A Corpus-Based Study on the Translation Style of Five English Versions of *Fu Sheng Liu Ji*, Vol I

Bing Zhang, Guangzhou College of Commerce, China*

ABSTRACT

Using a corpus approach, this article investigates the translation styles of the first chapter of *Fu Sheng Liu Ji* at three levels: the statistical parameters, the translation of culture-specific lexis, and readability calculations. It is found that Lin's version uses simpler words which makes it easier for the average English reader to understand traditional Chinese literature; while Wu's translation borrows to a great extent from the Lin's version, and its style is consistent with Lin's translation. The Pratt and Jiang's translation is the most annotated and readable by the average English reader. Sanders' version is centered on the source language, showing the translator's translation stance of spreading Chinese culture, with a tendency to move closer to thick translation. Black's version is more special in that the translator often imitates the author's tone to add cultural information to the original text. The main reasons for the very different styles of the five translations are due to the differences in the translators' social-culture backgrounds and the target readers.

KEYWORDS

Corpus, Culture-Specific Lexis, Fu Sheng Liu Ji, Readability, Translation Style

1. INTRODUCTION

The *Fu Sheng Liu Ji (*hereinafter referred to as "*Fu*") is a biographical essay written by Shen Fu, a literati of the Qing Dynasty. The essay takes the activities of Shen Fu and his wife as the main line and records their home life and wanderings, as well as the art of living and art criticism. With its bright and fresh writing and sincere and touching plot, *Fu* has been called one of the most beautiful classical prose in China by Feng Qiyong (Wang, 2015). Among the 55 literary texts included in the Greater China Library, a translation project of Chinese cultural texts launched by the state, *Fu* is listed (Xu, 2015). The first English translation of *Fu* was made by Lin Yutang in the 1930s and has since become "world-famous" (Jin & Jin, 2000). In addition to Lin Yutang's translation (hereinafter referred to as Lin's translation), there are three other English translations of *Fu*: Shirley Black's translation published by Oxford University Press in 1960 (hereinafter referred to as Black's translation), Leonard Pratt & Chiang Su-Hui's English translation published by Penguin Press in the 1980s (hereinafter referred to as Pratt's translation), and the Graham Sanders translation published by Hackett Publishing in 2011 (hereinafter referred to as the Sanders' translation). In addition, the author found a translation

*Corresponding Author

in the library of Tunghai University in Taiwan, it is an unpublished dissertation and only translated Volume 1 of the original text in 1960, and the translator is Wu Huei-Ching (hereinafter referred to as Wu's translation). Black's translation omitted the horticultural and botanical contents in volume 2, the temple and landscape episodes in volume 4, and part of the literary information for the reader's interest, while volume 1 remains relatively complete. Therefore, this study takes Volume 1 of *Fu* and its five English translations as the object of study and examines the linguistic and non-linguistic characteristics of the different translations.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Baker published "Corpus Linguistics and translation studies: implications and applications" in 1993, which marked the introduction of corpus linguistic methods into translation studies. In 2000, she published "Towards a methodology for investigating the style of a literary translator ", in which she introduced corpus into translator's style research, pointing out that the study of translator's style should focus on the translator's subconscious language habits and language usage characteristics that are different from others. Saldanha (2011) divided the studies of translator's style into two categories: translation style and translator's style, the former focuses on the way the translation reproduces the language and style of the original text, while the latter focuses on certain language usage habits of the translator. For example, Charlotte Bosseaux (2001) searched and analyzed the culturally specific words (food and architecture) in Virginia Woolf's *The Waves* based on a one-to-two English-French parallel corpus and studied the differences in translation strategies between the two translators. There are also studies on lexical creativity in translation with the help of self-constructed corpus and hapax legomena, such as Dorothy Kenny (2001). Domestic scholars have also made promising achievements in the study of translator's style based on the corpus. Hu & Li (2021: 103) pointed out that a translator's style refers specifically to "the characteristics of the translator in terms of language use and translation strategies and applications, as well as the characteristics of the translator in other auxiliary texts such as translation selections, prefaces, postscripts, and annotations". Took the English translation of reporting verbs in *Dream of the Red Chamber* as an example, and based on the "parallel corpus of *Dream of the Red Chamber* in Chinese and English", Liu & Yan (2010) explored the different translator styles presented by the reporting verbs in the three translations of *Dream of the Red Chamber* through source language influence, translation influence, and explicitation hypothesis verification. With the help of a corpus, Huang & Zhu (2012) investigate the translator's style presented in Howard Goldblatt's English translations of contemporary Chinese novels, and similar studies include Hou, Liu & Liu. (2014) and Hou & Hu (2019).

The number of research articles on The *Fu* and its English translation is quite large at home, mostly in journals and dissertations. For example, Wen Jun & Deng Chun (2012) divided 218 articles on the study of the English translation of *Fu* into seven categories according to the research perspective, reviewed each category, and finally suggested that the relevant research on *Fu* should not only adopt scientific research methods "to strengthen statistical analysis", but also expand more English translations of *Fu* for analysis and discussion, etc. The author found that only a few articles were published in "core journals" and "CSSCI journals" when searching the CNKI with the subject term "English translation of "*Fu Sheng Liu Ji*", there are only two dissertations based on the corpus. Given this, this study will establish a one-to-many Chinese-English comparable corpus, and discuss two aspects, namely, translation data and analysis, and translation of characteristics of culture-specific lexis. And we will take the Translational English Corpus (TEC) and British National Corpus (BNC) as reference corpora to explain the causes of these differences among different translations of *Fu*.

3. RESEARCH DESIGN

3.1 Research Materials and Research Questions

The corpus of this study includes Volume 1 of *Fu* and its five English translations, and the specific information of the corpus was showed in Table 1. Among them, Black's translation took into account the confusing chronological order of the original text and reorganized the original text chronologically. However, For the sake of convenience, we rearranged Black's translation according to the original text to achieve paragraph alignment.

