

STRUCTURAL COMPARATIVE CLASSIFICATION OF PHRASAL VERBS AND AFFIXAL VERBS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

Elmirzayeva Maftuna Dusmurodovna
Karshi State University, Foreign Language Faculty
Teacher of Practical English Department

Fayzullayeva Malika Jamshid qizi
4th Year Student of the English Language Department,
Philology and Language Teaching, Faculty of Foreign Languages,
Karshi State University

Abstract

This article explores the study of phrasal verbs in the English language through a comparative analysis with Uzbek phraseological units and existing classifications. The author presents a structural and comparative classification of phrasal verbs and affixal verbs in both English and Uzbek, along with their comparative descriptions with other phraseological units. Additionally, the article examines key linguistic trends in the study of English phrasal verbs.

Keywords: Phrasal verb, phraseological units, idiom, lexeme, phraseological fusions.

INTRODUCTION

Phrasal verbs in English and affixal verbs in Uzbek are fundamental linguistic components that significantly contribute to verb formation and syntactic flexibility in their respective languages. In English, phrasal verbs are formed by combining a main verb with one or more particles (such as prepositions or adverbs), which often result in idiomatic meanings that may not be directly inferred from their individual components. These phrasal constructions enable English verbs to express a wide range of nuanced actions, conditions, and states.

Uzbek, as an agglutinative language, primarily employs affixes—both prefixes and suffixes—to modify the meaning and grammatical function of verbs. Affixal verbs in Uzbek allow for various shades of meaning, including aspect, mood, and intensity, thereby playing a crucial role in verbal derivation and sentence construction. Unlike English phrasal verbs, which rely on separable particles, Uzbek verbs integrate morphological changes within the verb itself to indicate different actions and nuances.

This study seeks to explore, compare, and classify these two distinct yet functionally significant verb forms by analyzing their structural composition, syntactic behavior, and semantic functions. By drawing parallels and identifying differences, this research aims to provide insights into how phrasal verbs in English and affixal verbs in Uzbek serve similar communicative functions despite their contrasting linguistic structures. Additionally, the study will investigate how these verb forms impact sentence construction, word order, and meaning

interpretation in both languages. Through this comparative analysis, we aim to contribute to a better understanding of verb modification strategies in typologically different languages.

Phrasal verbs hold a special place in the lexical and phraseological system of modern English. Features such as polysemy and individual specificity make their classification challenging. Their contextual dependence continues to attract linguistic scholars' interest.

This research employs a comparative linguistic approach to analyze the structural and functional differences between English phrasal verbs and Uzbek affixal verbs. By examining their formation, syntactic behavior, and semantic variations, the study aims to establish parallels and distinctions between these two verb modification systems. To achieve this, a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods is applied, ensuring a comprehensive understanding of both verb forms.

The methodology includes the following key components:

1. Corpus-Based Analysis

The study utilizes linguistic corpora containing authentic texts in both English and Uzbek to identify and analyze commonly used phrasal verbs and affixal verbs.

Frequency analysis is conducted to determine the most commonly occurring verb structures in natural discourse.

Contextual examination of verb usage is performed to understand how meaning changes depending on syntactic positioning and co-occurring words.

2. Lexicographical Research

Standardized English dictionaries, such as the Oxford English Dictionary and Cambridge Dictionary, are consulted to gather definitions, usage examples, and classifications of phrasal verbs.

Uzbek dictionaries and linguistic reference materials, including etymological and morphological studies, are analyzed to categorize affixal verbs and their functional roles in verb derivation.

3. Structural and Morphological Analysis

The research examines how English phrasal verbs are constructed, focusing on the role of particles (prepositions and adverbs) in altering verb meanings.

Uzbek verb morphology is analyzed by identifying common affixes (prefixes, suffixes, and infixes) that modify meaning, tense, aspect, and modality.

A comparative breakdown of verb structures in both languages is conducted to highlight their similarities and differences in formation.

4. Syntactic and Semantic Comparison

The syntactic placement of phrasal verbs in English sentences is examined, including their separable and inseparable forms.

Uzbek affixal verbs are analyzed in terms of their position within a sentence and how affixation impacts word order and meaning.

Semantic equivalence between English phrasal verbs and Uzbek affixal verbs is explored to determine functional correspondences between the two linguistic systems.

5. Linguistic Literature Review

Existing research studies, academic papers, and linguistic theories on phrasal and affixal verb formation are reviewed to establish a theoretical framework for analysis.

Previous comparative studies of Indo-European and Turkic languages are examined to contextualize the findings within broader linguistic typology.

6. Practical Application and Translation Analysis

The study includes an examination of English-Uzbek translations to determine how phrasal verbs are rendered in Uzbek and vice versa.

