



中诗英译比录

吕叔湘

上海外语教育出版社

中诗英译比录

吕叔湘 编

上海外语教育出版社

Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press

1980·12

中诗英译比录

吕叔湘 编

上海外语教育出版社出版

(上海东体育会路 186 号)

新华书店上海发行所发行

上海外语学院印刷厂印刷

850×1156毫米 1/32 7.3 印张 17 千字

印数：1—5,000 册

统一书号：7218·007 定价：0.87 元

出版者的话

译文不易，译诗更难。谈英诗中译者有之，谈中诗英译的却比较少。吕叔湘先生这本《中诗英译比录》是三十多年前编著的，其中有古代《诗经》，也有盛唐诗歌，都是我们祖国文化遗产的一部分。对于我国人民在长期历史中所创造的文化精华，我们应该珍视。有些外国学者于欣赏之余，大胆移植，有译得比较好的，也有译得不那么好或者甚至译错的，吕叔湘先生选而录之，让读者研究比较。

更可贵的是吕叔湘先生原书中的《序》，对于中诗英译作了许多有意义的论述，如以诗体译诗的利弊以及变通的限度等等，都引实例以说明，足为译诗者借鉴。因此我们征得吕先生同意，把这本《中诗英译比录》重印出版。

原书中的诗我们这次用照相制版，繁体字未予改动，在此顺便说明。

一九八〇年

序

海通以还，西人渐窥中国文学之盛，多有转译，诗歌尤甚；以英文言，其著者亦十有余家。居蜀数载，教授翻译，颇取为检讨论说之资，辄于一诗而重译者择尤比而录之，上起风雅，下及唐季，得诗五十九首，英译二百有七首。¹ 客中得书不易，取资既隘，挂漏实多，然即此区区，中土名篇，彼邦佳译，大抵已在。研究译事者足资比较；欣赏艺文者亦得玩索而吟咏焉。将以付之剞劂，辄取昔日讲说之言弁之卷首；所引诸例，杂出各家，不尽在所录之内也。²

—

以原则言，从事翻译者于原文不容有一词一语之误解。然而谈何容易？以中国文字之艰深，诗词铸语之凝链，译人之误会在所难免。前期诸家多尚“达旨”，有所不解，易为闪避；后期译者渐崇信实，诠释讹误，昭然易晓。如韩愈山石诗，“僧言古壁佛画好，以火来照所见稀，” Bynner (p.29) 译为

And he brought a light and showed me, and I called them
wonderful.

以“稀少”为“希奇”，此为最简单的误解字义之例。

又如古诗为焦仲卿妻作，“妾不堪驱使，徒留无所施”， Waley (Temple, p.114) 译为

I said to myself, "I will not be driven away."

Yet if I stay, what use will it be?

以“驱使”为“驱逐”，因而语意不接，遂误以上句为自思自语，则又因字义之误而滋生句读之误。

1 其中有友人杨宪益先生伉俪所译数首，蒙假原稿过录，于此致谢。

2 各家书名见后附书目。

其次，词性之误解，亦为致误之因。如杜诗闻官军收河南河北：“却看妻子愁何在？漫卷诗书喜欲狂”句，Bynner (P.154) 误以“愁”为动词，译为

Where is my wife? Where are my sons?

Yet crazily sure of finding them, I pack my books and poems.
读之解颐。杜公虽“欲狂”，何至愁及妻子之下落？且“却看”之谓何？

中文动词之特殊意蕴，往往非西人所能识别，如杜诗“感时花溅泪，恨别鸟惊心”，泪为诗人之泪，心亦诗人之心，“溅”与“惊”皆致动词也，而 Bynner (P.148) 译为

...Where petals have been shed like tears

And lonely birds have sung their grief.