At the beginning of the study, this paper examines the situation of the original texts used in the different translations, which are all in traditional characters, except for Sanders' translation, which is in simplified characters. The current edition of "Fu" was mostly proofread and punctuated by Yu Pingbo, based on two editions, one is "*Du Wu An Cong Chao*" (1877) and the other is "*Yanlaihong Magazine*" (1906). The edition of Shuangfeng Press was issued in Beijing in 1924, but this edition is still only a reworked arrangement of the two previous editions (Wang & Xie, 2005: 136), and the original text of Lin Yutang's translation is also mainly based on Yu Pingbo's edition. The original text for this Sanders' translation comes from the 2010 edition of *Fu sheng liu ji*—edited by Miao Huaiming and published by Zhonghua Book Company in Beijing. We know that Shen Fu's original manuscript is untraceable, and the earliest known copy of the base text, which Yang Yinchuan found in an old bookstore and this copy was published and circulated by THE PRESS of Shanghai in 1877. In 1935, the Shanghai World Book published the entire six chapters of *Fu*, but this was proven to be a forgery. Though Pratt & Chiang (1983: 14) did not mention the original text of their translation, their version detailed these forgeries in two brief appendices. So, we can see Pratt's translation is based on this edition or at least considered this edition. While for Black's translation, "The edition I used was published within the last few years by the Wu Kuei T'ang (Five Cassia Hall) Publishing Company of Hong Kong. It too contains the spurious sections, neither of which I have included in this translation." (Black, 2012: xii-xiii). For Wu's translation, the original text of her translation from the edition published by Kaiming Book Co., Ltd of Taiwan (Wu, 1960: 36). However, after investigating the different original texts of different translations, the author found that there is no difference among these editions. Consequently, the content analysis of the five translations selected for this paper was not affected by the difference in original text.

With the help of literature review and problem-solving, this study attempts to address the following questions: 1) what features can effectively reflect the translation style of a translation; 2) what are the differences in translation style presented in different translations, and the reasons for them.

Table 1. Information on the corpus of *Fu* and the five English translations

Original work and author	Translator	Translation	Publication Date	Publisher
Fu Sheng Liu Ji (Shen Fu)	Li Yutang	*Six Chapters of a Floating Life*	1999	Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press
	Leonard Pratt & Chiang Su-Hui	*Six Chapters of Floating Life*	1983	Penguin Group
	Shirley M. Black	*Chapters from a Floating Life*	1960	Oxford University Press
	Graham Sanders	*Six Records of a Life Adrift*	2011	Hackett Publishing Company
	Wu Huei-Ching	*The Six Chapters of a Floating Life*	1960	Unpublished dissertation

3.2 Research Tools and Methods

The statistical tools used in this study are WordSmith Tools 7.0 and AntConc 3.4.0. The statistical tools used for the study were WordSmith Tools 7.0 and AntConc 3.4.0.

In terms of research methodology, this study focused on two levels: linguistic form parameters and culture-specific lexis translation. In terms of linguistic parameters, we mainly search and discuss them at the lexical and syntactic levels, while in terms of culture-specific lexis, we mainly classify the culture-specific lexis appearing in Volume 1 of *Fu*, and use AntConc3.4.0 to search the translation of relevant words in five translations to examine the differences in strategies of different translations in dealing with the same cultural phenomenon and explain the causes.

4. DATA STATISTICS AND ANALYSIS

Drawing on Li Yi's (2020) parametric design model of linguistic forms and using WordSmith 7.0, we can obtain relevant data at the lexical and sentence levels for the five translations of Faust Volume 1 (Table 2).

Types mean the number of different words in the text, while the tokens refer to the number of all occurrences of the word in the text (Baker 1995: 236). According to Baker (2000: 250), the ratio of types and tokens is proportional to the richness and diversity of the vocabulary used by the writer, and when the length of the compared texts are different, the standardized TTR is more reliable. Table 2 shows that Wu's translation has the lowest number of tokens among the five translations and Sanders' translation has the highest number, indicating that Sanders' translation has the highest degree of lexical diversity among the five translations and the Wu's translation has the lowest. The standardized TTR of the Novel sub-corpus of the Translated English Corpus is 44.63 (Olohan, 2004: 63) and the standardized TTR of the British National Corpus (BNC) is 41.20 (Li & Zhu, 2012: 78). Accordingly, we can find that among the five translations, the standardized TTR of Lin's, Pratt's, and Wu's translations are close to that of the English source corpus, indicating that these three translations are more in line with the wording of the original narrative text in English. While the standardized TTR of Sanders' translation is 44.22, Black's translation is 45.83, both of which are close to that of

Table 2. Linguistic formal parameters of the five English translations of Volume 1 of *Fu*

Items		Lin's version	Wu's version	Black's version	Sanders' version	Pratt's version
Lexical level	Types	2101	1926	2684	2852	2354
	Tokens	10955	9321	13253	14266	12912
	Std TTR	41.66	40.32	45.83	44.22	41.76
	Mean word length	4.10	3.97	4.25	4.13	4.10
	1-6 letter words	9446(86.2%)	8119(87.1%)	11057(83.4%)	12209(85.6%)	11190(86.7%)
	7 or more letter words	1509(13.8%)	1202(12.9%)	2196(16.6%)	2057(14.4%)	1722(13.3%)
	Lexical density	44.3%	43.7%	46.7%	47.3%	46.0%
Sentence level	Sentences	563	504	669	656	749
	Mean (in words)	19.46	18.49	19.81	21.75	17.24

the English translation corpus, indicating that the two translations are more in line with the word usage of the English translation corpus of novels.

The Mean word length is used to measure the degree of formality of a text, and the more formal the text, the longer the words tend to be used. In terms of average word length, Wu's translation is the lowest (3.97), Pratt's and Lin's translations are comparable (4.10), Sanders' translation is slightly higher (4.13), and Black's translation (4.25) is the highest and closer to the average word length of 4.36 in the Translated English Corpus (Olohan, 2004: 80). In general, "common texts generally consist of words with 2 to 6 letters" (Chen & Liu, 2013: 47), and we counted the number of words with 1 to 6 letters and words with 7 or more letters in the five translations, and the most frequent words with 1 to 6 letters were in Lin's, Wu's, and Pratt's translations. The lowest frequency is in Black's and Sanders' translations, indicating that Lin's, Wu's, and Pratt's translations tend to use simple words, while the words used in Black's and Sanders' translations are more complex.

Lexical density is the percentage of the ratio of content words to the total number of words in a text and can be used to measure the information load of a text. Stubbs (1996: 72-73) pointed out that content words in English are mainly composed of nouns, notional verbs, adjectives, and adverbs, while functional words are mainly composed of auxiliary verbs, modal verbs, pronouns, prepositions, qualifiers, and conjunctions, etc., and found that the lexical density of most written texts exceeds 40%. Baker (1995: 237-238) found that the lexical density of the English Translation Corpus was significantly lower than that of the original English corpus, inferring that this intentional or unconscious practice of translators made the translations more acceptable to readers. Laviosa (1998: 562) verifies Baker's finding of lower lexical density in the transliterated language when her examination of the English transliterated and original corpus reveals that the lexical density of the transliterated language of the narrative text is 52.87 and the lexical density of the original language is 54.95. In general, the higher the lexical density, the more information the text carries and the more difficult it is to read, and vice versa. Table 2 shows that the lexical density of all five translations does not exceed 50%, among which Sanders' translation is the highest (47.6%), Black's translation and Pratt's translations are the second and Wu's translation is the lowest, which indicates that the textual characteristics of all five translations as translated languages are more obvious. In comparison, the higher proportion of notional words in Sanders', Black's, and Pratt's translations implies that the text carries more information, and the translation is more difficult to read.

