



UNIVERSITÉ DE HOKKAIDO, SAPPORO(JAPON)

Août 2025

International Symposium PHRASEOPRAG The Pragmatic Phraseology of Oral and Mediated Interactions:

Cross-views and interdisciplinary perspectives.

August 1-3, 2025

Symposium theme

Phraseology is the study of *phraseologisms*, i.e., cohesive language elements that are syntactically and semantically fixed and that are used recurrently and conventionally. This discipline, strongly influenced by lexicology, aims to list, describe, and model the functioning of all prefabricated elements specific to a given language.

The work of Wray & Perkins (2000) shows that this fixity is not trivial and responds to essential cognitive resource management mechanisms. Indeed, the fixity, coalescence, and congruence of the constituents of phraseologisms, as well as their ability to concisely express complex meanings and functions, imply that they are generally memorized as a whole by the speaker and preferentially selected in a communicative situation due to their spontaneous, appropriate and conventional character. Prefabrication in a language is, therefore, not an anomaly or a trivial phenomenon, and it does not seem hasty to consider that phraseologisms occupy a significant place in the lexicon. Indeed, Wray & Perkins estimate that around 70% of an adult speaker's lexical palette consists of sequences with some degree of fixity in their structure or use (Wray & Perkins 2000:1-2). Mel'čuk (2023: 13-14), meanwhile, considers that at least 10% of a language's lexical stock consists of prefabricated sequences, with more or less variation depending on the language.

Phraseology lies at the crossroads of many disciplines in the language sciences: syntax, semantics, pragmatics, contrastive linguistics, lexicography, automatic language processing, cognitive linguistics, translation, and, more recently, didactics and language acquisition. This strong interdisciplinarity reflects the great complexity of the field and its object of study, but also the high terminological inflation to which it is subject (Mel'čuk 2023: 12). More recently, the perception of the field of phraseology has undergone a renewal in its object of study. The great interdisciplinarity to which it is subject and the diversity of forms of its object of study are behind a recent extension of the field of phraseology (cf. Legallois and Tutin 2013 ; Mogorrón Huerta, Grezka and Navarro-Brotons 2020) towards fields of study such as terminology, discourse analysis, interactional analysis, psychology, stylistics or artificial intelligence. This broadening has undeniably provided fertile ground for the emergence of a subfield of phraseology concerned with the link between <Form⇔meaning⇔Functions> in interactional contexts: *pragmatic phraseology*.

Pragmatic phraseology, which studies the *pragmatic lexicon of interactions* (henceforth PLI), i.e., phraseologisms endowed with a particular effect in discourse, is a sub-discipline of general phraseology. Essentially praxeological, it studies the reciprocal links between usage, conditions of production (enunciation situation, communication goal, relationship of speakers engaged in the interaction, etc.), and effects on participants or the interaction in progress (Tutin 2019, Dostie and Sikora 2021), whether oral (face-to-face) or mediated (communication tools or social networks).

The PLI includes a highly heterogeneous set of prefabricated lexical elements commonly observed in a wide range of interactional genres: friendly, family, professional, or academic conversation, for example. It consists mainly of prototypically polylexical utterances, presenting a certain degree of prefabrication and characterized by a meaning and illocutionary function generally not predictable from the addition of the meaning of its parts (Tutin 2019, Tutin and Grossmann 2024, Ladreyt 2022 2024). The encoding and decoding of these pre-constructed elements are conditioned by the nature of the enunciation situation (immediate and cultural context, shared knowledge, presuppositions) but also by the configuration of the interaction (setting, number of speakers, role, interpersonal relations, purpose of communication). The PLI comprises a broad inventory of linguistic objects, ranging from *discourse markers* (you know, well, I see, like) to *ritual expressions* (nice to meet you!, attention!), including *expressions of affect* (what the hell!, are you kidding me ?), the *routines of oral scientific discourse* (Given this arguments, Surprisingly enough) or *situational phrases* (it rains cats and dogs!, the writing on the wall!, cf. Klein and Lamiroy 2011).

