Document generated on 07/18/2025 1:14 p.m.

Meta
Journal des traducteurs
Translators' Journal

META

Managing in Translation: A Theoretical Model

Mohammed Farghal

Volume 38, Number 2, juin 1993

URI: https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/002721ar
DOI: https://doi.org/10.7202/002721ar

See table of contents

Publisher(s)

Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal

ISSN

0026-0452 (print)
1492-1421 (digital)

Explore this journal

Cite this article

Farghal, M. (1993). Managing in Translation: A Theoretical Model. *Meta*, *38*(2), 257–267. https://doi.org/10.7202/002721ar

Article abstract

The present paper aims to shed light on the notion of managing in the process of translating. It firmly distinguishes between two types of managing: Intrinsic vs. Extrinsic managing. Intrinsic managing, on the one hand, is entailed by the numerous asymmetries existing between the SL and TL, thus aiming to bring about natural naturalations. Extrinsic managing, on the other hand, is the translator's ideological superimposition on the SL text, thus steering it in a way as to meet his own goals. It is demonstrated that these two types of managing may operate at different levels in the process of translating, viz, syntactic, semantic, pragmatic, textual and cultural levels. The paper argues that intrinsic managing is inevitable, hence is commendable; whereas, extrinsic managing constitutes the translator's premeditated intervention in the message of the SL text, hence is condemnable.

Tous droits réservés © Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal, 1993

This document is protected by copyright law. Use of the services of Érudit (including reproduction) is subject to its terms and conditions, which can be viewed online.

https://apropos.erudit.org/en/users/policy-on-use/

érudit

This article is disseminated and preserved by Érudit.

Érudit is a non-profit inter-university consortium of the Université de Montréal, Université Laval, and the Université du Québec à Montréal. Its mission is to promote and disseminate research.

https://www.erudit.org/en/

MANAGING IN TRANSLATION: A THEORETICAL MODEL

MOHAMMED FARGHAL
Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan

Résumé

Le but de cet article est de mettre en lumière le procédé d'adaptation dans le processus de traduction. L'auteur distingue clairement deux types d'adaptation : l'adaptation intrinsèque et l'adaptation extrinsèque. L'une, engendrée par les nombreuses asymétries entre les langues source et cible, vise à établir des équivalences naturelles entre celles-ci, tandis que l'autre — l'adaptation extrinsèque — a trait à la superposition de l'idéologie du traducteur sur le texte-source, lequel est, par conséquent, mis au service de ses propres intérêts. Ces deux types d'adaptation peuvent agir à différents niveaux dans le processus de traduction : syntaxique, sémantique, pragmatique, textuel et culturel. Cet article soutient que l'adaptation intrinsèque est inévitable, donc louable, alors que l'adaptation extrinsèque, qui constitue une appropriation délibérée du message par le traducteur, est condamnable.

Abstract

The present paper aims to shed light on the notion of managing in the process of translating. It firmly distinguishes between two types of managing: Intrinsic vs. Extrinsic managing. Intrinsic managing, on the one hand, is entailed by the numerous asymmetries existing between the SL and TL, thus aiming to bring about natural naturalations. Extrinsic managing, on the other hand, is the translator's ideological superimposition on the SL text, thus steering it in a way as to meet his own goals. It is demonstrated that these two types of managing may operate at different levels in the process of translating, viz, syntactic, semantic, pragmatic, textual and cultural levels. The paper argues that intrinsic managing is inevitable, hence is commendable; whereas, extrinsic managing constitutes the translator's premeditated intervention in the message of the SL text, hence is condemnable.

INTRODUCTION

As a term, managing was historically introduced by de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) who view it as inherently related to argumentation where *situation managing* is meant to steer the text in a way that serves the text producer's goals. By contrast, exposition exhibits *monitoring of the situation* where a reasonably detached account is provided. Thus managing vs. monitoring is a discoursal parameter contingent on the text-type, *i.e.*, argumentative vs. expository texts. De Beaugrande and Dressler don't shed light on the term's bearings on the process of translating. De Beaugrande (1984: 39) reiterates this view, saying, "Monitoring occurs when the text serves mainly to give an account of the situation; managing occurs when the text serves mainly to guide the evolution of the situation toward one's goals." Consequently, in the process of discoursing, an author may opt for managing and/or monitoring depending on the text-type he has chosen.

