Williams, Jenny and Andrew Chesterman (2011) *The Map: A Beginner's Guide to Doing Research in Translation* (fifth edition). Manchester, UK: St. Jerome Publishing. 149 pp. ISBN: 978-1-900650-54-0 (pbk) £16.99

Saldanha, Gabriela and Sharon O'Brien (2014) *Research Methodologies in Translation Studies.* London: Routledge. 277 pp. ISBN 978-1-909485-00-6 (pbk) £31.99

Early in *Research Methodologies in Translation Studies* (2013), Gabriela Saldanha and Sharon O'Brien write, "the field of translation studies continues to attract researchers from many different backgrounds who may not be familiar with the wide range of methodological practices in the field" (pp. 1-2). I may be one of those researchers: according to the schematic Jenny Williams and Andrew Chesterman lay out at the beginning of *The Map* (2002), my research focuses on various aspects of Text Analysis and Translation (1.1, pp. 6-7), particularly in terms of how different visions of Translation Ethics (1.7, pp. 18-20) play out upon Translation History (1.6, pp. 16-18) in its interactions with the diachronic development of poetry (1.3: "Genre Translation," p. 10). Of course, as a teacher of translation, I also engage in Translation Quality Assessment (1.2, p. 8) and Translator Training (1.11, pp. 25-27), and I have done some interpreting (1.9, pp. 21-23), as I advocate for the Translation Profession (1.12, p. 27) both within and without academia. But a cognitive linguist (1.9, p. 22), say, who researches software localization and website translation (1.5, p. 15), occupies a very different corner of the field than I do. This is generally for the better: I want translation to be a big discipline, or trans-discipline. But with a background in literary studies and a PhD in Chinese literature, other Translation Studies scholars and I may not always see eye to eye—we should all be happy I was not wearing the device in question, for instance, when I got to Saldanha and O'Brien's description of "Eye tracking" (4.5; pp. 136-145), lest potential practitioners see just how interested I am in that research topic.

How does it feel, then, to read these two introductions to the field, *The Map* and *Research Methodologies in Translation Studies*, when my activities occupy such a limited area of that field? While maps by Google or other smart-phone apps can offer zoom-in, zoom-out options of greater or lesser detail depending on interest in location, reading these books together and in their entirety felt more like looking at every page of an atlas, regardless of where I wanted to go. This

is not to say that the books are not commendable and recommendable, but rather that they raise certain questions in a reader looking at them for something other than reference.

Both books are written in what I take to be social scientific style, modeled on such works as *Research Methods: A Practical Guide for the Social Sciences* (Matthews and Ross 2010). Such stylistic conventions make me question my degree of belonging to the field, highlighted in passages such as the following, on citation:

> Quote only if the actual words are significant or controversial, if they are primary data, or if you want to appeal to the authority of the original writer. Otherwise, prefer paraphrases in your own words. Do not make your text simply a patchwork of quotations or a list of paraphrases. (Williams and Chesterman 2002:104)

Is my own writing a 'patchwork of quotations'? Is this review? Is this a failure in my writing, a mark of psychological insecurity, or perhaps a result of training in North America, where the Translation Studies / Comparative Literature virgule is most permeable? I'd like to pursue this third option a bit more, and look into some of the disciplinary reasons behind differences in convention between Translation Studies and Comparative Literature. While I have elsewhere argued (2014) in support of Susan Bassnett's proposal to see "comparative literature as a valued but subsidiary subject area" of translation studies (Bassnett 1993:161), enough has been written about Comparative Literature giving translation short shrift (Venuti 2015) that perhaps it's worth considering the extent to which they are different, if not irreconcilable fields.

