

A Cognitively-Oriented Account of Some Arabic Causal Connectives with Reference to Translation

Asst. Prof. Dr. Anis Behnam Naoum*

Asst. Prof. Dr. Rabea Mohammed Qassim Agha**

تاريخ القبول: 2009/9/30

تاريخ التقديم: 2009/8/20

1. Introduction

It is not always easy to determine who causes what to whom depending only on the morphosyntactic properties of the text. Background knowledge about the environment of the text (its preceding context, setting, events, people, etc.) is prerequisite for determining what causes what and what causal chains specify events and link them together in the text. Moreover, readers/translators usually "draw upon prior knowledge about psychological and physical causality to find causes and consequences of focal events" (van den Broek, 1990:423). In the same vein, Kintsch (1995: 142) points out that "a great deal of specific world knowledge is often required, as well as a great deal of analysis: exactly what leads to what and why, inferences about goals, motivations, psychological states, causal relations and implications."

Garnham et al. (1996: 518), in this regard, state that "computing causal relations is a major component of building discourse models for narrative texts. A reader who fails to recognize those causal relations cannot be said to understand

* Dept. of Translation/ College of Arts/ University of Mosul.
E-mail: anisbehnam@yahoo.com

** Dept. of Translation/ College of Arts/ University of Mosul.
E-mail: lugh2008@yahoo.com

the text fully." Similarly van den Broek (1990: 423) points out that causal dependencies are among the most important relations that play a central role in the construction of a functional coherent representation of the text (and its rough equivalence) in memory.

Many scholars emphasize the role of causal relations in the structure and coherence of the text. Ventola and Mauranen (1992: 463, cited in Polo, 1995: 201) state that "text-connectors function as explicit markers of the semantic relations (consequence, addition, opposition, etc.) existing between the sentences or larger units of the text." These connecting elements "facilitate the reader's decoding task."

Moreno (2003: 268) maintains that "as human beings, we constantly wonder about the causes of events that take place in our daily life. Likewise, we often ponder the effect of certain events. For this form of analysis, we use a thinking process called causal analysis."

Pit (1997: 4) argues for a subjective approach to the explanation and distribution of some causal connectives that express background coherence relations. She concludes that there is a relation between the Sweetser's (1990) domains of interpretation (content domain: real world causality; epistemic domain: reasoning, inferencing; speech act domain: pragmatic causality) and the concept of subjectivity as opposed to objectivity. For instance, she found that epistemic (reasoning) relations may be considered as some type of subjective relations; whereas content (real world) relations are generally

less subjective relations, but they vary with respect to their degree of subjectivity.

The study of the meaning of causal connectives can gain from a cognitively oriented approach of coherence relations as worked out by Sanders et al. (1993). In this theory, coherence relations are conceived of as being more than mere features; they are attributed to a psychological status. The central claim is that coherence relations do not represent an unordered and arbitrary set, but instead can be classified in terms of cognitive primitives. One such cognitive primitive may be found in the distinction between relations in the content and in the epistemic domain which have previously been identified by Sweetser (1990). The following two examples of backward causality illustrate the difference between (1) content and (2) epistemic relations (Pit, 1997: 1)

(1) *The neighbours are not home. They went to see their daughter's new house*

(2) *The neighbours are not home. The lights are out.*

(1) expresses real world causality. The content of the first clause is the real world result of the fact presented in the second clause. In (2) the causality lies in the knowledge domain. The first clause is a conclusion drawn on the fact presented in the second clause.

2. Explicit and Implicit Causality

Garnham et al. (1996: 519) argue that "the implicit cause of the event described in the main clause may influence the interpretation of the explicit statement of the cause in the subordinate clause. In particular, it may affect the assignment

of reference to the pronoun in that clause." In other words, "explicit causality is integrated with a description of the event," whereas "implicit causality has its effect at integration," i.e. establishing coherence in the text (ibid: 517 and 538).

The source of implicit causality, as stated by Garnham et al. (ibid: 519) could be attributed to verbs imputing cause (e.g. kill, punish, etc.) as well as the social status of the participants in the event. Garnham et al suppose that "if implicit causality is seen primarily as a property of verbs, it becomes natural to talk of verbs as implicitly ascribing causality to one or other of the participants in the type of event denoted by the verb." The 'because clause' in the following sentence, for instance, might impute a cause to the non-preferred NP (i.e. subject or object). Though the subordinate conjunction 'because' shows an explicit causal relation, the interpretation of relation is not always straight forward

Consider the following examples from Garnham et al. (1996:518):

- *Betty punished Diane three weeks ago because she did not do the dishes.*

"The pronoun she is referentially indeterminate," i.e. the assignment of references is affected.

- *Sandra sold her tent to Tracy because she...*

'Sold' is usually regarded as NP1 bias, i.e. the agent is the cause. Caramazza et al. (1997) and Garvey and Caramazza (1974) both cited in Garnham et al (1996: 519-520) explicitly note the possibility that part of a clause other than the verb

might play a role in determining the implicit causality of the event described by the clause. Therefore, implicit causality should be accounted for "in terms of the mental representation of the complete event described by a clause" or "the 'scenes' that a verb bring to mind" (Fillmore, 1997, cited in Garnham et al; 1996: 520).

3. Physical and Psychological Causality

Van den Broek (1994:543) states that causality is the result of an interaction of properties, with the relation between two events varying in causal strength along one or more directions. The cause could be sometimes unexpected (e.g. envy, challenge, show off, etc.). If, for instance, one goes to the museum regularly, this will not be necessarily because one is an archeologist. Therefore, "the identification of causal relations is based on intuition rather than on an explicit definition or a set of criteria" (ibid).

Van de Broek (ibid: 549) differentiates between two major types of causality: physical and psychological. The former "connects statements that describe changes in the physical states of objects or persons; the latter "refers to the causal relations that have internal states such as emotions, plans, thoughts, and so on as their consequences. The following examples stand for the two types respectively:

- *He accidentally pushed the vase off the table and the vase broke into a thousand pieces.*
- *Brian's liking the CD player psychologically causes Brian's goal of wanting one.*

4. Hypotheses and Procedure

This study is based on the general assumption that communication relies, to a large extent, on the role of connectors (among many other cohesive devices) in the text. Therefore, differences at the discourse level are likely to arise either from the complexity and diversity of the connectives system or from neglecting it (in translation). Thus building on the fact that failure to catch the intended meaning of a text could be partly attributed to the failure to understand causal relations in the text, it is hypothesized that success is more likely if language students/ translators are well acquainted with effect- cause relationships as well as causal connectives. Moreover, it is hypothesized that perception of the text coherence cannot necessarily be realized by explicit causal signals or causal expressions; but rather by inferring implicit causal relations. The latter are likely to show much variation due to different "social, textual and contextual factors" (Moreno, 2003: 268).

