

Investigating Translators' Styles in The Little Prince: A Corpus-based Study

THEERA ROUNGTHEERA

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Mahasarakham University, Thailand

PORNTHIP SUPANFAI*

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Mahasarakham University, Thailand

*Corresponding author email: pornthip.su@msu.ac.th

Article information	Abstract
Article history: Received: 23 Aug 2023 Accepted: 15 Dec 2023 Available online: 14 Feb 2024	<i>The little prince is among the most renowned French novels that have been translated into numerous languages. In English, there are several translations available. Each translator inevitably infuses their unique style into their translations. This study aims to investigate the styles of the translators exhibited in two English versions of this novel and to identify the differences in the approaches adopted by the two translators using a corpus-based method. The translations by Irene Testot-Ferry and T.V.F. Cuffe have been selected since they were both published in the same year by two prominent British publishers. The parallel model is adopted as the primary methodology. The results suggest that Irene Testot-Ferry's translation appears to be more oriented towards the source text. She tends to opt for English words that closely resemble their French counterparts, while T.V.F. Cuffe appears more independent in his word selection. Furthermore, T.V.F. Cuffe has a tendency to incorporate old-fashioned terms more frequently compared to Irene Testot-Ferry.</i>
Keywords: Translator's style The little prince Corpus-based study	

INTRODUCTION

The little prince is one of the most popular works of French literature composed and illustrated by Antoine Saint-Exupéry (1900-1944). The story is about the journey of a young prince who visits various planets, including Earth. The important themes of this story are friendship, loneliness, love, and loss. According to the proposal of Eugene Reynal, the owner of Reynal & Hitchcock in New York, the author intended to compose this literary piece as a young literature work. Although the writing style of the work might appear simple as it was intended for children, the author added some philosophical concepts such as relationships, humanist values, or authority for adults. Thus, some consider it philosophical literature (Chirouter, 2008; Meunier, 2003; Thumrongsanta, 2017).

The first publication of *The little prince* was an English translation by Katherine Woods in 1943 and the original was later published in the same year. This work is very well-known all over the world. According to the Guinness World Record (2021), it is considered the most translated author; the book has been translated into 382 different languages and dialects since its

first publication. In addition to the first English version, there are at least twelve other English translations such as Irene Testot-Ferry (1st edition in 1995), T.V.F. Cuffe (1st edition in 1995), Alan Wakeman (1st edition in 1995), Richard Howard (1st edition in 2000), and Ros and Chloe Schwartz (1st edition in 2010). Despite some notable errors, Katherine Woods' version is the most widely read (Faulwetter, 2018) and considered the most poetic English version (Long, 2012).

As an individual translator has his or her style, a translator may not only offer different interpretations or different points of view of the same text but also present a different literary style. The reader can observe the use of words, structures, and rhetoric that the translator prefers. Wang and Li (2020) state that "no matter how much the translator desires to reproduce the authorial style, they will inevitably leave traces of their own style" (p. 156). This is called translators' styles or to use Baker's (2000) term *fingerprints*. Baker (2000) proposes a corpus-based methodology for investigating a literary translator's style including analyses of type/token ratio, average sentence length, and use of reporting structure.

The literature review shows that the studies of *The little prince* and its translations have been approached from many different angles, especially from a comparative perspective. The studies that make a comparative analysis of the original version and the translated versions include Lassila (2021), Strömberg (2010), and Dybiec-Gajer (2012). There has also been research on translation strategies (Arjomandi & Kafipour, 2016), translation problems (Onumajuru & Onumajuru, 2017), the perception of the readers (Chazal, 2003), discourse analysis (Ng, 2018) or transtextuality (Djavari & Rezaï, 2014). Nevertheless, no previous studies, to the best of our knowledge, have explored different translators' styles exhibited in *The little prince* using a corpus-based approach. The corpus-based approach to translator's style has in fact drawn considerable attention from scholars since Baker's proposal of the methodology in 2000 (Huang, 2021). Thus, the present study aims to investigate the translators' styles exhibited in two translations of *The little prince* with an emphasis on identifying differences by using a corpus-based approach. The two translations selected for the analysis are Irene Testot-Ferry (1995) (henceforth Testot-Ferry) and T.V.F. Cuffe (1995) (henceforth Cuffe). They are selected for the reason that both of them are popular with readers and were published in the same year. They were also published in the same country, the United Kingdom, one by Wordsworth Editions and the other by Penguin Books. As the present analysis requires background knowledge of French and corpus linguistics, it is worth noting that one of the researchers is a French university lecturer whose expertise is French linguistics and translation studies, and the other has completed her PhD thesis research using a corpus-based methodology.