Examples from bilingual texts and translation corpora are analyzed to assess the strategies used to maintain meaning and syntactic integrity across languages.

By employing this multifaceted methodological approach, the research aims to provide an in-depth comparative analysis of English phrasal verbs and Uzbek affixal verbs, shedding light on their linguistic functions, structural composition, and role in communication.

Despite these complexities, several criteria distinguish phrasal verbs as a separate category of phraseological units:

- A phrasal verb can be replaced by a multi-lexical verb (e.g., to put off - to postpone, to put up with - to tolerate). This indicates semantic unity, though it does not apply to all phrasal verbs since some can only be replaced by phrases (to break down - to stop functioning).
- Phrasal verbs share properties with idioms, meaning their definitions cannot be determined solely from their individual components (to bring up - to educate, to go off - to explode). However, due to polysemy, this criterion is not universally applicable.
- The position of the adverbial postposition relative to the noun used with the verb influences the semantic meaning of the phrasal verb.

Although these criteria have limitations, they allow scholars to classify phrasal verbs based on distinct characteristics. Many Uzbek linguists have studied phrasal verbs, focusing on their historical formation, internal structure, and stylistic applications. Due to linguistic evolution, many phrasal verbs have changed in meaning and usage, increasing the necessity for continued research.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study reveal that despite their structural differences, English phrasal verbs and Uzbek affixal verbs serve parallel functions in modifying verb meanings, adding nuances, and enhancing syntactic flexibility. While English phrasal verbs rely on the combination of a main verb with one or more particles (prepositions or adverbs), Uzbek verbs employ derivational affixes—both prefixes and suffixes—to achieve similar functional modifications. This structural divergence reflects the typological differences between English, a largely analytical language, and Uzbek, an agglutinative language.

A key observation is that English phrasal verbs often carry idiomatic meanings that are not always transparent when analyzing individual components. For example, the verb **"give up"** does not directly translate to "bermoq yuqoriga," but rather conveys the sense of quitting or stopping an action. In contrast, Uzbek affixal verbs tend to retain more predictable meanings through their morphological modifications, such as **"yashamoq (to live) → "yashatmoq" (to make someone live, to sustain)**. The addition of affixes systematically alters the meaning, making it more transparent compared to the often unpredictable nature of English phrasal verbs.

Another important aspect discussed in this study is the syntactic behavior of these verbs. In English, phrasal verbs can be separable or inseparable, affecting word order within a sentence (e.g., **"pick up the book"** vs. **"pick the book up"**). Uzbek affixal verbs, on the other hand, integrate modifications within the verb stem itself, making them inseparable by nature. This difference impacts translation strategies, as direct word-for-word translations may not accurately convey the intended meaning. Instead, translators and language learners must focus on understanding the functional equivalence of these verb forms rather than attempting a literal conversion.

Additionally, the study highlights the role of verb modification in language learning and translation studies. For Uzbek speakers learning English, mastering phrasal verbs poses a challenge due to their idiomatic nature and syntactic variability. Similarly, English speakers learning Uzbek must familiarize themselves with affixation rules to correctly form and interpret verbs. Understanding these structural distinctions can improve bilingual communication, facilitate more effective translation strategies, and enhance linguistic competence in both languages.

Overall, the comparative analysis of English phrasal verbs and Uzbek affixal verbs underscores the importance of examining linguistic structures beyond surface-level similarities. By recognizing how different languages modify verbs to express complex meanings, language learners and translators can develop a deeper understanding of cross-linguistic equivalence. Linguists have classified phrasal verbs using various methods, including typology, usage context, structural composition, and stylistic features. A fundamental classification principle, first introduced by V.V. Vinogradov and later revised by N.M. Shansky and S.P. Gavrin, is based on semantic fusion. Phraseological units are generally categorized using lexical-semantic and structural-grammatical criteria, as proposed by O.P. Dmitrieva.

Sh. Bally's classification, based on the divisibility and indivisibility of meaning, categorizes phrasal verbs as "free combinations." These include phrasal verbs where components retain their original meaning (to clean up - "to make a place clean and tidy"). Some scholars consider phrasal verbs to be phraseological units due to their semantic unity (to give up - "to surrender"). Comparing two types of phrasal verbs (phraseological units and free combinations), free combinations are semantically decomposable and sometimes allow for component substitution. For instance, replacing to blow with to blast in to blow off results in to blast off, which has a related but distinct meaning.

Vinogradov's classification divides phraseological units into phraseological fusions, phraseological unities, and phraseological combinations. Phraseological fusions, such as to bubble round, cannot have their components rearranged or substituted without altering meaning. Vinogradov argued that phrasal verbs exhibit strong semantic cohesion, with any modification of components potentially changing or nullifying their meanings.

