Past Participle Causative *Get*-Constructions in English and their Macedonian Equivalents

Eleni Bužarovska

Saints Cyril and Methodius University, Skopje, North Macedonia
E-mail: elenibuzarovska@t.mk
ORCID iD: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1334-0501
https://ror.org/02wk2vx54

Ana Arsovska

AUE-FON University, Skopje, North Macedonia
E-mail: ana.jankulovska@fon.edu.mk
ORCID iD: https://orcid.org/0009-0004-1695-3284
https://ror.org/00q7dn693

Abstract. This study investigates English causative *get*-constructions with a past participle and their Macedonian translation equivalents in written texts. These constructions are classified as prototypical, encoding indirect causation with a suppressed causee, or non-prototypical, marked by an agentive subject whose volitional involvement introduces pragmatic effects. Prototypical constructions resemble passives in their suppression of the agent, while non-prototypical ones highlight the agent's determination to complete an action. For the purposes of contrastive analysis, over 40 English e-books and the ParaSol and CLARIN.SI corpora were examined. English examples and their Macedonian translations were manually extracted and categorized by genre into two samples: literary and documentary prose. The analysis shows that both types are most frequently translated into Macedonian by using active verbs, with lexical verbs being more common in non-prototypical cases, whereas biclausal structures are rare. The findings highlight typological differences in how causation is expressed in the two languages and reveal how constructional meaning can override the original causative function of past participle *get*-constructions. This suggests that the compactness of the English causative *get*-construction is reflected in the choice of translation equivalents.

Keywords: causation, constructions, passive, volitionality, typology, pragmatic effects.

Конструкциите со *get* и минат партицип во англискиот јазик и нивните еквиваленти во македонскиот јазик

Апстракт. Во ова истражување се споредуваат англиските каузативни конструкции со глаголот *get* и минат партицип со преводните еквиваленти во македонскиот јазик во пишан јазик. Овие конструкции се делат на два вида: прототипни и непрототипни. Првите изразуваат индиректна каузација со потиснат агенс, а во вторите агенсот активно делува врз трпителот. Прототипни-

те конструкции наликуваат на пасивните по потиснувањето на агенсот, додека непрототипните вршат прагматичка функција нагласувајќи ја решеноста на агенсот да го изврши дејството. За потребите на контрастивната анализа, беа прегледани над 40 електронски книги на англиски јазик, како и корпусите ParaSol и CLARIN.SI. Англиските примери и нивните македонски преводи беа рачно ексцерпирани и групирани според жанр: уметничка наспроти публицистичка проза. Анализата покажа дека и двата вида конструкции најчесто се преведуваат со активни глаголи, а многу поретко со двореченични состави. Резултатите од анализата ги откриваат типолошките разлики во изразувањето на индиректна каузалност во двата јазика и покажуваат како самата конструкција со *get* и минат партицип може да ја промени својата изворна каузативна функција.

Клучни зборови: каузација, конструкции, пасив, волитивност, типологија, прагматички значења.

Anglų kalbos priežastinės dalyvinės konstrukcijos su veiksmažodžiu *get* „gauti" ir jų atitikmenys makedonų kalboje

Santrauka. Tyrime nagrinėjamos anglų kalbos priežastinės konstrukcijos su veiksmažodžiu *get* „gauti" ir praeities dalyviais bei jų makedonų kalbos atitikmenys rašytiniuose tekstuose. Šios konstrukcijos klasifikuojamos kaip prototipinės, koduojančios netiesioginę priežastį su nuslėpta priežastimi, arba neprototipinės, pažymėtos veiksmo subjektu, kurio valingas dalyvavimas sukelia pragmatinius padarinius. Prototipinės konstrukcijos panašios į pasyviąsias, nes jose slopinamas veikėjas, o neprototipinės konstrukcijos pabrėžia veikėjo pasiryžimą užbaigti veiksmą. Kontrastyvinės analizės tikslais buvo ištirta daugiau nei 40 anglų kalbos elektroninių knygų ir ParaSol bei CLARIN.SI korpusai. Anglų kalbos pavyzdžiai ir jų vertimai į makedonų kalbą buvo rankiniu būdu išgauti ir suskirstyti pagal žanrą į dvi grupes: literatūrinę ir dokumentinę prozą. Analizė rodo, kad abu tipai dažniausiai verčiami į makedonų kalbą vartojant aktyvius veiksmažodžius, o leksikiniai veiksmažodžiai yra dažnesni neprototipiniais atvejais; dviejų sakinių struktūros yra retos. Rezultatai pabrėžia tipologinius skirtumus, parodo priežastingumo išraiškos būdus abiejose kalbose ir atskleidžia, kaip konstrukcijos reikšmė gali pakeisti pradinę priežastingąją praeities dalyvio konstrukcijų funkciją.