Reflections on linguistic objects relating to PLI go back a long way. The seminal work of Charles Bally on *exclamatory phraseology* (Bally 1909) and Fònagy on *situation-bounded utterances* (Fònagy 1982) laid the foundations for the study of PLI. In their wake, other research has emerged, Martins-Baltar's typology of *usual phrases* (1997) or Mel'čuk's *pragmatemes* (2013), a description subsequently extended by Blanco and Mejri (2018). Recent years have seen the implementation, notably in Europe, of several lexicographic projects aimed at inventorying and describing the mechanisms of prefabricated phrases used specific to oral interactions. Examples include Kauffer's (2019) *stereotyped speech acts*, which gave rise to a bilingual French-German lexical resource developed at the ATILF, López Simó's (2016, 2023) bilingual Spanish-French lexicographic platform of *conversational formulas, prefabricated interaction phrases* (Tutin 2019), *expressive conversational formulas* (Krzyżanowska et al. 2021) or the *routinicon* for Russian (Bychkova et al. 2024).

The acquisition or teaching of PLI (or *phraseodidactics*, Sikora and Tsedryk 2019: 15; González-Rey 2019) is also a source of difficulty for the learner who is discovering everything about the target language (Forsberg 2010 and 2014, Ladreyt 2022) or for the native teacher who has learned PLI implicitly and incrementally. These difficulties are notably linked to the lack of sufficiently thorough lexicographic resources to describe IPL rigorously and the relative

absence of structured pedagogical devices based on these lexicographic resources. Thus, several works, notably in the acquisition of (lexico)pragmatic competence (Ladreyt 2022), highlight the need for a more linguistic, methodical, and empirical approach to teaching this type of lexicon (Taguchi 2009, Edmonds 2014, Culpeper et al. 2018, Bardovi-Harlig 2019, Ladreyt 2024), as well as on the need to develop concrete pedagogical tools, engaging and facilitating the learning of PLI. Other work shows that PLI acquisition involves deep cognitive processing as well as sustained psychological engagement (Boers & Lindstromberg, 2009). Ladreyt (2022), who studied the acquisition of PLI in advanced Japanese learners of French over three years, has shown that the complexity of acquisition inherent in PLI also seems to be the result of deficiencies that can be observed not only at the lexical level but also at the combinatorial (syntax), semantic (meaning, conceptual schema and polysemy), strategic (choosing an appropriate expression and being aware of its effects on the interlocutor or the enunciation situation) and metapragmatic (understanding the communication situation and its implications, prototyping the linguistic and extralinguistic conditions of PLI use). This difficulty of use is also linked to structural and conceptual differences between the target language and the mother tongue. Finally, work on the phenomenon of *pragmatic resistance* (Ishihara & Cohen, 2022), which can be defined as “the non-native speaker's psychological and linguistic resistance to the communicative norm in the target language” (Harada 2020; Ladreyt 2022), has shown that beyond the linguistic aspect, the learner's communicative ethos, cognitive state and degree of accommodation to the pragmatic norms of the target language seem to be very important clues for a better understanding of PLI acquisition.

From a methodological point of view, the issues are manifold. The great complexity and proteiformity of PLI imply the need to base its description on a methodology articulating three levels (cf. Krzyżanowska et al. 2021): the syntactic level (form and distributional constraints), the semantic level (meaning construction, semantic features, and/or patterns) and the pragmatic level (illocutionary function). The emergence of *phraseography* (Murano 2011: 45, González-Rey 2021) as a hybrid discipline between phraseology and lexicography has shown that standard lexicographic resources (notably dictionaries) are deficient and that it is necessary to rethink methodological and epistemological paradigms concerning the processing, formalization, and modeling of pragmatic phraseologisms. Current issues include the role of context and its description, as well as taking into account the specificities of interaction and speakers. The complexity of the processing and analysis of the PLI lies in modeling the specificities of PLI, both in encoding and decoding, while considering the formal and cultural constraints (Chen 2024) that weigh on their construction and use. In this respect, the PHRASEOPRAG project (<https://sites.google.com/view/phraseoprag/accueil>), which initiated this symposium, aims to develop a unified methodology for describing PLI that can be transposed to several languages (French and Japanese in this case, then other languages at a later stage of the project), to establish an open source lexicographic database that can be enriched and improved incrementally (Ladreyt, Grezka et Kijima 2024).

