Form Equivalence in Translating Chinese Poetic Prosody into English

Jimin Chen*
(University International College, Macao University of Science and Technology)

Abstract: Poetry, especially metrical poetry differs from other genres of literature for its unique creation of meter and rhyme. Form and content are the two criteria of poetry appreciation. Form includes the outer poetic structure, the use of meter and rhyme and antithesis (dui zhang) particularly in Chinese metrical poetry. Content refers to the meaning, imagery and mood of a poem. The quality of poetry translation is also assessed by comparing both form and content between two languages. This article aims to discuss the possibility of making pure form correspondence by exploring the maximum equivalence in translating Chinese metrical poetry into English. Such "form equivalence" in Chinese poetry translation refers not only to the structure and rhyming that have long been studied, but to the tonal prosodic patterns, in other words, whether the ping and ze tones of Chinese characters can correspond to the stressed and unstressed syllables of English words, and whether the number of syllables per line can be consistent with the number of tones in the original poem, all of which have rarely been discussed in translations between Chinese and English metrical poetry. Keeping the meaning and spirit of the source text (hereinafter referred to as "ST") is important, but if the form (both meter and rhyme) of poetry can also be entirely rendered into another language, would that be even more perfect or is such perfection attainable and necessary?

Keywords: form equivalence/correspondence; poetic prosody; ping and ze; stressed and unstressed syllables

淺談中國格律詩詞英譯的形式對等

陳季敏*
（澳門科技大學國際學院）

摘要：形式和內容是詩歌鑒賞的兩大標準，形式一般包括詩歌的結構、格律、韻律和對仗（主要用於近體詩）；內容即意思和意境的表達。好的詩歌翻譯亦是形式和內容兩方面的結合。本文主要探討英譯中國格律詩詞中純形式對等，尤其是聲律對等的可能性及可譯性。格律詩詞翻譯中的形式對等不單指當前討論較多的詩歌的結構和押韻，更體現在詩歌的聲律上，即中詩的平仄是否能對應英詩中的重輕音節，音節對應的同時又能否做到每行音節數相同或與源文一致。詩歌翻譯在確保內容、意境、結構、押韻對等的同時能否進一步在源語文本的平仄聲律、節奏上有所加強，抑或這種加強是否真正可行且必要？

關鍵詞：形式對等；詩律；平仄；輕重音節

Manuscript received: 26 January 2021, Accepted: 11 March 2022.
*Corresponding Author: Jimin Chen Annie, Lecturer of University International College, Macau University of Science and Technology, PhD candidate in Fine Arts, MA in Translation Studies, Research area: Translation and Literary Studies; Art History. E-mail: jmichen@must.edu.mo, Tel: +853-88972075.

0 Introduction

Although diverse translation theories and various translation principles, evaluation standards, strategies and methods have been keenly discussing for centuries, some scholar and linguists still insist that the highest standard of translation is zero translation, or word-for-word literal translation is the best translation technique for texts such as the *Holy Bible* and metrical poetry, provided that the source language feature and culture can be reserved as much as possible. Also known as a translator, Lu Xun proposed faithfulness and smoothness as the main criteria to be observed in translation though, he actually supported what he termed "yingyi", a mode of translation aiming at introducing foreign language expression to make the translation rather be faithful than smooth.[1] Moreover, understandability and readability of a translation are believed to be more acceptable in the receptor language (translation) culture, however, quite a few biblical scholars still claim that a word-for-word translation is the most accurate or the best strategy for translating religious classics.

Poetry, a very different genre of literature, requires strict form and unique content in its writing. Generally, the form of poetry consists of its layout structure, metrical structure, and rhyming patterns. The content of poetry refers to its meaning and the imagery reflected by verse lines. The form and content, which are considered the spirit of poetry, are two important aspects of poetry appreciation and analysis. Poetry translation is also evaluated through those two aspects. Therefore, in translating classical Chinese poetry into English, maintaining such form of the original poem is equally important as attaining the equivalence of the content. Sometimes, it is not so difficult to render the content of a classical Chinese poem if the translator applies a word-for-word literal translation as it is basically an intralingual to interlingual translation process. Put simply, what the translator needs to do is to understand and interpret the poem into its vernacular, and then transfer the vernacular meaning to another language. This is the common method of translating classical Chinese prose text (wen yan wen) into modern English language. The poetic form, however, is what creates a barrier between Chinese and English poetry. Chinese metrical poetry mainly features the same number of characters per line, the alternate tones of "ping" and "ze", the use of antithesis (dui zhang), and rhyming, while English metrical poetry is composed by feet formed by stressed and unstressed syllables, the use of figurative language and rhyming system. How to transfer those technical writing skills and make equivalence of those different language features in poetry translation seems to be more important and demanding than translate meanings. Therefore, Robert Frost considers poetry as "what gets lost in translation", [3] which corresponds to an Italian proverb "Traduttore, traditore" (translator, traitor). Though it seems to be unfair to the translator, it implies the challenge of poetry translation that is caused by the two entirely different language families of Chinese and English. They have little in common in terms of their language forms.

