СОВРЕМЕНА ФИЛОЛОГИЈА JOURNAL OF CONTEMPORARY PHILOLOGY
811.111:811.163.3 JCP2025
811.163.3:811.111

INDIRECT CAUSATION: ENGLISH *GET*-CONSTRUCTIONS AND THEIR MACEDONIAN EQUIVALENTS

Ana Arsovska
FON University, Skopje
ana.jankulovska@fon.edu.mk

Eleni Bužarovska
Ss Cyril and Methodius University, Skopje
elenibuzarovska@t.mk

This paper presents the results of an empirical investigation into the typology of indirect causation in English and Macedonian. The study focuses on English causative analytic constructions formed with the verb *get* and non-finite verb forms. The aim of this research is to identify typological differences in how indirect causation is encoded in the two languages by comparing English constructions with their translational equivalents in Macedonian. Given that English, unlike Macedonian, possesses dedicated lexico-grammatical markers for encoding indirect causation – such as the grammaticalized verb *get*, we hypothesize that the Macedonian translational equivalents of causative *get*-constructions will vary depending on the construction type. To test this hypothesis, we extracted examples of these constructions from both fiction and documentary prose. The quantitative analysis of the data shows that the functional equivalents of infinitival contructions are predominantly biclausal structures, whereas the translations of present participial *get*-constructions tend to use monolexical verbs.

Keywords: contrastive analysis, translation, constructions, typology, causation.

ИНДИРЕКТНА КАУЗАЦИЈА: АНГЛИСКИТЕ *GET*-КОНСТРУКЦИИ И НИВНИТЕ МАКЕДОНСКИ ЕКВИВАЛЕНТИ

Ана Арсовска
Универзитет ФОН, Скопје
ana.jankulovska@fon.edu.mk

Елени Бужаровска
Универзитет Св. Кирил и Методиј, Скопје
elenibuzarovska@t.mk

Овој труд ги претставува резултатите од емпириското истражување за типологијата на индиректната каузација во англискиот и во македонскиот јазик. Истражувањето се фокусира на англиските каузативни аналитички конструкции, формирани со глаголот *get*, и на нефинитните глаголски форми. Целта на ова истражување е да се утврдат типолошките разлики во изразувањето на индиректната каузација на двата јазика, преку споредба на англиските конструкции со нивните преводни еквиваленти на македонски јазик. Имајќи предвид дека англискиот, за разлика од македонскиот, поседува посебни лексико-граматички обележја за кодирање на индиректната каузација, како што е граматикализираниот глагол *get*, претпоставуваме дека македонските преводни еквиваленти на каузативните *get*-конструкции ќе варираат во зависност од типот на конструкцијата. За да ја провериме оваа хипотеза, собравме примери за овие конструкции од уметничката и од документарната проза. Квантитативната анализа на податоците покажува дека функционалните еквиваленти на инфинитивните конструкции се, претежно, двореченични структури, додека преводите на сегашните партиципни *get*-конструкции најчесто користат полнозначни глаголи.

Клучни зборови: контрастивна анализа, превод, конструкции, типологија, каузација.

1 Introduction

This paper presents the results of our investigation into English causative infinitival and present participial *get*-constructions (examples 1–2) and their translational equivalents in Macedonian. Formally, these analytical constructions consist of *get*, a semantically bleached causal predicate, and a non-finite complement.

(1) *I got him to sit.*
(2) *I got him sitting.*

These *get*-constructions express indirectly caused transitive events, representing mediated causation, in which a volitional causer initiates and controls the action, while an affected causee carries it out. The causee is seen as an intermediary force directly involved in bringing about the effect of the caused event. The effect predicate is expressed through a non-finite complement with either an intransitive or transitive verb. Our aim is to identify typological differences in how indirect causation is encoded in the two languages by comparing English *get*-constructions with their Macedonian translations.

In typological studies (e.g., Comrie 1989), causative constructions are considered to encode temporally ordered events, the cause and the result of the caused event, within a single macroevent. In other words, the entire causal situation is conceptualized as a single event (Shibatani and Pardeshi 2001: 140). This conceptual integration has led to syntactic fusion (Givón 2001). In *get*-constructions, blending occurs through raising, where the subordinate subject is promoted to the direct object position in the main clause. Raising has a cognitive basis, as it foregrounds the participant rather than the event, thereby affecting the degree of control of the object participant, i.e., the causee.[3]

In cognitively oriented literature, it has been argued that the caused event in periphrastic constructions is conceptually dependent on the main event and is therefore not fully elaborated (Kemmer and Verhagen 1994: 117). This semantic dependency means that *get*, having partially lost its lexical and morphosyntactic properties (Hopper and Traugott 2003), has grammaticalized into a causative auxiliary. As a full verb, *get* is characterized by a high degree of polysemy across a wide range of constructions (Downing 1996: 179). Its basic meanings are grounded in an abstract conceptualization of transfer between two participants (Hollmann 2003). From this, meanings such as *to obtain* (*I got a book*) or *to arrive at a location* (*I got home*) emerge, both of which imply a schematic notion of change.

