

EXPLORING METHODOLOGY IN TRANSLATION: EFFECTIVE STRATEGIES FOR TRANSLATING AND PROMOTING POETRY

[Micaela TAULEAN](#)

Associate Professor, PhD

("Alecu Russo" Balti State University, Republic of Moldova)

micaela.taulean@usarb.md, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0622-3654>

Abstract

This article is intended for both students and scholars who want to become acquainted with the key approaches and methods in translation and interpreting research. While it provides substantial theoretical background, its primary focus is on presenting the current state of the art regarding the methodological tools in use today. In this respect, the article deals with translation studies, which, although offering valuable insights into various translation research topics, only briefly touch upon the methodological aspects of conducting translation research.

Keywords: *translation and interpreting, comparative literature, translation studies, translating poetry, translation procedures*

Rezumat

Articolul este conceput atât pentru studenți, cât și pentru cercetătorii care doresc să se familiarizeze cu principalele abordări și metode în traducere și interpretare. Deși materialul are o bază teoretică substanțială, accentul principal este pus pe descrierea instrumentelor metodologice care permit traduceri adecvate contextului.

Cuvinte-cheie: *traducere și interpretare, literatură comparată, studii de traductologie, traducerea poeziei, proceduri de traducere*

1. Introduction

Since translation research has developed into an interdisciplinary field (Snell-Hornby et al., 1994), it has been shaped by a wide range of methodological approaches, including those from linguistics, comparative literature, postcolonial studies, cultural studies, sociology, philosophy, history, semiotics, computing, and cognitive studies, among others. As scholars from various disciplines began contributing to translation research, they introduced theoretical and methodological perspectives rooted in their own academic traditions.

Additionally, translation studies encompass various sub-disciplines or fields of inquiry, such as literary, religious, and audiovisual translation, as well as conference and community interpreting. Each of these sub-areas has developed its own distinct research approaches and methodologies. This diversity is evident in the different terms used by authors to describe the discipline. For instance, the choice between using "translation studies" (TS) or

"translation and interpreting studies" (TIS) reflects a different perspective on the field and signifies a distinct epistemological development.

2. Focus on Terminology and the Research

There are various approaches to studying translation and interpreting, and methodologies are often based on a set of sometimes implicit assumptions, as well as pre-established concepts that may conflict with translation data (Flynn and Gambier 2011, p. 88). To effectively navigate these research areas, methodological considerations are essential for interpreting the data and phenomena under investigation.

The term *methodology* can be understood as falling along a spectrum, ranging from approaches or frameworks to methods, techniques, procedures, tools, and so on (see Saldanha and O'Brien, 2013, pp. 12–14). While terms like *approach* and *framework* are used to describe abstract theories and organizational principles, "methods" and "techniques" refer to practical *tools* used to understand empirical reality (Saukko, 2003, p. 8, *apud* Saldanha & O'Brien, 2013, p. 13). Methodology, therefore, involves the application of these theories and principles in actual research; it "encompasses both the tools and the philosophical and political commitments associated with a particular research approach" (*ibidem*). This research seeks to describe and represent the various approaches within translation and interpreting studies, some of which are grounded in specific methods and techniques, while others focus more on the theoretical foundations that support those methods, aiming to present them in an accessible and authoritative manner.

According to Polit and Hungler (2004, p. 233), *methodology* refers to the methods used for obtaining, organizing, and analyzing data. Karfman, as cited in Mouton & Marais (1996, p. 16), defines methodology in research as the theory behind making correct scientific decisions. In this context, the research approach was qualitative, with methodology focusing on how the research was conducted and its logical progression. Mouton (1996, p. 35) describes methodology as the means or methods of carrying out a task. Burns and Grove (2003, p. 488) emphasize that methodology encompasses the study's design, setting, sample, methodological limitations, and techniques for data collection and analysis. Henning (2004, p. 36) defines methodology as a coherent set of methods that complement each other and are designed to produce data and findings that align with the research question and suit the researcher's purpose.