Al-Mahmoud (1986) borrows the dichotomy of *managing vs. monitoring* and applies it to the process of translating. Thus the translator rather than the author becomes the controller of this discoursal parameter; if he chooses to intervene in the message of the text, then he will be managing, while if he just renders the message untinkered with, then he will be monitoring. Al-Mahmoud, however, confuses the process of discoursing

with the process of translating when he commends the translator's managing in argumentative texts and condemns it in expository texts, because managing in the process of translating will alter the text to serve the translator's goals no matter whether it be argumentation or exposition. Thus the distinction between argumentation and exposition with reference to managing vs. monitoring is relevant to the process of discoursing rather than the process of translating. This being the case, the translator may either manage or monitor a text disregarding its being argumentative or expository. The only difference here is that an expository text will become, at least implicitly, argumentative when managed, whereas an argumentative text will stay argumentative by default (however, see examples (30) and (31)). In either case, however, the text is steered toward meeting the translator's rather than the text producer's goals.

Due to the fuzziness of the term *managing* in the translation literature and circles, this paper is designed to tighten this notion by spelling out what can be meant by it when talking about translation. To start with, we will distinguish between two types of managing: Intrinsic vs. Extrinsic managing. Intrinsic managing, on the one hand, relates to the alterations effected in the Target Language (TL) text due to the mismatches existing between the TL and the Source Language (SL). These mismatches range from the most micro to the most macro-levels; they involve phonic, syntactic, semantic, pragmatic, textual, and cultural mismatches. The managing of these mismatches is a prerequisite in the process of translating, for them leaving unmanaged would bring about unintelligible translations, hence a breakdown in communication. Extrinsic managing, on the other hand, relates to the translator's ideological superimposition on the TL text aiming to gear the TL text's message toward meeting his own goals. This premeditated intervention in the TL text may manifest itself in the syntax, semantics, pragmatics, and culture of the translations. In the following pages, we will theoretically explore these two types of managing with elaborate examples from Arabic and English. In the pursuit of normative concepts, we have concocted most of our examples.

INTRINSIC MANAGING

The fact that human languages phonologize, syntactize, lexicalize, pragmaticize, textualize, and culturalize differently makes intrinsic managing inevitable in the process of translating. Krazeszowki (1971: 37-48) states that there are few, if any, congruent structures between languages. As a consequence, one-to-one correspondence is practically impossible to come by. However, as Kachru (1982: 84) puts it, "whatever can be said in one language can be said equally well in any other language." This being the case, the picture that emerges is one of asymmetric equivalence between languages. The existing translation models selectively focus on differing asymmetries between languages: Cultural equivalence (Casagrande 1954), Situational or Sociolinguistic equivalence (Vinay and Darbelnet 1958), Dynamic or Psycholinguistic equivalence (Nida 1964), Formal or Grammatical equivalence (Catford 1965), Semiotic recoding (Jäger 1975), Textual equivalence (Van Dijk 1972), de Beaugrande (1980), de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981), etc. To bring about these types of equivalence in the TL text, the SL text must be subjected to intrinsic managing at one or more of its linguistic and/or cultural levels. As a matter of fact, this is the only route to having natural/idiomatic translations.

To illustrate intrinsic managing relating to syntax and phonology, let us consider the English sentences in (1) below.

(1) a. An Israeli bomber en route to Iraq was spotted by the Jordanian radar this morning.
b. The Jordanian radar spotted an Israeli bomber en route to Iraq this morning.

As can be seen, (1a) is a passive English sentence where all term-arguments are present, *i.e.*, the agent and the patient. The choice between (1a) and its active counterpart in (1b) is fundamentally structural although there are pragmatic implications that are irrelevant to our present discussion. By contrast, the passivization rule in Arabic is fundamentally pragmatic rather than structural, *viz.*, passivization in Arabic is resorted to in order to hide the agent rather than to provide for structural variation, among other things. Consequently, this asymmetry should be managed when rendering (1a) into Arabic. The Arabic rendition is in (2) below.

