

© 2026. Юльва Мухурджиши
Стамбульский университет,
г. Стамбул, Турция

Эквивалентные показатели в турецком и английском переводах «Драмы на охоте» А. П. Чехова

Аннотация: Интертекстуальная согласованность отражает степень соотнесенности исходного и целевого языков и в значительной мере влияет на восприятие читателями переводных произведений. Этот уровень соотнесенности представляет собой плодотворное поле для наблюдения социальных, лингвистических и культурных различий между исходным и целевым языками. Настоящая статья посвящена анализу «Драмы на охоте» Чехова в его турецком (2020) и английском переводах (1926) с точки зрения классификации эквивалентности Вернера Коллера. Цель исследования — выявить трудности, возникающие в процессе перевода, и оценить стратегии и приемы передачи художественной сущности произведения. Эти трудности частично обусловлены типологическими различиями между русским, турецким и английским языками, принадлежащим к разным языковым семьям. Полученные результаты также демонстрируют, что при переводе с русского на турецкий и английский нередко требуется использование вспомогательных элементов и пояснительных примечаний. При эффективном включении в текст перевода такие элементы играют важную роль в облегчении восприятия произведения читателем целевого языка.

Ключевые слова: А. П. Чехов, «Драма на охоте», Вернер Коллер, переводоведение, эквивалентность, интертекстуальная согласованность, языковые семьи

Информация об авторе: Юльва Мухурджиши, кандидат филологических наук, научный сотрудник, Стамбульский университет, ул. Орду, № 6, Фатих, г. Стамбул, Турция. ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6380-6867>

E-mail: yulvamuhurcisi@gmail.com

Дата поступления статьи в редакцию: 08.09.2025

Дата одобрения статьи рецензентами: 11.01.2026

Дата публикации статьи: 25.03.2026

Для цитирования: Мухурджиши Ю. Эквивалентные показатели в турецком и английском переводах «Драмы на охоте» А. П. Чехова // Два века русской классики. 2026. Т. 8, № 1. С. 258–279. <https://doi.org/10.22455/2686-7494-2026-8-1-258-279>



This is an open access article
distributed under the Creative
Commons Attribution 4.0
International (CC BY 4.0)

Dva veka russskoi klassiki,
vol. 8, no. 1, 2026, pp. 258–279. ISSN 2686-7494
Two centuries of the Russian classics,
vol. 8, no. 1, 2026, pp. 258–279. ISSN 2686-7494

Research Article

© 2026. **Yulva Muhurcisi**
Istanbul University
Istanbul, Turkey

Equivalent Indicators in the Turkish and English Translations of A. P. Chekhov’s “The Shooting Party”

Abstract: Intertextual consistency reflects the degree of alignment between translated works and significantly influences how readers comprehend them. This level of alignment offers a productive field, allowing for the observation of social, linguistic, and cultural differences between the source language (SL) and target language (TL). The focus of this article is to examine “The Shooting Party” by A. P. Chekhov; its Turkish (2020) and English (1926) translations in terms of equivalence classifications by Werner Koller. The aim of the research is to explore the challenges encountered during translation and to evaluate the strategies and expression methods used for conveying the essence of the novel. These challenges stem in part from the typological differences between Russian, Turkish, and English, belonging to different language families. The findings also suggest that, when translating from Russian to Turkish and English, it is often necessary to employ auxiliary elements and explanatory notes. Such elements, when incorporated effectively into the translation, play a critical role in facilitating the target reader’s comprehension.

Keywords: Anton Chekhov, The Shooting Party, Werner Koller, translation studies, equivalence, intertextual consistency, language families

Information about the author: Yulva Muhurcisi, PhD in Philology, Research Assistant PhD, Istanbul University, Ordu Cad, № 6, Fatih, Istanbul, Turkey. ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6380-6867>

E-mail: yulvamuhurcisi@gmail.com

Received: September 08, 2025

Approved after reviewing: January 11, 2026

Published: March 25, 2026

For citation: Muhurcisi, Yu. “Equivalent Indicators in the Turkish and English Translations of A. P. Chekhov’s ‘The Shooting Party.’” *Dva veka russskoi klassiki*, vol. 8, no. 1, 2026, pp. 258–279. (In English) <https://doi.org/10.22455/2686-7494-2026-8-1-258-279>

Introduction

It is undeniable that throughout the history of mankind, translation has served either for the benefit or the detriment of humanity. Through the translation of literary works, people have either had the opportunity to understand one another better, gain new insights, draw inspiration, and progress further, or, on the contrary, to develop biases and prejudices against each other.

Because of this, translation has always been of great social importance. Whenever one society interacts with another — through commerce, politics, or military affairs—translation emerges as an indispensable phenomenon, including everything from treaties and commercial agreements to military capitulations. In a broader sense, it serves as a prerequisite for keeping order and peace among nations [Belloc: 2]. This evidently illustrates the importance of translation, as it is the sole way of building bridges between nations.

And since every specific sentence in a literary work is part of a system and every sentence, literary work, and genre constitute a larger system in relation to one another, one could say that literature operates within the system and for the sake of human culture, as well [Scholes: 10]. In this regard, the translation of a literary work — and, more specifically, a proper and adequately equivalent translation — places a significant responsibility on the shoulders of translators throughout the world. By fulfilling this responsibility, it becomes evident that a translator serves not merely as a translator but as an interpreter and commentator of the work itself. This demonstrates that translation is not a simple task; rather, it is a complex, multifaceted process that requires the translator to take into account numerous variables.

