendering it into the TT; taking into his/her account the cultural differences between the two languages.

Implicit information refers to shared information that is part of the total information assumed by the writer, whereas explicit information refers to information that is overtly stated by lexical items and grammatical forms. For example, the sentence “some suggested that the president’s aggression was a masterful display of strategy and strength.” contains implicit meaning in the president’s aggression. If the audience does not recognize the meaning of president’s aggression, then the translator needs to provide explicit information: “some suggested that the Russian president’s aggression was a masterful display of strategy and strength.”

In addition to that the meaning conveying the implicit information has the implied message. This message is a part of the whole meaning, i.e. the writer and the receiver of the implicit meaning should be intelligent to comprehend and convey the meaning of the message. Therefore, the translation of the implicit meaning may lead to misinterpretation of the target language because of the linguistic and cultural differences between the source and target languages. Besides, it can produce ambiguity or even vagueness in the target language.

Larson (1984) asserts that the original meaning must stay constant. This means that the form it takes in the target language does not matter. Furthermore, the target text should be in its natural forms and appropriately communicative in the sense that it can convey all the aspects of meaning which are readily understandable to the readers. Hence, to be able to capture the implicit message properly, the translator must have the ability to recognize and translate the various kinds of meanings and ways of translating implicit meaning.

In any text, sometimes the meaning is not conveyed explicitly. On the contrary, the reference to certain things, events or relations might be left implicit which is the case of Implicit Referential Meaning that results in or signal Implicit Organizational Meaning so that to indicate old information, to add cohesion, or in some cases to mark theme or focus; therefore, the meaning does exist, but it is not expressed explicitly. Discovering the underlying meaning of the SL text requires the translator’s careful consideration of both explicit and implicit information.

The translator should beware of the point that, in every single language there is meaning which is expressed explicitly and there is some meaning which is left implicit, due to the different set of assumptions and shared knowledge of the different languages and cultures. In the process of understanding the implicit meaning, the responders sometimes have to try hard to get the proper interpretation by the imagery or interpretation. Responders need to know certain things like reference, situation and context. Knowledge of context will help responders to get the right interpretation.
In an attempt to understand and achieve the correct message of a source language text, the terms of reading the line and reading between the lines should be maintained. Reading the line refers to reading with a view to know the explicit meanings, while reading between the lines means reading to know the implicit meanings. To clarify this, the study gives the following example:

2. Implicit organizational Meaning

Larson (1984) has classified the implicit meaning into three types: **implicit referential meaning**, where a speaker or person uses a certain word or sentence to refer to certain thing or meaning that he/she intends or means in the real world. For example, the word apple refers to the fruit produced by a certain tree. Thus, people know the meaning of apple because they have seen an apple and learned to call it apple; **implicit situational meaning** where the message is produced in a given communication situation and results from several factors such as, the communication when it takes place, the age, sex, and social status of the speaker/writer and hearer / reader, the relationship between them which will affect the communication, the presuppositions that each brings to the communication, the cultural background of the speaker and the addressee, and many other situational matters; and **implicit organizational meaning** which is about the information content. This paper focused only on translating implicit organizational meaning in the presidential speech "Obama's 2015 State of the Union Address" because it has the implied information which needs to be treated appropriately.

The translator must take the organizational meaning into his account when translating a text; for this type of implicit meaning, is the one that organizes and puts the referential information or meaning together into coherent text. Therefore, she (Larson 1984: 41) refers to by saying that "It is the ORGANIZATIONAL MEANING that puts the referential information together into a coherent text."

Referential information can be varied into different kinds of information; some of them may be old information, others may be new, some information can be the topic of the discourse; while the other information commenting on the topic. Some information can be very important and essential to the message of discourse or the text. Certain information may be old information, some new; other information may be the topic (what is being talked about) of the discourse, information commenting on the topic; and some information may be more central to the message; that is, more important or more prominent."

There are many features in the grammatical structure of a text which are used to indicate the organizational meaning in the text such as: deictics, repetition, groupings, and many other features.