(2) **raṣada -l- rādār -u- -l- ʻurdiniyy -u**
spotted out -def- radar -nom- -def- Jordanian -nom
qāōifat -an isrāʼīliyyat -an fī tarīq -i- hā
bomber -acc Israeli -acc in route -gen- her
ʻila -l- ᶜirāq -i- hāōa -ṣ- ṣabāḥ
to -def- Iraq -gen- this -def- morning

The Arabic sentence in (2) is functionally, but not formally, equivalent to (1a), whereas it is both functionally and formally equivalent to (1b). Consequently, the English passive sentence has been managed into Arabic active sentence in order to provide dynamic equivalence where formal equivalence is untenable. Besides, the Arabic lexical borrowing *radar* has been phonologically managed to fit the Arabic phonetic inventory, thus becoming /rādār/ instead of /rēdèr/ in English.

To move the discussion on, let us consider lexis as an area where intrinsic managing is often needed. Observe the two Arabic examples and their English renditions in (3) and (4) below.

(3) **la ʻilāh -a ʻila -l- lāh**
no God -acc except -def- God
There is no God but God

(4) **ʻistušhida θalāθat -u falaṣṭīniyy -īna fi -ḍ- ḍiffat**
fell martyr three -nom Palestanian -gen in -def- bank
-i- -l- γarbiyyat -i ʻamsi
-gen- def- west -gen yesterday
Three Palestanians were killed in the West Bank yesterday.

On the face of it, *God* in (3) seems to be both a formal and functional equivalent for *ʻallāh* in Arabic. However, a closer look at these two lexical items reveals that the concept of God in Christianity is different from that in Islam. To explain, the concept of oneness is an inherent attribute of *ʻallāh*, whereas it is not of *God*, because Christians believe in the concept of Trinity. Thus, the word *ʻallāh* has undergone some intrinsic managing when rendered as *God* in English.

Similarly, the intransitive passive Arabic verb *ʻistušhida* in (4) is religion-orientated in that it signifies that the killed will go to heaven, thus it may semantically be rendered in English as *fell martyr*. However, this faithfulness to the concept can't be tolerated in a rational world because of its being biblical, hence should be avoided. As can be seen in the rendition of (4), the translator's choice *be killed* involves intrinsic managing of both the concept and the transitivity parameter. This managing scheme can be readily observed when we back-translate the English rendition of (4). The back-translation will most likely be (5) below.

(5) **qutila θalāθat-u falaṣṭīniyy-īna fi-ḍ-ḍiffat-i-**
killed+pass
l-γarbiyyat-i ʻamsi

The Arabic sentence in (5) is both formally and functionally equivalent to the English rendition of (4).

Intrinsic managing is sometimes carried out at the pragmatic level. Observe the Arabic examples in (6) below.

(6) a. **'awaddu** **'an** **'adᶜū -ka** **li** **-tanāwul** **-il-**
would like+I that invite -you (sg.) to -have -def-

γadā' **-i** **maᶜī**
lunch -gen with me
I would like to invite you to have lunch with me.

b. **'awaddu 'an 'adᶜū-kum li-tanāwul -il - γadā'-i maᶜī**
-you (sg.)
I would like to invite you to have lunch with me, sir.

The *-ka/kum* distinction is relevant to tenor in Arabic, *viz.*, *-ka* is used for addressing equals, whereas *-kum* is used for addressing superiors. Thus this social honorific has been built into 2nd person singular/plural distinction, while there is no such distinction found in English. The competent translator can capture the conventional implicature (see Levinson 1983) carried by *-kum* by resorting to intrinsic managing represented by the use of the social honorific *sir* in the rendition of (6b) which constitutes a functional equivalent to *-kum* in Arabic.

Intrinsic managing is often invoked to handle situation non-congruence between the SL and TL. Observe the Arabic text in (7) below along with its English rendition.

(7) **Ahmed:** **hal** **turīdu** **ka's** **-an** **min** **-aš** **-šāy?**
Q want cup -acc of -def- tea
Would you like a cup of tea?
Ali: **šukr** **-an**
thanks -acc
No, thank you!

As can be observed the Arabic *šukr-an* stands for a polite rejection of the offer being made. In English, however, *thank you* stands for a polite acceptance of the offer being made. Therefore, *šukr-an* in the above example entails intrinsic managing to bring about its functional equivalent, that is, *No, thank you* which functions as a polite rejection of the offer in English. The failure to manage the situation in (7) would result in a breakdown in communication.

