

CHOG'ISHTIRMA TILSHUNOSLIK VA TIL NAZARIYASI

UDC(UO'K,УДК): 81-26

LINGUOCOGNITIVE AND SEMANTIC ASPECTS OF FORMULAIC EXPRESSIONS IN ENGLISH, UZBEK, AND RUSSIAN¹⁹**Abdulkhakova Dilafruz Shamsiddinovna***PhD student**Uzbekistan state university of world languages**Tashkent, Uzbekistan**E-mail: abdulkhakovadilafruz@gmail.com**ORCID ID: 0009-0006-0237-6193**Tel: +998918156545***ABSTRACT**

This research focuses on the properties, structures, and cognitive structures of formulaic utterances in English, Russian, and Uzbek, and the analysis uses corpora and cognitive linguistics frameworks. Formulaic expressions are stable, recurring, multi-word sequences with the properties of analytical wholes that allow such communication to take place and where culture and pragmatics are of great importance. The research uses corpora such as COCA, BNC, the Russian National Corpus and electronic resources of Uzbek to study the words in the corpus and the words in the corpus in the form of formal, informal, and ritualized speech to study the words in the corpus in the form of formal, informal, and ritualized speech to study the words in the corpus. The cognitive schema and conceptual structures are employed in the framework and the results are the formulaic expressions that serve as a mechanism for the seamless functionality of culture and communication, the formulaic expressions overlay it. The most important functions of the language that serve the function of the language are the most important functions of the language that serve the function of the language.

KEY WORDS

Formulaic language, cognitive linguistics, semantic structure, mental frames, conceptual metaphors, multilingual analysis.

Received: January 30, 2026**Accepted:** February 16, 2026**Available online:** May 10, 2026

¹⁹ **For citation (Iqtibos keltirish uchun, для цитирования):**

Abdulkhakova D. Linguocognitive and semantic aspects of formulaic expressions in English, Uzbek, and Russian. // Komparativistika (Comparative Studies). — 2026. — Vol.3, № 2(10) — B. 119-131.

INGLIZ, O‘ZBEK VA RUS TILLARIDAGI FORMULALI IFODALAR LINGUOKOGNITIV VA SEMANTIK JIHLTLARI

Abdulxakova Dilafro‘z Shamsiddinovna

Tayanch doktorant

O‘zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti

Toshkent, O‘zbekiston

E-mail: abdulxakovadilafroz@gmail.com

ORCID ID: 0009-0006-0237-6193

Tel: +998918156545

ANNOTATSIYA

Ushbu tadqiqot ingliz, o‘zbek va rus tillaridagi formulali birliklarning xususiyatlari, tuzilishi hamda kognitiv mexanizmlarini o‘rganadi va tahlil jarayonida korpus lingvistikasi hamda kognitiv lingvistika yondashuvlaridan foydalanadi. Formulali ifodalar barqaror, takrorlanadigan, ko‘p so‘zli birliklar bo‘lib, ular nutqda yaxlit bo‘ladi, analitik birlik sifatida qo‘llanadi va madaniy hamda pragmatik omillar bilan bevosita bog‘liqdir. Tadqiqotda COCA, BNC, Rus milliy korpusi hamda o‘zbek tilining elektron korpuslari kabi manbalar asosida rasmiy, norasmiy va ritual nutqda uchraydigan formulali iboralar tahlil qilinadi. Kognitiv sxemalar va konseptual strukturalar metodologik asos sifatida qo‘llanilgan bo‘lib, natijalar shuni ko‘rsatadiki, formulali til birliklari madaniyat va kommunikatsiyaning uzviy va ravon faoliyatini ta‘minlovchi mexanizm sifatida xizmat qiladi. Shu bois formulali ifodalar tilning eng muhim funksional vazifalarini bajarishda asosiy rol o‘ynaydi

KALIT SO‘ZLAR

Formulaviy til, kognitiv lingvistika, semantik tuzilma, mental freymlar, konseptual metaforalar, ko‘p tili tahlil.