Although the form equivalence discussed in this paper sounds similar to another "formal equivalence" proposed by the American linguist and translation theorist Eugene Nida, who defines the term as "One is concerned that the message in the receptor language should match as closely as possible the different elements in the source language" (1964a: 159),[4] in other words, the target text (translation) should achieve "accuracy and correctness" in both form and content of the source text to get the readers closer to the source language and its culture, in fact, however, the "form equivalence" mentioned in this article is meant

to be a pure form correspondence. Specifically, it is not only about translating a jueju (a four-line Chinese verse) into a quatrain, or a duilian (a pair of Chinese lines) into a couplet, but about translating ping ze into trochee (a stressed sound followed by an unstressed sound), keeping the same number of syllables per line when translating a tangshi (a metrical poem written in or around the time of China's Tang dynasty), and using the same rhyme scheme and rhyme style in another language.

Poetry translation is like "dancing on ropes with fettered legs" (Dryden 2006: 10) [5] as it is not simply a translation from one language into another, but a translation of a poem into another. When facing dilemma, some translators would rather keep the meaning and imagery closer to the source text than keep the outer form in translation, which is a common and reasonable solution. They choose to put the TT (target text) reader in the first place and produce something natural and making sense. There is no denying that form correspondence should be based on the accurate rendition of meaning and content of the ST (source text). A good poetry translation is in fact the combination of sound and meaning. To what extent can form equivalence be achieved without affecting the imagery and meaning of the original text? Besides, to what extent is the pursuit of pure form correspondence necessary in poetry translation?

1 Significance and Objectives of the Study

Recent studies of metrical poetry translation between Chinese and English have focused more on comparing the outer form including the structure and rhyme as well as the translation techniques applied to achieve dynamic or functional equivalence between the original poem and its English translation. Some translators were practicing rhythmic equivalence / correspondence by replacing English feet with Chinese pauses (dun) or beats or groups of tones in translating English metrical poetry, which is now one of the most recognized ways of handling rhythmical issues. Few has analyzed a classical Chinese poem and its English translation in terms of pure form correspondence, that is, to correspond Chinese tones to English syllables to see how close the rhythm can be achieved between two languages. As one of the key outer forms of poetry, meter or rhythm seems to be left out for comparison and discussion. A hundred percent of faithfulness in translation is almost impossible to achieve since there is no substitute for any particular language. That is why zero translation is the only ideal yet unreachable method in translation. Therefore, "expressiveness" and "elegance" have become the top standards of translating literary texts, especially poetry. More attentions have been paid to restoring the original spirits and charm in the rendition. Such spirits and charm can be basically achieved through different translation techniques and strategies.

The reason for conducting this study is that the author of this paper used to write both Chinese and English metrical poetry and always wondered in addition to the line number and rhyme, whether the Chinese and English metrical patterns can be in some ways equivalent despite the huge difference between two languages. This idea impels the writer to assume for the first time that the Chinese ping and ze tones might correspond to the stressed and unstressed syllables respectively in English. This article makes an attempt to explore the possibility of such correspondence – keeping the poetic form, especially the sound effect as close as the original in its translation – and meanwhile discuss the necessity of pursuing such form equivalence, which hopefully can provide data and insight for further investigation

on metrical poetry translation.

2 Literature Review

2.1 Chinese metrical poetry translation studies in the past

Chinese translation theories are associated with Chinese aesthetics which has its roots in the philosophical ideas of Lao Zi, Confucius and Zhuang Zi. For a long time, the controversy between truth (faithfulness) and beauty (elegance) had existed in classic Chinese translation studies until two monks Dao An and Xuan Zang attempted to balance fluency and faithfulness in translation.[6] Such principle was developed by Yan Fu centuries later into his three golden rules for translation – faithfulness (xin), expressiveness (da) and elegance (ya), which has become one of the most influential translation criteria in China, especially in literary translation.[7] However, classical Chinese poetry has a "spirit" similar to what Qian Zhongshu put as "sublimation" (化 境).[8] In fact, this apparently abstract literary translation principle can be embodied by the "Three Beauties" of sound (音美), imagery (意美) and form (形美) put forward by Xu Yuanchong as the ontology of poetry translation. Xu also proposed three strategies and three skopos in translating Chinese metrical poetry[9], which have been effective and convincing in his own translations shown in the following chapter.

In the past ten years, studies of classical poetry translation have mainly focused on the rendition of the original meaning or imagery, which according to Xu should be evaluated before the sound and form. "Image construction" has always been a keyword and core of papers on Chinese poetry translation. As earlier scholars paid more attention to the different thinking modes between Chinese and English, specifically Chinese is a paratactic language which tend to be implicit, while English is a hypotactic language which tend to be explicit, a number of papers studied the barrier of rendering Chinese "subtleness" into English and what translation strategies and techniques can be applied to transform the imagery of Chinese metrical poetry. Recent studies on Chinese metrical poetry translation have been closely linked with interdisciplinary theories of humanities and arts. For example, quite a few Chinese scholars have studied the form and content of classical Chinese translation adopting schema theory, which is an aspect of cognitive psychology. Some other papers have studied classical Chinese poetry from the perspectives of aesthetic reception and philosophical hermeneutics. No matter how far its multi-perspective link with Chinese metrical poetry translation has been explored, classical Chinese poetry can never be understood and appreciated without its linguistic features. Therefore, the essence of poetry is still its creation of sound and structure. Most of the poetry translation studies of Xu Yuanchong, one of the translation masters in metrical poetry, focus on his application of what he proposes as the "Three Beauties" to his own translations through various translation skills including the use of figurative languages. The "form equivalence" for most poetry translation analysis is about the use of rhyme and the entire structure. None of the articles or papers compared English meter with Chinese tonal prosody purely by exploring the similarity between syllables and tones. And the poetic structure equivalence between Chinese and English, such as corresponding a jueju with a quatrain or a lüshi with an octave have rarely been discussed either. Many scholars and researchers only noticed the differences between two languages. However, Chinese and English sounds are in some ways similar, thus can be interconverted and equivalent in a certain way.

