

英華集

中詩英譯比錄

呂叔湘 編著

序

海通以還，西人漸窺中國文學之盛，多有轉譯，詩歌尤甚；以英文言，其著者亦十有餘家。居蜀數載，教授翻譯，頗取爲檢討論說之資，輒於一詩而重譯者擇尤比而錄之。上起風雅，下及唐季，得詩五十九首，英譯二百有七首。¹客中得書不易，取資既隘，掛漏實多。然卽此區區，中土名篇，彼邦佳譯，大抵已在。研究譯事者足資比較；欣賞藝文者亦得玩索而吟詠焉。將以付之剞劂，輒取昔日講說之言弁之卷首；所引諸例，雜出各家，不盡在所錄之內也。²

一

以原則言，從事翻譯者於原文不容有一詞一語之誤解。然而談何容易？以中國文字之艱深，詩詞鑄語之凝鍊，譯人之誤會在所難免。前期諸家多尙『達旨』，有所不解，易爲閃避；後期譯人漸崇信實，詮解訛誤，昭然易曉。如韓愈山石詩，『僧言古壁佛畫好，以火來照所見稀』，Bynner (p. 29)²譯爲

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

以『稀少』爲『希奇』，此爲最簡單的誤解字義之例。

又如古詩爲焦仲卿妻作，『妾不堪驅使，徒留無所施』，Waley (Temple. p. 114) 譯爲

I said to myself, "I will not be driven away."
Yet if I stay, what use will it be?

以『驅使』爲『驅逐』，因而語意不接，遂誤以上句爲自思自語，則又四字義之誤而滋生句讀之誤。

其次，詞性之誤解，亦爲致誤之因。如杜詩聞官軍收河南河北：『卻看妻子愁何在，漫卷詩書喜欲狂』句，Bynner (P. 154) 誤以『愁』爲動詞譯爲

Where is my wife? Where are my sons?

Yet crazily sure of finding them, I pack my books and poems.
讀之解頤。杜公雖『欲狂』，何至愁及妻子之下落？且『卻看』之謂何？

¹其中有友人楊憲益先生所譯數首，蒙假原稿過錄，於此致謝。

²各家書名見後附書目

中文動詞之特殊意蘊，往往非西人所能識別，如杜詩『感時花濺淚，惜別鳥驚心』，淚爲詩人之淚，心亦詩人之心，『濺』與『驚』皆致動詞也，而 Bynner (P. 148) 譯爲

.....Where petals have been shed like tears
And lonely birds have sung their grief.

頓成膚淺。

然一種文字之最足以困惑外人者，往往不在其單個之實字，而在其虛字與熟語，蓋虛字多歧義，而熟語不易於表面索解也。此亦可於諸家譯詩見之。Waley 在諸譯人中最爲翔實，然如所譯『焦仲卿妻』中，以『四角龍子旛』爲

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

『子』字實解；又譯『著我繡袂裙，事事四五通』爲

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

以『通』爲『件』，皆因虛字而誤。

餘人譯詩中亦多此例。如 Fletcher (*More Gems*, P. 12) 譯太白月下獨酌『月既不解飲』作

The moon then drinks *without a pause*,

由於不明『解』字作『能』講；譯『行樂須及春』作

Rejoice *until* the Spring come in,

由於不明『及』字作『乘』講。又如 Giles (*Verse*, p. 99) 譯杜詩『今年看又過，何日是歸年？』作

Alas! I see another spring has died.....

因不明『看』字之等於後世之『看看』或『眼見得』，遂誤『將過』爲『已過』，雖小小出入，殊失原詩低回往復之意也。

以言熟語，有極淺顯，不應誤而誤者。如年月序次祇以基數爲之，不加『第』字，凡稍習中文者不應不解，而 Fletcher (*Gems*, p. 8) 譯太白長干行『五月不可觸』句爲

For *five months* with you I cannot meet.

