Kuleli, M. and Uysal, N. M. (2021). In pursuit of multi-ethnic feminist signs and their translations in literary feminism: The case of *The Color Purple* by Alice Walker. *International Journal of Language Academy*, 9 (3), 233-257.

Volume 9/3 September 2021

p. 233/257

Article History:

Received

11/08/2021

Accepted

24/08/2021

Available online

19/09/2021

**IN PURSUIT OF MULTI-ETHNIC FEMINIST SIGNS AND
THEIR TRANSLATIONS IN LITERARY FEMINISM: THE
CASE OF *THE COLOR PURPLE* BY ALICE WALKER**

Mesut KULELİ¹

Nazan Müge UYSAL²

Abstract

Social hierarchy can simply be defined as a term involving the supremacy of specific parties over "others". Specifically, with the onset of industrialization, social hierarchy came to be exercised as a norm within societies. This type of hierarchy results from the factors like economy, ruling power, race, or gender that cannot be regarded as universal parameters but rather as socially constructed categories. As a result of the socially constructed dualities like "rich vs. poor", "strong vs. weak", "educated vs. uneducated", or "male vs. female" in societies, certain groups of individuals are placed in one end point of the spectrum as "otherized" or "*o(u)t[h]ermost*". Multi-ethnic feminism has arisen as resistance against these types of duality categories enforced by the patriarchy. This study aims at analyzing the multi-ethnic feminist signs in the literary text entitled *The Color Purple* by Alice Walker (1983). Following the analysis of the text from a multi-ethnic feminist perspective, its Turkish translation is evaluated based on Öztürk Kasar's (2021) "systematics of designification in translation" that consists of nine levels of designification showing degrees of meaning transformation on the original sign(s). A total of 37 contexts are analyzed based on three main themes in multi-ethnic feminism, namely gender-based oppression, race-based oppression, and social norms-based oppression. The results show that in cases of meaning transformation in the target text, the feminist signs are found to be rendered through more severe or less violent signs referring to the oppression on the "other". It is concluded through the discussion of meaning transformations in the target text that literary feminisms should be able to shape the *skopos* of literary translators in deciding whether to reproduce patriarchal values in another culture or not.

Keywords: Social hierarchy, multi-ethnic feminism, literary translation, *The Color Purple*, *Renklerden Moru*.

¹ Assoc. Prof. Dr., Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University, Department of Translation and Interpreting, mesut.kuleli@ibu.edu.tr, <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3477-0412>

² Assist. Prof. Dr., Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University, Department of Translation and Interpreting, mugeuysal@ibu.edu.tr, <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8983-4367>

INTRODUCTION

The term “social hierarchy”, in its essence, involves the supremacy of certain parties over “others”, the latter oppressed by the former on shallow grounds of socially constructed categories rather than natural qualities. It is beyond doubt that nature does not treat anyone based on pre-determined premises; however, society does this to the extent misperceived by the oppressed “others” to be a result of natural way of life. It is important to note that “hierarchy” here refers to the socially constructed categories observed in almost all modern societies.

While social hierarchy was not the case in primitive societies engaged in hunting and gathering, in which everyone had their own share of duties and benefits, it has become a norm since the onset of farming, later to be accelerated and “naturalized” with the advent of industrialization, in which the physically stronger, the more educated, the wealthier, the more physically attractive, the older, and the ones with more “prestigious jobs” have become the “dominant” powers in the society. This has not gone unnoticed by such eminent thinkers as Karl Marx, and naturally, Friedrich Engels, Ludwig Gumplowicz, Max Weber, or more recently Janet Chafetz, to name a few. The “social conflict theory” as purported by those thinkers, was based on the socially constructed class distinctions built upon such factors as economy, education, ruling power, race, or gender. Such distinctions can, on no account, be regarded as universal parameters but rather as the long-surviving categories on which a society’s maintenance of its oppressors’ values would rely. In this vein, the socially constructed “dualities”, made up of two supposedly contrasting signs (but indeed two complementary and integral entities) as permitted by languages, contribute to the maintenance of such values, with the initial sign considered the “expected and natural” quality and the second sign associated with the “unexpected and unnatural” qualities. The dualities of “rich vs. poor”, “strong vs. weak”, “educated vs. uneducated”, “beautiful vs. ugly”, “high-ranking vs. low-ranking”, “male vs. female”, “majority vs. minority”, “mature vs. novice” all favor the former qualities, rendering them as the “naturally expected” ones while “otherizing” the latter qualities. It is unfortunate to think that languages, one of the best manifestations of communally accepted norms of a culture, allow such dualities in such a way that those born into a given culture subconsciously accept the former qualities in those dualities as the “natural” ones.

While each duality suffices to make the latter quality the “other” on its own, the intersections of several or all of those “otherness” qualities in the society should take such individuals or groups to the endpoint of the “otherized” spectrum. In this respect, “the poor, weak, uneducated, unattractive, novice females belonging to minority ethnicities” should serve as the “*o(u)t[h]ermost*” individuals within their communities. It is at this point that multi-ethnic feminism should come to the fore. Lorber (1997, p. 25) categorizes multi-ethnic feminism among gender revolution feminisms in that this movement “attack[s] the dominant social order through questioning the clearness of the categories that comprise its hierarchies”. Therefore, multi-ethnic feminism also resists the duality of categories instilled by the patriarchy and tries to bring forth the multiplicity of voices and preferences. What differentiates gender revolution feminisms from gender resistant feminisms is that gender resistant feminisms tend to focus on women with their bodily integrities, whereas gender revolution feminisms try to deconstruct and destabilize the socially restricted number of views and pave the way for multiplicities of voices, thereby addressing and attacking the socially established demarcation of all hierarchical categories (Lorber, 1997).

Collins (2014, p. 45) states that discrimination against women in the labor market is generally tied to the “intersecting oppressions of race, class, and gender”, proposing that

women, already oppressed by patriarchy, are further oppressed when their race and social class also come into play. This view of feminist thought can be regarded as an approach toward multi-ethnic feminism since oppression is claimed to take its roots from a combination of socially constructed categories. This intersection of various social strata is also suggested by Allen (2018, p. 16), stating that men do not exercise the same level of domination on all women since “racial, ethnic and class differences” are also taken into account by men in determining the extent of oppression. It is unfortunate that it is always men who will decide on whom to oppress besides to what extent to exert their power on the “other”. This proposition could also be thought to support multi-ethnic feminism. “[Attacking] the multiple strands of oppression and exploitation, multi-ethnic feminism has shown that gender, ethnicity, religion, and social class are structurally intertwined relationships” (Lorber, 1997, p. 25). This points to the implication that the women oppressed due to one of those factors tend to be further oppressed due to their gender. This implication also gives rise to the supposition that a woman and a man oppressed due to some of such factors would not suffer the same amount of oppression.

The important point made by multi-ethnic feminism is that the subordinate group is not marked just by gender or by ethnicity or religion, but is in a social location in multiple systems of domination. [...] [M]en and women of disadvantaged groups are often oppressed in different ways (Lorber, 1997, p. 26).

The “multiple systems of domination” as propounded here would refer to the individuals at the intersection of all or several of the socially constructed categories. This also confirms the extensive scope of feminist movements. It is no longer enough to define feminism solely as the movement that strives to grant women the rights that they have been undeservedly deprived of for centuries. On the contrary, feminist movements are engaged in all types of unfairness and oppression individuals have been exposed to. What lies in the roots of all those oppressions is the “patriarchy”. While the term patriarchy refers to the domination of men over women in its most basic sense, it further involves the system established by the society to maintain the power the people in that society have been exercising in any field (Johnson, 2004, p. 26). Therefore, patriarchy cannot be reduced to the teachings of men as the powerholders at home or in the society, but it is an “efficient” system that allows the maintenance of the whole social system rendering certain parties the “dominant” and the rest the “other”. Those born into a given culture adopt and acquire its values as they grow up, yet this development is not without expense. They either learn to be the “dominant” individuals or “others” in line with the social “category” that they have been put into. This is the patriarchy that we use in its broader sense in this study. According to Lorber (2010, p. 15), while patriarchy has instilled the dominance of “advantaged” groups over “others”, men and women supposed to be equally disadvantaged in the matrix of domination turn out to create another inequality, favoring the former one in patriarchal societies.

In this study, the literary text titled *The Color Purple* by Alice Walker (1983) is analyzed from multi-ethnic feminism perspective since the intersection of socially constructed factors as diverse as ethnicity, race, economic status, educational background, age, sexual orientations, and most importantly, gender comes into play in the power relations all through the text. The contexts with implicit or explicit signs of oppression are discussed with reference to intersecting factors. The contexts determined accordingly in the source text are compared to Turkish translation of the text (1984a) titled *Renklerden Moru ...* to evaluate how and to what extent such feminist signs are preserved in transmission to the target culture based on “systematics of designification” by Öztürk Kasar (2021).

ALICE WALKER AND *THE COLOR PURPLE*

An American social activist and writer of various literary genres like short stories, poems, and novels, Alice Walker is generally known for her contribution to the feminist movement. She has published fictional works that deal with women's rights and black women's rights, in particular. Besides fiction, Walker has also been involved in non-fictional works like essays that reflect "autobiographical experiences [in dealing with] race, class, sexuality, and feminism", yet these works of non-fiction cannot be separated from her fiction. Rather, they are complementary to one another in content and philosophy (Lauret, 2011, pp. 2-3).

Walker (1984b) coined the term *womanist* to refer to "[a] black feminist or feminist of color. [...] Usually referring to outrageous, audacious, courageous, or willful behavior. Wanting to know more and in greater depth than is considered 'good' for one [...]" (p. xi). This definition of the term *womanist* focuses on race besides blacking out the socially constructed "good" to make room for multiple voices of what should be considered 'good'. Moreover, this task falls to women according to this definition. Walker (1984b) also defines *womanist* as "[a] woman who loves other women, sexually and/or nonsexually [...] Sometimes loves individual men, sexually and/or nonsexually. Committed to survival and wholeness of entire people, male and female [...] Not a separatist [...] Traditionally universalist [...]" (p. xi). The phrases like "wholeness of entire people", "loving other women (irrespective of the cause)", or "loving individual men (no matter what the motive would be)" in this second definition of the term are also concerned with the potentialities to which patriarchy has turned blind eye. The definitions of the term *womanist* by Walker (1984b) would justify why the text titled *The Color Purple* is analyzed from multi-ethnic feminist perspective in this study, which also seeks potential views to the long-established patriarchal categories.

