IRSTI 16.31.41 https://doi.org/10.26577/EJPh.2020.v178.i2.ph31

M. Malgaazhdar

Al-Farabi Kazakh National University,
Kazakhstan, Almaty, e-mail: malgaazhdar@gmail.com

TRANSLATION TECHNIQUES OF RENDERING FUTURE TENSE FORMS FROM KAZAKH INTO ENGLISH (based on the novels «Көшпенділер» and «Abaizholy»)

The article deals with different types of transformation used in the process of translating from Kazakh into English by applying the principle of comparison. For the principle of comparison makes it possible for us to establish differences and similarities of heterogeneous languages as far as Kazakh and English languages are syntactically, morphologically and structurally different. Moreover, a close comparative study of languages not only helps us detect peculiarities of different languages but also directs us to a deeper analysis of research results. English belongs to the Germanic group of language. The Kazakh pertains to the Turkic group of the Altaic family. Concerning the morphological type English is inflected and notable for its analytical character. Kazakh is an agglutinative language. As to grammar the principle means of expression in languages, possessing an analytical character is the order of words and use of words and use of function words (function words, word order and intonation pattern). The grammatical inflections are the principal means used in Kazakh. However, the rest of the grammatical means are also used but they are of less frequency than the grammatical inflections.

Key words: transformation, target language (TT), source language (ST), future, grammatical, lexical, comparative analysis.

М. Малгааждар

Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті,
Қазақстан, Алматы қ., e-mail: malgaazhdar@gmail.com

Қазақ тілінен ағылшын тіліне келер шақты аудару жолдары («Көшпенділер» және «Абай жолы» романдарына негізделген)

Бұл мақалада салыстыру әдісін қолдана отырып қазақ тілінен ағылшын тіліне аудару процесіндегі келер шақ формаларын аудару түрлері мен жолдары қарастырылады. Өйткені салыстыру әдісі морфологиялық, синтактикалық құрылыстары әртүрлі қазақ тілі және ағылшын тілі сияқты тілдердің айырмашылықтары мен ұқсастықтарын анықтауға көмектеседі. Сонымен қатар осы салыстыру әдісінің көмегімен зерттеу нәтижелеріне терең талдау жасауға болады. Қазақ тілі алтай тілдерінің ішіндегі түрік тілдер тобына жатады. Ал ағылшын тілі герман тілдер тобына жатады. Ал морфологиялық тұрғыдан алғанда ағылшын тілі флективті тілдер тобына жатады және ол аналитикалық сипатымен ерекшеленеді. Ал қазақ тілі агглютинативті тілдер тобына жатады. Ал грамматикалық ерекшелігіне келсек, аналитикалық сипатымен ерекшеленетін ағылшын тілінің негізгі әдістеріне сөздердің орын тәртібі, сөздердің қолданылуы және функциональдық сөздердің қолданылуын (көмекші сөздер, сөз тәртібі және интонация) жатқызуға болады. Ал қазақ тіліне келсек, ең негізгі маңызды қолданылатын әдіске грамматикалық жалғауларды жатқызуға болады. Қазақ тілінде басқа да грамматикалық әдістер қолданылады, бірақ олар грамматикалық жалғаулар сияқты жиі қолданыла бермейді.

Түйін сөздер: келер шақ, грамматикалық, лексикалық, контекстуальдық, салыстырмалы анализ, аударылатын тіл, негізгі тіл.

М. Малгааждар
Казахский национальный университет им. аль-Фараби,
Казахстан, г. Алматы, e-mail: malgaazhdar@gmail.com

Техника перевода форм будущего времени с казахского на английский (на основе романов «Кочевники» и «Путь Абая»)

В статье рассматриваются разные виды и пути перевода форм будущего времени, которые используются в процессе перевода с казахского языка на английский язык с применением сравнительного анализа, так как сравнительный анализ помогает установить сходства и различия гетерогенных языков, таких как казахский и английский языки, которые имеют различные морфологическую и синтактическую структуры. Кроме того, тщательный сравнительный анализ не только выявляет особенности разных языков, но также помогает провести более глубокий анализ результатов исследования. Казахский язык относится к тюркской группе алтайской языковой семьи. Английский язык относится к германской языковой группе. Что касается морфологического типа, английский язык относится к группе флективных языков и отличается аналитическим характером. Казахский язык является агглютинативным языком. Что касается грамматики английского языка, то основным средством выражения в языке, обладающим аналитическим характером, является порядок слов, использование слов и использование функциональных слов (служебные слова, порядок слов и интонация). Грамматические окончания являются основным средством, используемым в казахском языке. Хотя остальные грамматические средства также используются, но они менее часты, чем грамматические окончания.

Ключевые слова: будущее время, грамматический, лексический, контекстуальный, сравнительный анализ, исходный язык (ИЯ), язык перевода (ЯП).

Introduction

It has been argued that language is arbitrary. By arbitrariness, it is meant that there is no one-to-one correspondence between the form of the word and the shape of the object to which the word refers (Yule, 1988: 18). This is especially true in the case of the abstract words such as advice, meaning, feeling, etc. This means that language is based on conventions. The arbitrariness of language is a cause for variation among languages. Speakers of different languages mix the sounds of those languages differently to make the words, which refer to objects / concepts; they mix the words in different ways to make structural patterns: they use different grammatical forms.

When speaking about a grammatical form, we usually regard it as a discrete element, which exists in the grammatical system of this or that language. The «rules» of the language in question determine the usage of this form, and the «rules» of translation define the ways of re-coding. It is in no way dubitable, so long as we are describing the already-written and already-translated texts. However, if we change the «point of view», or the «position of observation» from that of a describing linguist that of a producer of the not-yet-written and the not-yet-translated texts (which is actually the position of a language user or of a translator), and if we try to see how exactly grammatical choices are made, we will find that a form never appears as an existing thing, or as a point in time, but rather as an event of choosing. This event is not governed by a rule or a set of rules with a definite «output», but rather by various factors of a different nature, having different degrees of influence and priority. Thus, the grammatical forms, from the point of view of the language user or of the translator, do not «exist», they «happen», they develop in time as a process of making a choice. Many years ago Wilhelm von Humboldt claimed that understanding in communication is limited to the point where two cones meet. Each cone represents the micro universe of one of the participants in the process of communication, or consensual interaction, in Humberto Maturana's terminology (Maturana, 1970:50-55). A linguistic sign (a grammatical form) taken statically, can be regarded as an intermediary, Vermittler, within a consensual domain between two interacting systems (micro universes) of the speaker and the receiver of the message (Humboldt). Dynamically, this intermediary point turns into a universe, a continuum of its own. It reflects a grammatical process, and if we observe grammar in real time parameters (Yurchenko, 1994: 8-9; 1995: 15-18) each grammatical unit will display different time perspectives, depending on the point of view of the observer: the sign to be used by the speaker and the sign already used, the sign to be understood by the receiver and the sign already understood, etc.

