



A Stealth Transmitter: How Does Ezra Pound Riddle the English Text? ¹

WU Guoxiang^{[a],*}

^[a]Ph.D., Lecturer, Department of Chinese Language and Literature, Peking University, Beijing, China.

*Corresponding author.

Received 20 November 2013; accepted 5 February 2014

Abstract

An attempt is made to explore how Chinese character riddles are embedded into the English text by Ezra Pound. In the Chinese-speaking context, the character riddle is a kind of cultural practice with a problem and a solution as its two major components, which in turn basically correspond to the lexicogrammatical description of a character and the character under description. The rule is not abstruse: Players of such a language game are supposed to get at the solution on a given problematic basis. Just as one tends to construe experience through language, so does Pound construe his own experience of the character through the English language. His representation of such experience is evident throughout his translation of the Chinese classics, e.g., Confucian *Analects*. He describes the character in terms of the English lexicogrammar and then adapts the description into the English text with necessary configurations. In this sense, Pound is not only a translator but also a transmitter who stealthily introduces the character riddle into the English text, since every reader of his translation works has to come into play. He leaves the legacy of the riddle problem for his English readers to find their way out to guess the solution.

Key words: Functional analysis; Chinese-English translation; Character riddle; Ezra Pound

WU Guoxiang (2014). A Stealth Transmitter: How Does Ezra Pound Riddle the English Text?. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 8(1), 32-38. Available from: <http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/sll/article/view/j.sll.1923156320140801.3048>
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/j.sll.1923156320140801.3048>

INTRODUCTION

Translation will be complicated when cultural factors are prominent, for what is culturally significant in one language is not necessarily so in another. Language can be considered both as semiotic and as social (Halliday, 1978). As a semiotic system, language is a meaning potential which is used to construe experience, to enact social relationship, and to create contextual relevance (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p.61). As a social phenomenon, language is a behaviour potential which is both learnt through interaction and instantiated in interaction. This is “what makes it possible for a culture to be transmitted from one generation to the next” (Halliday, 1978, p.18). All human languages are universal in terms of these two dimensions, whereas each specific language may have its own ways of experiential construing, social interacting and textual configuring. If these cultural ways “identified at any one time have evolved and become solidified over time”, they are “often taken for natural behaviour” (Kramsch, 1998, p.7). When a text of one language is translated into texts of another, what is involved on the part of the source text is its meaning both in the universal sense and in the cultural sense. So long as the cultural factor in a specific language is involved, the translator is likely to run into such a dilemma of searching a proper equivalent in the target language where the equivalent does not exist at all. One such example is what Nida (1993, p.112) refers to as the “dialectal equivalent”, in which a dialect in the target language is adapted to “reflect” a dialect in the source language. Through such reflection, a cultural instance is believed to have been transmitted from one language to another.

¹ This paper was originally presented at the 8th International Congress on English Grammar which was held from 12 to 14 January 2012 at the Hong Kong Polytechnic University.

In his English translation of the Chinese classics such as Confucian *Analects*, Ezra Pound seeks solutions not from the target language but from the source language in the guise of the target language. He adopts the formulating principle of the Chinese character riddle to describe the Chinese characters through the English lexicogrammar and then adapts the lexicogrammatical description into the English text. In so doing, he achieves a kind of “character equivalent” by way of formulating the riddle problem to reflect the character. This paper makes an exploration into how the Chinese character riddle is embedded into the English text, taking Pound’s translation of Confucian *Analects* as the linguistic data.

1. A FUNCTIONAL ANALYSIS OF THE CHARACTER RIDDLE

The riddle, together with the humour and the image, belongs to the language game defined by Zhu (1997, p.19) as a traditional technique of the folk poetry. In a humour characters or words are used to make jokes, whereas an image is a combination of characters or words which produces ridiculous meanings and rhythmic sounds, e.g., the nursery rhyme. By contrast, the riddle is a linguistic “hide-and-seek”, and, comparable to poetry and literature, it is also referred to as a folk art (Lin, 2006, p.305).

One of the most important types of riddles is the Chinese character riddle, in which the character information is stored in the form of lexicogrammar. Such information includes three aspects of the character: Its graph, its sound, and its meaning. For example, *it is military* (武 *wǔ*) *to stop* (止 *zhǐ*) *the weapon* (戈 *gē*) and *it is sincerity* (信 *xìn*) *when a person* (人 *rén*) *speaks* (言 *yán*). These are two typical instances of character riddles which have been transmitted from generation to generation.

