

Manifestation and Translation of Power Relationship in Postcolonial Literature: The Case of *Things Fall Apart* by Chinua Achebe

Postkolonyal Yazında Güç İlişkilerinin Dışavurumu ve Çevirileri: Chinua Achebe'nin *Things Fall Apart* Örneği

Araştırma Makalesi / Research Article

Esra Melek DEMİR ERYİĞİT*, Halil İbrahim BALKUL**, Mesut KULELİ***

△ Bu çalışma Sakarya Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Çeviribilim Yüksek Lisans Programında Doç. Dr. Halil İbrahim Balkul danışmanlığında ve Doç. Dr. Mesut Kuleli ortak danışmanlığında Esra Melek Demir Eryiğit tarafından hazırlanan yüksek lisans tezinden üretilmiştir.

* Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi, Sakarya Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Çeviribilim ABD, Sakarya, Türkiye, e-posta: esramelekdemir@outlook.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-3176-2011

** Doç. Dr., Sakarya Üniversitesi, İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Fakültesi, Mütercim ve Tercümanlık Bölümü, Sakarya, Türkiye, e-posta: hbalkul@sakarya.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-5775-962X

*** Doç. Dr., Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi, Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi, Mütercim ve Tercümanlık Bölümü, Bolu, Türkiye, e-posta: mesut.kuleli@ibu.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-3477-0412

ÖZET

Toplumsal ilişkilerde bir tarafın diğer tarafa nazaran sahip olduğu güç düzeyi, tarafların ürettiği söylemlerde kullanılan göstergeler ve söz dizimi kuralları üzerinde etkili olabilmektedir. Güç ilişkileri, toplumsal yaşamdaki normatif dışavurumların yanı sıra, yazınsal metinlerde güç sahibi bir karakterin, sözde daha az güçlü olduğu varsayılan bir karaktere olan yaklaşımı üzerinden okur kitlesi tarafından da gözlemlenebilmektedir. Güç ilişkilerinin, bir karakterin söylem oluşturmadaki belirleyici rolünün çok açık gözlemlenebildiği postkolonyal yazında sömürgeci, sömürgeleştirdiği toprakların zenginliklerini ve insan gücünü sömürmeye çalışırken toplumsal güç inşasının örtük bir şekilde anlatılmasından daha çok açık bir şekilde anlatıya dahil edildiği görülebilmektedir. Bu çalışmada, Chinua Achebe'nin *Things Fall Apart* başlıklı romanındaki karakterler arasındaki güç ilişkilerinin postkolonyal yazın eleştirisi perspektifinden belirlenmesi amaçlanmakta ve her bir karakterin farklı düzeylerde sahip olduğu gücün kaynağı tartışılmaktadır. Güç ilişkileri içeren bağlamların çözümlenmesi sonucunda güç sahibi karakterlerin, sömürgeci-sömürgeleştirilen, beyaz-siyah ve erkek-kadın ikili karşıtlıklarındaki birincil kategoridekilere ait olan birey veya toplumlardan oluştuğu ve bu karakterlerin ikincil kategoriye ait birey veya toplumlara karşı baskın olarak betimlediği görülmektedir. Kaynak metinde tespit edilen toplumsal olarak inşa edilmiş ve dengesiz güç ilişkilerini içeren bağlamlar, çeviri değerlendirmesi amacıyla Öztürk Kasar'ın (2021) "Çeviride Anlam Evrilmesi Dizgeselliği" temelinde iki Türkçe erek metinle karşılaştırılmıştır. Çeviri değerlendirmesi sonuçları, erek metinlerdeki güç ilişkileri içeren bağlam ve göstergelerin anlamlarının korunmasının yanı sıra anlam dönüşümleri olduğunu da ortaya koymakta ve bu dönüşümler, erek metin okurları için güç göstergelerinin anlamında ortaya çıkan evrilmelerle bağlantılı olarak ele alınmaktadır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Postkolonyal Yazın Eleştirisi, Yazınsal Çeviri, Güç İlişkileri, Chinua Achebe, Kolonyal Söylem

ABSTRACT

The level of power that one party has over the other may have an effect on the indicators and syntax rules used in the discourses produced by the parties in social relations. In addition to the socially normative manifestation of power relationships, literary texts are also among the media through which the reading public can observe the effect of power a character holds in addressing the supposedly less powerful. Power relationships and their definitive role in the production of a context by a character could be well-observed in postcolonial literature. With the colonizer attempting to exploit the valuables and the human labor of the colonized lands, social construction of power manifests itself more explicitly than an implicit narration of social mishaps. This study sets out to identify the power relationships between the characters in the novel titled *Things Fall Apart* by Chinua Achebe from the perspective of postcolonial literary criticism, followed by a discussion of the source of power each character holds in varying degrees. The analysis of the contexts with power relationship demonstrates that the binary oppositions of colonizer-colonized, white-black, and male-female favor the former elements, portraying them as the oppressors to the latter category. The contexts identified in the source text are further compared to two target texts in Turkish through the “Systematics of Designification” by Öztürk Kasar (2021) with a view to the evaluation of translation of contexts with unbalanced and socially constructed power relationship. The results of the evaluation yield preservation of the meaning as well as meaning transformations in target texts, which are discussed in relevance to the resulting signification of the signs of power for the target readers.

Keywords: Postcolonial Literary Criticism, Literary Translation, Power Relationship, Chinua Achebe, Colonial Discourse

1. Introduction

All actions and discourse on individual or social level in any community reflect power relations. Power relations shape social order and profoundly impact the ways individuals and societies communicate and interact. Several factors including gender, education level, economic status and race contribute significantly to the formation and manifestation of these power relations. Power relations generally act on binary oppositions, in which the former etiquette is regarded superior to the latter. To illustrate, women are subordinated to men in many areas, and they are often taught to be the silenced party. Women are not solely subordinated due to their gender, but a woman with suppressed characteristics in the context of power relations is positioned in an even more oppressed state. Individuals with a higher level of education are ascribed more favorable traits which could lead to higher roles in the social order. When it comes to economic status, the well-off individuals in the community are considered superior to the financially disadvantaged so, those considered to be part of the upper-class turn out to exercise power over the proletariat. Furthermore, people controlling the means of production are in a superior position to those lacking these opportunities and also have an influence on the proletariat. Another power relation is related to discrimination based on skin color. Black people are generally associated with a lower class and marginalized in society without any rational or natural basis. On the other hand, white people are associated with an elusive privilege deemed appropriate only by social conventions. Yet, the categories of power are far from a natural phenomenon, with the already powerholders in the social sphere determining and imposing, in a way, normalizing these categories. Besides the categories of power mentioned here so far, also termed as the binary oppositions in the relevant literature, colonization practices also hold

paramount importance in the “normal” of the power relations not only in the social and political life, but extend to the artistic productions of a society, with literature taking the lead among these endeavors.

As an elusive concept, “colonialism” does not come with a clear-cut definition in the relevant literature due to the frequent use of this term as a synonym to imperialism. Both terms were forms of conquest that were expected to benefit Europe economically and strategically in the previous centuries. The term “colonialism” is often used to describe the settlement of North America, Australia, New Zealand, Algeria and Brazil by permanent European residents (Kohn & Reddy, 2023: 2). Colonialism, which involves occupying foreign lands, bringing new settlers from the homeland, seizing all the resources of the country or territory, and if necessary, displacing the indigenous people, has been practiced to the favor of European countries in particular (Aydoğan, 2022, para. 2). These colonizing practices have inevitably resulted in an enduring power gap between the colonizer and the colonized, unsurprisingly favoring the former as in all socially constructed binary oppositions.

