

6. Пұшатайұлы М. Елкөшкенде / М. Пұшатайұлы. – Алматы: «Атажұрт», 2016. – Б. 35, 36, 37, 38.
7. Сүйіншәлиев Х. Қазақ әдебиетінің тарихы / Х. Сүйіншәлиев. – Алматы: «Санат», 2006. – Б. 240.
8. Жәркен Б. Жұлдызтас / Б. Жәркен. – Алматы: «Атамұра», 2010. – Б. 48.
9. Әсемқұлов Т. Таңдамалы шығармалары. 4-том / Т. Әсемқұлов. – Алматы: «Жетісу», 2016. – Б. 128.
10. Қайырбеков Ә. Қамал бұзар қалпында көрем / Ә. Қайырбеков // Түркістан. – 2014. – 13 мамыр. – Б. 37.

REFERENCES

1. Tasmaqambetov I., *Altaj Tarbaqataj onirlerinin halyq anderi. Almaty, Atamura, 2009, 110, 111 (in Kaz).*
2. Qospaqov Z., *Syr tartsaq tarihyndan anshiliktin. Almaty, Qylym, 1996, 3, 4 (in Kaz).*
3. Shakenuly Zh., *Aqazhaj aqat ajtylmasa eken. Turkistan. 2008, 3 sauir. 13, 53 (in Kaz).*
4. Tasmaqambetov I., *Altaj Tarbaqataj onirlerinin halyq anderi. Almaty, Atamura, 2008, 7 (in Kaz).*
5. <http://www.matin.kz/halyk-anderi> (in Kaz).
6. Pushatajuly M., *Elkoshkende. Almaty, Atazhurt, 2016, 35, 36, 37, 38 (in Kaz).*
7. Sujinshaliev H., *Qazaq adebietinin tarihy. Almaty, Sanat, 2006, 240 (in Kaz).*
8. Zharken B., *Zhuldyztas. Almaty, Atamura, 2010, 48 (in Kaz).*
9. Asemqulov T., *Tandamaly shyqarmalary. 4 tom. Almaty, Zhetisu, 2016, 128 (in Kaz).*
10. Qajyrbekov A., *Qamal buzar qalpynda korem. Turkistan. 2014, 13 mamyr, 37 (in Kaz).*

UDC 81'1'373.611

**G.K. KAPYSHEVA¹, N.A. SYDYKOVA²,
S.K. KAPYSHEV², M. GREIN³**

¹S. Amanzholov East Kazakhstan State University, Ust-Kamenogorsk, Kazakhstan

²Oralkhan Bokei School № 44 Ust-Kamenogorsk, Kazakhstan

³J. Gutenberg University, Germany

PHRASEOLOGICAL EQUIVALENTS OF ENGLISH, RUSSIAN AND KAZAKH LANGUAGES

The paper presents different languages comparative study, contrastive research has a theoretical applied and practical significance. Forms of knowledge about the world presented in comparative phraseological units appear as a certain types of structures of knowledge representation, as the types of concepts.

Keywords: linguistics, interlingual phraseological Equivalents, phraseological units.

ФРАЗЕОЛОГИЯЛЫҚ СӘЙКЕСТІКТЕРДІҢ АҒЫЛШЫН, ОРЫС ЖӘНЕ ҚАЗАҚ ТІЛДЕРІНДЕГІ БАЛАМАЛАРЫ

Мақалада әртүрлі құрылымды тілдерді салыстырмалы зерттеуде теориялық, практикалық және қолданбалы мақсаттарға байланысты мағлұматтар алуға болады. Әлемнің тілдегі бейнесі әртүрлі жүйедегі тілдердің концептерінде компаративті фразеологизмдер арқылы көрініс табады

Түйін сөздер: тіл білімі, тіліралық сәйкестіктер, фразеологиялық бірліктер.

ФРАЗЕОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ ЭКВИВАЛЕНТЫ В АНГЛИЙСКОМ, РУССКОМ И КАЗАХСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ

В статье рассматривается сопоставительное исследование разносистемных языков в практическом и теоретическом ключе. Языковая картина мира представлена в концептах компаративными фразеологизмами в разноструктурных языках

Ключевые слова: языкознание, межъязыковые эквиваленты, фразеологические единицы.

Interlingual phraseological equivalents and phraseological semantic in phraseological system consistency of different languages specifically question the turned into an axiom statement that the phraseology of each language is a unique, inimitable system mostly of idiomatic images, derivational bases, internal form of phraseological units.

New approaches, concepts, theories and methods developed in the last decade in the total, private and comparative theories of phraseology played an important role in this respect.

Among them structural-typological approach to the study of phraseology of related and unrelated languages of different systems, the use of the basic theory of nomination, language modeling, field approach, descriptive linguistics should be named.

However phraseological language system has, like all other language systems, its universal language quality and regularity typical of phraseological systems of all or most languages.

Phraseological universals contribute, like all other types of language universals, to opening and description of common frameworks, systems and structures of a single human language as being the main attribute and distinctive feature of the person along with the human, abstract-logical categorical thinking.

The relevance of the study is that interlanguage phraseological equivalents and compliance are the most fertile material for contemporary comparative phraseology to make a comparative study of different languages and reveal common, universal features and phraseological identity of phraseological world view of creative thinking, phraseological conceptualization of the world different languages.

Relevance of research provides a considerable degree of involvement in the orbit of the comparative, structural and typological study of English, Kazakh and Russian

languages.

The object of study forms interlanguage phraseological equivalents of semantic field “nature” of related and unrelated languages.

The subject of research is linguistic features and factors which guarantee the existence and functioning of phraseological system of unrelated languages of interlanguage phraseological equivalents of four degrees of intimacy.

The aim of this work is to identify and describe the main types of interlanguage phraseological equivalents of English, Russian and Kazakh languages, and the factors causing them.

The linguistic world image in this sense exists not due to the semantics, content of the language and linguistic, vocal formation, but only as linguistically explicated formally reflected and predictive world image or conceptual world view. In this understanding there is no the linguistic world images, that are based on the semantics of the language, but there are the linguistic world images, which are objectified by the language. Only such linguistic world images are real. The linguistic world image as a self-reflection of the language, semantics, content of the language, idioms - it's not the language world images, but the linguistic world images. The support in such differentiation of the world image we find from other authors. As was already mentioned, the picture of the world is the informative, positive phenomenon, and as such it is not derived from the values of various (and often considered in isolation) lexical variants and even the global semantic system of the language, which is the product of cognitive activity. However, one cannot deny the fact that the nominative means of any language, their different combinations illustrate the changes that occur in the conceptual world image [1].

The theoretical value of the work lies in the fact that the study of interlanguage phraseological equivalents will make some changes in some of the postulates of general and comparative phraseology, which became almost axiomatic in the theory of phraseology, for example, phraseological ethnicity, uniqueness of phraseological units, nonmodelable essence of phraseological units, nonverbal essence of phraseological units. The theoretical significance of this study lies in the fact that the study of interlanguage phraseological equivalents in different languages significantly enriches the theoretical linguistics universals, typological linguistics, and thus a united basis of phraseological system as a component of a single universal language.

Current development of linguistic science is characterized by its wide enough multidirection, in particular as for the language in general and the different aspects - systematic and structural, functional, anthropocentric, cultural linguistic, pragmatic, communicative, cognitive and typological.

Comparative sphere of linguistics, in particular, a comparative study of different systems, structurally and genetically related and unrelated languages, including the

phraseology of their system is very relevant in the Kazakh linguistics.

Phraseological component of a language takes a special part in any language for various reasons: it is in demand of the system inside, by outer linguistic factors and functionally. Not only the features of the language nature of phraseological units itself, but also of other levels of the language system, as well as universal and national peculiarities of different languages and their speakers are reflected in phraseological system and its units called phraseological ones.

