ТІЛ БІЛІМІНІҢ МӘСЕЛЕЛЕРІ

ПРОБЛЕМЫ ЯЗЫКОЗНАНИЯ

PROBLEMS OF LINGUISTICS

SRSTI 16.01.09 DOI: 10.59102/kufil/2026/iss3pp9-26

L. Aminova[1], K. Tekzhanov[2], Sh.Trent[3], *F. Yerekhanova[4]
[1]Innovative-Type Secondary School named after A.Baitusunuly, Pavlodar, 140006, Kazakhstan
[2]Pavlodar Pedagogical University named after A.Margulan, Pavlodar, 140002, Kazakhstan
[3]Autism Spectrum Program "Giving Hearts Homecare", New London, Connecticut, 06320, USA
[4]O. Zhanibekov South Kazakhstan Pedagogical University, Shymkent, 160012, Kazakhstan

THE HAVE CONSTRUCTION IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE

The article aims to reveal the key features that make the English "have" a complex construct, thus contributing to its placement in the category of have-type constructions in a systemic functional framework. The paper also focuses on the idea that it is not meant to create any direct equivalence or to draw any contrast between the two languages in any detail, but rather to look at how each language uses its respective constructions to convey relational meanings such as possession, existence, and attribute. From a methodological standpoint, the research makes use of transformational analysis, comparative analysis, and semantic analysis. The transformation analysis involves the examination of the transformation of sentence structures based on the type of transformation applied. Comparative analysis is concerned with the identification of similarities and differences between languages. Finally, the research makes use of semantic analysis in the interpretation of the meaning of the data. The research data was collected from various natural sources such as literary pieces, spoken language, and written language. Moreover, the research makes use of the application of the "have" construction in the analysis of its frequency.

The results show that the English word "have" is highly multifunctional, not only being used to indicate possession but also to indicate states of relations, physical experiences, and even attributes that could be interpreted as being related to the social and emotional spheres. Consequently, the conclusion is that the study underscores the point that the distinction between English and Russian in the expression of possession and relational concepts is best exemplified by the direct use of "have" constructions in English. In addition, the study is significant to the understanding of the role of language in the formation and expression of cognitive processes.

Key words: attributive logic, comparative linguistics, constructions, lexemes, linguistic phenomenon, transformational method, structures

MAIN PROVISIONS

In this regard, it is worth noting that the main goal of the present research is to explore the multifunctional characteristics of the *have* construction in English from a systemic functional and cross-linguistic point of view. The main aim of this research is to explore the multifunctional characteristics of the *have* construction in English from both systemic functional and cross-linguistic perspectives. Specifically, it seeks to analyze the syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic roles of *have*, emphasizing its multifunctionality and centrality in expressing possession, relational, and experiential states. Additionally, the study aims to compare these features with the Russian *be* construction to highlight cross-linguistic differences and similarities in how relational concepts are expressed. Moreover, the study is significant to the understanding of the typological variety of linguistic

ISSN 2788-7979 (online)

strategies used to express relational concepts. It is also significant to the understanding of the importance of the combination of systemic and functional linguistics and cross-linguistic studies.

This research focuses on the *have* construction as a fundamental and distinctive feature of the English language, marked by its particular combination of structural and semantic properties. It also refers to typological variation between English and Russian, in which Russian primarily uses the *be-construction* to express states of existence, relations, and attributes. English, on the contrary, heavily uses the verb *have* to describe the same. It is to be noted here that English does not limit the use of the verb *have* to the concept of possession; rather, it is also used with great significance to describe various forms of relations such as existence, attribution, personal experience, and obligation. This research also proves the importance of the *have* construction in the overall structure and meaning of the English language.

This study also aims to emphasize the importance of the concept of *have* in relation to the overall structure and meaning in English. This study aims to explore this concept and to better understand how English differs from other languages in the nuances of human experience. The main directions and aspects of approaches to this particular provision include:

1. Typological and Cross-Linguistic Comparison

- Comparison of the differences between English and Russian in expressing states, possession, and relations.
- Comparison of the specific role of *have* in contrast to the use of the verb *be* in Russian.

2. a) An examination of the multifunctionality of the word *have* concerning the expression of possession, existence, attribution, experience, and obligation.

b) An understanding of the multifunctionality of the word *have* based on the cognitive and communicative needs of the speaker.

3. Structural and Syntactic Approaches

- An examination of the structural forms of the word *have* and its differences with similar forms in other languages.
- An understanding of the structural forms concerning the syntactic structure.

4. Contrastive and Comparative Approaches

- An examination of the word *have* in English concerning its similarities and differences with similar forms in other languages.
- Understanding of the role of typological differences in the structures of other languages.

Research on the *have* construction in English has been extensively discussed in various linguistic articles. The linguistic issues associated with the "have" construction include the grammatical, semantic, and typological characteristics of the *have* construction.

The linguistics of the *have* construction in the English language has been a focus of attention of various linguistic theories, which proves the significance of the *have* construction in the systems of the English language. Among the works on the 'have' construction in the history of linguistics, the study carried out by M. Halliday in the 1999s on the systemic functional linguistics of the English verb *have* is worth mentioning, as this study provides a detailed description of the multifunctionality of the *have* construction in the expression of the concepts of possession, obligation, and experience. In this respect, the importance of the *have* construction in the English language is emphasized by Halliday from the systemic point of view, which is in accordance with the contemporary linguistic research on the multifunctionality of the *have* construction [1]

Following the semantic dimensions, D.M. Perlmutter explores the many semantic characteristics of *have*, specifically in terms of its ability to convey possession, existence, and other relationship connotations [2]. This study is also consistent with its focus on the multifunctionality and cognitive value of "have" beyond mere possession.

G. Leech further examines the syntactic and structural aspects of *have*, offering insight into its grammatical forms and constructions in English. His analysis clarifies how *have* interacts with syntactic structures, which is essential for contrasting its use with the Russian *be* construction [3].

Regarding domestic researchers, the majority of Kazakhstani studies address the topic within more general comparative linguistics, translation studies, or multilingualism studies, like the works

ISSN 2788-7979 (online)

of Y.A.Zhuravleva and A.E.Agmanova [4] Beiskhanova et al. [5] and there is comparatively less direct research on the verb *have* in comparison to its Russian equivalents.

Although there is extensive knowledge about the grammatical, semantic, and typological characteristics of the word *have* through the literature, the majority of the research has addressed these issues individually and in terms of specific languages. The purpose of the current research is to incorporate these views and shed light on the multifunctionality and the value of the word *have* in the English language, especially when compared with the Russian language, in terms of states, relations, and existence.

These articles, among others, may help a linguist gain an understanding of the complexity of the word *have*. The publications mentioned above can be obtained through linguistic publications such as "Language", "Linguistic Inquiry", "English Language and Linguistics", and "Corpus Linguistics". For specific publications, JSTOR, Scopus, Google Scholar, and ResearchGate may also be consulted for information retrieval.

INTRODUCTION

An important issue that is taken into consideration in this paper is that there is no direct equivalent of the English *have* in Russian, which makes it very difficult to draw any comparisons and thus calls for an in-depth analysis of functional and contextual similarities and dissimilarities. The analysis shows that the word *have* in English is related to cognitive schemas that involve the concepts of possession and experience. The Russian word *be* is predominantly used as an existential word, and the multifunctionality is not significant with respect to the expression of possession and experiences.

