MACEDONIAN TRANSLATION EQUIVALENTS OF THE ENGLISH *GET*-PASSIVE

Liljana Mitkovska
AUE-FON University in Skopje
liljana55@yahoo.com

Ana Arsovska
AUE-FON University in Skopje
ana.jankulovska@fon.edu.mk

This paper deals with the English *get*-passive construction and its possible translation equivalents in Macedonian. The aim of the research is to investigate which constructions in Macedonian can be used as functional equivalents to the English *get*-passive. This research is based on a database of 180 parallel examples created by the authors, searching translations in both directions, English-Macedonian and Macedonian-English. A qualitative and quantitative analysis of the collected data was conducted with an aim to establish a correlation between the English *get*-passive and its Macedonian equivalents. By determining the similarities and differences between the English *get*-passive and the Macedonian passive constructions (the periphrastic and the reflexive passive) we assumed that there is no full correspondence, thus a wider variety of structures were expected in the Macedonian counterpart examples. Consequently the distribution of the equivalent Macedonian structures will hopefully give some insight both into the nature of the English *get*-passive and the scarcely studied Macedonian passive constructions as well as relevant guidelines for translators and teachers.

Keywords: voice, contrastive analysis, periphrastic passive, reflexive, middle

МАКЕДОНСКИТЕ ПРЕВОДНИ ЕКВИВАЛЕНТИ НА АНГЛИСКИОТ *GET*-ПАСИВ

Лилјана Митковска
АУЕ-Фон Универзитет во Скопје
liljana55@yahoo.com

Ана Арсовска
АУЕ-Фон Универзитет во Скопје
ana.jankulovska@fon.edu.mk

Овој труд се занимава со англиската пасивна конструкција со глаголот get и нејзините можни преводни еквиваленти на македонски јазик. Целта на истражувањето е да се испита кои македонски конструкции се користат како функционални еквиваленти на англискиот get-пасив. За ова истражување е користена база на податоци од 180 паралелни примери, составена од авторите, со пребарување на преводи во двете насоки, англиско-македонски и македонско-англиски. Беше спроведена квалитативна и квантитативна анализа на собраните податоци, со цел да се воспостави корелација помеѓу англиската пасивна конструкција со глаголот get и нејзините македонски еквиваленти. По утврдување на сличностите и на разликите помеѓу get-пасивот и македонските пасивни конструкции (перифрастичниот и рефлексниот пасив), дојдовме до заклучок дека нема целосно совпаѓање, па затоа се очекуваше поширока разновидност на структурите во македонските примери. Така, дистрибуцијата на истоветните македонски структури овозможува да се добие увид како во природата на англискиот get-пасив така и во карактерот на малку проучуваните македонски пасивни конструкции, а дава и значајни насоки за преведувачите и за наставниците.

Клучни зборови: залог, контрастивна анализа, перифрастичен пасив, рефлексивни конструкции, медијална дијатеза

1 Introduction

This study deals with the English *get*-passive construction (1) and its possible translation equivalents in Macedonian. The term *get*-passive is used variously in the literature, covering different scopes of the functions/meanings expressed by the combination of the verb *get* and the past participle of the main verb, which can be more or less remote from the prototypical passive (Anderwald 2017). In some uses the participle is more clearly of an adjectival nature (Leech et al. 2009; Huddleston and Pullum 2002) indicated by the modifier *so* in (2). In the literature it is considered that in such meanings get is a kind of a copula and the participle has adjectival function (e.g., Biber et al. 1999; Huddleston and Pullum 2002). The term 'inchoative' is also often used for most of these constructions (Fleisher 2006; Anderwald 2017), while Hundt (2001: 69) considers them a type of inchoative-middle constructions. In many cases the distinction between the passive and the adjectival construction is blurred (3).

(1)   *He **got arrested** (by the police).*

(https://ludwig.guru/s/he+got+arrested)[1]

(2)   *He **got so confused** that he no longer knew what to do.*

(Leech et al. 2009: 154)

(3)   *The channel **got blocked**.*

(Leech et al. 2009: 154)

In our research we use the term *get*-passive for uses of this structure that exhibit typical passive-like features and are comparable with the *be*-passive (example 1), but also consider the ambiguous cases (3).

From a typological perspective, passive voice is considered a type of diathesis marked on the verb. Following the Leningrad-St Petersburg Typology Group terminology, Kulikov (2011: 370) defines the term 'diathesis' as follows: "Diathesis is determined as a pattern of mapping of semantic arguments onto syntactic functions (grammatical relations)."[2] Similarly, Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 1427) consider the term 'voice' to apply "to a system where the contrasting forms differ in the way semantic roles are aligned with syntactic functions, normally with some concomitant marking on the verb". Thus, the terms 'active' and 'passive' designate different "alignment of roles with functions in clauses that express an action" (ibid.): active voice encodes the "natural" argument hierarchy, while in the passive voice the subject does not code the initiating participant, but an undergoing entity. The pairs of corresponding active and passive clauses express the same propositional meaning, but differ in highlighting different aspects of the event, performing different discourse functions.[3]

---

[1] Source of examples is given in brackets. Absence of source implies that it is provided by the authors.

[2] Other terms utilized are: 'syntactic pattern', 'valency pattern', and 'construction type'(Kulikov 2011: 370).

[3] Quirk et al. (1985: 159) define voice as "a grammatical category which makes it possible to view the action of a sentence in either of two ways, without change in the facts reported."

The basic passive construction in English is the *be*-passive, formed with the past participle added to the copula *be.* Combinations of *get* and the past participle in English are of a more recent date, their first passive uses dating around the end of the eighteenth century (Hundt 2001). Though it is quite rare (especially compared to the *be*-passive, see e.g., Biber et al. 1999: 481; Leech 2009: 156), the *get*-passive is an established construction and is described in the basic grammars of the English language (e.g., Quirk et al. 1984: 160-163; Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 1443–1440). Thus, its properties and relation to the *be*-passive have been defined in the linguistic literature, as will be explicated in the next section, and they were applied in identifying examples for the present analysis.