Reikšminiai žodžiai: priežastingumas, konstrukcijos, pasyvumas, valingumas, tipologija, pragmatiniai efektai.

---

1 Introduction

This article examines English causative constructions with the verb *get* followed by a past participle, by comparing them to their counterparts in Macedonian as they appear in written texts. This causative *get*-construction will be referred to in this paper as *CPPC*. Our goal is to identify the strategies for encoding causality in Macedonian, thereby better determining the typological differences in expressing causality between the two languages. Causality is understood as a cause-and-effect relationship between two events [Shibatani 1976; Comrie 1981, 165]. In grammar, causality is expressed through causative verbs or verbal constructions that signify 'cause to V', where V is the dependent verb [Kulikov 2001, 386].

In the English language, there are three causative *get*-constructions with a non-finite form: infinitive (*I got him to write the letter*), present participle (*I got him writing the letter*), and past participle (*I got the letter written*). The CPPC in (1) expresses a complex situation in which the action is initiated in

the first event and takes place in the subsequent event. The execution of the action is indirect since one participant causes the action, and another performs it.

(1) Sam got/had his car washed.
    Сем ја измил колата.

Example (1) implies that Sam is only the initiator of the car washing, but, in the translation, he is represented as both the initiator and the performer of the action. At the semantic level, the English construction involves three participants: the causer, the causee (the performer of the action), and the patient, the object of the verb in the participial form. The causer acts upon the causee to perform the action on the patient. As a result of this action, the patient undergoes a change of state. The agent is not lexically realized because they are unknown, irrelevant, or cannot be understood from the context.

Such constructions are similar to passives in their resultative semantics and the omission of the agent. In fact, they represent passive correlates of causative infinitive *get*-constructions (with a transitive verb). Thus, *I got my car serviced* is derived from the active *I got [someone] to service my car* and implies that the car has been serviced. However, causative constructions differ from passives in the addition of a causer argument in the subject position. As in passive constructions, the unspecified agent is suppressed, and its position is taken by the promoted patient (the object of *get*).

Imposing an action on the patient can occur through linguistic manipulation, that is, through pressure and persuasion (2). In such cases, control over the patient is weaker. Thus, in (2), the event in Macedonian is expressed with a complex sentence in which the causing event is encoded in the main clause, while the effected predicate (*transfer*) is realized as a complement *da*-clause.

(2) I got him transferred.
    Издејствував да го преместат.

The above examples illustrate prototypical causative constructions. However, in the examined English texts, we found numerous examples in which the causer and the causee roles are indistinguishable. For instance, in (3), it is implied that the speaker completed the homework by themselves.

(3) I got my homework done.
Го напишав домашното.

We refer to these constructions as non-prototypical because they do not express true causation. In this study, we aim to explain these constructions in more detail, as they are not sufficiently addressed in English grammars.

This paper is organized into five sections. The next section provides a typological overview of causative contsructions, followed by a concise description of the methodology. Section 4 examines the main features of CPPCs, while Section 5 presents the results of their analysis by using translational equivalents. The paper concludes with a summary of the findings and their implications.

2 Typological Overview

Causation in English and Macedonian is expressed through lexical and syntactic means. A common lexical strategy in English involves labile verbs; these are verbs that can function both transitively and intransitively without morphological marking, as *break* in English or *седне* 'sit' in Macedonian. Lexical causatives in English also include transitive dynamic verbs that correspond to intransitive counterparts, either through suppletion (e.g., *raise – rise*) or distinct verb roots (e.g., *feed – eat*). In both languages, there are no dedicated causative morphemes used to increase verb valency.[1]

Syntactic strategies are realized through periphrastic constructions in English involving the grammaticalized verbs *make*, *have*, and *get*. Their status as constructions stems from the fact that they convey idiosyncratic, non-compositional meanings. According to Goldberg (1995, 4), constructions are linguistic patterns in which form and meaning interact at the level of the whole structure.

It has been observed in the literature that the semantics of *get* conceptualizes the causative event as completed [Hollmann 2003, 155]. Although its basic meaning is 'to obtain',[2] this usage reflects a metaphorical reconceptualization of causation in terms of possession, which is consistent with patterns described in conceptual metaphor theory [cf. Lakoff, Johnson 1980, 59].

The grammaticalization of *get* into an auxiliary causative verb [Hopper, Traugott 2003] has resulted in the conceptual and syntactic integration of the cause-event and the result-event into a single, unified event [Givón 2001]. Cognitively oriented literature also argues that the caused event in causative constructions is conceptually dependent on the main event and is not fully elaborated [Kemmer, Verhagen 1994, 117]. Consequently, the entire causal situation is represented as a single event [Shibatani, Pardeshi 2001, 140].