Each communication participant interprets his or her own role in the overall grammatical

process, trying to find consensual balance between counteracting factors, and not just mechanically obeying the rules. The speaker, as an acting linguistic subject, in his or her attempt to find a [temporary] balance between what s/he would like to express, and what s/he would like his or her interlocutor, the hearer, to understand, faces a menu of options, a graded set of possible choices, which is close to the widely used concept of functional field (grammatical, lexical and contextual means of conveying a certain grammatical idea or covering a certain domain of meaning) (Bondarko, 1975: 157; 1987: 11-13). This field has a hierarchical structure in two senses. Materially and statically, the grammatical means (or rather grammatical event patterns) as discrete units are distributed between the center (more probable choice) and the periphery (less probable choice). Processually, the hierarchy of choice factors within the field (as well as between the fields) can be graded into several steps of different priority.

Traditionally, the usage of the grammatical form is correlated with the context. Anyhow, every formal deterministic rule of the type context A >grammatical form B (context A definitely implies the use of form B) leaves open the question: And who is, finally, the author of the context? Traditionally, context is regarded as an objective and even natural circumstances, given a prior to the speaker or translator, so that the question never arises. Even if the question were to be asked, the answer may seem puzzling: the speaker him/herself is the author of both the context and the chosen grammatical form. The context is not given, it is created by the speaker while conceptualizing and coding his or her message. The actual grammatical usage thus turns out to be a process of choice activity seeking balance between at least two parameters, the aspect totally disregarded in the deterministic paradigm of traditional grammars.

In translation the outward situation is even more misleading: the first step towards balance (situational conceptualization) has already been taken by the author of the source text. So the situational and- to a high degree- contextual background seems to be provided initially for the translator. Nevertheless, re-coding is only a part of translation activity; the latter also includes monolingual understanding, occurring prior to re-coding. The translator first has to be the receiver of the message, and only then does s/he change his or her role to become the sender of the re-coded message. It might turn out to be more efficient to regard the overall process of interlingual communication (translation in the broad sense of the term) not purely as a deterministic response to source language stimuli with target language means, but as part of the integral probabilistic choice activity which is effectuated with the aim of striking a balance between several factors of various rank and range. In recoding a grammatical categorical situation (part of an utterance) with the help of the target means, a translator is also engaged in a probabilistic activity of choosing from a field of possible means of translation. This field includes not only grammatized forms but also other means from different levels of language structure which could be correlated with the functional potential of the grammatical form in the source language. It should also be noted that if in monolingual communication nobody predetermines anything for the speaker, in the process of translation we take the first stages for granted. The mediating translator is in a more advantageous position than the original speaker/ writer/sender: s/he presumably knows what to say, at least to the extent that s/he has understood the original text. So, s/he has a starting point, which is the original text, and all the choices s/he makes refer to a new text, constructed by him/her using the target language, and following the conceptualization and categorization lines of the writer of the original. It is exactly at this point that his or her advantages turn into problems. S/he has to find relatively adequate grammatical means of conveying the same ideas as in the original. Fortunately, linguistic relativity is not a powerful monster to hamper and stop altogether the process of transcoding.

Thus there appear to be two aspects to the use of a grammatical form as a processual pattern of choice activity. One may center on the multiple possibilities of translating one and the same utterance, or part of an utterance (grammatical form in context, in particular). The other might take into consideration the variety of choice factors in the actual grammatical activity of aspeaking/writing/ translating subject. The first aspect is essentially deterministic and straightforward: a situation stimulus or contextual position implies one or a limited number of grammatical choices, i.e. a> b, if a, then b. The second, however, seems to fall outside of the deterministic paradigm, drawing closer to the probabilistic nature of linguistic activity.

Actually, in language as a semiotic system deterministic relations are not basic, the key equation in language being not that of implication: a>b, if a, then b, but that of arbitrary consensual correspondence: a>b, if a, then let it be denoted by b. The viewpoint which has been criticized up to now is non-dynamic; it regards a linguistic sign as an existing thing. But in fact, linguistic signs

(grammatical forms, in particular) do not exist, they happen or occur. This means that a linguistic sign is not an object in the usual sense of the term, it is pattern of subjective linguistic activity of language users. It seems more appropriate to consider grammatical forms as grammatical actions, events, or even patterns, i.e. as more or less stable attractors in which the randomness of linguistic activity assumes a certain non-random shape.

Linguistic signs are centers of consensual balance between opposite forces and principles: motivation, speaker's intention, hearer's inference, deterministic rules, freedom of choice, etc. It is only in admitting the concept of linguistic actions, that it becomes possible to balance processually the interaction between the opposites. The sign in this model ceases to be an object, a point in space and time. It assumes two processual stages: the not yet-used-sign and the already-used sign. From this point of view, the sign-to-be-used is at the highest degree of speaker's intention, combined with some prognosis of the hearer's inference. When the sign has been used, the priorities are inverted: the hearer's inferences are aimed at restoring the speaker's intention. In both cases we have a choice of factors: first for the speaker, second for the hearer.

Experiment

As far as we are concerned with the future tense forms, we shall restrict ourselves to the choice matter of the English future tense forms. The following sentence will suffice to serve our purpose:

Мен онымен ертең кездесемін.

This Kazakh sentence can be rendered into English in several ways:

a. I shall meet him tomorrow.

b. I'm meeting him tomorrow.

c. I'm going to meet him tomorrow.

d. I'll be meeting him tomorrow.

e. I'm to meet him tomorrow.

Which of them is correct? Here the choice of equivalents depends on the context. Sentencea expresses speaker's present resolve to do something while sentence c reports what the speaker may have already decided to do. Sentence b refers to a future arrangement whereas sentence e also serves to indicate a future arrangement but in addition to that meaning it implies obligation resulting from this arrangement. Sentence d refers to a normal course of events: either I work with him or we attend classes together. But it should be born into mind that the difference between various means of referring an action to the future may sometimes become unimportant as the distinction is often very subtle. In the above case sentences b, c, d, e may be used interchangeably depending on the context.