A higher level of intrinsic managing may be necessitated by the differing ways of textualizing in the SL and TL. Let us consider the following example taken from a Newsweek report on the current peace process in the Middle East.

(8) "...Baker didn't lean on anyone during this visit (to the Middle East). The pressure will begin gently this week with Baker's follow-up phone calls to the leaders he saw, then intensify when President Bush makes his own trip to the region, expected later this spring..."

The competent reader will immediately decipher the implicit thought relationship between the two sentences in (8) above. It should be noted that there is an implicit thought connector, *as* is a good candidate, that links up the second sentence with the first sentence. Thus the writer in English may either mark this relationship explicity or implicity. That is to say, he has two textualizations at his disposal. By contrast, in the process of translating (8) into Arabic, the translator has no option but to render this thought relationship explicit. Therefore, the competent translator should be aware of this textual mismatch, thus subject-

ing the text to intrinsic managing at the textual level. Observe the partial Arabic translation of (8) in (9) below.

(9) **"...lam yaḍ̃γat bēkōr ᶜalā ʻaḥad -in fī hāōih**
NEG+past pressure Baker on anybody -gen in this
-iz ziyārat -i fa- ḍ̃ -ḍ̃aγt -u sa- yabda'u xafīf
-def visit -gen as -def-pressure -nom will -begin gentle
-an hāōa- l ʻusbūᶜ -a..."
-acc this -def week -acc

The use of the Arabic discourse marker *fa-* is of key importance — the absence of this marker would make the Arabic text incoherent.

Finally, culture is the most difficult to manage intrinsically in the process of translating. The degree of intrinsic managing of culture depends on the translator's choice between Communicative and Semantic translation (Newmark 1988). To illustrate, consider the example in (10) below.

(10) **wa -kāna -t laylā -hu hāōih -il- marat -a fatāt -an**
and -was -fem Layla -his this -def- time -acc girl -acc
min -al- badu
from -def- Beduins
His date this time was a Beduin girl.

The rendition of (10) above involves intrinsic managing of the cultural allusion to *Layla*, the famous girl who caused her Platonic lover *Qays* to go crazy in the 7th century, hence the love story is called *maǰnŭn laylā* or *The crazy of Layla*. This sad love story has been an inherent part of the Arabian folklore since then, hence the cultural allusion. As can be noticed, this cultural allusion is reduced to its communicative sense in the rendition of (10) above.

The competent translator may, however, not be satisfied with the above rendition, viewing it as an under-translation. In this spirit, Larson (1984: 171) writes, "there may be times when the source language lexical items can best be translated by using the word for some THING or EVENT which is not exactly the same but occurs in the receptor language." Therefore, the translator may look for a functionally equivalent cultural allusion in English. Such a cultural allusion is in fact found in the sad love story of *Romeo and Juliet* which has obtained a folkloric status in the western culture comparable to that of *Qays and Layla* in the Arabian culture. Thus his translation of (10) might run as follows.

(11) His Juliet this time was a Beduin girl.

Still, one might here object to the non-congruence of *Juliet* with a *Beduin girl* because the proper name *Juliet* is traditionally associated with palaces and their luxuries, whereas the proper name *Layla* is traditionally associated with the desert and its hardships. Consequently, some might, being aware of the distortion of meaning resulting from resorting to cultural substitutes, opt for a semantic translation where the cultural allusion is preserved in its entirety with the allusion explained in a footnote. This translation may run as (12) below.

(12) His Layla this time was a Beduin girl.

As has been demonstrated, intrinsic managing operates at all levels in the process of translating. The failure to manage intrinsically would bring about unnatural or deviant translations. Discussing the importance of intertextuality and playing down the significance of formal correspondences in the process of translating, de Beaugrande (1980: 291)

writes, "Translating is then an issue of INTERTEXTUALITY in which mediation works across different language intersystems." As we view it, mediation, in de Beaugrande's terminology, is what essentially constitutes managing. We have just looked at the good side of it, *i.e.*, intrinsic managing; we should not lose sight of the bad side of it, that is, extrinsic managing to which we turn next.

