

American Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Research (AJHSSR)

e-ISSN :2378-703X

Volume-08, Issue-02, pp-225-238

[www.ajhssr.com](http://www.ajhssr.com)

Research Paper

Open Access

## The problem of literary translation with particular attention to the case of the Sicilian writer Andrea Camilleri translated into Spanish

Maria Làudani

*PhD, UCAM-Universidad Católica Sant Antonio de Murcia, Spain*

**ABSTRACT:** This essay first of all traces a synthetic path of the translation orientations, starting from the theoretical bases already founded in the classical Greek-Latin world, up to the current theories on translation. In this regard, the methodological orientations of Spanish translators are examined more carefully, as this essay connects to in-depth research work that is the basis of the author's doctoral thesis. Then we move on to the topic of variations within the language and how to transpose these linguistic registers into the target languages. Finally, we propose a concrete example of the translation of literary works in which the author uses dialect and a language rich in variants: that is, the case of the Sicilian writer Andrea Camilleri and in particular the translations of his works in Spanish.

**KEYWORDS:** *Andrea Camilleri translated into Spain, linguistic variance, translation history, translation problems.*

### I. INTRODUCTION

In this short work, which is closely linked to the investigation developed to elaborate the author's doctoral thesis, we want to present a general framework on a very much debated topic which remains open for its complexity, that is the theme of the translation of literary texts.

Therefore, the purpose of this essay is not to find a definitive solution or to provide an unambiguous path, but rather to offer a synthetic framework on the subject, but that also takes into account the diachronic development, from antiquity to today, the main orientations and hypotheses concerning the method of translating a literary work. We wanted to focus, in particular, on the guidelines and translation theories of Spanish culture precisely because these topics were functional to address the issues of the doctoral thesis. However, beyond the context from which our brief discussion arose, it seems useful to us because, as has already been pointed out, it provides an overview and the main lines of the debate still in progress.

Within the general theme of how to deal with the transposition of a text from a source language to the target language, there is also an additional question to be taken into account: how to translate a text that is not written in the "standard" language, but that already presents a starting level of complexity because elaborated in dialect or because, inside, it inserts a linguistic stratification articulated on different diastratic, diatopic or diaphasic levels? Various questions therefore arise: should the translator take account of these variations? To what extent? By what means can he bring all these complex components of the original language of the text back into meta language? The answers are certainly very different and are based not only on cultural reasons, but also taking into account the perspective of the audience to which the translated text will reach.

Thus, for example, an Italian writer who has achieved a great success among readers internationally, namely the Sicilian Andrea Camilleri, is one of the authors who have aroused the greatest controversy even at the level of translation, because of the complexity of the language he uses in his texts. For these reasons, we decided to deal specifically with the topic of how to translate the works of Camilleri, in general, and in particular how to translate them into Castilian, because in Spain the writer is published since his first literary successes of the 90s of the last century, as shown by the numerous editions of his works, of which we have provided a brief review.

Consequently, the focal points of this article are centered on three main axes: a brief historical-critical frame on translation; essential theoretical references in relation to the theme of linguistic variation and possible solutions in translating the stratification and variation of languages in literary works; the case of the Sicilian writer Andrea Camilleri and the complexity of translating his works.

We believe that the usefulness of our study consists, in fact, in having provided the different elements necessary to frame the theme of translation, both in a synchronic and diachronic sense, through the historical path traced, but also through a paradigmatic and current example such as the problem of translating literary works written in an "idiolect", in an artificial language created by the author, as in the case of Andrea Camilleri.

## II. HISTORICAL PATH AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK ON LITERARY TRANSLATION

The problem of how to transpose a text from one language to another has occupied theorists and philosophers from Greco-Latin classicism to the present day. Already the current of sophistry, from Gorgias of Lentini (483 a. C.-375 a. C.), addressed the issue of the relationship between words and reference objects, concluding that words have a "deictic" value, that is, they are symbols that refer to objects, both concrete and abstract, with which the human being comes into contact through the senses (Untersteiner, 2009). Consequently, the relationship between word and truth is denied, while the relationship between word and experienced reality is affirmed. In this context, verbal language acquires a high value as a communicative and persuasive instrument, clearly depending on the contexts in which it is used. This point of view highlights the importance of context and, therefore, the potential of language as it conveys meaning. When changing from one language to another, the symbols and meanings of the source language are simply transposed into the target language. Obviously, this first approach does not yet explore the subjective and historical-cultural factors inherent in the specificity of each language, although the philosophical gnosological theory, based on relativism and empiricism, are important starting points for later theories of knowledge and language and therefore of translation. In fact, already in ancient times, thanks to both sophistic philosophy and Aristotelian logic, the foundations were laid for great writers such as Cicero, Horatio or Saint Jerome, when dealing with texts in Greek, to emphasize the need to translate not word for word, but taking into account the meaning of the text, even at the cost of departing from individual words and expressions, to maintain the communicative meaning of the original text in the translated text. For example, we quote Cicero (106- 43 B.C.) who, introducing his translations of the speeches of the speakers Aeschines and Demosthenes, had outlined his theories on the transposition into Latin of the classical Greek writers in *De optimo genere oratorum* (46 B. C.). Also, Horace (65-8 B. C.) in the work *Ars Poetica* (13 B. C.), vv. 133-134, states: «Nec verbum verbo curabis reddere fidus / interpres [...]», in other words: "Do not attempt to render, scrupulous interpreter, word for word". Quintilian (35-96 A. C.), in his treatise *Institutio oratoria*, L. X, 5, (90-96 A. C.), stresses the importance of paraphrasing as a means of teaching the student both to analyze the structures of a text and to experiment with extensions or summaries of the text itself. In this sense, Quintilian considers of great importance the Latin versions of the Greek texts, as proposed by the Latin speakers Crassus, Cicero and Messalla (Sanchez Montero, 1998:6). Then, in the twilight of classicism, even Saint Jerome (4th century A.C.) supported his "interpretive" method of translating the *Bible* with the following words: «Ego enim non solum fateor, sed libera voce profiteor me in interpretatione Graecorum, absque scripturis sanctis ubi et verborum ordo mysterium est, non verbum e verbo, sed sensum exprimere de sensu» (*Epistulae LVII*, 5), i.e. "I not only confess, but proclaim aloud that in the translation of the Greeks, with the exception of the Holy Scriptures, in which the very structure of the words encloses their mystery, what I convey is not the word from the word, but the idea from the idea". It follows from the foregoing that, while in translating the letters of bishop Epiphanius Jerome had limited himself to adopting the ciceronian principles to vivify the text, the *Bible* required particular attention to structures and ideas precisely to grasp the hidden and sacred meaning, that is, the *mysterium* that is hidden within them (Obolenskaya, 2003: 115-124).

It is essential to emphasize that the observations of ancient writers and "translators" derive directly from the concrete need to offer readers understandable and useful translations. One of the most important cultural organizations in the Western world, the well-known Toledo School of Translators, built between the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, began from the same need for concreteness, translation movement that focused mainly on the work of meta-sentences concerning works from Arabic to Latin. In this regard, the scholar María del Carmen Sánchez Montero (Sanchez Montero, 1998:9) highlights that, at the beginning of the eighth century, with the arrival of the Muslims to the Iberian Peninsula, we are witnessing very important cultural changes for Spanish history: the Arabic becomes, for centuries, in the language that serves as a bridge between East and West.

