

Self-translation as reimagining and supplementing the original:

Rollan Seisenbayev's "unfaithful" translation

By Gyuzel Kamalova

In 1966 Kazakhs were no more a nation in the fullest meaning of the word, as they were on the edge of losing their language and were no more nomads but a civilized socialist society locked up in the cities and *kolkhozs*¹. Kazakh youth, belonging to the Communist party, became disconnected from their national heritage as a result of Soviet policies that favored Socialist approaches over nationality. Literature is one of the first to rebel against the socialist oppression of nationality identity. Even though during the post-Stalin period (after Stalin's death in 1953) the censorship weakened giving rise to the new literary tradition in Kazakh literature, the young writers were expected to write being "nationalist in form, but Socialist in content" (Kocaoğlu 6). Timur Kocaoğlu argues that in fact the young writers of that period of Kazakh prose fiction were national *both* in form and content. Rollan Seisenbayev's, a prominent figure in Kazakh prose fiction, historical *povest*² "Намыс" ("Honor") written in Kazakh (1966) and the Russian self-translation "Честь" presents the struggle for humanity within strongly nationalist context describing the hardships of Kazakhs and Dzhugars during the one century war against each other. The *povest*' struggles against the Soviet censorship and bears the traces of Socialist call for humanity and unity of the nomadic nations: Kazakhs and Dzhungars. The language of the *povest*' in the Kazakh version, resembling the Russian socialist realism, in fact confirms the simple style of the literary Kazakh language. The self-translation, an attempt to renounce social realism, becomes re-imagining of the story³ in Russian and as a result gives the story another life with an epic tale-like flavor. Paradoxically the self-translation in the colonizer's language is not robbed of its nationality identity. The change occurs not in the context, but in the function of the self-translated text. Both texts are essentially telling one story, but due to the linguistic and literary style difference I consider the Russian translation to be a second version of the story. While the Kazakh version seeks

¹Kolkhoz - abbreviation for Russian *kollektivnoye khozyaynstvo*, English collective farm, in the former Soviet Union, a cooperative agricultural enterprise operated on state-owned land by peasants. (Encyclopedia Britannica)

² *Povest*' – the Russian literary genre which is similar to short-story genre

³ Throughout the paper story is used as a narratological term. Tyson defines Genette's story term as a "succession of events being narrated" where "the order does not coincide with the order in which they are presented in the narrative" (228).

for empathy through realistic depiction of the story, the Russian self-translation becomes an entertainment epic tale of long gone heroes and wars and teaches of wisdom of people.

Self-translation allows the author to exercise control over his works as well as gives him an opportunity to review and re-write his own work. As Raymond Federman notes that self-translation sometimes becomes a necessity because “the self-translation often augments, enriches, and even embellishes the original text – enriches it, not only in terms of meaning, but in its music, its rhythm, its metaphoric thickness, and even in its syntactical complexity”. Seisenbayev’s literary juggling with the languages both on linguistic and stylistic levels produces two different works: Kazakh realist *povest*’ and Russian self-translated epic tale. As Federman suggests, in the self-translation the author taking liberties, does not necessarily change the plot, but the author creates a supplement or a continuation of his work in the other language. The reason for a self-translation in Russian is the author’s dedication of the story to the Kazakh youth who were disconnected from their national heritage and did not speak and read the Kazakh language. Thus, I believe it is important to state the question that will be addressed in this paper clearly before proceeding into the analysis of the two versions. Rather than asking what the text is or becomes through translation, it is helpful (for the sake of the nationality identity theme pursued in the paper) to ask what the text does or what effects it has before and after translation? Does the effect or function of the text change after being translated?

“Намыс” and its self-translation “Честь” disguised under the Russian literary genre of *povest*’ and deceptive socialist realist-like language (and lyrical Russian in the self-translation) reveal the strong nationality character and as a literary partisan corrupts the dictatorial socialist literary realm. Even though self-translation practice denies the idea of betrayal of the original the issue of betrayal still exists. In the case of Seisenbayev, the question is whether the author committed betrayal other wise and how. Thus this essay is an attempt to analyze effects and values of both the original Kazakh version and the Russian self-translation. The major themes that will be addressed in the paper are nature imagery, the image of the hero/heroine and the antagonist.