The character riddle is both a cultural and a linguistic phenomenon, so it can be analysed from two different perspectives. From a cultural perspective, the character riddle is composed of a problem and a solution and the player of the riddle is supposed to guess the solution on the basis of the problem. From a linguistic perspective, it is concerned with the description of a character formulated in terms of the lexicogrammar and the character under description. The problem corresponds to the lexicogrammatical description and the solution, the character under description. The inherent pertinence between these two perspectives enables us to analyse the character riddle linguistically.

From a functional linguistic point of view, the character riddle is a character experientially construed as riddle. Just as one construes experience by using the ideational function of a language at large (Halliday & Matthiessen, 1999; Matthiessen & Halliday, 2009), so does a Chinese student tend to construe the experience of the Chinese character. In the case of *military*, the character is separated

into its two parts, i.e., *stop* and *weapon*. The part *stop* is construed into the process “to stop”, whereas the part *weapon* is construed into the participant “the weapon”. The process and the participant are then configured into the figure “to stop the weapon”. Similarly, in the case of *sincerity*, the character is decomposed into the parts of *person* and *speak*, which are construed into the participant “a person” and the process “to speak”, respectively. These two ideational elements are further configured into the figure “a person speaks”. In terms of lexicogrammar, the architecture of the character *military* is described through the verbal construction *to stop the weapon*, and that of *sincerity* is by the clause *a person speaks*. In this sense, a riddle problem is simply the lexicogrammatical description of a character. For the information of a character is “covered” by its lexicogrammatical description, which is why the character riddle is commonly referred to as a linguistic “hide-and-seek”.

In the case of *military*, the lexicogrammatical description *to stop the weapon* and the character *military* are in a one-to-one relation, in which the description uniquely corresponds to the character. There are also cases where one description corresponds to two or more than two characters or one single character has two or more than two ways of being described. These are cases of one-to-many relation or many-to-one relation. The riddle *sincerity* is such a case in which at least two different descriptions can be formulated, since the character can be encoded not only by the clause *a person speaks*, but also by the nominal group *person’s word*. Here, a two-to-one relation is involved. Since either of the descriptions can be satisfied by the same character, a two-to-one riddle can be seen as two separate one-to-one riddles.

Although the description may be formulated in a language other than Chinese, so long as it points back to the Chinese character, this is still counted as a character riddle. For example, the character *crystal* (晶 *jīng*) can be riddled as the nominal group *three days* (三日 *sān rì*) in Chinese, since it has three separate *days* (日 *rì*) as its parts. If the description is translated into English, we have an English description *three days*. This is a Chinese character riddle with its problem formulated in English. For such an “English Chinese character riddle” to make sense, the context should be extended into a Chinese-English bilingual one. Similarly, if the description is translated into the French nominal group *trois jours*, a “French Chinese character riddle” comes into being. In this case, the context needs to be extended into a Chinese-French bilingual one. It is cross-linguistic exchange that gives rise to such a new riddle variant. Foreign language learning is a must in China’s education system and more and more Chinese people know more or less about a foreign language, but the bilingual character riddle is far from being popular at present.

Just as the description can be re-formulated in another language, the riddle can be re-directed to another field.

For example, given a context where there is a woman whose name is *crystal*, the nominal group *three days* can be used to point not only to the character *crystal* but also to the name *crystal*. If the riddle is confined to the Chinese character, it is a character riddle. If it is confined to the person's name, it belongs to the name riddle – another type of riddle different from the character riddle. At least 70 types of riddles have been identified (Wu, 1989) and new ones are still emerging (Tian & Tian, 2005). For more researches on the Chinese riddle, we can further refer to Tan (1982) and Zhou (2006).

2. POUND'S FORMULATION OF THE CHARACTER RIDDLE

It is a “translation wonder” that after 200 years of the very first English translation of Confucian *Analects* over 60 different translation versions have been ever produced with new ones still emerging. The history was initiated by two missionaries, i.e., Marshman and Collie, who finished their own versions in 1809 and in 1828, respectively. Among the 60 versions, the most influential ones include Legge (1893/1971) (the first edition published in 1861), Ku (1898), Soothill (1910), Waley (1938), and Lau (1979). Recent years have witnessed a number of new translations, e.g., Xu (2005), Watson (2007), Zhou & White (2008), Lin (2010) and Song (2010). With the increasing number of English versions, the studies on translating Confucian *Analects* have aroused the interest of more and more researchers, including a number of functional linguists, e.g., Chen (2010), Huang (2011) and Wu (2012). Pound's version was divided into two parts and first published in 1950, which was later reprinted in 1969 together with his translation of *The Great Digest* and *The Unwobbling Pivot*.