This study is concerned with instances of explicit/ implicit causality, and how they are decoded (or realized) in Arabic and encoded in English with reference to translation. First, features of causal connectives and causal relations in English and Arabic are explored. Twenty Arabic sentences (taken from Wright, 1971 and Cantarino, 1975) with text-connectors that function as explicit/ implicit markers of the causal semantic relationship (effect-cause) have been selected and given to ten MA students in the Department of Translation, College of Arts, University of Mosul during the

academic year 2008-2009 to be translated into English. The sentences are divided into five categories: the adverbial accusative of cause, prepositions, the connective causal particle —ف, particles of motivation إذ, and causal inferences استدلالات سببية. These categories are some of the Arabic devices that show (most frequently) implicit causal relationships.

The study adopts a causal analysis conducted at the sentential level which depends on a set of criteria (implicit/explicit, inferential, morphosyntactic, stylistic, etc.) in order to detect the different causal relationships.

5. *Causality in English*

Causality is explicitly and implicitly realized by different lexical, structural and transitional devices, as well as some techniques of writing. Though the main concern of this study is not the system of causality in English per se, the researchers find it necessary to refer to some basic explicit and implicit realizations of this system briefly.

Sledd (1959: 312) states that some devices like conjunctions⁽¹⁾ clearly refer to earlier and later parts of discourse; they indicate the relations among individual states of affairs; and they convey the writer's judgements. Adverb clauses of reason (or cause), for instance are usually introduced by 'because, since, as, seeing that, now that, etc. (Eckersley and Eckersley, 1960: 339). Consider the causal role of the coordinating conjunction 'for' and the subordinating

(1) To differentiate between conjunctions and sentence connectors, see Roberts (1962: 110-111).

conjunction 'because' in the following examples cited in Roberts (1956: 208) and Fries (1952: 254), respectively:

- *Eggstone grew impatient, for Charlie slept.*
- *The boys we've had out there couldn't do anything satisfactory with lines because they are all clogged with roots.*

The coordinator 'for' introduces a clause; it indicates why 'Eggstone grew impatient.' Similarly, the subordinator 'because' in the second sentence "is used to establish a connection between the cause or explanation that it introduces... and the whole situation described in the previous sentence" (Moreno, 2003: 282).

Clauses of cause introduced by 'because' may be replaced by using 'because of, owing to, or on account of + noun/ gerund as in the following example:

- *He was unhappy owing to his failure*

The phrase 'owing to his failure' can replace the clause 'because he had failed' (Johnson and Thornley, 1988: 113).

Verbs can also be used to show causality. The implicit causative use of verbs such as 'have,' 'get,' etc. is frequent in English. Eckersley and Eckersley (1960: 195) state that "a construction containing 'have + past participle is used to show that, without doing something ourselves, we cause it to be done,

- e.g.** *We have just had our house painted*

The causative 'have' can be replaced by 'got'

- e.g.** *We have just got our house painted.*

With some verbs, the transitive use is the causative function of the verb itself as in:

He floated his boat on the lake (= he caused it to float)

(ibid: 155)

The implicit causal relationship can also be realized structurally by means of some techniques of writing like a semicolon as in:

He does not work hard; he's incapable of hard work.

(ibid: 307)

6. Causality in Arabic

6.1 Adverbial Accusative of Cause:

In his account of 'the adverbial accusative of cause and reason,' Wright (1971, vol.2: 12) states that by the adverbial accusative is designated "the motive and object of the agent in doing the act, the cause or reason of his doing it" as in:

- هربتُ خوفاً

- *I fled for fear*

- إذا رأيته أقوم تعظيماً لأستاذاي

- *When I see him, I stand up before him to show respect to my teacher.*

Each of the above examples is an answer to the question لِمَ؟ 'why'- why did you flee? Why do you stand up before him?

This accusative, Wright continues (ibid: 122) which must always be مصدر قلبي 'a mental or intellectual nomen verbi,' is called by Arab grammarians المفعول لأجله or المفعول له 'that on account of which something is done.'

This accusative usually agrees with its agent in person and tense. Consider the following example:

I departed from my country having desire for getting knowledge.

رغبة 'desire' here is a mental nomen verbi indicating an internal desire which is the cause behind doing the act, i.e. departure. In other words, it refers to a particular reason why 'departure' took place (cf. Al-Ishbiili, 1962: 249; Hasan, 1986: 225; Mansoor, 1987: 77 and Al-Galaayini, 2004: 439).

6.2 Prepositions

Building on Arab grammarian's account of prepositions, Wright (1971, vol. 2: 129) states that the local and temporal relationships that the prepositions designate are usually transferred to different ideal relations, "conceived under the figure of the local relations to which they correspond." One of these ideal relations is that of causality. Some of the Arabic prepositions that show implicit causality are *من*, *بـ*, *في*, *لـ*, and *على* (lit. from, for, in, by and on, respectively).

Consider the following examples:

1. *يُغْضِي حَيَاءً وَيُغْضِي مِنْ مَهَابَتِهِ فَمَا يُكَلِّمُ إِلَّا حِينَ يَبْتَسِمُ* -
He is silent out of modesty, and others are silent through fear of him. No one dare speak to him unless he starts smiling (unless willing to by smiling) (ibid: 131).

2. *عَجِبْتُ لِقَوْلِهِ* -
I wondered at (because of) what he said. (ibid: 150)

3. *ان امرأة دخلت النار في هرة حبستها* -

Verily a woman entered Hell because of a cat which she confined without food. (ibid: 155)

4. فشلتُم فشلاً ذريعاً بتبنيكم هذه السياسة
You have completely failed by adopting this policy.

(AsSaaqi, 1977: 333)

5. لا اسالكم عليه مالاً
I do not ask you for money on that account.

(Wright, 1971, vol.2: 155).

The motive and object of the agent in 'being silent' in (1) is designated by the adverbial accusative of cause *حياءً* 'modesty'. This causal relationship is supplemented by another causal relationship *من مهابته* 'through fear of him' assigned by the preposition *من*. With pronominal suffixes, *من* also denotes causality as in *فوقف يتعجب منها* 'and he stood admiring it.' His wonder, Wright (1971: 131) comments, is proceeding from or being caused by it.

Similarly, the preposition *لـ* is taken by Arab grammarians to account for the relation of the action to its purpose and cause; that is, the purpose for which, or the reason why, a thing is done. In (2) *لـ* is used to indicate the cause behind 'what he said'. A dependent clause after *لـ* and introduced by *أنَّ*, Cantarino (1975, vol.3: 82 and 140) states, is always explicitly causal; the prepositional compound stands for English 'because' or 'for' as in *ذلك مستحيل لأنك لا تحسن الكلام* 'that is impossible, for you do not speak elegantly.' Sometimes the causal *لـ*, as Hasan (1968: 491) points out, is omitted when its meaning is known from the context, as when it is dropped from *كي المصدرية* (the subjunctive) as in:

- الم نصلّ له؟ - نعم كي تسأله الخير لامراتك وولدك.

- "Did not we pray to Him?" - "Yes, (but you did) to ask Him
for the well-being of your wife and child.

(Cantarino, 1975, vol.3: 309)

Arab grammarians, it should be noted, call كي and other particles حروف التعليل 'particles of motivation' a name which does not necessarily always express the actual meaning and value of the construction.

