A Corpus-based Study of Gaoxin Huang's Poetry Translation Style

CHONGYUE LI

Abstract

Though he himself is not a poet, Gaoxin Huang (1936-) has published a dozen of translated poetry collections. Huang has further developed the poetry translation strategy of "yidun daibu" (substituting pause for foot) on the basis of his predecessors and proposed quantitative standards of poetic meter and the "Emulation Method". This study attempts to examine Huang's poetry translation style with a corpus-based quantitative and qualitative study. For the study two corpora are constructed: a bilingual parallel corpus of 100 English poems with their Chinese translations and a monolingual comparable corpus of Chinese translations of 100 English poems and 280 original Chinese poems. Data on lexicon, syntax and phonology are collected from the two corpora to address the stylistic characteristics of Huang's poetry translation at the lexical, syntactic and phonological levels. Huang's translation employs a richer vocabulary than the original English poems, and the choice of words is more akin to the original Chinese poems. Huang does not replicate the original poem, but preserves the original poem's harmony of structure, rhythm, and word count by substituting the Chinese pause for the English foot and making full use of the Chinese conjunctions.

Keywords：Gaoxin Huang, Poetry Translation, Translator's Style, Corpus.

Introduction

Since China's reform and opening up in 1980s, free verse has been increasingly popular, while metrical poetry has faded into obscurity. Gaoxin Huang (1936－), a prolific poetry translator and translation theorist in China, however, advocated that it is critical to translate foreign metrical poetry into Chinese in a metrical form in order to keep the flavor of the original

poems (G. X. Huang 1999b). Though he has not published his own poems, Huang has translated and published a dozen of collected poems, including *Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám* (E. Fitzgerald 1982), *Selected Lyrical Poems of Wordsworth* (Wordsworth 2000), and *Selected Poems of Tennyson* (Tennyson 1993). Huang sought to maintain the meter of the original poems, proposed the quantitative norms for poetic meter, advanced the "Emulation Method" theory, and expanded on his predecessors' principle of "*yidun daibu*" (substituting pause for foot) (G. X. Huang 1999a: 365-375). The uniqueness of Huang's style has distinguished his translated poems from others and sparked debates about his translation style. Those involved in the debate over Huang's poetry translation are divided into two camps: one (e.g. X. M. Liu 2007; L. Y. Zhang 2011; M. Yang & J. M. Cha 2016) believes that Huang's translations deliberately conform to his translation theory, misinterpreting the poems and abandoning the formal features of the original poems; the other (e.g. J. X. Zhu 2012; Y. Wang 2016) thinks that Huang's translations express not only the meaning but also the formal beauty of the original poems. For a better understanding of Huang's translation style, a compound corpus is constructed to compare his poem translations with their English originals and a collection of contemporary Chinese lyrical poems. The paper conducts a corpus-based study of Huang's poetry translation to find out Huang's poetry translation style at the lexical level, the syntactic level and the phonological level. This study aims to disprove, to some degree, the widely accepted assumption that only poets can translate poems.

Literature Review

Gaoxin Huang's achievements in poetry translation practice and theory are noticeable. He has challenged the notion that poetry is untranslatable and established the "Emulation

Method" and the quantitative criterion for the Chinese translation of English metrical poetry (G. X. Huang 1999a). G. X. Huang (1999: 1) suggested that "poetry may not be untranslatable". The issue of whether or not poetry is translatable has always been a matter of debate. The assumption that poetry is untranslatable is held by not a few poets, both Chinese and foreign. Shelley, for example, argued that "to translate a poet's composition from one language into another is as unwise as to throw a violet into a crucible and attempt to discover thereby the principles of its colour and fragrance" (as cited in Lefevere 2010: 58). Robert Frost was more direct, allegedly arguing that "poetry is what gets lost in translation" (A. Jones 1996: 408). G. X. Huang (2013) argued that the answer to whether poetry is translatable depends on what is to be translated and how it is translated.