顿成肤浅。

然一种文字之最足以困惑外人者，往往不在其单个之实字，而在其虚字与熟语，盖虚字多歧义，而熟语不易于表面索解也。此亦可于诸家译诗见之。Waley 在诸译人中最为翔实，然如所译《焦仲卿妻》中，以“四角龙子幡”为

At its four corners a dragon-child flag (*Temple*, p. 121),

“子”字实解；又译“著我绣夹裙，事事四五通”为

... Takes what she needs, four or five things (*ibid.*, p. 116),

以“通”为“件”，皆因虚字而误。

余人译诗中亦多此例。如 Fletcher (*More Gems*, P. 12) 译太白月下独酌“月既不解饮”作

The moon then drinks without a pause,

由于不明“解”字作“能”讲；译“行乐须及春”作

Rejoice until the Spring come in,

由于不明“及”字作“乘”讲。又如 Giles (*Verse*, p. 99) 译杜诗“今春看又过，何日是归年？”作

Alas! I see another spring has died ...

因不明“看”字之等于后世之“看看”或“眼见得”，遂误将“过”为“已过”，虽小小出入，殊失原诗低回往复之意也。

以言熟语，有极浅显，不应误而误者。如年月序次只以基数为之，不加“第”字，凡稍习中文者不应不解，而 Fletcher (*Gems*, p. 8) 译太白长干行“五月不可触”句为

For five months with you I cannot meet.

亦有较为生僻，其误可原者。如同篇“早晚下三巴”句不独 Fletcher (*ibid.* p. 9) 误为

Early and late I to gorges go,

Lowell (P. 29) 亦误为

*From early morning until late in the evening, you descend
the three Serpent River,*

惟小畑 (p. 152) 作

Some day when you return down the river,

为得其真象。

熟语之极致为“典故”，此则不仅不得其解者无从下手，即得其真解亦不易达其义蕴。如小杜金谷园结句“落花犹似坠楼人”，Giles (*Verse* p. 175) 译作

*Petals, like nymphs from balconies, come tumbling to the
ground,* 诚为不当，即 Bynner (p. 178) 译为

Petals are falling like a girl's robe long ago,

若非加注 (p. 292) 亦不明也。又如权德舆玉台体一绝之“昨夜裙带解，今朝蟾子飞”，Giles (*Verse*, p. 135) 译为

Last eve thou wert a bride,

This morn thy dream is o'er...

固是荒谬，而 Bynner (p. 25) 译为

Last night my girdle came undone,

And this morning a luck beetle flew over my bed.

仍不得不乞灵于附注 (p. 244)，且亦仅注出一“蟾子”，于“裙带”仍

不得其解也。(王建宫词“忽地下阶裙带解，非时应得见君王。”) 4

Bynner 所译诗中亦时有类此之错误，如译孟浩然秦中寄远上人诗“黄金燃桂尽，壮志逐年衰”作 4

Like ashes of gold in a cinnamon-flame, 4

My youthful desires have been burnt with the years (p. 111), 4
亦复不知所云也。

若干历史的或地理的词语亦具有熟语之性质，常为译家之陷阱。如香山赠梦得诗(长庆集卷六六)“寻花借马烦川守，弄水偷船恼令公”，Waley (*More Translations*, p.90)译为 4

When, seeking flowers, we borrowed his horse, the river-keeper
was vexed; 4

When, to play on the water, we stole his boat the Duke Ling
was sore. 4

以“川守”为“river-keeper”固已以意为之，以“令公”为“Duke Ling”尤可见其疏于考索。时裴度以中书令晋国公为东都留守，史称其与刘白过从甚密，长庆集同卷颇多题咏赠和之作，只应曰 Duke P'ei 或 Duke of Chin，不得以“令”为专名也。 4

又如“山东”一名，古今异指，而 Fletcher (*Gems*, p. 70) 译杜诗兵车行“君不闻汉家山东二百州，千村万落生荆杞”，作 Shantung; “河汉”指天河，而 Waley (*Poems*, p. 44) 译古诗十九首之十“迢迢牵牛星，皎皎河汉女”，作 Han River; 皆易滋误会，显为违失。 4