It should be noted that sentences conveying the action of the subject can be constructed according to the formula of attributive logic. Sentences constructed according to the subject–attribute scheme include not only sentences with intransitive verbs (such as to live, hate, smile, hope, etc.), but also sentences with transitive and intransitive verbs (to read, write, hear, feel). With a shift in logical accents, this article may also include sentences with transitive marginal verbs (give, take, send, lose, touch).

The linguistic characteristics of English and Russian present a fascinating area of study, yet the inherent differences in their grammatical frameworks pose significant challenges for direct comparison. Future research could explore alternative aspects of relational dynamics in Russian and examine how these variations influence perception and expression. Expanding the study to include other languages with structures similar to English or Russian could also yield valuable insights into this fascinating linguistic landscape. In English, the formula a R b is often used to establish relations between objects in the real world. For instance:

"I have a teacher" or "He has a woman in his room".

However, this formula can also be used to manifest the subject, for example:

"I have blue eyes" or "I have to do it".

Because English is ambiguous, contextual semantic connections are widely used to compensate for the lack of clearly defined morphological forms. In contrast, Russian has a well-developed morphological system that enables it to establish connections between the subject and its sign, as well as between two subjects when the relations between them are already fixed in their morphological forms.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Materials

The research data and specimens

The data and specimens used in the research were obtained from modern literature. Samples of English and Russian speech were collected through continuous sampling methods. We have analyzed the lexical and semantic group of the verb *have* in English-Russian language literature using a corpus consisting of 2,898 pages.

ISSN 2788-7979 (online)

The semantics of a sentence, that is, the main function, is the formation and expression of a complete thought, which cannot be understood without referring to logic, which explains the relationship between the thought and the linguistic form of its expression [6], [7], [8]. It is known that modern logic distinguishes two schemes of the logical structure of the judgment. Attributive logic uses a scheme introduced by Aristotle, which reflects the relationship between the subject and the attribute attributed to it (S is P). In contrast to attributive logic, the logic of relations provides a three-part division of judgments that establishes a relation between two objects (aRb). A similar opinion has been expressed by linguists who regard a sentence as a linguistic analogue of a judgment Hu et al [9], M. Grigoroglou & P.A. Ganea [10] note that a logical and linguistic justification is given for the existence of two principles of utterance construction in language. Language is dynamic and ever-evolving. Language is therefore neither consistent nor stable Pirmanova et al. [11], Saurbayev et al. [12], G. Akhmetova [13], Wei et al [14], A.Issina [15].

The reflection of the object in the real world in human consciousness occurs either according to the principle of subordination (where the subject is the attribute attributed to it) or according to the principle of autonomy (where certain relations connect two relatively independent objects). The first principle leads to a centripetally oriented statement, and the second to a centrifugally oriented one. This approach allows us to speak of two forms of correlation of our thinking with reality: qualitative (revealing the essence of the reflected object, its being in a certain manifestation) and quantitative (giving access to a new subject)

Since on the linguistic level, the described logical formulas find their expression in the structures of the verb to be on the one hand and with the *to have* on the other hand, it seems possible for us to speak about the structure of a simple sentence either according to the principle of being or according to the principle of having.

Depending on which of the two possible types of syntactic structures prevails in the language, it is referred to as be-constructions or as have-constructions. However, the criteria for assigning a language to a particular group are not yet sufficiently developed.

Research methods

The study uses a transformational method, a comparative method, and methods of semantic and contextual analysis. It also utilizes a combination of methodological approaches to ensure a thorough analysis.

Transformational Method: This method involves reconfiguring data or concepts to underlying principles and relationships. It aids in understanding the interaction and transformation of various elements within the studied phenomena.

By using the transformational method to analyze the have-construction, it is possible to gain an in-depth knowledge about the syntactic and semantic properties of the have-construction. This method helps achieve a better knowledge of the linguistic structure and the expression of ownership in different languages. The method reveals significant insights into the concepts of language, existence, and the cultural aspects embedded in language.

Comparative Method: This enables the assessment of similarities and differences among various subjects or cases. By contrasting different examples, it provides insights into distinctive characteristics and broader trends. The comparative analysis employed in our study involves comparing English, a have-construction, to its equivalent in Russian, a to be construction.

The comparative method also highlights an interesting distinction between languages based on how they express possession and existence. In English, possession is typically indicated using a form of the verb “to have” (as in “I have a book”), while in Russian, possession is often expressed using a form of the verb “to be” (as in “У меня есть книга”, which translates to “At me is a book”).

We use the semantic method to explore not just the meaning of a word, but also its role within the context. It focuses on the semantic approach to examine the different meanings of the word *have* in modern English. Without considering semantics, any analysis would be incomplete.

Contextual Analysis: This approach highlights the significance of the surrounding context in understanding the subjects under study. By considering historical and social contexts, it offers a richer and more understanding of the data.

ISSN 2788-7979 (online)

Contextual analysis is employed to discern the characteristics of the usage of the verb *have* in various contexts, as well as to comprehend its equivalence in the Russian language.

Theoretical Framework

The design of the research

The objective of this research is to examine the intricacies of English and Russian and to elucidate the distinctive characteristics of English as a have-construction.

Although in the preceding studies, the multifunctionality of the English *have* construction and its role in organizing the English language meaning have been emphasized, still little is known about how this construction is used from a typological perspective in comparison with the Russian language, which mainly employs the *be* construction in describing similar states and relations. In addition, little is known about how the multifunctionality of *have* construction influences its syntactic, semantic, and cognitive properties in comparison with the typological properties of the Russian language.

Central Research Question

How does the *have* construction in English function as a multifunctional linguistic tool in various syntactic and semantic contexts? Moreover, what are the differences in the typological usage of the *have* construction in English and the *be* construction in Russian?

Theoretical Base of the Research

The theoretical framework of the research is based on Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), which treats language as a multifunctional resource for social and cognitive purposes and helps in the analysis of the multifunctionality of the *have* construction in the English language. It also includes cross-linguistic typology in the analysis of the structural differences and similarities between languages, such as the use of the *have* verb in the English language and the use of the verb *быть* (to be) in the Russian language. Moreover, cognitive linguistics is also included in the research as a theoretical framework because it treats language as a reflection of underlying conceptual schemas, such as the concept of ownership. It is also evident in the research paper that there is a comparative analysis done between the two languages, namely English and Russian.

RESULTS

The meaning of proper possession. This meaning largely depends on the semantics of nominal groups. It presupposes the presence of a subject of possession (an animate person) and an object of possession (a specific type of property). Examples that demonstrate the desemantization of the verb *have* and the predominance of predicate-object connections can support this.

The use of *have* in English expresses not only possession in the strict sense but also a broader range of relational states, such as emotional experiences. The predominance of interrogative and negative forms emphasizes these relational aspects, bringing them closer to qualitative descriptions of the subject. This multifaceted use of *have* showcases the complexity of English as a have-construction and contrasts sharply with how Russian articulates similar concepts through different grammatical constructions, enriching the study of language and meaning in both contexts.

The comparison between English as a have-construction and Russian showcases significant differences in how possession and relationship concepts are linguistically constructed. English expresses ownership directly through the verb *have* emphasizing personal agency, while Russian relies on an existential framing that reflects contextual relationships. These distinctions resonate with broader cultural views on ownership, agency, and existence, providing deeper insights into the nature of language and thought in each linguistic tradition.