2.2 Studies about "Form Equivalence" in Chinese and English metrical poetry translation

More studies on poetic prosody have been found from English to Chinese metrical poetry translation. Among various solutions to "form equivalence" in metrical poetry translation, many scholars support the idea of translating English metrical poems into Chinese vernacular metrical poems, with Mr. Bian Zhilin being a representative and master of applying such idea into practice. Through a large amount of translation practice, Mr. Bian, together with other older generation of translators has come up with a practical method of translating English metrical poetry, which is called "replacing foot with dun", meaning using the basic rhythmic unit of modern spoken Chinese "dun" or "beat" or "sound/tone group" to translate English "foot". Later an article entitled "How to Translate English Metrical Poems?" by a translator and translation scholar Yang Deyu makes a comprehensive summary of such idea and method of metrical poetry translation. [10] According to Yang, the effect of a pause (dun) in modern spoken Chinese is roughly equivalent to one foot in English poetry, which has been verified by many Chinese poetry translations done by the translators who either intentionally or not apply this method to translation. Such method was later developed by a translator Huang Gaoxin into a form trio of rendering word number, pause number, and rhyme scheme in English to Chinese poetry translation (三兼顧). [11] Nevertheless, some other scholars argue that the foot in English poetry is not equivalent to the Chinese "dun" because there are many types of foot in English metrical poetry. Regardless of whether "foot" and "dun" correspond to each other or not, it is Chinese translators' attempt to create the equivalent rhythm effect when transferring English feet and their greatest contribution to restoring English meter to the Chinese translation.

The tonal prosody discussed in this paper, specifically, the equivalence between Chinese tones (ping and ze) and English syllables (stressed and unstressed) has not yet been elaborately explored, though there is certain claim about the translatability of syllable in correspondence to the ping and ze based on some translation practices by translators, such as Zhu Xiang and Liang Zongdai who translated Shakespeare's sonnets into verses with ten and twelve Chinese characters per line respectively. However, such way of dealing with English rhythmic structure was not agreed by Yang Deyu and many other people who support the equivalence between "dun" and foot. In fact, what Yang argued is not the same as what's been discussed in this paper in a way that Yang only mentioned the replacement of English syllables with Chinese characters instead of discussing the correspondence between the two rhythm units. Another article, [12] though assumes the correspondence between syllables and tones, fails to elaborate such idea with examples and further discussion.

The studies on poetic prosody are less founded in Chinese to English poetry translation. And rhyme issue is always the main topic for poetic form studies. There are basically two strategies for transferring English and Chinese rhyme schemes, that is, either to use the same rhyme scheme as the original poem or to apply the rhyme scheme that TT audience is familiar with. The former strategy seems to be supported by more translators and scholars. Since there is only one rhyme pattern in Chinese language, and Chinese rhyme and English end rhyme are almost equivalent in their sound effect, introducing metrical poetry by applying the same rhyme scheme to the translation can be accepted and appreciated by most poetry readers. According to Yang Deyu, translating English metrical poetry entirely to Chinese metrical poetry, which Yang

terms this as “assimilation”, will somehow confuse the TT readers in a way that they cannot learn the original form of the poem, thus won’t be able to appreciate the poem in the same way as the ST audience. In a word, rhyme issue is not as challenging as meter issue translators solve in poetry translation. There seems to be a possibility of syllabic-tone equivalence believed by a few researchers. [13] None of them has explored it deeply by analyzing which tone and syllable are equivalent, and the effect of such equivalence, and whether the TT audience can appreciate the imagery and sound effect in the same way as the ST audience, all of which will be discussed in the following case analysis section.

2.3 Data

Since this paper makes an attempt to discuss the possibility and necessity of rendering Chinese tonal prosody into English, classical Chinese poetry with the strictest form is selected to make comparison with different English translation versions. The two types of metrical poetry selected for analysis here are shi (a type of poem flourishing in the Tang Dynasty) and ci (a type of poem flourishing in the Song Dynasty). A five-character jueju (a four-line verse), a seven-character lüshi (an eight-line verse) and a Song ci will be studied and analyzed with the emphasis on form equivalence, or more accurately on form correspondence in the next section.

3 Case Analysis of Translating Chinese metrical poetry into English

ST1:

千山鳥飛***絕***， 平平仄平仄（e 韻）
萬徑人蹤***滅***。 仄仄平平仄（e 韻）
孤舟蓑笠翁， 平平仄仄平
獨釣寒江***雪***。 仄仄平平仄（e 韻）

“Jiang Xue” by Liu Zongyuan[14]

Jueju is one of the most conventional and influential forms of poetry in the Tang Dynasty. It looks short apparently yet follows a number of strict rules in the use of tonal patterns and rhymes. Jueju is a poem of four lines, each line consists of five or seven characters. The selected poem is a five-character jueju. There is only one rhyme in a jueju, and the second and the fourth lines must rhyme, so the rhyme scheme of a jueju is either aaba or abcb. The general prosodic rules of a jueju or any metrical poem must obey the three rules as follow:

1. The ping and ze tones should be used alternately within lines. Generally, two tones form one rhythm, two adjacent rhythms are different. In Chinese, it is called “ping ze xiang jian”. But the two tones within the rhythm must be the same.