In (3 and 4), في and بِ denote the assigning of cause. They indicate the relation between the acts ('confining a cat without food' and 'adopting such policy') and the consequences of their performance ('entering Hell' and 'complete failure').

في, to be noted, is not always equivalent in meaning to بِ (whether with pronominal suffixes or not). مات بِالجوع 'he died of hunger' (al-Galayiini, 2004:528) which denotes causality cannot be replaced by مات في الجوع; the latter, stylistically speaking, does not express reason or cause.

In (5) على with the pronominal suffix is used to mean 'building on or relying on such a thing I do not ask you for money.' على is particularly used in some common phrases such as بناءً على أن 'building upon, reckoning or relying upon, such and such a thing' (Wright, 1971, vol.3: 129).

6.3 The Connective Causal Particle **فـ**

The connective causal particle فـ usually connects two propositions with an internal cause and effect link (cf. Wright, 1971, vol. 2: 290). فـ in Arabic stands either for 'so' or 'for' in

English, depending on what precedes and follows it, and what logical sequences of thought underlies it, cause-effect or effect-cause. It corresponds to English 'for', as Beeston (1968: 56) notes, when the mind proceeds from a phenomenon (i.e. an effect) to a consideration of its cause or justificatory generalization. This usage, Beeston adds, is specially common when the second proposition begins with *أَنَّ*; *أَنَّ* 'that is because', however, is commonly used rather than *لأن* (ibid: 60) as in:

- قد اخطات فالخطأ إنساني

- *You have erred, for to err is human.*

ذلك *أَنَّ* الخطأ or *فإن* الخطأ... 'for to err' can be replaced by 'ذلك لان الخطأ'. But usually not

In general, *فَ* as Cantarino (1975, vol. 3: 23-24) points out, implies an internal –and logical- relationship between the two coordinate sentences; the sentence following the conjunction *فَ* may express the reason for or the cause of a preceding statement, as in:

- احمد الله فقد وجدت صديقي

- *I praise God, for I have found my friend.*

- ما أجمل الحياة هاهن يا حبيبي فهي مثل قلب الشاعر المملوء نوراً ورقةً
- *How beautiful life is here, my Beloved, for it is like a poet's heart, full of light and gentleness.*

In addition to the linguistic factors that express causality mentioned so far, Cantarino (1975, vol.3: 7-8) points out that two or more Arabic sentences with different structures can be combined together without any connecting particle to express the reason for the preceding statement as in

احمد الله فقد وجدت صديقي where causality is understood in terms

of effect-cause relationship which is basically context-dependent.

6. 4 Particles of Motivation

Some particles of motivation as *إذ* and *كي* are usually used to denote causality. Cantarino (1975, vol.3: 287) points out that "the temporal relationship stated or introduced by *إذ* frequently fades to the point that the particle can be used to express a logical relationship instead." It is then called *حرف التعليل* 'particle of motivation' by Arab grammarians. He adds that the relationship *إذ* introduces is an explicative one, which at times may be almost identical with a causative interpretation as in:

- *إذ كانت الحالة على هذه عادوا*

- *Since the situation was thus, they returned.*

(Beeston, 1968: 106)

إذ usually introduces a subordinate clause following the main clause. The relationship between the subordinate and main clauses may be causal as in:

- *لم أفهمه... إذ كنت غريباً عن هذه الديار*

- *I did not understand it... since I was a stranger in those places.*

(Cantarino, 1975, vol.3: 304)

Similarly, *كي* is a particle which governs the verb in the subjunctive of the imperfect, assigning the motive or reason behind an action as in:

- *سكتت دقيقة كيما تسترجع أنفاسها.*

- *She remained silent for a moment to recover her breath.*

(Cantarino, 1975, vol.3: 311)

For details on the particle of motivation كي and its governing function (i.e. subjunctive), see Hasan (1968: 224).

Like *اذ لما* is also used in the causal sense of 'since', 'because', etc. besides its temporal function, as in:

- *لما وجدنا هذا غير صحيح يمكن ان نُغفله*

- *Since we have found this to be untrue, we can disregard it.*

(Beeston, 1968: 106)

7. Data Analysis

Source Texts 1 and 2 (henceforth ST (1) and (2))

(1) *قعدت عن الحرب جينا*

You refrained from going to war out of cowardice (Wright, 1971, vol.2: 12).

(2) *وأغفر عوراء الكريم ادخاره وأعرض عن شتم اللئيم تكريما*

Forgive the harsh language of the noble, that I may treasure him up (as a friend in time of need), and I disregard the abuse of the vile out of generosity. (ibid)

In (1) an adverbial accusative of cause *جينا* 'out of cowardice' is employed to point out the cause of not going to war. This syntactic structure could serve as an answer to 'why did not you go to war?' The sense of causality has been correctly realized by Test-Subjects 5 and 8 (henceforth TS.5 and TS.8) who introduced the clause by a subordinating conjunction 'because' and a coordinating 'for', respectively.

TS.5- (I) * *fell behind from war because* (I) was coward.

* Items between brackets mean instances of mistranslation as provided by the test-subjects.

TS.8- *(She) didn't take part in the war for being coward.*

Though the sense of causality seems clear, the other test subjects failed to transfer it correctly by means of adequate syntactic structures. TS 1,2,3,4,7,9 and 10 rendered it into:

TS.10- *(I) didn't join the war (cowardly).*

'Cowardly' is used by the test subjects as an adverb of manner; it lacks any sense of causality. To be noted, 'cowardly' as a lexical item in English is an adjective (not an adverb). They could have rendered the ST into: *'It was cowardly of you not to take part in war.'* in order to keep, at least, a partial sense of causality. Moreover, all the test subjects misunderstood the identity of the agent and who is addressing whom; it is illogical for an Arab to accuse himself of being a coward or even to accept such accusation. This resulted in misrepresentation of the propositional content and the logical causal relationships in these interpretations.

As for TS.6, he adequately represented the implicit sense of the causal use of *جينا*, but he erroneously rendered it into a preposition + noun construction 'in cowardice' which does not sound English. This and the above-mentioned instances could also be considered instances of interference or of word-to-word literal translation.

In (2), two adverbial accusatives are stated *ادخاره* 'treasuring him up' (2.a) and *تكرما* 'out of generosity' (2.b) to designate the cause of 'forgiveness' and the reason of 'disregarding the abuse', respectively. The two structures are answers to 'why do I forgive the harsh language of the noble' and 'why do I disregard the abuse of the vile'

The sense of implicit causality has been partially realized by the TS.1 and TS. 10; they managed it in the form of a semicolon (TS.1), and replacing the second clause of cause by a prepositional phrase 'out of generosity' (TS.10).

TS.1- *(Forgive) the generous man's fault; you might need him and (proudly) avoid insulting the mean.*

TS.10- *(Forgive) the generous (if he saves his money) and do not insult the ungrateful out of generosity.*

However, the first instance of causality ادخاره is completely misunderstood by TS.10; 'saving money' has nothing to do with causality as he rendered it, but to treasuring the noble up (as a friend in time of need). Similarly, TS.1 did not realize the second instance of causality تکرما, translating it into an adverbial of manner 'proudly avoid insulting.'