至如 Giles (*History*, p. 170) 译长恨歌“渔阳鞞鼓动地来”作 4
But suddenly comes the roll of the fish-skin war-drums, 4
误以地名为非地名; Lowell (p. 98) 译太白闻王昌龄左迁龙标遥寄，“杨花落尽子规啼”作 4

In Yang-chou, the blossoms are dropping, 4

又误以非地名为地名; 与“山东”、“河汉”相较，虽事类相同，而难易有别。“渔阳”安得谓为“鱼皮”，“杨”、“扬”更字形悬异，其为谬误，尤难宥也。 4

二

中文常不举主语，韵语尤甚，西文则标举分明，诗作亦然。译中诗者遇此等处，不得不一一为之补出。如司空曙贼平后送人北归，云：“世乱同南去，时清独北还。他乡生白发，旧国见青山”，Bynner (p. 133) 译为

In dangerous times *we* two came south;
Now *you* go north in safety, without me.
But remember *my* head growing white among strangers,
When *you* look on the blue of the mountains of home.

四句皆补出主语，除第三句容有可商外（亦可指友或兼指二人），余均无误。

然亦往往缘此致误，如上引诗更下一联云“晓月过残垒，繁星宿故关”，“过”与“宿”之主语仍为 *you*，而 Bynner 译为

The moon goes down behind a ruined fort,
Leaving star-clusters above an old gate.

误以“晓月”与“繁星”当之，不知此二语之作用如副词也。

又如古诗十九首之十二，“燕赵多佳人……当户理清曲”继之以“驰情整巾带，沈吟聊踟蹰”，乃诗人自谓闻曲而有感也，Waley (*Poems*, p. 45) 误以蒙上佳人，译为

To ease their minds they arrange their shawls and belts;
Lowering their song, a little while they pause,

索然寡味矣。

又如 Fletcher (*More Gems*, p. 9) 译李白长干行“早晚下三巴，预将书报家，”作

Early and late *I* to gorges go,
Waiting for news that of thy coming told.

不明“早晚”之为询问，遂以“下”为“我下”，不知自长干至三巴

不得云“下”，两地之相去亦非朝暮可往来者。

又如刘长卿逢雪宿芙蓉山，“柴门闻犬吠，风雪夜归人”，闻者诗人自闻也，Fletcher (*Gems*, p. 184) 译为

The house dog's sudden barking, which hears the wicket go,
Greets us at night returning through driving gale and snow.

误为犬闻门响而吠，不知中文不容有“宾——动——主”之词序，杜诗“香稻啄余鸚鵡粒”之得失至今犹聚讼纷纭也。

此等错误往往因涉上下文主语而来，如上举“驰情整冠带”误承“当户理清曲”，“早晚下三巴”则其上既有“坐愁红颜老”，其下复有“相迎不道远”，不谙中文之常常更易主语而又从略者自易致误。如杜诗兵车行，“况复秦兵耐苦战，被驱不异犬与鸡”，即此土不学之人亦难免误解，Bynner (p. 169) 译为

Men of China are able to face the stiffest battle,
But their officers drive them like chickens and dogs.

其情可原。然“役夫”来自“山东”，与“秦兵”正为敌对，上下文足以确定被驱者非秦兵，B. 氏有江亢虎氏为助，不容并此而不达。

又因主语之省略而误解动词之意义者。如Waley译焦仲卿妻“谓言无罪过，供养卒大恩”(*Temple*, p. 116) 作

Never in spoken word did I transgress or fail ... 又“十七遣汝嫁，谓言无誓违” (p. 118) 作

... and hears you promise forever to be true,

此两“谓言”同于后世之“只道”、“只说是”，宜作 I thought 解，Waley 不了此义，殆由未举主语。

又如古诗十九首之十九“客行虽云乐，不如早旋归”，Waley (*Poems*, p. 48) 译作

My absent love says that he is happy,
But I would rather he said he was coming back,

又古诗上山采蘼芜“新人虽言好，不及古人姝” (p. 35) 译作

Although her talk is clever ...