Frequency and features of the use of the word "have" in English and Russian

The data reveals an interesting disparity with regard to the usage of the English verb *have* as compared to its usage in the Russian language. In the novel “The Fate of Man” by M. Sholokhov, the usage of the English verb *to have* is recorded at merely three instances in the original Russian novel. However, in the English translation of the novel, the usage of the English verb *to have* is recorded at an astonishing 227 instances. This disparity reveals that the English language makes greater usage of

ISSN 2788-7979 (online)

the English verb *to have* with regard to the expression of possession and relationships as compared to the Russian language, which may be using different grammatical structures and verbs to express the same concepts and relationships. It is interesting to note that only 23 of these cases refer to strict possession.

Semantic variations of the word "have"

The analysis demonstrates that "have" is employed in English not solely for proper possession but also extensively to express a wide array of relational states, including emotional experiences, qualities, abilities, and social attributes. For example, "His eyes have a misted oily look" shows "have" in the function of conveying a qualitative feature. In a similar vein, "You have the talent" or "They have no respect" illustrate "have" in conveying ability and moral qualities.

The function of *have* in conveying physical or mental states is seen in "I have a bad pain" or "He has to come close to it."

The function of *have* in conveying aspects of the subject's physical appearance, behavior, or costume extends its semantic function beyond possession.

Structural and syntactic patterns

Research has shown that the use of *have* yields a sentence with a word order of subject-predicate word order, as well as a predicate-object word order. This kind of word order may carry a different meaning. For instance, the sentence "His mouth is slack" can be rewritten as "His mouth has a slackness."

It is possible to employ the verb *have* in a sentence with causality, obligation, and futurity, as well as "have to do" and "have smth to do" as a modal verb.

The word order of this kind of sentence may carry great meaning.

Another pattern is the utilization of passive voice in sentences, which might be used to describe a state of activity without referring to the "actor" in the sentence, e.g., "The cards have been read."

Interlanguage differences

The comparison with Russian reveals contrasting grammatical frameworks. Russian is predominantly an existential language, while English makes direct use of the verb *have* to indicate possession, relational states, and qualitative attributes. For example, the Russian language may indicate possession using the existential sentence structure ("У него есть книга" – 'He has a book'), while the English language simply states it as 'He has a book,' which has multiple semantic implications.

findings

Special Constructions and Modal Shades

Analysis reveals that *have* is used in modal and future constructions, as in "I have to do this." This is used to convey the sense of obligation or necessity. This type of construction can sometimes involve changes in word order and can be ambiguous at times. For instance, "He had the wad hidden" can be used in a manner where more emphasis is given to either "wad" or "hidden," depending on the situation or the intended meaning by the speaker.

Moreover, the ambiguous use of the word *have* in a transitional manner is often observed, especially when the lack of differentiation is evident in terms of the relationship between the subject and predicate within the sentence. In such cases, there is ambiguity concerning the purpose and usage of each word in the sentence.

In fact, the concept of proper possession itself is based on the semantic meaning of nominal groups in a sentence. The concept of proper possession is a phrase that has two main aspects in relation to possession, and these two aspects relate to the subject of possession, who or which is normally animate, and the object of possession, which is a property/object that can be possessed by a particular individual or being. In the phrase "John's book," John is the subject of possession, while the object of possession is a book. This is a very simple and clear concept, as this concept normally involves a Subject-object relationship.

However, the use of the verb "have" in English extends beyond this classical notion of possession. It also extends to a wider variety of relational states beyond ownership itself. For instance, "have" is used to express emotional states ("I have a headache"), qualities or characteristics ("He has

ISSN 2788-7979 (online)

a kind heart"), abilities ("She has the skill to succeed"), and social or moral qualities ("They have respect for their elders"). The versatility of *have* in these different senses illustrates that it is a flexible word that may convey different kinds of relationships, which are not limited to ownership.

Additionally, the fact that the language predominantly utilizes interrogative and negative syntactical forms such as "Do you have...?", "He does not have...?" places greater emphasis on the relational and qualitative nature of *have*, making these states more prominent and closer in meaning to qualitative and relational expressions rather than possession per se. These forms tend to change the focus from possession to the experiential state of the subject, which somewhat confuses the two concepts. The multifaceted usage of the *have* concept in the English language is indicative of the complexity and the dual nature of the "have" construction that can be both concrete and abstract at the same time.

When comparing this to Russian, significant differences emerge in how concepts of possession and relationship are linguistically constructed. Russian grammar often relies on existential sentences such as "У него есть книга," meaning literally "There is a book with him." In this case, it is clear that the main emphasis is on the existence or presence of something within a particular context rather than on possession in a literal sense. The Russian construction seems to stress the contextual or relational nature of possession, which can be a function of a more general worldview in which possession is seen as a form of existence or a relationship within a particular context.

In contrast, the word *have* in English highlights personal involvement, ownership, and control. The subject is actively involved in having or holding the object, which is in line with individualistic cultural values of ownership and personal responsibility. This difference also brings to mind another contrast between cultures: in Western cultures, personal ownership and rights are highly valued, which is also reflected in the use of the word *have*, whereas in Russian culture and other Slavic cultures, there is a greater emphasis on situational or relational aspects of ownership, rather than personal involvement.

Thus, it may be argued in a nutshell that the difference in the use of possession in English and Russian may be said to be rooted in the cultural and cognitive differences in how we view or conceptualise the world. It can thus be argued that the usage of the word *have* in English can thus be said to be multifunctional in the sense that it can thus be used to refer to possession, emotions, qualities, and social attributes with a connotation of personal agency and control, whereas in Russian it is rooted in the existence and context of possession as a way of looking at the world as situations.

DISCUSSION

The usage of the word *have*, as observed in the above sentence, is quite evident in complex sentences, particularly when the sentence contains a phrase or a clause.

"Remember that old doctor they had years ago?" where the content of the message is not a subject-predicate but a predicate-object relationship – the presence of a doctor. The indetermination of the link between them and the feasibility of bracing the subject-predicate or the object-predicate relationship, on the other hand, leads the verb *have* to convey a wide variety of meanings in each specific instance of its use. Let us consider each of them in comparison with the Russian version.

For instance:

What I do have. I have toilet articles, a few clothes, a hot plate that I'm not supposed to have, a can opener – one that works with a key, you know; a knife, two forks and two spoons; three plates, a cup, a saucer, a drinking glass (Modern).

We never had enough clothes to wear, not enough food to eat (Huxley). Such restrictions imposed on the semantics of nominal groups make the use of *have* in the meaning of proper possession a rather rare phenomenon. This can be confirmed by the following example:

... And his uncle, I know, insists that he must carefully have mentioned having them (the bonds) in his possession (Huxley), where the clarification in his possession indicates the desemantization of the verb *have*. The predicate-object relation manifests itself in the presence of a statement about the

ISSN 2788-7979 (online)

existence of an object, and the subject-predicate relation shows the subordinate position of that object with respect to a particular person.

As mentioned earlier, the object of the real world is reflected in our consciousness either in one of its qualitative manifestations or in its relation to other objects of reality. Structures with *have* are objectively suitable for both kinds of reflection since we have both a subject-predicate and a predicate-object relation. Thus, structures with *have* can easily be reinterpreted as a qualitative property of the subject, for example:

His eyes have a misted, oily look, and his mouth is slack (O'Neill).

