HOW READERS PERCEIVE
TRANSLATED LITERARY WORKS:
AN ANALYSIS OF READER RECEPTION

ANGELA D'EGIDIO
UNIVERSITY OF SALENTO

Abstract – The aim of this paper is to investigate the reader's reception of translated literary texts and to explore the reader's expectations about literary works. For this purpose, three comparable corpora of British, American and Italian online book reviews commenting on the English version of Andrea Camilleri's *La forma dell'acqua* (*The Shape of Water*) and on the Italian version of Stephen King's *Joyland* were assembled and analysed. The way active target language readers perceive and evaluate a translated literary work was then explored by taking the language they actually used in book recommendation websites. The analysis demonstrates that the Anglo-American and Italian readers' reception of the translated text is different, in terms of focus and perception.

Keywords: literary translation; corpora; reader reception; book reviews.

1. Introduction

Reception theory is a particular form of reader response literary theory that emphasises the reader's reception of a literary text. In literary studies, reception theory originated from the work of German philosopher Hans-Robert Jauss in the late 1960s. In 1982 Jauss uses the term 'horizon of expectation' to describe the criteria readers use to judge literary texts in any given period. This horizon tells us how a literary work was valued and interpreted in a given time and place without establishing a fixed and final meaning. In his view, reader response does not investigate literary works directly but explores the reader's expectations about literary works based on education, knowledge and experience. According to cultural theorist Stuart Hall (1980), a text is decoded by readers in different ways, perhaps not in the way the producer intended. Many factors seem to influence the way audience members read, such as life experience, mood at the time of reading, age, culture, beliefs and gender. This means that a 'text' (i.e. a book, a movie, or other creative work) is not passively received by the audience but that readers receive and interpret a text based on their individual cultural background and everyday experience of life. Furthermore, Robert C. Holub (1984, p. 45)

defines reception theory as "a general shift in concern from the author and the work to the text and the reader", and highlights the crucial function of the reader in the process of literary experience. According to him, reception theory focuses on the role of the reader in the interpretation of a text and not on the text itself, and he defines literature as the process of how the reader and the text interact with each other.

As far as we know, most studies on Internet book reviews focus on their effects on consumer purchase intention (Chevalier and Mayzlin 2004; Lin and Chiu 2011; Lin *et al.* 2007; Yun and Wen 2010).

In this paper, we will try to explore how 'actual readers', as defined by Holub (1984) perceive and evaluate a translated literary work by taking the language actually used in book reviews as a point of reference. The aim is not to judge the translators' merits or their translation choices and strategies. Rather, by taking inspiration from the studies above we will investigate the reader's interpretation of the language and writing style in a translated text.

2. Material

This study reports on the qualitative analysis of three corpora of British, American and Italian book reviews. Book reviews in the UK and USA were published on Amazon and Goodreads,[1] and comment on the English version of Camilleri's *La forma dell'acqua* (*The Shape of Water*), translated by American poet Stephen Sartarelli for Penguin in 2002. Book reviews in Italian for Stephen King's *Joyland*, translated by Giovanni Arduino for Sperling and Kupfer in 2013, were collected from Amazon and Anobii.[2]

The choice to focus on these two literary works was guided by the results of Fina's (this volume) comprehensive analysis of recent trends in literary translation between the UK, the USA and Italy. The data for each of the three countries were retrieved from the Index Translationum[3] (IT) database (The Budapest Observatory 2010), an international bibliography managed by UNESCO and listing around 2 million entries for translated books from a number of disciplines. Fina found that the most translated authors from English into Italian are Robert L. Stine (29 books), Jan and Stan Berenstain (22 books) and Stephen King (22 books). As Stine and Berenstain write books for children, who tend not to write online book reviews, we

---

[1] The choice to focus on these two book recommendation websites was guided by the data retrieved on Alexa, a tool for discovering site rankings. *Amazon.com* is one of top 10 sites and the most popular online bookstore in the world, and *Goodreads.com* is ranked as the number 241 website in the world and the world's largest site for readers and book recommendations.

[2] Anobii is a social networking site aimed at readers. It has readers in over 20 countries and is most popular in Italy, unlike Goodreads, according to the data retrieved on Alexa.