The *povest*’ is set during a century long bloody Kazakh-Dzhungarian war and portrays people of both nations exhausted by the war. They wait for the winter as it gives rest from

the battles but wish for a spring that metaphorically signifies the end of the war. A young Kazakh *batyr*⁴ Kushikbai falls in love with the Dzhungarian girl Nazgul' (Nurgul' in the Russian translation) on the background of endless revengeful battles the protagonist, Even though Kushikbai passes the Soviet censorship for being a righteous humanist, he confirms the identity of a national hero in his devotion for his land, national music and people. In his work Seisenbayev question the idea of honor on both personal and national levels. Under the disguise of the social humanism “Намыс” makes its way through Soviet censorship and reveals the national dignity and identity to shatter the image of a “nationless” socialist society⁵ in which Kazakhs were living.

The nature imagery according to Kocaoğlu was one of an important element in the works of younger generation of authors, who by means of nature imagery confirmed their nationality identity. The self-translation reveals the complexity of the role of the nature imagery. The description of human misery and sorrow is re-imagined and re-written in the self-translation version and are represented by a metaphor of nature imagery. The first chapter depicts the Uak people mourning for their *batyr* Kushikbai, the protagonist of the *povest*'. People are ready to move away from their native land and find a place for their *aul*⁶, far away from the injustice of their fellow tribes-men. In the Kazakh version, the first chapter consists of the monologues of the mother of the protagonist, who is devastated by the death of her beloved son, and the description of her tribes-men, uneasy and sorrowful. Seisenbayev in the Russian self-translation makes some major re-arrangement on the paragraph level as well as adds a strong imagery of nature. The imagery of nature in both versions portrays the emotional state of the people.

Kazakh text (КТ) Себелеп жауын жауды. Қыз көктемнің ерке жауыны. Ана кеудесін кере дем алды. Иығын тік ұстап, рахман жауынға бетін тосты.
(Seisenbayev 18)

⁴ *Batyr* - a hero, warrior. It was sometimes attached to the name of a person signifying his (honorary or military)rank.

⁵ Even though the Soviets did strip people of their nationalities, they certainly favored above all the socialist approach. This, as they hoped was suppose to lead to a creation of one nation (out of all Soviet nations) – socialist nation.

⁶ *Aul* is a nomadic settlement. Nomads travelled from one place to another depending on the time of the year. They set their *aul* at the places where there was enough feed or forge or land etc for the cattle. Each tribe had their own land.

English Translation (ET) The drizzling began. (It was a) tender rain of the maiden spring (time). The mother breathed in deeply. Straightening (her) shoulders she (stood) facing the blessed rain (drops).

Russian translation (RT) *Заморосил дождь. Ласковый первый дождь новой весны. Люди вздохнули. Распрямили согнутые плечи, тверже стала осанка.* (Seisenbayev 92)

ET The dizzying began. Caressing rain of a new spring. People sighed (with relief). (They) Straightened crooked shoulders, (and) their bearing became stronger.

Both version show how rain comes and brings relief promising “maiden spring” or “new spring”. The rain imagery in the Kazakh version stands for mother’s emotional relief whereas in the self-translation the rain becomes the tears of the Uak people and relieves them from the emotional load. One of the interpretation of such an effect could be the difference in the purpose of the text; as the Russian version suggests an entertainment epic-tale it is less dense and dark. The Kazakh version suggests the strong connection between the mother and nature, not only because her emotions are undermined by nature, but rather it evokes the idea of mother-nature and mother-land. The mother of the protagonist becomes an embodiment of nature itself. Mother-nature is sorrowful and cries for her children who are dying in the war. The image of the mother-nature suffering for her children continues up to the end of the first chapter.