In 1983, Walker won the Pulitzer Prize for *The Color Purple*, which she narrates through a black girl's letters to God complaining about the oppression against her as a result of being categorized at the intersection of various "otherness" groups like race, age, economic status, appearance, educational background, and gender. It is written "in the African American vernacular of Black Southern speech" (Lauret, 2011, p. 90). Even the employment of this vernacular language in the text would suffice to show the representation of pluralities in various realms of life by Walker.

American literature has been interested in representing the speech of the people at least since Mark Twain, but not the speech of black people, much less black women, unless an object of ridicule or comedy. In Walker's hands that speech, long regarded as backward and degraded, becomes a vibrant literary language that gives voice to a girl, woman, a people, and a subject hitherto not regarded as worthy of, or fit for, writing- let alone literary writing. (Lauret, 2011, p. 90)

Novel to the literary canon when it was published, *The Color Purple* can be considered a representative of multi-ethnic feminist approach both in its style and in content. Besides serving as a revolt against the white and male dominant literary tradition, the text also lends itself to a multi-ethnic feminist analysis with the refutation of all absurdities created by patriarchy. According to Walker, "after the biggest of the white folks no longer on the earth, the only way to stop making somebody the serpent is for everybody to accept everybody else as a child of God, or one mother's children³" (1984b, p. 233). This clearly indicates the redundancy and threat of hierarchy in the society, and it is merely through the acknowledgment of all individuals as equal beings by nature that this threat can be overcome. Walker attacks the patriarchal family and social structure through the theme of

³ This is directly quoted from Walker (1984b, p. 233) without any manipulation or correction on the use of language.

queer to present the pluralities of doing gender, the essence of gender revolution feminisms, and the abuse directed at a girl disadvantaged in most aspect of social categories.

“SYSTEMATICS OF DESIGNIFICATION” IN TRANSLATION EVALUATION

Translation evaluation of the contexts with multi-ethnic feminist signs is conducted based on Öztürk Kasar’s (2021) “systematics of designification in translation”. While this systematics was first put forward by Öztürk Kasar in 2009, it was later updated with the addition of one more designificative tendency (Öztürk Kasar and Tuna, 2015) and given the final form in French (Öztürk Kasar, 2020) and in Turkish (Öztürk Kasar, 2021). However, as the most recent update of the systematics is only available in French and Turkish, English translations for the labeling of designificative tendencies in the systematics are adopted from Öztürk Kasar and Tuna (2017) in the present study.

“Systematics of designification in translation” consists of nine levels of designification, with each level pointing to a higher degree of manipulation on the original sign(s). The original contexts determined to bear multi-ethnic feminist signs as a result of the analysis of the source text were compared to their Turkish translations to find out how those signs are rendered into Turkish culture and to what extent a multi-ethnic feminist reading of the text is preserved or manipulated in Turkish. “Systematics of designification in translation” involves the following levels of designification: “Over-interpretation of the meaning; darkening of the meaning; under-interpretation of the 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, 2021, p. 28-35).⁴

While meaning transformations could be used by literary translators unconsciously, it is also possible that the linguistic discrepancy between the source and target languages could compel a translator to resort to some level of meaning transformation. Besides, the ideological structure in the target culture could result in the censorship of certain signs or contexts in the target text, which would also lead the translator to resort to designification in translation. Last but not least, the *skopos* of a translator as well as that of the translation commission, the target reader group, or the genre of the translated text could also exert their influence on the decisions of translators; as in the case of translating a Shakespearean play for stage or literary merit, each of which would necessitate diverse considerations from the translators. Therefore, these designificative tendencies are employed with a view to literary translation evaluation rather than translation criticism.

FINDINGS

This part of the study dwells on the findings and discussion regarding the multi-ethnic feminist signs or contexts determined as a result of the analysis on *The Color Purple* by Alice Walker (1983) besides translations of those signs and contexts based on the analysis of the on Turkish translation of the novel titled *Renklerden Moru ...* (1984a). Based on the premises of multi-ethnic feminism, the signs alluding or referring to “oppression” or “otherness” of disadvantaged characters or circles are divided into three parts. This categorization is based on the “most oppressive factor” that serves to render characters the “*o(u)t[h]ermost*” among several other factors. The principal factors of oppression are defined as hierarchical gender-based oppression, hierarchical race-based oppression, and finally hierarchical social norms-based oppression. It is important to note that all those oppressive

⁴ The labelling of designificative tendencies is directly adopted from Öztürk Kasar and Tuna (2017, p. 172). See the cited work for definitions.

factors are characterized by the adjective “hierarchical” seeing that such factors are not assigned to individuals by the nature to differentiate and discriminate one from another, but rather the ill-products of long-surviving patriarchal social systems.

Hierarchical gender-based oppression

Lorber's (1997, p. 26) suggestion that women tend to be the more oppressed individuals as compared to men when all other socially constructed factors are the same for each is a recurrent theme in the novel. Of a woman and a man of the same racial, economic, religious, or educational background, it is generally the former one oppressed by the latter one, let alone by the individuals from supposedly higher ranking “categories”. Table 1 presents the signs and contexts referring to the type of oppression merely tied to one's gender among all other “factors” together with their translations to show and discuss how these signs and contexts are preserved or manipulated in the target text.

Table 1. Hierarchical gender-based oppression on the “other”⁵

	Source Text (Walker, 1983)	Target Text (Walker, 1984a)
1.1	It nearly kill me to think she might marry somebody like Mr. _____ or wind up in some white lady kitchen. (p. 17)	Günün birinde onun da bizimki gibi biriyle biriyle evlenmek ya da bir beyaz kadının evinde aşçılık etmek zorunda kalacağını düşündükçe yüreğim daralıyor. (p. 17)
1.2	And her mammy take in white people dirty clothes to this day. Plus all her children got different daddys. It all just too trifling and confuse. (p. 50)	Anası da beyazların kirli çamaşırlarını yıkıyor hala. Ayrıca çocuklarının üçünü de başka başka heriflerden peydahladı. Bu laf kafamı karıştırıyor. (p. 47)
1.3	Both the girls bigged and gone. (p. 71)	Kızlar büyür büyümek evden kaçtılar. (p. 68)
1.4	[...] would you like to work for me, be my maid? Sofia say, Hell no. She say, What you say? Sofia say, Hell no. Mayor look at Sofia, push his wife out the way. Stick out his chest. Girl, what you say to Miss Millie? Sofia say, I say, Hell no. He slap her. (p. 76)	Benim evimde çalışmak ister misin? Hizmetçim olursun. Düşman başına, demiş Sofia. Kadın sormuş. Ne dedin? Düşman başına, dedim. Belediye reisi Sofia'ya bakmış, sonra karısını bir yana itmiş. Göğsünü şişirmiş güzelce. Bayan Millie'ye ne dedin, kız? Sofia bir kez daha söylemiş. Düşman başına, dedim. Belediye reisi yapıştırmış tokadı. (p. 73)
1.5	Mayor _____ bought Miz Millie a new car. (p. 89)	Belediye reisi Bayan Millie'ye bir otomobil aldı. (p. 84)
1.6	She was just on her way to town, I say. Stamps look like stamps round here. White man with long hair. Hm, she say, look like a little fat white woman was on one. What your sister Nettie like? she ast. Smart? (p. 101)	Bana kalırsa Nettie yalnız kasabaya kadar gidecekti, dedim. Bizim buranın pulları da hep bildiğin pullar. Üstlerinde uzun saçlı beyaz adamlar var. Hım, dedi. Benim gördüğüm pullardan birinde şişman bir beyaz kadın vardı gibime geliyor. Nasıl bir kızdır senin Nettie? Kafası çalışır mı? (p. 96)
	Oh, Celie, there are colored people in the world who want us to know! Want us to grow and see the light! They are not all mean	Ah Celie, bu dünyada bizlerin de öğrenim görmesini isteyen zenciler var! İlerleyip aydınlığa kavuşmamızı isteyenler de. Bütün zenciler babamla Albert gibi

⁵ The signs or phrases referring or alluding to oppression in the source and target texts are given in bold in Table1, Table 2, and Table 3 by the authors of this study.