The processing of PLI also involves many challenges. Whether in annotation, coding language, automatic labeling, retrieval, and extraction (Soler Cifuentes, Grezka and García Flores 2024), the creation of linguistic models that can be implemented on a computer system or the processing of textometric data, the questions and difficulties are numerous. In particular, computational linguistics is currently confronted with the problem of automatic annotation and detection of semantic and pragmatic features associated with certain constructions specific to oral interaction. AI, however powerful, is no more than a machine operating based on complex algorithms; it has no intellect of its own and cannot, therefore, understand and interpret nuances, cultural images, or a given semantic-pragmatic function on its own. The most recent research has brought to the fore new, highly promising models for overcoming these problems, such as neural network (machine learning) technology like transformers and word embedding, and increasingly powerful AIs have appeared (the BERT model, for example). Approaches for automatically identifying phraseologisms have emerged over the last decade, notably *pattern*, *construction*, and *ALR* (*Arbres lexico syntaxiques récurrents*, Kraif 2019) approaches, as demonstrated by the ANR projects PHRASEOROM (ANR-15-FRAL-0009) and more recently PREFAB (ANR-22-CE54-0013).

Corpus linguistics, for its part, is also facing new challenges with the use of multimodal data from social networks or mediated communication, data that are essential to the study of PLI. In particular, processing and annotation remain frequent difficulties. Indeed, this type of data abounds in observables to be taken into account for the analysis, so it is often very complex and time-consuming to formalize these data. Another challenge is to standardize the encoding of annotations and metadata to facilitate their reproducibility and dissemination. On this last point, the TEI initiative seems to be a most promising response but is struggling to establish itself in the emerging field of pragmatic phraseology. Annotation guides and transcription methods are just as abundant but would benefit from an overall reflection to propose a unified model applicable to a broad spectrum of data and contexts. Another frequent problem with work on oral corpora is the parsimony of certain linguistic objects that are, nonetheless, admittedly very common in oral or mediated interaction. We are thinking in particular of the case of greetings (it is common, when collecting data, to greet the informant before starting the recording, so this greeting does not appear on the recording) or insults (natural data very difficult to obtain, ethical problem if the data are “provoked” voluntarily) for which it is very difficult, if not almost impossible to find a sufficient number of occurrences in the corpora currently available. This paradox is highlighted in particular in the work of (Tutin 2019; Krzyżanowska, Grossmann & Kwapisz-Osadnik 2021). The question then arises of the choice of data type and source. What should be favored: authenticity or spontaneity of interaction data? Or both?

In Japan, which will be hosting the symposium, we are also seeing the development of various projects concerning the automatic retrieval of PLI, the constitution, and the annotation of corpora for the Japanese language. Concerning the automatic detection side, for example, work is in progress on gender bias detection (Nakanishi 2024), idiomatic expression detection

(Hashimoto, Sato, and Utsuro 2007; Hashimoto and Kawahara 2008; Shudo, Kurahone and Tanabe 2011), emotional phraseology detection (Matsumoto, Tsuchiya, Yoshida and Kita 2021) and automatic differentiation of literal and idiomatic meaning (Hashimoto, Sato and Utsuro 2006). Numerous initiatives are also underway to build PLI datasets and data exploration tools. We might mention, for example, the construction of corpora of idiomatic expressions (Ojima, Sato, and Utsuro 2006; Hashimoto and Kawahara 2008), the construction of a lexicographic database of emotional expressions (Minato, Bracewell, Ren, and Kuroiwa 2008) or the *corpus of everyday Japanese conversation* (CEJC) produced by NINJAL (Koiso et al. 2018). Finally, just as in Europe with the *Text Encoding Initiative*, Japanese researchers are also organizing themselves to unify the annotation system for interactional data, for example, Den et al. (2012) with *The Japanese discourse research initiative* project (<https://www.jdri.org>)

