

https://dspace.org/

Translating Andrea Camilleri: Strategies for the translation of

Ridonato, Giuseppe

2006-10-25T12:37:45Z
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/1439

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

TRANSLATING ANDREA CAMILLERI: STRATEGIES FOR THE TRANSLATION OF LINGUISTIC VARIATIONS

Giuseppe Ridonato

TRANSLATING ANDREA CAMILLERI: STRATEGIES FOR THE TRANSLATION OF LINGUISTIC VARUATIONS

Giuseppe Ridonato

A translation research project submitted to the Faculty of Humanities, University of the Witwatersrand, in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts (Translation).

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this research project is my own, unaided work. It is being submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in Translation at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any degree or examination in any other university.

_____

_____ day of _____, 20__.

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this research project is my own, unaided work. It is being submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in Translation at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any degree or examination in any other university.

_____

_____ day of _____, 20__.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the Human Sciences Research Council for financial assistance; my supervisor, Dr. E. Meintjes, and Dr. J. Inggs for their patience and guidance; and all other lecturers and fellow students who have, whether directly or indirectly, assisted me with this research project.

To my parents and to Nicole, for giving me everything and never expecting anything in return.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT……..1

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION…….2

1.1 Equivalence or not equivalence……..4

CHAPTER 2: DIALECTS AND LINGUISTIC VARIATIONS…….7

2.1 A brief history of the Sicilian language……..7

2.2 Functions of linguistic variations……..10

2.3 Linguistic variations and register in Camilleri's novels……12

2.4 Camilleri: a postcolonial writer?……...15

2.5 Camilleri's language…….27

2.6 A Sicilian Narrator?……..29

CHAPTER 3: TRANSLATING LINGUISTIC VARIATIONS……34

3.1 Translating Camilleri……40

3.2 Translating *La stagione della caccia*……42

3.3 Translating *La forma dell'acqua*……..59

CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSION……...74

BIBLIOGRAPHY...……78

ABSTRACT

The objective of this paper is to investigate how linguistic variations in a literary text can be translated by analysing and comparing the strategies employed by two different French translators when dealing with the works of the Italian author, Andrea Camilleri. Much has been written about the possibility/ impossibility of translation itself, with many writers and critics taking opposing sides on the issue. The intention of this study is not to fuel or further this, in our view, sterile discussion. The point is that translations do exist and have existed for thousands of years: that is, texts in one (source) language have in some way been recreated and rewritten into another (target) language[1]. By contrast, what has been explored only superficially is how linguistic variations and dialects present in literary texts have been reproduced in the target language. Textual analyses relative to this study will be carried out on selected passages of two different novels (one for each translator).

[1] The abbreviations SL and TL will be used to indicate 'source language' and 'target language' respectively, while ST and TT will be used to indicate 'target text' and 'source text'.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

> Chi si accosta, infatti, a uno qualunque dei suoi libri viene colpito di primo acchito dalla peculiarità del suo linguaggio connotato dall'uso di diversi registri e strati linguistici: lingua italiana, dialetto, lingua mescidata, lingue straniere; linguaggio aulico, medio, volgare (De Montis 2001: 14).
>
> *Those who come across any one of his books are struck by the peculiarity of his language, with its different registers and linguistic levels: the Italian language, dialect, mixed language, foreign languages, "high", "medium" and vulgar language*.

The Sicilian author, Andrea Camilleri, is one of the most prominent and successful writers in Italy today, and he has a very unique style which stems directly from the use of dialect and linguistic variation in his works. He has achieved extraordinary (popular and literary) success in Italy over the past five or six years: so much so, in fact, that he has been described as a genuine literary phenomenon. What makes his success all the more extraordinary and interesting is the fact that he writes most of his novels in a Sicilian dialectal variation of language, which cannot be (and is not) entirely understood by the majority of the Italian population (which nevertheless constitutes a large part of his readership). In fact, many critics have attributed his incredible success to the language he uses [Augias 1998, Malatesta 1997, La Capria 1998, De Montis – "Possiamo concludere che è certamente lo stile di Camilleri che ne ha decretato la fama, la celebrità e, perché no, la moda" (2001: 61)].

If it is indeed true that Camilleri's style has been the reason for his success, and we believe this to be the case, then we maintain it is necessary that the dialect (which is the essence of his style) be in some way reproduced in any translations of his novels. We believe that readers of these novels in other languages should be given an insight into Camilleri's unique style (even if the overall effects are not exactly the same). Both Dominique Vittoz and Serge Quadruppani have attempted to reproduce the dialect in their translations. However, the strategies they have employed are very different. These will be identified and compared, and possible conclusions will be drawn as to the reasons behind the choices made. These could vary in accordance

with numerous factors, such as: the availability of a "ready-to-use" dialect within the translator's knowledge; the connotations associated with particular dialects or linguistic variations; the willingness of the translator to "invent" a linguistic variation based on an existing dialect and the consequences this could involve because of the rigidity of the French language; and the genre conventions of the novels[2].

The research has as its starting point the analysis of the French translations of the Italian novels: this is a result of Toury's assumption that translations are "*facts of one system only*: the target system" (Toury 1995: 26). This approach, which forms the foundation for DTS (Descriptive Translation Studies), assigns a central role to the target text and the study thereof and regards the source text as the basis from which the translation develops, thereby making it product-oriented. The method used to carry out the study will be a comparative analysis between the ST and the TT, based on Hatim and Mason's model for the analysis of texts (1997: 16). The purpose of analysing the different strategies employed by the translators in dealing with these very particular works and uses of language is to contribute to the (limited) existing literature on the topic, by reinforcing some of the existing theoretical premises, or (possibly) by suggesting new ways in which the translation of linguistic variation could be approached and dealt with. It must be stressed that it is not an objective of this study to prescribe a set methodology to translate variations of language or to pass judgement on the strategies adopted by the translators.

1.1 Equivalence or not equivalence

[2] Camilleri writes two types of novels. The first type could be regarded as standard serial detective fiction like Simenon's Maigret, where the police inspector Salvo Montalbano investigates various crimes. The second type is the "historical novel": Camilleri invents fictional stories, usually based on events that actually occurred, that take place in the past (17th, 18th, 19th centuries). However, all of his novels (detective fiction and historical) take place in the imaginary city of Vigata (modelled on Camilleri's place of birth, Porto Empedocle) and the dialect spoken by the people of the place is always the same: so, even if the novels are of a different genre, they still contain the same linguistic variations.

Although it is not within the scope of this study to contribute to the vast literature concerning the possibility of translating or of achieving equivalence, a brief description of this concept and its history will give the reader an idea of the starting point for this particular research and therefore the perspective from which this analysis will be taken. Throughout the history of translation, and therefore from the times of ancient Greece and the Roman Empire, there has been endless debate surrounding the possibility of translation, in particular with regard to literary texts. Ortega y Gasset points out that "it is almost always (…) impossible to approximate all the dimensions of the original text at the same time. If we want to give an idea of its aesthetic qualities we will have to relinquish almost all the substance of the text in order to carry over its formal graces" (in Venuti 2001: 62). Therefore, if we consider translation to be the recreation of every single aspect of the source text (content, structure, meaning, style …), then translation would indeed be impossible because languages have different boundaries and limits which prevent texts being reproduced exactly from one language to another.

However, it is a fact that translation does indeed occur and translated texts do exist. This is an extremely convincing argument in favour of the possibility of translation. Among the theorists who believe that translation is possible are Nida and Tabor. Their definition of what they understand translation to be is as follows: "Translating consists in reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source-language message, firstly in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style" (1974: 12). Catford, another theorist, describes translation as "(t)he replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by an equivalent textual material in another language (TL)" (1965: 20).

One word that is common to both these definitions is *equivalence*. Although it may not be possible to reproduce everything associated with a text *exactly* from one language to another, it may indeed be possible to establish some form of equivalence between two texts. The debate around equivalence has divided critics into two categories: those who believe that equivalence is impossible and others who believe

that there are different levels of equivalence, some more 'correct' than others. Among the definitions of *equivalent* in *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* are: 'like in signification or import'; 'equal in value'; 'corresponding or virtually identical'. Without entering into a discussion of what the value of a text entails or in what way two texts can be identical, as practising translators, we believe that when we undertake the task of translating, we are trying to create some sort of equivalent text in the target language (TL) as exists in the source language (SL).

It is our view that in order for a translation to be worthy of the name, it needs to establish equivalence in one form or another. What would be the point of translating if this were not the case? The difficulty for the translator arises when s/he has to make a decision as to which level of equivalence to opt for, bearing in mind that it is not possible to retain all aspects of the source text in the translation. This will naturally influence the translator's strategy. According to Bell, the translator has the option of developing her/ his translation strategy according to the concept of *formal* equivalence, thereby preserving the semantic equivalence of the ST (source text) and hence disregarding the context, or *dynamic* equivalence, which preserves the communicative value of the ST in context (1991: 184). As a starting point, we will therefore subscribe to the view that translation is possible and that some form of equivalence must be achieved between source text (ST) and target text (TT) in order for the latter to be called a translation.

As Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere, in their essay entitled *"Where are we in Translation Studies?"* (1998: 1-11), point out: *equivalence* and *faithfulness*, which were once considered to be the key words associated with translation and the task of translating, are no longer regarded in the same authoritative light as before. This because it is generally accepted today that different types and degrees of equivalence (or faithfulness) can exist: there is no single, universal equivalence which can be transposed in only one way. There has been a realisation that "there are different types of faithfulness that may be adequate in different situations" (1998: 3).

CHAPTER 2: DIALECTS AND LINGUISTIC VARIATIONS

2.1 A brief history of the Sicilian language

In order to understand the relationship between the standard Italian language and the various different dialects in Italy (the Sicilian dialect in particular) it is necessary to understand some of the history of Sicily and of Latin languages. Sicilian is a Latin language, meaning that "a large portion of its vocabulary, grammatical forms, and syntactical constructions … come from Latin" (Bonner 1999: 3). There are many other languages in Southern and Western Europe that also stem from Latin, among these: Provençal, standard French, Catalan, standard Spanish, standard Italian as well as all the regional languages found on the Italian peninsula (Friulian, Venetian, Emilian, Calabrian, etc.). Considering that all these languages come from Latin, one may be led to ask why there are so many differences between them.

The reason so many languages have Latin roots can be attributed to the Roman Empire. At the height of its power (in the 1st and 2nd centuries AD), the Roman Empire exercised control over the entire Mediterranean basin, Gaul (France today), much of Western and Southern Europe, North Africa and part of the Near East (reaching the borders of Persia). As Dr J.K Bonner, an expert on Sicilian culture and dialect points out, "the Latin language spread throughout the Roman Empire due to colonisation and the spread of Roman soldiers, administrators and merchants […] In short, Latin became a lingua franca, enabling people throughout the Empire to communicate with each other with ease" (1999: 3-4). Bonner goes on to explain that, due to the lack of a centralised education system as we know it today, most people in the Roman Empire did not speak a "Standard Classical Latin", but rather a more popular version known as "Vulgar Latin" – where vulgar comes from the Latin term *vulgus* meaning "of the people/ common folk" (1999: 4).

It is important to note that Vulgar Latin was spoken in various different forms as there was no real standard form (because it was not codified and taught). However, with the

gradual demise of the Roman Empire, Latin became the language of the Roman Catholic Church, and the various forms of Vulgar Latin slowly evolved into different languages. This was mainly due to the breakdown in communication caused by the fall of the Empire, which resulted in there being no central power to give at least some uniformity to the different forms of Vulgar Latin. Language norms were maintained through social interaction, and therefore orally for the most part (interaction was restricted to spoken languages). This meant that there was no longer the contact there had been with the central power, causing the languages to develop and evolve independently.

"In the case of Sicily, the original peoples were the Siculi and the Sicani … [who] had arrived there before the end of the last ice age (circa 11 000 BCE)" (Bonner 1999: 6). Bonner believes that the languages spoken by these people were probably not Indo-European, and would therefore have had no relationship with modern European languages (1999: 6). Before being conquered by Rome, the island of Sicily (and in particular the Eastern and Southern portions) had been colonised by the Greeks. Greek was an Indo-European language – this meant that it only bore a distant resemblance to Latin, as it was not part of the "Italic languages" (Bonner 1999: 7). Sicily was also colonised by the Carthaginians whose language was Semitic (non Indo-European) and, after the fall of the Roman Empire the language was also exposed to Arabic, Norman, French and Spanish influences. It was mainly the vocabulary (and to a lesser extent, the grammar) which was affected by these influences.

The lengthy Roman occupation (600 years) ensured that the inhabitants of the island spoke some form of Latin. However, the many different linguistic influences to which Sicily was exposed resulted in the Vulgar Latin spoken in Sicily evolving to become the Sicilian dialect. This occurred at the same time as the Vulgar Latin spoken in Central Italy was evolving into Tuscan, which formed the foundations of the standard Italian spoken today, which is the official language of the Italian state. Bonner believes that, because of the separate history and development of Sicilian (and for that

matter, of all the other Italian dialects) when compared to standard Italian, the Sicilian language (as well as the other regional languages) could be considered as a separate language. This view is further reinforced by the fact that "Sicilian has its own dialects (*parrati*) [most of which]… are mutually intelligible, that is, a person speaking the dialect of Catania would have been able to understand someone speaking the dialect of Palermu, but he/ she would also have been conscious of some distinctive differences" (Bonner 1999:7).

> Language is a combination of convention and spontaneity. It is a flexible medium, capable of infinite shadings of meaning, moulded by the mores and habits of the people speaking it. Since it is an instrument of communication between people, it expresses both the society and the individual (Carroll 1981: 141).

Jaap van Marle (in Cheshire and Stein 1997: 14) explains how in many European countries there was a separation between the standard language, often expressed in writing, and dialectal variations which were usually oral only. These two linguistic levels were largely independent and there was often no interaction between dialect and the written standard. Camilleri has created a linguistic variation which is a mixture of the local Sicilian dialect spoken by him and standard Italian. This new, 'hybrid' language, because of the fact that it has been 'contaminated' by dialect, has very distinct oral qualities (characteristics of spoken language), and therefore represents language in its natural form: van Marle argues that "written languages represent language deprived of both its natural medium – its sound and its intonation – and its natural context" (1997: 15). If this is true, then written languages are by definition poorer than spoken languages because of the greater degree of expression which the latter allow. Camilleri states this explicitly when he says that by writing in dialect (which is of course essentially a spoken language) he can express certain things which he could not if he were writing in Italian.

"Sicilian has remained largely a spoken language with strong oral traditions. Of course, there is nothing wrong with this except that the lack of a strong literary standard has allowed each Sicilian dialect (*i parrati siciliani*) to express itself through

slightly different linguistic norms" (Bonner 1999: 8). Orality has traditionally been associated with storytelling, recalling ancient traditions where stories were passed down by word of mouth. Camilleri sees himself as a storyteller and, in accordance with that tradition, he tells stories, using the language which he feels is best suited for the purpose:

> È un mio difetto questo di considerare la scrittura allo stesso modo del parlare […] ho bisogno d'immaginarmi attorno quei quattro o cinque amici che mi restano stare a sentirmi, a seguirmi, mentre lascio il filo del discorso principale, ne agguanto un altro capo, lo tengo tanticchia, me lo perdo, torno all'argomento. (Camilleri in Sorgi 2000: 65-66)
>
> [*It is one of my defects to consider writing the same as speaking […] I need to imagine that those four or five friends I have left are around me, listening to me and following me, as I get side-tracked and leave the main path of the story to take another one, which I stay on for a while, then I get lost and go back to the main argument*.[3]]

Van Marle believes that "spoken standards may rightly be characterised as language varieties that are 'richer' than other languages in that they … are hybrids as far as their function is concerned. This is directly reflected by the rich inventory of registers and styles usually at the disposal of spoken standards" (1997: 17). This is a very important point when discussing Camilleri's novels and one which is discussed below. The linguistic variations present in the texts correspond to different functions and registers and we believe it is very important for translators to be aware of this when they decide to translate Camilleri's novels.

2.2 Functions of linguistic variations

The German sociolinguist, Norbert Dittmar, believes that linguistic systems are formed and vary according to social structures, which are represented by social groups, institutions, and nations as well as by communities which interact because of similar needs or situations which they share. He introduces the linguistic notion of *speech community*, defined as:

[3] All English translations of French and Italian texts in the present study are mine.

> qualsiasi aggregato umano caratterizzato da interazione frequente e regolare per mezzo di un patrimonio comune di segni verbali e distinto da aggregati simili in base a differenze significative nell'uso linguistico (1978: 158)
>
> *any human group which is characterised by frequent and regular interaction by means of a common set of verbal signs, and which is distinct from similar groups due to significant differences in the use of language*

Therefore, speech communities are groups of people that are characterised by the language they use when interacting with each other and they are classified according to their linguistic similarities and differences. It must be noted that speakers may belong to more than one speech community, with the result that these are often very difficult to define.

Dittmar explains how speech communities are seldom homogeneous because, on the one hand, they are made up of linguistic variations which are bound to the speech community by a group of shared social norms and, on the other, they reflect historical and regional differences which are often related to specific interests. He then proceeds to make the distinction between four different types of linguistic variations (1978: 160):

(i) standard variation: this is normally codified by norms which regulate its correct (written and oral) use, and is employed in social and state institutions (thereby often causing it to be a symbol of status and prestige).

