

Semantics of Causatives in American and British Short Stories: A Contrastive Study

دلالات التراكيب السببية في قصص قصيرة أمريكية وبريطانية: دراسة مقارنة

م. م. كريم علي رمضان(*)

Asst. Lecturer. Kareem Ali Ramadhan

kareemali313@uomustansiriyah.edu.iq

المستخلص

عندما يتسبب الفاعل (المُسبب) في تغيير المفعول به (المُسبب)، في جملة ما، أو التصرف بطريقة معينة، فإن هذا الشيء يعرف باسم السببية. إن السببية هو مفهوم لغوي يستخدم في وصف قواعد دلالي يشير إلى العلاقة بين حدث أو حدثين متتاليين. غالباً ما يتم الإشارة إليه باستخدام جمل وتراكيب سببية، والتي تُظهر أن شيئاً ما أو شخصاً ما يتسبب في حدوث فعل. تم اختيار أربع قصص قصيرة من ثقافتين مختلفتين - قصتان قصيرتان بريطانيتين وقصتان أمريكيتان - كنصوص للدراسة يُراد تحليلها دلالياً. يحاول الباحث تقديم إجابات ذات صلة باستفسارات واسئلة تعتبر أهدافاً تجريبية لهذه الورقة منها: أولاً، ما هي التصنيفات التي تنتمي إليها التراكيب السببية؟ ثانياً، في الكتابات الأدبية المكتوبة من قبل مؤلفين من الولايات المتحدة وإنجلترا، أي التراكيب السببية أكثر شيوعاً وأيهما أقل شيوعاً؟ وهل طريقة السرد لمجتمع أو حضارة معينة له مدخلية في بناء جمل وتراكيب سببية تختلف عنها في المجتمع والحضارة الأخرى؟ إذا كانت هناك تفسيرات موضوعية ولغوية، فكيف ولماذا؟ بناءً على صياغة مشكلة البحث، يُحدد هدف البحث باستكشاف وتحليل أنواع التراكيب السببية دلالياً في الأعمال الأدبية المستهدفة. وتكمن أهمية الدراسة في توقع توفير اشارات أو معلومات إضافية في المنهج الدلالي للسببية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: السببية، علم الدلالة، القصة القصيرة، الأفعال السببية، دراسة مقارنة.

(*) رئاسة الجامعة المستنصرية

Abstract

When one entity (the causer) causes another entity (the causee) to alter or act in a certain way, this is known as causativity. It is a concept employed in a semantic account indicating the link between two successive occurrences. It is frequently stated using causative constructs, which show that something or someone causes an action to occur. Four short stories from two distinct cultural variations—two British short stories and two American ones—have been chosen for the study's data collection. The researcher attempts to provide pertinent responses to such queries which are regarded as empirical goals of this paper are: first, what parameters do causatives belong to? Second, in literary writings written in the United States or England, are causative constructs more common and which are less common? if there are objective and linguistic explanations, then how and why? On the base of the formulation of the problem, the research objective lays out as; to explore and analyze semantically the types of causative constructions in the targeted literary works. The study significance lies in the expectation of providing an extra reference or information in the semantic approach to causativity.

Key Words: Causativity, Semantics, Short Story, Causative Verbs, & Comparative Study.

Introduction

Semantics refers to learning the meaning of the language. It examines the meaning of words, phrases and sentences on the base of their conceptual components and their relationship to other linguistic components (Levinson, 2000). By analyzing whether the conceptual meanings of words are connected, the semantic approach can explain why some sentences seem strange even if they are grammatically correct. According to (Heim & Kratzer, 1998), "If we define semantics as the study of meaning, it becomes crucial to the study of communication as well as discourse analysis, which is a key aspect in how each text is organized". For this reason, the researcher focused his study on this main branch of linguistics, considering that semantics is more important

than the rest of the branches, and it also matches what the research requires in terms of analyzing the targeted words and sentences in the targeted texts in this study. The other variable in this study is causativity and how to analyze words and sentences in the targeted texts semantically and identify their most important features and characteristics and study them in depth so that the researcher can expose the relationship of semantics and its effect in analyzing texts that include the aspect of causativity. The comparative study of causative verbs in English especially in the scope of examining and differentiating between literary works of two different backgrounds, cultures, and societies involves examining the similarities and differences between the forms and usage of these verbs in different contexts. This type of study is important for understanding how causative verbs function in English and how they are used in various contexts. It is obvious that theoretical factors are essential when conducting a comparative analysis of English causatives. Understanding the linguistic and cognitive factors that underpin English causatives is the theoretical foundation of any comparative study of these causative verbs. Such verbs, for instance, are linked to the concepts of agency and causality, both of which are essential to linguistics and cognitive science research. Besides, researchers can acquire insights into how causative verbs operate in English and how they are utilized in various texts and circumstances by investigating the theoretical principles that underlie them. Being a comparative study, the researcher here chooses literary works “British” and “American” short stories due to the fact that literature, which represents a society’s culture and aspirations, takes many different forms across the world. British and American literature makes significant contributions to the literary globe. Despite their shared historical origins, diverse literary traditions evolved separately, taking into consideration distinct historical, social, and cultural elements of the presence of several differences between British and American literature such as historic foundations, cultural and social influences, language and style, literary movements and themes, global impact and so on. Literary texts (two British short stories versus two American short stories) are chosen for the analysis since they may contain a wide variety of verb classes, allowing authors or writers to describe how the two types of causal verb structures—lexical

and periphrastic—are produced to demonstrate causativity using a variety of techniques. When such texts are semantically analyzed, this could be useful for those interested in linguistics, stylistics, and instructors and students of English as a foreign language.