Following Dayu Sun (1905-1997) and Zhilin Bian (1910-2000), Huang improved the principle of "*yidun daibu*" (substituting pause for foot) for the Chinese translation of foreign poetry. Combining the strengths of his two predecessors, he developed a method that is more faithful to the metrical form of the original poems, i.e. to equalize the number of pauses in each line of the Chinese translation with that of feet in each original line while making the number of Chinese characters in the translated lines corresponding to or equal to the number of syllables in the original English poems, and argued for its rationality, feasibility and necessity (G. X. Huang, 1999a: 365-375). This_method simultaneously paid attention to the number of pauses, the number of characters, and the rhythm patterns, also known as the "Emulation Method" (G. X. Huang 1999a: 365-377). X. M. Liu (2007) questioned this method, arguing that the number of pauses does not fully reflect the metre of the original poem, that the number of Chinese characters has little impact on the reproduction of the original rhythm, and that a fixed number of

words in a line do not contribute to the development of poetry translation. J. X. Zhu (2012) acclaimed the "Emulation Method" while M. Yang & J. M. Zha (2016) regarded the method as a seemingly scientific, seemingly faithful and seemingly reciprocal one.

The central thread running through Huang's translation practice and theory is his adherence to the principle of reciprocity and equivalence in poetry translation, i.e. Chinese translation of Western metrical poetry in metrical form (T. Liu 2011). Huang (1999b) proposed a quantitative criterion for poetry translation, by which poem translation can be divided into three levels of original-translation consistency according to the word count, syllables, and rhythms: totally consistent, partially consistent and utterly inconsistent. B. T. Wang (2005) found that some of Huang's translations seem to fall short of the quantitative standard. The quantitative standard set by Huang is, perhaps, an objective measure that can help translators to achieve the "highest standard of poetry translation", that is, simultaneously paying attention to the number of pauses, the number of characters, and the rhyming patterns in the Chinese translation (G. X. Huang 1999b), but it is not easy to realize.

On the one hand, corpus-based research on poetry translator's style is still scarce either in China or the other countries, and a mature corpus-based research model of poetry translator's style has not yet been created. On the other hand, although Huang's translation has been the subject of scholarly research, few corpus-based studies have been devoted to Huang's translation style. This study aims to introduce a corpus-based quantitative and qualitative approach to Gaoxin Huang's poetry translation to increase the scope and depth of poetry translation style research.

Translator's Style and Research Methodology

Whether translators could have a style of their own was controversial. Based on subjective perceptions and intuitive judgments, studies on translators' styles in the past examined how they should remain faithful to the original text and reproduce the author's style to the fullest extent possible. T. Savory (1957) argued that translations should transfer the style of the source work and that the translator's mission is to convey both the content and style of the original text and refrain from injecting his own style into the translation. Scholars have acquired a new understanding of the translator's style, that is, the translator's style is no longer unconditionally subordinate to the original author's style but becomes separate and independent (e.g., Baker 2000; C. Bosseaux 2001). Hermans (1996: 27) presented the concept of "translator's voice" for the first time in Translation Studies, arguing that in addition to the author's voice, there is a translator's voice in the translated narrative text. Baker (2000: 245) introduced the concept of the translator's style and suggested a "translator's fingerprint", that is, a translator's style is like a translator's fingerprint, with unique characteristics. As G. Saldanha (2011) claimed, the translator's style is the way the translator interprets texts, which is characterized by three main features: (1) embodied in different translations by the same translator; (2) different from that of other translators; and (3) driven by certain motives and serving a specific purpose. The translator's style has placed the translator at the centre of the translated work. In recent years, more and more studies have been carried out on the style of translators. Baker (2004: 169-181) proposed an analogy-based study of the translator's style, which focuses on the overall differences in the translation style exhibited by different translators across all their translations, such as differences in lexical diversity, sentence complexity, narrative style, and so on, without considering the influence of the

source text. Most current studies on the translator's style are based on Baker's research model. This paper applies the speakability of drama translation (S. Aaltonen 2000) to poetry as part of our examination of the style of poetry translator.