As the other Slavic languages, Macedonian possesses two types of passive: morphological (or periphrastic) passive (formed by *be* and the participle-like verbal adjective) and reflexive passive (built by the reflexive marker *se* and the conjugated form of the verb), which display similar functional properties, but vary in use and distribution. However, the Slavic passives are less common than the passive in English because of the flexible word order in these languages (Sussex and Cubberley 2006: 369). Inversion is the main strategy for marking changes in the information structure of the clause, while English resorts to different syntactic structures due to the more fixed word order. Thus, we expect to find different constructions in Macedonian as translation equivalents to English *get*-passive sentences. The main goal of this study is to investigate the functionally corresponding structures in Macedonian to the English *get*-passive clauses. With this in mind we pose the following research questions:

1.   Which Macedonian structures are possible translation equivalents?
2.   Which structures occur most frequently and in what contexts do they occur?
3.   What differences (semantic, syntactic, functional) exist between *get*-passive sentences that have/receive different translation equivalents in Macedonian?
4.   What do translation equivalents reveal about English *get*-passive and about Macedonian passive constructions?

We look for answers to these questions in parallel texts that render the same contents in English and in Macedonian: translations in both directions and translations of the same texts from different languages into English and into Macedonian. Sentences containing *get*-passive in the English text are extracted manually and classified into sub-groups. They are then matched with the Macedonian extracts conveying the same meaning. The data were subjected to quantitative and qualitative analysis. The findings are expected to shed some light both on the use and properties of the English *get*-passive as well as on the Macedonian diathetic constructions, which will be of theoretical and practical relevance.

The paper is structured as follows: the next section provides the theoretical underpinnings concerning the two passive constructions in English, as well as the Macedonian passive constructions and a brief comparison. The central sections of the paper present and discuss the results of our investigation. The most important findings are summarized in the concluding section.

2 Theoretical background

The passive voice is crosslinguistically one of the most common types of verb marked diathesis (Kazenin 2001). It is distinguished from the other voice alternations with well-defined morpho-syntactic and discourse properties, summed up as follows (see Haspelmath 1990: 27; Kazenin 2001: 899): (i) in a corresponding pair of active and passive clauses the latter one is marked (morphologically and functionally) and has a more restricted use, hence it is considered as derived from the former; (ii) the number of participants and their roles in the situation do not change: the active subject referent (actor/causer)[4] is always present in the semantic structure of the clause, but it is not expressed in subject position, which, if any, is occupied by a less prominent semantic role; (iii) the actor/causer is either not expressed at the syntactic level, or is coded in an adjunct position.

　　The use of passive voice is motivated by the discourse pragmatic needs of the speaker/writer. The two syntactic processes in passive formation, i.e. actor/causer demotion and undergoer promotion, express changes in the focus vis-à-vis the active clause. The English passive is usually assigned the following communicative functions (see Biber et al. 1999: 477; Schwartz 2018: 11–12): (i) to insure front position for the discourse topic and facilitate smooth information flow in the text; (ii) to background or omit the actor/causer if it is unknown, obvious or unimportant; (iii) to foreground and put emphasis on the undergoing participant. Which function will prevail depends on the text register, context and communication goals. Both *be*-passive and *get*-passive can be used for the described purposes, though the two constructions differ in other respects addressed below.

2.1 Review of the literature related to the English *get*-passive

In the following sections we provide the theoretical background on the *be*- and *get*-passive, focusing on the main similarities and differences between the two, as well as the basic properties of the *get*-passive explicated in previous studies and employed in our analysis.

2.1.1 Comparison and contrast of *be*- and *get*-passive

Two forms are used for marking passive voice in English. As Quirk et al. (1985: 160) note, passive voice is normally formed with auxiliary *be*, but the verb *get* can also be used to build a passive construction. However Quirk et al. (ibid.) also state that by most syntactic criteria *get* is not an auxiliary at all. This is because the passive *get* fails all of the syntactic tests for auxiliary verbs: it doesn't invert in questions, it triggers *do*-support in negative expressions, and it never occurs in question tags (Fleisher 2006: 228). The two passive constructions in English share some formal and pragmatic similarities: both *be* and *get* can be used in different tenses and are followed by a past participle. Both constructions are used to place focus on the patient, rather than on the agent of the action.

---

[4] Kazenin (2001) uses the term 'actor' to comprise 'agent' and 'experiencer', but 'causer' covers more subject roles.

Nevertheless, there are some striking differences between the two as well, most notably in style-dependent distribution and productivity, as discussed below. In addition, the *get*-passive "provides a convenient way of avoiding the passive with *be* in cases where there is a potential confusion between the normal passive interpretation and that of the 'statal passive'" (Quirk et al. 1985: 162).[5] In examples such as *The vase was broken*, the verb can be interpreted either as stative, implying the condition in which the vase is found, or as dynamic, referring that somebody/ something broke the vase, and the vase is the affected entity. However, if the same example is replaced by a *get*-passive (*The vase got broken*.) there would be no ambiguity, i.e. only a dynamic interpretation of the verb is possible. There is nevertheless ample ambiguity between *get*-passive and inchoative *get*-constructions, as noted by Leech et al. (2009), Fleisher (2006) and others.

2.1.2 Basic properties of the *get*-passive

In this section we offer an overview of the basic properties of the *get*-passive described in numerous studies (Lakoff 1971; Chappell 1980; Siewierska 1984; Collins 1996; Carter and McCarthy 1999; Hundt 2001; Alexiadou 2005; Fleisher 2006; among others). Some of them are still debated.

