

CONTEMPORARY ADAPTIVE LANGUAGE  
MODELS AND THE CHALLENGES OF LITERARY  
TRANSLATION (IN F. DOSTOYEVSKY'S NOVEL  
"THE BROTHERS KARAMAZOV")

Современные адаптивные модели языка и проблемы  
художественного перевода (на примере романа Ф.М. Достоевского  
«Братья Карамазовы»)

*Ekaterina A. Pokholkova*  
*pokholkova@gmail.com*  
*Moscow State Linguistic University (Moscow, Russia)*

*Iskra V. Kosmarskaia*  
*kosmarsky@mail.ru*  
*Moscow State Linguistic University (Moscow, Russia)*

*Valentina V. Borisova*  
*vvb1604@gmail.com*  
*Moscow State Linguistic University (Moscow, Russia)*

Екатерина Анатольевна Похолкова  
pokholkova@gmail.com  
Московский государственный лингвистический университет (Москва, Россия)

Искра Вадимовна Космарская  
kosmarsky@mail.ru  
Московский государственный лингвистический университет (Москва, Россия)

Валентина Васильевна Борисова  
vvb1604@gmail.com  
Московский государственный лингвистический университет (Москва, Россия)

ISSN: 1698-322X ISSN INTERNET: 2340-8146

Fecha de recepción: 05.03.2024

Fecha de evaluación: 18.12.2024

*Cuadernos de Rusística Española n° 20 (2024), 129 - 144*

**ABSTRACT**

The United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, adopted in 2006, has highlighted the need to find ways of ensuring access to information and full communication for people who have difficulty reading and understanding "standard" literary texts. The authors of the convention highlight the use of specific languages and the development of new methods of presenting text and its formatting. Particular emphasis is placed on the availability of cultural information in appropriate formats. Indeed, this

paves the way for a novel approach to language communication. The Convention has provided a catalyst for a new direction in linguistics, namely the comprehension and practical description of the communicative variant of a national language intended for certain groups of its speakers. Practical work has a long history and has undergone significant developments, whereas academic research is still in its infancy. Another parallel process is the general trend towards the need for simplified forms of language, caused by digitalization and the accelerated pace of life, which does not allow for extensive reading and in-depth understanding of texts. As a matter of fact, a revision of the criteria for linguistic norms in “standard” texts is currently being considered. However, it should be noted that the process does not only affect standard texts; the practice of translating complex cultural texts into more comprehensible forms is also on the rise. This encompasses both intralanguage transformations and interlingual translations. The objective of this paper is to elucidate the concepts of “plain” and “easy-to-read” languages, to examine the distinctive characteristics of their operational nuances, and to address the challenges associated with the translation of fictional texts into “easy-to-read language,” with a particular focus on F.M. Dostoevsky’s novel “The Brothers Karamazov,” translated into Japanese.

**Keywords:** adaptive language models, plain language, easy-to-read language, translation strategies, Dostoevsky, the Brothers Karamazov in Japanese

## РЕЗЮМЕ

Принятая Организацией Объединенных Наций в 2006 году Конвенция о правах инвалидов остро поставила вопрос о поиске возможностей для обеспечения доступности информации и полноценной коммуникации лиц, испытывающих трудности в чтении и понимании «стандартных» текстов. Авторы конвенции указывают на использование специальных языков и разработку новых способов подачи текста и его оформления. Особое место отводится доступности культурной информации в приемлемых форматах. Фактически речь идет о новом коммуникативном варианте языка. Конвенция дала импульс новому направлению в лингвистике – осмыслению и практическому описанию коммуникативного варианта национального языка, предназначенного для определенных групп его носителей. Практическая работа началась давно и заметно продвинулась, в академических же кругах исследования в самом начале пути. Параллельно идет и другой процесс: общая тенденция к потребности в упрощенных формах языка, вызванная цифровизацией и ускорившимся темпом жизни, не позволяющим тратить много времени на чтение и понимание текстов. По сути на повестке дня пересмотр критериев языковой нормы в «стандартных» текстах. Однако процесс затрагивает не только стандартные тексты – расширяется практика перевода сложных текстов культуры в более понятные формы. Это касается и внутриязыковых трансформаций, и межъязыковых переводов. Статья ставит своей задачей уточнение понятий «ясный (легкий)» и «простой» языки, анализ некоторых особенностей их функционирования и рассмотрение проблем, связанных с переводом художественных текстов на «простой язык», в частности романа Ф.М. Достоевского «Братья Карамазовы» на японский язык.

**Ключевые слова:** адаптивные модели языка, ясный (легкий) язык, простой язык, переводческие стратегии, Достоевский, «Братья Карамазовы» на японском языке.

## INTRODUCTION

Since the beginning of the 20th century, the issue of identifying avenues for ensuring the accessibility of cultural information and meaningful communication for individuals with difficulty reading and comprehending complex texts, including those of a fictional nature, has been a subject of active discourse. For example, a new approach to translation is required, which makes use of the latest communicative variants of the national language, including its “plain” and “easy-to-read” forms. This novel approach to linguistics is concomitant with the global phenomenon of a shift towards simplified linguistic forms, precipitated by the advent of digitalization and the acceleration of the pace of life. The number of individuals in the modern world seeking to obtain information in plain and easy-to-read language has been on a steady upward trajectory.

The objective of this article is to elucidate the nuances of the terms “plain language,” “clear language,” “simple language,” and “easy-to-read language.” This is done in order to ascertain the scope of tasks that arise from the necessity to simplify language, particularly in the context of translation activities.