In order to illustrate this, Larson gives an example about two propositions *Mary peeled an apple* and *Mary ate an apple*, in which both of them include Mary as the agent and apple as the affected. Mary and apple are both referred to twice as referential meaning. But in order to form a correct grammatical structure, Larson points out that , one must also know, if the organizational meaning includes the fact that; there is only one Mary and only one apple or if there are two Marys or two apples . Thus, Larson (1984: 42), states that "If they are the same, the surface structure in English would be a form like Mary peeled an apple, and then she ate it. After the first proposition is given, MARY and APPLE are both old information and so pronominal forms are used. If, however, there are two MARYS being referred to and
only one APPLE, then the grammatical form would need to indicate this with something like
Mary peeled an apple, and then the other Mary ate it.".

Languages differ from each other of signaling the organizational meaning. In that, each language has its own ways of signaling the organizational meaning. For example, all languages do not use pronominal forms in the same way, but all languages will have a formal way to indicate that certain information is old information.

Larson (1984: 46) indicates that " For example, the school was founded in 1902 might be used to put the school in focus, but to do this, the information of who founded the school has to be left implicit. The information left implicit is REFERENTIAL MEANING, but it is left implicit to signal ORGANIZATIONAL MEANING; that is, that school is in focus. The semantic proposition would be (someone) founded the school in 1902. "

Based on this, focus can be indicated by a passive grammatical form in one language; and by a completely different form in another language; where the passive would not occur. So in this case, the agent of the action should be made explicit. Therefore, Larson points out that, in Aguarunana language for example, it should be translated as (the community) founded a school. Thus, the organizational meaning of focus would need to be indicated by a special suffix on the word school marking focus.

From what has been stated above, the translator should be aware of the need to adjust these in translation. In that sometimes, the translation of the (TL) may require to be more explicit than the (SL). Whereas, other times the translation may require being implicit. Furthermore, the translator should be aware and expects to find differences between languages; in order to assess of how much information must be stated explicitly and others must be left implicitly.

3. Political Manipulation of Syntactic Style & Implicitness in Political speech

According to van Dijk(1997) the political manipulation of syntactic style refers to the "ways that are used to express the underlying meanings in sentence structures" i.e. implicit meanings; for example the use of pronouns, variations of word order, the use of specific syntactic categories, active and passive constructions, nominalizations, clause embedding, and sentence complexity. In addition to that, the use of deictic pronouns, such as the paradigmatic pair denoting political polarization: US vs. THEM (Maitland & Wilson 1987; Wilson 1990; Zupnik 1994).

Thus, the use of the political plural we (or possessive our) has many implications for the political position, alliances, solidarity, and other socio-political position of the speaker, depending on the relevant in group being constructed in the present context: We in the West, we the people, we American citizens, we Democrats, we in the government, or indeed we the President. Based on this, political pronouns are typical deictics for political contexts and their categories. Pronominal self-references within the same political speech, may vary, depending on which reference group is most relevant for each argument. Principles of exclusion and inclusion are at play, and reflect the partisan strategies of power in the political process. On the other hand, active sentences will associate responsible agency with (topical) syntactic subjects, whereas passive sentences will focus on objects (e.g. victims) of such actions and defocus responsible agency by putting agents last in prepositional phrases, or leaving it implicit, as in the well-known headlines Police killed demonstrators vs. Demonstrators killed by Police vs. Demonstrators killed.
Thus, syntactic structures are able to put more or less emphasis, concentration on specific words, phrases or clauses, and as a result indirectly contribute to corresponding semantic stress on specific meanings, as a function of the political interests and allegiances of the speaker or writer (Fowler et al. 1979; Kress & Hodge 1993). According to Beard (2000: 24), the use of pronouns may tell us a lot about how much responsibility a speaker wants to assume for an idea.

Thus, pronouns are words substituting for nouns or noun phrases. Jones & Wareing (1999: 46), indicate that, the first person singular pronoun I, for instance clearly declares who is responsible while the first person plural pronoun we makes the statues of responsibility more unclear. Charteris-Black (2005: 4), points out that, first person plural pronouns in the introduction of speech aim at an appeal to the sharing of interests between speaker and audience. In addition to that, Beard (ibid: 39), indicates that contrasts are also used to point out a difference between two ideas or a difference in time; as in between then and now by stating what something is and then contrasting it with what is not.