EXTRINSIC MANAGING

Extrinsic managing constitutes the second side of the coin whereby the translator comes in to manage the text not intrinsically, but rather extrinsically by superimposing a certain directionality on the text in order to approximate it to, if not have it meet, his own goals. Therefore, extrinsic managing is strictly the translator's ideological intervention in the SL text. Like intrinsic managing, it is both conscious and intentional; however, unlike intrinsic managing which is meant to facilitate things for the reader via bringing about natural translations, extrinsic managing intends to delude the reader by bringing about a world different from that intended in the SL text, hence its being condemnable.

To get the discussion started, let us consider some examples of extrinsic managing that take syntax as a point of departure. Observe (13) below.

(13) A Greek oil tanker was hit by an Iraqi jet-fighter, causing it to run aground off the Kuwaiti coast.

Normally, (13) above will be rendered as (14) below.

(14)	**ʿaṣāba**	**-t**	**ṭāʾirat**	**-un**	**ᶜirāqiyyat**	**-un**	**muqātilat**	**-un**		
	hit	-fem	aircraft	-nom	Iraqi	-nom	fighter	-nom		
	nāqilat	**-a**	**naft**	**-in**	**yūnāniyyat**	**-an**	**mimmā**	**ʿaddā**	**ʿilā**	
	tanker	-acc	oil	-gen	Greek	-acc	thus	causing	to	
	junūḥi	**-hā**	**li**	**-š-**	**šāṭiʾ**	**-l-**	**kuwaytiyy**			
	drift	-it	to	-def	coast	-def-	Kuwaiti			

However, a pro-Iraq translator, instructed by the Iraqi general policy to hide the responsibility of Iraq for such operations, may extrinsically manage (13) by rendering it as (15) below instead of (14) above.

(15)	**ʿuṣība**	**-t**	**nāqilat**	**-u**	**naft**	**-in**	**yūnāniyyat**	**-un**		
	hit+pass	-fem	tanker	-nom	oil	-gen	Greek	-nom		
	mimmā	**ʿaddā**	**ʿilā**	**junūḥi**	**-hā**	**li**	**-š-**	**šāṭiʾ**	**il**	
	thus	causing	to	drift	-it	to	-def	-coast	-def	
	-kuwaytiyy									
	Kuwaiti									

A Greek oil tanker was hit, causing it to run aground off the Kuwaiti coast.

The translator here has purposefully deluded the reader by deliberately hiding the agent, thus creating a world compatible with his regarding this state of affairs.

Another example may be drawn from the translator's maneuvering in relaying the evaluativeness markers in the SL into the TL text. Observe the example in (16) below.

(16)	**ʿinna**	**-l**	**falaṣṭīniyy-**	**īna**	**ᶜānū**	**li-**	**ᶜuqūd**	**-in**		
	Emp.	-def	-Palestanians	-gen	suffered	for	-decades	-gen		
	ᶜiddat	**-in**	**taḥt**	**-al**	**ʿiḥtilāl**	**-il**	**-ʾisrāʾīlī**			
	several	-gen	under	-def	-occupation	-def	-Israeli			

The Palestinians have terribly suffered for several decades under the Israeli occupation.

A biased translator, however, may deliberately choose not to relay the emphatic particle "inna" in his English rendering due to a lack of empathy with the Palestinians. His rendering may run as (17) below.

(17) The Palestinians have suffered for several decades under the Israeli occupation.

By so doing, the translator advances a world differing from that intended by (16).

It is worth mentioning here that some researchers, *e.g.* Hatim (1989) and Hatim and Mason (1990: 213), in the heat of attempting to relate evaluativeness/argumentation to choice of clause-type in Arabic, *i.e.*, the Nominal vs the Verbal, have mistakenly resorted to managing the text in a way such that a Tone-setter becomes a Scene-setter. For instance, the difference between (18) and (19) below is not relevant to Word Order variation; rather, it involves extrinsic managing by throwing a different world.

(18) Much credit flows to the State of Israel...
(19) The State of Israel deserves credit...

As can be noticed, the message of (19) is no longer similar to the message of (18) due to lexical managing rather than Word Order, that is, the text producer's negative attitudes vis-à-vis the flowing of much credit to the State of Israel is readily discernible, hence (18) functions as a Tone-setter paving the way for a rebuttal, whereas the text producer's attitude vis-à-vis the credit to the State of Israel in (19) is obviously positive, hence the ruling out of a rebuttal following. To illustrate, the Word Order variation of (20) below doesn't mitigate its being a Tone-setter.