## **METHODOLOGY: AN INSIGHT INTO LINGUISTIC CONCEPT OF EASY (“PLAIN”) LANGUAGE AND ITS PRINCIPLES**

The concept of “easy” (or “plain”) language has recently been the subject of considerable scientific interest and productive development. This has included the formulation of specific requirements for text in this language subsystem (Nechaeva, Kairova 2020; Osokina 2022; Kosmarskaya, Pokholkova 2023), as well as the examination of the experience of European scholars. Work in this field is also underway in Russia. It is evident that scientists have made a substantial contribution to the evolution of easy language. However, despite this, it is important to acknowledge that the existing recommendations on text simplification are, to some extent, haphazard. Each of these recommendations is, nevertheless, justifiable and significant. Furthermore, the situation is further complicated by the fact that they are not language-specific. In some cases, universal rules are effective, while in others, they are clearly not.

The fundamental principles of easy (“plain”) language, as a linguistic concept, can be delineated as follows:

The addressee (for whom): an individual who, for various reasons, experiences challenges in reading and comprehending written material.

Objectives (for what purpose): to guarantee equal rights for all (in particular, the right to information) and to establish conditions that facilitate barrier-free communication across all areas of life, as well as to simplify reading and comprehension.

Way ahead (how to achieve this): create texts of a special type, with a reduced complexity as much as possible in order to:

- ensure full or sufficient comprehension of information and the ability to apply it;
- eliminate or minimize the likelihood of inaccurate or incorrect interpretation;
- provide psychological comfort (when everything is clear).

Ways of text creation: adaptation and original composition.

In the case of existing texts, the objective is to adapt them, whereas in the case of new texts, the objective is to create them from scratch.

Algorithms of work:

Adaptation: thorough analysis of the source text, identifying potential issues, considering the key elements to retain, simplifying the text where necessary, formulating a clear structure, and ensuring the text adheres to the appropriate formatting conventions.

Writing new texts: the objective is to comprehend the content and structure of the text, analyze the referent, ascertain the intended meaning, and determine the optimal formulation and formatting.

## Lexical level (wording used):

- Reliance on a predominantly colloquial register;
- Selection of the most frequent, habitual words;
- Orientation on a limited vocabulary (lexicon of 2-3 thousand words);
- Selection of words from isosemic subgroups of parts of speech;
- choice of a word with a direct meaning;
- choice of a stylistically neutral word;
- choice of words in concrete meaning;
- choice of words not burdened with expressed associative and connotative links;
- choice of words free from complex paronymic links;
- choice of words free from various forms of homonymic relations.

## Sentence structure:

- isosemic constructions;
- standard, predominantly bipartite sentences;
- using simple uncomplicated sentences with a clear predicative base;
- neutral modal frame;
- using only the essential elements to convey the meaning of the sentence, but in sufficient volume;
- translating semi-predicative units into predicative units in order to make the text more comprehensible;
- choosing the most free from predicative density among parallel syntactic constructions;
- using direct word order in the active voice.

## Text writing:

- clear composition without a drawn-out introduction;
- neutral modus frame;
- selection of key information only (filtering the text for other types of information);
- special formatting for additional and repetitive information;
- explicit logical links between parts of the text;
- additional checking of the text for semantic “holes”, gaping holes, etc...;
- fractional division of the text by micro-paragraphs;
- taking into account insufficient or lack of academic and cognitive experience, background knowledge.

## New challenges:

- A new lexicographic practice is required, namely the compilation of specialized explanatory dictionaries utilizing a distinct interpretative toolkit.

It is possible that A. Vezhbitskaya’s concept of semantic primitives will prove to be a valuable and effective approach in this context. The Russian-language publication, “Dictionary of Culture in Plain Language/Museums. Libraries. Theaters” (*Slovar kulture na yasnom yazyke. Muzei. Biblioteki. Teatry*) by Lada Talyzina (2022), can be regarded as a notable achievement in this field. The author and the dictionary’s experts have

developed a new lexicographic principle that can serve as a basis for dictionaries in other subject areas. It is important to note that the vocabulary includes not only basic concepts such as “exhibit,” “playbill,” “spectator,” “inquiry,” “curator,” and “excursion,” but also more contemporary and timely concepts such as “mediation,” “book reader,” “scientific reconstruction,” “virtual library,” and so forth.

- It is imperative that research be conducted in the field of Russian syntax. In this regard, the findings of functional grammar, communicative grammar, and functional syntax can serve as a foundation for identifying consistent patterns between nuclear and peripheral syntactic constructions.
- Furthermore, research in the field of text linguistics is essential. These are novel forms of text that have emerged with their own distinctive linguistic and communicative norms.

The concept of plain language has already become a subject of linguistic interest and practical development. However, it still lacks a clear terminological status. Therefore, it is necessary to clarify and unify the term. In continuation of the research undertaken, which elucidates the nature and character of plain language, we will allow ourselves several considerations.

The communication of individuals with reading and comprehension difficulties is composed of the same fundamental elements as that of the general population. It is therefore beneficial to undertake a detailed examination of the specific characteristics of each of these elements in order to gain a deeper understanding of the nuances of communication in this context.

**The following set of elements is generally accepted within the field of linguistics: addressant, addressee, contact, referent (denotatum), and code**

Addressee. The term “addressee” is used in this context to describe individuals who experience difficulties in reading and understanding written information for various reasons. These individuals often have limited comprehension of literary written language, with a significant number of words and phrases being particularly challenging for them to grasp. Additionally, the structure and organization of written texts may be complex and difficult to navigate. This phenomenon is not exclusive to specialized or technical texts, but can also be observed in the context of general information.

