

Pázmány Péter Catholic University
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
Doctoral School of Literary Studies



Dóra Bodrogai

**Comparative Analysis of Andrea Camilleri's translations
in the hierarchy of languages and cultures**

Thesis booklet

Supervisors:

Dr. Margit Lukácsi, associate professor

Dr. Anikó Sohár, associate professor

Head of the Doctoral School: Dr. István Dobos, DSc

Budapest

2026

1. Historical Background and Research Questions

As the topic of the dissertation, I chose the translations in different languages of Andrea Camilleri's novels: I was interested in whether the target language influences how the text is formulated and what elements accompany the editions.

The author is memorable for its readers for many reasons: the humanity and the plots of his books and, especially, his unique use of language are all part of the so-called Camilleri phenomenon. Most researchers agree that the charm of his books is hidden in its particular linguistic rendering. This language use is so peculiar that his fans made dictionaries and vocabularies out of the words he used: the most recent is a dictionary consisting of more than one thousand pages compiled by Professor Giuseppe Marci, author of the website CamillerINDEX. It was published in 2025 as a special volume of the *Quaderni Camilleriani*.

The idiolect used in Camilleri's books, which is a mix of standard Italian, regional Italian, Sicilian dialect and the parlance used by Camilleri's family, is called *vigatese* inspired by Vigàta, the imaginary town in many of his books. Camilleri himself has used the term various times. The base of the *vigatese* is the Italian language, mixed with Sicilian elements, i.e. the incorporation of dialectal vowel use, morphemes and, in smaller amounts, whole words into the text. The language strongly recalls the way of speaking of the theatre and cinema, which is not a coincidence given Camilleri's past. It appears first and foremost in the construction of dialogues and the plot; among others, Sciacovelli and Serkowska consider this idiolect to be of the factors of his success.

Camilleri's novels have already been analysed from the point of view of translations but the focus was mostly on the correspondence between source and target texts, the general equivalence and the positioning of the translation on the good-bad scale. But the translations are shaped not only by translators but also by editors and publishers, furthermore, the target culture and its traditions also influence the formation of the text. This is why, in the dissertation, I examine Camilleri's translations from the point of view of the sociology of translation: I include the paratextual elements

(Genette 1996/1997) as well because they reveal the customs of the language and culture in question. For an analysis of this type, the most adequate theory seemed to be the hierarchy of languages formulated by Johan Heilbron and its later developments. Heilbron categorizes the languages into four groups (hypercentral, central, semi-central/semi-peripheral, peripheral) and determines general tendencies about the translations into the various types.

Heilbron establishes some principles, e.g. that peripheral and semi-peripheral languages are difficult to distinguish, the hierarchy changes dynamically, translations flow from the centre to the periphery, the communication between languages on the periphery happens often through a central one (what is translated from one peripheral language into another depends on what is published of it in a central language). The more central a language is in the international system of translations, the more types of books are translated from that language. Heilbron brings the example of English based on Dutch data: in the 33 established categories, only the English language is present in all, the German in 18, the Italian in 10. Thus, centrality implies variety: „since the small number of books translated from peripheral languages is generally concentrated in very few categories, the opposite also holds true: book translations from peripheral languages lack the variety that increases with the degree of centrality” (Heilbron 1999: 438). Despite all this, it has not occurred yet what many fear: translation from the hypercentral English has not supplanted translation from other languages. In the case of the Netherlands, it has brought on the decrease of the publishing of native books. (Based on the data provided by the Hungarian Central Statistical Office [KSH], the proportion of foreign authors published in Hungary between 2020–2024 is 34%. This proportion has been increasing since the end of the communist rule: 19% in 1990, almost 29% in 2010, 28% in 2010, thus Hungary shows similar tendencies to the Netherlands [cf. KSH – Culture, sports]).