From a contrastive and translational point of view, the analysis of PLI also raises several research questions. Sułkowska (2018) speaks in particular of *phraseotraductology* to evoke an emerging branch of translatology specializing in the study and translation of PLI (and more broadly of all phraseologisms) between two or more languages. The translation of a language requires a specific, multi-level methodological and theoretical approach. In the case of PLI, the morphosyntactic, semantic, pragmatic, and sociocultural levels are also complementary and essential variables in the translation process. This particular attention is all the more necessary for languages that are typologically distant and have never been in contact historically, as is the case for French and Japanese, for example. The question of untranslatable phraseologisms also remains. Does translating mean betraying the meaning of the language translated? How do we translate terms expressing sensory experiences, such as *gitaigo* 擬態語 in Japanese? How can we render social-cultural facts in language? Does a functional equivalent necessarily reproduce identically the functions of the expression translated? These are just some of the questions to which this scientific event aims to provide some clues.

This international symposium is in line with the still undeveloped disciplinary field of pragmatic phraseology and aims to initiate discussion on the characterization of PLI through the encounter of researchers from different epistemological and methodological horizons. As the symposium is intended to be interdisciplinary, its theme may be approached from the angle of 3 major topics:

Topic 1: Theoretical, descriptive, and applied linguistics and translatology

Topic 2: NLP, tool-based linguistics and AI

Topic 3: Didactics, acquisition, and pedagogical engineering

All languages may be used in the research that will be presented during the event, **but only French and English may be used for abstracts, presentations, or submitted papers.** A handout in Japanese may be prepared for Japanese speakers, but this is at the discretion of each

participant. On the theoretical side, **any theory is welcome and need not necessarily conform to the framework proposed above, which is indicative.** The symposium will provide an ideal setting for dialogue between different theoretical and epistemic approaches. Similarly, on the methodological side, experimental and new approaches are welcome.

This international symposium is, therefore, a unique opportunity to bring together international researchers working in this new research field, which we hope will pave the way for future research on PLI. We invite all researchers, doctoral students, teachers, research engineers, and language professionals to contribute to this symposium.

Provisional program of the symposium

The symposium is organized based on the present call for contribution. Abstracts for oral presentation (see submission details below) are **due by December 1, 2024**. The estimated number of presentations is around 70, divided into three parallel sessions (one per axe) over three days. The schedule of oral presentations will be published once all proposals have been received, evaluated, and revised by the contributors. We plan to open each day with an invited lecture and, on the final day, with a methodological workshop focusing on several useful tools for linguistic data processing and analysis. A gala dinner will be held on the evening of the first day of the symposium. A poster session will also be held. These posters will be displayed in the break room and/or in the hall. In March 2025, you will receive a notification containing the participation fee details, all the information you need for your stay, and a more comprehensive program of the event.

Submission procedures and schedule¹

We offer a choice of 4 submission options, each with its specific schedule, as detailed below:

<p>Type ① : Communication proposal only</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abstract to be submitted by December 1, 2024 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Notification of acceptance: February 1, 2025 • Peer reviewed
<p>Type ② : Proposal for a poster only</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abstract to be submitted by December 1, 2024 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Notification of acceptance: February 1, 2025 • Peer review • Printing and transport at your own expense • Self-installation on D-day (display stand and fixings provided)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Short-term publication, after the symposium. Submission before the symposium. • Abstract to be submitted by December 1, 2024 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Notification of acceptance: February 1, 2025

¹ Please note that offers to publish in conference proceedings or thematic issues are not contractually binding. Should the number of article proposals or the number of articles accepted after peer review not be sufficient to constitute an editorial project, we reserve the right to cancel these publications.

<p>Type ③ : Communication proposal + publication in the conference proceedings</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full paper to be submitted by July 1, 2025 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Notification of acceptance: September 15, 2025 ○ Estimated publication date: December 2025 • Peer review (abstract and article)
<p>Type ④: Communication proposal + publication in a scientific journal</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long-term publication, after the symposium. Submission after the symposium. • Abstract to be submitted by December 1, 2024 => Notification of acceptance: February 1, 2025 • Intent to publish to be submitted by July 30, 2025 (3-pages abstract + bibliography 5 keywords and intended language of publication). • Full paper to be submitted by October 30, 2025 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Notification of acceptance: March 31, 2026 ○ Provisional publication date: October 2026 • Limited slots: only 12 papers will be selected • Selection by the organizing committee followed by peer review (abstract and article)