According to Holloway (2005, p. 293), methodology refers to a framework of theories and principles on which methods and procedures are built. Methodologies vary depending on the specific area of translation. It is the systematic, theoretical analysis of the methods applied to a particular field of study and includes the theoretical examination of the methods and principles associated with a branch of knowledge. Typically, it involves concepts such as paradigm, theoretical model, phases, and quantitative or qualitative techniques. A methodology does not aim to provide direct solutions—

therefore, it differs from a method. Instead, it offers the theoretical foundation for understanding which method, set of methods, or best practices should be applied to a specific case, such as calculating a particular result.

From the theories given above we can conclude that methodology has also been defined as follows:

- the analysis of the principles behind the methods, rules, and postulates used within a discipline;
- the systematic study of methods that are, can be, or have been applied within a discipline;
- or the study or description of methods.

Research methodology in translation studies became an increasingly important focus after the discipline solidified in the final decades of the last century. *Research Models in Translation Studies* was one of the first publications to explicitly address methodological concerns. The first volume, edited by Olohan in 2000, explores the textual and cognitive aspects of translation research, while the second, edited by Hermans in 2002, concentrates on historical and ideological issues. Together, these volumes offer a comprehensive and valuable introduction to methodology in translation studies.

Hatim's *Teaching and Researching Translation* (with a second edition published in 2012) adopts an applied linguistics perspective. While Hatim dedicates several chapters to approaches within translation studies, such as descriptive translation studies (DTS), skopos theory, and issues of power and ideology – topics that gained prominence in the field largely due to research in cultural studies – the applied linguistics perspective is also evident in the sections of the book focused on translation teaching. These sections address topics like translation errors and text typologies.

Scholars Saldanha and O'Brien provide a valuable classification of research types and related terminology (e.g., inductive, deductive, empirical, and experimental), offering guidance on research ethics (e.g., informed consent and plagiarism) as well as research communication and dissemination (e.g., writing a research report). They also explore the theoretical assumptions that underlie any research project and present a range of specific examples from translation studies research to demonstrate how different methodologies can be applied. To summarize interdisciplinary contributions to translation studies, Saldanha and O'Brien (2013) employ a four-pronged classification that echoes Flynn and Gambier's four methodological focuses in their essay "Methodology in Translation Studies" (2011), namely discourses, practices, contexts, and actors. Saldanha and O'Brien's distinction between methodological orientations based on the nature of the data – whether they pertain to the products, the process, the participants of translation, or the broader social and cultural context of translated texts – has been highly influential, and their book has become a key reference for research in the field.

Another significant volume that provides young scholars with valuable guidelines for conducting research in interpreting, including preparing and

publishing a doctoral thesis, is Hale and Napier's *Research Methods in Interpreting: A Practical Resource* (2013). This book serves as a step-by-step guide to conducting research in interpreting, outlining the various stages of a research project in the tradition of Williams and Chesterman (2002). The authors aim to offer a comprehensive guide to research methods, featuring a variety of interactive activities designed to help researchers define and refine their research questions. They explore and discuss research methods such as questionnaires and survey data, ethnographic research, observational methods, interviews, and experimental techniques.

3. From Theory to Practice: Understanding the Relationship between Methodology, Paradigm, Algorithm, and Method

In addition to the terms mentioned above, many other terms are used in research with the assumption of general agreement about their meanings. However, even experienced researchers can sometimes use research terminology inconsistently, leading to confusion and frustration for readers, particularly for novice researchers.