Besides analytic constructions, English can also express indirect causation through complex sentences in which a causative verb in the main clause governs a non-finite complement. Both the English causative constructions in (1–2) and the causative sentence in (3) are typically translated into Macedonian as biclausal structures consisting of a verb with causative meaning and a subjunctive *da*-complement.

(3) *I urged him to sit down.*
‘Го натерав да седне.’

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 outlines the typology of causative *get*-constructions, with a focus on the encoding of indirect causation. Section 3 provides a brief overview

[3] Comrie (1989: 181) observes that the accussative, as the basic morphological encoding of the direct object, typically refers to an entity with a very low degree of control.

of the methodological procedure. The next section examines the semantic distinctions between infinitival and participial *get*-constructions, emphasizing the roles of animacy and volitionality. Section 5 offers an analysis of these constructions along with their translational equivalents. Finally, Section 6 concludes the paper by summarizing the key findings of the investigation.

2 Theoretical prerequisites: encoding indirect causation

A key distinction in causative typology is that of direct vs. indirect causation (Comrie 1985: 333), considered by Dixon (2000: 67) as a decisive feature. In direct causation, the causer physically manipulates the causee to bring about the effect, typically rendered by a transitive verb. The interaction between an agonist (the causer) and an antagonist (the causee) is captured by the force-dynamic nature of causation (Talmy 1978, 2000), which involves force transmission. For causation to occur, the agonist must exert a force that is stronger than the opposing force of the antagonist. Direct causation is expressed by lexical causatives, which form a causative–inchoative pair with a non-causative counterpart. They may be suppletive (e.g., *raise – rise*) or morphologically unrelated to their counterparts (e.g., *feed – eat*). Some intransitive verbs can also be used causatively without morphological marking (e.g., *dry*). Known as labile, they belong to lexical causatives (Kulikov 2001: 888).[4] Direct causation can also be realized morphologically through the addition of valency-increasing morphemes to a verb's argument structure (Haspelmath 1993). However, modern European languages do not possess dedicated causative morphemes.[5]

Indirect causation, where the action is mediated rather than directly imposed, is generally encoded syntactically through analytic causative constructions. Shibatani and Pardeshi (2001: 147) refer to indirect causativization as "associative", identifying three subtypes based on the degree of control the causer has over the causee: joint action, assisted action, and supervised action. For example, in *Mother seated her child*, the causer (mother) is physically involved in helping the child perform the action of sitting. In contrast, in the analytic causative *Mother got her child to sit*, the causer influences the action more indirectly, through commands or persuasion rather than physical assistance (Shibatani and Pardeshi 2001: 139). Thus, the contrast between synthetic and analytic causatives hinges on the level of causer control: the less physical involvement, the weaker the control. This claim indirectly supports Levshina's findings (2017) that the choice between lexical and analytic causatives in English reflects the causer's involvement and the nature of the effect. When the causation is indirect or involves a mental effect, speakers tend to prefer the longer, analytic forms.[6]

Our treatment of forms encoding indirect causation in English and Macedonian mainly draws on typological classifications (Dixon 1976; Comrie 1989; Haspelmath 2016) and cognitive-functional approaches that take into consideration the semantic intergration the causative event and the degree of agentivity of the causee (Shibatani 1976, 2002; Talmy 1976; Kemmer and Verhagen 1994; Givón 2001; Hilpert 2008; Gilquin 2010; Croft 2012; Levshina 2017, among others). Levshina et al. (2013: 843), drawing on Talmy's force-dynamic theory (Talmy 1976, 2000), suggest that the more animate or agentive the causee is, the stronger the causer must be in order for causation to occur.

It has been noted in the literature that *get*-constructions tend to select human causers and causees (Hollmann 2003: 201). According to Gilquin (2010: 118), the causer is typically human in both constructions, but the referents of the causees differ: in infinitival constructions, they are

[4] More on labile verbs in Macedonian, see Mitkovska and Bužarovska (2020). For typological comparisons see Letuchiy (2009).

[5] Macedonian, similar to other Slavic languages, often employs perfectivizing prefixes to mark causativization or transitivization (e.g., *ѝплаче – расѝплаче* 'cry').