The Mean (in words) can be used to measure the difficulty of the text; the longer the sentence, the more difficult the text is, which can be used as a marker of the general translator's style (Olohan, 2004: 81). Laviosa (1998: 564) compared a comparable corpus of English original and English translations and found that the length of the translations of narrative texts was significantly longer than that of the original language texts. Table 2 shows that among the five translations, Sanders' translation has the longest Mean (in words) (21.75), followed by the Black's translation (19.81) and Lin's translation (19.46), Wu's translation (18.49), and the lowest is Pratt's translations (17.25). According to Laviosa (1998: 561), the Mean (in words) of the original narrative text in the English comparable corpus is 15.6 words, and the average sentence length of the narrative text in the English translated corpus is 24.1 words. It is easy to see that Sanders' translation is closer to the English translation text in terms of Mean (in words), and Pratt's translations are closest to the English original text in terms of Mean (in words).

Overall, the five translations show three different translation styles. Sanders' and Black's translations are rich in vocabulary and complex in wording, and the feature of translated texts is obvious and are relatively more difficult to read. Pratt's translation is slightly less rich in vocabulary than Sanders' and Black's translations, but the wording is relatively simple, and the Mean (in words), average word length, and standardized TTR are close to the linguistic features of the original English text. Lin's and Wu's translations tend to use simple vocabulary and are closer in terms of Mean (in words) and standardized TTR, making them relatively less difficult to read.

5. TRANSLATION OF CULTURE-SPECIFIC LEXIS

According to Hu & Li (2021: 112), corpus-based translation style research needs to analyze those words that can highlight the translator's unique linguistic characteristics, in addition to retrieving and analyzing at the level of linguistic form parameters. The great differences between Eastern and Western languages and cultures, together with their different living environments, religious beliefs, values, and aesthetic concepts, make each of them have a more unique vocabulary of cultural characteristics. According to Yao (2010: 53), culture-specific lexis refers to "words that reflect a certain cultural phenomenon, embody a certain cultural understanding, and reflect a certain way of life". Given the rich cultural imagery contained in culture-specific lexis, their proper translation is crucial to the transmission of the source language culture in the target context. By examining the contents of Volume 1 of *Fu*, we grouped and classified the culture-specific lexis into historical and legendary characters, poems, operas and canonical texts, allusions, and festivals (Table 3), examined the differences in strategies and techniques used by different translations in dealing with the same cultural phenomena, analyzed the reasons for them, and verified the findings in the previous paper in terms of linguistic parameters.

According to Table 3, a total of 40 culture-specific lexis were involved in Volume 1 of *Fu*, among which the most are historical and legendary characters (26), followed by poetry, operas, and canonical texts (8), and 3 each are allusions and festivals. Based on the collation and summary of the culture-specific lexis, we searched the translations corresponding to these words with the help of AntConc 3.4.0 and analyzed and discussed them based on the search results.

5.1 Historical and Legendary Characters

There are 26 historical and legendary figures in Volume 1 of *Fu*, of which 24 are historical figures and 2 are legendary figures. 24 historical figures are mostly cultural figures in Chinese history, and these historical figures have become Chinese cultural symbols with typical cultural connotations. The legendary characters, on the other hand, are a cultural phenomenon formed in the unique historical and cultural context of China. Table 4 shows the translation skills of such culture-specific lexis in Volume 1 of *Fu*.

With the help of Table 4, we can see that the five translations of the historical and legendary characters differ greatly in their methods of translation, which involve literal translation, free translation, transliteration, literal translation, or free translation with annotations, transliteration, or free translation with annotations, and ellipsis. Lin's and Wu's translations are more consistent in their translation methods, using transliteration as a whole. Pratt's translation is more consistent with Sanders' translation, and the two translations have a higher proportion of adding annotations (including literal translation with annotations, transliteration with annotations, and free translation with annotations), among which the transliteration with annotations is the most frequent. Black's translation omitted the translation of 17 words, and more than half of the rest 9 cultural words were translated with the

Table 3. Words of cultural characteristics in Volume 1 of *Fu*

Culture-specific lexis	Examples	Number
Historical and legendary characters	李白*(LI bai)*、杜甫*(Du Fu)*、天孙*(Tian Sun)*、月老*(Yue Lao)* etc.	26
Operas and canonical texts	关雎*(Guan Ju)*、楚辞*(Ch'u Tz'u)*、琵琶行*(P'iP'a Player)*、刺梁 *(Ci Liang)*	8
Allusions	鸿案相庄*(Hong An XIang Zhuang)*、锦囊佳句*(Jin Nang Jia Ju)*、弓影杯蛇*(Gong Ying Bei She)*	3
Festivals	鬼节*(Gui Jie)*、七夕*(Qi Xi)*、中秋*(Zhong Qiu)*	3

Table 4. Translation methods of historical and legendary characters in Volume 1 of *Fu*

Versions	Translation method								
	Literal translation	Free translation	Transliteration	literal translation+annotation	Transliteration +annotation	Free translation+annotation	Transliteration+amplification	Free translation+amplification	Ellipsis
Pratt's	1	0	1	0	22	0	0	0	2
Sanders'	0	0	0	1	22	1	0	0	2
Black's	0	0	4	0	0	0	4	1	17
Lin's	1	0	22	1	2	0	0	0	0
Wu's	2	1	23	0	0	0	0	0	0

strategy of annotations. The strategy of transliteration undoubtedly gives readers a foreign language experience, but invariably adds to the difficulty of understanding and perceiving the translation. On the other hand, the strategy of annotations and amplification can obviously expand the capacity of the text and make the hidden information of the original text clear. Let us try to take an example for comparative analysis (to save space, we will partially omit the annotations in the translation below):

(1) 芸设香烛瓜果，同拜天孙于我取轩中。*(沈复 2000: 43)*
Yun she xiang zhu gua guo, tong bai tian sun yu wo qu xuan zhong.

