



# Analysis of Designificative Tendencies in Turkish Translations of the Book *a Tale of Two Cities* by Charles Dickens Throughout Semiotics of Translation

## Charles Dickens'in *İki Şehrin Hikayesi* Adlı Romanının Çeviri Göstergebilimi Yöntemiyle Türkçe Çevirilerindeki Anlam Bozucu Eğilimlerin İncelenmesi

Seda Türkmen<sup>1</sup> , Fatma Demiray Akbulut<sup>2</sup> 



### ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to analyse the book *A Tale of Two Cities* by Charles Dickens in terms of semiotics of translation. In this respect, the original book and two Turkish translations were analysed qualitatively through the "Theory of Instances of Enunciation" by Jean-Claude Coquet (2007) and relatively evaluated in the light of Systematics of Designificative Tendencies suggested by Sündüz Öztürk Kasar. Sixteen striking examples were chosen and categorized according to the selected six designificative tendencies which are *overinterpretation, darkening, sliding, alteration, perversion, and under-interpretation of the meaning*. According to the results, both translators transferred the meaning universe of the original book to the target texts somehow; however, it was inevitable for them to lean towards the designificative tendencies. Thus, it was concluded that both translators used designificative tendencies due to the fact that each language has its own cultural, structural, and sociological features. In this sense, it is significant to convey the meaning universe of the book especially for the literary works that contain many descriptions and offer readers the opportunity to imagine what they read. Therefore, in such a field that is governed by descriptions and by signs which create the meaning, the translator must make the decisions consciously.

**Keywords:** Emiotics, translation, written translation, semiotics of translation, designificative tendencies

### ÖZ

Bu çalışmanın amacı Charles Dickens'in *İki Şehrin Hikayesi* adlı kitabını çeviri göstergebilimi açısından incelemektir. Bu doğrultuda, orijinal eser ve iki Türkçe tercümesi Jean-Claude Coquet'in (2007) "Söyleyenler Kuramı" üzerinden nitel olarak incelenmiş ve Sündüz Öztürk Kasar tarafından ortaya konulan çeviride anlam bozucu eğilimler dizgeselliği ışığında değerlendirilmiştir. Çalışma için, kitap çevirilerinden on altı çarpıcı örnek seçilmiş ve bu örnekler *aşırı yorumlama, karartma, kaydırma, değiştirme, saptırma ve anlamın eksik yorumlanması* gibi çeviride anlam bozucu eğilimler temelinde sınıflandırılmıştır. Çalışmanın

<sup>1</sup>M.A. Ege University, Translation and Interpreting, Translation Studies, Izmir, Türkiye

<sup>2</sup>Assoc. Prof. Dr., Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University, Department of Translation and Interpreting, Bolu, Türkiye

ORCID: S.T. 0000-0001-5312-3694;  
F.D.A. 0000-0003-0689-8483

### Corresponding author/Sorumlu yazar:

Fatma Demiray Akbulut,  
Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University, Department  
of Translation and Interpreting, Bolu, Türkiye  
E-mail: demiray\_f@ibu.edu.tr

Submitted/Başvuru: 19.08.2022

Accepted/Kabul: 29.09.2022

**Citation/Atf:** Türkmen, S., Demiray Akbulut, F., (2022). Analysis of Designificative Tendencies in Turkish Translations of the Book *a Tale of Two Cities* by Charles Dickens Throughout Semiotics of Translation. *Istanbul Üniversitesi Çeviribilim Dergisi - Istanbul University Journal of Translation Studies*, 17, 61-77.  
<https://doi.org/10.26650/iujts.2022.1164040>



sonuçlarına göre, her iki çevirmen de orijinal kitabın anlam evrenini bir şekilde hedef metinlere aktarmıştır; ancak her iki çeviride de anlam bozucu eğilimlere başvurmanın kaçınılmaz olduğu görülmüştür. Bu nedenle, her iki çevirmenin de her dilin kendine özgü kültürel, yapısal ve sosyolojik özelliklere sahip olması nedeniyle anlam bozucu eğilimlere başvurdukları sonucuna varılmıştır. Bu anlamda özellikle çok sayıda betimleme içeren ve okuyucuya okuduklarını hayal etme fırsatı sunan edebî eserler için, kitabın anlam evrenini en iyi şekilde aktarmak oldukça önemlidir. Dolayısıyla anlamı oluşturan betimlemelerin ve göstergelerin yönettiği böyle bir alanda çevirmen bilinçli kararlar vermelidir.

**Anahtar kelimeler:** Göstergebilim, çeviri, yazılı çeviri, çeviri göstergebilimi, anlam bozucu eğilimler

## 1. Introduction

Literary translation is taking a text and giving it life in another language. This definition includes culture, identity, self-awareness, emotion, and empathy. When you read a novel you associate yourself with the characters, their lives, their emotions, and their acts by saying probably “if I were him/her...”. In other words, you empathize with the character because what you are reading is not just the words that are randomly written; you set out a journey with books and what makes this possible is translation. Even if the way of expressing emotions is different in every language, what is felt is the same. Here the translator has the greatest responsibility. Literary translators must make the reader feel what the source text reader feels. This is only possible with the imagination and what makes the reader imagine are the signs in the text. At this point, semiotics steps in and becomes a part of the translation process.

The aim of this study is to identify the designificative tendencies applied by the translators of the book *A Tale of Two Cities* by Charles Dickens relying on “Jean-Claude Coquet’s Theory of Instances of Enunciation” (2007) (Gürses Sanbay, 2021) and The Systematics of Designificative Tendencies coined by Sündüz Öztürk Kasar (Öztürk Kasar & Güzel, O.E. 2022). To achieve this, the selected chapters of the source book (book one chapter I, book two chapter IX and X and book three chapter VI) and two different translations by Meram Arvas and Zeynep Didar Batumlu were read and analysed comparatively. In this process, the designificative tendencies applied by two translators were detected and evaluated. In the evaluation part, the content was divided into six categories according to the selected designificative tendencies of *overinterpretation of the meaning, darkening of the meaning, sliding of the meaning, alteration of the meaning, perversion of the meaning and under-interpretation of the meaning*.

