

08 translation interpreting
and transfer

beyond the
translator's invisibility
critical reflections
and new perspectives

peter j. freeth and rafael o. treviño (eds)

Beyond the translator's invisibility

Critical reflections and new perspectives

Edited by
Peter J. Freeth and Rafael Treviño

LEUVEN UNIVERSITY PRESS

With support of



CETRA - CENTRE FOR
TRANSLATION STUDIES

“Introduction” by Peter J. Freeth is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution CC BY NC ND 4.0 International license.



To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>
Introduction © 2024 by P.J. Freeth.

© 2024 by Leuven University Press / Presses Universitaires de Louvain / Universitaire Pers
Leuven. Minderbroedersstraat 4, B-3000 Leuven (Belgium).

All rights reserved. Except in those cases expressly determined by law, no part of this publica-
tion may be multiplied, saved in an automated datafile or made public in any way whatsoever
without the express prior written consent of the publishers.

ISBN 978 94 6270 398 8

e-ISBN 978 94 6166 545 4

D/2024/1869/5

<https://doi.org/10.11116/9789461665454>

NUR: 610

Cover: Daniel Benneworth-Gray

Typesetting: Crius Group



GPRC
Guaranteed
Peer Reviewed
Content
www.gprc.be

Table of Contents

Introduction <i>Peter J. Freeth</i>	7
--	---

Part I: The plurality of visibility

Visibilities of translation – Visibilities of translators: Reflections on the theoretical foundations of an opaque concept <i>Klaus Kaindl, translated by Peter J. Freeth</i>	31
--	----

Reconfiguring the translator's/translation's online and digital (in)visibility <i>Renée Desjardins</i>	49
---	----

Bringing in the translators' views on their (in)visibility: The forms and significance of visibility in research on translator status <i>Helle V. Dam & Minna Ruokonen</i>	73
---	----

Towards a sociological redressing of interpreters' (in)visibility <i>Deborah Giustini</i>	95
--	----

Part II: Visibilities of translators

The implications of translator celebrity: Investigating the commercial impact of Haruki Murakami's fame as a translator <i>Motoko Akashi</i>	119
---	-----

"Yes: I translated it!": Visibility and the performance of translatorship in the digital paratextual space <i>Peter J. Freeth</i>	147
--	-----

(In)visible networks of translation in a time of cultural evolution: The case of the TEDA translation grant program <i>Seyhan Bozkurt Jobanputra</i>	173
---	-----

Part III: Visibilities of translation

What the invisible reader has to say about the invisibility of translation: Studying translation reception in online reading communities <i>Gys-Walt van Egdom & Haidee Kotze</i>	203
Making translation visible: The translator-in-residence program at the British Library <i>Pardaad Chamsaz, Rachel Foss & Will René</i>	235
The (in)visibility of translation and translatorial agents in academic research <i>Esa Penttilä, Juha Lång, Juho Suokas, Erja Vottonen & Helka Riionheimo</i>	253
Contributors	279

Introduction*

Peter J. Freeth

The extent to which a translator's intervention in a translated text can, or even should, be visible has become an evergreen topic of discussion in translation studies. Indeed, a desire to trace or efface the voice of an individual translator among the polysemy of translated texts can be found throughout historical debates on the concept of translation; whether that be in terms of taking a word-for-word or sense-for-sense approach; prioritizing fidelity to the source or eschewing linguistic equivalence; or what Munday refers to as "the valorization of the foreign" (2016, 47) and the emphasizing of the Other inherent in the movement of texts between languages and cultures. The question of how much translators intervene in translated texts, and whether we want those interventions to be seen by the receivers of said translations, is a common thread throughout translation history.

Within contemporary translation studies, however, visibility is usually discussed in reference to the work of Lawrence Venuti, who first described "the translator's invisibility" in 1986 before his subsequent monograph popularized the concept (1995 [2008/2018]). In the popular monograph, Venuti argues that contemporary Anglophone audiences want to read "fluent" texts that present themselves as English-language originals (ibid., 1). Consequently, the production processes of literary translation efface the translator's labor to maintain an illusion of originality, thereby rendering the translator invisible. Venuti's solution, as outlined in his "call to action" (ibid., 307–313), is for translators to "resist" these practices through the development of a "foreignizing practice of translation" that is, "not just more self-conscious" of the "ethnocentric violence of translation," but "more self-critical" (ibid., 309–310). Given that Venuti's *The Translator's Invisibility* serves as "the closest thing to an academic bestseller the discipline has seen in its recent history" (Delabastita 2010, 125), whilst also drawing links to some of the discipline's most longstanding theoretical discussions, his conceptualization of the translator's invisibility has since become one of the most ubiquitous concepts in contemporary translation studies.

* "Introduction" by Peter J. Freeth is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution CC BY NC ND 4.0 International license. © 2024 by P.J. Freeth.



Despite the entrance of invisibility into “the core vocabulary of translation studies and translation criticism” since the publication of *The Translator’s Invisibility* (Delabastita 2010, 125), however, Venuti’s vision of the translator’s invisibility is one that has proven polemic in translation studies. Oft-cited criticisms of Venuti’s invisibility are levelled at his dogmatic approach to resistant translation strategies; the risk of over-simplistic binarism in dichotomies such as visibility-invisibility; and the limited scope of his historical approach.¹ As Pym (1996) first pointed out, for instance, the “Anglophone” world in which Venuti’s historical methodology is grounded seems to in fact pertain only to Britain and the US and so not only neglects non-English-speaking contexts, but also English speakers in other regions—particularly native English speakers in other areas such as the Global South. As demonstrated by work investigating translator invisibility in other cultural and linguistic contexts, such as Japan (Bilodeau 2013, Akashi 2018), the “situation” and “activity” of translators outside the Anglophone world can both mirror and challenge the dominant invisibility put forward by Venuti. Furthermore, Venuti’s historical narrative also proves problematic due to its “lack of a consistent methodology” (Hatim 1999, 201), the selectiveness of the case studies discussed throughout the book, and a limited focus on translations primarily into English that were published between the 17th and 20th centuries (Delabastita 2010, 129). Even as a history of translation, the resulting preference for invisible translators and translation in contemporary translation practice, as argued by Venuti, cannot be assumed outside of this narrow context. Moreover, given the widespread proliferation of new forms of digital and online media since the first publication of *The Translator’s Invisibility*, as well as the resulting connectedness of our globalized world, questions must be raised as to whether the conceptualization of the translator’s invisibility in the British and US literary systems put forward by Venuti remains an appropriate theoretical framework. Indeed, Venuti’s purely historical methodology means no assumptions can be made about the appropriateness or relevance of this approach or its findings within other contexts.