The texts in this study are collected from *100 American Lyric Poems (English-Chinese)* (G. X. Huang 1994) and *Selected Lyric Poems of 100 Chinese Poets* (Z. M. Wang 1991). The former features a total of 100 great lyric poems by 82 American poets, and the latter is a collection of 280 lyric poems written by 102 excellent Chinese poets and published between 1949 and 1990. These poems are optimistic and elegant in ideas and style. The two collections were published roughly at the same time, so it is feasible to build a parallel corpus of English poems and Gaoxin Huang's translation and a comparable corpus of Huang's translation and original Chinese poems. The PDF version of the selected texts was first converted into a Word version, then into TXT texts and manually proofread, encoded in UTF-8. The text was initially created as a text file and then annotated for word separation, using Claws 4 (http://ucrel-api.lancaster.ac.uk/claws/free.html) for English and CorpusWordParser (www.cncorpus.org) for Chinese. To ensure the accuracy of the data, manual checking was conducted after the automatic processing. WordSmith 8.0, AntConc 3.5.7, ParaConc, and Praat were used to load the corpus into the processing software. The data was then processed to find the occurrences of the different parameters. Qualitative, quantitative and comparative analyses are used to ensure that the study is more scientific and objective in nature.

Results and Analysis

A poet's style is displayed by the poet's deviation from 'expected norms' of linguistic expression. Deviation in poetry may include lexical deviation, collocation deviation and syntactic deviation (Leech 2008: 59), from the perspective of

which a poetry translator's style can be studied. The concept of speakability was introduced at the phonological level in drama translation to enrich the study of the translator's style (S. Bassnett 1985). For the convenience of writing, the corpus of original English poems is referred to as CSP (Corpus of Source Poems); the corpus of Chinese translated poems is referred to as CTP (Corpus of Target Poems); and the corpus of original Chinese poems is referred to as CCP (Corpus of Chinese Poems).

Lexical Level

The translator's style at the lexical level is studied by the standardized type/token ratios (STTR), word length, lexical density, and high frequency words. The value of STTR in CTP was compared to those in CSP and CCP in order to determine the lexical variety of different corpora. Detailed data are shown in the following table.

CORPUS	**CSP**	**CTP**	**CCP**
Token	14,133	14,882	24,233
Type	3,353	4,156	6,896
STTR	47.51	55.67	58.09

Table 1. STTR of CSP, CTP and CCP

STTR values for CSP, CTP, and CCP are 47.51, 55.67 and 58.09 respectively. CCP has the highest degree of lexical variation in terms of data alone. CTP's STTR is 8.16 points higher than that of CSP, indicating that the diction is more extensive and the translation is more accessible than the source poems. The STTR of CTP is comparable to that of CCP, with just 2.42 in the D-value, indicating that the lexical richness and reading difficulty of the translated lyrics are comparable to those of the original Chinese poems. From the data, it can be concluded that Gaoxin Huang's translation style is quite similar to that of the original Chinese poems in lexical

richness.

The word length, related to the number of letters in English words and the number of characters in Chinese words, is crucial for demonstrating the translator's style. As a character equals a syllable in Chinese, the length of a Chinese word can be expressed in terms of the number of syllables. The word length of a translation reflects the translator's habits of and preferences for diction. WordSmith 8.0 was used to obtain the word length and average word length of CTP and CCP.

	CTP		**CCP**	
Word Length	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
1-character word	8374	56.269%	13477	55.614%
2-character word	6182	41.540%	10148	41.877%
3-character word	251	1.687%	420	1.733%
4-character word	73	0.491%	185	0.763%
5-character word	2	0.013%	3	0.012%
Mean word length	1.46		1.48	

Table 2. Mean word length and number of x-character word

As shown in Table 2, the average word lengths for CTP and CCP are similar. In both corpora, the 1-character word occurs most frequently in both Chinese corpora, followed by the 2-character word, followed by the 3-, 4-, and 5-character words in that sequence, which corresponds to the transcription of location and personal names in the original language. The frequency and proportion of x-character words in both corpora are consistent—the proportion decreases as the number of x-character words increases. This is because Chinese is a Sino-Tibetan language written in a syllabic script with ideographic tendencies, and the majority of its morphemes is monosyllabic and can be combined freely to form words. Because a single