The *have* constructions with the meaning of the qualitative characteristic of the subject are used here along with the initial structure for expressing this meaning, built according to the formula of attributive logic (*his mouth is slack*). The construction itself with HAVE is also easily transformed into the primary structure for such a function:

His eyes are misty and oily. Compare also: *All his teachers told us what a fine brain he had* (O'Neill) → *All the teachers told us how clever he was.*

The HAVE structures can convey a wide variety of subject characteristics:

1. Description of the subject:

a) The subject's appearance. For example:

Her face had a pretty regularity that was almost doll-like (Huxley);

...they've such bloody hard necks (Modern);

Val looks beyond her in the dim store, his light eyes have a dark gaze. (T. Williams).

b) Abilities of the subject. For example:

You had the talent to become a fine actor. You have it still.

You have neither the wit nor the courage.

c) Moral qualities of the subject. *For example:*

The youth of the present is quite monstrous. They have no respect for dyed hair. (O. Wilde);

Jesus, Papa, haven't you any pride or shame? (E. O'Neill).

In this case, the second nominal group can be expressed not only by an abstract noun (a name of a certain quality) but also by a noun of very specific semantics used in a metaphorical meaning.

For instance:

Does not have a tongue like an adder when he's drunk. (E. O'Neil);

I don't think you belong in the nursing profession; you have cold eyes; I think you like to watch pain! (T. Williams).

d) Profession, occupation, and education of the subject. *For example:*

It is a good thing to have an education behind you (M. Spark);

I have an executive position with a small publishing house (Modern).

d) Name of the subject. *For example:*

But we have the same Christian name (O. Wilde).

e) The behaviour of the subject. For instance:

She has a hesitant, over-polite manner and speaks with a slight accent (L. Hellman).

You had a strange way of showing your restlessness (Night).

f) Elements of the subject's costume. For example:

She has on a party dress, covered by a kitchen apron (L. Hellman).

A qualitative characteristic through the structure with HAVE can refer not only to an animated person:

These sets are that all the volumes have the look of having been read and reread (E. O'Neill).

The state of the subject:

a) Physical:

Doctor, *he says, I have a bad pain (S. Leacock)*;

It's all right for me not to have an appetite (E. O'Neill).

b) Mental:

Don't you have any idea, not even (Modern, 1970, p. 36);

He has. to come closest to it, a great weariness (Modern);

ISSN 2788-7979 (online)

We have an understanding (Modern).

c) Emotional:

This is the same wonderful place – My God, we had happy summers here, all of us (L. Hellman);

I have hours of great pleasure, great satisfaction right here, (Modern).

In cases where the structure with *have* expresses relatedness. Friendly service and other relationships occupy an intermediate position between a qualitative description of the subject and a message about the presence of the object. The predominant use of interrogative-negative sentences without the auxiliary verb *to do* brings them closer to the proper meaning of possession:

All people who have no children think that, Mrs Dennery (L. Hellman).

However, where kinship relations serve to characterize the subject, the auxiliary verb inevitably appears:

But, then again, I don't have one wife (Modern), where the possession of all the listed objects becomes a symbol of the bourgeois lifestyle.

According to the formula of attributive logic, the verb *have* organizes sentences in those cases when the subject-predicate connection, not the predicate-object, but the subject-predicate connection is brought to the next:

Come on, General. Have a bottle with me. (Hellman);

It depends on how the doctor is feeling and whether it has been a long time since he had a meal himself. (S. Leacock).

This also includes numerous analytical constructions with the verb “have”:

Go into your cell and have a smoke for yourself (Modern);

Why don't you go and have a chat with her?

I really must have a good stare at her. (O. Wilde);

The others have a read of the card (Modern).

Here again, there is a tendency of the English language to use structures with “have” to express an initially uncharacteristic subject-predicate relationship. This is especially clearly seen in the examples with the absolute (without direct addition) use of the verb, which, although rare, is found in the language:

But most Saturdays, I take my delight among the solemn crowds with their aimless purposes, their eternal life not far away, who push past the counters and stalls, who handle, buy, steal, touch, desire, and ogle the merchandise. I hear the tinkling tills, I hear the jangle of loose change and tongues and children wanting to hold and have. (M. Spark).

The separateness of the analytical structure makes passive transformations possible while maintaining a single semantics of the verbal lexeme:

... in the wall and at right angles to the audience, is a window, from which a view may be had of the laundry yard.

Passive conversion refers, in this case, to the analytical construction as a whole and not to a single verb “have”.

It should be noted that *have* is reinterpreted from the verb of state to the verb of action and in structures organized according to the formula of the logic of relations. However, if in the cases listed above, the meaning of the action arose from a separately formed but semantically uniform predicate and object, then the relative independence of the object in sentences constructed according to the formula *a R b* makes it the verb *have* the carrier of the action. *For example:*

Many other directors wanted Frederick's scripts, for his O. Wilde was well–informed and could have been cheap (M. Spark).

The ability of *have* to transmit an action makes it possible to use it as a kind of substitute verb. In cases where the semantic connection between the subject and the object is unambiguous, to understand the meaning of the sentence, it is enough to use the verb *have* as a symbol of a certain relationship between them, as a simple bundle that organizes the utterance (unlike *be*, which organizes the utterance according to the principle of subordination*):*

They had the cards, and they won (Christie);

Cecil, you'll have a whisky and soda?(O. Wilde);

ISSN 2788-7979 (online)

Let us turn to those cases where the verb *have* establishes certain relations between two objects of reality. We proceed from the fact that the verb *to have* is the same as the state to be, but with a reverse orientation. Indeed, from the Russian sentence “I have a pen” and the sentence synonymous with it *I have a pen,* it can be seen as clearly as possible that, while maintaining the same meaning of the sentence, *to have* changes its entire syntactic pattern. In the first sentence was the content of a subject-predicate relationship; in the second sentence becomes a predicate-object relationship. The relationship between the new subject and the predicate practically does not give the sentence any new meaning, which gives us the right to interpret *possession* as the existence or being of an object (object) in the sphere of a certain person or another object (subject). As was established above, in the case of proper possession, there is a certain balance between subject-predicate and predicate-object relations. With a logical emphasis on the subject-predicate relationship, as already noted, structures with the verb *have* can be used in sentences where a qualitative characteristic of the subject is given.

Before us is another logically possible way to rethink these structures – bringing the predicate-object relationship to the fore. In this case, first of all, the meaning of the presence of an object, that is, its being in a certain sphere, should be realized. A meaning close to this can be traced already in those examples where the verb *have* expresses:

I. An isolated case of possession. *For example:*

Have you your watch? Jack? (Modern);

He has a hen up his sleeve (S. Leacock);

I want in, very cautiously, and. I had the hamburgers, you remember (Modern).

Indeed, this meaning is closer not to the qualitative characteristic of the subject, but to the spatial position of the object (the presence of the object, its existence in well-defined coordinates of space and time). This is also confirmed by the fact that paraphrases with *Is the watch with you, Jack?* The hen is up his sleeve. The hamburgers were with me, in which the former object acts as the subject of the message.

II. A complete rethinking is possible when the verb HAVE does not express possession but is perceived as a verb of position in space:

Now, I understand, you have the reprieved man over there. Regan (Modern);

...it's been so wonderful having you home the way you've been… (E. O'Neill).