One bone of contention is style. I have found the work of Jean Boase-Beier (esp. 2006) helpful both in the classroom and in my own research for explaining the extent to which the *how* of a thing is inseparable from the *what* of a thing. But are the stylistic habits of Translation Studies at odds with those of Comparative Literature? Williams and Chesterman (2002:102) say, "In Translation Studies the most common format for inserting references in the text is the name-plus-date-system, together with the page number if necessary." Indeed, that is the house style of this journal. "These references are usually built into the text itself, rather than given in footnotes." And Comparative Literature? In a recent guide on how to write on literature with style, Eric Hayot (2014:152) simplifies it to "an intensely practical matter: should you use Chicago or MLA style?" These are effectively the only options, as he frames it—and usually the journal will make

that decision for you. "But if you can choose," Hayot continues, "I recommend Chicago, because it allows you to do one very important thing that MLA style does not: to conceal, permanently or temporarily, the source of a citation." In other words, the comparatist makes a point—and a good one, I think—relevant to rhetoric, rather than basing it on convention alone. Even citation can have an effect on argumentative style.

I find it a pity that a field such as Translation Studies in which stylistics plays such an important role would be defined by such unstylish conventions. This is not to disparage the conventions—or norms, an area in and about which Translation Studies has said a lot (see Schaffner 1999)—of one field from the position of another. For all that the downside of what I call "unstylish" about writing in Translation Studies may be an undramatic dullness, its benefit is clarity, particularly in light of an international readership, with many in Translation Studies coming to English as a second or third language (clarity is a plus even for native readers, as well; I have benefited greatly from the high readability of *Introducing Translation Studies* (Munday 2012)). Furthermore, who has not been mystified by the intractable, recalcitrant verbiage of so much Comparative Literature? Since when does that ponderousness get to be upheld as the exemplar of *style*?

As an example picked almost at random (from a book I received recently and which is still on my desk), here is an excerpt from the only discussion of translation, such as it is, in *A Companion to Comparative Literature* (Behdad and Thomas 2011):

> A new comparative literature cannot take existing theories and practices of translation at face value for to do so would mean to reinforce protocols already developed to translate texts in the hegemonic European languages; rather, the task of comparison must start by exploring how the reigning ideologies of translation are, or can be, dislodged, questioned or revised when scholars seriously engage with the history of texts produced in the non-European languages. (Gikandi 2011:259)

Gikandi's call is counter-normative, which itself requires both acknowledging norms and then seeing where they can be pushed beyond. Part of what I'm getting at in this review is the same impulse, to look at the normative writing in Translation Studies and ask if it cannot also be dislodged or revised. This can be rooted in Descriptive Translation Studies, the Manipulation

Group, and polysystem theory—though Gikandi does not cite their work (see Toury 1995; Even-Zohar 1990; Hermans 1985; and Hermans 1999). But if we in Translation Studies not only prescribe citation practice, but also reiterate social-science norms in our writing, then we are not questioning the reigning ideologies of practice within our own fields, and may be failing to live up to the standards or hopes established by some of our disciplinary forebears.

Not that everyone wants to question reigning practice, of course. And Gikandi's own style? While I think we can agree that few in Translation Studies would write like this (nor is a *Companion* an "introduction"), if it is an example of Comparative Literature style, then it, too, is normative, reinforcing protocols already developed even as it says it wants to interrogate them. The question, based on the stylistic acknowledgement of an interrelatedness between *how* and *what*, grows in both complexity and irony. But at least one of the reasons behind the prescription in Translation Studies to paraphrase more and quote less, and quote "only if the actual words are significant or controversial," is that the writing most likely to be cited in Translation Studies is easier to paraphrase, because its verbiage is less intricate. In other words, perhaps the Comparative Literature convention of quotation rather than paraphrase derives less from a different vector of its approach to language than from the norm of its complexity of expression.