亦有較爲生僻，其誤可原者。如同篇『早晚下之巴』句不獨 Fletcher (*ibid.* p. 9) 誤爲

Early and late I to gorges go,

Lowell (P. 29) 亦誤爲

*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,

爲得其真象。

熟語之極致爲『典故』，此則不僅不得其解者無從下手，即得其真解亦不易達其義蘊，如小杜金谷園結句『落花猶似墜樓人，』Giles (Verse p.175) 譯作

Petals, like nymphs from balconies, come tumbling to the ground,
誠爲不當，即 Bynner (p. 178) 譯爲

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

若非加註 (p. 292) 亦不明也。又如權德輿玉臺體一絕之『昨夜裙帶解，今朝蟾子飛』，(Giles Verse, p. 135) 譯爲

Last eve thou wert a bribe,

This morn thy dream is o'er.....

固是荒謬；而 Bynner (p. 25) 譯爲

Last night my girdle came undone,

And this morning a luck-beetle flew over my bed,

仍不得不乞靈於附註 (p. 244)，且亦僅註出一『蟾子』，於『裙帶』仍不得其解也。(王建宮詞『忽地下塔裙帶解，非時應得見君王。』)

Bynner 所譯詩中亦時有類此之錯誤，如譯孟浩然秦中寄遠上人詩『黃金燃桂盡，壯志逐年衰』作

Like ashes of gold in a cinnamon-flame,

My youthful desires have been burnt with the years (p. 111);

亦復不知所云也。

若干歷史的或地理的詞語亦具有熟語之性質，常爲譯家之陷阱。如香山贈夢得詩(長慶集卷六六)『尋花借馬煩川守，弄水偷船惱令公』，Waley (More Translations, p. 90) 譯爲

When, seeking flowers, we borrowed his horse, -the river-keeper

was vexed;

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

以『川守』爲“river-keeper”固已以意爲之，以『令公』爲“Duke Ling”尤可見其疏於考索。時裴度以中書令晉國公爲東都留守，史稱其與劉白過從甚密，長慶集同卷頗多題詠贈和之作，祇應曰 Duke P'ei 或 Duke of Chin，不得以『令』爲專名也。

又如『山東』一名，古今異指，而 Fletcher (*Gems*, p. 70) 譯杜詩兵車行『君不聞漢家山東二百州，千村萬落生荆杞』，作 Shantung；『河漢』指天河，而 Waley (*Poems*, p. 44) 譯古詩十九首之十『迢迢牽牛星，皎皎河漢女』，作 Han River；皆易滋誤會，顯爲違失。

至如 Giles (*History*, p. 170) 譯長恨歌『漁陽鼙鼓動地來』作

But suddenly comes the roll of the fish-skin war-drums,
誤以地名爲非地名；Lowell (p. 98) 譯太白聞王昌齡左遷龍標遙寄，『楊花落盡子規啼』作

In Yang-chou, the blossoms are dropping,

又誤以非地名爲地名：與『山東』『河漢』相較，雖事類相同，而難易有別。『漁陽』安得謂爲『魚皮』，『楊』『揚』更字形懸異，其爲謬誤，尤難有恕也。

二

中文常不舉主語，韻語尤甚，西文則標舉分明，詩作亦然。譯中詩者遇此等處，不得不一一爲之補出。如司空曙賊平後送人北歸，云：『世亂同南去，時清獨北還。他鄉生白髮，舊國見青山』，Bynner (p. 133) 譯爲

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.

四句皆補出主語，除第三句容有可商外（亦可指友或兼指二人），餘均無誤。

然亦往往緣此致誤，如上引詩更下一聯云『曉月過殘壘，繁星宿故關』，『過』與『宿』之主語仍爲 you，而 Bynner 譯爲

序

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

誤以『曉月』與『繁星』當之，不知此二語之作用如副詞也。

又如古詩十九首之十二，『燕趙多佳人……當戶理清曲』繼之以『馳情整巾帶，沈吟聊躑躅』，乃詩人自謂聞曲而有感也，Waley (*Poems*, p. 45) 誤以蒙上佳人，譯爲