The importance of this study is to stress how important semiotics of translation is and present how the designificative tendencies that are applied by translators make a difference. This study shows how large the part of the designificative tendencies is in understanding, analysing, and conveying the signs and the meaning universe.

### 1.1. Semiotics

As a field of science, semiotics is shortly defined as the study of signs (Chandler, 1994). Semiotics has developed as a subject of study during the last century, with Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure as its forerunner. Saussure (2001) who pioneered the growth of semiotics as a field of science expressed that a sign consists of two elements: “signifier” and “signified”; defining the term “sign”, which is the study area of semiotics. He proposed the term “auditory image” for the signifier and the term “concept” for the signified. He suggested that this case, which presents the signs, is the combination of the relationship between auditory image and the concept (Öztürk Kasar & Kuleli, 2016). Many linguists, including Saussure, researched semiotics, a branch of linguistics, such as American philosopher Charles Sanders Peirce (sic, pronounced ‘purse’) (1839-1914) and behaviorist semiotics offered by Charles William Morris

(1901-1979). Theorists such as Roland Barthes (1915-1980), Algirdas Greimas (1917-1992), Yuri Lotman (1922-1993), Christian Metz (1931-1993), Umberto Eco (b 1932), and Julia Kristeva are part of the contemporary semiotics movement (b 1941) (Chandler, 1994).

## 1.2. Translation and Semiotics

The semiotics of translation, as articulated by Evangelos Kourdis, should be seen in a broader multidisciplinary framework. Nowadays, the phrase is used to describe a semiotic approach to the translation process (Gorlée, 1994; Kourdis, 2015) and was conceptualized by Öztürk Kasar (2001). Although semiotics and translation theory are two distinct fields, there is a relationship between them, which may be defined as the potential for explanation and development as they respond to and understand one another (Petrilli, 2015). Every translation involving diverse domains has its own semiotics. That is to say, languages and cultures are made up of various domains, which indicates that language and culture differ in terms of signs. Translation and semiotics are inextricably linked in this setting. As a result, an increasing number of academics have been investigating semiotics as a research tool in translation in recent years (Kourdis, 2015). Semiotic acts in translation involve the shift from one semiotic system (source language) to another (target language). As Petrilli (2001) attributes “[t]ranslation [...] is a phenomenon of sign reality and as such it is the object of the study of semiotics” (pp.278-279). This semiotic act can be interlingual, intralingual, or intersemiotic translation (Kourdis, 2015). According to Ludskanov (1975, p. 5) it was suggested that the act of translation comprises the transfer of signs from one language to another and thus any transformation of signs between two languages can be considered within the framework of semiotics, which makes it inevitable for translators to take advantage of the principles of semiotics analysis.

Öztürk Kasar (2017) attributes this to the Theory of Instances of Enunciation which was introduced by Jean-Claude Coquet, a French semiotician and one of the founders of Paris School of Semiotics (Coquet, 1997 & 2007). This theory puts forward that in every discourse there is a producer and a receiver, but the agents are not determined. When the producer of the discourse finishes speaking, s/he begins to listen and assumes the role of the receiver of the discourse and vice versa. The production of discourse is realized through this collaboration, and the meaning of the discourse is generated by what the producer of the discourse says and what the receiver of the discourse grasps from it. In consideration of this theory, the translator takes upon herself/himself two roles: The receiver of the source text and the producer of the target text. However, what is said in the source text does not always exactly correspond to what is produced in the target text (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017) and “literary translators could benefit from designificative tendencies in overcoming the pitfalls in a literary text” (Kuleli, 2021: p. 86). From this point of view, the Systematics of Designificative Tendencies which consist of nine tendencies were propounded by Öztürk

Kasar (2017) which are: 1) over-interpretation of the meaning which means that a translation includes extreme commentary and a translation which puts the meaning across in the target text which is covert in the source text; 2) darkening of the meaning which means the translator makes the meaning obscure which is clear in the source text; 3) under-interpretation of the meaning in which the translator produces insufficient meaning; 4) sliding of the meaning putting forward an alternative meaning but not meant in the source text; 5) alteration of the meaning which means that producing a translation which is false but not totally irrelevant; 6) opposition of the meaning, that is, producing a meaning which is opposite to the meaning in the source text; 7) perversion of the meaning, in which the meaning which is produced in the target text is totally different from the meaning in the source text; 8) destruction of the meaning which involves producing a translation that is deprived of meaning; however, the meaning is not totally absent; 9) wiping out of the meaning which means the main meaning is absent and there is nothing left (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2015).

### 1.3. Present Study

The present study examines the selected parts of the book *A Tale of Two Cities* written by Charles Dickens and its translations in the light of *Systematics of Designification Tendencies in Translation* propounded by Öztürk Kasar (in Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2015). Turkish translations of the book, one by Zeynep Didar Batumlu and the other by Meram Arvas were selected to contribute the semiotic translation and designification tendencies. In the evaluation of the differences in the translations by Batumlu and Arvas, the selected parts of the book *A Tale of Two Cities* were analysed comparatively. The evaluation of the translation is made according to six designification tendencies. These are *over-interpretation of the meaning*, *darkening of the meaning*, *sliding of the meaning*, *alteration of the meaning*, *the pervasion of the meaning*, and *under-interpretation*. In line with this, the research questions are listed below:

- 1) Which of the translations is close to the source language and cultural signs?
- 2) Is there any interference that deprived the reader of the actual meaning?

