

“Crime and Punishment” in Greece, 1889-1912

ZORKA ŠLJIVANČANIN, *University of Cyprus*
sljivancanin.zorka@ucy.ac.cy

Received: July 30, 2017.

Accepted: October 18, 2017.

ABSTRACT

Over a period of two decades (1889-1912) two translations of *Crime and Punishment* were published in Greece. The first version of the work was translated by one of the most eminent prose writers of the period, Alexandros Papadiamantis, and appeared in serial form in the first mass circulation daily Athenian newspaper *Efimeris* (from April 14 until August 1, 1889). The second Greek edition was translated by Stelios Haritakis and published in Crete in 1912. Both translations were rendered from the first French edition of *Crime and Punishment* translated by Victor Derely (1884).

The article explores the early translational reception of Dostoevsky's novel in Greece. It focuses on the Epilogue and aims to analyze the translation of the words that are closely related to the two basic motives of the work: the motive of crime and the motive of regeneration. In addition, some of the questions that will be considered are: what is missing in the French and Greek editions of the Epilogue and what are the consequences of these omissions? Which phrases/words were added to the two Greek versions and why? Can we talk about creative translation in the case of the first Greek edition of *Crime and Punishment*, taking into account that the translator was a writer himself?

Keywords: literary translation, epilogue, Greece, Papadiamantis, reception.

Many theorists of literature, including Bakhtin, Girard and Bloom, pointed out the non-necessity and irrelevance of the Epilogue to *Crime and Punishment* from a philosophical, psychological or artistic point of view. The novel's ending, where the metamorphosis of the morally corrupted Raskolnikov starts to take place, has been characterized as “unfortunate” (Bloom, 2004) “conventionally monologic” (Bakhtin, 1999) and a “failure” (Curtler, 2004). However, there are a number of critics who emphasize the essential connection between the potential for transformation and repentance that the main character shows throughout the novel and the actual beginning of his spiritual change, which is evident on the last pages of *Crime and Punishment* (Matual, 2004). The current study seeks to illuminate the link between the novel's chapters and the Epilogue through close reading of the translated texts, while focusing on the words that are of significance for the motive of crime and the motive of spiritual rebirth.

The Papadiamantis' translation of *Crime and Punishment* played a key role in introducing the Greek-speaking public to Dostoevsky's prose. After the publication of two of his short stories (1886, 1888), which received hardly any critical response in Greece, the translation of Dostoevsky's first novel appeared in 1889 and brought him to the attention of the local readership. Papadiamantis, being one of the most important literary figures of the period in Greece, was very soon compared to the Russian writer. Only five years after the publication of the above-mentioned translation, he was called “Greece's Dostoevsky” for the first time in the anonymous article published by the newspaper *Akropolis*.⁸⁸ For almost 120 years after this reference in the *Akropolis*, a great number of researches have been exploring the similarities regarding themes, motives and narrative technique between the two writers, using as a basis

⁸⁸ *Akropolis*, 06 of January, 1894, p. 2.

for their intertextual dialog Papadiamantis' translation of *Crime and Punishment*. The second Greek translation of the novel appeared twenty-three years later and was translated by Stelios Haritakis.⁸⁹ The research conducted for the present article⁹⁰ has shown that both of the Greek translations of *Crime and Punishment* are based on Victor Derely's French translation of the Russian original, which was published in 1884.