(20) The State of Israel receives much credit...

Discoursally, (18) and (20) hold comparable status regarding their setting the stage for a rebuttal. Consequently, (19) should be condemned as involving extrinsic managing when related to (18) rather than Word Order variation.

By the same token, Arabic exhibits similar phenomena. Observe (21), (22) and (23) corresponding to (18), (19) and (20), respectively.

(21)	**yanhālu**	**kaθīr**	**-un**	**min**	**-aθ-**	**θanā'**	**-i**	**ᶜalā**	**dawlat**	**-i**
	flow	much	-nom	of	-def	-credit	-gen	on	country	-gen
	'isrā'īl...									
	Israel									

(22)	**tastaḥiqu**	**dawlat**	**-u**	**'isrā'īl**	**-a**	**kaθīr**	**-an**	**min**	**-aθ**
	deserve	country	-nom	Israel	-acc	much	-acc	of	-def
	-θanā'-i...								
	credit-gen								

(23)	**tastaθiru**	**dawlat**	**-u**	**'isrā'īl**	**-a**	**bi-**	**kaθīr**	**-in**	**min**
	receive	country	-nom	Israel	-acc	with	-much	-gen	-of
	-aθ-	**θanā'**	**-i...**						
	-def	credit	-gen						

(21) and (23) above function as Tone-setters in Arabic, whereas (22) functions as Scene-setter. This nullifies Hatim's claim (1989) that Arabic verbal sentences can not function as Tone-setters, for Tone-setters may be both Nominal and Verbal (for an elaborate refutation of Hatim's claims, see Farghal (1991)).

Lexis is another tempting area for extrinsic managing. The translator, armed with an ideology that may differ from that expounded in the SL text, may fiddle with the lexical

items in the SL so as to offer a world harmonious with his rather than the SL text producer's. To illustrate, consider the example in (24) below.

(24) In an interview on CBS, the Israeli Prime Minister said that the ball is now in the Palestinians' court.

The translator of (24) should monitor when translating it into Arabic, thus rendering it as (25) below.

(25) **fi muqābalat in ma^{c} -il qanāl -il- 'amrīkī 'as**
in interview -gen with -def channel -def American def
-sī bī'as qāla ra'īs -u -l wuzarā' -i -l-
-CBS said Prime -nom -def ministers -gen -def
'isrā'īlī 'inna -l kurat -a l'āna fī marma -l
-Israeli that -def -ball -acc now in goal -def
falaṣṭīniyy -ina
Palestinians -gen

The Arab translator, however, would normally intervene in the lexis of (24), thus rendering it as (26) rather than (25).

(26) **fi muqābalat -n ma^{c} -il qanāl -il- 'amrīkī 'as-sī bī'as**
in interview -gen with -def -channel -def American def-CBS
'idda^{c}ā ra'īs- u wuzarā' -i l- kiyān -iṣ-ṣah yūnī
claimed Prime -nom ministers -gen -def -entity -def -zionist
'anna -l -kurat -a l'āna fī marma -l- falaṣṭīniyy -ina
that -def -ball -acc -now in goal -def -Palestinians -gen

Most importantly, the translator of (26) has extrinsically managed the framing device "*qāla*" by altering it to "*idda^{c}ā*", thus changing the communicative import of the text. Further, he has managed the attributes of the Topic Entity, *i.e.*, the Israeli Prime Minister, by changing them into negative attributes, thus "'*isrā' īlī*" becomes "*ṣahyūnī*". (It should be noted that Zionism was condemned as a form of racism by the United Nations in 1975). Moreover, the translator has opted for the addition of the modifier noun "*kiyān*" in order to call the legitimacy of Israel as a state into question. By undertaking such a managing scheme, it should be clear that the translator has furnished a world that is markedly different from the world intended by the SL text.

A theoretical question arises at this juncture: Assuming that (26) is the SL text, how would an objective translator render it into English? Should he monitor or manage? By far, our answer would be that he should monitor, thus offering the rendering in (27) below.

(27) In an interview on CBS, the Zionist entity Prime Minister claimed that the ball is now in the Palestinians' court.

If he, however, chooses to manage, he would most likely come up with the rendering in (28).

(28) In an interview on CBS, the Israeli Prime Minister said that the ball is now in the Palestinians' court.