The reason behind other test subjects' complete failure (and TS.1 and TS.10 partial failure) in detecting causality in (2) could be attributed to the mental misrepresentation of the propositions described by the two clauses; hence the failure to preserve coherence relations (referential coherence in particular) within the TTs. They have translated the two statements of the verse into two imperative sentences due to their incorrect reading of the verse and inappropriate assignment of morphosyntactic properties of the two main verbs اغفرُ and اعرضُ 'I forgive and I disregard' respectively.

Moreover, the inability of the test subjects to realize the additional emphasis given to the adverbial accusatives of reason ادخاره and تکرما resulted in infelicitous renderings. Here is TS.8 rendering, mentioned below for convenience:

TS.8- (*Turn*) a blind eye to the errors of the grateful

(*pay no heed to the abuse of the ungrateful*).

If the translators had resorted to paraphrasing the ST and negotiating its meaning, they would have inferred the implicit causality encapsulated in the ST and represented it adequately in their renderings.

ST (3) and (4)

(3) يُغْضِي حَيَاءً وَيُغْضَى مِنْ مَهَابَتِهِ فَمَا يُكَلِّمُ إِلَّا حِينَ يَبْتَسِمُ

He is silent out of modesty, and others are silent through fear of him. No one dare speak to him unless willing to by smiling (Wright, 1971, vol.2: 131).

(4) فَعَارٌ ثَمَّ عَارٌ ثَمَّ عَارٌ شَقَاءُ الْمَرْءِ مِنْ أَجْلِ الطَّعَامِ

It is a threefold disgrace for a man to be in misery on account of (for want of) good. (ibid: 132)

The first part of (3) consists of two structures used to assign the reason: the adverbial accusative of cause *حَيَاءً* 'out of modesty' (3.a) which could be an answer why the 3rd person is silent, and a prepositional phrase headed by *مِنْ مَهَابَتِهِ*, 'Lit. through fear of him' (3.b) which could be an answer to 'why others have a reverential owe of him.'

Similar to texts (1) and (2), all test-subject translators except TS.8 failed to realize the implicit causality in (3.a). They translated it into an adverb of manner 'shyly' (TS.1), conditional 'unless' and 'only when' (TS.2 and TS.3), conjunction of consequence 'therefore' (TS.4), and others left it untranslated (TS.5, 6, 7, 9, 10).

The sense of causality designated by *من* in (3.b) has been explicitly realized by a coordinating conjunction 'for' (TS.1 and TS.8) and a subordinating conjunction 'because' (TS.3)

TS.1- *He lowers his eyes shyly, the eyes to be lowered for his dignity.*

TS.8- *He turns a blind eye for being polite and blind eye is turned to him for being revered.*

TS.3- *You can speak with him only when he smiles because he is conspicuous.*

TS.4, to be noted, thought of (3) as one of cause-effect relationship; she rendered the implied causality incorrectly into two clauses joined by a semicolon:

TS.4 – He is very wise and moral; you can't speak to him only when he smiles.

The diversity of mistranslation could be attributed to the causal relationships that have internal psychological states (such as shyness, fear) as their consequences. If, however, the translators had relied on their intuitions, they would have probably identified the causal relations and then rendered them adequately.

In (4), all translators except TS.1 (who left the sentence untranslated) managed the causal relationship between *عار* 'disgrace' and *شقاء المرء من اجل الطعام* 'to be in misery for food.' The translators' success can be attributed to the fact that *من اجل* 'on account of' is one of the most frequently used expressions in speaking of person to assign the reason; whereas the preposition *من* alone is not commonly used to assign cause in

everyday spoken Arabic; its original function is to designate a local relationship.

ST (5) and (6)

طلب الجاه لـلأمر بالمعروف

He sought the dignity (or office) for the purpose of ordering good (Wright, 1971: vol.2:150)

واني لتعروني لـلذكراك هزة

And verily a feeling of joy comes over me at remembering you. (ibid)

'Seeking for dignity' in (5) is the cause behind 'ordering good' which is not the case in ordinary situations. It cannot be true since it may be regarded as a sort of hypocrisy; one can order without being in power. It also contradicts some religious teachings which emphasize that 'ordering good' should be a cause behind any deed or behaviour. This text, however, can be an answer to 'why did he seek for dignity?'

All the translators (except 5, 7 and 9 who left the text untranslated) misunderstood the causal relationship in this instance; they rendered it into cause-effect instead of effect-cause. Here are some instances of translators' renderings illustrated below:

TS.2- *He sought power to enjoin righteousness.*

TS.8- *He asked power to do good.*

TS.3- *He was after influence to order good deeds.*

TS.5- *He sought honour (prestige) to order for good deeds.*

This misunderstanding of the causal link can be firstly attributed to the translators reliance on their prior knowledge

which contradicts the content of the text, and secondly to lack of inferencing about the motivation behind 'the purpose for ordering good.' Moreover, the different meanings/ functions of ل (Lit. to/ for) in the Arabic syntax may be another reason behind this misunderstanding. One of these functions is that of governing the verb in the subjunctive of the imperfect (called لام الناصبة in Arabic) signifying 'that,' 'in order that,' etc. as in تب ليغفر لك الله 'repent, that God may forgive thee' (Wright, 1971, vol.1: 291). ل in (5), however, is used to indicate the purpose for which or why 'he sought for dignity' (called لام التعليل in Arabic) as has been mentioned earlier.

On the other hand, the misunderstanding of the causal link between 'feeling of joy' and 'remembering' in (6) could be related to the test subjects unawareness of the use of the preposition ل to account for the relation of the action to its cause. They are accustomed to the causal use of ل with ان (hence, لان which stands for the English 'because' or 'for') introducing a dependent clause as in ذلك مستحيل لأنك لا تحسن الكلام 'that is impossible, for you don't speak elegantly' (Cantarino, 1975, vol.3: 82 and 140).

TS. 1, 4 and 6 succeeded in reflecting the sense of causality explicitly. TS. 1 and TS. 4 used 'for' whereas TS. 6 employed the transitive use of the verb 'make' which is the causative function of the verb itself.

TS.1- *I tremble for your memorization.*

TS.4- *A shake would afflict me for your remembrance.*

TS.6- *Recalling you makes me tremble.*

TS.2 neglected the form which carries the sense of causality and rendered only the intended meaning explicitly 'I miss you

he adequately understood the causal relationship between the two parts of the sentence but he failed, stylistically speaking, to render it into English 'He beat him for drinking (penalty).'

The main reason for the translators' failure could be attributed to the lack of inferencing. They could have, with little cognitive effort, inferred the causal relationship from their background knowledge, since Islamic teachings forbid drinking wine.

In (8), the preposition في functions as an explicit marker of a causal relation between the two propositions 'blaming' and 'doing that.' It facilitates the test subjects' decoding and encoding tasks. Moreover, the verb لَمَّ 'to blame' itself is usually an explicit effect of a certain cause; it is frequently followed by a clause introduced by لَأَنَّ 'because.' This is why, unlike (7), all translators except TS.1 managed the translation of (8) successfully using the explicit coordinator 'for' in their renderings.