As for the School of Translators of Toledo, we remember that Alfonso X promoted the activity of translation not only from Arabic to Latin, but also from Arabic to Spanish, for example, the *Bible* called "Alfonsina". The Toledo School of Translators implemented an interesting system that ranged from the retrieval of texts through travellers and merchants, to the "collaborative" and multidisciplinary translation activity that saw the relationship between various fields of knowledge: mathematical, medical, philosophical, literary, logical. (Sanchez Montero, 1998: 17- 21). In general, the method adopted was that of "mediated" translation: an oral Latin version was made from the Arabic source text, which was translated simultaneously in writing. These translators are also oriented towards a non-literal interpretation, but faithful to the meaning. We can see this attitude, for example, in a letter of 1199 from Maimonides, who expresses himself in favor of a translation made "according to intelligence", that is, trying to grasp the deep meaning of the original text, instead of translating word for word

(Vega Cemuda, 1994: 87). On the other hand, along with the problem of respecting the meaning of the source text, since the Middle Ages questions have been asked about what we now define as significant: the uniqueness and unrepeatability of sounds, of typical constructions, the rhythm, inherent in a literary work and to a poetic text. In fact, it is evident that in the passage from one language to another the above-mentioned and unrepeatability characters will be irretrievably lost in translation. In fact, it is evident that in the passage from one language to another the above-mentioned and unrepeatability characters will be irretrievably lost in translation.

Already the great Dante Alighieri (1265-1321) in the *Convivio*, L. I, VII (1304-1307) showed full awareness of this phenomenon when he affirmed: «E però sappia ciascuno che nulla cosa per legame musaico armonizzata si può de la sua loquela in altra transmutare, senza rompere tutta sua dolcezza e armonia», that is: «And therefore everyone should know that nothing harmonized by a mosaic bond can be transmuted from one's speech into another, without breaking all its sweetness and harmony».

In addition to general considerations, in the Middle Ages another problem arose for the translators of sacred texts, since they had to deal with contents related mainly to exegesis, and with the interpretation of those texts (Folena, 1973: 57-1209; Salmon, 2017). As a result, the way of interpreting and translating the Old Testament into several languages has become the main focus of some well-known ecdotic and translation theories (Nida, 1945:194-208).

At the time of Humanism, between the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, interest in the Greco-Latin world grew in almost all of Europe so that both the market for classical works and their translation increased. For example, in Italy, a relevant figure in this regard was Leonzio Pilato (early 14th century - 1364), a Calabrian intellectual who translated the works of Homer and Euripides into Latin for both Petrarch and Boccaccio. He was, among other things, the first teacher of ancient Greek in Italy, where he taught at the *Studium* in Florence (Pertusi, 1964). In Spain among the first translators of the ancient classics we find Pedro López de Ayala who was a translator of the First, Second and Fourth Decades of Tito Livio, as well as Fernán Pérez de Guzmán (1376-1460), Ayala's nephew, who translated Seneca and Cicero (Sanchez Montero, 1998: 22).

In addition, the knowledge of ancient works exerted a considerable influence on the formation of Romance languages, so that translations of the classics were cultural and political instruments, intended to instill admiration for some models of government. The study of Greco-Latin works and culture is not, for these writers-translators, a simple matter of knowledge, but a superior ideal in which they believed blindly and which they sought to revitalize. In this context, the translations had an instrumental and exegetical character, were often ad verbum and addressed to a large part of the cultured public which, but, rarely knew the Greek language or only had a partial knowledge of it, therefore, most translations were made from Greek to Latin. (Sanchez Montero, 1998: 22-25).

At this time interesting theories on literary translation were formulated, such as that of Leonardo Bruni (1370-1444) in the text *De interpretatione recta* (Bruni, 1420, new-ed. 1996), a short treatise in which the translation from ancient Greek to Latin is discussed. Bruni maintains that the translator must be "transparent" and that the approach to the texts must be mimetic. Thus, for example, in translating Aristotle, the author is outraged to compare the original works with the various translations, since the Aristotelian text, rich in elegance, softness and beauty in the Latin versions, appears banalized and disfigured. His treatise is divided into three parts in which Bruni sets out the five fundamental philological rules that, in his opinion, a translator must follow and that we can synthesize in: the knowledge of the language to be translated and of the authors; the knowledge of the language to which it is translated (in this case, Latin); understand the meaning of the text and the expressive will of the author to embody it; know the culture of the author (i.e. the context) and its style to reproduce it in the target language; have a good ear to reproduce the rhythm of the text being translated. A good translation is one that maintains the style of the original text without leaving aside the words in relation to the contents and without the words lacking in elegance and beauty. A good translator, concludes Bruni, must know the "strength" and "nature" of words and identify with the style of the author who translates (Bruni, 1996: 152-159).

In the 16th century national languages were affirmed, this factor also influenced reflections on translation and in several European countries treaties on the subject began to be written, often influenced by Italian theorists such as Bruni. In this period French translation was born, founded by Étienne Dolet who, in his essay *La manière de bien traduire d'une langue en autre* (1540), proposed again the five Bruni rules applied, however, in the translation from Latin into the vulgar languages (Dolet, 1540, new ed. 1972). This is also the context in which the work of Luther, who translates and comments on the sacred texts, in particular the Bible, is situated: from this choice was born the important cultural and religious transformation of the Reformation. In the *Epistle on the Art of Translation* (1530) Luther proposes a translation that respects spoken German and gives the reader an effect equivalent to that aroused in the reader who reads the text in the original language. Indeed, in the German theologian there is a desire to make the sacred text as comprehensible as possible to all, proposing it in the languages spoken by the different peoples. Indeed, in the German theologian there is a desire to make the sacred text as comprehensible as possible to all, proposing it in the languages spoken by the different peoples. Luther's translation of the *Bible* into German marked a turning point not only in religious and political terms, but also in

literature: it not only made German assert itself as a national language, but also founded and shaped literary German. Moreover, in Germany it represents a turning point in the history of translation, which will henceforth occupy a central place in the cultural life of the country as the creation, transmission and growth of the language. In general, Luther's *Bible* will have its effects: in fact, it will become a model for later translations of this sacred text into other European languages.

In the 17th century France was also a very active place for translation studies, and here intellectuals were convinced that they had reached the highest level of civilization, living between the idealization of the ancient world and the sense of their own superiority. This nation became the driving force of a translation focused on the target culture, which adapted to the main stylistic criterion of the time, that is, that it was *agréable* and *élégante*, and did not offend the *délicatesses* of the French language. Therefore, the purpose of achieving elegance and beauty justifies any intervention on the original text. It is no coincidence that the French translations of the time are called *belles infidèles* (cfr. Mounin, 1994, Amparo, 1990: 231). In fact, the activity of translation is considered a reinvention, just as the translator is not considered a mediator but a co-author, all this to obtain the same effect that the original author wanted in the readers, adapting it, however, to the taste of their own culture and their time.

Between the 17th and 18th centuries Spain, unlike the other European nations, remained somewhat marginal to the themes of rationalism and the Enlightenment already penetrated and assimilated almost everywhere. However, in addition to the conservative majority, which defends the canons of traditionalism, a critical minority also emerges, with innovative ideas that refer to European currents of thought. Thanks to these cultural orientations, this minority of "enlightened" was also affirmed in Spain. The introduction of several contemporary foreign texts also raised in Spain the problem of translation, which is rooted in the need to affirm Castilian as a national language and accordingly, to establish its formal correctness also in relation to the translated texts (Sanchez Montero, 1998: 51). The real turning point in the relationship with the texts to be translated occurred in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries when, thanks to the currents of thought of the Enlightenment and Romanticism, the perspective changed and the questions were related not only with the translation of ancient texts, sacred or profane, but also almost exclusively the problem of the transposition of contemporary texts belonging to cultures other than European.