All proposals (abstracts and articles) must mention the chosen submission type and be submitted in two versions: one with author information and another anonymized version. Proposals must be submitted via sciencesconf :

<https://phraseoprag.sciencesconf.org/>

Please note that acceptance of the abstracts, required in all the submission types, gives access to the conference presentation, but in the case of submission types ③ and ④, acceptance of the abstract does not guarantee publication of the full paper. As mentioned above, the latter two submission types include an additional evaluation phase for full paper proposals, which conditions the publication in the proceedings or the scientific journal. Please take careful note of the schedule for submission and evaluation of abstracts and papers.

Remarks on evaluation and publication procedures

This symposium is an international event characterized by a rigorous evaluation procedure for the presentation, as well as for papers to be published afterward:

- **Abstracts and articles must comply strictly with the formatting recommendations given for each formula in the guidelines.** This formatting criterion plays a key role in the evaluation and acceptance of proposals. You can find the guidelines for formatting your submission via the following link: <https://phraseoprag.sciencesconf.org/resource/page/id/2>
- Anonymized proposals will be evaluated by a scientific committee (see list of committee members) using a unified grid. At least two experts will be appointed to evaluate abstracts or papers.

- Accepted presentations will have their abstracts published on the event website. **Details of publication of the proceedings and scientific journal will be announced at a later date.**

Organizing Committee

Hisaé AKIHIRO (Tokyo University of Foreign Studies)
Aude GREZKA (LIPN, CNRS-Université Sorbonne Paris Nord)
Shinya HORI (Université de Hokkaidō)
Ai KIJIMA (Chiba Institut of Technology)
Alexis LADREYT (Université de Hokkaidō et LiDiLEM)
Takafumi NAKANISHI (Musashino university)
Agnès TUTIN (Université Grenoble Alpes, LiDiLEM)

Scientific Committee (provisional list)

Heike BALDAUF-QUILLIATRE (Université Lumière Lyon 2, ICAR)
Christophe BENZITOUN (Université de Lorraine, ATILF)
Elena BERTHEMET (Centre de Linguistique en Sorbonne)
Claire BEYSSADE (Université Paris 8, SFL-CNRS)
Xavier BLANCO (Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona)
Cristelle CAVALLA (Université Sorbonne Nouvelle, DILTEC)
Lian CHEN (Cergy Paris Université, LT2D & Université d'Orléans, LLL-CNRS)
Gloria CORPAS PASTOR (University of Malaga, IUITLM)
Ludivine CRIBLE (Ghent University)
Mathilde DARGNAT (Université de Lorraine, ATILF)
Gaétane DOSTIE (Université de Sherbrooke, CRIFUQ)
Carole ETIENNE (Laboratoire ICAR (ENS Lyon))
Fanny FORSBERG LUNDELL (Université de Stockholm)
Eglantina GISHTI (Université de Tirana)
Araceli GÓMEZ FERNÁNDEZ (Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia)
Vannina GOOSSENS (Université Grenoble Alpes, LiDiLEM)
Francis GROSSMANN (Université Grenoble Alpes, LiDiLEM)
Gaëlle GUIBON (Université Sorbonne Nord, LIPN)
Sanae HARADA (Université Sophia)
Tomoko HIGASHI (Université Grenoble Alpes, LiDiLEM)
Kosuké HINAI (Université de Fukuoka et LiDiLEM)
Yvon KEROMNES (Université de Lorraine, ATILF)
Olivier KRAIF (Université Grenoble Alpes, LiDiLEM)
Anna KRZYŻANOWSKA (Université Marie Curie Skłodowska de Lublin)
Tadahiko KUMAMOTO (Chiba Institute of Technology)
Joseph LE ROUX (Université Sorbonne Nord, LIPN)
Mireia LÓPEZ-SIMÓ (Universidad de Alicante)
Carmen MELLADO BLANCO (University of Santiago de Compostela)
Nagisa MORITOKI (University of Ljubljana)