Chinese character can cover many meanings, the percentage of the one-character words and two-character words are close in both corpora, which indicates that the semantic complexity of the Chinese words does not increase with the number of characters in the words. The complexity of words and the word choice pattern in Huang Gaoxin's poem translations are closer to those of the original Chinese poets of the same period, which reflects the fact that despite Huang Gaoxin's preference for conveying the structure of the English poems, his style of diction in poetry translation is the same as that of Chinese poets.

The higher the lexical density, the greater the number of content words in the text, and the more information the sentence contains. Content word in English refers to a word, typically a noun, verb, adjective, or adverb (Ginzburg 1966: 7), which contains semantic meanings without regard to its role in the sentence. It is distinct from function words like pronouns, prepositions, conjunctions, articles, and auxiliary verbs, among others. However, the distinction between content and function words remains debatable in the classification of Chinese words. TTR value may also be interpreted as lexical density (M. C. Liang, W. Z. Li, & J. J. Xu 2010). Biber and others (1999: 15) argued that content words include nouns, content verbs, adjectives and adverbs. In the classification of Chinese content words, some Chinese scholars adopted the view of S. X. Lv and D. X. Zhu (2013: 185), who classified nouns, verbs and adjectives as content words and adverbs, pronouns, prepositions, conjunctions, auxiliaries and exclamations as function words; Other scholars have followed the English standard, classifying nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs as the content words (B. R. Huang & X. D. Liao 1991; W. D. Chen 1997; Y S Hu 2019). Therefore, to obtain more precise statistics, we calculated the lexical density by these two classification criteria respectively. Using CLAWS C7 Tagset

and Corpus-Word-Parser, we annotated the English poems, Gaoxin Huang's Chinese translations, and the Chinese original poems, and obtained the following results.

CORPUS	**CSP**	**CTP**	**CCP**
Nouns	3424	3812	7234
Verbs	2600	3642	5584
Adjectives	1078	1211	1941
Adverbs	748	1011	1407
Lexical Density (excludes adverbs)	50.25%	58.22%	60.90%
Lexical Density (includes adverbs)	55.54%	65.02%	66.71%

Table 3. Lexical density of three corpora

Table 3 reveals that despite the differences in the values obtained by the different criteria, their results are similar. The lexical density of the original English poems is the lowest. In contrast, the lexical density of Huang Gaoxin's translation is higher than that of the original English lyrics and is very close to that of the original Chinese poems, indicating that Huang Gaoxin tended to use more content words to reproduce the source texts so that more information was conveyed in a limited number of characters. It is worth noting that the ratio of nouns to verbs in the original English poems is 1.32: 1, while the ratio of nouns to verbs in Huang Gaoxin's translation is 1.05: 1. It is evident that Huang increased the use of verbs in his poem translations, which also shows that he has consciously adapted his translation strategy to the target language, as Chinese is a verb-first language, while English is a noun-first language (D. Q. Liu 2010: 3). Apart from nouns and verbs, there is no significant difference in the proportion of adjectives and adverbs. Therefore, we can assume that lexical density is directly related to the proportion of nouns and verbs (mainly nouns).

It may be a misconception to assume that the higher the lexical density, the higher the quality of the translation. Gaoxin Huang insisted on the translation's "similarity" to the source poem in terms of structure and a similar musical effect in terms of rhythm. As a result, Huang's translation has a somewhat higher lexical density than the original English poetry. The similarity in lexical density between Huang's translated poems and the original Chinese poems suggests that the two corpora are similar in complexity and difficulty, showing that Huang's translated poems and the original Chinese poems share common qualities.