Another principle is that the world system of translations determines the measure of the import of books: the more central a language, the less the number of books translated into this language and the bigger the national production, e.g. in the case of the UK and the USA, the proportion of translation among the published books is around 5%. In his lecture in

2018, Heilbron gave the following numbers for this proportion: UK and USA 2–4%, France and Germany 12–18%, for semi-peripheral languages 20%, in Scandinavia 30%, in his home country, the Netherlands, 34%, where three quarters of all translations were from English. This works similarly in the case of other cultural goods such as movies, popular music or television.

In the dissertation, following the literature, in particular Heilbron's writings, I often use the word 'hierarchy.' I mean it in a sociological sense: according to Heilbron, languages can be classified into certain hierarchical positions and thus into relationships of subordination based on how much is translated from and into them (he takes the data from the *Index Translationum*). Naturally, I do not think that this system implies a hierarchy of values among different literatures. Heilbron's system – a hierarchy based on the amount of translations – does not claim it either; it only points out the asymmetry in the cultural transfer.

Following Heilbron's theory and the case studies presented in the book edited by Marija Zlatnar Moe, Tanja Žigon and Tamara Mikolič Južnič (2019), we can rightfully expect that when translating into a given language, translators work with strategies based on the language's position: for central languages, it is more customary to see (more) domesticating, (more) target-oriented translations, i.e. translations which are closer to readers' expectations. Meanwhile, for (semi-)peripheral languages, translations tend to be "faithful," (more) foreignizing and (more) source-oriented, i.e. closer the original text.

The advantage of theoretical frame of the dissertation is that translations in several languages can be taken into account at the same time and the analysis foregrounds the translation norms and customs of the cultures in question without emphasizing the quality of the translation (which is oftentimes very subjective and, as mentioned above, the final text is not only produced by the translator, see e.g. Solum 2018). Furthermore, I have access to languages (English, German, Italian, Hungarian) which can help examine this stratification and division. The framework makes it possible to examine Camilleri's oeuvre in a global context and, focusing especially on the paratextual characteristics, to show

the specifics of what the position filled in the target language hierarchy implies in case studies.

In the dissertation, I also take the source texts into consideration, but, above all, examine how the norms of the language and culture in question influence the formulation of the target texts, and if this can be explained by the hierarchy established by Heilbron. I shall also attempt to answer, based on Heilbron's theory, whether the translator and editor do carry out less changes in the case of the Hungarian edition than in those of the central German or the hypercentral English translations, and whether the texts appear to be more domesticating in English than in the German and Hungarian editions in the case of Camilleri, too. The author's works have not been examined from this point of view yet so it is worth our while to analyse and compare the translations into different languages.

2. Research Methodology

Thus, I want to examine Camilleri's works in the target cultural systems (Even-Zohar 1990) through the position of the languages in the flow of translations (Heilbron 1999) with a descriptive method (Toury 1995/2012). For this analysis, I chose three languages that I know well and fall into different categories: Hungarian is a peripheral, German is a central, and English is the hypercentral language in Heilbron's system. Based on the works presented in the theoretical background of the research I made the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: according to Heilbron's theoretical works and the case studies of the Slovene researchers **the English and German translations are expected to be more domesticating** than the Hungarian one because the translators are compelled to use a more neutral language due to the centrality of their target languages. We can also expect that the Hungarian translators will try to do a "faithful" translation, i.e. to represent the peculiar language use of Camilleri and to keep the realia.

Hypothesis 2: the translated detective stories will be more domesticating than the translated historical novel, and due to the hierarchy, most of all the English one, because for books of this genre the story is in the focus; it is more important to throw light on the mystery and there is less space for linguistic experimenting.

Hypothesis 3 (following from the first two hypotheses): the non-standard linguistic elements – mostly the Sicilian dialect and Camilleri’s own language creation – will be most present in the Hungarian translation while the German and especially the English one will only have some left for show.

To test the hypotheses, I examine several intra- and extralinguistic features: the paratextual elements around the texts, the textual representation of Sicilian dialect and other language (other Italian dialects, German) and the translation of realia.