In order to fully comprehend the communicative role of the addressee, it is essential to delve into the concept of “pragmatic presupposition lifting.” In typical circumstances, the addressant and the addressee anticipate a certain degree of shared understanding about the world, a common reservoir of preliminary information. The addressant not only anticipates this, but also relies on it. In scientific literature, general presuppositions are distinguished (including encyclopedic knowledge and so-called frames); semantic presuppositions (common understandings about the truth of certain statements) and pragmatic presuppositions (certain information and/or obvious facts known to both participants in the discussion).

This establishes a communicative context, which enables communication to occur. It is important to note that the presence of a communicative background does not always guarantee success. The communicative situation is particularly challenging when the addressee lacks presuppositions or they are insufficient. For various reasons, they are unable to establish intertextual relationships with other texts, unable to decipher many (if not all) implicatures and presuppositions. All these can be achieved by using plain language, but requires the addressant to make additional efforts.

Referent (denotatum). In plain texts, there are two types of reference: identifying and introductory. Identifying references relate the statement to the object of speech in a way that allows the addressee to recognize a known object. Introductory references relate the statement to the object of speech in a way that allows the addressee to imagine, or “see,” an unknown object.

The greater the accuracy of such reference, the greater the likelihood that the text will be perceived and understood. However, traditional reference methods and the application of traditional interpretation mechanisms are not suitable for plain language. Two important issues must be addressed: the presentation (presentation, interpretation) of the referent in the case of adapting an existing text, and the selection of the referent plus its presentation in case of the necessity to create a text in plain language.

Code. The issues associated with the code utilized for data packing and unpacking encompass a diverse array of linguistic tasks, varying considerably in nature and scope. The primary issue is the commonality of the code. A cursory examination of the code suggests that its commonality may be attributed to its affiliation with the same language. This is a crucial condition, though not the sole determining factor. Another one is the belonging to the same system of encoding and decoding. Linguistic pragmatics demonstrates that comprehension of text is not solely dependent on knowledge of the language, but also on the rules and skills associated with language use in each particular context. In routine situations, individuals make communicative decisions based on intuition. The distinctive aspect of this element in communication with a different target group is the lack of clarity or absence of skills, including intuitive ones, that helps decode information. A more detailed discussion of the code in the translation aspect will be presented below.

Addressant. The role of the addressant is not well understood and has not been the subject of any significant research in the context of the creation of texts in plain language. It is evident that this is a distinctive qualification, necessitating an understanding of the fundamentals of communication, linguistic pragmatics, the ability to utilise a range of speech registers, and the utilisation of techniques for adapting existing texts to the capabilities of the recipient and the conventions of writing new texts. Every text is created with the intention of being understood. Adapting the text to the capabilities of the recipient represents a crucial objective and a fundamental skill for the author in the creation of adaptive texts.

The aforementioned considerations lead to the conclusion that plain language is one of the varieties of a national language. Given that plain language is primarily expressed in written texts, it can be classified as one of the varieties of literary language, a distinct communicative variant that serves the communicative needs of specific social groups. This variant possesses its own communicative and linguistic standard, which is determined by the particularities of all its elements.

## PLAIN LANGUAGE AS A TOOL FOR WORKING WITH TEXT

The use of plain language as a tool for working with texts is not a novel concept; linguists have been grappling with this issue for a considerable period of time. The movement for easy-to-read language originated in the 1950s, initially in England and subsequently in the USA. Concurrently, a similar movement emerged in the French-speaking world, advocating for the simplification of language and communication. It subsequently proliferated across the globe. It is noteworthy that the movement initially sought to simplify legal texts and various government documents. Subsequently, the scope of the initiative broadened to encompass texts in a multitude of disciplines, including healthcare, economics, and culture, among others. Currently, supporters of this movement can be found in numerous countries, yet practical developments and the application of simple language in many of them remain at the stage of supporting the idea. The experiences of Finland, Sweden, Norway, the Netherlands, Germany, Canada, the United Kingdom, the United States, and Belarus can be considered successful and effective. In Russia, the necessity for work in this field is also acknowledged, theoretical research is being conducted, and there is already a certain empirical basis.

The concept of “easy-to-read language” is designed for those who, for various reasons, may encounter difficulty in reading and understanding complex literary texts. The use of simple language allows for a retelling of complex texts in a comprehensible format that is accessible to the general reader. In essence, this is a form of conveying information in a way that is readily understandable.

The advent of the digital age has precipitated the rapid and unstoppable development of simple language, which has resulted in a number of anthropological (and arguably existential) changes. The following are discussed in detail in the relevant literature:

- sliding perception of screen information, which distorts conceptual culture;
- visual surface scanning of information (“content browsers”);
- not assimilating knowledge, but “renting” it;
- reduction of cultural experience and narrowing of background knowledge.

Consequently, two concurrent and parallel processes are occurring: the desire of speakers to simplify specific text types due to social and technological factors, and the humanistic movement towards the creation of barrier-free communication for all individuals.

## TRANSLATING FICTION TEXTS INTO PLAIN LANGUAGE: SETTING THE STAGE FOR THE ISSUE

In their 2012 study, Zakharov and Lukov cite the case of Russian literary translations of Shakespeare as an illustrative example. They observe a dual tendency among translators: on the one hand, there is a desire to approach the original text, as evidenced by the work of M. Lozinsky and M. Kuzmin; on the other hand, there is a tendency to reproduce Shakespeare’s text in a lively modern language, combining the

necessary accuracy of meaning with poetic freedom and the naturalness of Russian speech, as exemplified by the work of B. Pasternak and S. Marshak. “As a result of these translations, Shakespeare is more accessible to Russians than to English speakers, for whom the archaic language of Shakespeare’s plays represents a significant obstacle” (Zakharov & Lukov, 111). Peeter Torop (1995) referred to the ongoing debates between “linguists” and “literati” as a form of creative translation (Torop, 133). At the same time, he underscored the fundamental flexibility in selecting different translation strategies or methods, including literal, word-for-word, and functional approaches. These methods, he argued, can facilitate “maximum simplification of translation procedures” (Torop, 57).