4. Data Analysis and Findings

The data of this study has been derived from the political speech (Obama’s 2015 State of the Union Address) 20 January 2015 Published on the website of the White House: http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/texttrans/2015/01/20150121313075.html#axzz3s2VduRhX; using two versions of Arabic translations. This study deals with the analysis and translation of implicit organizational meaning lexically and grammatically in English and Arabic depending on Larson’s model (1984). The study does not cover all the speech, but only taking some texts and divided into (12) texts as samples to be analyzed and translated, and comparing both translations in the Arabic versions. One has been taken from the White House website: :http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/arabic/texttrans/2015/01/20150123313140.html#axzz3s2VduRhX; and the other one has been taken from varieties sources of some Arab news & mass media.

(Text 1)

“We are fifteen years into this new century. Fifteen years that dawned with terror touching our shores....."

Trans.1

إننا الآن في السنة الخامسة عشرة من هذا القرن الجديد

Trans.2

نحن الآن في عامنا الخامس عشر من هذا القرن الجديد

The first translator renders the political plural deictic pronoun we which has many implications as (إننا), whereas the second translator renders it as (نحن). English has only the political plural deictic pronoun we that is used to indicate many implications, particularly implicit organizational meaning; whereas Arabic has two pronominal forms (نحن, إننا). Therefore, both of them can be used to express implicitness indicating certain old information.

Thus, president Obama here uses the political plural deictic pronoun we which has many implications for the socio-political position of the speaker, depending on the relevant in group being constructed in the present context: we the people, we American citizens, we Democrats, we in the government, or indeed we the President, and since organizational meaning is signaled by deixics, repetition, groupings, and many other features in the grammatical structure of a text, so in this case, one may conclude that, the implicit meaning
in (Text 1) indicated or implied by the political plural deictic pronoun \textit{we}; is the implicit organizational meaning in order to indicate old information that is the "Fifteen years" implicitly indicated by president Obama. As a result, the second "Fifteen years" in the text is the same first one; therefore it has to be left implicit, so that, to indicate old information.

The grammatical realization of the implicit organizational meaning in (Text 1) has been expressed by the political plural deictic pronoun \textit{we}, whereas the lexical realization has been expressed by indicating old information \textit{Fifteen years}.

(Text 2)

"It has been, and still is, a hard time for many"

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textbf{Trans. 1} & \textit{وعدت، ولا تزال وقتاً عصيباً بالنسبة للكثيرين} \\
\textbf{Trans. 2} & \textit{لقد كانت، ولاتزال سنين صعبة للكثيرين} \\
\end{tabular}

In (Text 2) both translators have semantically rendered the political pronoun \textit{it} which expresses implicit organizational meaning to indicate old information "Fifteen years" in (Text 1); into the Arabic equivalents \textit{وقت\'{\textacuten}ا عصيبا\'{\textacuten}}, or \textit{قد كانت}, respectively. However, each translator has rendered the attribution "a hard time" which expresses implicit referential meaning indicating and implying to those fifteen years in (Text 1); and thus, resulting in implicit organizational meaning in order to indicate old information that is "Fifteen years" in (Text 1); in a different way.

Accordingly, the first translator has semantically rendered it into the Arabic equivalents \textit{وقت\'{\textacuten}ا عصيبا\'{\textacuten}} whereas, the second one has communicatively rendered it into the proper Arabic equivalent \textit{سنين صعبة} which is more appropriate. In fact, the translator has been qualified when he rendered the implicit meanings expressed by the attribution "a hard time" explicitly into the proper Arabic equivalent \textit{سنين صعبة} since he is explaining by this to the reader of the Arabic TT; that when Obama says "a hard time" he has implicitly indicated to those "Fifteen years" in particular not more or less, and resulting by this in implicit organizational meaning so that to indicate old information. Thus, the second translator has changed the implicit meanings in the English ST into the explicit meanings in the Arabic TT. Thus, the suggested translation for the implicit meanings in (Text 2) can be:

\textit{لقد كانت، ولاتزال سنين صعبة بالنسبة للكثيرين}.

The grammatical realization of the implicit organizational meaning in (Text 2) has been expressed by the political pronoun \textit{it}, and the lexical realization has been realized by indicating old information \textit{Fifteen years} in (Text 1).