1. Review of Related Literature:

The primary purpose of language is to communicate meaning. People talk and communicate to explain the meanings of their thoughts, which might lead to misunderstandings otherwise. Palmer (1983), Crystal (1998), and other linguists and grammarians agree that the technical term ‘semantics’ refers to the study of meaning expressed via language. According to Thakur (2001), ‘semantics’ explores how the meanings of words in a language connect to one another and how these words do gain their meanings when they take their position in the system of meanings. So, in what way, then, would a semantic approach aid in our understanding of the language nature? It might be useful, for example, in explaining the ‘oddness’ we experience and feel when we read lines in English like the ones below:

1. The pizza ate the girl
2. His dog learned philosophy

It should be noticed that the oddness of the sentences above does not stem from their syntactic structure. According to (Lyon, 1973), some basic syntactic rules for forming English sentences, we have well-structured sentences:

The pizza ate the girl

This sentence is syntactically accurate, but semantically odd. Since the sentence ‘*the girl ate the pizza*’ is perfectly acceptable, what is the source of the oddness we experience? One answer may relate to the components of the conceptual meaning of the noun pizza which differ significantly from those of the noun girl, especially when those nouns are used as subjects of the verb ate. The kinds of nouns which can be subjects of the verb ate must denote entities which are capable of ‘eating’. The noun pizza does not have this property (and girl does), hence the oddness of the first sentence above exists. For this

reason and due to the importance of semantics in conveying and analyzing the true meaning of a written or spoken text, the researcher has used it as a basic tool in analyzing texts that include causative structures and verbs with an accurate analysis using an appropriate model for a specialized linguist. Here first, it is necessary to present the concept of causativity and causative verbs and the most prominent definitions that have been commented on by some prominent linguists. There are good reasons why: causation is related to verbal aspectuality, and it forces the theorist to make decisions about how events are structured, and about how the participants in the events are related to the description of the event.” It may be concluded that a causative verb could be recognized as a type of verb that is commonly used in English to express that one person causes another person to do something or causes something to happen (Amer: 2010). Causative verbs are an important aspect of the English language, and comprehending them is critical for learning it. Another point of view by Halliday, causativity denotes to whether the process is being carried out by a causer or another entity, like a causee. There is a clear contrast between a self-stimulated event and an event that is stimulated, i.e., triggered by another participant or power (1994). Frawley has a similar position, positing that a causal relation establishes determination between two occurrences or events, with a prior event giving birth to a subsequent event (1992). He argues that causal occurrences should be interpreted using the logic of antecedence and consequence. According to Valin (2000) sentences, like below, illustrate the causative alternation: In (a. the glass broke) and (b. Sarah broke the glass), the notion of causativity here can be viewed that “Sarah” is the causer of the action that made “the glass” to be “broken”. Such verbs have a complex and interesting aspect of the English language and are the subject of much study and research over the years. In this study, accordingly, the researcher will discuss and analyze the various types of causative verbs in English, their forms, and their usage in different contexts.

2.1. Definition and Common Features of Literary Language

The term 'literature' has signified different things at several periods throughout English literature's history; to simplify writing in the broadest sense of the word (e.g. diaries, travelogues, historical and biographical accounts). Literature is not universally the same everywhere and is as a category of text eminently negotiable (Carter: 1997). However, the language used for expression in literature is referred to as language of literature or more often called as literary language. This type of language is more distinguished and shapely than any other language. We are able to convey our emotions, sentiments, and thoughts more attractively and effectively than others. Literary language is unique in that it places a higher value on the transmission of message than the message itself. Based on the above, it is possible to summarize some of the features that the literary text possesses. Firstly, being formalized, literary language is founded on particular words with distinct meanings, and we concentrate on the splendor of language, even when we use smooth terms. Novelists, short story writers, and poets all employ literary texts in formal ways. Idioms and difficult words are regarded as the attractiveness of literary language. Second, rather than actuality, literature places a greater emphasis on imagination. Literature employs imagination to tell stories about unnatural and fabricated happenings. Last but not least, the expression of literary texts is symbolic, symbols are employed. Words have metaphorical connotations (Wilson, J. 1990).