WordSmith 8.0 is used to tabulate the frequency of the words in the corpora. After due consideration, the top 200 high-frequency words from each of the three corpora are selected for analysis. There are 108 content words among the top 200 high-frequency words in CSP, while there are 98 content words among the top 200 high-frequency words in CTP. Only 81 of the 108 content words in the CSP have a corresponding content word in the CTP, indicating a 75% overlap of content words. To ascertain the features of Huang's choice of words, we searched the parallel corpus for certain Chinese content words and discovered some new items. We discovered that one content word in Chinese often corresponded to several English content words. For instance, the word 哭 in the Chinese translation corresponds to *cry* and *weep* in the English original. The word 风 corresponds to the words *blast, breeze, wind, etc.* in the English original. Huang simplified the words in English poems according to the context and other factors when translating them into Chinese.

Syntactic Level

Analyzing the syntactic characteristics of the original English poetry, Huang's translations and the original Chinese poems enable a more comprehensive generalisation of Huang's

translation style. This section explores the syntactic features in terms of average sentence length and sentence cohesion.

The average sentence length is used to analyze such genres as fiction, drama and prose. The average sentence length reflects the poems' beauty of form and is a critical indicator of a poetry translator's style. A single sentence in a poem can consist of one line or several lines. Due to the unique nature of poetry, it is more appropriate to investigate the length of the line, and hence the average sentence length is actually the average line length. Table 4 shows the average line lengths of CSP, CTP and CCP.

CORPUS	**WORDS**	**LINE**	**MSL**
CSP	14133	2164	6.53
CTP	24381	2164	11.27
CCP	40260	4359	9.24

Table 4. MSL (mean sentence length) of CSP, CTP and CCP

According to Table 4, the number of lines of the original English poems and Huang Gaoxin's translated poems is identical, while the average number of words (characters) per line in the CSP is 6.53 and in the CTP is 11.27. This is due to Huang's ideas about translation, as he further developed the "substituting pause for foot" on the basis of his predecessors Zhilin Bian (1984) and Dayu Sun (1956), which simultaneously pays attention to the number of pauses, characters, and the rhythm patterns, as is demonstrated in the following example.

English original：

Thou ill-formed offspring of my feeble brain,
Who after birth didst by my side remain,
Till snatched from thence by friends, less wise than true,
Who thee abroad exposed to public view, ...

Chinese translation：

我无力的头脑产下幼稚的你；
出生后你本来同我待在一起，
直到被忠实的糊涂朋友拿掉，
把褴褛的你带了出去给人瞧，……

Each line in the original poem consists of 10 syllables. Huang translated 1 line into 5 pauses with 12 Chinese characters, retaining the original's AABB rhyme scheme. While the number of Chinese characters is slightly greater than the number of syllables in the original, it is not inconsistent because it is proportional to the number of syllables in the original. Although the mean line length does not correspond to that of the original English poem, the pauses, the number of characters, and the rhythm patterns are taken into account. Here we will not analyse the Chinese poems, as most of them are free verse, which is not comparable to Huang's translations.

The Concordance function of WordSmith 8.0 was used to retrieve the distribution of conjunctions in CSP, CTP and CCP, as shown in Table 5.

TYPES	**CSP**	**CTP**	**CCP**
Coordinating conjunction	613	141	162
Temporal conjunction	144	1	0
Adversative conjunction	84	86	51
Subordinating conjunction	145	134	145
Total number	986	362	358

Table 5. Different types of conjunctions in CSP, CTP &CCP

Table 5 reveals that the number of conjunctions in Huang's translation is about one-third of that in the original English poems, with the most significant difference in the number of coordinating conjunctions and temporal conjunctions and the

number of adversative conjunctions and subordinating conjunctions is closer. We searched for coordinating conjunctions and temporal conjunctions through CUC_ParaConc and found that many coordinating conjunctions in the original English poems were invisible in Huang's translation. Huang's translation retains some of the coordinating conjunctions in the English poems, while the rest of them are invisible through some special treatment. Huang replaced the coordinating conjunctions in the original poems with punctuation and Chinese idioms or just ignored them. The translator manipulated the structure of the translated lyrics by maximizing the use of the Chinese coordinating conjunctions 和, 或 and并且 to reproduce the formal and rhythmic beauty of the original poems as far as possible on the one hand and to make the Chinese expressions more fluent on the other. Huang dealt with the temporal conjunctions in the original poems in a similar way, reflecting the implied logic that Chinese is a language loose in form but concentrated in spirit (Y. R. Xiao1961). The logical relationship between sentences does not depend on the formal means of the language but focuses on the coherence of the meaning. Chinese is paratactic while English is hypotactic S. L. Lian 2013: 73). In contrast, the logical relationship between English sentences relies on linguistic devices (both grammatical and lexical) and formal consistency.