If Venuti’s vision of the translator’s invisibility is so limited in scope, then, we may be drawn to ask why the ideas put forward in *The Translator’s Invisibility* continue to dominate discussions on the topic. There are two primary answers to this question. The first becomes clear when we look outside the academic world, where debates on the invisibility of translators and the impact of this invisibility on working conditions, as well as calls for increased translator visibility that mirror Venuti’s own call to action, remain loud in the first years of the 2020s. Launching in the UK in 2021, for instance, the Society

1 See, Pym (1996), Hatim, (1999), Tymoczko (2000) and Delabastita (2010), for example.

of Authors' #*TranslatorsOnTheCover* campaign calls on British publishers to ensure that translators are “properly recognized, celebrated and rewarded,” and has prompted heated debates in the trade press (Charkin 2022, Wynne 2022), the mainstream British media (Croft 2021) and online. Furthermore, the case of the British Museum's failure to credit Yilin Wang as the translator of poems by the Chinese feminist poet Qiu Jin in their 2023 exhibition *China's Hidden Century*, let alone their failure to obtain permission from copyright holders to even include these poems in the first place, demonstrates the high stakes and high profile ways that literary translators continue to be rendered invisible in Anglophone contexts (for more, see Summers 2023). As demonstrated by Gameloc Gathering's #*TranslatorsInTheCredits* campaign (Wyndham 2022), however, such drives for greater recognition and remuneration are not just limited to the field of literary translation, but also spill out into areas such as video game localization, where entire teams of translators can often go uncredited despite the widespread commercial success of localized games. Thus, despite ardent criticism within translation studies discourse and a narrow focus on one particular historical context, the arguments put forward in *The Translator's Invisibility* remain relevant to contemporary translation practice both within, and far removed from, Venuti's own literary focus over a quarter of a century later.

The second answer to the question of why Venuti's invisibility continues to have such a strong foothold lies in the volume and variety of research stemming from the ideas put forward in *The Translator's Invisibility*. Venuti himself was keen to focus on visibility within translated texts, primarily through the use of resistant translation strategies that have a foreignizing effect on the target text. This has led to research into translator style (Baker 2000), voice and attitude (Hermans 1996, 2007), as well as empirical studies on the effects of different translation styles on reader comprehension (Liang 2008, Walker 2021). Others, however, were quick to point out that “the validation of the translator's voice as a legitimate interface in the translated text will only be truly able to start making a difference when visibility begins to be marked by the signature of his or her own authorial name” (Arrojo 1997). As such, scholarly attention has also been paid to what Koskinen refers to as “paratextual” visibility, that is, “translators' statements about their work outside or in the margins” of the literary text, and extratextual visibility, defined as “the social status of translation outside and beyond the immediate vicinity of the translated text” (2000, 99). For instance, investigations into the way translators are presented to readers on book covers (Alvstad 2014, Podlevskikh Carlström 2022) or their ability to discuss their work in prefaces and translator notes (McRae 2012, Norberg 2012) have demonstrated the various ways in which literary translators and their labor are presented to readers.

Reception-side studies have also demonstrated the ways in which readers, often professionals reviewing in the mainstream press or trade publications, discuss translators and translation (Vanderschelden 2000, Baer 2016). In both cases, researchers working in English-language and European contexts often find evidence in support of Venuti's invisibility, and so his argument that readers favor fluent, transparent translations has subsequently found its way into theories of translation by other scholars, such as Theo Herman's *The Conference of the Tongues* (2007, particularly 18–64).

The real value of translator visibility as a concept can most readily be seen, however, in work outside of Venuti's own historical, literary research context that has also made productive use of the concept. In digital contexts, for instance, Littau (1997/2010) and Coldiron (2012) have argued that the hypertextual nature of digital technology and a media culture that is open to the "visible alterity" (Coldiron 2012, 197) of presenting the Other in new contexts can reveal the translational labor inherent in digital literary texts and make the translator visible to readers. Indeed, there have even been recent calls to create a "blueprint of the main features" of Coldiron's "aesthetic of visibility" (2012) in another proposed edited volume on the topic of translator visibility (Cercel and Leal, 2022). Others have taken greater leaps away from Venuti's context and applied invisibility to additional translational practices, such as news translation. Bielsa and Bassnett (2008), for instance, discuss the visibility of translators within news organizations whilst Hong (2019) seeks to identify the paratextual spaces surrounding online news articles in which translators are, or could be, made visible. Research into translator invisibility has even gone beyond written translation, with work in audio-visual translation demonstrating the various strategies used to achieve and limitations on the visibility of subtitlers within both professional and fan-subbing contexts (such as Pederson 2011, and Zhang and Mao 2013, respectively, see also Huang 2021, 47–49) while scholars such as Baker (2010) and Ellicessor (2015) have discussed the implications of the interpreter's visibility in both spoken- and sign-language contexts.

What both this brief overview of the wide varieties of research contexts in which translator invisibility has been discussed and its continued real-world relevance across a variety of translational practices demonstrate, therefore, is an urgent need for further development and diversification of invisibility and its corollary visibility both as theoretical terms and operationalizable analytical tools. The varied contributions in this volume therefore seek to take this step by presenting new interdisciplinary ways of understanding translator visibility whilst simultaneously demonstrating the value of these innovations across a diverse range of subfields within translation studies and interpreting studies. Where these authors discuss the visibility of translation

and translators, then, they include translational practices and agents spanning interpreting, business translation, machine translation, literary translation and academic translation, among others, thereby reflecting the widespread take up of invisibility across translation and interpreting studies.