At the beginning of the Epilogue, Raskolnikov's Siberian exile is depicted as a place situated on the banks of a broad and desolate river⁹¹ (Достоевский, 1973: 410). The same description is repeated near the very end of the novel, just before the moment when the first signs of the main character's moral transformation are noticeable.⁹² In both instances, the river is described by the adjective "пустынный", which Derely translates as "désert", and consequently so does Haritakis, employing the word "έρημος", which represents the Greek equivalent of the above-mentioned French adjective. Papadiamantis, however, in the first sentence of interest does not translate the related adjective, omitting it, while in the second sentence he renders it as the adjective "πολυχεύμονα", which refers to the stream of a river abundant with water. The omission and the misinterpretation of the source text by Papadiamantis cannot be considered as an unintentional translation error due to incompetency in French. He was famous as a responsible and attentive translator (Σκαμπιτσόφσκη, 1905: 621)⁹³ with a great language sensibility (Ελύτης, 1996). His translational choice had to do with the untranslatability of the semantic depth of the Russian adjective, which was lost in the French version. The importance of the appropriate comprehension of the word "пустынный" in the context of the Epilogue, which in the first place describes the emptiness and absence of humans, lays in its etymological connection with the word "пустынь", which, apart from "desert" and "wilderness", can refer to a hermitage or monastery. Therefore, it refers to a place where one can deepen his relationship with God and repent of his sins through spiritual exercises and sacrificial love. Here, it is important to mention the case of the young painter, Mikolka, who confessed to a crime he did not commit. In Chapter II of Part VI, when referring to his act of seeking a kind of spiritual purgation, the inspector, Porfiry Petrovitch, explains that the Old Believer Mikolka wanted to "в пустыню бежать" [escape into the desert] (Достоевский, 1973: 347) to sacrifice the rest of his life in order to cleanse himself of sins that tempted him during his stay in St. Petersburg. In the Derely edition of *Crime and Punishment*, the sentence that contains Porfiry's phrase is left out, along with the lines referring to Mikolka's two-year experience of spiritual guidance from a certain elder. The same omissions are subsequently found in Papadiamantis' and Haritakis' versions. Thus,

⁸⁹ In addition to translating Dostoevsky, Haritakis rendered works of Gogol and Lermontov into Greek.

⁹⁰ This conclusion is based on the results of a comparative analysis made between Papadiamantis', Haritakis' and Derely's texts. The analysis proved that the Greek translators omitted the same episodes and segments that the French translator left out, they copied his footnotes, reproduced the same mistakes that he did, etc.

⁹¹ "На берегу широкой, пустынной реки [...]" [On the banks of a wide, desolate river ...]. Please note that all the English translations in the current article were done by the author, except for the cases where it is noted otherwise.

⁹² "Раскольников [...] стал глядеть на широкую и пустынную реку." [Raskolnikov ... began gazing at the wide, desolate river ...].

⁹³ The statement belongs to Theodoros Vellianitis, Greek translator of Skabichevsky's *History of Modern Russian literature*.

Greek translators could be hardly aware of the meaning expressed by the phrase: “escape into desert”, in the terms of one’s seeking suffering in order to reach salvation. According to Nikolai Berdyaev (Μπερδιάγιεφ, 1990, p. 93), Dostoyevsky insisted on the necessity of the criminal’s punishment, which emerges not only from the Law, but from the conscience of a criminal himself, who thereby confirms his responsibility for a wrongful deed, and which becomes evidence of his freedom. The reference to the desert as a place of martyrdom is also found in Chapter IV of Part VI of the novel. The word “пустыня” is mentioned by Svidrigajlov in his attempt to characterize Dunia as a person who is longing to escape into the desert and to face torture on behalf of someone else (Достоевский, 1973: 365). What is more, a parallel is made between Raskolnikov’s sister and Mary of Egypt, one of the most worshiped patron saints of penitents, who practiced asceticism as a hermit in the wilderness after leading the life of a morally corrupted woman. Analysis has shown that the episode that includes Svidrigajlov’s reference to Dunia is missing from the French edition of the novel. Thus, the Greek translators were not able to follow the gradual unfolding of Raskolnikov’s Siberian exile as a sort of purgatory in which the main character finds himself after violating the limits and breaking the Law.

At this point, it is important to focus on the word “преступник” [criminal], which was used carefully from the very beginning of the novel. Its significance is evident, taking into account the fact that the noun derived from the same root “-преступ-” was used in the title of the prototype: *Преступление и наказание*. The mentioned words (“преступник” and “преступление”), which do not have translational equivalents in many languages outside of Slavic ones, successfully express the ambiguity of the ideologically motivated homicide Raskolnikov commits and the etiology of pawnbroker’s murder. These words focus on the student’s experiment of violating the limits, without implying whether the murder was entirely a wrongful act or whether there are aspects of it that may be considered as beneficial for the community. The use of the Russian verb “преступить”, which originally means “to transgress”, and the nouns that are etymologically linked to it, offers an opportunity to narrate about the crime with a sort of neutral connotation. What is more, as Olga Meerson discusses (1998), Raskolnikov and certain characters prefer not to refer directly to the murder in their discourse. It represents a “sore spot” for them and they use different verbal devices in order to block their awareness of it.

On the pages of the Epilogue, the noun “преступник” appears eleven times in the Russian original text, while the noun “преступление” appears nine times in total. Although, the word “преступление” did not encounter any difficulties during the process of translation, the interpretation of the noun “преступник”, which mostly refers to Raskolnikov, turned out to be problematic in French, which affected the Greek translators. According to the Table 1, “преступление” was consistently translated as “crime”, except in two cases when it was rendered as a blameful deed and an unlawful act. In contrast, “преступник” was interpreted in different manners and it was substituted with the words: “guilty person”, “murderer”, “accused”, “wrongdoer” and “villain”. Hence, the French and Greek versions contributed to the creation of a monolithic image of the pawnbroker’s murderer, by annihilating the antinomies of Raskolnikov’s character and by diminishing the previously mentioned dilemmas that arise from his deed. Furthermore, the creation of that monolithic image was helped by the exaggerated usage of the nouns “murderer”, “guilty person” and “accused” in instances when

the word “преступник” was not even used in the Russian original text. In these cases, these specific nouns were used in order to substitute personal pronouns referring to Raskolnikov or to contribute to the French and Greek versions’ readability. According to the Table 3, when translating the French words meaning “to murder” and “murderer”, Papadiamantis preferred verbs and nouns with the root “φον-”. More precisely, in his translation of the Epilogue, he used nine words derived from the same root, while Haritakis, for example, used these words only twice. It is worth mentioning that in 1903, Papadiamantis published a novella, with the title: “Φόνισσα” [The Murderess], which contains the root “φον-” in its title. This work is rich with elements of intertextual dialog with *Crime and Punishment* and focuses on a psychological and social account of murders that were committed by the main character, who is motivated by the idea of benefiting the community with the crimes she commits.

Table 1

Translation of the word “преступление” [crime] in Darely’s, Papadiamantis’ and Haritakis’ editions of the Epilogue of Crime and Punishment

| <i>Преступление и наказание,</i> 1866 | <i>Le Crime et le Châtiment,</i> 1884 | <i>Το έγκλημα και η τιμωρία,</i> 1889 | <i>Το έγκλημα και η τιμωρία,</i> 1912 |
|--|--|--|--|
| преступления | crime | έγκλημα | έγκλημα |
| преступление | crime | έγκλημα | έγκλημα |
| преступлению | crime | έγκλημα | έγκλημα |
| преступления | crime | εγκλήματος | έγκλημα |
| преступления | forfait | έγκλημα | έγκλημα |
| преступлении | crime | έγκλημα | έγκλημα |
| уголовное преступление | acte illicite | έκνομον πράξιν | πράξη παράνομη |
| преступление | tort [wrong] | πταίσμα [fault] | άδικο [wrong] |
| преступлением | crime | έγκλημα | έγκλημα |

Table 2

Translation of the word “преступник” [criminal] in Darely’s, Papadiamantis’ and Haritakis’ editions of the Epilogue of Crime and Punishment

| <i>Преступление и наказание,</i> 1866 | <i>Le Crime et le Châtiment,</i> 1884 | <i>Το έγκλημα και η τιμωρία,</i> 1889 | <i>Το έγκλημα και η τιμωρία,</i> 1912 |
|--|--|--|--|
| преступник | coupable[guilty] | ένοχος [guilty] | ένοχος [guilty] |
| преступник | assassin[murderer] | φονεύς [murderer] | δόλοφόνος [murderer] |
| преступникам | malfaiteurs [wrongdoers] | κακοποιών [wrongdoers] | κακοποιών [wrongdoers] |

| | | | |
|-------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| преступник | coupable[guilty] | ένοχος[guilty] | Ρασκολνικόφ |
| преступник | prévenu [accused] | κατηγορούμενον [accused] | κατηγορούμενο [accused] |
| преступника | coupable [guilty] | ένοχος [guilty] | κατηγορουμένου [accused] |
| преступника | coupable[guilty] | ένοχον[guilty] | ένοχο[guilty] |
| преступник | X | X | X |
| преступник | coupable[guilty] | κατηγορουμένου | κατηγορουμένου |
| преступника | criminel[criminal] | ενόχου[guilty] | εγκληματία[criminal] |
| преступники | criminels [criminals] | κακούργων [villains] | εγκληματίες [criminals] |