Because Camilleri wrote more than 100 volumes, it would be impossible to analyse all of them along with their translations in a single dissertation. In German and English, there are numerous volumes available of the Montalbano series, in Hungarian only six. Three of the novels were translated by Margit Lukácsi (*The Terracotta Dog*, *The Snack Thief*, *The Voice of the Violin*), one by Noémi Kovács and Kornél Zaránd (*The Shape of Water*), and two volumes of short stories by Ádám András Kürthy (*Un mese con Montalbano*, *Gli arancini di Montalbano*). Since none of the short story collections were available in English at the time of writing the dissertation, I decided to leave those out. Also, since the two most translated volumes are *The Shape of Water* and *The Terracotta Dog*, and these were translated into German and into Hungarian by different translators, I considered these to be the best suited for analysis. I planned to choose volumes that were available in all three languages, among the historical novels only *The Brewer of Preston* fits the criterion. The works chosen for analysis are thus *The Shape of Water* (transl. Stephen Sartarelli/Schahrzad Assemi/Noémi Kovács & Kornél Zaránd), *The Terracotta Dog* (transl. Stephen Sartarelli/Christiane von Bechtolsheim/Margit Lukácsi) and *The Brewer of Preston* (transl. Stephen Sartarelli/Monika Lustig/Margit Lukácsi).

First, I examine the solution for translating the Sicilian dialect in the novels *The Shape of Water* and *The Terracotta Dog* with a comparative analysis based on Jana Vizmuller-Zocco's writings (1999, 2001). Then, I examine in *The Brewer of Preston* how the translations reflect the hierarchy. In the last chapter, I examine the reception of the analysed novels among professional and unprofessional readers. I wanted to see if the elements examined in the previous two chapters (translators, translators' solutions, the presence of dialects) are also present in their opinions. To compare the unprofessional readers' opinions, I used websites like goodreads.com, moly.hu and lovelybooks.de. As for the professional readers, I looked for their perspective in reviews and review articles in printed and digital form. The translator testimonials presented in the third part of the chapter, apart from being a special critical relationship, contribute to the reception of the works in the target as well as the source culture (cf. Venuti 1995). The statements of translators about their own translations fall into the category of public authorial epitexts: even though Genette does not write about translation, he considers autocommentary to be a part of this category (cf. Genette 1997: 367).

The principal method of the case studies is thus the comparative textual analysis of different elements (verbal and visual text, paratexts, dialects, culture specific items), meanwhile, in the third case study, I carried out reception and discourse analysis. I have not made a quantitative, statistical analysis because I was most interested in the impressions of the readers as they were formulated in their opinions. I consider examining the reception of Camilleri's works of key importance because otherwise we cannot judge the success (or unsuccess) of the translations among readers. While it is true that translators do not necessarily translate for the readers, but the success of the book as a product (and thus also of the translation) is defined by readers' opinions and sales.

3. Results

The hypotheses have partly proven to be true: the German and American translator indeed use a more neutral language in their texts, the Hungarian

translations try most to reproduce Camilleri's peculiar language, while the more central, i.e. German and English texts present some Italian and Sicilian words and expressions to represent the milieu. The historical novel is, in both the Hungarian and English cases, more domesticating than the crime stories.

After the analysis of *The Shape of Water* and *The Terracotta Dog*, we can draw the following conclusions: the Hungarian text breaks often the literary language norms (e.g. on the lexical level and, above all, the phonetic level) which is not usual in the traditions of Hungarian literary translation. Up until recently, overstylisation was more customary, but nowadays translators (as well as editors and publishers) give more emphasis on keeping the original registers of the source text. The third hypothesis has thus proven to be true: only the Hungarian translation tries to recreate the peculiar language of Camilleri in *The Terracotta Dog* for which the translator uses dialectal words (*csimota*, *máma*, *celőke*), endings (*-bül*) and phonetic distortions (*hunnan*). As it emerges from Russi's analysis (2019), phonological differences are present in greater numbers than morphological, morphosyntactic or lexical ones, which contradicts the claims that Camilleri uses the lexical level the most. Similar phonological changes can be observed in Lukácsi's translation (the use of /i/ instead of /ε/ or /e/ [*békében* > *békiben*, *nyelvén* > *nyelvin*] or the closing of /o/ to /u/ [*honnán* > *hunnan*]). The dialectal elements concern mostly the speech of the characters, "the regional language varieties are cancelled from the narrative parts and slang or archaized words come into their place. The conscious use of regional language is characterized primarily by the blending of the linguistic features of different regions, the use of dialectal universals, and the use of folk spelling" (Kollár 2009: 56, my translation).