2.2. British vs. American Literary Works

Comparative literature serves a similar function to the study of international relationships, but it works with languages and traditions of art to grasp cultures from the inside out. Every issue offers reviews of significant works of literary criticism categorized under the umbrella category of comparative literature. English literature predates the American English. Identifying the distinctions between English literature and American literature is a key factor for literature researchers and students since both of them can play a signifi-

cant part in the definition of literature. However, by reviewing the literary works of both types of literature, throughout history, there are many differences between them in all literary aspects, for example: writers, style, genres and topics, grammar, punctuation and others. We cannot go into all the details, but we can summarize a few of them. For instance, English literature mostly represents the culture of England and its mannerisms, whereas American literature reflects culture, history, and revolutionary ideals of the U. S. such as connections with the state, the church, and supernatural elements that evolved in the country, such as “the battle in Massachusetts”. When reading works by American and English writers, there are noticeable linguistic differences. British writers tend to employ classic and traditional British English, and the vocabulary is more extensive. As for linguistic style, Walker continues, political, economic, and social statuses are recurrent themes in American literature. Cynicism, sarcasm, and satire are common themes in American literature. Language, for example, serves as a form of protest in “The Catcher in the Rye” and “The Great Gatsby.” Contrarily, romanticism, human values, aspirations, and etiquette are primarily invoked in British literature from the same period; however class distinctions are frequently addressed or mentioned in a significant way. Such linguistic distinctions between British and American literature highlight how language is dynamic and shaped by cultural, social, and historic influences. These distinctions not just make for a delightful read, but also focus on two literary traditions’ individual identities and how each contributes to the broader area of English literature.

2.3. Causativity: Concept and Role of Causative Verbs

By and large, the concept of causativity refers to the relationship between two or more successive occurrences, where the second event, known as a caused event, is seen as the possible result of the first event, known as a causing event (Yueru Ni, 2012). Halliday (1994) defined causativity as the question of whether a causer or another entity, such as a causee, is responsible for the process. A clear distinction is made between an occurrence that is self-stimulated and one that is triggered by a different person or authority.

According to Frawley (1992, p.159), causal events should be interpreted using the logic of antecedence and consequence. It is represented as a “if / then” relation:

- Ammar compelled his kid to complete his schoolwork.

This implies that the kid completed the schoolwork if Ammar compelled him to. Moreover, the ergative causative structures can also benefit from this relationship:

- If the general marched the soldiers, the soldiers would also march.

It is possible to express causativity in a variety of ways. Hladký and Růžicka (2001, p.36) maintain that causativity can be shown via a syntactic construction as in e.g. “help a person do something” by lexical instrument e.g. “pairs made up of a transitive and an intransitive verb like fall / fell” or by an alteration from intransitive to transitive form of the verb itself:

a. The gull fell. b. The huntsman fell the gull.

The realization of causativity in (a and b) is that ‘the huntsman caused the gull to be fallen’. A causal construction often involves “two events.” Frawley (1992, p.159) refers to “a shared event” and “a result event” whereas Shibatani (1976, p.1) defines “a causing event” and “a caused event”. Dixon (2000) states that lexical causatives, such as the verb ‘trip’, which is utilized in two syntactic frames and whose primary function is engaged in an intransitive phrase, are likely to be subject to a constraint, for example:

a. Jack (S) tripped

yet, it can also be employed in a transitive statement having a causal role, for example:

b. Kevin (causer) tripped Jack.

Dixon explains that the usage of causative constructions, where their syntactic function is indicated by their position in the word order, is limited by the potential surface structure, this is first. Second, in addition to the intransitive ‘Jack tripped’ and its causative counterpart ‘Kevin tripped Jack’, it is not possible to build a causal counterpart for a transitive construction; thus, it would be completely unrealistic to state:

a. * Kevin kicked Jack the car or b. * Kevin Jack kicked the car.

2.4. Common Causative Verbs and Main Types

A causative verb in English grammar, basically, denotes that something happens because of someone or something, or because that one or thing aids in the happening of something. Verbs like cause, make, have, get, help, enable, hold, force, require, prevent, allow, keep, let, and others can also be referred to as causal verbs or basically causatives. Any causative verb may describe anything that occurs as a result of someone, place, or thing whose activities cause some change in another entity. It could come in any tense. It is typically followed by an object and another verb form, which is frequently an infinitive or a participle. Below are some examples for the most used causatives in English:

Have (giving a person responsibility for doing something)

- Jim had the mechanic repair the vehicle.

Make (forcing a person for doing something)

- The father made his son collect the money from the shops' owners.

Generally speaking, Crystal (2008) distinguishes two types of verb forms in English: they are dynamic and stative. The distinguishing parameter is essentially syntactic. Unlike dynamic verbs, stative verbs do not appear in the progressive or imperative forms, as seen by the examples below:

- | | | |
|-------------|-------------------|------------|
| 1. a. *Want | b. *He is liking | c. *Belong |
| 2. a. Run | b. She is walking | c. Eat |

Dynamic verbs, in terms of semantics, are primarily used to interpret actions, whereas stative verbs are used to interpret, at best, states of affairs. Lyons (1971) defines a stative verb as one that causes a change of state during its action. According to Menzel (1975), dynamic verbs can describe events, activities, and processes, whereas stative (or state) verbs can represent properties as well as states. Chafe (1970) distinguishes causative verbs as a subclass of stative verbs. According to Lyons (ibid), "melt" and "boil" are examples of stative verbs. These verbs can be used both in intransitive and transitive

forms. For instance:

a. The ice melted

b. The juice melted the ice

In (b), he claims that the stative verb “melt” serves as a causative verb. Some grammarians, such as Farber (1976), disagree with this view. He suggests that all stative verbs aren’t causative. Other grammarians, including Tylor (1976), imply that this viewpoint is inexact. He views that causative verbs are graded within state verbs. Conversely, stative verbs are not causative at all since they refer to an event that expresses a change, which may or may not occur. This viewpoint is noted by Chung & Timberlake (1985). They further say that causative verbs could be subclassified as dynamic verbs since dynamic verbs require a change in events. In conclusion, as certain verbs that do not normally have a causal meaning can be used in a causal sense, (e.g. verbs of perception, such as “notice” to be paraphrased as “cause to see”, or verbs of duration such as “keep” might be paraphrased “cause to remain”), the family of verbs with causal meaning might be described as open-ended.