2. The ping and ze tones must be opposite to each other in each couplet (xiang dui) while they must be identical in each adjacent lines (xiang nian). Specifically, the two lines within a couplet (e.g. lines 1-2) must be opposite in rhythm, while the first line of the second couplet (lines 3-4) and the second line of the first couplet (lines 1-2) must be identical in rhythm, especially for the even characters in those two lines.

3. Though it is not compulsory, the parts of speech in each pair of couplets are supposed to be matched (ci xing xiang dui), which is called antithesis.

In fact, the selected jueju here by Liu Zongyuan is not regular in its rhythm as the second and third lines use opposite but not identical tonal structure. Such irregular situation is called “shi nian”, which is a rare case in jueju. However, none of the translators seem to be aware of this issue and all translations

tend to be target language-oriented at least in the use of rhythm. Nevertheless, the first two lines of "Jiang Xue" use antithesis and the second couplet (last two lines) uses opposite ping and ze tones.

The following three English versions of "Jiang Xue" have all rendered the original meaning and images carefully and precisely. Let's compare and discuss the form of each English translation.

TT1:

˘ / ˘ / ˘ / ˘ /
From hill to hill no bird in ***flight***;
˘ / ˘ / ˘ / ˘ /
From path to path no man in ***sight***.
˘ / / / ˘˘ / ˘
A straw-cloak'd man in a boat, ***lo***!
/ ˘ ˘ /˘ / ˘ /
Fishing on river clad in ***snow***.

Tr. Xu Yuanchong [15]

TT2:

/˘ ˘ / ˘ / ˘ / ˘ /
Over a thousand hills, no bird's in ***flight***;
˘ / ˘ / ˘ / / ˘ ˘ /
On myriads paths, not one foot-print in ***sight***.
˘˘ / ˘ / / ˘ / ˘ /
In a small lone boat straw-caped man with hat,
˘/ / ˘ /˘ ˘ / / /
Alone, angling river in cold, snow ***white***.

Tr. Frank C Yue

TT3:

˘ / ˘ / ˘ ˘ / /
A hundred mountains and no bird,
˘ / ˘ / ˘ / ˘ / /
A thousand paths without a foot print;
˘/˘ / ˘˘ / /
A little boat, a bamboo cloak,
˘ / / /˘ ˘˘ / /˘ /
An old man fishing in the cold river-snow.

Tr. Witter Banner

In English poetry, a quatrain can be the most equivalent type of poetry to a Chinese jueju in terms of its structure. A quatrain is usually written in iambic pentameter or tetrameter, with a rhyme scheme of abab or abba. In a sense, translating jueju into quatrain is a natural and smooth bridge between Chinese and English languages. However, none of the selected three English translations here is a real quatrain due to the use of rhyme scheme. The closest version to the English quatrain is TT1 for its metrical pattern and the rhythm. Since jueju and quatrain don't have the same rhyme scheme, TT1 uses a typical English couplet rhyme scheme of aabb, TT2 uses the same rhyme scheme aaba as the original poem, and TT3 is unrhymed. Since none of the three translations adopt the rhyme scheme of an English quatrain, TT2 seems to be the most faithful to the source text in terms of its rhyme scheme. Regarding the rhythmic structure, a five-character jueju is more equivalent to a quatrain written in tetrameter than pentameter, because iambic tetrameter which contains eight syllables per line is shorter than iambic pentameter of ten syllables per line. Syllables are different from tones or characters. Each Chinese character has only one sound or tone, while English is basically a polysyllabic language with many words having more than one sound/syllable. In poetry translation, it is hard or almost impossible to make an English syllable correspondent to a Chinese character as they are two different language families. A five-character jueju, if rendering into a five-syllable poem would have no more than five words in each line assuming all five words are monosyllabic, which could barely convey any original meaning or message to English. Moreover, Chinese metrical poetry is characterized by the use of opposite tones in the successive verse lines which creates a rhythmical and pleasant sound to the audience, while English metrical poetry is created by different types of foot. The iambus, an unstressed syllable followed by a stressed syllable (" ˘ /"), is the most common type of foot

used in English poetry. Most English metrical poetry is written in one foot with approximate same number of syllables in each line. Therefore, though matching ping tone with stressed syllable and ze tone with unstressed syllable is theoretically possible, creating syllables with opposite sounds in the successive verse lines (see Fig. 1) by no means makes a sensible and readable poetic rhythm to the English audience as spondee (two stressed syllables marked as "/ /") and pyrrhic (two unstressed syllables marked as " ⏑ ⏑ ") feet are rarely used in English verses, which sound awkward and unnatural as well in English reading. Moreover, each foot of an English verse always contains one stressed sound (beat). Nevertheless, in Chinese, not only two ping tones and two ze tones can be put together, but even three same tones can be put together as long as the sounds are opposite to each other in two connected lines.