Masaki MURATA (Tottori University)
Yayoi NAKAMURA-DELLOYE (Inalco, IFRAE)
Malgorzata NIZIOLEK (Université de la Commission de l'Education Nationale)
Iva NOVAKOVA (Université Grenoble Alpes, LiDiLEM)
Mojca PECMAN (Université Paris Cité, CLILLAC-ARP)
Céline POUDAT (Université Côte d'Azur)
Angeles Belém PRIEGO (Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana Unidad Azcapotzalco)
Nathalie ROSSI-GENSANE (Université Lumière Lyon 2, ICAR)
Dorota SIKORA (Université du Littoral-Côte d'Opale , HLLI)
Julie SORBA (Université Grenoble Alpes, LiDiLEM)
Monika SUŁKOWSKA (Université de Silésie)
Yumi TAKAGAKI (Université Kwansei Gakuin)
Pascale TRÉVISIOL OKAMURA (Université Sorbonne Nouvelle, DILTEC)
Alexandra TSEDRYK (Mount Saint Vincent University)
Tomoyuki TSUCHIYA (Kyushu University)
Simon TUCHAIS (Université Sophia)
Daciana VLAD (Université d'Oradea)
Rui YAN (Université Grenoble Alpes, LiDiLEM)
Manel ZARROUK (Université Sorbonne Nord, LIPN)

Scientific and institutional partners (Provisional list)

- Campus France
- Chiba Institute of Technology
- CNRS
- JSPS
- LiDiLEM (Université Grenoble Alpes)
- LIPN / U. Sorbonne Nord
- Musashino university
- PHC Sakura
- Tokyo University of Foreign Studies
- Université de Hokkaidō

References

- Bally, C. (1909), *Traité de stylistique française*. 3ème éd., nouv. Tirage, Georg [usw.], Genève.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2019), “Routines in L2 pragmatics research”, *The Routledge Handbook of Second Language Acquisition and Pragmatics*, Routledge, p. 47-62.
- Blanco, X. et Mejri, S., (2018), *Les pragmatèmes*, Classiques Garnier, Paris.
- Boers, F. & Lindstromberg, S., (2009), *Optimizing a Lexical Approach to Instructed Second Language Acquisition*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bychkova, P., Yaskevich, A., Gyulasaryan, S., and Rakhilina, E., (2024), “Building a Database of Conversational Routines.” In *Proceedings of the 2024 Joint International Conference on*

Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024), pages 2548–2555, Torino, Italy. ELRA and ICCL.

Chen, L., (2024), « Traitement de la traduction et de la transmission culturelle dans la microstructure des dictionnaires bilingues des UP : étude contrastive de corpus métaphraséographiques », SHS Web of Conferences 191, Congrès Mondial de Linguistique Française - CMLF 2024.

Culpeper, J., Mackey, A., & Taguchi, N., (2018), *Second language pragmatics: from theory to research*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Den, Y., Koiso, H., Takanashi, K., & Yoshida, N., (2012), “Annotation of response tokens and their triggering expressions in Japanese multi-party conversations.” In *Proceedings of the 8th Language Resources and Evaluation Conference (LREC 2012)* (pp. 1332-1337). Istanbul, Turkey.

Dostie, G., & Sikora, D., (2021), « Les phraséologismes pragmatiques: Entre langue et discours. Présentation ». *Les phraséologismes pragmatiques.*, Lexique 29, Presse universitaire de Lille.

Edmonds, A., (2014), “Conventional expressions: Investigating pragmatics and processing,” *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 36, p. 69-99.

Fónagy, I., (1982), *Situation et signification*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Forsberg F., (2010), “Using conventional sequences in L2 French”, *IRAL* 48, Walter de Gruyter, 25-51.

Forsberg F., (2014), “Using conventional expressions in L2 French”, *International Review of Applied Linguistics and Language Teaching*, 48, p. 25-51.

González Rey, M.-I. (2019), « La phraséodidactique : état des lieux ». *Repères DoRiF*, phraséodidactique : de la conscience à la compétence, n° 18.

González Rey, M.-I. (2021), *La nouvelle phraséologie du français*, 3^e édition revue et augmentée, Toulouse, Presses universitaires du Midi, collection « Interlangues », 280 p.