其实此处“云”、“言”皆无主动词，it is said 之义，仍实字之近于虚字者，缀于“虽”字之后，作用类似衬字，今语亦有“虽说是”，可为比较；waley 视为寻常动词，遂有“言谈”之解。

与主语省略相似者又有宾词之省略，亦为译家致误之由。如元稹遣悲怀，“尚想旧情怜婢仆，也曾因梦送钱财”，Bynner (p. 216) 译为

... Sometimes, in a dream, I bring you gifts.

谓梦中送钱财于亡妻，无乃费解？此则远不及 Fletcher (*More Gems*, p. 191) 所译

The slaves' and servants' love moves me to love,
And presents I gave them, when I dreamed of you.

之信达而兼雅也。

又有因连词之省略而致误者。如渊明责子诗“雍端年十三，不识六与七”，Budd (p. 150) 误于前，

Yong-tuan is thirteen now.

Waley (*Poems*, p. 76) 误于后，

Yung-tuan is thirteen.

皆昧于中文平联词语常不用连词之惯例，遂以“雍”与“端”为一人也。

三

译诗者往往改变原诗之观点，或易叙写为告语，因中文诗句多省略代词，动词复无词形变化，译者所受限制不严也。其中有因而转更亲切或生动者。试引二三例，则如李商隐嫦娥诗：“嫦娥应悔偷灵药，碧海青天夜夜心，”Bynner (p. 75) 译为

Are you sorry for having stolen the potion that has set you
Over purple seas and blue skies, to brood through the long
nights?

此由第三身之叙写改为对第二身之告语者，视原来为亲切。如卢纶

塞下曲之“野幕敞琼筵，羌戎贺劳旋；醉和金甲舞，雷鼓动山川，”

Bynner (p. 104) 译为

Let feasting begin in the wild camp!

Let bugles cry our victory!

Let us drink, let us dance in our golden armour!

Let us thunder on rivers and hills with our drums!

此由第三身之叙写改为一二身之告语者，视原来为生动。

如王维班婕妤诗：“怪来妆阁里，朝下不相迎；总向春园里，花间笑语声”，Fletcher (*Gems*, p. 120) 译为

Dost wonder if my toilet room be shut?

If in the regal halls we meet no more?

I ever haunt the garden of the spring;

From smiling flowers to learn their whispered lore.

原来为汉帝告婕妤，译诗改为婕妤告汉帝，观点适相反，而译诗似较胜。

但如王建新嫁娘诗：“三日入厨下，洗手作羹汤” Fletcher (*More Gems*, p. 208) 译为

Now married three days, to the kitchen I go,

And washing my hands a fine broth I prepare.

杜牧秋夕诗“银烛秋光冷画屏，轻罗小扇扑流萤”，Bynner (p. 177) 译为

Her candle-light is silvery on her chill bright screen.

Her little silk fan is for fireflies ...

原诗之为一身抑三身，未可遽定：前一诗似是三身，今作一身，后一诗似是一身，今作三身，其间得失，正自难言。然中诗可无主语，无人称，译为英文，即非有主语有人称不可，此亦译中诗者所常遇之困难也。

四

不同之语言有不同之音律，欧洲语言同出一系，尚且各有独特之

诗体，以英语与汉语相去之远，其诗体自不能苟且相同。初期译人好以诗体翻译，即令达意，风格已殊，稍一不慎，流弊丛生。故后期译人 Waley, 小畑, Bynner 诸氏率用散体为之，原诗情趣，转易保存。此中得失，可发深省。

以诗体译诗之弊，约有三端。一曰趁韵：如 Fletcher (*Gems*, p. 211) 译王绩过酒家，“眼看人尽醉，何忍独为醒”作

With wine o'ercome when all our fellows be,
Can I alone sit in sobriety?