There are a number of ways of expressing future time in English: will/shall + V, be going to + V, Present Progressive, Simple Present, be to + V and etc. These verb forms all have their particular nuances of meaning, and are far from being interchangeable. In translation the expression of English future time presents considerable difficulty for Kazakh speaking people as there are no future tense forms that can be referred to as peculiar to future. The double function of will/shall as modal verbs and the auxiliaries of the future and the secondary use of Present Progressive and Simple Present in reference to the future are quite confusing.

This is a complicated area of grammar: the difference between the meanings and the uses of the different structures are not easy to analyze and describe clearly. In many, but not all situations, two or more structures are possible with similar meanings.

The use of will\shall have been +Viii and Present tense in reference to the future causes considerable difficulty on the part of Kazakh speaking people. For example:

1) Сынақ жұмысы сағат 5ке қарай аяқталады.

The test will have been completed by 5 o'clock.

2) Поезд сағат 7 де келеді

The train comes at 7o'clock.

3) Келесі жылы Біріккен Ұлттар Ұйымы өзінің 10жылдық мерей тойын тойлайды.

Next Year the United Nations celebrates its 10th anniversary.

Kazakh speaking people would translate them as: will be completed, will come and will celebrate.

Here I want to notice that the following facts should be taken into consideration while using the present tense in reference to the future to denote a future action planned in advance.

Firstly, if there is a slightest doubt as to the fulfillment of a future action at a definite future moment the future indefinite is used instead of the present. For instance:

*Sam will pick me up at 10.00 and drive me to the station: then I catch the 10.00 train to Skuthorp*e.

Here the use of will pick instead of picks would exclude the possibility of unpredicted event that may prevent the planned action from happening at exactly 10.00. Besides picks would be misinterpreted as a regular action which is a main meaning peculiar to the present tense.

Secondly, the present tense in reference to the future doesn't always substitute the future indefinite:

When does the train to Karagandy leave?
Қарағандығапоездқашанжүреді?
When will the train to Karagandy leave?
Қарағандыға поезд қашан жүреді екен енді?

Lastly, present indefinite in reference to the future is used in questions like «Why don't you...», «How long+be+for»:

Why don't you take a day off tomorrow?
How long are you here for?

Worthy of notice is also an independent use of will/shall+Progressive Infinitive as future-as-a-matter-of-course that is quite tempting.

Ерте ме кеш пе ол да үйленеді.
Sooner or later, she too will be getting married.
Асқар бүгін келмейді. Ол ауырып қалды
Bob will not be coming. He has been taken ill.

Instead of will/shall + Progressive Infinitive Kazakh, speaking communicants would use will/shall +Infinitive and would translate them as: will get married, will not come.

In order to avoid the collision between modal and future meanings of will, Future Indefinite is substituted by Future Continuous. For instance, instead of«I won't see him again»implying two meaning – I don't want to see him again and I won't see him again – «I won't be seeing him again»is used in the latter meaning. Also:

I certainly will be sending to you the manuscript of material that I have prepared on Understanding English (extract from the letter of the prominent linguist Nida)

In the above meaning Future Continuous is similar to that of«be going to + Infinitive» and runs in parallel with it.

I will be working or I am going to work all day tomorrow, so I won't have time to stop.

As you may have noticed to one Kazakh sentence correspond several English sentences and each corresponding sentence is interchangeable or vice versa to certain degree. The choice of them depends on the context or situation in which the source utterance is given and requires good knowledge and skill on the part of a translator.

Results and discussion

Ways of translating «ғалы\гелі, қалы\келі+ тұр\жатыр\отыр» forms into English.

Хасен Қожа тағы да жазықсыз біреудің қаны төгілгелі тұрғанын ұқты (Yesenberlin I., 2007:358).

Someone's death was soon to follow (Yesenberlin I., 2000: 235).

Он хорошо знал что если засветиться радостью сероватые глаза и улыбка тронет кончики рта у эмира то быть чьей то смерти. (Yesenberlin I., 1986b: 59).

We can infer from «төгілгелі тұр» that someone was doomed to die. This meaning is rendered by«was to +V» that refers to something that is destined to happen as well and coincides with that of Kazakh in the given context.

Ясыны шапқалы отырсың (Yesenberlin I., 2007:371).

Now you are going to carry out a massacre in the town of Yassi (Yesenberlin I., 2000: 246).

Ты идешь сейчас затопить кровью наш город Яссы (Yesenberlin I., 1986b: 69).

«Шабу»is replaced by a word combination «carry out a massacre». Here we observe full correspondence between the Kazakh «қалы» and the English «be going to V» (both sentence refer to a speaker's present intention).

One more example: *Сендер қайткелі тұрсыңдар? (Yesenberlin I., 2007: 309).*

What are you going to do? (Yesenberlin I., 2000: 191).

Что вы собирайтесь делать? (Yesenberlin I., 1986b: 124).

Әбілмамбет Жоңғар қонтайшысы Қалден Церенмен жақындасқалы жүр (Yesenberlin I., 2007:144).

Khan Abilmambet isscheming with the Jungar Kontaichi (Yesenberlin I., 2000: 295).

Контайчи якшается с джунгарским контайчи (Yesenberlin I., 1986b: 124).

The English translation is rendered by Present Simple under the influence of the Russian translation. Present Simple doesn't serve to indicate the future fulfillment of the present intention or determination. My version is: *Khan Abilmambet is going to scheme with the JungarKontaichi.*

Келер жылы Есіл бойындағы бір ауқатты адамға бергелі отырған Гауһарды әке шешесі керуенге ілесіп саяхат құрып бара жатқан бір топ қыз бозбалаларға қосып жіберген (Yesenberlin I., 2007: 350).

Gauhar, with a group of girls who were getting married soon, went with the caravan (Yesenberlin I., 2000:231).

С группой девушек которым предстояло в ближайшее время выйти замуж поехала с караваном и Гаухар (Yesenberlin I., 1986b: 54).

Gauhar's marriage that is expected to take place soon after a definite past moment is rendered by the Past Continuous.

Дәл осындай мезгілде бір күні Шалғай Созақтан келген керуеншіден Дайыр Қожаның баласы сүзектен кайтыс болып жесір калган Күнсананы «аға өлсе жеңге мұра, іні өлсе келін мұра» деген қазақтың көне дәстүрі бойынша қожаның үлкен баласына бергелі жатыр деген хабарды естиді (Yesenberlin I., 2007: 327).

But Shagai heard from a mouth of a caravan driver who had arrived in Tashkent from Soazak, that the son of Suleiman-Kodzhi had died of an ulcer, and his wife Kunsan was going, according to the law of «amengerstva»-the succession of the wives among relatives, to be given to the eldest son of the ruler Sozak (Yesenberlin I., 2000: 214).