To elaborate on this responsibility further, as Susan Bassnet states, the first step a translator takes when working with an SL text is to become thoroughly acquainted with it—to analyze and understand it in depth — before rendering it into a TL. In doing so, the translator bears a far greater responsibility than the reader of an SL text, as he has to take into account more than one set

of systems when dealing with the text. For this reason, Bassnet argues that it is foolish to claim that the mere task of the translator is to translate and not to interpret. It is entirely natural for the translators to contribute their own creative insights [Bassnet: 86]. Beyond dealing with texts on multiple levels, the translator's motivation in choosing a particular literary work in a foreign language is also important. This motivation may stem from a variety of factors, and the translator's engagement with the SL text contributes significantly to the understanding of the culture and representatives of the SL community. In this sense, we can say that the efforts of early Turkish translators paved the way for the initial acquaintance with Russian society in the 20th century, and this holds particular importance in the history of the translation of Russian literary works in Turkey.

Among the first Russian writers whose works were translated in the early 1900s were Chekhov, Turgenev, Gogol, Fonvizin, Griboyedov, etc. The reason these authors' works were selected was probably due to the personal tastes of the translators. Nevertheless, it can be said that the translation activity of this period made a significant contribution to acquainting the Turkish readers with Russia's cultural and artistic heritage. The Turkish readers started hearing Chekhov's name with his *Minds in Ferment* in 1910. In 1935, a collection of short stories titled *The Fellow Traveller of Life* was published in Turkish, featuring six stories [Oldzhaj: 28–31]. In 1938, Zeki Baştımar translated *Mask* with an eight-page preface, while Hasan Ali Ediz translated *Ward No. 6* with a forty-seven-page preface [Aykut: 17]. In 1939, six stories were translated by Ediz and eight by Haydar Rifat Yorulmaz, although from French. In 1940, *A Marriage Proposal* was translated by Gaffar Güney, and *The Seagull*, *Uncle Vanya*, *Three Sisters*, and *The Cherry Orchard* were translated by Erol Güney and Melih Cevdet Anday. In 1944, *The Shooting Party* was translated under the title *The Girl with the Red Dress* by Adnan Tahir Tan. In 1960, Mehmet Özgül gained recognition with his translation of *The Steppe*, followed by Ergin Altay with *The Lady with the Dog*. In 1967, Chekhov's play *Ivanov* and his later dramatic works were translated into Turkish in two volumes by the prominent poet and writer Ataol Behramoğlu [Oldzhaj: 33–41]. The translation of various Russian prose works and plays not only had a great impact on the development of the Turkish theatre and literature but also gave birth to an increased interest in the history and culture of Russia, strengthening Russian-Turkish cultural relations and popularizing Russian literature, particularly Chekhov. To this day, due to Chekhov's popularity,

many of his plays continue to be staged, and his stories continue to be translated into Turkish.

The translation of his works not only contributed to his popularity but also prompted a number of academics to study Chekhov at universities, producing scholarly publications and organizing academic events. For instance, Zeynep Zafer's book *Anton Chekhov's Art of the Short Story* (2002, Ankara University) analyzes Chekhov's life and creativity, his humour, artistic principles, as well as the structural characteristics and artistic integrity of his short stories. Hülya Arslan's book *Chekhov in Turkey* (2012, Yeditepe University) examines the history of Chekhov translation in the Ottoman period, his reception in Turkish novella and theatre, the dramaturgy of Chekhov and its influence on Turkish national theatre. Emine İnanır's articles (Istanbul University) focus on Chekhov's plays and the impact of his literary tradition on Turkish literature, including an analysis of the play *Uncle Vanya* and the historical and cultural atmosphere in which Chekhov lived. Whereas Türkan Olcay's articles (Istanbul University) outline the theatrical reception of Chekhov's plays in Turkish theatres. In addition, a collective translation by Turkish academics, *30 Stories Picked by Tolstoi*, was published in 2004. In the same year, the symposium *The Century after Chekhov* was held in Istanbul University, where numerous literary scholars, academics, and researchers presented papers on Chekhov, later published in a proceedings volume. Thus, as the list suggests, among the academics who have studied Chekhov, his works have been examined primarily through his short stories and plays, as well as their influence on Turkish novel writing and theatre. Despite the fact that Zeynep Zafer and Hülya Arslan list *The Shooting Party* in the bibliographies of their works, to this date, however, there has been no scholarly study devoted specifically to this work in Turkey.

The only known novel of Chekhov, *The Shooting Party*, which first appeared in the newspaper *Novosti dnia* in 1884, was not translated into Turkish until 1944, whereas its English translation dates back to 1926. The reason for this may be related to the fact that Chekhov did not include this novel in his published collected works at the time and did not mention it. However, the fact that the narrator in the novel turns out to be the criminal — contrary to the European and American novels, where the attention is concentrated on the investigator or detective — makes this work interesting for readers who are quite familiar with Chekhov's plays and short stories, but not with a novel [Overina: 19–20]. Since crime novels were popular in Europe, America,

and Russia during the last decades of the 19th century, their translation into Turkish in 1944 may have received different reactions from readers in Turkey. The fact that the novel was translated into Turkish a second time in 2020 makes it even more interesting for Chekhov admirers, as its structure differs considerably from his other well-known short stories.



**Figure 1. The first translation of *The Shooting Party* into Turkish in 1944:
*The Girl with the Red Dress***

The Turkish translation published in 1944 under the title *The Girl with the Red Dress* is a clear indication of the emphasis placed on the main female character, Olga, whose beauty is repeatedly associated with the red dress she wears throughout the novel. While no information and reader feedback is available regarding the 1944 translation, the 2020 translation offers numerous opinions and reviews from Turkish readers.