Gross, G. (1996), *Les expressions figées en français: noms composés et autres locutions*. Éditions Ophrys,.

Harada, S., (2020), « Les stratégies de refus : excessives ou insuffisantes ». *Apprentissage des langues : Compétence pragmatique, Interculturalité*, 51, 39.

Hashimoto, C., & Kawahara, D., (2008), “Construction of an idiom corpus and its application to idiom identification based on WSD incorporating idiom-specific features.” In *Proceedings of the 2008 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing* (pp. 992-1001).

Hashimoto, C., & Kawahara, D., (2008), “Construction of Japanese idiom corpus and its application to Japanese idiom identification.” *IEICE Technical Report Natural Language Understanding and Models of Communication*, 108(141), 1-6.

Hashimoto, C., Sato, S., & Utsuro, T., (2006a), “Detecting Japanese idioms with a linguistically rich dictionary.” *Language Resources and Evaluation*, 40, 243-252.

Hashimoto, C., Sato, S., & Utsuro, T., (2006b), “Japanese idiom recognition: Drawing a line between literal and idiomatic meanings.” In *Proceedings of the COLING/ACL 2006 Main Conference Poster Sessions* (pp. 353-360).

Ishihara, N. & Cohen, A. D., (2022), *Teaching and Learning Pragmatics - Where Language and Culture Meet* – Second edition, Routledge.

Kauffer (2019), « Les ‘Actes de Langage Stéréotypés’ : Essai de Synthèse Critique », *Cahiers de Lexicologie*, 114/1, p. 149-171.

Klein, J. & Lamiroy, B., (2011), « Routines conversationnelles et figement », in Anscombre, J. C., Mejri, S. (éds), *Le figement linguistique : la parole entravée*, Honoré Champion, p. 195-217.

Koiso, H., Den, Y., Iseki, Y., Kashino, W., Kawabata, Y., Nishikawa, K. Y. & Usuda, Y., (2018), “Construction of the corpus of everyday Japanese conversation: An interim report” In *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2018)*.

Kraif, O., (2019), “Explorer la combinatoire lexico-syntaxique des mots et expressions avec le LEXICOSCOPE. » *Langue française*, 2019/3 N° 203. pp. 67-82.

Krzyżanowska, A., Grossmann, F., et Kwapisz-Osadnik, K., (2021), *Les formules expressives de la conversation : analyse contrastive : français - polonais - italien*. Lublin : Wydawnictwo Episteme.

Ladreyt A., (2022), « Une étude linguistique de l’emploi des phraséologismes pragmatiques à fonction expressive de la conversation quotidienne chez des locuteurs japonophones du français de niveau avancé », thèse de doctorat, Université Grenoble Alpes.

Ladreyt A., (2024), « Les phraséologismes pragmatiques : de la modélisation linguistique à la construction d’un outil d’apprentissage », *メディア・コミュニケーション研究 = Media and Communication Studies* ; n°77, Hokkaido University Press (HUSCAP).

Ladreyt A., Grezka, A. et Kijima, A. (2024). Une étude contrastive de l’emploi de phraséologismes pragmatiques exprimant la colère en français et en japonais. *CMLF2024 : Congrès Mondial de Linguistique française, SHS Web of Conferences*, 191, pp. 05001.

Legallois, D., et Tutin, A., (2013), «Présentation: Vers une extension du domaine de la phraséologie». *Langages* 189, n°1 : 3.

López Simó, M., (2016), *Fórmulas de la conversación. Propuesta de definición y clasificación con vistas a su traducción español-francés, francés-español*, Thèse de doctorat, Université d’Alicante.

López Simó, M., (2023), « Une nouvelle ressource en ligne de formules des interactions orales : le Dictionnaire phraséologique de formules orales de relation interpersonnelle. Questions de

macrostructure ». In Ladreyt, A. & Tutin, A. (dir.), *Les phraséologismes des interactions orales : sens, forme(s), usage(s)*, Studii de Lingvistică 13/2, Université d'Oradea, Roumanie.