Table 3

Translation of French words meaning “to murder”, “murder” and “murderer” in Papadiamantis’ and Haritakis’ editions of the Epilogue of Crime and Punishment

| <i>Преступление и наказание, 1866</i> | <i>Le Crime et le Châtiment, 1884</i> | <i>Το έγκλημα και η τιμωρία, 1889</i> | <i>Το έγκλημα και η τιμωρία, 1912</i> |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| преступник | assassin | φονεύς | δολοφόνος |
| он | assassin | φονεύς | δολοφόνος |
| убийства | assassinat | φόνου | δολοφονίας |
| убийцу | assassin | δολοφόνος | δολοφόνος |
| разбойника | escarpe | X | φονιάς |
| смертоубийств | meurtre | φόνον | να σκοτώσει |
| убийство | assassin | δολοφόνον | δολοφόνο |
| убийство | meurtre | φόνος | φόνος |
| убийства | assassinats | φόνους | δολοφονίες |
| X | devais assassiner | εσκότωσες | να σκοτώσεις |
| Убить тебе надо | faut te tuer | θα σε σκοτώσουμε | θα σε σκοτώσωμε |
| убить | tuer | φονεύσωσιν | σκοτώσουν |
| убийце | assassin | διάκτου | δολοφόνου |
| убивали | tuaient | εφόνευαν | X |
| резались | se tuer | φονεύονται | σκοτώνονται |

The next word of interest for the present article is the noun “судьба” [destiny]. The importance of its function lays in the link it has with the issue that arises from the novel concerning the question of whether a criminal act can be determined independently (i.e. socially, genetically or by some kind of a higher force) of the criminal’s free will and reason. After committing the homicide, Raskolnikov repeatedly declared that he was gripped by the idea of murdering a pawnbroker. Furthermore, when he, the narrator or other characters discuss his life and the path he followed, they often use the noun “судьба”, which is repeated seven times in the Epilogue of the Russian original text. Consequently, the image of an

indefinable, external power is created which controls the main character's actions in the background and forces him to conduct his plan to kill.

The noun "destiny" appears in the translated texts for the first time as a part of the idiom "blind fortune", in the following sentence: "Он стыдился именно того, что он, Раскольников, погиб так слепо, безнадежно, глухо и глупо, по какому-то приговору слепой судьбы..." (Достоевский, 1973: 419) [He was ashamed just because he, Raskolnikov, had hopelessly, stupidly come to grief through some decree of blind fate...] (Dostoevsky, 1927: 547). The specific idiom originates from the Latin proverb: "Fortuna caeca est", which crossed the borders of many European languages and therefore would not have produced any difficulties for the translators' understanding, and consequently they substituted it with French and Greek equivalents. Namely, Derely translated it with "aveugle destinée", Papadiamantis with "τυφλή εμαρμένη", and Haritakis rendered it as "στραβή τύχη". The next instance where the French and Greek equivalents of the word "судьба" were used in translations of the Epilogue is when it refers to some kind of a higher power that interferes with human life. Thus, the noun "судьба", from the sentence: "И хотя бы судьба послала ему раскаяние..." (Достоевский, 1973: 417) [And if only fate would have sent him repentance...] (Dostoevsky, 1927: 547) is translated as "destinée" by Derely, as "πεπρωμένο" by Papadiamantis and as "μοίρα" by Haritakis.

Although the word "судьба" was used seven times in the Epilogue of the original Russian text, it was translated only twice in the French and Greek editions. In the remaining cases it was completely omitted, usually to accommodate rephrasing. Thus, the omission of the specific noun made it more difficult for the readers of the translated editions to identify Raskolnikov's attempts to free his conscience from the responsibility for the murder. They could not easily recognize the function of the force, expressed by the key word "судьба", which gives the main character the opportunity to project his guilt onto external factors.

Raskolnikov's aspiration for the liberation of his conscience is also indicated by the treatment of the word "freedom" in the phrase: "Но теперь, уже в остроге, на свободе" [But now in prison, in freedom]. The importance of the specific noun is emphasized by the author himself, who italicized it in the original text of the novel. The purpose of the word "freedom" in the above-mentioned statement is, on the one hand to distinguish between two kinds of freedom: inner and outer, and on the other hand, to point on Raskolnikov's preference for spiritual liberation. According to the narrator, unlike other prisoners, the main character is not dreaming about the day when he will be set free from the Siberian prison. On contrary, Raskolnikov yearns to regain his inner freedom, which was violated by the crimes he committed. It is evident that the imprisonment of the "theoretical killer" (Porfiry's phrase), is not around him, but inside him. Therefore, liberation cannot come from outside, but must be regained from the inside through the means of deepest remorse. This concept of freedom was, apparently, a demanding task for the French and Greek translators. As it will be seen from the examples below, although they managed to reveal Raskolnikov's lack of interest for outer freedom, they missed expressing his attempts for spiritual liberation as a painful process. Derely rendered the specific phrase as: "dans le loisir de la captivité" [in the leisure of captivity], Haritakis as: "στην άνεση της αιχμαλωσίας" [in the comfort of captivity] and Papadiamantis as: "εν τη αναπαύσει της ειρκτής" [in the rest of prison].