At the dawn of the development of the great colonial empires and the intensification of long-distance travel, intellectuals like Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, Friedrich Schleiermacher and Wilhelm von Humboldt began to address the problems posed by the difference between languages and cultures in a new way. In fact, the topic of translation entered into the philosophical debate on the foundations of language and hermeneutics: in particular, it referred to the problems posed by the diversity of languages, the relationship between language, thought and reality, the articulation of the meaning of linguistic signs. Each individual must strive to interpret, with its own system of references, what is expressed in systems that are located at different geographical distances (languages, dialects), chronological (different stages of the same language), social (records spoken by the different classes that make up a community), individual. Thus, for example, in the notes on the *West-Eastern Divan* (1827), Goethe argues that in any literature there exist three types of translation, equivalent to three different epochs that are repeated, intersected or even can coexist. For his part, Wilhelm von Humboldt in 1816, in an introduction to the translation of Euripides' *Agamemnon*, makes an important reflection on translation.

First, Humboldt highlights the fact that languages are not a priori models of pre-established concepts, but organize ideas and thoughts from internal structures, so thought and word are interdependent entities. On the other hand, no word is the same as another language, but in the interlingual transition we find only synonyms. It is therefore impossible for a word to correspond entirely to another word in another language, so that each translation can only partially translate what the original represents, while the true spirit of the work remains only in the original. For Humboldt, translating means moving from an area that has a certain vision of the world to another with a different character: precisely for that reason, translating is necessary, both because it gives the possibility to read works of literature even if they do not know the language in which they are, and because translating increases the expressive capacity of the language itself, so its fundamental characteristic must be fidelity.

Also the reflections of another German intellectual, Friedrich Schleiermacher, are particularly interesting because he starts from a first distinction between "general" translation and "restricted" translation observing how we are faced with a translation even in the context of the same language, as evidenced, for example, by the differences between language and dialect, between different social classes, between people with different backgrounds, between the historical development of the same language. We do not enter into the specificity of the modalities that the philosopher suggests for translation and the types of translation he identifies. Suffice it to stress that for him the purpose of translation can be achieved only by inculcating in the translated work, in addition to the spirit of language, also the particular spirit of the author of the work (Schleiermacher, 1813, new ed. 1962: 38-70, and 129).



Even in Spain the thought of Romanticism broke through among intellectuals. However, the absolutism of 1823, represented by Ferdinand VII and his government, destroyed the precarious freedom of the press, and until the death of the king in 1833, the only publications were the official ones. Meanwhile, the Spanish liberals, who emigrated to London and Paris, created their own newspapers and magazines in foreign capitals. After the death of Fernando there was an opening that allowed a new cultural renaissance. The newspaper was again used as a weapon of struggle and as an effective means of influencing public opinion. Poetry, novels and romantic theories prevailed and began a period of great editorial interest for foreign works that were translated and published: translations flooded the market. The intellectuals of the time, as had already done those of the eighteenth century, admonished the bad translators and reproached the editors for the lack of quality of the translations. For example, Mariano José de Larra in his article entitled *De las traducciones* (1835, new-ed. 1960), referring to the translations of dramatic texts and comedies broadcast in Spain stated: «Varias cosas se necesitan para traducir del francés al castellano una comedia. Primera, saber lo que son comedias; segunda, conocer el teatro y el publico francés; tercera, conocer el teatro y el publico español; cuarta, saber leer el francés; y quinta, saber escribir el castellano». In this regard, it is interesting the position of the writer Leopoldo Alas Clarín, according to him that, to translate literary texts well, the sine qua non condition is to be literate. In the article entitled *Las traducciones* (1885), the writer cites the well-known passage from the work of Cervantes in which Don Quixote compares the translation with the Flemish tapestries seen from the reverse, and reiterates the qualities of a good translator. The considerations of the great writer show an interesting point of view, which evaluates the translator's role as essential for the knowledge of ancient or modern foreign literary works. At the same time, he considers that translating is not a simple trade, but a vocation that presupposes the preparation and sensitivity of a literate in whom he prepares for the company. It also stresses the importance of a representation of the text not word for word, but try to maintain the beauty, elegance and spirit of the original work (Alas Clarín, 1887: 247–252). We will not go any further, but we will limit ourselves here to remember that in the nineteenth century great Spanish intellectuals such as Antonio Machado, Benito Pérez Galdós and Miguel de Unamuno dedicated themselves to translating the fundamental authors of contemporary European literature (Sanchez Montero, 1998: 58-59).

Returning to the general picture, let us see how some of the considerations of German theorists found, at the beginning of the 20th century, an even more radical confirmation in Ferdinand de Saussure's reflections on language. De Saussure (*Cours de linguistique générale*, 1916), who laid the foundations of the philosophical current of structuralism, believed that not only the relationship between the word and the thing was conventional, that is, arbitrary, as had already seemed to the ancient philosophers, including the sophists and Gorgias, but also the relation of meanings between them: each language organizes the whole system of concepts and references to external reality, in a peculiar way, so that no word of a language can be equal to a word of another language, since its possible uses, their possible associations and combinations with other words can never coincide in every respect between the starting language and the target language. It follows that a translation, however literal, can never exactly reproduce the set of meanings contained in the original. On the basis of previous studies, reflections on the translation of Benedetto Croce and Walter Benjamin were developed in the early 20th century.

Croce, in the essay *Estetica come scienza dell'espressione e linguistica generale* (1922), argues that expressive forms are untranslatable because they are unique and unrepeatable acts, so that each translation deforms and dwarfs the original, since it is the creation of a new expression, born from the fusion of the original expression with the impressions of the translator. The only possibility of translation, although relative, is based on the similarity of expressions. The untranslatability of a work leads the Italian thinker to affirm that a good translation is an approach that has the original value of a work of art, as well as its own autonomy.

In the same years, Walter Benjamin also wrote a work that had as its object the theme of translation, *The Task of the Translator* (1921): in this rich and intense essay, the author proposes to consider translation as a literary genre in itself, between philosophical thought and literary production. Benjamin rejects the centrality of the problem of reception because, in his opinion, in a literary work and in its translation, the essential is not the communication of the content, but the essence of the work. Then the translator has the task of capturing this essence and making it survive: between the translated text and the original text a necessary relation is established: the latter is the source from which the translation derives, which however is of fundamental importance to keep the original alive and the translator becomes the intermediary of this survival.

Other consequences of structuralist thought led, for example, to the competitive vision of translation as proof of defeats and successes as read in the essay of José Ortega y Gasset, *Miseria y esplendor de la traducción* (1937). Ortega's thinking about the possibility of translating a text is strongly influenced by the previous German scholars we mentioned and by Walter Benjamin. Ortega himself questions the possibility of translating and opens the essay with questions: «¿No es traducir; sin remedio, un afán utópico? [...] ¿Qué hará (el traductor) con el texto rebelde? ¿No es pedirle demasiado que, lo sea él también y por cuenta ajena?» (Ortega y Gasset, 1980: 11-12). One of Ortega's most interesting contributions is to consider translation as a specific literary genre whose foundation is identified in hermeneutics and in the search for the rhythm of the target language, in which even the silences and the unspoken appear significant.

The later evolution of literary translation theories is marked by the studies of the 1950s and 1960s, when the definition of *Translation Studies* was introduced. With the invention of the computer and automatic translators, a new chapter is opened in the history of translation theories: it is assumed that translation is possible and an attempt is made to create a decalogue of the good translator, based on mathematical models and scientific foundations. The point of reference is the theory of linguistic universality formulated by Noam Chomsky in *Aspects of the theory of syntax* (1965), according to which these scientific models can lead to a perfect translation, performed entirely by machines. This research involves computer theorists, linguists, engineers, mathematicians, who believe that the problem of translation can be described, sketched and formalized in terms of formal logic. To obtain satisfactory results with this mathematical methodology it is necessary to restrict the field of research to translation at the level of single words or, at most, sentences. The first function that this theory wants to fulfill is of a practical nature, in fact it seeks to identify stable criteria aimed at producing a translation equivalent to the original. Clearly, the results obtained from these technical and mechanical methods have great limitations since they are oriented only towards the source (i.e., they tend to think of translation as functional to the source text, without considering the destination culture; moreover, they rely on general rules a priori that are independent of the textual, contextual, linguistic and subjective situation specific to the texts.