The plurality of visibility

In seeking to go beyond the translator's invisibility, the approaches found within this volume focus on three core themes that are manifested in its tripartite structure: *the plurality of visibility*, *the visibilities of translators*, and *the visibilities of translation*. In the first section, *The plurality of visibility*, we move away from the assumed position of invisibility as the status quo as argued by Venuti, and the associated argument in favor of its corollary visibility, to instead theorize and recognize the plurality of potential visibilities within a given context—including invisibility. Movements towards taking such steps and developing more nuanced understandings of the ways translators and translation are recognized and presented can be seen in recent spatial and relational conceptualizations of (in)visibility. Drawing on a definition of visibility from sociologist Andrea Brighenti, for instance, Boyi Huang describes a “spectrum” of visibility (2021) in which visibility is understood “as a relational, strategic, and processual feature of social life” (Brighenti 2007a). As such, he argues that different subtitlers working in different contexts, such as professionals or fan-subbers, can achieve different forms of visibility, which therefore “complicate[s] the subtitler visibility spectrum” and problematiz[es] dichotomized definitions of subtitler visibility” (Huang 2021, 64). Similarly, in my own work I have described visibility as a “continuum” that spans the complete absence of any reference to translators or translation, to translators actively participating and making themselves and their labor visible to audiences (Freeth 2022). Such conceptualizations, however, are grounded in their own specific contexts—in the case of Huang (2021) and Freeth (2022), these are subtitling and contemporary literary translation respectively. As such, much work remains to be done on potential ways to add nuance to the space between visibility and invisibility and the multifaceted ways in which this (in)visibility may be manifested in other contexts.

The four chapters comprising section one of this volume seek to add such nuance to theoretical understandings of visibility and empirical applications thereof. **Klaus Kaindl** begins by suggesting the antidote to typically one-dimensional understandings of invisibility within translation studies lies in drawing on work from other disciplines. Within Kaindl's discussion, this

interdisciplinarity stems primarily from philosophy and sociology. In the case of the former, Kaindl draws on the work of Axel Honneth (2003) to remind us of the difference between “cognizing” and “recognizing” translation, which in turn refer to consciously perceiving when a text is a translation and the expressive act of affirming this perception. In other words, not only must visibility be understood as something we perceive, but also something that we can construct. Consequently, Kaindl reminds us that the assumed “imperative of visibility” (Holert 2002, 200) in translation studies must be called into question, particularly in digital and online contexts where the social power to construct visibility can easily fall outside of the translator’s control. As such, it is towards the second interdisciplinary intervention suggested by Kaindl, the sociology of Andrea Brighenti (2007b), that we must turn to fully understand visibility as a dynamic relationship of social power. Harkening back to the work of André Lefevere, Kaindl’s suggestion is that we see the poetics of translations on one side and the politics of translation on the other, with the way in which the foreignness of the source text is understood and reproduced serving as the point of intersection between the two. It is then at this intersection where visibility and invisibility are achieved. In taking this approach, Kaindl argues that visibility becomes a fully-fledged analytical instrument that can then be observed in four distinct dimensions: textual visibility, media visibility, social visibility and academic visibility. These four dimensions should not, however, be seen in isolation, rather they interact within a system of visibility that emerges from the performative act of translation itself.

In Chapter 2, **Renée Desjardins** then develops Kaindl’s brief discussion of digital and online visibility to examine the ways in which new digital technologies and online platforms challenge existing conceptualizations of translator visibility. Pointing out that previous research has typically focused on the visibility-invisibility dichotomy, Desjardins gives four key examples of how digital and online spaces reconfigure the “visibilities” of translation and translators, coming to the conclusion that the former constitutes a central process and product in online spaces yet the latter, human dimension is increasingly invisibilized. Her first example pertains to the rise in popularity of subtitled and dubbed audio-visual content on streaming platforms such as Netflix. In the cases of *Tidying Up With Marie Kondo* and *Squid Game*, Desjardins argues that not only does the success of these shows attain visibility for their status as translated products, but the online social media discussion surrounding the success of the translated products made their status as translations visible, whilst also providing insight into the way lay audiences perceive translation. What’s more, Desjardins points out that coverage of these online debates and posts by academics working within the field of

audiovisual translation resulted in further online conversation and so raises the question of how we might include the concept of online virality into a “spectrum” of visibility (Huang 2021).

Desjardin’s second example then turns to the ubiquity and visibility of machine translation on social media. On Instagram, for instance, the “see translation” function is made available to users for almost all multilingual accounts on the platform and automatically translates written content into the language in which users access the application. Whilst this visibilizes translation processes to the general public and linguistically democratizes social media spaces, Desjardins leads us to question the purpose of such functions on social media platforms. Keeping users frictionlessly accessing content regardless of language retains their attention within a given platform, thereby presenting further opportunities for monetization, yet presents translation as an instant, automated process independent of human intervention. To what extent, then, is this visibility beneficial to the profession of translation? Similar questions are later raised in terms of smartphone applications that allow instant translation and are built into devices such as Apple’s iPhone. Desjardins notes that while such applications grant visibility to the process of translation, a lack of machine translation literacy in the general public similarly poses risks when automatic machine translation is used in contexts for which it is ill-suited.

The final example discussed by Desjardins pertains to the opportunities that online platforms such as LinkedIn offer professional translators to make themselves and their skills more visible and discoverable. Where the human elements of translators, such as their appearance and background, often remain invisible in traditional print contexts in favor of an author’s image or biography, social media profiles provide a space for translators to make these aspects of themselves visible to the public and their clients. While the desirability of this visibility remains an avenue for further research, comparing this chapter with Desjardins’ earlier work indicates that social networking sites remaining increasingly important to professional translators and so pose a key site of potential visibility going forward.

Helle V. Dam and **Minna Ruokonen** continue discussions of how professional translators are made visible, as well as the desirability of this visibility, by drawing links between visibility and research into the status of translators. Their theoretical framework builds on Koskinen’s distinction between textual, paratextual and extratextual visibility (2000, 99). However, rather than focusing on how translators are made visible in translated products and the materials that surround them as done in both Venuti’s and Koskinen’s work, Dam and Ruokonen present a sociological approach that accounts for what they define as *beyond-textual* visibility. With this term, the authors develop

existing approaches by incorporating the *physical*, *professional*, and more general *societal* visibility of translators, with the evidence for their value then coming from an extensive review of interview- and survey-based literature within status research. Notably, their review finds that the physical visibility of translators remains low regardless of whether they work within large institutions that rely heavily on translation and multilingual communication, such as the European Union, or remotely from home offices. This low physical visibility does not, however, equate to low professional visibility, which Dam and Ruokonen define as the translators' "salience" and "connectedness at work." As indicated by Desjardins' discussion of LinkedIn, the reasons for this may stem from translators' involvements in (online) professional networks or professional associations. In cases where freelancers may typically be seen as working in isolation, contact with clients and agencies can still generate this professional visibility, whilst the collegial networks surrounding in-house translators present such opportunities when direct access to clients may not be possible. Dam and Ruokonen note an interesting correlation between professional visibility, in particular being known and recognized by service users, and job satisfaction that transcends physical/digital divides, thereby indicating a complicated relationship between physical and professional visibility. The final element, societal visibility, pertains to the status of translators in society more broadly. Although less research has been conducted in this area, Dam and Ruokonen conclude that translators themselves ascribe a low level of societal visibility to themselves and the profession, even when said translators have an otherwise high status within their own professional circles.