(ii) regional variation: these are the dialects (regional and local), which are distinguished according to geographical location and are not normally codified (or if they are, then not as rigidly) as the standard variation.

(iii) social variation: these correspond to variations used by different social groups (also known as sociolects).

(iv) functional variation: the use of functional variations intersects with the use of the standard variety, sociolect and dialect. These variations may be linked to particular interactions, institutions, relationships, situations (formal/ informal) and even to the individual characteristics of the speaker. Thus, speakers use the different variations at their disposal functionally, that is they use one variation in a certain field/ situation, and another in a different field/ situation: these are often technical and/or commercial languages or jargons. Functional variation thus incorporates all the factors associated with linguistic behaviour (interregional, regional and social). The notion of functional variation of language is therefore closely associated with register.

2.3 Linguistic variation and register in Camilleri's novels

The association of functional language variations and register is very important when considering Camilleri's works. The Canadian linguist, Vizmuller-Zocco (2001: 3) identifies several different linguistic variations in Camilleri's novels[4], each one with a specific function, which largely coincide with the variations put forward by Dittmar. She believes that the dialect in Andrea Camilleri's novels is the author's way of mapping different linguistic variations onto different functions in his works. The major linguistic variations she identifies are:

(i) the *local Sicilian dialect* which resembles the dialect of Camilleri's place of birth (Porto Empedocle in South West Sicily) and is used in direct speech when spoken between certain characters, or in magical formulas and proverbs (expressions)

(ii) the *mixed variation* which is the local Sicilian dialect integrated with Italian discourse, which is also used in direct speech as well as by the narrator. Vizmuller-Zocco points out that this language variation is neither

[4] The functions highlighted by Vizmuller-Zocco in her analysis of the linguistic variations in Camilleri's work refer principally to the detective novels.

Italian nor dialect, but rather an Italianisation of the regional dialect by apposing Italian morphemes onto Sicilian roots.

(iii) *standard Italian*, without which it would not be possible to compare the use of dialect and which is used in passages that deal with current affairs topics or socially relevant comments made by the narrator, or when there is some formal dialogue taking place between characters of a higher social status, or characters that are not Sicilian (locals).

Vizmuller- Zocco concludes that the dialect in Andrea Camilleri's novels is the author's way of mapping different linguistic variations onto different functions in his works. The dialect has a number of different functions: the first being the need to concretely identify the place of action – this place is Sicily and this can be clearly identified by the language that is used. Another function of the language is to allow the reader to experience the humour and the irony which is characteristic of Sicilian people. Camilleri himself says that his intention is to please and entertain the reader, but also to make the reader reflect on the history of Sicily, a history marred by sufferance and injustice.

As we can see from Vizmuller-Zocco's analysis of the linguistic variations present in the novels, different variations are utilised in different situations. Traditionally, a distinction has been made between user- and use-related variations of language, with the former being termed *dialect* and the latter *register*. However, what happens here is that dialectal and register features overlap: dialect in Camilleri's novels has a specific function which is often related to a particular situation type or *use*. As a result, in these texts, dialectal variations often coincide with variations in register. It is therefore important for the translator to be aware of the shifts in register, particularly if they do correspond to linguistic variations.

To these different linguistic variations mentioned by Vizmuller-Zocco we would like to add another linguistic variation which is not a dialect but is associated with register. This additional variation is a type of formal, bureaucratic Italian spoken by certain

characters (normally government officials or politicians, who often turn out to be corrupt or evil) who appear in Camilleri's novels. The language used by these characters is very 'pompous' and filled with words and expressions which are not commonly used in spoken Italian. There is a definite sense of irony and a particular ideology reflected in this use of language. Camilleri has openly admitted his dislike for bureaucratic language and the people who speak in this way in his novels are normally not looked upon favourably by detective Montalbano[5], who despises them. Montalbano at times resorts to this manner of speaking in dialogues with these characters but the reader can sense the irony and sarcastic tone which underlie his words.

A brief discussion on register analysis and its relation to literary discourse will be of some use to gain a better understanding of how translation strategies may be affected by this. Register is defined by Halliday as "the configuration of semantic resources that the member of a culture associates with a situation type" (1985: 111). Josep Marco believes that "register analysis is the most comprehensive framework proposed for the characterisation of context" because of the link it provides between the act of communication and the context in which it occurs. This implies that specific lexico-grammatical structures create meanings which in turn allow us to derive context from text (2000: 1).

Marco makes an important distinction between *inner* and *outer* context of situation: he states that although a literary text may be a mere representation free from constraints of the external situation, it needs to create its own internal, *fictional* context – "the inner context of situation" - with fictional participants in order for it to be intelligible (2000:2). Thus, the characters in the fictional world construct an inner context by means of register. Hatim and Mason believe that "register membership of a text is an essential part of discourse processing; it involves the reader in a reconstruction of context through an analysis of what has taken place (field), who has

[5] see footnote 2

participated (tenor), and what medium has been selected for relaying the message (mode)" (1990: 55).

Camilleri uses a whole range of different registers in his works. These are characterised by linguistic variations spanning from dialects through to bureaucratic Italian, which is often parodied. Montalbano, the principal character of Camilleri's detective novels, uses different registers (and therefore different linguistic variations) depending on the person with whom he is communicating (and the mode). With Livia, his girlfriend from Genoa, he speaks in Italian because she is not familiar with the local Sicilian dialect. When he speaks to the chief of police (with whom he has a good relationship), he speaks Italian with occasional (rare) words in dialect. With people from outside Sicily he speaks in Italian, and with people from Sicily he may either speak in dialect, the mixed dialect or standard Italian depending on his relationship to them. When he has to write reports or notices, faxes and telegrams he uses bureaucratic Italian, which he despises. In the light of the considerations made by Vizmuller-Zocco, which highlight the functions performed by the linguistic variations, it must be noted that we find a functional approach to translating the linguistic variations present in these novels particularly appealing. By functional approach, we mean translating linguistic variations in accordance with the functions of register they perform in the text. This would involve identifying and re-creating linguistic variations in the target text in accordance with different situations in which different forms of language are spoken.

2.4 Camilleri: a postcolonial writer?

> La società contemporanea ormai deve fare continuo riferimento a situazioni multietniche, interrazziali, e pertanto cerca di dare spazio ai vari linguaggi che siano espressione di realtà altre rispetto alla civiltà di ciascun Paese. (De Montis 2001: 13)
>
> *Contemporary society must nowadays continuously refer to multiethnic, interracial situations, and therefore it tries to give space to the various languages that are the expression of realities that differ from the cultures of each country.*

Camilleri does not write in a pure dialect (he does not aspire to linguistic purism or historic/ archaeological precision) and thus the stories are not hermetically closed in a strictly local context. He reaches into the depths of the linguistic reserves provided by the dialect and he mixes this with the Italian language, livening it up with expressions, notions, social codes, tastes and behaviour which belong to the culture of that particular corner of Sicily where he comes from: Porto Empedocle.

> Le particularisme linguistique ainsi utilisé est une défénse contre les incompréhensions, les stereotypes et les manipulations qu'engendre l'usage exclusif d'une langue venue de l'exterieur, comme ce fut le cas de l'italien au siècle dernier pour tous les Siciliens qui ne possédaient pas un certain degree d'instruction. (Vittoz in Camilleri 2001: 211)
>
> *The linguistic particularism used in this way is a defence mechanism against misunderstandings, stereotypes and manipulations which are associated with the exclusive use of a language that comes from the outside, as was the case in the last century with Italian for all Sicilians who did not possess a certain level of education.*

Here, we would like to make a brief digression to introduce what is, to our mind, a likeness which exists between Camilleri's style of writing and certain forms of postcolonial writing. By this we do not wish to insinuate that Sicily is or was a colony of Italy, but we would like to highlight certain similarities with postcolonial texts which are characteristic of Camilleri's style of writing. This could be important for a translator to know because it may open the way to different approaches and strategies which could be employed when translating such texts, or it could aid the translator in deciding between different strategies. Writing about how dialect has been used in Italian literature, Simona de Montis states the following:

> L'uso del dialetto e il suo recupero in ambito letterario ha quindi svolto frequentemente una funzione polemica nei confronti della lingua e della cultura egemonica, acquistando sovente il significato di affermazione di un'identità specifica che rischiava di perdersi e realizzando, come sottolinea Dionisotti, <<un processo centrifugo, di resistenza e di repulsione all'unità>>. (2001: 10)
>
> *The rediscovery and use of dialect in literature has therefore often taken on a controversial role against the dominant language and culture, thereby often*

representing the affirmation of a specific identity that ran the risk of losing itself, as pointed out by Dionisotti, <<a centrifugal process, of resistance and repulsion against unity>>.

A brief outline of what postcolonial theory and writing are and what they entail will help to recognise and understand the similarities that exist with Camilleri's writing, and their relationship with translation studies. Utilising Robinson's theory on postcolonialism and translation, as well as a couple of recent articles by Samia Mehrez and Maria Tymoczko, we would like to show how certain forms of writing (particularly postcolonial writing) may be considered as 'translations'. This is because certain techniques of writing and language use, as well as certain strategies of text production (employed frequently by authors stemming from former colonies) correspond to ways of translating culture and making it known to a wider audience. This, we will see, is done by creating a hybrid text which creates a space for itself on the borderline of two different cultures. Andrea Camilleri uses a similar technique, creating his own (hybrid) language which, as we have mentioned, is a mixture of the local Sicilian dialect of his birthplace and Italian.

Bassnett and Lefevere point out how context plays an increasingly important role in translation today, and how it is the *cultural context* in particular which has dominated research in translation studies in recent years (1998: 1-11). They state: "the field … has taken a 'cultural turn', because people in the field began to realise, some time ago, that translations are never produced in a vacuum, and that they are also never received in a vacuum" (1998: 3).

According to them "(o)ne of the great strides that has been made over the last twenty years is the realisation that the house of translation has, indeed, many mansions now, not least because the definition of the field has been widened to include more than just the technique of translating, as it is studied and taught" (1998: 5). Over the last twenty years, translation studies has carved out a space for itself, refusing to be situated as a sub-category of literary studies or linguistics. The multidisciplinary nature of translation studies has led it to identify with another interdisciplinary field that has

come to the fore since the late 1970s: cultural studies. As Susan Bassnett points out, the meeting between cultural studies and translation studies has been productive because "(w)ork in both fields called into question the disciplinary boundaries and seemed to be moving towards the notion of a new space in which interaction could happen" (1998: 125). As a result, in recent years there has been a shift in translation studies from the linguistic to the cultural aspect of translation. Theorists of translation have become increasingly concerned with the ideological norms and social systems of power that are at the base of different cultures and which have a direct influence on translation. "Translation is … a matter of first discerning the differences between and within social codes and then of seeing the possibility of getting across those differences" (Rafael in Robinson 1997: 5).

Postcolonial studies or "(t)he study of translation and empire, or even of translation as empire, was born in the mid- to late 1980s out of the realization that translation has always been an indispensable channel of imperial conquest and occupation" (Robinson 1997: 10). Cultural theorists describe themselves as 'counter-hegemonic', where, in accordance with Antonio Gramsci, 'hegemony' is defined "as the ruling political, social, cultural, ideological and intellectual structures of a society" (Robinson 1997: 13). Their objective is to expose and demystify certain myths and discourses associated with colonialism, the aim of which is to preserve power and to ensure the domination of the colonised people. Language is an important instrument which carries out this function of domination and submission.

Cheyfitz sees "language as eloquence, the premier technology of domination and control, a powerful channel for the formation and education of societies; it is culture and ideology, the reigning conceptual system that makes it possible to see certain things and impossible to see others" (in Robinson 1997: 78). Robinson explains how the term postcolonialism is in itself problematic, because of the controversy surrounding what should be included under postcolonial studies. This has been defined in three different ways:

(i) referring to cultures after the end of colonialism

(ii) referring to cultures after the beginning of colonialism

(iii) referring to the "late-twentieth-century perspective on political and cultural power relations" and therefore covering all human history

(1997: 13-14)

As Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin point out: "Some contemporary critics have suggested that post-colonialism is more than a body of texts produced within post-colonial societies, and that it is best conceived of as a reading practice" (in Robinson 1997: 15). Therefore, texts can be read in postcolonial ways, and we would like to show how this could be one of the ways in which Camilleri's writing could be read (form a purely linguistic point of view), even though Sicily never has been a colony of Italy.

What are the features of postcolonial writing and how does a dominated culture free itself from the dominating culture? It is not plausible to think that a culture can simply return to its pre-colonial state (or to believe that the precolonial state was uncorrupted, pure and good): what has been assimilated during the period of colonisation cannot simply be forgotten – "(d)ecolonization will never mean the eradication of all traces of colonial rule" (Robinson 1997: 90). Therefore, writers from former colonies often write in the language of the colonisers, and at the same time modify it by allowing their own (dominated) culture to emerge and find a space to breathe: the result is a 'hybrid' text written predominantly in the language of the coloniser, but with numerous 'intrusions' from the language of the colonised. As Bassnett notes:

> A writer does not just write in a vacuum: he or she is the product of a particular culture, of a particular moment in time, and the writing reflects those factors such as race, gender, age, class, and birthplace as well as the stylistic, idiosyncratic features of the individual. (Bassnett and Lefevere 1998: 136)

The fact that there are processes of manipulation involved when texts are produced is something which has become increasingly important in translation studies as well as cultural studies over the past few decades.

According to certain postcolonial theorists, it is important for hybridity and difference to be celebrated and not suppressed. As far as translation is concerned, there exists a current of thought that believes this involves creating translations which are 'foreignising' in the dominant culture (and not assimilated by it), and therefore resistant to the dominating forces of the receptor language. This type of strategy implies that certain words for which there is no direct equivalent should not be translated at all: this, in turn, implies a power shift towards the dominated culture because the resulting texts require an extra processing effort, and they can only be fully understood by someone with a knowledge of both cultures.

Maria Tymoczko (in Bassnett and Trivedi 1999: 20) establishes an important link between translation and postcolonial writing. She states that "post-colonial writing might be imaged as a form of translation" in the sense that what is important to a colonised culture (historical, mythical and literary texts for example) is *carried across* (translated) "to another central and more secure (because more powerful) location", where this culture may be in some way preserved, and in which it may take root and find a new life. This view implies that the culture needs to take something from the colonial experience and to combine this with what already existed before colonialism, in order to mould a new postcolonial identity for itself. Both are concerned with "the transmission of elements from one culture and/ or linguistic gap" (1999: 23).

There are many similarities between the activity of translating and the way in which certain postcolonial texts are written. Whereas translators are mainly concerned with transposing texts (although this often does imply translating cultures too, as many theorists have pointed out), postcolonial writers are "transposing a culture – to be understood as a language, a cognitive system… a material culture, a social system, …a history, and so forth" (1999: 20). Therefore, when writing, a postcolonial writer has his culture as a metatext, just as a translator has a text to translate. The translator has the problem of deciding how to translate a particular text: the choice of which cultural elements to include and to suppress, and this is often determined by the audience. In the same way, "a post-colonial writer …chooses which cultural elements

to transpose to the receiving audience" (1999: 21). The writer has the choice of including unfamiliar cultural elements which may cause problems for the receiving audience or may limit the readership itself (this corresponds to the foreignising translations mentioned above). By contrast, s/he may decide to assimilate the text by toning down the cultural differences, possibly in order to appeal to a wider audience (and therefore "domesticating" the text by bringing it towards the dominant culture).

Naturally, this can be done by utilising linguistic features related to the source culture. An interesting article by Samia Mehrez deals with precisely this problem with regard to the French and Arabic languages in North Africa. She shows how certain North-African writers have adopted the language of the colonisers (in this case French, and often, the reason for this is to have a wider readership), but they have introduced words in Arabic, which have contributed to create a new hybrid form of language which requires more decoding effort for a reader who is not familiar with the Arab culture:

> **These postcolonial texts, frequently referred to as 'hybrid' or 'métisées' because of the culturo-linguistic layering which exists within them, have succeeded in forcing a new language … a language 'in between' …[which occupies] …a space 'in between'. (Mehrez in Venuti 1992: 121)**

This may be seen as a strategy of decolonisation, and of creating a new identity by combining elements of the pre-colonial, original culture and elements (language, for example) introduced (imposed?) by the colonial power. Opting to use both languages at once enables the writer to communicate with those who hold the power without rejecting the native language, which is in essence already breaking the conventions of colonialism. As Robinson points out:

> **Linguistic creolization too, long seen in monocultural terms as the 'bastardization' of language is now increasingly considered to be a cross-cultural enrichment of language: when two languages are mixed lexically and syntactically, the product is not so much a third language that must be perceived as falling-away as it is a proliferating variation within one or the other (or both) of the**

> **tongues, a spinning out of the new linguistic possibilities in dialect, sociolect and idiolect. (1997: 26)**

In our view, there are similarities between the situation described by Mehrez and that of Camilleri. Camilleri also creates a new hybrid form of language, an idiolect which is a mixture of Italian and the local Sicilian dialect of his childhood. Sicily is not a colony of Italy, but the relationship between the Italian State and Sicily has been a troubled one. It is almost as if Sicily has a separate culture of its own: historically, Sicily was dominated by the Greeks, the Normans, the Saracens and even the Spanish for lengthy periods of time and, as a consequence, its culture was greatly influenced by the Greek, and particularly, Arabic cultures. Even after the unification of Italy, Sicily has always felt neglected by the Italian state, and, consequently, Sicilians harbour a great distrust for the Italian state, leading to the development of a particular insular mentality. Sicily was treated as second-rate: corrupt state officials from the North were sent to work in Sicily as punishment for their crimes of corruption (they could not be fired by law). One of the theories stemming form this is that these corrupt state officials sowed the seeds of corruption in Sicily, and were in part responsible for the origins of the Mafia (De Montis 2001: 52).