One of the most distinguishing features of Pound's *Analects* is his unique way of encoding the Chinese character through the English language. This is exactly what is referred to as the bilingual character riddle mentioned in Section 2. He uses the English lexicogrammar to describe the Chinese character, so such a description can point back to the character under description. It is said that if a Chinese student finds it difficult to understand the Chinese classics, the corresponding English translation is suggested as an alternative, because the general translator overcomes every difficulty in the source text so as to make it ready for the reader of the target text to understand. It is, however, not the case in Pound's translation. If readers cannot fully understand the source text, neither can they fully understand the target text. He tends to transmit the difficulty of the source text into the target text, rather than simply illuminates it. If “difficulty” is also one of the textual properties, then the successful transmission of the difficulty from the source text to the target text is

a prerequisite to the textual equivalence. In this sense, he achieves a kind of “difficulty equivalent”.

Pound (1950, p.194) himself holds that Confucian *Analects* is “neither a continuous narrative, nor a collection of fancy ideas” and that “the translation succeeds in its moderate aim if it gives the flavour of laconism and the sense of the live man speaking”. His translation gives a sense of the live man experiencing the Chinese character. According to our statistics, at least 50 characters or words are not translated but transmitted by him into his English version of Confucian *Analects* in the guise of the English lexicogrammar. He mainly uses three principles to formulate the lexicogrammatical description, which correspond to the graph, the sound and the meaning of the Chinese character, respectively: With the graph-based principle, the description is formulated according to the graphic architecture of the character; with the sound-based principle, the description is congruent to its phonetic features; with the meaning-based principle, the character is described in conformity with its semantic composition. Most descriptions are formulated on a graphic basis.

In the following analysis, Legge's translation is used as the frame of reference against which Pound's translation is under discussion. When a character is mentioned for the first time, it is expressed as follows: Legge's translation (the character plus its Chinese Pinyin), e.g., *sincerity* (信 *xìn*). Afterwards, it is expressed as “the character *sincerity*” or simply “*sincerity*”.

2.1 The Graph-Based Principle

As we mentioned in section 2, the lexicogrammatical description of the character *sincerity* can be formulated as the nominal group *person's word*. Pound (1950, p.193) also construes the two parts of the character into the participants of “person” and “word”, but he moves a step forward. Since the parts of *person* and *word* stand side by side graphically, this relation is construed into the process “to stand”. These three ideational elements are then configured into the figure “man standing by the word”.

Other such examples include: *Faithfulness* (忠 *zhōng*), with *middle* (中 *zhōng*) and *heart* (心 *xīn*) as its parts, is formulated into *to get to the middle of the heart* (Pound, 1950, p.195); *virtue* (德 *dé*), containing a horizontal *eye* (目 *mù*), *go* (行 *chì*) and *heart* (心 *xīn*), is formulated into *to look straight into one's heart and then act on it* (Pound, 1950, p.198); *profound* (穆 *mù*), containing a *grain* (禾 *hé*) and a *sunlight* (日 *rì*), is encoded as *a field of grain in the sunlight* (Pound, 1950, p.201); *blended* (彬 *bīn*), consisting of two *trees* (木 *mù*) and a *pattern of hair* (彡 *shān*), is rendered into *two trees grow side by side and together with leafage* (Pound, 1950, p.216); *desire* (志 *zhì*), containing the part *heart* (心 *xīn*), is formulated into *to keep your mind on* (Pound, 1950, p.219); *retire* (藏 *cáng*), with *grass* (艸 *zǎo*) and *store* (臧 *cáng*) as its parts, is encoded into *to keep under the grass* (Pound, 1950, p.220); *firm* (篤 *dǔ*) as in *firm sincerity*, having *bamboo*