Even though cold emptiness saturates the imagery of the closing scenes in the first chapter, the ending of the chapter is different in the Kazakh and Russian versions. In the Kazakh version the narrator starts the last three paragraphs with “Рахым жауын” (Seisenbayev 19) (“Blessed rain”). The narrator, in the last three paragraphs, describes the nomads departing from their homeland. The Kazakh narrator is situated in the story whereas the Russian narrator seems to be an outsider looking back at the story of Uak nomads. The Kazakh narrator rethorically questions mother-nature (“Blessed rain”) about what she knows of the sorrows of the nation. The narrator answers himself in the following paragraph: “under the raining sky, the land that felt thousand hooves [galoping] painfully over its chest has exhausted itself [watching] people fatigue from making one

another to weep [of deep sorrow]”⁷ (ibid). The idea of the mother-nature watching over and weeping with the people as well as implies what Gérard Genette calls the testimonial function of the narrator⁸.

The are additions in the Russian self-translation imply that the the people left their land long ago and the land lost its hospitality. One might see the suggested implication to be far fetched, however it is important to remember the time when the story was written. Due to increasing urbanization and defined settlement of former nomads, vast territories of Kazakhstan were abandoned. Or even worse, turned into kolkhozs which had significant input on the natural landscape (Kosaoglu). The additions made in the Russian self-translation criticize the the abandonment not only of the land in literal sense but rather the abandonment of the former relationships with the motherland (nature).

RT *Говорят, что после того как люди ушли отсюда северный ветер изгнал гусей с их насиженных мест [...] (93).*

ET It is said that after the people left this place northern wind drove the geese away from their (old) haunt.

As the author in the ending scene in the Russian self-translation refers to the present condition of the land as “[i]t is said that” the land became hostile and empty as the people left it. The subsequent narration distances the narrator from the story he is telling. This brings reliability in to question; how much the reader can trust the narrator’s word? The addition in the Russian self-translation hints that the story is an epic tale of the past that teaches the wisdom of the sacred relationships between people and the land. One might think that the presence of people harms nature, however the self-translation points out strong bond between the Kazakhs and their motherland.

The functions of the narrators in two versions of “Намыс” (“Pride”) undermine the function of the stories on a whole. As mention earlier, the Kazakh version is a realistic account of the historical event, and the Russian version is an epic tale story of long gone Kushikbai *batyr* and the Kazakh-Dzhungar war. The distance of the narrator from the story he is telling differs in two versions; the Kazakh narrator sympathizes and feels the

⁷ “... себелеген аспанның астында, бірін-бірі еңіреткен адамзат шіркіннің тірлігінен әбден титықтап, көкірегін сан мың тұлпардың тұяғы жаншыған сары дала талқысып жатыр”

⁸ The testimonial function according to Genette is the involvement of the narrator and expression of his emotions towards the story and “The affective relation he has with it (involvement)” (Guillemette, and Lévesque)

pain and hardship of his people, whereas the Russian narrator is a storyteller who retells the story of the past. “Nomads are weeping”⁹ (Seisenbayev 19) says the narrator in the Kazakh version. The narrator uses the narratized speech¹⁰ and it seems as if he is crying with the people. The narrator and the people cry “*Oihoi ... Oihoi ... Oihh-o-o-i-i-i-i...*” (ibid). “People are saying a lot (about these times) ...”¹¹ (Seisenbayev 93) notes the Russian narrator. The Russian version becomes a continuation of the story in a different format. Now it is not an immediate account of the story, but rather a distant narration of a story that took place a long time ago. For the Kazakh reader both versions are valuable. The Kazakh reader can feel immediate sympathy towards the hardships of their nation. The Kazakh version almost transfers the reader into 18th century because the narrator has situated himself in this time discourse. The Kazakh reader who reads the Russian version becomes distanced from the story through the narrator. This distancing brings a question of the author’s betrayal of the text and its functions. However this does not mean that the nationality identity theme is weakened or undermined. The epic tales are valuable in the Kazakh culture and they as well bear the strong traces of nationality identity. Thus both versions contribute to the evoking a nationality identity in the Kazakh youth, to whom the author himself dedicates the story¹².