## 2. Methodology

### 2.1. Data Collection Tools

The novel *A Tale of Two Cities* by Charles Dickens and two translations were chosen for data collection. Two translations were compared to the source text from the semiotics of translation point of view. One of the translations of the book was written by Meram Arvas by Can Publishing House (which will be known as Target Text 1 afterword) and the other was written by Zeynep Didar Batumlu by Is Bankasi Publishing House (which will be known as Target Text 2 afterword).

### 2.1.1. About the Author

Charles Dickens was born in Landport, near Portsmouth, England in 1812. In 1817 his family moved to London and because of his frail body he could not join in the games of his peers. That is why Charles Dickens was fond of reading. When he was ten, because of his father's debts they had to sell all of their household goods. His mother tried to start up a school but ended up in failure. After five years, when he was fifteen, he found a job with the help of his mother as an office boy. At first, he wanted to be a journalist and started to work as a freelance reporter. In 1836, he started to write pieces of sketches and published them with the name Boz which is the nickname of his brother. His stories were liked and he ended up being immensely popular. Thanks to this popularity, he began to write for *The Pickwick Papers* monthly. He was a critic of society; he was a great critic of parliament, family, education, the church, and marriage which were all highly regarded by Victorians. He achieved the publication of major novels, for example, *David Copperfield* (1849-50), *Hard Times* (1854), *A Tale of Two Cities* (1859), *Great Expectations* (1860-61). (<https://www.ucm.es/data/cont/docs/119-2014-02-19-5.%20Charles%20Dickens.pdf>)

### 2.1.2. About the Book

*A Tale of Two Cities* by Charles Dickens is a great retelling of the French Revolution period in which terrifying events were experienced. The novel is set in London, Paris, and the suburbs of France in the 18th century and was written in the 19th century. The rulers and the upper class of both countries lived their best lives; however, they were disconnected from the public. Dickens describes this period as the “best” and the “worst” of times. The upper class and ruling-class were living the best of their times and the common people or the public were living the worst of their times. There is a duality throughout the novel, which includes “hope” and “despair”, the “best” and the “worst”. While Dickens highly supports the decline of the French aristocracy, he also criticizes the terror, fear, oppression, and torture coming with this decline. Dickens tells us about the public issues that affect all people and also about the private life of the main characters - Doctor Alexandre Manette, Lucie Manette, Charles Darnay, Sydney Darnay, Mr.Lorry, Miss Pross, and Madame Defarge.

## 2.2. Data Analysis

In this study, a qualitative analysis is applied. The original novel was examined based on the Theory of Instances of Enunciation which was propounded by Jean-Claude Coquet and relatively through the Systematics of Designificative Tendencies by Sündüz Öztürk Kasar (Öztürk Kasar, 2017). Two different translations of selected parts of the book were evaluated by comparing them both through the six of the systematics of designificative tendencies by Sündüz Kasar (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2015) which are *overinterpretation*, *darkening*, *sliding*, *alteration*, *perversion*, and *under-interpretation of the meaning*. Clear and outstanding examples

were detected and evaluated in this study.

### 3. Findings

#### 3.1. Which of the translations is close to the source language and cultural signs?

Target text 1 is close to the target language and cultural signs in terms of tendencies; for example, while there is more over-interpretation in target text 2, target text 1 is better at rendering and does not need to add extra explanations to convey the meaning. Target text 2 is closer to the source language and cultural signs. While Batumlu was conveying the meaning, she did a word for word translation in some parts; that is why some parts are odd to the target language and cultural signs; maybe, she wanted to make the reader close to the source language and its signs. However, this gives a rise to incoherency and ambiguity.

#### 3.2. Is there any interference that deprived us of the actual meaning?

##### 3.2.1. Over-interpretation of the Meaning

Over-interpretation is making the meaning explicit which is implicit in the original text or making excessive comment on it. In this part, the words that include excessive comment in their translations will be examined.

	Source Text	Target Text 1	Target Text 2
1	“It was the year of Our Lord one thousand seven hundred and seventy-five.” (p. 7)	“Milattan sonra 1775 senesiydi.” (p. 13).	“Efendimizin doğumunun üzerinden 1775 sene geçmişti.” (p.3).
2	“‘Ha!’ said Miss Pross, ‘it doesn’t need an interpreter to explain the meaning of these creatures. They have but one, and it’s Midnight Murder, and Mischief.’” (p.352)	“Miss Pross, Haa! dedi. Bu adamların ne işe yaradıklarını açıklamaya hacet yok. Bir tane uğraşları var zaten, o da gece yarısı adam öldürüp ortalık karıştırmak.”(p.358)	“Hah! dedi Miss Pross. Bunlar gibi yaratıkların ne mal olduğunu anlamak için <i>allameicihan</i> olmaya gerek yok. Tek bildikleri gece yarısı katliamları ve şeytanlık.” (p.382)
3	“well, my sweet, said Miss Pross, nodding her head emphatically, the short and the long if it is, that I am a <i>subject</i> of His Most Gracious Majesty King George the Third; Miss Pross curtsayed at the name; and as such, my maxim is Confound their politics, Frustrate their knavish tricks, on him our hopes we fix, God save the King!” (p.353)	“Miss Pross başını kuvvetlice öne doğru sallayarak, ‘Tamam tatlım’, dedi, ‘neyse kısaca, Majesteleri <i>Kral III. George’a bağlıyım ben</i> ’; Miss Pross kralın adını söylerken reverans yapmıştı, ‘ve <i>hep dediğim gibi</i> politikaları batsın, hileleri düzenleri çöksün ve bunun akabinde umutlarımıza kavuşalım, Tanrı kralı korusun!’”(p.359).	“‘Bak canım,’ dedi Miss Pross, ‘işin aslı şu ki, ben hala Majesteleri Kral Üçüncü George’un <i>tebaasıyım</i> ,’ dedi ve kralın adını zikrederken dizlerini bükerek reverans yaptı. ‘Bu yüzden de <i>şiarım</i> şudur: Kahrolsun onların politikaları, yerin dibine batsın hileleri hurdaları, biz umudumuzu ona bağlamışız, Tanrı Kral’ı korusun!’”(p.382)