The most important typological distinction in causation is that between direct and indirect causation [Dixon 2000, 67]. According to Shibatani and

---

[1]   Slavic languages are detransitivizing because they possess a detransitivizing morphological device for reducing the valency of the verb [Nichols et al. 2004], for instance, *se* in Macedonian (*крши* 'break' – *се крши* 'break itself').

[2]   *Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary*. (n.d.). *Get*. In Merriam-Webster.com. Retrieved August 19, 2025, from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/get

Pardeshi [2002, 139], indirect causation occurs when the causer exerts influence in a mediated way, often by inducing or enabling the causee to act, rather than by acting directly. *Direct causation,* on the other hand, typically involves physical manipulation and high control by the causer. The authors discuss different degrees of control that a causer can have over the causee, ranging from direct joint action, to assistance, and finally to supervision with less direct involvement.

Lexical causatives typically involve physical contact between the causer and the causee, as well as cotemporality between the causing and the caused events; hence, they are structurally the most compact form of causatives on the lexical–morphological–periphrastic continuum [Song 1996, 17–72]. For example, in *Sam walked the dog*, the causee's action (walking) happens simultaneously with the causer's action (controlling the dog). In contrast, CPPCs do not imply cotemporality; in *Sam got the car serviced*, the causer most probably did not supervise the causee's (mechanic's) activity.

This difference in structural compactness reflects a cross-linguistic tendency: as shown in Levshina's (2016) typological study, longer and more complex causative constructions are typically associated with indirect causation. The interpretation of the causal relationship thus depends not only on the meaning of the verb and shared knowledge between interlocutors but also on the degree of formal compactness. For example, the Macedonian translation of *Sam got Paul fired* 'Сем издејствува да го избркаат Пол' is realized by a causative predicate in the main clause and complemented by the effect predication. Depending on the nature of the relationship between Sam and Paul, different causative predicates may be used (e.g., *order, vote*, *arrange*). Since the causing and the effect event are conceptualized as separate, the Macedonian equivalent cannot be considered a single causative construction but rather a biclausal structure. This distinction reflects a broader linguistic observation made by Dixon (2000, 74), who argues that the degree of grammatical compactness of causative constructions is scalar. It ranges from the most compact forms, such as lexical causatives, through less compact morphological and periphrastic causatives, to the least compact biclausal structures where causality is encoded by separate clauses. Therefore, we assume that the compactness of the CPPCs may influence the choice of Macedonian translation equivalents.

3 Methodological Procedure

To examine the translation equivalents of CPPCs, we searched for relevant examples in over 40 electronic books originally written in English, as well as in the electronic corpora *ParaSol* and *CLARIN.SI*. The English examples and their Macedonian translations were manually extracted and organized into two databases based on their genre: literary texts (fiction) versus documentary

texts (non-fiction). English CPPCs are characteristic of spoken language and occur comparatively infrequently in written literary texts.[3]

For the analysis of distribution, we collected over 370 examples across three types of *get*-causative constructions: those with an infinitive, those with a present participle, and those with a past participle. In the next phase, we identified their translation equivalents in the corresponding Macedonian texts. Due to space limitations and the need for a more detailed analysis, this article focuses specifically on examples with a past participle. Each of the 219 excerpted examples was analyzed in terms of the type of causative relation and the semantics of the participants.

To explore typological differences in the expression of causation between the two languages, we pose the following research questions:

1. Does the choice of translation equivalents differ between prototypical and non-prototypical CPPCs?
2. What factors influence the choice of a translation strategy?

Although the study draws on a large amount of reviewed material (approximately 12,000 pages), the total number of analyzed examples is relatively small. Therefore, the results are intended to reveal general tendencies rather than offer definitive conclusions.

4 Properties of CPPCs

The CPPC is often seen as an alternative to the construction formed with the causative *have*, although the difference has been discussed in the literature.[4] *Get*-constructions are generally considered more typical of spoken language, reflecting the more informal or colloquial character of *get* in comparison to *have.* According to a corpus-based study of causative *get*-constructions in English [Gilquin 2010, 48], the most common form is the CPPC (62%), followed by the infinitive construction (28%), while the present participle construction (10%) is the least frequent.[5] Our research confirms these findings: CPPCs were the most frequent in our dataset, with 219 occurrences, of which, 131 in fiction and 88 in non-fiction.

The analysis of the English examples revealed two types of constructions, distinguished by whether the roles of the initiator and the agent/causee are separate or not. In the first scenario, i.e., the prototypical type, the action is

---

[3]   Our corpus includes several 19th-century British novels, in which we found only a few instances of CPPC. In the 20th and 21st centuries, mostly represented by American works, the frequency of this construction rises sharply, especially in the more recent texts.

[4]   Wierzbicka [1998, 124–125] notes that causative *get* does not imply that the causee will act on the causer's intent; rather, the causee is often initially unwilling, and therefore the causer makes an effort to persuade them.