The act of translating texts into a simplified language entails a certain degree of transformation, whereby the text is translated into an alternative system of signs, frequently within the context of different stylistic registers. Conversely, the very issue of artistic translation in this context remains a matter of contention. One viewpoint asserts that this approach contravenes the tenets of artistic translation and the deployment of adaptive models in the translation of literary works is inadvisable, as it will result in the homogenization of the idiosyncrasy of the “complex text.”

Conversely, contemporary translation methodology substantiates the necessity of resorting to a straightforward language that is imbued with its own tradition. It is not fortuitous that P. Torop, in his examination of the history and theory of translation studies, identifies the phenomenon of scientific synonymy, whereby established concepts are presented in an updated form, most frequently in a novel meta-language (Torop, 64). This is corroborated by the correlation of contemporary experiences of interlingual translation with an ancient tradition, exemplified by the translations of the Church Slavonic Bible into the Russian literary language, which was once accessible to all believers (Mengel 2021).

In the early 19th century, Vasily Bogorodsky translated the book “One Hundred and Four Sacred Stories of the Old and New Testament” from German into plain Russian. This translation was characterized by a more accessible presentation of the biblical text, designed for children’s reading. Additionally, in 1823, the Russian Bible Society translated the New Testament from Old Slavonic. The impetus for this translation was the substantial “distancing” of everyday Russian from the Slavonic language, which had become “little comprehended” by the populace. Archimandrite Philaret (Drozdov), who would later become the Metropolitan of Moscow, argued that the significance of Holy Scripture lies not in its vocabulary, but in its capacity to inspire and guide. He therefore advised against undue attachment to Slavonic words and expressions, suggesting that their perceived importance may be misplaced (Tikhomirov 2007:118).

Those who opposed this approach, primarily A. S. Shishkov, argued that the “Slavonic language” is the optimal vehicle for conveying the divinely revealed truths of the Bible due to its expressive capabilities. This translation strategy ultimately led to the assertion that language takes precedence over the meaning of the text. However, the New Testament in Russian was primarily concerned with the preservation and transmission of the original meaning of the Sacred Text, taking into account the predominantly oral tradition of the Russian people. St. Filaret is, therefore, credited for the fact that the translation of the Holy Scriptures into Russian provided the Russian Christians with

the opportunity to hear the word of God in a language with which they were familiar (Council of Bishops 1995, 3).

Contemporary interlingual and intersemiotic plain language translation methodologies also consider the addressee, who may encounter challenges in reading and comprehending complex, intricate texts, particularly those of a fictional nature. As observed by a Chinese researcher, “in such a case, the translator must adapt the text to the parameters of the reader” (Li Lun: 59). This approach is becoming more prevalent in contemporary translation practice, despite the prevailing bias against the use of “plain and clear language” in contemporary culture and literature. The digital age is a significant contributing factor to its continued dissemination.

In light of these considerations, the new algorithm for the translator’s work is designed with a primary focus on the modern colloquial register, simplifying the expression of meaning at the lexical and syntactic levels, and incorporating stylistic elements. This approach aligns with the strategy of translation transformations, allowing for deviations from semantic-structural parallelism between the original and translated text. The final text’s status is also a factor to be considered. The objective of a classical translation is to maintain the genre, lexical, grammatical, and stylistic particularities of the original text. For instance, an identical text may be transformed into an entirely different genre and multimedia text type with distinct communicative objectives through intermedial translation. This phenomenon is exemplified by the genre of manga (with its variations “manhua,” “manhwa,” and “amerimanga”), which is comprehensible in all languages and has achieved immense popularity worldwide (see Novikova).

## **MATERIAL ANALYSIS. FICTION TEXT IN PLAIN LANGUAGE: JAPANESE EXPERIENCE**

The aspiration towards global cultural communication for all people is evidenced, in particular, by the Japanese experience of translating Dostoevsky’s texts. In 2007, a new translation of Fyodor Dostoevsky’s novel “The Brothers Karamazov” was published in Japan with an unprecedented circulation of almost a million copies, made by the well-known scholar, translator, and writer Ikuo Kameyama. In 2007, a new translation of Dostoevsky’s *The Brothers Karamazov* was published in Japan by Ikuo Kameyama, a translator, writer, and the rector of Nagoya University of Foreign Studies, as well as one of Japan’s leading Slavists. This tenth iteration of the translation, published in a million copies, led to a surge of interest in Dostoevsky in Japan, which persists to this day.

In 2008, Kamayama was awarded the Pushkin Medal for his contribution to the promotion of the Russian language and literature. His simple and accessible translation was fundamentally new: the characters of the novel speak in the language of the 21st century and became surprisingly close to the modern Japanese reader. Kameyama’s original Japanese novel, *The New Brothers Karamazov*, which is set in Japan of 1995, was published by Kawadeshobo, and achieved notable commercial success. In 2013, the Japanese television company Fuji TV created a series based on it called “The Brothers Karamazov.” The new interpretation of Dostoevsky’s work, made possible by the success of Kameyama’s translation, has also attracted a significant amount of attention from a diverse audience.