ЛИНГВОКОГНИТИВНЫЕ И СЕМАНТИЧЕСКИЕ АСПЕКТЫ ФОРМУЛЬНЫХ ВЫРАЖЕНИЙ В АНГЛИЙСКОМ, УЗБЕКСКОМ И РУССКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ

Абдулхакова Дилафруз Шамсиддиновна

Базовый докторант

Узбекский государственный университет мировых языков

Ташкент, Узбекистан

E-mail: abdulkhakovadilafruz@gmail.com

ORCIDID: 0009-0006-0237-6193

Тел.: +998918156545

АННОТАЦИЯ

Данное исследование посвящено изучению свойств, структуры и когнитивных механизмов формульных высказываний в английском, русском и узбекском языках. Анализ основывается на данных корпусной лингвистики и теоретических положениях когнитивной лингвистики. Формульные выражения представляют собой устойчивые, повторяющиеся, многословные единицы, функционирующие как аналитически цельные структуры, непосредственное влияние на которые оказывают культурные и прагматические факторы. В работе для анализа формульных единиц в официальной, неофициальной и ритуализированной речи используются такие корпуса, как COCA, BNC, Национальный корпус русского языка, а также электронные ресурсы узбекского языка. Методологическую основу составляют когнитивные схемы и концептуальные структуры. Полученные результаты показывают, что формульные выражения служат механизмом, обеспечивающим непрерывность и согласованность культурной и коммуникативной деятельности. Тем самым формульные единицы играют основную роль в решении самых важных функциональных задач языка.

КЛЮЧЕВЫЕ СЛОВА

Формульный язык, когнитивная лингвистика, семантическая структура, ментальные фреймы, концептуальные метафоры, многоязычный анализ.

INTRODUCTION

It has been demonstrated that formulaic phrases are ready-made lexical chunks that may be found in both formal registers (such as “Good morning”, “Good day”, “Sir/Madam”) and informal registers (such as “What’s up?”, “Hey” and “How are you?”). Even if certain lexical components can be swapped within the same template, these expressions are considered formulaic since their structural pattern is fixed. For example, “have a good day/journey/class/flight/weekend” are all examples of **formulaic expressions**. It has also been noticed that formulaic language may be broken down into single-word units (*okay, bye*), short multi-word expressions (*take care, assist yourself*), and lengthier routine formulas (*Long time no see, How have you been?*). This highlights the fundamental role that formulaic language plays in communicative, usage-based approaches to vocabulary (Abdulkhakova D., 2023, 116).

In the theory of language, formulaic expressions are defined as conventionalised, recurring multi-word chunks that are retained and processed as holistic cognitive entities rather than being composed each time anew. In linguistics, formulaic expressions are defined as conventionalised, recurring multi-word units that are recognised and processed as whole cognitive entities, rather than being formed afresh each time. These phrases provide consistent semantic and pragmatic roles, enabling speakers to access established meanings quickly. Cognitive frameworks such as Conceptual Metaphor Theory, Frame Semantics and Prototype Theory explain how formulaic units acquire stable meanings, activate fundamental conceptual structures and become ingrained in speakers’ mental lexicons. These theories view formulaic language as a linguistic phenomenon and a manifestation of conceptual structures and cognitive processes. Metaphor is a universal yet culturally distinctive cognitive process that can be found in a variety of languages and civilisations. It not only helps individuals to understand their own experiences, but also demonstrates the fundamental principles that govern how individuals perceive things. These principles are based on their bodies and senses, as well as the unique characteristics associated with how people from different cultures view the world through language (Abdulkhakova D. & Bazarbaeva A., 2025, 20).

This study uses data from English, Russian and Uzbek to explore formulaic phrases from a multilingual perspective without making language comparisons. This approach maintains a focus on language theory. It enables an individual examination of each language system, demonstrating how universal cognitive processes operate across different language types. The study aims to clarify the linguistic, cognitive, and semantic features of formulaic expressions in each language. It demonstrates

how fixed phrases encapsulate conceptual frameworks, cultural insights and consistent meanings, without drawing direct comparisons between languages.