[5]   Out of 371 examples of the three causative *get*-constructions, 219 are CPPCs, followed by infinitival constructions with 99 instances, and only 53 present participle constructions.

performed by an unspecified causee. In the non-prototypical type, a volitional agent themselves initiates and performs the action. In the fiction sample (131 examples), prototypical constructions are more frequent, with 73 occurrences (55.7%) compared to 58 (44.3%) non-prototypical examples. Conversely, in the non-fiction sample (88 examples), non-prototypical usages dominate, with 59 (65%) compared to 29 (35%) prototypical examples. Overall, combining both samples, non-prototypical constructions account for approximately 60% of the data.

These results differ from those of the corpus-based study on English causative constructions [Gilquin 2010, 145–168], where non-prototypical *get*-constructions make up about 24.5%. This discrepancy is due to the frequent use of the non-prototypical constructions *get something done* and *get someone started*, particularly common in the non-fiction sample.

4.1 Prototypical CPPCs

In this category, the causer and the causee are distinct participants. The causer acts consciously and intentionally upon an unspecified causee, who functions merely as a mediator through whom the patient's state is changed, typically for the benefit of the causer. In only a few cases is the causee syntactically realized through an agentive *by*-phrase, referring either to an unspecified expert (4) or an unknown individual (5).

(4) She'd **get** her hair and make-up **done** <u>by a professional</u>! [Moriarty 2005, 327]

(5) The younger boy,... having **got** the door **opened** for him <u>by someone</u>, made his determined appearance. [Austen 2006b, 68]

In the sample, constructions with inanimate patients predominate (6), typically expressing various types of service-related activities.[6] Animate patients make up 33.8% of the total examples appearing more frequently in the fiction sample than in the non-fiction (38.9% vs. 26.1%). Manipulation involving a human referent is generally weaker, as the person being manipulated often retains some degree of control over the situation [Givón 2001, 78]. When the causee, who is typically some professional, acts upon an animate patient, the initiator usually assumes a supportive or facilitating role; for example, by taking a child to the doctor (7).

(6) He … decided to wait and **get** his shoe **fixed**, his suit **mended** and get a new shirt. [MaCoCu_en_mk]

(7) Should I **get** my child **tested** for coronavirus disease? [MaCoCu_en_mk]

---

6   Stefanowitsch [2001, 155] observes that the *get*-causative has an embedded passive variant that, in 75% of cases, is used to express service frame situations.

In some cases, we observed non-prototypical referential semantics of the participants: an inanimate causer (an event) and an animate patient (8). Here, the volitional component is significantly weakened, and the resultative meaning predominates.

(8) Not that this preparation would do anything but **get them killed**... [Meyer 2008, 620]

These constructions are characterized by syntactic compactness. The removal of the causee from the predicate-argument structure and the promotion of the patient to the core of predication result in a tight integration of the causal subevents.

4.2 Non-prototypical CPPCs

In these constructions, the subject referent initiates the action and carries it out successfully. The strength of the manipulation over the patient depends on the semantics of the effected predicate, i.e., the participle, while the participial form itself implies resultativity. The volitional component predominates in examples with an inanimate manipulated patient, upon which, the initiator exerts some physical action (9). The construction implies that the agent puts in a certain effort to complete the action. A few examples may be interpteted as prototypical, but the context helps clarify their type.

(9) The noise stopped before we **got the boat docked**. [Meyer 2007, 353]

In these examples, the CPPC can be substituted by the base verb (forming the participle), but the pragmatic effects and the stylistic expressiveness of the non-prototypical construction will be lost. The syntactic property of the construction allowing for a longer constituent between *get* and the participle (10) deserves attention.

(10) I was able to **get** both windows in the truck almost completely **rolled down**. [Meyer 2005, 151]

The animate referent is characterized by a high degree of volitionality, even when causing emotional changes in the patient (11). In (12), the result is achieved through another activity presented as an instrument.

(11) Carlisle and Jasper **got things calmed down** before it got out of hand. [Meyer 2007, 55]
(12) First, he'd **got them all worked up** by ceasing to play their game. [Prince Harry 2023, 266]

The animate participant in the construction can assume all three semantic roles: the causer, the causee, and the patient. In such cases, the patient is typically realized as a reflexive pronoun (13). According to Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 1443), in these configurations, the subject referent takes responsibility for the consequence of the action.

(13) I can't believe I **got** myself **sucked** into this mess. [Meyer 2008, 686]

In several examples, the causal meaning is fused with the purposive one. However, Wierzbicka [1998, 248] thinks that the purposive construction is not 'inherently causative'.