[6] Comrie (1989: 169) identifies a typological correlation, noting that the continuum from analytic to morphological to lexical causatives corresponds to a continuum from less direct to more direct causation.

predominantly human (92%), whereas in participial constructions, human causees are much less frequent (37%). This variation reflects more general patterns in how animacy and volitionality influence the meaning of causative constructions. We argue that the animacy of the causee plays a crucial role in shaping the semantics of *get*-constructions and underlies their classification into different causation types. Building on Talmy's (1976) classification of semantic causative types, causatives can be differentiated according to the animacy and volitionality of both participants: inductive (animate causer and causee), affective (inanimate causer and animate causee), volitional (animate causer and inanimate causee), and physical (both inanimate).

In the context of *get*-constructions, we propose that differences in the animacy of the causee help distinguish between prototypical and non-prototypical forms. This distinction is supported by Comrie (1989), who contrasts the prototypical scenario (where an animate causee performs the action) with marginal or non-prototypical constructions involving inanimate causees that exhibit limited control or autonomy.

Prototypical *get*-constructions feature animate causees upon whom the causer exerts effort to bring about an action that the causee performs. Non-prototypical constructions, by contrast, involve inanimate causees, which typically lack volition or agency. Gilquin (2003) notes that although the conflation of the causer and the causee makes them less typical examples, they still convey causation. The effect predicates typically refer to physical actions often caused by external force acting on an entity to generate a physical result (*start, open, mov*e, etc.).

The typological and cognitive-functional approaches outlined above explain how variations in causer control and causees' animacy influences the meaning of causative *get*-constructions and their distinction from non-protioypical isomorphic forms.

3 Methodology

To investigate the translational equivalents of causative *get*-constructions, we initially collected over 370 instances of these constructions along with their corresponding translations. However, due to space limitations and a need for a deeper and more comprehensive analysis, the study focuses on 153 examples involving infinitival and present participial *get*-constructions. These were selected because they exhibit distinct semantic and syntactic properties. The remaining 219 past participle examples were excluded on this basis.

English examples and their Macedonian translations were manually extracted from more than 40 e-books originally written in English, as well as from electronic corpora such as ParaSol and CLARIN.SI. The collected data were organized into two databases according to genre: fiction and non-fiction.

We acknowledge that the overall number of analyzed examples is relatively small. This is due to the fact that infinitival and present participial *get*-constructions are more typical of spoken language and thus underrepresented in written corpora. Consequently, while the study is based on a substantial body of written texts, the findings are intended to reveal general tendencies rather than provide definitive conclusions.

Each example was analyzed with respect to the form and meaning of the English construction and its translational equivalent, the type of causative relation involved, and the semantics of the participants, including animacy. We hypothesize that the translational equivalents of infinitival and present participial *get*-constructions will differ.

To test this hypothesis, we propose the following research questions:

1. Does the choice of translational equivalents depend on the distinction between prototypical and non-prototypical *get*-constructions?
2. Is the choice of translational equivalents influenced by the form of the *get*-construction?
3. Is the choice of translational equivalents influenced by genre?

4 Properties of *get*-constructions

4.1 Distribution

The distribution of *get*-construction in English corpus was established in Gilquin (2010: 48). It was found that the most frequent is the past participial construction (62%), followed by the infinitival construction (28%), while the present participial construction is the least represented (10%) of the three *get*-constructions. These constructions are more frequent in spoken than in written language, reflecting their colloquial and more dynamic nature in comparison to causative *have*-constructions (Gilquin 2010: 226). In all three constructions, the causer predominantly (99%) refers to a human participant.

The above findings were also confirmed in our own research. In the examined sample, infinitival and present participial constructions are less represented than past participial constructions. Out of a total of 371 examples, 219 are past participial constructions, followed by 100 infinitival and 53 present participial constructions.

Table 1. Distribution of the causative *get*-constructions in the sample

Constructions	**Fiction**	**Non-fiction**	**Total**
Get smb/smth to do	75	25	100
Get smb/smth doing	41	12	53
Total	116	37	153

The past participial *get*-constructions (e.g., *I got the car washed*) significantly outnumber the other two constructions: of 219 examples 131 were found in fiction and 88 in non-fiction. As mentioned earlier, they are not discussed here because its complex semantics and multifunctionality warrant a separate and in-depth investigation.

The infinitival and present participial *get*-constructions share similar semantics and syntax but differ in aspect (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 1233). Infinitival constructions, which are unmarked for aspect, typically profile the inception of a process, whereas durative participial constructions emphasize the ongoing nature of the event. For example, *Bill got the boy to run* implies that the boy was caused to begin running. In contrast, *Bill got the boy running* suggests the boy was already in the process of running as a result of the causer's influence.