Echoing concerns raised by Desjardins, Dam and Ruokonen then conclude their chapter with a discussion of how desirable visibility is for translators. Where Venuti argues in favor of visibility, going so far as to write his "call to action" for translators to take up, the literature review presented here indicates that for many translators working in non-literary contexts, textual or paratextual visibility is not possible, whilst physical and societal visibility remain low priorities. Translators in the studies reviewed here instead prioritize creativity and a sense of meaningfulness in their work, alongside good working relationships with clients and/or colleagues. As such, it is the professional aspect of Dam and Ruokonen's beyond-textual visibility that translators desire the most. The authors then suggest that the key to achieving this visibility lies in professional networking and proficiency, thereby returning the agency for achieving visibility back to translators themselves.

To conclude section one, **Deborah Giustini** presents a sociological redressing of the invisibility of interpreters. Early conceptualizations of the interpreter's role positioned them as a conduit, or passive channel through

which the meaning of service users' utterances is communicated without interference. Giustini notes the work done to challenge this notion within interpreting studies, citing in particular the work of sociological scholars who have demonstrated the participatory roles played by interpreters within the communicative events that they interpret. While this movement has led some to argue that (in)visibility has limited use as a concept within interpreting studies, such as Ozolins (2016), Giustini argues that integrating concepts from the sociology of work can still provide key insights into the way interpreters and their labor are made visible. Scholars working on the visibility of work have noted how knowledge, tasks and practices not typically understood as work are often invisibilized (e.g. Star and Strauss 1999), with administrative tasks often falling into such categories due to a lack of recognition of their value. Consequently, Giustini draws on the work of Erin Hatton (2007) to describe the *sociocultural*, *sociolegal*, and *sociospatial* mechanisms through which interpreters' labor, and so interpreters themselves, are rendered invisible.

In the case of the sociocultural mechanisms, these can be seen most prominently in the devaluing of labor due to an expectation that the necessary skills are inherent within the individual, rather than developed competencies. The language skills necessary to interpret effectively prove an apt example, whereby the immaterial labor of language acquisition and proficiency is hidden behind the status of currently being bi- or multilingual. Furthermore, the interpreting skills that make multilingual communication appear effortless invisibilize the years spent developing linguistic, intercultural and communicative expertise. Indeed, Giustini argues that this performative excellence is not only a by-product of successful interpreting, but rather is mandated by the professional codes of conduct that govern the profession. Such codes of conduct are typically deemed necessary, however, due to a lack of sociolegal recognition and accreditation across the globe. In many cases, anyone can become a freelance interpreter without a standardized professional profile or educational background. The status of many interpreters as freelancers further demonstrates the sociolegal mechanism of invisibility, as it leads to a lack of industry regulation and increased precarity within the profession, whereby many are reliant on others (such as agencies) to secure regular work. Finally, the sociospatial mechanism refers to the disassociation of interpreters from the socially constructed workplace. Interpreters instead work in non-traditional sites, such as hospitals and prisons, or may even be disembodied from the communicative event through their segregation into booths at conferences or through remote, online access. This results in interpreters performing labor that is both "ubiquitous and yet concealed" (Rabelo and Mahalingam 2019).

Thus, by introducing concepts from the sociology of work into interpreting studies, Giustini finds that the sociocultural, sociolegal, and sociospatial mechanisms that govern the interpreter's labor are as relevant to discussions of the visibility of interpreters as their role within the communicative act.

A criticism levelled at *The Translator's Invisibility* by Delabastita (2010) is that it is "overly adaptable," resulting in "so much interpretive leeway that the precision of the concepts suffers" (2010, 131–132). The four chapters in this first section seek to remedy this by adding nuance to the various forms of visibility that can be achieved across a variety of translational contexts. Furthermore, the diverse contexts used to support these theoretical discussions demonstrate the multifaceted and multidimensional nature of visibility, to borrow terms from Kaindl's chapter. It would be naïve to assume that the visibilities available to literary translators are the same as business translators or interpreters due to the very different contexts and modalities in which they work. However, as demonstrated through the discussions in this section, underlying questions of status, recognition and remuneration are relevant across all these contexts. Furthermore, the increasing ubiquity of translated texts in both digital and analogue contexts is giving more visibility to some aspects of translation, and so the need for new conceptualizations that can account for these new technological and societal developments is becoming increasingly urgent. The visibilities discussed here, then, serve not to reinforce the over adaptability of visibility as a concept, but rather provide necessary nuance and diversification to the ways in which we frame and understand discussions of visibility across translation and interpreting studies.

Visibilities of translators

After presenting various frameworks through which to conceptualize and investigate visibilities, section two of this volume, *Visibilities of translators*, then puts the translator firmly in its focus. Notably, we have chosen to differentiate between the visibilities of translators and translation within the structure of this book. Such a move not only reflects the arguments made by the authors in section one of this volume, but also mirrors efforts to humanize translation studies by putting the focus more squarely on the point of contact between source and target text, the translator, rather than on the texts themselves. Early calls for this came from scholars such as Hu (2004), Pym (2009) and Chesterman (2009), with the latter going so far as to riff on Holmes' famous mapping of translation studies to define "the name and nature of translator studies." Yet within visibility focused research, manifestations of

the translator's visibility in the target texts they produce and the materials surrounding said texts dominate, rather than accounts that focus on the translator's actions and agency.² Indeed, despite the centrality of the translator in the title of Venuti's monograph, it is on translation strategies and reception that even he primarily focuses. The authors in this section, therefore, seek to redress this through a specific focus on the agents responsible for translation.