Fig. 1. The Japanese edition of *The Brothers Karamazov* translated by I. Kameyama

The success of this translation can be attributed to the implementation of a novel translation strategy, which entailed the purposeful simplification of the original text. This approach was designed with the understanding that the target audience lacked the requisite knowledge to engage with a foreign cultural fiction text in its original form.

It is a challenging task to read, comprehend, and translate the works of Dostoevsky. For an extended period, translators have striven to reproduce the intricate grammatical and lexical structures of the source text in their translations. This was done with the aim of accurately portraying the realities of Russia during the 19th century, the distinctive features of the polyphonic plot, and the subtle nuances of meaning that may be opaque to readers from other linguistic backgrounds.

Prior to Kamayama's, there were seven previous translations of Dostoevsky's renowned novel in Japan. However, these were stylistically intricate and replete with archaic linguistic conventions. The complexity of the original text, coupled with its stylistic nuances, often proved challenging for Japanese readers, who frequently struggled to comprehend its intricacies. Kamayama set himself the task of translating the novel in such a way that the swiftness of the narrative, helping to read without stopping, was preserved in the translation" (Borisova, Andrianova, 2023: 290).

Kamayama's novel is rendered more accessible to the modern reader by his bold departure from the established norms of classical translation. He shortened sentences, minimized complex subordinate clauses, simplified opposing constructions, divided the text into shorter paragraphs to facilitate returning to previously read text to reconstruct plot connections, and made Dostoevsky's text more rhythmic for the Japanese language. Furthermore, while previous translations predominantly used hieroglyphs, in the new version, they are complemented by a more easily perceptible syllabic alphabet (hiragana and katakana).

In other words, Kamayama attempted to simplify and clarify the text. Prior to his work, translators had translated the text literally, including the use of complex Russian

names that were challenging for the Japanese audience to perceive. Ikou Kameyama discussed his translation principles in the book “Worship. 59 wanderings with Dostoevsky” (Palmyra, 2022).

In addition, Ikuo Kameyama elucidated his translation strategy in the “Guide to Reading” for Japanese readers in the first volume of *The Brothers Karamazov*. He stated, “I endeavored to utilize ordinary colloquial language so that the reader could reincarnate himself into the characters of the novel. I slightly modernized the text, especially Russian names, which are difficult for our perception. In the translation, I maximally eliminated discrepancies in the variants of names. I removed patronymics, which do not exist in the Japanese language, and removed diminutive forms. For Japanese people who have no idea about word formation in the Russian language, this causes confusion. They find it difficult to understand that Dmitry, Mitia, Mitka, and Mitenka are lexical forms of the name of one character. Therefore, Dmitry Fyodorovich is called Dmitry-san in the Japanese manner, so that it is immediately clear that this is a respectful address to the person.” (Dostoevsky translated by Ikuo Kameyama 2007:434–435). It is accurate to conclude that nominal suffixes represent a uniquely Japanese linguistic phenomenon. In Kameyama’s translation, they are treated as an organic component (Sycheva, 2009).

And most importantly, the translator changed the stylistic register of the text, using predominantly colloquial Japanese language: “I tried to use everyday conversational language so that the reader could immerse themselves in the characters of the novel” (Kameyama 2022:122). Similarly, Oliver Ready, an English-Russian scholar and translator from Oxford, underscores the necessity of compromise in the selection of a translation strategy. He said he did not confine himself to the English vocabulary of the nineteenth century, but also used words and expressions that have gained currency in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries (Redi, 2014).

In the Japanese translations made prior to Kameyama, Ivan Karamazov elucidated his philosophy through the use of “wise words.” In contrast, the new translation portrays him as a contemporary young man expressing the common youthful exclamation “Yatta yo!” (meaning “I did it!”).

For example, in Ivan Karamazov’s story about a child torn apart by dogs, the emblematic word “picture” in the original vividly expresses the writer’s idea. In the translation, it is replaced by a lexeme similar to the Russian expression “joke”. Despite the freedom of the translation, it nevertheless captures the essence of Ivan Karamazov’s controversial discourse, which incites and provokes his brother Alexey to engage in “rebellion.”

Like many contemporary translators, Kameyama augmented his rendering with a succinct portrayal of the principal figures and a delineation of a multitude of historical and cultural realities and locutions (for example, he proffered a citation concerning schismatics and fools, the distinction between the Russian ruble and the kopeck, the Russian justice system, the ranks of the civil service, with particular emphasis on elucidating the idiosyncrasies of Russian Orthodox existence, Christian holidays, and saints). The Japanese translator provided an extensive commentary on the term “yurodivy (holy fool),” which was translated as “kamigakari gyōja”.

## CONCLUSION

The latest iteration of the translation has facilitated greater accessibility to Dostoevsky's works for a broader readership in Japan, comprising individuals from diverse age groups. Written in a lively and accessible style, the translation enabled a wider audience to appreciate Dostoevsky's perceptive insights into the spiritual condition of humanity in the context of globalisation. By infusing the narrative with a sense of dynamism and imbuing the characters with a new depth of emotion, Kamayama brought the work into alignment with contemporary Japanese sensibilities, as though viewing Japan through the lens of Dostoevsky's era. This resonates with Japanese readers, who often perceive the story of the Karamazovs as a reflection of their own experiences and acquaintances.

The new translation of Dostoevsky's novel was met with enthusiasm by the general reading public. However, it provoked a strongly negative response from the scientific community of Japanese researchers, with accusations of falsification and distortion of the classics being levied against it. For example, Kamayama's colleague at the University of Tokyo, the esteemed Russian scholar Mitsuyoshi Numano, asserted that Kamayama had committed "patricide" against his predecessors, who had established the tradition of translating Dostoevsky.