Research question

Particularly, the purpose of this study is to answer the following question: What are the differences in the two translators' styles reflected by keyword analysis?

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this section, a brief overview of a translator's style will be given. Some previous corpus-based studies on a translator's style are also briefly presented.

Translator's style: A brief overview

The term *style* is an umbrella term that can be variously defined depending on the research area (Li et al., 2022). Generally, style can refer to “the way in which language is used in a given context, by a given person, for a given purpose, and so on” (Leech & Short, 2007, p. 9). In traditional translation studies, the study of style means the study of the style of the author of a source text (Hu, 2011). This is because translation is traditionally viewed as “a derivative rather than creative activity” (Baker, 2000, p. 244), suggesting that the duty of a translator is no more than reproducing the target text by replicating the author's style (Hu, 2011). Specifically, a translated text is considered inferior to a source text and thus should not serve as an object that can be studied independently of the original text from which it is derived. Moreover, a translated text is supposed to be “faithful and equivalent to the source text” (Hu, 2011, p. 124). Under these views, a translator's style becomes invisible (Hu, 2011).

The rise of descriptive translation studies (DTS) has changed a research direction in translation studies (Hu, 2011). This approach places emphasis on description of features of translated texts and translation process in relation to cultural contexts in which translations are produced (Hu, 2011). Contrary to the traditional approach, a source text becomes subordinate to a target text, and translated language is considered “the product of communicative events which serves to construct cultural identity rather than a deviant or substandard language variety” (Hu, 2011, p. 4). A translator also “plays a central role rather than a subordinate role in translation which is now deemed as a cross-cultural activity” (Hu, 2011, p. 125). Particularly, a translator works as a source text interpreter who is expected to *create* a text that can fulfil the needs of the target reader within a specific culture in his/her own way. This means a translator can interpret the source text in various ways, making it possible for him/her to demonstrate and constitute his/her style in translations.

Corpus-based translator's style studies

Baker (2000) was the first researcher to adopt a corpus-based approach to investigate a translator's style within the framework of descriptive translation studies. Baker (2000) defines a translator's style as “a kind of thumb-print that is expressed in a range of linguistic - as well as non-linguistic - features” (p. 245) arguing that a translator cannot translate a text in a completely objective manner without leaving his/her traces, or to use Baker's (2000) term, *fingerprints*. From Baker's (2000) viewpoint, the study of a translator's style must strive to describe “preferred or recurring patterns of linguistic behaviour, rather than individual or one-off instances of intervention” (p. 245), and such patterns can be identified with the aid of corpora, corpus analysis software, and corpus methodology. Employing a corpus-based methodology, Baker (2000) investigates the stylistic patterns used in various translations of different source texts by two English translators Peter Bush and Peter Clark in the Translated English Corpus focusing on type/token ratio, average sentence length, and structure of the reporting verb SAY. The analysis shows that these features prove useful indicators of the translators' styles. She goes on to conclude that further research is needed in order to investigate “the potential motivation for the stylistic patterns” (p. 258) and that “a methodology for distinguishing what is attributable to the individual translator and what is simply carried over from the source text” (p. 258) should be established.

Baker's proposed methodology has been adopted as well as adjusted by other researchers interested in examining a translator's style using a corpus-based approach. Huang (2015) argues that research on a translator's style can be classified into two models: a comparable model and a parallel model. The comparable model is methodologically similar to Baker's in that only translated texts are investigated without taking into consideration their corresponding source texts. By contrast, the parallel model pays attention to both target and source texts. The studies that adopt this model tend to look at different translations of one source text, bringing the source text into the investigation of the translators' styles, frequently through the creation of parallel corpora. Within this model, it is thus possible to detect the impacts of source texts and distinguish them from features that are attributable to the style of a particular translator (Huang, 2015).

Corpus-based translator's style research has recently been growing in number (Li et al., 2022). That said, there has not been an established or agreed-upon research methodology on a translator's style (Li et al., 2022). In addition to the indicators of a translator's style put forward by Baker (2000) which include type/token ratio, average sentence length, and reporting structure, other linguistic features have been utilised as the indicators of a translator's style in different studies. Different corpus statistics and methods such as keyword analysis and word/sentence alignment have also been frequently used as a starting point for identifying differences in translators' styles.