What is more, from the very beginning of the Epilogue, it is indicated that inner freedom cannot be gained through a formal confession at court. The descriptions of Raskolnikov’s behavior during the trial that are found in the first paragraphs of the Epilogue show that he was not trying to justify himself; on the contrary, he was insisting on describing the murder in great detail without softening it in his own interest. One of the functions of these descriptions was to explore the nature of Raskolnikov’s official confession in order to distinguish it from the genuine repentance that, as has already been mentioned, leads to spiritual freedom. Therefore, the adaptations of the Russian text that were made in the French version regarding the shortening of the trial scenes outlining Raskolnikov’s confession could have influenced the Greek translators by making it more difficult for them to be introduced to the philosophically charged links between freedom, suffering and repentance. The following sentence is an example of the translational practice employed in the source text of the Greek editions of the novel.

Преступление и наказание, 1865: “[...] описал укладку и чем она была наполнена; даже исчислил некоторые из отдельных предметов, лежавших в ней;” [...he described the trunk and what it was filled with, even enumerated some of the particular objects that were in it.]

Le Crime et le Châtiment, 1884: “[...] il décrit le coffre et en indiqua le contenu;” [he described the chest and its contents].

Το έγκλημα και η τιμωρία, 1889: “[...] περιέγραψε το κιβώτιο και το περιεχόμενο αυτού [...]” [he described the chest and its contents].

Το έγκλημα και η τιμωρία, 1912: “[...]: “[...] περιέγραψε την κάσα και το περιεχόμενο της [...]” [he described the chest and its contents].

After Raskolnikov commits the crimes, he finds himself in a state of alienation and passivity, because, according to himself, by killing the old woman he killed himself (Достоевский, 1973: 322). This state of apathy and isolation prevails until the final paragraphs of the novel, where his potential for moral regeneration is more noticeable. This spiritual waking, however, is already indirectly announced in Chapter IV of Part IV, where Sonia and Rodia read together the Gospel story of the raising of Lazarus, which allegorically refers to the victory of life over the death of sins on account on love. Consequently, the words that are etymologically related to the noun “воскресение” [resurrection] play a significant role in the context of Raskolnikov’s spiritual transformation. In the Russian text of the Epilogue, there are five words derived from the root “воскрес-”. In Derely’s and Haritakis’ versions, the specific words appear three times, while in Papadiamantis’ version they do not appear at all. Instead of them, he preferred the following words: “ανάπλασις” [remodel], “αναγέννησις” [rebirth] and “έγερσις” [rising]. Papadiamantis’ obvious avoidance of the words derived from the root “воскрес-” can be linked to his system of belief. The words that are etymologically related to the notion of resurrection were considered sacred and represented a translational taboo for him because they express a tremendously significant notion for a Christian Orthodox

believer, which he was, so he preferred not to use the words in a secular context.