1.7	like Pa and Albert, or beaten down like ma was. (p. 112)	hain, annemiz gibi ezilmiş insanlar değiller. (p. 108)
1.8	My spirits sort of drooped after being at the Society. On every wall there was a Picture of a white man. Somebody called Speke, somebody called Livingstone. Somebody called Daly. Or was it Stanley? I looked for a Picture of the white woman but didn't see one. (p. 115)	Dernekten çıkarken biraz sıkıldım. Duvarlarda hep beyazların resimleri asılıydı. Speke adında biri, Livingstone adında biri, Daly adında biri. Stanley miydi yoksa? Belki bir beyaz kadının da resmini görürüm diye bakındım ama hiç kadın resmi yoktu. (p. 111)
1.9	[...] once, a long time ago, one man in the village wanted more than his share of land to plant. [...] Because he was chief at the time, he gradually took more and more of the common land, and took more and more wives to work it. (pp. 129-130)	[...] bir zamanlar, hakkına düşenden daha fazla toprağı ekip biçmek isteyen bir adam çıkmış. [...] O dönemde köyün reisi olduğundan, köyün ortak topraklarından biraz daha fazlasına el koymuş her yıl. O toprakları ekip biçmeleri için bir sürü de karı almış. (p. 124)
1.10	They [students] are all boys. Olivia is the only girl. The Olinka do not believe girls should be educated. When I asked a mother why she thought this, she said: A girl is nothing to herself; only to her husband can she become something. [...] When I told her the Olinka don't believe in educating girls she said, quick as a flash, they are like white people at home who don't want colored people to learn. (p. 132-133)	Öğrencilerimizin hepsi erkek. Aralarındaki tek kız Olivia. Olinkalılar kızların öğrenim görmeleri gerektiğini kabul etmiyorlar. Bir anneye neden böyle düşündüğünü sordum. Kız dediğin tek başına hiçbir şey değildir, diye karşılık verdi. Ancak evlendikten sonra bir şey olabilir. [...] Olinkalıların kızlarını okutmak istemediklerini açıkladım. Amerika'daki beyazlar gibi, dedi hemen. Onlar da zencilerin okumasını istemezler. (p. 128)
1.11	Our women are respected here, said the father. We would never let them tramp the world as American women do. There is always someone to look after the Olinka woman. A father. An uncle. A brother or nephew. (p. 136)	Biz kadınlarımıza saygı duyarız, dedi baba. Onların Amerikalı kadınlar gibi dünyanın dört bucağına sürünmelerine asla izin vermeyiz. Olinka kadınına bakıp besleyecek biri bulunur her zaman. Bir baba. Bir amca. Bir ağabey ya da bir yeğen. (p. 132)
1.12	They [men] listen just long enough to issue instructions. They don't even look at women when women are speaking. They look at the ground and bend their heads toward the ground. The women also do not "look in a man's face" as they say. (p. 137)	Yalnızca bir karar ya da emir vermelerine yetecek kadar dinliyorlar kadınların sözlerini. Kadınlar konuşurken onların yüzlerine bile bakmıyorlar. Yere bakıyor, başlarını yere eğiyorlar. Kadınlar da 'erkeğin yüzüne' bakamazlarmış. (p. 133)
1.13	They [women] indulge their husbands, if anything. You should just see how they make admiration over them. Praise their smallest accomplishments. [...] especially since, among the Olinka, the husband has life and death power over the wife. If he accuses one of his wives of witchcraft or infidelity, she can be killed. (p. 141-142)	Kocalarına karşı davranışlarını 'suyuna gitmek diye tanımlamak en doğrusu. Adamları nasıl övdükleri görülecek şey. Erkeğin en küçük başarısını hayranlıkla karşılar gibi görünüyorlar. [...] Özellikle de, Olinkalar gibi, kadının canını erkeğin eline teslim eden toplumlarda. Bir Olinka erkeği karılarından herhangi birinin onu aldattığını ya da büyü yaptığını ileri sürer, böyle bir suçlamada bulunursa, o kadın öldürülebilir. (p. 137)
	The whole territory, including the Olinkas' village, now belongs to a rubber manufacturer in England. [...] Since the Olinka no longer own their village, they must pay rent for it, and in order to use	Olinka köyünün bulunduğu toprakları da içine alan koskoca bir bölge İngiltere'deki bir kauçuk fabrikatörünün malı olmuş artık. [...] Olinkalılar artık kendi köylerinin sahipleri olmadıklarına göre kira ödemeleri

1.14	the water, which also no longer belongs to them, they must pay a water tax. [...] and more mothers are sending their daughters to school. The men do not like it: who wants a wife who knows everything her husband knows? they fume. (pp. 144-145)	bekleniyormuş. Bir de başkasının malı olan suları kullandıklarına göre, bir su vergisi. [...] Okula gelen kız öğrencilerin de sayısı arttı. Anneleri gönderiyor onları. Erkekler homurdanıyorlar. Kocasının bildiği her şeyi bilen kızı kim alırmış karı diye! (pp. 139-141)
1.15	If you hadn't tried to rule over Sofia the white folks never would have caught her. (p. 170)	[...] ille de Sofia'ya söz dinleteceğim diye tutturmasaydın beyazların eline düşmezdi o kadın. (p. 166)
1.16	You ugly. You skinny. You shape funny. [...] All you fit to do in Memphis is be Shug's maid.[...] You black , you pore, you ugly, you a woman. [...] you nothing at all. (pp. 175-176)	Sen çirkinsin. Sıksasın. Kadın denecek yanın yok. Memphis'te olsa olsa Shug'ın hizmetçisi olursun sen. [...] Karasın , çirkinsin, yoksulsun, üstelik kadınsın. [...] Sen hiçsin, hiç. (p. 172)
1.17	She was born to a great wealth in England. Her father was Lord Somebody or Other. [...] she wanted to write books. Her family were against it. Totally. They hoped she'd marry. (p. 194)	İngiltere'de çok zengin bir ailenin kızı olarak doğmuş. Babası Lord Bilmem-kimmiş. [...] O kitap yazmak istiyormuş. Ailesi de buna karşıymış. Kesinlikle. Onlar kızlarını bir an önce evlendirmeyi umuyorlarmış. (p. 191)

While the phrase “wind up in some white lady kitchen” in 1.1 makes explicit reference to hierarchical race discrimination with the sign “white”, it implicitly refers to gender-based oppression limiting the woman’s place and position to a “kitchen”. While the “race category” has an effect on the character’s position in public in this context, it goes without saying that the gender of that oppressed individual intensifies the extent of oppression. A man with the same “race category” as the woman is not as restricted or oppressed as the latter one. Therefore, example 1.1 can safely be considered as a context alluding to gender-based oppression. As for the translation of multi-ethnic feminist signs in 1.1, the possibility modal verb “might” in the source text is translated as “zorunda kalma” (be obliged to), which renders the possibility in the source text as an obligation in the target text, thereby changing the feminist reading of the text for the target culture reader. This could be considered alteration of the meaning as the translator comes up with a false meaning for a significant modal verb while still carrying traces from the source text. This meaning transformation would lead the target culture reader to a misinterpretation that the woman of the “other” race must end up in the white race’s kitchens as maid while this is presented only as a possibility in the source text. In example 1.2, the sign “white people” might be considered to belong to race “category”, yet the deeper meaning of the context manifests itself considering the sign “take in [...] dirty clothes” which alludes to the position of women as laundry-doing people. No man of the same race is assigned the position of doing the laundry; on the contrary, the socially-constructed belief attributes this task to women. Therefore, while a combination of the “other” race and gender makes the character “oppressed”, as claimed by multi-ethnic feminism, gender exerts a more significant influence on the intensity of the oppression. The translation of 1.2 as “[a]nası da beyazların kirli çamaşırlarını yıkıyor hala” bears all the signs of oppression like “beyazlar” (white people), “kirli çamaşırlarını yıkıyor” (take in [...] dirty clothes) with the manifestation of the character’s gender “anası” (her mammy), which means that the multi-ethnic feminist signs in 1.2 are translated without meaning transformation.

In 1.3, the sign “gone” is the act performed by girls at home. It is a socially-constructed phenomenon that when girls grow up, they are the ones who have to leave home for marriage. In this context, the girls leave home due to the oppression they are exposed to in home-setting. While boys still stay at home for their contribution to the family budget or

their resistance against potential oppressions, girls are portrayed as too weak to confront and stand up to oppression. They are left with no option but leave home, making them the “other” even in the smallest unit of the society, home. The translation of the sign “gone” is given with the sign “evden kaçtılar” (eloped). While the sign “gone” refers to leaving home for any motive, “evden kaçmak” (eloping) implies saving yourself from any bad condition or threat by leaving home, which can be considered over-interpretation of the meaning, leading the target culture reader to imagine the bad conditions girls have been exposed to while this particular sign does not bear such implications in the source text.

The phrase “would you like to work for me, be my maid” is produced by a wealthy woman asking an economically disadvantaged woman from the “other” race to be her maid in 1.4. While this could be interpreted as a “race-based oppression” with its surface meaning, it is still evident that this context demarcates a woman’s place as the house. The oppression of the “other” gender is further manifested with the phrase “Mayor [...] push his wife out the way. Stick out his chest”, showing the white man stronger than both the white and black women before the public. This makes it obvious that while race and social status (like wealth) provide a socially-constructed “power” to an individual, gender is still of utmost importance in determining the distribution and extent of this power. In translations of the phrases in question in 1.4, “[b]enim evimde çalışmak ister misin? Hizmetçim olursun” refers to the house-bound position of women as in the source phrase “would you like to work for me, be my maid”. Moreover, the signs in the context “Belediye reisi [...] karısını bir yana itmiş. Göğsünü şişirmiş” refer to the mayor’s “pushing his wife out the way” (karısını bir yana itmiş) and his manifestation of his power “sticking out his chest” (göğsünü şişirmiş). Therefore, all signs bearing oppression on the “other gender” are preserved in the target text without any meaning transformation.

In 1.5, the male character Mayor is portrayed as the dominant and superior party while the female character Miz Millie is only an object of a white man’s greed to show his “hegemony” on the “other gender” buying a car for his wife. In this context, it is the male character who decides when his wife should own a car, as can be understood from the sentence “Mayor _____ bought Miz Millie a new car”. This context denotes that it is the males who work outside and therefore earn money to buy anything anytime they like, while females are the ones who should yield to the decisions of the male characters. This economic dependence of women on men is already a socially constructed phenomenon ascribing the workplace or governing positions to men while associating women with the household environment. In the Turkish translation of this context, the economic and social “hegemony” of the males is preserved with all signs in the sentence “[b]elediye reisi Bayan Millie’ye bir otomobil aldı” without any meaning transformations.

The sign “stamps” in 1.6 is significant as the portraits on the stamps always represent the great people for the country a stamp belongs to. “White man with long hair” in context 1.6 clearly shows that one of the greatest people in the country’s history is a man. Even if the female stereotype of “long hair” is deconstructed here as a feature belonging to a man, the long-held stereotype of history’s associating power with men is yet again reproduced in this context. The phrase “uzun saçlı beyaz adamlar” (White men with long hair) in Turkish translation refer to the plural form of “man”, ascribing power to a higher number of men, thereby resulting in the over-interpretation of male hegemony in the society. On the other hand, the sentence “a little fat white woman was on one” refers to the association of a woman with power through a woman’s portrait on one of the stamps. Yet, far from granting power to a woman, this context still shows the “otherness” of women even if they could be the power-holders as this woman on the stamp is “redundantly” depicted as “a little fat white woman” referring to the physical qualities of that woman. The Turkish translation of

the sign “a little fat white women” bears a meaning transformation with the expression “şişman bir beyaz kadın” (a fat white woman). The characterization of “a little fat” is under-interpreted in the Turkish translation with the omission of “a little”, directly emphasizing the physical qualities of the woman rather than showing her as a power-holder.