Among these reviews, readers describe the novel as a highly distinctive crime narrative and “a book within a book” in which the murderer and the person who uncovers the crime are one and the same. Readers note its strong psychological and social dimensions, emphasizing that it reflects a

broad panorama of the period and remarking that the narrative initially resembles a typical Russian novel, only to transform suddenly into a crime story. Given that Chekhov was a trained physician, the detailed depiction of the murder, and the fact that the novel was written as a reaction to the Russian aristocracy — exposing the tastes, indifference and moral emptiness of the wealthy in contrast to the poor — are among its most striking features.

The work indeed seems to present a comprehensive image of Russia at the time, introducing aristocrats, villagers, gypsies, doctors, and lawmakers within a sociological framework. Moreover, it offers a sharp critique of the aristocracy, counts and their comfortable, alcohol-soaked lifestyle. Chekhov's use of anatomical terminology and his profound medical knowledge are noted as particularly engaging, as well. Although the work can be classified as a crime novel, it stands out due to its narrative structure, the author's distinctive style, and depth of psychological analysis of the characters. Unlike many Russian classics, it is perceived by the readers as dynamic and fast-paced. The gradual collapse of the Russian aristocracy and the critique of the social system are conveyed through the crime narrative in a manner that resonated strongly with Turkish readers.

Apart from general readers, the 2020 translation was also met with enthusiasm by two critics. For instance, Turkish critic Beyza Ertem argues that the psychological states and internal conflicts of the characters are integrated into the murder investigation, which distinguishes the novel from classic crime fiction and positions it as both a crime novel and a parody of the genre. She notes that the introductory section of the novel, in which the publisher's opinions are presented, is highly unconventional and encourages readers to move back and forth between reality and fiction. Ertem also points out that the protagonist, Zinoviev, functions simultaneously as both narrator and investigator, a narrative strategy that further differentiates the work from traditional crime novels. She emphasizes that Zinoviev is a character driven by his emotions rather than detached from them, and that his emotional involvement undermines the principle of objectivity typically expected in the crime genre. Finally, she characterizes the novel as a crime narrative marked by Chekhov's distinctive authorial signature [Ertem].

Another Turkish writer and poet, Ömer Yalçınova, approaches the novel through an analysis of its characters and by comparing them with figures from other works of Russian literature. He argues that Olga resembles Tolstoi's Anna Karenina, with the crucial difference that Olga betrays both

her husband and her lover. Unlike Anna Karenina, Olga is not solely in pursuit of love; rather, she seeks a luxurious life in order to escape her former life with her insane father. These motives are more important to her than love itself, which places her in direct contrast not only to Anna Karenina but also to Flaubert's *Madame Bovary*. Yalçınova also compares the characters in the novel to those in Dostoevsky's *The Gambler*, noting that they are similarly trapped in cycles of indecision and self-destructive behavior. Sergei Petrovich in *The Shooting Party* is fully aware of the count's immorality and intends to end their friendship, yet he continues to attend the count's gatherings. The count repeatedly promises to stop drinking but drinks more heavily each day. Urbenin knows that Olga will ultimately bring about his downfall, yet he never leaves her. These figures resemble Dostoevsky's characters, who perceive the truth but fail to act upon it. Finally, Yalçınova compares Zinoviev and Raskolnikov in terms of conscience. Zinoviev attempts to silence his conscience by killing the parrot, which echoes the same accusations voiced by his inner moral awareness. Raskolnikov, by contrast, follows a different path: he kisses Sonia's feet, turns himself in and confesses his crime, whereas Zinoviev continues to deny his guilt [Yalçınova].

Regarding general Turkish readers' feedback and critics' remarks on the novel, it is evident that the Turkish audience—already well acquainted with Chekhov within Russian literature — perceives this work as different, both in terms of its structure and in its distinctive combination of crime fiction with the psychological states of the characters. This reception is closely aligned with the novel's overall content and narrative strategy. General concepts like love, betrayal, ambition, murder and secrecy are woven together in such a way that they keep readers enthusiastic until the end.

Consequently, in order to gain a deeper understanding of the work, it becomes necessary to examine its linguistic and translational features in greater detail. Such an analysis allows for a more nuanced interpretation of the text, although those aspects are primarily discernible to translation scholars and academics who are able to engage with the text beyond surface-level reading.

The reason this novel was chosen for analysis in terms of equivalence classifications of Werner Koller in its English and Turkish translations lies in Chekhov's distinctive use of the Russian language. His rich expressive methods, use of idioms, zoonyms, and other features inherent to Russian — such as grammatical gender of nouns, the use of second-person singular and

plural pronouns, and linguocultural connotations—require particular attention in translation. The fact that all these cultural phenomena demand a careful approach when translating makes this novel an important material for the present study, which aims to produce meaningful results on the role and degree of equivalence in translated literary texts and illustrate how crucial an equivalent translation is for reflecting the Russian mentality within a literary work.

Method & Findings

Derived from the Latin words *aequus* (equal) and *valentis* (strong), equivalence means equality in value and force. In translation studies, it refers to the approximation of meaning and the degree of equivalence between the source and target texts [Iljushkina: 29]. The theory of equivalence has been studied thoroughly from various perspectives, each offering a different point of view. For instance, A. D. Shvejcer considers that equivalence is achieved at the communicative level; L. S. Barhudarov defines it as a semantic category of the text as a whole; V. S. Vinogradov interprets it as the equivalence of content-related, semantic, stylistic and functional-communicative information; and V. N. Komissarov regards it as the maximal identity of all contents between the source and target text.