However, Camilleri believes that the unification of Italy had a positive influence on famous Sicilian writers:

> Sono convinto, e non credo di essere il solo, che l'Unità d'Italia sia stata una fortuna per i grandi scrittori siciliani: solo così si può spiegare il loro tentativo disperato di individuazione e di descrizione della propria identità, l'identità siciliana, di fronte a un processo di unità che tende naturalmente all'omologazione. (in Sorgi 2000: 153)
>
> *I am convinced, and I think I am not the only one, that the Unification of Italy was a stroke of luck for the great Sicilian writers: this is the only way to explain their desperate attempt to identify and describe their own identity, the Sicilian identity, when confronted with a unifying process which naturally tended towards standardisation.*

We believe that Camilleri is carrying on this tradition of searching for a Sicilian identity and he is doing this principally through his language. It is almost a natural

consequence that the Italian language should not be regarded highly by Sicilians. The Italian language symbolises the state, formality and bureaucracy. The language is therefore associated with the ideology of the State – a state which, according to the general consensus in Sicily, did not take enough interest in Sicily and its problems. Writing in a hybrid language, a melange of local Sicilian dialect and Italian, Camilleri is describing his culture and at the same time resisting standardisation: Camilleri is 'translating' Sicilian culture into Italian in such a way that it will be understood by a greater number of people, while at the same time maintaining a Sicilian identity. It is his way of identifying and describing his Sicilian identity.

Tymoczko points out that "not everything in a postcolonial cultural metatext can be transposed in a literary format… [therefore] just as literary translations are simpler than their STs, so postcolonial authors of necessity simplify the cultural field they write about" (in 1999: 23), and are often criticised for this. Therefore, a minority-culture writer must pick aspects of the home culture to convey. Camilleri picks language.

> Cosa fa un fiorentino quando incontra un siciliano? Pensano ognuno nel proprio dialetto, poi per parlare si mettono d'accordo e traducono. Ma quello che pensavano, nella parola tradotta si annacqua. (in Sorgi 2000: 117)
>
> *What happens when a person from Florence meets a person from Sicily? They both think in their own dialect, then, when they need to speak, they come to an agreement and they translate. But what they had been thinking is watered down in the translated words.*

Reading this little anecdote by Luigi Pirandello (another Sicilian writer), which Camilleri repeats in an interview with Marcello Sorgi (2000: 117), allows one to understand the important role that dialects play in Italy, and it gives an idea of the relationship dialects have with the standard Italian language. According to this, Italy is a country that relies heavily on translation to communicate, even within its borders. It can thus be argued that using a dialect to write a story does not only consist in describing and representing a Sicilian reality, but it is also making Sicily a symbol for the rest of Italy, with its many linguistic varieties and the struggle to resist the

"domination" and forced standardisation imposed by the Italian language. Camilleri goes on to say that, for him, dialects are the real essence of characters. He says that when writing an historical novel it is imperative for him to do some research on the time period, and language is an important part of this research:

> … se devo raccontare un contadino siciliano del '700, ho bisogno di capire come parlava ai suoi tempi. E mentre cerco di capirlo, il personaggio comincia a prendere forma; nasce, quasi, dalle parole che deve dire. (in Sorgi 2000: 121)
>
> *… if I have to tell the story of an 18th century Sicilian farmer, I need to know how he spoke in those times. And while I try understand him, the character begins to take shape; it is almost as if he is born from the words he has to say.*

Another analogy between translation and postcolonial writing (which is also relevant to Camilleri's work) is that of certain lexical items which have no equivalent in the receptor culture. In translation, these are often left untranslated and explained by footnotes, paraphrases or similar strategies. Tymoczko explains that "(t)he use of rare or untranslated words in translations and the inclusion of unfamiliar cultural material are not necessarily defects of translated texts: translation is one of the activities of a culture in which natural expansion occurs and in which linguistic options are expanded through the importation of loan transfers, calques, and the like" (in 1999: 25). Camilleri's strategy of introducing words of the local Sicilian dialect for which there is no Italian equivalent, and subsequently explaining them in the text is akin to the techniques employed by many postcolonial writers (the same applies to certain myths which belong to a culture). For Camilleri, it is language more than anything else that explains what it means to be Sicilian, and his way of expressing Sicilian reality and describing Sicily is by translating this culture into a mixed language. Camilleri creates a text which could be defined a 'foreignising' translation, which the Italian reader can decode if s/he is willing to make the effort. This shows that language is an important part of any culture, and that it can be an important instrument with which cultures can create an identity for themselves (even if this identity is established through the creation of a hybrid language). The study of a

language is therefore not only of importance to translation studies, but it could play a significant role in the study of culture too.

Certain postcolonial theorists would prefer that these cultural differences not be explained, leaving the dominant power in the dark, so to speak. According to them, explanations imply that the text is aimed at the former coloniser or a dominant audience, because they are there to facilitate the reading of the text. They believe that it is precisely this difference which should be maintained because it represents (and should be taken as a symbol of) decolonisation, and a shift in power. By withholding the information, the colonised culture acquires a position of power with respect to the dominant culture. Is this silence positive or does it result in a loss of audience, which may make it counterproductive? If the author is writing in the language of the colonised, s/he has a particular audience in mind. Therefore, if it is the author's intention to use a hybrid language to describe aspects of her/his culture to the other (dominant) culture, it is necessary for her/him to strike a balance with regard to the hybridity of the text, and the extent to which this is explained in the text. This is because if the text is too hermetic and difficult to read, if it has too many (unexplained) 'foreign' words, it may result in a loss of readership as it becomes too difficult to decode.

Camilleri believes that his first novel was rejected by many publishers because of the language he uses - it was in fact published 10 years after he first tried to get it published! Camilleri's first few novels were historical – he explains that he took certain events from historical documents and constructed stories around those events. Through Leonardo Sciascia, another famous Sicilian author, Camilleri met the Sicilan editor Elvira Sellerio, who agreed to publish his book, *La stagione della caccia*. He says, however, that although she appreciated his mode of writing, she was not pleased by the way he wrote: she criticised his use of dialectal terms and even suggested that he scrap them (Sorgi 2000: 71). She did however publish his novel in the series of novels dedicated to Sicilian history and narrative. The novel encountered great

success (unexpectedly) and was subsequently republished in the more popular *"La memoria"* narrative series.

Camilleri refused to change his language. He has tried writing in Italian before, but he says that it felt strange to him. Italian did not belong to him as a writer although he spoke and worked with it every day of his life. He feels that to write and say what he wants to say in Italian, he first has to translate out of Sicilian, the language he needs to "write" Sicily (De Montis 2001: 19). The use of dialect in Camilleri's works often corresponds to a sort of "rebellion" against the state, its ideology and the institutional language of power. This is made quite clear in certain historical novels were the "truth" comes out in the dialect and is disguised by Italian, the language of power. Nowhere is this more evident than in the novel "La scomparsa di Patò" (Camilleri 2001), in which a person goes missing and a body is found which is presumed to be that of the missing person. As the story unfolds, we learn from the characters of the novel that the missing person actually ran away with his lover and that the body found was not his. However, the official police and newspaper reports do not (are not allowed to) reveal this because the missing person is from a prominent, politically-involved and wealthy family and it is in their interest (and that of high government officials) that the truth not be revealed. Therefore, the reader learns the truth from certain characters in the novel (who often speak in dialect amongst each other) and not from the official published versions. This may be taken as an example supporting the interpretation that language can represent a form of resistance to the dominant power (it is the Sicilian dialect that goes against the government's wishes to reveal the truth).

Camilleri's language, and hybrid languages in general, could be seen as revolutionary in the sense that they break the conventions imposed by power. Roland Barthes considers revolutionary writing to be pure writing in that it is exact, it is not mere rhetoric supporting the dominant ideology (1977: 22). Forms of revolutionary writing have what he defines a closed character, which separates them from the conventions of dominant discourse. Does Camilleri's language not create the same effect? It too

has a closed character because of its lexical characteristics and it flows against the current of the dominating, standard discourse. Camilleri uses words in dialect for which there are equivalent Italian words. This corresponds to a different way of perceiving the world and a different way of wanting to express that world. Using dialect and words which may be unknown to many is a means of taking the reader away from what he is used to, of transporting him into a different reality. It should be noted that the presumed analogy between Camilleri's style of writing and certain postcolonial forms of writing has not been made to support the theory that Sicily is, or has been, an Italian colony, but rather to highlight the similarities between certain invented "hybrid" languages, which, in our opinion, are ways in which writers attempt to describe their identity. This is just one of many ways in which such texts can be read, but it could provide a valuable insight to the translator when s/he is faced with the problems associated with the translation of said texts (most importantly, whether to preserve or eliminate any linguistic variations).

2.5 Camilleri's language

As was mentioned above, the use of dialect in Italian literature often has ideological implications, coming into conflict and assuming a polemic function against the language that represents a kind of cultural hegemony (Italian). The establishment of an Italian language shared by all throughout the territory was a long and arduous process, and many may argue that it has not happened in full yet. Before the unification of Italy (1861) there was a written, literary language which possessed its own characteristic norms. The imposition of the "fiorentino colto" (cultured Florentine dialect) in the latter part of the nineteenth century implicitly signified the end of the road for other cultural and geographic areas and their dialects. This standardisation of the language sacrificed the democratic ideal of the nation because it did not reflect the many other linguistic varieties. Dialect, therefore, often represents the affirmation of a particular identity which is in danger of becoming extinct.

> Il dialetto ha la funzione quasi fisica di dare corpo a strati di realtà che altrimenti rimarrebbero inconoscibili. (Corti 1975: 76)
>
> *Dialect has the almost physical function of giving substance to levels of reality which would otherwise remain unrecognisable.*

Camilleri uses dialect as a means of expressing a certain reality. The fact that Camilleri uses a particular Sicilian dialect, which often becomes an idiolect (or invented language) making use of the roots of a local Sicilian dialect is also significant. He says that his novels "don't work" in Italian: this implies that there are concepts which he feels can only be expressed using dialect. The language he uses corresponds to the language of his childhood and that of his father:

> Il linguaggio è nato a casa mia. Era lo *slang* usato dai miei genitori fra loro e con noi figli: la parte dialettale del linguaggio corrispondeva alle emozioni, quella italiana ufficializzava il discorso. (Camilleri in Grimaldi 1998)
>
> *The language was born at home. It was the slang used by my parents when they spoke with each other and with us: the dialectal part of the language corresponds to the emotions, Italian made the conversation official.*

The author's intention is therefore to portray and depict something which is close to him (or in his memories) and this is the only way he can express it. It is also interesting to note the distinction the author makes between the 'official' Italian language and the 'unofficial' dialect:

> Mi feci presto persuaso, dopo qualche tentativo di scrittura, che le parole che adoperavo non mi appartenevano interamente. Me ne servivo questo sì, ma erano le stesse che trovavo pronte per redigere una domanda o un biglietto d'auguri. Quando cercavo una frase o una parola che più si avvicinava a quello che avevo in mente di scrivere immediatamente invece la trovavo nel mio dialetto o meglio nel 'parlato' quotidiano di casa mia. Che fare? (Camilleri 1998)
>
> *I quickly convinced myself, after a few attempts at writing, that the words I was using did not entirely belong to me. I was indeed using them, but they were the same words I found ready for me to use when I was filling in an official document or a birthday card. When searching for a word that came nearest to what I intended to write, I used to find it in my dialect or rather in the everyday 'spoken language' we used at home. What was I to do?*

Camilleri expressly declares that his intention is to pay homage to his place of birth, and the only way for him to describe home in an authentic way is by utilising dialect (De Montis 2001: 16). This could explain why the dialect plays a vital role, not only in the speech of the main characters, but also in the actual narrative.

The language he uses is the instrument he needs to describe this culture. He says himself that the dialect/ idiolect captures the essence of the people and of the place. His concern is not to portray his culture by assimilating and describing it in words that a greater readership would understand (Italian – described by him as the language used to fill in forms). He says himself that he was not (originally) writing for a vast audience. It was not a concern of his that a large part of the receiver audience might not be able to understand his work (the information that needs to be decoded may be too great and not worth the effort to many). His is a need to express his culture, the Sicilian culture, and the way he can best do this is by writing in the language of this culture. Camilleri creates what in translation terms would be called a 'foreignising' translation, that is, a text which is ultimately Italian, but which contains many words which are entrenched in Sicilian culture and which cannot be understood by the average Italian reader. Therefore, he translates the Sicilian culture into a form of Italian, but he does this by inventing a new language and not by submitting to the Italian language.

2.6 A Sicilian narrator?

The fact that the narrator utilises the same linguistic variation as the characters in the novel is very interesting and makes the text unique. According to Seymour Chatman, there are two ways in which narrations can be presented: directly or through mediation. Direct presentation presupposes the audience being in some way present and overhearing the story, whereas mediated presentation presumes the express communication of the story from the narrator to the audience. This corresponds to the distinction made by Plato between *mimesis* (showing) and *diegesis* (telling). Chatman therefore concludes logically that if there is telling involved then there must be a

"teller" or "narrating voice", who is accounted for on a continuum from those narrators who are least audible to those that are most so (1978:146).

Chatman then makes the distinction between "real author, implied author, narrator, real reader, implied reader, [and] narratee" (1978: 147). In the first place, the narrator must not be confused with the author. The notion of author is divided by Chatman into real author and implied author, the latter being the author that the reader reconstructs from the narrative (1978; 148). The implied author is not the narrator, but the entity/ principle that invented the narrator as well as the rest of the narrative. Therefore, the implied author does not communicate directly with the reader and has no voice (s/he does not tell the reader anything) –s/he is the creator of all the voices (of the characters) present in the narrative and it is through these voices and the story as a whole that s/he communicates. The implied author has no personality or presence, and her/ his only motivation is "the purely theoretical one of constructing the narrative itself" (1978: 158). The *implied reader* is the counterpart of the implied author. This does not correspond to the person who actually reads the book but to the audience that the narrative itself presupposes. The narratee can be either implicit, and therefore not specified (corresponding to the omniscient narrator), or explicit, that is clearly identified as a character or group of characters within the story. The narratee in Camilleri's works is usually implicit: it is the reader to whom Camilleri is directing his writing. This is clearly demonstrated when the narrator alludes to facts or gives explanations which are not known by the characters in the story.

Chatman defines point of view as "the physical place or ideological situation or practical-life orientation to which narrative events stand in relation" (1978: 153). This should not be confused with voice which corresponds to what the characters actually express overtly to the audience (whether by speech or other means). Chatman stresses that point of view does not mean expression itself, but the perspective through which the expression is made, and that "point of view is *in* the story (when it is the character's), but voice is always outside, in the discourse" (1978: 153-4). If a narrator is completely external to a text, s/he never was in the world of the work (as a narrator

who is recounting/ remembering a sequence of events may have been) and therefore did not "perceive" or "see" the event in the same (direct/ diegetic) sense that any character did. The narrator may therefore narrate events and have a different ideological point of view from the character/s he is narrating about (therefore, he may in fact be expressing some sort of judgement).

In the majority of Camilleri's works, the narration occurs through an extradiegetic-heterodiegetic, omniscient narrator (De Montis 2001: 235). The narrator is thus external and not directly involved as a character in the story. This often results in zero focalisation, in that the narration does not coincide with any particular character's view(point). This type of narrator has the privilege of possessing knowledge which is not accessible to other characters: in fact, the omniscient narrator has the 'power' to reveal the emotions and feelings of the characters and to announce, *a priori*, events that will happen in the future.

A remarkable and interesting aspect of Camilleri's narrative technique is that, although Camilleri's narrator is omniscient, he[6] simultaneously enters the role of a mimetic narrator (who is actually, physically present at the scene) because he utilises the same idiolect (that is, he narrates in the same way the characters speak) that the characters use. Therefore, from this particular mode of expression, the reader gets the impression that whoever is speaking (the narrator) is a person who is part of, or directly involved in, the scene taking place (and thus a Sicilian?). In this way, the narrator has the function of contextualising the works further: the narrator's use of the same linguistic variation that the characters use serves to root the action firmly into the soil of Vigata (the fictional, yet typically Sicilian village where most of the novels are set). However, the narrator is not directly involved in the plot, he is not an

[6] The gender of the narrator is never expressly revealed. The reason we use "he" to refer to the narrator is because the impression given is that it is Camilleri narrating (or the fictional version of Camilleri). We will try to explain this - Camilleri is the author of the novels and does not necessarily correspond to the narrator. However, the novels take place in Vigata which is an imaginary town, modelled on Porto Empedocle (Camilleri's place of birth). The impression the reader receives, therefore, is that the narrator who is telling the story is the imaginary version of Camilleri (from Vigata), who is hence also male.

eyewitness giving an account. We know this because of the instances when he intervenes with information which forms part of a knowledge that is not available to the characters, when characters' emotions and attitudes are revealed, or when the narrator makes certain intertextual references which are superfluous to the narration of the action itself (extradiegetic expressions). It would therefore be interesting to see whether the translators have taken this aspect of the narrator into account and to see whether the narrative itself maintains the dialect, or whether the dialect is only reserved to the speech of the characters.