One of the most recent studies on a translator's style is Gao and Shih's (2022) examination of three Chinese translations of *The old man and the sea* with emphasis on word choice. The analysis is carried out based on type/token ratio, word alignment, and keyword analysis. The study shows that the three translators do not completely retain Hemingway's style. For example, one of the translators adopts Hemmingway's concise writing style but, unlike Hemmingway, opts for formal rather than simple words. In another study, Wang and Li (2020) compare two Chinese translations of *Ulysses* focusing on word choice and syntactic structure, i.e. position of dependent clauses. The comparison is made based on the bilingual parallel corpus and keyword analysis. The keyword analysis reveals the preference for colloquialism by one of the translators. In terms of syntactic structure, the two translators are found to similarly retain in their translations the position of dependent clauses as used in the original text. Mastropierro (2018) analyses two Italian versions of *At the mountain of madness* with focus on key cluster analysis, finding the difference in the use of some linguistic features such as the Italian euphonic -d between the two translators. Hu (2011) examines the translation of the passive marker BEI in two Chinese translations of Shakespeare's plays, finding that the difference in the use of BEI structure reflects the differing purposes of the two translations. Last but not least, Ji (2008) investigates phraseological style in two Chinese translations of *Don quijote* that were published two decades apart. The analysis reveals that the more recent translation pays more attention to target readership as reflected in the translator's frequent use of four-character expressions.

METHODOLOGY

The study adopted the parallel model, which means both the source text and the target text were investigated. To identify differences in the translators' styles, the study relies on keyword analysis as a starting point. Keywords refer to "words that are important because they occur significantly more frequently in a specialised corpus, or even a single text, than in a more general corpus" (Hunston, 2022, p. 88). They have been used as an indicator of lexical idiosyncrasy in many previous studies (e.g., Gao & Shih, 2022; Wang & Li, 2020). In the study, the keywords were generated using AntConc version 4.2.1 (Anthony, 2022). In terms of statistical measures, the default settings were applied.

In addition to keyword analysis, a bilingual parallel corpus, The Little Prince Corpus (LPC), was manually built. The corpus consists of the original version of the novel in French, Testot-Ferry's translation and Cuffe's translation. Overall, the corpus contains 46,207 tokens, or individual words. The source text and the translations were manually aligned at the sentence level. Table 1 below shows the number of tokens in the source text, Testot-Ferry's translation, and Cuffe's translation.

Table 1
Number of tokens in LPC

Versions	Tokens
Source text	14,775
Testot-Ferry's translation	15,699
Cuffe's translation	15,733
Total	46,207

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the results of the study. It begins with a presentation and general discussion of keyword analysis. This will be followed by a detailed discussion of important keywords based on the examination of the bilingual parallel concordance in the LPC. The use of punctuation and grammatical lexeme *si* will also be discussed.

Keyword analysis

To generate the keyword lists of the two translations, the BE06_FicGen was used as a reference corpus. The corpus is pre-built in AntConc. It is a subcorpus of the BE06 Corpus of British English, which is a one-million-word corpus of published British English (Baker, 2009). The BE06_FicGen contains general fiction texts with 59,525 tokens in total.

There are 73 words on the keyword list of Cuffe's translation and 74 words on the keyword list of Testot-Ferry's translation. Among these, 56 keywords overlap. Many of these overlapping keywords are nouns that reflect the theme and refer to the characters in the story. For example, the words *prince*, *little* and *planet* are the top three keywords with the highest keyness scores

on the two lists. The words *prince* and *little* refer to the main character in the story, the little prince, while *planet* reflects the plot. In the story, the little prince travels to various planets looking for friendship and love. Other character words are *flower*, *king*, *sheep*, *geographer*, *snake*, *lamplighter*, *boa*, *explorer*, and *businessman*. There are also many overlapping pronouns (e.g., *you*, *I*), modals (e.g., *shall*, *will*), and the verb *be* (e.g., *is*, *am*, *are*).

With regard to distinctive keywords, there are 17 keywords that appear only in Cuffe's translation and 18 that appear only in Testot-Ferry's translation. We examined each distinctive keyword in the parallel concordance in the LPC looking for its translation equivalent in the other translation and its equivalent in French in the source text. Of the 35 words we examined, 4 appear to indicate the different styles of the two translators as will be discussed in the following section.