In an effort to establish themselves as the norm of the universal values, the colonizers sought several techniques, the most important of which can be counted as the use of language to include the colonialist discourse. The reason for this technique can be attributed to the implicit power that language use exerts on the speaking public. Simply defined, the term “colonialist discourse” should involve the socially acquired and therefore subconscious use of the already established values of the colonizer in daily language without any elaboration on the construction of those phrases by the speaking public. While this basic definition can be ascribed to the general speech community, colonialist discourse is analyzed in academic circles with a critical focus on the constituents making up the discourse, with a retrospection into the construction and social implications on power relationships of such contexts. The methods and strategies in transferring the discourse to different cultures and languages, as well as issues such as rewriting and revising works in the colonial context, linguistic imitation, and the difficulties encountered in translations from European languages into African languages are investigated. Through the lens of literary studies, researchers demonstrate the significance of the effects of colonial discourse and their potential consequences (Al-Leithy, 2022; Woltmann, 2019; Sandten, 2020; Mshaweh&Benmessaud, 2024; Diko, 2024). While the relevant literature already abounds in studies on the colonialist discourse analysis in literature, this study delves into colonialist discourse analysis with a view to the evaluation and discussion of the original contexts in a literary text in relation to their Turkish translations.

In this study, Chinua Achebe’s novel titled “*Things Fall Apart*” along with its translations and the discourse of power relations in the source and target texts will be analyzed from a postcolonial perspective based on postcolonial terms. The power relations identified in the original text are based on such social constructions as gender, race and military power. The ultimate aim of the study is to discover if and to what extent the colonialist discourse is preserved in the target texts based on Systematics of Designification as proposed by Öztürk Kasar (2021), with implications on the possible transformations in the meaning of contexts with

colonialist discourse, further extended to modest recommendations for prospective literary translators on informed decision-making in their translation tasks of post colonialist literature.

2. Post colonialist terms and their relevance to literary analysis

The terms and concepts put forth by Edward Said, Spivak and Bhabha are essential to understanding the postcolonial criticism as well as its application to literary studies. Therefore, this part of the study delves into definition and discussion of the postcolonial terms by these three scholars with an ultimate aim to apply them to literary criticism.

The term “Orientalism” was coined by Edward Said. “Orientalism” is the perception that both ontological and epistemological differences exist between the West and the East (Said, 1979: 2). The term signifies the portrayal of the East through the eyes of the West. The West, through its discriminatory discourse, attempted to reconstruct and establish sovereignty over the East. Said argues that orientalism cannot be truly understood without analyzing it as a discourse (1979: 3). The discourse used and produced by the West serves to alienate and marginalize the East with its assumption that Western epistemology is superior enough for the West to exercise epistemological violence against the East. To that end, colonial discourse is produced only one-sided, moreover, it is only Westerners that define non-Westerners as Easterners (Said, 1979: 228). According to the West, power would not exist without knowledge, and as the sole power holder, it considers itself entitled to dominate the East with its epistemology. The imposition of Western epistemology presents itself not only in education or religion but also in political power, or culture.

Popularly known for the concept of “subaltern”, Spivak refers to the marginalized people of a society, oppressed in almost every aspect; be it from economical, epistemological, or most notably gender aspect. Spivak criticizes the fact that oppressed people, subalterns, do not have the opportunity to express themselves, hence, raises the question “Can the subaltern speak?”. It is through this question that Spivak indicates it is not actually possible for subalterns to make their voices heard under the current system (1994: 78-80). Focusing more on females as the subalterns, Spivak claims that women are in a secondary position even in the subaltern class, which makes them sub-subordinated (1994: 84). While the colonizer could consider the Easterner, or black, “the other” just because of their ethnicity or race, simply being a woman is more than enough to be seen as subaltern. For these reasons, the subaltern (females) are destined to remain silent (Spivak, 1994: 90), thus the chances for women to represent and express themselves are even less in comparison to all second elements of the socially constructed categories in binary oppositions. In postcolonial context, while the colonized (and the black in Western rationalization of the colonization practices) remain mute in the presence of the colonizer (and the white), the poor and colonized is even more silent than the colonized but well-off mimicry, yet it should also be the case that the colonized, poor female should remain mute in the presence of the colonized, poor male.

Homi Bhabha, another significant scholar addressed in this study coined the terms “mimicry”, “stereotype” and “hybridity”. The term mimicry refers to the Easterner trying to imitate the way of life that the Western lead. Due to the absence of the western values in the

East, the East is considered underdeveloped and inferior. Thus, the West, with promises to bring so-called civilization to the East, imposed their epistemology in line with the interests of the West. As Bhabha states “colonial mimicry is the desire for a reformed, recognizable ‘other’, as a subject of a difference that is almost the same, but not quite” (1984: 126). The term mimicry is also said to be constructed around ambivalence. The Easterner, despite imitating the West not to be perceived as the other, is never considered fully Western. The more they imitate the West, the more marginalized they become, as the differences become more evident. In this regard, Bhabha uses the term stereotype to refer to the discourse colonizers formulated to maintain their dominance over the colonized. “An important feature of colonial discourse is its dependence on the concept of ‘fixity’ in the ideological construction of otherness” (Bhabha 1994: 66). The East is portrayed as inferior and marginalized through Western stereotypes (Bhabha, 2016: 157). Over time, the East was genuinely led to believe that they were inferior to the West, and this empowered the West to maintain dominance over the East. Finally, Bhabha used the term “hybridity” to describe the shifts in the identity of the East owing to the norms imposed by the West. The Easterner attempts to imitate the West to avoid being marginalized, however, this inevitably results in alienation from their own identity in time, and so they could neither be truly Western, nor preserve their own culture. This in-betweenness leads to a hybrid identity of the Easterner.

The terms relating to postcolonialism are also applied to literary studies. It is observed that the studies on postcolonial literary criticism focus on subjects such as the impacts of colonialism, translation strategies applied to contexts of colonial discourse, translation of ideological discourse, the challenges of translating (post)colonial literary texts, the perspectives of postcolonial critics on translation, identification of identity and representation in literary texts, feminist translation in relevance to postcolonial terms, and orientalism. For instance, Bozkurt (2014) identifies the adopted translation strategies in two Turkish translated texts of Chinua Achebe’s *Things Fall Apart* by focusing especially on the cultural elements and relates them to Venuti’s concepts of domestication and foreignization. Aghasiyev (2024) investigates the linguistic, cultural and religious impacts of colonialism on the Igbo people in the study titled “Cultural, religious linguistic hybridity in Chinua Achebe’s novel *Things Fall Apart*” while Altıntaş (2015) analyzes the translations of Chinua Achebe’s novel *Things Fall Apart* through Paul Bandia’s postcolonial translation approach. Although these studies use similar corpus with this study, our study differs by focusing on the colonizer-colonized power relations in the novel *Things Fall Apart* and evaluating two Turkish translations through “Systematics of Designification in Translation” proposed by Öztürk Kasar (2021). Uysal and Kuleli (2022) examine Rudyard Kipling’s “*How the Camel Got His Hump*” and “*How the Leopard Got His Spots*” in the context of postcolonial literary criticism and analyze the ideological discourse referring to power relations with a view to the evaluation of the Turkish translations of such colonial discourse in children’s literature. On the other hand, Parlak (2014) conducts a study on the problems encountered in the translation of postcolonial literary text. Chris Cleave’s novel *Little Bee* is also analyzed by Sandten (2020) in the context of discursive imitation. The story, by imitating the Queen’s English and also using an ironic tone, reflects the social inequality between hosting culture and refugees. As can be seen from the local and international studies

cited here, postcolonial terms defined and discussed in this part are also used by various scholars on literary criticism as well as literary translation. However, this study focuses on a postcolonial literary text only for the contexts of power relationship, further elaborating on two target texts for the preservation or transformation of the meaning of the signs that target readers will signify in terms of postcolonial discourse, with implications for prospective postcolonial literary translations.