De Montis comes to the conclusion that it is Camilleri's style which has led to his success and popularity and she maintains that what really makes him unusual is precisely the narrator's role:

> **La vera soluzione insolita, la freschezza di questo autore sta nel modo di raccontare e sopratutto in quel suo coinvolgere anche il narratore e renderlo partecipe, personaggio esso stesso della storia: un narratore in grado di condividere piuttosto che descrivere le emozioni dei suoi personaggi, di trasfigurarsi nell'ambientazione pur non facendone parte, di fornire al lettore la chiave per accedere a un mondo solo apparentemente chiuso. (2001: 62)**
>
> *The real unusual solution, the freshness of this author lies in the way he tells the story and, above all, in the way he involves the narrator and makes him a character in the story: a narrator that shares the emotions of his characters rather than just describing them, who appears in the setting even if he is not part thereof, and who provides the reader with the key to access a world which only appears to be closed.*

Taken from this perspective, the hybrid language used by Camilleri is of great importance to his works. In fact, it is probably the single most important aspect associated with his works. It is what has made him very different from many other authors and probably what has contributed to his amazing success. This being the case, we believe that it is absolutely necessary that any translation of his works retain, in some form, the linguistic variations which are so significant and which, by their very nature, define Camilleri. Readers in the TL should have access to this innovative language so that they too can have some idea of what makes these novels different

from others written in standard Italian. There would be absolutely no point in translating Camilleri without retaining the variations in language – it just wouldn't be Camilleri!

CHAPTER 3: TRANSLATING LINGUISTIC VARIATIONS

> Pour ma part, en traduisant ainsi cette roman à la langue plurielle, j'ai suivi la pente du <<désir de traduire>> dont parle Paul Ricoeur, vérifiant avec plaisir qu'il porte en effet à <<la découverte de sa propre langue et des ses resources laissées en jachère>>. (Vittoz in Camilleri 2001: 218)
>
> *By translating this linguistically-varied novel in this way, I followed Paul Ricoeur's "desire to translate", and I discovered, with great pleasure, that it leads to the "discovery of one's own language and its resources which had been left to lie fallow.*

The analysis of the translation of linguistic variation has been granted very little space by translation scholars and researchers, often in the form of a brief paragraph or limited to a fleeting mention in their works. An article that takes an in-depth look at the translation of linguistic variations in literature is Maria T Sanchez's 'Translation as a(n) (Im)possible Task: Dialect in Literature' (*Babel* 1999: 301-319). She points out that any form of language that deviates from the norm presents a problem for the translator. Citing Sumner Ives (1950: 138), she notes that often authors themselves do not utilise complete forms of dialects but they only use certain peculiarities and particular variants of dialects to suit their needs (2000: 305). This can only add to the difficulty of representing such texts in the target language because it involves more than just selecting an available dialect in the target language and employing it to represent the dialect in the source text.

The translator must take into account all the possible linguistic variations encountered in a text and then decide whether to make use of them. Naturally, the choice depends on the quantity of idiolect/ dialect in a particular text as well as the function that the dialect plays within the context of the work. It must be noted that a lot depends on the single text being translated: if there are more than two linguistic variations present, the problem becomes more complex. Sanchez (in 2000: 305), basing herself on the work of Hervey, Higgins, and Haywood (1995) identifies four problems associated with the translation of a text where dialect is used. The first major problem is that translators may not be familiar with the SL dialects, resulting in serious mistranslations, regardless of whether an attempt has been made to render the dialect

or to neutralise it. The second problem, as stated in the words of Hervey, Higgins and Haywood is "that of deciding how important the dialectal features, and the information they convey, are to the overall effect of a ST. The translator always has the option of rendering the ST into a bland, standard version of the TL, with no notable dialectal traces…" (Sanchez 2000: 305). Among the options available to the translator are: using a dialect which is available in the target language; replacing a dialect with standard language; or using standard language with explanatory phrases such as "said in dialect". Another important aspect which the translator may try to reflect, and which renders the process of translation even more complex, is the phonetic representation of the dialect sound.

The last, and possibly most important, problem is that of which TT dialect to choose. Factors which can influence the choice of a dialect include geographical location and connotations associated with the dialect (such as social status). "(I)n the majority of cases, the connotations of the two dialects are very different [because] they are part of a particular society having their own sociolinguistic background" (Sanchez 2000: 307). Bell is of the same opinion, stating that "(t)he problem with discussing linguistic variation in texts – and sociolinguistic variation in the broadest sense – is that while the linguistic features present in the text are categorically there or absent… the sociological, socio-psychological and psychological characteristics we are attempting to match them with are not discrete but spread out along a continuum of more-or-less" (Bell 1991: 184). By rendering a dialect with another dialect, there is always the risk of creating effects which were not intended, precisely because of different connotations that dialects may have (e.g. a dialect in the TL may have low social connotations which are not associated with the dialect used in the SL). This obviously needs to be taken into account by the translator, who must ultimately make the decision of what strategy to employ. Naturally, this decision will also be influenced by such factors as the genre of the novel and the intended target audience, as well as any constraints imposed by publishers.

As has been mentioned above, the study involves a comparative analysis of text-portions of two Italian novels and their French translations. The method used to analyse these texts will be based on Hatim and Mason's model (1997: 14-35) for the analysis of texts, which is now discussed. Texts are regarded as communicative instances, and in order for them to be so they must meet the "seven standards of textuality" , which according to Bell also correspond to the following key questions which the reader (and translator) has to pose when confronted with a text (1991: 163):

1. How do the clauses hold together? (**cohesion**)
2. How do the propositions hold together? (**coherence**)
3. Why did the speaker/ writer produce this? (**intentionality**)
4. How does the reader take it? (**acceptability**)
5. What does it tell us? (**informativity**)
6. What is the text for? (**relevance**)
7. What other texts does this one resemble? (**intertextuality**)

(1991: 163-4)

These are the standards which need to be met to uphold textuality and to ensure that a passage of language (text) is a successful act of communication. Hatim and Mason's (1997: 14-35) model of textual analysis is largely based on these standards of textuality, as their perspective holds that the structure and the texture of texts are subject to contextual requirements of a higher order. The first element that Hatim and Mason identify is cohesion "in the sense that the various components of the surface text (the actual words we see) are mutually connected within a sequence of some kind" (1997: 15). This means that the surface components are dependent on each other in creating continuity in the text and then maintaining it.

However, the simple fact that a text is cohesive is not enough to ensure its textuality. The dependencies established may not be sufficient for the reader to link these concepts and relations to reality, or what Hatim and Mason refer to as "text world" (1997: 16), in such a way as to create meaning. The passage may therefore be

cohesive but it may not mean anything to the reader (text receiver) because it does not reflect anything s/he can identify in the "real world". Hence, it is important that the underlying concepts and relations appear to the reader in a way that establishes "sense constancy" (Hatim & Mason 1997: 16) or coherence, which in Bell's words "consists of the configuration and sequencing of the CONCEPTS and RELATIONS of the TEXTUAL WORLD which underlie and are realised by the surface text" (1991: 165, capitals in the original text). According to Hatim and Mason, cohesion and coherence incorporate elements of what they refer to as the "texture and structure" of texts, which involve the way texts are organised and the way their organisation corresponds to some model of reality (1997: 16).

The first assumption that Hatim and Mason make is that receivers negotiate texts in a "text-to-context direction" (1997: 16). This implies that, initially, the context will not be clear to the reader, but as the texts unfolds a more detailed picture of the context emerges. As the context becomes clearer, the reader formulates certain expectations as to how the text should proceed based on her/his previous knowledge of texts. These expectations may or may not be fulfilled, but the final decision will be made through an analysis of the text in context.

The second assumption is that text users take contextual factors and assess these in terms of what they already know from other (previously encountered) "texts". This is the semiotic process known as intertextuality "which builds on the fundamental notion that various surface elements of a text, together with their underlying conceptual meaning, are in effect 'signs' which play a role in the signification process" (Hatim & Mason 1997: 17). Bell stresses the important role that previous texts (including knowledge of the forms and functions of texts) play " in 'making sense' of newly encountered texts [and in] …making texts of new sense" (1991: 171). Intertextual references are normally recognisable within a community/society by means of what Hatim and Mason call "socio-cultural objects" (1997: 18) – these are elements which are common and recur within a linguistic community, and which reflect common assumptions (of that community). Intertextuality also manifests itself

through "socio-textual practices" (Hatim & Mason 1997: 18) i.e. conventions governing text (rhetorical purpose), genre (linguistic expression for social occasion: tenor) and discourse (attitudinal expression). Hatim and Mason identify intertextuality as a "semiotic parameter" (1997: 19) which text users utilise by taking into account socio-cultural significance as well as socio-textual practices.

The amalgamation of an analysis of texts in a text-to-context direction, and subsequently in a context-to-text direction, regulates the way texts fulfil their intentions. Intentionality at a highly abstract level consists in the author's effort to create a cohesive and coherent text which links up to a series of recognisable (for a given community) socio-textual conventions. At a more concrete level of analysis, it may be that the author has a set of goals which may be achieved locally (micro-intentions), that is, in passages which deviate from the general intentionality (macro-intention) of the text to express intentions which do not coincide with the global intention of the text. The intentionality of a text can therefore be inferred from the type of text or from the textual elements present, which invoke particular socio-cultural concepts. When analysing intentionality, pragmatic (as well as semiotic) considerations must be taken into account: the text producer is trying to do something with the words and therefore these words have to be situated in a context in which, it is hoped, they will have the intended communicative effect on the reader.

From this follows Hatim and Mason's next assumption that "text producers' intentions, beliefs, presuppositions and inferences are brought to bear on the analysis and perception of a given unit of meaning"(1997: 20). Part of the translator's task is to relay these into the target culture. The difficulty lies in what Hatim and Mason call situationality (1997: 20), which is the degree of appropriateness, or relevance, as Bell defines it (1991: 164), of the textual linguistic elements to a given situation. This is given by the way text users interact with the register variables: field (subject matter), mode (written/spoken) and tenor (formality). When analysing register, an important factor which needs to be taken into account is distance: this can be divided into social

distance (tenor: level of formality – relationship) and physical distance (which is often determined by the mode – written/ spoken).

The notion of informativity concerns the extent to which an utterance is expected/ unexpected (Hatim and Mason 1997: 26). A text can be seen as the realisation of choices among a set of options. Each choice which is made can be more or less probable, and therefore more or less predictable. As Bell points out: "The less probable and predictable a choice is, the more informative and interesting it is. Conversely, choices which are wholly predictable are uninformative and uninteresting" (1991: 167-68). Hatim and Mason define language situations which are predictable, and thus expected, as 'static' and those which are unpredictable and unexpected as 'dynamic' (1997: 28). They introduce the notion of "marked" and "unmarked" use of language (1997: 101) to describe instances when the use of language fulfils the reader's expectations and when it does not respectively. When expectations are upheld (a lawyer using legal terms i.e. speaking like lawyers), no problem is posed and the language used corresponds to the situation: it is therefore "static". In this type of situation "the interaction of signs is highly uniform and norms of language use strictly adhered to" (1997: 27). This is opposed to situations in which expectations are flouted and hence represent "dynamic" uses of language. In highly dynamic uses of language "communicative stability [is] … removed, intentions are blurred and intertextuality is less than straightforward" (1997: 101).

Does the fact that the works are written in "dialect" constitute a dynamic use of language? We believe it does. If we look at it from the author-reader perspective, the language used is not what the average Italian reader (or anyone for that matter) is used to and is in this sense unexpected: the fact that dialectal variations are used even when there are corresponding words in standard Italian suggests that there is a high degree of informativity in the text as a whole. When translators encounters dynamic uses of language, they need to be able to recognise them and to account for the effects which the register features may create, which extend beyond the boundaries of what is considered "unmarked". These can only be explained when compared to some

unmarked norm which exists within the broader pragmatic and semiotic domains: "To explain these adequately, we have to detect the rhetorical purposes which they serve (in the text), the attitudinal meanings they express (in discourse) and the social activity they perform (in genre)" (Hatim and Mason 1997: 102).

Umberto Eco calls the text a lazy mechanism which requires the reader to make sense of it with the knowledge s/he has: "un testo è un meccanismo pigro (o economico) che vive sul plusvalore di senso introdottovi dal destinatario , e solo in casi di estrema pignoleria, estrema preoccupazione didascalica o estrema repressività il testo si complica di ridondanze e specificazioni ulteriori…un testo vuole lasciare al lettore l'iniziativa interpretative …Un testo vuole che qualcuno lo aiuti a funzionare" (1979: 52). Blank spaces in a text (things which are left unsaid) are there to be filled by the (model?) reader. In the same way Camilleri's language is a code which has to be deciphered by the reader: "Il linguaggio <<nazionale>> medio, per quanto certo più comprensibile non ha la stessa seduzione della lingua mescidata, la quale mette alla prova il lettore, lo sfida, quasi lo invita a ricostruire un puzzle linguistico" (De Montis 2001: 60). In the Italian text, the reader must take up the challenge and fill in the "blank" spaces created by the dialect. This could be taken as a starting point for any translations too: as a possible solution, the translator could undertake to the make the TT as challenging (from a linguistic perspective) for the TL reader as the Italian text is for the SL reader.

3.1 Translating Camilleri

The interpretation of the text (language) becomes a game for the reader. Camilleri asks the reader to make an (initial) effort to enter into a language which is incomprehensible at the outset, but which becomes clearer as the reading continues because of the way it recurs in similar contexts and situations and eventually, once the code is deciphered, it even acquires a degree of familiarity in its foreignness. Camilleri facilitates the reader's task in deciphering the language by helping her/ him along the way. He often resorts to certain stylistic devices to clarify obscure terms:

using an Italian synonym for a word in dialect in the same paragraph; using the same dialectal terms over and over again in such a way that they will be identified with particular contexts or situations; and, less frequently, making a character who is not from Sicily intervene in a conversation which is taking place in dialect and making the character ask for an explanation which will in turn benefit the reader when it is given. The reward for the reader is that s/he acquires a certain complicity with the author, who gives the reader access to a colourful variation of language which allows him/ her to glimpse/ taste the expressivity thereof, and therefore to gain access to a new and different world. Camilleri's success bears testimony to the fact that readers have accepted the challenge and, in so doing, have enriched their own linguistic repertoire: "Del resto, dopo l'uscita dei romanzi *di* Montalbano, i lettori non hanno sentito alcun bisogno di spiegazioni, anzi hanno fatto proprio quell linguaggio così singolare, arrichendo il proprio dizionario personale…" (De Montis 2001: 19).

> A mes interlocuteurs qui … avouaient mal comprendre comment on pouvait restituer aux lecteurs français l'impression que Camilleri produit sur les lecteurs italiens, je répondais que c'était simple: on ne le pouvait pas. (Quadruppani in Camilleri 1998: 16)
>
> *To my readers who… could not understand how it would be possible to give the French reader the same impression that Camilleri gives his Italian readers, I answered that it was simple: it is not possible.*

This research involves analysing portions of texts of two of Camilleri's novels and their subsequent translations into French by two different translators, Dominique Vittoz and Serge Quadruppani. The choice of the novels is determined by the genre they represent – one of them, *La stagione della caccia*, is a historical novel (translated by Dominique Vittoz) and the other, *La forma dell'acqua*, is a detective novel (translated by Serge Quadruppani). They are both the first novels of each genre to be translated[7] into French. The parts of the text to be analysed will be chosen on the basis of the different types of linguistic variations and the functions they represent, as identified in Vizmuller-Zocco's analysis above. The chosen texts will then be analysed according to certain concepts introduced by Hatim and Mason in their model

[7] Dominique Vittoz received the 'Amedée-Pichot de la Ville d'Arles' prize at the *18èmes Assises de la Traduction Litteraire* for her translation *La saison de la chasse*.

of textual analysis (1997: 15-39) in an attempt to identify the strategies adopted by the translators in dealing with the linguistic variations. The idea is to compare portions of text in the two novels and to see if and how the translators have dealt with the linguistic variations present in these texts. This will allow the differences between the two different styles of translating the linguistic variation to be pointed out, leading to subsequent comments on the different strategies employed by the translators.

As we have mentioned, Camilleri creates a hybrid language by mixing elements of the local Sicilian dialect from the place of his birth with the standard Italian language. As Serge Quadruppani, one of Camilleri's French translators, puts it: "La langue paternelle de Andrea Camilleri est une re-création personelle du parler de la province d'Agrigente" (in Camilleri 1998: 14). The translator therefore is confronted with the problem of attempting to reproduce this mélange between an official language, which is accepted as the dominant (and dominating) norm, and as such is codified and set in its elegance, and an unofficial language, which is not universal and is extremely expressive because of its strong roots in the local tradition. Vittoz's main concern was to find a language which was "suffisamment riche et inhabituel pour créer chez le lecteur français le sentiment d'étrangeté familière dont Camilleri regale ses lecteurs italiens" (in Camilleri 2001: 214). As we can see, Vittoz's main concern was creating the same effect for French readers of the translated text as is experienced by Italian readers when confronted with the Italian text.