Motoko Akashi brings a celebrity studies approach into discussions of translator visibility with a case study of two Japanese publishing imprints associated with Haruki Murakami. In literary contexts, the transformation of a famous author into a celebrity stems from the cultivation of an authorial brand, whereby their personality and reputation are leveraged as marketing tools to garner interest and increase confidence within a product. Within this chapter, Akashi demonstrates how Murakami's personality and reputation are leveraged in such a way, thereby pushing him beyond a simply visible translator and into the realm of a celebrity. The evidence for this comes from the paratextual materials created by two imprints with which Murakami is associated. Through paratextual analysis, Akashi reveals how Murakami's name and experience as both an author and translator are frequently leveraged to endorse the quality of the translations published within both imprints. In the case of one, the *Haruki Murakami Translation Library*, even the imprint's name creates a personal brand surrounding Murakami and his translation practice. The second case discussed by Akashi, the *Murakami Shibata House of Translation*, presents a more complex situation, however, as both Murakami and fellow translator Motoyuki Shibata's personal brands are leveraged within the paratextual space. Notably, Akashi finds a hierarchy of visibility in which Murakami's celebrity renders him visible in many of the imprint's paratextual spaces, even when the translations were completed by others. Shibata then comes below Murakami within this hierarchy, as his reputation and personality are typically only leveraged in conjunction with Murakami's. Finally, the other translators whose works have been published by the imprint then come at the bottom, with Murakami and Shibata as the two series editors serving as the most visible figures within both the books covers and webpages created by the publishers. Akashi's findings pose interesting practical and ethical questions relating to the potential advantages and disadvantages of pushing translator visibility into celebrity. For instance, if Murakami's celebrity renders other translators invisible, then is such celebrity the kind of visibility translators should be striving for? One thing that is clear from Akashi's chapter, however, is

2 This can be seen most keenly in work investigating translator style (Baker 2000) and voice (Hermans 1996). For a more recent example, see Ponomareva's doctoral dissertation (2018).

that the assumption that translators cannot achieve a level of fame or celebrity to generate interest from readers within an Anglophone context most certainly does not ring true in Murakami's Japanese context.

Peter J. Freeth then continues discussions of how translators are made visible by others, such as publishing houses, in comparison to their own ability to achieve visibility in chapter six. Freeth returns to a European context with a case study of German-to-English translator Jamie Bulloch but focuses specifically on the opportunities for translators to perform their own translatorship and render themselves visible in digital spaces. Freeth's focus on the digital space combines the paratextual and extratextual visibility discussed by Koskinen (2000) with contemporary understandings of paratextuality (such as Batchelor 2018 and Freeth 2023), thereby modernizing the scope of paratextual visibility in line with contemporary online and digital culture. Following this, he then draws on the "performance of authorship" discussed in literary studies and book history (see Murray 2018) to investigate the ways in which translators embody and perform their translatorship to readers and audiences. To do so, Freeth analyses this performance in relation to two of Bulloch's translations, *Look Who's Back* and *The Hungry and the Fat*, with examples taken from both digital and non-digital spaces. In the case of the non-digital spaces, which are the codices for the two novels and live events alongside author Timur Vermes, Freeth finds that Bulloch's ability to perform his translatorship is limited by the fact that these spaces are controlled by other agents, namely publisher MacLehose Press, whose control over the design of the codex and booking of promotional events results in Bulloch's adherence to publishing policies that do not promote translator visibility. In the digital space, Freeth finds that publisher-controlled spaces remain sites of low visibility for Bulloch, even though such online content is not limited in length or scope in the same way as materials found within a book. Where Bulloch can perform his translatorship and make himself visible, however, is on social media, where he uses his own account to promote his work and interact with readers. As such, Freeth argues that digital spaces do offer unique opportunities for translators to perform their translatorship and so achieve visibility outside the control of other agents, such as publishers. However, he also reminds us that such work is not only labor intensive, but can also rely on a translator's existing access to resources and social networks. As such, the online visibility achieved by Bulloch in these cases cannot be understood as a possibility for every translator.

Seyhan Bozkurt Jobanputra's chapter then provides a broader perspective by presenting findings from an interview-based study with a group of translators, authors and literary agents involved in the Turkish government's *Translation and Publication Grant Program* (TEDA). Bozkurt Jobanputra uses

Actor-Network Theory as an analytical framework through which to trace the professional networks that emerged during the program to assess the ways in which translators made themselves visible and were made visible by other stakeholders. In doing so, she argues that professional activities that both precede and follow the translation process are central to the translator's ability to generate professional visibility. Evidence for this comes directly from her qualitative interviews, in which participants described the invaluable role of translators in pitching titles to publishers and applying for funding, with some participants noting that without translators' proactive labor in finding publishers, the translations would never have been completed. However, as discussed by Giustini in terms of interpreting, much of this labor and the vital role played by translators in the movement of texts between literary systems remains invisible. At the other end of the publishing process, Bozkurt Jobanputra's study also emphasizes the vital role played by translators in promoting their work at live events after publication. As in Freeth's previous chapter, she finds that this post-publication process increases the translators' visibility within their professional networks and that authors are typically happy to share visibility and recognition with their translators, given that the latter are responsible for the existence of a text in another language. What's more, translators who participated in the study also reported feeling that their visibility was second only to that of the authors, whereas other agents involved in the process were deemed less visible. Echoing Jansen and Wegener's definition of "multiple translatorship" (2013), then, Bozkurt Jobanputra demonstrates the need to contextualize literary translator visibility both within the broader publishing processes in which it is situated, and in relation to other agents involved in those processes. She also echoes calls from others in this volume, such as Dam and Ruokonen, to refocus our discussions of visibility on aspects beyond translated texts themselves, with particular reference to sociological approaches and the concept of professional visibility.

One element that ties the three chapters in this section together is their focus on the visibilities of translators in literary contexts, which may initially seem to limit their scope in a similar vein to Venuti's own, primarily literary history of translation. What is notable throughout these three chapters, however, is how the interdisciplinary approaches utilized draw parallels to the theoretical conceptualizations and typologies of visibility discussed in section one of this volume. In the case of the Haruki Murakami imprints discussed by Akashi, for instance, his status and visibility as a celebrity translator can be understood as generating societal visibility, in Dam and Ruokonen's terms, for both the practice of literary translation and other practitioners thereof. Freeth's study of how translator Jamie Bulloch performs his translatorship

on Twitter can similarly be linked to Desjardins' argument that social media serves as a site where discussion of popular translated products can increase the visibility of both translators and translation, whilst also demonstrating what Kaindl describes as media visibility. Finally, the sociologically informed approach taken by Bozkurt Jobanputra explicitly acknowledges the significance of professional visibility in ensuring literary translators continue to work, a form of visibility noted for its desirability in non-literary contexts by Dam and Ruokonen, whilst her analysis of the invisible labor of literary translators that precedes and extends beyond the translation process harkens to Giustini's discussion of invisible labor in the interpreting field. As such, the research contexts and case studies discussed here demonstrate the value of the more nuanced and diversified understandings of visibility put forward in section one, despite the literary focus of these three chapters.