(Text 3)

"America ……… know this: The shadow of crisis has passed"

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textbf{Trans. 1} & \textit{لقد غاب يهم الأزمة، وأصبحت حالة الاتحاد قوية} \\
\textbf{Trans. 2} & \textit{لقد مر ظلم الأزمة، والبلاد بحالة قوية.} \\
\end{tabular}

In the above stated (Text 3) both translators use the communicative and semantic approaches in their translations. The first translator renders the implicit meanings in the first part "The shadow of crisis has passed" communicatively into Arabic \textit{لقد غاب يهم الأزمة} where he translates "shadow" into the proper Arabic equivalent \textit{شبح} which is very accurate and
proper equivalent, since that, the Global Financial Crisis of 2007-2008 was a real and crucial crisis not only for USA but for the whole world. It was exactly like a ghost that was threatening the whole world financially and economically. So, the translator has been successful in his choice of the proper Arabic equivalent which implies the above stated crisis.

Whereas the translator has rendered the second part of (Text 3), "and the State of the Union is strong" semantically into the Arabic equivalent وأصبحت حالة الاتحاد قوية which is a good translation, but it would be more appropriate if it is rendered communicatively into the Arabic equivalent البلاد; and thus the best translation would be:

لقد غاب شبح الأزمة. وأصبحت البلاد بحالة قوية.

As for the second translator, the implicit meanings in the first part "The shadow of crisis has passed" semantically into Arabicecd مر ظل الأزمة which is in fact not very qualified rendering with the situation of context; in that "shadow" here does not mean ظل the shadow of a person or something in its true sense. Besides, "crisis" is not an animate or even inanimate something to have a shadow, rather, it is something abstract and intangible. Therefore, it has to be translated communicatively into the appropriate Arabic equivalent شبح since "shadow" implies many different kinds of implicit meanings indicating to the dark times of the Global Financial Crisis of 2007-2008.

Thus, the translator has not been very successful in his choice of the Arabic equivalent ظل which does not imply the above stated crisis. But on the other hand, the translator has been qualified with his rendering into Arabic in the second part of the text والبلاد بحالة قوية; and thus it is good translation since it has been translated communicatively.

Furthermore, it is worthy to mention that both translators render the verb in the present perfect in "The shadow of crisis has passed" into the Arabic equivalentsقد مر شبح الأزمة and لقد مر ظل الأزمة sequentially; however, it is suggested that the translation would be more appropriate if the translator uses the Arabic equivalent لقد ولى شبح الأزمة, and thus, the suggested translation for the implicit meanings in this text would be like this:

لقد ولى شبح الأزمة، وأصبحت البلاد بحالة قوية.

The grammatical realization of the implicit organizational meaning in (Text 3) which results from implicit referential meaning has been expressed by the sentence of the (Present perfect tense): "The shadow of crisis has passed", while the lexical realization has been expressed through marking focus. (The Global Financial Crisis of 2007-2008).

(Text 4)

"Instead of sending large ground forces overseas, we’re partnering with nations from South Asia to North Africa to deny safe haven to terrorists who threaten America. In Iraq and Syria, American leadership – including our military power – is stopping ISIL’s advance. Instead of getting dragged into another ground war in the Middle East, we are leading a broad coalition, including Arab nations, to degrade and ultimately destroy this terrorist group”.

Trans.1

وبدلاً من إرسال قوات بحرية كبيرة إلى الخارج، نتعاون في إطار شراكة مع دول من جنوب آسيا إلى شمال أفريقيا لحرمان الإرهابيين الذين يهددون أمريكا من إيجاد الملاذ الآمن. وفي العراق وسوريا، تعمل القيادة الأمريكية ومن الحرباء الأمريفيين الذين يهددون أمنها من إيجاد الملاذ الآمن. وفي العراق وسوريا، تعمل القيادة الأمريكية ومن
ضمنها قواتنا العسكرية على وقف تقدم الدولة الإسلامية في العراق والشام. وبدلاً من الانجرار إلى حرب برية أخرى في الشرق الأوسط، فإننا نقود تحالفًا واسع النطاق، يضم دولًا عربية، لحظر من قدرات هذه المجموعة الإرهابية وهزيمتها في نهاية المطاف.

وقال أوباما: بدلا من إرسال قوات برية كبيرة للخارج، نحن نتعاون مع دول جنوب آسيا وحتى شمال أفريقيا لمنع الإرهابيين من العمل ضد أمريكا تحت سيطرة القيادة الأمريكية. وقفل داعش في سوريا والعراق. بدلاً من الانجرار وراء حرب أخرى في الشرق الأوسط، إننا نعمل على إدامة واسع، يشمل الدول العربية، لوقف وتدمير الإرهاب.