In Kovács and Zaránd's translation there is only one similar case (*emberje*) but it is important to note that the novel they translated contains less attention worthy linguistic moments: *The Shape of Water* is the first novel of the Montalbano series, at the time of its publication Camilleri was not a successful author yet in his home country, he did not want to exaggerate with the Sicilian items.

Stephen Sartarelli, the American translator, tried to foreignise as much as possible in accordance with Venuti's idea (1995), as McRae states in her dissertation (2011), but he acknowledges the editors' and publishers' influence on the language, their adherence to norms and thus the extinguishing of any linguistic experimenting. Sartarelli translates Camilleri's language majorly into standard English and only lets the readers in on the varying language use on some rare occasions, e.g. in the case of Adelina and the neighbour. There are some items taken from the source text but usually ones that can be deduced from the context (e.g. *signora, va bene, buongiorno*) or ones that give an Italian flavour to the text, e.g. food names or realia like real or fictitious newspaper titles which are explained in the Notes. When the realia express essential information, Sartarelli translates them. An exception is *omertà* whose meaning cannot be deduced from the text but is found in the Notes at the end of the book, thus Sartarelli does not leave items in the text that are not deducible or explained. Sanna (2019) thinks that the linguistic mix goes lost in translation, the text becomes monolingual, Sartarelli adjusts the text to the knowledge and customs of his readers.

Linguistic formality and the preference of standard to dialects and lower registers are characteristic of the German literary tradition (cf. e.g. Polenz 2009), thus also of translations. This is why translations usually neutralise the language; Sicilian/Italian items like addresses, offices (*signora, dottori, commissario*) and other items like exclamations, topographical elements (*Männara*) and an incantation, left in translations are only there to give it a (fore)taste of the source culture and signify otherness. The fact that annotated expressions which could interrupt the reading process are rare also shows the requirement of a smooth translation. Both translators, Assemi and Bechtolsheim, use similar strategies: none of them try to translate Camilleri's language into German, they try to render the Italian character of the novel perceptible by leaving Italian and Sicilian items in the text. There are also notes in the German editions: some names and expressions (*Männara, Lombroso, Sturzo, La liggi*) are explained at the end of *Die Form des Wassers*, others are not, which does not seem to show any consistency. At the end of *Der Hund aus Terracotta*, on the other hand, there is not only the translator's remarks

(*Anmerkungen der Übersetzerin*, in which Asinara, Eduardo de Filippo, Mário de Sá-Carneiro, Delio Tessa and Vucciria are explained) but also the dishes mentioned in the book (*Im Text erwähnte kulinarische Köstlichkeiten*). These can be found in all of the later volumes translated by Bechtolsheim so their inclusion can be attributed to the decision of the publisher and/or the editor. However, this is contradicted by the fact that these paratextual elements are missing from the translations by Moshe Kahn and the duo Rita Seuß-Walter Kögler. Another interesting moment of the German Montalbano-books are the subheadings (*Commissario Montalbano löst seinen zweiten Fall* [Inspector Montalbano solves his second case], *Commissario Montalbano denkt nach* [Inspector Montalbano's thinking]) which can be found in all volumes independently of the translator; it could thus also show the influence of the publisher and the editor. As a marketing tool, the subheadings could help make the series more recognizable.