In the first segment, the writer renders that it was the year of 1775 AC which means that it was the 1775th year after the birth of Christ. Here, the problem is the sign “*Lord*”. In the

English context, the source text reader can easily comprehend what the writer states by this sign; however, in the Turkish context, when it comes to the target text reader, it cannot be comprehended so easily. The sign “*Lord*” which is transferred as “*Efendimiz*” to Turkish in the second translation by Batumlu is too explicit. Here, Batumlu translated the sign word by word which made the sign over-interpreted and explicit because in Turkish culture “*Efendimiz*” means “*Hz. Muhammed*” who is holy for Muslims. For this reason, a target reader who has no information about what the sign “*Lord*” represents for Christians cannot comprehend who the Lord is or what the writer is trying to state. On the other hand, the first translation by Arvas transfers the sign exactly by transferring the sign as “*milattan sonra*”.

In the second segment, Miss Pross states that it is not rocket science to understand who these people are while mentioning the Redheads. Thus, the rendered statement is that it is not very hard to know who these people are. In the first translation, Arvas used the word “*açıklamak* (explain)” in Turkish by omitting the word “*interpreter*” in the target text; however, omitting this word does not destruct the meaning but instead creates the exact meaning. In the second translation by Batumlu the word “*interpreter*” is over-interpreted by transferring it as “*allameicihan*” which cannot be comprehended even by a Turkish reader. Actually, the origin of the word “*allameicihan*” which means wise man in English is Arabic. Thus, the target text reader who does not know the meaning of this word cannot understand what it means without checking it in a dictionary.

In the third segment which is the following line of the second segment in the original text, Miss Pross states how serious her relationship with His Majesty King George the Third is and mentions her principle related to the current authority. Firstly, as seen in the text, the second translation by Batumlu is over-interpreted. The word “*tebaa*” which is used by Batumlu is not even Turkish. The word “*subject*” means *belong to* and Miss Pross states that she belongs to His Majesty King George the Third’s nation. From this point of view, the word “*tebaa*” is the right word choice to make a word-for-word translation; however, it is not accurate. According to the Turkish Language Association Dictionary, the word “*tebaa*” means *nationality*. Thus, the word “*tebaa*” does not reflect the sign “*subject*” in the target text. On the other hand, the word choice in the first translation which is “*bağlı olmak*” by Arvas successfully transfers the sign in the original text into the target text.

### 3.2.2. Darkening of the Meaning

One of the designificative tendencies is darkening of the meaning, which means that translator makes the meaning ambiguous, or unclear which is clear in the source text. This makes the reader confused and causes her/him to question what s/he reads.

Tablo 2. Examples of Darkening of the Meaning

	Source Text	Target Text 1	Target Text 2
4	“To the eye it is fair enough, here; but seen in its integrity, under the sky, and by the daylight, it is a crumbling tower of <i>waste, mismanagement, extortion, debt, mortgage, oppression, hunger, nakedness, and suffering.</i> ” (p. 153)	“Göze hoş görünüyor burası ama bir bütün olarak bakıldığında, bu gökkubbenin altında, gün ışığında israfın, <i>kötü yönetimin, zorbalığın, borcun, ipoteğin, zulmün, açlığın, çıplaklığın ve acının üst üste yığıldığı bir kule aslında.</i> ” (p. 157)	“Göze hoş görünüyor olabilir fakat gündüz, çıplak gözle meselenin özüne bakıldığında, burası yıkılmakta olan bir <i>israf, basiretsizlik, zorbalık, zimmet, rehin, baskı, açlık, çulsuzluk</i> ve ıstırap kulesi.” (p. 161)
5	“...; in the next room (my bedroom), one fellow, to our knowledge, was poniarded on the spot for professing <i>some insolent delicacy respecting his daughter—his daughter?</i> ” (p. 150)	“...; yan odada (yatak odamda), bir adamın kızıyla ilgili sarf ettiği <i>küçük düşürücü laflardan</i> dolayı hançerlendiğini biliyoruz, evet kızıyla.” (p. 154)	“...; yan odada- ki orası benim yatak odam olur- bildiğimiz kadarıyla, <i>öz kızına ahlaksızca şehvet duyduğunu itiraf eden</i> bir adam hançerlenmişti- <i>öz kızına!</i> ” (p. 158)

In the fourth segment, the Marquis specifies his thoughts about the room; however, some of the adjectives such as *mismanagement*, *mortgage*, and *nakedness* cause ambiguity in the target text. Firstly, the sign “*mismanagement*” is transferred as “*kötü yönetim*” in the first translation by Arvas and as “*basiretsizlik*” in the second translation by Batumlu. The word “*mismanagement*” means “*kötü yönetim*”. That is why the first translation by Arvas perfectly matches with the source language sign. However, the word “*basiretsizlik*” which is in the second translation by Batumlu is not even close to the sign of source language “*mismanagement*”. According to the Turkish Language Association Dictionary, the word “*basiret*” means clairvoyance, foresight, and vision. Batumlu’s word choice is not accurate and also creates a mismatch for the reader. That is why the sign that is transferred to the target text and assumed as the same sign as in the source text is totally different and makes the reader confused. However, this sign is obvious in the source text and has a match as “*kötü yönetim*” (misgovernment) in the target language.