Property 1: Stylistic Distribution
The undisputed property of the *get*-passive is its affiliation with the informal language (*cf*. Quirk et al. 1985: 161; Huddleston 1984: 161; Collins 1996: 43). In the COCA (Corpus of Contemporary American English), which is a balanced corpus with about 400 million words, Kim (2012: 440) finds that "the *get*-passive is most frequently used in spoken texts then in fiction, but least frequently used in academic texts". Equally, Kim (2012: 441) notes that the normalized frequency in spoken texts is "about 11 times higher than the one in written texts" in the BNC (British National Corpus)-WEB corpus. These findings indicate preference in use of the *get*-passive in more informal style in both British and American English, more frequent in fiction than in other written styles (as shown in Anderwald 2017). However, it is much less used than the *be*-passive "and even in informal English it is far less frequent than the *be*-passive" (Quirk et al. 1984: 161).

Property 2: Productivity
It is often claimed that the *get*-passive is found only with dynamic verbs in contrast to the *be*-passive (e.g., Downing 1996: 186; Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 1442; Alexiadou 2005: 16). Similarly, Kim (2012: 447) provides evidence that there is a high-frequency of non-stative verbs in the *get*-passive (*get caught, get paid, get hit, get fired, get arrested, get kicked, get turned, get invited, get burned*), as opposed to the non-dynamic stative verbs which do not occur in the *get*-passive form in the COCA and are typically found in the *be*-passive (*be considered, be expected, be remembered, be obtained, be required, be needed, be regarded, be believed*). Thus, Kim (ibid.) concludes that the *get*-passive is "sensitive to the lexical properties of the main verb". This is also related to the restriction of the *get*-passive

---

[5] See also Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 1441).

to verbs expressing affectedness of the subject (Quirk et al. 1985; Taranto 2005). Alexiadou (2005: 17) notes that the *get*-passive is not permitted with states and "verbs that do not allow for the subject of the construction to be interpreted as affected". Kim (2012: 448-449) observes that this property is often found in the corpus. However, issues arise due to examples found in corpora which violate the affectedness condition (*The truth got known.; The light got invented*.). These examples are unacceptable among linguists who consider this property as typical of the *get*-passive. Nevertheless, research shows that such examples are actually found in corpora. Hence, this issue needs to be further addressed.

It has also been noted that *get*-passives are much less commonly used with an expressed animate agent/causer than *be*-passives (e.g., Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 1441–1443). Collins (1996), as well as Carter and McCarthy (1999), found that more than 90% of the *get*-passives did not include a *by*-phrase. Quirk et al. (1985: 161) suggest that the agent is less usual with a *get*-passive because of the "emphasis which *get* places on the subject referent's condition (usually an unfavorable condition)".

Property 3: 'Resultant state' meaning

Downing (1996: 184) states that the *get*-passive carries the meaning of "arrive at a resultant state", a feature also noted by other authors (e.g., Vanrespaille 1991; Taranto 2005). Kim (2012: 449) observes that "the *get*-passive has tendency to denote a resulting state of an event because of the action involved" and the findings from the COCA indicate that "the main predicates in the *get*-passive are mainly telic predicates", which supports the resultant state property of the *get*-passive since the eventuality the *get*-passive describes has an endpoint.

Property 4: Responsibility of the subject referent

The property of active involvement of the surface subject in the event in *get*-passives, as noted by Chappell (1980: 429) relying on Lakoff and Hatcher is frequently discussed in the literature (cf. Hundt 2001: 53; Kim 2012: 445). This property links the *get*-passive to the inchoative/resultative uses of the *get*+past participle construction.

Property 5: Adversative and beneficial semantics

It is widely agreed among linguists that the *get*-passive is used to express events and situations that have either adversative or beneficial connotation (cf. Chappell 1980, Siewierska 1984: 161, Fleisher 2006: 249; Hatcher 1949: 441). Lakoff (1971: 154) states that, unlike the *be*-passive, the *get*-passive in English is frequently used to reflect the attitude of the speaker towards the events described in the sentence. Corpus data have also shown that "the adversative implicature dominates strongly over the beneficial" (Collins, 1996: 52): out of the 291 central *get*-passives in his corpus, 196 or 67.4% have an adversative implicature, 68 or 23.4% are beneficial, while only 27 (9.3%) are neutral. Carter and McCarthy (1999: 50) also notice that "*get* coincides mostly, but not exclusively, with verbs referring to unfortunate events, or at least events perceived as unfortunate for the speaker".

2.2 The Macedonian passive constructions

The two passive constructions in Macedonian are not firmly established. Topolinjska (2008: 130) points out that they "show a tendency towards grammaticalization, although – due to many lexical and contextual barriers – it is difficult to speak about strictly grammaticalized diathetic distinctions". According to Koneski (1981: 382), there are no special verb forms for expressing passive in Macedonian, hence there is no real active-passive dichotomy. The categories used in Macedonian are clearly syntactic and not morphological. On the other hand, Minova-Gjurkova (1994: 167) states that in Macedonian there are two passive constructions: the periphrastic *sum*-passive and the reflexive *se*-passive form. She notes that, as opposed to the past, nowadays the *sum*-passive is more frequently used, both forms being equally common in the media (169).