On the sentence level Seisenbayev re-writes in the Russian with additions that result in the change of the style and mood of the narration. In the Kazakh version in the scene where Tobet batyr, the antagonist, confronts the Dzhungar captives “the people are mute”¹³ and “the steppes is silent”¹⁴ (Seisenbayev 38). The author describes the scene in two short sentences. The straightforward sentences produce immediacy of the experience of this silence. In the Russian version:

RT *Людской гомон затих. Молчали казахи, молчали и джунгары. И тишина плыла над степью.* (111-12)

⁹ “Көш түр еңіреп” (Seisenbayev 19)

¹⁰ “The character's words and actions are integrated into the narration, and are treated like any other event” (Guillemette, and Lévesque)

¹¹ **RT** “О многом говорят люди” (Seisenbayev 93).

¹² “Қазақ жастарына” says Rollan Seisenbayev in the dedication of his book.

¹³ **KT** “Жұрт үнсіз”

¹⁴ **KT** “Дала тыныш”

ET The hubbub died away. The Kazakhs were silent, and the Dzhungars were silent (as well). And silence floated over the steppes.

The “silent steppes” became the steppes upon which “silence float[s]”. The author expands his self-translation and it becomes more poetic. The Russian version is not the immediate account of the breathless expectations of what is to happen between Tobet and captive Dzhungars. This is one of the examples where the author changes the style of his narration. As a result of such expansion the passage reads itself differently: the Kazakh version being immediate and the Russian version more descriptive and poetic. However, according to Genette the extensive description of the scene in fact creates more realistic (mimetic) experience for the reader. The same passage thus has different emotional impact on the reader. In the Kazakh version the immediacy of the experience gives a sense of reality of the situation. The Russian version, being an epic-tale, has a poetic language and a dramatic overtone that creates an emotional involvement of the reader.

The image of the heroine differs in both versions; the Kazakh heroine is proud and strong whereas the Russian heroine is melodramatic. The author uses the same translation technique to change aggressiveness and anger of the girl in Kazakh version into a melodramatic tone in the Russian self-translation in the monologue the captive Dzhungar girl Seisenbayev changes narratized speech in the Kazakh version into reported speech in the Russian self-translation. The narrator in the Kazakh version seems to be sympathizing with the sufferings of the young girls. The narrator in the Russian self-translation lets the girl express her feelings on her own.

КТ Үйінен сүйрелеп алып шыққанда, сонан соң алпамсадай жігіт алдына өңгеріп жүре бергенде, сол жігіттің қынындағы қанжарға өлерше қарай бергенше, жұлып алып өз кеудесіне де, күрзідей қатты қолдары өзін ұятсыз кұшақтап келген жігіт жүрегіне де болайтып неге салмады? (Seisenbayev 27)

ET (She wondered) why instead of hypnotizing the dagger on the man’s belt to death haven’t she snatched it away, and then stabbed herself and the man with mace like hands who grabbed her shamelessly into his (very) heart?

RT “...Ах, зачем я не вырвала кинжал, что торчал в ножнах у джигита, который бессовестно обнимал меня всю дальнюю дорогу? Не вырвала и не всадила по самую рукоять в его поганое сердце?... А потом бы и себя заколола...” (Seisenbayev 101)

ET “... Ah, why didn't I grab the dagger, that was just out of the man's sheath who was impudently hugging me for the whole time (during) the long journey? Didn't grab and didn't thrust (the dagger) up to its hilt into his rotten heart? ... And then would have stabbed myself (too)...”

Nazgul (The Kazakh version heroine) is angry and revengeful whereas Nurgul (The Russian version heroine) is scared and regretful. There is a rearrangement on the sentence level, where Nazgul says “stabbed herself and the man” (ibid) and Nurgul asks herself why she “didn't thrust (the dagger) [...] into his rotten heart? ... And then would have stabbed [her]self” (Seisenbayev 101). It might look a bit far fetch interpretation, however this sentence level rearrangement evokes a sense that Nazgul is not afraid to die for her honor, whereas Nurgul is less willing to die. In fact the self-translation almost creates two different characters. However, it does not undermine the theme of nationality identity in the *povest'*. Nazgul's image confirms to the dense and dark realist depiction of the *povest'* whereas Nurgul confirms the epic tale like style of the story.