The research is based on data from significant corpora, including the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) and the British National Corpus for English, the Russian National Corpus for Russian and accessible digital corpora for Uzbek. These materials include naturally occurring instances that demonstrate the frequency, contextual use and semantic diversity of formulaic expressions. The research incorporates multiple theoretical frameworks: Frame Semantics to identify conceptual structures; Conceptual Metaphor Theory to reveal metaphorical motivations; and cognitive-linguistic principles such as entrenchment and schema activation to analyse the functioning of formulaic expressions within the three linguistic systems in a systematic way. Taken together, these corpora and theoretical approaches establish a cohesive methodological framework for examining the cognitive and semantic features of formulaic language.

METHODS

The study is based on data extracted from several major corpora, including COCA and the British National Corpus for English, the Russian National Corpus for Russian, and available digital corpora for Uzbek. These corpora provide large, representative samples of naturally occurring language, enabling the identification of stable formulaic expressions. To ensure consistency and reliability, expressions were selected according to four core criteria: high frequency of occurrence, structural fixedness, degree of idiomaticity, and pragmatic function in discourse. These criteria allow for the systematic isolation of conventionalised multi-word units that demonstrate clear semantic and cognitive stability.

E.Goffman employed an innovative research methodology including three distinct “methods”. In order to learn more about a phenomena, researchers employed observation and analysing with synthesizing approaches to study its opposite. “Frame Analysis” posits that individuals pursuing certainty would exploit it to mislead us. [*... It turns out that finding out about lies is primarily about making up stories. [... By examining the replication or distortion of reality, we can get insight into the construction of our experiential world.* (Goffman E., 1974, 251). The third step, conceptualisation, was employed for systematisation, analysis, and interpretation. It has been asserted that E.Goffman formulated over 900 concepts, signifying a substantial methodology for him. E.Goffman preferred observation because he didn't trust the interview method, which depended on what the performers said (Williams R., 1988, 88).

The research incorporates essential cognitive-linguistic frameworks to reveal the conceptual and semantic organisation of formulaic utterances. Conceptual

Metaphor Theory elucidates the metaphorical intentions behind several fixed phrases, whereas Frame Semantics offers methodologies for discerning the mental sceneries and structures they invoke. Prototype Theory further substantiates the delineation of primary and peripheral semantic attributes within formulaic units. The analytical process comprises four stages:

- 1) extracting expressions from the corpora;
- 2) identifying the conceptual metaphors, frames, or prototype structures that inform their meanings;
- 3) delineating the semantic patterns that arise from corpus usage; and
- 4) interpreting these patterns concerning cognitive mechanisms such as entrenchment, chunking, and schema activation.

This comprehensive technique guarantees a consistent and systematic analysis of the linguocognitive and semantic characteristics of formulaic statements across the chosen language systems. This article presents the following research questions:

1. In what ways do formulaic expressions appear in the corpora of English, Russian, and Uzbek from a linguocognitive standpoint?
2. What are the main semantic features and idiomatic meanings of formulaic expressions in these three languages?
3. What cognitive processes govern the processing and retention of formulaic phrases in different languages?

RESULTS

The frame analysis developed by E. Goffman makes use of ethnographic research to investigate “strips” of social behaviour, also known as “frames” that individuals employ in order to perceive their surroundings. Principal frames are interpretive schemas that are responsible for providing social circumstances with meaning. The meaning of a social activity can be altered through the use of keying’s, which are transformations. It is possible for analysts to determine the “rules” of a social situation by employing this method, which is analogous to reading a “key” on a map.

Formulaic expressions comprising idioms, collocations, proverbs, and set phrases are integral to natural language usage and mirror the cognitive frameworks of speakers in English, Russian, and Uzbek. From a linguocognitive standpoint, these phrases function as cognitive shortcuts, offering efficient communication mechanisms that convey intricate meanings and cultural subtleties inside established linguistic structures.

In English, formulaic statements frequently encompass idioms (e.g., *speak of the devil, up the air, call it a day*), collocations (e.g., *take time off, throw a party, pay a visit*), and phrasal verbs (e.g., *give up, let down, put up with*). These terms

enhance communication and enrich the language by offering vivid visuals and cultural references. Their abundance in daily language underscores their significance in cognitive processes, enabling speakers to communicate meaning effectively without necessitating lengthy elaboration.