3.2 Translating *La Stagione della caccia*

As was mentioned above, Dominique Vittoz is the translator of Camilleri's first historical novel, *La stagione della caccia* (The Hunting Season). The story is set in 1880, when Fofò La Matina, who had left Vigata[8] many years before following the death of his father, comes back to open up a pharmacy. A short while after his return a number of deaths plagues the family of Marquis Filippo Peluso: the Marquis's old

[8] This is the imaginary Sicilian town which is based on Camilleri's town of birth, Porto Empedocle, and the place where most of Camilleri's novels (both historical and detective fiction) take place.

father commits suicide; his son Rico dies after eating poisonous mushrooms; his wife, *donna* Matilde, dies as she is consumed by the anguish of losing her only son; and Filippo himself is found dead. The family of the Marquis's brother, who had emigrated to America and had become an oil tycoon and who had come back to Vigata to prevent 'Ntontò, the sole heir of the Peluso family and daughter of the Marquis, from getting married, is also wiped out. The person 'Ntonto was supposed to marry also dies of diabetes. The only person who remains close to the girl is the pharmacist, Fofò La Matina. The two eventually get married but, soon afterwards, Fofò tells the head of the military garrison (with whom he has become good friends because of their mutual passion for hunting) that he is responsible for the chain of events that have plagued his wife's family. Fofò, who had been in love with 'Ntonto from his childhood days, knew that he could never marry her because he was of a lower social standing and he thus decided to go about eliminating all the obstacles in his way. However, disappointment in his marriage pushes him to confess his crazy plan and to face his trial and subsequent sentencing to death with indifference.

Vittoz explains that the language used by Camilleri is often not what one might find in dictionaries, but one which stems from real people in real-life situations – it is at times language borne of, and entrenched, in an oral tradition, and, therefore, not always codified:

> Camilleri suit une logique affective et jubilatoire selon laquelle les bonnes expressions ne sont pas celles qu'autorise quelque dictionnaire, mais celles qui tirent leur attestation d'une situation vécue, de personnes bien réelles, humbles ou célèbres, dont l'expérience, les souffrances et le joie deviennent patrimoine linguistique d'un communauté humaine. (in Camilleri 2001: 211)
>
> *Camilleri follows an emotional and sentimental logic according to which the correct expressions are not those authorised by some dictionary, but those that are drawn from real-life situations of real people, both ordinary and famous, whose experience, suffering and joy become the linguistic heritage of a human community.*

In certain parts of the narration as well as in the dialogues, Camilleri introduces words in Sicilian dialect which are more or less recognisable for the average reader. Words

such as ***fimmina*** (woman), ***nìvuro*** (black), ***astreco*** (Austrian) and ***armalo*** (animal) are relatively similar to the Italian words *femmina, nero, austriaco* and *animale*. Thus, because these words closely resemble standard Italian, their degree of informativity is not as high as other terms which require greater processing effort on the part of the reader. Other typically Sicilian expressions and words can only be deciphered in context and with difficulty. ***Camurrìa,*** a typically Sicilian expression which is derived from the venereal disease *gonorrea* (gonorrhoea), is used (and often) to express disgust/ irritation/ annoyance/ bother. There are also numerous examples of *faux amis*, words that are orthographically or phonetically alike in Italian and Sicilian dialect but which have different meanings: ***taliare*** – 'to look' (and not 'to cut' like the Italian *tagliare*); ***tanticchia*** – 'a little bit' (not 'a lot/ much' like the Italian *tanto*); ***sintomo*** – 'a fainting spell' (and not 'a symptom' which is what the word means in Italian). As we can see, these words are part of a more highly dynamic use of language and therefore are more informative. The average Italian reader may not be aware of the meanings of these dialect words which they recognise and believe to be familiar. The only tool that the reader who does not understand Sicilian has is context – the reader realises that the particular word with its Italian meaning does not fit in that particular situation and, from there, s/he realises that it must have an alternative meaning. This situation could lead to an incorrect interpretation of the particular portion of text. A translation carried out according to these functions would need to take this into account so that an equivalent effect (foreignising) could be created on the TL reader.

In *La stagione della caccia*, Camilleri often mediates the intensity of the dialect words used. By this, we mean that, at times, words appear in their strict dialectal form (this is often the case in direct speech/ dialogue), particularly when the people speaking them belong to the lower social classes. The third person singular masculine pronoun *esso* or *lui* (he) becomes ***iddu***; the masculine singular article *il* becomes ***u***; the word *perché* (why/ because) becomes ***pirchì***. However, at other times Camilleri 'italianises' certain words in dialect to make them more easily understandable/ intelligible for the reader: ***càvudu*** (hot – *caldo* in Italian) becomes ***càvudo*** (ending in –o which is the characteristic masculine ending in Italian); the infinitive verb ***spiari*** (to ask –

domandare in Italian) becomes ***spiare*** (with the typical Italian first conjugation *–are* verb ending); and the verb ***arrisbigghiari*** (to wake up – *svegliare* in Italian) becomes ***arrisbigliare*** (again with the *–are* ending and the *-gl-* common to Italian words). As far as syntax is concerned, Camilleri often utilises a sentence construction with the verb at the end which is typical of the Sicilian dialect, and he makes frequent use of the historic past/ simple past (*passato remoto*) – characteristically used in spoken language in the South of Italy - as opposed to the past perfect (*passato prossimo*) which is more common and prevalent in Northern Italy.

> Andrea Camilleri écrit dans un italien enrichi de termes siciliens, drôles et savoureux. Souvent, le lecteur non sicilien ne comprendrait pas ce mots en dehors du contexte où Camilleri sait les placer pour le rendre compréhensibles.
> La présente traduction française s'efforce de rendre cette variété linguistique – et le dépaysment qu'elle crée – en faisant appel à un parler regional qui offre des tournures de phrases inhabituelles et dont le lecteur curieux trouvera le glossaire en fin de volume.
> Tout a été fait néanmoins pour que le lecteur de la traduction française, comme c'est le cas pour le lecteur de l'original italien, puisse se passer de ces éclaircissements annexes. (Vittoz, Note de la traductrice, in Camilleri 2001)

> *Andrea Camilleri writes in an Italian that is enhanced with Sicilian words, which are both funny and expressive. Often, a reader who is not Sicilian does not understand these words outside the context in which Camilleri places them to make them understandable.*
> *This French translation forces itself to render this linguistic variety – and the foreignness it creates – by resorting to a regional language that provides certain unusual expressions, which the curious reader will find a glossary at the end of the novel.*
> *Nevertheless, as is the case for the Italian reader of the original text, these explanations will not be necessary for the French reader to understand this translation.*

According to Dominique Vittoz, one of the fundamental problems when translating from Italian to French is the difference in elasticity between the two languages. She goes on to say that translating Camilleri is a matter of combining two excesses: Camilleri's genetically modified and particularly inventive Italian as source language and the very rigid French language as target language. Camilleri's language leads the translator to explore the limits of elasticity of his/ her language, but she feels that this

should be done respecting the "genius of the language" in order to avoid arbitrary inventiveness which runs the risk of the translator creating what she calls a "narcissistic idiolect/ dialect" (2002c).

The major obstacles which restrict linguistic elasticity in France are academic scruple and linguistic centralism. The French linguistic code has a rigid structure and deviations from syntactic, orthographic and lexical norms are not looked upon favourably. Vittoz maintains that, even when it comes to oral language, there seems to be strong French self-control which tends to be based on the written language. She believes this should be borne in mind when attempting to translate Camilleri's linguistic deviations from the norm of national/ standard Italian, which are (almost always) of a dialectal, and not grammatical or orthographical, nature.

Vittoz points out French *argot* as an example of the violation of the rigid French linguistic code, which has been utilised by many authors who oppose the academic consensus. The two characteristics associated with *argot* are that: it is the language of social transgression and rebellion; and that it is exclusively an adult language, in that it is not used to tell fairy tales, bedtime stories or to sing songs. These are the fundamental differences which make the use of *argot* problematic when compared to the local Sicilian dialect used by Camilleri: the two are not similar, because they have very different connotations. That is precisely why utilising *argot* was not an option for Vittoz: "L'hypothèse de recourir à l'argot, qui peut se prévaloir d'une tradition litteraire, n'était pas recevable car j'aurai opéré ainsi une uniformisation sociologique indue" (in Camilleri 2001: 213). She also rules out the stereotyped southern-French dialects, which are used to dub Italian movies, because of their connotations, and because too many readers would have been familiar with them already (and the element of foreignness which she was seeking to reproduce would have been lost).

With regard to French linguistic centralism, it is widely accepted and known that Paris is the yardstick according to which national identity is measured. As a consequence, the spoken dialects of the provinces have been branded as rough, unrefined and they

have been ridiculed and cast aside as *faut de goût*, or lack of taste. This to demonstrate the disregard and the negative connotations associated with dialects in France. It must be said, though, that the Sicilian dialect in Italy, particularly when it is mixed with standard Italian, is not looked upon particularly favourably by literary critics. Therefore, Camilleri went against the traditional literary currents when writing his novels: a fact which could be important in influencing the translator's decision on what strategy to use. Viewing this with reference to what has been said about postcolonial writing, and the similarities Camilleri's style bears with these forms of writing, we believe that attempting to translate in a way which goes against certain conventions and currents is not something to be looked upon negatively. After all, Camilleri's writing does go against Italian literary conventions – so why not translate against French literary conventions?

Despite the reservations expressed by Vittoz with regard to the use of dialect in French literature, she has indeed attempted to reproduce the dialect. This indicates the value she places on the linguistic variations in Camilleri's works, and it indicates that she felt it was necessary to give the French reader access to Camilleri's unique style. When translating *La Stagione della Caccia*, Vittoz says that she was taken back to some very remote place in her memory where she too found that she possessed a certain range of words which had the same effect as Camilleri's dialect. These were the words of her *patois*, to use the degrading French term, otherwise known as the franco-provençal dialect of Lyon.

> Le pari alors était de répéter la démarche de Camilleri, en employant un parler local qui ne soit pas lettre morte pour l'auteur de la traduction afin qu'il devienne parlant même pour le lecteur externe à ce microcosme-là. C'est ainsi que j'ai sollicité le parler Lyonnais, passé et present, qui appartient au groupe des dialects franco-provençaux. (Vittoz in Camilleri 2001: 214)
>
> *The challenge was therefore to retrace Camilleri's steps, by using a local dialect that is not "dead" for the author of the translation, so that it also becomes "alive" for the reader who is not part of that microcosm. That is why I decided on the Lyonnais variation, both past and present, which belongs to the Franco-Provençal group of dialects.*

She maintains that Camilleri's language forces the French translator to go back and plough fields that had been abandoned (2002c), that is: to go back and dig out of the entire baggage of resources that the translator possesses and that become necessary to translate these works, thereby liberating him/herself from the obsession of the *pureté de la langue*.

Vittoz cites three major reasons for deciding to use a *Lyonnais* dialect:

(i) it has a rich vocabulary which is totally distinct from French
(ii) the absence of phonetic deformations which are too distant from the norm of elegance in French (she says that the French ear is very touchy when it comes to sounds and this should be respected)
(iii) it is rooted in a cultural tradition of short stories, songs and marionette plays (as is Sicilian dialect)

The lexical variety of the language allows her to play with the two languages (French and local dialect) in a way that she believes is similar to the way Camilleri marries Italian and the local Sicilian dialect. Vittoz stresses that although she allowed herself a certain degree of freedom when translating this particular text, she did follow one rule in particular: "choisir les mots pour leur expressivité, leur spécificité, leur cocasserie, leur irreductible personnalité" (in Camilleri 2001: 214). She describes what she does as "coining a new hybrid French", but she stresses that this does not involve inventing a language.

From the discussion above and from the knowledge we have of translation, it should be quite obvious that it is not possible to achieve complete, systematic equivalence when translating any text, let alone these particular texts. Therefore, it was not possible for the translator to match each use of *Lyonnais* dialect in the translation with each use of local Sicilian dialect in the original (whether it be word-for-word or expression-for-expression). Vittoz adopts three types of solutions to the problems of translating this dialect. The first, and what she calls the most faithful way, consists in

providing a *Lyonnais* equivalent for the Sicilian word (these are cases in which, coincidentally, there are perfect equivalences between the words in dialect when compared to words in the standard language. The following are a few examples of this: ***taliare*** (meaning 'to look' in Sicilian, as opposed to the Italian *guardare*) is translated as ***apincher*** (and not the French *regarder*); ***caruso*** ('child' – *bambino* in Italian) is translated as ***mami*** (and not *enfant*); ***strammo*** ('strange' – *strano* in Italian) is translated as ***bachique*** (*étrange* in French); ***babbiare*** ('to mock' – *prendere in giro* in Italian) as ***gandoiser*** (*plaisanter* in French); ***allifarisi*** ('to take care of one's self'- *prendersi cura di sè* in Italian) as ***se rapapilloter*** (*se pomponner* in French); ***timbulata*** ('slap' – *schiaffo* in Italian) as ***plamuse*** (*gifle* in French); ***cato*** ('bucket' – *secchio* in Italian) as ***seille*** (*bassine* in French); ***intortato*** ('curved' – *curvo* in Italian) as ***récrenillé*** (*rabougri* in French); ***tirribilio*** ('chaos' – *caos/ confusione* in Italian) as ***sicotis*** (*remue-ménage* in French); ***allopiare*** ('to put to into a deep sleep by giving opium' – *addormentare profondamente dando dell'oppio*) as ***potringuer*** (*donner de l'opium* in French); ***una pigliata per il sedere*** ('mock' – *una presa in giro* in Italian) as ***une gosse*** (*moquerie/ tromperie* in French); ***una troffa*** ('a bush' - *un cespuglio* in Italian) as ***une sévelée*** (*une buisson* in French); ***fare una curruta*** ('to run' – *correre* in Italian) as ***pataler*** (*courir* in French); ***scantato*** ('to be afraid' – *spaventato* in Italian) as ***ébravagé*** (*éffrayé* in French); ***quadiarsi*** ('to warm oneself up' – *riscaldarsi* in Italian) as ***se cafourner*** (*se chauffer* in French); ***andare nel retré*** ('to go to the toilet' – *andare in bagno/ al gabinetto* in Italian) as ***prendre faute*** (*aller aux toilettes* in French); ***mi fa raggia*** ('it makes me angry' - *mi fa rabbia* in Italian) as ***il me fait endéver*** (*il m'énerve* in French); ***scursuni*** ('snake' – *serpente* in Italian) as ***gicle*** (*serpent* in French).

Then, there were instances where there was no satisfactory word in *Lyonnais* to translate the Sicilian. She therefore had to compensate, using what she calls "compensations of proximity"[9]:

[9] In the following examples I will give the original text and its French translation both containing the respective dialects (separated by the arrow), each one followed by my translation in the round parentheses (the bold text indicates the words that are in dialect in each text to show what is meant by

"il padre dà un ***càvucio*** nel culo al **c*aruso***" (the father gives the **child** a **kick** in the arse) → "son père ***atouse*** au ***mami*** un coup de pied au cul" (the father **gives** the **child** a kick in the arse);
[il padre dà un calcio in culo al bambino] → [le père donne à l'enfant un coup de pied au cul]

As we can see from the text above, the words 'child'(***caruso***) and 'kick'(***càvucio***) are in dialect in the original, while in the French it is the words 'gives'(***atouse***) and 'child'(***mami***) that are in dialect. Here, the translator was not able to find a dialectal equivalent for ***càvucio***, so she left it as 'coup de pied' and decided to operate a "compensation of proximity" by using the word ***atouse*** to translate 'dà' which is standard Italian. The result is that in both the original and the translation the sentences contain two words in dialect although they are not the exact same words.

Here is another example where this strategy is employed:

"ci ***trasì*** il sole in testa" (the sun **entered** into his head) → "le soleil lui est entré dans le ***questin***" (the sun entered into his **head**)

In the original text, Camilleri uses the dialect word ***trasiri*** ('to enter'), whereas the French translator was not able to find a dialect equivalent of that particular word so she decided to compensate by using ***questin*** (dialect for 'head') instead of the standard French *tête*. If we analyse both these text according to the concept of informativity discussed above, we notice that in both the original and the translation there are the same number of words which will be foreign to the average SL and TL reader respectively. Therefore, by compensating in this way the translator has managed to achieve an equivalent effect between ST and TT on the level of informativity.

"compensations of proximity"), and below that, what the respective Italian and French would be without dialect.

The third type of solution employed by Vittoz is compensation operated on a large scale (spanning the entire text). When she encountered certain Sicilian dialect words for which she could find no *Lyonnais* equivalent she decided to compensate by changing some words, which recur frequently and which Camilleri writes in Italian, into dialect: e.g. she introduced the *Lyonnais* words ***rebriquer*** ('to reply' - *répliquer* in French) and ***quinchée*** ('a cry' - *cri* in French), whereas Camilleri uses Italian words to express these concepts. Another example is when Vittoz translates as "***s'abousant*** au sol comme un ***boge*** de pommes de terres" the phrase "*cadendo* a terra come un *sacco* di patate". Again, there is no dialect in the Italian original but Vittoz pursues her strategy of compensating on the level of the entire text by introducing dialect into the French translation. The reason she does this is to compensate for Sicilian dialect terms which she could only translate into standard French, words such as ***pilaia*** (beach) in place of the Italian *spiaggia*, ***spiare*** (to ask) instead of *chiedere* or *domandare*; ***trasire*** (to enter) instead of *entrare*, ***addunarsi*** (to take notice) instead of *rendersi conto/ accorgersi*, ***appinicato*** (fell asleep) instead of *addormentato* – these were all translated by the respective French words *plage, demander, entrer, se rendre compte* and *endormi*.