2.5. The concepts of Causer and Causee

Halliday (ibid) points out; a participant who causes the action to be executed or acted immediately by the causee is called an initiator; an actor, frequently by providing an impetus; for instance:

- The headmaster marched the pupils towards the classrooms.

This example, as Cruse (1973, p.20) makes it clear, demands ‘agentivity’ that the object be agentic, that there be a line of communication between the subject and the object, and the object be receptive to commands. Cruse emphasizes, in a sentence like this, the act of marching is brought about or executed by ‘pupils’, whilst the act of making ‘them’ (pupils) march is being done by ‘the headmaster’.

In turn, Dixon (2000) asserts that the causer in a causative structure may be a person, as in the following example:

- Hassan has made son smile.

or to a thing that is abstract such as:

- The strong wind is making me feel dizzy.

or a happening like:

- Waiting for two hours makes an individual exhausted.

3. Research Methodology

The data source and data collection for the analysis are provided in this section. Along with describing the data, it also displays the model used to analyze the data.

3.1. Data Source:

The source of the data researched is taken from two web-cites which are (<https://americanliterature.com/twenty-great-american-short-stories/>) and (<https://theshortstory.co.uk/resources/free-short-stories/>) where there are lists of the British and American short stories that the researcher has chosen for the analysis.

3.2. Data Selection:

Four famous short stories are selected for the analysis. Two of them are by British writers; (“The Ghost of Art” by Charles Dickens, and “Out of the Rose” by William Butler Yeats). The other two short stories are by American writers; (“The Gift of the Magi” by O. Henry, and “An Angel in Disguise” by T.S. Arthur).

3.3. Dixon’s Model (2000)

This semantic model is selected for the analysis for being comprehensive and more applicable than those reviewed - elsewhere - by the researcher. By having various semantic parameters, the model can give plausible accounts about all the elements involved in any causative construction. Within that orientation, Dixon (2000) serves to classify semantic parameters involved in the

meaning of any causative construction as it is uniquely acted in language. In languages like English, which have multiple causative mechanisms, there is typically a semantic distinction, with one or more of the following seven parameters being involved. Dixon categorizes these semantic differences, which involve the verb, the causee (the entity affected by the action), and the causer (the entity that initiates the action). The model can be summarized as shown below:

a) Verb-related questions:

1. State/action: Does a causative mechanism apply only to verbs that describe a state, or does it also apply to those describing an action?

2. Transitivity: Is the causative mechanism restricted to transitive verbs, or does it also apply to intransitive, simple transitive, and ditransitive verbs?

b) Causee-related questions:

3. Control: Does the causee have control over the action (e.g., if they are inanimate or a young child), or do they not have control?

4. Affectedness: Is the causee only partially affected by the action, or are they fully affected?

c) Causer-related questions:

5. Directness: Does the causer directly perform the action, or do they act indirectly?

6. Naturalness: Does the action occur naturally (as the causer just starts a natural process), or is the result accomplished through effort, possibly with violence?

7. Involvement: Is the causer actively involved in the action, in addition to the causee, or is the causer uninvolved?

“The seven parameters are not entirely autonomous,” Dixon said. If **action** is chosen under parameter no. 1, he asserts, parameter no. 2, **transitivity**, may be transitive at most. He continues by saying that when the **control** parameter is selected beneath no. 3, the **volition** may frequently be employed. It should be highlighted that it might be difficult to discern between **control** and **volition** with regard of the causee. In addition, many causal constructs involve no causee in the occurrence. In other terms, the causer is the lone person who ini-

tiates the activity involved in a causal occurrence. Parameter, no. 6 mentioned above, refers to whether the causer had to exert **effort** or achieved the result **naturally**. Lastly, **involvement** is utilized regardless of whether the causer is actively, that is, if the causer is taking part and accompanying the causee involved in the action. Unlike the other parameters, the **transitivity** parameter has a special property that should be noted. The shape of the causative structure can change within the transitivity parameter based on whether it applies to only transitive or also to intransitive or/and ditransitive phenomena. To put it another way, the transitivity parameter can be employed to make the causative verb in a causal event simultaneously intransitive, transitive, or ditransitive. In the case of a causal occurrence, for example, the verb ‘break’ would be considered both transitive and intransitive. As opposed to the situation of directness parameter, for instance, which is applied to the causer of a causative event, it must be either direct or indirect, but not both at the same time.