Reinterpretation is even more evident in cases where the role of the subject is an indefinite personal pronoun or when the subject is omitted altogether. In such cases, the meaning of the spatial position of the object is no longer burdened by anything:

Was not taken in the ambulance. You must come to the hospital now, please, to identify him. They have his friend, there, Mr. O'Brien, whose telephone was in his book (M. Spark);

If you've to do anything reasonable in this world, you must have a class of people who are secure, safe from public opinion: (Huxley).

It should be noted, however, that the presence of a specifically expressed subject makes it possible to revive the subject-predicate relationship. If the main logical emphasis falls on the relationship between the predicate and the object, then the subject has the opportunity to express his attitude toward it:

I will have no one in my house about any scandal (O.Wilde).

All these cases are easily transformed into sentences with the verb *be*, in which the object becomes the subject:

The reprieved man is over there. Birds were hanging off St. Francis, and you were at home.

In cases where we have an indefinite subject, it is generally omitted: *His friend, Mr O'Brien is there, or There must be a class of people*.

The role of an indefinite spatial limiter is played in this case by *there.* Placing an object in a space that is not limited by any framework is an affirmation of its existence.

The situation is more complicated when *have* has the meaning of *premises in space:*

Before I have those four in, I want to hear what you've got to tell me (Christie).

The *be* transform conveys the content of the predicate-object relationship, but minus the latter, the scope of the subject's action remains in the original sentence, the effort that brought the object to

ISSN 2788-7979 (online)

this position: *Before I have those four in ← Before they are in + I cause them in; They'll have him down to reception hall ← He will be down to reception + They'll cause him to do this*.

The meaning of causality given to the verb *have* in this structure seems at odds with the general, broad meaning of static contained in the verb. For example, this meaning goes beyond such a definition of the broad meaning of the verb: It expresses the state of the subject or his attitude toward the object that results as a result of the subject's assigning or performing the object, with passivity or irrevocable activity of the subject.

It seems to us that this definition practically limits the broad meaning of the verb; it does not take into account the peculiarities of the verb that allow it to describe not only the state of the subject but also the position of the object of the utterance. The function of *have* is that it puts two objects of reality on the same level and, without defining the relation between them, allows one to *play through* the most diverse variants of their relation. This allows *have* to be used in a wide variety of structures:

1. *He has smth. Done*
2. *He has done smth.*
3. *He has smb. do smth.*
4. *He has smth. to do*
5. *He has to do smth.*

Let us take the example (I0 and (2) for comparison. The meaning of *have* in /I/ is described by dictionaries as follows: With a complicated object, it shows that the action is performed not by the doer expressed by the subject, but by another person at the request of the subject, or that it is performed without his desire. For example:

Police: I warn you, I'll have you arrested (Modern);

...and did you see the way she had her hair bleached?

As it can be seen from the structure itself, the person performing the action expressed by the passive form of the second participle is not explicated. The question arises – what gives us the right to assert that the carrier of the action does not coincide with the subject? After all, in the form of the perfect (2), which differs from (I) only by the permutation of two elements (*smth. done and done smth.*), the subject is simultaneously the carrier of the action. Let us turn to the history of the language. It is known that the perfect is developed from the free syntactic combination N1 - *habban* - [N2 + Part II attr], both in form and content constructed according to the logical formula a R b.

Moreover, only the participles of transitive verbs were combined with the verb *habban*, while the participles of intransitive verbs were used in perfect forms with *beon* (*Was not fled*), constructed according to the formula *Subject – predicate.* The fact that the further verb *have* becomes a unified indicator of the perfect indicates, in particular, the reorientation of the centrifugal orientation of the free syntactic combination to the centripetal (subject–predicate) structure of the perfect form. The latter already expresses the relationship between two relatively autonomous objects (N2 and N2 with an attribute), N2 loses its independence, and the action contained in the second participle comes to the fore. The perfect, therefore, arises as a result of the negation of the predicate-object and the realization of the subject-predicate relationship. Its logical formula is *subject–predicate*. The English language also uses the second way of understanding, which is in the free syntactic combination N1 – *habban* – N2 + [Part II attr]. When implementing the predicate-object relation, the communicative purpose of the statement becomes a statement about the presence of a complex complement (N2 + Part II). The latter represents a certain state of the object. However, if this state appears in the perfect tense as a result of the subject's action, then its autonomy in this case manifests itself in independence from the subject, who is presented with a fait accompli or expresses a certain modal meaning concerning it.

In the greatest revival of the subject-predicate relationship, the greatest activity of the subject is observed in cases when it initiates an action, causing that. Indeed, if we imagine the structure *smth. done* as a secondary, derived from Smb. does smth, then the causative construction (5) is synonymous with (I): *I have my portrait done → I have smb. do my portrait.*

However, the meaning of *have* is perceived differently depending on whether we have an active carrier of action, to which the will of the subject can be directed, or it is not expressed.

ISSN 2788-7979 (online)

It can be concluded that *have* with causative meaning builds structures with the simultaneous implementation of subject-predicate and predicate-object relationships. The first is reflected in the causation of a certain event, the message about which is the content of the statement:

... he had the cabman drive them to one of the more exclusive apartment hotels (T.Dreiser);

You wouldn't have me tell those people the truth? I'd cut my tongue out first. (E.L. Voynich).

Note the examples that do not fit the frame of the usual form for this value or, conversely, contain a value that is not characteristic of this form. Compare, for example:

Don't look at me that way. If I've had a drop taken. I was invited (Night), where the unusual word order for the perfect tense (*I've dropped taken instead of I've taken a drop*) is explained by the desire to emphasize the object *(a drop)*, to give it back the relative autonomy it loses in the perfect tense. We can observe the same in the following example:

They have all their arrangements made (and very good arrangements, too) for the abduction, where the logical selection of an object is made not only by changing the order of words but also by repeating *(and very good arrangements, too).* Whether the bearer of the action agrees with the subject, and thus whether this form remains within the frame, can often only be judged from the context

I was fooled in front of Mom (by someone not specified in the sentence). It is only from the broad context that it becomes clear that Jimmy is blaming his mother. He, who usually does not believe either other people or his mother, was fooled by his mother this time. The emphasis on the object explains the unusual form of the perfect.

The following example is also ambiguous:

He had the wad hidden? (Modern).

Without the following context, this sentence can be understood as:

Did someone hide his money? However, the following text *(That's right. He was cute enough to hide his wad somewhere, drunk and all as he was the previous night* (Modern) leaves no doubt that the subject and the carrier of the action are one person, and the change in the usual word order for the perfect is caused by the desire to emphasize the role of the complement (the wad), around which, is the whole conversation.

Thus, without any special means of emphasizing the complement, the perfect appears as a structure with centripetal orientation, built according to the formula of attributive logic. The structures in which the agent and subject do not coincide are centrifugally directed and built according to the formula of relational logic. Between them, there are transitional cases that can be understood in two ways, indicating a close connection and a single source of development of these two structures.

Let us turn further to the structures (4) and (5). The only thing that formally distinguishes them is the word order *(smth. to do and to do smth.).* It differs from the above cases; here, the definition of the object is not the passive participle but the infinitive. The latter expresses not so much the action as the orientation towards its long-term development. If something has already been performed *(smth. done),* and the carrier of the action coincides with the subject, then this state naturally appears as the result of the subject's influence. In contrast, attributing an action to the sphere of the future makes it at least problematic, which contributes to the development of a modal meaning in the construction.

