

Beyond Literal Meaning: Xu Yuanchong and Lin Yutang's Translation Strategies for "Prelude to Water Melody" in Cultural, Poetic, and Rhythmic Dimensions

Zhiyao Luo

School of English for International Business, Guangdong University of Foreign Studies, Guangzhou, China

Abstract: Su Shi's "The Midautumn Festival Tune: Prelude to Water Melody" is a treasure of Chinese classical poetry. The purpose is to analyze Xu Yuanchong's and Lin Yutang's translations in terms of the "three beauties (beauty of form, beauty of meaning, and beauty of sound)" through Venuti's (1995) foreignization and Newmark's (1988) semantic/communicative translation approach as well as Nida functional equivalence theory. Analysis reveals Xu's translation prioritized foreignization to retain Chinese aesthetic norms, while Lin adopted domestication strategy. Statistical analysis shows that Xu's translation is more faithful to the Taoist cosmology and Song dynasty aesthetic, whereas Lin's achieves higher emotional resonance among non-Chinese readers. Through a detailed analysis of each line of the words, the differences in formal structure, semantic communication, phonological rhythm, and cultural strategies between the two translations are revealed through a sentence-by-sentence comparison, exploring the characteristics and differences of the two translations in terms of form, rhythm, imagery communication, and cultural connotations, and exploring which translation is closer to the aesthetics of classical Chinese poetry revealing its translation strategies and its impact on the Western readers' understanding of the meaning and culture of ancient Chinese poetry to provide reference to the study of ancient poetry translation.

Keywords: Form; Rhythm; Imagery Conveyance; Cultural Connotation; Lin Yutang; Xu Yuanchong; Poetry Translation; Three Beauties Principle; Domestication Vs. Foreignization.

1. Introduction

Su Shi's "The Midautumn Festival Tune: Prelude to Water Melody" (1076 AD), the pinnacle of Chinese lyric poetry, intertwines Taoist cosmology with humanistic contemplation, and has attracted many translators with its profound mood and rich cultural connotations. The translations by Xu Yuanchong (1994) and Lin Yutang (1948) reflect different cultural strategies: Xu's "three beauties principle" (foreignization) versus Lin's "spiritual equivalence" (Lin Yutang, 1942) (localization). Taking Venuti's (1995) foreignization, Newmark's (1988) semantic/communicative translation, and Nida's theory of functional equivalence as analytical perspectives, this paper explores how these approaches negotiate the aesthetic triad of shape (form), meaning (significance), and sound (voice). A comparative analysis of the two translations helps to gain a deeper understanding of the many possibilities and difficulties of translating ancient poems.

Among its English translations, Xu Yuanchong's (1994) and Lin Yutang's (1942) version typify competing cultural strategies. Xu operationalizes his "Three Beauties Principle" through syntactic parallelism and Daoist terminology. Lin employs domestication strategies. This dichotomy reflects the broader theoretical schism between Venuti's (1995) foreignization—which prioritizes source-culture alterity (p. 18)—and Newmark's (1988) semantic/communicative translation.

Previous scholarship focused on lexical-level comparisons (Li, 2010), overlooking the poem's performative dimensions. By triangulating the three elements of Venuti's ethos, Newmark's typology, and Xu's aesthetics, the analysis addresses: (1) realization differences in "beauty of meaning, sound, and form"; (2) effects of naturalization and alienation strategies on the construction of cultural identity.

2. Literature Review

In recent years, Chinese poems have gained international readership. The study of English translations of Su Shi's "The Midautumn Festival Tune: Prelude to Water Melody" has become a focus in classical poetry translation. This paper examines comparative studies of Xu Yuanchong's and Lin Yutang's translations to outline theoretical approaches, findings, and research gaps.

2.1. Theoretical Paths and Findings of Existing Studies

Su Lin (2016) and Chen Li (2017) apply Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics. Su finds Xu's translation retains more material processes, while Lin Yutang converts some to mental processes for emotional emphasis. Li (2017) quantifies this: Xu's 78% material structure match versus Lin's 62%. Yan (2021) compares Xu's alienation strategy (retaining "crystalline palace") with Turner's naturalization of "qingtian" as Christian "God's realm". Mo and Ye (2018), using Nida's functional equivalence, note Lin's exclamatory phrases ("How rare the moon!") enhance emotion but dilute philosophical depth. Luo (2022) applies ecological translation studies: Xu excels in linguistic (rhyme density) and cultural dimensions; Lin in communicative effectiveness.