Consideration of phraseology and phraseological system of one of different languages in terms of linguistic universals - this is a new trend in linguistics. Traditionally the phraseology is considered in linguistics as a system and language section, reflecting primarily the national cultural identity of that language carriers. However phraseological language system has universal qualities and properties at different levels of the intralinguistic phraseological units organization, its functioning, in various aspects of existence, development, interaction with other languages, qualities and characteristics, inherited in most languages and unique phraseological ethnical properties, which are peculiar to only one, particular language or a group of related languages, but absent in all other languages. Linguistic universals raises linguistics as a science to a new level, giving it a new cognitive quality, improving its cognitive, methodological capabilities, expanding its horizons, as it involves all the new languages, compares multiple related and unrelated languages.

Linguistics of universals analyzes and is interested in features that allow you to combine a variety of languages or languages. Establishing similarities and differences in languages of different types is one of the central problems of linguistics. In the early days of its development, linguistics was interested in more languages in relation to their origin. The nature and type of language were based on the construction of any language to any original condition. In recent years, the study of a common language was made by identifying similarities on the basis of certain characteristics or specially selected groups, justified from the standpoint of linguistics universals and typological linguistics. Languages are grouped due to the nature of the spatial distribution and juxtaposition, their local contacts, which is the subject of the so-called areal linguistics or on the basis of their internal consistency - the actual typological features, which is the subject of typological linguistics.

In the analysis of the national language features are included, as it is known, on the one hand, those which are caused by the national culture of the people and a speaker, and those that relate to the internal organization and structure of the language system. The first and the second are not the same and should not be confused.

Many of the objects and phenomena of the physical world are imprinted in the consciousness, mind, reason, and memory of all the people. This leads to the fact that we are dealing with almost two not identified and no identifiable levels: 1) the linguistic level, 2) cognitive level.

In the history of linguistic onomasiologic approach in learning the language carry out in a different areas and manifestation: in the theory of nomination, in the connection with the functioning of the language and the necessity of the choice of the means of nomination, the means of expression of certain linguistic, under the necessity of the developing of thesaurus, during the learning the language as a system and systematic relations in the language. One of the brightest spheres of the manifestation is the concept of linguistic field, which has direct relation to the problematics in linguistic as the language and consciousness, the language and thinking. Historically, the idea of the theory of the field goes back exactly to that thinking, is a perfect reflection of the world through the language and initially fixed in the language. In this sense we have in mind, in thinking something that exists in the native language. Between the ideal image of the world and the language means of expression there is a complete parallelism. In many languages the real objective world is presented in perfect shape, but in many ways different, because each in its own way divides the world. The language fields, that are a means of expressing language, cover completely what he knows and is reflected by some people in a particular area of the real world in a particular field of knowledge. Among the variety of linguistic expressions, concepts and values in terms of linguistic fields, the units of vocabulary words have been considered at first.

If between phraseological units of different languages there are no compliances, there is nothing to compare. In other words, the comparative linguistics assumes existence between the compared language facts of communities, similarities in an obligatory measure, instead of full distinction. The character and that and others, their typology, it is necessary to reveal during the comparative, typological analysis. Equally it belongs and to comparative phraseology, in line with which phraseological units of the most different languages is exposed to the analysis.

Phraseological equivalence of English, Russian and Kazakh languages requires full compliance of derivation base, prototypes correlated of phraseological equivalents in different languages at the lexical, grammatical levels, and there is full compliance of their shaped base. In phraseological field of the word “nature”, there is founded the structural-typological species in three compared languages. In quantitative terms, they are few; they have shaped a common framework that is particularly branching.

The total number of interlingual phraseological equivalence types of study in three languages - about 800. As shaped base in favor types of interlingual phraseological equivalence lexical components that represent, as a rule, the reaction of the human organism to fear or consequences caused by fear. Because the physiology and biology of the human body is the same in all people regardless of the race and language, and a phrase conceptualization consequences of fear in the human body has a high similarity and analogy, and most of all are expressed in the derivation basis.