Terms like *model*, *framework*, *theory*, *typology*, *concept*, *method*, and *methodology* are often left unexplained or used interchangeably, leading to confusion. To clarify, we provide some definitions for these common terms, primarily drawing from Silverman (2006, p. 13), except for the definitions of '*framework*' and '*typology*,' which are sourced from Matthews and Ross (2010, p. 34), (2010, p. 112). Not everyone may agree with these definitions, as they represent just one approach to defining these concepts. What is essential for each researcher is to carefully consider how they use research terminology, justify the definitions chosen for their specific purpose, and maintain consistency in their usage, all while being mindful that others may interpret these terms differently.

A *model* is a representation of the 'reality' of the research topic or domain. Some scholars compared the model of translation studies research with those suggested by Chesterman (2000) and Marco (2009). However, it is important to note that models are often not explicitly stated in research projects, and sometimes there can be a gap between the assumed model and the actual object of investigation (Tymoczko, 2007).

A *framework* is a collection of ideas and approaches that provides a structure for viewing and acquiring knowledge about a specific domain. Halliday's systemic functional grammar is commonly used as an analytical framework in corpus-based translation and critical discourse analysis research.

A *concept* is an idea derived from a model or a framework. A *theory* organizes sets of concepts to define and explain a particular phenomenon, or as Chesterman puts it, a theory is "an instrument of understanding" (2007, p. 1). A *typology* refers to a typical model that illustrates how items are commonly related to one another. For instance, one might attempt to create a typology of translation strategies employed in specific contexts.

A *methodology* is a general approach to studying a phenomenon, while a method is a specific research technique. As Sealy states, "methodology is the science of method" (2010, p. 61). Saukko distinguishes between the two concepts as follows (2003, p. 8): whereas methods refer to practical "tools" used to make sense of empirical reality, methodology encompasses a broader framework that includes both these tools and the philosophical and political commitment associated with a particular research approach.

The relationship between a theory and a method is explained by Chertman as follows: "methods are the ways in which one actually uses, develops, applies, and tests a theory in order to reach the understanding it offers" (2007, p. 1).

Methods and tools are often confused, but a useful way to distinguish between them in the context of translation studies is to consider an example from translation process research. In this case, our model might be a specific type of cognitive processing—essentially, a representation of how the brain perceives signals, processes them, and converts them into meaning and instructions.

Concepts within that framework might include the translation process itself—an activity the brain engages in when a person translates from one language to another—along with other related concepts such as short-term memory, long-term memory, and the limitations on the brain's capacity, to name just a few.

Methodology is the overall research strategy that outlines how research will be conducted, including identifying the methods to be used. These methods, as described in the methodology, define the means or modes of data collection, or in some cases, how a specific result is to be calculated. While methodology provides a broader framework, it does not specify particular methods. Instead, it focuses on the nature and types of processes to be followed in a procedure or to achieve a specific goal. In the context of a methodology study, these processes form a constructive, generic framework, which can be broken down into sub-processes, combined, or have their sequence altered as needed.

A *paradigm* is similar to a methodology in that it is also a constructive framework. In theoretical work, the development of paradigms meets most or all of the criteria for methodology. An *algorithm*, like a paradigm, is another type of constructive framework, meaning that its construction is a logical arrangement of connected elements rather than a physical one. Any description of how to calculate a specific result is always a description of a method, not a methodology. Therefore, it is important to avoid using methodology as a *synonym for method* or a *body of methods*. Doing so shifts its meaning away from its true epistemological purpose, reducing it to merely a procedure, set of tools, or instruments that should have been its outcome.

Methodology is the design process for conducting research or the development of a procedure, and is not itself an instrument, method, or procedure.

Methodology and method are not interchangeable. However, in recent years, there has been a tendency to use "methodology" as a pretentious substitute for "method." Using methodology as a synonym for method or a set of methods leads to confusion and misinterpretation, ultimately undermining the careful analysis needed in designing research.