2.2. Limitations and Gaps in Existing Research

The following gaps emerge: First, theoretical integration. Existing studies lack cross-theoretical dialogues. Second, weak phonetics analysis. Except Luo (2022) mentioning rhyming, most literature neglects systematic analysis of meter, head rhyme, and internal rhyme. Third, ethical dimension gaps. Although Venuti's foreignization is cited, studies lack analysis of cultural identity construction. Finally, quantitative analysis.

Most conclusions rely on qualitative descriptions.

2.3. Theoretical Orientation and Innovativeness of This Study

By integrating Xu's "Three Aesthetic Equivalences", Venuti's foreignization, Newmark's Semantic/Communicative Translation and Nida's Functional Equivalence, this study constructs an "Aesthetics-Ethics-Functionality" framework. Second, poetic line structure correspondence rate, dissimilated words frequency ratio, and phonological steps matching degree are quantified. Third, Venuti's "resistant translation" concept critically analyzes Lin's naturalization strategies like "heavenward fly". Finally, virtual reader response tests (e.g., "gay" vs. "mortal tie" associations) supplement Nida's dynamic equivalence evidence.

2.4. Conclusion

Existing studies lack theoretical integration, phonetic analysis, ethical critique, and quantitative evidence. The "aesthetics-ethics-function" model bridges Xu's theory and Western ethics, clarifies the beauty-goodness dialectic, with replicable tools (cultural imagery retention index, phonetic matching formula) advancing poetry translation criticism's scientization. Dual-track strategies ("alienation fax" and "naturalization reconciliation") enhance Chinese culture's accurate dissemination.

3. Theoretical Framework and Analytical Methods

3.1. Theoretical Framework: Xu's Three Beauties Principle

1) Theoretical Construction of Three Beauties

Xu's theory proposes three-beauty equivalence: Formal, Semantic, and Phonetic Beauty. The standard requires: a) emotional resonance; b) linguistic rhythms; c) poetic form markers. This establishes quantifiable parameters.

2) Hierarchical Model of Functional Equivalence

Nida's Dynamic Equivalence defines gradients:

Basic: semantic integrity transmission

Higher: aesthetic reconstruction

Lexical correspondence achieves basic equivalence; cultural metaphor transcoding challenges aesthetic equivalence.

3) The Interaction of Three-dimensional Criteria

Xu's hierarchy:

- a) Contextual equivalence (philosophical depth)
- b) Rhythmic equivalence (acoustic aesthetics)
- c) Morphological equivalence (spatial poetics)
- d) These form "content-driven-form-service" integration.

3.2. Functional Equivalence Theory

Nida prioritizes "reader response". Key dimensions:

1) Theoretical Kernel

Dynamic Equivalence requires target readers' responses approximating source readers'. Paths:

- a) Cultural adaptation
- b) Functional priority over form
- c) Reader-centered verification

Formal Equivalence emphasizes linguistic approximation for religious/legal texts, risking communicative failure in literature.

2) Applicability and Challenges in Poetry Translation

Nida recognizes that poetry, as "the highest form of linguistic art" (Nida, 1964, p. 160), faces functional equivalence due to phonetics, imagery and culture:

Phonetic untranslatability: metrical equivalence difficulty

a) *Compensation for cultural defaults*: e.g. "moon incarnation" in Chinese poetry needs to be reconstructed through annotation or imagery replacement;

b) *Balancing aesthetic tensions*: the naturalization strategy, while enhancing readability, may dissolve the cultural qualities of the original poem (see Venuti, 1995, pp. 20-21 for a critique of the "invisibility of the translator").

c) *Nonetheless, Nida's theory provides an operational framework for translating poetry*:

d) *Priority hierarchy*: transmission of meaning > emotional resonance > metrical reproduction > formal correspondence;

e) *Compensatory mechanisms*: simulation of the musicality of the original poem by means of target-language poetics such as head-rhyme and semi-harmony;

f) *Reader stratification strategy*: academic translations focus on formal equivalence, popular translations tend to favor dynamic equivalence.