(竹zhú) and horse (马mǎ) as its parts, is encoded into *bamboo-horse* (ibid, p.224); *majestic* (巍wēi), with *hill* (山shān), *grain* (禾hé), *female* (女nǚ) and *ghost* (鬼guǐ) as its parts, is rendered into *lofty as the spirits of the hills and the grain mother* or *lofty as the spirits of the hills* (Pound, 1950, p.227); *overstep* (畔pàn), with *field* (田tián) and *half* (半bàn) as its parts, is rendered into *by short-cut across fields* (Pound, 1950, p.246); *earnest* (恳kěn), consisting of a *man* (人rén) and a *thinking* (思sī), the latter in turn composed of a *heart* (心xīn) and a *field* (田tián), is encoded into *standing by or looking at his own thought, his own mind-field* or *heart-field* (Pound, 1950, p.254); *appointment* (命mìng) as in *the appointment of Heaven*, containing a *mouth* (口kǒu) and the right part of *seal* (印yìn), is encoded into *the mouth and seal or the seal and mouth of Heaven* (Pound, 1950, p.261); *insinuating* (佞nìng) as in *insinuating talker*, with *man* (人rén), *two* (二èr) and *female* (女nǚ) as its parts, is encoded into *double-talkers* (Pound, 1950, p.265); *fidelity* (谅liàng), having *word* (言yán) and *capital* (京jīng) as its parts, is formulated into *to stick to a belief* (Pound, 1950, p.268), similar to the description of *sincerity*; *attentive* (慎shèn), having the parts of *heart* (心xīn) and *straight* (直zhí) which in turn contains the part *eye* (目mù), is encoded into *to look very straight at* (Pound, 1950, p.220).

In order to fully understand the text riddled by Pound, it helps for a reader to have a basic knowledge of the traditional Chinese character, since it is on this basis (not on the simplified Chinese character) that Pound formulates the description. For example, *grasp* (据jù) is translated into *to grab as a tiger lays hold of a pig* (Pound, 1950, p.219), since the traditional character is 據, containing *hand* (扌shǒu), the upper part of *tiger* (虎hǔ) and *pig* (豕shǐ). Another two examples are *vast* (荡dàng) and *flesh* (肤fū). The character *vast*, with 蕩 as the traditional character which contains *grass* (艸zǎo), *water* (氵shuǐ) and *sun* (日rì), is encoded into *grass, sun, shade, flowing out* (Pound, 1950, p.224) or *to spread as grass, sunlight and shadow* (Pound, 1950, p.227). Similarly, the description of the character *flesh* is formulated as *tiger-stomach* (Pound, 1950, p.245), since the corresponding traditional character 膚 is composed of the upper part of *tiger* (虎hū) and *stomach* (胃wèi).

A number of cases are found where the parts of the character are construed into the participants, which are not further configured into figures. Pound simply arranges the participants together by using relators such as “and” and “with”. Three such examples are listed as follows: *Complete* (郁yù), dismantled into *full* (有yǒu) and *ear* (耳ěr), is translated into *to full and precise* (Pound, 1950, p.203); *satisfied* (坦tǎn), with *land* (土tǔ), *sun* (日rì) and *one* (一yī) as its parts, is arranged into *sun-rise over the land, level* (Pound, 1950, p.224); *firm* (贞zhēn) as in *correctly firm*, composed of *prediction* (卜bù) and *shell* (贝bèi), is simply rendered as *a shell and a direction* (Pound, 1950, p.268).

Since the above-mentioned examples are descriptions formulated on a graphic basis, the meaning realised by the wording may turn out to be “absurd” or “unreasonable”. Another two typical examples are *accord* (依yī) and *simple* (恂xún). The former, with *man* (人rén) and *dress* (衣yī) as its parts, is encoded into *that outward act* (Pound, 1950, p.219), whereas the latter, with *heart* (心xīn) and *full* (旬xún) as its parts, is rendered as *simple-hearted* (Pound, 1950, p.233). In such cases, the description of the character often leads to a significant deviation from the meaning intended in the source text.

2.2 The Sound-Based Principle

The sound-based principle is closely related to what is commonly called transliteration, through which the phonetic features of a character is transcribed into the target text. Transliteration is most frequently used in the translation of the proper name, including the person’s name. When it is used to translate an item other than a proper name, it becomes difficult for the reader to understand. Occasionally, Pound transliterates a number of Chinese lexical items into English, but he has special ways of dealing with the trouble which the transliteration may bring about.