4. Translation Procedures, Strategies, and Methods: Understanding the Methodology in Translation Poetry

The translation procedures outlined by Nida are as follows:

- *technical procedures*: (a) analyzing both the source and target languages; (b) conducting a thorough study of the source language text before attempting translation; (c) making judgments on the semantic and syntactic equivalences. (Nida, 1994, pp. 241-45);
- *organizational procedures*: continuously reassessing the translation attempts, comparing them with other available translations of the same text by different translators, and evaluating the communicative effectiveness of the text by asking target language readers to assess its accuracy and effectiveness, while studying their responses (idem, pp. 246-47).

Krings defines translation strategy as the "translator's potentially conscious plans for solving specific translation problems within the context of a particular translation task" (Krings, 1986, p. 18). Seguinot (1989) suggests that translators typically employ at least three global strategies: (i) translating continuously without interruption for as long as possible; (ii) correcting surface errors as they arise; and (iii) reserving the correction of qualitative or stylistic errors for the revision stage.

Additionally, Loescher defines translation strategy as "a potentially conscious procedure for solving a problem encountered while translating a text, or any part of it" (Loescher, 1991, p. 8). The concept of consciousness, as highlighted in this definition, is crucial for distinguishing between strategies used by learners or translators. In this context, Cohen emphasizes that "the element of consciousness is what separates strategies from processes that are not strategic" (Cohen, 1998, p. 4). Furthermore, Bell makes a distinction between global strategies (those that address entire texts) and local strategies (those that focus on specific text segments), noting that this differentiation arises from the various types of translation challenges encountered (Bell, 1998, p. 188).

As Jaaskelainen (2005, p. 15) explains, product-related strategies involve the fundamental tasks of selecting the source language (SL) text and developing a method for translating it. However, she argues that process-related strategies "are a set of (loosely formulated) rules or principles that a translator employs to achieve the goals set by the translation situation" (p. 16). Fur-

thermore, Jaaskelainen (2005, p. 16) categorizes these into two types: global strategies and local strategies. "Global strategies refer to general principles and approaches, while local strategies pertain to specific activities related to the translator's problem-solving and decision-making".

Newmark (1988b) distinguishes between translation methods and translation procedures. He notes that, "while translation methods relate to whole texts, translation procedures are used for sentences and smaller units of language" (p. 81). He then proceeds to outline the following methods of translation:

- *word-for-word translation*: this method preserves the source language (SL) word order, translating each word individually by its most common meaning, out of context;
- *literal translation*: in this method, SL grammatical structures are converted to their nearest target language (TL) equivalents, while lexical words are translated individually, out of context;
- *faithful translation*: this approach strives to convey the exact contextual meaning of the original text within the constraints of the TL's grammatical structures;
- *idiomatic translation*: it reproduces the 'message' of the original text but often distorts meaning nuances by using colloquialisms and idioms where these are not present in the original;
- *semantic translation*: similar to 'faithful translation,' but it gives more attention to the aesthetic value of the SL text;
- *adaptation*: The freest form of translation, typically used for plays (comedies) and poetry. It maintains the themes, characters, and plots, but the SL culture is transformed into the TL culture, and the text is rewritten;
- *free translation*: this approach produces a TL text that lacks the style, form, or content of the original.
- *communicative translation*: this method aims to transmit the exact contextual meaning of the original while ensuring that both the content and language are easily understandable and acceptable to the target audience (Newmark, 1988b, pp. 45-47).

Great poetry, it is often argued, cannot truly survive the translation process, as it cannot retain all of its original qualities once translated. Interestingly, this is not because of the challenge of translating the metrical structure, but due to the very essence of poetry itself. The value of the debate on translation lies in encouraging us to critically examine both the poet's craft and the function of poetry. Poetry is not merely words or metre alone. Translators and theorists often describe it as the "music of words," a method of perceiving and interpreting the world, and a way of conveying to the audience a deeper awareness of reality through an intense concentration of metaphors and language. In this way, the natural rhythm of spoken language is

shaped into a formal structure. However, such patterns can never be replicated in translation. These patterns are, of course, shaped by the syntax and prosody rules of the original language, and while poets may either embrace or challenge these rules, they are still influenced by the historical and social context in which they are created.