The first hypothesis presented in the methodological chapter has thus proven to be true in part: the American and German translators used the standard language and they coloured it with Italian and Sicilian words, i.e. they foreignise a bit as well, they make it known that it is a text of foreign origin. The Hungarian translator also domesticates and foreignises at the same time: the text invokes a foreign feeling in the reader because, by trying to recreate the characteristics of the original text, it differs from the literary norms. It is domesticating because, with one exception, no Italian or Sicilian items occur in it.

As it emerges from the analysis of *The Brewer of Preston*, the American translator handled the text the most freely: he left out the table of contents so important for Camilleri's game, he put its content – along with his own remarks – into the Notes, and he rewrote the Post Scriptum which was moved from the end of the table of contents to after Camilleri's afterword. Sartarelli made numerous insertions and modifications and, in order to add colour and exoticism to the text he often leaves Italian/Sicilian words in it, thus domesticates and foreignises at the same time. The German translator, Monika Lustig only added *The Translator's Remarks* to the book but she also made insertions.

The Hungarian translation tried most to render the diverse nature of the language, although the English one also presented some elements like this, e.g. Bortuzzi's Tuscan pronunciation, the Milanese colour of the dialogue between Colombo and his wife, and the orality of the Sicilian dialogues. The foreign words and expressions left in the English text, the *couleur locale*, satisfy (or elicit) the interest of the Anglophone audience for exoticism. However, all of this is negligible in contrast with the Hungarian experiment, which mostly employs phonological and – a small but memorable amount of – lexical modifications in the text compared to the literary language.

Similarly to other case studies (cf. Zlatnar Moe, Žigon and Mikolič Južnič 2019) it can be asserted that the American translator treats the text and the accompanying elements more freely than the German and Hungarian translators. Naturally, the editor(s) and publishers also have a say, the changes could have thus been made by the translator.

The linguistic formulation of the novels in translation shows great variety. The German translator did not try at all to represent the linguistic diversity: the novel is read in literary German (*Hochdeutsch*) in which there is a negligible amount of Italian and dialectal elements (e.g. the aria titles and passages, *dindarolo*, *caruso*). The English text shows only the Florentine prefect's Tuscan manner of speaking, some Milanese expressions, and some Sicilian words. The Hungarian is the most varied from this point of view: the translator uses mixed dialectal elements only for characters of lower social status (e.g. Agatina). The realia stand already with their explanations in the source text, the translators did not have to invent anything for most of them, but in the Hungarian translation there are exclusively Hungarian words in this case as well.

The factors listed above seem to support Heilbron's model and the hypothesis following from it: the English and German translations are more domesticating than the Hungarian one since the translators are compelled to use a more neutral language due to the centrality of their languages. All three translations are domesticating to a great extent, but they accomplish it with different methods: the Hungarian, source-oriented, tries to recreate Camilleri's language mixed with dialect, but exchanges the cultural elements for Hungarian ones. The German, on the other hand,

neutralises both the language and the realia, thus adjusts the translation to the German readers. The English domesticates the language of the text but often leaves the realia in original; it handles the elements accompanying the text with great liberty. The fact that the German translator did not even try to translate the language could signal the centrality of German. In contrast, the Hungarian translator tries to render the linguistic diversity through various methods. The Anglophone audience is used to leaving out the “inessential” elements, i.e. those that are not strongly connected to the text, which is why the originals of the titles in the table of contents are moved to the Notes which almost hides them among all the other supplementary information. The rate of translations for the hypercentral English is around 5%, translations are considered exotic, that is why the translator’s name could be figured on the title page (also true for the German edition) whose reputation and fame as a poet could induce trust. The representation of the translator’s name on the title page indicates the importance of the individual efforts in the English-speaking and German cultures, as well as the efforts to make translators more visible.

Thus, the statement by Zlatnar Moe and her colleagues that the more central languages “experiment” less, they try less to render the linguistic diversity and tend to produce texts that are more homogenous and customary to readers. In the case of extratextual elements, they exert more freedom seems valid.