Formulaic statements are prevalent in both conversational discourse and literary works in Russian. Expressions like “*плыть против течения*” (to swim against the tide) exemplify the influence of cultural context on the interpretation of phrases. Furthermore, collocations such as “*сделать вывод*” (to draw a conclusion) are essential for formulating clear and nuanced arguments. The utilisation of fixed terms enhances familiarity and facilitates communication among speakers.

In the Uzbek language, also utilises formulaic terms that are profoundly embedded in its cultural tradition. This is the literal translation of the phrase “*Ona yurtning - oltin beshiging*”, which translates to “*Your motherland is your golden cradle*”. A profound cultural bond and a reverence for one's origins are shown in the fact that it emphasises the fact that one's country is the most valuable location. Moreover, expressions that embody social etiquette or customary behaviours are crucial for fostering rapport in dialogue. The prevalence of formulaic terms in all three languages is influenced by cognitive economy, which is our inclination to utilise existing speech patterns instead than creating original sentences. This dependence streamlines the language processing work and improves fluency. The semantic characteristics of formulaic phrases include fixedness, idiomaticity, and conventionalisation. Fixedness refers to the generally immutable structure of certain phrases, which cannot be modified without losing meaning. This feature exemplifies idiomatic idioms, wherein the meaning is not simply obtained from the individual words (e.g., “*spill the beans*” signifies revealing a secret). Idiomatic interpretations frequently encompass metaphors or cultural allusions that elicit specific visual or emotional responses. For example, in English, the phrase “*beat around the bush*” signifies an indirect manner of communication, but in Russian, “*знаться запризрачным удовольствием*” (to seek an illusory pleasure) underscores cultural perspectives on drive and ambition. In the Uzbek language, idiomatic phrases show both fixedness and cultural individuality. They have meanings that can't always be figured out from the individual words. For instance, “*ochiq yuz bilan*” technically means “with an open face”, but it may also indicate “with a good mood” or “pleasant disposition” which shows how much people appreciate being kind and honest. “*Adabini berdi*” which literally means “gave (someone) their manners” is an idiom that means penalizing or punishing someone based on what they did. This demonstrates how moral and social conventions become embedded in language. Similarly, “*dumini tugmoq*”, which literally means “to tie the tail”, is an idiom that

implies driving someone away forever. This demonstrates how everyday actions can be transformed into dramatic, metaphorical expressions. Such set phrases demonstrate the formulaic and idiomatic nature of Uzbek, where multi-word units possess culturally based meanings that transcend the literal significance of their constituent words. Such statements possess pragmatic connotations that reflect the attitudes and relationship dynamics between speakers. Using courteous expressions or idioms can indicate respect or familiarity, thereby affecting social interactions in all three linguistic cultures. The cognitive processing of formulaic statements is mainly enabled by two mechanisms: retrieval and storage.

“Retrieval” refers to the ability to quickly and efficiently access these expressions during language development. Research indicates that proficient speakers can access stored formulaic expressions more quickly than they can create original sentences, highlighting the advantage of having a large repertoire of readily available terms. The frequency with which phrases are used affects this process: those used often are more accessible in memory.

“Storage” refers to the cognitive organisation and classification of formulaic statements in memory. According to cognitive linguistics, these statements are retained as holistic entities rather than as a compilation of separate words. This comprehensive storage facilitates faster retrieval and seamless integration into conversation. In summary, context plays a significant role in both storage and retrieval. Increased exposure to a given formulaic language in relevant situations strengthens its connection to specific events, emotions, or meanings. This contextual anchoring deepens comprehension and improves the user’s ability to manage social interactions effectively.

DISCUSSION

Scholars in many fields of linguistics and second language acquisition consistently acknowledge the systematic presence of formulaic or prefabricated language in oral and written discourse, albeit to varying degrees (Schmale G., 2021a, 9). Phraseological competence is essential for attaining proficiency in a foreign language, a concept first proposed by Ch. Bally (1909) and later strongly supported by I. Mel’čuk (1993). Both studies assert that the systematic acquisition of formulaic and prepared language is crucial for effective communication. Nevertheless, the book asserts that several publications advocating for the instruction of formulaic language lack sufficient linguistic and methodological depth, failing to account for the multimodal and situational dimensions of authentic communication structures.