The analysis of examples with the free syntactic combination to have smth. do indicates that in most of them, there is an implementation of the predicate-object relationship; that is, the purpose of the statement is not the manifestation of the subject, but the introduction of a new object. This is proved by the fact that the subject-predicate relationship, in general, can be easily omitted without violating the semantic integrity of the text:

I shall have some Honest Work to do (A. Huxley).

– I was so lonesome I kept Cathleer with me Just to tell to someone; I have nothing to forgive her for, Grandma (L. Hellman).

– There is nothing to forgive her for; I'll have something to lie awake and think about (L. Hellman).

– I'll lie awake and think about something.

ISSN 2788-7979 (online)

This English-specific function does not exhaust the possibilities of this syntactic combination. It already traces those individual modal shades that develop into a certain modal meaning of the construction *to have to do smth*

I have a lot to talk to you about (O. Wilde).

– I shall talk to you about a lot of things.

The paraphrase uses the future tense form; in the original sentence, this meaning is contained in the present tense form of the verb *have* in the form of a modal shade of meaning – *it needs, it is necessary.* Also:

She sniveled and implored me to pray for the animal. I wanted to say to her: Madam, I have myself to pray for, the coloured queen, the Puerto Rican family, the person in the front room, the woman who cries deliberately behind her closed door, and the rest of the people in all rooming-houses, everywhere; besides, madam, I don't understand how to pray, where the modal meaning of the construction is not contradicted by an unusual word order designed to emphasize the special role of the object.

The cases of particular difficulty are manifested where these structures are used in subordinate clauses, since all formal differences between them are erased:

That is all you have to tell me?

Without a broad context, it remains unclear whether the subject-predicate relationship is realized here *(Is that all you have to tell me?)* or the predicate-object relationship *(Is that all you have to tell me?*) +. However, from the following text *(That is all you have to tell me? - Yes. - There is no other circumstance that you have omitted, milord?)* it becomes clear that the main thing in the statement is the predicate-object relationship.

Note, by the way, that one of the obsolete meanings of the Russian verb *to have* in combination with the indefinite form of the verb was the formation of the future tense (with a hint of ought or possibility):

A few days later it was announced to Prince Andrew that he had to come to the Minister of War (L. Tolstoy War and Peace).

The increase in modal quality can be seen in the following examples*:*

I'll bet you told her all she had to do was use a little willpower. (Night).

The *to-have-to-do construction* reflects the subject-predicate relationship; its logical formula is *subject – predicate*:

I had to blackmail them a little (L. Hellman).

For the experiment, we will change the order of words – *I had them to blackmail*, where the modal meaning is lost, and the predicate-object relationship comes to the fore – *I had someone at my disposal who could be blackmailed.* The same relationship is observed in the following pairs: *I have some questions to ask – I have to ask some questions; We have to make some decisions – We have some decisions to make.*

In this case, English uses the structure with the verb *have* both to describe the state of the subject and to establish its connection with the object. The structures listed above are logically organized as follows:

(1) *He has (smth. done)*

S Have Ob

a R b

(2) *He (has done smth.)*

S – pred.

The implementation of both links leads to the preservation of the meaning of the perfect with a special addition phase *(I've a drop taken).*

(3) *He has (smb. do smth)*

a R b He has (smb. do smth.)

S – pred He [has (smb. do smth.)]

(4) *He has (smth. to do)*

S have ob

ISSN 2788-7979 (online)

a R b

(5) *He (has to do smth.)*

S – pred

The implementation of both links takes place, intending to emphasise the object while maintaining a common modal meaning. Thus, there is a unification of one of the two possible forms of reflection within the framework of one language. If the Russian language uses the formula *Subject – predicate* to describe the state of the subject *(You – teacher, You did it, You have to do it)*, and for the introduction of a new object *(I have a teacher, It's done (by someone)*, *It needs to be done (by someone), He has a woman in his room*, and the formula *a R b* in its inherent function of establishing relations between the objects of reality *(You have a teacher),* then the English language prefers the formula *a R b* both for the manifestation of the subject *(I have blue eyes, I have done this, I have to do this*), so and to establish a relationship between the subject and the newly introduced object *(I have a flat, I have smth, dons, He has smth to do, He has a woman in his room,* etc.

CONCLUSION

The fact that the English language is designed in a way that it can accommodate ambiguities is what has led to the development of different meanings for the sentence in question. It is in this regard that it becomes imperative to use the contextual semantic connections in arriving at the meaning of the sentence in question. Contrary to the English language, which is found not to have any defined morphological forms that can be used in arriving at the connections, it is quite clear that the Russian language has an extensive list of morphological indicators that not only help in the understanding of the relationship between the subject and attributes, but also in the understanding of the relationship between subjects and attributes.

These unique characteristics of the English language serve to shed additional light on the reason why the language makes extensive use of what is termed the *have* construction. It is evident that the verb *have* is an essential verb in the English language because it has two main functions. Firstly, the verb *have* is employed in defining the state or condition of the subject. Secondly, the verb *have* is employed in the creation of a relationship between the subject and the object. Nevertheless, the functionality of the verb *have* is more extensive when the verb is employed in the representation of the causative form because it is employed in the creation of the definition of the subject-predicate relationship and the predicate-object relationship.

This dual purpose of *have* is significant as it effectively captures the dynamics of events and conveys their meanings within the context of a statement. The high frequency of *have* in the English language may be explained in terms of its use in different constructions that follow a logical pattern, normally expressed as aRb, where R represents some type of relational connection. Additionally, *have* may also be found in constructions that are interpreted in terms of attributive logic.

As may be observed from the provided linguistic evidence, it may be stated that the high frequency of *have* in the English language results from different combinations of relational and attributive logic, which are associated with one of the fundamental aspects of its creation and perception.

Implications for Translation and Semantic Analysis

The findings indicate that translation requires more than just lexical replacement; it requires a detailed analysis of the semantic roles *have* plays in different situations. Understanding the multifunctionality of *have* is essential in translation, especially when dealing with literature since it is rich in shades of meaning.

Limitations and Future Directions

Though this study offers a detailed analysis of *have* in a particular literary context, further research can be conducted on a larger scope, including spoken language, in order to ascertain the universality of this analysis. Further research can be conducted on *have* in different languages in order to enhance its multifunctionality analysis.