Visibilities of translation

In the final section of this volume, the focus then shifts to the visibility of translation as a process of textual creation, rather than agents responsible for this process. The need to distinguish between the visibility of the translator as an individual agent involved in the production of the text and the visibility of translation as a process has already been noted by scholars working in literary contexts, such as Baer (2016) and Freeth (2022). However, within research on the visibility of translation, the focus has typically remained on translation strategies and a translator's ability to account for their decisions within paratextual and extratextual materials, rather than on the ways textual receivers perceive and discuss the translated-ness of the products they consume. As shown by the authors of the following three chapters, understanding the way receivers perceive the translated nature of the texts they consume not only serves as a potential solution to the invisibilization of translational labor noted by other contributors in this volume (such as Giustini and Bozkurt Jobanputra), but also incites interesting discussions surrounding the ways translation is understood more broadly, particularly outside of the academy or profession.

Gys-Walt van Egdom and **Haidee Kotze** begin this section with their chapter investigating the way lay-readers discuss and understand translation in online reading communities. The need for empirical evidence to challenge or confirm the argument that readers demand fluent translations that present themselves as originals has been a frequent criticism of Venuti's work and so van Egdom and Kotze's chapter takes up this call. Once again, the digital space

provides an opportunity for such research and the authors present findings gleaned from the *Digital Opinions on Translated Literature* (DIOPTRA-L) database, which contains thousands of reviews for several translated texts posted to online bookish community site GoodReads. Through a mixed-methods approach, van Egdom and Kotze not only reveal the ways in which users from different cultural backgrounds discuss and frame the translated nature of *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone* and the Dutch novel *Het diner* in their online reviews, they also use distant reading methodologies developed in the digital humanities to reveal the overall attitudes to translation across their entire corpus. Notably, the authors find that translation is largely invisible within the alpha version of the DIOPTRA-L corpus, thereby providing empirical evidence for Venuti's hypothesis. Where translation was made visible within their corpus, van Egdom and Kotze find that this can correlate both to negative appraisals of the novels, for which translation may be used as a scapegoat for a reader's disliking of a book, and within the positive framing of the consecratory power of translation. This points to the complex and even contradictory ways in which different readers may understand translational processes, labor and products. As such, van Egdom and Kotze caution against generalization from their findings, not least due to the limited size of their dataset in what was the alpha version of the DIOPTRA-L database. Nevertheless, their findings indicate the value of such quantitative and digital methodologies in developing our understanding of visibility and encourage further research to continue the development of such tools and analytical frameworks in the future.

Pardaad Chamsaz, Rachel Foss and Will René then present a critical reflection on the ways in which the British Library's translator-in-residence program has made both translation and the multilingual nature of the library's collections visible. Thus far, two translators have completed residencies at the Library and, as the authors point out, a key part of their work has been exploring and defining what this role can entail. What both translators, Jen Calleja and Rahul Bery, found during their residencies was that multilingualism lay at the heart of much of the British Library's work and collections, yet the translation that facilitates this multilingualism often remains invisible. Chamsaz, Foss and René are keen to argue, however, that within the context of cultural institutions such as the British Library, the visibilization of the translation at the heart of their collections results in difficult ethical discussions as to the colonial past upon which the very institution is built. The act of translation within the multilingual institution, therefore, serves to make its colonial legacy visible to visitors and staff, and demonstrates the need for further self-reflection from translators as they play a significant role in making

the marginalized and invisibilized Other seen within cultural systems built on historical oppression.

According to Chamsaz, Foss and René, the primary way in which Calleja and Bery achieved visibility during their residences lay in the extratextual, whether that be by engaging the public in practical exercises and exhibitions that challenged understandings of what translation can be; through embedding themselves within the Library's existing collections, staff and premises; or creating a platform for translators to perform their visibility at live events. Such activities not only drew attention to multilingualism in contemporary Britain, but also the historic linguistic diversity of the British Isles and the linguistic variations found in different cultural communities, such as the gay community. Consequently, the authors' account of the translator-in-residence program reveals the entanglement of translation with everyday processes, thereby making the translation of intercultural and interlinguistic difference a positive talking point through which to better reflect on our own identities. As they note in their conclusion, however, the role of the translator in residence within cultural institutions is still relatively unknown. As such, much work remains to be done to define how such programs can continue to visibilize the multilingual and translational heart of cultural and heritage institutions so as to most productively benefit the communities they represent and serve whilst acknowledging their difficult historical legacies.

The final chapter in the volume comes from **Esa Penttilä, Juha Lång, Juho Suokas, Erja Vottonen and Helka Riionheimo**, whose research into the translation skills of multilingual researchers demonstrates the need for us to reflect on the translational processes that allow academic knowledge to be generated and spread internationally. As with the previous chapter, Penttilä et al.'s findings are coupled with critical self-reflection, this time focusing on the translational processes involved in writing this very chapter. The authors' main argument is that a variety of multilingual practices underpin contemporary research processes, particularly in collaborative and international contexts, and so translation is more common and necessary than scholars often acknowledge due to its position as invisible labor (thereby drawing links back to Giustini's earlier chapter). To gain a better understanding of the translational practices that underpin academic work, Penttilä et al. call for a focus on *research translatoriality*, a term which draws on Kolehmainen et al. (2015) and Koskinen (2020) and expands their focus beyond prototypical written translation.

To begin charting all the labor involved in research translatoriality, Penttilä et al. draw on findings from questionnaires completed by academics at the University of Eastern Finland, materials from a translation course aimed

at PhD students, and their own practice when working on this chapter. In doing so, they find forms of research translatoriality can occur from the initial planning stages of a research project and data collection, all the way through to data analysis, reporting research findings and reporting to funders. In some cases, this stems from the international nature of many contemporary research projects and the position of English as an academic lingua franca, whereby collaborators and participants may work in a second or third language to conduct research across linguistic and cultural borders. In others, the need for publications in English or the use of English by national and international funding bodies necessitates that researchers translate their work even when their projects are intrinsically monolingual. Notably, as the authors go on to demonstrate through the qualitative analysis of questionnaire data, researchers may often be the ones responsible for completing this translatorial labor, even if they are not the best equipped to do so or if this work goes unrecognized, either in terms of professional development or financial remuneration. The solution, according to Penttillä et al., is for translation to be understood as a key skill in a researcher's toolkit regardless of the discipline in which they work, thereby necessitating the development of pedagogical intervention within PhD programs to ensure the next generation of researchers are properly equipped to undertake the translatorial labor that will underpin much of their research careers.