This research shows how fluently participating members of the community possess homogenous knowledge of formulaic language and the inflexible parts of a given schema, as shown by the high accuracy of target words for formulaic

expressions. Their responses showed very little variation in the word boxes for formulaic and schema-fixed expressions, illustrating the presence of cohesive, consolidated mental representations of these formulaic expressions in their surface forms. The knowledge exhibited in this instance was uniform and intergenerational without age impacting the results in any significant manner, which counters the position that formulaic language is subject to decay over the generations. That broad knowledge leads to a third observation where open slots in a schema produce the most flexibility in thought and language, often introducing even more unique categories than would otherwise be the case for a new sentence. The most diverse responses lexically in high variability were for open schema items, demonstrating that schemata possess an interesting hybrid cognitive status in that they are both structurally formulaic and, to an extent, open to coining of new words into the open slot. Hence, schemata were shown to combine the social and communicative benefits of formulaic sequences along with the opportunity for unencumbered discourse making the unique position to be partially fixed and partially generative (Van Lancker Sidtis D. et al, 2015).

In common terminology and in mainstream phraseology, descriptions of “formulaic language” as a broad category – “an umbrella term” (Wray A. & Perkins M., 2000, 3), consistently reference three notions to differentiate pre-existing word combinations from spontaneously generated constructions:

- **Polylexicality**, or “multi-word combinations” as defined by Wood D. comprises at least two lexical autosemantic and/or synsemantic units – *make a mistake, as a matter of fact* (Wood D., 2015, 3);

- **Stability**: both lexical components and their combinations are relatively fixed cognitively and/or frequently utilised in a specific form – *take into account, by the way*;

- **Idiomacity**: the aggregate meaning of its constituents does not equate to the phraseological meaning, indicating a semantically non-compositional nature – *have a go, to be all ears, couch potato*.

Given that the majority of phrases adhere to conventional syntax and semantics, polylexicality and (relative) stability delineate their reach in a more expansive context. Expressions that are colloquial yet whose meanings are not discernible from a strictly semantic perspective fall into a tighter classification. The linguist, namely G. Schmale, the issues are based on the essential hyponymic idea of “*polyfactoriality*” which will be clarified through the following hypernymic sub-concepts: the degree of formulaicity, the continual use of formulaic expressions, their idiomacity, and their multimodal features. These considerations will

culminate in a revised concept of prefabricated communicative structures (Schmale G., 2022, 95).

From our viewpoint, formulaic language constitutes a category of lexical units, namely one or more assembled linguistic units that can express fixed or non-compositional, conceptual, perceptual, and compositional information. Formulaic expressions may be identified by assessing their degree of formulaicity, which includes their frequency in native speech or writing (as evidenced by corpora like as COCA, BNC, and NOW), fixedness or non-compositionality in meaning and context, cognitive entrenchment, and holistic processing. Formulaic expressions can be exemplified as “**mathematical formulas**” including **noun + after + noun** (e.g., *day after day, year after year*), **noun + by + noun** (e.g., *day by day, bit by bit*), **by + noun phrase** (e.g., *by all means, by the way*), and **binomial expressions (X and Y)**, which constitute a traditional formula - **Noun/Verb/Adj + and + Noun/Verb/Adj - coordinated pairs** - *black and white, salt and pepper*; **reduplicative binomials** - *trial and error, high and low, safe and sound*; **comparative and superlative templates** - **as + Adj + as + Noun** - *as clear as day, as light as a feather*; **Adj + -er + and + Adj + -er** - *bigger and bigger, sooner and sooner*.

Ch. Fillmore, J. Kay, and P. O’Connor characterise “constructions” as “form-meaning pairs” including a syntactic framework that is lexically populated or provides slots that may be occupied by items from certain lexical categories. There exist two categories of “constructions” – “substantive idioms”, predominantly classical phrasemes that exhibit lexical stability, and “formal idioms” which consist of morphosyntactic frameworks with slots that are either partially or entirely unfilled lexically. “Formal idioms” encompass the phraseological model [**x is x**], however they are not limited to this category (Schmale G., 2022, 97).