Martins-Baltar, M., (1997), *La locution entre langue et usages*. Languages. Fontenay/Saint-Cloud: ENS Éd.

Matsumoto, K., Tsuchiya, S., Yoshida, M., & Kita, K., (2021), "Construction and expansion of dictionary of idiomatic emotional expressions and idiomatic emotional expression corpus." *International Journal of Computer & Software Engineering*, 6(2), 174.

Mel'čuk, I., A., (2013), « Tout ce que nous voulions savoir sur les phrasèmes, mais ». *Cahiers de lexicologie: Revue internationale de lexicologie et lexicographie*, n o 102, 129-49.

Mel'čuk, I., A., (2023), *General phraseology: theory and practice*. *Lingvisticæ investigationes supplementa*, volume 36. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Minato, J., Bracewell, D. B., Ren, F., & Kuroiwa, S., (2008), "Japanese Emotion Corpus Analysis and its Use for Automatic Emotion Word Identification." *Engineering Letters*, 16(1).

Mogorrón Huerta, P., Grezka, A. & Navarro-Brotons, L. (2020), Les variations diatopiques dans les expressions figées. *Lingvisticæ investigationes : International Journal of Linguistics and Language*, 43 (2), 211p.

Murano, M., (2010), *Le traitement des séquences figées dans les dictionnaires bilingues français-italien, italien-français*. Polimetrica.

Nakanishi, T., (2024) "Detection of Latent Gender Biases in Data and Models Using the Approximate Generalized Inverse Method," in 2024 IEEE 18th International Conference on Semantic Computing (ICSC), Laguna Hills, CA, USA, pp. 191-196.

Shudo, K., Kurahone, A., & Tanabe, T., (2011), "A comprehensive dictionary of multiword expressions." In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies* (pp. 161-170).

Sikora, D., & Tsedryk, A., (2019), «De quelques aspects de compétence phraséologique en L2: locutions en test». *Linguistica Atlantica* 37, n°2.

Soler Cifuentes, N. & Grezka, A. (à venir), « Les noms de marque dans les unités phraséologiques : aspects linguistiques, lexicographiques et culturels d'un corpus franco-espagnol non normé. ». In *New Trends in Phraseology: Languages and Cultures in Comparison*, Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Soler Cifuentes, N., Grezka, A. & García Flores, J. (2024)., « Phraséologie et noms de marque. Références culturelles en français et en espagnol dans le projet Phrasemark ». In López-Simó, Mogorrón Huerta & Cuadrado-Rey, *Referencias culturales: Retos en la traducción de la fraseología y del lenguaje de especialidad*, IVITRA Research in Linguistics and Literature, John Benjamins, 43.

Sułkowska, M., (2018), « Phraséologie appliquée et ses nouvelles branches: phraséodidactique et phraséotraduction ». *Romanica Cracoviensia*, 18(3), 159-170.

Taguchi, N., (2009), *Pragmatic Competence*. Mouton Series in Pragmatics 5. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Tutin, A. et Grossmann, F., (2023), « Les phrases préfabriquées exprimant la surprise : vers l'élaboration de schémas sémantico-syntaxiques et pragma-sémantiques rendant compte des régularités ». In Ladreyt, A. & Tutin A. (dir.), *Les phraséologismes des interactions orales : sens, forme(s), usage(s)*, Studii de Lingvistică 13/2, Université d'Oradea, Roumanie.

Tutin, A., (2019), « Phrases préfabriquées des interactions : quelques observations sur le corpus CLAPI », *Cahiers de lexicologie*, 114/1, p. 63-91.

Wray, A. & Perkins, M., (2000), «The functions of formulaic language: An integrated model.» *Language & Communication - LANG COMMUN* 20: 1-28.

尾嶋憲治, 佐藤理史, & 宇津呂武仁. (2006). 日本語慣用句用例データベースの構築法. *言語処理学会 第12回年次大会発表論文集*, 456-459. [Ojima, K., Sato, S. & Utsuro, T. (2006). « Nihongo kanyōku rei deetabeesu no kōchikuhō », *genko shori gakkai dai 12 kai nenji taikai happyō hyōron bunshū*, 456-459.]