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) 譯李白長干行『早晚下三巴，預將書報家』，作

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

不明『早晚』之爲詢問，遂以『下』爲『我下』，不知自長干至三巴不得云『下』，兩地之相去亦非朝暮可往來者。

又如劉長卿逢雪宿芙蓉山，『柴門聞犬吠，風雪夜歸人』，聞者詩人自聞也，Fletcher (*Gems*, p. 184) 譯爲

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

誤爲犬聞門響而吠，不知中文不容有『賓——動——主』之詞序，杜詩『香稻啄餘鸚鵡粒』之得失至今猶聚訟紛紛也。

此等錯誤往往因涉上下文主語而來，如上舉『馳情整冠帶』誤承『當戶理清曲』，『早晚下三巴』則其上既有『坐愁紅顏老』，其下復有『相迎不道遠』，不諳中文之常常更易主語而又從略者自易致誤。如杜詩兵車行，『況復秦兵耐苦戰，被驅不異犬與雞』，卽此土不學之人亦難免誤解，Bynner (p. 169) 譯爲

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

真情可原。然『役夫』來自『山東』，與『秦兵』正爲敵對，上下文足以確定被驅者非秦兵，B. 氏有江亢虎氏爲助，不容並此而不達。

又因主語之省略而誤解動詞之意義者。如 Waley 譯焦仲卿妻『謂言無罪過，供養卒大恩』(Temple, p. 116) 作

Never in spoken word did I transgress or fail.....又『十七遺汝嫁，謂言無誓違』(p. 118) 作

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

此兩『謂言』同於後世之『只道』『只說是』，宜作 I thought 解，Waley 不了此義，殆由未舉主語。

又如古詩十九首之十九『客行雖云樂，不如早旋歸』，Waley (Poems, p. 48) 譯作

My absent love says that he is happy,

But I would rather he said he was coming back,

又古詩上山採蘼蕪『新人雖言好，不及故人姝』(p. 35) 譯作

Although her talk is clever.....

其實此處『云』『言』皆無主動詞，it is said 之義，仍實字之近於虛字者，縱於『雖』字之後，作用類似視字，今語亦有『雖說是』，可為比較；waley 視為尋常動詞，遂有『言談』之解。

與主語省略相似者又有賓詞之省略，亦為譯家致誤之由。如元稹遺悲懷，『尙想舊情憐婢僕，也曾因夢送錢財』，Bynner (p. 216) 譯為

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

謂夢中送錢財於亡妻，無乃費解？此則遠不及 Fletcher (More Gems, p. 191) 所譯

The slaves' and servants' love moves me to love,

And presents I gave them, when I dreamed of you.

之信達而兼雅也。

又有因連詞之省略而致誤者。如淵明責子詩『雍端年十三，不識六與七。』Budd (p. 150) 誤於前，

Yong-tuan is thirteen now.

Waley (Poems, p. 76) 誤於後，

Yung-tuan is thirteen.

皆昧於中文平聯詞語常不用連詞之慣例，遂以『雍』與『端』為一人也。

三

譯詩者往往改變原詩之觀點，或易敍寫爲告語，因中文詩句多省略代詞，動詞復無語形變化，譯者所受限制不嚴也。其中有因而轉更親切或生動者。試引三五例，則如賈島尋隱者不遇詩：『松下問童子，言師採藥去，』Bynner (p. 17) 譯爲

When I questioned *your* pupil, under a pine-tree,
 ‘My teacher’, he answered, “went for herbs.....”

此由單純之第一身敍寫改爲對第二身之告語者。如李商隱嫦娥詩：『嫦娥應悔偷靈藥，碧海青天夜夜心，』Bynner (p. 75) 譯爲

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

此由第三身之敍寫改爲對第二身之告語者。皆視原來爲親切。如盧綸塞下曲之『野幕敞瓊筵，羌戎賀勞旋；醉和金甲舞，雷鼓動山川，』Bynner (p. 104) 譯爲

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 ovr drums!

此由第三身之敍寫改爲一二身之告語者，視原來爲生動。

如王維班婕妤詩：『怪來粧閣裏，朝下不相迎；總向春園裏，花間笑語聲，』Fletcher (*Gems*, p. 129) 譯爲

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.

原來爲漢帝告婕妤，譯詩改爲婕妤告漢帝，觀點適相反，而譯詩似較勝。

但如王建新嫁娘詩：『三日入廚下，洗手作羹湯』Fletcher (*More Gmes*, p. 208) 譯爲

Now married three days, to the kitchen I go,

And washing *my* hands a fine broth I prepare.