ISSN 2788-7979 (online)

REFERENCES

1 Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (1999). *Construing experience through meaning: A language-based approach to cognition*. London: Continuum.
2 Perlmutter, D. M. (Ed.). (1984). *Studies in relational grammar 2.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
3 Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
4 Zhuravleva, Ye.A., and A.E. Agmanova. (2021). Russian Language in Kazakhstan: Specific Learning and Functioning in the Context of Interlingual Interaction. *Polylinguality and Transcultural Practices*, *18*(1). – P.20 - 28. DOI: https://doi.org/10.22363/2618-897X-2021-18-1-20-28
5 Beiskhanova, S.A., Zhunussova, Zh.N., Zoltan, A. (2023). Paroemiographic interpretation of proverbs and sayings corpus on the material of different structural languages. *Vestnik Karagandinskogo universiteta. Seriya «Filologiya», 2*(110). DOI: https://doi.org/10.31489/2023ph2/81-88 [In English]
6 Woltran, F., & Schwab, S. (2025). Language as a distinguishing feature or common ground? A participatory study on manifestations of intergroup relations in the lived experiences of multilingual students. *Linguistics and Education*, *85*(101379), 1-9. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2024.101379
7 Davis, W. (2024). *Foundations of Semantics*. Oxford: Oxford Handbook to Contemporary Philosophy of Language Publisher. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780192856852.013.35
8 Panjaitan, L.L., & Patria, A.N. (2024). Social Media and Language Evolution: The Impact of Digital Communication on Language Change. *International Journal of Linguistics Literature & Translation, 7*(12). – P. 53-57. DOI: https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt.2024.7.12.8
9 Hu, J., Mahowald, K., Lupyan, G., Ivanova, A., & Levy, R. (2024). Language models align with human judgments on key grammatical constructions. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A., 121*(36). DOI: https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2400917121
10 Grigoroglou., M., & Ganea P.A. (2022). Language as a mechanism for reasoning about possibilities. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc., 377*(20210334). DOI: https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2021.0334
11 Pirmanova, K.K., Turekhanova, A., Ashimova, N. (2023). Theory and methodology of the world's national linguistic corpora. *Abylaj han atyndaғy QazKHQzhәneӘTU Habarshysy, 69*(2). https://doi.org/10.48371/PHILS.2023.69.2.011 [In English]
12 Saurbayev, R., Zhumasheva, A., Yerekhanova, F, et al. (2024). The Problem of Translatability of Texts of The Sublanguage of Mathematical Logic in English-Kazakh Translations. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 10*(2), 203-214. http://dx.doi.org/10.32601/ejal.10217
13 Akhmetova, G. (2024). Lexico-semantic nature of toponyms: theory and analysis *SH. Uәlihanov atyndaғy KU habarshysy. Filologiya seriyasy, 4*. – P. 9-22. DOI: https://doi.org/10.59102/kufil/2024/iss4pp9-22 [In English]
14 Wei, L., King, T., & Lee. (2025). Transpositioning: Translanguaging and the Liquidity of Identity. *Applied Linguistics, 45*(5). – P.873–888. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amad065
15 Issina, A. (2025). Linguistics markers of Kazakh national mentality based on the concepts “ел/people”, “қонақжайлылық/hospitality”, “бата/blessing”. *SH. Uәlihanov atyndaғy KU habarshysy. Filologiya seriyasy, 4.* – P.127–137. DOI: https://doi.org/10.59102/kufil/2025/iss4pp65-78 [In English]

Received: 28.12.2025

Ағылшын тіліндегі “иемдену”-конструкциясы

Л.А. Аминова[1], К.М. Текжанов[2] , Ш. Трент[3] , *Ф.Т. Ереханова[4]
[1]Средняя школа инновационного типа имени А. Байтурсынулы, Павлодар, 140006, Қазақстан
[2]Ә.Марғұлан атындағы Павлодар педагогикалық университеті, Павлодар, 140002, Қазақстан
[3]“Giving Hearts Homecare” аутизм спектрі бағдарламасы, Нью-Лондон, Коннектикут, 06320, АҚШ

ISSN 2788-7979 (online)
[4]Ө.Жәнібеков атындағы Оңтүстік Қазақстан педагогикалық университеті, Шымкент, 160012, Қазақстан

Мақаланың мақсаты – ағылшын тіліндегі "have" етістігінің күрделі құрылым ретіндегі негізгі ерекшеліктерін анықтау және оның жүйелік-функционалдық тұрғыда have-типті конструкциялар санатына жатқызылуын көрсету. Сонымен қатар, зерттеу екі тіл арасында тікелей сәйкестік орнатуды немесе оларды егжей-тегжейлі салыстыруды мақсат етпейді, керісінше әр тілдің иелік, болмыс және қасиет сияқты қатынастық мағыналарды білдіру үшін өзіне тән құрылымдарды қалай қолданатынын қарастырады.

Әдіснамалық тұрғыдан зерттеуде трансформациялық талдау, салыстырмалы талдау және семантикалық талдау әдістері қолданылды. Трансформациялық талдау сөйлем құрылымдарының әртүрлі трансформация түрлері негізінде өзгеруін зерттеуге бағытталған. Салыстырмалы талдау тілдер арасындағы ұқсастықтар мен айырмашылықтарды анықтауға мүмкіндік береді. Ал семантикалық талдау зерттеу деректерінің мағынасын түсіндіруде қолданылды. Зерттеу материалы көркем әдебиет, ауызша сөйлеу және жазбаша мәтіндер сияқты табиғи дереккөздерден жиналды. Сонымен қатар, зерттеуде "have" конструкциясының қолданылу жиілігі де талданды.

Зерттеу нәтижелері ағылшын тіліндегі "have" сөзінің көпфункционалды екенін көрсетті: ол тек иелікті білдіру үшін ғана емес, сонымен қатар әртүрлі қатынастарды, физикалық сезімдерді, сондай-ақ әлеуметтік және эмоциялық салаға қатысты қасиеттерді білдіру үшін де қолданылады. Осылайша, ағылшын және орыс тілдеріндегі иелік пен қатынастық ұғымдарды білдіру ерекшеліктері ағылшын тіліндегі have-конструкцияларының тікелей қолданылуынан айқын көрінеді деген қорытынды жасалды. Сонымен қатар, зерттеу тілдің когнитивтік үдерістерді қалыптастыру мен білдірудегі рөлін түсінуге де маңызды үлес қосады.

Кілт сөздер: атрибутивтік логика, салыстырмалы лингвистика, конструкциялар, лексемалар, тілдік құбылыс, трансформациялық әдіс, құрылымдар

ӘДЕБИЕТТЕР ТІЗІМІ

1 Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. Construing experience through meaning: A language-based approach to cognition. – London: Continuum, 1999.
2 Perlmutter, D. M. (Ed.). Studies in relational grammar 2. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.
3 Leech, G. N. Principles of Pragmatics. – London: Longman, 1983.
4 Zhuravleva, Ye.A., and A.E. Agmanova. Russian Language in Kazakhstan: Specific Learning and Functioning in the Context of Interlingual Interaction. *Polylinguality and Transcultural Practices*, *18*(1), 2021. – P.20 - 28. DOI: https://doi.org/10.22363/2618-897X-2021-18-1-20-28
5 Beiskhanova, S.A., Zhunussova, Zh.N., Zoltan, A. Paroemiographic interpretation of proverbs and sayings corpus on the material of different structural languages // Вестник Карагандинского университета. Серия «Филология». – 2023. – №2(110). DOI: https://doi.org/10.31489/2023ph2/81-88
6 Woltran, F., & Schwab, S. Language as a distinguishing feature or common ground? A participatory study on manifestations of intergroup relations in the lived experiences of multilingual students. *Linguistics and Education*, *85*(101379), 2025. – P.1-9. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2024.101379
7 Davis, W. Foundations of Semantics. – Oxford: Oxford Handbook to Contemporary Philosophy of Language Publisher, 2024. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780192856852.013.35
8 Panjaitan, L.L., & Patria, A.N. Social Media and Language Evolution: The Impact of Digital Communication on Language Change. *International Journal of Linguistics Literature & Translation, 7*(12), 2024. – P. 53-57. DOI: https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt.2024.7.12.8