In Trans 1 of (Text 4), the translator uses the semantic approach in his rendering in which he focuses basically upon the semantic content of the ST; as he attempts to reproduce the precise meaning of the ST.

However, it should be mentioned that the translator has made a great offense to the culture of the Arabic TT by rendering the attribution ISIL which expresses implicit referential meaning as تنظيم الدولة الإسلامية في العراق والشام; as it has been stated before, that the translation of implicit meaning may lead to misinterpretation of the target language because of the linguistic and cultural differences between the source and target languages. Besides, it can produce ambiguity or even vagueness in the target language.

The translator is not supposed to translate the attribution ISIL which expresses implicit referential meaning into تنظيم الدولة الإسلامية في العراق والشام for the following crucial reasons:

1- It is considered to be as a great offence to the Islamic religion itself; since that ISIL or ISIS has nothing to do with Islam. Furthermore, Islam is a great religion and it cannot be a state, so, rendering ISIL or ISIS in such a way by some Arab translators and also by some Arab news and mass media is a huge mistake that one should be aware of it; since translating ISIL or ISIS into تنظيم الدولة الإسلامية في العراق والشام as a result will give legality and confession to such terrorists groups which has nothing to do with humanity.

2- The Arabic term الدولة is used when talking about a real state that possesses all the requests, needs and conditions for being a state which is recognized and accepted by both the community and International Law. ISIS is nothing, but global terrorists groups or gangs.

3- Translators are required not only to have a good command of the source language (SL) and the target language (TL), but they must understand language, culture and implicit meaning found in the source language and the target language in order to obtain a good translation.

Therefore, the translator in Trans 1 of (Text 4) should translate communicatively the English term ISIL into the appropriate Arabic equivalent: عصابات داعش الإرهابية or simply to the proper Arabic equivalent داعش في سوريا والعراق.

As for the translator in Trans 2 of (Text 4), the translator here uses the semantic approach in some parts of the text attempting to reproduce the precise meaning of the ST, whereas other parts uses the communicative approach in which he attempts to produce the same effect on the receptor. In fact he does this correctly, especially when he translates the attribution ISIL which expresses implicit referential meaning communicatively as داعش في سوريا والعراق in which he is very qualified and succeeds in his choice. Thus, the translator should be the master of the two cultures as well as the two language structures.
The grammatical realization of the implicit organizational meaning in (Text 4) can be expressed by the political plural deictic pronoun we; and the lexical realization which can be realized by indicating old information "terrorist group" or terrorists"

(Text 5)

"We're also supporting a moderate opposition in Syria that can help us in this effort, and assisting people everywhere who stand up to the bankrupt ideology of violent extremism. Now this effort will take time."

Trans.1

كما ندعم المعارضة المعترضة في سوريا التي يمكننا أن نتعاون معها في هذا الجهود، ونساعدهم الناس في كل مكان من منفردة أيديولوجيا التطرف المتطرفة. والآن فان هذا الجهود سيستغرق وقتًا طويلاً.

Trans.2

ندعم معارضة معترضة في سوريا يمكن أن نتعاون معها في وجهنا ضد الجماعات الإرهابية، وتدعيم الجميع في كل مكان لنقف ضد الأيديولوجيا المتطرفة التي لتغطى قضات طويل.

In Trans.1 of (Text 5), the translator here uses the semantic approach. However, he translates the political plural deictic pronoun we which is used to express implicit organizational meaning into Arabic as ندعم instead of نحن ندعم which is more appropriate; thus, the translation can be in this way:

نحن أيضا ندعم المعارضة المعترضة في سوريا.

In addition to that, the translator has semantically rendered the word "effort" twice which is an old information indicated by the implicit organizational meaning into the Arabic equivalent جهد; but instead, the translator can communicatively render "effort" into the proper Arabic equivalent معركة in both cases in that, the first "effort" and the second one are the same, and since Obama has implicitly indicated that, the war with extremism and ISIS will take a long time for instance years or may be decades to defeat them not only existentially, but intellectually.

As for Trans.2 of (Text 5), the translator here uses the communicative approach. He translates the political plural deictic pronoun we which is used to express implicit organizational meaning into Arabic as ندعم instead of نحن ندعم which is more appropriate; while he omits "also" from the rendering.

In addition to that, the translator renders the word "effort" which is an old information indicated by the implicit organizational meaning into two different ways, gathering both communicative and semantic approaches.