Lin's: Yün prepared incense, candles and some melons and other fruits, so that we might worship the Grandson and Heaven1 in the Hall called " After My Heart." (1. The seventh day.... is ...heavenly lovers, the Cowherd ("Grandson of Heaven")) and the Spinster .... (Lin 1999: 27)

Wu's: Yun prepared incense, candles and some melons and other fruits for worshiping the Grandson of Heaven in the hall called "After my desire." (Wu 1960: 12)

Pratt's: Yün lit candles and set out fruit on the altar by the Pavilion of My Desire, and we worshipped Tien Sun20 together. (20. The Weaver's Star. The legend tells the weaver and the cowherd... in search of a husband.) (Pratt & Chiang 1983: 33-151)

Sanders': Yun set up a small altar with incense sticks and pieces of melon and fruit in My Choice Hall, where we made our obeisance to the Weaving Girl star.23 (23. Legend has it that the Weaving Girl star (Vega) fell in love with the Herd Boy star (Altair) ....) (Sanders 2011: 12)

Black's: Yuen arranged some candles, incense and fruit on a table at the pavilion called 'My Choice', so that she and I could pay our The story goes that the Weaver-girl .... (Black 2012: 15-16)

According to Jin & Jin (2013: 42), "天孙" refers to the star Vega, "in ancient times it was said that the Weaver-girl was the granddaughter of the Emperor of Heaven". In ancient and contemporary China, the familiar mythical love story of the Cowherd and the Weaving Maiden is the most popular one, and the story of the Cowherd and the Weaving Maiden is a symbol of people's desire for beautiful love.

Among the five translations, Wu's translation is simple, translating "天孙" directly as "the Grandson of Heaven", which is literally faithful but not conducive to readers' understanding. It would have been better to add "Chinese Valentine's Day" after the translation. Lin's translation adopted the method of literal translation with 39 annotations, which compensated for the cultural information of

the original text to a certain extent, but the translation of "牛郎" into "天孙" is not correct. Besides, in the annotation, "Grandson of Heaven" should be placed after "Spinster". According to the online etymology dictionary, the word had a literal meaning before the 17th century as "Spinster". After the 17th century, it lost its original meaning and became a legal term meaning "unmarried woman", and in the 18th century it was given the meaning of "old maid", but this does not mean that Lin's translation is wrong, because the word was brought to America by the Puritans and retained its original meaning of "spinner". Pratt's translations take a more detailed strategy of transliteration with annotations so that the reader can taste the original linguistic features and appreciate the unique cultural information of the original text. However, the explaining the legend of the story of the "cowherd and the weaver" in Pratt's version (The legend tells that the weaver and the cowherd were so much in love that they neglected both cloth and cows) is not quite correct, for the reason why they were separated is one of them is mortal and the other is immortal. "天孙" was translated as "Weaving Girl star" in Sanders' version, and the explanation of 103 words was added in the form of footnotes, which added richer and more accurate cultural information than Pratt's translations, and it also uses such familiar constellations as "Vega" and "Altair" to explain the original text. Black's translation is special in that it first translated "天孙" as "Heavenly Suns", and then provided a detailed annotation of the story of the "Cowherd and the Weaving Maiden" in a separate paragraph (113 words). Appiah (2000) ever introduced the concept of thick translation, which is defined as a translated text that the translator tries to reconstruct through interpretation or commentary in a context with deep linguistic and cultural connotations and pointed out that the translated text should contain a large amount of interpretative subtextual materials such as translation notes, footnotes and explanations. Martha Cheung (2006) also pointed out that annotation and commentary were standard methods for academic translation and could achieve thick translation. In this regard, Pratt's translation and Sanders' translation both have a more obvious tendency to converge toward thick translation.

5.2 Poetry, Opera, and Classics

There are eight poems, operas, and canonical texts in Volume 1 of the *Fu*, including famous (关雎) *Guan Ju*, Tang poetry (琵琶行)*Pipa Xing*, ancient Chinese literary texts like (战国策)*Zhang guo ce* etc, and opera plays like (西厢记)*Xi xiang ji*. Table 5 collates the translations of the eight poems, operas, and canonical texts covered in Volume I of *Fu*.

Table 5. Translation methods of poems and songs, operas and canonical texts in Volume 1 of *Fu*

Versions	Translation methods						
	Literal translation	Free translation	Transliteration	Literal translation+annotations	Transliteration+annotations	Free translation+annotations	Ellipsis
Pratt's	1	1	2	2	1	1	0
Sanders'	0	0	0	7	1	0	0
Black's	1	3	2	0	0	0	2
Lin's	2	1	5	0	0	0	0
Wu's	2	1	5	0	0	0	0

Table 5 shows that the five translations of the poetry, operas, and canonical texts in Volume 1 of *Fu* have been translated in different ways, involving seven types of translations methods: literal translation, free translation, transliteration, literal translation, or free translation with annotations, and ellipsis. Among them, Pratt's translations take six translation methods for the eight culture-specific lexis, half of which were translated with annotations. Sanders' translation has the least variation in translation methods, involving only literal translation with annotations and transliteration with annotations. In Black's translation, two words were omitted, and the rest six words were translated by the methods of literal translation, free translation, and transliteration. Lin's and Wu's translations were in complete agreement, with the transliteration method being the main one, supplemented by the literal and free translations. Among the five translations, Sanders' translation is the most adequate in translating the words with cultural characteristics of poetry, opera, and canonical texts in Volume 1 of *Fu,* followed by Pratt's translations. While Black's, Lin's, and Wu's translations added least to such culture-specific lexis of the original text. Let's take an example to show the translation difference between different translations.

(2) 芸忙回首起立曰:*"...西厢之名闻之熟矣..."*。*(沈复 2000: 39)*
Yun mang hui shou qi li yue: "...xi xiang zhi ming wen zhi shu yi...".

Lin's: Quickly Yün.... I have heard of the name of Western Chamber for a long time,... (Lin 1999: 13) (Lin 1999: 13)
Wu's: Yun turned... I have heard of the name of Western Chamber for a long time,... (Wu 1960: 5) (Wu 1960: 5)
Pratt's: Yun turned... *The Romance of the Western Chamber*[8]. (8. A famous Yuan Dynasty play by Wang Shih-fu and Kuan Han-ch'ing...and Yun must have intended her casual reading of the book to be provocative.))) (Pratt & Chiang 1983: 28-149) (Pratt's version added 65 words in the annotation.)
Sanders': Yun quickly... I've heard about Romance of the Western Chamber many times.... .7 (*Xixiang ji*) was an extremely popular Yuan dynasty play ... I've heard about Romance of the Western Chamber many times ... .7 (*Xixiang ji*) was an extremely popular Yuan dynasty play... by Yuan Zhen (779-831) (Sanders 2011: 5) (Sanders' translation added 85 words to the annotation)
Black's: Quickly raising... I have been hearing about The West Chamber... (Black 2012: 9)