The following are four descriptions formulated according to the pronunciation of the characters: *Wǎn* (文wén) as in *that title of WǎN* (Legge, 1893, p.178), *good* (善shàn) as in *the good* (Legge, 1893, p.152), *lute* (瑟sè) as in *he was playing on his lute* (Legge, 1893, p.248), and *wǎn* (汶wèn) as in *the banks of the WǎN* (Legge, 1893, p.187).

If it is not used as a proper name, the first wǎn has at least three senses: *Study* as in *polite studies* (Legge, 1893, p.140), *accomplishment* as in *the accomplishments and solid qualities* (Legge, 1893, p.190), and *letter* as in *letters, ethics, devotion of soul, and trustfulness* (ibid, p.202). Pound’s (1950, p.211) translation is “Wan”, *the accomplished*, which is a combination of both its sound and its meaning. Similarly, the character *good* is transmitted into the English text as “shan” as in a “shan” *man* with the additional note: [Dictionary: good man] (Pound, 1950, p.241), and the *lute* is translated into *se* as in *se (25-string lute)* (Pound, 1950, p.242). The last item, i.e., the second wǎn, is transliterated into *the Wan* as in *live up over the Wan* (Pound, 1950, p.215), the same transliteration as the first wǎn, but this is a river on the border between the Ancient Chinese states of Lu and Qi. Since this additional information is not indicated in the translation, the second wǎn tends to be understood as the first one.

2.3 The Meaning-Based Principle

The construal of a character according to its semantic composition gives rise to the meaning-based character riddle. This is related to the translation in its proper sense, where the equivalence between the source and the target

item is also established on a semantic basis. For a specific character, once the contextual variables are given, its translation is determined by the probability of equivalence (Halliday, 1962, p.25). The general translator will choose the most probable equivalent item. Pound, however, intentionally manipulates the probability of equivalence. In his translation, cases are found where the principle of highest equivalence probability is violated. The choice of the target item is based on a less or a least probability. Such translation may produce a sense of vividness, straightness, strangeness, or foreignness.

The following characters are encoded according to the meaning-based principle: *Insubordination* (孙 sūn) as in *extravagance leads to insubordination* (Legge, 1893, p.207), *gentle* (巽 xùn) as in *words of gentle advice* (Legge, 1893, p.224), *simple* (木 mù) as in *the firm, the enduring, the simple and the modest* (Legge, 1893, p.274), *Ch'iu* (丘 qiū) as in Confucius' name *K'ung Ch'iu* (Legge, 1893, p.333), and *compare* (方 fāng) as in *comparing men together* (Legge, 1893, p.287).

Although the meaning of a character may vary from context to context, for the cases mentioned in the previous paragraph, Pound substitutes one contextual meaning for the other. The character *insubordination* and *son* are different characters in Modern Chinese, but they are homographs in Classical Chinese, so the same graph has different meanings. Pound (1950, p.223) does not choose the more probable equivalent (i.e., *insubordination*) according to the actual context, but uses the less probable one (i.e., *a pattern of grandson*) instead. This alternative choice may or may not bring about an association with “subordination”. The character *gentle* is encoded into *south-east* as in *south-east gentleness of discourse* (Pound, 1950, p.232), because in *The Book of Change* it is also one of the eight trigrams, which can be used to refer to one of the eight directions, i.e., south-east. The character *simple* is used to describe a personality in this context, but it is construed as a thing, i.e., “tree”, and encoded into *the tree-like* (Pound, 1950, p.253). As was mentioned in Section 3.2, transliteration is mostly used as a strategy to cope with a proper name. *Ch'iu* is Confucius' given name, so it is more reasonable to be transliterated than translated. However, it is translated into *Hillock* as in *Kung Hillock* (Pound, 1950, p.232). Since *Kung* is the transliteration of Confucius' family name, *Kung Hillock* is partially transliterated and partially translated. The last character *compare* has a sense of *square*, so it is formulated into *square-measure* (Pound, 1950, p.259), a combination of two different contextual meanings.

2.4 Word Riddle

In addition to the character riddle, word riddles are also found in Pound's *Analects*, in which there are two or more than two characters involved. Since “word” is a highly vague concept, we just use this term to broadly refer to a character group – a combination of two or more than two

characters. Many Chinese words are composed of only one character, so two characters may constitute not only a word, but also a group, a phrase, or a clause.