Spanish culture also approaches these standards and in 1954 the *Asociación Profesional Española de Traductores e Intérpretes* (APETI) was founded, which that same year was integrated into the *Fédération Internationale des Traducteurs*, founded in Paris in 1953 under the auspices of UNESCO. Since the 1960s, Spanish translators have adopted the descriptive theory of a linguistic nature for scientific purposes which replaces the poetic translation-logic that until then constituted the norm. The description of the translation process leads to the conclusion that translation must always be accompanied by a rule to guide practice. At a general level, in the 70s and 80s of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the emphasis shifted to "translation theory", so there was no longer talk of "translation science". Translation studies now become theoretical-descriptive, that is, functional hypotheses are formulated to the phenomenon of translation, describing the factors and elements that characterize translation. In those years scholars no longer focus on the language but on the text, so translation now means the passage of a text from one language to another.

Another turning point occurred in the 1980s with the adoption of the term Translation Studies (cf. Agorni, 1999:219-229), which indicates the vast field of interdisciplinary studies underlying the study of translation. Translation is no longer considered a 'mechanical' process, a mere passage from one language to another, but a creative process not accessible to all; and the study of translation is not relegated to a branch of linguistics or comparative literature, since the importance now given to extralinguistic factors allows a much broader view. The fundamental role of translation highlighted by poly-systemic studies has emphasized the importance of the translator as a cultural mediator: he, knowing the two cultures in comparison, is able to adapt the original text to the cultural needs of the users. Before a literary text, the translator identifies the difference between the origin culture and the destination culture and evaluates how to proceed in his work, to decide which elements to preserve, which to adapt and how to present the specific elements of the original culture to the target audience. Therefore, the translator is the necessary medium for the interaction of different cultures (Ulrych, 1998). Consequently, translation is considered one of the basic forms of intercultural communication, that is, an operation that involves the entire mechanism of interaction between cultures (Meschonnic, 1973: 305-323). One cannot ignore the fact that there are language barriers, ethnic boundaries, different political-institutional modalities, so the practice leads translators to create an image of the original influenced by ideology, the poetics and expectations of the recipients of the translation. The strategy to be chosen in addition to being linguistic, is also of an ideological and poetic character: it includes the entire universe of discourse. Each translator reconciles the information provided by the text and the dictionary with the reality of their own socio-cultural context.

In the evolution of the theories of this period, post-structuralist studies, influenced by deconstructionism, occupy a central role. Within these currents, the writings of Jacques Derrida, in particular, *Des Tours de Babel* (1985) constitute the main impulses that lead to a critical reconsideration of traditional concepts such as text, language, nationality, originality and authority.

Since the last decades of the 20th century, translation studies have developed even further: increasing importance is given to the ideological and cultural aspects and problems arising from the relationships that are established, in some circumstances, among the most distant and heterogeneous cultures; this leads, among other things, to an expansion of discourse in the direction of post-colonial studies. In fact, non-Western academics, who introduce the topics of the current of cultural studies (Cappello, 2023), participate more actively in the debate: this means investigating the translation between dominant and dominated cultures, as well as the relationships between translation and gender (gender studies), translation and ideology, translation and subjectivity. The consequences that post-colonial culture determines within the translation process are analyzed: hybridization phenomena and new cultural relations.

As far as Spain is concerned, during the twentieth century, the exercise of translation underwent several changes and involved illustrious intellectuals, therefore theoretical studies on translation have increased particularly in recent decades, and have devoted themselves to deepening theoretical, methodological and historical aspects of the translation activity. Thus, to cite some examples, we have *Traducción, Traducciones, Traductores: Ensayo de Bibliografía Española* (1987) by Julio César Santoyo, where more than 1200 titles of books and articles on translation have been collected, written by Spaniards or translated into Spanish. The same author also wrote *Teoría y Crítica de la Traducción: Antología* (1987), a review of studies on the subject of Spanish or Spanish-speaking authors, and in his work *El delito de traducir* (1996), he gives an account of the studies, magazines and official translation offices in Spain. In Spain many translation schools have emerged within the universities, among which the University Centre of Cluny, linked to the Faculty of Letters of the Catholic Institute of Paris, The University School of Translators and Interpreters of the Autonomous University of Barcelona, University of Modern Languages and Translators of the Complutense University of Madrid. We can conclude that, if we also take into account the thousands of texts that are translated and published each year, Spain is among the most open and sensitive nations towards foreign literature. Generally speaking, the guidelines of Spanish translators are those based on the main translation theories illustrated above, in particular from *Translation Studies*.

### III. TRANSLATION FACED WITH THE PROBLEM OF LINGUISTIC VARIATION AND DIALECTAL VARIETIES

Within the complex framework that we have outlined in its historical journey, a fundamental sector is that of the translation of linguistic varieties and, therefore, of dialectal varieties, as well as the translation of linguistic variations and idiolects. These problems are closely related to the method of translation and the approach of texts in Sicilian dialect that we have discussed in this research. From the definition of linguistic variety, we read: «Each language has in itself differentiations connected with social and extralinguistic factors and articulates in *varieties*. The *language varieties* represent the different updates, each different in some features of the others, in which the linguistic system manifests itself concretely in its uses in a community» (*Enciclopedia Treccani* online). On the other hand, «By *linguistic variation* we mean the important characteristic of languages to be mutable and to present themselves in different ways in the behaviour of speakers [...] The varieties of languages present in the repertoire of a community, in fact, are not equally available or possessed to the same extent by all members of the community. The variation, therefore, is manifested in linguistic behaviour not only in the use of different forms of language, but also through diversified access to the varieties of language and the choice of variety to use in a given verbal interaction, which are strongly conditioned by the social rank of the speaker, by his level of education, by the characteristics of the community of which he is a member» (*Enciclopedia Treccani* online). On the basis of what has just been said, the aspect of language must be considered at two structured and interdependent levels, namely that constituted by the "dialect" component, which obviously represents a "linguistic variety", and that constituted by the differentiation between linguistic and dialectal registers within the same work representing "linguistic variation". Clearly, the translator must deal with these peculiar aspects of each literary text, especially those in dialect. In addition, we must not forget that within literary works the author characterizes characters and situations through a wide linguistic range that often sees dialectal forms mixed and intertwined with forms taken from Italian or other languages. Even the dialect is mostly calibrated and differentiated according to the social class of the characters or their character and role within the narrative context. The character of the text linked to the dialect, therefore to the "linguistic variety", is regulated by the rules concerning the specific grammar of the language examined. On the other hand, what concerns "linguistic variation" is clearly connected with socio-cultural, geographical, contextual or individual aspects of the speaker. The variation in a language is not random, but depends on social factors external to the language, which go back to some main categories, namely time, space, the social location of the speakers and the communicative situation.

Based on these reflections, Eugenio Coseriu (1973: 135-152) proposed the following classification:

1. *Diatopic variation* which is the diversity linked to the communicative space of the speaker, that is, to the territory and context in which the linguistic habits of the speaker were formed.

2. *Diastratic variation*, characterized by expressive peculiarities correlated with socio-cultural/socioeconomic belonging, age, gender, etc.

3. *Diaphasic variation* referring to differentiation in relation to the degree of formality of the communicative situation, the relationship of roles between speakers or the subject of verbal interaction.

The model created by Coseriu that was tripartite, is now completed by a fourth element, that is to say *the diamesic variation*, construct elaborated in 1983 by Alberto Mioni, who resorts to the Greek word *mésos*, "medium", in reference to the expressive medium (written, spoken, transmitted, etc.) selected to enunciate a message, therefore the "diamesic variation" has also been added (Mioni, 1983: 495-517), which is the modulation of the statement linked to the selection of the code: written, spoken, transmitted, etc.