From the reader ratings in the chapter about reception, we can gather that the Hungarians write most often about translation. The Anglophone and Germanophone readers also mention the translators and judge the translations but superficially. The Anglophone readers mention the translator by name the most, which suggests the exoticism and foreign nature of translated literature, as well as the importance of individualism in the English-speaking cultures. It is also interesting to observe how they generally mention Sartarelli’s name in a positive context; when they judge the translation as bad, they do not name the translator. The presence of Italian/Sicilian words is judged in a mixed way, but it leans towards the positive. The readers of the Hungarian text have decidedly noted that the translator tried to recreate Camilleri’s language: most of them mention *csimota*, *kamara* and other (seemingly) dialectal words in their reviews.

Those who read in English or German also signalled in their reviews that the text contains Italian/Sicilian words.

The reviews in English mention quite often the swearwords, which can be traced back to the cultural norms – in the Anglophone territories their use is less accepted in literature. Many readers think they serve no purpose and are therefore pointless.

Both the Anglophone and Germanophone readers and critics draw parallels with other authors whose stories also take place in Italy (e.g. Donna Leon's Inspector Brunetti in Venice), with authors who also write crime stories (e.g. Henning Mankell, Georges Simenon), and with other inspectors (e.g. Philip Marlowe). In the case of the English language editions, the Donna Leon quotes on the front cover could strengthen these comparisons.

As for the professional reviews, they usually do not discuss the translation itself in detail, they sometimes mention Camilleri's mixed language but usually underline the plot and the author's origins and his charm originating from it. Some other paratextual elements, mostly the cover, are also mentioned by the readers, but they do not really indicate the presence of the Italian and dialectal words.

We can see how the fact of the translation remains in the background in all three target cultures: most of the readers do not mention that the novels they read are translations. Although it is the Anglophone readers who mention the translator by name the most, but there are hardly any comments on the translation itself in their goodreads reviews. When they do comment on the translation, it remains quite superficial, there are only a handful of comments which deal with one aspect of translation in detail (e.g. the use of the word *dawdle* for *tambasiàre*). We can also say, based on reader reviews, that a translation can never make them fully content: the readers judge the same translational feature in opposite ways because each one of them approaches the text with different expectations which depend on personal reading experiences, perceptions and status.

Based on the professional and non-professional reviews it seems clear that the translation itself has no proper reception: there is no explicit translation criticism, website reviews that could be regarded as that are rare and usually deal with just one aspect. The reception touches first of

all on the plot of the books and other aspects beyond textuality, e.g. the author's real or alleged way of thinking (e.g. sexism, homophobia).

I agree with McRae's statement that foreignisation (Venuti (1995) is implemented and not only in the case of the English text. The translations of Camilleri's works analysed in this dissertation do contain foreign items for readers: the Hungarian readers encounter strange words of sometimes unknown meaning in the text, while the readers of the English and German texts encounter words and expressions taken over from the source text. Due to these, we have texts which have similar effects and can be identified as translations. The different ways of foreignisation can point to not only the translators' own decisions but the norms of the target cultures as well: Lustig makes the decision to choose the standard literary language all on her own, as she writes in her afterword, and Assemi and Bechtolsheim also used their own (similar) strategies; it seems like the German speaking audiences tolerate quite well the presence of foreign words.

The Hungarian text published by Bastei contains less foreign words – these are used to render other elements than the Sicilian dialect (cf. agent Balassone in *The Terracotta Dog* or German in *The Brewer of Preston*). The Sicilian dialect itself is rendered through Hungarian dialects and sociolects, which Antonio Donato Sciacovelli advised to the translator and the publisher accepted it. *The Shape of Water* translated by Noémi Kovács and Kornél Zaránd contain less dialectal elements in the original, and the Hungarian translation does not have any. In the Anglophone countries, the focus is on making a fluent, easy-to-read text and on winning the approval of the readers—this is confirmed by Sartarelli himself. That is why he chose to incorporate the Italian/Sicilian vocabulary and the variety different from the standard (Brooklyn accent) gradually as Camilleri himself did it in Italian. However, it is important to note regardless of their position in the language hierarchy, that English, German and Hungarian have a different status: the several national standards existing next to each other grants the opportunity to view the elements non corresponding to the primary standard as non-substandard, which is not possible for Hungarian. The imitation of spoken language is one of the problems of modern and contemporary prose because there are different rules in force for the

spoken language written down than for the de facto spoken language. This imitation is one of the most important tools Camilleri uses and it imposes other translation difficulties since the dialect used by the author does have a standard but it is not the written one.