In the fifth segment the Marquis again mentions one of the rooms - his bedroom. The Marquis says one fellow was poniarded because of his “*insolent delicacy*” to his daughter. At first sight, it might be seen so obvious to the reader, yet it is not as obvious to the target text’s reader as it is to the source text’s reader. In the first translation by Arvas this sign transferred into target text as “*küçük düşürücü laf*” (insulting word) and in the second translation by Batumlu it is transferred as “*ahlaksızca şehvet duymak*” (lust for his daughter dissolutely). Here, the problem arises from the unclear transfer. In the first translation, the reader thinks that this fellow was poniarded because of his unpleasant words to his daughter, yet how

serious and crucial are these unpleasant words and caused that fellow to be poniarded? This sign is so vital that it can stun the reader. That is why it is unclear in the first translation. On the other hand, in the second translation by Batumlu, this sign is successfully transferred to the target text. Batumlu puts herself in the reader's place and imagines how the reader can comprehend how serious this case is and exactly why this fellow was poniarded and reflects the image in the source text.

### 3.2.3. Sliding of Meaning

As another of the designificative tendencies, sliding of meaning means that the translator creates an image, which is not mentioned in the source text but is a potential one.

	Source Text	Target Text 1	Target Text 2
6	“But the question, Doctor Manette. Is there—it was the good creature’s way to affect to <i>make light of</i> anything that was great anxiety with them all, and to come at it in this chance manner—is there any prospect yet, of our getting out of this place?”(p. 353)	“Ama Doktor Manette, size sorum şu. Acaba—herkesi endişelendiren bir meselede bir <i>umut ışıǰı yakmaya çalışıyordu</i> —buradan kurtulmamız gibi bir ihtimal var mı?”(p. 359)	““Neyse sorum şu Doktor Manette, buradan kurtulabilmek gibi bir olasılık var mı acaba?’ İyi kalpli kadın, konuyu tesadüfen açmış gibi yaparak, herkesi son derece endişelendiren bir meseleyi <i>hafifletmeye çalışıyordu</i> .”(p. 382)
7	“I would not be sure of that. A good opportunity for <i>consideration</i> , surrounded by the advantages of solitude, might influence your destiny to far greater advantage than you influence it for yourself. But it is useless to discuss the question....” (p. 150)	“Yalnızlıǰın getirdiǰi avantajlarla çevrili iyi bir <i>itibar</i> şansı, kendi başına yaptıklarından çok daha fazla etkileyebilir kaderini.” (p. 153)	“Yalnızlıǰın avantajlarıyla çevrelenmiş olmak, <i>derin derin düşünmek</i> için iyi <i>nimet</i> ve kaderini, senin etkileyebileceğinden çok daha olumlu etkileyebilir.” (p. 157)

In the sixth segment, Darnay is released but Lucie’s fear remains. The whole family has a cheerful conversation. However, the gloomy ambiance has remained, and Miss Pross asks Doctor Manette “*is there any chance of getting out of this place?*”. At this point, the writer describes the intention asking the question with the expression of “*to make light of*”. In the first translation, this is conveyed as “*umut ışıǰı yakmaya çalışmak*” (to give a glimmer of hope) by Arvas and in the second translation; it is conveyed as “*hafifletmek*” (to lighten) by Batumlu. In the Oxford Dictionary, the phrase “*to make light of*” is defined as “*to treat sth as not being important and not serious*” and it contains a negative meaning, which is not proper to the context. Consequently, in both translations, there is a sliding of meaning; both of them use a possible meaning of the phrase. Nevertheless, the first translation is the best fitting one

because “*seek hope for something that causes great anxiety*” is more accurate than “*lighten something which causes great anxiety*”. The word “*lighten*” is more accurate for a context that includes a mystery.

In the seventh segment, the word “*consideration*” is changed in terms of both parts of the speech and the meaning in one of the translations. The word “*consideration*” means “*düşünce, dikkat, hatır, itibar*” (idea, caution, respect, prestige) in the target language. In the first translation by Arvas, the meaning is conveyed with the word “*itibar*” and in the second translation by Batumlu, the meaning is conveyed with the word “*derin derin düşünmek*”. The first translation conveys the meaning exactly the same as the original text. However, in the second translation, the translator gives the possible but not actualized meaning as in the original text and even the part of the speech with the words “*consideration and consider*” is different. In short, the second translation is neither appropriate to the context in terms of the meaning nor a good example of the tendency to sliding of the meaning.

### 3.2.4. Alteration of the meaning

In this kind of designificative tendency, the meaning created in the target text is not totally irrelevant but it is also not the one actualized in the source text.

	Source Text	Target Text 1	Target Text 2
8	“...in short, the period was so far like the present period, that some of its noisiest authorities insisted on its being received, for good or for evil, in the <i>superlative degree</i> of comparison only.” (p.7)	“...sözün kısası, şimdikine öylesine yakın bir dönemdi ki, kimi yaygaracı otoriteler bu dönemin, iyi ya da kötü fark etmez, sadece ‘ <i>daha</i> ’ sözcüğü kullanılarak diğerleriyle karşılaştırılabileceğini iddia ederdi.” (p.13)	“...özetle, şu an içinde bulunduğumuz döneme öyle benzer bir dönemdi ki dönemin, sesi çok çıkan otoriteleri bu günler hakkında -olumlu anlamda da, olumsuz anlamda da- ancak ve ancak ‘ <i>en</i> ’ sözcüğü kullanılarak konuşulabileceğini iddia ediyorlardı.” (p.13)
9	“The stone faces on the outer walls <i>stared blindly at the black night</i> for three heavy hours; ...”(p. 156)	“Üç yoğun saat boyunca binanın dış duvarlarındaki taş yüzler <i>kara geceye kör gözlerle baktılar</i> ; üç yoğun saat boyunca...”(p. 159)	“O kopkoyu üç saat boyunca, dış duvarların yüzeyindeki taş yüzler, <i>gecenin kör karanlığını seyrettiler</i> ; o kopkoyu üç saat boyunca ...”(p. 163)