Every linguistic message is always produced in a particular variety of language and is subject to variations and therefore has its place in each of the dimensions. The examination of these characteristics of languages obviously takes place within a purely sociolinguistic framework which becomes the prerequisite for linguistic and dialectological analysis. The question we must ask ourselves when we examine the relationship between dialect literature and its reception in other countries is, above all, to what extent the translator has understood the elements of variation and linguistic variety in the works he is about to translate. Secondly, in what proportion and with what precautions it intends to transfer the peculiarities of the language of the original text to the target language.

Without going into the numerous studies that refer specifically to the translation of dialects, let us summarize what are the possible attitudes on the part of the translators. First, the most common and simple strategy to adopt is to translate a dialectal text into the standard language, that is, the language adopted in the country of arrival of the literary work. It is clear that this type of translation completely nullifies the most peculiar characteristics of the text, those related to the variety of the language, its variations and the specific style of the author. On the other hand, it is the easiest method to transpose from one language to another, without having to stop looking for nuances and correspondences. Another method is to leave the original dialectal elements also in translation, accompanied by a caption. In this case, the reader is left with an additional task of interpretation. Another solution is to adopt a dialect of the target language to stylistically emulate the original text.

Finally, there is a small minority of translators who try to identify the diastratic, diatopic and diaphatic varieties of the source text to try to propose them again in the target text. Obviously this last form of translation is much more demanding and complex than the previous ones, so it is, in general, it would be desirable for it to become the usual method for translating works such as those in the Sicilian dialect and whose predominant stylistic trait consists precisely in linguistic texture, even more than in content. All efforts must therefore be directed in this direction, unless we want to fall back on previous hypotheses that saw in the substantial untranslatability the answer to questions about the transposition of literary works from one language to another.

#### **IV. THEORETICAL GUIDELINES FOR THE TRANSLATION OF THE WORKS OF ANDREA CAMILLERI IN SPAIN**

One of the world's successful writers, whose works present considerable problems in translation is the Sicilian Andrea Camilleri: the style he uses is a mixture of Sicilian, Italian and other languages and dialects, in practice a language of his own, an "idiolect" absolutely original. This author, among other things, has had a very close relationship with Spain, both for the affinities between the culture and tradition of Sicily and Spain in which the author identifies himself in many respects, both for the reception that his works have received in the Iberian land. So even if, as we said, the success of Camilleri's novels has been a widespread phenomenon, in Spain it has manifested itself with particular intensity: here already from the 90s of the past century they begin to translate the works of the Sicilian writer. There are 15 publishers and 16 translators and the translations extend to the two majority Iberian languages, Spanish and Catalan, as well as Basque and Galician. Among other things, scholars have found that initially between the publication of the original, in Italy, and the translation in Spain the time span was longer, in recent years has been considerably shortened, one year between the Italian and Spanish publications. In addition, paperback editions have become more widespread, serving a less demanding but broader readership. Another important element refers specifically to the translators who have become a group of "specialists" who have dedicated themselves exclusively to the works of Camilleri. Therefore, in the general theoretical framework, already outlined above, let us move on to clarify the main methods used by Spanish translators to approach an author like Camilleri whose peculiar stylistic code is precisely the language, or rather the specific idiolect. Andrea Camilleri is an author who is in perfect continuity with the culture of classical sophistry, in the sense of gnoseological relativism and, above all, linguistic relativism. Language is a malleable tool that lends itself to be shaped according to different situations and different characters; Camilleri exploits all its flexibility, all its expressive potential, in a baroque game that also reflects the influence of Spanish culture on the Sicilian tradition. However, it is not a game in itself, but through the language Camilleri wants to offer the various nuances, the different points of view with which reality manifests itself. We add that, in choosing the use of the Sicilian there is not only the need for a plurality of focal points, nor only a reference to the affective bond that the author admits and evokes regarding its origins; it is present, above all, the awareness of being able to exploit a complex language, stratified, with words of different etymologies, far from a standardized language like the national Italian. In this regard, Camilleri himself declared that, from the first attempts at literary writing, Italian did not allow him to express what he had in mind, on the contrary, he found in dialect, or rather in the language spoken in the family, the most appropriate means of expression for their narrative needs (Camilleri, 1998: 141-142). We believe that these considerations also reflect the point of view of the writer who feeds "with the lymph" of the dialect" the "tree of his language". But not only this: the works of Camilleri also show a taste for experiencing and following peculiar expressive modalities. Therefore, when the translators confront the texts of this author, they must start from the confrontation with a complex language that, within the variety of the Sicilian



dialect and the alternation between it, Italian, and other languages, sees an articulated structure, full of linguistic variations, both in the “diastatic” and “diaphasic” sense. As you can imagine, given the success, most of the translations refer to the “Commissioner Montalbano”, which includes numerous novels always inserted in the same context and with the same protagonists: for these reasons, in this case we can almost speak of a linguistic “typology”, which adopts specific mannerisms and phraseologisms as in *personalmenti di pirsona* of Catarella, or the colorful and baroque swearwords used by doctor Pasquano, or the expression of Montalbano *ruttura di cabasisi / rumpiri i cabasisi*, just to provide a couple of examples. In these cases, the appropriate solution could be to leave the Sicilian expressions unchanged since, given the recurrence, they have become completely transparent and do not require clarification, also give the text a flavor of “sicilianità” (Brandimonte, 2015: 35-54). Thus, in the case of the novels of the series by Commissioner Montalbano, once the translators have made the general choices, it has been easier to continue, re-proposing proven solutions to the problems that the “idiolect” used implies. More complex is the translation of Camilleri’s other works, mostly of a historical nature, since he has had to focus on different chronological areas and has also had to face new linguistic experimentations of the author. In general, both for the first group, consisting of detective novels, and for the other texts, the strategies identified by translations into several languages are multiple. For example, the famous German translator Moshe Kahn generally opts for the solution of developing a German slang that is not identifiable with a specific geographic area or dialectal tradition, but that is understandable to all readers. However, in some cases, as in the translation of the novel *La mossa del cavallo* (1999), it leaves some Sicilian terms untranslated, but which are understandable by context (Kahn, 2004: 180-186). Kahn identifies particular difficulties in approaching the novel *Il re di Girgenti* (2001) since four different languages are intertwined. In this case it appeals to the style of a German writer of the early nineteenth century, Jean Paul, who is considered a “German Camilleri”, and whose rereading serves the translator as a preliminary and model “preparation” phase (Kahn, 2004: 184-185). With regard to French, the translator Dominique Vittoz, also appealing to the words of the philosopher Paul Ricoeur when he invites us to discover the resources that remain uneducated in our own language, to translate Camilleri proposes the recovery of the substrate French dialect, in his case the dialect of Lyon (Vittoz, 2004: 187-199). A similar way of translating Camilleri’s works is identified by another French translator from Camilleri, Serge Quadruppani, who adopts the dialect of Marseilles (Quadruppani, 2004: 200-205). The American translator Stephen Sartarelli chooses to use American jargon to translate a basic linguistic register, dominated by vulgar language and swearing. Other times, instead, he prefers a “literal” translation, almost a linguistic tracing, to transpose into English the expressions of Camilleri as they are in the original (Sartarelli, 2004: 213-219).

We have brought these examples to highlight the variety of translation strategies adopted in various countries with respect to the works of Camilleri; obviously each of them is legitimized, not only by the specificity of the text to be translated and by subjective choices, but also because of the specific structure of the target language. In summary, the main methods of translation identified are as follows: 1) domestication: substitution of the Sicilian dialect by a local dialect; 2) some typically Italian/Sicilian words have been kept in the original language and explained when necessary; 3) creation of a supporting glossary along with explanatory notes.