4.2 Infinitival *get*-constructions

Infinitival *get*-constructions in our sample appear far more often in fiction than in non-fiction (75 vs 25 tokens). Using the parameter of animacy we separated the prototypical causative *get*-constructions from non-prototypical ones. Prototypical causatives make up the majority of the sample: 89 tokens out of 100 examples (89%).[7] This distribution correlates with Gilquin's (2010: 128) corpus findings.

The predominant causation type is inductive, while the number of affective examples is considerably lower. Both types dominate in fiction: of 88 tokens, 81% are in fiction and 19% in non-fiction. Non-prototypical *get*-contructions make up 12%, with the volitional type greatly prevailing over the physical.

[7] According to Gilquin (2010: 128), prototypical infinitival constructions account for 89%, whereas only 34% present participial constructions belong to prototypical.

Table 2. Distribution of causative types in infinitival *get*-constructions

Causation type	**Animacy**	**Fiction**	**Non-fiction**	total
Inductive	Anim-Anim	65	14	**79**
Affective	Inanim-Anim	6	3	**9**
Volitional	Anim-Inanim	3	7	10
Physical	Inanim-Inanim	1	1	2
Total		75	25	100

The majority of examples express inductive causation, where a human causer acts on an animate causee: 79/88 (90%) in fiction and 9/88 (10%) in non-fiction.

(4) *He could not get her to speak or move...*
(5) *I could not get Rebecca to give me any help.*

Human causers pressure human causees to act according to their wishes or social norms, typically through verbal persuasion, ranging from subtle to coercive (6). As Givón (2005) notes, the manipulation of a human agent tends to be weaker, less direct, and less successful, with the manipulee retaining a larger degree of agentive control. On the other hand, causers referring to social phenomena exert less control over human causees (7).

(6) *Practically, you have to bribe her to get her to take a bath…*
(7) *There has been an aggressive campaign to get her to join an Internet dating site.*

In the following example, the causer physically manipulates a child, which is characteristic of assistive causation (Shibatani and Pardeshi 2002).

(8) *Meanwhile Mom tried to get the little kid to sleep on her lap.*

The affective type involves an animate causee pressured by an inanimate causer to perform an action typically associated with human activity.

(9) *There has been an aggressive campaign to get her to join an Internet dating site.*
(10) *Sometimes I'd be… yelling at her, anything just to get her to talk to me again.*

In several examples, the *get*-construction conceptualizes the transfer of an entity to a new location (11). This indirectly supports the hypothesis that the infinitival *get*-construction historically originated from the grammaticalization of a structure combining an infinitive, noun phrase, and locative complement (Hollmann 2003: 90).

(11) *First you and Bobby Lee get him and that little boy to step over yonder with you.*

The non-prototypical causative *get*-contructions are relatively rare (12 out of 100 examples), but they are more common in non-fiction (8 tokens). The volitional causation type dominates. In such constructions, the causer physically manipulates the inanimate causee, provoking its change. The volitional causer is highly determined to fulfil the activity to the end despite causee's resistance (12). In (13), the causer/agent aims to "shine" the car by washing. The infinitive form implies a goal that needs to be achieved.

(12) *They finally managed to get the door open.*

(13) *Your neighbor doesn't stop washing and getting his little economy car to shine….*

We assume that non-prototypical *get*-constructions are used for pragmatic effects: they add extra emphasis on the causer's effort and causee's resistance. Thus, in (14), it seems that the agent makes a greater effort to open their eyes compared to the sentence with the transitive verb *I opened my eyelids* (which is very unusual).

(14) *I got my lids to open, and I stared into warm gold.*

4.3 Present participial *get*-constructions

Present participial constructions are the least frequent in both samples, with 53 instances, 41 of which (77%) appear in fiction.

Table 3. Distribution of casative types in present participial *get*-constructions

Causation type	**Animacy correlation**	**Fiction**	**Non-fiction**	**total**
inductive	Animate-Anim	13	1	14
affective	Inanimate-Anim	4	2	6
volitional	Animate-Inanim	21	5	26
physical	Inanim-Inanim	3	4	7
Total		41	12	53

Though structurally similar to infinitival constructions, they differ in aspect: the present participle encodes a durative event, implying that "the caused event can continue for some time after the impingement stops" (Levshina et al. 2013: 829).

(15) *She'd come up with something new to get people talking again*.

In addition to differences in frequency and durativity, these constructions also differ in the referential semantics of their causees, which predominantly refer to inanimate entities (62.3%). This indicates that more than half of such examples are non-prototypical. The corpus fundings in Gilquin (2010: 128) are very similar showing 66%. In contrast, non-prototypical infinitival constructions make up only 11.9% of the cases.