[3] http://portal.unesco.org/culture/es/files/41748/13390726483Translation_trends_1990_2005_Dec_2010.pdf/ Translation%2Btrends%2B1990_2005_Dec%2B2010.pdf

decided to focus on Stephen King, the third most translated author in Italy. It is not by chance that, according to IT statistics, Stephen King is the ninth most translated author in the global Top 50,[4] and the eighth in the Top 10 authors translated in Italy since 1979.[5] His translated works are mostly horror (9 books) and dark fantasy (7 books), but also include the science fiction sub-genre (2 books), the gothic novel (1 book), and two essays.

Regarding translation into English, Andrea Camilleri is the most translated author in the popular detective genre both in the UK and USA. Interestingly, 11 and 16 works from the popular *Commissario Montalbano* series were translated in the UK and USA respectively.

In order to ensure (as much as possible) that the texts included in the corpora were written by native speakers of English or Italian, only reviews published by readers who specified their nationality on their public profile were included. As the analysis focussed on the reader reception of the translation, reviews focussing on the content or plot were also excluded. The remaining comments were then analysed qualitatively and quantitatively. By qualitative analysis, we mean the categorisation of sentences in a book review into semantic fields. This procedure has been commonly used by Critical Discourse Analysis researchers (Baker *et al.* 2008). Through the detailed examination of each review, four semantic fields: 'translation/translator', 'author', 'language' and 'style' were identified. All the sentences under each semantic field were then quantified by using percentages and qualitatively analysed. In doing so, we could ascertain the semantic prosody, i.e. the reviewer's stance (positive, negative or neutral) on the translator/translation in general and the style of the books (see Section 3 and 4), and identify the most commented stylistic and linguistic aspects of the reviewed books (see Sections 4 and 5). Table 1 provides a summary of the composition of the three corpora in terms of total number of reader reviews collected commenting on the books *The Shape of Water* and *Joyland*; whereas Table 2 displays the percentages of comments related to the four emerging semantic fields.

Book recommendation websites	USA	UK	ITALY
Amazon	254	136	63
Goodreads	100	44	//
Anobii	//	//	100
Total number of reviews	154	180	163

Table 1.
Composition of the three corpora.

Book recommendation websites	USA	UK	ITALY
Amazon	51%	44%	23%
Goodreads	44%	34%	//
Anobii	//	//	32%

Table 2.
Percentages of comments related to the four semantic fields.

As can be noticed in Table 2, the American and British reviewers tended to comment more on the stylistic and linguistic aspects than the Italian reviewers. These, instead, tended to focus more on the plot of the book.

3. The semantic fields of 'translation/translator' and 'author'

Generally speaking, more than 40% of the American and British reviewers included comments referring to Sartarelli's translation of *La forma dell'acqua* (*The Shape of Water*) by Camilleri, although neither negative comments nor positive comments clearly prevail in either of the English corpora (see Table 3). Also, few Italians mentioned Arduino's translation of *Joyland*.

Semantic fields of 'translation/translator'	USA	UK	ITALY
Positive comments	34%	40%	28%
Negative comments	40%	40%	44%
Neutral comments	26%	20%	28%
Total comments referring to Sartarelli's and Arduino's translations	65%	49%	15%

Table 3.
Number of positive, negative and neutral comments referring to
Sartarelli's and Arduino's translations.

Interestingly, among the positive comments the Anglo-American reviewers underline the ability of Sartarelli of translating 'smoothly' Camilleri's interlanguage into English and of even being invisible as a translator, as in (1), (2) and (3):

> (1) "Great translation -didn't feel like one." (AM_Corpus)
> (2) "I would've thought it was written in English, you cannot tell at all that it is translated from Italian." (UK_Corpus)
> (3) "This book is translated from the Sicilian-Italian and I think the translator has done a good job." (UK_Corpus)

These positive opinions are consistent in praising fluent discourse and the translator's invisibility. This can be read in light of Lawrence Venuti's (1995) ideas on what he calls the 'illusion of transparency' when translating a foreign text:

> A translated text, whether prose or poetry, fiction or nonfiction, is judged acceptable by most publishers, reviewers, and readers when it reads fluently, when the absence of any linguistic or stylistic peculiarities makes it seem transparent, giving the appearance that it reflects the foreign writer's personality or intention or the essential meaning of the foreign text — the appearance, in other words, that the translation is not in fact a translation, but the "original." (Venuti 1995, p. 1)

It is also worth mentioning that almost all American and British reviewers appreciated the detailed explanatory notes added by the translator at the end of the book with the aim of introducing English readers to Sicilian expressions which were not translated. Also noted were the intertextual allusions to other writers and to the Italian socio-cultural context. This is evident in examples (4) to (8):

> (4) "The translator, American Stephen Sartarelli, does a fine job […] Sartarelli provides three dozen notes in the back of the book, to help Americans understand Sicilian customs and culture. This goes a long way to breaking down the barriers to the book." (AM_Corpus)
>
> (5) "Sartarelli has done a very good job keeping much of the dialogue quirky enough in English to convey some of the changes in dialect set out in the original. The book also contains some handy reference notes at the end that explains words and phrases that may be commonly understood by Italians but would otherwise be lost on foreigners." (AM_Corpus)
>
> (6) "The Shape of Water is translated quite smoothly from Italian by Stephen Sartarelli. […] Sartarelli also includes helpful notes on the text explaining cultural references and nuances, which add to the story." (AM_Corpus)
>
> (7) "The translator, Stephan Sartarelli, does a masterly job, especially in the rapid exchanges between the characters - even adding notes on some of the puzzling minutiae." (UK_Corpus)
>
> (8) "I enjoyed the notes at the back." (UK_Corpus)

The examples above show that the English readers noted Sartarelli's approach to Camilleri's language and narration through a basically domesticating method. Conversely, 40% of American and British reviewers considered Sartarelli's translation not very readable. The reviewers were aware that they were reading a translation and not the original text and judged it as inaccurate in terms of choice of words and grammar. The examples (9) to (16) clarify the Anglo-American negative perception of the *The Shape of Water*:

Lingue e Linguaggi

(9) "The translation occasionally stumbled […] a few things needed to be read twice to fully understand them." (AM_Corpus)

(10) "Must say the translator also needed to review it once again at the copy editing level. There some points where the English broke down grammatically and I had to re-read a few times to clarify/guess." (AM_Corpus)

(11) "At no point did I find the book funny - as a previous reviewer mentioned, this may be the result of a weak translation. I suspect the plodding first few chapters are similarly the result of poor translating." (AM_Corpus)

(12) "Unfortunately, this was a rather poor translation; on several occasions I was jolted out of the book by a word or phrase that just didn't work or was wrong." (AM_Corpus)

(13) "I would guess that this book is far better in its original Italian rather than in translation. For about the first one third of the book you are very much aware that this is a translation as the writing and choice of words are often very stilted and awkward. However, as you get further into the book it's almost as if a different translator takes over as it becomes much easier to read." (UK_Corpus)

(14) "However, I found the translation somewhat stilted and jarring." (UK_Corpus)

(15) "the translation is very poor and I have failed to finish it." (UK_Corpus)

(16) "The opening chapter, until the speech set in, I was very confused. I'm not sure if it is because of how the book was translated and stuff." (UK_Corpus)

It is worth underlining that our aim is not to judge Sartarelli's translation of Camilleri's literary work but to look at the effects that the translation had on Anglo-American readers and attempt to understand the reasons behind them. However, we might suggest that one underlying cause might be that the translator was working under less than ideal conditions. The editorial market has always been guided by profit and competition to get on the market first, which represent one of the leading principles, and therefore the work of translators is a negotiation between their loyalty to the source text and the publisher's 'translation policy'. In an essay about his own translations of Camilleri, in fact, Sartarelli (2004) admits to the pressures exerted upon his stylistic and linguistic choices by the editors of his translations. As a consequence, many of his discursive strategies are directly influenced by the translational norms of the editors and of the publisher.

On the other hand, the analysis of the semantic field of 'translation/translator' in the Italian corpus, instead, shows that Italian readers tended not to mention the translation or the translator in their reviews. This can be explained by the fact that Italians are more used to reading translated books from English than Americans or British people. As Fina (this volume) found in the LAF report (2010, p. 8), the English language accounted for almost 70% of the whole literature translation production in Italy over the 1990-2005 time span.