Another prominent figure in the field of Japanese Dostoevsky studies, Toyofusa Kinoshita, challenged the approach taken by Kameyama, arguing that it resulted in an undue simplification of the style of the Russian writer. Kinoshita asserted that this was driven by the desire to "maximally approximate Dostoevsky's novel to the tastes of the Japanese mass audience" (T. Kinoshita, 2013:213). Still, Kinoshita was compelled to acknowledge the growing tendency among Japanese readers, which had emerged in the 1970s, to simplify the original text in translation (Frolova 2019:76).

Nevertheless, the triumph of the innovative translation of "The Brothers Karamazov" is irrefutable. Kamayama himself articulated this notion as follows: "In 'The Brothers Karamazov', the insignificance of the individual in the hands of fate is demonstrated. Analogies with our era of globalization are evident here." (Dostoevsky Fresh 2007).

It is our contention that Kameyama's translation is an adequate actualization and modern adaptation of Dostoevsky's work. It has found a foreign-language reader thanks to its orientation toward plain language, and as a result, it has become a text that is felt "native," understandable and accessible.

In accordance with the terminology proposed by A. V. Mikhailov, we may designate Kameyama's translation as "inverse," which, in both a cultural and literal sense, signifies a translation, "for example, from Germany to Russia, from the epoch of the work to the present one." As Mikhailov (2000:16) notes, or as S. G. Bocharov further specifies, such a translation is "the process of transferring meaning from the language of our understanding into other languages of other epochs" (Bocharov 2007:500).

It is evident that Ikuo Kameyama's translation strategy diverges from the conventional theory of equivalence, ecliparity, and "mirroring" of translation. However, it is sufficiently aligned with a functional approach that enables the comprehensive coverage of contemporary translation activities, including the translation of Dostoevsky's intricate and profound texts into "plain language."

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. BOHNENN, E., CEULEMANS, C., van de GUCHTE, C., KURVERS, J., van Tendeloo (2004) *Laaggeletterd in de Lage Landen*. URL: <https://taalunie.org/publicaties/75/laaggeletterd-in-de-lage-landen>
2. BREDEL, U., MAAS, C. (2016) *Leichte Sprache. Theoretische Grundlagen. Orientierung für die Praxis*. Duden, Berlin.
3. KAMEYAMA, I. translated by (2007): *The Brothers Karamazov*. Kobunsha Publ. (In Japanese).  
*Dostoevsky Fresh*. New Translation of “The Brothers Karamazov”, in Five Volumes (2007) The Asahi Shimbun, 1<sup>st</sup> September
4. KAMEYAMA, I. (2010): *Dostoevsky to no 59 no tabi*. Tokyo: Nikkei Business Publications, 155 p. (In Japanese)
5. LESKELÄ, L. (2019) *Helppoa vai vaativampaa selkokieltä – Selkokielen mittaaminen ja vaikeustasot*. URL: <https://journal.fi/pk/article/view/75679>
6. E. Uotila. *Selko Suomessa – Selkokielen ja soveluksia*. 2020. URL: E. Uotila. *Selko Suomessa – Selkokielen kehitys ja sovelluksia*. 2020. URL: <https://journal.fi/pk/article/download/74581/49886/146725>
7. Архиерейский собор Русской православной церкви, 29 ноября–2 декабря 1994 г. Документы. Изд-во Московской патриархии. Москва. 208 с.
8. БОРИСОВА, В.В., АНДРИАНОВА И.С. (2023): «Какой он — японский Достоевский»? Достоевский и мировая культура. Филологический журнал, 4 (24), стр. 284–304. <https://doi.org/10.22455/2619-0311-2023-4-284-304>
9. БОЧАРОВ, С.Г. (2007): *Филологические сюжеты*. Языки славянских культур. Москва  
РЕДИ, О. (2014): «Достоевский как русский Диккенс», URL: <https://russkiymir.ru/publications/86293/>
10. ЗАХАРОВ, Н.В., ЛУКОВ, В.А. (2012): *Гений на века: Шекспир в европейской культуре*, Издательство ГИТР. Москва. 504 с.
11. КАМЕЯМА, И. (2022): *Поклонение. 59 странствий с Достоевским*, Издательство Пальмира. Москва–Санкт-Петербург. 155 с.
12. КИНОСИТА, Т. (2013): *Восприятие и изучение творчества Достоевского в Японии за последние 40 лет в свете истории восприятия творчества писателя с конца XIX в.*, Достоевский: Материалы и исследования, 20, стр. 194–220.
13. КИНОСИТА, Т. (2013): «Одна из современных фальшей» — общее явление в журналистике Японии и России, Достоевский и журнализм. Dostoevsky Monographs, 4, Издательство Дмитрий Буланин, стр. 349-360.
14. КОСМАРСКАЯ, И.В., ПОХОЛКОВА, Е.А. (2023): *О лингвистической концепции ясного (легкого) языка* in «Русский язык и русская литература в цифровую эпоху». Издательство Бук, Казань, стр. 86–98.
15. ЛИ, ЛУНЬ (2020): *Роль и функции художественного перевода в XXI веке*, Вестник Полоцкого государственного университета. Серия А. Гуманитарные науки, 2, стр. 58–62. [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <https://journals.psu.by/humanities/article/view/761> (10.02.2024).