3. Method

In this part of the research, the source and target literary texts as the corpus of the study, the procedure followed in collection of the data in either text as well as the tool used to analyze the data obtained from the texts will be introduced and discussed.

3.1. Corpus of the study

The corpus of this study is the novel titled *Things Fall Apart* by Chinua Achebe, honored with numerous awards including Nigerian National Trophy, the Peace Prize of the German Book Trade, also awarded the Man Booker International Prize for his contribution to world literature in 2007. *Things Fall Apart* is selected by TIME as one of the 100 best English-language novels published between 1923 and 2005 (Lacayo, 2010). This novel is generally subclassified as a postcolonial literary text. Along with the source text, its two Turkish target texts entitled *Ruhum Yeniden Doğacak* by Anjel Selveroğlu, published by Sosyalist Yayınlar Publishing House in 1997¹ (referred to as TT1 in the rest of the study) and *Parçalanma* published by Ithaki Publishing House in 2022² and translated by Nazan Aribaş Erbil, already translator of several other novels by Achebe (referred to as TT2 in the rest of the study), are also involved in the corpus of this study.

The novel is set in the Igbo village of Umuofia, portraying the hardship of Igbo people against colonialism. Okonkwo, the protagonist, is a wrestler well-known for his strength and success. He expects to earn new titles in his village; however, things take a turn for the worse for him. One day, he accidentally shoots a clansman, as a result of which he is sent to his mother's village on exile. Meanwhile, missionaries come to Okonkwo's village and demand a plot of land to build their shrine, subsequently, they build their church, house and school. Returning from exile, Okonkwo finds missionaries and colonizers in his village and realizes many clansmen including his son having fallen under the sway of missionaries. He urges his own people to fight against the colonizers, and kills a messenger, only to find no one with him. Thereupon, Okonkwo takes his own life before getting caught by the colonizers.

¹ First published by Üç Çiçek Yayınevi in 1983. In this study, the second edition of this translated text will be used.

² First published in 2019. In this study, the third edition of this translated text will be used.

3.2. Data collection procedure

Power relations in communities are also reflected in literary texts which can be seen as a mirror of society. In the corpus of this study, considered as postcolonial literature, the contexts of power relations have been determined based on the postcolonial terms and perspectives introduced by Said (1979), Spivak (1994) and Bhabha (1984). In light of postcolonial literary criticism, ten contexts identified in the source text involve colonizer-colonized and white-black power relations. The contexts on power relations in the source text are compared to the two target texts with a view to the identification of how power relations are preserved or transformed in another culture with no colonial history.

3.3. Data analysis

In this study, the contexts of power relations identified in the source text will be evaluated for possible transformation or preservation of the meaning in the target texts based on “Systematics of Designification in Translation”, initially proposed in 2009, updated in 2015, and finalized in 2021 by Öztürk Kasar³. The systematics include nine designificative tendencies in translation; namely, over-interpretation of the meaning, darkening of the meaning, under-interpretation of meaning, sliding of the meaning, alteration of the meaning, opposition of the meaning, perversion of the meaning, destruction of the meaning, wiping out of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar and Tuna, 2017: 172)⁴. In terms of the field of signification, Öztürk Kasar and Tuna classify the designificative tendencies of over-interpretation of the meaning, darkening of the meaning, and under-interpretation of meaning as “within the field of the meaning of the sign”, still preserving the conceptual framework of source sign in the target text with little transformation of the meaning; the designificative tendencies of sliding of the meaning, alteration of the meaning, and opposition of the meaning are placed “at the limits of the field of the sign”, resulting in a “peri-meaning” of the source sign in the target text; and finally, the designificative tendencies of perversion of the meaning, destruction of the meaning, and wiping out of the meaning are positioned “outside the field of the meaning of the sign”, leading to “meaninglessness” of the source sign in the target texts (2017: 172).

4. Findings

In this part of the study, the contexts alluding to power relationship between the colonizer and colonized, white and black, and male and female are presented in the Tables. The contexts in the source text (ST) are discussed from a postcolonial perspective. Further, their translations in target text 1 (TT1) and target text 2 (TT2) are evaluated based on Systematics of Designification by Öztürk Kasar (2021) together with the potential meaning transformations for the target readers of either target text.

³ While the first proposition of this systematics (2009) is published in French, the latter two updates (2015, 2021) are in Turkish. Since this study is in English, the names of the tendencies as part of this systematics is adopted from Öztürk Kasar and Tuna (2017).

⁴ For detailed definition of each designificative tendency, see Öztürk Kasar and Tuna (2017), Öztürk Kasar (2021).

Table 1. The source and target contexts of power relationship-Example 1

ST	TT1	TT2
None of his converts was a man whose word was heeded in the assembly of the people. None of them was a man of title. They were mostly the kind of people that were called <i>efulefu</i> , worthless, empty men. The imagery of an <i>efulefu</i> in the language of the clan was a man who sold his machete and wore the sheath to battle. (Achebe, 1994: 143)	Onlara inananlardan hiçbir toplandırlarda söz söyleyen, ya da sözü önemsenen kişi değildi. Aralarında san sahibi biri yoktu. Çoğunluğu efulefu diye anılan türden kişilerdi, değersiz, bomboş adamlardı. Kabile dilinde efulefu, savaşmak için palasını satıp kılıf alan kişi anlamına gelirdi. (Achebe, 1997: 121)	Mühtedilerin hiçbirisi toplandırlarda sözüne itibar edilen adamlar değildi. Hiçbirinin unvanı yoktu. Genellikle efulefu denen değersiz, boş insanlardı. Klan dilinde efulefu, palasını satan ve savaşa giderken sadece kın takan adam olarak tasvir ediliyordu. (Achebe, 2022: 127)