(14) But we had to go to the hotel **to get our bags packed** and pay the bill. [Hemingway 2014, 80]

In both analyzed samples, there are numerous instances of the *get done* construction with an inanimate patient. In rare cases, the context remains ambiguous as to whether the causer and the agent are the same individual (15). In the non-fiction sample, the *get started* construction with animate patients appears relatively frequently (16).

(15) I was rested enough to **get some work done**. [Meyer 2008, 347]
(16) Let's **get** you **started**. [MaCoCu_en_mk]

The examples above illustrate that the CPPC is not used to express indirect causation, but rather to denote highly volitional actions. These constructions, we argue, should therefore be treated as fundamentally agentive. However, some scholars [e.g., Gilquin 2003] contend that even non-prototypical constructions can convey causation, despite the overlap between the roles of causer and agent. We suggest that, in such cases, the prototypical construction is metaphorically extended to encompass actions that a volitional agent performs with emphatic determination to bring them to completion. This type of extension is consistent with Hilpert's (2019, 17) observation that constructions can shape interpretation by overriding word-level meanings and producing non-compositional, construction-specific meanings. Speakers appear to have extended the CPPC to self-initiated events because these also involve a change of state. Under this pressure, the causative *get* underwent semantic bleaching, foregrounding determination and volition, and thus leading to semantic reanalysis.

5 Translation Equivalents of English Causative *Get*-Constructions

In this Section, we analyze the Macedonian translation equivalents of proto-typical and non-prototypical CPPCs with the objective to determine whether they differ in terms of inventory and frequency. Table 1 presents their distribution across the following categories: (a) active verbs, which are further classified based on the degree of causative semantics they express: causative verbs, labile verbs, quasi-causative verbs (with weaker causativity), and non-causative verbs (typically denoting spontaneous events); (b) biclausal constructions; (c) paraphrases; (d) nominalizations; (e) passive verb forms; and (f) others. The final category includes cases of free translation.

Since the auxiliary *get* conceptualizes the causative event as telic, we expect that Macedonian translations will tend to use perfective verbs. We also expect to find a wide range of translational equivalents to English CPPCs because of typological differences between the two languages in encoding indirect causation and the semantic distinction between prototypical and non-prototypical *get*-construction. However, the translations may be affected by differences in the conceptualization of causativity shared between the two languages or 'common conceptual space' [Levshina et al. 2013, 837]. This conceptual space is based on the co-occurrence of semantic classes. As the authors explain, it reflects how various features of the initiator, the agent, and the resulting event typically co-occur in human experience as conveyed through causative constructions. However, this issue warrants separate investigation and will not be addressed here.

Table 1 below presents the distribution of the translation equivalents of the past pasrticiple *get*-constructions in the two samples: fiction versus non-fiction.

Table 1. Translation equivalents of CPPCs in the samples

Translational equivalents		Non-fiction (NF)			Fiction (F)			Overall
		Prototyp	Non-prototyp	Total	Prototyp	Non-prototyp	Total	
		29	59	88	58	73	131	219
Active verbs	causative	/	1	1	4	7	11	12
	labile	1	20	21	1	12	13	34
	quasicaus	4	9	13	24	20	44	57
	anticaus	3	10	13	8	14	23	36
Biclausal		2	1	3	2	2	4	7
Paraphrases		5	3	8	5	2	7	15
Nominalizations		8	4	12	1	1	2	14
Passive		2	2	4	8	3	11	15
Other		6	8	15	5	11	16	31

In the non-fiction sample, the distribution of translation equivalents is influenced by the frequent occurrence of two non-prototypical CPPCs: *get something done* (30 examples), and *get someone started* (7 examples). Percentage-wise, the former accounts for 30% of the non-fiction sample, compared to as little as 10% (11 examples) in the fiction sample. The overall results indicate that there are no major differences in the choice and use of translation strategies between prototypical and agentive CPPCs, except for a significantly higher number of labile verbs and a greater presence of anticausative verbs in the translations of non-prototypical constructions. The first difference can be attributed to the frequent use of *get started* and *get done*, which are predominantly translated by using the labile verbs *почне* 'start' (17) and *заврши* 'finish' (18). As in other languages, phrasal verbs tend to be labile (Letuchiy 2009; Mitkovska, Bužarovska 2020).

(17) D**on't get me started** on the number of my friends who complain…. [Hoover 2018a, 40]

'А да не **почнувам** ич за бројот на пријатели кои се жалат...' [Хувер 2018, 52]

(18) During that time, we **got things done**. [Vlasho 2022, 136]

'За тоа време, ги **завршивме** работите.' [Влашо 2022, 311]

Due to their strong causative semantics, labile verbs can be grouped with the smaller set of causative verbs. In Macedonian, these verbs often become causative through the removal of the reflexive marker. In (19), the transitive verbs *истушира* 'shower' and *пресоблече* 'change someone's clothes' have anticausative reflexive correlates. The verb *легне* 'put someone to sleep' is labile, with its intransitive correlate meaning 'lie down.'