The construction with the copula *sum* 'be' and the "verbal adjective" in -*n/-t* is typically used with transitive verbs and the affected participant is promoted to subject position agreeing with the verb. Yet, its more pronounced function is to demote the actor/causer and put emphasis on the results of the predication, rather than on the affected entity itself. Without contextual support this construction with the copula *sum* in present tense and a perfective verbal adjective is interpreted as resultative[6] (see 4a). The dynamic interpretation is contingent upon the lexical meaning of the verb and specific contextually conditioned circumstances, such as the tense of the auxiliary and a definite time point, as illustrated in (4b). Velkovska (1998: 85) claims that this construction is almost always ambiguous and only rarely can it unequivocally be declared as passive. This is related to the changes the Old Slavic passive participle has undergone, spreading from transitive to intransitive verbs and turning into a general participle (cf. Koneski 1986: 184–5).[7]

(4)   *a. Новиот закон* **е усвоен и објавен**.
          'The new law **has been passed and announced**.'
          b. Законот за пензионирање **беше изгласан** *во Собранието вчера*.
          'The retirement law **was/got passed** in the Parlament yesterday.'

Present tense with imperfective verbs is used in the passive only for habitual and general events, whereas this construction is impossible for expressing current present. According to Topolinjska (2008: 135), this feature of the *sum*-passive "is one of the reasons for the wide distribution of passive *se*-constructions in the Macedonian language".

Reflexive constructions are regularly used in all Slavic languages for expressing a wide range of voice alternations marking various departures from the typical transitive situation: from active reflexive, through middle to passive ones. They mark different degrees of demoting the initiator from the construction/

---

[6] Velkovska (1998: 21) distinguishes between resultative in a broad and in a narrow sense. The former (following Nedjalkov and Jahontov) is defined as a state, no matter if it is caused by a previous event or not, while the latter refers only to states presented as an outcome of a previously completed activity.

[7] It combines nowadays with *sum* to build perfect resultative (*Tie se dojdeni* 'They have arrived') and with *ima* 'have' for perfect tenses (*Imam/Imav plateno*. 'I have/had paid').

event. Macedonian has a rich inventory of these constructions (cf. Mitkovska 2011). The situations in which the subject referent is affected, but no outside actor/causer is implied are considered as representatives of middle diathesis/voice. According to Mitkovska and Bužarovska (2011: 5) the middle voice "involves only one participant whose semantic role contains characteristics of both initiator and undergoer". They comprise a range of reflexive constructions in which the affected entity is also an intentional or unintentional causer (e.g., autocausative: *se mie* 'wash', *se dviži* 'move'; emotional: *se raduva* 'rejoice'; resultative: *se povredi* 'get hurt'), or the event is viewed as an autonomous occurrence (e.g., anticausative: *se pojavi* 'appear').

At the passive pole *se*-constructions encode situations in which the initiating participant is not expressed as an argument in the syntactic structure of the sentence, but it is always present in the semantic structure, implied as an actor with a general feature [+human]. It can be expressed by an agentive prepositional phrase, though not frequently.[8] Macedonian reflexive passive occurs in all types of register and seems to be more grammaticalized than in some other Slavic languages, being more readily built with perfective verbs (5a) and equally possible with stative and dynamic verbs. It, however, displays ambiguity with various other types of *se*-constructions.

Formally, there are two types of *se*-passives: those which contain a transitive verb with an expressed second participant have a subject in the syntactic structure imposing agreement on the verb (5a); if the verb is intransitive, the subject position remains empty and the verb acquires an impersonal form – 3rd person singular, neuter with participles (5b).

(5)   *a. Сигурно може да **се најде** кавал.*
        'Surely a flute **can be found**.'
        *b. Секогаш во сейшември **се зборува** за дома.*
        '**One always talks** about home in September.'

(Mitkovska 2011: 181 and 185)

In view of the descriptions in this section, we can conclude that the Macedonian *sum*-passive construction shares morphological features both with the English *be*- and *get*-passive. However, it is functionally different as it more often places emphasis on the result from the event, thus constraining the dynamic interpretations. Considering that the *get*-passive has been reported to place emphasis on the resultant state (Vanrespaille 1991; Downing 1996; Kim 2012) it may be expected to be a good translation equivalent to the *sum*-passive. Yet the distributional and other properties of the *get*-passive, as well as its more dynamic nature, do not correlate with the *sum*-passive.

The Macedonian reflexive passive, however, is rather different from the English passives. It is largely a devise for promoting the event itself, abstracting the participants, especially the initiating one, but in its more grammaticalized uses it resembles the discourse functions of the English *be*-, and to some extent, of the *get*-passive. In a Macedonian – English contrastive study Mitkovska (2011: 182–188)

---

[8] See the possibilities in Mitkovska 1998 and 2011.

finds that reflexive passives with a promoted affected participant are equivalent to both *be*-passives (43%) and active constructions with a generalized or indefinite agent (*one, you, people* vs. *someone, they*) in the subject position (42%). For the subjectless ones, the latter tendency prevails (64%) while the *be*-passive is rarer (16%). There are no *get*-passive equivalents to the reflexive passive in this data, though constructions with *get* + past participle are found to correspond to various middle reflexives (about 10%): *se izgubi* 'get lost', *se isplaši* 'get scared', *se skrši* 'get broken'. Indeed, it has been pointed out in the literature that some English *get*-constructions express middle semantics and that in many cases they can evoke passive interpretation (see the discussion in Hundt 2001: 54–55).

This brief overview suggests that we are more likely to find English *get*-passives as equivalents to *sum*-passives than to reflexive passives. However, we expect that in many cases the translation equivalents will be of a different type.

3 Research procedure and results

The main goal of this research is to examine what Macedonian structures correspond to the English *get*-passive constructions and how the Macedonian passive structures relate to it. For that purpose we collected examples from translations in both directions (English-Macedonian and Macedonian-English). The sample consists of texts on various topics, novels and internet sources (authors and addresses are provided in the reference section). Data from the electronic databases, *ParaSol* and *MaCoCu_en_mk,* was extracted manually. *ParaSol* contains translations of fiction in Slavic and other (Indo)-European languages. We included examples from *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone* by J. K. Rowling, the only English-Macedonian parallel text in this database. *MaCoCu_en_mk* is a 23 879 769 words Macedonian-English parallel corpus on CLARIN.SI repository, encompassing website documents in both target languages.

