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ABSTRACT
Phraseology as a separate linguistic discipline has existed for only about sixty years, presumes as the subject of phraseology have been known for a long time – since the time when scholars started showing interest in rhetoric and stylistics.
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1. INTRODUCTION
Charles Bally is considered to be the founder of phraseology in modern linguistics, and its sudden development was encouraged by Russian linguistics in the second half of the 20th century. Russian linguists (Potebnja, Fortunatov, Shaxmatov, Molotkov, Telija and others) developed hypotheses for the theory of phraseology. Around the middle of the 20th century, more precisely, after the publication of Basic Types of Phraseological Units in the Russian Language by Viktor Vladimirovich Vinogradov in 1947, phraseology started to isolate itself from lexicology as one of the youngest linguistic disciplines. As a result, in the 20th century, phraseology developed into a relatively autonomous linguistic discipline which has its own object of research, its own name and its own methods of analysis and description.

In addition, to the name of a linguistic discipline, the word phraseology is used as a name for the accumulation of such expressions in a language, that is, the phraseological fund of one language community.

According to Charles Bally, there are different combinations of words. Some of them are free, e.g. to read books (news papers, a letter, etc.) others are fixed, limited in their combinative power, e.g. to go to bed, to make a report. The combinations of words which are fixed (set-expressions) are called phraseological units. A free combination is a syntactical unit, which consists notional and form words, and in which notional words have the function of independent parts of the sentence. In a phraseological unit words are not independent. They form set-expressions, in which neither words nor the order of words can be changed. Free combinations are created by the speaker. Phraseological units are used by the speaker in a ready form, without any changes. The whole phraseological unit has a meaning which may be quite different from the meaning of its components, and therefore the whole unit, and not separate words, has the function of a part of sentence. Phraseological units consist of separate words and therefore they are different words, even from compounds. Word have several structural forms, but in phraseological units only one of the components has all the forms of the paradigm of the part of speech it belongs to e.g. to go to bed, goes to bed, went to bed, gone to bed, going to bed, etc., the rest of the components do not change their form.

Moreover, Charles Bally writes in his research that Phraseological Unit (PU) can be defined as a non-motivated word-group that cannot be freely made up in speech, but is reproduced as a ready-made unit. It is a group of words whose meaning cannot be deduced by examining the meaning of the constituent lexemes.

It is important to note that free word-groups may possess some of the features characteristic of phraseological units. On the other hand, phraseological units are
heterogeneous. Alongside absolutely unchangeable phraseological units, there are expressions that allow some degree of substitution. Phraseology is concerned with all types of set expressions including those that stand for certain sentences.

In spite of the fact that Charles Bally introduced the term ‘phraseology’, this term has not acquired rights of citizenship in the writings of Western European and American linguists. Charles Bally considered that phraseology is a part of the stylistics. The question of phraseology as a linguistic discipline was first raised by the outstanding Soviet linguist prof. E. D. Polivanov. E. D. Polivanov repeatedly returned to this issue and argued that vocabulary study individual lexical meanings of words, morphology - the formal meanings of words, syntax - the formal values of expressions. "And then there is a need for a special department, which would be commensurate with the syntax, but at the same time was not referring to common types, and individual data values of individual phrases, just as the lexicon has to deal with the individual (lexical) meaning of individual words”1.

We can differ free word-groups from phraseological units according to following ways:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Free word-groups</th>
<th>Phraseological units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. are formed in the process of speech according to the standards of the language.</td>
<td>1. exist in the language side-by-side with separate words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. are constructed in the process of communication by joining together words into a phrase.</td>
<td>2. are reproduced in speech as ready-made units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. substitution is possible.</td>
<td>3. no substitution is possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. each of its components preserves its denotational meaning.</td>
<td>4. the denotational meaning belongs to the word group as a single semantically inseparable unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. less structural unity.</td>
<td>5. greater structural unity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. components may have any of the forms of their paradigm.</td>
<td>6. components often have just one form of all the forms of their paradigm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E.D.Polivanov's prediction has been done - today. The value of statements of E.D.Polivanov about phraseology was emphasized by a number of researchers2.

Phraseological units are included in the vocabulary of the language and phraseology - a part of lexicology is mainly for the reason that idioms are regarded as equivalents of words, and lexicology, as a linguistic discipline, studying the vocabulary of a language, i.e. words and their equivalents.

---


E. D. Polivanov considered that the phraseology “will stand apart and steady position (similarly to phonetics, morphology) in the linguistic literature of the future-when in consecutive statement of various problems our science will be deprived casual blanks.”

Consequently, the theory of equivalence of a phraseological unit to a word deserves special consideration. It goes back to the theory of identification of expressive facts developed by Ch. Bally, who pointed out that the most common sign of set phrases, superseding all others is the ability or inability to substitute for this turnover is one simple word. This word Ch. Bally called word-identifier.

Bally sees the presence of such a synonym as the internal feature integrity of phraseological units.

This view is objectionable. Semantic integrity of a phraseological unit cannot be installed in such a way as variables and combinations of words may be synonyms - words. In addition, many phraseological units do not have words, identifiers, and can be identified only by using combinations of variables, for example, *drink like a fish* - *drink too much, a hard nut to crack* - a very difficult problem, *in a small way* - on a small scale, etc³.

Semantic integrity of the phraseological unit can be installed by comparing its value with the value of its components as separate words, and to identify features of its use in context.

Too broad understanding of phraseology by V. V. Vinogradov made it impossible to establish its boundaries and to separate the phraseological units from adjacent formations.

In view of these considerations, the concept of V. V. Vinogradov may not be the basis of phraseology as a linguistic discipline. However, several important observations contained in the writings of V.V. Vinogradov on phraseology, of course must be taken into account when further developing the theory of phraseology.

Furthermore, Vinogradov said that not all phraseological units in the semantic relations have the same degree of equivalence to the word. Fusions are considered as equivalents of words, and unities - as potential equivalents of words.

V.V. Vinogradov also considers, that all terms are equivalents of words on the basis that the attitude of the term to a subject designated by it creates “inextricably of phrase structure” at all terminological words-combinations⁴.

Thus, the equivalents of words-fusions and potential equivalents of words – unities are allocated on a purely semantic basis, without regard to their structural features and without discrimination among types of words and features of their semantics. The assignment of all the terminology to the equivalent combination of words along with the fusions also remains inconclusive, due to differences in their semantic structure. In many terminological combinations there is no rethinking of the values of the components, and they are very far from the words in the structural and semantic relationships.
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