The long process of Raskolnikov's reunion with mankind shows its first signs in relation to Sonia's sacrificial love, whose role in the novel is the one of spiritual principle.⁹⁴ While waking from inertia, Raskolnikov starts to become aware of the unfair behavior with which he tortured her. According to the Epilogue, Raskolnikov promises to repay her suffering, offering her infinite love. At this point it is important to focus on the noun "любовь" and its translations in the target languages. Derely translated it as "amour", Haritakis as "αγάπη", while Papadiamantis interpreted it with the noun "έρως". In Modern Greek the noun "αγάπη" expresses love, affection, fondness and has somewhat of a neutral connotation, while "έρως" refers to the intense emotional connection between two people. It also expresses the feeling that has earthly connotations and includes sexual desire (Μπαμπινιώτης, 2002). However, nowadays the noun "έρως" is also used as a part of the phrase "θείος έρωτας", which refers to an unlimited, strong and everlasting desire for union with God. This phrase proves that the specific word had a different connotation in Ancient and Byzantine Greek, which opposes the contemporary use of it in the context of acquisitive desire (Yannaras, 2007). Since Papadiamantis was well acquainted with Greek Orthodox liturgical texts and Ancient Greek scholarship, it is difficult to believe that he was not aware of the polysemy of the specific word and to consider his choice as unintentional. The usage of the noun "έρως" like a dynamic movement of loving and self-offering, successfully expresses the basic meaning of something that leads to the deepest spiritual transformation, according to Dostoevsky (Тарасов, 2013: 165). Therefore, the potential for a new life for Raskolnikov can only be found in a union with Sonia involving sacrificial love. According to the text of the Epilogue, the process of his repentance starts under the influence of the "έρως" and it is characteristically expressed with the sentence: "Их воскресила любовь, сердце одного заключало бесконечные источники жизни для сердца другого." (Достоевский, 1973: 421) [They were resurrected by love, the heart of each held infinite sources of life for the heart of the other]. This spiritual transformation, which starts in the Epilogue, helps Raskolnikov to escape from the alienation and to repair his relationships with mankind, from whom he cut himself off after the crime. As is well known from the text of the Epilogue, his metamorphosis begins after the "biblical" (Белов, 2015: 228, 229) dream he has while he is in hospital. Through analysis of the French and Greek versions of the text that refers to Raskolnikov's dream, one can find out that "Greece's Dostoevsky" again breaks the law of the "translator's invisibility".⁹⁵ His creative reading of the dream description is noticeable from the phrase: "φόβος και τρόμος έπέπεσε τή κτίσει" [fear and trembling seized all creation], which he adds to the source text. This line was taken from the Aposticha that are chanted in the service of the Holy Passion on Thursday Evening during the reading of the Gospel story of the Crucifixion of Christ. The central theme of the hymn that the above-mentioned line was taken from is the regeneration of mortal men and annihilation of death by the Lord, who is characterized as a "Lover of mankind". Hence, from the above example of Papadiamantis' translational practice, we realized that the addition he made did not bring his translational result farther from the uniqueness of the source text, but closer to its fulfillment, as is suggested by Walter Benjamin in the essay "The Task of

⁹⁴ The name "Sonia" is derived from the Greek word "σοφία", meaning human or God wisdom.

⁹⁵ This term belongs to American translation theorist, Lawrence Venutti.

the Translator” (Benjamin, 2002). Furthermore, Papadiamantis’ creative understanding of the source text is a result of the assimilation of the novel’s world through his own system of religious beliefs: he rendered Derely’s “amour de la vie” [love for life] with “φιλοψυχία” [love and care for soul]; through the system of the culture he belonged to: he substituted “des pâtés et des kalatchi” [pies and rolls] from the French version with “τηγανίταις και χριστόψωμα”, which are Greek traditional pastries made at Christmas; through hypersensitivity of his own character, he replaced “blattes” [cockroaches] with “ξένες ουσίες” [unknown substances]; his attitude toward the Greek language shows through his choice to translate the narrative descriptions of the novel in Katharevousa, the official standard of the Greek language of the time, while for the dialog parts he engaged Demotic, the colloquial language of the period, with strong elements of the language of his home island (Skiathos).

Despite the fact that Haritakis’ translational practice seems to be less creative in comparison to Papadiamantis’, the uniqueness of his translation is related to the language he uses. In his version, Haritakis employs Demotic,⁹⁶ thus his translational result becomes one of the pieces of historical evidence of the struggle for the standardization of the colloquial language. It is important to mention that during the publication of Haritakis’ translation, the Greek language question⁹⁷ was one of the burning social and cultural issues. What is more, according to the note that was included on the last page of the translated novel, it was the first book to be published in Demotic on the island of Crete. Therefore, the language of Haritakis’ translation, which was under the influence of the Greek diglossia of the time, serves as evidence that confirms Lawrence Venuti’s claim that the act of translation does not happen in a cultural and temporal vacuum (Venuti, 1992).