In the original text, 西厢 mentioned by Chen Yun refers to 西厢记(*Xi xiang ji*), whose full title is 崔莺莺待月西厢记 *(Cui ying ying dai yue xi xiang ji)*, a traditional Chinese opera written by the Yuan Dynasty literati Wang Shifu, in which the main characters are Zhang Sheng and Cui Yingying. In China, *The Western Chamber* has become synonymous with the love story of man and woman and has a rich cultural connotation. Among the five translations, Lin's, Wu's, and Black's translations all adopted a literal translation method, among them Wu's translation underlining the word "*Western Chamber*" to remind readers that the word has a special meaning. The reason why these three translations adopted a literal translation method might be that *The Western Chamber* is one of the most familiar ancient Chinese plays translated in the English-speaking world. Besides, it had been translated by Arthur David Waley as early as 1919, and his collection of published translations included more than one translation or fragment of 莺莺传*(Ying Ying Zhuan)* (Zhang, 1992: 292). So these three translations translated the title directly without explaining the content of the opera. Pratt's and Sanders' translations translated 西厢记 *(Xi xiang ji)* into *Romance of the Western Chamber* with annotations, which strictly speaking belongs to a combination of domestication and foreignization strategy. As we all know, romance in the English-speaking world emphasizes legendary and romantic features, and its application to classical Chinese literature is more in line with readers' reading perceptions and conducive to better acceptance

by readers of the target language. However, Pratt's focused on the language and content of the story and speculated the purpose of Chen Yun's nightly reading of 西厢记 *(Xi xiang ji)*, while Sanders' translation aims to show readers the background information of the story and its controversies in Chinese literary history, which showed more reference value for readers' academic research.

5.3 Allusions and Festivals

There are only six allusions and festivals in Volume 1 of *Fu*. Allusions generally refer to ancient stories or words with origins that can be cited and have a familiar character to the public. Festivals, on the other hand, refer to holidays and special seasons. The translations of the six culture-specific lexis in the five translations were listed as follows (Table 6).

In Table 6, we find that the translations of allusions and festivals in Pratt's translations did not adopt the same strategy of adding annotations as in the case of the previous two types of culture-specific lexis, and only two of the three allusions were translated by the literal translation method, omitted 鸿案相庄*(Hong an xiang zhuang)*. Among the three festivals, 七夕*(Qi xi)* and中秋*(Zhong qiu)* were translated by literal translation method, and鬼节*(Gui jie)* was translated as "All Souls' Day". Lin's and Wu's translations were basically same, both omitted弓影杯蛇 *(Gong ying bei she)*. In Sanders' translation, the two culture-specific lexis, 锦囊佳句*(Jin nang jia ju)*and鬼节 *(Gui jie)*, were translated literal with annotations, but鸿案相庄*(Hong an xiang zhuang)*were omitted. Among the other three words, two were translated by literal translation method and one by free translation method. In Black's translation, three translation methods were adopted to translate these six culture-specific lexis. Let's take two examples for analysis.

(3) 鸿案相庄廿有三年。*(沈复 2000: 43)*
Hong an xiang zhuang er shi you san niang.

Lin's: And so we remained courteous to each other for twenty-three years of our married life like Liang Hung and Meng Kuang [of the East Han Dynasty]. (Lin 1999: 25)
Wu's: And so we kept courteous to each other for twenty-three years like Liang Hung and his wife. (Wu 1960: 12)
Pratt's: We lived together with the greatest mutual respect for three and twenty years. (Pratt & Chiang 1983: 33)
Sanders': We were to live together as a devoted husband and wife for three and twenty years. (Sanders 2011: 12)
Black's: We lived the years of our short married life with a courtesy and harmony worthy of Liang Hung and Meng Kuang, whose story is told in the Records of the Han Dynasty. Here is the tale as I remember it....Or so the story goes. (Black 2012: 15-16)

Table 6. Translation methods of allusions and festivals in Volume 1 of *Fu*

Versions	Translation methods					
	Literal translation	Free translation	Amplification	Literal translation+annotation	Transliteration+annotation	Ellipsis
Pratt's	5	1	0	0	0	1
Sanders'	2	1	0	2	0	1
Black's	2	2	2	0	0	0
Lin's	3	1	0	0	1	1
Wu's	4	1	0	0	0	1

The allusion鸿案相庄(*Hong an xiang zhuang*)is from the *Book of the Later Han*, which tells the love story of Liang Hong and Meng Guang, and it was often used in later times to express the harmony and respect between husband and wife. Shen Fu used the phrase鸿案相庄(*Hong an xiang zhuang*)to refer to the respectful relationship between himself and his wife. Among the five translations, Lin's and Wu's translations are closer, with the slight difference that Lin's translation added a simple annotation of "of the East Han Dynasty" to鸿案相庄(*Hong an xiang zhuang*), while Wu's translation used the phrase "like Liang Hung and his wife". The fact that neither Pratt's translation nor Sanders' translation translated the allusion of鸿案相庄(*Hong an xiang zhuang*)is a kind of shortcoming. The reason for this situation might be that the allusion is more story-based, especially Sanders' translation was re-translated with full reference to the Pratt's translation and Lin's translation, and the translator tended to add more scholarly culture-specific lexis in the translation. For instance, Sanders' translation added 87 words of annotation to the allusion of锦囊佳句 *(Jin nang jia ju)*. Black's translation is the most adequate, translated the allusion to Liang Hong and Meng Guang in the form of a story, with 197 words in two paragraphs, not only attracting readers' interest but also realizing the cultural exchange function.

(4) 七月望，俗谓之鬼节。*(沈复 2000: 44)*
Qi yue wang, su cheng gui jie.

Lin's version: The fifteenth of the seventh moon was All Souls' Day. (Lin 1999: 29)
Wu's version: The fifteenth of the seventh month was All Soul's Day. (Wu 1960: 13)
Pratt's version: The 15th day of the seventh month, when the moon is full, is the day called the Ghost Festival. (Pratt & Chiang 1983: 34)
Sanders' version: August 14, 1780, was the full moon in the middle of the month, known as the Ghost Festival24. (24. During the Ghost Festival.... . the gates of the underworld were opened to allow the souls of the deceased to return home ....) (Sanders 2011: 13)
Black's version: For the Festival of Hungry Ghosts, on the fifteenth night of the seventh month. (Yuen prepared a little feast in honour of those poor, unhappy spirits who have no living descendants to burn incense before their spirit-tablets.) (Black 2012: 20)

鬼节*(gui jie)*, also known as 中元节(*Zhong Yuan Jie*), is a relatively special festival in China. The Western world also has a ghost festival, generally known as All Souls' Day, which is a religious holiday, and in some denominations, there is even more than one day. We know that it is undoubtedly ideal to find equivalent words to translate between different languages and cultures. In the five translations, Lin and Wu both translated it as "All Souls' Day", which is more easily understood and accepted by the target readers, but it is not conducive to the cultural transmission of the source language. Pratt's translations adopted literal translation strategy, which retains the characteristics of the source language, but the cultural information contained in the source language is missing. Sanders' translation adopted the strategy of literal translation with annotation (44 words), which not only preserved the characteristics of the source language but also presented the cultural information of the source language to target readers. Besides, this also helps to disseminate the cultural information of the source language to the target language. In addition, another point to be noted in Sanders' translation is that when translating historical time, translators often add the corresponding Western calendar time with the Chinese old calendar time in the original text. The strategy of combining domestication and foreignization not only enables readers to fully appreciate the characteristics of the original language but also enhances readers' interest in reading. The original text is 芸备小酌，拟邀月畅饮 (*Yun bei xiao zhuo, ni yao yue chang yin,*)), which means Yun prepared a little dinner so that we could drink together with the moon as our company. However, in Black's translation, it became a small feast prepared by Chen Yun for those unfortunate ghosts who have no descendants, which increased the

content that did not present in the original work, but the adding information seems very smoothly in the translation and did not increase the reader's reading burden at all.