Within the final section of this volume, then, we are reminded by all three chapters of the ubiquity of translational activities across all levels of society. Whether academics discussing research findings, lay readers reflecting on the books they read in their spare time, or within major cultural institutions, translation can be found throughout the contemporary, globalized world. In many cases, however, these translational practices remain invisible, both in terms of how we understand our own interactions with our multilingual world and how translated products are interacted with and perceived. Thus, if we understand translators and translation as two sides of a coin, linked through the act and labor of translating, it is the recognition and understanding of this labor that renders both translation and translators visible.

In putting out the call for this volume and seeing the huge variety of possible perspectives and frameworks through which to understand, operationalize and analyze visibility, it became clear to us that much work remains to be done in terms of understanding how translators and translation are presented to the world that receives them. While invisibility has become a key term in translation studies since Venuti's work in 1980s and 90s, however, we feel that development of the concept, particularly in terms of theoretical work, has stagnated and remained entrenched in assumptions based on his historical,

Anglocentric approach. Thus, given the continued relevance of the concept in professional and public debates on translation and interpreting, this currently feels like wasted potential. The multifaceted approaches suggested and utilized by the authors in this volume therefore seek to diversify the concept of visibility within our field and reignite research into the ways translation and translators are, can, or even should be made visible. Indeed, from sociological and historical approaches, to quantitative, digital humanities and social media research, the interdisciplinarity of the contributions in this book demonstrates the many stones still left unturned within visibility research in translation studies. We therefore hope that readers working both across our field and beyond see the continued relevance of the questions raised in this volume and we look forward to seeing further nuance and diversification within discussions of translator visibility in the coming years.

References

- Akashi, Motoko. 2018. "Translator Celebrity: Investigating Haruki Murakami's Visibility as a Translator." *Celebrity Studies* 9, no. 2: 271–278.
- Alvstad, Cecilia. 2014. "The Translation Pact." *Language and Literature: International Journal of Stylistics* 23, no. 3: 270–284.
- Arrojo, Rosemary. 1997. "The 'Death' of the Author and the Limits of the Translator's Visibility." In *Translation as Intercultural Communication: Selected Papers from the EST Congress, Prague 1995*, edited by Marty Snell-Hornby, Zuzana Jettmarová and Klaus Kaindl, 21–32. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Baer, Brian. 2016. "Translation Criticism in Newspaper Reviews: The Rise of Readability." In *Authorizing Translation*. Edited by Michelle Woods, 12–31. Abingdon and New York: Routledge.
- Baker, Mona. 2000. "Towards a Methodology for Investigating the Style of a Literary Translator." *Target* 12, no. 2: 241–266.
- . 2010. "Interpreters and Translators in the War Zone: Narrated and Narrators." *The Translator* 16 (2): 197–222.
- Batchelor, Kathryn. 2018. *Translation and Paratexts*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Bielsa, Esperança and Susan Bassnett. 2008. *Translation in Global News*. London: Routledge.
- Bilodeau, Isabelle. 2013. "Discursive Visibility: Quantifying the Practice of Translator Commentary in Contemporary Japanese Publishing." In *Emerging Research in Translation Studies: Selected Papers of the CETRA Research Summer School 2012*. Edited by Gabriel González Núñez, Yasmine Khaled and Tanya Voinova. Ant-

- werp: CETRA, University of Leuven. <https://www.arts.kuleuven.be/cetra/papers/files/bilodeau>
- Brighenti, Andrea. 2007a. "Visibility." In *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology*, edited by George Ritzer. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405165518.wbeosv021>
- . 2007b. "Visibility. A Category for the Social Sciences." *Current Sociology* 55, no. 3: 323–342.
- Charkin, Richard. 2022. "Richard Charkin: A Publisher on the Translators' Debate." Accessed December 15, 2022. <https://publishingperspectives.com/2022/06/richard-charkin-a-publisher-on-the-translators-debate/>
- Cercel, Larisa and Alice Leal. 2022. "The Translator's Visibility (edited by Larisa Cercel and Alice Leal): Call for Chapters." *Alice Leal*. <https://www.aliceleal.com/call-for-papers>
- Chesterman, Andrew. 2009. "The Name and Nature of Translator Studies." *Hermes* 42: 13–22.
- Coldiron, A. E. B. 2012. "Visibility Now: Historicizing Foreign Presences in Translation." *Translation Studies* 5, no. 2: 189–200.
- Croft, Jennifer. 2021. "Why Translators Should Be Named on Book Covers." *The Guardian*, September 10, 2021. Accessed December 15, 2022. <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2021/sep/10/why-translators-should-be-named-on-book-covers>
- Delabastita, Dirk. 2010. "Histories and Utopias: On Venuti's *The Translator's Invisibility*." *The Translator* 16, no. 1: 125–134.
- Ellessor, Elizabeth. 2015. "Is There a Sign for That? Media, American Sign Language Interpretation, and the Paradox of Visibility." *Perspectives* 23 (4): 586–598.
- Freeth, Peter J. 2022. "Beyond Invisibility: The Position and Role of the Literary Translator in the Digital Paratextual Space." PhD diss., University of Leeds. <https://etheses.whiterose.ac.uk/30818/>
- . 2023. "Between Consciously Crafted and the Vastness of Context: Collateral Paratextuality and its Implications for Translation Studies." *Translation Studies* 16, no. 3. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14781700.2023.2194882>
- Hatim, Basil. 1999. "Implications of Research into Translator Invisibility." *Target* 11, no. 2: 201–222.
- Hatton, Erin. 2017. "Mechanisms of Invisibility: Rethinking the Concept of Invisible Work." *Work, Employment and Society* 31, no. 2: 336–351.
- Hermans, Theo. 1996. "The Translator's Voice in Translated Narrative." *Target* 8, no. 1: 23–48.
- . 2007. *The Conference of the Tongues*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Holert, Tom. 2002. "Evidenz-Effekte. Überzeugungsarbeit in der visuellen Kultur der Gegenwart" [Evidence effects: Persuasion in contemporary visual culture]. In *Korrespondenzen. Visuelle Kulturen zwischen früher Neuzeit und Gegenwart* [Corre-