Но как то из уст караванщика прибывшего в Ташкент из Созакаон услышал что сын Сулеймана ходжы умер от моровой язвы, а жену его собираются по закону амангарства переемственности между родственниками передать старшему сыну правителя Созака (Yesenberlin I., 1986b: 35).

«Бергелі жатыр» is substituted by «was going to be given» as the former is given in the past context. Here we observe full correspondence between the grammatical meanings of two forms: both of them express a future intention planned in advance viewed from the past though Active Voice in the original is replaced by Passive Voice in translation.

Мына шешелерің сыбаға әкеп енді тарағалы отыр (Auyezov M.,1989: 419).

My son, your mothers and the elder women are preparing to go separate ways (Auyezov M., 1977:91).

Сын дорогой твои матери и старшие невестки принесли угощение. Теперь мы собираемся расходиться (Auyezov M., 1982: 69).

Жиен аға тағы бір қауіпті іс тапсырғалы түрмын.

Zhienaga I want to ask you to do something very important (Yesenberlin I., 2000: 171).

Жиен ага я хочу поручить вам одно важное дело (Yesenberlin I., 1986a: 200).

As you may have noticed the Kazakh «-ғалы отыр, -ғалы жатыр, -ғалы жүр, -ғалы тұр» forms are rendered by:

is/are preparing+V

want/wants+V

am/is/are going to +V

Ways of translating Мақсатты келер шақ into English

Дәл осы кезде бұларға Әбілқайыр әскерінің келе жатқаны оған жақында Арқадан Сәмеке бастаған қол келіп қосылмақ деген хабар жетті (Yesenberlin I., 2007:351).

And, soon «usin kulak», the famous steppe long ear, brought news that Sameke khan's cavalry was going to join up with Abulkhair (Yesenberlin I., 2000:231).

А вскоре узункулак знаменитое степное длинное ухо принес вести и о движений конницы Самеке хана идущего на соединение с Абулхаиром (Yesenberlin I., 1986b:54).

Here we have full correspondence, general grammatical meaning attached to both sentences being future fulfillment of premeditated intention viewed from the Past.

Also the same can be noted in the following sentence but viewed from the present:

Қайсысымызды теуіп кетпек? (Yesenberlin I., 2007:351).

Whom is he going to give a kick this time? (Yesenberlin I., 2000:231).

Кого он собирается пнуть ногой на этот раз меня или Аблая? (Yesenberlin I., 1986b:54).

Қандай зұлым еді Абдолла! Өзіне қас сұлтандарын бір біріне айдап салып оп оңай жеңіске жетпек қой! Ие бұл оның негізгі айласы осылай ол Самарқант сұлтандарын да құртпақ... (Yesenberlin I., 2007:137).

And that Emir Abdullah is cunning. He will set the Kazakh sultans against each other, roil their sultans up, set us against them and them against us (Yesenberlin I., 2000:224).

Хитер же эмир Абдуллах Ему главное поссорить казахских султанов друг с другом, перессорить и своих султанов, нас натравливать на них, на киргизских вождей, тех на нас (Yesenberlin I., 1986b:45).

Under the influence of the Russian translation, so far as we are concerned with the future we will confine ourselves only to analyzing future verb forms, the English version is not translated grammatically correct. That is to say, the grammatical meaning of the English future «will» doesn't coincide with that of the Kazakh future «пақ/пек». My version of the translation is: *And that Emir Abdullah is cunning. By setting his enemy-sultans against each other he is easily going to succeed! No doubt this is his main method…..I suppose he is going to do away with Samarkhand sultans in the same way.*

Екі жақтың әскері Шиелі тұсында түйіспек (Yesenberlin I., 2007:343).

The daughter relayed that both Kazakh armies would join up at the flood land of the Shieli River (Yesenberlin I., 2000:228).

Дочь передавала что оба казахские войска должны соединиться у поймы реки Шиели (Yesenberlin I., 1986b:59).

Here we see the disparity between the original sentence and its English translation in their grammatical meanings. Neither «will» nor its past form «would» are used to refer to planned future actions. My version: *The daughter relayed that both Kazakh armies were going to join up at the flood land of the Shieli River.*

The same mistake can be observed in the following translation:

Қашан келіп қосылмақ? (Yesenberlin I., 2007:348).

When will Abulkhair and Samek meet up? (Yesenberlin I., 2000:230).

Когда же они должны встретиться Абулхаир и Самеке? (Yesenberlin I., 1986b:53).

My version: *When are Abulkhair and Samek going to meet up?*

Ал бүгін оның әскерін өзінен бұрын шаппақшы болып отырмын.

Now I'm getting ready to give a good rebuff to his tumens.

As you may have noticed the Kazakh «галы\гелі, қалы\келі+ тұр\жатыр\отыр» forms are rendered by:

is/are getting ready to + V

am/is/are going to +V

is/are/preparing+V

Ways of translating Болжалды келер шақ into English.

Оны соңынан көрерміз.

We shall see about it later.

The meaning of prediction embedded in «ер» which is rendered by «shall+V» fully coincides with that of Kazakh.

Күшті екенімізді көрсе сыйлар (Yesenberlin I., 2007:170).

When they see we are strong they will respect us (Yesenberlin I., 2000:112).

Увидят что мы сильны станут уважать (Yesenberlin I., 1986a:131).

Күшсіз екенімізді көрсе аяар (Yesenberlin I., 2007:170).

If we are exhausted they will only be pitying us (Yesenberlin I., 2000:112).

А если придем изможденными то станут только жалеть. (Yesenberlin I., 1986a:131).

Here we have two Kazakh sentences similar in their grammatical structure. But their translations differ. In the first case the verb in the main clause is rendered by «will+V» whereas in the second case by «will be +Ving». The meaningful difference between two translations consists in that while the latter shows the future action in the very process of its realization, the former points it out as a mere fact.

Әрине Теуіпкелді ана жылғыдай құрметтеп сырнай кернелеп қарсы алатын шығарсың (Yesenberlin I., 2007:414).

Will you be welcoming your Teupkel with a zhurna and a kernei like you did last time? (Yesenberlin I., 2000:278).

Что как и прошлый раз с зурной и карнаем будете встречать своего Теупкеля (Yesenberlin I., 1986b:102).

An action that will be in progress in the future is translated by means of will+Ving. A mocking note attached to «Сырнай кернелеп» is well disclosed by «with zhurna and kernei».

Ways of translating Ауыспалы келер шақ into English

Ауыспалы келер шақ with neutral predictive meaning is rendered by «will/shall+V»forms:

Кет кейін дей қоймас (Yesenberlin I., 2007:170).