For the paratextual elements, the elimination of the table of contents, pushing of the Notes to the back of the book, and stating the translator's name on the title page all support the influence of the centrality of English. It is also important to mention that the English publication of the historical novels happened quite late, in 2014, while the German (2000) and Hungarian (2002) translation appeared closer to the original (1995). Both the publisher and the translator were conscious of the fact the crime stories were closer to the taste of Anglophone audiences, so they published those first, and decided to wait with the historical novels until Camilleri was considered a bestseller author in their countries.

Although of course we cannot draw general conclusions based on (three by) three novels, we can observe the tendencies in translation of the central languages: in the Anglophone world it is important to emphasise the success of the author achieved in his home country and the exoticism of the book (in this case, the Sicilian-Italian ambience), in German speaking territories these are present but less stressed, while in Hungarian the focus is on the genre and the locality. Central languages experiment less with the narrative language, they try to render the linguistic diversity by inserting items and passages from the source text, generally expect a more homogenous text from the translators, and handle paratextual elements with greater liberty.

It would be fortunate if the research presented in this dissertation could extend to other translations: it would be expedient to include more languages – and researchers – in the analysis in order to get a completer and more nuanced picture about the role Camilleri's books fulfil in the target cultures, the translation solutions applied and the influence of the hierarchy of languages both on the text and the paratextual elements. In future research, it would be worth our while to examine in more translations if the tendencies presented here apply to other (semi-)peripheral languages, other authors, other genres, and earlier periods. Analyses like this would show if the position occupied by languages in the

hierarchy do in fact generally influence translation process and product, i.e. the linguistic and cultural transfer, or only in certain cases, and if the latter is the case, which are these cases, how they change, how they can be changed, and how they relate to other extralinguistic factors. All these surpass the capacities of one researcher, there is thus a need for a multidisciplinary approach and analysis with wide-reaching cooperation to settle the question of language hierarchy and translation relationship once and for all.

Cited works

- Even-Zohar, Itamar. 1990. Polysystem Studies. *Poetics Today* 11 (1).
- Genette, Gérard. 1996. Transztextualitás. Ford. Burján Monika. *Helikon* 42 (1–2): 82–90.
(original: Genette, Gérard. 1982. *Palimpsestes*. Paris: Seuil, 7–17.)
- Genette, Gérard. 1997. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Ford. Jane E. Lewin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
(original: Genette, Gérard. 1987. *Seuils*. Paris: Seuil.)
- Heilbron, Johan. 1999. Towards a Sociology of Translation: Book Translations as a Cultural World-System. *European Journal of Social Theory* 2 (4): 429–444.
- Kollár, Andrea. 2009. Ekvivalencia és fordíthatóság. A tájnyelvi elemek szerepe Andrea Camilleri *Az agyagkutya* című regényében. *Translatologia Pannonica*: 53–56.
- KSH – Culture, sports
https://www.ksh.hu/stadat_eng?lang=en&theme=ksp (Megtekintés ideje: 2026.06.02.)
- McRae, Ellen. 2011. *Translation of the Sicilianità in the Fictional Languages of Giovanni Verga and Andrea Camilleri*. Doktori értekezés. Auckland: University of Auckland.
- Polenz, Peter von. 2009. *Geschichte der deutschen Sprache*. Berlin-New York: Walter De Gruyter.
- Sanna, Elena. 2019. Il metodo traduttivo di Stephen Sartarelli: una prospettiva diacronica sulla resa in inglese delle opere di Andrea Camilleri. In: Demontis, Simona (szerk.). *Il telero di Vigàta (Quaderni Camilleriani 9)*. Cagliari: Grafiche Ghiani, 104–116.
- Sciacovelli, Antonio Donato. 2009. Le ragioni profonde del successo di un modello idiomático non inedito: i romanzi di Andrea Camilleri. In: Da Rif, Bianca