DISCUSSION OF TRANSLATORS' STYLES BASED ON THE BILINGUAL PARALLEL CONCORDANCE

Keywords in Cuffe's translation

The interesting keywords found in Cuffe's translation include *fellow* and *pointsman*. The noun *fellow* appears in Cuffe's translation 14 times in total. In most of these instances, *fellow* is the translation of the French word *bonhomme* or *homme*, which means a man. Looking at Testot-Ferry's translation, we found that in the 14 places where Cuffe uses *fellow*, Testot-Ferry uses *fellow* only twice. In addition to *fellow*, Testot-Ferry also uses *person* (1 time), *boy* (1 time), *chap* (3 times), *prince* (3 times), and *man* (4 times). Table 2 below shows an example of Cuffe's and Testot-Ferry's translation of *bonhomme*.

Table 2
Translation of *bonhomme*

Original text	Mon petit bonhomme , il ne s'agit plus du renard ! (p. 77)
Cuffe's translation	'But my dear fellow , now is too late for foxes!' (p. 75)
Testot-Ferry's translation	'My dear little chap , this has nothing to do with a fox!' (p. 88)

Based on the online Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (LDOCE), *fellow* is an old-fashioned word that is used to refer to a man. Thus, at this point, it might be argued based on this evidence that when compared to Testot-Ferry, Cuffe tends to use more old-fashioned words in his translation. That said, this does not mean that he always uses old-fashioned words in his work. In fact, aside from *fellow*, Cuffe also renders his translation of *bonhomme* or *homme* as *person*, *man/men*, *subject*, *people*, or *prince*, etc.

Another point worth noting from the example above is the difference in the connotation of the words *fellow* and *chap*. In the example, the two words refer to the little prince. Even though both are informal terms, *fellow* sounds gentle and friendly, with a sense of camaraderie, while *chap* carries a diminutive connotation. Thus, at this point it could be interpreted that Cuffe

seems to consider the little prince as a friend of the narrator, whereas Testot-Ferry views him as a child or a younger individual.

Cuffe's tendency to utilise old-fashioned words is also reflected by his use of *pointsman*. The noun *pointsman* appears only in Cuffe's translation. It is the translation of the word *aiguilleur* in French, which is rendered by Testot-Ferry as *signalman* in all instances. The word *pointsman* does not appear in the LDOCE. In the original British National Corpus (Aston & Burnard, 1998), it appears only once while *signalman* is found 74 times. In addition, according to the online Oxford English Dictionary, *pointsman* has a frequency of occurrence of fewer than 0.01 per million words while the frequency of occurrence of *signalman* is about 0.1 per million words in modern written English. All these then seem to suggest that *pointsman* is relatively less frequent and probably more old-fashioned. The examples of the translation of *aiguilleur* are presented in Table 3.

Table 3
Translation of *aiguilleur*

Original text	Je trie les voyageurs, par paquets de mille, dit l' aiguilleur . (p. 74)
Cuffe's translation	'I sort the passengers into bundles of one thousand,' said the pointsman . (p. 73)
Testot-Ferry's translation	'I sort out the travellers, in bundles of a thousand,' said the signalman . (p. 85)

Keywords in Testot-Ferry's translation

The interesting keywords in Testot-Ferry's translation include *morning* and *one*. Investigating the noun *morning* in the bilingual parallel concordance, we discovered that 21 instances of *morning* in the translation of Testot-Ferry is part of the greeting *good-morning*, which is translated from the French word *bonjour*. The word *bonjour* occurs 21 times in total in the source text. Thus, we can see that in Testot-Ferry's translation, all of the instances of *bonjour* are translated into *good-morning*. Cuffe, in contrast, translates *bonjour* into *good morning* in only three instances. In the other 18 instances, Cuffe renders it as *good day*, which is, according to the LDOCE, an old-fashioned expression that is used to say hello or goodbye. This finding thus appears to lend support to the argument previously put forward that Cuffe tends to use old-fashioned expressions or words in his translation.

One is another interesting keyword found in Testot-Ferry's translation with 131 occurrences. This word has many functions such as a number, a determiner, or a pronoun. After examining the parallel concordance, we found that this word is used as a pronoun 28 times, rendered from the pronoun *on* in French. The pronoun *on* can be exclusively used as a subject. It is commonly employed when the speaker does not wish to specify the exact identity of the person or persons being referred to, a vague subject (Riegel et al., 1994). *On* can replace the third person pronouns, either singular or plural, masculine or feminine, when the referent is animate. It functions as an indefinite personal pronoun (Tomassone, 2002).

Hence, translating this pronoun into English can pose a challenge for translators, as they must carefully analyse the contextual cues to determine its appropriate rendering. Chuquet and Paillard (1989) propose two methods for translating the pronoun *on* into English: syntactic transformation and substitution with a noun or pronoun.

In the original text, there are 63 occurrences of *on*. In many cases, the pronoun is translated into an English noun or pronoun. In other cases, they undergo a syntactic transformation as presented in Table 4.