They will not kick us out (Yesenberlin I., 2000:112).

Прогнать возможно и не прогонять (Yesenberlin I., 1986a:131).

Кім бұған жауап береді?

Who would answer that question? (Yesenberlin I., 2000:203).

Кто ответить на этот вопрос? (Yesenberlin I., 1986b:22).

Әрі кетсе ертең күн шыға (Yesenberlin I., 2007:170).

They will be here not later than tomorrow (Yesenberlin I., 2000:112).

There is no Future in the past in Kazakh. The above Kazakh sentence with predictive future meaning is given in the past context. Accordingly the translation is rendered into English by«would+V».

Ауыспалы келер шақ in promises and sentences with strong volitional color is rendered by «will+V»:

Ешкімге тіс жарушы болма! (Yesenberlin I., 2007:341).

You won't tell anyone (Yesenberlin I., 2000:227).

Ты не расскажешь!(Yesenberlin I., 1986b:49).

Айбымды адал қанаммен жуамын! (Yesenberlin I., 2007:328).

I will wash my guilt before you with my blood (Yesenberlin I., 2000:216).

Кровью смою свою вину перед вами (Yesenberlin I., 1986b:37).

Ауыспалы келер шақ in threats (with all persons) and in promises (only with the first persons) is rendered by «shall+V»:

Сенің бұл шешіміңді мен ұлы қонтайшыға күні ертең ақ жеткіземін (Yesenberlin I., 2007:423).

I shall pass your decision to the Great Kontaichi in so many words and all tumens will come to you in Irghis (Yesenberlin I., 2000:284).

Так и скажу про такое решение великому контайчи (Yesenberlin I., 1986b:158).

In prophetic statements Ауыспалы келер шақ is rendered by «will/shall+V» forms:

Қырыққа келмей табытта жатсаң өмірің ұзақ болады екен (Yesenberlin I., 2007:495).

A person who is in his prime dreams about his own death will live to ripe old age.

Кому снится собственная смерть во цвете лет тому жить до старости лет (Yesenberlin I., 1986b:158).

Сен өлген күні үшеуі үш жаққа ыдырап кетеді екен (Yesenberlin I., 2007:495).

But on the day of your death the Zhuzes will take three separate paths.

Но в день твоей смерти разойдутся эти жузы в трех направлениях (Yesenberlin I., 1986b:158).

Here «be going to+V» is also used:

Ал аяқ жағында тұрған үрім бұтағының ішінен бірі құран оқып бірі қанжар қайраса Уәлидің ұрпағынан шыққан бір тұқымың атын қағазда ал Қасымнан туған бір балаң атағын майданда қалдырады екен (Yesenberlin I., 2007:495).

One family branch is going to glorify you with learnedness whereas the other is with sanguine battles.

Одна ветвапрославит тебя ученостью другая кровавами битвами (Yesenberlin I., 1986b:159).

«Be going to+V» is often used when one takes a fatalistic view of the future. In speech the two constructions «be going to+V» and «will+V» can often be substituted. One more example:

Бірақ мен өлсем де менің арманым 7ші ұрпағымда бір кайталанады (Yesenberlin I., 2007:519).

They say we are going to be born anew in the seventh century.

Говорят что в седьмом поколении мы повторяемся (Yesenberlin I., 1986b:176).

Хан ием мен қайың жұртыма бармаймын (Yesenberlin I., 2007:328).

I'm not going anywhere (Yesenberlin I., 2000:216).

Никуда я не поеду (Yesenberlin I., 1986b:36).

Premeditated intention indicated by Ауыспалы келер шақ is rendered into English by Present Continuous. We see that the speaker has long been pondering over the situation.

Ауыспалы келер шақ is rendered by Present Continuous when it indicates future event anticipated by virtue of a present plan:

Қашан және қанша уақытта барады? (Yesenberlin I., 2007:443).

When he is going and how long (Yesenberlin I., 2000:294).

Мы прискакали узнатькуда когда и на какой срок он едет (YesenberlinI., 1986b:122).

Шыңғыс ұзаққа барады (Yesenberlin I., 2007:443).

He is departing for long (Yesenberlin I., 2000:291).

Чингиз уедет надолго (Yesenberlin I., 1986b:122).

Ауыспалы келер шақ abundant in proverbs/ sayings are usually rendered into English by «will/ shall+V»:

Тісі шыққан балаға шайнап берген ас болмас.

Chewed food will do no good to a large toothed wolf.

He who talks without caution will die without being sick.

An action that will be in progress some time later in the future denoted by Ауыспалы келер шақ is rendered into English by Future Continuous:

Осы қамалды қоршап алыпбірің қалмай аштан өлгеенше той тойлапби билеуде боламыз (Yesenberlin I., 2007:168).

Next we will be feasting at your walls until the last of your dies of hunger (Yesenberlin I., 2000:243).

Мы будем пировать под вашими стенами до тех пор пока последний из вас не издохнет от голода! (Yesenberlin I., 1986b:66).

Өз билігің қолыңнан кеткен соң бізді жоңғар бақара ма орыс басқара ма бәрібір емес пе? (Yesenberlin I., 2007:414).

What does it matter who will be ruling us the Russians or Dzhungars? (Yesenberlin I., 2000:278).

Какая разница кто будет правит нами-орысы или джунгары(Yesenberlin I., 1986b:102).

In Kazakh an action accomplished before a given future moment may be expressed in two ways: 1. V+ып/іп and auxiliary words with the future endings a/e+personal endings (келіп қалам, бітіріп коямын and etc) and 2. simply by Ауыспалы келер шақ forms+personal endings. And the meaning is conveyed by Future Perfect in English.

Егер біз барғанша ар жағынан Самекенің әскері жетіп қалса қайтесіз?

As an example I have taken the above sentence that wasn't translated but left out. Here the meaning of completeness of an action at a definite point

in the future embedded in «жетіп қалса» can be rendered into English by the Future Perfect forms. My translation is*: Supposing that Sameke's army will have joined them by the time we get there, what will you do then?*

Әбілқайырдың қолын жеңген Сыбан Раптан біздің жадап жүдеп әрең жеткен әскерміздіңбыт шытын шығаруы дауыссыз .Текке құримыз (Yesenberlin I., 2007:354).

If SybanRaptan could conquer Abulkhair, then he won't have any trouble with our weary family and we will have died for nothing (Yesenberlin I., 2000:233).

Если Сыбан смог победить Абулхаира то тем более справиться с нашими утомленным войском и мы погибнем без всякой пользы (Yesenberlin I., 1986b:56).