平平仄仄平　　/ / ⏑ ⏑ /
仄仄平平仄　　⏑ ⏑ / / ⏑

Figure 1

Based on the different prosodic rules between Chinese and English metrical poetry, and the unworkable correspondence between characters and syllables, it can be concluded that the most equivalent type of English poetry to a Chinese five-character jueju is a quatrain written in iambic tetrameter with a certain rhyme scheme. A general quatrain rhymes abab, but a jueju rhymes abcb or aaba. According to this criterion, TT2 seems to be most faithful to the original rhyming. TT1 rhymes aabb, which is a common rhyme pattern for English couplets. As for meter, TT1 has created a perfect iambic tetrameter with exact eight syllables per line. The rhythms in the other two translations are irregular, even though they have all tried to start each verse line with an unstressed sound as this is the effect of an iambic foot. TT3 has done slightly better than TT2 in rhythm but failed in the last line which consists of eleven syllables and puts too many same sounds together.

Lastly, part of speech matching (antithesis) appears in the first two lines of the poem "Jiang Xue". The part of speech of each character matches precisely one another in the same position in the following line. All three translations have attempted keeping the first two lines in the same structure. TT1 tops the other two in creating eight monosyllabic words per line, making the two lines exactly parallel to each other, thus creating the most rhythmical sound among all three versions.

All in all, despite the technical possibility of the equivalence between ping ze and stressed and unstressed sounds, none of the translators have ever made an attempt to match the rhythm of the two languages in this way, because it will perhaps confuse the English readers and destroy the sound beauty of Chinese metrical poetry.

ST2:

錦瑟無端五十弦，仄仄平平仄仄平（an 韻）
一弦一柱思華年。平平仄仄仄平平（an 韻）
莊生曉夢迷蝴蝶，*平平仄仄平平仄*
望帝春心托杜鵑。*仄仄平平仄仄平*（an 韻）
滄海月明珠有淚，*平仄仄平平仄仄*
藍田日暖玉生煙。*平平仄仄仄平平*（an 韻）
此情可待成追憶，仄平仄仄平平仄
只是當時已惘然。仄仄平平仄仄平（an 韻）

"Jin Se" by Li Shangyin[16]

TT1 (Lines 3-6):

⏑ / / / ⏑ / / ⏑ ⏑ / ⏑ / ⏑ /
The sage Chuang-tzu is day-dreaming, bewitched by butterflies,
⏑ / / ⏑ / ⏑ ⏑ / ⏑ / ⏑ ⏑ / ⏑
The spring-heart of Emperor Wang is crying in a cuckoo,
/ ⏑ / ⏑ / ⏑ / ⏑ ⏑ / / /
Mermen weep their pearly tears down a moon-green sea,
/ / ⏑ / ⏑ ⏑ / ⏑ ⏑ /
Blue fields are breathing their jade to the sun.

Tr. Witter Banner

TT2 (Lines 3-6):

/ / ⏑ / ⏑ / ⏑ / ⏑ /
Dim morning dream to be a ***butterfly***;
/ ⏑ ⏑ / ⏑ / ⏑ / ⏑ /
Amorous heart poured out in cuckoo's ***cry***.
⏑ / ⏑ / ⏑ / ⏑ / ⏑ /
In moonlit pearls see tears in mermaid's ***eyes***;
⏑ / ⏑ / ⏑ / ⏑ / ⏑ /
From sunburnt jade in Blue Field let smoke ***rise***!

Tr. Xu Yuanchong

The second example is a lüshi, an eight-line Chinese metrical verse. There are mainly two types of lüshi, a five-character and a seven-character lüshi. The selected poem is a seven-character lüshi named "Jin Se" (an ancient instrument like a harp) by Li Shangyin, a well-known poet in the Tang Dynasty. This poem follows strictly the rules of Chinese metrical poetry as mentioned in the precious case analysis.

Based on its structure, a lüshi can be regarded as a two-stanza quatrain or four couplets. Therefore, it is longer and more complex than a jueju in the following aspects: 1. Using one rhyme throughout the poem. Even lines must rhyme, odd lines except the first line must not rhyme. 2. The second couplet (hanlian, third and fourth lines) and the third couplet (jinglian, fifth and sixth lines) must use antithesis. 3. The ping and ze tones must be opposite in each successive line of the second and third couplets. The translations for comparison and discussion here only cover the second and third couplets (lines 3-6) of the poem for they are the most important and demanding lines in a lüshi.

Based on its form, a lüshi is mostly equivalent to an octave, which is a verse of eight lines written in iambic pentameter, commonly rhyming abbaabba. The octave is originally the first eight lines of an Italian sonnet. Since lüshi can be considered an extended edition of jueju, it is reasonable and equivalent to transfer the tonal prosodic patterns of "Jin Se" to iambic pentameter as the original poem has seven characters per line. TT2 is successful in creating an iambic pentameter rhythm with exact ten syllables per line in the translation. However, it adopts neither rhyme scheme of the original poem nor that of an octave, but turns this lüshi into a heroic couplet, which is an iambic pentameter poem rhyming in pairs. Such transfer is by all means a smart choice since the translation not only keeps the poetic form of the source text, but also creates a type of poetry that is familiar to the TT readers. The success of TT2 is that it creates a balance between the formal equivalence and the dynamic equivalence by bringing the TT readers to the source language and culture through their own language features and poetry writing.

