The OSCAR PUBLISHING Services
American Journal of Philological Sciences

VOLUME Vol.05 Issue10 2025
PAGE NO. 51-53
DOI 10.37547/ajps/Volume05Issue10-14

The Presentation Of Formulaic Structures In Parallel Texts In English And Uzbek Languages

Asqarova Madina Boymurod qizi
Phd Student, Uzbekistan State World Languages University, Uzbekistan

Received: 17 August 2025; **Accepted:** 13 September 2025; **Published:** 15 October 2025

Abstract: This study investigates the translation strategies employed in rendering formulaic expressions from Uzbek to English within the context of philological dissertation abstracts. Formulaic expressions—multi-word units stored and retrieved as complete entities—play a crucial role in academic discourse by facilitating logical coherence, credibility, and precision in communication. The investigation focuses on the challenges arising from fundamental typological differences between Uzbek (an agglutinative Turkic language) and English (an analytic Indo-European language).

A corpus of 157 formulaic expressions was systematically extracted from dissertation abstracts in the philological sciences and analyzed to identify predominant translation strategies. The findings reveal that adaptive translation—particularly the conversion of active voice constructions to passive voice—emerged as the most frequently employed strategy for achieving functional equivalence across the two languages. This research contributes to understanding interlingual equivalence in academic translation and highlights the importance of formulaic expressions in establishing author credibility and disciplinary membership in scholarly texts.

Keywords: Formulaic expressions, translation strategies, academic discourse, Uzbek-English translation, corpus analysis.

Introduction: In recent years, linguists and methodologists have devoted considerable attention to the issue of employing formulaic expressions—multi-word units stored in ready-made form in our language system—in both written and oral discourse. Every language contains units that are preserved in our subconscious as complete entities, which are referred to as formulaic expressions or collocations. Such units facilitate the accurate, concise, and effective communication of information in both everyday and formal interactions.

Theoretical Background

The analysis of formulaic units has a rich history in linguistics, with its earliest roots traceable to the pioneering work of O. Jespersen and J. Firth. Scholars have provided various definitions of formulaic units. Notably, A. Wray characterizes them as "a sequence, continuous or discontinuous, of words or other meaning elements, which is, or appears to be, prefabricated: that is, stored and retrieved whole from memory at the time of use, rather than being subject to generation or analysis by the language grammar" (Wray, 2002). R. Langacker, in contrast, defines formulaic expressions more broadly, encompassing units ranging from simple collocations to extensive constructions (Langacker, 1987).

D. Biber (2006) classified the functional types of formulaic expressions into three primary categories:

1. Referential expressions;
2. Discourse-organizing expressions;
3. Stance expressions.

Formulaic expressions are multi-word sequences that occur with high frequency, are employed in ready-made form by speakers, and function as single units. Examples include: it is said that, it is well known that, as mentioned above, and similar constructions. M. Paquot (2014) provides a definition stating that formulaic expressions can be lexically phrasal (e.g., the result of this) or clausal (e.g., it is noted that, it is shown

that), and they serve various discourse functions.

R. Reppen, who analyzed the role of formulaic structures in second language learners' discourse, demonstrated both positive and negative aspects of these units in her research. Specifically, as learners' linguistic competence increases, they employ a greater variety and quantity of formulaic structures. For instance, research findings indicate that the accuracy of lexical bundles improved significantly over the course of one year. However, paradoxically, as learners' proficiency advanced, their use of such units decreased. Furthermore, students who spent more time in English-speaking environments demonstrated even lower usage rates of formulaic expressions.

Formulaic units constitute actively employed elements not only in oral discourse but also in written communication. These units vary according to textual genre. For example, in English, expressions such as as a result of and it should be noted that are characteristic of scientific style, while in pursuance of and in accordance with are frequently utilized in legal texts. The employment of such structures represents not merely a stylistic necessity for writers but also a lexical means of ensuring logical coherence, credibility, and precision in communication.

Scientific texts, by virtue of their universal characteristics, require stylistic units that are familiar and comprehensible to all audiences. Moreover, formulaic units ensure logical connectivity between the introductory, main, and concluding sections of texts, which is why they are also studied as discourse markers. These expressions function as cohesive devices that guide readers through complex argumentative structures and facilitate the comprehension of academic discourse across disciplinary boundaries.

The significance of formulaic expressions in academic writing extends to their role in establishing author credibility and disciplinary membership. Mastery of appropriate formulaic language distinguishes expert from novice writers and contributes substantially to the perceived quality of scholarly texts. As such, the systematic investigation of these conventionalized linguistic patterns remains a priority in applied linguistics, corpus linguistics, and language pedagogy research.