Confucius' full name *Kung Hillock* mentioned in Section 3.3 can be regarded as a word riddle, whose lexicogrammatical description is formulated partially according to its sound and partially according to its meaning. Other word riddles include: *Pleased* (天天 yāoyāo) as in *he looked pleased* (Legge, 1971, p.196), *always full of distress* (长戚戚 chángqīqī) as in *the mean man is always full of distress* (Legge, 1971, p.207), *how* (洋洋 yángyáng) as in *how it filled the ears* (Legge, 1971, p.213), *empty-like* (空空 kōngkōng) as in *who appears quite empty-like* (Legge, 1971, p.219), *most great and sovereign* (皇皇 huánghuáng) as in *O most great and sovereign God* (Legge, 1971, p.350), *one-ideaed obstinacy* (矜矜 kēngkēng) as in *how contemptible is the one-ideaed obstinacy* (Legge, 1971, p.291), and *for him* (人也 rén yě) as in *for him* (i.e., for this man) *the city of Pien was taken* (Legge, 1971, p.278).

The first six words are reduplicative words, in which the repetition of the same character is involved. The word *pleased* is riddled into *with a smile-smile* on a graphic basis (Pound, 1950, p.219), since its constituent character itself is a constituent part of another character *smile* (笑 xiào). The word (group) *always full of distress* is separated into three characters: *Always* (长 cháng) and two *distresses* (戚 qī). The character *always* has the sense of *add* (加 jiā), so Pound formulates the description as *add distress to distress* (Pound, 1950, p.224). Similarly, the word *how* is divided into two separate characters and encoded into *wave over wave* (Pound, 1950, p.227), because the meaning of its constituent character is related to “ocean” or “sea”; the word *empty-like* is formulated into *empty as empty* (Pound, 1950, p.229), for the character *empty* is repeated twice in it. In these four examples, the words are separated into its constituent characters, on which the experiential construal is based. Two reduplicative words are found whose grammatical formulation is based on the constituent part of its constituent characters. They are *most great and sovereign* and *one-ideaed obstinacy*. The former is riddled as *the Whiteness above all Whiteness* (Pound, 1950, p.286), since its constituent character in turn contains *whiteness* (白 bái) as its constituent part. Similarly, the word *one-ideaed obstinacy* is translated into *water-on-stone, water-on-stone* (Pound, 1950, p.252), based on the fact that its constituent character contains *stone* (石 shí) and *river* (川 chuān) as its parts.

As to *for him*, the phrase is separated and formulated into *jen yeh* (Pound, 1950, p.256), which is a transliteration. Whereas *jen* is the phonetic transcription of the character *man*, *yeh* serves as the equivalent for a Chinese tone of voice such as “oh”, “ugh”, or “ah”. Since the character *man* and *benevolence* are homophones in Chinese, the transliteration *jen* invites an association between “man” and “benevolence”.

Similar to a character riddle, in a word riddle the word is also first divided into its constituent characters, which may or may not be further disassembled into its constituent parts, and these constituents are then construed into participants or processes, which are configured into figures or complex participants in the final analysis. Many word riddles are related to the reduplicative words in the source text and Pound also tends to transmit this morphological feature into the English text.

3. ADJUSTMENT AND ADAPTATION OF THE RIDDLE INTO THE ENGLISH TEXT

Pound construes his experience of the character on the basis of its graph, its sound, and its meaning. The experiential construal is realised through the English lexicogrammar. Since it is in the English translation of Confucian *Analects* that such experiential construal takes place, the corresponding lexicogrammatical description has to be embedded into the translation text with necessary adjustments. This section focuses on the adjustment and adaptation of the riddle into the target text.

Take the character *blended* for example. As it was mentioned in Section 3.1, its lexicogrammatical description is formulated as *two trees grow side by side and together with leafage*. The whole clause, where it occurs, is translated by Legge (1893, p.190) into “when the accomplishments and solid qualities are equally blended, we then have the man of virtue”. Pound (1950, p.216) replaces “equally blended” with his own formulation and produces his own version: “Accomplishment and solidity as two trees growing side by side and together with leafage and the consequence is the proper man.” His formulation is thus introduced into the clause through the preposition *as*.

As for a character which occurs more than once in the source text, such as *faithfulness*, *sincerity*, *virtue*, and *firm*, necessary changes in the formulation should be made according to different contexts. This may produce variations of the same riddle. For example, *sincerity* has 38 occurrences and *faithfulness* has 17.