The image of the hero bearing nationality identity according to Kocaoğlu reinforces and develops the nationality consciousness of Kazakhs during the Soviet Union. The choice of such heroes was a reaction towards the Soviet critics favoring “new man of the Communist epoch” multinational or rather nationless hero image. I questioned how the protagonist Kushikbai- a hero with a strong nationality identity- passed Soviet censorship. The only way I can explain it, is that even though he is certainly Kazakh, who loves his people, land and culture, he also is a humanist who is against war between Kazakh and Dzhungars. Kushikbai says that it's not Dzhungars fault or the Dzhugar gates fault; Kazakhs too should be blamed for the war. Interestingly, the annotation of the *povest'* call it a work that “destroys century long stereotypes” meaning the antagonistic image of Dzhungars and heroic image of Kazakhs. In fact such an interpretation of the image of the hero who by suggesting forgetting the revenge and hatred towards each other blurs the boundaries between two nations and thus confirms the socialist views.

The image of Kushikbai differs in the original and the self-translation. Kushikbai is respectful and righteous in the Kazakh version when he confronts the antagonist Tobet who is older than him and is well know *batyr* - warrior.

KT “Дат Төбет аға” “Мына құлдарыңның өмірін қи маған. Еліне қайыр” (Seisenbayev 48).

ET “*Dat*¹⁵ Tobet *aga*¹⁶” “Give the lives of your captives to me. Let them go (back) home”

RT “*Дат, Тобет-ага!*” “*Я прошу тебя – подари мне жизнь этих людей. Верни их на родину.*” (123)

ET “*Dat* Tobet *aga!*” “I ask (beg) you – give the lives of this people to me. Return them to the homeland”.

In the Kazakh version Kushikbai is respectful but firm. He almost sounds harsh. He acknowledges the Dzhungars as Tobet’s captives and still insists on taking their lives and letting them go. But in the Russian self-translation Kushikbai is almost begging Tobet to let the Dzhungars go (who by the way in the Russian version are not captives and do not belong to Tobet). The Kazakh version presents the hero as a mature and self-confident, whereas in the Russian version there are several instances when Kushikbai is represented rather as a young boy. Which in fact he is, as we are told in the beginning of the story he dies before he reaches his twenties. The image of mature and battle-hardened hero in the Kazakh version ties to the idea that the original text is more realistic. The softhearted and young Russian-version Kushikbai confirms to the theme epic tale. The way he talks in the Russian version he appears as a hero from epic tale.

Self-translation allows Seisenbayev to create another dimension in the hero’s character. This ambiguity uses the image of the hero to its fullest or even greater capacity to transfer the author intention. The image of the Kazakh version Kushikbai, firm and battle hardened hero, is both a fighter for the peaceful co-existence of Kazakhs and Dzhungars and a symbol of this idea that is strengthened by the exhaustion from the century long war. The Russian self-translation version Kushikbai, who is softhearted and young, symbolizes both the novelty (youth) of the idea of peaceful co-existence itself and its naivety. The Kazakh version Kushikbai, acknowledging captives as Tobet’s, understands the difficulty and resistance of this peaceful coexistence idea. However the Russian Kushikbai naively believes in the equality of Kazakhs and Dzhungars and humanism. Through the self-translation Seisenbayev makes the hero Kushikbai express the complexity of the idea of the long awaited peace among Kazakhs and Dzhungars.

¹⁵ Listen to me.

¹⁶ A respectful way of addressing an elder whom one knows.

Even though in the Russian version he did not transform completely, the image of the antagonist Tobet *batyr* is also affected by the self-translation. After the Dzhungar Anarhoi dishonorably slaughters Tobet's younger brother, he becomes obsessed with the revenge.

КТ Есіне тағы да басы жусан аңқыған даланың төсінде домалап бара жатқан Анархой келді. Көз алдында домалап...Анархойдың басы... (Seisenbayev 29).

ЕТ (He) remembered Anarhoi's head rolling over the fragrant absinth field. In front of his eyes rolling...Anarhoi's head...