A characteristic of this Sicilian dialect is the slight phonetic variation which occurs with certain words: ***forasteri*** for *forestiero* (stranger); ***accusì*** for *così* (like this/ as); ***baullo*** for *baule* (trunk); ***papore*** for *vapore* (steamboat); ***omu*** for *uomo* (man); ***quatra*** for *quadra* (agree/ correspond); ***biniditta*** for *benedetta* (blessed); ***paro*** for *pari* (similar/ equal); ***ccà*** for *qua* (here); ***vestia*** for *bestia* (beast); ***mia*** for *me* (me) to mention a few. Vittoz decided not to operate any phonetic variations to the French text. This is probably because she wanted to remain constant in the use of the *Lyonnais* dialect which does not contain phonetic variations of this type. As was mentioned above, there are different variations (subdialects) within the Sicilian dialect which result in certain words being pronounced differently depending on the region of Sicily in which they are spoken. Therefore, in Sicilian, any phonetic deviations would not detract from the authenticity of the dialect because they would not be invented

from scratch. This is not the case with the *Lyonnais* and the translator probably felt that distorting certain sounds would have been akin to inventing a new language.

The following are a few passages taken from the novel which should illustrate how Camilleri uses linguistic variations in his works. It will be interesting to see how Vittoz has dealt with the language in these passages. The passages have been selected in accordance with the different types of linguistic variations present in the novel. The first passage we will analyse contains Camilleri's mixed/ hybrid language. This is the language most frequently used by the narrator and by most of the characters in the novel when they speak amongst each other.

> Rimase **assittato** a lungo alla tavola **sconsata**, bevendo di tanto in tanto **mocconcelli** di vino. Poi, quando fu certo che tutti se ne fossero andati, si avviò verso la camera di Rico. Erano anni che non ci metteva più piede e subito gli parve assai più **nica** di quanto ricordasse. Posò il lume su uno **scagno** e si **taliò** attorno. Gli pareva di provare una sensazione **stramma** che non sapeva spiegarsi e più **taliava** e **ritaliava** più quell'impressione s'inforzava.[10]
>
> (Camilleri 1992: 60)

> **He remained seated at the table which had already been cleared, from time to time taking small sips of wine. Then, when he was certain that everybody had left, he made his way towards Rico's room. Many years had passed since he had last set foot in there and, at first glance, it seemed much smaller than he remembered. He rested the lamp on a desk and he looked around. He seemed to feel a strange sensation which he could not explain and the more closely he looked around, the stronger that feeling became.**

[10] The words in bold indicate dialect (both in the Italian and the French texts)

> Il resta longtemps assis devant la table encombrée, **lichant** de fois à autre de petits gorgeons de vin. Puis quand il fut certain que tout le monde était parti, il se dirigea vers la chambre de Rico. Cela faisait des années qu'il n'y mettait plus les pieds et elle lui sembla tout de suite plus petite que dans son souvenir. Il posa le **chelu** sur un bureau et **apincha** autour de lui. Il avait l'impression d'éprouver une sensation étrange qu'il ne savait pas s'expliquer et plus il **aguinchait** et plus cette impression grandissait.
>
> (Camilleri 2001: 76)

This short passage should give some idea of how Camilleri mixes Italian and dialect. In this particular text there are nine words that are in dialect (of which three are the same verb: **taliare**). This can be interpreted as dynamic use of language, in accordance with Hatim and Mason's model of textual analysis. The dialect words are unknown to the reader and yet necessary to understand the passage properly. The words **assittato** (seated) and **strammo** (strange) are phonetically similar to the Italian words *seduto* and *strano* and therefore their degree of informativity is lower than other words such as **sconsata** (cleared [table]), **mocconcelli** (small sips), **nica** (small), **taliò/ taliava** (looked/ was looking) which in Italian are *sparecchiata, piccoli sorsi, piccola, guardò/ guardava*. This high degree of informativity is reflected in the French translation which contains a minor mistranslation: **sconsata**[11] is translated as *encombrée* which means 'cluttered' as opposed to 'cleared' (as in the table being cleared after dinner). This to show how dynamic the language is and how these words in dialect can mislead readers, even expert readers like professional translators. The French text has four words in dialect: **lichant** (drinking)**, chelu** (lamp)**, apincha** (looked)**, aguinchait** (looked closely). The function of these words is much the same as it is in the Italian text. These all have a high degree of informativity due to the fact that they are very different from the standard French words *buvant, lampe, regarder, épier/ guetter*. Vittoz only managed to find four words in dialect to replace

[11] The word **sconsata** comes from the verb **scunsari** defined as "*guastare, sconciare*; per *iscomodare*; parl. di mensa, vale sparecchiare" (Biundi 1978: 405) – this shows that when speaking about eating, as is the case in the passage analysed where they have just finished having dinner, the word indicates that the table has been cleared

Camilleri's words in dialect, demonstrating how difficult it is to reproduce the linguistic variations in the target text. However, by using dialect words in the target text, a similar effect has been created to the source text. We believe that this is important because it gives the reader an idea of how Camilleri's language differs from standard Italian, and therefore provides the reader with an insight into one of the possible reasons for Camilleri's success in Italy.

The other type of language Camilleri uses in his works is a more authentic form of the Sicilian dialect with less intrusions of standard Italian. Normally, this language appears when proverbs are cited or when Sicilians (usually from the less educated classes) speak amongst each other. An example of a Sicilian proverb in *La stagione della caccia* is the following:

> "**Fùttiri addritta e camminari na rina, portanu l'omu a la rovina**."
> Sulla sabbia aveva camminato e sapeva quanto era faticoso, ora, **ficcando** all'inpiedi, stava sperimentando l'intera verità del detto.
>
> (Camilleri 1992: 76-7)

> "Having sex standing up and walking in the sand lead a man to his ruin"
> He had walked on the sand and he knew how tiring it was, now, having sex on his feet, he was experiencing the entire truth of the saying.

> "**Fifrer** debout et marcher dans la sable, ça vous demolit son homme."
> Il avait marché dans la sable et il savait comme c'était éreinant, maintenant, en **fifrant** debout, il éprouvait la verité du dicton dans son integralité.
>
> (Camilleri 2001: 98)

In the original text, the proverb is in Sicilian because it is a Sicilian proverb. The French translator could obviously not find an equivalent proverb in *Lyonnais*, so she had to reproduce it in standard French. She did however use the dialect word **fifrer/ fifrant** to translate the Sicilian **fùttiri/** *ficcando*, which are both rather vulgar words to

describe the sexual act. This works well because the *Lyonnais* **fifrer** is also a vulgar term to describe the sexual act. This particular text is also interesting because it shows how Camilleri explains to the reader who may not understand the Sicilian proverb, what it actually means. He does so by paraphrasing it as the narration continues: immediately after the proverb the narrator tells us how the Marquis had walked in the sand before, and how he was making love standing upright: the highly dynamic **fùttiri addritta** (standing up – in Italian *in piedi*) and **camminari na rina** (sand – in Italian *sabbia*) are explained by "ficcando all'inpiedi" and "sulla sabbia aveva camminato." Obviously, the same effect has not been recreated in the translation where the words "debout" (standing up) and "sable" (sand) are repeated in the proverb as well as in the passage that follows.

This next passage illustrates how people from different social backgrounds speak differently in Camilleri's novels. In accordance with this, characters can often be classified as coming from a higher or lower social class by the language (linguistic variation) they speak.

"**Voscenza è patruna di spiare tutto chiddu ca ci passa pi la testa**."
"Di chi è?" domandò 'Ntonto indicando il **piccilido**.
"Della **bonarma do marchisi**" fece Pirotta. "E **lo pozzo** dire a testa alta, **pirchì non ci fu né minzogna né tradimentu. Ma chisto il mondo nun lo devi da sapire, il figliu e miu**."
"È giusto" disse 'Ntonto. Si era fatta dare il **piciliddo** da Trisìna e ora lo teneva in braccio.
"Come mori?" domandò dopo una pausa.
"**Sirinamente, nnu letto so'. Mancu sinni addunò, Quannu Trisìna trasì per arrisbigliarlu, u truvò mortu. E manco parìa, ch'era mortu, parìa ca durmiva**" disse Pirotta.
"E perché l'avete gettato in un fosso?"
"**Pirchì** se lo trovavano **dintra a me casa**, con tutti **i vuci ca currivanu** in giro, ero certo **ca dicivano ca** l'avevamo ammazzato io e Trisìna. Me lo

carricai sulle spalle, lo portai vicino al fosso e **feci tanticchia di teatru pi fari crìdiri a Portera che il marchisi era sciddicatu**."
(Camilleri 1992: 103-4)

"You're free to ask me anything which comes into your head."
"Whose is it?" asked 'Ntonto pointing to the child.
"It belongs to the good soul of the Marquis," said Pirotta. "And I can say that with my head held high, because there were no lies and no betrayal involved. But the world must not know this, the son is mine."
"It's right," said 'Ntonto. She had asked Trisìna to give her the child and now she held it in her arms.
"How did he die?" she asked after a short pause.
"Serenely, in his bed. He didn't even notice. When Trisìna went into the room to wake him up, she found him dead. And it didn't even look as if he was dead, it looked like he was sleeping" said Pirrotta.
"And why did you throw him into the ditch?"
"Because if they found him inside my house, with all the gossip around, I'm sure they would have said that Trisìna and I killed him. I put him on my shoulders, I took him near the ditch and I set up a scene to make Portera believe that the Marquis had fallen."

"**Censément** vous pouvez me demander tout ce qui vous passe pour la tête."
"De qui est-il?" demanda 'Ntonto en montrant le **mami**.
"De **feu mecieu le marquis**," **rebriqua** Pirrotta. "Et je peux y dire la tête haute, **pasqu'il** n'y a eu ni mensonge ni tromperie. Mais ça, **le monde ont pas a y savoir**, le **mami** est de moi."
"C'est juste," dit 'Ntonto. Elle s'était fait donner le **mami** par Trisìna et maintenant elle le tenait dans ses bras.
"Comment est-il mort?" demanda-t-elle après une pause.

"En douceur, dans son lit. Il **s'est pas vu partir**. Trisina était entrée pour le réveiller et elle l'a trouvé **qu'avait défunté**. Et on n'aurait même pas dit qu'il était mort, on aurait dit qu'il dormait," fit Pirrotta.

"Et pourquoi l'avez vous jeté dans un ravin?"

"Pasque si on le trouvait chez nous, avec ce que les gens **cancornaient**, manquablement on allait dire que Trisìna et moi on l'avait **escoffié**. Je l'ai pris sur mon dos, je l'ai porté au ravin, et j'ai tâché moyen de faire accroire à Portera que le marquis avait **baroulé**."

(Camilleri 2001: 133-4)

In this passage, 'Ntonto, the daughter of the late Marquis Peluso (and therefore a noblewoman) is speaking with two servants (a farmer and his wife) who worked her father's land. The difference in social standing can be seen from the language: 'Ntonto speaks in Italian (at other times she speaks the mixed variation which is symbolic of educated Sicilians) whereas Pirrotta, the farm worker, speaks in a heavy Sicilian dialect. Pirrotta's speech represents a dynamic use of language and therefore the degree of informativity is high. Once the linguistic deviation from the norm has been identified by the reader, its meaning needs to be interpreted. The average Italian reader is presumed to have some knowledge of the history of Italy and Sicily – this corresponds to the intertextuality Hatim and Mason have shown us. Utilising this intertextual knowledge, the reader would be able to infer that it is the people of the lower classes who express themselves in a very heavy (pure?) dialect. Here, once again, we can see the difficulties which dialects pose for the translator. Vittoz uses dialect and colloquial expressions such as **feu mecieu le marquis** (*monsieur le marquis)***, pasqu'il** *(parce qu'il)* which should allow a French reader (using her/ his intertextual knowledge regarding those expressions and the people with whom they are normally associated) to infer that the person speaking belongs to the lower class. This strategy is successful because the expressions and the language used have a high degree of informativity (they deviate from the norm), even though it may not be as great as in the original, where there are a greater number of dialect words (this is probably due to the fact that Sicilian is almost a language of its own, and therefore

more evolved [particularly with regard to lexicon] when compared to *Lyonnais*). Another interesting aspect is that Vittoz has decided not to retain the historic past (*passé simple*) typically used in the Sicilian dialect (both spoken and written). She has opted to use the perfect (*passé compose*), which is more common in spoken French: so the verbs **carricai** and *portai* (historic past) are translated as *je l'ai pris* and *je l'ai porté* respectively (past perfect).

The same argument also applies to the only character in the novel who speaks Italian: lieutenant Emiliano di San Vincent, a piedmontese nobleman from Asti who is sent down to Sicily as head of the military garrison in Vigata. We will not analyse any of (the very few) passages that are completely in standard Italian because they do not pose any particular linguistic problems from the translator's point of view. What is important to note, is that he does not know Sicilian and can only speak Italian. This should be obvious to any Italian reader: firstly, the name itself informs us that he cannot be Sicilian – Emiliano di San Vincent is a name which sounds typically and unmistakably Northern; secondly, Camilleri actually tells us that he is from Asti in Piedmont, a region in the North of Italy; and thirdly, Camilleri describes him as tall and blonde (hardly what anyone would expect a Sicilian to look like!). It is through this type of intertextuality (recognising the name as typically Northern; knowing where Asti and Piedmont are; and knowing that, generally, Sicilians are not tall and blonde) that the reader develops expectations as to how the character should speak (also taking into account the linguistic variations that form part of the entire text – and therefore intratextuality too).

3.3 Translating *La forma dell'acqua*

This is Camilleri's first novel of the series featuring detective Salvo Montalbano. The story is set in Vigata, this time in 1994. Two rubbish collectors find one of the town's

most prominent citizens, *ingegner* Luparello[12], dead and half-naked inside a car which is parked at the *mànnara* (the pasture), a seedy place on the outskirts of town and a haven for drug dealers and prostitutes. It is established that *ingegner* Luparello died of natural causes and detective Montalbano is put under pressure by prominent members of society and other 'leading citizens' to declare the case closed. However, he soon comes to the conclusion that the scene where the body was found at the *mànnara* was staged to ruin the dead man's reputation – *ingegner* Luparello was involved in politics and he was very well known. After Luparello's death, a struggle develops within the party to elect his successor. Gradually, Montalbano penetrates into the dead man's private life and his environment. He discovers some of Luparello's weaknesses, which had never been publicly revealed. He figures out who is pulling the strings behind the scenes within the party and, in so doing, he succeeds in foiling attempts which were being made to blackmail certain innocent people. However, he keeps the truth to himself and, even though he can foresee what will happen, he does not intervene to prevent the dramatic conclusion.

Quadruppani believes that Camilleri has succeeded in creating a type of literature which is for the most part foreign to Italians, but which contains its potential translation (in Camilleri 1998: 16). He also recognises the distinction between three different levels of language used by Camilleri, which correspond to the functions pointed out by Vizmuller-Zocco. The first level is what he calls "l'italien des Italiens" (in Camilleri 1998: 17) which is the standard Italian language spoken by everyone. The third level of language is pure dialect, which is normally used in dialogues taking place between locals. The second is an intermediate level which is a mixture of the first and third levels, what Quadruppani calls "italien sicilianisé" (in Camilleri 1998: 17). Quadruppani believes that it is this intermediate level, this hybrid mix of Italian and Sicilian that presents the greatest problems for the translator. He also says that he found it impossible to find a dialect equivalent for all the words that were in Sicilian dialect. The dialect he decides to use is what he calls "francitan" which stands for

[1212] People who have a specialised university degree in Italy are designated by the title of their specific profession: *ingegner* (engineer), *ragionier* (accountant). *Dottor*(doctor) is more generic and indicates people that have any university degree.

"français occitanisé" and is basically the French language mixed with elements of the langue d'oc dialect (an example of this is the use of the word **minot** instead of *garçon* – a boy) – according to him, this also gives the French text a "parfum de Sud", a Southern flavour, a characteristic shared by the original with its Sicilian dialect (in Camilleri 1998: 18). We will see from the passages that follow that Quadruppani's use of dialect is not as extensive as Vittoz's use of *Lyonnais* in her translation of *La stagione della caccia*. Quadruppani resorts to a number of different strategies to render the linguistic variations in the text – a few of these will be discussed below.

Quadruppani points out how he has tried to preserve the syntax of the Sicilian dialect: "La sicilianité de notre auteur ne s'exprime pas seulement dans les mots, mais aussi dans la syntaxe, ce qui est ici beacoup plus facile a rendre" (in Camilleri 1998: 19). Therefore, when characters introduce themselves saying, for example **"Montalbano sono"** or "Rizzo sono" (thereby placing the verb after the subject) instead of the more typically Italian *"sono Montalbano"* or *"sono Rizzo"* (in front of the subject). Quadruppani has translated these expressions as **"Montalbano je suis"** or **"Rizzo je suis"** and not *"je suis Montalbano"* or *"je suis Rizzo",* as would be correct in French. Quadruppani has also attempted to reproduce another aspect that is characteristic of the Sicilian language: the use of the historic past (*passé simple*) in direct speech (spoken language) which, when speaking Italian or French, would be replaced by the perfect (*passé composé*) or the present tense. An example is the Sicilian expression **"Chi successi?"** which in Italian would be *"Cos'è successo?"*: Quadruppani has translated this as **"Que se passa-t-il?"** and not the commonly accepted French way *"Qu'est-ce qui se passe?"*.