杜牧秋夕詩『銀燭秋光冷畫屏，輕羅小扇撲流螢』，Bynner (p. 177) 譯爲

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

Her little silk fan is for fireflies.....

原詩之爲一身抑三身，未可遽定：前一詩似是三身，今作一身，後一詩似是一身，今作三身，其間得失，正白難言。然中詩可無主語，無人稱，譯爲英文，卽非有主語有人稱不可，此亦譯中詩者所常遇之困難也。

四

不同之語言有不同之音律，歐洲語言同出一系，尙且各有獨特之詩體，以英語與漢語相去之遠，其詩體自不能苟且相同。初期譯人好以詩體翻譯，卽令達意，風格已殊，稍一不慎，流弊叢生。故後期譯人 Waley, 小畑, Bynner 諸氏率用散體爲之，原詩情趣，轉易保存。此中得失，可發深省。

以詩體譯詩之弊，約有三端。一曰趁韻：如 Fletcher (*Gems*, p. 211) 譯王績過酒家，『眼看人盡醉，何忍獨爲醒』作

With wine o'ercome when all our fellows be,

Can I alone sit in sobriety?

二曰顛倒詞語以求協律：如 Fletcher (*More Gems*, p. 62) 譯杜詩秋興，『幾回青瑣點朝班』作

Just in dream by the gate when to number I sate

The courtiers' attendants who throng at its side.

三曰增刪及更易原詩意義：如陳子昂登幽州臺詩，『前不見古人，後不見來者，念天地之悠悠，獨愴然而涕下』，Giles (p. 58) 譯爲

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!

其第二行爲與原詩第三句相當乎，則甚不切合，爲不與相當乎，則原句甚重要，不容刪省。又如杜詩『露從今夜白，月是故鄉明』，Giles (p. 101) 譯爲

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

『今夜』與『故鄉』爲此聯詩眼，而橫遭刊落。

與此相反者，如張泌寄人詩，『別夢依依到謝家，小廊回合曲闌斜』，Giles (p. 209) 譯爲

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

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

第二行之下半完全爲足成音段而增加。

其全部意義加以更易者，如 Giles (p. 65) 譯張九齡詩『思君如明月，夜夜滅清輝』作

My heart is like the full moon, full of pains,

Save that 'tis always full and never wanes.

漢譯便是『思君異明月，終歲無益虧』。

前兩種病，中外惡詩所同有，初無間於創作與翻譯。第三種病，則以詩體譯詩尤易犯之，雖高手如 Giles 亦所不免。Fletcher 尤甚於 Giles; Budd, Martin 諸人更甚於 Fletcher，有依稀彷彿，面目全非者，其例難於列舉。

五

自一方面言，以詩體譯詩，常不免於削足適履，自另一方面言，逐字轉譯，亦有類乎膠柱鼓瑟。硬性的直譯，在散文容有可能，在詩殆絕不可能。Waley 在 *More Gems* 序言中云，所譯白居易詩不止此數，有若干未能賦以『詩形』，不得不終於棄去。Waley 所謂『詩形』(poetic form)，非尋常所謂『詩體』，因所刊布者皆散體也。Waley 舉其初稿兩首爲例，試錄其一：早春獨登天宮閣(長慶集卷六十八)，『天宮日暖閣門開，獨上迎春飲一盃。無限遊人遙怪我，緣何最老最先來？』

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 認爲詩的原料，未經琢磨不得爲詩者。而 Ayscough 譯杜詩，願以此爲已足。如垂老別首四句：『西郊未寧靜，垂老不得安。子孫陣亡盡，焉用身獨完？』(Tu Fu, I., p. 336), 譯爲

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 與 Ayscough 合譯『松花箋』集，以不識中文故，不得不唯 Ayscough 之初稿是賴，因之多有不必要之拘泥處，如譯太白山中答俗人問 (p. 69), 『問余何事棲碧山』作

He asks why I perch in the green jade hills.

然其佳者如劉禹錫石頭城 (p. 120), 『山圍故國周遭在，潮打空城寂寞回』，譯爲

Hills surround the ancient kingdom; they never change.