РТ Он застонал. Перед глазами его вновь встала страшная картина.

Могильник...Кружащееся вороны...Голова Естыбека... Пустые глазницы...

(Seisenbayev 104)

ЕТ He groaned. In front of his eyes once again appeared (that) dreadful image. The grave...Crows flying around...Estybek's head...Empty eye-sockets...

In the Kazakh version Tobet is revengeful as he sees dead Anarhoi, whereas in the Russian version he sees his brother's head and thus appears mournful. The captive Dzhungars remind him of revenge, and in the Russian version it seems that his cruelty towards the captives is justified by this strong image of his dead younger brother. In the Kazakh version on the contrary there is no sentimentality but a harsh and all-absorbing hatred.

Even though the antagonist Tobet embodies strong nationalism the manifestation of it is backward. In the Kazakh version Tobet is absorbed with the idea of revenge and honor and does not see anything besides it, only "Anarhoi's head" (Seisenbayev 29). He exercises a strong nationality identity character through his hatred towards Dzhungars. In the Russian self-translation he is absorbed with his mourning for his younger brother. His slaughtered younger brother symbolizes the Kazakh nation now buried under the Soviet socialism. Tobet expressing strong nationality identity embodies the desire of Kazakh nationalist who dreamed of the revival of the deceased nation. The rivalry between Tobet and Kushikbai suggests the clash between the desire to revive against the desire to build a new nation. Kushikbai in Kazakh version represents a wisdom acquired through manifold errors of many attempt at preserving the nation's integrity. The Russian version Kushikbai confirms the novelty and naivety of the idea of the re-creation of the nation

rather than attempting to preserve the old nation. Through the self-translation the author shows the complexity of the issue of nationality identity both in the 18th century and in the times of the Soviet Union.

Throughout the analysis, the author's intentions, which is the expansion on the nationality identity theme in his *povest'*, manifests itself both in the original Kazakh version and the Russian self-translation. Even though the original and self-translations are never associated with a betrayal of the story, the preservation and exercising author's intention is not possible without committing some sort of betrayal. In the case of Rollan Seisenbayev's "Намыс" ("Honor") and the self-translation "Честь" the betrayal appears in the choice of the genre of *povest'* which is traditionally Russian. The genre fits perfectly for the story, however, it undermines the nationality identity theme, which is prevalent in it. Seisenbayev commits a betrayal by choosing the genre from the colonizer's literary tradition.

The reason for choosing *povest'* over any other traditional Kazakh literary genre, and probably justification of his choice, lies in the fact that the Kazakh youth in the Soviet Union as it was mentioned earlier were disconnected from their heritage, which involves literary tradition as well. The Kazakh youth was affected by the classic of the Russian literature. Certainly, there were young intellectuals, such as Rollan Seisenbayev, who were interested in the revival of the traditional genres. Singing dithyrambs to the Russian literary genres, the majority of the Kazakh youth, were not interested in what they saw as inferior or undeveloped traditional Kazakh literary genres. The mimicry of the colonizer's literary tastes lead to devastation of the native literature. Thus, Rollan Seisenbayev chooses nationality identity theme as his major focus and he has to commit a betrayal of the national literature by using the genre of *povest'*. This literary genre is more attractive to the Kazakh youth as it is not strongly Kazakh, however the story is strongly nationalist. Thus, at the cost of a betrayal Seisenbayev is able to communicate his story.

Self-translation (or any translation for that matter) reveals the limitations and abilities of the given languages. Rollan Seisenbayev, being a bilingual author and knowing the limitations of the Kazakh and the Russian languages, uses self-translation to break away from these limitations, and create complexities and ambiguities within one story. The

comparative reading and the analysis of the nature imagery, the image of the hero/heroine and the antagonist in both “Намыс” (“Honor”) original Kazakh version and “Честь” Russian self-translation shows how the author expands one story to produce diverse effects. Due to the complex political situation that affected Kazakh literature I chose to look at the original Kazakh version and the Russian self-translation from a nationality identity point of view. This was not only a random choice, but rather the story, being a historical *povest'*, has lend itself to this specific type of reading. The nationality identity theme and struggle for preservation/revival/re-creation of the Kazakh nation are strongly present in the *povest'*. Rollan Seisenbayev being a younger generation author found a way to reconnect himself and the Kazakh youth to the lost national heritage through his bilingual work.