Turning to the editions published in Spain, as we have already seen, the panorama is very varied and the translations also follow different directions.

Based on Camilleri’s editorial success, the scholar María de las Nieves Muñoz Muñoz suggests following the narrative rhythm and reproducing this peculiar aspect of Camilleri’s prose, as if it were poetry whose significance should be kept as intact as possible even in translations (Muñoz Muñoz, 2004: 206-212). Muñoz Muñoz reproaches the Spanish translators, both Spanish and Catalan, for not having understood this important trait. The main flaw of these translations is that they actually “normalize” the original language, proposing the standard Spanish texts. Within this panorama, Caterina Briguglia points out an important exception (Briguglia, 2009), in the Catalan version of the novel *Il birraio di Preston* (1995). The translator, Pau Vidal, adopts in his dialogues several dialects of Catalan area, from Mallorcan, to Leridan, passing through the dialects of Barcelona or Girona, to the dialect of Rossellò, which is an area of the French border. Each dialect must represent the linguistic varieties spoken by the characters of the novel, i.e., Sicilian, Florentine, Roman, Milanese, Turinese.

Although this modality marks the diatopic differences of the speakers, however, according to the scholar, it would alter the original semantic references, to acquire new ones, totally alien to the source text. This would lead to internal inconsistencies in the narrative structure and the “credibility with respect to the cultural and social microcosm represented in the work” would be irretrievably lost (Briguglia, 2009: 4).

Briguglia concludes that the translator will be able to choose the methods with which to operate on the basis of a *skopós*, to an objective that he has set himself, in addition the scholar appeals to functionalist theories that refer to the form, content or function of the original text. It is evident that in the case of Camilleri’s novels the linguistic variety plays a referential function both in terms of the connotation of the characters, and the creation of an artistic language and a personal style of writing. However, it also plays an expressive role to the extent that it is the projection of a social and cultural reality, that is, the Sicilian world represented in relation to other contexts, both in a diachronic sense and in relation to the national situation or other Italian regions (Briguglia, 2009: 4). Also

very interesting are the observations of Giovanni Caprara, who attributes to the cinematographic transposition of successful novels (and among them also those of Camilleri) the responsibility of spreading interpretive models of the text, of the characters, of the context. These models will inevitably condition readers (Caprara, 2011). The scholar addresses the issue of translations of Camilleri's novels from three perspectives, that is, with reference to the relationship between the translation of best sellers and editing; in relation to the role of the translator in relation to the concepts of literal translation or free translation, or domestication, that is, as regards the field of action and the translator's choices to bring the original text closer to the target language; finally: the specific way to approach the complex language of Camilleri. First, Caprara offers a concise but exhaustive vision of the character "Andrea Camilleri", remembering his illustrious masters Verga, Pirandello (who was also his distant relative), Sciascia, and also his friend, the Spanish writer Manuel Vázquez Montalbán, from which Camilleri was inspired to start the police series of Commissioner Montalbano, whose surname takes up precisely that of "Montalbán". Finally, it reminds us of the late success of the writer, a success that comes when Camilleri was already over seventy. Then he goes on to examine the specificity of the idiolect that represents the typical trait of the Sicilian writer (Caprara, 2011: 4). Caprara also highlights the mixture of linguistic registers used: the auric, the cult, the formal, the medium, the colloquial, the popular and the familiar and also points out that this form of multilingualism is intimately linked to the different narrative structures of the different works (Caprara, 2011: 4). Another fundamental feature of Camilleri's narrative is the role that the writer reserves to "orality" which confers on the text the character of immediacy and which makes define the writer as the best "troubadour" of the current era (Caprara, 2011: 5); in this context the dialect, used by both the omniscient narrator and the characters, favors narrative fluidity and reduces the distance between the narrator, the characters and the reader of the novel. The use of dialect increases progressively from one novel to another and Camilleri ends up creating an absolutely "experimental" language that puts it in marked contrast and break with the current literature (Caprara, 2011: 5). Considering all this, how does the Spanish translator compare with Camilleri's texts?

Caprara highlights some objective difficulties that are, above all, due to the proximity between Spanish and Italian, which feeds misunderstandings and translation errors. Another important element to consider is the closeness between both cultures. Finally, the central element in Camilleri's translation problem consists precisely in his style that not only intertwines the Italian language, the Sicilian dialects and other languages (Spanish and Latin), but also combines different literary genres simultaneously. Another component present in the work of the Sicilian writer is that of an ethical and social character, which is expressed, from time to time, through the historical and political context of reference. An element of particular interest for our research and highlighted by Caprara is the proximity between Spanish and Sicilian, feature that cannot be ignored or underestimated in the translations of texts that present the use of dialect as in the case of the works of Camilleri (Caprara, 2011: 9). The difficulty of translating the Camilleri's idiolect into Spanish makes the student reflect on the concrete and contextualized use of the dialect in the original language and in the target language. The suggestion is that the translator, before proposing his version, analyze the functions of the dialect, that is, the use of slang, the "diastratic" variations that characterize the social classes represented in the text and the context of the local culture. Therefore, without fear that something is irretrievably lost, the components that characterize the text, that is, expressiveness, emphasis, sounds, popular or obscene nuances, irony, comedy, must be translated into translation, ensuring that these "otherness" functions with respect to the target language are transferred to the new context (Caprara, 2011: 14). In this regard, Caprara makes a precise rebuke to the Spanish translators: «A los traductores españoles les ha faltado quizás la determinación de querer recuperar, junto al texto, el motivo por el cual éste ha sido escrito» (Caprara, 2011: 14).

Equally critical is the judgment of Giovanni Brandimonte in his essay *Tradurre Camilleri: dall'artificio linguistico alle teorie traduttologiche* (2016). Regarding the choice of the two major Spanish publishing houses that publish Camilleri's novels, namely Emecé and Destino, the scholar observes that: «Ad ogni modo, entrambe le case editrici hanno ritenuto di realizzare un prodotto nel quale è stata pressoché neutralizzata la sperimentazione linguistica di Camilleri, semplificando e standardizzando ogni registro ed annullando quasi del tutto la varietà locale» (Brandimonte, 2015: 35-54). On the contrary, the scholar suggests interesting solutions such as the insertion of dialectalisms according to a system of code mixing (code-mixing) Spanish-Sicilian that, in terms of structure, would take up the original text in which we witness the interlacing, at least of the Italian and dialect languages (Brandimonte, 2015: 35-54). Brandimonte highlights another very important element of Camilleri's narrative method, namely the presence of the figure of the "omniscient narrator" or, as has also been defined, of the "tragediatore", of the histrion (La Fauci, 2004: 161-176). In fact, in the indirect discourse the presence of the omniscient narrator has a particular tone in the works of Camilleri, the "tragediatore" addresses the reader almost with affection and involves him to reduce the distance that separates the text from the reader. Thus, the narrator would have a "didascalica" (explanatory) function from within the text and would replace annoying notes or additional glossaries. In addition, Camilleri himself uses in his novels the record of explaining, from time to time, the most controversial dialectal expressions. In general, Brandimonte also provides concrete suggestions, such as,

in the case of dialogues in dialect, in which he proposes to abandon the expressions of "formal" Spanish, to replace them with phrases taken from the colloquial and family register (Brandimonte, 2015: 53).