The classification of these constructions also reveals important differences. The most widespread non-prototypical type is the volitional type, which accounts for 85% of the non-prototypical examples, found predominantly in fiction (twenty two instances vs. six in non-fiction). In this type, represented by eighteen instances, typically a human causer induces an inanimate causee into a state or process, as in (16). In contrast, the less frequent physical type (15%) involves inanimate causers, such as activities (17).

(16) *We got the motor going, but we're low on power.*
(17) *Exercise, in the form of running, gets the circulation pumping.*

Prototypical causatives account for 37.7% of the data, with the inductive type featuring animate participants as in (18), predominantly occurring in fiction with thirteen instances versus one. In the affective type, causers refer to activities or abtract entities (19).

(18) *Esme's got them finishing things up out back.*
(19) *Brief as it was, that taste of freedom had got us thinking.*

5 Analysis of translation equivalents

Macedonian translation equivalents of the causative *get*-constructions include: (a) lexical verbs, comprising mostly transitive verbs with causative semantics as well as some non-causative verbs; (b) biclausal structures; (c) paraphrases; and (d) nominalizations. The remaining examples consist of free translations, idiomatic expressions, and passive verbs. The distribution of more frequent forms is given in Table 4.

Table 4. Distribution of translational equivalents in the sample

	Get smb/smth to do		**Get smb/smth doing**	
	Non-fiction 25	**Fiction 75**	**Non-fiction 12**	**Fiction 41**
Lexical verbs	10	4	3	15
Biclausal structures	8	48	4	12
Paraphrases	4	19	/	6
Nominalizations	1	/	/	5
Other	12	4	5	3

5.1 Translational equivalents of the infinitival *get*-constructions

The analysis of the examples shows that prototypical infinitival *get*-constructions are most often translated into Macedonian using biclausal structures (56 instances), followed by paraphrases (22 instances). These two strategies dominate in fiction, accounting for 86% of the cases. The third most frequent strategy is the use of lexical verbs, with 10 occurrences, which are more common in non-fiction (7 instances).

The main clause in the biclausal structure contains a verb with causative or broadly undersood manipulative semantics, while the complement *da*-clause expresses the effect of the induced action. The most common causal verb is *natera* 'force', while other verbs are less frequent: *se obide* 'try' (20), *ubedi* 'convince' (21), *navede* 'direct', *nagovori* 'persuade', *prinudi* 'force', *se potrudi* 'make effort', *pobara* 'ask for', *načne* 'start', *izdejstvuva* 'achieve' etc. The verbs in the *da*-clause are usually in the perfective aspect, except for a few examples with verbs that denote processes (*spie* 'sleep') or ongoing activities (*gleda* 'watch', or *probuva* 'try').

(20) *Now I am trying to get her to leave again…*
'Сега пак се обидувам да ја **натерам** да си замине.'

(21) *How do you get people to spend money and come to your events?*
'Како да ги **убедите** луѓето да **потрошат** пари и да дојдат на вашите настани.'

Persuasion is occasionally accompanied by more forceful and even violent methods, including threats (22). This nuance is conveyed in the translation through the use of the verb *natera* 'force'. Such examples confirm Wierzbicka's observation (1998: 124–125) that the causee in get-constructions is typically more autonomous. This autonomy is reflected in the get-causative's encoding of situations involving resistance from the causee.[8]

[8] Stefanowitsch (2001:154) points out that in *get*-constructions, the resistance tends to be much more passive than in *force*-causatives, resembling inertia.

(22) *Sometimes I'd be begging her to stop it, crying, yelling at her, anything just to get her to talk to me again.*
'Понекогаш ќе ја преколнував да престане, ќе плачев, ќе се дерев, …само за да ја **натерам** повторно да ми зборува.'

However, the causer's influence on the causee can be subtler and need not involve overt or unpleasant coercion. In such cases, it is rendered by the verb *navede* 'lead to' (23).

(23) *Sophie is telling her mother about how she got Jake to smile for the first time.*
'Софи ѝ раскажува на мајка си како го **навела** Џејк да се насмевне првпат во неговиот живот.'

Next in frequency are the paraphrases (over 20 instances), which include more flexible biclausal structures where the *da*-clause can indicate purpose. They are characterized by weaker syntactic integration because the two events are not cotemporal. In some examples, when the infinitive construction expresses purpose, verbs such as *vikne* 'call' or *najde* 'find' are used as translation equivalents. These verbs indirectly cause the action, as finding and/or calling the necessary person is a prerequisite for the action to take place (24).