To compile the database, first the English *get*+past participle constructions expressing typical passive voice were searched, which proved to be a challenging task. In some cases, as in example (6), it is clear that the subject referent is the recipient of the predication (*training*) and a separate agent that carries out the training is implied.

(6) *SEEU lecturers **get trained** at the University of Oregon.*
Предавачи од УЈИЕ на **обука** на Универзитетот во Орегон – Американско англиски институт .

(MaCoCu_en_mk)

However, in many cases the clause allowed more than one interpretation and the context offered no clear clues to determine its status. As pointed out above, this ambiguity between the passive and middle interpretation in some *get*+past participle constructions has been noticed by other authors (e.g., Quirk et al. 1985; Huddleston 1984; Hundt 2001: 52; Fleisher 2006: 230; Leech et al. 2009: 154). Such clauses were classified in an indeterminate passive/middle group. The

subject referent may be the intentional or unintentional causer[9] (autocausative, actional, emotional, resultative) or the event is presented as occurring autonomously (anticausative). For instance, the sentence in (7) is a typical example of passive/middle ambiguity: it can imply either that women in such states should not undergo vaccination (autocausative) or that medical stuff should not vaccinate those women (passive).

(7)   *Women who are pregnant or breastfeeding should also not **get vaccinated** as a precaution, [...]*
        […] жените кои се бремени или дојат, […], не би требало да **се вакцинираат**.

                                                                  (MaCoCu_en_mk)

Examples in which a corresponding Macedonian clause was missing or it expressed something quite different were discarded. Eventually, the database for the analysis comprised 135 *get*-passive sentences and 45 examples indeterminate between passive and middle voice reading. In the next stage the structures used in the corresponding Macedonian clauses were annotated and counted. The results for both groups are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. *Overall results*

Translation equivalents in Macedonian		get-passive		indeterminate middle/ passive	
		n	%	n	%
active	similar verb	24	18%	/	/
	different verb	16	12%	/	/
periphrastic passive		29	21%	1	2%
reflexive passive		17	13%	/	/
reflexive passive/middle		7	5%	10	22%
middle		15	11%	18	40%
nominalization		20	15%	13	30%
participle (verbal adjective)		0	0%	1	2%
free translation		7	5%	2	4%
total		135	100%	45	100%

In more than a third of the Macedonian equivalents we encounter active predicates. We find verbs with the same semantic structure as the English passive verb (8) as well as such in which a corresponding verb with a different distribution of the participants along syntactic positions is used. In (9) the verb *kill* is not translated

---

[9] Subject referents may serve different semantic roles, agent, causer and experiencer being the most typical ones. It is usual to use the term agent for animate referents acting intentionally, while causer implies no intention and may be animate or inanimate (e.g., Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 240). We use 'causer' as a cover term.

with the equivalent transitive verb 'ubiva', but with the intransitive *gine* 'perish' with the affected entity in the subject position.

(8)   *That's why Seekers **get fouled** so much.*
         Затоа трагачите многу ги **фаулираат**.

<div align="right">(ParaSol)</div>

(9)   *How come so many emigrants **get killed** on the railway tracks in Macedonia all of a sudden.*
         Како тоа одеднаш **гинат** толку многу емигранти на железничката пруга во Македонија.

<div align="right">(MaCoCu_en_mk)</div>

Passive equivalents make up another third of the *get*-passive sentences, where the dynamic periphrastic passive (10) dominates. In a few cases there is a possibility of stative interpretation in the Macedonian clause, which may depart more or less from the English counterpart (11).

(10)   *[…], and the more students **get thrown out**, the better, he'll think.*
         Колку повеќе ученици **ќе бидат исфрлени**, толку поарно за него.

<div align="right">(ParaSol)</div>

(11)   *So, whether immunity lasts weeks or days depends on the person who **gets infected**.*
         Дали имунитетот трае со недели или месеци, тоа зависи од лицето кое **е заразено**.

<div align="right">(MaCoCu_en_mk)</div>

Equivalents with the reflexive passive in Macedonian rarely allow a straightforward passive interpretation as in (12). Often the distinction between the passive and middle interpretation is blurred in the Macedonian *se*-construction: in (13) the way the event is interpreted does not affect the meaning. In a number of cases, however, a middle reading (autocausative or autonomous) is more likely (14). Verbs like *testira* 'test', *vakcinira* 'vaccinate', *operira* 'operate' when used with the reflexive marker strongly impose an autocausative interpretation in which the subject is presented as an initiator though it is the entity undergoing the activity.

(12)   *Skopje **is getting cleaned up** quickly, in order to leave a better impression for the tourists […]*
         Скопје забрзано **се чисти**, за да се остави што поубава слика пред очите на туристите […]

<div align="right">(MaCoCu_en_mk)</div>

(13)   *The government says that they have brought many foreign companies in the country and that many people **are getting employed**…*
         Од власта велат дека донеле многу странски фирми во државата и дека многу луѓе **се вработуваат**, …

<div align="right">(MaCoCu_en_mk)</div>

(14)   *Meanwhile, tens of thousands of ordinary people struggle to even **get tested***.
         Во меѓувреме, десетици илјади обични луѓе се борат само за да **се тестираат**.

                                                          (MaCoCu_en_mk)

Another type of equivalents that feature notably in our data are different types of nominalizations that represent the predicate; both verbal nouns in *–nje* as well as deverbal nouns, more or less remote from the verbal pole, are encountered. This is partly due to the property of the English passives to be used in non-finite forms (infinitive and gerund/present participle), which lack corresponding structures in Macedonian. If a verbal noun is used as an equivalent in Macedonian all verbal features are lost (15). It is possible to preserve the passive voice in the complement *da*-clause[10] (a common equivalent to the English infinitive), but a verbal or deverbal noun is also an option (16). However, for various, mainly stylistic reasons, nominalizations can also correspond to *get*-passive predicates in finite clauses (see example 6 and 17).