The conjunctions in the original Chinese poems (CCP) were also analyzed to see if the use of conjunctions is similar to that in Huang's translation, namely, whether the number of coordinating conjunctions accounts for a small proportion of the total number of conjunctions or not. It can be seen from Table 5 that the number of temporal conjunctions is 0, which implies that when translating the poems, Huang did not exactly copy the original poems at the syntactic level but made use of the characteristics of conjunctions in Chinese to better preserve

the form of the original English poems.

Phonological Level

According to E. Espasa (2013: 320), speakability refers to "the peculiar orality of the text, the need to produce a text that favours immediate comprehension and which, on the whole, is easy to pronounce". At the phonological level, the speakability of Huang's translation is studied. G. X. Huang (2013: 83) proposed that it is possible to transfer properly the content, metrical pattern, and poetic quality of the original, and the translator should pursue the "original flavour of the original poem". Compared with other literary genres, the language of poetry is characterized by its brevity, imagery, tonal harmony and rhythm. The speakability and aural beauty of translated poetry is an essential dimension of a poetry translator's style. The Chinese and English texts were converted into speeches with iFlytek intelligent dubbing, and a macroscopic analysis of the speakability features concerning duration, pitch and intensity was conducted with Praat 6.0.

The term *duration*, here the time to recite a poem, is mainly determined by the number of characters in Chinese or syllables in English poems; the more characters or syllables in a poem, the longer the duration. To facilitate the tabulation of duration, the poems in CSP and poems in CTP are divided into ten parts of 12 verses respectively. A comparison of sound duration of both Chinese and English lyrics was conducted to explore Huang's translated poems.

Part No.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**
CSP	741.8	917.1	496.8	544.1	476.6	471.3	333.6	499.0	501.7	540.1
CTP	755.1	924.9	504.4	568.5	496.4	515.8	353.6	529.3	524.4	569.3
D-value	13.3	7.8	7.6	24.4	19.8	44.5	20	30.3	22.7	29

Table 6. Duration of CSP & CTP

From Table 6, we can see that the duration of each part in the CSP and CTP are relatively similar, which indicates that Huang paid great attention to the speakability of the poems and tried to agree with the original lyrics in terms of sound duration. Lyric poetry not only expresses emotion but also reveals the beauty of the language. To preserve the lyric beauty, the Chinese translator tends to increase the number of characters (syllables) in the translated poem and thus increase its duration. To harmonise the differences in the way of conveying thoughts and emotions between Chinese and English, Huang re-arranged the order of words of the translated poems which may increase the syllables in a certain ratio.

When reciting a poem, the reciter expresses his or her emotion through pitch within a specific range. The tone range (max.pitch-min.pitch) is used to demonstrate a voice's tonal diversity, with the high pitch range frequently signifying a high level of emotion.

Part No.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**
CSP	433.9	410.8	428.7	430.9	421.5	524.3	418.8	429.9	447.7	431.9
CTP	384	409.1	364.2	314.8	293.6	410.5	310	292.7	322.3	288.5
CCP	320	400.3	391.6	393.9	409.6	309.2	395.8	327.5	340.7	321.4

Table 7. Tone range of CSP, CTP& CCP

At the pitch level, the main focus is on pitch variation. Table 7 shows that the English poems have the most significant pitch variation, higher than that of Huang's translation. Compared with CCP, the tone range of CSP is also generally higher. It can be concluded that the pitch level is language-related.