TS.1- *He blamed him (in) that.*

It seems that TS.1 failed to notice that the English preposition 'in' cannot be used to assign cause unless followed by a that-clause. He could have rendered (8) into 'He blamed him in that he had done such and such.' However, under the influence of Arabic, he preferred this word-to-word literal translation.

ST (9) and (10)

(9)

يرزقه الله بـبركة دعائه

God will grant him patience through the salutary power of prayer to HIM. (Wright, 1971, vol.2: 160)

(10)

بِتَوْفِيقِ اللَّهِ حَجَّجْتُ

By God's help I have performed pilgrimage. (ibid)

The local relationship that the Arabic preposition \rightarrow (Lit. in/ with/ by) in (9) and (10) designates is transferred to ideal causal relations conceived by the test subjects through the relation of the action to its purpose and cause.

In (9), \rightarrow indicates the coherent relation between 'granting patience' and 'the salutary power of prayer.' In (10), it indicates the same coherent causal relation between 'performing pilgrimage' and 'God's help.'

The adequate mental representation, based on background knowledge, resulted in appropriate renderings in the two instances. The test-subjects managed the causal relation in (9) by means of 'for' (TS.4, 6, 10), 'by' (TS.1, 2, 3, 7), and 'with' (TS.9) which stands for 'because' or 'on account of':

TS.4- *God bless him for (the benediction of his invocation)*

TS.2- *Allah gives him patience by the blessing of his prayer.*

TS.9- *God may provide him (patient with supplication).*

However, TS.5 and TS.8 misunderstood the causal relationship between the act and the reason why it is performed. The former mistranslated the preposition introducing \rightarrow into 'in' instead of 'in that' followed by a clause; the latter missed the causal relationship in translating (9) into a semantic relationship of consequence:

TS.5- *God grants him patience (in the bless) of his prayer.*

TS.8- *Thanks to his supplications, may Allah grant him patience.*

Similarly in (10), the test-subjects realized the causal relationship between 'performing pilgrimage' and 'God's help' through using 'by' (TS.1, 3, 4, 10), 'with' (TS.6, 9), 'due to' (TS.2), and an implicit cognitively-based causal relationship (TS.8).

TS.1- *I went on pilgrimage by the help of God.*

TS.2- *Due to success granted by the blessing of his prayer*

TS.9- *With God's help I performed Hajj.*

TS.8- *Guided by Allah, I performed pilgrimage.*

TS.5 left (10) untranslated and TS.7 rendered it as a religious duty imposed on believers without reflecting any sense of causality.

TS.7- *I have performed pilgrimage (favoured by Allah).*

In sum, the background knowledge of the test-subjects about the religious environment of (9) and (10) facilitated determining what causes what. However, instances of failure can be mainly attributed to the misuse of the preposition (due to the interference of Arabic), and misunderstanding of the functional semantic relationships.

ST (11) and (12)

(11) يعاتبه على ترك المهاداة

He reproached him for having neglected to send him a present in return. (Wright, 1971, vol.2: 170)

(12) على أي شيء أعطيك مالي؟

Why am I to give you my money? (ibid)

Our data show that the causal relationship assigned by the preposition على (Lit. on) is easily and successfully determined by all test-subjects in both (11) and (12). This can be attributed to the fact that the causal relationship can be easily conceived in terms of the textual relations. One can easily realize that 'reproaching' in (11) and 'giving money' in (12) presuppose a reason. Hence, any other semantic relationships are intuitively excluded. This is why all the test-subjects except TS.9 in (11) who left it untranslated, managed it successfully by using 'for.' Similarly, the interrogative sentence in (12) introduced by the prepositional phrase على أي شيء 'what for?', functioning as an explicit marker of the causal semantic relationship, facilitated the decoding task of the test-subjects and encoding it into English correctly as 'why...', 'for what...', and 'what for...'

TS.1- *why should I give you my money?*

TS.2- *for what I should give you my money?*

TS.5- *what for am I to give you my money?*

ST (13) and (14)

(13)

قد أخطأت في الخطأ إنساني

You have erred, for to err is human. (Beeston, 1968: 56)

(14)

أحس بيبؤس الفقراء في قد نشأ فقيراً

He felt sympathetic toward the lot of you the poor, for he had been raised in poverty. (Cantarino, 1975, vol.3: 24)

The connective causal particle ف is used in (13) and (14) to connect two propositions in each with an internal effect and cause link: the effect is represented by 'having erred' and

'feeling sympathetic,' the cause 'to err is human' and 'being raised in poverty.'

In (13), TS.1 and TS.5 adequately rendered the causal link into a semicolon (TS.1) which shows implicitly this relationship between 'you have erred' and 'to err is human,' and 'for' (TS.5) which designates explicitly the reason for erring, respectively.

TS.1- *(I) committed an error; to err is human.*

TS.5- *I made a mistake for to make mistakes is human.*

TS.2, 4, 7, and 8 failed to convey the sense of causality introducing the second sentence with 'and' which explicitly indicates the semantic relationship of addition.

TS.2- *(I) had made a mistake and to err is human.*

TS.3, TS.6, and TS.9 misunderstood the causal internal relationship, and rendered (13) into an explanation of the error itself by using a relative clause introduced by 'which.'

TS.9- *(I) made a mistake which is intrinsic in human.*

The success of the translators can be partly attributed to their familiarity with the well known English saying 'To err is human (to forgive is divine)'. TS.10, to be noted, stated this saying verbatim.

All translators, except TS.6, adequately rendered (14) into English; they realized the function of ـﺎ which implies an internal and logical causal relationship between the two coordinate sentences.

TS.1 explicitly showed this relationship by employing 'that's why,' the causal connective 'since' (TS.2), 'because' (TS.3, 4, 5, 8), 'as' (TS.9) and a semicolon (TS. 10).

TS.6 failed to notice what precedes and follows the particle **ف** and what logical sequence of thought underlies it. He proceeded from the cause to its effect; hence he mistakenly rendered it into 'so.'

TS.6- *He grew up in poverty, so he felt the misery of the poor.*

ST (15) and (16)

(15) **أسرعتُ في توديعه إذ بدأت اشعر بشبه دوار في راسي**

*I hurried to say good-bye, for I began to feel a heaviness
in my head. (Cantarino 1975, vol.3: 288)*

(16) **ليس الأدب في ذلك شيئاً خالداً إذ هو يتغير بتغير الظروف**

*Nevertheless, literature is not something eternal, since it
changes with the need of those people. (ibid: 289)*

The particle of motivation **إذ** in (15) and (16) is identical with a causative interpretation. In both cases the relationship between the subordinate clause and main clause is causal but with only one difference. The former is explicative, the latter implied.

All the test-subjects adequately rendered (15) except TS.1, 3 and 7 who kept the temporal relationship that **إذ** usually states or introduces, hence, they mistranslated the text. Here is one of the renderings stated below for convenience:

TS.3- *I hurried up to say farewell to him when I felt dizzy.*

TS.8 used a semicolon to explicate the relationship between the two clauses. Hence, he managed to show this relationship implicitly.