As a result, very few comments regarding Giovanni Arduino's translation were found. Some examples are shown below:

(17) "Un traduttore che non è Tullio Dobner". (A translator that is not Tullio Dobner).

(18) "Magari un piccolo cambiamento di stile lo si può trovare a causa della traduzione, poiché Wu Ming 1 (Tullio Dobner) lascia la penna a Giovanni Arduino". (A slight change of style can probably be found due to the translation, as Wu Ming 1 (Tullio Dobner) put the words in Giovanni Arduino's hands).

Interestingly, the Italian reviewers noticed that the translator Tullio Dobner was substituted by Giovanni Arduino, and that the different style of translation was evident. Also, although reviewers had no access to the original writing qualities of the authors, the analysis of the semantic field of 'author' (in Table 4) reveals that Italian reviewers tended to praise the writing qualities of Stephen King much more than American and British reviewers did with Camilleri.

Semantic fields of 'author'	USA	UK	ITALY
Andrea Camilleri	0.05%	0.10%	
Stephen King			45%

Table 4.
Number of comments referring to the authors Andrea Camilleri and Stephen King.

The table above shows that 45% of the Italian readers gave credit to the author of *Joyland*, as can be noted in examples (19) to (23), while forgetting the ability of a translator to recreate the words of a book.

(19) "[…] per esaltare la bravura di Stephen King che scrive veramente da Dio!... Il libro inoltre è scaturito dalla penna e dal genio di Stephen King". ([…] to praise Stephen King's skills, which writes very very well!...The book also flows from Stephen King's pen and brilliance).

(20) "King si conferma sempre un ottimo scrittore". (King always proves to be an excellent writer).

(21) "La narrazione del Re è sempre brillante e fluida". (The King's writing is always stellar and fluent).

(22) "King si cala perfettamente nella parte con una scrittura fresca, giovane e con un linguaggio davvero particolare". (King has really got into the part with a fresh, lively writing and a very peculiar language).

(23) "[…] esempio della incredibile capacità di King". ([…] example of King's incredible skills).

4. The semantic fields of 'style'

An important example of the different perceptions of the literary works among readers is also represented by the importance they attribute to the writing style. Interestingly, 83% of the Italian reviewers commented about the style used by Stephen King or his translator, while only 57% of the American and British readers commented on the writing style used by Camilleri or recreated by his translator. In addition, 62% of the British and 36% of the American reviewers evaluated the style positively. Some examples of these positive comments found in the UK and American corpora are shown below:

> (24) "It was well written and easy to follow." (UK_Corpus)
> (25) "I liked the pace of the writing." (UK_Corpus)
> (26) "Excellent writing." (UK_Corpus)
> (27) "An easy book to read. It is short, the story is told in an uncomplicated manner." (AM_Corpus)
> (28) "Well-written and plotted." (AM_Corpus)
> (29) "Easily readable." (AM_Corpus)

The American reviewers tended to leave more negative comments (63%), while only 38% of negative comments were found in the British corpus. Negative comments were related mainly to Montalbano's language when conducting investigations, including the convoluted Sicilian-like syntactic structure based upon a repetitive use of subordinate clauses following Camilleri's own use of free indirect speech to reproduce the inspector Montalbano's thoughts.

Examples (30) to (42) illustrate the words used by both American and British readers to describe the reason for their negative evaluation.

> (30) "I had to read the first chapter 3 times because I felt like I had to be missing something." (AM_Corpus)
> (31) "There were times when he clearly should have paused to indicate a shift from one situation to the next, and he didn't, which was momentarily confusing, as I had to reorient myself after realizing the scene had changed." (AM_Corpus)
> (32) "I had trouble getting into the book at first, but it picked up in the second half."(AM_Corpus)
> (33) "The writing style was confusing." (AM_Corpus)
> (34) "It took me a while to get into Camilleri's style of writing, but I came to like it in the end." (AM_Corpus)
> (35) "It was hard to get really into it the first few pages but afterward it was pretty good." (AM_Corpus)
> (36) "It took me a bit to get used to the long sentences […] the style came across odd to me." (AM_Corpus)