The source context in Table 1 includes signs of power relationship regarding colonizer-colonized and male-female agents. The sign “convert” refers to the people who change their faith to adopt a new religious paradigm. In this context, this sign refers to the people in the colonized lands who adopted the faith system of the colonizer, implying the term “mimicry” as a postcolonial concept. Seeing that it is only the natives of the colonized lands that convert to the faith system of the colonizer powers, but not the opposite direction, the latter is portrayed strong enough to influence the long-held religious system of the former, which is one of the hardest processes in a society or individual’s way of life. Another sign in the source text that implies the power relationship between the colonizer and the colonized is “empty”. This adjective in this context is used to refer to the natives of the colonized land. As the colonizer is portrayed as the sole power-holder in those lands, even the mimicry men who have adopted the values of the colonizer are considered uncivilized and lack of the epistemological power of the colonizer. The evaluation of the target texts regarding these two signs shows that the sign “convert” is translated as “inananlar” (believers) in TT1. While the sign “convert” refers to an already faith-holder who changes their faith system to a new one, the target sign “believer” does not even imply the change in the religious footing, leading to a false meaning. This false meaning plays down the extent of the power that the colonizers possess, since converting a group of people into a new religious system alludes to a greater influence of the converter over the convert as compared to the “believers” of a faith system. As a result of this meaning transformation, the power relationship between the colonizer and colonized is not projected to TT1 reader in its extremity. As regards the second sign “empty”, it is translated as “bomboş” (very empty) in TT1. Portraying the natives of the colonized lands as “very empty” results in excessive meaning in TT1, giving rise to the thought that the colonizer depicts the colonized as totally deviated only because the latter do not hold the epistemology of the former.

Besides the colonizer-colonized power inequity, the source context in Table 1 also includes signs of inequality regarding gender. The singular and plural use of the sign “man” in the source text should be interpreted in relation to the sign “assembly” in the same context. Since an assembly is the decision-making body of a person, this power is attributed to the males

through the text. Therefore, the assembly in question must consist of males only, alluding to the inequality favoring males over females in the society. The sign “man” in this context is used to refer to all people in the colonized lands; however, it is also a sign that manifests the ruling power of males. In TT1, the singular “man” is translated as “kişi” (a person); however, it is translated as “adam” (man) in TT2 to refer to the same gender-based inequality, preserving the meaning. In contrast, the plural “men” in the source text is translated as “adamlar” (men) in TT1, preserving the male-female power relationship, whereas it is rendered as “insanlar” (people) in TT2. Translation of the gender-discriminative sign “man” as “kişi” in TT1 or “men” as insanlar in TT2 produces another meaning of the source sign, which is one of the potential denotative or connotative meanings but not actualized in the source text. This meaning transformation in either target text leads the target reader into missing the gender-based power inequality in society.

Table 2. The source and target contexts of power relationship-Example 2

ST	TT1	TT2
He said he was one of them, as they could see from his color and his language. The other four black men were also their brothers, although one of them did not speak Ibo. The white man was also their brother because they were all sons of God. (Achebe, 1994: 144-145)	Onlardan biri olduğunu söyledi, bu renginden ve dilinden de belliydi. Aralarından biri Ibo dilini konuşamamasına karşın, öteki dört kara tenli adam da onların kardeşleriydiler. Beyaz adam da onların kardeşiymi, değil mi ki hepsi de Tanrı'nın oğullarıydılar. (Achebe, 1997: 122)	Renginden ve dilinden anlayacakları üzere, kendisinin onlardan biri olduğunu söyledi. İçlerinden biri İgbo dilini bilmesede diğer dört siyah adamın da kardeşleri olduğunu, ayrıca beyaz adamın da kardeşleri olduğunu, çünkü herkesin Tanrı'nın oğlu olduğunu söyledi. (Achebe, 2022: 128)

In Table 2, the source context includes signs of race-related power relationships. It signifies the power relationship between the white and black. The sign “black men” is generally used to refer to dark skinned men of African descent. Within this context, the sign “black men” refers to missionaries who came to Mbanta village with a “white man”. A person in the role of a translator tries to convey what the white man says to people not from his village but of the same race, also encouraging them to join the missionaries by showing his own skin color as an example with the message “I am one of you”. The evaluation of the target texts concerning the sign “black men” shows that this sign is translated as “kara tenli” (dark-skinned) in TT1. The over-emphasis on having a black skin in this sign may disrupt the reading flow. Over-interpretation of the sign increases the potential of being subordinated by the dominant race, resulting in excessive meaning of the power relationship with regard to race. Ultimately, the meaning transformation of the power relationship between white and black is over-interpreted in TT1. On the other hand, the sign “black men” is translated as “siyah adam” in TT2, preserving the meaning of the sign as to the otherness of the non-white in the colonial practices.

Table 3. The source and target contexts of power relationship-Example 3

ST	TT1	TT2
But on one occasion the missionaries had tried to overstep the bounds. Three converts had gone into the village and boasted openly that all the gods were dead and impotent and that they were prepared to defy them by burning all their shrines. "Go and burn your mothers' genitals," said one of the Priests. The men were seized and beaten until they streamed with blood. (Achebe, 1994: 154)	Ancak bir gün misyonerler sınırı aşmaya kalkıştılar. İnancını değiştiren köylülerden üçü köye gidip tanrılarının öldüğünü, artık güçsüz olduklarını ve bütün gömütleri yakarak tanrılara meydan okumaya okumaya hazırlandıklarını söylediler övünerek. "Sen git de ananı yak," dedi tanrılarının sözcülerinden biri. Adamları yakalayıp, ağızlarından burunlarından kan gelene dek dövdüler. (Achebe, 1997: 131)	Fakat bir defasında misyonerler sınırı aşmıştı. Üç mühtedi köye gelmiş ve açıkça böbürlenerek tüm tanrılarının cansız ve etkisiz olduğunu, hepsinin mabetlerini yakarak onlara meydan okuyacaklarını söylemişlerdi. Bunun üzerine rahiplerden biri, "Sen git de annenin cinsel organını yak," demişti. Adamlar yakalanmış ve kanlar içinde kalana dek dövülmüştü. (Achebe, 2022: 136)

The power relationship regarding the assumed superiority of the colonizer over the colonized can be seen with the signs "try to overstep the bounds" and "prepare" in Table 3. The sign "try to overstep the bounds" refers to attempts to exercise one's control beyond the allocated spatial capacity. The verb used in this context refers to converted missionaries who try to overstep the bounds by contemplating and acting individually. The latter sign "prepare" relates to getting ready for something in advance and in this context, referring to the three converts who have gone to the village and remarked that the gods in which villagers believe are not real, and they intend to set out to burn the villagers' places of worship and expose them to violence in consequence of these actions and considerations. As for the evaluation of target texts, it is seen that the sign "try to overstep the bounds" is omitted and translated as "sınırı aştılar" (overstep the bounds) instead of "sınırı aşmaya çalıştılar" (tried to overstep the bounds) in TT2. The second sign "prepare" is also omitted and translated as "meydan okumak" (defy) instead of "meydan okumaya hazırlanmak" (prepare to defy) in TT2. From the perspective of power relations, even if a clan member converts and joins the missionaries, they are still not considered power holders as the missionaries are and have to get their approval to act. Since clansmen are not free to act independently, omitting the sign of the source text, in this case "try to" and "prepare" are considered wiping out of the meaning, leading to absence of signs in TT2. Within this context, converts exhibit mimicry by seeming to be colonizers. Furthermore, the absence of indications disrupts the power dynamics between missionaries and clansmen for the intended readers, giving the impression that the clansmen have free will. Another sign in Table 3, "priests", refers to a religious leader who performs sacred rites, and it is translated as "tanrılarının sözcüleri" (messengers of gods), resulting in ambiguous meaning in TT1. In this way, the sign refers to a greater role and reinforces the power relationship between religious professionals and individuals in society. The last sign in this context is "streamed with blood", referring to the cover of the body by blood. In this context, it refers to the three converts exposed to violence on account of their actions, and the sign is translated as "ağızlarından burunlarından

kan gelene dek” (until they are bled out from their mouth and nose) in TT1, resulting in excessive meaning.