16. МЕНГЕЛЬ, С. (2021): «*Harmonia vocum hebræicum cum Sclavonicis rutenicis et polonicis*» – сравнительное исследование студента Симеона Тодорского и концепция «простого» языка в его «русских» переводах из Галле в начале XVIII века» in *Sub specie aeternitatis* Издательский центр Азбуковник, Москва, стр. 654-663.
17. МИХАЙЛОВ, А.В.(2000): *Обратный перевод: русская и западноевропейская культура: проблемы взаимосвязей*. Издательство Языки русской культур, стр. 14–16.
18. НЕЧАЕВА, Н.В., ХЕЛЬМЛЕ К.-С., КАИРОВА Э.М.(2020): «Перевод на ясный и простой языки: зарубежный опыт и перспективы в России», *Вестник ПНИПУ. Проблемы языкознания и педагогики*, 3, стр. 8–24.
19. НОВИКОВА, Е.Г.(2019): «Ф. М. Достоевский в японских комиксах», *Текст. Книга. Книгоиздание*,19, стр. 75–94. [Электронный ресурс]. URL: [https://journals.tsu.ru/book/&journal\\_page=archive&id=1817&article\\_id=40357](https://journals.tsu.ru/book/&journal_page=archive&id=1817&article_id=40357) (10.02.2024). DOI: 10.17223/23062061/19/6
20. РЕДИ, О.(2014) «*Достоевский как русский Диккенс*», URL: <https://ruskiymir.ru/publications/86293/>
21. СЫЧЕВА, Е.С. (2015): «Проблема перевода обращений и именных суффиксов в современной массовой культуре Японии (на примере аниме и манга)», *Вестник Московского университета. Серия 22. Теория перевода*,1, стр. 46–56. [Электронный ресурс]. URL: [http://vestnik-translation.ru/upload/iblock/781/2015\\_1.pdf](http://vestnik-translation.ru/upload/iblock/781/2015_1.pdf) (10.02.2024).
22. ОСОКИНА, С.А. (2022): «Концепция «легкого языка» и перспективы ее развития в лингвистике», *Филология и человек*, 2 DOI: 10.14258/filichel(2022)2-08. URL: <http://journal.asu.ru/pm/article/view/10746>
23. ТАЛЫЗИНА, Л.(2022): *Словарь культуры на ясном языке*. Издательство Бюро Ч. Москва.
24. ТИХОМИРОВ, Б.А.(2007): «Начало истории русского перевода Библии и Российское Библейское общество», *Христианское чтение*, 28, стр.111–146 [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <https://scientific-journals-spbda.ru/f/2007-28-08.pdf> (10.02.2024).
25. ТИРАДО, Р.Г.(2019): «Особенности перевода художественного текста с русского языка на испанский (на материале перевода романа Евгения Водолазкина «Авиатор»», *Вестник РУДН. Серия: ЛИНГВИСТИКА*, том 23,2, стр. 473–486.
26. ТОРОП, П.(1995): *Тотальный перевод*. Tartu ülikooli kirjastus, Tartu. 220 с.
27. ФРОЛОВА, Е.Л.(2019): «На пути к мультикультурализму в Японии – популяризация «простого японского языка»,/ *Вестник Новосибирского государственного университета. Серия: История, филология*, Т. 18, № 10: Востоковедение, стр. 66–77.
28. ЯКОВЛЕВА, С.Ф. (2013): «Теоретические и практические аспекты перевода культурно значимой лексики с мексиканского испанского на русский», *Cuadernos de Rusística española*, том 10 (2013), сс. 159-177
29. ЯКОБСОН, Р.(1978): «О лингвистических аспектах перевода» in *Вопросы теории перевода в зарубежной лингвистике*. Издательство Международные отношения. Москва, стр.16-24.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. BOHNENN, E., CEULEMANS, C., van de GUCHTE, C., KURVERS, J., van Tendeloo (2004): *Laaggeletterd in de Lage Landen*. URL:<https://taalunie.org/publicaties/75/laaggeletterd-in-de-lage-landen>
2. BOCHAROV, S.G. (2007): *Filologicheskie syuzhety. Yazyki slavyanskix kultur*. Moskva
3. BREDEL, U., MAAS, C. (2016): *Leichte Sprache. Theoretische Grundlagen. Orientierung für die Praxis*. Duden, Berlin.
4. Council of Bishops of the Russian Orthodox Church, November 29-December 2, 1994. Documents. Publishing house of the Moscow Patriarchate. Moscow. 208 c.
5. BORISOVA V.V., ANDRIANOVA I. S. (2023): Kakoj on — «yaponskij Dostoevskij»? (XVIII Simpozium Mezhdunarodnogo obshchestva pisatelya) Dostoevskij i mirovaya kultura. *Filologicheskij zhurnal*, 4 (24), s. 284–304. <https://doi.org/10.22455/2619-0311-2023-4-284-304>
6. FROLOVA, E.L. (2019): “Na puti k multikulturalizmu v Iaponii – populiarizatsiia «prostogo iaponskogo iazyka», / *Vestnik Novosibirskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*. Seriya: Istoriia, filologiya, T. 18, № 10: *Vostokovedenie*, s. 66–77.
7. KAMEYAMA, I. translated by (2007): *The Brothers Karamazov*. Kobunsha Publ. (In Japanese). *Dostoevsky Fresh*. New Translation of “The Brothers Karamazov”, in Five Volumes (2007) *The Asahi Shimbun*, 1<sup>st</sup> September
8. KAMEYAMA, I. (2010): *Dostoevsky to no 59 no tabi*. Tokyo: Nikkei Business Publications, 155 p. (In Japanese)
9. KAMEYAMA, I. (2022): *Dostoevsky to no 59 no tabi*. (Poklonenie. 59 stranstvij s Dostoevskim,) Izdatelstvo Palmira. Moskva–Sankt-Peterburg. 155 s.
10. KINOSITA, T. (2013, In Rus): *Vospriyatie i izuchenie tvorchestva Dostoevskogo v Yaponii za poslednie 40 let v svete istorii vospriyatija tvorchestva pisatelya s konca XIX v., Dostoyevsky: Materialy i issledovaniya*, 20, s. 194–220.
11. KINOSITA, T. (2013, In Rus): “*Odna iz sovremennykh falshei*” — *obshchee iavlenie v zhurnalistike Iaponii i Rossii, Dostoevsky i zhurnalizm. Dostoevsky Monographs*, 4, Izdatelstvo Dmitriy Bulanin, s. 349-360.
12. KOSMARSKAYA, I.V., POKHOLKOVA, E.A. (2023): *O lingvisticheskoy koncepcii yasnogo (legkogo) yazyka* in “*Russkij yazyk i russkaya literatura v cifrovuyu epohu*”. Izdatelstvo Buk, Kazan, s.86–98.
13. LESKELÄ, L. (2019): *Helppoa vai vaativampaa selkokieltä – Selkokielen mittaaminen ja vaikeustasot*. URL: <https://journal.fi/pk/article/view/75679>
14. LI LUN (2020): *Rol i funkcii xudozhestvennogo perevoda v XXI veke, Vestnik Poloczkogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya A. Gumanitarnye nauki*, 2, s.58–62. URL: <https://journals.psu.by/humanities/article/view/761> (10.02.2024).
15. MENGEL, S. (2021): “*Harmonia vocum hebraicum cum Slavonicis rutenicis et polonicis*” – sravnitelnoe issledovanie studenta Simeona Todorskogo i koncepciya «prostogo» yazyka v ego «russkikh» perevodah iz Galle v nachale XVIII veka. *Sub specie aeternitatis* Izdatelskij centr Azbukovnik, Moskva, s. 654-663.
16. MIKHAYLOV, A.V. (2000): *Obratnyj perevod: russkaya i zapadnoevropejskaya kultura: problemy vzaimosvyazej*. Izdatelstvo Yazyki russkoj kultur, s. 14–16.