(19) By the time Jeremy **got her showered**, **changed,** and **put to bed**, the spaghetti was cold. [Hoover 2018b, 154]

'Додека Џереми да ја **истушира**, да ја **пресоблече** и да ја **легне** во кревет, неговите шпагети веќе беа камен ладни.' [Хувер 2019, 247]

The most common translation equivalents for both types of *CPPCs* are transitive verbs with a weaker causative meaning ('quasi-causative'), which appear in both prototypical (20–21) and non-prototypical uses (22). Almost all verbs occur in the perfective aspect, e.g., *поправи 'repair', отвори 'open'*, *извлече* 'pull out', *добие 'receive'*, *сплеска 'pressure'*, among others. In the translational equivalents of prototypical CPPCs, the causer is often rendered as performing the activity by themselves (20), but the interlocutors' shared knowledge clarifies that it is carried out by a professional. In (21), the *get*-construction is translated by using an active verb with an indefinite subject

referent, which is a common strategy for expressing passivization in Slavic languages [Siewierska 1988, 249].

(20) I have to **get** my **hair done**. [Morrison 1977, 333]
    'Морам да си ја **средам** косата.' [Морисон 2012, 286]
(21) Don't **get** your family **slaughtered** for pride. [Meyer 2008, 625]
    'Немојте да ви ги **заколат** семејствата од пуста гордост.' [Мајер 2010, 396]
(22) **Got** your saddles **covered** up good? [Hemingway 1996, 99]
    'Добро ли ги **покри** седлата?' [Хемингвеј 2000, 234]

Anticausative verbs, which are typically reflexive, appear more frequently in the translations of non-prototypical CPPCs. This group includes mostly anticausative verbs with inchoative semantics. Some of these verbs express psychological states (23), while others denote spontaneous events (24).

(23) It's **got** her **worried**. [Meyer 2007, 29]
    'Таа **се загрижи** поради тоа.' [Мајер 2010, 42]
(24) Melanie gets **her** broom **tangled** in the electric cord. [Coetzee 1999, 82]
    'На Мелани ѝ **се заплеткува** метлата во електричниот кабел.' [Куци 2013, 164]

The few examples of non-prototypical CPPCs are translated with causative verbs that form a pair with anticausative reflexive verbs, e.g., *се заплетка* 'got entangled,' *се изнервира* 'got upset', *се замеша* 'got involved', *се омажи* 'got married'. The pragmatic effects of the English non-prototypical CPPCs, incuding the agent's volitionality and effort, are not conveyed in the Macedonian translations.

(25) I **got** Leigh **involved** in this. [Brown 2003, 339]
    'Го **заплеткав** Ли во ова.' [Браун 2004, 416]
(26) The business of her life was to **get** her daughters **married**. [Austen 2006a, 3]
    'Целта во животот ѝ беше да ги **омажи** ќерките.' [Остин 2008, 8]

In both samples, translations using biclausal constructions appear mostly in prototypical CPPCs. They consist of a causative verb (e.g., *направи 'make'*) followed by a complement *da*-clause.

(27) You could **get** me **transferred**, I said. [Atwood 1985, 150]
    'Можеш да **направиш** да ме **префрлат**, реков.' [Атвуд 2020, 181]

Another strategy for translating CPPCs is the use of nominalizations, as *добивање* 'getting' in (28). They occur significantly more often in prototypical examples, particularly in the non-fiction sample.

(28) Is there a fee for **getting** a security clearance certificate **issued**?
'Дали се наплаќа **добивањето** безбедносен сертификат?' [MaCoCu_en_mk]

The passive constructions in Macedonian, both the reflexive (29) and the periphrasic (30) ones, are used relatively rarely as translation strategies. However, the use of the periphrastic passive was more frequent in the translations of prototypical CPPCs in fiction (30), likely due to its strong resultative semantics [Mitkovska et al., in press].

(29) 'You could **get** it **corrected**,' you know,' said the doctor, but did not offer to correct it. [Coetzee 1983, 42]
'Тоа може да **се среди**, знаеш, рече лекарот, но не се понуди ништо да среди.' [Куци 2006, 57]
(30) We managed to **get** our paper **accepted** in the journal.
'Успеавме нашиот труд да **биде прифатен** во списанието.' [MaCoCu_en_mk]

In translations of CPPCs, paraphrases (31–33) occur more frequently than in those of non-prototypical constructions. In some cases, these paraphrases approach a free translation (33).