Table 4. The source and target contexts of power relationship-Example 4

ST	TT1	TT2
There was no question of killing a missionary here, for Mr. Kiaga, despite his madness, was quite harmless. As for his converts, no one could kill them without having to flee from the clan, for in spite of their worthlessness they still belonged to the clan. And so nobody gave serious thought to the stories about the white man's government or the consequences of killing the Christians. If they became more troublesome than they already were they would simply be driven out of the clan. (Achebe, 1994: 155)	Burada misyoner öldürmek kimsenin aklından geçmiyordu, çünkü delirmiş olmasına karşın Bay Kiega'nın hiçbir zararı yoktu. Tanrılarını bırakıp ona inananları ise, kabileden kaçmak zorunda olmayan hiç kimse öldürmezdi, çünkü ne denli değersiz, aşağılık olurlarsa olsunlar, hâlâ kabileye aittiler. Öyle ki beyaz adamın yönetimiyle, ya da Hristiyanları öldürmenin sonuçlarıyla ilgili öyküleri hiç kimse önemsemiyordu. Eğer sorun yaratacak olurlarsa kabileden atıverirlerdi. (Achebe, 1997: 132)	Burada bir misyonerin öldürülmesi söz konusu olamazdı. Bay Kiaga ne kadar deli olsa da zararsız bir adamdı. Mühtedileri de klandan kaçmak zorunda kalmadan kimse öldüremezdi. Çünkü ne kadar değersiz de olsalar, onlar hâlâ klan üyesiydiler. Dolayısıyla beyaz adamın hükümeti ve Hristiyanları öldürmenin sonuçları hakkındaki söylentileri hiç kimse ciddiye almadı. Zaten şimdiye dek verdiklerinden daha fazla rahatsızlık yaratacak olurlarsa klandan kovup kurtulurlardı. (Achebe, 2022: 137)

Regarding Table 4, the source context includes signs of colonizer-colonized power relationships. The sign “quite harmless” refers to someone not causing any trouble or without the power or willingness to harm others. In ST, this sign refers to one of the local people who has converted along with the translator of the missionaries. Colonized people are often perceived as ignorant and unable to foresee the outcomes of an action, whether for their benefit or detriment. In this context, the colonized fail to anticipate the threat and join the colonizers. In the evaluation of the TT1, it is seen that the sign “quite harmless” is translated as “zararsız” (harmless). However, the sign “quite harmless” indicates a quantity with the adverb “quite”, and translating this sign as “zararsız” alleviates the degree of the source sign, resulting in insufficient meaning. The other sign “converts” refers to the individuals who have changed their religion as mentioned earlier, in this framework, it refers to colonized villagers. In TT1, it is translated as “tanrılarını bırakıp ona inananlar” (those abandoning their god and believing in him), leading to an excessive meaning in comparison to the source sign, yet the same sign is translated as “mühtediler” (converts) in TT2, preserving the meaning. As a result, the sign is overemphasized for the power that the colonizer holds in TT1. Also, the sign “worthlessness” is used to address the converts in source text. While this noun is translated as “değersiz” (worthless) in TT1, preserving the meaning, in TT2 the sign is over-interpreted as “değersiz, aşağılık” (worthless, contemptible), leading to excessive meaning. As the last sign of power in Table 4, “troublesome than they already were” in source text refers to colonizers who have formed their government and set legislations for protecting themselves and the converts as their mimicry. This colonizer-colonized power relationship is translated as “eğer sorun yaratacak

olurlarsa” (if they are to cause trouble) in TT2. The colonized consider themselves superior and seek to impose their doctrines or epistemology on the colonizers. For the colonizer, the colonized are ignorant, uncivilized and in need of the colonizer’s epistemology for improvement and civilization. While the colonizer already cause trouble in the source context, the conditional structure and the resulting possibility of “causing trouble” leads to insufficient meaning of the colonizer’s oppression. As a result of this meaning transformation, the reader of TT2 could under-interpret the extent of control that colonizers exert on the colonized.

Table 5. The source and target contexts of power relationship-Example 5

ST	TT1	TT2
"Does the white man understand our custom about land?"	"Beyaz adam toprakla ilgili geleneğimizi anlıyor mu?"	"Beyaz adam toprakla ilgili adetlerimizi biliyor mu?"
"How can he when he does not even speak our tongue? But he says that our customs are bad, and our own brothers who have taken up his religion also say that our customs are bad. (Achebe, 1994: 176)	"Dilimizi konuşamıyor ki nasıl anlasın? Ama geleneklerimizin kötü olduğunu söylüyor ve onun dinine inanan öz kardeşlerimiz de onları onaylıyorlar. (Achebe, 1997: 146)	"Daha dilimizi bile konuşamazken nereden bilsin? Ama adetlerimizin kötü olduğunu söylüyor, onun dinine giren kendi kardeşlerimiz de adetlerimizin kötü olduğunu söylüyorlar. (Achebe, 2022: 155)

The source context in Table 5 also includes a significant sign concerning colonizer-colonized power relationship. The sign “our own brothers” refers to native people living in the clan in the source context. However, in TT1 the sign is translated as “öz kardeşlerimiz” (our biological brothers), leading to the target signification of the sign “our own” as its other meaning. The sign “our own brothers” is not used in its literal meaning but in its figurative meaning implying that the people they live with are considered as their brothers. The fact that the sign is translated as “öz kardeşlerimiz” (our biological brothers) demonstrates that solidarity cannot even be an assumed character among the natives. Moreover, rendering this sign with its literal meaning in TT1, as opposed to the sign “kendi kardeşlerimiz” in TT2 that preserves the meaning of solidarity and brotherhood among the natives, results in the signification that most of the natives are bonded to each other by blood and they reproduce in large numbers, turning out to be original brothers in great numbers, further emphasizing the assumed otherness of the natives.