(24) *Get somebody to fix that door.*
'Викни некој да ја поправи онаа врата.'

Some *get*-contructions that imply causation are translated with verbs denoting transfer of the human causee to a locative goal (25). In the translation of (26), the causative relation becomes clear only within the context of the intended activity: that the causer will take the causee to a football match.

(25) *First you and Bobby Lee get him and that little boy to step over yonder with you.*
'Прво ти и Боби Ли **однесете** ги него и момчево таму позади.'

(26) *So I hear you're getting my girl to watch baseball.*
'Значи, ќе ја **водиш** мојата малечка да гледа бејзбол.'

More flexible translation equivalents are justified when a causal connection is made between two consecutive events, e.g., begging the craftsman and getting the product of his work (27). In such examples, the semantic and syntactic integration between the clauses expressing cause and effect is not tight (cf. Givón 2001: 40).

(27) *After much begging and whining, Circe got a Negro blacksmith to solder a bit of gold wire to the box.*
'На крајот по многу молење и цимолење, Кирке **отиде** кај еден ковач црнец кој ѝ **залеми** златна жичка на кутијата.'

Lexical verbs rank next in frequency among the translation equivalents. The category of lexical verbs is not uniform as it includes verbs with varying degree of causative semantics.

Most of these verbs (*open, collect, scatter*) are highly transitive and can be considered causative in a broad sense. In (28), the translation employs the deontic *treba* ('should') to impose a required practice on the customer, making the plea more direct and forceful than the original *get*-construction.

(28) *I'll just get you to fill out these two forms, and then I will need proof of identity.*
'Треба само да ги **пополните** овие два формулара, а потоа ќе ми треба документ за идентификација.'

However, non-causative verbs are also present, more frequently in non-fiction (e.g., *spend*, *learn*). In (29) the causal relation is established based on encyclopedic knowledge about educational institutions. In (30), the intransitive verb *se trga* 'move away' implies causation because it occurs in a purpose clause.

(29) *School gardens are a great way to get children to learn about nutrition…*
'Училишните градини се одличен начин децата **да научат** за исхраната.'

(30) *If you blow your horn to try to get them to clear your way, they will not move...*
'Ако им свирите за да ви **се тргнат** од патот … тие нема да се поместат.'

The causative meaning can be marked morphologically with a prefix. Thus, the transitive verb *uspie* 'put to sleep' is formed by adding the perfective aspect prefix *u-* to the intransitive *spie* 'sleep' (31). In (32), the reflexive verb is transitivized by removing the reflexive marker *se* (e.g., *se premisliv – premisliv nekogo* – change someone's mind).

(31) *When they can't get the baby to sleep, Callum puts him over one shoulder.*
'Кога не можат да го **успијат** бебето, Калум го става преку едно рамо.'

(32) *In an attempt to get the police to reconsider and let them protest ... citizens shouted "Release the people".*
'Во обид да ја **премислат** полицијата да ги пушти да протестираат … граѓаните извикуваа „Пуштете го народот!"'

Among the translation equivalents of infinitival constructions, we also found a labile verb that has become causative without morphological derivation. In (33), the causer applies verbal imposition on the causee to sit down. Interestingly, the author did not use the transitive causative verb *to seat*, but instead chose an infinitival *get*-construction. It seems that the verb *seat* refers to assisted causation involving physical manipulation, while the verb *sit* is more suitable for expressing inductive causation.

(33) *Now when I finally managed to get you to sit down with me, I wanted to ask you why you think that is the case?*
'Сега кога конечно те **седнав** на маса, сакам да те прашам зошто така мислиш?'

The translations of twelve non-prototypical *get*-constructions rarely employ biclausal structures. Instead, they favor paraphrastic renderings (5 tokens), as in (34), or lexical verbs (2 tokens). In (35), the verb acquired a causative meaning through transitivization of the reflexive verb.

(34) *Petrus is struggling to get the coupling to fit.*
'Петрус **се мачи** со муфот.'

(35) *You should flee from any sort of turmoil in order to get your hypersensitive nervous system to relax.*
'Со цел да го **одморите** пречувствителниот нервен систем, би требало да ги избегнувате турканиците.'

5.2 Translation equivalents of present participial *get*-constructions

The translation equivalents of present participial *get*-constructions show a more balanced distribution between lexical verbs and biclausal structures (17 vs. 23). Biclausal structures generally employ causative verbs that convey directive manipulation of the causee, such as *naredi* 'order' (36) and *nauči* 'teach' (37). The causee is typically reluctant at first to do what the causer wants, so the causer has to put in extra effort to convince them. (cf. Wierzbicka 1998: 124–125). This is felt strongly with the verb *natera* (36).