The specific nature of the Epilogue, including on the one hand its independence from the other chapters in the term of its chronotope, and on the other hand, its genetic thematic connection with the rest of the novel, gave us the opportunity to analyze the issue of the transactional reception of the *Crime and Punishment* in Greece from two perspective. A close reading analysis of the nouns: *desert*, *criminal*, *destiny* and *freedom* has proven that because certain words, paragraphs, segments and episodes were omitted from the French version, which served as a source text for the first Greek translators, the translators encountered certain difficulties in expressing the meaning of basic motives of the novel. Secondly, the specific reading of the words: *resurrection* and *love* located in the Greek versions, together with certain changes made to the source text by Greek translators, have provided us with evidence that the act of translation is a practice closely linked to the translators’ creative capability of understanding the source text. Furthermore, the present analysis of the sample of Papadiamantis’ translation showed that it deserves further analysis, because it would shed new light on the intertextual dialog between his *Murderess* and Dostoevsky’s theoretical murder, and give us the answers that Greek scholarship has sought to find for more than a

⁹⁶ Some of the features of Demotic he employs are: usage of foreign language words borrowed mainly from Turkish language: “κεμέρι” [wallet], “ινάτι” [stubbornness], “τσαντήρα” [tent]; of everyday language idioms: “στα καλά καθούμενα” [all of a sudden], “συχνά-πυκνά” [very often]; of contracted forms of verbs, pronouns and articles: “πούκαμε” instead of “που έκανε”, “κάνας” instead of “και ένας”, etc.

⁹⁷ The Greek language question concerned the standardization of the spoken language (Demotic) that was opposed by the supporters of a cultivate imitation of Ancient Greek (Katharevousa) during the 19th and the 20th century.

hundred years.

At the end, it should be noted that the current article presents part of the results of the author's ongoing doctoral research project on the Greek reception of F. M. Dostoevsky (1877-1939).

REFERENCES

- Bakhtin, M. (1999). *Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics*. Caryl Emerson (Ed. and Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Белов, С. В. (2015). *Роман Ф. М. Достоевского "Преступление и наказание". Комментарий*. Москва: URSS.
- Benjamin, W. (2002). The task of the translator. In *Walter Benjamin: Selected writings (1913-1926)*, Vol. 1 (pp. 253–263). Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Bloom, H. (2004). Introduction. In H. Bloom (Ed.), *Fyodor Dostoevsky's Crime and Punishment* (pp. 1–5). Philadelphia: Chelsea House Publishers.
- Curtler, H. M. (2004). The artistic failure of Crime and Punishment. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 38(1), 1-11.
- Dostoevsky, F. M. (1927). *Crime and Punishment* (C. Garnett, Trans.). New York: Grosset & Dunlap.
- Dostoïevski, F. M. (1884). *Le Crime et le Châtiment* (V. Darely, Trans.). Paris: E. Plon.
- Достоевский, Ф. М. (1973). *Полное собрание сочинений*. Т. 6. Ленинград: Наука.
- Δοστογιέφσκη, Θ. (1899). *Το έγκλημα και η τιμωρία* (Α. Παπαδιαμάντης, Μτφρ.). Αθήνα: *Εφημερίς* (14.04-01.08.1889).
- Ελύτης, Ο. (1996). *Η μαγεία του Παπαδιαμάντη*. Αθήνα: Ύψιλον/Βιβλία.
- Matual, D. (2004). In defense of the Epilogue of the Crime and Punishment. In H. Bloom (Ed.), *Fyodor Dostoevsky's Crime and Punishment* (pp. 105–115). Philadelphia: Chelsea House Publishers.
- Μπαμπινιώτης, Γ. (2002). *Λεξικό τής Νέας Ελληνικής Γλώσσας*. Αθήνα: Κέντρο Λεξικολογίας.
- Meerson, O. (1998). *Dostoevsky's Taboo*. Dresden-Munich: Dresden University Press.
- Μπερδιάγιεφ, Ν. (1990). *Το πνεύμα του Ντοστογιέφσκι*. Θεσσαλονίκη: Π. Πουρναρά.
- Ντοστογιέφσκη, Φ. (1912). *Το έγκλημα και η τιμωρία* (Σ. Χαριτάκης, Μτφρ.). Χανιά: Γοργίας Π. Φορτσάκης.
- Σκαμπιτσέφσκη, Α. Μ. (1905). *Ιστορία της Ρωσικής λογοτεχνίας* (Θ. Βελλανίτης, Μτφρ.). Αθήνα: Τύποις Π. Δ. Σακελλαρίου.
- Тарасов Б., Ф. М. (2013). *Достоевский и современный мир*. Москва: Московские учебники.
- Venuti, L. (1992). *Rethinking translation*. London: Routledge.
- Yannaras, C. (2007). *Person and Eros*. Mass.: Holy Cross Orthodox Press.