However, before diving into the depth of equivalence definitions, one needs to take into consideration that the degree of approximation to the original depends on several factors. For instance, the translator's skill, the specific features of the languages and cultures being compared, the period in which the source text and the translation were produced, the method of translation, the nature of the texts being translated and so forth [Vinogradov: 9]. And, for a firm approach to the subject, one should also acknowledge that equivalence should not be regarded as a pursuit of sameness, since it cannot exist even between two TL versions of the same text [Bassnet: 37]. There are things such as lack of denotations or connotations that may not find equivalents in the TL, as well as linguistic expressions, grammatical structures, idioms and phrases that may not have adequate equivalents in the translated text. These factors affect the degree of untranslatability and prove that full equivalence is not possible.

What deserves particular attention is that the translated text should evoke in the TL reader an effect analogous to that produced by the original text

on its SL reader [Göktürk: 60]. To achieve this, Werner Koller proposes the following set of correspondences that he regards as particularly significant for the framework of equivalence:

1) The extra-linguistic circumstances conveyed by the text; 2) The connotations conveyed by the text via the mode of verbalisation; 3) The text and language norms (usage norms) which apply to parallel texts in the TL; 4) The way the receiver is taken into account, and 5) Aesthetic properties of the SL text [Koller: 197]. According to Koller, equivalence can be achieved only when the translator meets the requirements in the TL text. To further elaborate on the classifications and examples from the source and target texts:

1) Denotative equivalence involves not translating word-for-word or sentence-for-sentence, but rather conveying the semantic content. To achieve this, a translator must use the most established, widely accepted and straightforward meaning of words, structures and expressions such as “No smoking” or “Entry prohibited” [Göktürk: 68]. In this type of equivalence, the translator’s main objective is to convey the exact meaning of the circumstances described in the source text. In doing so, he does not have to adhere strictly to the literal translation of words and sentences, but to rather ensure that the TL reader can fully comprehend the context. For instance:

SL: — *Как когда!* — отвечал голос Поликарпа [Chekhov 1983: 248].

TL 1: “*Ne zaman mı?*” diye yanıtladı Polikarp’ın sesi [Çehov 2020: 20].

TL 2: “*That depends!*” Polycarp’s voice answered [Chekhov 1926: 11].

The idiomatic meaning of *как когда* depends on the context in which it is used, meaning *it depends*, or *sometimes yes, sometimes no*. In the Turkish translation, it is given simply as *when?* — which does not correspond to the situation itself, although it is not completely a word-for-word translation. However, in the English translation, we can see the proper equivalent, allowing the TL reader to fully comprehend the context.

SL: — Известно, *делать ничего...* [Chekhov 1983: 248].

TL 1: “*Bilinen bir durum, yapacak bir şey yok...*” [Çehov 2020: 20].

TL 2: “*Everybody knows he has nothing to do.*” [Chekhov 1926: 11].

The phrase *делать ничего* either refers to a person’s lack of occupation or to a situation in which there is nothing to do. In the Turkish translation,

it is given as *there is nothing to do*. However, the passage describes the count's laziness and the fact that he has nothing to occupy himself with — not a situation in which nothing can be done. In this regard, the Turkish translation demonstrates a shift, failing to depict the content, whereas the English translation conveys the meaning correctly.

SL: Не вспомнить ли старину? [Chekhov 1983: 276].

TL 1: “Eski günleri hatırlamıyor musun?” [Çehov 2020: 52].

TL 2: “Shouldn't we remember old times?” [Chekhov 1926: 49].

This expression reflects the main character's willingness to recall and reminisce the old days. In the Turkish translation, it appears as *don't you remember the old days?*; however, this does not fully correspond to the situation, since afterward the main character pours himself a drink. The English translation, on the other hand, conveys the literal meaning more accurately by expressing it as an invitation or suggestion. As we can see, in all three examples, although the Turkish translations are grammatically correct and not strictly word-for-word, they convey a meaning that is close to the situation yet fail to reflect the literal meaning. The equivalence is met, though not entirely.

2) Connotative equivalence involves the stylistic and lexical choices belonging to social classes, regional dialects. The text may include everyday, didactic, colloquial, or even coarse usage of language and speech of students, workers, soldiers, clerks, police officers, peasants, or representatives of the middle or upper classes. The text may also employ rigid and elaborate written style. The translator's task here is to examine the semantic fields of words, along with their denotative and connotative relations [Göktürk: 70]. The fact that Chekhov's works encompass a wide range of social classes, each characterized by distinct patterns of speech, places on the translator the responsibility of accurately conveying the appropriate use of language in the SL. For instance:

SL: — Я не пью-с, — сказал он [Chekhov 1983: 313].

TL 1: “İçmiyorum, *efendim*” dedi [Çehov 2020: 91].

TL 2: “I don't drink, *sir*” he said [Chekhov 1926: 100].

The suffix *-с* comes from *сударь* (*sir*) / *сударыня* (*madam*) and is an old form of polite address, which is shortened and attached to words. It

demonstrates the hierarchy of social class and the relationship between the characters. As this shortened suffix can not be translated into the target languages in the same form, the Turkish and English translations were made using the full word *sir*. In this case, it can be said that the appropriate translation has been achieved.

SL: — Извени <...> [Chekhov 1983: 293].

TL 1: “Üzgünüm <...>” [Çehov 2020: 70].

TL 2: “Forgive me <...>” [Chekhov 1926: 71].

The second-person singular imperative of *извинить* is phonetically misspelled in this fragment, demonstrating the speaker’s level of education. This form is not conveyed in either the Turkish or English translations, as doing so would require alterations in the TL. This detail is significant because it highlights the social distinction between an educated and an uneducated person. However, since this detail is not conveyed in the translations, it can be said that equivalence is not fully achieved. While the reader of the SL text can grasp the character’s level of education, the TL readers have no indication of it, which results in the failure to convey Chekhov’s artistic mastery in using colloquial language.

SL: — Здорово, *Сычиха!* — сказал я ей [Chekhov 1983: 254].