Қыс болса келіп қалды. Жоңғар әскері де ұрысын тоқтатады. Арқа жаққа бәрібір беттемейді (Yesenberlin I., 2007:354).

Winter will be upon us soon. The Kontaichi will also cease fighting. The Jungar cavalry won't get to our Sary-Arka (Yesenberlin I., 2000:56).

Зима уже не за горами. Контайчи тоже прекратит войну зимой. Джунгарские кони не доберутся до нашей Сарыарки. (Yesenberlin I., 1986b:233).

«Тоқтатады» and «беттемейді» are both rendered by the Future Simple: will cease and won't get. The former corresponds to that of Kazakh but the latter doesn't. The war used to cease in winter in those times. So both «тоқтатады» and «беттемейді» should be rendered by Future Continuous as that was what was expected to happen from the speaker's point of view in the natural course of events. The verb «cease» isn't usually used in the continuous because of its meaning. So «will cease» is quiet appropriate but the latter one should be translated as: The Jungar cavalry won't be getting to our Sary-Arka in the winter.

The same can be said of about the following sentence:

Ертең қыстауға кетеміз де қыс бойы інге кіргендей жатып каламыз (Auyezov M., 1989:91).

Tomorrow we shall separate to go to our winter quarters where we shall stay like animals in their lairs until spring (Auyezov M., 1977: 47).

Завтра мы разъедимся по зимовьям и до весны нам придется просидеть как в норах (Auyezov M., 1982:69).

My variant: *Tomorrow we will be going to our winter quarters where we will have to stay like animals in their lairs until spring?*

Ал тегі айырыла көшпесек қайтесің? (Auyezov M., 1989:91).

But what if we don't separate? (Auyezov M., 1977:47).

А что если не будем разъезжаться? (Auyezov M., 1982:69).

With reference to the future Present Simple is usually used in questions beginning with «why don't you….», «How long+be+for», «What if…»:

Әлі тұра тұр! Басыңда үкің жоқ деп қиғылық салады (Auyezov M., 1989:180).

You are going to be tortured very soon and very soon. There are no feathers in our hat to begin with (Auyezov M., 1977: 236).

Вот тебя и начнут терзать прежде всего попадет за то что на шапке нет перьев (Auyezov M., 1982:292).

HereАуыспалы келер шақ is rendered by«be going to+V», the form which is used to predict the future on the basis of present evidence. Here the present evidence is «Басыңда үкің жоқ» that is «There are no feathers in our hat to begin with!»

Мен қайтейін? Барып тұрып былтырғыдай кеудеге қақтырам ба? (Yesenberlin I.,2007:311).

What am I to do? Shall I go there to be kicked in the chest as last year? (Yesenberlin I., 2000:193).

Что я должен делать? Идти самому и получить пинок в грудь?

«Мен қайтейін» is substituted by the English set phrase «What am I to do?». In the second sentence Ауыспалы келер шақ is rendered by «shall+V». Here the speaker asks after the will of the person addressed.

Жүреміз! Жақында қайтамыз! (Auyezov M., 1989:168).

We are going home! Home! (Auyezov M., 1977:97).

Едем домой! Возвращаемся! (Auyezov M., 1982:134).

Two Kazakh sentences are integrated into one and Ауыспалы келер шақ is substituted by Present Continuous referring the action to the immediate future.

Мырза сендерге салем айтады ертең көп кісімен осында келеді. Мұнда Бөжей Байсалдар да келеді. Соңғы жиналыс және келісім Үлкен үйде болады. (Auyezov M., 1989:177).

Мырза передает привет. Завтра приедет сюда с гостями. Сбор и окончательное примирение будут у вас в большом доме (Auyezov M., 1982: 141).

Myrza sends his greetings. Mane quests will arrive tomorrow. Bozhei and Baisal will be here too.

The gathering and the final reconciliation is to take place in the Great House (Auyezov M., 1977:102).

The last three Kazakh sentences are in Ауыспалы келер шақ; the second and the third sentences. are rendered into English by «will+V» and the last one by «be to+V». In «осында келеді» the future action that is to take place at the time mentioned has been arranged in advance. «Will/shall+V» forms are not used to denote arranged future actions. As to the last sentences I fully agree with the translation as«be to+V» form is usually used to denote arranged future actions when there are not any future time indicators. My version is: *Myrza sends his greetings. He is coming here with many quests tomorrow. Bozhei and Baisal are coming too (Bozhei and Baisal will be here too is also possible). The gathering and the final reconciliation is to take place in the Great House*. The same mistake has been made in the following sentences:

Осы намаз осы астың үстіне олар да келеді оны естідің бе? (Auyezov M.,1989:159).

Have you heard that he'll attend the service in the mosque and take part in the Mirza's feast? (Auyezov M., 1977:126).

Ты слышал что он приедет и в мечеть и на праздник к мырзе.

My version is: *Have you heard that he is also coming to attend the service in the mosque and take part in the Mirza's feast?*

Осы Үркімбай Қазмен Қараша үшеуіңнің ауылыңда сияз болады (Auyezov M., 1989:59).

Gathering is to be held in you aul (Auyezov M., 1977:59).

В ваших аулах состоится сьезд (Auyezov M., 1982: 86).

«Сияз болады»is rendered by «be to+V» form. The both forms indicate a future event already determined in the present.

Соны қай қай ауылға саламыз (Auyezov M., 1989:112).

From what auls are we to take them? (Auyezov M., 1977:60).

С каких аулов будем собирать их? (Auyezov M., 1982:87).

Ауыспалы келер шақ is rendered by «be to+V»: the speaker is asking for an instruction.

Теңді шештірме! Ертең тағы көшесің (Auyezov M., 1989:47).

Don't order the packs to be undone! We travel on tomorrow (Auyezov M., 1977:92).

Не вели развязывать тюки и ставить юрты. Завтра опять двинемся (Auyezov M., 1982: 70).

«Ертең тағы көшесің» is translated as «We travel on tomorrow». Here the speaker informs his addressee of part of his plan.

Мен болсам енді қашанғы көне берейін! Қашаңғы құр қала берейін!

How long shall we endure? Shall we remain long disinherited?

Сколько же мне терпеть еще? Долго ли сидеть обойденным?

The English translation is wrong. «Shall» with the first person in the interrogative sentences is used to ask after the will of the person addressed. My version is: *How long are we going to endure it? How long are we going to remain disinherited?*

Келе жаткан арғын ереуілшілеріне қарсы шықпай бой тасалай тұрайық!