Of particular interest are the considerations of one of the Spanish translators of Camilleri, namely Carlos Mayor, collected in the essay *A commissioner, many dictionaries and a train in progress* (2017). Much of the consideration that the translation still provides the reader with the contents and meaning of the original work, so it is a worthwhile operation to offer the texts in different languages. Then it goes directly to the topic of contender, that is, how to translate into Spanish the set of complex linguistic plots and variations that Camilleri's idiolect implies: «¿Qué hacer con la variación lingüística, con el dialecto camilleriense, cómo reflejar los usos lingüísticos del autor [...]; si planchar o no planchar, si domesticar o forzar, si hacer inventos o buscar equivalencias, si acercar o mantener bien lejos?» (Mayor, 2017: 23). Another interesting observation concerns the fact that a direction has already been mapped out on the methods of translation of Camilleri's works, given that for almost thirty years this writer has been translated in Spain (Mayor, 2017: 23). However, Mayor gives translators very useful and shareable suggestions: first of all, read a lot and write a lot, that is, know how to read in depth and be good writers.

Then, the translator must adopt a strategy regarding the linguistic and cultural context to which the translation will arrive, but also take into account the context of the source text so as not to lose sight of the author's vision. Reading the source text several times is fundamental because the translator basically has to "rewrite" it (Mayor, 2017: 24). Then Mayor proposes some examples that compare several translations of Camilleri passages, including his own. Very important are the indications on the use of dictionaries that Mayor strongly recommends and that range from the Italians, passing by the thematic ones on Sicilian, and by the glossaries and specific repertoires extracted from the works of Camilleri. Mayor also provides detailed bibliographical indications of all of them. These works are an indispensable support for the scrupulous translator and allow him to expand his linguistic knowledge. We complete this brief review with the considerations of Annacristina Panarello (2019), who in his extensive and profound doctoral thesis, examines the main translation trends of Camilleri in Spain, and summarizes them schematically in: neutralizing the dialectal variety, that is, its translation into standard language (in standard Spanish, for example); the transcription of dialectal elements as they appear in the original text accompanied by an explanatory glossary or a translation in a footnote; the adoption of a dialect of the target language; searching for a linguistic variety that explores the records of the target language without specific geographical or local markings. The scholar agrees with the various critics who have examined the Spanish translations of Camilleri's works in that: «La mayoría de las editoriales y traductores españolas estandarizan las variedades dialectales, salvo unas pocas excepciones básicamente surgidas de los círculos académicos, excepciones que invitan a considerar deseable y posible invertir la tendencia general aplicando variedades diatópicas y diastráticas» (Panarello, 2019: 2). Panarello also offers several examples of translation in which Camilleri's idiolect can be translated through the adoption of idioms present in Spanish: the comparison between these solutions and the current translations that standardize the language makes us understand how many nuances of the text can be recovered through a mediation that takes into account mainly diatopic, diastratic and diaphasic factors, certainly present in a language rich in sayings and mannerisms such as Castilian. We can only hope that the next translations move in this direction and succeed in translating the linguistic richness of texts such as those of Camilleri into varied and stratified languages such as those present in Spain.

From the examples examined and the analyses presented, we can conclude that Andrea Camilleri is a particularly popular writer in Spain, where his works have considerable public success. This factor, in fact, if it favors the diffusion of the works of the Sicilian writer, moreover, it also contributes in the editorial choices that they project for translations that privilege the standard language. This strategy is certainly not dictated solely by the need to offer translated works to a wide audience and in the shortest possible time; In fact, Camilleri's idiolect involves a complex preliminary analysis and translation work into metalanguage that lends itself to various solutions. The decision to standardize the target language responds to theoretical assumptions that tip the balance towards users, their culture and context, although all do not escape the element linked to respect for the source text, the context that connotes it and the intentions of the author. Then, translating Camilleri remains an open problem and we cannot fail to agree with those who say that every work of art, once born, walks with its own feet and is "reinterpreted" autonomously by those who enjoy it: the work of art, therefore, is reborn each time differently and is also regenerated through good translations. At the closing conference of the study days on *Il caso Camilleri. Letteratura e storia* (2004), where the writer himself drew the conclusions of the Congress, Camilleri stressed how each scholar had made emerge from his writings elements that he himself was unaware until that moment. And to paraphrase the writer, we conclude that translations can also bring out "some thing of the work that the author did not know and that is revealed".

## V. CONCLUSION

The essay proposed here has tried to provide an overall picture of the history of translation in Western culture, starting from the classical world, up to the most accredited contemporary theories. For this reason, a large paragraph has been developed that has deepened the theme addressed in a diachronic sense and offering various examples related to the various currents of translation. In the third paragraph we dealt with a problem that was much discussed in the general debate on how to translate literary texts, that is how to render the variability of linguistic registers within a text: First of all, the internal differences that can be identified in the main categories of language that diversifies the speakers on the basis of diatopic, diaphasic and diastratic variations, to which is also added the diamesic variation.

These differences can be found, for example, in literary works such as those of the Sicilian writer Andrea Camilleri, who uses the language with originality and has created his own peculiar style that has been called "idiolect" in which are mixed both the different linguistic codes, both different languages such as Sicilian, Italian, Spanish, Latin, various Italian dialects, etc. Translating the works of this writer poses complex problems and switching to the target languages is a real challenge for translators. In this regard, a review of the translation guidelines adopted for Camilleri's novels has been proposed, with particular attention to the Spanish translations, considering also the privileged relationship and the cultural link between Spain and Sicily of which the Sicilian writer has been one of the most aware interpreters. We also proposed a review of the various translation solutions of Camilleri's works: for example, we pass from leaving some typical and perfectly "transparent" expressions untranslated because they return frequently in the novels of the series of "Inspector Montalbano" and have been emphasized also through the lucky films, the adoption of slang or dialects of the target language, to the translation into a standard language that does not take into account the aspects closely related to the "idiolect" invented by the Sicilian writer. The writer hopes that in addition to the editorial needs, linked to the requests and needs of the readers, the quality of the translations and respect for the original texts will be taken into account. So we hope that translators will acquire more and more the ability to transpose literary works following theoretical and practical guidelines appropriate to each author and the typicality of the works, making the linguistic nuances that are the most precious aspect of a literary work. Naturally, the questions raised remain open to new and varied proposals.

Here we think we have proposed an interesting topic of fundamental importance in literary and comparative studies, with the hope of adding a useful piece and finding a follow-up in that direction.

## REFERENCES

- [1] M. Untersteiner, *Sofisti: testimonianze e frammenti* (Milano: Bompiani, 2009).
- [2] M. T. Ciceron, *Obras completas* (Madrid: Librería de la viuda de Hernando y c.a., 1889).
- [3] Q. Orazio Flacco, *Ars Poetica- Epistulae*, (Milano: Feltrinelli, 2015).
- [4] Quintiliano, *Instit utio oratoria*, L. X, 5, (Segrate: Rizzoli, 1997).
- [5] M. C. Sanchez Montero, *Lineamenti di storia della traduzione in Spagna* (Trieste: Scuola superiore di lingue moderne per interpreti e traduttori, 1998).
- [6] Sancti Hieronymi, *Epistulae LVII*, 5 (Madrid: Biblioteca de autores cristianos, 1973).
- [7] J. Obolenskaya, (2003: 115-124), La adecuación y la equivalencia de la traducción: ¿la cuestión de terminología o la oposición conceptual? in M. A. Vega Cernuda (Ed.), *Una mirada al taller de San Jerónimo: bibliografías, técnicas y reflexiones en torno a la traducción*, (Madrid: Complutense, 2003) 115-124.
- [8] M. A. Vega Cemuda, *Textos clásicos de teoría de la traducción* (Madrid: Cátedra, 1994).
- [9] Dante Alighieri, *Convivio*, L. I, VII (Madrid: Tipografía Renovación, 1919).
- [10] G. Folena, (1973: 57-1209, "Volgarizzare" e "tradurre": idea e terminologia della traduzione dal Medioevo italiano e romanzo all'Umanesimo europeo, in *La traduzione, saggi e studi* (Torino. Einaudi, 1999) 57-1209.
- [11] L. Salmon, *Teoria della traduzione* (Milano: Franco Angeli, 2017).
- [12] E. Nida, Linguistics and Ethnology in Translation-Problems. *WORD: Vol. 1, No. 2*, 1945, 194-208.
- [13] A. Pertusi, *Leonzio Pilato tra Petrarca e Boccaccio* (Firenze: Olschki, 1964).
- [14] L. Bruni, *Opere letterarie e politiche* (UTET: Torino 1996).
- [15] E. Dolet, *La manière de bien traduire d'une langue en autre* (Lyon 1540) (Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1972).
- [16] M. Lutero, Epistola sull'arte del tradurre e sulla intercessione dei santi, in V. Vinay (Ed.), *Scritti religiosi* (Torino: Utet, 1967).
- [17] G. Mounin, *Les belles infidèles*, (Lille: PUL, 1994).
- [18] H. A. Amparo, *La notion de fidélité en traduction* (Paris: Didier, 1990).
- [19] J. W. Goethe, *Divan occidentale-orientale*, editado por G. Cusatelli, (Einaudi: Torino, 1990).
- [20] W. Von Humboldt, Einleitung zur Agamemnon-Übersetzung, in G. Franchi E. A. Marchetti (Ed.), «*Ripaepulteriori amores*». *Traduzione e Traduttori* (Bologna: Marietti, 1991).