We have collected twelve translation instances of the character *faithfulness*, among which seven are construed as riddle. These seven instances are listed as follows (the riddled text is italicised by us):

- (1) *to get to the middle of mind* when planning with men (Pound, 1950, p.195)
- (2) *get to the middle of mind* (Pound, 1950, p.196)
- (3) put first *getting to the centre of the mind* (Pound, 1950, p.232)
- (4) the first thing is: *Get to the centre* (Pound, 1950, p.246)
- (5) to act from *the middle of the heart* (Pound, 1950, p.246)
- (6) speak out from *the center of your mind* (Pound, 1950, p.248)

- (7) speak from *the plumb centre of your mind* (Pound, 1950, p.263)

It is obvious that *middle* and *centre* are exchangeable whereas *mind* and *heart* are replaceable. This produces variations such as *get to the middle of the heart* and *get to the centre of your mind*. When the character is related to an action or a speech, “get to” is replaced by “act from” or “speak out from” as in (5) and (6). In (4), *mind* is omitted, so the description is shortened into *get to the centre*. Altogether, *middle* occurs five times (twice in the following instance 10), *heart* occurs thrice (once in the following instance 10), and *mind* occurs six times (once in the following instance 10). In (7), there is an additional word *plumb*, which gives rise to another variation: *The plumb centre of your mind*.

The rest five are not riddled with the exception of (10), to which a bracket containing a character riddle is added. They are listed as follows (the words involved are italicised by us):

- (8) Ministers serve the prince by *their sincerity* (Pound, 1950, p.204)
- (9) A village with ten homes all contain *sincere men* (Pound, 1950, p.213)
- (10) Where there is *sincerity (mid-mind, mid-heart)* can it refrain from teaching (Pound, 1950, p.255)
- (11) The big man’s way consists in *sincerity* and sympathy (Pound, 1950, p.207)
- (12) A *sincere* man (Pound, 1950, p.212)

For the same character *faithfulness*, it may be riddled in one context but translated in another. Unlike Legge’s translation, Pound chooses the English word *sincerity* for the Chinese character *faithfulness* and *sincere* is the adjectival form. In (10), the translation is accompanied by a riddle included in the bracket: *Mid-mind, mid-heart*. They are the short forms for *the middle of the mind* and *the middle of the heart*. These are yet another two variations of the same character riddle.

Unlike the graph-based description of the character, which is often conditioned by the lexical meaning, the adjustment of the description is driven by the need for its adaptation into the text. Therefore, it is generally conditioned by the grammatical acceptability.

CONCLUSION

It is generally acknowledged that translation should be aimed at equivalence, but the understanding of equivalence varies, so different translators may seek different equivalents. As to the graph, the sound and the meaning of a Chinese character, the general translator picks up its semantic composition, leaving out the other two aspects, and thus the Chinese-specific meaning often gets lost in its English translation. This is also true in the English translation of Confucian *Analects*.

In his version, Pound manages to retain every aspect of the character by making use of the formulating principles of the character riddle. The character is first disassembled

into its constituent parts, which are then construed and configured into such ideational elements as participant, process and figure. These ideational elements are in turn realised through the English lexicogrammar. Finally, the lexicogrammatical description is adapted into the English text with necessary adjustments. With similar principles, a number of Chinese words are also riddled into the target text. In so doing, Pound stealthily transmits the Chinese character riddle into the English language.

Just as the rule of the character riddle is for the player to guess the solution (i.e., the character itself) on the basis of the problem (i.e., the description of the character), Pound's readers should unriddle the embedded riddles so as to understand the riddled text. To achieve this, a basic knowledge of the Chinese character is necessary. Once the embedded riddles are solved, the English text looks like being inserted by Chinese characters among English lexical items.

If the readers know the Chinese character, however, they no longer need the translation. This is a paradox in Pound's translation. He plays a language game by embedding the character riddle into the English text. In this sense, Pound is not really a translator but a stealth transmitter of the Chinese character, since his reader has to always come into play: He formulates the riddle problem for the readers to find their way out to get at the riddle solution.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This paper is in essence a report on a piece of research carried out during the author's Ph.D. studies from 2010 to 2013 at School of Foreign Languages, Sun Yat-sen University. We extend our heart-felt thanks to Sun Yat-sen University, my Ph.D. supervisor Mr. HUANG Guowen and the Dean of School of Foreign Languages Mr. CHANG Chenguang.