(31) One day Petre gave his watch to the local ranger to **get** it **repaired** by the watchmaker in Neret. [Alabakov 2011, 18]
'Еден ден Петре му го даде својот рачен часовник на полјак да **го однесе на саатчија** во Нерет.' [Алабаков 2011, 13]
(32) Joyce had been trying in vain to **get this episode typed**. [MaCoCu_en_mk]
'Џојс залудно се обидуваше да **најде некој што ќе ја искуца** оваа епизода.'
(33) I almost **get myself killed** on a daily basis! [Meyer 2006, 436]
'**Јас сум во опасност од умирање** секој ден!' [Мајер 2009, 295]

5 Conclusion

The analysis of Macedonian translational equivalents of English CPPCs has revealed that perfective verbs overwhelmingly dominate the translations of both prototypical and non-prototypical types, supporting the assumption that *get* conveys the completion of an action resulting in a new state of the patient. The findings indicate that the compactness of the prototypical CPPCs is reflected in the choice of Macedonian translation equivalents. These range from the most compact forms, such as lexical causatives, through less compact morphological and periphrastic causatives, to the least compact biclausal structures, where causality is expressed through separate clauses. Non-prototypical CPPCs are predominantly translated by using lexical verbs reflecting the simple event structure they encode. These constructions are, in fact, pseudocausative, as they primarily serve to intensify the agent's volitionality in achieving

a beneficial outcome through the action. The combination of *get* with a past participle foregrounds the result of the event, creating pragmatic effects such as the agent's self-coercion and commitment to completing the task despite the effort involved. However, the pragmatic nuances of the English non-prototypical (i.e., pseudocausative) past participle *get*-construction are not fully preserved in the Macedonian translations, because these effects arise from the constructional meaning.

Author contributions

Eleni Bužarovska: conceptualization, methodology, formal analysis, investigation, writing – original draft, writing – review and editing, visualization.

Ana Arsovska: conceptualization, methodology, data curation, investigation, writing – review and editing.

Data Sources

ALABAKOV, K., 2011. *My Partisan Life*. Abbotsford: Pollitecon Publications.
ATWOOD, M., 1985. *The Handmaid's Tale*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart.
AUSTEN, J., 2006a. *Pride and Prejudice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
AUSTEN, J., 2006b. *Persuasion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
BROWN, D., 2003. *The Da Vinci Code*. New York: Doubleday.
COETZEE, J. M., 1983. *Life & Times of Michael K.* Johannesburg: Ravan Press.
COETZEE, J. M., 1999. *Disgrace*. London: Secker & Warburg.
HEMINGWAY, E., 2014. *The Sun Also Rises*. New York: Scribner.
HEMINGWAY, E., 1996. *For Whom the Bell Toll*s. New York: Scribner.
HOOVER, C., 2018a. *All Your Perfects*. New York: Atria Books.
HOOVER, C., 2018b. *Verity*. New York: Atria Books.
MEYER, S., 2005. *Twilight*. New York: Little, Brown.
MEYER S., 2006. *New Moon*. New York: Little, Brown.
MEYER, S., 2007. *Eclipse*. New York: Little, Brown.
MEYER, S., 2008. *Breaking Dawn*. New York: Little, Brown.
MORIARTY, L., 2005. *The Last Anniversary*. New York: Harper Collins.
MORRISON, T., 1977. *Song of Solomon*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf Inc.
MORRISON, T., 1987. *Beloved*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf Inc.
PRINCE HARRY, 2023. *Spare*. New York: Random House.
VLASHO, L., 2022. *An American Son of Macedonia*. Skopje: Macedonian Spark.
АЛАБАКОВ, К., 2011. *Мојот партизански живот*. Еботсворт: Политикон.
АТВУД, М., 2020. *Приказната за робинката*. Скопје: Бегемот.
БРАУН, Д., 2004. *Кодот на Да Винчи*. Скопје: Три.
ВЛАШО, Л., 2022. *Американски син на Македонија*. Скопје: Македонска искра.
КУЦИ, Џ. М., 2006. *Животот и времињата на Мајкл К.* Скопје: Арс Либрис.
КУЦИ, Џ. М., 2013. *Срамота*. Скопје: Магор.

МАЈЕР, С., 2009. *Млада месечина*. Скопје: Три.
МАЈЕР, С., 2010. *Помрачување*. Скопје: Три.
МАЈЕР, С., 2010. *Зазорување*. Скопје: Три.
МОРИСОН, Т., 1993. *Љубена*. Скопје: Детска радост.
МОРИСОН, Т., 2012. *Соломоновата песна*. Скопје: Магор.
ОСТИН, Џ., 2008. *Гордост и предрасуда*. Скопје: Нова наша книга.
ХЕМИНГВЕЈ, Е., 2020. *За кого бијат камбаните*. Скопје: Матица македонска.
ХУВЕР, К., 2018. *Сите твои совршености*. Скопје: Сакам книги.
ХУВЕР, К., 2019. *Верити*. Скопје: Сакам книги.

