

Date: 13th August-2026

LEXICOGRAPHIC REPRESENTATION OF ENGLISH PHRASAL VERBS IN UZBEK AND PRINCIPLES OF DICTIONARY COMPILATION

Ilmurodov Abbos Malik ugli

Teacher, Specialized School,
Kattakurgan City, Samarkand Region

Annotation: This article addresses the problem of representing English phrasal verbs in Uzbek-language dictionaries and proposes a set of principles for compiling a specialized English–Uzbek phrasal verb dictionary. Existing bilingual dictionaries often treat phrasal verbs inconsistently, either listing them as sub-entries under the base verb without adequate semantic differentiation, or omitting many idiomatic senses altogether. The article analyzes the main lexicographic challenges — polysemy, register labeling, syntactic patterning, and translation equivalence — and proposes a structured entry model that integrates grammatical, semantic, pragmatic, and illustrative information. Such a model is intended to improve both the accuracy and pedagogical usefulness of phrasal verb dictionaries for Uzbek-speaking learners of English.

Key words: lexicography, phrasal verbs, bilingual dictionary, dictionary entry, Uzbek language, English language, learner's dictionary.

Phrasal verbs represent one of the most lexicographically demanding categories of English vocabulary. Their combination of high frequency, semantic opacity, and syntactic flexibility makes them difficult to capture adequately within the conventional dictionary entry format, especially in bilingual English–Uzbek dictionaries, where the target language lacks a structurally parallel category. Many existing dictionaries either underrepresent phrasal verbs, treating them as marginal appendices to the main verb entry, or list them without sufficient contextual, grammatical, or stylistic information, leaving Uzbek-speaking learners without adequate guidance on usage.

Several features of phrasal verbs create distinct lexicographic challenges. Polysemy is the most significant: a single phrasal verb may have five or more distinct senses, ranging from literal-spatial to fully idiomatic, and each sense may require a different Uzbek equivalent. Syntactic variability is also important, since phrasal verbs may be separable or inseparable, transitive or intransitive, and this behavior must be indicated explicitly, as it is not predictable from the base verb alone. Register variation further complicates entries, as many phrasal verbs are informal or colloquial, while their Uzbek equivalents may carry a different stylistic value, risking a mismatch that misleads the learner. Finally, collocational behavior — the tendency of phrasal verbs to co-occur with particular nouns, prepositions, or grammatical structures — is often omitted from bilingual dictionaries despite being essential for correct usage.

A review of currently available English–Uzbek dictionaries shows that phrasal verbs are typically handled in one of three ways: as an undifferentiated list appended to the base verb entry, with minimal example material; as separate headword entries, which



Date: 13th August-2026



improves accessibility but often loses the connection to the base verb's other meanings; or, in the weakest cases, as omissions, particularly for less frequent or highly idiomatic combinations. Monolingual learner's dictionaries of English, by contrast, tend to apply a much more elaborated entry structure, including sense numbering, grammatical codes, register labels, and multiple example sentences per sense. This asymmetry suggests that bilingual English–Uzbek lexicography has significant room for methodological improvement, particularly by adapting entry-structuring principles from monolingual learner's dictionaries to the bilingual context.

Based on the challenges identified above, the following principles are proposed for compiling a specialized English–Uzbek phrasal verb dictionary.

First, sense differentiation: each distinct meaning of a phrasal verb should be listed as a separate numbered sense, with its own Uzbek equivalent, rather than grouping multiple meanings under a single translation.

Second, grammatical annotation: each sense should indicate transitivity, separability, and any restrictions on the object (for example, whether the object must be animate, abstract, or a specific type of noun), since these properties directly affect correct usage and cannot be inferred from the Uzbek equivalent.

Third, register and frequency labeling: entries should specify whether a phrasal verb is formal, informal, colloquial, or specialized in register, and ideally indicate relative frequency, so that learners can judge appropriateness of use in different contexts.

Fourth, example-based illustration: every sense should be accompanied by at least one authentic or naturalistic example sentence in English with a corresponding Uzbek translation, since phrasal verbs are best acquired through contextualized input rather than isolated translation equivalents.