According to "The Oxford Thesaurus: An A-Z Dictionary of Synonyms," the verb to make has over 50 synonyms, yet replacing to make with a synonym in to make up results in a different phrasal verb (to fix up - "to repair"). This illustrates how phrasal verbs differ from phraseological combinations.

Phraseological combinations, as Vinogradov described, include phrasal verbs with multiple meanings based on context (to come along - "to arrive, to appear, to make progress"). Unlike synonyms, their meanings depend on situational use, making them partially non-free.

Semantically, postpositions significantly influence phrasal verb meanings. Some classifications distinguish between compositional and non-compositional verbs. Compositional verbs retain spatial meanings (to come out - "discover"), while non-compositional verbs form idiomatic phrases (to fall out - "quarrel").

Phrasal verbs can also be divided into simple and verb-dominant combinations, where the verb element determines meaning. The complexity of phrasal verbs often results in wide polysemy, restricting their lexical and phraseological relationships. Structurally, some phrasal verbs consist of three components (fall in with, make up with), where the third component retains lexical meaning but has syntactic independence.

Despite similarities between phrasal verbs and phraseological units, no single classification fully encompasses them. Scholars argue that Uzbek lacks distinct terminology for "phraseological unit," "phraseological unity," and "phraseologism." As a result, there is ongoing debate in both English and Uzbek linguistic studies regarding the categorization of phrasal verbs. The classification of phrasal verbs shifts due to changes in meaning, resulting in transitions between phraseological categories.

Given this complexity, classifying phrasal verbs in English and Uzbek requires consideration of the verb's semantics, the placement and role of postpositions, and synonymic substitutions. Additionally, some phrasal verbs remain semantically indivisible, preventing their classification into specific categories.

CONCLUSION

This study offers a comparative structural classification of English phrasal verbs and Uzbek affixal verbs, highlighting their morphological and syntactic roles in each language. The analysis demonstrates that while English relies on verb-particle constructions to modify meaning, Uzbek utilizes affixation to achieve similar functional outcomes. Despite their structural differences, both linguistic systems enable verbs to convey nuanced meanings, alter verb functions, and enhance syntactic flexibility.

By examining these verb forms from a structural perspective, this research contributes to a deeper understanding of how different languages approach verb modification. The findings

have important implications for language learning, translation studies, and cross-linguistic comparisons, emphasizing the necessity of understanding functional equivalence rather than relying on direct word-for-word translations.

Given the complexity of phrasal and affixal verbs, further research could expand on their cognitive and semantic implications, particularly in bilingual and multilingual contexts. Future studies could explore how speakers of Uzbek acquire and process English phrasal verbs and vice versa, shedding light on the cognitive strategies involved in learning and using these verb forms. Additionally, investigating the role of cultural and contextual factors in shaping verb usage could provide further insights into the broader linguistic and communicative functions of these constructions. Ultimately, this study underscores the importance of cross-linguistic analysis in understanding verb formation processes, aiding both language learners and translators in navigating the complexities of English and Uzbek verb systems more effectively.

REFERENCES

1. Zafarov, R. (2024). Study of structural-semantic and grammatical features of phrasal verbs of the English language by students of non-linguistic specialties. *Bulletin of TGSPU*, 4, 63-69.
2. Vinogradov, V.V. (2007). *Selected Works: Lexicology and Lexicography*. Moscow: Nauka.
3. Pivonekova, T.B. (2023). Semantic classification of phrasal verbs with figurative potential. *Bulletin of MGOU*, 2, 112-119.
4. Salamatina, Yu. V. (2024). Classification of phrasal verbs in the English language. *The World of Science, Culture, Education*, 2, 180-182.
5. Jalolov, M. (2023). Structural and Semantic Features of Phrasal Verbs. *Eurasian Union of Scientists*, 5, 88-91.
6. Elmirzayeva, Maftuna. "STUDY OF THE EVOLUTION OF SOCIAL PROTECTION TERMS AND COMPARATIVE STUDY IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES." *American Journal of Philological Sciences* 4.05 (2024): 61-67.
7. Nizomova, M. B., Elmirzayeva, M. D., Ashurova, M. A., Nusratov, J. B., & Suvanov, I. D. Structural and Semantic Analysis of Social Protection Terms in English and Uzbek Languages.
8. Elmirzayeva, Maftuna D. "FORMATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIAL PROTECTION TERMS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES." *Mental Enlightenment Scientific-Methodological Journal* 5.03 (2024): 131-138.
9. Rasulova, N. (2024). Phrasal verbs in modern English and Uzbek: terminology, features, classification. *Theory and Practice Issues*, 5, 136-141.
10. Phrasal verbs (go in, fall off, run away etc.). Retrieved from [<https://hasanboy.uz>]