In the eighth segment, the writer mentions the degree of the adjectives which is the “*superlative degree*” used by people when they are mentioning that age. This sign is constructed by adding “-st or -est” suffixes in English; however, in the Turkish language, the superlative degree of the adjectives cannot be expressed as in English. It is expressed using the word “*en (in Turkish)*” which is “the most” in English. The first translation by Arvas tries to convey that sign with the word “*daha*” (more) and the second translation by Batumlu conveys that sign

with the word “*en*”. Here, the problem is that the meaning is conveyed improperly by Arvas due to the wrong word choice. At the very beginning, in the first sentence of the book, the writer begins with these words: “It was the *best* of the times, it was the *worst* of the times...” and the sentence ends with: “in short, the period was so far like the present period, that some of its *noisiest* authorities insisted on its being received, for good or for evil, in the *superlative degree* of comparison only”. Consequently, Arvas ruins the meaning when it is considered as the comparison degree of the adjectives in the original text. It has also self-contradiction. On the other hand, the second translation by Batumlu conveys the same meaning as in the original text and the comparative degree of the adjectives are in harmony when it is compared with the first translation.

In the ninth segment, the stone faces of the chateau, their eyes, and the night are described. The eyes of stone faces are blind, and the night is black. In other words, the one which is blind is the eyes and the one which is black is the night. In the second translation by Batumlu, it is conveyed as “gecenin kör karanlığı” which means *the night blind as black*. In the first translation by Arvas it is conveyed as “kara geceye gör gözlerle” which is very similar to the original text. However, in the second translation, it is described as if the one which is blind is the black night and it is not the one that is actualized in the source text. Consequently, although it is not described in that way, the reader of the second translation will consider that the night is blind.

### 3.2.5. Perversion of the meaning

This kind of designificative tendency leads to creating a meaning which is totally irrelevant to the meaning actualized in the original text and arises from wrong word choices.

	Source Text	Target Text 1	Target Text 2
10	“‘There is all manner of things wanted,’ said Miss Pross, <i>and we shall have a precious time of it we want wine, among the rest</i> . Nice toast these Redheads will be drinking wherever you buy it.” (p. 352)	“‘Almamız gereken bir dolu şey var,’ dedi Miss Pross , ‘epey vakit gerek. Bir de şarap alacağız. Nereden alırsak alalım bu Kızıl Şapkalılar her yerde kadeh kaldırıyorlar.’” (p. 358)	“‘İhtiyacımız olan bir sürü şey var,’ dedi Miss Pross, ‘ <i>ve vaktimiz kıymetli. Her şeyden önemlisi, şarap almamız gerekiyor. Biz şarabı nereden alırsak alalım, o kırmızı kafalılar kadeh kaldırıp içecek bir bahane buluyorlar.</i> ’” (p. 381)
11	“.....high vaulted rooms with <i>cool</i> uncarpeted floors, great dogs upon the hearths for the burning of wood in winter time, and all luxuries befitting the state of a marquis in a luxurious age and country.” (p. 147)	“...Yüksek kubbeli, halısız <i>güzel</i> zeminler, kış aylarında odunları yakmak için kullanılan şömine tabanının üzerindeki ocak ayakları ve her türlü lüks, bu lüks çağında ve diyarında yaşayan bir markiye yakışır tarzdaydı.” (p. 150)	“...Yüksek kubbeli, halı serilmemiş <i>soğuk</i> zeminli, kışın odun yakılan, büyük ocak demirleri olan şömineleriyle odalar, o şaşaalı ülkeye ve döneme uygun şekilde, bir markiye yaraşacak her türlü lükse sahipti.” (p. 154)

12	“The fashion of <i>the last Louis but one</i> , of the line that was never to break—the fourteenth Louis—was conspicuous in their rich furniture...”(p. 147)	“Hükümdarlığı hiç bitmeyecek sanılan <i>soyun sondan bir önceki ferdinin</i> —XIV. Louis’ nin— <i>üslubu</i> bütün o zengin mobilyalarda kendini gösteriyordu...”(p. 150)	“Hanedanlarının sonu hiç gelmeyecekmiş gibi görünen <i>Louisler’in sonuncusunun</i> —on dördüncü Louis— <i>tarzı</i> tüm mobilyalarda görülüyordu...”(p. 154)
13	“He had heard of Monseigneur, <i>at the posting-houses</i> , as being before him.” (p. 148)	“ <i>Posta merkezlerinde</i> monsenyörün kendisinden biraz önde gittiğini öğrenmişti.” (p. 151)	“ <i>Atların dinlendirildiği mola yerinde</i> , Monsenyör’ün kendisinden önde olduğunu öğrenmişti.” (p. 155)
14	“I think you may take that liberty...”(p. 353)	“Tabii ki <i>hakkınız</i> bu...”(p. 358)	“sanırım bu <i>özgürlüğünüzü</i> kullanabilirsiniz...”(p. 382)

In the tenth segment, Miss Pross and Mr. Cruncher go to the purveyor to buy food every afternoon as usual. They are charged for this. On this specific day, they have a conversation while going to the purveyor. Miss Pross says they must go out at that time, and they should not waste their time. Miss Pross expresses that by saying: “*We shall have a precious time of it*”. In the first translation by Arvas this is conveyed as “*”epey vakit gerek*” (we need a lot of time) and in the second translation by Batumlu it is conveyed as “*vaktimiz kıymetli*”. The word “*precious*” means “*kıymetli, değerli*” (rare and very valuable). Here the first translation cannot convey the actual meaning but instead transfers it irrelevantly and thus, it is an example of the perversion of the meaning. On the other hand, the second translation by Batumlu conveys the meaning the same.