One of the most well-known and intriguing catalogs of methods used by translators of poetry is the one created by André Lefevere (apud Bassnett, pp. 81-82):

- *phonemic translation*: this method attempts to reproduce the sound of the original in the target language, offering an acceptable paraphrase of its meaning;
- *literal translation*: a word-for-word approach that often distorts the original sense and syntax;
- *metrical translation*: focuses on reproducing the metre of the original text;
- *poetry into prose*: this method alters the sense, communicative value, and syntax of the original text;
- *rhymed translation*: the translator works under the "double bondage" of metre and rhyme, often resulting in a "caricature" of the original;
- *blank verse translation*: while imposing certain restrictions on the translator, this method allows for greater accuracy and a higher degree of literalness;
- *interpretation*: the substance or meaning of the original is preserved, but the form is lost in the process.

The translation of poetry can be described – using Pound's words – not just in terms of a "dead" piece of writing, but as the process of "bringing a dead man back to life." This "literary resurrection" is one of the most significant motivations behind why translators take on such a challenging task: to revive dead poetry or to introduce pre-existing poetry into a new cultural context.

In our research we focused on some representatives of contemporary Romanian poetry: Mircea Florin Șandru, a Romanian poet and journalist, member of the Romanian Writers' Union since 1976 and Radu Gyr, a Romanian poet, playwright, essayist and journalist who also served for a long time as a university assistant in the Department of Aesthetics under Professor Mihail Dragomirescu. These poets are inherently drawn to a special genre that combines lyricism, epic narrative and philosophy: feelings are drawn into an intellectual orbit, and the intellect into the anxiety of contemporary world consciousness. Behind all this there is an acute sense of involvement in our common struggle for a reasonable future, a sense of responsibility for it.

Lev Berinsky, born in the Bessarabian place Căușeni (now the district centre of the Căușeni district of Moldova), is the author of numerous transla-

tions from German, Romanian, Spanish, Hebrew and other languages into Yiddish and Russian, as well as from Yiddish into Russian and vice versa. His Russian translations of poetry and prose by Marc Chagall, Dora Teitelboim, Itzhok Bashevis-Zinger and Mordhe Tzanin (from Yiddish), Mircea Dinescu and Shaul Carmel (from Romanian) were published in separate books. In addition, he translated into Russian Antonio Machado, Omar Lara and Rafael Alberti (from Spanish), Jorge Amado (from Portuguese), the drama of Alfred Jarry (from French) and Marin Sorescu (from Romanian), poems by Emilian Bukov, Andrei Lupan, Pavel Botsu, Paul Mihni, Dumitru Matkovski (from Bessarabian Romanian), essayistic works by Rabbi Moses Rosen (from Romanian), many Romanian poets (M. Eminescu, G. Bacovia, V. Teodorescu, N. Stanescu, I. Alexandru, and several others). His translations from Mircea Dinescu, Dan Pagis, Yehuda Amihai, Alexei Parshchikov, Eugene Rein, Vasil Stus, from German poetry (R. M. Rilke, Sarah Kirsch, Emil Bruckner), and many other poets have been published in Yiddish.

We can find below Lev Berinsky's translation in Russian ("Время года – весна") of Mircea Florin Șandru's *Anno Domini*, and our commentary:

Mircea Florin Șandru, <i>Anno Domini</i>	Lev Berinsky's Translation in Russian, <i>Время года – весна</i>	Our Commentary
<p>Anno Domini... am văzut cimitirele de mașini Înverzite, răvășite de vântul de primăvară, Am văzut omul în câmpie semănând, Sălbăticiunea tânără, umflată, Fugind în pădure să nască. Anno Domini... pun mâna streașină la ochi Și până departe în zare pământul Pulsează ca o venă deschisă, Cu cereale verzi, cu câmpuri petrolifere, cu orașe. Anno Domini... a trecut iarna cu păstrăvi morți și crengi putrezite, Plămânii noștri, ca niște păsări, ciugulesc aerul, se umflă, Aleargă și plutesc încet,</p>	<p>Anno Domini, видел я кладбище автомобилей позеленевших, разворошенных ветром весны. Видел, как пашет в полях человек; молодую брюхатую видел волчицу, убегающую в дебри рожать. Anno Domini, только прикрою рукою глаза – вижу в зорях большую слезу, нашу круглую Землю с изумрудными злаками, нефтяными полями, сиянием городов. Anno Domini, кончилась зимняя стужа с погибшей форелью и сырыми ветвями; наши легкие – воздух, как птицы, клюя – наполняются вновь,</p>	<p>Interpretive poetic translation, leaning toward metrical translation (without strict rhyme or meter), with creative liberties taken to preserve emotional tone, rhythm, and imagery.</p>

sângerând.	оппадают и кровоточат ¹ .	
------------	---	--

Igor Ivanov is a poet, a philosopher, a culturologist. He is a regular author of literary collections of the Periscope-Volga publishing house. Author of the poetry book 'Armour of the trouver' (Volgograd, 2018). He is also a Laureate in the category 'Civil Lyrics' of the I International Literary Award 'Periscope-2017'.

We can find below Igor Ivanov's translation in Russian ("Клич") of Radu Gyr's, *Îndemn la luptă*, and our commentary:

Radu Gyr, <i>Îndemn la luptă</i>	Igor Ivanov's translation in Russian ("Клич")	Our Commentary
Nu dor nici luptele pierdute, nici rănilile din piept nu dor, cum dor acele brațe slute care să lupte nu mai vor. Cât inima în piept îți cântă ce-înseamnă-n lupta-un braț răpus? Ce-ți pasă-n colb de-o spadă frântă când te ridici cu-n steag, mai sus?	Не желаю позорной битвы и тяжелых ран не хочу! Но худые руки молитвы неослабно рвутся к мечу. И без песни душа немеет, коль сломался клинок, а друг так руками всплеснул нелепо, – кто решится поднять хоругвь? Не беда, если в кровь изранен, и глаза горьких слез полны. Ибо полное поражение – отречение от мечты ² .	This translation is an interpretive + metrical + poetic translation. It reimagines the poem, while staying emotionally loyal to the original's message. It doesn't try to be literal, but instead aims for symbolic equivalence and lyrical resonance in Russian.
Înfrânt nu ești atunci când sângerî, nici ochii când în lacrimi ți-s. Adevăratele înfrângeri, sunt renunțările la vis.		

Mason and Hatim (1990) present a valid argument, suggesting that translations should be evaluated based on the translator's specific goals, rather than by some abstract standard of what makes a "good" poetry translation. They propose that instead of trying to replicate every aspect of prosody,

¹ https://imwerden.de/pdf/romanian_roetry_perevod_berinskogo.pdf.

² <https://xn--80alhdjhdcxhy5hl.xn--p1ai/content/perevody-stihotvoreniy-rumynskih-poetov>.

translators should concentrate on the element they believe is most central to the poem. This means that different translation strategies may emerge depending on which prosodic features the translator chooses to prioritize.

The challenges of translating poetry can be divided into two main areas: conveying the content and message, and preserving the sound patterns and associative meanings. Rhyme, meter, structure, and patterns are what set one poetic form apart from another. These elements carry considerable importance, and it's the translator's responsibility to pay close attention to them. A mimetic strategy may appear unfeasible for rhymed poetry, since finding exact equivalents in prosodic systems across languages is extremely difficult.