Juxtaposed with (27), (28) would sound more natural to the native speakers of English, despite the fact that it has been subjected to extensive managing. This naturalness, however, can't disguise the markedly differing worlds of (27) and (28). We believe, in such a circumstance, that the translator, for the sake of naturalness, may come in to manage counter-intuitive material, *i.e.*, material running counter to truisms, but he has no right to

manage the referential/denotative signification of a lexical item, *e.g.* the framing device in (26). In this spirit, we opt for (29) as a balanced rendering of (26).

(29) In an interview on CBS, the Israeli Prime Minister claimed that the ball is now in the Palestinians' court.

Extrinsic managing may also operate at the textual level where the Rhetorical function (Hatim 1985) rather that the syntax or lexis managed. The rhetorical function relates to the textual strategies employed by the writer in the process of discoursing which ultimately result in a text-typological focus, *e.g.* exposition vs. argumentation or a thesis to be argued through vs. a thesis to be later counter-argued. The translator, as an intruder exploring a finished product, may deliberately attempt to alter the rhetorical function chosen by the discourser in order to create his own world, thus fulfilling his own goals. To illustrate how extrinsic managing may operate at the textual level, let us observe the example in (30) taken from the *Times* and cited by Hatim (1987).

(30) **The Cohesion of OPEC**
Tomorrow's meeting of OPEC is a different affair. Certainly, it is formally about prices and about Saudi Arabia's determination to keep them down. Certainly, it will also have immediate implications for the price of petrol, especially for Britain which recently lowered its price of North Sea Oil and may now have to raise it again. But this meeting, called at short notice, and confirmed only after the most intensive round of preliminary discussions between the parties concerned, is not primarily about selling arrangements between producer and consumer. It is primarily about the future cohesion of the organization itself.

The text in (30) creates its world via counter-argumentation, *viz.*, citing a thesis in the second and third sentences in the text not to argue it through, but rather to counter-argue it in the rest of the text. This textualization constitutes the thrust of the text and should be held constant in a faithful translation. Notwithstanding this line of argumentation, a biased OPEC translator may extrinsically manage this text to nullify the counter-argumentation element by means of assigning a full lexical/discoursal force to the concessive marker "certainly" which emphasizes nothing but a gap in the SL text and also by means of dropping the concessive contrast marker "But" in order to bring about a harmonious world. By so doing, the translator will create a completely different textualization embracing an entirely different world. For ease of exposition, the following is an approximate back-translation of the managed Arabic version.

(31) Tomorrow's OPEC meeting is a different affair, for it is certainly about prices and about Saudi Arabia's determination to keep them down, and it will certainly have implications for the price of petrol, especially for Britain which recently lowered its price of North Sea Oil and may now have to raise it again. This meeting...

As can be noticed, the translator has transformed the SL text from an evaluative/argumentative text into a non-evaluative/expository one, thus altering its intended world.

Finally, we should not rule out the possibility of extrinsic managing of culture. We have often heard, for instance, of the orientalists' distorting the Muslim culture. Therefore, the translator coming in contact with a text belonging to a remote culture may effect extrinsic managing whereby the cultural values of the SL text are distorted. To illustrate this point, let us first consider the following faithful English rendering of a concocted Arabic text.

(32) In Ramadan, Muslims awake in the night or just before dawn to have "*As-sahūr*", thus preparing themselves for a long day before breakfast is permitted at sunset. Having had *As-saūr*, most men make for the mosque to have their dawn prayer.

Encountered by an intolerant translator, the SL text of (32) may undergo extrinsic cultural managing, thus offering a distorted translation like (33) below.

(33) In Ramadan, Muslims awake in the middle of the night or just before dawn to stuff themselves with food that could last them for a whole day before a meal is permitted at sunset. Still worse, most men, having supplied themselves with the required ammunition (food), make for the mosque to have their dawn rituals.

The extrinsic cultural managing in (33) is self-explanatory — the biased translator has presented a distorted world of the culture concerned basing this on his own cultural values. For instance, people don't awake to eat in the night in the Western culture, thus an activity of this sort is deemed eccentric by those intolerant of other cultures' values. By the same token, the rendering of the concept of "*As-saḥūr*" as "stuffing themselves with food" and "supplying themselves with ammunition", and the hybridization of the concept of "dawn prayer" by rendering it as "dawn rituals" unmistakenly express a lack of tolerance of the SL culture on the part of the translator.