In the eleventh segment, the Marquis and the nephew walk around the chateau, and a corridor leads them to a private apartment of the Marquis. Here, the writer describes how luxurious this room is. At a point, the writer talks about uncarpeted floors by describing them with the word “*cool*”. In the first translation by Arvas, it is conveyed to the target text as “*güzel*” (nice) and in the second translation by Batumlu, it is conveyed as “*soğuk*” (cold). Here the second translator goes with another meaning of the word “*cool*” which is “*soğuk*” and is not relevant to the context of the conversation. On the other hand, Arvas conveys the meaning relevantly. The writer talks about how gorgeous and magnificent the furniture in the apartment is and how they benefit the state of marquis. That is why the writer cannot mention how cold the uncarpeted floors are. Here, what is stressed by the writer is how nice and beautiful the *uncarpeted* floors are. Thus, the meaning attributed by Batumlu is totally irrelevant to the context and provides an example of the perversion of the meaning.

In the twelfth segment, where the writer talks about the king before the last who is the fourteenth Louis of the Louis dynasty by saying “*the last but one*”. This saying is conveyed to the target text as “*sondan bir önceki*” (the last but one) by Arvas and “*sonuncu*” (the last) by Batumlu. Arvas conveys this term and information successfully and properly; however, the reader who reads the second translation by Batumlu, considers that Louis the fourteenth

is the last of the line, which is not true. Thus, Batumlu both mis-conveys the meaning and also misinforms the reader. The other problem is the translations of the word “*fashion*” which means “*moda, üslup, tarz*” (fashion, style). Here both words “*üslup*” and “*tarz*” mean “*style*”. However, the contexts in which they are used are different. The word “*üslup*” connotates literature and the way writers express themselves. On the other hand, the word “*tarz*” connotates the things related to fashion (the way Louis the Fourteenth decorates his apartment). Thus, the second translation by Batumlu conveys the actual meaning and also provides an example of perversion of the meaning.

In the thirteenth segment, the Monseigneur waits for his nephew, who is known as Charles Darnay in England, for the supper; however, the nephew is late. Actually, they were together, and then the Monseigneur reaches the chateau before the nephew and the place where he gets ahead of the nephew, which is the “*posting-house*” (postahane, posta merkezi), is explicitly specified in the source text. In the first translation by Arvas, it is conveyed to the target text as “*posta merkezi*” (post office) and in the second translation by Batumlu, it is conveyed as “*atların dinlendirildiği mola yeri*” (resting places for horses). The signs posting-house and resting place do not match at all and they are totally irrelevant. Thus, it can be said that the term “*posting-house*” is mistranslated into the target language and provides a good example of perversion of the meaning.

In the fourteenth segment, Miss Pross and Mr. Cruncher are about to leave for shopping, but Miss Pross wants to ask a question (the question which is in the sixth segment) before leaving: “*May I ask a question, Doctor Manette, before I go?*” and the Doctor smiles and answers: “*I think you may take that liberty*”. The word “*liberty*” is conveyed in Turkish as “*hak*” (right) in the first translation by Arvas and in the second translation by Batumlu, it is conveyed as “*özgürlük*” (freedom, liberty). The word “*hak*” is very irrelevant to the context and the word “*liberty*”. On the other hand, the second translation conveys the meaning, which is in the source text. Also, the word “*liberty*” has a special meaning for the context and the period because the pressure arisen from the regime of that time dominates the period. From this point of view, the second translation is more accurate, and it is a good example of perversion of the meaning.

### **3.2.6. Under-interpretation of the meaning**

Under-interpretation is giving insufficient information about the situation, which is described in the original text, and this leads the reader image irrelevantly or insufficiently.

Tablo 6. Examples of Under-interpretation of the meaning			
	Source Text	Target Text 1	Target Text 2
15	".....said Miss Pross, <i>cheerfully repressing</i> a sigh as she glanced at her darling's golden hair in the light of the fire,..." (p. 353)	"Miss Pross tatlı yavrusunun, şöminenin ateşinde parlayan altın sarısı saçlarına bakıp <i>derin bir iç çekerek</i> ,..." (p. 359)	"Miss Pross biricik kuzusunun şöminenin ışığında parıldayan altın saçlarına bakıp <i>iç çekişini neşeyle savuşturarak</i> ,..."(p. 383)
16	"...,and <i>stood with that blank behind him</i> , looking round for instructions." (p. 148)	"..., <i>sonra içeri çekilip kendisine verilecek emirleri bekledi.</i> " (p. 151)	"... <i>sonra sırtını boşluğa vererek emirleri beklemeye koyulmuştu.</i> " (p. 155)

In the fifteenth segment, Miss Pross sighs but represses it cheerfully. This situation is conveyed to the target text as "*derin derin iç çekerek*" in the first translation by Arvas. In the second translation it is conveyed as "*iç çekişini neşeyle savuşturarak*" by Batumlu. The way Batumlu conveyed the meaning is exactly the same as the source text. The reader can visualize exactly the same thing as the reader of the source text. However, in the first translation by Arvas, Miss Pross just sighs and the part of "*cheerfully repressing*" is omitted. That is why it does not create the same effect on the target language reader as it does on the source language reader.

In the sixteenth segment, the Monseigneur sees something outside and wants his servant to check it out. The servant does what he is told to and sees there is nothing outside and closes the blinds again. After that, he stands in a specific position. In the first translation, it is omitted. On the other hand, it is conveyed precisely. In that way, the translator makes the target text reader imagine as the source text reader does. To convey this kind of description made by the writer is crucial because it helps to grasp the style of the writer. When the first translation by Arvas is considered, it is not adequate to visualize how the servant stood and it causes losses from the style of the writer. Thus, it provides a good example of under-interpreting of the meaning.

#### 4. Conclusion and Discussion

The source book, *A Tale of Two Cities* by Charles Dickens, and two translations of it were comparatively analysed in terms of The Systematics of Designificative Tendencies which is propounded by Sündüz Öztürk Kasar (Öztürk Kasar, 2017). Sixteen striking examples were detected, categorized into the related tendencies, and evaluated.