In summary, the translations of the five translations of the culture-specific lexis in Volume 1 of *Fu* can be said to be very different. Lin's and Wu's translations are more consistent, mainly adopted a combination of transliteration and literal translation strategies. While the transliteration strategy can not only reflect the characteristics of the Chinese language, but also "help retain the mystery and exoticism of the original language, and the audience of the translated language can get a better experience of the special effect of Chinese culture" (Xiong, 2014: 40). Over 60% of the culture-specific lexis in both Pratt's and Sanders' translation used annotation strategy, which helps to strengthen and deepen readers' understanding of the original language and cultural information and expand their reading horizons. Besides, it also provides better reference materials for readers who are interested in the Chinese language and culture for their research. Black's translation is special in that the translator often added the translator's own understanding and explanatory words in the translation process, and also developed the story narration in the author's voice. In addition, the content added in Black's translation is mostly story-based information, which can greatly increase readers' interest in reading, and then to realize the communicative purpose of translation. Although it was not considered faithful to the original work, the use of additional translation or creative translation strategies is more helpful to improve readers' acceptance and to expand the spread of cultural information about the original language among the target language group.

6. READABILITY TEST

Generally speaking, the factors that determine the readability of a text are mainly the sentence length and the difficulty of the vocabulary. We can use the readability formula to analyze the readability of the text. The Flesh Reading Ease Readability Formula, Flesh-Kincaid Grade Level Readability Formula, and Gunning FOG Formula are the main readability formulas. These three formulas measure the readability index, difficulty level, and FOG index of a text, respectively.

The Flesh Reading Ease Readability Formula (RE) is considered as one of the oldest and most accurate readability formulas. This Formula is the most widely used formula outside of the educational community, and a reading ease index between 60 and 70 is considered "standard difficulty" (Yang, 2004). The Flesh Reading Ease Readability Formula (RE) is:

$$RE=206.835-(1.015 \times ASL)-(84.6 \times ASW)$$

The ASL in this formula represents the Average Sentence Length (ASL); ASW represents the Average number of syllables per word (ASW). The relationship between the readability index and the difficulty of the text is as follows: the output, i.e., RE is a number ranging from 0 to 100. The higher the number, the easier the text is to read. When the scores is 90~100, the text is very easy to read, which is equivalent to the difficulty of reading the text by native English readers in grade 5; when the scores is 80~89, the readability in a document is easy; when the scores is 70~79, the readability in a document is fairly easy, when the score is 60~69, the readability in a document is standard, which is equivalent to the difficulty of reading the text by native English readers in grade 8-9; when the score is 50~59, the readability in the text is fairly difficult; when the scores is 30~49, it means the readability of the document is difficult; when the scores is 0~29, the readability of the document is very confusing, which is equivalent to the difficulty of reading texts by college students.

Flesch Grade Level Readability Formula improves upon the Flesch Reading Ease Readability Formula. And it is mainly used to measure the grade level of American schools, and its formula is:

$$FKRA = (0.39 \times ASL) + (11.8 \times ASW) - 15.99$$

The ASL and ASW in this formula are the same as those indicated by The Flesh Reading Ease Readability Formula, and the results of their calculation are easier to understand, such as a result of 5.0 indicating that the text is suitable for reading by elementary school students in grade 5 (the average age is about 10 years old), and a score of 9.3 indicating that the text is suitable for reading by secondary school students in grade 9.

The Gunning's Fog Index (or FOG) Readability Formula can calculate the difficulty of text readability, the larger the FOG index means the text is more difficult to read, the smaller the index means the text is easier to read, in other words, short sentences written in ordinary English are easier to read than long sentences written in complex language. The formula is:

Grade Level = 0.4 (ASL + PHW)

In the formula, ASL is the average sentence length, while PHW indicates the average number of words with three or more syllables per hundred words. The FOG Index measures how many years of education a reader needs to read a text to understand it. The ideal readability score for the FOG Index is 7 or 8, and a score above 12 indicates that the text is too difficult for most readers to read; in other words, a score above 12 indicates that a reader needs a college degree to read it.

The SMOG Index, the Coleman-Liau Index, the Linsear Write Formula, and the Automated Reader's Index are other formulas of text readability that could also be found in the online website https://readabilityformulas.com/gunning-fog-readability-formula.php. In this paper, We selected the common readability measurement formulas such as: The Flesh Reading Ease Readability Formula, Flesh-Kincaid Grade Level Readability Formula, and Gunning FOG Formula, to measure the readability of different translations of the five translations of *Fu* (see Table 7).

With the help of Table 7, we can find that among the three Readability indexes of the five translations, Pratt's translation has the highest score of Flesh Reading Ease Readability (80), and the lowest scores of Flesh-Kincaid Grade Level Readability and Gunning FOG (8.8), which means that Pratt's translation is the easiest one to read, and the translation can be read by readers of 6th-grade language level whose native language is English. The reason for this is that there are many annotations in the translation. Among the three Readability measures of the five translations, the one with the lowest Flesh Reading Ease Readability, the highest Flesh-Kincaid Grade Level Readability level, and the highest FOG index is Sanders' translation, which indicates that Sanders' translation is the most difficult to understand. The FOG Index for Sanders' translation is 12.4, indicating that Sanders' translation is more suitable for well-educated (higher-educated) readers. Among the other three translations, Black's translation is slightly easier than Sanders' translation, but the reading difficulty index is still higher than the other translations. Lin's and Wu's translations are slightly more difficult to read than Pratt's translation because they used more transliteration for culture-specific lexis and did not have many annotations. These data are also consistent with the statistical results of our analysis in the previous section.