The same biology and physiology reaction of the body and its parts and organs to fear allow concluding with certainty that interlanguage phraseological equivalents

of phraseological semantical field of “fear” arose independently from each other in the four languages. In the system of interlanguage phraseological equivalents of these four languages there are borrowings and tracings, which for their part are responsible for the presence of the interlanguage phraseological equivalents in other languages. Structural-typological approach to the study of phraseological systems of different languages is a new trend in linguistics and phraseology theory. It is completely justified, because phraseological system like all other language systems and the languages of the whole has universal properties and characteristics upon which linguistic basis, common linguistic features, phraseological system categories itself and regularities, typical for phraseological systems in any language can be installed. Phraseological language system can and should be studied like any other system of the language in terms of universals linguistic and typological linguistic. Universal features of phraseological systems and phraseological units are expressed and manifested in various ways, but only on the phraseological level. Phraseological system of any language, like all other language systems, is characterized by two principles, on which it is based: 1) paradigmatic and in 2) syntagmatic

Paradigmatic and syntagmatic, language and speech are central universals of human languages and any of their systems, including the phraseology. Central universals of different languages’ phraseological systems are set phrases of the language. They are the object of study of phraseology. The objects of study of this science are universal features and properties of phraseological units and phraseological systems of different languages. They are studied from the standpoint of two disciplines of universals’ linguistics, typological linguistics, on the one hand and comparative phraseology, on the other. There are three types of language universals in the system of this nonidentical science: a) linguistic universals; b) linguistic universals-implications. Only with these types of universals we can deeper and more comprehensively reflect and convey the essential, which is, universal and typological, characteristic features of human languages, because only on the basis of a set of absolute and relative universals we can derive the general principles, universal features and patterns of human languages. Universal-implications are more hypothetical than empirical universals.

The phraseological system consists of two types of defining universals:

- a) Conceptual- semantic or extralinguistic;
- b) Systemic and structural caused and interlinguistic.

The first ones reflect the deep structures of language content, the latter – the surface structure, the form of linguistic signs. Here mechanisms and patterns of language category can be revealed more brightly. Phraseological units are a special language type of secondary nomination means characterized as multicomponent, separately formed and by the structure of certain phrase of figurative-holistic indecomposable semantics. In linguistics it is accepted to distinguish the language means of primary, secondary and tertiary category. The first type is basically stated, extralinguistically

motivated word, the second is linguistically motivated word, and the third is phraseological unit, which is situationally motivated by phrase. Lexical and phraseological categories differ in the extent of its versatility, the first is omnivorous and versatile, and the second shows the limitations and selectivity in this function.

For structural-typological study of phraseological systems of different languages distinction between two types of universals is essential: lexical-phraseological and proper phraseological. In the first case dominates semasiological approach in linguistics with elements of onomasiological principle of language learning. From the position of lexical-phraseological universals in language and in its nominative system there is an important fact, that vocabulary and phraseology are not separated, but they are related to each other and interact with each other, mutually dependent.

They are one single species of nominative system of linguistic resources generalized category. To the sphere of lexical-phraseological universals such general semasiological categories as polysemy, synonymy, antonymy and homonymy are related, which are inherent in the vocabulary and phraseology. However, they are language categories and phenomena, but not only lexical and phraseological. They are able to show on their core some differences between the vocabulary and phraseology. Some types of derivational bases may be universal in phraseological systems of different languages, for example, somatization and associative relationship. Types of derivational bases may cause different new phraseological universals implications.

All universal manifestations and patterns related with motivation are closely connected, because they discover the associative-psychological substrate. On the one hand we speak about linguistic facts, about the relationship between internal form and actual phraseological meaning. On the other hand in the base of motivation lay the mechanisms and processes of cognitive-semantic order, image-associative operation of consciousness, memory, perception and recollection. Proper phraseological universals are completely different type than the lexical-phraseological universals. They have to do only with phraseological system and phraseological units. Their establishment has its stages and approaches.