Table 6. The source and target contexts of power relationship-Example 6

ST	TT1	TT2
He said that the leaders of the land in the future would be men and women who had learned to read and write. If Umuofia failed to send her children to the school, strangers would come from other places to rule them. They could already see that happening in the	Ülkenin gelecekteki önderlerinin okuma yazma bilen kişiler olacağını söyledi. Eğer Umuofia çocuklarını okula göndermese yabancılar gelip onları yönetecekti. Yerel yargı evinde böyle olmuştu. Bölge Müdürü'nün çevresinde kendi	Gelecekte bu toprakların liderlerinin okuma yazma öğrenmiş erkek ve kadınlar olacağını söyledi. Umuofia halkı çocuklarını okula göndermezse başka yerlerden yabancılar gelip onları yönetecekti. Hatta şimdiden böyle olduğunu Yerel

Native Court, where the D.C. was surrounded by strangers who spoke his tongue. (Achebe, 1994: 181)	dilini konuşan yabancılar vardı yalnızca. (Achebe, 1997: 151)	Mahkeme'ye bakıp görebilirlerdi. Bölge Komiseri'nin etrafı kendi dilini konuşan yabancılarla çevriliydi. (Achebe, 2022: 160)
--	---	--

Further signs of power relationship between the colonizer and colonized are also evident in Table 6. The sign “land” in this context refers to the territory the natives inhabit. This sign is translated as “ülke” (country) in TT1. While the natives live as clanspeople on a territory rather than in the form of an established country, the sign “ülke” (country) results in another meaning of the source sign. Rendering the sign “land” as “ülke” (country) as in TT1 leads to a significant meaning transformation since the sign “ülke” (country) is a greater structure with its established institutions and legislation. Another sign of power relationship in the source text in Table 6, “Native Court” is translated as “yerel yargı evi” (local judiciary house), leading to meaninglessness in TT1. It is a fact that colonizers have enough power to set up a court in the lands they have settled in, however, rendering the source sign “Native Court” as “yerel yargı evi” (local judiciary house) in TT1 causes the reader to miss the underlying meaning of the sign which cannot represent the oppressive power of the colonizer.

Table 7. The source and target contexts of power relationship-Example 7

ST	TT1	TT2
Mr. Brown's successor was the Reverend James Smith, and he was a different kind of man. He condemned openly Mr. Brown's policy of compromise and accommodation. He saw things as black and white. And black was evil. He saw the world as a battlefield in which the children of light were locked in mortal conflict with the sons of darkness. (Achebe, 1994: 184)	Bay Brown'un yerine gelen vaiz James Smith değişik yapıda biriydi. Bay Brown'un uzlaşma siyasetini açıkça yeriordu. Her şeyi ak ve kara olarak görüyordu ve kara kötülüğün simgesiydi ona göre. Yeryüzünü ışığın çocukları ile karanlığın çocuklarının ölümcül bir çatışmaya girdiği bir savaş alanı olarak nitelendiriyordu. (Achebe, 1997: 153)	Bay Brown'un yerine gelen kişi Peder James Smith'ti. Oldukça farklı bir adamdı, Bay Brown'un taviz ve uzlaşmaya dayalı politikasını açıkça kınıyordu. Onun görüşüne göre her şey siyah ve beyazdan ibaretti ve siyah kötüydü. Dünyayı, ışığın çocuklarının karanlığın oğullarıyla ölümcül bir çatışmaya mahkum edildiği bir savaş alanı olarak görüyordu (Achebe, 2022: 162)

The signs “compromise and accommodation” in the source text in Table 7 are given as the qualities of the colonizer. The sign “compromise” entails concessions from both parties, the colonizer and colonized in our context. This sign indeed refers to the hybridity of cultures in the colonized lands in the postcolonial theory of Bhabha (2016). With this sign, the source reader signifies the good deeds of the colonizer for the colonized, making concessions at times in order to avoid conflict. Analysis of the target texts shows that both signs are preserved in TT1 with the target signs (taviz ve uzlaşma), clearly pointing to the affectionate side of the colonizer for the target reader. However, translation of these two signs as “uzlaşma” (accommodation) in TT2 results in the absence of the sign “compromise” for the target reader. The colonizer’s assumed rationale for staying on the lands of the colonized is wiped out for

TT2 reader. As a result of this “wiping-out of the meaning” by Öztürk Kasar’s (2021) terms in the systematics of designification, the long-held concept of “hybridity of cultures” is also rendered to TT2 reader in an implicit manner rather than explicitly as is the case in the source context.

Besides the power relationship regarding the colonizer and the colonized, the race-based power relationship is also revealed to the source reader with the explicit signs of “black was evil”. Associating the skin color of the natives with the evil, the colonizer also attempts to show that the people of the colonized lands are out of the “norm” human color. This rationalization of the colonial practices is translated in TT1 as “siyah kötüydü” (black was bad). While the adjective “bad” refers to someone or something that causes problems, “evil” can define a subject or an object that is repulsive and likely to cause harm to others. Therefore, there is a semantic difference between the two adjectives with the latter implying a more violent condition than the former. The target sign “kötü” implies under-interpretation of the extent of negativity the white colonizers hold and attribute to the natives in TT1, leading to insufficient meaning of racial discrimination against the black community by the colonizer white. On the other hand, the sign “evil” is translated as “kötülüğün simgesi” (symbol of evil) in TT2. When an object or subject is considered the “symbol” of a quality, good or bad, it is indeed attributed to *the* characteristic “stereotype”, possessing all the qualities of that feature. Given this, the sign in TT2 results in excessive meaning, leading the target reader to over-interpretation of the demonization of the natives solely on account of their skin color with a view to rationalization of the colonial practices. Another race-based discriminative sign in the source context is white children’s (“the children of light”) being compelled to (locked in) fight against the black children (“sons of darkness”). While association of whiteness and blackness with “light” and “darkness” respectively suffices to attribute negative traits to natives’ children, the sign “locked in” furthers the rationalization efforts of the colonizer implying that they would like to bring peace and order to the colonized lands, but the latter compel them to defend themselves, showing the trait of savageness. This sign is translated as “mahkum edilmek” in TT1, preserving the claimed soft attitude of the colonizer white to the colonized black. However, the sign “locked in” is wiped out in TT2, leading to absence of the sign and thereby sounding as if it is the intentional act of the white children to be involved in a fight with the native children. As a result of this meaning transformation, the rationalization of the colonial practices is not conveyed to the target reader, showing the two parties of the fight as equal parties.

Table 8. The source and target contexts of power relationship-Example 8

ST	TT1	TT2
Three days later the District Commissioner sent his sweet-tongued messenger to the leaders of Umuofia asking them to meet him in his headquarters. That also was not strange. He often asked them to hold such	Üçüncü gün Bölge Müdürü bir görüşme yapmak üzere, tatlı dilli ulaşı aracılığıyla Umuofia önderlerini merkeze çağırdı. Bunun da olağandışı bir yanı yoktu. Sık sık bu tür görüşmeler yapmak isterdi. (Achebe, 1997: 160)	Üç gün sonra Bölge Komiseri, Umuofia'nın liderlerine tatlı dilli mübaşirini göndererek kendisiyle merkez binada görüşmelerini rica etti. Bunda da tuhaf bir yan yoktu. Zaten sık sık kendi tabiriyle yerlilerle

palavers, as he called them.
(Achebe, 1994: 193)

görüşme talebinde bulunuyordu.
(Achebe, 2022: 170)

The sign “palavers” in the context in Table 8 refers to an idle talk, a long discussion, often between people from different cultures or, a misleading speech¹. In the source context, the expression “to hold such palavers, as he called them” refers to the discussions that the natives and colonizers used to have, and it is said that the District Commissioner called these meetings as “palavers”. Therefore, the source expression indicates that colonizers disparage colonized people, consider them unworthy to have a word and when they needed to, it is seen as “idle talk”. Nevertheless, in TT2, the sign “to hold such palavers, as he called them” is translated as “kendi tabiriyle yerlilerle görüşme” (discussion with natives, as he called them), resulting in false meaning since the defining expression “kendi tabiriyle” (as he called them) refers to the natives in TT2 while it refers to the sign “palavers” in the ST. As a result, while the power holder colonizer despises the thoughts of the natives in discussions, in a way underestimating their epistemology, this contempt is directed at the whole being of natives in TT2, transforming the focus of power relationship from epistemological superiority of the colonizer to racial issues. On the other hand, the sign “bu tür görüşmeler” (such discussions) in TT1 comes with the absence of the signified “idle talk” in the sign “palaver”, wiping out the source signification that the colonizer considers the colonized inferior to themselves in epistemology, further wiping out the assumed superiority of the colonizer in their power relationship to the colonized.