TL 1: “Merhaba, *Kukumav!*” dedim [Çehov 2020: 27].

TL 2: “How do you do, *Scops?*” I said to her [Chekhov 1926: 19].

The old woman Nastasia is named after a type of owl in Russian — *сычиха*. Here, Chekhov aims to give an impression of her resembling an owl in appearance, while also conveying personality traits such as gloominess, unsociability, and quietness, much like the old woman herself. In the Turkish and English translations, we see the equivalents of this type of owl. However, the Russian word also carries an abstract meaning related to a person’s character, whereas in English, *scops* lack such connotations. In Turkish, *kukumav* carries such emotional and cultural associations, making the Turkish translation a close and adequate equivalent. The English translation, on the other hand, conveys only her physical appearance but not the nature of her character.

SL: — Чёрт вас возьми, *щуренька!* [Chekhov 1983: 289].

TL 1: “Lanet olsun, *İspinoz!*” [Çehov 2020: 66].

TL 2: “The devil take you, *Screwy!*” [Chekhov 1926: 66].

Pavel Ivanovich Voznesenskij is called *щур* / *щуренька* because of his squinting eyes and the way he screws them up when observing objects; the nickname derives from the verb *щурить* (*to squint*). In the Turkish translation, however, we see the word *ispinoz* (*chaffinch*), a type of bird, which comes from the Russian noun *щур*. The translation choice here appears inadequate, as there is a semantic shift in the meaning, despite the novel's explanation of why the main character and the whole district call him *screwy*. On the contrary, the English translation is more appropriate, as the word *screwy* comes from the verb *to screw*, which conveys the literal meaning. Although there is an explanation of why he is called *screwy* in the Turkish translation, there remains no logical connection between this and the reason he is named after a bird.

A zoonym can define a person in terms of his behaviour, actions, character traits and appearance. When characterizing a fictional character, a zoonym most often gives a negative assessment to a person [Ivanishcheva, Bolgova: 666]. Proper names and zoonyms may carry a wide range of additional connotations, and their function may extend beyond identification to characterization [Recker: 15]. It should be noted that the adequate translation of proper names and zoonyms is of utmost importance for allowing the TL reader to empathize with the characters and they demonstrate the artistic creativity of the writer. They do not necessarily carry negative characteristics; in these examples, they convey the characters' appearance, personality and behavioral habits, which once again makes an equivalent translation crucial for the TL reader.

3) Text-normative equivalence relating to text types requires to observe certain syntactic and lexical conventions and convey them in the established norms and traditions of the TL in the translation of contracts, business correspondence, or letters. For instance, in the translation of novels composed entirely of letters, it is natural that the letters be translated in a format familiar to the TL reader [Göktürk: 73]. As Chekhov's works also encompass a variety of letters, the accurate translation of forms of address and titles requires a careful approach to ensure the TL reader's comprehension. For instance:

SL: — Милый мой Лекок! <...> Твой А. К. [Chekhov 1983: 249].

TL 1: “Sevgili Lecoq’um! <...> Hürmetler, A. K.” [Çehov 2020: 21].

TL 2: “My Dear Lecoq, <...> Your A. K.” [Chekhov 1926: 12].

In both the Turkish and English translations, the form of address at the beginning of the count’s letter is conveyed correctly with the words *sevgili* and *my dear*, with a slight difference in the closing lines. While the English version provides a literal translation with *your*, the Turkish version ends with *hürmetler*, meaning *respectfully* (с уважением). This choice is mainly due to the fact that target reader in Turkish is taken into account, as in Turkish, letters do not end with *your* in the same way as English and Russian ones.

4) Pragmatic equivalence involves conveying subjects and contents specific to a given language or culture in the most comprehensible way to the TL reader. For instance, the translation of *fish and chips* into Turkish would be *köfte ekmek* (бутерброд с котлетой). Or in Bible translations for Eskimos, the sentence “Give us this day our daily bread” would be “Give us this day our daily fish” as Eskimos are not familiar with bread [Göktürk: 76]. The examples in this category are also abundant, since Russian cuisine and culture contain elements that are unfamiliar to Turkish- or English-speaking communities. A literal translation would not be appropriate here, as there may simply be no equivalents in the TL. For instance:

SL: <...> стакан со сливками <...> [Chekhov 1983: 254].

TL 1: <...> içinde *kaymak* olan bardağı <...> [Çehov 2020: 27].

TL 2: <...> a glass of *milk* <...> [Chekhov 1926: 19].

The word *сливка* refers either to the thick layer that forms on the surface of milk or to the liquid form of cream. The Turkish translation conveys a closer meaning if it refers to the condensed part of the milk, whereas if it denotes the liquid cream that is poured into coffee or tea, *cream* would be a more appropriate choice. On the other hand, the English translation is given as *milk*, which does not correspond to the cultural context and therefore remains inadequate.

In his article titled *On Linguistic Aspects of Translation*, Roman Jakobson states the following: “No one can understand the word *cheese* unless he has an acquaintance with the meaning assigned to this word in the lexical code of English. Any representative of a cheese-less culinary culture will understand

the English word *cheese* if he is aware that in this language it means *food made of pressed curds* and if he has at least a linguistic acquaintance with *curds*.” He suggests intralingual translation or rewording, in case there is deficiency, and using loanwords or loan-translations, neologisms or semantic shifts [Jacobson: 232–234]. This appears to be the most effective solution in cases where there are differences in cultural connotations between the languages.

SL: <...> в потраченном *гривеннике* <...> [Chekhov 1983: 280].

TL 1: <...> on *rubleyi unutsam* <...> [Çehov 2020: 56].

TL 2: <...> an account of ten *kopecks* <...> [Chekhov 1926: 54].