On the first stage it is necessary to distinguish three groups of phraseological universals: 1) specified in extra-linguistic way; 2) lexical-phraseological; 3) proper phraseological.

These problems should be solved in in two phases, involving: a) the delimitation of intersystem language phraseological universals from extralinguistic; b) the delimitation of proper phraseological universals from lexical-phraseological. We say about two options: a) the parameters of lexical-semantic universals; b) the parameters of proper phraseological universals. Regularity in phraseology and phraseological universals manifest themselves very clearly and systematically in phraseological models and phraseology simulation.

Phraseological units of one language, as a rule, have correspondence similar

in somewhat with phraseological units in another language. With a glance of extent of structural-typological proximity of matched phraseological units different types of structural-typological correspondences and affinity are allocated:

- 1) Interlanguage phraseological equivalents of various types;
- 2) Interlanguage phraseological-semantic correspondences of different types.

Determining role in interlanguage phraseological equivalents and phraseological-semantic correspondences is played by the concept of phraseological image, representation and relationship between them and actual value of a phrase. There is no 1:1 correlation in different languages. In addition, the actual phraseological value is rarely predictable fully with all their pragmatic and semantic nuances.

Like any other images phraseological images associated with organisms reflex processes, the human memory, perception and reflection of the world, the knowledge and associative nature of human psyche. Besides, they largely determine the world's phraseological picture, which has its own characteristics of reflection and representation of the world and differs significantly from the lexical world picture.

Different nations are able to equally divide, reflect and see the world. For this there are a variety of reasons, among which should be noted, first of all the unity and similarity of the real world, lifestyle, needs and desires of the people, the identity of their biology, physiology, psychology and of course ascending of modern languages phraseological units to the general image-semantic prototype. The fact of similarity of phraseological units in different languages on various aspects of their linguistic nature, development and operation makes the study's comparative structural-typological principles necessary and relevant.

Comparative structural-typological study of different languages phraseological systems shows two patterns:

- a) The existence of thought unity and mental operations in both processes of conceptualizing the world and phraseology building, that is, phraseological derivation;
- b) Selectivity and national characteristics in the two types of cognitive and linguistic human activities.

Phraseological component is an essential constituent of any language. Between the maturity of language and phraseological system there is a direct relationship. In addition, visual-image thinking is higher level of human consciousness and more complex form of thought, than ingeniously subject, objectively due to conceptual thinking.

Phraseological component of language is one of the most difficult elements in the study of foreign languages and language acquisition. Mostly it is connected with the complexity of linguistic nature. Its most typical and categorical features are: multi-component, separately statefulness, phrase form, imagery, semantic integrity, phraseological stability in all aspects of its linguistic nature, belonging to the language and linguistic phraseological system, therefore, taking them out from of memory or

phrasebook ready, as much as one man does this with words. The typical, characteristic features of phraseology are their attribution not to the primary, but to the secondary language system, that is, their genetic unoriginality and structural derivatives. Primary linguistic systems make the language, on the one hand, the universal mean of communication and cognition, knowledge storage, identification and differentiation of real phenomena and expression of different relations between them, and, on the other hand, for the speech organization, communication and more complex language and speech formation.

This feature is that during learning and reflection man creates, first of all, ideal entities, and in one quality form, namely in the form of generalizations. These are concepts, with the help of which man organizes judgments, inferences, that is, thought, thinking activity, speech and communication. Generalization is a necessity in cognitive and mental activity of man, otherwise it would have died in the individual and separate particulars, also in the isolated from each other events and would not have an idea about the integrity and coherence of the world and its phenomena, about its categorical nature, that is, its class system, that the world consists not so much from the individual, separate events, as from the classes, genera, species, groups, subgroups of various objects and the world's phenomena. The world consists of communities, categories of different order, generalizations of objective order of various subject areas as material world phenomena and their cognitive-reflective categorical existence, not in the real world already, which, as such, exists always, but in the human mind. The most common and regular form of consolidation of knowledge about the world is a concept, which encompasses the essential features and functions of the objects and phenomena of the real world in a summarized form. The notion, in turn, is fixed, as usually, in the language in such the most widespread and regular language unit as word. The notion is usually the objective world in its natural quality, as it is in reality. For this the concept and the notional system in cognitive, conceptual system of a nation are responsible. The subjective, human predetermined or nationally and culturally predefined knowledge, reflection and representation of the world meet another ideal, conceptual, epistemological essence, another unit of consciousness, namely the concept.