(36) *Esme's got them finishing things up out back.*
'Есме ги **натера да довршат** одзади во дворот.'

(37) *Of course, Connie had been the one to get Rose smoking in the first place.*
'Се разбира, Кони првично беше онаа што ја **научи** Роуз **да пуши**.'

The distribution of lexical verbs in translations is influenced by genre: there are 15 instances in fiction and only 3 in non-fiction. Some translational choices do not express causative meaning.

(38) *I bet she's got her working away on that dried-up old withered.*
'Се обложувам дека **работела** на таа исушена, стара, овената.'

In (39), the translation does not express any causation because of a structural change in the translation equivalent: the causer in the subject position is removed from the sentence and the causee (Jessica) becomes and agent who acts on their own.

(39) *Once I got Jessica talking, I would be able to get away with a few mumbled responses.*
'Штом Џесика ќе **почнеше да зборува**, јас не морав да учествувам во разговорот.'

Other verbs used in translations express varying degrees of causation, ranging from weak to strong, depending on the level of manipulation involved. In (40), the causer is instructed to help the causee breathe, likely by creating enabling conditions rather than exerting direct control. In (41), the causee is forced to "run" while performing various Christmas-related chores. The Macedonian translation, which adopts a colloquial style, conveys the causative meaning by transitivizing the reflexive verb *se iznatrča* ('run a lot').

(40) *Get her breathing.*
'Нека **дише**!'

(41) *They got me runnin tonight. Christmas comin and all, all I do is run up and down.*
'Ме **изнатрчаа** вечерва. Со доаѓањето на Божиќ, само трчам ваму-таму.'

The paraphrastic translation of (42) successfully conveys the non-causative meaning of the *get*-construction. It implies that the is nonagentive and non-volitional causer does not bear any responsibility for the durative effect event.

(42) *Yeah, it's an off day when I don't get somebody telling me how edible I smell.*
'Аха, ретки се деновите кога **некој нема да ми каже** дека мирисам хранливо.'

Non-prototypical constructions have inanimate causees, frequently related to machines or systems, that are portrayed as having a will of their own (Wierzbicka 1998: 124). The choice of translational equivalents mirrors the strategies observed in prototypical constructions Lexical verbs are used most frequently (12 instances), followed by paraphrastic expressions (10 instances) and biclausal structures (6 instances). All three strategies are predominantly found in fiction, whereas translations of non-fiction examples tend to favor lexical verbs and paraphrases over biclausal structures (examples 43–45). They instantiate cases of volitional causation, which represents the most typical form of force transmission. As Croft (2012: 266) notes, it is conveyed through a simple verb, whose participants are subject and object.

(43) *I couldn't wait to get the heat going in my truck.*
'Одвај чекав да **вклучам** греење во камионетот.'

(44) *This will get the waterworks going!*
'Од оваа ќе почнат да се **леат** реки!'

(45) *Exercise… gets the circulation pumping.*
'Вежбите … ја **поттикнуваат** циркулацијата.'

In some translational equivalents, the English causative constructions are rendered using verbs that do not emphasize causer's control. For instance, in (46), *get your head working* implies initiating a mental process, but the translation uses *razmisli* 'think over', which denotes a cognitive process but does not explicitly encode the cause. Similarly, in (47), *get a fire going* captures both the initiation and potential maintenance of a fire, while in the translation, the volitional involvement of the agent is less explicitly conveyed. These constructional shifts suggest a certain weakening of causativity in the translations.

(46) *Get some sleep, Bells. You've got to get your head working.*
'Наспиј се, Бела. За да можеш убаво да **размислиш**.'

(47) *Behind the stable they get a fire going*.
'**Палат** оган зад шталата.'

6 Conclusion

This study examined the Macedonian equivalents of English *get*-constructions, testing the hypothesis that translation choices vary based on linguistic and contextual factors. The analysis identified three key factors: the prototypicality of the construction, its form (infinitival vs. participial), and the genre of the source text.

The findings show that the prototypicality of the *get*-construction strongly affects its Macedonian equivalent. Prototypical constructions are most frequently translated using biclausal structures with causative or directive verbs such as *натера* 'force'. In contrast, non-prototypical *get*-constructions are more likely to be translated using paraphrases or single lexical verbs.

The form of the English *get*-construction, infinitival vs. present participial, also plays a significant role in determining the translational strategy. Infinitival *get*-constructions, which

separate the causer's and causee's roles and express purposive or manipulative causation, in Macedonian are predominantly rendered as biclausal structures with *da*-complements. Present participial *get*-constructions are more frequently translated using lexical verbs or paraphrastic expressions, sometimes with a reduced causal implication when it is contextually implied.