J. Sinclair’s “idiom principle” asserts that a language user has several semi-preconstructed phrases that serve as unique choices, despite their seeming potential to be broken down into smaller parts. (Sinclair J, 1991, 110) – often seems to go beyond “free choice” or, at the very least, limit it through grammatical rules or paradigmatic lexical restrictions. After that, there are just a few examples of “constructions” as defined by corpus-based research in this framework (Schmale G., 2022, 97):

1. The incredulity response construction [**prep.phrase + verb/non phrase/adj./etc. + ?**]: *Me, lie /a liar? Me, crazy?*, also existing in Uzbek with an ending to the pronoun and noun – **mi** – *Menmi, yolg‘onchi/telba?* whereas in Russian this can be sounded like... *Я вру , ... Меня лжецом/меня безумной?*

2. The exclamatory/emphatic construction [**how + adj. + is/are + that/complement + !**]: *How stupid/strange/weird/etc. is that!*; in Uzbek – *Qanday axmoqona/g'alati holat/vaziyat/axmoqlik!* - an exact noun (what we are talking about) can be added here in Uzbek or an adjective translated as a noun, in Russian it is similar - *Как глупо/странно это!*

3. The dissatisfaction/reproach construction [**why + are + pers. pron.12 + V-ing + comp. + ?**]: *Why are you staring at me? Why are you saying that?*; There is a similarity between languages see - in Uzbek - *Nimaga menga qarayabsan/tikilyapsan? Nima sababdan buni aytyapsan?*; in Russian - *Почему ты смотришь на меня? Почему ты говоришь, это?*

The Russian items bring into focus formulaic language encoding strong cultural scripts and evaluative force. Idioms such as *бить баклуши* and *дело в шляпе* make use of historically grounded imagery and outcome-certainty frames, while expressions like *кене в своей тарелке* employ embodied-location metaphors in their depiction of emotional states. The semantic profile is dominated by high fixedness and expressive intensity, along with a range of directive or evaluative pragmatic roles played by many of the expressions. These characteristics suggest that the formulaic units of Russian frequently exhibit condensed semantic weight and are deeply embedded within social and cultural interactional scripts.

Uzbek examples focus on ritualized social formulas and culturally salient metaphors: *Assalomu alaykum* – greeting which means “Peace be upon you”; *Omadlaringni bersin* — blessing formula; *Baraka toping* — “May you be blessed”; *Do‘stim, marhamat* — friendly invitation; *Mayli, ko‘rishamiz*. *Charchamang\lar* — fixed farewell formula or gratitude markers like *Rahmat*, *Katta rahmat/Rahmat kattakonare* highly fixed and perform crucial politeness and social-bonding functions, while other units, like *Mehmon otangdan ulug‘*, *Hashar* — *elga yarashar*. invoke sensory-to-cognition metaphors to encode community work (teamwork) and hospitality, respect and honor expressions instantiate strong, culturally anchored frames. Community cooperation and mutual help strengthen social harmony; working together brings benefits to all. Semantically, Uzbek formulaic expressions tend to be compact, pragmatically indirect in expressions of politeness, and closely tied to social norms-features that reflect entrenched cognitive schemas and sociopragmatic expectations in Uzbek discourse.

CONCLUSION

It can be concluded that formulaic statements in English, Russian, and Uzbek are complex linguistic and cognitive structures that reflect cultural importance. Their expression is fundamentally based on the efficacy of communication, the depth of idiomatic significance, and the cognitive processes that regulate language

comprehension and memory retention. They embody both the structural elements of language and the cognitive and cultural facets of linguistic interaction.

The findings of the investigation imply that formulaic phrases are pre-formed, cognitively stamped units of language that are crucial for effective communication and the encoding of cultural, pragmatic, and semantic information. In languages such as Uzbek, English, and Russian, these idioms are characterised by high levels of fixedness, idiomaticity, and conventionalisation. They are holistic rather than compositional units. These components make it easier to find things in a restricted period, minimize the level of mental effort that is experienced, and provide the speaker with pre-produced frames that aid in social interaction and conversation management. The incorporation of formulaic words into speakers' mental lexicons is demonstrated by cognitive-linguistic theories such as Frame Semantics, Conceptual Metaphor Theory, and Prototype Theory. This activation of conceptual schemas and information of cultural origin is triggered by the occurrence of formulaic terms. Phrases in Uzbek such as “Ona yurting — oltin beshiging”, “Mehmon otangdan ulug‘” and “Hashar — elga yarashar” are some of those instances that reveal the interdependence of language, cognition, and culture. These also show that formulaic units represent both social practices and moral propositions. The outcomes of this research underpin the significance of formulaic language in terms of its potential to impact linguistic competence, cognitive processing, and the creation of conceptual structures that are grounded in cultural heritage.