We are leaving.

Мы уходим.

The Kazakh analytical form of verb with the restrictive meaning imposed on the action in «бой тасалай тұрайық» is rendered by Present Continuous. Present Continuous is used to refer actions to the immediate future.

Бар жақсысын тағы да Құдайберді таңдап меншіктеп қояды. Таңдаулысын алам. Алып келем. Осы жол ма! Көрер-ақпын! (Auyezov M., 1989:102).

Kudaiberdi of course will take the best! But I'll pick some too. We'll see who gets the best (Auyezov M., 1977: 177).

Конечно Кудайберди заберет самых хороших! Я тоже отберу себе и приведу! Посмотрим чьи будут лучше! (Auyezov M., 1982:140).

The first English translation «Kudaiberdi of course will take the best» doesn't coincide with the original sentence «Бар жақсысын тағы да Құдайберді таңдап меншіктеп қояды» in the given context. Here «таңдап меншіктеп қояды» has the grammatical meaning of Past-in-the-Future. It could be rendered by Future Perfect but it is impossible as Future Perfect requires a point of orientation in the future and with no time reference Future Perfect is usually used to make prediction about the present. As to «Kudaiberdi of course will take the best» it does render the additional meaning of annoyance attached to «Бар жақсысын тағы да Құдайберді таңдап меншіктеп қояды» but the original sentence has nothing to do with the meaning of insistence the form «will» has, it rather expresses Kudaiberdi's future intention in the given situation. My version is: *I know Kudaiberdi is going to take the best as usual. But I'll pick some too. We'll see who gets the best.* Here I used meaning extension and translated it by rendering the effect «таңдап меншіктеп қояды» (will have taken) by its cause «is going to take».

When used as a predicate in the future context «жоқ» acquires a future meaning and is rendered into English by future tense forms. For example:

Мен сендерге енді жоқпын(Yesenberlin I., 2007:153).

I'm leaving you (Yesenberlin I., 2000:153).

Я покидаю вас (Yesenberlin I., 1986a:179).

The effect «жоқпын» is translated by its cause «leaving you»

Мен бұл тобыңда жоқпын (Auyezov M., 1989:52).

But you'll be fighting alone (Auyezov M., 1977:75).

The cause «тобыңда жоқпын» is translated by its effect «you'll be fighting alone». Here the meaning is: «I won't be with you so you'll be fighting alone».

Олай болса өрісің ұзаққа бармайды екен (Yesenberlin I., 2007:341).

If you will be so…so heartless, so you won't go far.

Если будешь таким бессердечным то далеко не уйдешь (Yesenberlin I., 1986b:48).

In the principal clause Ауыспалы келер шақ is rendered by Future Simple. As a rule, in conditional sentences Present Simple is used in reference to the future in the subordinate clauses. But in our case in the subordinate clause «will+V» is used as a modal verb in the meaning of persistence, insistence.

Kazakh nouns denoting some kind of action when used as a predicate in the future context are rendered by Future Simple:

Тек кімнің өнері асса сол менің қалауым (Yesenberlin I., 2007: 419).

But I will give a place in my heart only to the one who wins the competition (Yesenberlin I., 2000:281).

Но кто выиграет в состязании того и приму в свое сердце (Yesenberlin I., 1986b:106).

The Kazakh noun «қалауым» is converted into English verb in translation and is rendered by Future Simple.

Conclusion

Every language has a specific system, which differs from that of any other. This is all the more so with respect to English and Kazakh whose grammatical systems are morphologically and genetically heterogeneous. English belongs to the Germanic group language. The Kazakh pertains to The Turkic group of the Altaic family concerning the morphological type. English is inflected and notable for its analytical character. Kazakh is an agglutinative language.

As to grammar, the principle means of expression in language, possessing an analytical character is the order of words and use of function words (grammatical inflections, function words, word order, and intonation pattern).

The grammatical inflections are the principle means used in Kazakh. Though the rest of grammatical means are also used but they are of less frequency than the grammatical inflections.

There are a number of ways of expressing future time in English: will/shall +infinitive be going to + Infinitive, Present Progressive, Simple Present, be to +Infinitive and etc. These verbsforms all have their particular nuances of meaning, and are far from being interchangeable. Though in many, but not all situations, two or more structures are possible with similar meanings. Accordingly, to one Kazakh sentence correspond several Englishsentences and each corresponding sentence is interchangeable or vice versa to certain degree. The choice of them depends on the context or situation in which the source utterance is given and requires good knowledge and skill on the part of a translator. The choice factors work symmetrically in both coding and decoding, these activities being the roles of the two main participants in the communication process: the speaker/writer and the hearer/reader. The speaker is seeking balance between his or her intention and planned adequate understanding of his or her intention by the speaker. The balance lies in the language means s/he chooses. The hearer/reader is aiming at restoring the intention of the speaker via the language means. The translator has, in fact, to combine both roles: first, s/he is the receiver, and second, s/he is the sender of a recoded message. S/he has to correlate the understood intention of the source-language speaker with a possible interpretation of the receiver via a consensual domain of more or less adequate grammatical means in the target language. S/he has to deal with a field of possible translation choices, a field of possible grammatical event patterns united on the basis of an interlinguistic consensual domain of universal semantic dimensions.

Translators, as linguistic and communication mediators, should be conscious about the structure of the text in the source language in order to be able to decode the message and, at the same time, encode the message into the target language. However, in the performance of this activity, more than only one element plays a role. That is why translators must be skilful to realize how these small changes in the surface structure of the text can modify the message meaning

The translator should understand perfectly the content and intention of the author whom he is

translating. The principal way to reach it is reading all the sentences or the text completely so that you can give the idea that you want to say in the target language because the most important characteristic of this technique is translating the message as clearly and natural as possible.

The translator should have a perfect knowledge of the language from which he is translating and an equally excellent knowledge of the language into which he is translating. At this point, the translator must have a wide knowledge in both languages of getting the equivalence in the target language, because the deficiency of the knowledge of both languages will result in a translation without logic and sense. The translation task becomes a complex process where either linguistic or non-linguistic elements provide the text with that nuance that makes it unique. For this reason, translators should demonstrate that they have developed both linguistic and communicative competence in the languages involved in their translating exercise in order to solve possible problems they may face during their professional practice.

Proceeding from our comparative analysis of the Kazakh sentences and their English translations we can state that in translating from Kazakh into English the context in which the original utterance is given plays key role in the choice factors of future tense forms, for the wrong choice of the grammatical form may misinterpret the source utterance distorting its meaning and can cause misunderstanding on the part of the TL readers as is the case with many English translations that have been wrongly rendered above.