The complexity of its expression, I say, not the complexity of its thought. For while, as I said, *how* and *what* are largely inseparable, there is considerable complexity of thought in much of Translation Studies. And you can find it here, too: while some have critiqued Translation Studies for being too empirical and neglecting "the philosophical implications and social effects that accompany every translation practice" (Venuti 2013:61), *Research Methodologies in Translation Studies*, at any rate, frames its cartography in opposition to such neglect of ontology and epistemology: "Here, we follow Matthews and Ross in distinguishing, in very broad terms, three different ways of seeing the social world—**objectivism**, **constructivism**, and **realism**—and three epistemological positions linked to these ontological categories: **positivism**, **interpretivism**, and **realism**" (Saldanha and O'Brien 2013:10). In bold, so you don't miss it. Of course, while they claim not to "prescribe a specific ontological or epistemological framework," and say that "the approaches outlined are not necessarily mutually exclusive" (12), the fact that they name the third case in both lists "realism" conveys the authors' ideological imprimatur (it's always an uphill

battle to argue against reality). They could be more self-consciousness, if it didn't risk too much reflexivity and Comparative Literature styles of rhetoric.

So what of *The Map* and *Research Methodologies*, then? I will recommend them both to my students, the former for everyone to read all the way through, and the latter to read selectively, for a better sense of the ontology, epistemology, and methodology of their own and adjacent areas of interest within the broader discipline of Translation Studies. And whether they conceive of themselves as doing literary or social scientific work, I will encourage them to write both with clarity and with style.

<div align="right">

Lucas Klein

University of Hong Kong

</div>

References

Bassnett, Susan (1993) *Comparative Literature: A Critical Introduction.* West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.

Behdad, Ali, and Dominic Richard David Thomas (eds) (2011) *A Companion to Comparative Literature. Blackwell Companions to Literature and Culture.* West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.

Boase-Beier, Jean (2006) *Stylistic Approaches to Translation. Translation Theories Explored, 10.* Manchester: St. Jerome.

Even-Zohar, Itamar (1990) 'Polysystem Studies' *Poetics Today: International Journal for Theory and Analysis of Literature and Communication* 11(1): 1-262.

Gikandi, Simon (2011) 'Contested Grammars: Comparative Literature, Translation, and the Challenge of Locality', in Ali Behdad, Dominic Richard and David Thomas (eds) *A Companion to Comparative Literature.* West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 254-272.

Hayot, Eric (2014) *The Elements of Academic Style: Writing for the Humanities.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Hermans, Theo (1985) *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation.* London: Croom Helm.

Hermans, Theo (1999) *Translation in Systems.* Manchester: St. Jerome.

Klein, Lucas (2014) 'Institution, Translation, Nation, Metaphor.' State of the Discipline Report. [http;//stateofthediscipline.acla.org/entry/institution-translation-nation-metaphor] (accessed 6 May 2015).

Matthews, Bob, and Liz Ross (2010) *Research Methods: A Practical Guide for the Social Sciences* (1ˢᵗ ed). New York, NY: Pearson Longman.

Munday, Jeremy (2012) *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications* (3ʳᵈ ed). Abingdon, Oxon; New York: Routledge.

Saldanha, Gabriela, and Sharon O'Brien (2013) *Research Methodologies in Translation Studies.* Manchester, UK: St. Jerome.

Schaffner, Christina (ed) (1999) *Translation and Norms. Current Issues in Language and Society.* Clevedon, England: Philadelphia, Pa: Multilingual Matters.

Toury, Gideon (1995) *Descriptive Translation Studies—and Beyond.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Venuti, Lawrence (2013) *Translation Changes Everything: Theory and Practice.* London; New York: Routledge.

Venuti, Lawrence (2015) 'Hijacking Translation: How Comp Lit Continues to Suppress Translated texts' *Boundary 2: An International Journal of Literature and Culture 42.* [http://boundary2.org/2015/02/19/hijacking-translation/] (accessed 6 May, 2015).

Williams, Jenny, and Andrew Chesterman (2002) *The Map: A Beginner's Guide to Doing Research in Translation Studies.* Manchester, UK; Northampton, MA: St. Jerome.