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

亦自具有 Waley 所謂『詩形』，非 Ayscough 自譯杜詩可比也。

故嚴格言之，譯詩無直譯意譯之分，唯有平實與工巧之別。散體諸譯家中，Lowell, Waley, 小畑，皆以平實勝，而除 Lowell 外，亦未嘗無工巧；至於 Bynner，則頗逞工巧，而亦未嘗無平實處。

所謂平實，非一語不增，一字不減之謂也。小畑之譯太白詩，常不爲貌似，而語氣轉折，多能曲肖。如『兩岸猿聲啼不住，輕舟已過萬重山』(p. 76) 譯爲

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，『過』字，『啼不住』三字，皆扣合甚緊，可謂譯中上選。又如獨坐敬亭山絕句 (p. 57) 『衆鳥高飛盡；孤雲獨去閑。相看兩不厭，只有敬亭山』之譯爲

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.

蘇臺覽古 (p. 74) 『舊苑荒臺楊柳新，菱歌清唱不勝春。只今惟有西江月，曾照吳王宮裏人』之譯爲

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.

皆未嘗炫奇求勝，而自然切合，情致具足者。

譯人雖以平穩爲要義，亦不得自安於苟簡或晦塞，遇原來異常凝鍊之詩句，固不得不婉轉以求曲達。Waley 譯古詩有頗擅此勝者：如十九首之九 (Poems, p. 43), 『此物何足貴，但感別經時，』後句譯爲

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』譯爲

Success is bitter when it is slow in coming.

十九首之十三 (p. 46), 『萬歲更相送』譯爲

For ever it has been that mourners in their turn were mourned.
 又如焦仲卿妻 (Temple, p. 122), 『自君別我後，人事不可量；果不如先願，又非君所詳』，末句言約而意深，譯作

You would understand if only you knew.

此皆善爲婉達，具見匠心者也。

至 Bynner 譯唐詩三百首乃好出奇以制勝，雖儘可依循原來詞語，亦往往不甘墨守。如孟浩然留別王維 (p. 112), 『欲尋芳草去，惜與故人違』，譯爲

How sweet the road-side flowers might be
 If they did not mean good-bye, old friend.

章應物滁州西澗 (p. 206), 『春潮帶雨晚來急, 夜渡無人舟自橫』譯爲

On the spring flood of last night's rain

The ferry-boat moves as though someone were poling.

同人夕次盱眙縣 (p. 211), 『獨應憶秦關, 聽鐘未眠客』譯爲

At midnight I think of northeren city-gate,

And I hear a bell tolling between me and sleep.

皆撇開原文, 另作說法, 頗見工巧。然措詞雖已迥異, 意義卻無增減, 雖非譯事之正宗, 亦不得謂爲已犯譯人之戒律也。

六

上舉 Bynner 諸例引起譯事上一大問題, 卽譯人究有何種限度之自由? 變通爲應限於詞語, 爲可兼及意義? 何者爲必需變通? 何者爲無害變通? 變通逾限之流弊又如何?

譯事之不能不有變通, 最顯明之例爲典故。如元稹遣悲懷詩, 『鄧攸無子知命, 潘岳悼亡猶費詞』, Bynner (p. 216) 譯爲

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.

孟郊古別離詩: 『不恨歸來遲, 莫向臨邛去』, Fletcher (*Gems*, p. 175) 譯爲

Your late returning does not anger me,
But that another steal your heart away.

皆可謂善於變通, 允臻上乘。若將『潘』『鄧』, 『臨邛』照樣譯出, 卽非加註不可, 讀詩而非註不明, 則焚琴煮鶴, 大殺風景矣。(第一例尤佳, 因『知命』與『費詞』亦暗中扣緊也。)

亦有不必變通而無妨變通者。試舉二三簡單之例: 如太白江上吟之結句云, 『功名富貴若長在, 漢水亦應西北流』, Lowell (p. 43) 與小畑 (p. 25) 均直譯『西北流』, 小畑加註云漢水東南流入江, 實則循上句語氣, 無註亦明。然若如 Fletcher (*Gems*, p. 44) 之譯爲

But sooner could flow backward to is fountains
This stream, than wealth and honour can remain.