What follows is an analysis of passages taken from *La forma dell'acqua* and their French translation: once again, these particular passages have been selected either because they correspond to the linguistic levels proposed by Vizmuller-Zocco or because they could have posed particular problems for the translator (again, we have not included passages in standard Italian which do not present any particular difficulty for the translator). The intention, as stated above, is to compare the ST and the TT to

see how the translator deals with the linguistic variations, and to comment on how he has done this. The following text consists of a couple of exchanges of a dialogue between the two rubbish collectors who found Luparello's body, and a piece of narrative in between. The two men are both educated and when they speak to each other they use the mixed language:

"Io a quello non gli telefono, **mi scanto**, non lo conosco." […]
Si taliarono, perplessi. A Rizzo era come se gli avessero **contato** di avere trovato un tale **catafero**, di cui non sapevano il nome.
"E **che minchia**, era amico suo, no?" sbottò Saro.
"E che ne sappiamo? Capace che negli ultimi tempi si erano **sciarriati**" si consolò Pino.

(Camilleri 1994: 16)

"I'm not phoning that guy, I'm scared, I don't know him." […]
They looked at each other, perplexed. It was as if they they had just told Rizzo they had found any old corpse, whose name they didn't even know.
"What the hell was that about –he was his friend, wasn't he?" exclaimed Saro.
"What do we know? Maybe they had a fight recently," said Pino, consoling himself.]

"Moi, à celui-là, je lui telephone pas, ça me **fout la trouille**, je le connais pas" […]
Ils échangèrent un regard perplexe. **Rizzo**, on aurait dit que le mort dont ils venaient de lui parler, c'était un **macchabée** quelconque, un inconnu.
"Et **merde** alors, c'était son ami, non?" lança Saro.
"Et qu'est-ce qu'on en sait? **Si ça se trouve**, ces derniers temps, ils s'étaient **engueulés**" se consola Pino.

(Camilleri 1998: 37-8)

Looking at this passage, we notice that Quadruppani has tried to reproduce the linguistic variations present in the Italian text. However, the words and expressions he uses (**fout la trouille, macchabée, engueulés, si ça se trouve**) are not so much taken from dialect as they are colloquial forms of language: they are characteristic of very informal language used when speaking. The result is that these expressions are probably known to the average French reader (all these words can be found in a French dictionary, whereas the Sicilian words **mi scanto, catafero** and **sciarriati** cannot be found in an Italian dictionary), and the effect is therefore not quite the same as if a regional or local dialect had been used. This is because the degree of informativity is not the same (less people would have access to a regional dialect than to an accepted French colloquial form of speaking).

The following passage has been selected because it is a typical example of the mixed (Italo-Sicilian) linguistic variation adopted by the narrator in all Camilleri's novels:

> Saro e Tana ebbero la **mala nottata**. **Dubbio non c'era** che Saro avesse scoperto una **trovatura**, simile a quella che **si contava nei cunti**, dove pastori pezzenti s'imbattevano in giarre piene di monete d'oro o in **agnidruzza** ricoperti di brillanti. Ma qui la **quistione** era diversa **assà** dall'antico: la collana, di fattura moderna, era stata persa il giorno avanti, su questo la **pinione** era certa, e a stimarla a occhio e croce **una fortuna valeva**: possibile che nessuno **si era apprisintato** a dire che era sua? **Assitàti** al tavolino di cucina, la televisione **addrumata** e la finestra spalancata come ogni sera, per evitare che i vicini, da un minimo mutamento, **principiassero** a sparlare facendosi **occhiuti**, Tana ribatté prontamente all'intenzione manifestata dal marito di andarsela a vendere quel giorno stesso, appena **rapriva** il negozio dei fratelli Siracusa, gioiellieri.
>
> (Camilleri 1994: 27)

> Saro and Tana had a tormented night. There was no doubt that Saro had discovered a treasure, similar to the ones in the folktales, where poor

shepherds came across pots full of gold or small lambs covered in gems. But the issue here was very different from what it was then: the necklace, crafted in a modern style, had been lost the day before, that was certain, and, making a rough estimate, it must have been worth a fortune: how was it possible that nobody had come to claim it? Sitting around the small kitchen table, with the television on and the window open wide, as they did every evening, to prevent the neighbours from gossiping because of the slightest change in behaviour, Tana quickly opposed her husband's intention to go sell it that same day, as soon as the Siracusa brothers' jewellery store opened.

Saro et Tana passèrent une mauvaise nuit. Il n'y avait pas de doute, Sarò avait trouvé un trésor, comes dans les contes où des bergers puants tombent sur des jarres pleines des pièces d'or ou d'agneaux recouverts des brillants. Mais ici, la question était très différent de celle des Anciens: le collier, de facture moderne, avait été perdu la veille, là-dessus, on pouvait pas se tromper et à le voir, comme ça, à vue de nez, il valait une fortune: était-il possible que personne ne se soit présenté pour dire qu'il lui appartenait?
Tandis qu'il étaient assis à la table de la cuisine, la télévision allumée et la fenêtre grande ouverte comme chaque soir, pour éviter que les voisins, à cause d'un changement minime, se mettent à déparler et à soupçonner, Tana s'insurgea promptement contre l'intention manifestée par son mari d'aller le vendre le jour même, dès que rouvrirait la boutique des frères Siracusa, bijoutiers.

(Camilleri 1998: 52)

From this passage, we can see how Quadruppani's use of dialect is much less frequent than it is in the original. This particular text, where the narrator is telling the story, contains no linguistic variation at all in the French translation, whereas the Italian text contains more than ten dialectal words and expressions. Even the position of the verb in the phrases **"Dubbio non c'era"** and **"una fortuna valeva"** has not been reproduced, as the standard French syntax has been maintained *("Il n'y avait pas de*

doute" and "*il valait une fortune*"). The result is that this passage does not contain the same degree of informativity in the French as it does in the Italian. Whereas in the Italian text, the reader notices that the narrator narrates in a language which is a mixture of Italian and Sicilian dialect (like the characters in the novel), in the French this is not the case. Therefore, this does not convey Camilleri's style of writing in the same way that Vittoz's translation does.

In the following passage, Montalbano is speaking to one of the prostitutes who works at the *mànnara* to get some information on the case he is working. The prostitute is a Tunisian woman by the name of Fatma.

"Non ti spaventare" disse il commissario.
"**Io non spavento. Io molta sfortuna**"
"E perché?"
"**Perché se tu aspettare qualche giorno, io non era più qua**."
"E dove volevi andare?"
"**C'è signore di Fela, me affezionato, a lui io piacere, domenica detto me sposare. Io credo lui**."
"Quello che ti viene a trovare ogni sabato e domenica?"
Fatma sgranò gli occhi.
"**Come tu sapere**?"
Ripigliò a piangere.
"**Ma ora tutto finito**".

(Camilleri 1994: 59)

"Don't be afraid" said the inspector.
"I not afraid. I very unlucky"
"Why?"
"Because if you wait couple days, I not here anymore."
"Where did you plan on going?"

"There is man from Fela, he like me, Sunday he say he marry me. I believe him."

"The one who comes to visit you every Saturday and Sunday?"

Fatma's eyes widened.

"How you know?"

She began to weep again.

"But now all over."

"N'aie pas peur," lui dit le commissaire.

"**Pas peur. Vraiment, je non ai de chance**."

"Et pourquoi?"

"**Parce que si tu attends quelques jours, je non suis plus là**."

"Et tu voulais aller où?"

"**Il y a mônsieur di Fela, attaché à moi, je plais à lui, dimanche, il dit m'épouser mois. Je crois à lui**."

"Celui qui vient te voir chaque samedi et dimanche?"

Fatma écarquilla les yeux.

"**Comment tu sais**?"

Elle se remit à pleurer.

"**Mais maintenant, tout fini**."

(Camilleri 1998: 95-6)

Being Tunisian, one might expect the woman's Italian to be broken as it is not her mother tongue. This is clearly shown by Camilleri in the way he makes her speak: certain pronouns (**Io non mi spavento**), verbs (**io ho molta sfortuna**) as well as articles and prepositions (**C'è un signore di Fela** and **Io credo a lui)** have been omitted and certain verbs have not been conjugated (**Come tu sapere** instead of C*ome lo sai*), or have been conjugated incorrectly (**io non era più qua** instead of *io non ero più qua*) to make her sound like a foreigner. Quadruppani manages to reproduce the effect by also omitting certain parts of speech (**Je n'ai pas peur**) and by using **non** where **ne** should be used. Thus, he has succeeded in maintaining the

overall effect of the passage – the French reader (like the Italian reader) should be able to infer that the woman is a foreigner because of her broken speech. What is interesting is that there is a minor mistranslation, which again shows how linguistic variations can lead to misinterpretations of the text. The woman says: "**C'è signore di Fela"** (instead of "*C'è <u>un</u> signore di Fela"*) omitting the article *un*. By this she means that there is a man from Fela (a town in Sicily) who wants to marry her. The French reads as follows: "**Il y a mônsieur di Fela**" – if the translator had simply wanted to omit the article *un* he would have had to say "*de Fela*", meaning from Fela. The word *di* does not exist in French. This therefore implies that the man's name is Mr di Fela, which is not what the woman is actually saying.

The next passage is one in which Montalbano is speaking to an old Sicilian lady. He speaks in Italian whereas she speaks in proper Sicilian dialect (old people almost always use dialect in Camilleri's novels, particularly when they are not well educated).

> "**Signuri Montaperto? Ca quali signuri! Chiddri munizzari vastasi sunnu**!"
> Non doveva correre buon sangue fra le due famiglie.
> "**Lei cu è**?"
> "Sono un commissario di pubblica sicurezza."
> La donna s'illuminò in volto, pigliò a fare voci con note acute di contentezza.
> "**Turiddru! Turiddru! Veni di cursa ccà**!"
> "**Chi fu?**" **spiò** apparendo un vecchio magrissimo.
> "**Chistu signuri un commissario è! Vidi ch'aviva ragiuni!? Vidi ca i guardii i cercanu? U vidi ca eranu gente tinta? U vidi ca sinni scapparu pi nun finiri in galera?**"
> " Quando se ne sono scappati, signora?"
> "**Mancu mezz'ura, havi. Cu u piccilidru. Si ci curri appressu, capaci ca li trova strata strata**."
>
> (Camilleri 1994: 148)

“Mr and Mrs Montaperto? I wouldn’t call them Mr and Mrs, that’s for sure! They’re just dirty trash collectors!”

The two families were obviously not on good terms.

“Who are you?”

“I’m a police inspector.”

The woman’s face lit up, she began screaming shrilly with delight.

“Turiddru! Turiddru! Come here, quick!”

“What’s the matter?” asked a very thin old man entering the room.

“This gentleman is an inspector! You see, I was right all along!? I told you the police are looking for them? I told you they were shady people? I told you they ran away so they wouldn’t end up in jail?”

“When did they run away, madam?”

“Less than half an hour ago. With the child. If you run after them, you might find them on the road.”

“Monsieur et Madame?” retorqua-t-elle en dialecte pur. “Tu parles de messieurs! Mais ce gens, c’est rien que de **traîne-misère**, des ramasse-poubelles! ***Chiddri munnizzari vastasi sunnu*!”**

Ça ne **gazait** pas forte entre les deux familles.

“Vous-êtes qui, vous?” reprit-elle.

“Je suis une commissaire de la Securité publique”.

Le visage de la femme s’illumina elle se mit à pousser de cris où pointaient des notes aiguës de satisfaction.

“Turiddru! Turiddru! Arrive, **bolègue-toi**!”

“**Qu’est-ce qui fut**?” lança un vieux très maigre en apparaissant.”

“Ce monsieur, **commissaire, il est**! Tu vois que j’avais raison? Tu vois que les gardes le cherchent? Tu vois que c’étaient des gens pas propres? Tu vois qu’ils se sont **escampés** pour pas finir **à l’ombre**?”

“Ils se sont enfuis quand, madame?”

"Pas même une heure, il y a. Avec **le minot**. Si vous leur courez après, peut-être que vous les rattrapez juste juste."

(Camilleri 1998: 218-9)

In this passage, Quadruppani has tried to reproduce the linguistic variations of the original (as we can see by the words in bold). He has also maintained the sentence construction with the verb at the end of the sentence (...**commissaire, il est!**) Therefore, the informativity of the ST has in some measure been retained in the translation, although to a lesser extent. Quadruppani has also added "*en dialecte pur*" (in pure dialect) to indicate that the woman is speaking in dialect – he has obviously done this to compensate for the fact that he could not translate the whole passage into dialect. Another interesting aspect in this passage is that Quadruppani first translates the sentence "**Chiddi munnizzari vastasi sunnu!**" as "Mais ces gens, c'est rien que de traîne-misère, des ramasse-poubelles!" and then repeats the sentence in the Sicilian dialect. He uses this strategy because he believes that, in this way, he can maintain some of the flavour of the original text, and give the reader access to the Sicilian language.

At times, Quadruppani resorts to footnotes to explain terms or puns which can only be understood through some knowledge of Sicilian dialect or Italian. An example is given by the following text:

Partirono con la macchina di servizio, lasciando Giallombardo di guardia. Al volante ci stava Gallo, oggetto, con Galluzzo, di facili battute tipo "Commissario, che si dice nel pollaio?"...

(Camilleri 1994: 20)

They left with the patrol car, leaving Giallombardo behind to keep watch. At the wheel was Gallo, who, together with Galluzzo, was often on the receiving end of jokes such as "Inspector, any news from the hen house?"...

> Ils partirent avec la voiture de service, en laissant Gialombardo de garde. Au volant s'était installé Gallo, dont le nom était prétexte, avec celui de Galluzzo, à des plaisanteries faciles du genre "Commissaire, qu'est-ce qu'on raconte au poulailler?"...
>
> (Camilleri 1998: 43)

The translator has added the following footonote to the text: "*Gallo*: "poulet". *Galluzzo*: diminutif sicilien de Gallo, "petit poulet" (this is the footnote to the French text)"

In this passage there is a play on the words *Gallo* (rooster in Italian and Sicilian) and *Galluzzo* (baby rooster in Sicilian), which are also the characters' names, and *pollaio* (hen house in Italian). An Italian reader, by means of intertextuality and her/ his knowledge of the language, would be able to make the connection between these three words. With the fact that the characters' names have been retained in the translation (and rightly so), the play on the words which exists in the Italian text is no longer there in the French translation. When a passage of this sort presents itself to a translator, s/he has the option of either omitting the part of the text which contains the play of words, or providing the reader with a footnote to explain the text. This is what Quadruppani does to supply the information which will be lacking for the TT reader. If there is no footnote the TT reader will not be able to make any sense of the text (as there is no connection between the words *Gallo, Galluzzo* and *poulailler* in French).

The following is another example of a comparative analysis of source- and target-language text portions. This is not taken from one of the two novels analysed above, but we have included it because of the interesting nature of the text and because it also gives an insight into the many different kinds of linguistic variations which can be found in Camilleri's works. This text (and its French translation) is taken from another of Andrea Camilleri's novels, *Il ladro di merendine* (1996). The text and the translation (which was also carried out by Serge Quadruppani) will again be analysed

according to certain aspects of the model of textual analysis proposed above to highlight the similarities and differences that exist between the ST and its translation.

> **Dottore** Montalbano, lei **personalmenti** non mi **conosci** e io non **conosci** a lei com'è fatto. Mi chiamo Prestifilippo Arcangelo e **sonno** il socio di suo **patre** nell'**azenda viniccola** che **ringrazziando** il **Signori** va bene assai e ci frutta. Suo patre non parla mai di lei però **o** scoperto che nella casa sua **teni** tutti i giornali che scrivono di lei e macari **si** lui lo vede **quarche** volta comparire in televisione si mette a **piangire** ma cerca di non farlo **vidire**. (Camilleri 1996b: 201 - the bold text is to highlight the words that are misspelled or incorrect)

The following is what the Italian version with orthographical corrections would look like:

> Dottor Montalbano, Lei personalmente non mi conosce e io non La conosco (neppure). Mi chiamo Prestifilippo Arcangelo e sono il socio di suo padre nell'azienda vinicola che ringraziando il Signore va molto bene e ci frutta. Suo padre non parla di Lei però ho scoperto che nella sua casa tiene tutti i giornali che scrivono di Lei, e poi se La vede comparire qualche volta in televisione si mette a piangere ma cerca di non farlo vedere.

> Dottor Montalbano, you don't know me personally and I don't know what you look like. My name is Prestifilippo Arcangelo and I am your father's partner on the wine farm, which, the Lord be praised, is going very well and is fruitful for us. Your father never speaks about you but I have found out that in his house he keeps all the newspapers that write about you and, also, when he sometimes sees you appear on television he cries but he tries to hide it.

> *Dottore* Montalbano, vous, personnellement, vous ne me connaissez pas, et moi je ne connais pas comment voue êtes fait. Je m'appelle Prestifilippo Arcangelo et je suis l'associé de votre père dans le domaine vinicole qui, grace

> au Seigneur, va très bien et nous rapporte. Votre père ne parle jamais de vous mais j'ai découvert que chez lui, il garde tous les journaux qui parlent de vous et aussi, lui, quand quelquefois il vous voit apparaître a la television, il se met à pleurer mais il cherche à ne pas se faire voir.
>
> (Camilleri 2000: 204)

The text is a letter which detective Montalbano's father's partner, Prestifilippo, sends him. Montalbano's father is seriously ill and does not want his son to know, but Prestifilippo thinks it is his duty to inform Montalbano by writing a letter. This already gives us a great deal of information. Firstly, considering the delicate subject matter (field) and the fact that Montalbano and Prestifilippo have never met and therefore do not know each other (distance), the letter would probably be considered the most appropriate form of communication in this instance. Here we can see how social conventions govern the choice of text type. Prestifilippo lives in a society in which the most appropriate way to communicate such an event (which is not very common) would be in writing, and he therefore conforms to this social convention (even if he is not comfortable with the written form of the language, as demonstrated by his 'version' of Italian, which corresponds to spoken language).