CONCLUSION

The present study has explored a theoretical model of managing in the process of translating. It has firmly distinguished between two types of managing: Intrinsic vs. Extrinsic managing. The two types, albeit they may intersect at some junctures, can easily be distinguished as has been elaborately demonstrated throughout this paper. Probably, the most important distinguishing feature between them relates to good intentions as opposed to bad intentions on the part of the translator. That is to say, if the translator is motivated by good intentions, he will most likely be exercising intrinsic managing; whereas, if he is driven by bad intentions, *i.e.*, to meet his own goals rather than the text producer's, he will definitely be exercising extrinsic managing. The trade-off existing between monitoring and managing in the process of translating is most interestingly, and probably most eloquently, expressed by Enkvist (1978: 169) as follows, "Translations are like women in that the most faithful are rarely the most beautiful and vice versa."

Thus the process of translating is essentially a feat of mediation. The translator is, in a way, practically the sole actualizer in this process. This being the case, he should be aware of the aspects of the process of mediating, *viz.*, intrinsic and extrinsic managing. The translator's unawareness of the repercussions of what he is doing to the SL text are far greater than what one might think. To bring this paper to a close, let us quote Hartmann (1980: 52),

> "The most significant step in translation theory is to go beyond the comparison of different textual versions and linguistic systems towards an understanding of how translation operates in the totality of all communicative interaction, how communication can take place when different codes are involved, and what the mediating translator does to bring about communication."

In this paper, we have focused on the quality of communication the translator is getting across.

REFERENCES

AL-MAHMOUD, A. (1986): *Reporting on Argument in the Language of Broadcasting and Newspapers with Reference to Problems in English-Arabic Translation*, Unpublished MA thesis, University of Salford.

CASAGRANDE, J. (1954): "The Ends of Translation", *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 20, pp. 335-340.

DE BEAUGRANDE, R. (1980): *Text, Discourse and Process*, London, Longman.

DE BEAUGRANDE, R. (1984): *Text Production Toward a Science of Composition*, New Jersey, ABLEX Publishing Corporation.

DE BEAUGRANDE, R. and W. DRESSLER (1981): *Introduction to Text Linguistics*, London, Longman.

ENKVIST, N. (1978): "Contrastive Text Linguistics and Translation", Grahs, L., *et al.* (Eds.), *Theory and Practice of Translation*, Peter Lang, pp. 169-187.

FARGHAL, M. (1991): "Evaluativeness Parameter and the Translator from English into Arabic and Vice Versa", To appear in *Babel*.

HARTMANN, R. (1980): *Contrastive Textology*, Julius Groos Verlag Heidelberg.

HATIM, B. (1987): "A Text-Linguistic Model for the Analysis of Discourse Errors: Contributions from Arabic Linguistics", Monaghan, J. (Ed.), *Grammar in the Construction of Texts*, Prentice-Hall.

HATIM, B. (1989): "Text Linguistics in the Didactics of Translation: The Case of the Verbal and Nominal Clause in Arabic", *IRAL*, XXVII(2), pp. 137-144.

HATIM, B. and I. MASON (1990): *Discourse and the Translator*, Longman.

JÄGER, G. (1975): *Translation und Translationslinguistik*, Halle / Saale, Niemeyer.

KACHRU, Y. (1982): "Toward Defining the Notion 'Equivalence' in Contrastive Analysis", *TESL 5*, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champagne, pp. 82-98.

KRZESZOWSKI, T. (1971): "Equivalence, Congruence and Deep Structure", Nickel, G. (Ed.), *Papers in Contrastive Linguistics*, Cambridge, CUP, pp. 37-48.

LARSON, M. (1984): *Meaning-based Translation*, Pergamon Press.

LEVINSON, S. (1983): *Pragmatics*, Cambridge, CUP.

NEWMARK, P. (1988): *A Textbook of Translation*, Prentice Hall International (UK) Ltd.

NIDA, E. (1964): *Towards a Science of Translating*, Brill, Leiden.

VAN DIJK, T. (1977): *Text and Context*, Longman.

VINAY, J.P. and J. DARBELNET (1958): *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais : Méthode de traduction*, Paris, Didier.