TS.8- *I hurried to see him off ; I felt some what dizzy.*

The rest of the test-subjects also managed to render (15) into a causal relationship introduced by causal connectives 'because' (TS.2, 5), 'as' (TS. 4, 6, 9) and 'since' (TS.10).

TS.2- *I hurried to see him off because I felt a little bit dizzy.*

TS.6- *As I felt some dizziness, I rushed to see him off.*

TS.10- *I saw him off since I have got dizziness.*

Similarly, the same strategies are employed by the test-subjects in rendering (16): a semicolon (TS. 1, 5, 8, 9), causal connectives 'since,' 'because' and 'as' (TS. 2, 3, 4), respectively. However, TS.10 failed to detect the causal relationship between the two clauses of the sentence, rendering it into a contrastive relationship:

TS.10- *Literature is not eternal but changes according to circumstances.*

ST (17) and (18)

(17) *اما وقد فرغنا من هذا فيجب ان نفكر في امر آخر*

In as much as we have now finished with this, we must consider another matter. (Beeston, 1968: 82).

(18) *هو سارق قد دخل الدير ليلا*

He is a thief; he broke into the convent at night. (Cantarino 1975, vol.3: 8).

The particle *ف* (called *حرف العطف* 'particle of gradation') prefixed to the verb *يجب* 'must' that immediately follows it in (17) introduces an action *نفكر في امر آخر* 'we consider another matter' which is basically intended as the logical result of the previous action realized as a circumstance clause beginning with the connective *و* (treated functionally as a theme phrase)

and introduced by أما وقد فرغنا من هذا: أما 'in as much as we have now finished with this' stated to achieve such a consequence.

Some translators succeeded in rendering (17) into a cause-effect relationship, using the causal connective 'as' (TS.3, 4, 6 and 10), whereas others rendered it into a local (temporal) relationship (TS.1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 9) which could be considered (with a little cognitive effort) as carrying implicit causality; however, this last sense cannot be determined without specific contexts.

TS.1- *As far as we (are done) with this, we ought to think about another issue.*

TS.5- *Now we have finished this we should think of another matter.*

TS.8- *Having finished this, we should think of another thing.*

The translators success can be attributed to the logical sequence of propositions in the sentence, for in (17) the mind can easily proceed from the cause introduced by the particle أما to a consideration of its effect. This also conforms with what Beeston (1968: 56) states that the particle of gradation ف implies that what precedes it has some sort of priority over what follows it.

This can be enough evidence that cause-effect relationships are easier to realize than effect-cause relationships. This however can be further investigated.

In (18) one translator (TS.3) managed the implicit causal relationship explicitly using the causal connective

'because'. Two other test-subjects (TS.2, 4) rendered it implicitly using a semicolon.

TS.3- *He is a thief because he had entered the monastery at night.*

TS.4- *He is a thief ; he entered the cloister at night.*

The other test-subjects failed to grasp the intended meaning of (18) due to their failure to understand the implicit cognitively-based causal relationship. TS.1 translated it into a cause-effect relationship, indicating a consequence relationship.

TS.1- *He entered the monastery at night, he is a thief.*

TS.7, 8, 9 thought of it as relationship of addition

TS.9- *He is a burglar and he entered the monastery at night.*

Finally, TS. 5, 6, 10 thought of it as one complex sentence in which the dependent clause identifies 'the thief' without any sense of either explicit or implicit causality.

ST (19) and (20)

(19) دعه يلعب انه صغير

Let him play, he is young. (Cantarino 1975, vol.3: 8)

(20) انه حدث لا يعرف الخير من الشر

He is still young; he cannot differentiate between good and evil.

No connecting particle is used to express the reason for the stated actions in (19) and (20). Causality is realized in terms of effect-cause relationship which is context-dependent in both examples; hence inferences are required to detect it.

All the test subjects adequately understood (19) and then explicitly rendered the effect-cause relationship between the two structures, using a semicolon (TS.1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9).

However, TS.7 and TS.10 rendered it explicitly by means of causal connectives 'for' (TS.7) and 'since' (TS.10).

TS.4- *Let him play; he is just a child.*

TS.10- *Let him play since he is a child.*

TS.7- *Leave him play please, for he is just a kid.*

The success of the test subjects can be also partly attributed to the causal function of **أَنَّ** (from which the causal **لـ** is dropped) which introduces the dependent clause **انه صغير** 'He is young.'

In (20), only three test-subjects (TS.7, 8, 9) appropriately rendered the implicit causal relationship between the two clauses of the sentence using a semicolon. Their understanding is basically built on the context.

TS.7- *He cannot differentiate between the good and bad; he is nothing but a juvenile.*

The failure of other translators is due to their use of clauses (TS.1, 2, 3, 10), a noun phrase (TS.6) and cognitive misrepresentation of the text (TS.4, 5).

TS.3- *He is a juvenile who does not distinguish between evil and good.*

TS.6- *He is an indiscriminate juvenile.*

TS.5- *(It happened that) he does not distinguish between good and evil.*

In general, the translators' failure can be attributed to their inability to realize that the causal connective **لأنَّ** 'because' is dropped from the dependent clause **لا يعرف الخير من الشر** which is the cause of being 'young.' This should have been inferred from the text itself. That is, the propositional information tells us that the boy is still young and that he cannot differentiate

between good and evil. To link these two sentences in a coherent way, the translators should have relied on whatever inferences available depending on their prior knowledge of similar texts, experience, etc.

8. Findings and Discussion

The data analysis reveals the following:

1. The results show that student-translators who are familiar with different Arabic realizations of causal connectives and causal relationships achieve greater success in understanding and then rendering them into English (TS.4 and 8) than those who are not (TS. 5 and 7). Hence, this finding supports the hypothesis that knowing the conventions for causal relations could affect determining what causes what in a text. It follows then that texts with apparent morphosyntactic properties indicating causality in language do not frequently pose a serious problem for translators due to their explicitness.
2. The results also show a sort of contradiction in the students achievement with respect to different categories. At the time the adverbial accusative of cause poses difficulty in a translation task due to its implicitness (10%) other categories which are no less implicit reflect a moderate difficulty (causal inferences 50%, connective causal particle (—ف) 50%, propositions 64% and particle of motivation (ذ!) 70%). The success/ failure of the (student) translators can be attributed to their ability/ inability to infer from the context what causes what, their background knowledge and the system of causality in both languages.

3. Another instance of inconsistent performance is in the category of prepositions, where the test-subjects' performance with respect to the preposition لـ does not exceed 15%, whereas 95% for the preposition على. The same inconsistency can be found in the test-subjects rendering of the connective causal particle فـ in (13) and (14). At a time أحس ببؤس الفقراء فقد نشأ فقيراً poses no difficulty for most of the translators (95%), قد اخطأت فالخطأ إنساني, does (20%). This, however, can be attributed to either the inability to draw on their background knowledge in finding causes of the focal event or lack of analysis, usually required to infer causal relations which, in turn, build a functional coherent representation of the text.
4. One significant result is that translators frequently tend to use either only explicit means in their renderings for implicit causality (9 instances), or both explicit and implicit (7 instances). However, only 3 instances of implicit-implicit causality have been detected. The only two explicit ST items (4) and (12) are rendered explicitly by the test-subjects. This finding can be also attributed to the test-subjects' familiarity with the text (seen or practiced earlier) and the sophistication of the causality system in both languages.
5. Finally, the results do not show a systematic use of certain specific connectives in similar situations (even by the same test subject). Therefore, it would be difficult to judge or decide which strategies are the best, and why they are chosen by the

student translators. Therefore, this area requires further research.