二曰颠倒词语以求协律：如 Fletcher (*More Gems*, p. 62) 译杜诗秋兴，“几回青琐点朝班”作

Just in dream by the gate when to number I sate
The courtiers' attendants who throng at its side.

三曰增删及更易原诗意义：如陈子昂登幽州台诗，“前不见古人，后不见来者，念天地之悠悠，独怆然而涕下”，Giles (p. 58) 译为

My eyes saw not the men of old;
And now their age away has rolled
I weep—to think that I shall not see
The heroes of posterity!

其第二行为与原诗第三句相当乎，则甚不切合，为不与相当乎，则原句甚重要，不容删省。又如杜诗“露从今夜白，月是故乡明”，Giles (p. 101) 译为

The crystal dew is glittering at my feet,
The moon sheds, as of old, her silvery light.

“今夜”与“故乡”为此联诗眼，而横遭刊落。

与此相反者，如张泌寄人诗，“别梦依依到谢家，小廊回合曲阑斜”，Giles (p. 209) 译为

After parting, dreams possessed me and I wandered you know
where,

And we sat in the verandah and you sang the sweet old air.

第二行之下半完全为足成音段而增加。

其全部意义加以更易者，如 Giles (p. 65) 译张九龄诗“思君如明月，夜夜减清辉”作

My heart is like the full moon, full of pains,
Save that 'tis always full and never wanes.

汉译便是“思君异明月，终岁无盈亏”。

前两种病，中外恶诗所同有，初无间于创作与翻译。第三种病，则以诗体译诗尤易犯之，虽高手如 Giles 亦所不免。Fletcher 尤甚于 Giles; Budd, Martin 诸人更甚于 Fletcher，有依稀仿佛，面目全非者，其例难于列举。

五

自一方面言，以诗体译诗，常不免于削足适履，自另一方面言，逐字转译，亦有类乎胶柱鼓瑟。硬性的直译，在散文容有可能，在诗殆绝不可能。Waley 在 *More Gems* 序言中云，所译白居易诗不止此数，有若干未能赋以“诗形”，不得不终于弃去。Waley 所谓“诗形” (poetic form)，非寻常所谓“诗体”，因所刊布者皆散体也。Waley 举其初稿两首为例，试录其一：早春独登天宫阁（长庆集卷六十八），“天宫日暖阁门开，独上迎春饮一杯。无限游人遥怪我，缘何最老最先来？”

Tien-kung Sun warm, pagoda door open;
Alone climbing, greet Spring, drink one cup.
Without limit excursion-people afar-off wonder at me;
What cause most old most first arrived!

此 Waley 认为诗的原料，未经琢磨不得为诗者。而 Ayscough 译杜诗，顾以此为已足。如垂老别首四句：“四郊未宁静，垂老不得安。子孙阵亡尽，焉用身独完？” (Tu Fu, I., p. 336)，译为

On all four sides, in open spaces beyond the city, no unity,
no rest;

Men fallen into old age have not attained peace.

Their sons, grandsons, every one has died in battle:

Why should a lone body finish its course?

Lowell 与 Ayscough 合译《松花笺》集，以不识中文故，不得不唯 Ayscough 之初稿是赖，因之多有不必要之拘泥处，如译太白山中答俗人问 (p. 69)，“问余何事栖碧山”作

He asks why I perch in the green jade hills.

然其佳者如刘禹锡石头城 (p. 120)，“山园故国周遭在，潮打空城寂寞回”，译为

Hills surround the ancient kingdom; they never change.

The tide beats against the empty city, and silently, silently
returns.

亦自具有 Waley 所谓“诗形”，非 Ayscough 自译杜诗可比也。

故严格言之，译诗无直译意译之分，唯有平实与工巧之别。散体诸译家中，Lowell, Waley, 小畑，皆以平实胜，而除 Lowell 外，亦未尝无工巧；至于 Bynner，则颇逞工巧，而亦未尝无平实处。

所谓平实，非一语不增，一字不减之谓也。小畑之译太白诗，常不为貌似，而语气转折，多能曲肖。如“两岸猿声啼不住，轻舟已过万重山” (p. 76) 译为

The screams of monkeys on either bank

Had scarcely ceased echoing in my ear

When my skiff had left behind it

Ten thousand ranges of hills.