9 Hu, J., Mahowald, K., Lupyan, G., Ivanova, A., & Levy, R. Language models align with human judgments on key grammatical constructions. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A., 121*(36), 2024. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2400917121
10 Grigoroglou., M., & Ganea P.A. Language as a mechanism for reasoning about possibilities. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc., 377*(20210334), 2022. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2021.0334
11 Пирманова, К.К., Туреханова, А., Ашимова, Н. Theory and methodology of the world's national linguistic corpora // Абылай хан атындағы ҚазХҚжәнеӘТУ Хабаршысы. – 2023. – №69(2). https://doi.org/10.48371/PHILS.2023.69.2.011
12 Saurbayev, R., Zhumasheva, A., Yerekhanova, F, et al. (2024). The Problem of Translatability of Texts of The Sublanguage of Mathematical Logic in English-Kazakh Translations. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 10*(2), 2024. – P.203-214. http://dx.doi.org/10.32601/ejal.10217
13 Akhmetova, G. Lexico-semantic nature of toponyms: theory and analysis // Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы КУ хабаршысы. Филология сериясы. – 2024. – №4. – P. 9–22. DOI: https://doi.org/10.59102/kufil/2024/iss4pp9-22
14 Wei, L., King, T., & Lee. Transpositioning: Translanguaging and the Liquidity of Identity. *Applied Linguistics, 45*(5), 2025. – P.873–888. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amad065
15 Issina, A. Linguistics markers of Kazakh national mentality based on the concepts “ел/people”, “қонақжайлылық/hospitality”, “бата/blessing” // SH. Uəlihanov atyndağy KU habarshysy. Filologiya seriyasy. – 2025. – №4. – P.127–137. DOI: https://doi.org/10.59102/kufil/2025/iss4pp65-78

Материал 28.12.2025 баспаға түсті

Конструкция «иметь» в английском языке

Л.А. Аминова[1], Ш. Трент[2] , К.М. Текжанов[3] , *Ф.Т. Ереханова[4]
[1]Средняя школа инновационного типа имени А. Байтурсынулы, Павлодар, 140006, Казахстан
[2]Павлодарский педагогический университет имени А.Маргулана, Павлодар, 140002, Казахстан
[3]Программа аутистического спектра “Giving Hearts Homecare”, Нью-Лондон, Коннектикут, 06320, США
[4]Южно-Казахстанский педагогический университет имени У.Жанибекова, Шымкент, 160012, Казахстан

Цель статьи — выявить ключевые особенности, которые делают английский глагол “have” сложной конструкцией, тем самым объясняя его отнесение к категории have-конструкций в рамках системно-функционального подхода. В работе также подчеркивается, что целью исследования не является установление прямого соответствия или детального сопоставления двух языков, а скорее анализ того, как каждый из них использует свои собственные конструкции для выражения реляционных значений, таких как обладание, существование и признак.

С методологической точки зрения в исследовании используются трансформационный анализ, сравнительный анализ и семантический анализ. Трансформационный анализ предполагает рассмотрение преобразований структур предложений в зависимости от типа применяемой трансформации. Сравнительный анализ направлен на выявление сходств и различий между языками. Наконец, семантический анализ используется для интерпретации значений исследуемых языковых данных. Материал исследования был собран из различных естественных источников, таких как художественные тексты, устная речь и письменные источники. Кроме того, в исследовании рассматривается частотность употребления конструкции “have”.

Результаты показывают, что английское слово “have” является высокофункциональным и используется не только для выражения обладания, но и для обозначения различных отношений, физических ощущений, а также признаков, которые могут быть связаны с

ISSN 2788-7979 (online)

социально-эмоциональной сферой. В итоге делается вывод, что различие между английским и русским языками в выражении обладания и реляционных понятий наиболее наглядно проявляется в непосредственном использовании have-конструкций в английском языке. Кроме того, исследование имеет значение для понимания роли языка в формировании и выражении когнитивных процессов.

Ключевые слова: атрибутивная логика, сравнительная лингвистика, конструкции, лексемы, лингвистические явления, трансформационный метод, структуры

СПИСОК ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ

1 Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. Construing experience through meaning: A language-based approach to cognition. – London: Continuum, 1999.
2 Perlmutter, D. M. (Ed.). Studies in relational grammar 2. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.
3 Leech, G. N. Principles of Pragmatics. – London: Longman, 1983.
4 Zhuravleva, Ye.A., and A.E. Agmanova. Russian Language in Kazakhstan: Specific Learning and Functioning in the Context of Interlingual Interaction. Polylinguality and Transcultural Practices, 18(1). – 2021. – P.20 - 28. DOI: https://doi.org/10.22363/2618-897X-2021-18-1-20-28
5 Beiskhanova, S.A., Zhunussova, Zh.N., Zoltan, A. Paroemiographic interpretation of proverbs and sayings corpus on the material of different structural languages // Вестник Карагандинского университета. Серия «Филология». – 2023. – №2(110). DOI: https://doi.org/10.31489/2023ph2/81-88
6 Woltran, F., & Schwab, S. Language as a distinguishing feature or common ground? A participatory study on manifestations of intergroup relations in the lived experiences of multilingual students. Linguistics and Education, 85(101379). – 2025. – P.1-9. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2024.101379
7 Davis, W. Foundations of Semantics. – Oxford: Oxford Handbook to Contemporary Philosophy of Language Publisher, 2024. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780192856852.013.35
8 Panjaitan, L.L., & Patria, A.N. Social Media and Language Evolution: The Impact of Digital Communication on Language Change. International Journal of Linguistics Literature & Translation, 7(12). – 2024. – P. 53-57. DOI: https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt.2024.7.12.8
9 Hu, J., Mahowald, K., Lupyan, G., Ivanova, A., & Levy, R. Language models align with human judgments on key grammatical constructions. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A., 121(36). – 2024. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2400917121
10 Grigoroglou., M., & Ganea P.A. Language as a mechanism for reasoning about possibilities. Phil. Trans. R. Soc., 377(20210334). – 2022. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2021.0334
11 Пирманова, К.К., Туреханова, А., Ашимова, Н. Theory and methodology of the world's national linguistic corpora // Абылай хан атындағы ҚазХҚжәнеӘТУ Хабаршысы. – 2023. – №69(2). https://doi.org/10.48371/PHILS.2023.69.2.011
12 Saurbayev, R., Zhumasheva, A., Yerekhanova, F, et al. (2024). The Problem of Translatability of Texts of The Sublanguage of Mathematical Logic in English-Kazakh Translations. Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 10(2). – 2024. – P.203-214. http://dx.doi.org/10.32601/ejal.10217
13 Akhmetova, G. Lexico-semantic nature of toponyms: theory and analysis // Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы КУ хабаршысы. Филология сериясы. – 2024. – №4. – P. 9–22. DOI: https://doi.org/10.59102/kufil/2024/iss4pp9-22
14 Wei, L., King, T., & Lee. Transpositioning: Translanguaging and the Liquidity of Identity. Applied Linguistics, 45(5). – 2025. – P.873–888. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amad065
15 Issina, A. Linguistics markers of Kazakh national mentality based on the concepts “ел/people”, “қонақжайлылық/hospitality”, “бата/blessing” // SH. Uəlihanov atyndağy KU habarshysy. Filologiya seriyasy. – 2025. – №4. – P.127–137. DOI: https://doi.org/10.59102/kufil/2025/iss4pp65-78
Материал поступил в редакцию журнала 28.12.2025