Table 4
Translation strategies of *on*

Strategies	T.-F.	%	Cuffe	%	Sum	%
Substitution with a noun or pronoun						
1. One	28	44.44	12	19.05	40	31.75
2. It (+its)	7	11.11	7	11.11	14	11.11
3. You (+your)	6	9.52	22	34.92	28	22.22
4. I	0	0.00	1	1.59	1	0.79
5. We	2	3.17	6	9.52	8	6.35
6. Anyone, someone, somebody, nobody, no one, everyone	5	7.94	5	7.94	10	7.94
7. Who	0	0.00	1	1.59	1	0.79
Syntactic transformation						
8. Passive voice	10	15.87	6	9.52	16	12.70
9. Thematic: change the position and grammatical function	1	1.59	0	0.00	1	0.79
10. Existential construction (i.e., there are)	1	1.59	0	0.00	1	0.79
11. Omission	3	4.76	3	4.76	6	4.76
	63	100.00	63	100.00	126	100.00

The translation of the pronoun *on* can vary among translators, and each translator handles it differently. Testot-Ferry typically renders *on* as *one*, that is, 28 times or 44.44%, while Cuffe prefers *you* with a frequency of 22 which accounts for 34.95%. *One* tends to be used in general cases, particularly when principles or definitions are involved. In contrast, *you* is more commonly employed for general remarks, explanations, suggestions, or instructions (Chuquet & Paillard, 1989).

According to Table 4, it can be observed that in Cuffe's version, the pronoun *on* is translated into a pronoun with a more personal connotation. It was found in Cuffe's translation that 29 instances of *on* is translated into the personal pronoun *you*, *we*, or *I*. Notably, the use of *you* or *we* gives a more direct tone as if the writer is directly addressing the reader. Table 5 below shows an example of the translation of *on*.

Table 5
Translation of *on*

Original text	Comment peut- on posséder les étoiles ? (p. 48)
Cuffe's translation	'How can you own the stars?' (p. 46)
Testot-Ferry's translation	'How can one own stars?' (p. 55)

Cuffe's use of these personal pronouns can create a more personal and immediate connection with the reader. In contrast, Testot-Ferry often translates *on* into *one* as well as variations like *someone*, *everyone*, *no one*, and *nobody* in approximately 52.38% of cases. Such terms convey an impersonal and generalized sense of *on* as an unspecified person. In other words, the use of *one* and its variations is recognized as more respectful of the source text since this pronoun is also a gender-neutral and indefinite pronoun in English. Hence, it seems that Testot-Ferry's translation is more source-text oriented than Cuffe's.

Furthermore, based on our observation, we also discovered some other features that seem to represent Testot-Ferry's style of adopting a source-text oriented approach. Firstly, Testot-Ferry frequently uses words sharing some similarities to the French counterparts. The word *ordre(s)* (in the sense of instructions) is a good example to illustrate this point. In the original text, *ordre(s)* occurs five times. It is a noun. Interestingly, Testot-Ferry consistently translates this word into the English word *order(s)*, whose form is very close to the French equivalent *ordre(s)*. But Cuffe renders *ordre(s)* as either *command(s)* or *orders*; *command(s)* was found four times while *orders* once. The example is presented in the table below.

Table 6
Translation of *ordre*

Original text	Si Votre Majesté désirait être obéie ponctuellement, elle pourrait me donner un ordre raisonnable. (p. 41)
Cuffe's translation	'If Your Majesty wishes to be obeyed promptly, he might give me a reasonable command . (p. 39)
Testot-Ferry's translation	'If Your Majesty wishes to be promptly obeyed, you should give me a reasonable order . (p. 47)

Closely related to *ordre(s)* is the lemma *ordonner*. Both have the same etymological origin. *Ordonner* is a verb that means giving instructions. The lemma appears ten times in the source text. In all instances of the different forms of *ordonner*, Testot-Ferry translates it into *order(ed)*, while Cuffe renders the word as *command* in nine instances and omits the translation in one instance.

Other examples are the translation of *gravement*, *merveilleux*, *abandonnée*, and *exact*. Testot-Ferry opts for *gravely*, *marvellous*, *abandoned*, and *exactly*, which have proximity in the form to the French equivalents. Conversely, Cuffe selects different words that deviate from the French forms, such as *solemnly* for *gravement* and *wonderful* for *merveilleux*. These choices by Cuffe move away from adhering strictly to the original French forms, reflecting a departure in favor of alternative linguistic considerations.