- spondences. *Visual Cultures between the early modern period and the present*, edited by Matthias Blickenbach and Axel Fliethmann, 198–225. Köln: DuMont.
- Hong, Jungmin. 2019. “News Translator’s Para-Textual Visibility in South Korea.” *Babel* 65 (1): 26–50.
- Honneth, Axel. 2003a. “Der Grund der Anerkennung. Eine Erwiderung auf kritische Rückfragen” [The reason for recognition: A response to critical feedback]. In *Kampf um Anerkennung. Zur moralischen Grammatik sozialer Konflikte (um ein neues Nachwort erweiterte Ausgabe)* [The struggle for recognition: On the moral grammar of social conflicts (expanded edition with a new afterword)], edited by Axel Honneth, 303–341. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Hu, Gengshen. 2004. “Translator-Centredness.” *Perspectives* 12, no. 2: 106–117.
- Huang, Boyi. 2021. “Subtitlers’ Visibilities on a Spectrum in the Digital Age: A Comparison of Different Chinese Translations of *The Big Bang Theory*.” In *When Translation Goes Digital*, edited by Renée Desjardins, Claire Larssonneur and Philippe Lacour, 45–68. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jansen, Hanne and Anna Wegener. 2013. “Multiple Translatorship.” In *Authorial and Editorial Voices in Translation (Vita Traductiva 2 & 3)*, 1–42. Montreal: Éditions québécoises de l’oeuvre.
- Kolehmainen, Leena, Kaisa Koskinen and Helka Riionheimo. 2015. “Arjen näkymätön kääntäminen: Translatoisen toiminnan jatkumot” [Everyday invisible translation: The continua of translatorial activity]. *Virittäjä* 119: 372–400.
- Koskinen, Kaisa. 2000. “Beyond Ambivalence: Postmodernity and the Ethics of Translation.” PhD diss., University of Tampere, <https://trepo.tuni.fi/handle/10024/67049>
- . 2020. “Käännöskäsitykset, muuttuva translatoisuus ja merkitysten välittämisen taito” [Conceptions of translation, changing translatoriality and the art of communicating meanings]. In *Päättymätön projekti III: Kirjoitettua vuorovaikutusta eri S2-foorumeilla* [Endless project III: Written interaction in the different forums of FSL], edited by Sirkku Latomaa and Yrjö Lauranto, 234–247. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopiston suomalais-ugrilainen ja pohjoismainen osasto.
- Liang, Wen-chun. 2008. “A Descriptive Study of Translating Children’s Fantasy Fiction.” *Perspectives: Studies in Translation Theory and Practice* 15, no. 2: 92–105.
- Littau, Karin. 1997/2010. “Translation in the Age of Postmodern Production: From Text to Intertext to Hypertext.” *Forum for Modern Language Studies* 33 (1): 81–96.
- McRae, Ellen. 2012. “The Role of Translator’s Prefaces to Contemporary Literary Translations into English: An Empirical Study.” In *Translation Peripheries: Paratextual Elements in Translation*, edited by Anna Gil Bardaji, Pilar Orero and Sara Rovira Esteva, 63–82. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Munday, Jeremy. 2016. *Introducing Translation Studies*. 4th ed. London and New York: Routledge.

- Murray, Simone. 2018. *The Digital Literary Sphere: Reading, Writing, and Selling Books in the Internet Era*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Norberg, Ulf. 2012. "Literary Translators' Comments on their Translations in Prefaces and Afterwords: The Case of Contemporary Sweden." In *Translation Peripheries: Paratextual Elements in Translation*, edited by Anna Gil Bardaji, Pilar Ore-ro and Sara Rovira Esteval, 101–116. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Ozolins, Uldis. 2004. "Language Policy and its Rationales." *Current Issues in Language Planning* 5, no. 4: 361–375.
- Pedersen, Jan. 2011. *Subtitling Norms for Television*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Podlevskikh Carlström, Malin. 2022. "The (In)visibility of Translation and Translators in the Swedish Publication of Post-Soviet Russian Literature: An Analysis of Peritexts." *STRIDON: Studies in Translation and Interpreting* 2, no. 2: 45–74. <https://doi.org/10.4312/stridon.2.2.45-74>
- Ponomareva, Anne. 2018. "Translation Methods and the Notion of the Translator's Visibility: Evaluating the Latest Translations of Alexander Pushkin's 'Eugene Onegin' into English." PhD diss., University College London, <https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/10043911/>
- Pym, Anthony. 1996. "Venuti's Visibility." *Target* 8, no. 1: 165–177.
- . 2009. "Humanizing Translation History." *Hermes* 42: 23–48.
- Rabelo, Verónica C. and Ramaswami Mahalingam. 2019. "'They Really Don't Want to See Us': How Cleaners Experience Invisible 'Dirty Work.'" *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 113: 103–114.
- Star, Susan L. and Anselm Strauss. 1999. "Layers of Silence, Arenas of Voice: The Ecology of Visible and Invisible Work." *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)* 8, no. 1: 9–30.
- Summers, Caroline. 2023. "Controversy over Poems at British Museum Shows Urgent Need for More Recognition for Translators." *The Conversation*. Accessed July 7, 2023. https://theconversation.com/controversy-over-poems-at-british-museum-shows-urgent-need-for-more-recognition-for-translators-208781?utm_source=twitter&utm_medium=bylinetwitterbutton
- Tymoczko, Maria. 2000. "Translation and Political Engagement: Activism, Social Change and the Role of Translation in Geopolitical Shifts." *The Translator* 6, no. 1: 23–47.
- Vanderschelden, Isabelle. 2000. "Quality Assessment and Literary Translation in France." *The Translator* 6, no. 2: 271–293.
- Venuti, Lawrence. 1986. "The Translator's Invisibility." *Criticism* 28, no. 2: 179–212.
- . 1995 [2008/2018]. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.

- Walker, Callum. 2021. *An Eye-Tracking Study of Equivalent Effect in Translation: The Reader Experience of Literary Style*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wyndham, Anne. 2022. "Game Developers, Publishers Begin to Respond to 'Translator in the Credits' Movement." *Slator*. Accessed December 15, 2022. <https://slator.com/game-developers-publishers-translator-in-the-credits-movement/>
- Wynne, Frank. 2022. "Translator Frank Wynne Responds to Richard Charkin's Column." Accessed December 15, 2022. <https://publishingperspectives.com/2022/06/translator-frank-wynne-responds-to-richard-charkins-column/>
- Zhang, Weiyu and Chengting Mao. 2013. "Fan Activism Sustained and Challenged Participatory Culture in Chinese Online Translation Communities." *Chinese Journal of Communication* 6, no. 1: 45–61.