(37) "The book's main drawback is that the sentence structure is often extremely long and convoluted. The last sentence on the first page has 96 words in it, for example." (UK_Corpus)

(38) "Lots of unbelievably long sentences." (UK_Corpus)

(39) "The book seems to be continuous with no chapters (though there are gaps) and sentences running on for a whole page in some instances." (UK_Corpus)

(40) "At the start particularly there are some over-long sentences: at the end of page 5 there is one of over 100 words and the following sentence is 61 words long." (UK_Corpus)

(41) "I think I went through 2 pages without encountering a full stop or any other grammatical mark that may allow one to pause for breath." (UK_Corpus)

(42) "Some of the sentences in this translation are so awkward and convoluted." (UK_Corpus)

Positive and negative evaluations clearly convey the reviewer's subjectivity; however, one might relate the higher frequency of the American difficulty with reading to a well-noted difference between Italian, British and American preferred communication orientations. For example, Hall ([1976]1989) and Katan (2004) argue that the English culture is a Low Context Culture (with the American preferring even more Low Context than the British). The examples above confirm that Anglo-American people prefer a more synthetic and simplified writing style. This approach is popularly termed "KISS": keep it short and simple. Furthermore, as already pointed out by Katan (2004, p. 273), "An essential feature of the KISS principle is the sensitivity to information load", i.e. "the speed at which new information is introduced […]. Some languages introduce information slowly. Others use complicated noun phrases which allow for information to be introduced more rapidly" (Larson 1984, p. 438 in Katan 2004, p. 273). So, the use of long sentences and the rapid introduction to new information lead the Anglo-American (and in particular the American) readers to define Camilleri's (and his translator's) writing style as 'awkward' and 'confusing'.

As previously mentioned, 83% of the Italian reviewers focussed on the writing style used by Stephen King or his translator. The content analysis of the comments however revealed that Italian readers tended to be generic and did not include the detailed opinions that the Anglo-American reviewers did. The most frequent evaluative expressions are shown in examples (43) to (46):

(43) "Lettura molto scorrevole" (Very fluent writing)

(44) "Scritto bene, in maniera scorrevole" (Well-written, fluent writing)

(45) "Si legge bene, scorrevole" (Easy to read, fluent)

(46) "Prosa scorrevole" (Fluent writing)

5. The semantic fields of 'language'

Here we analysed reviewers' opinions regarding the language used in the two translations. In line with the comment in the previous section, Italian reviewers tended not to write detailed opinions regarding style or language. As a result, only 5 (out of 47) comments about the language used – a secret carnival lingo based on invented words and real slang, the Talk – were found, and are reported below:

> (47) "Condito dal solito fastidioso slang ammiccante pieno di pseudo-neologismi che forse costituiscono un problema per i traduttori ma nulla aggiungono alla narrazione." (Animated with the usual annoying and alluring slang full of pseudo-neologisms which maybe are a problem for translators and nothing add to the translation).
>
> (48) "A Joyland si utilizza un "gergo" particolare, un linguaggio che l'autore si è inventato di sana pianta (credo!). Temo che la traduzione pecchi un po', perché certi termini proprio non si possono sentire!!!!" (At Joyland they use a specific "lingo", a language which the author pulled out of the air (I guess!). I suspect the translation is a bit lacking because some terms should not be heard!!!!).
>
> (49) "Qui si diverte con "La Parlata", lo slang di chi lavora nel parco di divertimenti." (Here he has fun with "The Talk", the slang used by the people working in the amusement park).
>
> (50) "In Joyland King decide di calcare la mano al punto da inventarsi di sana pianta un gergo segreto (La Parlata) che chi lavora al parco divertimenti utilizza per non farsi capire." (In Joyland King decides to exaggerate and pulled a secret lingo (The Talk) out of the air, which people working at the amusement park use in order not to be understood).
>
> (51) "Proprio il linguaggio usato, lo stile scanzonato e rilassato e l'utilizzo del gergo sono riusciti a farmi calare nella narrazione facendomi leggere il libro molto velocemente e facendomelo apprezzare." (The language used, the easygoing style and the use of the lingo made me get into the story causing me to read the book quickly and appreciate it).