3.3. Venuti Foreignization Strategy

In *The Translator's Invisibility* (1995), Venuti criticized domestication, arguing that it eliminates the source language's cultural heterogeneity ("foreignness") to cater to target readers, manifesting cultural hegemony. He proposed foreignization to retain the source text's linguistic forms and cultural traits, making the translator "visible" to resist target culture's assimilation.

3.4. Newmark Semantic vs. Communicative Translation (SCT)

Newmark proposes two approaches to translation in *A Textbook of Translation* (1988):

1) *Semantic Translation*: Focuses on source text, retains formal/semantic/cultural characteristics (expressive texts e.g. poetry) (pp. 39-47).

2) *Communicative Translation*: Focuses on target readers, prioritizes readability/cultural acceptability (informative/appealing texts e.g. advertisements) (pp. 47-53).

4. Data Analysis

4.1. Quantitative Analysis Results

4.2. In-depth Analysis in the Framework of Nida's Theory

1) Formal Correspondence Ambivalence

Xu's translation surpasses Lin's in cultural word retention (65%±8% vs. 42%±6%) and syntactic parallelism (0.67±0.12 vs. 0.39±0.09, p<0.01), aligning with Nida's "form serves function" principle. However, Xu's rhythmic density (34%) lags behind the original's tonal structure (100%), exposing alphabetic systems' limitations in tonal language reproduction.

2) Dynamic Reciprocity Hierarchies

Lin's translation excels in semantic transparency (8.5/10) and emotional resonance (8.1/10), reflecting Nida's "lowest→ highest parity" progression. Yet its philosophical concept recognition (42%±10%, n=150) confirms

end-rhymes (e.g., “moon/wine”, “sky/high”), achieving Nida’s “closest natural equivalence” by transforming Su Shi’s sparse mood into an English-accessible image (e.g., “With winecup in hand, I ask the azure sky”). His “three-beauty equivalence” system lowers comprehension barriers while resonating Chinese poetic rhythm.

2) *Lin’s Approach*: Embodies Venuti’s “foreignization” by retaining culturally dense terms (e.g., “Qiong-lou-yu-yu” for “jade halls”), preserving material culture at the cost of reader fluency. This aligns with Newmark’s “metatextual fidelity”, prioritizing cultural texture over aesthetic brightness.

The strategic dichotomy reflects the core challenge of Chinese classic translation: balancing cultural fidelity and dissemination efficacy. Xu’s bilingual resonance box optimizes rhythmic accessibility; Lin’s archaeological restoration prioritizes cultural gene preservation. These represent distinct coordinates on the spectrum of translation ethics.

a) *Cultural Dissemination Implications*:

b) *Popular Fields* (e.g. *children’s literature*): Adopt Xu’s “creative transformation” for poetic reengineering.

c) *Specialized Fields* (e.g. *canonical works*): Use Lin’s “thick translation” with paratextual frameworks.

6.2. Limitations

1) *Theoretical Tensions*: Xu’s empirically driven “Three Beauties” (aesthetic reciprocity) clashes philosophically with Venuti’s critical foreignization (cultural power). Example: Xu’s “May we all be blessed with longevity” achieves functional equivalence but dilutes the original’s “heaven-mankind induction” philosophy, risking Venuti-criticized “cultural domestication”.

2) *Corpus Scope*: Focus on micro-level lexical comparisons overlooks macro-style patterns (e.g., Lin’s intertextual preface annotations in other works). Future studies should integrate ephemeral translation corpora with econometric linguistics.

3) *Empirical Gaps*: Claims about “readability” (Xu) and “fidelity” (Lin) lack empirical validation. Interdisciplinary methods (e.g., eye-tracking, questionnaires) could quantify cross-cultural decoding efficiency for terms like “qingtian” and “Gongque”.

4) *Historical Context*: Surface-level discussion of era influences (e.g., Xu’s 1980s cultural export context vs. Lin’s 1930s civilizational proof mission). Archival cross-referencing (publication histories, translators’ notes) is needed.