Thus, the first "effort" in "We’re also supporting a moderate opposition in Syria that can help us in this effort," has been translated semantically into the Arabic equivalent جهدنا followed by the addition ضد الجماعات الإرهابية; but instead, the translator can communicatively render "effort" into the proper Arabic equivalent معركة or حرب as it has been stated before with first rendering previously, and thus, the translation will be more appropriate as:

معركتنا ضد الجماعات الإرهابية

Whereas, the second "effort" in "Now this effort will take time" has been translated communicatively into the Arabic equivalent المعركة followed by the addition ضد داعش which in which the translator has been qualified with his choice since "effort" here expresses implicit organizational meaning in order to indicate old information; thus, the translation will be:

أن المعركة ضد داعش تحتاج لوقت طويل.
According to this, the first "effort" and the second one are the same, since Obama has implicitly indicated that the war with extremism and ISIS will take a long time for instance years or may be decades to defeat them not only existentially but intellectually.

The grammatical realization of the implicit organizational meaning in (Text 5), is realized by using political plural deictic pronouns: (we, us); whereas the lexical realization can be realized by indicating to old information that is "effort".

(Text 6)

"Now this effort will take time. It will require focus. But we will succeed."

In Trans.1 of (Text 6), the translator has semantically rendered the word "effort", which expresses implicit organizational meaning in order to indicate old information, into the Arabic equivalent الجهد; however, it is more appropriate for the translator to render the word "effort" communicatively into the Arabic equivalent المعركة or الحرب thus the suggested translation by this study will be:

والآن فان هذه الحرب أو المعركة ستستغرق وقتًا طويلاً. ويتطلب التركيز. ولكننا سوف ننجح.

In Trans.2 of (Text 6), the translator has communicatively rendered the word "effort", which expresses implicit organizational meaning in order to indicate old information, into the proper Arabic equivalent المعركة and this is the fact since that Obama and the White House have implicitly stated that the war with ISIS may last for few years. In addition to that, the translator has rendered the modal verb "will require" into the Arabic equivalent تحتاج, but the translator should render it into more appropriate Arabic equivalent ستحتاج where he has to use السين or سوف which indicates to the future and which stands with (will) in English ST, in that the war with ISIS will last for long time in the future. Thus, the suggested translation by this study is:

أن المعركة ضد داعش ستحتاج لوقت طويل.

In addition to that, the translator has used in his rendering into the Arabic the addition ضد داعش and has omitted the rest. Thus, the grammatical realization for the implicit organizational meaning in (Text 6) can be realized in both the word "effort" and the political deictic pronoun "it", while the lexical realization can be expressed by indicating to old information.
"I call on this Congress to show the world that we are united in this mission by passing a resolution to authorize the use of force against ISIL."

Trans.1
وفي هذا المساء، أدعو هذا الكونغرس لأن يظهر للعالم أننا متحدون في هذه المهمة من خلال المصادقة على قرار يجوز لنا استخدام القوة ضد تنظيم الدولة الإسلامية في العراق والشام (داعش) لأننا بحاجة إلى هذه السلطة.

Trans.2
وأطلب من الكونجرس أن نظهر للعالم أننا متحدون في هذه المهمة عبر تمرير قرار استخدام القوة ضد داعش.

In Trans.1 of (Text 7), again, the translator has made an enormous offence to the culture of the Arabic TT by rendering the word "ISIL" which indicate to the old information in (Text 4) expressing implicit organizational meaning into the Arabic equivalent as: تنظيم الدولة الإسلامية في العراق والشام (داعش), (cf. Text 4).

In Trans.2 of (Text 7), the translator has been very qualified when he communicatively translates the English term "ISIL" into the proper Arabic equivalent داعش, taking the culture of the Arabic TT into his consideration. The analysis goes in harmony with what Larson (1984: 470) says "Culture is a complex of beliefs, attitudes, values, and rules which a group of people share….etc. The translator will need to understand them in order to adequately understand the source text and adequately translate it for people who have a different set of beliefs, attitudes, values, and rules".

Thus, the grammatical realization of the implicit organizational meaning in (Text 7), has been realized by the use of the political deictic pronouns (I and we), while the lexical realization of the implicit organizational meaning has been realized by indicating old information where "ISIL" refers to the old information in (Text 4).

