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V - Conclusions:

I - It has been found that there is a very cohesive relationship between "Have" and "Get"; since they are regarded as the basis of many standard idioms in English.

II - Both of them are used as causative verbs in specific constructions. In other words, they have a kind of causative association.

III - It is also noticed, in this paper, that the verbs "Have" and "Get" have the "do - support."

IV - Under certain conditions, both of them can be regarded as lexical verbs within sentences in Standard English.

V - The passive transformation can be applied to the verbs "Have" and "Get" in English.

VI - Finally, one can say that the present paper can be considered as an attempt to outline the main aspects of both similarities and differences between "Have" and "Get" with respect to some of the modal auxiliary verbs from the syntactic and semantic points of view. It is also hoped that it will serve the purpose intended.
VII - From a semantic point of view, "Have" and "Not have" on one hand, and "Get" and "Not Get" on the other are in relation to "gain" and "lost".

"Gain" is related to "have" and "get" and "lose" is related to "not have" and "not get", e.g.:

John had the book.
John gained the book.
John did not have the book.
John did not get the book.

Meaning

John lost the book.

VIII - From a syntactic point of view, "Get" takes two objects, of which one usually standing for a person, whereas the other foe a thing, e.g.

73. They got him some new historical books.

IX - Moreover, "Get" alone, i.e., not "getten", can be used as a main transitive verb or what is called a "full verb" as in:

He gets money.

X - Finally, it can be used as a linking verb, since it links between the subject and complement, e.g.

74. She soon got tired of waiting (See, Leech, 1975, p.213).
65. He hasn't left the house.
66. He wasn't killed.
67. He gotsn't killed.

IV - From a syntactic point of view, Lakoff, R. (1971) notices that "Get Passive" indicates an "immediate action" when there is no manner adverbial as in the following example:

His book got lost.

V - "Get" like all other lexical verbs has do - support as in:
68. He didn't get killed.
Moreover, "Get" can be used as a causative verb meaning "cause to" or "receive", e.g.
69. Bill got Susan a book on economics.
It can also be used to pattern like, "prove" as in:
70. I proved them to be wrong.
71. I got them to be careful. (See, Leech, 1975, p. 259).

VI - Comparing "Get" with "Have", the latter is used as a "stative verb", whereas the former acts as an "event verb". Consider the following examples:

72. We've lived in London since last September (i.e. London is where we are living now).
58. The song gets me.

59. The pain got him in the back.

60. Something I got used to.


II - This verb is also handled among the catenatives; it could be argued that it is an alternative “to be” in the formation of passivized constructions illustrated in (63) below:

62. John was killed in the war.

63. John got killed by car accident.

Moreover, in the traditional literature the “Get - passive” is usually treated as a variant of the “be - Passive”, to escape responsibility. The verb “Get” here is considered as a passive auxiliary and this use of cannot be related to its use as a causative verb in examples such as (64):

64. He got his girl - friend invited to all important meeting.

III - Quirk et al (1972: 802) label “Get” as a passive auxiliary. However, this seems to be unjustified since “Get” in its passive use fails all the formal tests standardly applied to determine the auxiliary status of averbal element. The auxiliaries “Have”, “Be”, and modals permit negative contraction (V+ Not --- Vn’t) whereas “Get” does not as in:
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When "Have" patterns the same way as the auxiliaries like "ought", "used", and "be", it is then an auxiliary. Otherwise we consider it as a catenative verb. The two cases are exemplified in the pairs of sentences below:

49. Has he to work this evening?
50. Does he have to work this evening?
51. He hasn't to work this evening.
52. He doesn't have to work this evening (See, Scott, 1968, p. 109).

Finally, Fries, 1952, p. 205, mentions that the verb "may" can be replaced by the following constructions:

53. The concert (may) be good.
Substituted by
54. The concert has been good.
55. The concert has to be good.
56. The concert had moved.
57. The concert got moved.

IV - Uses of Get:

I - "Get" is commonly used with the present tense of "Have"; it is not so usual with other forms. It is also regarded as the basis of many standard idioms, but also used in many colloquial and slang expressions. Consider the following examples:
expresses external obligation. Compare the following pairs of situations, where these two forms are used in their natural context:

45. You must stay the night. (I (we) press him to do so ).

46. He has to stay the night (He cannot get back tonight ) (See, Allen, 1958, pp.38 - 39).

Furthermore, it can be said that there is a difference in the modal presuppositions attached to the selection of must / have to and ought. Although these presuppositions are not dependent upon tense, they have the effect that from the past - tense sentences as in:

He ought to have gone, the hearer will correctly infer that the person referred to did not in fact go, and from:

He had to go that he did in fact go.

It is worth mentioning that this distinction within the ‘ obligation’ is sometimes rather misleadingly described in terms of a difference in the ‘force’ of the obligation.

Comparing “have to” with the modals can, may, must, shall, should and will, we can say that such verbs are sometimes regarded as auxiliaries of mode.