E-database

MaCoCu_en_mk Macedonian-English parallel corpus.
https://www.clarin.si/repository/xmlui/handle/11356/1513

References

COMRIE, B., 1989. *Language Universals and Language Typology*. Oxford: Blackwell.
DIXON, R. M. W., 2000. A typology of causatives: form, syntax and meaning. In DIXON, R. M. W., AIKHENVALD, A. Y. (Eds.). *Changing valency: Case Studies in Transitivity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 30–83. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511627750.003
GILQUIN, G., 2003. Causative 'get' and 'have'. So close, so different, *Journal of English Linguistics*, 31(2). 125–148. https://doi.org/10.1177/007542420303100200
GILQUIN, G., 2010. *Corpus, cognition and causative constructions*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/scl.39
GIVÓN, T., 2001. *Syntax. A functional-typological introduction*. Vol. 2. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
GOLDBERG, A. E., 1995. *Constructions. A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
GOLDBERG, A. E., 2006. *Constructions at Work: The Nature of Generalization in Language.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
HILPERT, M., 2019. *Construction Grammar and its Application to English* (2nd ed.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
HOLLMANN, W. B., 2003. *Synchrony and diachrony of English periphrastic causatives: a cognitive perspective*. PhD thesis. University of Manchester.
HOPPER, P., TRAUGOTT, E. C., 2003. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
HUDDLESTON, R., PULLUM, G. K., 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
KEMMER, S., VERHAGEN, A., 1994. The grammar of causatives and the conceptual structure of events, *Cognitive Linguistics*, 5(2). 115–156.
KULIKOV, L., 2001. Causatives. In HASPELMATH, M., KONIG, E., OESTER-REICHER, W., RAIBLE, W. (Eds.). *Language Typology and Language Universals*. Vol. 2. Berlin: de Gruyter, 886–898.

LAKOFF, G., 1987. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

LAKOFF, G., JOHNSON, M., 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

LETUCHIY, A., 2009. Towards typology of labile verbs: lability vs. derivation. In EPPS, P., ARKHIPOV, A. (Eds.). *New challenges in typology: Transcending the borders and re ning the distinctions*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 247–268. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110219067.4.247

LEVSHINA, N., GEERAERTS, D., SPEELMAN, D., 2013. Mapping Constructional Spaces: A Contrastive Analysis of English and Dutch Analytic Causatives, *Linguistics*, 51(4). 825–854. https://doi.org/10.1515/ling-2013-0028

LEVSHINA, N., 2016. *Finding the best fit for direct and indirect causation: A typological study*, *Lingua Posnaniensis*, 58(2). 65–82. https://doi.org/10.1515/linpo-2016-0010

MITKOVSKA, L., BUŽAROVSKA, E., 2020. Zero-marked valency alternations in Macedonian, *Prace Filologiczne*, 75(1). 355–372. https://doi.org/10.32798/pf.666

MITKOVSKA, L., UHLIK, M., BUŽAROVSKA, E., (in press). Unraveling the reflexive passive in South Slavic: A contrastive analysis of its use in Macedonian and Slovene. In SOBOTKA, P., SKRZYPEK, D. (Eds.) *Exploring Passivization: Cross-Linguistic Insights and Methodological Challenges*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

NICHOLS, J., DAVID, A., PETERSON, D. A., BARNES, J., 2004. Transitivizing and detransitivizing languages, *Linguistic Typology*, 8(2). 249–311. https://doi.org/10.1515/lity.2004.005

SHIBATANI, M., 1976. The grammar of causative constructions: A conspectus. In SHIBATANI, M. (Ed.). *The grammar of causative constructions*. New York: Academic Press, 1–40.

SHIBATANI, M., PARDESHI, P., 2001. The causative continuum, *Kobe Papers in Linguistics*, 3. 136–177.

SHIBATANI, M., 2002. Some basic issues in the grammar of causation. In SHIBATANI, M. (Ed.). *The Grammar of Causation and Interpersonal Manipulation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1–22.

SIEWIERSKA, A., 1988. The passive in Slavic. In SHIBATANI, M. (Ed.). *Passive and Voice*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 243–289.

SONG, J. J., 2006. Causatives: Semantics. In BROWN, K. (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Elsevier, 265–268.

STEFANOWITSCH, A., 2001. *Constructing causation: A construction-grammar approach to analytic causatives*. PhD dissertation. Houston: Rice University.

TALMY, L., 1976. Semantic Causative Types. In SHIBATANI, M. (Ed.). *The Grammar of Causative Constructions*. New York: Academic Press, 43–116.

WIERZBICKA, A., 1998. The new psychology of language: Cognitive and functional approaches to language structure. In TOMASELLO, M. (Ed.). *The semantics of English causative constructions in a universal-typological perspective*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 113–153.