(15)   *Regardless if it is about getting a job or assistance, or about **getting promoted** at work [...]*
         Сеедно дали се работи за добивање работно место или одредена помош, или за одредено **напредување** во работата […]
                                                          (MaCoCu_en_mk)

(16)   *Branko Geroski the Editor of "Sloboden Pechat" who received threats to **get slapped** on twitter by Ljupcho Pavlevski, [...]*
         Бранко Героски, уредникот на "Слободен печат", кој доби закана за **шлаканица** на Твитер од Љупчо Палевски, […]
                                                          (MaCoCu_en_mk)

(17)   *I am convinced that the past stereotypes **are** slowly but steadily **getting forgotten***.
         Убеден сум дека оние стереотипи кои се присутни полека, но сигурно, **одат во историски заборав**.
                                                          (MaCoCu_en_mk)

Sentences with *get*+past participle exhibiting passive/middle ambiguity correspond most frequently to Macedonian reflexive constructions (about 60%), in which passive and middle reading may also be blurred (see example 7). Here, too, nominalizations are common in the Macedonian equivalents (18), while periphrastic passives and active predicates do not seem to correspond to the English examples in this sub-group.

(18)   *[...] the interest for **getting vaccinated** is increasing [...]*
         […] интересот за **вакцинација** секојдневно се зголемува, […]
                                                          (MaCoCu_en_mk)

---

[10] The construction with the modal particle *da* + present tense V has replaced the Old Slavic infinitive in Balkan Slavic.

The topic of the source texts has influenced the inventory of verbs that dominate in the indeterminate group: *vaccinate, inoculate* and *test*. These activities are performed on a person by a professional, but it is the affected person who, as a conscious adult, makes a decision about the treatment. Therefore, the affected entity is coded as the subject of an English *get*+past participle clause and in a reflexive construction in Macedonian. If the initiating aspect is more pronounced a middle interpretation prevails, but if the context foregrounds the affected aspect and the outside actor, a passive reading suggests itself. In Macedonian, the reflexive forms of these verbs (*se vakcinira, se imunizira, se testira*) are more likely to be interpreted as middle, unless it is clear that the subject referent is not an initiator: in example (19) babies cannot possibly initiate the activity.

(19)   *На Клиниката за гинекологија бебињата **не се вакцинираат** против туберкулоза.*
         (https://a1on.mk/macedonia/video-andonovski-neodgovornata-vlast-shto-gi-ostavi-bebinjata-4-meseci-bez-bszh-da-go-reshi-problemot/)
         'Babies **do not get vaccinated** against tuberculosis at the Gynaecology Ward.'

The English get-passive, on the other hand, may imply some subject responsibility despite the passive interpretation (cf. Hatcher, 1949; Lakoff, 1971; Collins, 1996; Hundt, 2001). Thus the English *get*+past participle counterparts of the Macedonian sentences with the discussed verbs, though equally oscillating between the adjectival/inchoative and passive interpretation, tend to lean towards the passive pole. It is, nevertheless, clear that the indeterminate *get*+past participle constructions correspond mainly to the Macedonian reflexive constructions.

4 Discussion

In this study we set off to examine the relation of the English *get*-passive to the corresponding voice structures in Macedonian. Despite the limited data, our findings point out some tendencies that merit further investigation. On the basis of the comparison of the two Macedonian passive voice constructions with the *get*-passive (section 2.2) we assumed that passive translation equivalents would not dominate and that, if passive was chosen, the periphrastic passive would be more frequent than the reflexive passive. The results (Table 1) confirmed these expectations: passive equivalents feature in one third of the central passive examples, 60% of those being periphrastic passive. A considerable portion of active equivalents was also expected, corroborating reports about the use of passive in Slavic languages (Sussex and Cubberley 2006). As similar English-Macedonian contrastive studies are lacking, these findings offer some indications that need to be further investigated on larger data.

We can draw some tentative conclusions regarding the question if the more frequent translation equivalents tend to occur in certain type of contexts. The periphrastic passive seldom occurs in present tense, which may be accounted by a strong resultative implication of such forms. The 6 examples we found evoke stative interpretation (see 11 above). Past tense forms are also rare (only 2). Most of the periphrastic passive equivalents are rendered with *bide,* perfective forms of the auxiliary (mainly in *da*-constructions), future tense (see 10 above) or conditional clauses. There are also two examples in which the imperfective form *biva* instead of *sum* is used, which preserves the dynamic aspect (20). However, as they occur in religious contexts they sound bookish and outdated.

(20)   *The self-loved man **gets easily cheated** by the devil [...]*
           Самоволниот лесно **бива прелажан** од ѓаволот […]
                                                                  (MaCoCu_en_mk)

The reflexive passive equivalents are used mainly for *get*-passive in present tense, most convincingly for present progressive, as in (12) and (13) above, which supports Topolinjska's (2008) claim that the *se*-passive is the only passive form expressing current events in Macedonian (see section 2.2). However, such equivalents are also found for habitual present. Furthermore, the *se*-passive from perfective verbs may correspond to the *get*-passive in infinitive clauses, though in our sample the periphrastic passive prevails.

Active counterparts are mainly used for finite *get*-passive clauses, both in present and in past tense. We noted that Macedonian often chooses a verb with a different mapping of semantic roles to syntactic positions, which allows to avoid the passive while preserving the same perspective of the English clause involving departure from the affected entity. This indicates that passive voice in Macedonian is not used in the same way as in English. However, a more in-depth analysis of Macedonian active counterparts of *get*-passives focusing on the discourse status of the participants is needed in the future. Such study may yield more insights into the nature and the use of Macedonian passive constructions.