A literary translation is the process of bringing a work to life in a different language. As Çelik (2020) stated, "the fact that rendering a text from one language to another involves losses or gains should not be restrictive for a translator" (p.591). Language does not comprise only the basic elements such as grammar, syntax, punctuation. It consists of culture, identity, ideology, and society; that is why translating a piece of literary work from one language to another means conveying all these elements. Most of the authors use descriptions in their works and this helps them to draw a picture for the reader to imagine what the writer wants to tell. While doing this, they make use of

semiotics, which is the study of signs and symbols. However, signs are mostly peculiar to nations; a sign that exist in a culture may not exist in another culture. That is why; sometimes translators have difficulties in conveying the signs. When the examples of designificative tendencies are considered in this study, it is obvious that even the translators of a great classic novel were influenced by these tendencies. Sometimes the difficulties that are faced by translators makes them apply these tendencies and sometimes they are influenced by them unconsciously. Although they had hardships in the process of translation, they succeed conveying the main theme and the meaning universe of the original book. As Kuleli (2017) indicated, translators should know the fact that “translating a literary text not only involves knowing the source language and target language well, but also grasping the meaning universe of the text” (p530). Translators may have difficulties in translating the unique features of the language on the basis of translation semiotics and therefore they may need a guide to help them (Kuleli, 2018; Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017). As seen in this study, no matter how diligently the translators work on texts, they experience designificative tendencies due to the unique elements between languages, cultural differences and intra-language changes. At this point the important thing is that even if it is not possible to make a translation, which is completely lacks in Designificative Tendencies, it is possible to minimize these tendencies by thinking critically in the process of translation.

---

**Hakem Değerlendirmesi:** Dış bağımsız.

**Author Contributions:** Conception/Design of Study- S.T., F.D.A.; Data Acquisition- S.T.; Data Analysis/Interpretation- F.D.A., S.T.; Drafting Manuscript- S.T.; Critical Revision of Manuscript- F.D.A.; Final Approval and Accountability- F.D.A., S.T.

**Çıkar Çatışması:** Yazarlar çıkar çatışması bildirmemiştir.

**Finansal Destek:** Yazarlar bu çalışma için finansal destek almadığını beyan etmiştir.

---

## References/Kaynakça

- Çelik, B. (2020). Translation of space: The case of short story entitled Have You Got Everything You Want? by Agatha Christie. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (Ö8), 583-597.
- Chandler, D. (2001). Semiotics for beginners. Retrieved from <http://lanlib.alzahra.ac.ir/multiMediaFile/2231493-4-1.pdf>
- Coquet, J.-C. (1997). *La quête du sens. Le langage en question*. Paris: PUF.
- Coquet, J.-C. (2007). *Phusis et Logos. Une Phénoménologie du langage*. Presses Universitaires de Vincennes.
- Gorlée, D. L. (1994). *Semiotics and the problem of translation: With special reference to the semiotics of Charles S. Peirce*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- <https://www.ucm.es/data/cont/docs/119-2014-02-19-5.%20Charles%20Dickens.pdf>
- Kasar, S. Ö., & Güzel, O. E. (2022). Ayşe Kulin’in Nefes Nefese adlı romanı ile İngilizce çevirilerinin kent göstergebilimi ve çeviri göstergebilimi odağında çözümlenmesi. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (27), 869-890.
- Kasar, S. Ö., & Kuleli, M. (2016). Antony and Cleopatra oyununun göstergebilimsel çözümlemesi ve çeviri göstergebilimi bakış açısıyla Türkçe çevirilerinin değerlendirilmesi. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (5), 98-123.

- Kasar, S. Ö., & Tuna, D. (2015). Yaşam, Yazın ve Yazın Çevirisi İçin Gösterge Okuma. *Frankofoni*, (27), 457-482.
- Kasar, S.Ö., & Tuna, D. (2017). Shakespeare in Three Languages Reading and Analyzing Sonnet 130 and Its Translations in Light of Semiotics. *Online Submission*, 5(1), 170-181.
- Kasar, S.Ö. (2017). Jean-Claude Coquet ve söyleyenler kuramı. *Prof. Dr. Ayşe Eziler Kıran'a armağan*. 183-199. Hacettepe Üniversitesi Basımevi
- Kourdis, E. (2015). Semiotics of translation: An interdisciplinary approach to translation. In *International handbook of semiotics* (pp. 303-320). Springer, Dordrecht.
- Kuleli, M. (2017). Analysis of Subjectivity in Literary Translation From Semiotics of Translation Point of View: Analysis of Subjectivity in The Play “Coriolanus” and Translation Evaluation. *Electronic Turkish Studies*, 12(22).
- Kuleli, M. (2018). Intertextuality in translation: Analysis of intertextual signs and evaluation of translation of a short story. *IJLET-International Journal of Languages' Education and Teaching*, 6(3), 317-330.
- Kuleli, M. (2021). Coquet's “Theory of instances of enunciation” in the analysis of *Othello* from the perspective of semiotics of translation. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17(S1), 86-108.
- Ludskanov, A. (1975). A Semiotic Approach to the Theory of Translation. *Language Sciences* (35), 5- 8.
- Petrilli, S. (2015). Translation of semiotics into translation theory, and vice versa. Punctum. *International Journal of Semiotics*, 1(2), 96-117.
- Şanbay, S. G. (2021). La perception de la «guerre» dans La Force de l'âge de Simone de Beauvoir: une lecture sous la lumière de la sémiotique des instances. *Turkish Studies-Language and Literature*, 16(3), 2009-2019.
- Saussure, F. (2001). *Genel dilbilim dersleri*. (B. Vardar, Trans.) İstanbul: Multilingual Yabancı Dil Publishing.