Intensity is the amount of sound perceived by the ear and

measured in decibels (dB) (Crystal 2008: 248). The intensity of pronunciation is proportional to its amplitude. The intensity of the words may affect the reader's expression of the emotions when reading. The difference between the minimum and maximum intensity of the English poems, Huang's translations and the Chinese poems are shown in the table below.

Part No.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**
CSP	39.3	39.5	38.8	39	39.3	39	38.9	38.7	39	38.9
CTP	39.9	40.1	39.8	39.6	39.9	39.9	40	39.7	39.7	39.6
CCP	39.44	40.1	40	39.5	39.7	39.8	39.8	39.7	40.1	40

Table 8. Difference between minimum and maximum intensity of CSP, CTP& CCP

Table 8 reveals that the values of both CTP and CCP are very close to each other. In other words, the intensity of words in Huang's translation is considerably comparable to that of the Chinese poems. Nevertheless, the intensity of Huang's Chinese translations is generally higher than that of the original English poems, which implies that the translator's diction is more potent than that of the original English poems, so that the readers will recite the poems with more effort and higher volume. In order to make the conclusion more rigorous, the sound intensity of Huang's Chinese translations is compared with that of the Chinese poems. Both in pitch and intensity, there is an inherent difference in the languages. Despite the translator's great efforts to transfer the emotion of the original poems, he is still unable to do it without any loss.

Conclusion

Generally speaking, Gaoxin Huang's style of Chinese translation is similar to that of the original Chinese poems. In the complexity and selection of words, Huang's style is comparable to that of the Chinese poets. Huang simplified the words in English poems according to the context and other factors when translating them into Chinese. Although he advocated preserving the English poems' taste in his Chinese translation, Huang did not literally translate the words in the original English poems. His style in terms of diction is closer to that of the original Chinese poems. At the syntactic level, Huang's style is reflected in his translation theories "substituting pause for foot" and "emulation method". He paid simultaneous attention to the number of pauses, characters, and rhythm patterns in his Chinese translations. Although the number of Chinese characters in each line is a little higher than that of the original, it forms a fixed proportion to the number of words in the original. Huang did not exactly copy the original poems at the syntactic level but used the features of the pause, characters, rhythms and conjunctions in Chinese better to preserve the form of the original English poems. He re-arranged the order of words in the translated poems to better convey the thoughts of the original and increase the speakability of his translation. In general, apart from expressing the meaning of the original English poems, Huang reproduced the poems' original forms and patterns, i.e. the structure, rhythm and word count. Huang's translation of poems, which is both rational and artistic, may be an inspiration for later poetry translators.

Acknowledgement

This paper has been sponsored by Jiangsu Philosophy and Social Science Key Program for Universities and Colleges (Grant No.: 2018SJZDI160).

References

AALTONEN, S. 2000. *Time-sharing on Stage: Drama Translation in Theatre and Society*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

BAKER, M. 2000. Towards a Methodology for Investigating the Style of a Literary Translator. *Target*, 12(12). 241-266.

BAKER, M. 2004. A Corpus-based View of Similarity and Difference in Translation. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 9(2). 167- 193.

BASSNETT, S. 1985. Ways through the Labyrinth: Strategies and Methods for Translating Theatre Texts. In Theo Hermans (ed.), *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*. 87-102. London: Croom Helm.

BIAN, Z. L. 1984. *Man and Poetry*. Beijing: Joint Publishing House.

BOSSEAUX, C. 2001. A Study of the Translator's Voice and Style in the French Translations of Virginia Woolf's *The Waves*. In M. Olohan (ed.), *CTIS Occasional Papers*.55-75. Manchester: CTIS, UMIST.

CRYSTAL, D. 2008. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

CHEN, W. D. 1997. *A Tentative Study of Chinese Grammar*. Shanghai: Shanghai Education Press.

ESPASA, E. 2013. *Stage Translation*. In C. Millán & F. Bartrina (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Translation Studies*. 317-331. London: Routledge.

FITZGERALD, E. 1982. *Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám* (G. X. Huang, Trans.). Shanghai: Shanghai Translation Publishing House.