The word *гривенник* refers to an old monetary unit consisting of ten kopecks and serves as an excellent example of a culture-specific detail. The translators' choices differ significantly here: The English translator gives it as *ten kopecks*, thus providing a literal explanation of the term, whereas the Turkish translator completely misses the meaning by translating it as *ten roubles*, which is a clear miscalculation. The most appropriate approach would be to retain the word *grivennik* in the text and include a footnote explaining its meaning, allowing the TL reader to grasp the cultural background of the term.

SL: престольный праздник [Chekhov 1983: 294].

TL 1: Tapınak Bayramı [Çehov 2020: 72].

TL 2: fête of the church [Chekhov 1926: 74].

Names of religious festivals and references to Orthodox Christianity are abundant in Russian prose, as religion constitutes an integral part of Russian society. The Turkish translation of *престольный праздник* is given as *Tapınak Bayramı* (Temple Festival). However, the term *tapınak* in Turkish carries a pagan connotation, which makes this an inaccurate translation. A more appropriate choice would be *Kilise Bayramı* (Church Festival), which better reflects the Christian roots. The English translation, *church festival* or *feast day*, on the other hand, is closer in meaning, though the translator's choice plays a significant role here.

SL: помещичьи *брички* [Chekhov 1983: 307].

TL 1: toprak sahiplerinin *brıçkaları* [Çehov 2020: 85].

TL 2: landowners' *britzkas* [Chekhov 1926: 92].

The Russian language is particularly rich in various types of cart names, each reflecting distinct features and functions. In the case of the term *бричка*, the Turkish language holds an advantage, as the word has also been adopted into Turkish and is listed in the dictionary as *brıçka*. Therefore, the Turkish translation demonstrates the literal equivalent of the Russian word. The English version, however, uses the transliteration without a footnote explaining its meaning, leaving the TL reader either to look it up or remain uncertain about the exact reference, although it is clear from the context that it refers to a type of cart.

SL: перед картиной *Пукирева* [Chekhov 1983: 316].

TL 1: *Pukirev'in tablosunun önünde* [Çehov 2020: 95].

TL 2: before *Pukirev's* picture [Chekhov 1926: 105].

Names of famous Russian writers, artists, and their works play a significant role in introducing Russian culture to any TL reader. Writers reference other writers or artists and their works to provide context for a situation or to support their ideas. In the novel, the Russian artist V. V. Pukirev's most famous painting, *The Unequal Marriage* is mentioned to draw a parallel with the situation Olga finds herself in. This provides an excellent opportunity for the translator to convey cultural background to the TL reader. In the Turkish translation, the painting is referred to as *Pukirev'in tablosu*, with a footnote explaining his most famous work, thereby allowing the reader to comprehend Olga's circumstances. The English translation, on the contrary, mentions only the artist's name, offering no background information.

5) Formal equivalence encompasses the aesthetic properties of the SL, such as the translation of syntactic and stylistic features, in a way that achieves a comparable aesthetic effect. In this type of equivalence, attention is given to the translation of idioms, wordplay, rhyme, meter, imagery and metaphors. Interior monologues also play a crucial role, as they reflect the author's stylistic characteristics [Göktürk: 77]. The role of the translator in this category is to convey the closest possible meaning in idioms, wordplay, imagery, and metaphors, as each culture contains numerous expressions with similar meanings. To achieve this, the translator must not only have an excellent knowledge of the SL but also a deep understanding of the TL into which he is translating. For instance:

SL: <...> чтобы они поцеловались! *Горько!* [Chekhov 1983: 322].

TL 1: <...> onlar öpüşsünler diye söylüyorum! *Üzücü!* [Çehov 2020: 101].

TL 2: <...> that they should kiss each other! *Bitter!* [Chekhov 1926: 113].

According to Slavic culture, during wedding feasts, guests pretend that the wine tastes bitter until the newlyweds kiss. They express this with the Russian adverb *горько* (*bitter*), they shout so that the bride and groom kiss and the wine tastes good again. This adverb in its Turkish translation is translated as *üzücü*, which means *upsetting*, *saddening* and there is a negative shift in the meaning. In its English translation it is translated as *bitter*, which in a way gives a decent equivalent, although there is too not a footnote explaining the custom behind this word. The English-speaking community may or may not be familiar with the Slavic custom, but in both cases a footnote explaining the background of the adverb is needed for the TL reader. The Turkish-speaking community is absolutely not comprehending why *upsetting* is used after a sentence about kissing, thus not comprehending the context.

SL: Я, на вашем месте, на семи осинах удавился [Chekhov 1983: 309].

TL 1: Sizin yerinizde olsaydım kendimi asardım [Çehov 2020: 87].

TL 2: I, in your place, would have hanged myself on seven aspens [Chekhov 1926: 95].

The Russian phrase *на семи осинах*, although literally meaning *on seven aspens*, is used to intensify the situation the main character is in and to express his emotional state. As seen in the Turkish translation, this phrase is omitted, and the line is simply given as *I would have hanged myself if I were you*. In the English translation, the literal meaning of the phrase is preserved, which may not be entirely clear to the English-speaking readers but still conveys the sense of exaggeration and emotional intensity of the statement. The word-for-word translation of the phrase into Turkish would be out of place; therefore finding another expression that conveys the exaggeration would be more appropriate.

As we can see, in each idiomatic term a whole phrase is packed, and the term must be unpacked if we would put its meaning into our own tongue, where there is no general close-corresponding single term by which to express it. Rendering idiom by idiom here would be the best solution. For instance, the Greek exclamation, “By the Dog!” is in literal English merely comic.