Comparative structural-typological study of phraseology can effectively implement and provide interesting, valuable and useful scientific results under certain research conditions: the use of unified theory of methodology, a unified conceptual-terminological apparatus. Characterization and comparison of phraseology of different languages are carried out under different conditions, with different coverage of phraseological system and, usually, at the level of the whole phraseological system, the definitions of categories, classes of phraseological units, specific and individual phraseological units. Among the most important research tasks of comparative phraseology are, above all, such as the identification of deep-rooted intralanguage and extralinguistic factors and causes of the similarities and differences of phraseology systems,

phraseological units, phraseological picture of the different languages world, phraseological regularities and universals of various languages.

REFERENCES

1. Kursisa A., *Deutsch ist easy! Lehrerhandreichungen und Kopiervorlagen, Deutsch nach Englisch. A. Kursisa, Für den Anfangsunterricht. 2011, 18, 102, 104 (in Deu).*
2. Rösler D., *Deutsch als Zweit- und Fremdsprache, Gemeinsamkeiten und Unterschiede. D. Roessler; Deutsch als Fremdsprache. 2011, 14, 149, 160 (in Deu).*
3. Rösler D., *Deutsch als Fremdsprache außerhalb des deutschsprachigen Raums. D. Roessler; Ein praktischer Beitrag zur Fortbildung von Fremdsprachenlehrern. 2011, 12, 105, 108 (in Deu).*
4. Marion G., *Neue methodische Ansätze im DaF-Unterricht mit Beiträgen deutscher und usbekischer WissenschaftlerInnen. G. Marion, Neue methodische Ansätze. 2011, 55, 58 (in Deu).*
5. Jakobson R., *Implications of language universals for linguistics. R. Jakobson, Universals of language. 2006, 11, 107, 111 (in Eng).*

ӘОЖ 331.101.3:347.966

А.С. КЕНЕСПАЕВ, А.С. ПАМАЗАНОВА

С. Аманжолов атындағы Шығыс Қазақстан мемлекеттік университеті,
Өскемен қ., Қазақстан

СУДЬЯЛАРДЫҢ КӘСІБИ ЭТИКАСЫНЫҢ МӘСЕЛЕСІ

Мақалада заң саласының басты категориясы этика мәселесі, оның ішінде судьялардың кәсіби этикасы барынша жан-жақты сөз болған. Авторлардың пікірінше, судья – тәжірибелі, адамдық қарым-қатынаста талғамды, ойлы, салауатты, білімді, турашыл және ізгілікті болуы қажет, ал құқық қорғау қызметін жүзеге асыратын мемлекеттік органдардың лауазымды тұлғаларының ішінде судья басты тұлға болып табылады.

Түйін сөздер: судья этикасы, сот, құқық қорғау, заңнама, кәсіби кодекс.

ПРОБЛЕМА ПРОФЕССИОНАЛЬНОЙ ЭТИКИ СУДЬИ

В статье рассматриваются проблемы этики как важнейшей категории в сфере права, а также вопросы, касающиеся профессиональной этики судьи. По мнению авторов, судья – должны быть опытными, солидарными в человеческих отношениях, образованными, коммуникабельными, гуманными, так как среди должностных лиц государственных органов, осуществляющих правоохранительную деятельность, судья является главным лицом.

Ключевые слова: этика судьи, суд, защита права, законодательство, профессиональный кодекс.