The nature imagery has a strong connection with the nationality identity, because the Kazakh people, originally nomads, saw their land as sacred. Seisenbayev points out the lost connection of the Kazakh youth, due to the Socialist policies, with their land. In the Kazakh version the mother of the protagonist symbolizes the motherland and her sorrow becomes the sorrow of the land for its children. The Russian version supplements, or even equally emphasizes the sacredness of the relationships between the people and the land. The abandoned by *Uak* people the land embodies abandoned relationships of the land and the Kazakh people. This abandonment lead to the loss of the national identity, and the subsequent trying on the Socialist identity.

The self-translation gives the image of the hero/heroine and the antagonist a broad range of implications. The first, and the basic implication is the divergence of the characters to fit in the either realist historical Kazakh version or epic tale-like Russian self-translation. For example the protagonist Kushikbai is a just warrior who is respectful of the elders in the realist text and a youthful almost naïve defender of the weak in the epic tale. The larger implication of the image of the hero/heroine and the antagonist is symbolic. Kushikbai in his both manifestations represents the idea of re-creation of the nation taking into account former mistakes whereas Tobet symbolizes the traditionalist backward nationalism, which favors segregation and preservation of the Kazakh nation. The collision of these two characters implies the complexity of the nationality identity. The re-creation of the nation is impossible without considerations of the former mistakes.

Certainly, the relationships between the protagonist and the antagonist signify the struggle for nationality identity of the Kazakhs beginning from the formation of the nation in 15th century up to modern independent Kazakhstan.

If the self-translation supplements and expands the original then there a legitimate question arises: who will be able to read both version of one story? For one thing, the self-translation, despite the assigned terms, is not subordinate to the original. Each version works on its own, however in separate reading they produce a different experience. The bilingual simultaneous reading, which was less possible in the 1960s became possible now. The 2010 edition of the Rollan Seisenbayev's "Намыс" ("Honor") includes his self-translation "Честь". This edition marks the development of the bilingual environment in which the status of the national language is privileged and of the Russian language is preserved as a secondary language. This bilingual environment is still developing and there are no dramatic subversions of the Russian/Kazakh hierarchy.

In the larger body of translation studies, the self-translation case proves that the translation is not a subordinate or secondary to the original text. However, the self-translation (as a translation in general) is strongly affected by the national, social and political issues that surround the text. The analysis of the self-translation of Rollan Seisenbayev's *povest'* situates itself in the discourse of the nationality identity in the Soviet Socialist society. The analysis has shown that the original Kazakh version as well as the Russian self-translation both are strongly affected by the Soviet Socialism. It is possible that the different approach in reading both the "Намыс" and "Честь" would produce a different interpretation. One of the future approaches of reading self-translation in Kazakh literature is the context of the modern independent bilingual Kazakhstan.

Works cited

- "Kolkhoz (Soviet Agriculture) -- Britannica Online Encyclopedia." *Encyclopedia - Britannica Online Encyclopedia*. Web. 08 Dec. 2011.
<<http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/321400/kolkhoz>>.
- Federman, Raymond. "A Voice within a Voice. Federman Translating/translating Federman." 1996. Web. Nov.-Dec. 2011. <www.federman.com/rfsr2.htm>.
- Guillemette, Lucie, and Cynthia Lévesque. "Gérard Genette : Narratology / Signo - Applied Semiotics Theories." *Signo - Théories Sémiotiques Appliquées*. Web. 08 Dec. 2011. <<http://www.signosemio.com/genette/narratology.asp>>.
- Seisenbayev, Rollan. "Намыс. Честь" [Pride]. Trans. Seisenbayev Rollan. Almaty: RS, 2010.
- Tyson, Lois. "Structuralist Criticism." *Critical Theory Today: a User-friendly Guide*. New York: Routledge, 2006. 224-29.