Instead of this, “By God!” is much nearer to “By the Dog!” than anything else [Belloc: 9–11]. If the translator is unable to reproduce an equivalent proverb in the TL, it is preferable to resort to a paraphrase of its meaning [Shereminskaja: 158]. In this way, it is absolutely more suitable for the target readers to comprehend the given situations in case footnotes are not present.

SL: Накаленный воздух был неподвижен и сух, несмотря на то, что дорога моя лежала по берегу громаднейшего озера... [Chekhov 1983: 251].

TL 1: Kızgın hava hareketsiz ve kuru olmasına rağmen yolum bir gölün kıyısından geçiyordu... [Çehov 2020: 24].

TL 2: The hot air was dry and motionless, although my road led along the banks of an enormous lake... [Chekhov 1926: 15].

This example serves as a good illustration of syntactical mistakes that may occur in translation from another language. The Turkish translation is given literally as “Even though the air was hot, still, and dry, my path ran along the shore of a lake”. The fact that the main character is puzzled by the air being hot and dry despite the presence of an enormous lake is presented in a reverse logical order when the syntactical structure is disrupted. On the other hand, the English translation maintains the correct order, making the logical connection between the two clauses easier to comprehend.

SL: — Взять бы вот у тебя, Кузьма, твою нагайку да отшпандорить тебя во все корки [Chekhov 1983: 255].

TL 1: “Kuzma, kırbacını yanına alaydın da derin soyulana kadar kendini bir güzel ıslataydın” [Çehov 2020: 29].

TL 2: “Kusma, you deserve to be thrashed black and blue with your own whip” [Chekhov 1926: 20].

This example also serves as a good illustration of syntactical mistakes, although in this case the mistake leads to a shift in meaning, as the characters’ intention is to thrash Kusma, not to have him thrash himself. In the Turkish translation, this is given as: “Kuzma, you should have taken your whip with you and soaked yourself nicely until your skin was flayed”. This syntactical mistake shows how incorrect ordering of the elements within a clause can result in shifts in meaning. The English translation, on

the other hand, is a closer equivalent in meaning and is further enriched by the use of an idiom.

SL: — Петр Егорыч, садитесь, пожалуйста! Будет вам стоять! [Chekhov 1983: 258].

TL 1: “Pyotr Yegoriç, otur lütfen! Bu kadar ayakta durman yeter!” [Çehov 2020: 31].

TL 2: “Petr Egorych, sit down, please! Why are you standing there?” [Chekhov 1926: 24].

As the final example, and perhaps one of the most significant, is the distinction between the second-person singular and plural personal pronouns. This distinction also exists in Turkish and English, as in Russian, the second-person plural pronoun also shows a degree of respect and establishes social boundaries. This detail is disregarded in both the Turkish and English translations, thereby altering the aesthetic effect the writer intended. The incorrect introduction of the second-person singular and plural pronouns is preserved throughout the entire texts. While this distinction may easily be overlooked in English, the Turkish language also has verb conjugations according to personal pronouns. Therefore, disregarding this distinction leads to a significant change of the writer’s style.

However, it should also be acknowledged that the translator has the right to differ, to be independent, and this independence should not distort the original text, but rather contribute to creating a living work. Although the translation process may involve shifts, this does not mean that the translator aims to underemphasize the text but endeavors to convey the semantic properties despite the differences between the languages [Bassnet: 88–94]. Koller’s classifications, which outline various spectrums of equivalence in the translations of literary texts, provide a valuable framework for analyzing translated works, as they encompass a wide range of variables that must be considered to achieve a proper translation.

Discussion & Conclusion

The theory of equivalence seeks to provide the closest translation of a literary work into the target language, preserving the semantic, syntactic,

idiomatic, and other multi-layered features of the original text. The goal is largely achieved through establishing a hierarchy among the different types of equivalence. The classifications proposed by Koller and other translation theorists in the field offer satisfactory results for analyzing translations between Indo-European languages, including Russian and English. However, Turkish, which belongs to the Ural-Altai language family, differs fundamentally from these languages in terms of its structural characteristics.

Although there are differences between Russian, English and Turkish, certain similarities assist translators in fulfilling their task—such as the presence of second-person singular and plural pronouns, which denote varying degrees of respect toward the addressee. Preserving such distinctions in translation enables the TL reader to better comprehend the work and gain a deeper understanding of the society it depicts. However, it is evident in this study that Chekhov's novel *The Shooting Party* is rich in cultural expressions and linguistic usages specific to Russian society, making its translation a particularly challenging and specialized endeavor. The accurate and adequate transfer of such cultural phenomena requires meticulous and comprehensive study and it can be said that the Turkish and English translations have achieved or failed this responsibility in different aspects.

To avoid excessive length, only the most notable examples from the English and Turkish translations were selected for analysis. The examples illustrating the translators' choices demonstrate that a hierarchy of equivalence has been achieved across different spectrums, though not entirely. In this regard, it can be asserted that the translators' responsibility in conveying the original text into their target languages is a great one, and that transferring all the cultural phenomena into the language of another society deserves the highest praise, as translators serve as true mediators between cultures. In doing so, a translator not only has to know the source language almost like a native speaker, but also needs to have a deep understanding of the history, culture, and social background of the society of the source language.

To sum it up, it can be asserted that the Turkish translation was met with great enthusiasm by both general Turkish readers and critics. These groups tend to be more interested in Chekhov's artistic style, language and narrative technique — features they are already familiar with — rather than in the scientific accuracy of the translation itself. In this regard, *The Shooting Party* is accepted as a masterpiece and appraised as the only novel of the author;

however, it still requires further academic study at a scholarly level in Turkey, particularly in terms of literary analysis, linguistics and translation studies.

Список литературы

Источники

Чехов А. П. Полн. собр. соч. и писем.: в 30 т. М.: Наука, 1983. Т. 3. 624 с.