Table 7. The readability calculation of the five translations in Volume 1 of *Fu*

Versions	Flesh Reading Ease Readability Formula	Flesh-Kincaid Grade Level Readability Formula	Gunning FOG Formula
Pratt's	80	6.3	8.8
Sanders'	66.5	10	12.4
Black's	70.2	8.9	11.4
Lin's	73.7	8.4	10.9
Wu's	75.5	7.9	10.4

7. ANALYSIS OF THE CAUSES OF TRANSLATION STYLE

We know that translation, as a special social activity, is inevitably influenced by the social ideology of a specific historical period, and also by the individual ideology of the translator himself. The differences are not only influenced by the socio-cultural background of the translator, but also by the translator's ideology such as the translation purpose and the focus point of the target readers.

With the help of the parameters of the corpus data counted by the corpus software, the comparison of translations of culture-specific lexis, and the readability test, we find that the five translations roughly present three different styles. In terms of the translators' backgrounds, the five translations appear over a span of more than 70 years, with Lin's translation being the earliest, in the 1930s. For English translations of Chinese literature, the first thirty years of the twentieth century can be said to be the pioneering period of translating Chinese classical literature into the European and American world, "the Western world was far from paying that much attention to Chinese affairs" (Wang, 2007: 100). China was a distant country to them, and Chinese culture was full of mystery. Therefore, Lin's translation tends to use simple vocabulary, and the culture-specific lexis in the original text were mostly translated phonetically without affecting the translator's understanding of the content of the original text. As for the cultural phenomena common to both the Chinese and English-speaking worlds, it was translated by their English equivalents, which not only satisfies the readers' curiosity but also does not affect their understanding and acceptance. Wu's translation is closer to the style of Lin's translation, which appeared in Taiwan in the 1960s. Since it was only a dissertation and the translator did it might to complete her degree requirements, the translation borrowed a lot from Lin's translation. Black's translation was published in Britain in the 1960s, and the Cold War confrontation between the Eastern and Western worlds made the interest of Western readers in Chinese culture more limited during this period. So the translator clearly stated in the translator's introduction that one of his translation strategies is to try to present the translation in the way the author expresses himself (Black 2012: xiii), to achieve seamless integration between the translation and the original text, and the cultural otherness in the original text was minimized. Pratt's translation was made in the 1980s, a period when China was in the early stages of reform and opening up and the Western world was eager to learn about China. Therefore, in the introduction, the translators discussed the culture of courtesans, the issue of marriage, and the issue of education in ancient China, etc. The translation is richer in vocabulary, with a large number of transliterations of culture-specific lexis and a large number of annotations, which serve to spread the culture of the source language. Besides, the two translators of this version, one is a native Chinese translator and the other is a native English speaker, so the language is simpler and easier to understand, and the extensive annotations also greatly increased the readability of the translation. Sanders' translation was published in 2011, a period when China's economic strength and cultural soft power were unparalleled, and the cultural exchange between East and West had entered a new stage. Sanders' translation had begun with a translator's foreword (Sanders, 2011: viii), stating that the main purpose of his translation was to add background information and that he had made good use of research-style view and commentary on the content of the original text.

In terms of the target readers, Lin translation, as mentioned in the translator's introduction, is intended primarily to translate the story for the world to know (Lin, 1999: 17) and is intended for a general audience, while the Lin translation's excellent writing has led to its selection as one of the Chinese literature textbooks used in English classes for American high school students (Harry, 1943: 23). According to Birch (1961: 527), Lin's version tended toward domestication in translating culture-loaded words, however, the annotation is too few. But Kwong (2011:191) treated Lin's translation of the name of the original text is most accurate and labor-saving translation. Wu's

translation, similar to the Lin translation, mentions in the introduction to the translation (1960) that the purpose of its translation is to tell the story, but this translation is only a dissertation with one chapter, so the dissemination is extremely limited. Black's translation omitted the overly specialized linguistic and cultural information in the original text. However, we all know that human beings share a "mythological complex" (Zhang, 1992: 202) in both the East and the West, and Black's translation treated the stories or myths and legends in the original text in an augmented and more naturalized form, which can be easily recognized by English readers. Birch (1961: 527) commented that Black's translation is accurate, natural, beautiful, and dynamic version. To make up for the shortcomings of Lin's translation, Pratt's translation provided readers with a most faithful, accurate, and complete translation of the original text in modern English (Pratt 1983: 14), and the target reader is not limited to general readers as in the previous translation but to professional readers or researchers. Heiter (2001) ever commented that "While the beauty of Shen Fu's words truly merit the efforts required to read it in the original Chinese, lacking that ability, his English-speaking readers will no doubt experience the next best thing with this (Leonard Pratt and Chiang Su-Hui) skillful translation." Similar to Pratt's translations, Sanders' translation often adopts a combination of domestication and foreignization in translating Chinese cultural characteristics,. With rich wording and a tendency of thick translation, this version made an all-round and exhaustive approach to the original text and has a high research value for Chinese language and literature researchers. Among the five translations, Sanders' translation received the most compliments. Hill (2012: 621) believed that Sanders' translation corrected many of the errors in previous versions and provided a reference for the study of late Qing or modern Chinese literature, history, and culture, described it as a "new authoritative translation". Sample (2012: 118) praised Sanders' translation is the richest and most comprehensive than the previous translation of *Fu.*

8. CONCLUSION

The study compared and contrasted the translation styles of Volume 1 of *Fu,* and its five English translations with the help of corpus tools. It is found that the five translations are very different from each other, showing three different styles of translation. Lin's translation is simpler in wording, with higher accuracy, readability, and acceptability. The main purpose is to let western readers understand traditional Chinese literary works and to expand the influence of Chinese literary works in the West, and the culture-specific lexis in the original text are mostly translated phonetically without affecting the translator's understanding of the content of the original text. The literal translation strategy will cause obstacles to the target language readers' understanding, so the translator can adjust the unfamiliar elements of the original text through free translation strategy. Wu's translation basically maintains the same translation style as Lin's translation, and we presume that Wu's translation borrowed a lot from Lin's translation. Pratt's translations and Sanders' translation are centered on the source language, faithful to the unique features of the source language. And it shows the translator's translation position of spreading Chinese culture, especially in compensating for the cultural information of the original language in different dimensions. However, in comparison, the readability of Pratt's translations are the highest, most suitable for general readers to read and understand, while the readability of Sanders' translation is the lowest and the most difficult to understand, with a more obvious tendency to approach thick translation. Black's translation is special in that the translator made good use of the translator's role in the translation process, it added and embellished the information of the original language in the translation process with the help of the translator's own understanding of the culture of the original language. So, Black's version appears to be well-written and full of ink, and the translator also imitated the author's tone

to add the implicit cultural information of the original language, which brings the distance between the author and the readers closer. The very different translation styles of the five translations are mainly due to the differences in the translators' backgrounds and target readers.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

FUNDING BODY INFORMATION

REFERENCES

Appiah, K. A. (2000). Thick Translation. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader*. Routledge.