Testot-Ferry's tendency to adhere to the source text is also reflected by his translation of the grammatical lexeme *si*, which can be straightforwardly translated into *if* in English. The lexeme occurs 56 times in the source text. Testot-Ferry renders it as *if* in 55 instances and omits the translation in 1 instance. Cuffe, in contrast, uses *if* in only 43 instances. Tables 7 and 8 show the translation of *si*.

Table 7
Translation of *si* (1)

Original text	« Si j'ordonnais, disait-il couramment, <i>si</i> j'ordonnais à un général de se changer en oiseau de mer, et si le général n'obéissait pas, ce ne serait pas la faute du général. (pp. 37-38)
Cuffe's translation	Were I , he would often say, ' <i>were I</i> to command a general to change into a sea-bird, and were this general not to obey, it would not be the general's fault. (p. 37)
Testot-Ferry's translation	' If I ordered a general,' he would say, ' <i>if</i> I ordered a general to change himself into a sea-bird, and if the general did not obey, it wouldn't be the general's fault. (p. 44)

Table 8
Translation of *si* (2)

Original text	Ainsi, si vous leur dites : « La preuve que le petit prince a existé c'est qu'il était ravissant, qu'il riait, et qu'il voulait un mouton. (p. 20)
Cuffe's translation	Again, you might say to them: 'The proof that the little prince existed is that he was enchanting, that he laughed, and that he was looking for a sheep. (p. 17)
Testot-Ferry's translation	Thus if you said to them: 'The proof that the little prince really existed was that he was enchanting, that he laughed and that he wanted a sheep. (p. 22)

We can thus see from the tables above that in addition to *if*, Cuffe also uses the inverted structure *were I* and the modal verb *might* rather than the direct equivalent *if*. To be specific, Cuffe employs inversion in nine instances, use *might* in one instance and omit the translation in three instances. This then seems to suggest then unlike Testot-Ferry, Cuffe tends to move away from the source text.

Finally, we found a difference in the two translators' use of punctuation. It is obvious that dashes are frequently used in Cuffe's version to express the description or break the dialogue as shown in Tables 9 and 10.

Table 9
Use of dashes in Cuffe's translation (1)

Original text	Pour vous qui aimez aussi le petit prince, comme pour moi, rien de l'univers n'est semblable si quelque part, on ne sait où , un mouton que nous ne connaissons pas a, oui ou non, mangé une rose... (p. 93)
Cuffe's translation	For you who love the little prince, as for me, nothing in the universe can be the same if somewhere — we do not know where — a sheep we have never met has or has not eaten a rose. (p. 91)
Testot-Ferry's translation	For those of you who, like me, love the little prince, nothing in the universe can be the same while somewhere, nobody knows where , a sheep which we have never seen may or may not have eaten a flower. (pp. 106-107)

Table 10
Use of dashes in Cuffe's translation (2)

Original text	Tu sais, ma chute sur la Terre... c'en sera demain l'anniversaire... (p. 82)
Cuffe's translation	'You know — the day I fell to Earth ... Tomorrow will be the anniversary.' (p. 80)
Testot-Ferry's translation	You know, my descent to the Earth ... tomorrow will be its anniversary ...' (p. 94)

It can be seen from the tables above that contrary to Cuffe, Testot-Ferry appears to show respect to the source text by using commas. It is worth noting at this point that in the source text, there is not any use of dashes.

CONCLUSION AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Employing a corpus methodology, the study investigated the two translators' styles in their translation of *The little prince*. The data for the analysis were mainly drawn from the keyword lists and the manually built parallel concordance. The findings seem to suggest that in terms of word choice, based on our evidence, Cuffe tends to use old-fashioned terms more frequently than Testot-Ferry. As *The little prince* is a timeless, classic piece, it could be argued that he intentionally opts for these old-fashioned terms to evoke an older era. We have seen, for example, that Cuffe consistently translates *bonjour* into *good day*, an old-fashioned greeting expression, whereas Testot-Ferry renders the word into *good-morning* in all instances. It also appears from the analysis that Testot-Ferry has a tendency to opt for English words that resemble in form to their French counterparts. Cuffe, on the other hand, seems to be more independent in this respect. Thus, at this point, it might be argued that Testot-Ferry seems to be more loyal to the original text than Cuffe does. In other words, Cuffe appears to employ the interpretative translation technique while Testot-Ferry tends to use the direct translation technique. This is possibly attributable to her view of *The little prince* as a work of children's literature, which can be characterised by simple and straightforward language (Moe & Zigon, 2020). This argument can be further supported by the analysis of *si* and observation of the

use of punctuation. That is, Testot-Ferry consistently translates *si* into *if*, its English equivalent, while Cuffe appears to use more literary structure, i.e., *were* I. Moreover, Testot-Ferry utilises commas following the authorial style, but Cuffe uses dashes instead.