(Text 8)

"Second, we are demonstrating the power of American strength and diplomacy. We’re upholding the principle that bigger nations can’t bully the small – by opposing Russian aggression, and supporting Ukraine’s democracy, and reassuring our NATO allies."

Trans.1
ثانيًا، إننا نظهر أهمية القوة والدبلوماسية الأميركية. إننا نتمسك بالمبادئ القائل إنه لا يجوز للدول الكبرى أن تفرض سلطتها على الدول الصغرى - من خلال معارضة العدوان الروسي، ودعم الديمقراطية في أوكرانيا، وطمأنة حلفائنا في حلف شمال الأطلسي (الناتو).

Trans.2
نحن نظهر عظمة ودبلوماسية وقوة الولايات المتحدة، وندافع عن المبدأ القائل إن القوى العظمى يجب ألا تقهر الصغرى، من خلال معارضةتنا لإعدام الروس ودعمنا للديمقراطية في أوكرانيا وإعطائنا ضمانات لحلفائنا في الحلف الأطلسي.

In Trans.1 of (Text 8), the translator uses the semantic approach in the translation. Thus, he translates the political plural pronoun we in "Second, we are demonstrating the power of American strength and diplomacy." into the Arabic TT as إننا نظهر نتمسك, however, it is better to be translated into the proper Arabic equivalent نحن نظهر نتمسك.

The political plural pronoun we, in "We’re upholding the principle that.......", has been also translated into the Arabic TT as إننا نتمسك instead of translating it as نحن نتمسك for the translator can communicatively render as the following:
We're demonstrating the power of American strength and diplomacy.

Well, today, it is America that stands strong and united with our allies, while Russia is isolated, with its economy in tatters. That's how America leads – not with bluster, but with persistent, steady resolve.
As it has been stated before, that the pronoun it is used to emphasize the power and strength of America and being united with its allies. According to this, both translators have rendered it is America into the Arabic equivalent أميركا هي, or only أميركا في time both translators can render it into the proper Arabic equivalent إنها أميركا to make it more influence on the Arabic TT readership. Thus, the suggested translation can be like this:

إنها أميركا التي تقف قوية ومتحدة مع حلفائنا، في حين باتت روسيا معزولة، واقتصادها يتهاوى.

The grammatical realization of the implicit organizational meaning can be realized by political plural possessive "our", the deictic "that" and the repetition of the word "America", so that to indicate old information where this is the lexical realization.

6. Conclusions

The study has concluded the following:

1- Implicit meaning plays the crucial role in political texts especially, presidential speeches. It is a very complex, important, crucial, and challenging phenomenon. Implicit information can be characterized by communicating with varying degrees of strength, conveying a potentially open-ended range of thoughts, and the responsibility for implicit information can be shared between communicator and audience to varying degrees. Larson's Model (1984) is the best one which can be applied grammatically and lexically on the translation of implicit meaning from English into Arabic in political texts. In both English and Arabic, implicit meaning is considered to be as a very complicated process of assuming and deducing the intended meaning of the speaker and then translated accurately to the hearer i.e. the hidden meaning or in other words translating meaning behind words. According to this, the translation of English implicit meaning into Arabic can be done implicitly or explicitly by paying attention to the reference. Therefore, the entailments of references should be clear and understandable without causing ambiguity and without sacrificing the unity of meaning.

2- Implicit meaning is considered to be as one of the most challenging phenomenon in Arabic for two main reasons: first, the lack of necessary resources, and the cultural differences between the two languages. A good and alert translator is expected to be acquainted with the new words and expressions by finding the proper equivalent that helps the reader to understand the new terms in the right context and more specifically, the terms which carry the crucial implicit meanings.

The rendering of the implicit meaning has been considered to be as a tough task for the translator; especially within the grammatical manipulation where the use of political plural deictic pronouns is very common such as: We, possessive Our, Us. In addition to that, the use
of the singular pronoun *I*, in which the use of these political pronouns express both implicit referential and organizational meanings in political texts so that to indicate old information; to add cohesion and to mark theme or focus according to the model of Larson. The study has found that implicit organizational meaning is the most common kind that is widely used in Obama's presidential speech which has the frequency of 15 occurrences grammatically representing 60% of the total number, and 10 lexically representing 40% of the total number of the use of the implicit organizational meaning in Obama's presidential speech.
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