直捷了當，亦未嘗不可。又如 Fletcher (*Gems*, p. 214) 譯賈至春思詩，『桃花歷亂李花香』，作

The peach and pear blossoms in masséd fragrance grow.

李花未必不歷亂，桃花亦未必不香，正不必拘拘於原文字面。又如 Giles (*Verse*, p. 164) 譯白居易後宮詞『紅顏未老恩先斷，斜倚熏籠坐到明』，作

Alas, although his love has gone, her beauty lingers yet;

Sadly she sits till early dawn but never can forget.

原云『紅顏未老恩先斷』，今云『君恩已去紅顏在』，先者後之，後者先之，在譯者自是爲湊下兩行之韻脚，而意思似轉深入，此亦變通之可取者。又如 Bynner (p. 127) 譯白居易琵琶行，『暮去朝來顏色故』作

And evenings went and evenings came, and her beauty faded.

中文『暮去朝來』本兼『朝去暮來』言，英文 evenings went and mornings came 則無此涵義，若譯爲 evenings and mornings went and came，又未免過於絮煩，自惟有如上譯法，言簡而意賅。

又如杜審言和晉陵陸丞早春遊望詩『忍聞歌古調，歸思欲沾禁』，『歸思』下本隱有『使我』意，爲五言所限，不得不爾。照字面譯出，雖不至於費解，終覺勉強。Bynner (p. 179) 譯爲

Suddenly an old song fills

My heart with home, my eyes with tears.

便較顯豁。此種變通實已近於必要矣。

如斯之例，諸家多有，上節所引 Waley 與 Bynner 諸譯咸屬此類，皆未嘗以辭害意，爲譯人應有之自由。然而詞語之變通與意義之更易，其間界限，亦自難言。變通而及於意義，則如履薄冰，如行懸絙，時時有阻越之虞，不得不審慎以將事。試以二例明之。Waley (*Poems*, p. 35) 譯古詩上山採蘼蕪，『新人工織纈，故人工織素。纈纈日一匹，織素五丈餘』，作

My new wife is clever at embroidering silk;

My old wife was good at plain sewing.

Of silk embroidery one can do an inch a day;

Of plain sewing, more than five feet.

纈素之別，以及一匹與五丈之分，譯出均欠顯豁，故改爲繡與織，一寸與五尺，

於原文意義頗有更張，而主旨則無出入。此變通之可取者。反之，如 Bynner (P. 4) 譯張繼楓橋夜泊詩，『江楓漁火對愁眠，』作

Under the shadows of maple-trees a fisherman moves with the torch.

一靜一動，與原詩意境迥異，雖或見仁見智，難為軒輊，而謂鹿為馬，終非轉譯所宜。二例之間，界限漸而非頓，然不得謂為無界限。得失寸心，疏漏與穿鑿固惟有付之譯人之感覺與判斷矣。

意義之變通有三，或相異，或省減，或增加。相異之例已如上舉。意義之省減，時亦不免，若不關宏旨，亦即不足為病。如 Bynner (p. 148) 譯杜詩『白頭搔更短，渾欲不勝簪，』作

I stroke my white hair. It has grown too thin

To hold the hairpins any more.

『更』字『欲』字皆未能傳出，而大體不謬。

不可省而省，則失之疏漏。如 Waley (*Temple*, p. 117) 譯焦仲卿妻詩，『今日還家去，念母勞家裏，』作

To-day I am going back to my father's home;

And this house I leave in Madam's hands.

『念』字『勞』字皆不可省而省者。又如 Bynner (p. 174) 譯杜荀鶴春宮怨，『承恩不在貌，教妾若為容？』作

To please a fastidious emperor,

How shall I array myself?

『不在貌』三字以一 fastidious 當之，全然未達。（若改為 capricious，則庶幾近之。）又如所譯閩名雜詩『等是有家歸未得，杜鵑休向耳邊啼』（p. 3），

We are thinking of our kinsfolk, far away from us.

O cuckoo, why do you follow us, why do you call us home?