Our relatively small sample does not allow reaching definite conclusions regarding possible syntactic, semantic or functional conditions that may influence the choice of the Macedonian equivalents of the English *get*-passive. Looking at the presence of the *by*-phrase encoding the demoted subject and the nature of the subject referent in the *get*-passive clause we came to the following findings: only ten examples with a *by*-phrase were found, six with an animate and four with an inanimate causer.[11] Though this phrase more clearly indicates a passive perspective which should be rendered by passive counterparts in Macedonian, we find (Table 2) that the periphrastic passive (see 20 above) occurs only in three of these cases, while half of the examples have active voice counterparts (21).

---

[11] The *by*-phrase is rarely used in *get*-passive clauses (cf. Carter and McCarthy 1999).

Table 2. *Equivalents of passive clauses with a by-phrase*

Translation equivalents		active	periphrastic passive	reflexive passive	middle	total
get-passive with a *by*-phrase	animate actor	2 (same v) 1 (diff. v)	2	1		6
	inanimate actor	2 (diff. v)	1		1	4
	total	5	3	1	1	10

(21)   *Seekers are always the ones who **get clobbered** <u>by the other team</u> [...]*
       *<u>Противничкиот тим</u> секогаш сака да ги **онеспособи** трагачите [...]*

(ParaSol)

The subject in *get*-passive clauses is typically animate, which is confirmed in our sample: only 19 out of 135 examples have inanimate subjects. Inanimate subjects are considered a sign of further grammaticalization of the passive use (Hundt 2001: 75), hence such clauses are expected to have passive counterparts. However, our data show that all types of equivalents are found (Table 3). The amount of reflexive passive equivalents (around 30%) mirrors the affinity of the reflexive passive to choose inanimate subjects, a tendency that calls for further investigation.

Table 3. *Equivalents of clauses with inanimate subject*

Translation equivalents	active	periphrastic passive	reflexive passive	middle	nominalization	free transl.	total
get-passive with an inanimate subject	5	3	6	1	3	1	19

The documents we excerpted the examples from contained numerous sentences with *get*+past participle that suggested mainly a middle reading, but some could also be interpreted as passives. It seems that even contextual support is often not enough to resolve the ambiguity, which is probably frequently contingent upon subjective factors, as noted by Carter and McCarthy (1999: 54): "The key to understanding the *get*-passive is that it highlights the stance of the speaker in context towards the event and the grammatical subject." We selected and analysed the most indeterminate examples for comparison with the central passive group. It turned out that they exhibited a different ratio of equivalents, showing the closest affinity with the Macedonian reflexive middle constructions and reflexive passives, often also displaying middle/passive ambiguity (example 7 above). This indicates a con-

nection between the English *get*-passive and the middle voice, a property that accounts for its grammaticalization path to the passive (Haspelmath 1990; Mitkovska and Bužarovska 2011). An in-depth comparison with the Macedonian reflexive constructions may provide more insights into the middle to passive development in the *get*+past participle construction.

5 Concluding remarks

In this paper we present an analysis of the English *get*-passive construction and its equivalents in Macedonian. The study has shown that in Macedonian there are multiple structures that can represent translation equivalents of the English *get*-passive: active (with a similar or a different verb), the two passive structures in Macedonian – periphrastic and reflexive passive, middle, nominalization, participle (verbal adjective) and free translation. As expected, most commonly used in this case is the active voice due to the pragmatically governed word order in Macedonian (Bužarovska 2020) in comparison to the grammaticalized linearization in English, which allows agent demotion or patient promotion without the use of passive forms. As for the two types of passive in Macedonian, the periphrastic passive features more frequently than the reflexive passive, which supports our observation that the *get*-passive shares more properties with the *sum*-passive than with the *se*-passive. Moreover, regarding the English examples involving middle/passive ambiguity, we noticed that their Macedonian equivalents were reflexive middle and passive constructions, an observation that warrants further consideration. Despite the limited number and style range of the analysed examples, these conclusions, supported by theoretical claims, may serve as a basis for future more extensive investigation of the Macedonian counterparts of the English *get*-constructions.

Bibliography

Alexiadou, A. (2005). A note on non-canonical passives: the case of the *get* passive. In H. Broekhuis, N. Corver, R. Huybregts, U. Kleinhenz, and J. Koster (eds.). *Organizing Grammar: Linguistic Studies in Honor of Henk van Riemsdijk*, 13-21. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Anderwald, L. (2017). GET, GET-constructions and the GET-passive in 19th-century English: Corpus analysis and prescriptive comments. In S. Hoffmann, A. Sand, and S. Arndt-Lappe (eds). *Studies in Variation, Contacts and Change in English*, Vol. 18. Helsinki: Varieng. [Online] Available from: https://varieng.helsinki.fi/series/volumes/18/anderwald/ [Accessed: March 30th, 2023]

Biber, D., Johnson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., and Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow: Pearson.

Carter, R. and McCarthy, M. (1999). The English *get*-passive in spoken discourse: Description and implications for an interpersonal grammar. *English Language and Linguistics,* 3 (1): 41–58. DOI: 10.1017/S136067439900012X

Chappell, H. (1980). Is the g*et*-passive adversative? *Papers in Linguistics: International Journal of Human Communication,* 13 (3): 411–451. DOI: 10.1080/08351818009370504

Collins, P. C. (1996). *Get*-passives in English. *World Englishes,* 15: 43–56. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-971X.1996.tb00091.x

Downing, A. (1996). The semantics of get-passives. In R. Hasan, C. Cloran, and D. Butt (eds). *Functional descriptions. Theory in practice,* 179–205. Amsterdam: Benjamins. doi.org/10.1075/cilt.121.07dow

Fleisher, N. (2006). The origin of passive *get. English Language and Linguistics,* 10: 225–252. doi.org/10.1017/S1360674306001912

Fried, M. (2006). Demoting the agent: Passive, middle and other voice phenomena. In B. Lyngfelt and T. Solstad (eds.). *Agent-backgrounding as a functional domain: Reflexivization and passivization in Czech and Russian*, 83−110. Amsterdam: Benjamins. doi.org/10.1075/la.96

Haspelmath, M. (1990). The grammaticization of passive morphology. *Studies in Language,* 14: 25–72.