REFERENCES

- Chen, Y. (2010). Lúnyǔ yīngyībēn yángjiū de gōngnéng yǔpiān fēnxī fāngfǎ [A functional discourse analysis of English translations of *Analects of Confucius*]. *Waiguó Yǔwén [Foreign Language and Literature]*, 26(1), 105-109.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1962). Linguistics and machine translation. In J. J. Webster (Ed.), *Computational and quantitative studies* (Reprint 2007; Vol.6, pp.20-36.). Beijing: Peking University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M.I.M. (1999). *Construing experience through meaning: A language-based approach to cognition*. Beijing: World Publishing Company.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M.I.M. (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar* (3rd ed.). London: Edward Arnold.

- Huang, G. W. (2011). Lúnyǔ de piānzhāng jiégòu jí yīngyǔ fānyì de jǐgè wèntí [The textual structure of Confucius *Lun Yu* (*The Analects*) in relation to the English translation of the book title and chapter headings]. *Zhōngguó Wàiyǔ [Foreign Languages in China]*, 44(6), 88-95.
- Kramersch, C. (1998). *Language and culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ku, H. M. (1898). *The discourses and sayings of Confucius: A new special translation, illustrated with quotations from Goethe and other writers*. Shanghai: Kelly & Walsh Press.
- Lau, D. C. (1979). *The analects* (Lun yǔ). New York: Penguin Books.
- Legge, J. (1893). Confucian analects. In J. Legge (Ed.), *Confucius: Confucian analects, The great learning & The doctrine of the mean* (pp.137-354). New York: Dover Publications, Inc.
- Lin, W. S. (2010). *Getting to know Confucius – A new translation of the Analects*. Beijing: Foreign Languages Press.
- Lin, Y. M. (2006). *Zhōngguó míyǔ jīchǔ zhīshí [An introduction to Chinese riddles]*. Xiamen: Xiamen University Press.
- Matthiessen, C. M. I. M., & Halliday, M. A. K. (2009). *Systemic functional grammar: A first step into the theory*. Beijing: Higher Education Press.
- Nida, E. A. (2003). *Language, culture, and translating*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Pound, E. (1950). The Analects. In E. Pound (Ed.), *Confucius: The great digest, the unwobbling pivot, the analects* (pp. 189-288). New York: New Directions.
- Song, D. L. (2010). *The analects of Confucius*. Beijing: University of International Business and Economics Press.
- Soothill, W. E. (1910/1995). *Confucius: The analects*. New York: Dover Publications, Inc.
- Tan, D. X. (1982). *Zhōngguó mínjiān míyǔ yánjiū [On Chinese folk riddles]*. Taiwan: The Commercial Press.
- Tian, H. N., & Tian, S. W. (2005). *Yǎowén-jǎozì cāi dēngmí [Guessing lantern riddles]*. Beijing: Xueyuan Press.
- Waley, A. (1938). *The analects of Confucius*. London: G. Allen & Unwin Ltd.
- Watson, B. (2007). *The analects of Confucius*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Wu, G. X. (2012). Jīngdiǎn fānyì yǔ wénhuà chuānchéng – “Shǒujiè Lúnyǔ Fānyì Yántǎohuì” jiǎnshù [Classics translation and cultural transmission: A review of the 1st Conference on Translating Confucian *Analects*]. *Zhōngguó Wàiyǔ [Foreign Languages in China]*, 45(1), 104-107.
- Wu, Z. X. (1989). *Zhōnghuà míyǔ gailùn [Introducing Chinese riddles]*. Chengdu: Bashu Shushe.
- Xu, Y. Z. (2005). *Confucius modernized: Thus spoke the master*. Beijing: Higher Education Press.
- Zhu, G. Q. (1997). *Shī lùn [On poetry]*. Hefei: Anhui Education Press.
- Zhou, C. C., & P. White. (2008). *The illustrated book of the analects*. Beijing: New World Press.
- Zhou, C. L. (2006). Xīzì mífǎ jí qí leixíng [The disassemblage of the Chinese character and its types]. *Yúnán Shīfàn Dàxué Xuébào (Zhéxué Shèhuì Kēxué Bǎn) [Journal of Yunnan Normal University (Philosophy and Social Sciences)]*, 5(38), 82-85.