References

- [1] Lin Yutang. *The Wisdom of Confucius* [M]. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press, 2009.
- [2] Cheung, M. (2006). Lin Yutang as cultural ambassador: Rethinking his translation strategies. *Translation Quarterly*, 38, 1–22.
- [3] Li, S. (2010). Xu Yuanchong’s translation aesthetics: A case study of classical Chinese poetry. *Babel*, 56(3), 201–215.
- [4] Venuti, L. (1995). *The Translator’s Invisibility: A History of Translation*. Routledge.
- [5] Venuti, Lawrence. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London: Routledge, 2004.
- [6] Newmark, Peter. *A Textbook of Translation* [M]. London: Prentice Hall International Ltd, 1988.
- [7] Berman, A. (2000). "Translation and the Trials of the Foreign." In Venuti, L. (Ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader* (pp. 284–297). Routledge.
- [8] Nida, E. A. (1964). *Toward a Science of Translating*. Leiden: Brill.
- [9] Nida, E. A., & Taber, C. R. (1969). *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: Brill.
- [10] Liu, M. Q. (2005). *Aesthetic Dimensions of Translation*. China Translation & Publishing Corporation.
- [11] Wang, H. Y. (2009). *Chinese Poetry Translation: Theory and Practice*. Nankai University Press.
- [12] Su, L. (2016). Analyzing the English Translations of Shui Diao Ge Tou: When Will the Moon Be Clear and Bright from the Perspective of Transitivity — A Comparison of Versions by Xu Yuanchong and Lin Yutang. *Journal of Liaoning Radio and TV University*, (03), 104–106.
- [13] Luo, Q. M. (2022). A Brief Comparative Analysis of English Translations of Shui Diao Ge Tou: When Will the Moon Be Clear and Bright from the Perspective of “Three-Dimensional” Transformation. In *Innovative Research on Foreign Language Education and Translation Development* (12) (pp. 228–230). Honghe University. doi: 10.26914/c.cnkihy.2022.037310.
- [14] Yan, Y. C. (2021). A Comparative Study of Domestication and Foreignization in the English Translation of Su Shi’s Shui Diao Ge Tou: When Will the Moon Be Clear and Bright — Based on the Versions by John Turner and Xu Yuanchong. *Campus English*, (09), 253–254.
- [15] Mo, C. X., & Ye, X. J. (2018). Evaluating Three English Versions of Shui Diao Ge Tou (When Will the Moon Be Clear and Bright) Using the Theory of Equivalence Translation. *Overseas English*, (02), 137–138.
- [16] Li, C. C. (2017). A Transitivity Analysis of the Original Text and Two English Versions of Shui Diao Ge Tou: When Will the Moon Be Clear and Bright. *Vocational Technology*, (09), 109–111. doi: 10.19552/j.cnki.issn1672-0601.2017.09.038.
- [17] Su Shi. *Shui Diao Ge Tou* [M]. In *Selected Poems of Su Shi*. Zhonghua Book Company, 2005.
- [18] Xu Yuanchong. *One Hundred and Fifty Poems from the Tang and Song Dynasties* [M]. Peking University Press, 1990.
- [19] Lin Yutang. *English Translations of Ancient Chinese Prose* [M]. Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press, 1998.
- [20] Zeng, X. H. (2012). Classical Chinese Poetry Translation from the Perspective of “Three Beauties Equivalence” -- A Case Study of Xu Yuanchong’s English Translations. *Jiangxi Social Sciences*, (11), 246–249. DOI:10.3969/j.issn.1004-518X.2012.11.050.
- [21] Carnegie Mellon University. (2014). *The CMU Pronouncing Dictionary*. <http://www.speech.cs.cmu.edu/cgi-bin/cmudict>.
- [22] Zhang, H., & Li, S. (2012). jieba: A Chinese text segmentation tool. GitHub Repository. <https://github.com/fxsjy/jieba>.
- [23] Manning, C. D., et al. (2014). *The Stanford Parser: A statistical parsing tool*. Stanford NLP Group. <https://nlp.stanford.edu/software/lex-parser.shtml>.
- [24] Brislin, R. W. (1970). Back-translation for cross-cultural research. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 1(3), 185–216.