Hatcher, A. G. (1949). To *get/be* invited. *Modern Language Notes*, 64: 433–446.

Huddleston, R. (1984). *Introduction to the grammar of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Hundt, M. (2001). What corpora can tell us about the grammaticalisation of voice in *get*-constructions. *Studies in Language,* 25 (1): 49–88. doi.org/10.1075/sl.25.1.03hun

Kazenin, K. (2001). The passive voice. In M. Haspelmath, E. König, W. Österreicher and W. Raible (eds.) *Language typology and language universals. An International Handbook*, 899–916. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Kim, J. B. (2012). English Get-Passive Constructions: A Corpus-Based Approach. *Studies in Generative Grammar,* 22 (2): 437–457. DOI: 10.15860/SIGG.22.2.201205.437

Kulikov, L. (2011). Voice typology. In J.J. Song (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Typology*, 368–398. Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199281251.013.0019

Lakoff, R. (1971). Passive resistance. *Papers from the Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 7: 149–162.

Leech, G., Hundt, M., Mair, C. and Smith, N. (2009). *Change in Contemporary English: A Grammatical Study*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Siewierska, A. (1984). *The Passive: A Comparative Linguistic Analysis*. London: Croom Helm.

Mitkovska, L. (1998). The *se*-Passive in Macedonian Compared to the Neighbouring Slavic Languages. *Studia Linguistica Polono-Meridianoslavica*, 9: 47–60.

Mitkovska, L. and Bužarovska, E. (2011). An Alternative Analysis of the English *Get*-Past Participle Constructions: Is *Get* All That Passive? *Journal of English Linguistics,* 20 (10): 1-20. doi.org/10.1177/0075424211418978

Sussex, R. and Cubberley, P. (2006). *The Slavic Languags*. Cambridge University Press.

Schwarz, S. (2018). *Passive voices: BE-, GET- and prepositional passives in recent American English*. PhD Dissertation. Uppsala University.

Taranto, G. (2005). *An event structure analysis of the causative and passive get*. Ms,. University of California, San Diego.

Vanrespaille, M. (1991). A semantic analysis of the English get-passive. *Interface*, 5: 95–112.

Бужаровска, Е. (2020). Информациската структура и синтаксата на простата реченица во македонскиот јазик. *Современа филологија*, 4 (1): 7–19. [Bužarovska, E. (2020). Informaciskata struktura i sintaksata na prostata rečenica vo makedonskiot jazik. *Journal of Contemporary Philology*, 4 (1): 7–19.] doi.org/10.37834/JCP21410041b

Велковска, С. (1998). *Изразување на резултативност во македонскиот стандарден јазик*. Скопје: ИМЈ. [Velkovska, S. (1998). *Izrazuvanje na rezultativnost vo makedonskiot standarden jazik*. Skopje: IMJ.]

Конески, Б. (1981). *Граматика на македонскиот литературен јазик*. Култура: Скопје. [Koneski, B. (1981). *Gramatika na makedonskiot literaturen jazik*. Skopje: Kultura.]

Конески, Б. (1986). *Историја на македонскиот јазик*. Култура: Скопје. [Koneski, B. (1986). *Istorija na makedonskiot jazik*. Skopje: Kultura.]

Минова-Ѓуркова, Л. (1994). *Синтакса на македонскиот стандарден јазик*. Скопје: Магор. [Minova-Gjurkova, L. (1994). *Sintaksa na makedonskiot standarden jazik*. Skopje: Magor.]

Митковска, Л. (2011). *Македонските се-конструкции и нивните еквиваленти во англискиот јазик*. Скопје: Македонска реч. [Mitkovska, L. (2011). *Makedonskite se-konstrukcii i nivnite ekvivalenti vo angliskiot jazik*. Skopje: Makedonska reč.]

Тополињска, З. (2008). *Полски-македонски граматичка конфронтација: развиток на граматичките категории*. Скопје: МАНУ. [Topolinjska, Z. (2008). *Polsko-makedonski. gramatička konfrontacija: razvitok na gramatičkite kategorii*. Skopje: MANU.]

Sources of examples

ParaSol English-Macedonian parallel texts. http://parasolcorpus.org/

von Waldenfels, Ruprecht and Meyer, Roland (2006-) *ParaSol, a Corpus of Slavic and Other Languages.* Bern, Regensburg. [Accessed 25.05.2021]

MaCoCu_en_mk Macedonian-English parallel corpus.

Bañón, Marta; et al., 2022, Macedonian-English parallel corpus MaCoCu-mk-en 1.0, Slovenian language resource repository CLARIN.SI, ISSN 2820-4042, http://hdl.handle.net/11356/1513 . [Accessed 19.02.2023]

Старова, Л. (1992). *Татковите книги*. Битола: Микена. / Starova, L. (2012). *My Father's Books*, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press. Translated from Macedonian by Christina E. Kramer.

Алабаков, К. *Мојот партизански живот* /Alabakov, K. *My Partisan Life* http://www.pollitecon.com/html/ebooks/Index.htm. Translator not indicated.

Gaughran, R. "The Tour Guide"/ Гофрен, Р. "Туристички водич", *Blesok,* no. 12. https://blesok.mk/en/literature/the-tour-guide-12/ Translated from English by Lenče Miloševska. [Accessed 20.02.2020]