“已”字，“过”字，“啼不住”三字，皆扣合甚紧，可谓译中上选。又如独坐敬亭山绝句 (p. 57) “众鸟高飞尽；孤云独去闲。相看两不厌，只有敬亭山”之译为

Flocks of birds have flown high and away;

A solitary drift of cloud, too, has gone, wandering on.

And I sit alone with the Ching-ting Peak, towering beyond.

We never grow tired of each other, the mountain and I.

苏台览古 (p. 74) “旧苑荒台杨柳新，菱歌清唱不胜春。只今惟有西江月，曾照吴王宫里人”之译为

In the deserted garden among the crumbling walls,

The willows show green again,

While the sweet notes of the water-nut song

Seem to lament the spring.

Nothing remains but the moon above the river—

The moon that once shone on the fair faces

That smiled in the king's palace of Wu.

皆未尝炫奇求胜，而自然切合，情致具足者。

译者虽以平稳为要义，亦不得自安于苟简或晦塞，遇原来异常凝练之诗句，固不得不婉转以求曲达。Waley 译古诗有颇擅此胜者：如十九首之九 (*Poems*, p. 43)，“此物何足贵，但感别经时，”后句译为

But it may remind him of the time that has past since he left.

十九首之十一 (p. 44)，“立身苦不早”译为

Success is bitter when it is slow in coming.

十九首之十三 (p. 46)，“万岁更相送”译为

For ever it has been that mourners in their turn were mourned.

又如焦仲卿妻 (*Temple*, p. 122)，“自君别我后，人事不可量；果不如先愿，又非君所详”，末句言约而意深，译作

You would understand if only you knew.

此皆善为婉达，具见匠心者也。

至 Bynner 译唐诗三百首乃好出奇以制胜，虽尽可依循原来词语，亦往往不甘墨守。如孟浩然留别王维 (p. 112)，“欲寻芳草去，惜与故人违，”译为

How sweet the road-side flowers might be

If they did not mean good-bye, old friend.

韦应物滁州西涧 (p. 206), “春潮带雨晚来急, 野渡无人舟自横” 译为

On the spring flood of last night's rain

The ferry-boat moves as though someone were poling.

同人夕次盱眙县 (p. 211), “独应忆秦关, 听钟未眠客” 译为

At midnight I think of northern city-gate,

And I hear a bell tolling between me and sleep.

皆撇开原文, 另作说法, 颇见工巧。然措词虽已迥异, 意义却无增减, 虽非译事之正宗, 亦不得谓为已犯译人之戒律也。

六

上举 Bynner 诸例引起译事上一大问题, 即译人究有何种限度之自由? 变通为应限于词语, 为可兼及意义? 何者为必须变通? 何者为无害变通? 变通逾限之流弊又如何?

译事之不能不有变通, 最显明之例为典故。如元稹遣悲怀诗, “邓攸无子寻知命, 潘岳悼亡犹费词”, Bynner (p. 216) 译为

There have been better men than I to whom heaven denied a son,

There was a poet better than I whose dead wife could not hear him.

孟郊古别离诗: “不恨归来迟, 莫向临邛去”, Fletcher (*Gems*, p. 175) 译为

Your late returning does not anger me,

But that another steal your heart away.

皆可谓善于变通, 允臻上乘。若将“潘”“邓”, “临邛”照样译出, 即非加注不可, 读诗而非注不明, 则焚琴煮鹤, 大杀风景矣。(第一例尤佳, 因“知命”与“费词”亦暗中扣紧也。)

亦有不变通而无妨变通者。试举二三简单之例: 如太白江上吟之结句云, “功名富贵若长在, 汉水亦应西北流”, Lowell (p. 43) 与小