Context 1.7 refers to the overwhelmed position of women as compared to the oppressive forces of men with the sign “beaten down like ma”. While the male characters in this context are depicted as the oppressors with the sign “mean”, the female character “ma” is characterized by the sign “beaten down” alluding to the physically and mentally weak condition of a woman. This is one of the most striking and direct examples of men’s oppression over women in this novel. The males’ quality of “mean” is translated as “hain” while the woman’s quality of “beaten down” is translated as “ezilmiş”, preserving the oppressor-oppressed dichotomy. Therefore, the Turkish translation of this context yet again reproduces the patriarchal campaign that women are the beings to be oppressed and finally suppressed.

As in the sign of stamp portraits 1.6, the portraits on the walls are also significant signs since the people whose portraits are hung on the walls are generally, or always the great people in the current or historical politics of a society. The sentence “[o]n every wall there was a Picture of a white man” reproduces the historically attributed role of men as the governors. This is further emphasized with the sentence “I looked for a Picture of the white woman but didn’t see one” alluding to the supposed negligibility of women in a society’s past or present in 1.8. The patriarchal assumption of “men as the sole power-holders” is reproduced in this context. When it comes to the Turkish translation, the sentence “[d]uvarlarda hep beyazların resimleri asılıydı” ([o]n every wall there was a picture of the whites) wipes out the sign “man” and alludes to hierarchical race-based oppression rather than gender-based oppression in opposition to the source text, which reproduces the latter type of oppression. However, this cannot be considered wiping out of the meaning just because one significant sign is omitted from the sentence. From a broader, but at the same time deeper reflection on the translated sentence, this could be considered under-interpretation of the meaning since the “wholeness of information is not projected, providing an insufficient meaning in the source text” (Öztürk Kasar, 2021, p. 30).

In 1.9, a man’s taking “more and more wives to work” on the land implies the free choice of men to get married to as many women as they like. Moreover, the use of the verb “take” further implies the dependent nature of women on men since women are considered objects to men. What’s more, the use of “more and more wives” clearly points to the continuation and gradual expansion of male hegemony over females since this sign implies that there is no restriction to the free choice of men to literally “employ” wives to make them work on the lands. The patriarchy-driven sign “took more and more women” is translated as “bir sürü karı almış” (took a lot of wives), preserving the object position of women with the use of the verb “almış” (took) yet altering the meaning of the significant sign “more and more” as “bir sürü” (a lot of). Though the translated context still shows the free choice of men to “take” as many wives as they like, rendering women only as the agreeing parties in a marital relationship, the sustainability of the malpractice of a man’s getting married to new women all the time without any age limit is not preserved in the target language. Though the target context bears some traces from the source context, a false meaning was produced in the target text, resulting in alteration of meaning.

While the sentence “[t]he Olinka do not believe girls should be educated” in 1.10 reproduces the long-held conception that schools are not for girls due to the social roles attributed to women, the sentence “[a] girl is nothing to herself; only to her husband can she become

something” shows women as dependent beings and demarcates their roles to serve a husband. Women are traditionally restricted to the role of servants for their husbands, and this misbelief is reproduced in this context. This patriarchal misbelief is translated as “[a]ncak evlendikten sonra bir şey olabilir” (only after marriage can she become something), preserving the socially constructed dependent nature of women yet darkening the meaning with the wiping-out of the sign “husband”. While the source text attributes women the role of servants for their husbands, the target text enlarges their servant roles to the whole household after marriage. A clear sign restricting the women is rendered with an ambiguous meaning in the target text, which leads the target text reader to ambiguity of for whom women should be the servants after marriage.

The pronoun “we” refers to men while “them” refers to women” in the sentence “[w]e would never let them tramp the world as American women do” in 1.11. This context shows men as the sole authorities while women are totally dependent on men. Unless permitted by their male counterparts, women can on no account leave their home. This context seems to reproduce the socially-assigned roles to men and women. Further, the sentence “[t]here is always someone to look after the Olinka woman. A father. An uncle. A brother or nephew” reinforces the socially constructed power of men and the need of the women to be cared for by those “strong beings”. Women are portrayed as weak beings who always need the shelter of men in this context. Those powerful beings are counted as a “father, uncle, brother, or nephew”, each of them belonging to the male “category”. In translation of this context, the sign “nephew” is rendered as “yeğen” in Turkish. While English language contains gender-specific nouns like niece or nephew for the daughters or sons of our siblings respectively, this kinship bond is addressed through a gender-neutral noun “yeğen” in Turkish. While the dynamics of the target language might have forced the translator to resort to a meaning transformation, it is beyond doubt that the under-interpretation of meaning has, deliberately or indeliberately, destructed a patriarchal sign even if all others are preserved. As the gender of the last person to shelter a woman is not specified in the target text, this could be considered under-interpretation of the meaning, not projecting the wholeness of the patriarchal assumption.

In 1.12, men’s listening to women only “to issue instructions” renders women “the other” and “objects”. Women are placed in the secondary position, not taken seriously for their ideas and views. This also implies the authority of men as the ones who have a say in everything, unlike women who do not have a say even on their own issues. In the target text, this secondary position of women is transformed in meaning as “[y]alnızca bir karar ya da emir vermelerine yetecek kadar dinliyorlar kadınların sözlerini” (They [men] listen just long enough to make decisions or issue instructions). In this target context, the sign “karar vermek” (make a decision) frees women from the secondary position and incorporates them into the decision-making process, as opposed to the context in the source context. While the addition of a non-existent sign could be considered over-interpretation of meaning based on Öztürk Kasar’s (2021) “systematics of designification”, the feminist reading of the context yields this meaning transformation as opposition of the meaning since women are portrayed contrary to the situation they are located in the source text.

The context in 1.13 downsizes the role of women to appreciating anything their husbands perform while men do not need to do such a thing for their wives. Even worse than that, the sentence “the husband has life and death power over the wife” reveals that it is the men who should decide on any activity or condition of women. This patriarchy-driven malpractice strips women off any decision for themselves, let alone for their households.

All signs pointing to the absolute authority of men over women are preserved in the target text, thereby reproducing the patriarchal values.

In 1.14, the sentence “Olinkas’ village, now belongs to a rubber manufacturer in England”, translated as “Olinka köyünün bulunduğu topraklar [...] İngiltere’deki bir kauçuk fabrikatörünün malı olmuş artık” without any meaning transformation in the target text, points to Olinka’s residents’ “otherness” based on economic hierarchy. In this sense, while the rubber manufacturer from England is the economic oppressor here, the Olinkas are the oppressed party in view of the hierarchical categorization system in that the latter “must pay a water tax” to the former one. The Olinkas’ obligation to “pay a water tax” for the water they formerly used as their own is translated as “bir su vergisi”, pointing to the oppression on Olinkas without any meaning transformation. Hierarchically driven economic status category is reproduced both in the source and target texts. While all residents of Olinka village are placed in the “other” category economically, the sentence “[t]he men do not like it: who wants a wife who knows everything her husband knows” further makes women the outermost category since it is the men in Olinka who decide on the education of women. This context suffices to show that among all discriminative factors, it is gender that plays the greatest role. The women of an oppressed group are far more oppressed than the men in the same group. In the translated text, the sentence “[k]ocasının bildiği her şeyi bilen kızı kim alırmış karı diye” (who would take a girl as a wife who knows everything her husband knows) takes the “otherness” of women to a level more severe than the case in the source text. The use of the verb “alırmış” (would take) shows women as the object of men. Moreover, the use of the sign “kız” (girl), non-existent in the source text, is added by the translator to refer to the young age of females in marriage, implying the lesser “status” of older females in comparison to younger ones for marriage, and intensifying the feeling of “otherness” based on the age of women. This could be considered over-interpretation of the meaning since the “otherness” of women is intensified with the translators’ choice of addition of new signs to reproduce the patriarchal system.

In 1.15, the female character Sofia is oppressed not only due to her race (as can be understood from the expression “the white folks never would have caught her”) but also on account of her gender now that her husband “tried to rule over Sofia”. In the novel, her husband tries to rule over Sofia only because his father and other men around do so. Therefore, what makes the female character vulnerable to oppression stems from the socially-constructed expectation that men should rule over women. In the translated text, the sign “tutturmak” (insist upon) in the expression “ille de Sofia’ya söz dinleteceğim diye tutturmasaydın” (If you hadn’t insisted upon ruling over Sofia) could be considered a more intense activity of “trying to rule over”. While “trying to rule over someone” should refer to the attempts to take someone under your own control, “insisting upon ruling over someone” refers to the more energetic and uninterrupted endeavors to be able to rule over that person. Therefore, the meaning transformation in translation of this context could be shown as an example for over-interpretation of the meaning, with the oppression of a woman by a man intensified with the use of a verb referring to a harsher treatment of women.

In 1.16, the signs “[y]ou ugly. You skinny [...] You black” are used to define a person lacking the socially expected physical properties of a person. These signs clearly show the variety of hierarchical categorizations multi-ethnic feminism attacks. The devaluing features directed to a person in this context indeed imply the hierarchical superiority of the physical attractive and the white. Therefore, those people lacking such features are portrayed as deserving humiliation. However, the most recent sign of humiliation in this context is “you a woman”, which refers to the *o(u)t[h]ermost* status of women stemming from the gender factor playing the most prominent role among all “otherizing” factors. While all the signs

(ugly, skinny, black, and women) in this context are used to denote the hierarchical “inferiority” of a person bearing all those properties, the recency effect points to the gender factor as the utmost prevailing factor. This clearly indicates that a woman and man possessing the former three traits in this context (ugly, skinny, and black) are not discriminated equally, on the contrary, it is the women discriminated more severely. This exemplifies the multi-ethnic feminist discourse that women must first struggle to achieve the standards the oppressed men do have, and it is only after they have acquired those standards of men that they could proceed to climb the ladder in the hierarchical categories of physical appearance, economic, or social status. This emphasis on the gender factor through the recency effect in the source text is further emphasized and made apparent with the addition of the sign “üstelik” (not only that) in the target text. The implicit emphasis on the primary role of gender in the interplay of all otherizing factors through a literary technique in the source text is made more explicit with a significant sign in the target text; therefore, this meaning transformation can be considered over-interpretation of the meaning. Target text readers are made to accept gender as the most crucial hierarchical factor, thereby reproducing the belief long ingrained in patriarchal societies.