The language which would then be used, taking the circumstances into account, is standard Italian, and that is precisely what Prestifilippo does (or better, attempts to do). This is in line with the idea that there is a particular mode of expression (discourse) which is associated with the genre (in this instance, a formal letter to communicate bad news to a person he does not really know). Prestifilippo uses the formal pronoun "Lei" when addressing Montalbano, out of respect and in accordance with the social conventions that require the use of this form when addressing people with whom there is not a close relationship. The notion of intertextuality also fits into this part of the analysis: the letter is written (even if not correctly) in accordance with the norms that govern these types of texts. These norms are not given in the context of the novel itself. Thus, for the reader to understand the structure and mode of

expression of the letter, s/he needs to call on her/his knowledge of other similar texts which exist outside this text, and outside the context of the novel.

Prestifilippo is communicating bad news and he believes that he should use Italian to do it because dialect would be too informal for this situation. From the context of the novel, we know that Prestifilippo belongs to a low and 'semi-educated' class, and that he normally expresses himself in Sicilian dialect, rather than standard Italian. Therefore, in his letter he expresses himself in the only form of Italian he knows: this is a marked (orthographically incorrect) form of Italian, in that many words are misspelled – they are written according to the way he pronounces them – and "lei" (the polite form of address) is not written with a capital. The fact that he does not really know the Italian language well is also demonstrated by him using words from other dialects ("quarche" is typical of Roman dialects) thinking that they are actually Italian. In this passage, the author is not simply trying to create a comic effect (even if the result is rather comical). The author's intention is to demonstrate, through the creation of Prestifilippo's hybrid idiolect, how many fellow Sicilians use dialect when they speak and (try to use) the national Italian language when writing, in accordance with the norm in schools. To do this, he relies on the notion of informativity. Prestifilippo's incorrect Italian represents an unexpected (dynamic) use of language: unexpected in the sense that the reader has to process the information and decide why the orthographical errors are indeed there. It could be that the author has simply made a mistake, but this hypothesis is disregarded *a priori* because we know that the text has been edited and that the same words have been spelled correctly elsewhere in the text. The reader, being aware of the context of the novel, should then infer that the author's intention is to illustrate Prestifilippo's difficulty.

For someone who has some background knowledge of Sicily, this could reveal certain ideological undertones. The question of language has always been a contentious issue in Sicily, where the acceptance of Italian after the unification of Italy was a difficult and slow process. Many Sicilians were opposed to this and preferred to speak their own language. Here, Camilleri illustrates the conflict that could arise when a Sicilian,

in respect of social conventions, forces himself to write in a language with which he is not comfortable.

The French translation does not render this difference between the spoken and written modes. The French in the translation is grammatically and orthographically correct, unlike the Italian version. The particular structure of the sentence "moi je ne connais pas comment vous êtes fait" which is probably slightly marked in the French, as it is in the Italian, is retained. In this passage, we can see that Quadruppani has attempted to preserve some of the local flavour of Camilleri's dialect by keeping the word "*Dottore*". This is a strategy he uses frequently in his translations. However, he was not able to convey the effort (and struggle) made by Prestifilippo as he attempts to express himself in Italian. This obviously results in a loss because the conflict between Sicilian dialect and Italian is not portrayed, but the translator may have thought that this was not important or highly relevant to the potential reader of this type of text.

CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSION

The objective of this study has been to contribute to the existing literature on the translation of linguistic variations, a subject that has not been researched in any great detail in the discipline of translation studies. We have tried to do this by analysing novels written by Andrea Camilleri, an Italian author who uses Sicilian dialect and other linguistic variations extensively in his writing. In fact, his enormous success and immense popularity in Italy have been attributed to his particular use of language which has become the marker of his style. In light of this, we have attempted to analyse this particular variation and its translation in order to highlight the difficulties encountered by translators when confronted with these types of language, as well as to provide some insight on how these difficulties may be overcome.

We have traced the history and development of the Sicilian dialect (language) to demonstrate the importance and significance associated with its use in Camilleri's novels. Camilleri makes use of the local Sicilian dialect from the place of his birth (at times combined with Italian) for specific reasons: he says that in order for him to express what he needs to express, and to describe the situations he wants to describe, he needs to write in this mixed language which he has created, because he cannot do it using Italian alone. According to him, there is something missing from the standard Italian language and this does not allow him to describe the setting and the environment in which the novels take place. Camilleri is 'writing' Sicily (his land) and to do it he needs to use this language: this demonstrated just how important the language is for him (and, consequently, for the texts). This being the case, it would seem that the translator has no option but to reproduce the linguistic variations in the translation (even if only to allow the TL reader a glimpse into Camilleri's style, and to give him/ her access to one of the reasons for his success).

The texts were analysed adopting certain aspects of Hatim and Mason's model for textual analysis. It is obviously extremely difficult to compare translation and different translating styles, but the model provides a common point from which to

begin such an analysis. The "seven standards of textuality" (De Beaugrande and Dressler 1981: 3) on which Hatim and Mason's model is based, and in particular the notions of intentionality and informativity, together with register have been used to analyse the ST as well as to compare the two TTs to each other, and to comment on the translations. This was done to gain some insight on which of these aspects were deemed to be more important by the translators themselves, whether consciously or sub-consciously.

We have seen that Dominique Vittoz and Serge Quadruppani, the two translators who have translated Camilleri's novels into French, have both opted to retain the dialect in one way or another. From this initial fact, we can conclude that they felt it was necessary to convey the difference present in the language that Camilleri uses to the readers in the target language. The analysis of the selected texts revealed the many options available to the translators as they implemented their strategies to deal with the variations. More importantly, it was also possible to see the many difficulties associated with attempting to translate these variations. These ranged from not having a perfect knowledge and understanding of the dialect in the ST to the impossibility of finding a direct TT dialect equivalent for each ST dialect term. However, as we know, this is a common problem associated with all translation and it stems directly from the nature of languages themselves: not all words in one language have an equivalent in another language. The problem is naturally accentuated when a new language that is far less commonly spoken and understood appears. It not only becomes more difficult to find words or expressions that may be equivalent, but it is almost as if each dialectal word now has to be translated out of the dialect into the standard linguistic variation, then into the target language, and then again into a lingustic variation of the target language.

Dominique Vittoz maintained a coherent strategy throughout her translation, by making use of the dialect of Lyon, the place where she was born and where she grew up. This strategy turned out to be particularly successful because of the analogy with Camilleri, who also uses the dialect from his childhood and place of birth. We

analysed her translation and saw how she operated various types of compensations to create an effect which was very similar to the effect created by Camilleri in the original text (the analysis was carried out utilising Hatim and Mason's model of textuality, and in particular with regard to their notion of informativity). By contrast, Quadruppani does not use dialect as extensively as Vittoz, and he resorts to other devices such as footnotes and reproducing the actual Sicilian dialect words to create a similar effect to the one created in the original.

It is not our intention to comment on the suitability of the different strategies employed by the two translators. The objective has been to analyse the types of linguistic variations present in the text and to describe how the translators have dealt with these. This has revealed some of the problems that translators are faced with when they are required to translate linguistic variations, and it gives us an insight on how these problems can be resolved (if they can be resolved). The analysis has shown that there are many difficulties which arise when translating linguistic variations and that these vary in nature each time.

The most obvious difficulty is finding a "suitable" linguistic variation in the target language – "suitability" itself is highly subjective and depends on the translator's perception of the text and the linguistic variations contained therein. The translator decides what s/he wants to give back to the reader in the target language according to the function s/he perceives the language varieties to have in the source text. If the translator is struck by the phonetic aspect of a dialect, which may be very different from the standard language, s/he may try to reproduce a similar variance in sounds by using an existing target-language dialect that sounds very different from the standard language. The social context of the linguistic variation may influence the translator's decision: the variation used in the source text may have particular social connotations (higher/lower class; oppressed/discriminated community), which may be associated with a given variation in the target. If the translator believes such a linguistic variation to be important to the text and the TL reader's understanding thereof, then s/he will use the variation available in the TL in an attempt to reproduce that particular effect

on TL readers. As was mentioned in the analysis above, Dominique Vittoz'z main concern when translating Camilleri's novels was to find a language that was rich and unusual enough to give the French reader that feeling of "étrangeté familière" (familiar foreignness) which Camilleri gives his readers (in Camilleri 2001: 214).

There are already many different views on how texts should be translated from one standard language to another, and there is no set way of doing so due to the inherent differences that exist between languages. In the analysis above, Vittoz explains how, in her view, the French language is less flexible than the Italian language, and how deviations from syntactic, orthographic and lexical norms are not generally well-accepted in France. Linguistic variations in texts therefore further complicate the task of the translator: s/he now not only has to reproduce a meaningful text in a different language, but s/he also has to reproduce language differences within a text in a different language. To do this, it is essential for the translator to identify what the importance of the linguistic variations in the ST are according to him/her and, subsequently, to attempt to reproduce these important aspects in the TT (the translator may believe that the variations are of no great importance to the text, in which case he may choose not to reproduce them). The conclusion we arrive at is that just as two translations that do not contain linguistic variations will never be alike, so too will the linguistic variations in a text never be translated in the same way. There is no systematic and set way to translate all variations in all texts. Each time, the nature of the text as well as the nature of the variation (and the way the translator perceives this) have to be taken into account and the translations have to be carried out accordingly.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Augias, C. 1998. L'Italia si tinge di giallo. *La Repubblica*, 8 July. http://www.vigata.org.

Avolio, C. 1973. *Introduzione allo studio del dialetto siciliano*. Palermo: Edizione della Regione siciliana.

Barthes, R. 1968. *Writing Degree Zero*, translated by Annette Lavers and Colin Smith. New York: Hill and Wang.

Barthes, R. 1977. *L'analisi del racconto*. Milano: Bompiani.

Bassnett, S. & Lefevere, A. 1998. *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Bassnett, S. & Trivedi, H. (eds). 1999. *Postcolonial Translation: Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.

Bell, R. 1991. *Translation and Translating*. London: Longman

Biundi, G. 1978. *Dizionario siciliano-italiano*. Palermo: Il Vespro.

Bonner, J.K. 1999. Sicilian: Language or Dialect. http://www.capital.net/~soialban/siclang.html

Camilleri, A. 1988. *Il corso delle cose*. Palermo: Sellerio.

Camilleri, A. 1992. *La stagione della caccia*. Palermo: Sellerio.

Camilleri, A. 1994. *La forma dell'acqua*. Palermo: Sellerio.

Camilleri, A. 1996. *Il ladro di merendine*. Palermo: Sellerio.

Camilleri, A. 1998. *La forme de l'eau*, translated by Quadruppani, S. La Flèche: Fleuve Noir.

Camilleri, A. 2000. *Le voleur de goûter*, translated by Quadruppani, S. La Flèche: Fleuve Noir.

Camilleri, A. 2000. *La scomparsa di Patò*. Milano: Mondadori.

Camilleri, A. 2001. *La saison de la chasse*, translated by Vittoz, D. Saint-Amand-Montrond: Fayard.

Carloni, M. 1994. *L'Italia in giallo: geografia e storia del giallo italiano contemporaneo*. Reggio Emilia: Diabaris.

Carroll, L. 1981. *Language and Dialect in Ruzante and Goldoni*. Ravenna: Longo.

Catford, J. C. 1965. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cawelti, J.G. 1976. *Adventure, Mystery and Romance*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Chatman, S. 1978. *Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*. London: Cornell University Press.

Cheshire, J. & Stein, D. eds. 1997. *Taming the Vernacular: From Dialect to Written Standard Language*. London and New York: Longman.

Concolino Abram, B. 1999. Pluralità di linguaggio e conflitti sociali be *Il birraio di Preston* di Andrea Camilleri. *Narrativa*, 16: 233-241.

Corti, M. 1975. Dialetti in Appello in *Letteratura e Dialetto*, edited by G. Beccaria. Bologna: Zanichelli.

Crespo, R. 2000. Problems in the Translation of Paul Auster's *The New York Trilogy*. *Fédération International des Traducteurs (FIT) Revue Babel*, 46(3): 227-224.

De Mauro, T. 1978. *Linguaggio e società nell'Italia d'oggi*. Torino: ERI.

De Montis, S. 2001. *I colori della letteratura: un'indagine sul caso Camilleri*. Milano: Rizzoli.

Dittmar, N. 1978. *Manuale di Sociolinguistica*. Bari: Laterza.

Eco, U. 1979. *Lector in Fabula*. Milano: Bompiani.

Genette, G. 1988. *Narrative Discourse Revisited*. New York: Cornell University Press.

Grimaldi, G. 1998. Le avventure in giallo di un 'europolizzioto. *La Nuova Sardegna*, 17 June.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1985. *An introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Arnold.

Hatim, B & Mason, I. 1990. *Discourse and the Translator*. London: Longman.

Hatim, B & Mason, I. 1997. *The Translator as Communicator*. London: Routledge.

Hoffer, B. 1978. "Problems in Sociolinguistic Translation". *The Journal of the Linguistic Association of the Southwest*, 165-72. Texas: Trinity University.

Ives, S. 1950. "Theory of Literary Dialect". *Tulane Studies in English 2*, 137-82.

La Capria, R. 1998. Camilleri, la Sicilia, così è se vi pare. *Corriere della Sera*, 5 May.

Mack Smith, D. 1968. *A History of Sicily: Modern Sicily After 1713*. London: Chatto & Windus.

Malatesta, S. 1997. Montalbano, Maigret di Sicilia. *La Repubblica*, 10 June.

Marco, J. 2000. Register Analysis in Literary Translation: A Functional Approach. *Fédération International des Traucteurs (FIT) Revue Babel*, 46(1): 1-19.

Mehrez, S. Translation and the Post Colonial Experience, in Venuti, L. ed. 1992. *Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology*. London and New York: Routledge.

Nida, E.A. and Taber, C. 1974. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leyden: Brill.

Ortega Y Gasset. 2001 (1937). The Misery and the Splendor of Translation, in *The Translation Studies Reader* edited by L. Venuti. London: Routledge.

Panichi, J. Andrea Camilleri Decided His Writing Didn't Work Without the Dialect of His Youth. *Italy Daily*. http://www.duesicilie.org/article25.html

Pym, A. 1996. "Open letter on hybrids and translation". http://www.fut.es/~apym/on-line/hybrids/hybrids.html

Pym, A. 1998. The Translation of American Varieties in Mark Twain's *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. http://www.fut.es/~apym/students/Hucktrans.html

Pym, A. 2000. Translating Linguistic Variation: Parody and the Creation of Authenticity. http://www.fut.es?~apym/on-line/authenticity.html

Pym, A. 2002. "Intercultures and the Interface with Nationalist Culture". http://www.fut.es/~apym/on-line/intnation.pdf

Quadruppani, S. 1999. A propos de la langue paternelle d'Andrea Camilleri. *Narrativa*, 16: 249-253.

Rambelli, L. 1979. *La storia del giallo italiano*. Milano: Garzanti.

Ricoeur, P. Le paradigme de la traduction. *Esprit*, June 1999, p.15

Robinson, D. ed 1997. *Translation and Empire: Postcolonial Theories Explained*. Manchester: St Jerome.

Sanchez, M. T. 1999. Translation as a(n) (Im)possible Task: Dialect in Literature. *Fédération International des Traucteurs (FIT) Revue Babel*, 45(4): 301-310.

Schulte, R & Biguenet, J. 1992. *Theories of Translation*. London: The University of Chicago Press.

Sorgi, M. 2000. *La testa ci fa dire: Dialogo con Andrea Camilleri*. Palermo: Sellerio.

Tymoczko, M. Postcolonial Writing and Literary Translation, in Bassnett, S. & Trivedi, H. (eds). 1999. *Postcolonial Translation: Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.

Toury, G. 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Toury, G. 1980. *In Search of a Theory of Translation*. Tel Aviv: The Porter Institute For Poetics & Semiotics.

Van Marle, J. Dialect versus standard language: nature versus culture, in Cheshire, J. & Stein, D. eds. 1997. *Taming the Vernacular: From Dialect to Written Standard Language*. London and New York: Longman.

Van Peer, W. ed. 1989. *The Taming of the Text*. London and New York: Routledge.

Venuti, L. ed. 1992. *Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology*. London and New York: Routledge.

Venuti, L. ed. 2001. *The Translation Studies Reader*. London: Routledge.

Vittoz, D. 2002a. L'italien, la langue Arlequin. *L'Humanité*, Paris, 21 March.

Vittoz, D. 2002b. Camilleri in francese: un work in progress. *Stilos*, 19 March.

Vittoz, D. 2002c. Quale francese per tradurre l'italiano di Camilleri? Una proposta non pacifica, unpublished conference paper, Palermo.

Vizmuller-Zocco, J. 2001. Il dialetto nei romanzi di Andrea Camilleri. http://www.vigata.org/dialetto_camilleri/dialetto_camilleri.shtml

Webster's Third New International Dictionary. 1961. Cologne: Könemann.