TT1 has done better in rendering antithesis (using same sentence structure). In fact, matching the part of speech in classical Chinese texts is common. Antithesis is also used frequently in English literary texts. However, matching Chinese parts of speech with English antithesis word for word or phrase for phrase is hard, because one of the major differences between Chinese and English is that English tends to be hypotactic while Chinese is basically a paratactic language. That is, English uses tense while Chinese does not use very often. Nevertheless, matching sentence structure is possible because English is syntactically similar to Chinese language. That is why TT1 written in present progressive tense can still correspond to the original verses in a "subject-verb" pattern. What makes TT1 a less successful translation is that it has failed to make form equivalence to the original poem for using irregular metrical structure and no rhyme. TT1 is merely an interpretation of images and meaning by simply adopting the original poetic structure rather than turning ST2 into a metrical poem in English language.

Furthermore, classical Chinese texts use many

allusions to create symbolism and imagery. Allusions without the source language cultural background by paraphrasing are difficult to be understood by TT readers. One of the translation techniques of tackling allusion is using a word-for-word or literal translation of the source text with some annotation put in a footnote, which makes the rendition faithful to the ST form and meanwhile accesses the TT readers to ST language and culture. TT1 has done a literal translation of the third line "莊生曉夢迷蝴蝶" without explaining the allusion of "莊周夢蝶" in the Chinese cultural context. TT2 has tactfully avoided this allusion by changing the subject of the original lines. Such allusion rendition issues in poetry translation could be further investigated and discussed.

ST3:

世情***薄***，人情***惡***，　　仄平仄，平仄平（o 韻）
雨送黃昏花易***落***。　　仄仄平平平仄仄（o 韻）
曉風***乾***，淚痕***殘***。　　仄平平，仄平平（an 韻）
欲箋心事，獨語斜***闌***。仄平平仄，仄仄平平（an 韻）
難！***難***！***難***！　　平平平（an 韻）

人成***各***，今非***昨***，　　平平仄，平平仄（o 韻）
病魂常似秋千***索***。　　仄平平仄平平仄（o 韻）
角聲***寒***，夜闌***珊***。　　仄平平，仄平平（an 韻）
怕人尋問，咽淚裝***歡***。仄平平仄，仄仄平平（an 韻）
瞞！***瞞***！***瞞***！　　平平平（an 韻）

"Phoenix Hairpin" by Tang Wan [17]

TT1:

‿ / ‿ / / / ‿ /
The world ***unfair***, True manhood ***rare***.
/ / ‿ / ‿ / ‿ / ‿ / ‿ /
Dusk melts away in rain and blooming trees turn ***bare***.
/ ‿ / / / / ‿ /
Morning wind ***high***, Tear traces ***dry***.
‿ / ‿ / ‿ / ‿ / / ‿ ‿ / / ‿ ‿ /
I'll write to you what's in my ***heart***, Leaning on rails, speaking ***apart***.
/ / /
Hard, ***hard***, ***hard***!

‿ / ‿ / / ‿ ‿ /
Go each our ***ways***! Gone are our ***days***.
‿ / ‿ / ‿ / ‿ / ‿ / / ‿
Like long, long ropes of swing my sick soul groans ***always***.
‿ / ‿ / / ‿ ‿ /
The horn blows ***cold***, Night has grown ***old***.
‿ / ‿ / ‿ / ‿ / ‿ / ‿ / ‿ / ‿ /
Afraid my grief may be ***descried***, I try to hide my tears ***undried***.
/ / /
Hide, ***hide***, ***hide***!

Tr. Xu Yuanchong

The third selected poem for case analysis is a ci (lyric) booming in the Song dynasty. As one of the most traditional and important Chinese metrical poetry, ci differs from shi for it was initially created for singing, which is the same as Anglo-Saxon (old English) poetry. Every ci has its own tune called cipu which is somehow like music staves showing the tune formed by its tonal patterns and rhyme. When writing a ci, a poet must stick to the tune of the lyrics and fill in each character following the set ping-ze tonal patterns and the rules for rhyming prescribed in the cipu. In general, there is always one rhyme throughout a Chinese metrical poem. However, according to the tune of "Phoenix Hairpin", there is a rhyme shift between the first two lines and the last three lines of each stanza. The main rhyme is a flat tone rhymed "an". The ping and ze is used alternatively based on the tonal prosodic rules of the tune. The two stanzas are almost parallel to each other in the use of structure, tonal pattern and rhyme.

The equivalence of ci, such as "Phoenix Hairpin"

can hardly be found in English poetry, because ci has its own structural pattern. Though using different number of characters or tones per line, ci is still catchy and rhythmical. However, the meter of English poem is rarely created by different number of syllables per line. English metrical poetry can be unrhymed, yet must be written in certain metrical structure, such as a blank verse. In general, there is always one type of foot used throughout an English metrical poem. Therefore, the English cinquain (a five-line poem) is not equivalent to the "Phoenix Hairpin" as none of its rules is similar to the tune of "Phoenix Hairpin" except for the line number.