The character in 1.17, born to a rich family in a developed country could be expected to be in one of the highest ladders of hierarchical categorization system economy and status-wise. However, “[h]er family’s [being] against” her wish “to write books” is another indication of gender being the ultimate determinant factor in the social status of a person. Her family rejects this undertaking only because of her gender, and their only wish is to see her get married to a man as can be understood from the sentence “[t]hey hoped she’d marry”. What falls to a woman of age in patriarchy is getting married, which is reproduced in the source text clearly. In the analysis to see to what extent this patriarchal discourse is reproduced in the target text, it can be seen that the addition of the sign “bir an önce” (in no time – [meaning as soon as possible]) makes the patriarchal discourse more severe referring to the marriage of a woman irrespective of her age or wishes. Therefore, the patriarchal values are more openly directed to the target text reader through over-interpretation of meaning. Moreover, the sentence “they hoped she’d marry” is translated as “onlar kızlarımı [...] evlendirmeyi umuyorlarmış” (they hoped to marry her). While the context in the source text gives freedom to the female character in her marriage in terms of time and spouse, the context in the target text restricts the character with the allocation of all decisions to the family. “Evlendirmeyi umuyorlarmış” (hoped to marry her) shows the female character as the object of all decisions taken by the family as is the case in patriarchal societies, in which women are expected to marry the person the family chooses at a time the family considers appropriate for their daughter. The meaning transformation here can be considered alteration of the meaning since the target text context bears the feminist signs in the source text yet comes up with a false meaning for the sign “marry”, which ends up with a more severe practice of discrimination against women in marriage.

Taken together, the 17 contexts from the source text all point to the oppression or otherness of characters based on gender as the principal factor. Besides other hierarchical factors like economic or social status, race, or education level, it is gender that exerts the most significant influence on discrimination against certain characters. While the multi-ethnic feminist signs in those contexts are generally preserved in the target text, the patriarchal values are occasionally reproduced more severely through certain meaning transformations, intensifying the feminist reading of the novel for the target text reader.

Hierarchical race-based oppression

Apart from gender-based oppression, the characters in the novel are also oppressed merely on account of their race, which does not assign any natural advantages or disadvantages to a person, but solely socially constructed stereotypes. Table 2 demonstrates the signs and contexts with the type of oppression associated with one's race among all other "factors" together with their translations to discuss how these signs and contexts are preserved or transformed meaning-wise in the target text.

Table 2. Hierarchical race-based oppression on the "other"

	Source Text (Walker, 1983)	Target Text (Walker, 1984a)
2.1	She shrug. She busy looking at a magazine. White women in it laughing, holding they beads out on one fingee, dancing on top of motocars. Jumping into fountains. She flip the pages. (p. 46)	Omuz silkti. Dergi karıştırıyor. Beyaz kadınların resimleri var dergide. Otomobillerin üstünde duruyorlar, boyunlarındaki uzun boncukları parmaklarına takıp çekiyorlar. Çeşmelerin havuzlarına atlıyorlar. Shug sayfaları çeviriyor habire. (p. 44)
2.2	God all white too, looking like some stout white man work at the bank. (p. 80)	Tanrı da bembeyaz. Bankada çalışan şişman beyazlara benziyor. (p. 77)
2.3	Squeak sing, They calls me yellow like yellow be my name They calls me yellow like yellow be my name But if yellow is a name Why ain't black the same Well, if I say Hey black girl Lord, she try to ruin my game (p. 85)	Gıcır şarkı söylüyor. Kara kız derler bana, Kara adımmış gibi Kara kız derler bana... (p. 82)
2.4	Too many to kill off, I say. Us outnumbered from the start. I speck we knock over one or two, though, here and there, through the years, I say. (p. 87)	Sayıları çok da ondan, dedim. Beyazlar bizden çok daha fazla. Ama arada sırada bir ikisini temizlemeyi becermişiz. (p. 82)
2.5	Well, I say, us don't have to wonder that bout darkies. (p. 88)	Eh, dedim, zencilerin neden dünyaya geldiklerini sormaya gerek yok hiç değilse. (p. 84)
2.6	That's the problem, she say. Have you ever seen a white person and a coloured sitting side by side in a car, when one of 'em wasn't showing the other one how to drive it or clean it? (p. 90)	Evet, sorun da o ya! Bir beyazla bir zencinin herhangi bir otomobilde yan yana oturduklarını gördün mü hiç? Bir iş ya da ders yapıyor olsak başka ama gezmeye giderken hiç olmaz. (p. 86)
2.7	Oh, she say, I couldn't ride in a pick-up with a strange colored man. (p. 92)	A yoo, dedi. Tanımadığım bir zencinin kamyonetine binmem. Hem de erkek. (p. 87)
	It is the pictures in the Bible that fool you. The pictures that illustrate the words. All of the people are White and so you just think all the people from the Bible were white too. But really white white people lived somewhere else during those times.....What can I tell you about New York- or even about the train that took us there! We had tor ide in the sit-down section of the train, but Celie, there are beds on trains! And a restaurant! And toilets! The	İncil'deki resimler aldatıyor bizi. Sözleri açıklaması beklenen resimler. Sözleri açıklaması beklenen resimler. O resimlerde herkes beyaz. Dolayısıyla, İncil'deki herkesin de beyaz olduğunu düşünüyor insan. Oysa aslını ararsan, o çağlarda beyazlar dünyanın başka yerlerinde yaşarlarmış.Sana New York'u nasıl anlatsam! New York'u bırak, oraya giderken bindiğimiz treni anlatmak bile kolay değil. Biz oturarak yolculuk ettik ama o trende

2.8	beds come down out of the walls, over the tops of the seats, and are called berths. Only White people can ride in the beds and use the restaurant. And they have different toilets from colored. (p. 113)	yataklar vardı! Bir de lokanta! Hatta tuvaletler. Yataklar duvardan çıkıyor. Yataklı vagonlarda yalnız beyazlar yatabiliyor, lokantada yalnız onlar yemek yiyebiliyor. Zencilerle beyazların tuvaletleri de ayrı. (p. 109)
2.9	They know many things, and I think will not find American society such a shock, except for the hatred of black people, which is also very clear in all the news. (p. 218)	[...] zencilere duyulan nefret onları çok sarsabilir. Hemen her gazetede bununla ilgili bir haber çıktığından, o nefretin varlığından da habersiz değiller. (p. 215)
2.10	Some colored people so scared of white folks they claim to love the cotton gin. (p. 225)	Zencilerin bazıları beyazlardan öylesine korkar ki pamuk çapalamaya bayıldıklarını bile söyleyebilirler. (p. 222)
2.11	White people busy celebrating they independence from England July 4 th , say Harpo, so most black folks don't have to work. (p. 243)	Beyazlar, diyor Harpo, İngilizlerin boyunduruğundan kurtulunca bu günü egemenlik bayramı olarak seçmişler. Onlar bayramlarını kutluyorlar, zenciler de bugün çalışmaktan kurtulmuş oluyorlar. (p. 239)

Related to example 2.1, in the source text the character called Shug Avery is looking at a magazine in which “white women” are shown “laughing” and “dancing” on cars and holding beads out. The magazine photo described in these lines is a common scene that is included in the popular magazines generally directed to women readers, and in this sense, it can be considered as a race-based interpretation in the source text: White women are having joy, or they are in comfort, a typical scene, mostly attributed to white women, depicted in popular magazines. Two levels of meaning transformation can be observed in the translation of this context, the first being wiping out of the sign “laughing” and the second being under-interpretation of the sign “dancing” on top of cars. In the target text, the fact that the white women in the magazine are “laughing” as a representation of joy, happiness and comfort is omitted in the translation, so this sign is missing for the target text readers. A certain degree of under-interpretation of the meaning is also observed due to the translation of “dancing” as “duruyorlar”. The wholeness of the scene depicted in the source text is provided with an insufficient meaning for the target text readers with the transformation of the meaning in the phrase “dancing on the motcars”, which represents joy and happiness of the white women and action as in “duruyorlar” (standing on the cars).

Example 2.2 can be interpreted as an example of a race-based discrimination because God is reflected as possessing a race-based feature- being “all white”- and also God is likened to the “white man” who is stout and works at a bank. Therefore, it can be interpreted that the source text includes race-based discrimination leading to the oppression of “others” who are female and non-white because according to the source text the God is “all-white” and “male”. Although the sign related to the God’s being “white” is reflected in the target text, the other sign comparing the God with the stout “man” working at the bank is omitted leading to wiping-out of the meaning for Turkish readers.

Another race-based discrimination is observed in example 2.3. In the source text, based on the lyrics of the song sang by the character called Squeak, the author obviously puts forward a sort of criticism concerning race-based prejudice towards the color of people’s skin. The lyrics make it clear that black and yellow are both names of colors and they deserve to be considered equal. Yet, the use of the color “black” includes a race-based oppression, which makes it different from the color “yellow”. Thus, the lyrics aim at questioning why yellow and black are not accepted equal and why calling a “black girl” poses a problem whereas referring to a girl as yellow does not. The author depicts that

black is actually more than the name of a color, it symbolizes a race-based prejudice. This comparison of the two colors to criticize the race-based symbols attached to the color black cannot be observed in the target text as it is omitted in the translation. The Turkish translation only reveals the theme “black” and the fact that the girl is called the “black girl”, thereby wiping out the author’s questioning related to why the use of the color “black” possesses a race-based connotation whereas the color “yellow” does not and why these two colors cannot be accepted equal.

Another race-based oppression is observed in the main character Celie’s letter to God in context 2.4. Celie states in her letter that the white have always been the majority, outnumbering the black from the very beginning (Us outnumbered from the start). These lines reflecting a race-based oppression in the form of the words of a member belonging to “the other” group are translated as “Beyazlar bizden çok daha fazla” preserving the sign of race-based oppression in a sufficient way, thus; no meaning transformation is observed in the target text. In 2.5, the main character Celie’s remarks concerning the unnecessary of questioning why the “darkies” are ever born as a response to another character Sofia’s comment on the existence of the little daughter of Miss Millie can be considered as a sign of a race-based oppression, as well. According to Celie, there is no point in questioning the existence of “blacks”. This sign representing the “so-called valuelessness” of “the darkies” is reflected in the Turkish translation as “zencilerin neden dünyaya geldiklerini sormaya gerek yok hiç değilse”, rendering it without any meaning transformation. In Example 2.6, a comparison between the social position of white and black in society is depicted in the comments of Celie (Have you ever seen a white person and a colored sitting side by side in a car). Celie thinks that a white and a colored can only sit next to each other in cases of necessity or obligation, e.g. for work, when a white person is in need of a black person. The Turkish translation preserves the context created in the source text as a sign of social inequality (Bir beyazla bir zencinin herhangi bir otomobilde yan yana oturduklarını gördün mü hiç?), so no meaning transformation can be reported for the Turkish readers of this context.