HERMANS, T. 1996. The Translator's Voice in Translated Narrative. *Target*, 8(1). 23-48.

HU, Y. S. 2019. *Modern Chinese*. Shanghai: Shanghai Education Press.

HUANG, B. R. & LIAO, X. D. 1991. *Modern Chinese*. Beijing:

Higher Education Press.
HUANG, G. X. 1994. *100 American Lyric Poems (English-Chinese).* Shanghai: Shanghai Translation Publishing House.
HUANG, G. X. 1999a. *Studies of Chinese Translation of English Poems: From Rubaiyat to Canterbury Tales*. Wuhan: Hubei Education Press.
HUANG, G. X. 1999b. Quantization and Application of Criteria for Chinese Translation of English Metrical Poetry. *Chinese Translators Journal* (06). 15-19.
HUANG, G. X. 2013. Breaking the Tradition of Chinese Translation of English Poetry. *Chinese Translators Journal* (02). 83-87.
JONES, A. (ed.). 1996. *Chambers Dictionary of Quotations*. New York: Chambers.
LEFEVERE, A. 2010. *Translation, History, Culture*. Shanghai: Foreign Language Education Press.
LIAN, S. L. 2013. *Contrastive Studies of English and Chinese*. Beijing: Higher Education Press.
LIU, T. 2011. Relationship between Huang Gaoxin's Correspondence in Poetry Translation and Modern Metrical Poetics. *Northern Literature* (08). 71-72.
LIU, X. J. 2007. Function and Differences of Pitches in Chinese and English. *Science and Technology Information* 36. 577 & 582.
LIU, X. M. 2007. Queries on Huang Gaoxin's Principle of "Paying Attention to Number of Pauses and Characters". *Journal of Sichuan International Studies University* 1. 118-123.
SALDANHA, G. 2011. Translator Style: Methodological Considerations. *The Translator: Studies in Intercultural Communication*, 17(1). 25-50.
SAVORY, T. 1957. *The Art of Translation*. London: Jonathan Cape.
SUN, D. Y. 1956. Poetic Meter. *The Journal of Fudan* 2. 1-30.

TENNYSON, A. 1993. *Selected Poems of Tennyson* (G. X. Huang, Trans.). Shanghai: Shanghai Translation Publishing House.

WANG, B. T. 2005. Reflections on Huang Gaoxin's "Emulation Method" in E-C Poetry Translation. *Chinese Translators Journal* 26(01). 35-40.

WANG, Y. 2016. An Editor's Accomplishments: My View on the Centennial Development of Chinese Translation of English Poetry and Huang Gaoxin's Theory about Poetry Translation. *View on Publishing* 12. 54-55.

WORDSWORTH, W. 2000. *Selected Lyrical Poems of Wordsworth* (G. X. Huang, Trans.). Shanghai: Shanghai Translation Publishing House.

XIAO, Y. R. 1961. Loose in Form but Concentrated in Spirit. *People's Daily*. 8.

YANG, M. & ZHA, J. M. 2016.Three Specious Directions of "Emulation Method" in English-Chinese Metrical Poetry Translation. *Journal of Nanchang Normal University* 37(06). 87-89.

ZHANG, L.Y. 2022. Personal Opinions on "Emulation Method" Proposed by Mr. HUANG Gaoxin. *FLLTP* 3. 93-97.

ZHU, J. X. 2012. Analysis of Huang Gaoxin's "Emulation Method" in English - Chinese Poetry Translation in Terms of Foreignization. *Academic Exploration* 9. 150-153.

***

About the Author

Chongyue Li got his PhD from Shanghai University of International Studies, and has been teaching translation-relevant courses for about 30 years in Chinese universities, and has published more than 20 papers about translation theory and practice. E-mail: lcy2003[AT]ujs[DOT]edu[DOT]cn

Cite this Work:

LI, Chongyue. 2022. A Corpus-based Study of Gaoxin Huang's Poetry Translation Style. *Translation Today*, Vol. 16(2). 1-21. DOI: 10.46623/tt/2022.16.2.ar1