- Maria (szerk.). *Civiltà italiana e geografie d'Europa. XIX Congresso AISLLI 19–24 settembre 2006 Trieste Capodistria Padova Pola*. Trieste: EUT Edizioni Università di Trieste, 429–434.
- Serkowska, Hanna. 2006. Sedurre con il giallo. Il caso Camilleri. *Cahiers d'études italiennes* 5 (Images littéraires de la société contemporaine): 163–172.
- Solum, Kristina. 2018. The Tacit Influence of the Copy-Editor in Literary Translation. *Perspectives* 26 (4): 543–559.
- Toury, Gideon. 1995. (2012²). *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Venuti, Lawrence. 1995. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London-New York: Routledge.
- Vizmuller-Zocco, Jana. 1999. Il dialetto nei romanzi di Andrea Camilleri. *Camilleri Fans Club*.
http://www.vigata.org/dialetto_camilleri/dialetto_camilleri.shtml
(2025.05.21.)
- Vizmuller-Zocco, Jana. 2001. I test dell'(im)popolarità. *Quaderni d'Italianistica* XXII (1): 35–46.
- Zlatnar Moe, Marija & Žigon, Tanja & Mikolič Južnič, Tamara. 2019. *Center and Periphery: Power Relations in the World of Translation*. Ljubljana: Ljubljana University Press.

4. Related Publications

- „Klasszikusok újratöltve?”. *Magyar Napló* 2022/5: 69–70.
- „Mario Inglese. Scrivere la Sicilia. Saggi di letteratura contemporanea”.
In: *Annali d’Italianistica* 41 (2023): 618–621.
- „Bruno Berni, Catia De Marco, and Anna Wegener, eds. Passaggi intermedi. La traduzione indiretta in Italia”. In: *Annali d’Italianistica* 42 (2024): 633–635.
- „Reticenze e coincidenze in *Il Birraio di Preston*”. In: *I fantasmi di Camilleri* (ed. Milly Curcio), L’Harmattan, Budapest-Torino-Paris, 2017, 133–146.
- „«La grazia sarebbe di morire assieme». Appunti sulla produzione breve di Andrea Camilleri”. In: *Contributi alle ricerche romanze* (eds. Tímea Farkis, Tünde Wallendums), Pécsi Tudományegyetem, Pécs, 2022, 19–25. (Online elérés: <https://pea.lib.pte.hu/handle/pea/34220>)
- „Tradurre la lingua non standard: Andrea Camilleri in ungherese”. In: *Contributi alle ricerche romanze 2* (eds. Linda Németh, Ingrid Petkova, Eszter Salamon), Pécsi Tudományegyetem, Pécs, 2023, 9–16. (<https://pea.lib.pte.hu/handle/pea/44454>)
- „Translating Non-Standard Language. Andrea Camilleri in Hungarian”.
In: *Pázmány Papers* 1/1 (2023): 215–235.
(<https://ojs.ppke.hu/index.php/pp/article/view/1048/1044>), also
In: *Varietas Delectat. A Hieronymus Fordítástudományi Kutatócsoport bemutatkozó kötete* (ed. Anikó Sohár), Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, 2024. (https://mersz.hu/dokumentum/m1143vd__72/#m1143vd__70)
- „»Ekkor, teljesen véletlenül, egy opera címe képződött meg a fejemben«
– *A prestoni serfőző fordításairól*”. In: *Triplíciter dicere. Szokott és szokatlan fordítási jelenségek* (ed. Anikó Sohár). Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, forthcoming.