4.1. Data Analysis

This section concentrates on the analysis of causative constructions in literary works, particularly short stories. The research investigates four short stories, two British and two American, to investigate the disparities in how causal structures are employed in each group. The section seeks to identify patterns, stylistic decisions, and cultural nuances that differentiate British and American short story writing in their use of causative constructions by conducting a semantic analysis of these texts using Dixon’s semantic model, which comprises seven parameters that were previously covered in this study. It also aims to shed light on the distinctive features of each tradition while illuminating wider implications of causal sentence usage in literary discourse via in-depth linguistic and contextual analysis. The short stories that the researcher have chosen are by widely recognized American and British authors, who are both prominent for their contributions to the short story genre. The selection of these writers was decided on their skill at producing riveting narratives and their capability of incorporating a variety of causal structures. The major goal of this selection is to investigate the semantics of causal structures

found in stories, as well as how these constructions communicate meaning and emotions within literary works. One of the distinguishing specifications for selecting these stories was their comparable length. By selecting stories of equivalent length, the analysis guarantees a fair comparison, enabling the emphasis to concentrate on the employment of causal constructs rather than being impacted by structural discrepancies. Each short story will undergo a semantic analysis. A specific table will be presented for each short story in the analysis, with an emphasis on the semantics of causality. The tables will display the components of “relation,” “parameter,” “frequency,” and “percentage” for the semantic analysis by utilizing Dixon’s model’s seven semantic parameters. Following the data tabulation, there will be commentary and reflections on the data provided, along with a few chosen instances of causal constructs. Hence, readers will be capable of grasping the semantic analysis of each causal construction through these instances.

To calculate the percentage values presented in the tables, the following methodological steps were undertaken:

1. Identification of Causative Sentences:

Each short story was closely examined to extract sentences that exhibit causative constructions, based on the semantic parameters established in the study.

2. Categorization by Causative Relation:

The extracted causative sentences were then classified according to the type of causative relation they represent as defined by the theoretical framework.

3. Recording Frequency (Raw Counts):

The number of occurrences (frequency) of each causative relation type within each story was recorded in the corresponding column.

4. Determining the Total Number of Causative Sentences per Short Story:

All causative sentences identified in each short story were totaled to determine the base number used for percentage calculation.

5. Calculating the Percentage:

The percentage was derived using the following formula:

Percentage = (Frequency of a specific relation ÷ Total number of causative sentences in the short story) × 100

Example: If a short story contained 20 causative sentences in total, and 5 of them were classified as “action verbs”, the percentage for that relation would be:

$(5 \div 20) \times 100 = 25\%$

This approach allowed for a normalized comparison of causative patterns across texts of varying lengths and ensured consistency in the statistical treatment of data.

4.2. Analysis of American Short Story Texts

4.2.1. “The Gift of the Magi” by O. Henry

Relation	Parameter		Frequency	Percentage
Relating to Verb	Action/state	action	13	81.25 %
		state	3	18.75 %
	Transitivity	Intransitive	2	12.5 %
		Transitive	12	75 %
		Ditransitive	2	12.5 %
Relating to causee	Control	having control	5	31.25 %
		lacking control	2	12.5 %
	Affectedness	completely affected	3	18.75 %
		partially affected	4	25 %
No causee found in the event			9	56.25 %
Relating to causer	Directness	Directly	12	75 %
		Indirectly	4	25 %
	Naturalness	fairly naturally	3	18.75 %
		with effort	13	81.25 %
	Involvement	Involved	12	75 %
		not involved	4	25 %
Total			16	

Table (4-1): Distribution and percentage of the semantic parameters in “The Gift of the Magi”

It should be highlighted from the semantic analysis of causativity in “**The Gift of the Magi**” that the author utilizes the semantic parameters almost not equally in several passages. Nevertheless, table (4-1) shows that the author employs action verbs in **13** instances, representing **81.25 %**, and causal state verbs in **3** instances, representing **18.75 %**. As to the **transitivity** parameter, all verbs in this text, except for 4 verbs which are divided into 2 intransitive and 2 ditransitive verbs, are **transitive**. In terms of parameter of **relating to causee**, the cases of **having control** used by the writer are **5** to represent **31.25 %** whereas **lacking control** cases are only 2 times used in this short story recording **12.5 %**. In a similar vein, as for the **affectedness**, the causee is being **completely affected** only 3 times in this text, whereas 4 times the causee is **partially affected** by the causer. Of the total number of causative structures, which is **16** causatives, **9** cases had no causee **involved** in the event, accounting for **56.25 %** of the total. When it comes to the **directness** parameter, **12** constructions are utilized in which the causer acts **directly**, recording **75 %**, whereas **4** are utilized in which the causer acts **indirectly**, recording **25 %**. Following the **naturalness** parameter, there are **3** causal constructs where the action occurs pretty **naturally**, and **13** are used when the causer exerts **effort** to bring about the activity. In the end, **12** instances are used in causative constructs if the causer is **involved** in the occurrence, but only **4** cases are used when the causer is not **involved**.

4.2.2. “An Angel in Disguise” by T.S. Arthur

Relation	Parameter		Frequency	Percentage
Relating to verb	Action/state	action	16	76.19 %
	state	5	23.81 %	
	Transitivity	Intransitive	3	14.29 %
	Transitive	17	80.95 %	
	Ditransitive	1	4.76 %	
Relating to causee	Control	having control	4	19.05 %
	lacking control	10	47.62 %	
	Affectedness	completely affected	12	57.15 %
	partially affected	2	9.52 %	
	No causee found in the event		7	33.33 %
Relating to causer Naturalness Involvement	Directness	Directly	19	90.48 %
	Indirectly	2	9.52 %	
	fairly naturally	3	14.29 %	
	with effort	18	85.71 %	
	Involved	18	85.71 %	
	not involved	3	14.29 %	
Total			21	