Example 2.7 shows another race-based oppression with the following line: “I couldn’t ride in a pick-up with a strange colored man”. The color of Odessa’s husband Jack is described as strange by “the white lady” Miss Millie, who declares that she cannot travel with a strange colored man even though she is the one who is in need of urgent help. She is offered to be driven by Jack, but she refuses the offer because of the color of the man. In this context, a race-based discrimination is created with the words of the white lady. In the Turkish translation of this utterance (Tanımadığım bir zencinin kamyonetine binmem. Hem de erkek) over-interpretation as an instance of designification is observed specifically with the addition of the sign “hem de” (even/what’s more). The source text does not include such an emphasis on the fact that the driver is a man, yet; the related utterance is translated with a strong emphasis on the driver’s gender as “hem de erkek”, thereby ruling out gender as an oppressive factor when race is in play for discrimination contrary to the cases in hierarchical gender-based oppression contexts in Table 1.

Example 2.8 is taken from the letter of Celie’s sister Nettie. Nettie believes that the social inequality between black and white people as a form of race-based discrimination arises from the pictures in the Bible. As to Nettie, the pictures of the Bible create the misunderstanding that all the people in the Bible are white, although content of the Bible does not say so. This context is reflected without any meaning transformation in Turkish translation. Example 2.8 also very clearly depicts the fact that social order brings about certain advantages for the ones who are stronger and drawbacks for those who are oppressed. Inequality between black and white people in the USA is reflected in the letter

of Nettie who is amazed by her experience in New York. The train to New York is one of the things that make her surprised a lot. While sharing her experience in the train, she reveals that white people are the privileged ones who can make use of the restaurants and the beds on the train. The social inequality can be seen even in the use of the toilets. Black and white people cannot use the same toilets in the train. This sign of inequality is preserved in the Turkish translation as “Yataklı vagonlarda yalnız beyazlar yatabiliyor, lokantada yalnız onlar yemek yiyebiliyor. Zencilerle beyazların tuvaletleri de ayrı”. Therefore, the signs in example 2.8 showing race-based discrimination in the source text are preserved in the target text.

In 2.9, the race-based discrimination in American society is expressed with a focus on the term “hatred of the black people” and this hatred can widely be seen, even “all the news” talk about this hatred very clearly. Although the focus on the wideness of the hatred of the black in the news is explicit with the use of “in all the news” in the source text, this sign is under-interpreted with the use of “hemen her gazetede” (almost in all the news) in the target text. This can be considered as an instance of under-interpretation of the meaning as the translator produces an insufficient meaning in the target text, not projecting the wholeness of information and severity of the discrimination provided in the source text.

Another race-based interpretation is obvious in the lines belonging to Sofia, the (ex-)wife of Harpo in 2.10. Sofia expresses that some of the colored people are so afraid of the white people that they even claim to love “ginning the cotton” and this way makes the weak, lower position of the black in society. This sign representing the fear of the black resulting from their weakness towards the white is reflected as “Zencilerin bazıları beyazlardan öylesine korkar ki...” in the target text. As the wholeness of meaning of the discriminative signs is created in the Turkish translation, there appears no meaning transformations.

In 2.11, the conversation between Henrietta and Harpo about July the 4th depicts another race-based oppression. In these lines, Henrietta complains about having family reunion on July the 4th, the day on which “white people celebrate their independence” from England. Harpo states since July the 4th is the holiday of the white, they make use of the day and celebrate each other in the family reunion. In other words, black people don’t have to work only when white people don’t have to work. This sign of race-based oppression is translated as “Beyazlar, diyor Harpo, İngilizlerin boyunduruğundan kurtulunca bu günü egemenlik bayramı olarak seçmişler. Onlar bayramlarını kutluyorlar, zenciler de bugün çalışmaktan kurtulmuş oluyorlar.”. This context in the target text reproduces a sufficient context for the Turkish readers of the text to grasp the meaning and symbol of July the 4th both for black and white people, so there is no transformation of meaning in the translation of the discriminative signs in context 2.11.

As a result, the contexts in Table 2 refer to the socially constructed discriminative factor of “race”. While nature does not provide any race with advantages over the other(s), patriarchally driven society produces “man”-made advantages for a certain race. In this sense, patriarchy is not only concerned with the continuation of naturally groundless privileges of males, but it aims for the sustainability of any type of inequality, thereby passing down the long-held “privileges” of certain groups over others to the next generations. Despite occasional meaning transformations, the target text tends to preserve all race-based discriminative signs or clusters of signs, whereby reproducing the patriarchal system in another culture, which shows that patriarchy is the prevailing system across cultures, easy to spot and reproduce in one’s own language and culture.

Hierarchical social norms-based oppression

The multi-ethnic feminism suggests that women and men experience various types of privilege or subordination based on their race or social class. In Collins' terms (2014, p. 45), "intersecting oppressions of race, class, and gender" generally bring about discrimination against women especially in the labor market, and oppression is based on a combination of socially constructed categories. In addition to the oppression of women by patriarchy in general, women are located in the "other" spectrum due to their race and social class more than men. Social norm or social order may lead to certain drawbacks for the ones situated at the oppressed end of the spectrum. Yet the same norms or order may provide advantages for those located at the top of the hierarchy spectrum. Table 3 presents the signs and contexts referring to social norms-based oppression in the novel together with a comparison of the translations of these signs in the target text.

Table 3. Hierarchical social norms-based oppression on the "other"

	Source Text (Walker, 1983)	Target Text (Walker, 1984a)
3.1	I can't let you have Nettie. She too young. Don't know nothing but what you tell her. Sides, I want her to git some more schooling. Make a school teacher out of her. But I can let you have Celie. She the oldest anyway. She ought to marry first. She ain't fresh tho, but I spect you know that. She spoiled. Twice. (p. 9)	Nettie'yi veremem, o daha çok küçük. Ayrıca biraz daha okusun istiyorum. Öğretmen yapacağım onu. Ama istersen Celie'yi alabilirsin. En büyükleri odur zaten. Önce onun kocaya gitmesi gerekir. Kız değildir gerçi. Birileri becerdi onu. İki kere hem de. (pp. 9-10)
3.2	Even the preacher got his mouth on Shug Avery, now she down. He take her condition for his text. He don't call no name, but he don't have to. Everybody know who he mean. He talk bout a strumpet in short skirts, smoking cigarettes, drinking gin. Singing for money and talking other women mens. Talk bout slut, hussy, heifer and streetcleaner. (p. 40)	Düşene vurulmaz demişler ama, papazımız bile Shug Avery'yi diline doladı geçende. Vaazda onu konuştu hep. Gerçi adını vermedi ama vermesine de gerek yoktu. Kimden söz ettiğini bilmeyen mi var? Kısa etekle gezen şıfıntılar dedi. Sigara içerler, içki içerler, namuslu kadınların kocalarını ayartırlar. Para kazanmak için uygunsuz yerlerde şarkı söylerler. Utanmaz arlanmazlar. Şıllıklar. Sokak sürpüntüleri. (p. 38)
3.3	He love looking at Shug. I love looking at Shug. But Shug don't love looking at but one of us. Him. But that the way it spose to be. I know that. But if that so, why my heart hurt me so? (p. 64)	Bizimki Shug'a bakmaya bayılıyor. Ben de öyle. Ama Shug yalnızca birimize bakmaktan hoşlanıyor. Ona. Dünyanın düzeni böyle kurulmuş. Doğrusu öyle. Biliyorum. Dünyanın düzenin böyleyse neden yüreğim sızlıyor peki? (p. 62)
3.4	When we got to New York we were tired and dirty. But so excited! Listen, Celie, New York is a beautiful city. And colored own a whole section of it, called Harlem. There are colored people in more fancy motor cars than I thought existed, and living in houses that are finer than any White person's houses down home. (p. 114)	New York'a indiğimizde yorgunduk, kir pas içindeydik. Yine de çok heyecanlıydık. New York eşi bulunmaz bir kent, Celie! Koskoca bir semti de zencilerin mülküymüş. Oraya Harlem diyorlar. Süslü püslü otomobillerle gezen zenciler var burada. Bizim orada, beyazların bile oturamadıkları güpgüzel evlerde oturanları var. (p. 110)
3.5	[...] they don't own the cacao fields, Celie, even the president Tubman doesn't own them. People in a place called Holland do. The people who make Dutch chocolate. And there are overseers who make sure the people work hard, who live in stone houses in the corners of the fields. (p. 120)	[...] Celie, kakao bahçeleri o insanların kendi malı da değil. Cumhurbaşkanı Tubman'ın malı bile değil. Kakao ağaçlarının sahipleri Hollanda denen bir yerde oturuyorlar. Hollanda çukulasını yapanlar onlar. Afrika'da, 'yerlilerin' gerektiği gibi çalışıp çalışmadıklarını denetleyen kahyaları var. (p. 116)
	[T]hose eight and over are already workers in the fields. In order to pay rent for the	[S]ekiz yaşını aşanlar kauçuk bahçelerinde çalışmaya gidiyorlar. Barakaların kirasını,

3.6	barracks, taxes on the land, and to buy water and wood and food, everyone must work. (p. 205)	toprak vergisi ödemek, su, yiyecek ve odun alabilecek parayı denkleştirmek için herkes çalışmak zorunda. (p. 203)
3.7	In plowing under the Olinka's yam crop and substituting canned and powdered goods, the planters destroyed what makes them resistant to malaria. (p. 217)	Beyazlar Olinkalıların tatlı patates tarlalarını söküp, halkı o patateslerin yerine konserve yiyeceklerle beslenmek zorunda bıraktıklarında, bu insanlarda malaryaya karşı direnç sağlayan temel maddeyi yok etmiş oldular. (p. 214)
3.8	Sofia and Harpo always try to set me up with some man. They know I love Shug but they think womens love just by accident. (p. 221)	Sofia'yla Harpo da bana bir erkek ayarlamak peşindeler. Shug'ı sevdiğimi biliyorlar ama kadınların arasındaki sevgi rastgele ortaya çıkan bir şey sanıyorlar galiba. (p. 218)
3.9	Men and women not suppose to wear the same thing, he said. Men sponse to wear the pants. (p. 230)	Kadınlarla erkeklerin aynı şeyi giymeleri yakışık almaz, dedi. Pantolonu erkek giyer benim bildiğim. (p. 226)