9. Conclusions

Building on the findings of data analysis, the study comes to the following conclusions:

1. The difficulty of translating causal connectives and causal relationships from Arabic into English stems from the sophistication of causality system in both languages. Being part and parcel of the integrity of the text, decoding such relationships requires an extra cognitive effort of reading and processing the material to be translated.
2. Instances of problematic implicit causal relations can be solved "either after a series of metalinguistic considerations or by means of exclusively implicit knowledge, or intentions" (Naoum, 2001: 188). Therefore, failure to translate implicit causal relationships (and consequently realizing causal coherence of the target text) is very much likely when the student- translators have insufficient background assumptions about the text (especially that the translator is less familiar with).
3. Finally, though student-translators' tendency to use explicit means for determining what causes what in a text affects the stylistic aspect of the text itself, it is useful in achieving denotative equivalence (i.e. communicating the desired message and effect to the readership).

REFERNCES

- Al-Galaayini, M. (2004). **Jaami 'ud-Duruusl-'Arabiyya.**
Tripoli (Lebanon).Al-Mu'assasatul-Hadiithatu
LilKitab.
- Al-Ishbili al-Nahawi, Abu Bakr (1962). **Kitaabul-Waadhih.**
Publications of the Jordanian University.
Verification: Dr. Abdulkariim Khaliifa.
- As-Saaqi, F. (1977). **Aqsaamul-Kalaamil-Arabi min
Haythul-Shakli wal-Waziifa.** Cairo: Al-Khanachi
Library.
- Beeston, A. (1968). **Written Arabic: An Approach to the
Basic Structures.** Cambridge. Cambridge
University Press.
- Cantarino, V. (1975). (vol.3) **Syntax of Modern Arabic
Prose.** Bloomington/London: Indiana University
Press.
- Celce-Murcia, M. and Larsen-Freeman, D. (1983). **The
Grammar Book.** Newbury House Publishers, INC.
- Eckersley, C.E and Eckersley, J. M. (1960). **Comprehensive
English Grammar.** London: Longman.
- Fries, Ch. (1952). **The Structure of English.** Harcourt, Brace
and Company, INC.
- Garnham, A., Traxler, M., Oakhill, J. and Gernsbacher, M-A.
(1996). "The Locus of Implicit Causality Effects in
Comprehension." **Journal of Memory and
Language** 35, 517-543.

- Haroon, A. (1979) (2nd Ed.). Al-Asaalibul-Insha'yya Fin-Nahwil-Arabi. Cairo. Al-Khanachi Library.
- Hasan, A. (1968). An-Nahul-Waafi (vol.2). Egypt. Mataabi^c Darul-Ma^caarif.
- Johnson, A. and Thornley, G. C. (1948). Grammar and Idiom. London: Longmans, Green and Co. LTD.
- Kintsch, W. (1995). "How Can Readers Construct Situation Models for Stories: The Role of Syntactic Cues and Causal Inferences." In: M. A. Gernsbacher & T. Givon (Eds.). Coherence in Spontaneous Text. (139-160). Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Mansoor, O. (1987). Al-Muqtataf fin-Nahwi was-Sarf.^cAmman, Jordan. Dar ^cAmmaar.
- Moreno, A. (2003). "Matching Theoretical Descriptions of Discourse and Practical Applications to Teaching: the Case of Causal Metatext." English for Special Purposes. 22, 265-295.
- Naoum, A. (2001). A Cognitive Pragmatic Approach to Translation. Unpublished Ph D Thesis. University of Mosul.
- Pit, M. (1997). A Cognitively-Based Account of Some Causal Connectives. 5th International Cognitive Linguistic Conference. 14-19 July 1997.
- Polo, J. F. (1995). Some Discoursal Aspects in Translation of Popular science Texts from English into Spanish. Organization in Discourse. Proceedings from the Turken Conference, 1995.

A Cognitively-Oriented Account of Some Arabic Causal Connectives with Reference to Translation Asst. Prof. Dr. Anis B. Naoum & Asst. Prof. Dr. Rabea M. O. Agha

Roberts, P. (1956). **Patterns of English.** New York. Harcourt, Brace and World, INC.

Roberts, P. (1962). **English Sentence.** New York. Harcourt, Brace and World, INC.

Sanders, T., Sporen, W. and Noordman, L. "Coherence Relations in a Cognitive Theory of Discourse Representation." **Cognitive Linguistics** 4, 93-133.

Sledd, J.(1959). **A Short Introduction to English Grammar.** Atlanta: Scott, Foreman and Company.

Sweester, E. (1990). **From Etymology to Pragmatics. Metaphorical and Cultural Aspects of Semantic Structure.** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

van den Broek, P. (1990). **The Causal Inference Maker: Towards a Process Model of Inference Generation in Text Comprehension.** In: D. A. Balota, G. P. Flores d'Arcais & K. Rayner (Eds.). *Comprehension Processes in Reading.*

_____ (1994). **Comprehension and Memory of Narrative Texts. Inferences and Coherence.** *Handbook of Psycholinguistics.* Academic Press. INC.

Wright, W. (1971). **A Grammar of the Arabic Language.** Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

APPENDIX

SL Texts:

1. قعدتَ عن الحرب جبنا.
2. واغفر عوراء الكريمِ ادخاره واعرض عن شتم اللئيم نكرما
3. يغضي حياءً ويغضى من مهابته فما يُكلمُ إلا حين يبتسم
4. فعار ثم عار ثم عار شقاء المرء من اجل الطعام
5. طلب الجاه للأمر بالمعروف.
6. واني لتعروني لذكراك هزة.
7. ضربه الحد في شرب الخمر.
8. لامه في ذلك
9. يرزقه الله ببركة دعائه
10. بتوفيق الله حجبت.
11. يعاتبه على ترك المهاداة
12. على أي شيء أعطيك مالي؟
13. قد أخطأت فالخطأ إنساني
14. أحس ببؤس الفقراء فقد نشأ فقيرا.
15. أسرعت في توديعه إذ بدأت اشعر بشبه دوار في راسي.
16. ليس الأدب في ذلك شيئاً خالدا إذ هو يتغير بتغير الظروف
17. أما وقد فرغنا من هذا فيجب ان نفكر في أمر آخر.
18. هو سارق قد دخل الدير ليلا
19. دعه يلعب انه صغير.
20. انه حدث لا يعرف الخير من الشر

Samples of Test Subjects Rendering

TS.4

1. Cowardly, I did not go to war.
2. Angry be not with a good manner people and treat not bad manner people like they do.
3. He cannot be talked to unless he is in a good temper.
4. Shame, shame and shame the distress of a man for food.
5. He sought power to enjoin righteousness.
6. I miss you so much.
7. He drinks too much.
8. He blamed him for that.
9. Allah gives him patience by the blessing of his prayer.
10. Due to success, granted by Allah, I went to pilgrimage.
11. He is admonishing him for abandoning the truce.
12. Why should I give you my money?
13. I had made a mistake and to err is human.
14. He felt the misery of the poor since he was brought up as a poor.
15. I hurried to see him off because I felt a little bit dizzy.
16. Literature is not immortal, since it changes according to circumstances.
17. Having finished this, we should think in another issue.
18. He is a thief, he had entered the monastery at night.
19. Let him play, he is young.
20. He is a juvenile and cannot differentiate between good and evil.