Chekhov A. The Shooting Party. London: Stanley Paul, 1926. 244 p.

Çehov A. P. Avda Trajedi. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2020. 197 s.

Исследования

Илюшкина М. Ю. Теория перевода: Основные понятия и проблемы. Екатеринбург: Изд-во Уральского ун-та, 2015. 80 с.

Олджай Т. Рецепция переводов русских литературно-художественных произведений в Турции // *International Journal of Russian Studies*. 2010. Т. 3, № 1. С. 23–44.

Рецкер Я. И. Теория перевода и переводческая практика. М.: Р. Валент, 2007. 244 с.

Шереминская Л. Г. Настольная книга переводчика. Ростов н/Д: Феникс, 2008. 252 с.

Виноградов В. С. Введение в переводоведение. М.: Изд-во ИОСО РАО, 2001. 224 с.

Aykut A. Türkiye’de Rus Dili ve Edebiyatı Çalışmaları. Rus Edebiyatından Çeviriler (1884–1940) ve Rusça Öğrenimi (1883–2006) // *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi*. 2006. Vol. 46. № 2. S. 1–27.

Bassnet S. Translation Studies. New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, 2005. 176 p.

Belloc H. On Translation. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1931. 44 p.

Ertem B. Çehov’un Biricik Romanı: Avda Trajedi. URL: <https://www.gazeteduvar.com.tr/kitap/2020/09/24/cehovun-biricik-romani-avda-trajedi> (дата обращения: 7.01.2026).

Göktürk A. Çeviri: Dillerin Dili. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1994. 120 s.

Jacobson R. On Linguistic Aspects of Translation // *On Translation*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959. P. 232–239.

Ivanishcheva O., Bolgova E. Russian Culture Codes (On the Example of the Russian Language Zonyms) // *Social and Behavioural Sciences*. European Publisher. 2021. P. 664–673.

Koller W. The Concept of Equivalence and the Object of Translation Studies // *International Journal of Translation Studies*. 1995. Vol. 7. № 2. P. 191–222.

Overina K. S. A. P. Chekhov’s “The Shooting Party”: The Problem of Perception // *Art Logos*. 2023. № 1, pp. 18–27.

Scholes R. Structuralism in Literature. London: Yale University Press, 1975. 223 p.

Yalçınova Ö. Anton Çehov Neden Roman Yazdı? URL: <https://www.sabitfikir.com/elestiri/anton-cehov-neden-roman-yazdi> (дата обращения: 7.01.2026).

References

- Iliushkina, M. Iu. *Teoriia perevoda: Osnovnye poniatii i problemy* [Translation Theory: Basic Concepts and Problems]. Ekaterinburg, Ural University Publ., 2015. 80 p. (In Russ.)
- Oldzhai, T. “Retseptsiia perevodov russkikh literaturno-khudozhestvennykh proizvedenii v Turtsii” [“The Reception of Translations of Russian Literary and Artistic Works in Turkey”]. *International Journal of Russian Studies*, vol. 3, no. 1, 2010, pp. 23–44. (In Russ.)
- Retsker, Ia. I. *Teoriia perevoda i perevodcheskaia praktika* [The Theory and Practice of Translation]. Moscow, R. Valent Publ., 2007. 244 p. (In Russ.)
- Shereminskaia, L. G. *Nastolnaia kniga perevodchika* [The Translator’s Handbook]. Rostov on Don, Feniks Publ., 2008. 252 p. (In Russ.)
- Vinogradov, V. S. *Vvedenie v perevodovedenie* [Introduction to Translation Studies]. Moscow, Institute of General Secondary Education of the Russian Academy of Education Publ., 2001. 224 p. (In Russ.)
- Aykut, Altan. “Türkiye’de Rus Dili ve Edebiyatı Çalışmaları. Rus Edebiyatından Çeviriler (1884–1940) ve Rusça Öğrenimi (1883–2006).” *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi*, vol. 46, no. 2, 2006, pp. 1–27. (In Turkish)
- Bassnet, Susan. *Translation Studies*. New York, Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, 2005. 176 p. (In English)
- Belloc, Hilaire. *On Translation*. Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1931. 44 p. (In English)
- Ertem, Beyza. *Çehov’un Biricik Romanı: Avda Trajedi* [Chekhov’s Only Novel: Tragedy in the Hunt] URL: <https://www.gazeteduvar.com.tr/kitap/2020/09/24/cehovun-biricik-romani-avda-trajedi> (Accessed 7 January 2026). (In Turkish)
- Göktürk, Akşit. *Çeviri: Dillerin Dili*. İstanbul, Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1994. 120 p. (In Turkish)
- Jacobson, Roman. “On Linguistic Aspects of Translation.” *On Translation*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1959, pp. 232–239. (In English)
- Ivanishcheva, Olga, and Elena Bolgova. “Russian Culture Codes (On the Example of the Russian Language Zoonyms).” *Social and Behavioural Sciences. European Publisher*, 2021, pp. 664–673. (In English)
- Koller, Werner. “The Concept of Equivalence and the Object of Translation Studies.” *International Journal of Translation Studies*, vol. 7, no. 2, 1995, pp. 191–222. (In English)
- Overina, Kseniya S. “A. P. Chekhov’s ‘The Shooting Party’: The Problem of Perception.” *Art Logos*, no. 1, 2023, pp. 18–27. (In English)
- Scholes, Robert. *Structuralism in Literature*. London, Yale University Press, 1975. 223 p. (In English)
- Yalçınova, Ömer. *Anton Çehov Neden Roman Yazdı?* Available at: <https://www.sabitfikir.com/elestiri/anton-cehov-neden-roman-yazdi> (Accessed 7 January 2026). (In Turkish)