- [21] F. Schleiermacher, Sobre los diferentes métodos de traducir, in E. López García (Ed.), *Teorías de la traducción, Antología de textos* (Ediciones de la Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha: Cuenca, 1996).
- [22] M. J. de Larra, De las traducciones, *Biblioteca de Autores Españoles*, vol. CXXVIII (Madrid: Atlas, 1835, new-ed.1960).
- [23] L. Alas Clarín, La traducciones, en *Nueva campaña (1885–1886)*, (Madrid: Fernando Fe, 1887) 247–252.
- [24] F. De Saussure, *Corso di linguistica generale*, (Roma-Bari: Laterza, 2009).
- [25] B. Croce, *Estetica come scienza dell'espressione e linguistica generale* (Bari: Laterza, 1922).
- [26] W. Benjamin, (1996), La tarea del traductor, in D. López García (Ed.) *Teorías de la traducción, Antología de textos*, (Ediciones de la Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha: Cuenca, 1996).
- [27] J. Ortega Y Gasset, *Miseria y esplendor de la traducción* (Granada: Universidad de Granada, 1980 [ed., 1<sup>a</sup> Buenos Aires, *La Nación*, 1937]).
- [28] N. Chomsky, *Aspects of the theory of syntax*, (Cambridge–Mass: The MIT Press,1965).
- [29] M. Agorni, Translation Studies: la revisione del rapporto traduzione/originale continua", in *Transiti letterari e culturali. Volume II* (Trieste: EUT Edizioni Università di Trieste, 1999) 219-229.
- [30] M. Ulrych, Introduzione, in A. Lefevere, *Traduzione e riscrittura. La manipolazione della forma letteraria* (Torino: UTET, 1998).
- [31] H. Meschonnic, Poétique de la traduction, in H. Meschonnic, *Pour la poétique, II* (Paris: Gallimard, 1973).
- [32] J. Derrida, Des Tours de Babel, in S. Nergaard (Ed.), *Teorie contemporanee della traduzione*, (Bompiani: Milano, 1995).
- [33] G. Cappello, *Cultural studies*, in F. Lever – P. C. Rivoltella – A. Zancchi (Edd.), *La comunicazione. Dizionario di scienze e tecniche*, [www.lacomunicazione.it](http://www.lacomunicazione.it) (14/08/2023).
- [34] J.C. Santoyo, *Traducción, Traducciones, Traductores: Ensayo de Bibliografía Española* (Leon: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de León, 1987).
- [35] Id., *Teoría y Crítica de la Traducción: Antología* (Barcelona: Bellaterra,1987).
- [36] Id., *El delito de traducir* (León: Universidad de León, 1985).
- [37] *Enciclopedia Treccani* online, [https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/varietà\\_\(Enciclopedia-dell%27Italiano\)/](https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/varietà_(Enciclopedia-dell%27Italiano)/)
- [38] *Enciclopedia Treccani* online, [https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/variazione-linguistica\\_\(Enciclopedia-dell'Italiano\)](https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/variazione-linguistica_(Enciclopedia-dell'Italiano))
- [39] E. Coseriu, *Lezioni di linguistica generale* (Torino: Boringhieri, 1973).
- [40] A. Mioni, Italiano tendenziale: osservazioni su alcuni aspetti della standardizzazione, in P. Benincà et al. (Ed.), *Scritti linguistici in onore di Giovan Battista Pellegrini, 2 voll., vol. I* (Pisa: Pacini, 1983), 495-517.
- [41] A. Camilleri, «Mani avanti», in *Il corso delle cose* (Palermo: Sellerio,1998).
- [42] G. Brandimonte, Tradurre Camilleri: dall'artificio linguistico alle teorie traduttologiche, in *Lingue Linguaggi* 13, 2015, 35-54.
- [43] A. Camilleri, *La mossa del cavallo* (Palermo: Sellerio, 1999).
- [44] M. Kahn, Il dialetto nelle traduzioni di Andrea Camilleri, in *Il caso Camilleri* (Palermo: Sellerio, 2004) 180-186.
- [45] A. Camilleri, *Il re di Girgenti* (Palermo: Sellerio, 2001).
- [46] D. Vittoz, Quale francese per tradurre l'italiano di Camilleri? Una proposta non pacifica, in *Il caso Camilleri* (Palermo: Sellerio, 2004) 187-199.
- [47] S. Quadrupani, Il caso Camilleri in Francia. Le ragioni di un successo, in *Il caso Camilleri* (Palermo: Sellerio, 2004) 200-205.
- [48] S. Sartarelli, L'alterità linguistica di Camilleri in inglese, in *Il caso Camilleri* (Palermo: Sellerio, 2004) 200-219.
- [49] M. Muñoz Muñoz, Lo stile della traduzione: Camilleri in Spagna, en *Il caso Camilleri. Letteratura e storia* (Palermo: Sellerio, 2004) 207- 208.
- [50] C. Briguglia, Riflessioni intorno alla traduzione del dialetto in letteratura Interpretare e rendere le funzioni del linguaggio di Andrea Camilleri in spagnolo ed in catalano, in *TRAlinea Special Issue: The Translation of Dialects in Multimedia*, 2009. [http://www.intralinea.org/specials/article/Riflessioni\\_intorno\\_alla\\_traduzione\\_del\\_dialetto\\_in\\_letteratura](http://www.intralinea.org/specials/article/Riflessioni_intorno_alla_traduzione_del_dialetto_in_letteratura)
- [51] A. Camilleri, *Il birraio di Preston* (Palermo: Sellerio, 1995).
- [52] G. Caprara, *Andrea Camilleri: Sobre el "best-seller" y la traducción de la interlengua*, in *Entre Lenguas. Vol. 16*, (2011), 95-110.

- [53] N. La Fauci, L'allotropia del tragediatore, in *Il caso Camilleri. Letteratura e storia*, (Palermo: Sellerio, 2004) 161-176.
- [54] C. Mayor, Un comisario, muchos diccionarios y un tren en marcha, en *Oltre il poliziesco: letteratura/multilinguismo/traduzioni nell'area mediterranea, Quaderni camilleriani 3, Il cimento della traduzione* (2017) 23-30.
- [55] A. Panarello, (2019), *Traducir el dialecto: técnicas y estrategias en las traducciones al español de la narrativa italiana moderna parcialmente dialectal*, doctoral diss., Facultat de Traducció i d'Interpretació Departament de Traducció i d'Interpretació i d'Estudis de l'Àsia Oriental, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 2019.