As can be seen below, the Anglo-American reviewers tended once again to be more detailed when sharing their opinions on these book recommendation websites. 43% and 54% of comments referring to the semantic field of 'language' were found in the American and British corpora respectively. More specifically, the expressions used to comment on specific linguistic aspects of the translation focussed on the presence of the high number of Italian names, Italianized Sicilian words, expressions, exclamations, idioms, names of typical Sicilian food, and last but not least on the sense of humour that runs throughout the book. For the majority of Anglo-American readers the Italian names were confusing and difficult to remember, as can be noted in examples (52) to (57):

(52) "Others may have difficulty with the long, unknown Italian names, or the characters and situations raised once, from which we never again hear." (AM_Corpus)

(53) "There are too many characters who are indistinguishable, and the geography and governmental structure of Sicily makes everything hard to follow." (AM_Corpus)

(54) "The names of people and places in Sicily may be a little overwhelming too at first, but don't give up! Read on!" (AM_Corpus)

(55) "It was a difficult book to read because I have a bad memory of names, so I will continue to watch the DVD's." (UK_Corpus)

(56) "The Italian names were confusing and difficult to attach to the characters and I repeatedly had to refer back to previous chapters in order to link names to events." (UK_Corpus)

(57) "[…] occasionally confused the similar-ish Italian names." (UK_Corpus)

Yet, though the Anglo-American readers had difficulty with the long Italian names, they appreciated the strong sense of place evoked by the extensive use of Italianized Sicilian terms and dialect, which add a certain foreignness to the narrative conveying the local flavour. This is evident in examples (58) to (70):

(58) "The book gives a very tangible sense of Sicily." (AM_Corpus)

(59) "I like the insights into Italian culture and the references to local cuisine and history." (AM_Corpus)

(60) "Camilleri evokes a strong sense of place here, there are rarely any distractions which get in the way of either the main plot or the characters." (AM_Corpus)

(61) "It had a lot of "flavor" of the locality." (AM_Corpus)

(62) "[…] with broad ethnic humor including well-rendered translations of local dialects that connote ignorance and peasantry." (AM_Corpus)

(63) "Apparently much of the dialogue in the original is very idiomatic and reflects much of the slang common to Sicily. Sartarelli has done a very good job keeping much of the dialogue quirky enough in English to convey some of the changes in dialect set out in the original." (AM_Corpus)

(64) "The use of language in translation gives accurate and wonderful insight into Sicilian attitudes to Italy and Italian attitudes in general." (UK_Corpus)

(65) "You can taste Sicily through the page." (UK_Corpus)

(66) "This, like all Montalbano novels give a great insight into real Italian life." (UK_Corpus)

(67) "The author's style [...] creates a great sense of place, although I've never visited Sicily myself." (UK_Corpus)

(68) "I think the translator has done a good job adding the Sicilian flavour to it." (UK_Corpus)

(69) "Comic Italian accents and dialects added for effect! Excellent." (UK_Corpus)

(70) "It must have been hell creating English style out of Camilleri's colloquialisms, but it's really worth the work." (UK_Corpus)

Clearly, the Anglo-American readers recognized Sartarelli's attempt to remain as close to Camilleri's language style as possible since the use of the Italianized Sicilian words and dialect constitutes an intrinsic part of his style.

Sartarelli also appears to convey a *dry*, *wry*, *subtle* humour in the book. Some examples are illustrated below:

(71) "There is a lot of subtle humor in the book." (UK_Corpus)
(72) "[…] with a vein of humour throughout." (UK_Corpus)
(73) "[…] with spots of humour throughout." (UK_Corpus)
(74) "[…] and there's a sarcastic sense of humor that floats in the background of this book." (AM_Corpus)
(75) "I liked the dry sense of humor that ran as an undercurrent to the violence of modern-day Sicily." (AM_Corpus)
(76) "A great mystery amply bolstered by subtle humor." (AM_Corpus)

3. Conclusions

In this paper we explored how actual readers evaluate a translated literary work by taking the language they used in online book reviews as a point of reference. Moreover, we investigated the readers' interpretation of the language and writing style in the translated text, which is the result of both a reaction to their expectations of the genre norm and their literary experience and cultural background.