Similarly, “Have to” is used for instructions on notices or orders as with “must”, Examples:

47. Passangers must cross the lines by the footbridge.

48. Porters often have to walk across the lines.
41. He had them all singing.
42. He had all the prisoners punished.

III - “Have” in Relation to Modal Auxiliaries:

There are close relations of meaning between the verbs “may”, “can”, “must” and “have to”. Such relations between all four can be clearly illustrated by the following diagram:

Permission      May       Must

obligation / necessity

Possibility     Can       Have to

It can be noted that “may” and “can” share the same box since both of them express “permission” and “possibility” whereas “must” and “Have (got ..) to” express “obligation” and necessity. Therefore, it can be said that “Have (got to)” is in the same semantic area with “Must” (See, Leech, 1971, p. 74); in other words, they are mutually substitutable. This is particularly clear if we wish to state the necessary conditions for an event to occur as in:

43. If you want to be fit, you must take exercise.
44. If you want to be fit, you have to take exercise.

It is also worth mentioning that there is usually a difference of meaning between the present tense forms of “must” and “Have to” in affirmative statements. In other words, “must” expresses obligation or Compulsion from the speaker’s point of view, whereas “Have to”
30. Bill had John give a book to Mary.
31. John had the boy learn English.
32. John had the stone moved.
   Instead of:
33. Bill caused John to give a book to Mary.
34. John caused the boy to learn English.
35. John caused the stone to move.

   VII - As can be seen in the following examples, containing the formula of “Have + a past participle”, is used to indicate that, without doing something ourselves, we had it to be done.

36. We have just had our house painted (caused our house to be painted).
37. I have just had my hair cut; why don’t you have your done? (cf, Eckersely, 1960, p. 195).

the same is applicable to other constructions, where instead of “causing” something, you suffer something, e.g.
38. I had my pocket picked (i.e. something stolen from it) this morning.
39. Ralph had his licence endorsed for careless driving.
40. You will have your house broken into one of those days.

   VIII - “Have” as a causative verb is similar to those verbs including “help”, “let” and “make”. Semantically, they have much in common and are all “futurity” verbs as in:
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22. Lord Emsworth stood in thought. 'No ... Ah, I have it. It's vail (i.e., 'remember').

23. Beards are not banned in the Metropolitan Police, and several officers have them (i.e., 'wear them') (See, Karlsen, 1959, p. 168).

IV - Moreover, "Have" normally does not allow a passive transformation of the sentence, e.g.

24. They have a nice house.

V - When "Have" is used as an event verb in the sense of "receive" "take", etc., the main verb "Have" normally has the do-construction in both American and British English. Examples:

25. Does he have coffee with his breakfast?

26. Did you have any difficulty getting here?

The do-construction is also needed in the following structures, e.g.

27. Did you have a good time? (cf., Leech, 1975, p. 208).

VI - The following prepositional phrases have a comparable relationship with the verb "Have": a man of courage, a man with large ears, which can be rewritten as:

28. The man has courage.

29. The man has large ears (See, Quirk, 1973, p. 161).

II - "Have" in Causative Constructions:

English causative constructions with "Have" are preferred to "cause". Consider the following sentences:
11. Did you have (= receive) a letter from home this morning?
12. I didn’t have (= eat) my breakfast this morning.
13. Did you have (= drink) tea or coffee for breakfast?
14. They don’t have (= find, experience) much difficulty with English grammar.
15. Did you have (= enjoy) a good time of the dance last night?
16. Do you have some cheese? --- Thank you; I have had some (i.e. helped myself to).

It is also worth mentioning that the verb “to have” can be used with certain constructions in the sense of “to hold”, “to get” or “to obtain”. Consider the following constructions:

17. He’s got (= obtained) what he wants.
18. I have my paper all written.

Again, in the following example, the participle “had” implies the meaning of “partake of”, as in:

20. The talks that we have had with them two dayes ago, were, in fact, very important.

III - There is another property of “Have” which often forms part of idioms in which an explicit connecter appears as its object; this is the case in the following quotations:

21. I can’t put Doctor Page off the list, there’s a number of the men wouldn’t have that (have = to tolerate, to put up with).
This is equally valid of "Have", when used with modals.
Consider the following examples:

3. He may have finished already / yesterday.

4. He ought to have finished by now / yesterday (See, Palmer, 1974, p. 55).

II - When "Have" is used as a full verb, it sometimes, but not always, behaves like a special finite, for example forming its interrogative by inversion and its negative simply by the addition of "not". It also behaves like a special finite verb especially when the possession is permanent. Consider the following sentences:

5. How many brothers and sisters have you (got)?

6. We haven't much money, but we do see life.

7. Has your sister (got) blue eyes or brown eyes?

At the same time, Eckersely, 1965, p. 195, states other specific cases in which the verb "Have" is treated as a special finite verb particularly when we are speaking of one particular occasion, e.g.

8. Have you a headache now? But when the possession is a recurring or habitual thing, e.g.

9. Do you often have a headache? (I. e. Habitually) then "Have" is not treated as a special finite verb, e.g.

10. Do you often have visitors staying with you?

Furthermore, "Have" does not behave like a special finite when it takes different contextual meanings other than "possessions" as in:
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"HAVE" AND "GET" WITH REFERNCE TO
MODALS IN STANDARD ENGLISH
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Introduction:

This paper explores the relationship between the various uses of verbs "Have" and "Get" in Standard English, since the verb "Have" shares a great number of qualities with the verb "Get", with reference to the models. The basic uses of such verbs can be distinguished; namely the causative "Have" and "Get". This paper considers such uses of these verbs in some detail. The paper is also concerned with the use of "Get" in the string "Have got (to)" which, diachronically related, has developed its own properties.

Finally, it is hoped that this paper will be useful for both Iraqi and Arab students learning English as a second or foreign language.

I - Uses of "Have" in English:

I - It is necessary here to mention that the non-finite forms of "Have" may mark tense and aspect. This is quite clear from the adverbials which are possible with the infinitive and participle as in:

1. To have finished already / yesterday.
2. Having finished already / yesterday.
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