Genre influences the selection of translational equivalents, with fiction showing a stronger preference for biclausal causative structures and a more varied use of causative verbs. This can be attributed to the expressive character of fictional discourse, which often foregrounds interpersonal manipulation and internal states. Fiction also tolerates more idiomatic or colloquial expressions, as seen in examples involving emotional coercion, threats, or subtle influence. In contrast, non-fiction favors more neutral or simplified constructions, relying on lexical verbs or paraphrastic renderings to preserve informational clarity and textual cohesion.

In sum, the study shows that the choice of translational equivalents for English *get*-constructions in Macedonian is guided by an interplay of semantic, pragmatic, and stylistic factors. Prototypical, infinitival and fiction-based constructions tend to be rendered with biclausal causative structures, while non-prototypical, participial, and non-fictional constructions more often receive paraphrastic or lexical translations with weaker causative force. Despite the limited dataset, these findings offer a starting point for further cross-linguistic research on the expression of indirect causation.

Bibliography

Comrie, B. (1985). Causative verb formation and other verb-deriving morphology. In T. Shopen (ed.). *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, Vol. 3: *Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon*, 309–348. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Comrie, B. (1989). *Language Universals and Language Typology*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Croft, W. (2012). *Verbs: Aspect and clausal structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dixon, R.M.W. (2000). A typology of causatives: form, syntax and meaning. In R.M.W. Dixon and A. Aikhenvald (eds.). *Changing valency: Case Studies in Transitivity*, 30–83. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Downing, A. (2014). *English Grammar: A University Course* (3rd ed.). London: Routledge.

Gilquin, G. (2003). So close, so different. Causative 'get' and 'have'. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 31(2): 125–148.

Gilquin, G. (2010). *Corpus, cognition and causative constructions*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Givón, T. (2001). *Syntax. A functional-typological introduction*. Vol. 2. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Givón**,** T. (2005). *Context as Other Minds: The Pragmatics of Sociality, Cognition and Communication***.** Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Haspelmath, M. (1993). Causatives and Other Valency-Changing Devices. In B. Comrie (ed.). *Valency and Voice*, 73–166. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Haspelmath, M. (2016). Universals of causative and anticausative verb formation and the spontaneity scale. *Lingua Posnaniensis*, 58(2): 33–63.

Hilpert, M. (2014). *Construction Grammar and Its Application to English*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Hollmann, W. B. (2003). *Synchrony and diachrony of English periphrastic causatives: a cognitive perspective*. PhD dissertation, University of Manchester.

Hopper, P. and Traugott, E. C. (2003). *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Huddleston, R. and Pullum, G. K. (2002). *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kemmer, S. and Verhagen, A. (1994). The grammar of causatives and the conceptual structure of events. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 5(2): 115–156.

Kulikov, L. I. (2001). Causative. In M. Haspelmath, E. König, W. Oesterreicher and W. Raible (eds.). *Language typology and language universals. An International Handbook*, Vol. 2, 886–898. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.

Letuchiy, A. (2009). Towards typology of labile verbs: lability vs. derivation. In P. Epps and A. Arkhipov (eds.). *New challenges in typology: Transcending the borders and re ning the distinctions,* 247–268. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.

Levshina, N., Geeraerts, D. and Speelman, D. (2013). Mapping Constructional Spaces: A Contrastive Analysis of English and Dutch Analytic Causatives. *Linguistics*, 51(4): 825–854.

Levshina, N. (2017). Measuring iconicity: A quantitative study of lexical and analytic causatives in British English. *Functions of Language*, 24(3): 319–347.

Mitkovska, L. and Bužarovska, E. (2020). Zero-marked valency alternations in Macedonian. *Prace Filologiczne*, 75(1): 355–372.

Shibatani, M. (1976). The Grammar of Causative Constructions: A Conspectus. In M. Shibatani (ed.). *The Grammar of Causative Constructions,* 1–40. New York: Academic Press.

Shibatani, M. and 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 M. Shibatani (ed.). *The Grammar of Causation and Interpersonal Manipulation*, 1–22, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

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

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

Talmy, L. (1988). Force Dynamics in Language and Cognition. *Cognitive Science*, 12(1): 49–100.

Talmy, L. (2000). *Toward a Cognitive Semantics: Vol. 1: Concept Structuring Systems*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Wierzbicka, A. (1998). The semantics of English causative constructions in a universal-typological perspective. In M. Tomasello (ed.). *The new psychology of language: Cognitive and functional approaches to language structure*, 113–53. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.