Table (4-2): Distribution and percentage of the semantic parameters in “An Angel in Disguise”

Table (4-2) shows that **action** causative verbs take place in **16** of the **21** cases in this short story, accounting for **76.19 %** of the total proportion while **state** causative verbs appear in **5** occurrences, accounting for **23.81 %**. All of the verbs in this text are **transitive** within the same verb-related scope, namely the **transitivity** parameter; only one verb may function as a **ditransitive**, and 3 of them can behave as **intransitive**. Regarding **the causee relating**, if one looks at the **control** parameter, it can be seen that there are **4** occasions where the causee **has control**, for **19.05 %** of the total, while there are **10** situations where the causee **lacks control**, to account for **47.62 %**. Relating the **affectedness** parameter, there are 12 instances in which the causee is **com-**

pletely affected, while this text employs merely 2 instances in which the causee is only **partially affected**. All within the context of relating to the causer, and specifically the directness parameter, the author uses **19** cases where the causer acts directly in the event, whereas only 2 cases utilize the causer acting indirectly. Finally, as to the **involvement** parameter, author's causatives in which the causer is **involved** in the occurrence occur in **18** cases, accounting for **85.71 %** of the total percentage, whereas **3** examples occur in the text where the causer is **not involved**, accounting for **14.29 %**. To demonstrate how the researcher analyzes the text semantically, the following causal construct is taken from the first American short story "**The Gift of the Magi**" and analyzed using the seven parameters:

- God, make him think I am still pretty

- **Relating to verb [make]**

Action/state → frequently observed to function as an action verb

Transitivity → transitive

- **Relating to causee [him]**

Control → through the use of the verb "make" which semantically indicates acknowledging an occurrence as legitimate or acceptable, the causee has power granted by the causer.

Affectedness → the causee here is entirely affected by the causer.

- **Relating to causer [God]**

Directness → the causer performs the action directly since the causee is not in complete control of bringing about the even's intended target.

Involvement → the factual performance is clearly undertaken by the causee, hence the causer is not involved or participating directly in the event.

4.3. Analysis of British Short Story Texts

4.3.1. "The Ghost of Art" by Charles Dickens

<i>Relation</i>	<i>Parameter</i>		<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
<i>Relating to Verb</i>	<i>Action/state</i>	<i>action</i>	31	86.11 %
		<i>state</i>	5	13.89 %
	<i>Transitivity</i>	<i>Intransitive</i>	0	0 %
		<i>Transitive</i>	30	83.33 %
		<i>Ditransitive</i>	6	16.67 %
<i>Relating to causee</i>	<i>Control</i>	<i>having control</i>	4	11.11 %
		<i>lacking control</i>	17	47.22 %
	<i>Affectedness</i>	<i>completely affected</i>	18	50 %
		<i>partially affected</i>	3	8.33 %
<i>No causee found in the event</i>			15	41.67 %
<i>Relating to causer</i>	<i>Directness</i>	<i>Directly</i>	32	88.89 %
		<i>Indirectly</i>	4	11.11 %
	<i>Naturalness</i>	<i>fairly naturally</i>	12	33.33 %
		<i>with effort</i>	24	66.67 %
	<i>Involvement</i>	<i>Involved</i>	24	66.67 %
		<i>not involved</i>	12	33.33 %
<i>Total</i>			36	

Table (4-3): Distribution and percentage of the semantic parameters in
“The Ghost of Art”

Semantically analyzing the text of ‘The Ghost of Art’, it is necessary to note that, within the context of related verbs, the writer’s use of **state** verbs in his short story appears in only 5 out of 31 instances, accounting for 13.89 % of the total, while 31 instances appear when the verbs act as **action** verbs, accounting for 86.11%. Additionally, the majority of causative verbs employed in this text are **transitive** recording 30 verbs, except 6 verbs can act as **ditransitive**, but no any single verb appears **intransitively**. In regards to causee, while considering the **control** parameter, it is discovered that the number of times the causee **lacks control** is 17 cases, reflecting 47.22%, and the times when the causee **has control** is only 4 cases, reflecting 11.11% of the overall percentage. Concerning the **affectedness** parameter, 18 cases have been accounted in this text where the causee is **completely affected** in the activ-

ity, and only 3 times have been accounted were the causee is **completely affected**. In the same scope, there are 15 out of 36 instances where the causee is not participating in the event, with a total proportion of 41.67%. Furthermore, 32 situations are used in the text where the causer acts **directly** in the event, while 4 cases are used where the causer acts **indirectly**, all within the parameters of causer, namely the **directness** parameter. It is evident from the **naturalness** parameter that 12 examples employ causative constructs where the activity comes **rather naturally**, whereas 24 cases use causative constructs where the action happens with the **causer's effort**. Finally, considering the **involvement** parameter, the writer employs causatives in 24 times where the causer is **involved** in the occurrence, whereas in 12 times, the causer is **not involved** in this text.