In example 3.1, a socially constructed phenomenon that elder girls “ought to” marry earlier than younger ones is reflected. Moreover, the one who decides who will marry when is the patriarch in the family most of the time, that is the father, and the girl’s thoughts or feelings are not taken into consideration. Girls are left with no option but marry, and this puts them in the position of the “other” in the family. This sign of the social norms-based oppression is translated as “[ö]nce onun kocaya gitmesi gerekir” in the target text. The translation of the sign “marry” is reflected with the sign “kocaya gitmek” (to go to her husband’s home), which can be considered as an example of an over-interpretation of the meaning. “Kocaya gitmek” possesses a negative connotation with the implication of the lower and weaker position of women in the target text. The one to leave home and settle in a new place is the female in this connection. While the verb “marry” denotes the action of both parties to settle to form a family, for the Turkish readers of the text this sign is transformed meaning-wise and over-interpreted with the meaning of “eloping”.

Example 3.2 indicates a social norms-based oppression due to the negative comments of the preacher about Shug Avery. In this context, the preacher describes certain motives of Shug Avery, addressing her without directly giving her name, in a negative tone using insulting words. As to the preacher, Avery is a strumpet and what makes her a strumpet is the fact that she wears short skirts, smokes, and drinks gin. She also sings for money and talks with the men of other women. The social norms-based oppression arises from the fact that although women are easily labelled in a negative way due to their dressing, their preference for taking alcohol or smoking and their way of communicating with the other sex, generally men are not labelled negatively for these types of motives in society. In the target text, the lines specifically referring to these descriptions “[s]inging for money and talking other women mens” are translated with an over-interpretation. Even though the source text only reveals the fact that “strumpets sing for money”, in the target text the translator makes an addition of “uygunsuz yerlerde” (at inappropriate places), this way over-emphasizing the inconvenience of the places where strumpets sing. Besides, the fact that strumpets talk with other women’s men in the source text is translated as “namuslu kadınların kocalarını ayartırlar” with an addition of the adjective “namuslu” (honorable) attributing a positive connotation for the women “married to” the men strumpets talk to, thereby also creating a meaning dichotomy observed in the target culture as honorable (namuslu) vs. dishonorable (namussuz) (married women are honorable whereas strumbets are dishonorable). The addition of these signs reinforces the negative implications of a strumpet for the target text readers and creates interpretations that do not exist in the source text.

Example 3.3 indicates social norms-based oppression with the comment of Shug on the social order of the society. In this context, Celie, Albert-husband of Shug- and his big love Shug are together. Shug has just started to live with Albert and Celie in their house. In this context, Albert and Shug are looking at each other, and Celie's existence means nothing to them. The fact that Celie accepts being kept in such a position despite being the wife of Albert puts Celie in the position of the oppressed "other". This inferior position symbolized by Celie is mostly attributed to women, not men, in society. The utterance showing this social norms-based oppression in the source text (But that the way it spose to be. I know that) is translated as "Dünyanın düzeni böyle kurulmuş. Doğrusu öyle. Biliyorum" preserving the discriminative signs, so no meaning transformation is present in this context.

Example 3.4 is a part from the letter of Nettie to Celie. She shares her experience of the New York travel with Celie and how deeply she was affected from New York, especially from Harlem as the center for the colored in the USA. Actually, Nettie is aware of the fact that Harlem is the place where the colored live in the USA, and they lead a comfortable and nice life there, which is not the case for those living back home like them. Moreover, Nettie symbolizes an intelligent and curious girl in the novel. She likes to read a lot and is eager to learn. Example 3.4 involves a point of comparison by Nettie concerning the lifestyles of the black in Harlem with the use of the utterance "than I thought existed". As a result, this sign of comparison shows that the living conditions of the colored in Harlem are way better than Celie has thought (has read and learnt). However, the sign showing the comparison in Nettie's mind is not reflected in the translation. As this sign is wiped out, Turkish readers of the novel would understand that Nettie has not been familiar with the living conditions of the colored in other parts of the world, and this sign supporting the fact that Nettie is the clever and curious girl in the novel is absent for the Turkish readers due to wiping out of the meaning.

Example 3.5 shows another social norms-based oppression related to the position of blacks in society in terms of economic issues. In this part Nettie writes to Celie about her observations in Monrovia, Senegal. Nettie has visited one of the cocoa plantations owned by the Dutch there. In these plantations, the native black people work for the Dutch land owners, and they are checked by the overseers to "make sure" that those native people work properly in the fields. As is revealed in the text, these overseers live in stone houses in the corners of the field, which means that they live in better conditions than blacks who work in the fields. This description related to where the overseers live can be interpreted as a sign emphasizing the social norms-based discrimination in Senegal, Africa. Nonetheless, this discriminative sign is not reflected in the Turkish translation. The sign supporting the position of blacks as opposed to whites even in their homeland where the lands are owned by the Dutch and the performance of blacks as field workers are watched out by the servants working for the Dutch and living in better conditions than the native citizens of the country is omitted leading to wiping out of the meaning.

Example 3.6 is taken from one other letter of Nettie in which she shares her experience in Africa with Celie. While revealing what her responsibility as a missionary in Africa is, Nettie gives information about the social order of working in Africa. Children at the age of six and over are obliged to work there because for the African to pay rents and taxes and to survive, everyone in the society-including the children over eight- has to work. This sign is preserved in Turkish translation as "sekiz yaşını aşanlar kauçuk bahçelerinde çalışmaya gidiyorlar" and no meaning transformation is observed in this example of social norms-based oppression.

In 3.7, another social norms-based oppression is observed. In this example, people who live in Olinka where Nettie performs her task as a missionary, are reflected in an oppressed and inferior position. Malaria is a deadly disease in Olinka and the production of yam food that has traditionally been used as a treatment for malaria has been stopped by the planters. Instead of yam crop harvest, planters have made the people in Olinka get used to consuming canned and powdered goods, which are not effective in treating this severe disease. The replacement of a yam crop as an important and necessary food in Olinka with canned and powdered goods by the planters can be interpreted as an example of social norms-based oppression on the part of the native people of Olinka. The agents of the oppression are mentioned as “planters” in the source text, which is defined as “someone who grows a particular crop in a hot part of the world” in Cambridge Dictionary⁶. Although the planters are not described in terms of a race-based definition such as “the white” in the target text, they are translated as “beyazlar” meaning “whites” in English. Due to this sign, it can be concluded that an over-interpretation of the meaning is observed. Though no race-based description is present in the source text for the people who plant the crops, for the target text readers planters are reflected as white people, coming up with a race-based definition.

Example 3.8 signifies a social norm regarding sexual orientations accepted as “normal” by patriarchy and the fact that women should be accompanied by men throughout life. In this example, Sofia and Harpo try to set Celie up with a man after Celie and Albert have settled off. As obedience to the social norm directed by patriarchal society, people are expected to match with the opposite sex; therefore, heterosexuality is the only accepted form. In fact, Celie and Shug have deep feelings towards each other. The words of Celie revealing these feelings can be observed in the following lines explicitly: “They know I love Shug but they think womens love just by accident.” The love they have for each other is more than a love of friendship. This sign of romantic love of two women is translated as “Shug’ı sevdiğimi biliyorlar ama kadınların arasındaki sevgi rastgele ortaya çıkan bir şey sanıyorlar galiba” in the target text, preserving the explicit romantic love between Shug and Celie for the Turkish readers, so no meaning transformation is observed in the translation.

Example 3.9 makes it obvious that the expectations of society from women and men are different in several fields of social life, and the way they are dressed is one of them. According to the social norms indicated in the source text, women and men are not expected to wear the same type of clothes; in the case of “pants” for instance, men are the ones who are expected to wear them, not women. This sign showing a social norms-based discrimination against women preserved in Turkish in the following lines: “Kadınlarla erkeklerin aynı şeyi giymeleri yakışık almaz... Pantolonu erkek giyer”. This means that no meaning transformation is observed in this example.

As can be seen in the nine contexts in Table 3, the patriarchal society already imposes its own values ranging from who should wear what or who should eat what to who should get married earlier and to whom. With few meaning transformations, social norms-based discriminative signs are mostly preserved in the target text. The meaning transformations observed in Table 3 tend to reproduce the values of patriarchy more severely while casting a veil on a discriminative sign.

Enriched use of language and its projection in the target text

⁶ Cambridge Online Dictionary.
<https://dictionary.cambridge.org/tr/s%C3%B6zl%C3%BCk/ingilizce/planter>. [Accessed 29.07.2021].

The novel is narrated by an oppressed black woman through her diary and correspondence with her sister, another oppressed character solely on grounds of her race, economic status, and gender. The narrator's use of "enriched"⁷ language is striking throughout the novel. The writer seems to have aimed to deliberately project the "minority" language use of an oppressed woman through repetitive "enriched" structures like syntactical features, morphology, or misspellings. Table 4 shows some randomly selected examples regarding the use of enriched language in the source text together with their translations.