TS.8

1. She did not take part in the war for being coward.
2. Turn a blind eye to the errors of the grateful.
3. He turns a blind eye for being polite.
4. Indeed it's a shame to be humiliated for getting food.
5. He asked power to do good.
6. I feel shaken when I remember you.
7. He flogged him for drinking alcohol.
8. He blamed him for doing so.
9. Thanks to his supplications, may Allah grant him patience.
- 10.Guided by Allah, I performed Hajj (pilgrimage).
- 11.He blames him for not exchanging presents.
- 12.For what should I give you my money?
- 13.I've made a mistake and this mistake rendered me forgetful.
- 14.He felt the bitter of poverty because he has led a poverty life.
- 15.I hurried to see him off, I felt somewhat dizzy.
- 16.Literature is not something fixed. It is changeable depending on situations.
- 17.Having finished this, we should think of another thing.
- 18.He is a thief and he has entered the monastery at night.
- 19.Let him play, he is just a kid.
- 20.He is merely a juvenile, he knows nothing.

Tabulated Performance of TSs.

Category No.	Text No.	STs		TTs		Test Subjects Performance - / + / 0										Percentage	Causes of Failure		
		Realization of Causality	Sense	Realization of Causality	Sense	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10				
1	1	المفعول لاجله 'Adverbial accusative of cause' (جينا)	implicit	Subordinating conjunction 'because'	Explicit					+							5/ 50 10%	-Misunderstanding of morphosyntactic properties of the verb phrase. -Interference. Literal word-to-word translation. -Misrepresentation due to text genre (poetry) and stylistics. - Failure to preserve coherence relations. -Lack of intuition. - Task difficulty/ Unfamiliarity or carelessness. (similar causes are not repeated any more)	
				Coordinating conjunction 'for'	Explicit									+					
				Prepositional* phrase 'in cowardice'									-						
				Adverb of manner * 'cowardly'		-	-	-	-					-		-			-
	2.a	المفعول لاجله 'Adverbial accusative of cause' (ادخاره)	implicit	Semicolon	implicit	+													
				Misrepresentation*											-				-
				Left untranslated															
	2.b	المفعول لاجله 'Adverbial accusative of cause' (تكرماً)	Explicit	Prepositional phrase 'out of generosity'	Explicit														+
				Adverb of manner* 'proudly'		-													
				Misrepresentation*			-	-	-							-			
			Left untranslated							0	0	0			0				
3.a	المفعول لاجله	implicit	'for'	Explicit															

3		connective causal particle (فـ)		Relationship of addition * 'and'			-	-			-	-			11/20 55%	relationships. -irrelevant explanation. -expressing cause-effect relationship.		
				Circumstance relative clause * 'which'														
				Intended meaning														-
				'cultural equivalence'														
	14	فاء السببية connective causal particle (فـ)		'that's why'	Explicit	+												
				Causal connectives 'for, as, since, because'	Explicit		+	+	+	+		+	+	+				
				Semicolon	Implicit												+	
				Consequence* relation 'so'								-						
4	15	حرف التعليل "اذ" particle of motivation	Implicit	Causal connectives	Explicit		+		+	+	+			+	+	14/20 70%	Misunderstanding of internal relationships	
				Semicolon	Implicit									+				
				Temporal relationship* 'when'		-		-					-					
	16	حرف التعليل "اذ" particle of motivation	Implicit	Causal connectives 'since, because, as'	Explicit		+	+	+									
				Semicolon	Implicit	+				+			+	+				
				Contrast* relationship											-			
	17	Causal inference	Implicit	Causal connective 'as'	Explicit			+	+		+				+		-misunderstanding of internal relationships	

5		(without explicit connectives or particles)		Temporal relationship*		-	-			-		-	-	-				- misunderstanding of structural properties.	
	18	Causal inference	Implicit	'Because'	Explicit			+										20/40 50%	
				Semicolon	Implicit		+		+										
				Consequence* relation 'so'		-													
				Relationship of addition* 'and'									-	-	-				
				Misrepresentation*							-	-							
	19	Causal inference		Semicolon	Implicit	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+					
				Causal connectives 'for, since'	Explicit								+			+			
	20	Causal inference	Implicit	Semicolon	Implicit								+	+	+				
				Relative clause		-	-	-									-		
				Noun phrase*								-							
				Misrepresentation*						-	-								
Total																	49.8%		

(*) Misunderstanding of causal relationships.

Tabulated Statistics of the TSs Performance:

category		Text No.	Correctness out of 10	Percentage per text	Percentage per sub-category	Total percentage		
Adverbial accusative of cause		1	2	20		10		
		2.a	1	10				
		2.b	1	10				
		3.a	1	10				
prepositions	من	3.b	4	40	65	64		
		4	9	90				
	إلى	5	0	0	15			
		6	3	30				
	في	7	4	40	65			
		8	9	90				
	أبداً	9	8	80	80			
		10	8	80				
	على	11	9	90	95			
		12	10	100				
	Connective causal particle		13	2	20			55
			14	9	90			
Particle of motivation		15	7	70		70		
		16	7	70				
Causal inferences		17	4	40		50		
		18	3	30				
		19	10	100				
		20	3	30				
					Total	49.8		

مقاربة إدراكية لبعض أدوات الربط السببية في العربية مع

الإشارة إلى الترجمة

أ.م.د. أنيس بهنام نعوم* و أ.م.د. ربيع محمد قاسم آغا**

المستخلص

تعتمد هذه الدراسة إلى تعريف المترجمين العرب (الطلبة) بكيفية تحقق العلاقات السببية في اللغة العربية والى المدى الذي تضيفه إلى أو تعينهم في فهم تماسك النص. تفترض الدراسة إن الخواص الصرفية النحوية للنص لا تساعد دائماً على تحديد المسببات في النص بل إن الأعراف السائدة في التعبير عن العلاقات السببية الضمنية والتي قد لا يدركها طلبة الترجمة وغالباً ما تمر دون أن يرصدها احد، هي التي يجب أن يعول عليها.

وتظهر الدراسة أن جزء من إخفاق المترجمين في المحافظة على تماسك النص مرده إلى اعتمادهم على حالات التحقق الصريح للسببية وبالتالي إساءة فهم العلاقات السببية الضمنية والتي تقضي إلى فشل في التواصل.

* قسم الترجمة/ كلية الآداب/ جامعة الموصل.

** قسم الترجمة/ كلية الآداب/ جامعة الموصل.