Fifth, cross-referencing of related forms: entries should cross-reference related phrasal verbs (synonymous, antonymous, or formed from the same base verb with different particles), helping learners build a systematic understanding of particle semantics rather than memorizing forms in isolation.

A proposed phrasal verb entry follows a fixed structure: headword with pronunciation, grammatical code (transitivity/separability), numbered senses each with a Uzbek equivalent, register label, example sentence with translation, and optional collocation notes — mirroring monolingual learner's dictionaries while addressing Uzbek learners' need for explicit grammatical guidance.

Beyond the printed or static entry model, digital lexicography offers additional possibilities for representing phrasal verbs more effectively for Uzbek-speaking learners. A digital dictionary can incorporate audio pronunciation, searchable example databases drawn from authentic corpora, and frequency-ranked sense ordering, so that the most common meaning of a phrasal verb is presented first rather than in historical or alphabetical order. Corpus-based frequency data can also inform which phrasal verbs merit full treatment with multiple examples and which can be treated more briefly, allowing compilers to allocate lexicographic effort efficiently. Furthermore, a digital format allows cross-linking between an entry and related particle-based entries, enabling learners to

Date: 13th August-2026

explore how the same particle contributes similar shades of meaning across different base verbs, reinforcing the systematic, rule-governed aspects of an otherwise idiomatic area of vocabulary.

Another valuable digital feature is the inclusion of common learner errors associated with specific phrasal verbs, such as incorrect particle choice or improper word order in separable constructions. Since Uzbek-speaking learners do not have an intuitive structural analogue to rely on, explicit error warnings embedded in the dictionary entry can preempt frequent mistakes and reinforce correct usage patterns more effectively than a translation equivalent alone.

Building on the principles proposed above, a pilot project could begin with a core list of the several hundred most frequent English phrasal verbs, selected on the basis of established frequency data from general English corpora. Each entry would be compiled according to the structured model described in Section 4, and reviewed by both an English linguistics specialist and a native Uzbek lexicographer to ensure accuracy on both sides of the language pair. Piloting the dictionary with a sample group of Uzbek-speaking English learners, followed by feedback collection on entry clarity and usefulness, would allow the entry model to be refined iteratively before a full-scale dictionary is compiled. Such a project would fill a significant gap in existing English–Uzbek lexicographic resources and directly support both classroom instruction and independent learning.

It should be acknowledged that any dictionary compilation effort of this kind faces practical limitations, including the time and expertise required to annotate register and collocational information accurately, and the ongoing evolution of English phrasal verb usage, particularly in informal digital communication, which can outpace periodic dictionary revisions. Further research is needed to determine the optimal number of example sentences per sense for effective learning without overwhelming the user, as well as to evaluate empirically whether the proposed structured entry model measurably improves learners' comprehension and production accuracy compared to existing simplified entries. Longitudinal studies tracking learner performance before and after exposure to a structured dictionary model would provide valuable evidence for refining lexicographic practice in this area.

Adequate lexicographic representation of English phrasal verbs in Uzbek-language dictionaries requires moving beyond simple word-for-word equivalents toward a structured, sense-differentiated entry model that accounts for grammar, register, and context. The principles proposed in this article — sense differentiation, grammatical annotation, register labeling, example-based illustration, and cross-referencing — offer a practical foundation for compiling a dedicated English–Uzbek phrasal verb dictionary that would substantially improve learners' ability to acquire and correctly use this challenging area of English vocabulary. Future work in this area would benefit from corpus-based frequency data to prioritize which phrasal verbs and senses merit the most detailed treatment.



Date: 13th August-2026

REFERENCES:

1. Cowie A.P., Mackin R. Oxford Dictionary of Phrasal Verbs. — Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
2. Landau S.I. Dictionaries: The Art and Craft of Lexicography. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
3. Atkins B.T.S., Rundell M. The Oxford Guide to Practical Lexicography. — Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
4. Bolinger D. The Phrasal Verb in English. — Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971.
5. Begmatov E. Hozirgi o'zbek leksikografiyasi. — Toshkent: Fan, 2003.
6. Hartmann R.R.K., James G. Dictionary of Lexicography. — London: Routledge, 1998.
7. Mahmudov N. O'zbek tili leksikologiyasi va leksikografiyasi. — Toshkent: O'qituvchi, 2012.