Table 4. Use of "enriched" language and translations

	Source Text (Walker, 1983)	Target Text (Walker, 1984a)
Syntax-wise	My mama dead. She die screaming and cussing. (p. 4)	Anam öldü. Bağıra çağıra öldü. (p. 6)
	He act like she can't stand me no more. (p. 5)	Şimdi beni bir kaşık suda bulsa boğacak. (p. 6)
	He not undernourish, she say. (53)	Bununki dengesiz beslenme falan değil. (p. 51)
	I loves to hug up, period, she say. (p. 124)	Sana sarılıp yatmak bana yetiyor, diyor. (p. 118)
	How he die? (p. 206)	Nasıl öldü? (p. 204)
	You was even sewing good way back then, he say. (p. 221)	Sen o zaman da iyi dikiş dikiyordun, Celie, diyor Albert. (p. 218)
Phonology-wise	[...] cryin, talking bout [...] (p. 4)	ağlıyor (p. 6)
	She was kilt by her boyfriend. (p. 6)	[...] dostu öldürmüş kadını (p. 7)
	I ast her to give me the picture. [...] An now when I dream, [...] (p. 8)	Resim bende kalsın dedim. [...] Şimdi düşünürsem [...] (p. 9)
	Who could forgit it? (p. 221)	Hatırlanmaz mı? (p. 218)
	I still git letters from you. (p. 233.)	Mektupların geliyor hala. (p. 230)

As can be seen in Table 4, the language in the narration of the source text was deliberately enriched by the writer. "Language is a political instrument, means, and proof of power. It is the most vivid and crucial key to identity: It reveals the private identity, and connects one with, or divorces one from, the larger, public, or communal identity" (Baldwin, 1997, p. 5). Therefore, the writer might have aimed to show the power that the people oppressed due to their ethnicity or gender have grasped over the course of time. By not conforming to the standard English of the time, the writer could have aimed at showing that the oppressed characters do not need the approval or confirmation of the larger community to get themselves recognized. The phonological, grammatical, lexical, and figurative enrichment of the standard English in the source text could be interpreted as the reflections of a character's geographical affiliation, social status, and ethnic background, which are not the factors for "otherness" of that character, but rather the richness and strength of the culture s/he belongs to. However, having a look at the translation of those contexts with enriched use of language in Table 4 shows that all signs of enrichment are eliminated in the target text, thereby stripping the target text reader off the opportunity to recognize the identification of the writer with the non-standard use of language. As the individual use of language perfectly reflects the group identity, the standardization of non-standard source language in line with Turkish language norms and rules can be regarded wiping out of the meaning. The target text reader is faced with a narrator who does not bear any traces from her ethnical background.

⁷ The authors of this paper prefer to use the term "enriched" for the use of non-standard forms of language in the novel as the use of the term "deviated" would produce another "otherness" factor. Not conforming to the norms and rules of a language must be regarded as richness rather than "deviation".

Moreover, the reflection of non-standard spoken language through such signs as “gimme” (give me), “ain’t” (negated copula be), “scuse me” (excuse me), “ ’em” (them), “gonna” (going to for future), “yall” (y’all – you all) in the written register is also of significance in providing clues as to the ethnicity and identity of the narrator. While the use of such signs does not make the character “other”, but shows the pride she takes in everything that shapes her personality, those signs are also eliminated in the target text with the use of standard Turkish. However, making every effort to reflect the ethnical use of language in the target text could also be worthwhile from multi-ethnic feminist perspective, which would allow enriched language use to sound natural and discourage the “otherizing” approach to the use of non-standard language in a literary work.

CONCLUSION

The novel titled *The Color Purple* by Alice Walker was analyzed from multi-ethnic feminist perspective in this study. Adopted from Lorber’s (1997, 2010) definitions, multi-ethnic feminist theory regards gender at the intersection of all “otherness” categories. While the socially constructed norms devise a hierarchy of groups for people based on such factors as economic status, social status, profession, ethnicity, race, religion, or educational background, it is gender that leads one to be considered the “*o(u)t[h]ermost*”. This feminist theory takes the view that such factors as religion, race, ethnicity, or gender would not assign any advantage to certain groups by nature, but the patriarchal society, in search of the sustainability of “power groups” established and built upon “man”-made norms, instills theatrical properties on the members of each “category” under these factors. Translations of the signs or contexts with “otherizing” or “oppressive” features were analyzed based on Öztürk Kasar’s (2021) “Systematics of Designification”. Translation analysis was conducted to find out if the patriarchal system and discourse are reproduced in the target text as severely as is the case in the source text.

Multi-ethnic feminist analysis of the novel yielded 17 contexts in which a character is oppressed only due to her gender among all other oppressive factors. A female character is shown more oppressed than her male counterpart with all other factors ensured comparable for the two. This finding supports the multi-ethnic argument that gender is of utmost importance at the interplay of all factors for one’s social status. Those contexts with hierarchical gender-based oppression are occasionally preserved in the target text, presenting target text readers the oppression the characters are faced with solely due to their genders. Over-interpretation of the meaning is identified in the translation of five contexts; under-interpretation of the meaning and alteration of the meaning are determined in three contexts each; darkening of the meaning and opposition of the meaning are detected in the translation of one context for each. As a result, meaning transformations were found in the translation of 13 contexts with signs referring or alluding to gender-based oppression, which changes the feminist reading of the text with more severe contexts (due to meaning transformations through over-interpretation of the meaning, alteration of the meaning, and opposition of the meaning) and milder contexts (through darkening of the meaning and under-interpretation of the meaning).

When it comes to race-based oppression, 11 contexts were found in the source text. The characters in those contexts come up against oppression and are considered “other” due to their race. It is generally the black population that is shown hierarchically inferior to the white population. With so many revolutionary steps taken particularly in the last two decades, racism is no longer practised as severely as it used to be across the world, including the United States. However, given that this novel was written in the first half of 1980s, racist discourse was more prevalent in those years. With the members of the black

population serving the white population or not having the rights to use the same restaurants or other public spaces as the white population, the severity of race-based oppression is clear in the source text. Though not as many in number compared to gender-based oppression, race-based oppression is another recurrent theme of the novel. Just as it does not make any sense to discriminate against women on naturally baseless grounds, it is beyond doubt that mistreatment of people only because of their race does not stand to reason. The patriarchal social system is yet again to blame for this malpractice as it does not only concern itself with the sustainability of “male power”; it has further been extended to all walks of life to ensure the supposed superiority of a “category” over another. In the target text, four contexts are translated with meaning transformations while the rest seven contexts are preserved in the target culture, reproducing the patriarchal norm of whites’ “superiority”. Whereas under-interpretation of the meaning was found in two contexts, the meaning transformations in the other two contexts were identified as wiping out of the meaning, alleviating the severity of race-based oppression in either designificative tendency.

The final oppressive factor is determined as social norms-based oppression in the source text, for which nine contexts are found. Those contexts are concerned with the socially constructed paradigms regarding marriage, clothing, housing, sexual orientations, and financial situation. The novel draws, and at the same time attacks, clear boundaries for what is considered normal and not with reference to these phenomena. The type of clothing women are allowed to wear in the society, the socially acknowledged appropriate age and ritual for marriage, heterosexuality, and luxury houses or apartments deserved by whites, not by the black population are the favored “preferences” while an otherwise condition is considered abnormal socially. Five of those nine contexts are translated without any meaning transformations, explicitly reproducing the patriarchy-driven social norms in the target text. On the other hand, two contexts are translated through over-interpretation of the meaning (thereby intensifying the oppression resulting from social norms) while the other two are translated through wiping-out of the meaning (alleviating the severity of social norms-based oppression).

Considering the language use in the novel, non-standard forms of English language are thought to have been deliberately used by the writer to signify the identity formation of characters with the language that they produce. This non-standard use of English is considered the enrichment of language in this study since this could be considered a call for the recognition of redundancy of standard values in society. Literary feminisms must be directed to the struggle for this recognition, showing the multiplicity of potentialities in social life rather than tailoring people in line with the needs and expectations of the society. This non-standard source language is translated into standard Turkish use in the target text, which can be thought as wiping-out of the meaning since the narrator’s, and accordingly the writer’s intention of the acknowledgment of various potentialities is omitted in the source text. It goes without saying that this does not devalue the effort and *skopos* in the target text, but this can be attributed to the translator’s choice.

It is through the efforts of literary feminisms that the oppression of people placed into certain unnatural categories can be made more visible to the society. However, we are in such an age that literary feminisms are primarily required to do more than just revealing the oppression. Literary feminisms must be ready to show the members so far portrayed as the oppressed beings equal to, or even more powerful than what the society considers “normal beings” until true equality is achieved in all social settings. This task of literary feminisms could/should be extended to the act of translation, as well. Literary translators could adopt and adjust their *skopos* to fulfil the primary task of literary feminisms

suggested here. Deconstructing the patriarchal values and producing the values of equality in literary works, literary feminisms must be able to provide a guide to translators in adopting the translation strategies or choices “appropriate” to this end.

REFERENCES

- Allen, A. (2018). *The power of feminist theory: Domination, resistance, solidarity*. New York & London: Routledge.
- Baldwin, J. (1997). If Black English isn't a language, then tell me, what is? *The Black Scholar*, 27(1), 5-6.
- Collins, P. H. (2014). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. 2nd ed. London & New York: Routledge.
- Johnson, A. G. (2004). Patriarchy, the system. *Women's lives: Multicultural perspectives*, 3, 25-32.
- Lauret, M. (2011). *Alice Walker*. 2nd ed. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lorber, J. (1997). *The variety of feminisms and their contribution to gender equality*. Oldenburg: Bibliotheks- und Informationssystem der Universität Oldenburg.
- Lorber, J. (2010). *Gender inequality: Feminist theories and politics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Öztürk Kasar, S. (2009). Un chef-d'oeuvre très connu: Le chef-d'oeuvre inconnu de Balzac. Commentaires d'une traduction à l'autre laissant des traces. In M. Nowotna and A. Moghani (Eds.), *Les traces du traducteur* (pp. 87-211). Paris: Publications de l'INALCO.
- Öztürk Kasar, S. (2020). De la désignification en traduction littéraire: Les Gens d'en face de Georges Simenon dans le contexte turc du point de vue de la sémiotique de la traduction. *Parallèles*, 32(1), 154-175.
- Öztürk Kasar, S. (2021). Çevirmek, anlamı eğip bükme sanatı mıdır? In D. Tuna and M. Kuleli (Eds.), *Interdisciplinary debates on discourse, meaning and translation* (pp. 19-44). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Öztürk Kasar, S. and 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. and 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.
- Walker, A. (1983). *The color purple*. London: The Women's Press.
- Walker, A. (1984a). *Renklerden moru ... Armağan İlkin* (Çev.). İstanbul: İnkılap Yayınevi.
- Walker, A. (1984b). *In search of our mothers' garden: Womanist prose*. London: The Women's Press.