However, it could be more applicable to unrhymed poems, such as those written in free verse, where strict prosodic matching is less of a concern. Sound in poetry encompasses elements like meter, rhyme, and rhythm, while associations relate to figurative language and deeper meanings. Since sound plays a fundamental role in defining poetry, translators must carefully consider how to address sound-related challenges – particularly those involving metrical lines, rhyme schemes, and rhythmic patterns – when translating a poem. Translations can be evaluated based on the translator's intended goals, rather than by relying on abstract or fixed standards of what constitutes a "good" poetry translation.

References

- Bassnett, S. (1994). *Translation Studies*, Revised Edition. Routledge.
- Bell, R. T. (1998). Psychological/Cognitive Approaches. In M. Baker (Ed), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Routledge.
- Chesterman, A. (1997). *The Memes of Translation: The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory*. John Benjamins.
- Cohen, A.D. (1984). On Taking Tests: What the Students Report. *Language Testing*, 11 (1), 70-81.
- Delisle, J. (1980). L'Analyse du discours comme méthode de traduction. *Cahiers de traductologie*, 2.
- Delisle, J. (1981). *L'enseignement de l'interprétation et de la traduction*. Editions de l'Université d'Ottawa.
- Flynn, P., Gambier, Y. (2011). 'Methodology in Translation Studies'. In *Handbook of Translation Studies*, 2, 88-96. John Benjamins.
- Hale, S., Napier, J. (2013). *Research Methods in Interpreting: A Practical Resource*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Hatim, B. (2001). *Teaching and Researching Translation*. Pearson.

- Krings, H.P. (1986). Translation Problems and Translation strategies of Advanced German Learners of French. In J. House, & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.). *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication* (pp. 263-75). Gunter Narr.
- Kussmaul, P. (1995). *Training the Translator*. John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Loescher, W. (1991). *Translation Performance, Translation Process and Translation Strategies*. Gunter Narr.
- Mason, I., Basil, H. (1990). *Discourse and the Translator*. Longman Group.
- Matthews, B., Liz, R. (2010) *Research Methods: A Practical Guide for the Social Sciences*. Pearson Education Ltd.
- Newmark, P. (1988b). *Approaches to Translation*. Prentice Hall.
- Newmark, P. (1995). *A Textbook of Translation*. Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data.
- Nida, E. A. (1994). *Towards a Science of Translation, with Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating*. Brill.
- Nida, E., Taber, Ch. (1974). *The Theory and Practice of Translating*. Bill.
- Olohan, M. (ed.) (2000) *Intercultural Faultlines: Research Models in Translation Studies 1: Textual and Cognitive Aspects*. St Jerome.
- Roger T. 1994. *Translation and Translating*. Longman Group UK Ltd.
- Saldanha, G., O'Brien, Sh. (2013) *Research Methodologies in Translation Studies*. St Jerome.
- Saukko, P. (2003). *Doing Research in Cultural Studies: An Introduction to Classical and New Methodological Approaches*. Thousand Oaks & New Delhi, Sage.
- Silverman, D. (2006). *Interpreting Qualitative Data* (3rd edition). Sage.
- Snell-Hornby, M., Pöchhacker, Fr., Kaindl, K. (eds) (1994). *Translation Studies: An Interdiscipline*. John Benjamins.
- Tymoczko, M. (2007). 'Connecting the Two Infinite Orders: Research Methods in Translation Studies'. In Theo Hermans (ed.). *Crosscultural Transgressions: Research Models in Translation Studies II: Historical and Ideological Issues* (pp. 9-25). St. Jerome.
- Vinay, J.-P., & Darbelnet, J. (1958/2000). *A Methodology for Translation*. [An excerpt from *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation* (trans. and eds. J. C. Sager & M.-J. Hamel). John Benjamins, first published in 1958 as *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais. Méthode de traduction*]. In Venuti, L. (Ed.). *The Translation Studies Reader* (pp. 84-93). Routledge.
- Williams, J., Chesterman, A. (2002). *The Map: A Beginner's Guide to Doing Research in Translation Studies*. St Jerome.