Table 9. The source and target contexts of power relationship-Example 9

ST	TT1	TT2
"We shall not do you any harm," said the District Commissioner to them later, "if only you agree to cooperate with us. We have brought a peaceful administration to you and your people so that you may be happy. If any man ill-treats you we shall come to your rescue. But we will not allow you to ill-treat others. We have a court of law where we judge cases and administer justice just as it is done in my own country under a great queen. (Achebe, 1994: 194)	"Eğer bizimle işbirliği yaparsanız size dokunmayacağız," dedi Bölge Müdürü daha sonra. "Size ve halkınıza barışçıl bir yönetim getirdik, mutlu olmanız gerekiyor. Ola ki biri size kötü davranırsa, sizi biz kurtaracağız. Ama sizin de başkalarına kötü davranmanıza izin vermeyeceğiz. Burada bir yargı organı kurduk, davalara bakıp, adaleti sağlıyoruz, tıpkı yüce bir kraliçenin yönettiği benim ülkemde olduğu gibi. (Achebe, 1997: 161)	Daha sonra Bölge Komiseri gelip, "Size zarar vermeyeceğiz," dedi, "ancak bizimle işbirliği yapmaya razı olursanız. Mutlu olabilmeniz için size ve halkınıza barışçıl bir yönetim getirdik. Biri size kötü muamelede bulunduğunda gelip sizi kurtaracağız. Ama sizin de başkalarına kötü muamele etmenize izin vermeyeceğiz. Tıpkı büyük bir kraliçenin yönetimi altındaki ülkemde olduğu gibi, burada da davalara bakıp adaleti uyguladığımız bir mahkememiz var. (Achebe, 2022: 171)

As in several other examples, in Table 9, the signs in the source context also include colonizer-colonized power relationship. The source sign “so that you may be happy” is directed to the colonized showing the assumed affection and good deeds of the colonizer for the colonized. This is already among the supposed rationales of the colonizer to grasp the lands of the natives far away, stating that they have arrived in those lands to the benefit of the colonized, on the assumption that they will bring education, civilization, intellect, and sociopolitical order to those people. This phrase is translated as “mutlu olmanız gerekiyor (you must be happy) in TT1. In the source context, the subject pronoun “you” refers to colonized people who are supposed to be happy just because the colonizers have imposed their so-called peaceful administration on them. However, the target context in TT1 implies a necessity or strong possibility of “getting happy”, resulting in excessive meaning in comparison to the source modal “may”. There is a common perception by the colonizers that they are the ones who can bring civilization and without them the colonized would not be civilized. In TT1, due to over interpretation, the sign sounds more dominant in terms of power relationships. Another sign of power relationship in the source context is “court of law”. This sign demonstrates the establishment of the so-called sociopolitical and legal order in the colonized lands by the colonizer. While the source text implies a specific sign “court of law”, conveying it with a generalized sign “yargı organı” (a judicial body) in TT1 results in ambiguous meaning. In the source context, it is clear that the West has brought its own administrative and judicial system, however, in TT1 the meaning of the sign is ambiguous, lessening the impact of the colonizer-colonized power relationship, excessively favoring the former.

Table 10. The source and target contexts of power relationship-Example 10

ST	TT1	TT2
The Commissioner went away, taking three or four of the soldiers with him. in the many years in which he had toiled to bring civilization to different parts of Africa he had learned a number of things. (Achebe, 1994: 208)	Müdür askerlerden üç, ya da dördünü yanına alıp gitti. Afrika'nın değişik bölgelerine uygarlık getirmeye çalıştığı yıllar birçok şey öğrenmişti. (Achebe, 1997: 173)	Komiser yanına üç dört asker alıp gitti. Uzun yıllardır Afrika'nın farklı bölgelerine medeniyet götürme uğraşı veriyordu. Bu süre içinde çok şey öğrenmişti. (Achebe, 2022: 182)

As it is clear from the source context in Table 10, with a view to the exploitation of the valuables of the colonized territories, the colonizer stayed in those lands “many years”, rationalizing its practices with the excuse of “bringing civilization to different parts of Africa”. In essence, the colonizer shows its power relationship with the colonized as if this encounter favors the latter, exhibiting itself as serving to the needs of the natives. However, the needs of the natives are determined by the colonizer, making this power relationship explicit to the source readers. The extended stay of the colonizer on the colonized lands, explicit from the sign “in many years” in the source text is translated as “uzun yıllardır” in TT2, preserving the long years of exploitation of the colonized lands by the colonizer. On the other hand, this sign is translated as “yıllar” (in the years) in TT1, wiping out the source sign “many”. This meaning

transformation leads to the absence of the high number of the years the colonizer exploited the colonized lands. Therefore, the power relationship greatly favoring the colonizer in the source text is not made explicit to the target readers with this wiping-out of the sign.

5. Conclusion

In this study, the novel titled *Things Falling Apart* by Chinua Achebe is analyzed based on post colonialist literary criticism. To that end, the terms Said (1979), Spivak (1994) and Bhabha (1984) coined and proposed in the framework of postcolonial criticism are used in the analysis of the novel. The source contexts alluding to power relationship in a postcolonial environment are further discussed for their relevance to the binary opposition categories, namely colonizer-colonized, white-black, and male-female. The former elements in those binary oppositions are found to be the oppressors to the latter components based on no sound biological rationale, but on grounds of social construction.

The contexts of power relationship in the source text are further compared to their translations in two target texts in Turkish with a view to the evaluation of translation based on “Systematics of Designification” proposed by Öztürk Kasar (2021). As any context of power relationship is expected to involve a socially constructed powerful and powerless party, the word choices besides the syntax conventions are significantly shaped in the act of translation by the amount of power a character supposedly holds. Therefore, the evaluation of Turkish translations of the source contexts with power relationship is expected to shed light on prospective translator decisions dealing with literary texts of postcolonial focus.

Analysis of the source text yielded ten contexts with power relationship, favoring the former element of a binary opposition over the latter. While colonizing power turned out to be the most frequent oppressor to the colonized people, implying the effects of military and epistemological superiority on the amount of power a character exercises over the other, race and gender issues also proved effective in the colonizer’s efforts to reinforce their power. Translation evaluation of those contexts in two target texts further demonstrated that the power the colonizer is supposed to possess is over-interpreted in seven signs of power relationship, resulting in excessive comment on the extent of power one party exercises. Besides reproducing a context with excessive meaning of the source sign, the power one party holds in an interaction is under-interpreted in three cases, leading to insufficient meaning of the sign of power. On the other hand, a specific sign of power in the source text is reproduced with a more general meaning in two cases, leading to ambiguity in the signification of a particular sign of power for the target readers. However, these three tendencies of designification are categorized under the “meaning” field of sign in a target text by Öztürk Kasar (2021: 28). The implications of this categorization are significant for the extent of meaning transformations. Whether the tendency is identified as over-interpretation, darkening, or under-interpretation of the meaning, the sign can be acknowledged to be reproduced within the meaning field in the target text, still bearing the comparable signification for the target readers as the source readers can be assumed to achieve.