METHODOLOGY

The present study adopted a corpus-analytical approach, establishing its empirical foundation through the systematic extraction of formulaic units from dissertation abstracts (avtoreferats) in the philological sciences. The analytical focus centered on identifying and categorizing the translation strategies implemented when transferring these formulaic expressions from Uzbek to English.

From a linguistic typology perspective, the investigation revealed that the fundamental structural divergences between Uzbek (an agglutinative Turkic language) and English (an analytic Indo-European language) precipitate numerous translation challenges. These typological disparities manifest in various aspects of the translation process, necessitating strategic adaptations to achieve functional equivalence.

Result and Discussions

Due to English and Uzbek belong to different language families, we encountered the issue of interlingual equivalence. A total of 157 formulaic expressions were extracted from the dissertation abstracts and subjected to systematic analysis. The study examined the translation strategies applied to each expression, identifying patterns of lexical, functional, structural, and adaptive equivalence. The research findings indicate that the most frequently employed method was the adaptive approach, whereby expressions in the active voice were rendered into the passive voice in translation. This pattern can be observed in the table below.

Table 1.

Typology and Frequency Distribution of Equivalence Patterns in English-Uzbek Formulaic Expression Translation

Name	Uzbek	English	Number	%	Degree of equivalence
Leksik ekvivalentlik	Xususan, aytish mumkinki, shu sababdan	In particular, for this reason, it can be said,	9 ta	5.7%	90-100%

Functional equivalence			2 ta	1.3 %	70-89%
Structural equivalence	Asarda berilgan rivoyatga ko‘ra, ochiq haqiqat,	As it is reported, it is obvious fact that,	5 ta	3.2 %	50-69%
Adaptive equivalence			141 ta	89.9%	30-49%

The research findings demonstrate that the largest portion of analyzed lexical units – 141 units or 89.9% – possess an equivalence level within the 30-49% range. This figure clearly illustrates how difficult it is to achieve complete equivalence in the translation process and that translators are often forced to settle for partial equivalence. Such a high percentage indicates that in most cases, finding complete lexical correspondence between source and target languages is challenging, and the translator must resort to various transformations, explanations, or approximations.

Functional equivalence (90-100% correspondence) was observed in only 9 lexical units (5.7%). The provided example "Xususan, aytish mumkinki, shu sababdan" → "In particular, for this reason, it can be said" demonstrates a high level of functional equivalence. In these cases, the translator has managed to preserve almost completely the meaning, style, and pragmatic effect of the source language expression in the target language. However, such high-level equivalence is relatively rare, which testifies to the profound differences between both language systems.

Structural equivalence (70-89%) was recorded in the smallest number of cases – only 2 instances (1.3%). This shows that expressions with structurally identical construction are very rare. Adaptive equivalence (50-69%) was observed in 5 examples (3.2%), for instance, in the translation "Asarda berilgan rivoyatga ko'ra, ochiq haqiqat" → "As it is reported, it is obvious fact that." In these cases, the translator needed to make certain adaptations and took linguistic-cultural differences into account. This statistical analysis yields several important conclusions for translation theory and practice. First, complete lexical equivalence is an exception in translation, not the norm. Second, translators are forced in most cases to work with partial equivalence and find creative solutions. Third, high-quality translation requires not only lexical knowledge but also comprehensive linguistic and cultural competence. The research findings can serve as valuable material for improving translation education and professional development programs for translators.

CONCLUSION

Formulaic expressions constitute an important linguistic resource in academic discourse for substantiating authorial claims and providing exemplification. The widespread employment of such constructions throughout a text enhances clarity of meaning and serves to support subsequent propositions. Translation of formulaic expressions necessitates considerable bilingual competence on the part of the translator, encompassing awareness of cross-linguistic typological distinctions and deployment of appropriate translation strategies. Furthermore, the appropriate selection of formulaic expressions in accordance with genre conventions is critical, reflecting the author's academic expertise.

REFERENCE

1. Biber, D. (2006). Stance in spoken and written university registers. Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 5(2), 97-116.
2. Langacker, R. W. (1987). Foundations of cognitive grammar: Theoretical prerequisites (Vol. 1). Stanford University Press.
3. Paquot, M. (2014). Lexical bundles and phraseology. In A. Jespersen & J. Firth (Eds.), The Routledge handbook of corpus linguistics (pp. 506-520). Routledge.
4. Reppen, R. [1996]. Corpus-based investigations of language use. Annual review of Applied Linguistics, volume 16, March 1996, pp.115-136.
5. Wray, A. (2002). Formulaic language and the lexicon. Cambridge University Press.