Generally speaking, the American and British reviewers commented more on the stylistic and linguistic aspects of the translation itself than the Italians did because they found the language difficult. As a result, Anglo-American reviewers appreciated the detailed explanatory notes added by the translator at the end of the book with the aim of introducing them to the Italian socio-cultural and linguistic background. Furthermore, if the sense of humour had been conveyed, they found the presence of a high number of Italian names confusing and difficult to remember. In particular, the American readers defined the syntactic structure of the translated book as complex. On the other hand, Italian reviewers focussed more on the plot than on the style or the language used by the author or his translator. Very few comments on the translation itself were found. Conversely, they praised the writing qualities of the author.

Finally, the Italian reviewers tended not to write detailed opinions about stylistic and linguistic features of a translated book. This suggests that they did not notice the effort the translator made to be invisible or to adopt a domesticating method, which certainly helped the book become popular – but not the translator.

Bionote: Angela D'Egidio is a PhD in Intercultural Studies at the University of Salento, Italy, and a visiting postgraduate student at the University of Lancaster, UK. D'Egidio graduated with honours in Translation and Interpreting at the University of Salento, Italy, holds a Master's Degree in Literary and Technical Translation (University of Salento, Italy) and an M.A. in Technical and Specialised Translation (University of Westminster, London). Her research fields are related to corpus linguistics, semantic analysis, application of new language technologies, translation studies, with a special focus on the language of tourism in English and Italian.

References

Baker P., Gabrielatos C., Khossravinik M., Krzyzanowski M., Mcenery T. and Wodak R. 2008, *A useful methodological synergy? Combining critical discourse analysis and corpus linguistics to examine discourses of refugees and asylum seekers in the UK press*, in "Discourse and Society" 19 [3], pp. 273-306.

Chevalier J. and Mayzlin D. 2004, *The Effect of Word of Mouth on Sales: Online Book Reviews*, in "National Bureau of Economic Research", Cambridge, MA.

Hall E.T. 1989, *Beyond Culture*, New York, Doubleday.

Hall S. 1980, *Encoding/Decoding*, in Hall S., Hobson D., Lowe A. and Willis P. (eds.), *Culture, Media, Language: Working Papers in Cultural Studies*, *1972–79*, Unwin Hyman, Boston, pp. 128-38.

Holub R.C. 1984, *Reception Theory: A Critical Introduction*, Methuen, London/New York.

Jauss H.R. 1982, *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Katan D. 2004, *Translating Cultures* (2nd edition): *An Introduction for Translators, Interpreters and Mediators*, St. Jerome, Manchester.

Larson M. 1984, *Meaning Based Translation: A Guide to Cross-Language Equivalence*, University Press of America, Lanham MD.

Lin C.Y. and Chiu M.H.P. 2011, *Analyzing Online Book Reviews for Scientific Popularization Genre: A Genre Analysis Study*, in "Journal of Educational Media & Library Sciences" 48 [2], pp. 269-298.

Lin T.M.Y., Huang Y.K. and Yang W.I. 2007, *An experimental design approach to investigating the relationship between internet book reviews and purchase intention*, in "Library and Information Science Research" 29 [3], pp. 397-415.

Sartarelli S. 2004, *L'alterità linguistica di Camilleri in inglese*, in Buttitta A. (ed.), *Il caso Camilleri: letteratura e storia*, Sellerio, Palermo, pp. 213-219.

Venuti L. 1995, *The Translator's Invisibility. A History of Translation*, Routledge, London/New York.

Yun K.H. and Wen I.Y. 2010, *A study of internet book reviews and borrowing intention*, in "Library Review" 59 [7], pp. 512-521.

The Budapest Observatory (2010), *Publishing translations in Europe. Trends 1990-2005*, Wales, Literature Across Frontiers, Aberystwyth University. http://portal.unesco.org/culture/es/files/41748/13390726483Translation_trends_1990_2005_Dec_2010.pdf/Translation%2Btrends%2B1990_2005_Dec%2B2010.pdf (12.03.2014).