Baker, M. (1993). Corpus Linguistics and translation studies: implications and applications. In M. Baker, G. Francis, & E. Tognini-Bonelli (Eds.), *Text and Technology: In Honour of John Sinclair,* (pp. 233–250). John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/z.64.15bak

Baker, M. (1995). Corpora in translation studies: An overview and some suggestions for future research. *Target*, *7*(2), 223–243. doi:10.1075/target.7.2.03bak

Baker, M. (2000). Towards a methodology for investigating the style of a literary translator. *Target*, *12*(2), 241–266. doi:10.1075/target.12.2.04bak

Birch, C. (1961). Book review: Chapters from a Floating Life, The Autobiography of a Chinese Artist, by Shen Fu: Shirley M. Black. *The Journal of Asian Studies*, *4*, 526–527. doi:10.2307/2049966

Black, S. M. (1960). *Six Records of Floating Life*. Oxford University Press.

Bosseaux, C. (2001). A study of the translator's voice and style in the French translations of Virginia Wolf's *The Waves. CTIS Occasional Papers, 1*, 55-75.

Chen, J. S. & L. G. (2013). A Corpus-based Study of Translator's Style: A Case Study of Two English Versions of Mu Dan Ting. *Journal of Tianjin Foreign Studies University*, *6*, 45–51.

Cheung, M. P. Y. (2006). In P. Y. Martha Cheung. eds., An Anthology of Chinese Discourse on Translation: From Earliest Times to the Buddhist Project. Manchester, UK and Kinderhook; USA, Saint Jerome Publications.

Harry, A. (1943). Domincovich. Chinese Literature for the English Classroom. *English Journal*, *1*, 19–26.

HeiterC. (2001). http://thingsasian.com/story/book-review-six-records-floating-life-shen-fu

Hill, M. G. (2012). Shen Fu (translated, with introduction and notes, by Graham Sanders): *Six Records of a Life Adrift. Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies. University of London. School of Oriental and African Studies*, *75*(3), 620–621. doi:10.1017/S0041977X12000961

Hou, Y., & Hu, K.B. (2019). A Corpus-Based Study of Co-Translation Style of Howard Goldblatt and Lin Li-chun: With Reference to Their English Version of Liu Zhunyun's Novels. *Journal of Yanshan University (Philosophy and Social Science Edition), 1*, 32-41.

Hou, Yu., Liu, Z. Q., & Liu, D. J. (2014). A Corpus-based Study of Howard Goldblatt's Translator's Style: With Reference to Their English Version of Mo Yan's Novel. *Foreign Languages and Their Teaching*, *2*, 72–78.

Hu, K. B., & Li, Y. (2021). *Introducing Corpus-Based Study of Literary Translation*. Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.

Huang, L. B., & Zhu, Z. Y. (2012). Corpus-Based Study of Translator's Style: A Case Study of Howard Goldblatt's English Translation of Modern and Contemporary Chinese Novels. *Foreign Languages Research*, *5*, 64–71.

Kenny, D. (2001). *Lexis and Creativity in Translation: A corpus-based study* [M]. Manchester, St Jerome.

Laviosa, S. (1998). Core Patterns of Lexical Use in a Comparative Corpus of English Narrative Prose. *Meta*, *43*(4), 557–570. doi:10.7202/003425ar

Li, M. J., & Zhu, W. (2012). A Study of the Style of the English Translation of *Hong Lou Meng* based on a Parallel Corpus. *Journal of South-Central University for Nationalities*, *2*, 177–180.

Li, Y. (2020). A Corpus-based Comparative Study on the Translation Style of Two English Versions of Qi Wang. *Shangdong Foreign Language Teaching*, *1*, 125–135.

Lin, Y. T. (1999). *Six Chapters of A floating Life*. Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.

Liu, Z. Q., & Yan, J. M. (2010). Choice and Style: On the English Translation of the Reporting Verbs Headed by *Dao* in *Hong Lou Meng. Journal of PLA University of Foreign Languages*, *4*, 87–92.

Olohan, M. (2004). *Introducing Corpora in Translation Studies*. Rutledge. doi:10.4324/9780203640005

Pratt, L., & Chiang, S. H. (1983). *Six Records of Floating Life*. Penguin Grouup.

Saldanha, G. (2011). Translator Style: Methodological Considerations. *Translator*, *17*(1), 25–50. doi:10.1080/13556509.2011.10799478

Sample, J. (2012). Book review: Shen Fu. *Six Records of a Life Adrift*, translated with an introduction and notes by Graham Sanders. *China Review International*, *19*(1), 116–118. doi:10.1353/cri.2012.0011

Sanders, G. (2011). *Six Records of a Life Adrift*. Hackett Publishing Company, Inc.

Shen, F. (2000). Fu Sheng Liu Ji and Other Three. Shanghai, Shanghai Chinese Classics Publishing House.

Shen, F. translated by Wang, Yanghai, from English Version of Pratt, Leonard & Chiang, Su-hui (trans.). (2015). Six Chapter of a Floating Life: A Version of Chinese and English [M]. Nanjing, Yilin Press.

Stubbs, Michael. (1996). *Text and Corpus Analysis*. Oxford, Black well.

Wang, H. L. (2007). *From Sea to Sea: Columbia University and Modern China*. Shanghai Bookstore Publishing House.

Wang, R. E., & Xie, Z. H. (2005). A Review of the Century Studies on *Fu Sheng Liu Ji. Gansu Social Science*, *4*, 136–144.

Wen, J., & Deng, C. (2012). The Study of English Translations of *Fushengliuji* in China: Reviews and Suggestions. *Contemporary Foreign Languages Studies*, *10*, 56–60.

Xiong, X. (2014). Theory of Transliteration and the background of Transliteration Creation. *Chinese Science & Technology Translations Journal*, *1*, 39–41.

Xu, D., & Xu, J. (2015). Translation and Dissemination of Chinese Classics: On the "Library of Chinese Classics". *Foreign Language Learning Theory and Practice*, *3*, 13–17.

Yang, H. Z. (2004). An Analysis of the English Proficiency of the Chinese Studies as Reflected in the National CET Test. *Foreign Languages in China*, *1*, 56–60.

Yao, X. M. (2010). On Defining the Culture-specific Words in the Chinese-English Dictionary. *Shanghai Journal of Translators*, *4*, 53–56.

Zhang, H. (1992). *Chinese Literature in England*. Huacheng Publishing House.

Bing Zhang is a lecturer in the international college of Guangzhou College of Commerce, and he is also a doctoral student of the Graduate Institute of Translation and Interpretation, Taiwan Normal University. His main research interests include translation studies and corpus-based translation study.