17. NECHAEVA, N.V., HELMLE K.-S., KAIROVA E.M. (2020): «Perevod na yasnyj i prostoj yazyki: zarubezhnyj opyt i perspektivy v Rossii», Vestnik PNIPU. Problemy yazykoznanija i pedagogiki, 3, s. 8–24.
18. NOVIKOVA, E.G. (2019): “F. M. Dostoevskij v yaponskix komiksax», Tekst. Kniga. Knigoizdanie, 19, s. 75–94. URL: [https://journals.tsu.ru/book/&journal\\_page=archive&id=1817&article\\_id=40357](https://journals.tsu.ru/book/&journal_page=archive&id=1817&article_id=40357) (10.02.2024). DOI: 10.17223/23062061/19/6
19. OSOKINA, S.A. (2022): “Kontseptsiiia ‘legkogo yazyka’ i perspektivy ee razvitiia v lingvistike”, Filologija i chelovek, 2 DOI: 10.14258/filichel(2022)2-08. URL: <http://journal.asu.ru/pm/article/view/10746>
20. READY, O. (2014): *Dostoevsky as Russian Dickens* [Dostoevskiy kak russkiy Dikkens]. URL: <https://russkiymir.ru/publications/86293/>
21. SYCHEVA, E.S. (2015): «Problema perevoda obrashchenii i imennykh suffiksov v sovremennoi massovoi kulture Iaponii (na primere anime i manga) », Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. Seriya 22. Teoriia perevoda, 1, s. 46–56. URL: [http://vestnik-translation.ru/upload/iblock/781/2015\\_1.pdf](http://vestnik-translation.ru/upload/iblock/781/2015_1.pdf) (10.02.2024).
22. TALYZINA, L. (2022): Slovar kulture na iasnom yazyke. Izdatelstvo Biuro Ch. Moskva.
23. TIKHOMIROV, B.A. (2007): “Nachalo istorii russkogo perevoda Biblii i Rossiiskoe Bibleiskoe obshchestvo”, Khristianskoe chtenie, 28, s.111–146, 28, s.111–146. URL: <https://scientific-journals-spbd.ru/f/2007-28-08.pdf> (10.02.2024).
24. TIRADO, R.G. (2019): Osobennosti perevoda khudozhestvennogo teksta s russkogo yazyka na ispanskii (na materiale perevoda romana Evgeniia Vodolazkina ‘Aviator’, Vestnik RUDN. Seriy: LINGVISTIKA, tom 23,2, s. 473–486.”
25. TOROP, P. (1995): Total Translation. Tartu ülikooli kirjastus, Tartu. 220 c.
26. UOTILA, E. Selko Suomessa – Selkokielen ja soveluksia. 2020. URL: <https://journal.fi/pk/article/download/74581/49886/146725>
27. YAKOVLEVA, S.F. (2013): “Teoreticheskie i prakticheskie aspekty perevoda kulturno znachimoi leksiki s meksikanskogo ispanskogo na russkii”, Cuadernos de Rusística española, tom 10 (2013), ss. 159-177
28. YAKOBSON, R. (1978): “O lingvisticheskikh aspektakh perevoda”. Voprosy teorii perevoda v zarubezhnoi lingvistike. Izdatelstvo Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia. Moskva, s.16-24.
29. ZAKHAROV, N.V., LUKOV, V.A. (2012): *Genij na veka: Shekspir v evropejskoj kulture*, Izdatelstvo GITR. Moskva. 504 s.