REFERENCE:

1. Abdulkhakova, D. (2023). *Formulaic language for communicative competence: Native speakers and ESL learners*. International Journal of Inclusive and Sustainable Education, 2(3), 115–118. <https://inter-publishing.com/index.php/IJISE/article/view/1361/1167>
2. Abdulkhakova, D., & Bazarbaeva, A. (2025). *The cognitive and cultural fabric of formulaic language: Insights from English, Russian, and Uzbek expressions*. Philology Matters, 2025(D2), 3–23. <https://doi.org/10.36078/987656102https://journals.tnmu.uz/index.php/fm/article/view/1176>
3. Bally, Charles (1909a): *Traité de stylistique française*. Volume I. Heidelberg: Winter.
4. Bally, Charles (1909b): *Traité de stylistique française*. Volume II. Heidelberg: Winter.

5. Fillmore, Charles J./Kay, Paul/O'Connor, Mary C. (1988): "Regularity and Idiomaticity in Grammatical Construction: The Case of Let Alone". *Language* 64/3: 501–538.
6. Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: an essay on the organization of experience*. New York: Harper and Row.
7. Goffman, E. (1976). Replies and responses. *Language in Society*, 5(3), 257–313
8. <https://audiobook.uz/blogs/news/frazeologik-iboralar-va-ularga-misollar>
9. Lyons, J. (1977). Structural semantics I: semantic fields. In *Semantics* (pp. 230–269). chapter, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
10. Mel'čuk, Igor (1993): "La phraséologie et son rôle dans l'enseignement/apprentissage d'une langue étrangère". *Études de Linguistique Appliquée* 92: 82–113.
11. Mirzayev, T., Musoqulov, A., & Sarimsakov, B. (2005). *O'zbek xalq maqollari*. Toshkent: Sharq Nashriyot-Matbaa Aksiyadorlik Korporatsiyasi. https://www.academia.edu/32630081/Ozbek_xalq_maqollari_OZBEK_XALQ_MAQOLLARI
12. Persson, A. (2018). Framing Social Interaction: Continuities and Cracks in Goffman's Frame Analysis. (1 ed.) p.201. Routledge. https://lup.lub.lu.se/search/files/74985595/Framing_Social_Interaction.pdf
13. Schmale, G. (2022). Formulaic Expressions for Foreign Language Learning and Teaching. *Linguistik Online*, 113(1), 91-110. <https://doi.org/10.13092/lo.113.8328>
14. Schmale, Günter (2021a): "Expressions préformées et apprentissage des langues étrangères". *Zeitschrift für Romanische Sprachen und ihre Didaktik (ZRomSD)* 15/1: 9–37.
15. Van Lancker Sidtis, D., Cameron, K., Bridges, K., & Sidtis, J. J. (2015). *The formulaic schema in the minds of two generations of native speakers*. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 81, 33–46. <file:///C:/Users/Surface/Desktop/Formulaic%20expressions%20Analysis%20data/the%20formulaic%20schema%20in%20natives%20minds.pdf>
16. Williams, R. (1988). Understanding Goffman's methods. In P. Drew & A. Wootton (Eds.), *Erving Goffman. Exploring the Interaction Order* (pp. 64–88). Cambridge: Polity Press.
17. Wood, David (2015): *Fundamentals of Formulaic Language, An Introduction*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
18. Wray, Alison/Perkins, Michael R. (2000): "The Functions of Formulaic Language: An Integrated Model". *Language & Communication* 20: 1–28.
19. <https://www.english-corpora.org/coca/>
20. <https://ruscorpora.ru/en>
21. <https://uzbekcorpus.uz/authorCorpus>