Due to the syntactical, morphological and structural differences of the Kazakh and the English languages a translator has to make transformations in the process of translation. During our analysis the most common observed transformations the translator resorted to are:

omission,
addition,
transposition,
change of grammatical forms,
generalization,
antonymic translation,
meaning extension,
sentence integration, and
sentence fragmentation.

Ауыспалы келер шақ, the most frequently tense form used in speech can be rendered into English by 6 ways and the choice of them depends on the context and the situation they are given in.

Болжалды келер шақ, mostly rendered into English by Future Simple,due to its meaning of supposition inherent to it may be rendered by modal verbs in some cases.

«Ғалы/гелі, қалы/келі» forms, the meaning of which coincide with that of«be going to+V»form are sometimes rendered into English by «want\ wants+V» when the speaker is talking about his/her intention.

Мақсатты келер шақ and «ғалы/гелі, қалы/келі» forms are mostly translated into English by «be going to+V» form. But during our comparative analysis we found that they have been rendered in some cases into English as «are\is getting ready/ preparing+V».

There is no Future-in-the-Past, to be exact special forms to express it in the Kazakh grammar. But in Kazakh Ауыспалы келер шақ, Болжалды келер шақ, Мақсатты келер шақ and other analytical forms with the future meaning may denote actions that are viewed from the past if given in the past context. Accordingly, they can be rendered into English by Future-in-the-Past.

References

Auyezov M. (1989). Abaizholy: Abai. Birinshikitap [Abai. Book 1]. Almaty: Zhazushi, 419,91,180,168,177,159, 59,112,47,102,52 pp. (in Kazakh)

Auezov M. (1977). Abai. Book one. Moskow: Foreign languages publishing house, 47, 236, 97, 102, 126, 59, 60, 92, 177, 75 pp.

Auyezov M. (1982). Put Abaya: Abai. Tom1 [Abai. Book 1]. Moskva: Hudozhestvennayaliteratura, 69, 134, 141, 86, 87, 70, 140 pp. (in Russian)

Bondarko A. V. (1975). On field theory in grammar diathesis and its field. Linguistics,157 p.

Bondarko A. V. (1987). Vvedeniye: Osnovnayafunktsionalnayagrammatika[Introduction: Foundations of functional grammar], 11-13 pp. (in Russian)

Humboldt W. von. http://www.weltkreis.com/mauthner/humb.htlm.

Malgaazhdar M. (2008).The translation techniques of rendering future tense forms from Kazakh into English. Master's dissertation. Almaty,40-60 pp.

Maturana H. R. (1970).Biology of Cognition. BCL Report No.90. Urbana. University of Illinois. Department of Electrical Engineering. Biological Engineering laboratory, 50-55 pp.

Yesenberlin I. (2007).Koshpendiler[The nomads]. Almaty:Koshpendilerbaspasy,358, 371, 309,144, 350, 327, 351, 137, 343, 348, 170, 414, 170, 341, 328, 423, 495, 519, 328, 443, 168, 414, 354, 311, 341, 419 pp.(in Kazakh)

Yesenberlin I. (2000). The Nomads. Almaty,235,246,191,295,231, 214,171,231,224,228,230,112, 278,112,203,227,216,284,29 1,243,273, 233,56,193,153,281 pp.

Yesenberlin I. (1986a). Kochevniki. Kniga1 [The nomads. Book 1]. Alma-Ata: Zhazushi, 131,179pp. (in Russian)

Yesenberlin I. (1986b).Kochevniki. Kniga2 [The nomads. Book 2]. Alma-Ata: Zhazushi, 59,69,129,54,45, 50,53,102,22,49,37, 158,159,176,36,56,233,66,48,106 pp. (in Russian)

Yule G. (1988). The study of language. Cambridge university press, 18 p.

Yurchenko V. (1994).Realnoyevremyaistrukturayazika[Real time and the structure of language]. Saratov:Pedinstitute, 8-9 pp. (in Russian)

Yurchenko V. (1995). Ocherkpofilosofiygrammatiki [Essay on the philosophy of grammar]. Saratov:Pedinstitute, 15-19 pp. (in Russian)

Литература

Bondarko A.B. On field theoryin grammar diathesis and its field. – Linguistics, 1975. – 157p.

Бондарко А.В. Введение: Основная функциональная грамматика. – 1987. – С.11-13.

Maturano H. R.Biology of Cognition. BCL Report No.90. Urbana. University of Illinois. Department of Electrical Engineering. Biological Engineering laboratory. – Urbana:University of Illinois, 1970. – 50-55 pp.

Юрченко В. Реальное время и структура языка. – Саратов: Пединститут, 1994. – С. 8-9.

Юрченко В. Очерк по философии грамматики. – Саратов: Пединститут, 1995.– С. 15-19.

Yule G. The study of language. – Cambridge University Press, 1988. – 18p.

Humboldt. Wilhelm. http://www.weltkreis.com/mauthner/humb.htlm.

Malgaazhdar M. The translation techniques of rendering future tense forms from Kazakh into English. Master's dissertation. – Almaty, 2008. –40-60 pp.

Есенберлин И. Көшпенділер. – Алматы: Көшпенділер Баспасы, 2007.–358, 371, 309, 144, 350, 327, 351, 137, 343, 348, 170, 414, 170, 341, 328, 423, 495, 519, 328, 168, 414, 354, 311, 341, 419 бб.

Yesenberlin I.Nomads. – Almaty, 2000. –235, 246, 191, 295, 231, 214, 171, 231, 224, 228, 230, 112, 278, 112, 203, 227, 216, 284, 291, 243, 273, 233, 56, 193, 153, 281 pp.

Есенберлин И. Кочевники. Книга1. – Алма Ата: Жазушы,1986. – С. 131, 179.

Есенберлин И. Кочевники.Книга2. – Алма Ата: Жазушы, 1986. – С. 59, 69, 129, 54, 45, 50, 53, 102, 22, 49, 37, 158, 159, 176, 36, 56, 233, 66, 48, 106.

Әуезов М.Абай жолы: Абай. Бірінші кітап.– Алматы:Жазушы, 1989.– 419, 91, 180, 168, 177, 159, 59, 112, 47, 102, 52 бб.

Auezov M. Abai. Book One. – Moskow: Foreign languages publishing house, 1977. – 47, 236, 97, 102, 126, 59, 60, 92, 177, 75 pp.

Ауезов М. Путь Абая. Том первый. – Москва: Художественная литература, 1982. – С. 69, 134, 141, 86, 87, 70, 140.