『等是』二字何等重要，豈容漏去？類比之例，不盡由於有意之變通，亦有識解不周，或為才力所限，遂至陷於淺薄疲弱，雖其情可原，其病不可不知。以詩體譯詩者，為湊韻脚與節拍，尤易觸犯此戒，前節已申論之矣。

增飾原詩之意義，亦有無傷大雅者。如 Giles (*Verse*, p. 96) 譯太白詩『白髮三千丈，緣愁似箇長，』作

My whitening hair would make a long long rope,
Yet could not fathom all my depth of woe.

比原來意義略進一步，而不足爲病。

過此則往往流於穿鑿。如 Giles (*Verse*, p. 53) 譯薛道衡詩『立春纔七日，離家已二年』作

A week in the spring to the exile appears
Like an absence from home of a couple of years.

卽犯“read in”之病，殆以爲二句不相連屬，未免平淡，遂爲『一日三秋』之解，不知此二句本平淡，故陳人有『底言』之謂，及『人歸落雁後，思發在花前』二句出，始知名下無虛耳（見隋唐嘉話）。

又如 Waley (*Poems*, p. 35) 譯古詩上山探蘼蕪：『新人從門入，故人從閣去』，作

My new wife comes in from the road to meet me;
My old wife always come down from her tower.

原詩祇狀其得新棄故耳，譯文乃言新人好遊樂，故人動女紅。（或緣誤『去』爲『出』？）

更有甚於此者，如 Fletcher (*Gems*, p. 209) 譯賀知章題袁氏別業詩：『主人不相識，偶坐爲林泉。莫謾愁沽酒，囊中自有錢』，作

The Lord of All to us is all unknown,
And yet these Woods and Springs must Some One own.
Let us not murmur if our Wine we Buy:
In our own Purse have we Sufficiency.

卽事之詩，解爲論道，刻意求深，翻失真象。又 Giles 譯司空圖詩品 (*History*, P. 179-188)，全作道家玄語，與詩文了無關涉。如斯穿鑿，宜爲厲禁。

至如 Martin (P. 55) 之譯太白長干行，『郎騎竹馬來，繞床弄青梅』，作
You rode a bamboo horse,
And deemed yourself a knight,
With paper helm and shield
And wooden sword bedight.

則緣根本誤會詩中主體，以商人婦爲軍士妻，因而任意枝蔓，全無依據，無以

名之，荒謬而已。

七

中詩大率每句自爲段落，兩句連貫如『舊時王謝堂前燕，飛入尋常百姓家』者，其例已鮮。西詩則常一句連跨數行，有多至十數行者。譯中詩者嫌其呆板，亦往往用此手法，Bynner 書中最饒此例。如譯太白詩『但見淚痕溼，不知心恨誰』(p. 53)，作

You may see the tears now, bright on her cheek,
But not the man she so bitterly loves.

利用關係子句，便見連貫。又如譯王維九月九日憶山東兄弟 (p. 190)，『獨在異鄉爲異客，每逢佳節倍思親，遙知兄弟登高處，遍插茱萸少一人』作

All alone in a foreign land,
I am twice as homesick on this day
When brothers carry dogwood up the mountain,
Each of them a branch—and my branch missing.

雖四行與原詩四句分別相當，而原詩祇三四連貫，此則一氣呵成矣。

然此二例猶可在逐行之末小作停頓，若如所譯王維秋夜曲 (p. 191)，『桂魄初生秋露微，輕羅已薄未更衣』，作

Under the crescent moon a light autumn dew
Has chilled the robe she will not change.

卽不復有停頓之理。又如 Cranmer-Byng (*Feast of Lanterns*, p. 43) 譯王維送春辭，『相歡在樽酒，不用惜花飛』，作

Then fill the wine-cup of to-day and let
Night and the roses fall, while we forget.

停頓不在上行之末，而在下行之中，純用西詩節律，與中詩相去更遠矣。

此類譯作，雖音調不侔，其佳者亦至有情致。然若一味求連貫，有時卽不免流於牽強傅會。如 Bynner (p. 192) 譯王維歸嵩山作，『清川帶長薄，車馬去閒閒。流水如有意，暮禽相與還』作

The limpid river, past its rushes
Running slowly as my chariot.