4.3.2. “Out of the Rose” by William Butler Yeats

Relation	Parameter			Frequency	Percentage	
Relating to verb	Action/state		Action	32	86.49 %	
		State	4	13.51 %		
	Transitivity		Intransitive	4	8.11 %	
		Transitive	24	83.78 %		
		Ditransitive	8	8.11 %		
Relating to causee	Control		having control	7	18.92 %	
		lacking control		14	37.84 %	
	Affectedness		completely affected	16	43.24 %	
		partially affected		5	13.52 %	
No causee found in the event				15	40.54 %	
Relating to causer		Directness		Directly	21	58.33 %
		Indirectly				
		15		41.67 %		
	Naturalness with effort		fairly naturally	14	38.89 %	
			22	61.11 %		
	Involvement not involved		Involved	22	61.11 %	
			14	38.89 %		
Total				36		

Table (4-4): Distribution and percentage of the semantic parameters in “Out of the Rose”

By analyzing the text of “Out of the Rose,” semantically, it is worthy to notice that, in terms of relating to verbs, the writer uses **action** verbs in 32 out of 36 causatives in this short story, accounting for 86.49% of the total, while merely 4 instances occur when the verbs act as **state** verbs, to account for 13.51% of the total. In addition, 24 of the causal verbs in this text are **transitive**, 4 are **intransitive**, and 8 are **ditransitive**, according to the **transitivity** parameter. If we look at the parameter of control in relation to the **causee**, we find that the causee **has control** in 7 situations, which represents 18.92% of the total, and **lacks control** in 14 situations, which represents 37.84%. In the same environment, there are 15 out of 36 occasions where the **causee** is not participating in the event, which results in a total proportion of 40.54%. Within the framework of the **causer**, specifically the parameter of **directness**, the text uses 21 examples in which the causer does act **directly** in the occurrence and 15 examples in which the causer does act **indirectly**. The **naturalness** parameter, in turn, shows that, whereas 22 occasions use causative constructs wherein the activity occurs with the causer’s **effort** during the activity, recording 61.11%, 14 occasions use causative constructs wherein the activity takes place **fairly naturally**, to record 38.89%. At last, regarding the **involvement**, the author’s usage of causative structures in which the causer is **involved** in the occurrence is seen in 22 cases, to account for 61.11% of the total, while 14 examples appear in the text where the causer is **not involved**, to account 38.89%.

Comparison			American short stories		British short stories	
Relation	Parameter		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Relating to verb Transitivity	Action / state state	action	29	78.38%	63	87.5%
		8	21.62%	9	12.5%	
	intransitive	5	13.51%	4	5.56%	
	transitive	29	78.38%	54	75 %	
	ditransitive	3	8.11%	14	19.44%	
Relating to causee Affectedness	Control lacking control	having control	9	24.32%	11	15.28%
		12	32.43%	31	43.06%	
	completely affected	15	40.54%	34	47.22%	
	partially affected	6	16.22%	8	11.11%	
No causee found in the event			16	43.24%	30	41.67%
Relating to causer	Directness indirectly	directly	31	83.78%	53	73.61%
		6	16.22%	19	26.39%	
	Naturalness with effort	fairly naturally	6	16.22%	26	36.11%
		31	83.78%	46	63.89%	
	Involvement not involved	involved	30	81.08%	46	63.89%
		7	18.92%	26	36.11%	
Total			37		72	

Table (4-5): Frequency and percentage of the semantic parameters in American and British short stories

As can be seen from table (4-5), action causal verbs are the most prevalent in both American and British literature when it comes to the **verb-related** parameter of **action/state**. Likewise, **transitive** verbs are used more frequently than **intransitive** and **ditransitive** verbs in both texts. The table further demonstrates that, within the context of causee-related occurrences, it is important to note that the involved causee; **having control** appears in 9 occasions, representing 24.32% of the total, and **partially affected** 6 times constituting 16.22%, have been less frequent in American literature than those in British literature which are more frequent accomplishing 11 occasions to constitute 15.28% for **having control**, and 8 occasions to constitute 11.11% for **partially affected**. On the other hand, the occurrences in which the causee is

involved but **lacking control** appearing in 9 times or 24.32% of the total, and **completely affected** appearing in 15 times or 40.54% of the total, have been employed in American literature but 31 times or 43.06% for **lacking control**, and 34 times or 47.22% of the total for **completely affected** have been employed in British literature. Moreover, according the table, it can be viewed that the structures in which the causee is **not involved** in the activity appear less frequently utilized in American texts than in British ones. As a result, the former has 16 cases, or 43.24% of the total, while the latter has 30 cases, or 41.67%. Regarding the causer portion, specifically the **directness** parameter, the table shows that the most frequent occurrences in both texts are those when the causer **acts directly**: There have been 31 cases reported in American, accounting for 83.78% of the total, and 53 in British, representing around 73.61%. When the **naturalness** parameter is used, it becomes evident that the occurrences in which the causer **exerts** effort achieve the greatest score in both texts. In American text, 31 instances have been detected, accounting for 83.78% of the total, whereas in British, 46 occurrences have been identified, representing 63.89%. Finally, regarding the involvement parameter, both texts have determined that the instances in which the causer is truly involved in the action receive a higher score: In American text, 30 instances have been recorded, totaling 81.08% of the total; in British text, 46 cases have been recorded, totaling 63.89%.