However, even though we argued earlier that Cuffe appears to be less confined to the source text, we have also observed in some instances that he did choose the words that are semantically close to the original French words. A clear example is his use of the expression *good day*. The original French *bonjour* is generally used from any time in the morning until late afternoon. Similarly, *good day* is not confined to any particular time of the day, so unlike *good-morning*, it is more akin to *bonjour*. That said, based on our observation, his reliance on the original text is less obvious than Testot-Ferry's.

It should be noted at this point that the study focused on the translators' styles exhibited in their translations of *The little prince*. Therefore, the styles displayed in these translations might not reflect their typical use of language in their original writing. Thus, further studies may include the translators' original writing in the investigation to identify whether the styles exhibited in the translations have been influenced by the translators' typical use of language. Moreover, the study only adopted keyword analysis. There are in fact, as suggested by Li et al. (2022), other possible methods and indicators of a translator's style. Thus, the results of the study could be more comprehensive should additional research methods such as the application of word alignment are employed in the study.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The study reported in this paper is part of the research project *Literary translators' styles in Le petit prince from French into English: A corpus-based study*, funded by Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Mahasarakham University (2022). The researchers are also grateful to the two anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments on the manuscript.

THE AUTHORS

Theera Rongtheera is an assistant professor at the Department of Western Languages and Linguistics, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Mahasarakham University, Thailand. He received his PhD in Sciences of Language from Université Sorbonne Nouvelle – Paris 3, France. His main interests include translation studies, tourism discourse, and onomastics.

theerar@msu.ac.th

Pornthip Supanfai is a lecturer at the Department of Western Languages and Linguistics, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Mahasarakham University, Thailand. She received her PhD in Linguistics from Lancaster University, UK. Her main research interest lies in corpus linguistics.

pornthip.su@msu.ac.th

REFERENCES

- Anthony, L. (2022). *AntConc* (Version 4.2.1). Waseda University. <https://www.laurenceanthony.net/software>
- Arjomandi, S., & Kafipour, R. (2016). A review on translation strategies of 'Little Prince' by Ahmad Shamlou and Abolhasan Najafi. *International Journal of English Language and Translation Studies*, 04(03), 60–68. <https://doaj.org/article/b5b2bc242b324dbeae8fe83d20523c7a>
- Aston, G., & Burnard, L. (1998). *The BNC handbook: Exploring the British National Corpus with SARA*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Baker, M. (2000). Towards a methodology for investigating the style of a literary translator. *Target-international Journal of Translation Studies*, 12(2), 241–266. <https://doi.org/10.1075/target.12.2.04bak>
- Baker, P. (2009). The BE06 Corpus of British English and recent language change. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 14(3), 312–337. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ijcl.14.3.02bak>
- Chazal, A. (2003). *Translation and readership: Readers' opinions and preferences in two translations of The little prince* [Master's dissertation, Macquarie University].
- Chirouter, E. (2008). Philosophie et littérature de jeunesse: La vérité, la fiction et la vie. *Nouveaux cahiers de la recherche en éducation*, 11(2), 161-168.
- Chuquet, H., & Paillard, M. (1989). *Approche linguistique des problèmes de traduction anglais- français*. Ophrys.
- Djavari, M. H., & Rezaï, M. (2014). L'étude des cinq hypertextes du Petit prince de Saint-Exupéry dans sa traduction persane. *Études de langue et littérature françaises*, 5(1), 21-32.
- Dybiec-Gajer, J. (2012). The challenges of simplicity. Le petit prince in Polish and English translation from the perspective of critical point analysis. In J. Górniewicz, I. Piechnik & M. Swiatkowska (Eds.), *Le petit prince et les amis au pays des traducteurs. Études dédiées à Urszula-Prokop* (pp. 110-125). Księgarnia Akademicka.
- Faulwetter, K. (2018). The little prince - still unique through translation. *Motaword*. <https://www.motaword.com/blog/the-little-prince>
- Gao, Z.-M., & Shih, J.-A. (2022). A corpus-based computational study on translators' styles based on three Chinese translations of The old man and the sea. In C. Shei & S. Li (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of Asian linguistics* (pp. 531-547). Routledge.
- Guinness World Records. (2021). *Most translated author, same book*. Guinness World Records. <https://www.guinnessworldrecords.com/world-records/most-translated-author-same-book>
- Hu, K. (2011). *Introducing corpus-based translation studies*. Springer.
- Huang, L. (2015). *Style in translation: A corpus-based perspective*. Springer.
- Huang, L. (2021). New trends in corpus-based translator's style studies. In V. X. Wang, L. Lim & D. Li (Eds.), *New perspectives on corpus translation studies* (pp. 59-73). Springer.
- Hunston, S. (2022). *Corpora in applied linguistics* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Ji, M. (2008). Quantifying phraseological style of in two modern Chinese versions of Don quijote. *Journal des Traducteurs Translators' Journal*, 53(4), 397-341.
- Lassila, N. A. (2021). *Les comparaisons dans Le petit prince et leurs traductions en finnois : comment la traductrice a-t-elle choisi de traduire les comparaisons ?* [Unpublished bachelor's thesis]. University of Jyväskylä.
- Leech, G., & Short, M. (2007). *Style in fiction* (2nd ed.). Pearson Longman.
- Li, Y., Abdullah, M., & Wong, L. (2022). A systematic literature review of translator's style in translation studies. In B. Mabaroeh et al. (Eds.), *International Conference on Language, Education and Social Science 2022* (pp. 80-91). Atlantis Press. <https://www.atlantis-press.com/proceedings/icless-22/125976784>
- Long, N. (2012). On translation and The little prince. *Ephemeral Pursuits*. <http://ephemeralpursuits.com/blog/2012/10/on-translation-and-the-little-prince/>
- Mastropierro, L. (2018). Key clusters as indicators of translator style. *Target-international Journal of Translation Studies*, 30(2), 240–259. <https://doi.org/10.1075/target.17040.mas>