For rhyming, English rhyming system is much more complex than Chinese rhymes. Specifically, the rhyming form of Chinese language is strictly fixed as it all depends on the simple or compound vowel of Chinese characters while English has a more flexible rhyming pattern based on the polysyllabic feature of English language. In English, not only vowels and consonants can rhyme, beginning, middle and end syllables can also rhyme. Alliteration, assonance, end rhyme are the most common rhyming forms of English language. Nevertheless, Chinese is a monosyllabic language, and the repetition of vowel sound (equivalent to end rhyme) is the only type of rhyme in Chinese. In TT1 by Xu Yuanchong, there are seven end rhymes throughout the poem: [eə], [ai], [ɑrt] [ɑrd] in the first stanza and [eiz], [ould], [aid] in the second stanza. The original ci poem has only two rhymes with different underlined marks in ST3. To stick to the rhyme of this tune, the translator has made each stanza rhyme similarly as the original tune, especially the second stanza, which uses half rhyme in the sounds [ould] and [aid] to be closer to the original rhyming. The first two lines rhyme the same as the source text. The following three lines, though do not use the same rhyme as the original poem, try to create more rhyme patterns other than end rhyme to make it like an English poem. For instance, "high", "heart", "hard", "hide" use alliteration; "heart", "hard" though do not use end rhyme, sound rhythmical because they use both alliteration and assonance. "hard" and "hide" use half rhyme instead of end rhyme. All those different rhymes are rendered skillfully to be both faithful to the original poem and readable in the target language.

The tonal pattern of a ci is fixed according to the cipu. The opposites of ping and ze tones and antithesis are not necessary as all rules for different tunes are set and written in the cipu. That is why writing a ci is also called "tianci" (fill in the characters) in Chinese. Since the rhythmic structure of a ci poem is not regular, a poem in irregular rhythmic structure cannot be considered a metrical poem in English, the translation mainly adopts iambic foot – a most frequently used foot in English poetry. With the use of various rhymes and iambus, the translator uses domesticating translation strategy to familiarize TT readers with their poetic form, and meanwhile introduces Chinese ci poem to the English audience.

4 Conclusion

A poem's "spirit" lies in not only its profound meaning, but the creation of sound and poetic form. A good translator should keep such spirit as much as he/she can in poetry translation. According to Dendam (2006: 9) [18], poetry translation is a transfer between two poems rather than two languages. The spirit of a poem must be restored to its translation. Otherwise, translation is nothing but a mechanical activity that can be done by any machine if only meanings are

This study initially plans to explore the possibility and necessity of pure form correspondence between Chinese metrical poetry and its English translation. Upon carefully examining and comparing

the structure, tonal assignment and rhyming system of three typical Chinese metrical poems, namely a five-character jueju, a seven-character lüshi and a ci, with their different English versions, it can be concluded that corresponding the unstressed syllable to the ze tone, and the stressed syllable to the ping tone, and putting the end rhyme in the same place in the translated verse as it's used in the original Chinese poem are technically possible. Nevertheless, hardly any existing translation deal with Chinese and English rhythm in this way. One evident reason is that the metrical structure imitating Chinese ping and ze tones in the English translation could be awkward and unnatural, or such pattern might not be rhythmical at all to the English readers. Another reason could be such tonal correspondence doesn't really contribute to the smoothness and elegance of the original poem, conversely, it might ruin the beauty of the meaning and sound both in the original Chinese poem and in its English translation in a way that the meaning is not likely to be fully rendered due to the restriction of metrical structure in both languages. Unfortunately, no translation example of such correspondence can be found to support the writer's deduction, which can be one of the limitations of this study. Nevertheless, some aforementioned translators and scholars insist on transferring the English poetic foot into the Chinese "pause" as the only strategy for handling the rhythm issue in poetry translation. This strategy is proved to be workable through a large number of well-translated English metrical poems by translators, such as Bian Zhilin, Yang Deyu, etc. But it is still the equivalence between the two different rhythmical units instead of two words' tones/sounds. We cannot say that poetry is untranslatable just because there's no existing translation adopting tone correspondence. Besides, such strategy is only used in poetry translations from English to Chinese. All in all, the conclusion of this study is that though tone-syllable tonal correspondence is technically possible, thus translatable, yet no translation example of such could be found, which somehow indicates that such translatability might be too ideal to be necessary in poetry translation, meanwhile some certain equivalence of structure, meter and rhyme can be achieved without the "spirit" of the original poem being lost. If both form and functional equivalence can be achieved, readers of both languages would understand the texts in a similar fashion.

According to the above case analysis and discussion, a five-character jueju can be equivalent to an English quatrain written in iambic tetrameter; a seven-character lüshi can be equivalent to an octave in iambic pentameter or in heroic couplet. Regarding tonal prosody, the ping and ze tones in Chinese are somehow equivalent to the stresses and unstressed syllables in English. It is impossible to create opposite rhythm (xiang dui) in the English translation as there is basically only one rhythm depending on the main foot type throughout an English metrical poem. However, creating identical rhythm between lines in English resembles Chinese xiang nian, still the English rhythm cannot be used the same as that in Chinese metrical poetry, because the alternate use of "dui" and "nian" in Chinese poetry aims to diversify the tones, while the use of one rhythm in English is to make the poem rhythmic and readable. Thus, the English rhythm is more similar to the pause (dun) than the tones in Chinese language. As for rhyming, pair rhymes and alternate rhymes are used more often in English poetry than in Chinese poetry which uses only one rhyme. Even though ci seems to be more flexible in using rhymes, there is always a main rhyme in Chinese lyrics. Therefore, whether adopting the original rhyme scheme in poetry translation or using the rhyme pattern which TT readers are familiar with is still a

dilemma between foreignization and domestication strategies in translation. However, according to the poetic effect, the Chinese translator Xu Yuanchong's versions tend to be more fluent and readable for both ST and TT readers as he uses parallelism, iambic pentameter, almost same number of syllables per line, and pair rhymes for Chinese poetry and alternate rhymes for Chinese lyrics that are consistent with the original rhyme patterns in ci in his translations. Such combination of both Chinese language features and English language features creates a balance between poetry translations by preserving the most of the two languages as well as the unique beauty and the soul of metrical poetry.