The tendencies of “sliding of the meaning” and “alteration of the meaning”, identified in three and two cases respectively in the contexts analyzed are classified as “at the limits of the meaning of the sign,” resulting in “peri-meaning” as compared to the source sign (Öztürk Kasar, 2021: 28). This implies that these two tendencies force the target sign to the limits of the source sign, yet not too far to lead to meaninglessness. While three signs of power are found to be reproduced with another meaning that the source sign potentially bears but not realized in the contexts, two signs are reproduced with false meanings but not totally irrelevant to the source sign. As a result of these meaning transformations, the power relationship in the contexts is still the case for the target readers, yet the direction and essence of the power exercise are taken to the limits of signification.

Öztürk Kasar (2021: 28) further classifies “destruction of the meaning” and “wiping out of the sign” under the field of meaninglessness, resulting in a target meaning “out of the field of meaning of the source sign”. While destruction of the meaning is identified in one context, wiping out of the sign is found in six cases, which means that seven target signs of power do not hold the signification that the source signs bear. The reason for wiping out a sign might vary, ranging from auto-censor by a translator to the insurmountable linguistic differences between the source and target languages. However, be it out of censorship or linguistic matters, this tendency leads to the absence of a significant sign for the target reader. Thus, a literary translator's decision-making process should be structured in accordance with the source text's meaning universe and the meaning outcomes of any choices for the intended audience. With a thorough command of “systematics of designification”, a literary translator could avoid meaning transformations potentially leading to meaninglessness or reduce the extent of meaning losses or meaning transformations, putting the decision at the tendency that will result in minimum level of designification for the target reader if various reasons compel the translator to resort to designificative tendencies.

REFERENCES

- Achebe, C. (1994). *Things fall apart*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Achebe, C. (1997). *Ruhum yeniden doğacak* (A. Selveroğlu, Trans.). (2nd Ed.) İstanbul: Sosyalist Yayınları.
- Achebe, C. (2022). *Parçalanma* (N. Arıbaş Erbil, Trans.). (2nd Ed.) İstanbul: İthaki Yayınları.
- Aghasiyev, K. (2024). Cultural, religious, and linguistic hybridity in Chinua Achebe's novel *Things Fall Apart*. *Journal of Young Intellectuals*, 5(1), 174–188.
- Al-Leithy, M. A. (2022). A comparative study of postcolonial aspects in T. Salih's *Season of Migration to the North* and C. Achebe's *No Longer at Ease*. *Comparative Literature: East & West*, 5(2), 123–136. <https://doi.org/10.1080/25723618.2021.2004678>
- Altıntaş, Ö. (2015). *A comparative analysis of the two Turkish translations of Chinua Achebe's Things Fall Apart within the framework of Paul Bandia's approach to postcolonial translation* (Unpublished MA Thesis). Hacettepe University, Ankara, Türkiye.
- Aydoğan, İ. (2022, December 18). Sömürgecilik. *TürkMaarifAnsiklopedisi*. Retrieved from <https://turkmaarifansiklopedisi.org.tr/somurgecilik> Accessed on: 11.04.2025

- Bhabha, H. (1984). Of mimicry and man: The ambivalence of colonial discourse. *Discipleship: A Special Issue on Psychoanalysis*, (28), 125–133.
- Bhabha, H. (1994). *The location of culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Bhabha, H. (2016). *Kültürel konumlanış* (T. Uluç, Trans.). İstanbul: İnsanYayınları.
- Bozkurt, S. (2014). Sömürgecilik sonrası dönem eserlerinin Türkçeye çevrilmesinde tercih edilebilecek yöntemler: "Things Fall Apart" adlı eserin Türkçe çevirilerinin karşılaştırmalı analizi. *Kebikeç*, 38, 241-262
- Çetin Uysal, Y. & Kuleli, M. (2022). Postkolonyal yaklaşım ve çeviri göstergeliliği: Muğlak metinlerdeki ideolojik söylemlerde kuramlararasılık. In M. Kuleli & D. Tuna (Eds.), *Edebiyat kuramı odağında çeviri amaçlı çözümlemeler* (pp. 187-211). Konya: Eğitim Yayınevi.
- Diko, M. (2024). Harmonizing Africa's linguistic symphony: Navigating the complexities of translating African literature using a postcolonial theory. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 11(1), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2024.2411871>
- Kohn, M. & Reddy, K. (2023). Colonialism. In E. N. Zalta & U. Nodelman (Eds.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Accessed on March 28, 2025, Retrieved from <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2024/entries/colonialism/>
- Lacayo, R. (2010, January 11). All-TIME 100 novels. *TIME*. <https://entertainment.time.com/2005/10/16/all-time-100-novels/slide/things-fall-apart-1959-by-chinua-achebe/> Accessed on: 16.04.2025.
- Mshaweh, R. & Benmessaoud, S. (2024). Colonialism and race in Arabic translation: The case of Joseph Conrad's Heart of Darkness. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 11(1), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2024.2374646>
- Öztürk Kasar, S. (2009). Un chef-d'oeuvre trèsconnu: Le chef-d'oeuvre inconnu de Balzac. Commentaires d'unetraduction à l'autrelaissant des traces. In M. Nowotna and A. Moghani (Eds.), *Les traces du traducteur* (pp. 87-211). Paris: Publications de l'INALCO.
- Öztürk Kasar, S. (2021). Çevirmek, anlamieğipbükmesanatımıdır? In D. Tuna & M. Kuleli (Eds.), *Interdisciplinary debates on discourse, meaning and translation* (pp. 19–44). Ankara: AnıYayıncılık.
- Öztürk Kasar, S. & Tuna, D. (2015). Yaşam, yazın ve yazın çevirisi için gösterge okuma. *Frankofoni Fransız Dili ve Edebiyatı İnceleme ve Araştırmaları Ortak Kitabı*, 27 (pp. 457-482). Ankara: Bizim Grup Basımevi.
- Öztürk Kasar, S., & Tuna, D. (2017). Shakespeare in three languages: Reading and analyzing Sonnet 130 and its translations in light of semiotics. *International Journal of Languages' Education and Teaching*, 5(1), 170–181.
- Parlak, B. (2014). Sömürgeciliksonrasıyazınveçeviri. *Litera: Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies*, 15(1), 58–73. (Original work published in 2003)
- Said, E. W. (1979). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Sandten, C. (2020). Precarious discourse, discursive precarity: Chris Cleave's (postcolonial) refugee novel Little Bee (The Other Hand) (2008). *Postcolonial Interventions*, 5(2), 14–45.
- Spivak, G. C. (1994). Can the subaltern speak? In P. Williams & L. Chrisman (Eds.), *Colonial discourse and postcolonial theory: A reader* (pp. 66-111). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Woltmann, S. (2019). Annie John, the postcolonial palimpsest, and the limits of adaptation. *Postcolonial Interventions: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Postcolonial Studies*, 4(1), 138–170. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.2554511>