5. Discussion, Conclusions, and Pedagogical Implications

Notable variations in the frequency and usage of causal phrases have been found when comparing American and British short stories. This part provides a better understanding of how causality is conveyed in the two literary traditions by examining linguistic, stylistic, and cultural elements in relation to significant conclusions. It's interesting to note that British short stories use causal sentences more often than American short stories. This discrepancy may be due to a number of linguistic, cultural, and stylistic factors. The

following are a few potential explanations: First, “Stylistic Preferences and Linguistic Traditions” American English frequently prefers a more straightforward and succinct style, whereas British English is typically more formal and organized. Because of their narrative style, and this emphasizes logical flow and in-depth explication. Second, “Literary Traditions’ Influence” the essayistic tradition of authors such as Charles Dickens and William Butler Yeats has affected British literature’s historical emphasis on logical reasoning and ordered speech. This may account for a predilection for causal relationships in narrative. Contrarily, American literature frequently stresses action and immediacy, and it tends to be minimalist (e.g., EO Henry, T.S. Arthur), which may result in less explicit causal constructs. Third, “Effects of Themes and Genre” It may be necessary to use more causal reasoning, when examined, the British short storied had a tendency toward philosophical or introspective topics. American short stories, frequently impacted by minimalism and realism, may specifically emphasize events and conversation rather than constantly providing an explanation for them. More specifically, the following conclusions are drawn from the current study:

1. Comparatively speaking, British texts use the appearance of causativity more frequently than American texts.
2. According to the examination of both kinds of texts, action verbs are more frequently employed in causative forms than state verbs. The adopted data also shows that more than 84% of all causal verbs are transitive.
3. Compared to events that involve the causee, causative events-in which the causee is not involved-are utilized less frequently. As a result, causal complicated and compound sentences are used more often than causative simple ones.
5. The adopted data shows a much higher frequency of causal occurrences in which the causer acts directly, does the activity with effort, and is involved than in which the causer acts indirectly and is not involved in the activity.
6. Remarkable differences between American and British texts; explicit

causal ties are necessary in British short stories, which may place a greater emphasis on cause-and-effect interactions within character development and story structure. Direct causal claims may be less common in American short stories because of their embracing of ambiguity, fractured narratives, and a “show, don’t tell” strategy, especially in the contemporary styles.

American English tends to emphasize conversational comfort and reader inference, whereas British English speakers prefer to depend more on explicit logical links in writing, according to pragmatics and semantics studies. Writing short stories may also exhibit this variation in communication style.

Since the study aims to identify the semantic traits that predominate in a particular issue, it may have pedagogical implications for both language specialists—specifically, those who specialize in semantics—and English language learners. Literature and literary analysis enthusiasts will also find it interesting.

References

- Amer, W. (2010). Causativity in English and Arabic: A constructive study. *Journal of Scientific Research in Arts. Faculty of Women, Science and Education*, 4(11), 399-414.
- Carter, R. (1997). *Vocabulary: Applied linguistic perspectives* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Chung, S. & Timberlake, A. (1985). Tense, Aspect, and mood. In T. Shopen, (Eds.), (pp. 58-202).
- Cruse, D.A. (1973). Some thoughts on agentivity. *Journal of Linguistics* 9 (1), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chafe, W. L. (1984). *Meaning and structure of language*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Crystal, D. (1998). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Davidse, K. (1991). *Categories of experiential Grammar*. Leuven: Katho-

lieke universiteit.

- Dixon, R.M.W. (2000). A typology of causatives: form, syntax and meaning. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gisborne, N. (2010). The event structure of perception verbs. Oxford University Press.
- Farber, J. (1976). The semantics of causative constructions. Amsterdam: North Holland Publishing Company.
- Frawley, W. (1992). Linguistic semantics. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum associates.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1994). An introduction to functional grammar. London: Edward Arnold.
- Heim, I., & Kratzer, A. (1998). Semantics in generative grammar. Blackwell.
- Hladký, J. & Ružička, M. (2001). A functional onomatology of English: Masarykova univerzita.
- Levinson, S. C. (2000). Pragmatics. Cambridge University Press.
- Lyons, J. (1971). Noam Chomsky. München: Deutscher Taschenbuch.
- Menzel, P. (1975). Semantics and syntax in complementation. The Hague: Mouton.
- Ni, Y. (2012). Categories of causative verbs: A corpus study of Mandarin Chinese (doctoral dissertation). Amsterdam: Utrecht University.
- Palmer, F. R. (1983). Semantics. Cambridge University Press.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, J. & Svartvik, J. (1985). A comprehensive grammar of the English language. London: Longman.
- Shibatani, M. (1976). The grammar of causative constructions. New York: Academic Press.
- Taylor, I. (1976). Introduction to Psycholinguistics. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

- Thakur, D. (1999). *Linguistics Simplified: Semantics*. Bharati Bhawan Publishers & Distributors.
- Van Valin, R. D., Jr. (2000). *Lexical representation and linking syntax and semantics*.
- Wilson, J. (1990). *Politically speaking*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Appendixes

The following are the websites from which the researcher has taken the targeted short stories:

1. https://americanliterature.com/author/o-henry/short-story/the-gift-of-the-magi/#google_vignette.
2. <https://americanliterature.com/author/ts-arthur/short-story/an-angel-in-disguise/>.
3. <https://theshortstory.co.uk/devsitegkl/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/Dickens-Charles-The-Ghost-of-Art-short-stories.pdf>.
4. <https://theshortstory.co.uk/devsitegkl/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/Yeats-William-Butler-Out-of-the-Rose.pdf>.