Peter Newmark thinks that "translation is for discussion" (1991: 132). [19] Poetry as a typical genre of literature can be rendered with a variety of strategies and methods. Despite the fact that there has never been standard perfect translation ever, poetry translation assessment is generally based on Yan Fu's three golden rules of "faithfulness", "fluency" and "elegance", or Xu Yuanchong's three beauties of "sound", "imagery" and "form". No matter what translation technique is adopted or what assessment method is applied, sound beauty outweighs other elements of a poem somehow, for much of old Chinese and English poetry was intended to be chanted initially.

Last but not least, one of the limitations of this study is that no example of pure tonal correspondence translation can be found to be compared with the existing various translations that mostly focus on the structure and rhyme. Xu Yuanchong, who did pay attention to the tonal prosody issue, attempts to make an equivalence between Chinese tonal patterns and English meter by creating the rhythmic structure English readers are familiar with, yet leaving the original poetic prosody of Chinese poetry untouched. Another limitation is that, due to space constraints, the writer has only selected three most representative Chinese metrical poems in terms of their strict form rules for analysis, yet the number of cases in this paper is still not enough to support the argument of technical translatability but lack of readability in corresponding Chinese tones to English syllables. This study will definitely be continued to explore various solutions to tonal equivalence by providing more tone-syllable corresponding translation examples and perhaps some experimental translations done on purpose for merely tonal prosody analysis by the writer.

Hopefully, more and more researchers will pay attention to the meter in both languages and provide various viable solutions to the form of classical poetry rendition for further investigation. Future studies of this issue can be far more mature with more versions of poetry translation produced by ambitious translators.

References

[1] 魯迅，《關於翻譯的通信·二心集》， 北京，人民文學出版社，1953。

[2] Daniel B. Wallace. "Fifteen Myths about Bible Translation." In *Bible Translation*, 30 Nov. 2012, danielbwallace.com/2012/10/08/fifteen-myths-about-bible-translation/.

[3] "A Quote by Robert Frost." Goodreads, Goodreads, http://www.goodreads.com/quotes/625-poetry-is-what-gets-lost-in-translation.

[4] Nida, Eugene A. *Toward a Science of Translating*. Leiden: Brill, 1964.

[5] Dryden, John. *The Turns of Translation Studies: New Paradigms or Shifting Viewpoints?* .Ed. Mary Snell-Hornby. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2006.

[6] 劉華文，《翻譯詩學》（*Translation Poetics*），北京：外語教學與研究出版社，2015。

[7] 嚴複，《譯例言》（*Tian Yan Lun*），by Thomas Henry Huxley, Shang Wu Yin Shu Guan, 1981.

[8] 劉宓慶，《翻譯美學導論》，北京：北京對外翻譯出版社，2005。

[9] 許淵沖，《翻譯的藝術》，北京：五洲傳播出版社，2006。

[10] 楊德豫，〈用什麼形式翻譯英語格律詩？〉，《中國翻譯》，3（北京，1990），2-6。

[11] 萬龍生，〈兼顧字數與音步的譯法是可行的〉 ，《中華讀書報》，018（2014. 03. 05）。

[12] 萬兵，〈從文體學視角看格律詩的翻譯—以許淵沖英譯李商隱的《無題》爲例〉，《天津外國語學院學報》，6（天津，2010），24-28。

[13] 孟憲忠，〈「以頓爲步」是翻譯英語格律詩的光明大道〉，《外國文學》，6（北京：2001），79-82。

[14] 吳鈞陶，et al.《唐詩三百首新譯 : 英漢對照》（*300 Tang Poems: a New Translation: English-Chinese*）/ [許淵沖, 陸佩弦, 吳鈞陶編]，北京：中國對外翻譯出版公司，1988。

[15] Liu, Zongyuan. “Fishing in Snow(Jiang Xue)” *300 Tang Poems: a New Translation: English-Chinese* / [許淵沖，陸佩弦，吳鈞陶編]. Ed. Roman Tang，（北京：中國對外翻譯出版公司，1988），305。

[16] Li, Shangyin. “The Inlaid Harp.” *Love Songs from China*. Ed. Roman Tang. (Chengdu: Si Chuan People’s Publishing House, 2006), 91.

[17] Tang, Wan. “Tune: ‘Phoenix Hairpin’.” *Love Songs from China*. Ed. Roman Tang. (Chengdu: Si Chuan People’s Publishing House, 2006), 148.

[18] Denham, John. “Preface.” *Love Songs from China*. Ed. Roman Tang. (Chengdu: Si Chuan People's Publishing House, 2006), 3-10.

[19] Newmark, Peter. *About Translation*. Clevedon and Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters, 1991.