- McEnery, T., Xiao, R. Z., & Tono, Y. (2006). *Corpus-based language studies: An advanced resource book*. Routledge.
- Meunier, P. (2003). *La philosophie du petit prince: Ou le retour à l'essentiel*. Libres d'écrire.
- Moe, M. Z., & Zigon, T. (2020). Said, spoke, spluttered, spouted: The role of text editors in stylistic shifts in translated children's literature. In J. V. Coillie & J. McMartin (Eds.), *Children's literature in translation: Texts and contexts* (pp. 125-140). Leuven University Press.
- Ng, Y. N. (2018). Domestication analysis of The little prince in Cantonese from the perspective of Fairclough's critical discourse analysis (CDA) theory. *Outstanding Academic Papers by Students (OAPS)*. City University of Hong Kong.
- Onumajuru, E. M. & Onumajuru, V. C. (2017). La problématique de la traduction de français en igbo: Le cas de petit prince d'Antoine de Saint-Exupéry. *International Journal of Language, Literature and Gender Studies (LALIGENS)*, 6(1), 123-132. <https://doi.org/10.4314/laligens.v6i1.11>
- Riegel, M., Pellat, J. C., & Rioul, R. (1994). *Grammaire méthodique du français* (éd. 4). Puf.
- Strömberg, A. (2010). *Le petit prince d'Antoine de Saint-Exupéry : Étude de la traduction en suédois d'un livre d'enfants* [Unpublished bachelor's thesis]. University of Linnaeus.
- Thumrongsanta, T. (2017). The little prince: A philosophical novel or a tale for children. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 9(2), 39-66.
- Tomassone, R. (2002). *Pour enseigner la grammaire. Nouvelle édition*. Delagrave.
- Wang, Q., & Li, D. (2020). Looking for translators' fingerprints: A corpus-based study on Chinese translations of Ulysses. In K. Hu & K. H. Kim (Eds.), *Corpus-based translation and interpreting studies in Chinese contexts* (pp. 155-179). Palgrave.



APPENDIX

The translations of *Le petit prince* into English

After the publication of the first English version by Katherine Wood in 1943, a multitude of subsequent translations is as follows:

- Irene Testot-Ferry (1st ed. 1995)
- T.V.F. Cuffe (1st ed. 1995)
- Alan Wakeman (1st ed. 1995)
- Richard Howard (1st ed. 2000)
- Ros and Chloe Schwartz (1st ed. 2010)
- David Wilkinson (bilingual version, 1st ed. 2011)
- Gregory Norminton (1st ed. 2015)
- John Hinds (1st ed. 2016)
- Rowland Hill (1st ed. 2017)
- Michael Morpurgo (1st ed. 2018)
- Jeff Mcneill (1st ed. 2019)
- Marina Zhigalova (1st ed. 2020)