THE BAWDY BARD IN CHINA

– A STUDY OF THE TRANSLATION OF

SHAKESPEARE'S SEXUALLY AND

SCATOLOGICALLY SUGGESTIVE LANGUAGE

TIEN YUK SUNNY

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE

REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY

AT

THE DEPARTMENT OF CHINESE AND BILINGUAL STUDIES

THE HONG KONG POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY

MAY 2005

CERTIFICATE OF ORIGINALITY

I hereby declare that this thesis is my own work and that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, it reproduces no material previously published or written, nor material that has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma, except where due acknowledgement has been made in the text.

_____(Signed)

  TIEN YUK SUNNY (Name of Student)

Abstract

This thesis focuses on the Chinese translation of Shakespeare's bawdy language, a subject which is seldom addressed in the field of Shakespearean studies within China. Among the many works by Shakespeare, ten plays and the sonnets are taken as the primary texts and are dissected in great detail. The selected bawdy innuendoes are then distinguished into two aspects, "sexual" and "non-sexual" bawdy. Once categorized, these suggestive terms are studied and compared with their translations to identify the various relationships between the source-text bawdy and their corresponding sections in the target texts.

In this study, I have adopted a descriptive approach, with the ultimate aim of finding reasons and explanations for the changes that have been made to the source text after undergoing the translation process. The first two chapters are introductions to the definition of "bawdy", the characteristics of Shakespeare's suggestive language, previous studies on the topic and the overall theoretical framework of the present research. In chapters three and four, I will move on to present findings of a contrastive analysis of the bawdy innuendoes in Shakespeare's texts and their translations, from the macro- and micro angle respectively. The implications of the results are further discussed in chapter five, where I seek to evaluate and expound the occurrence of specific translational behaviour by uncovering a variety of the "norms" that govern the translators' preferences in dealing with the problem.

An in-depth analysis shows that the transposition of Shakespeare's bawdy, in the Chinese context, involves a rich combination of underlying factors that exert influence on the decisions of different translators. Firstly, there is a cultural norm

which prescribes the minimization of bawdy elements. The norm, however, was in conflict with other types of norms that prevailed at the time of the translations. In addition, linguistic constraints arose during the transference of ribaldry, fluctuating theatrical interpretations of bawdy overtones and the subtle changes in indelicate vocabulary over the centuries all contributed to the distortion and loss in translation.

Acknowledgements

I am deeply grateful to my research supervisors Dr. Chu Chi-yu and Mr. Brian Holton, whose suggestions and criticisms have helped me immensely in writing the dissertation. Both of them have inspired and supported me through the last few years. A special thank goes to my colleague Agnes, for her friendship and encouragement. I am also indebted to Siu Pong, for reviewing the manuscript and having endured my highs and lows. Finally, I would like to thank my beloved family, for their patience and care, and without whom my graduate work would not have been completed.

Contents

Abstract

Acknowledgements

List of abbreviations and figures

Abbreviations

Translation:

ST   source text
TT   target text
SL   source language
TL   target language
FE   formal equivalence
DE   dynamic equivalence

Shakespeare's works:

A&C   *Antony and Cleopatra*
ADO   *Much Ado About Nothing*
CE   *Comedy of Errors*
2H4   *The Second Part of Henry IV*
H5   *Henry V*
HAM   *Hamlet*
LR   *King Lear*
MM   *Measure for Measure*
MN   *A Midsummer Night's Dream*
MW   *The Merry Wives of Windsor*
OTH   *Othello*
R&J   *Romeo and Juliet*
SON   *The Sonnets*
T&C   *Troilus and Cressida*

Names of translators:

Bian Z.L.   Bian Zhilin
Cao W.F.   Cao Weifeng
Cao Y.   Cao Yu
Fang P.   Fang Ping
Gu Z.K.   Gu Zhengkun
Liang S.Q.   Liang Shiqiu
Liang Z.D.   Liang Zongdai
Peng J.X.   Peng Jingxi
Shi Y.Z.   Shi Yongzhou
Sun D.Y.   Sun Dayu
Tian H.   Tian Han

Tu A.	Tu An
Yang X.N.	Yang Xining
Ying R.C.	Ying Ruocheng
Yu E.C.	Yu Erchang
Zhou Z.P.	Zhou Zhuangping
Zhu S.H.	Zhu Shenghao

Scholarly works and other abbreviations:

OED	*Oxford English Dictionary*
SOD	*Shorter Oxford Dictionary*
S1	sense one
S2	sense two
ie.	that is
eg.	for example

List of Figures

1. Introduction and Literature Review

1.1 Introduction

The interpretations of Shakespeare's plays and sonnets have been subject to considerable debate since their very inception, with one of the most controversial topics of all being his use of bawdy language. Shakespeare himself is revered by many as one of the most celebrated playwrights to have ever lived and a genius who was "not of an age, but for all time" (Jonson, 1623)[1]. The Bard's works undoubtedly represent the very best of English literature; and to a certain extent, the masterpieces were and to this day still are so popular that they have actually become a "cultural stronghold" or even a "secular Bible" of the West (Epstein, 1992: 8). However, contrary to the elevated status of the playwright, abusive expressions are considered to be offensive, indecent language supposedly spoken only by the lower classes. Shakespeare was thought of as being "just too good", so that he could not have written such strikingly low scenes of bawdy talk (Macrone, 1997: 7).

According to Macrone, the tendency to "decorate" or "embellish" Shakespeare "began shortly after his death and reached full speed by the end of the seventeenth century" (Macrone, 1997: 7). Since then, "few of the English editors and critics have moved freely and without constraint in their exposition of the sex imagery and allusion of Shakespearean art" (Hulme, 1977: 91). The so-called "incorrect" lines and poor behaviour of Shakespeare were simply cut or ignored in order to hide the filthy side of the Bard from the populace. Famous expurgators like Thomas Bowdler and his sister Henrietta would "weed Shakespeare like a garden", preserving what they regarded as "flowers", while eradicating the "nettles" that disgrace the work of the Bard (Perrin, 1992: 63-64). On the other

1

hand, repeated attempts were made by the critics to protect Shakespeare's reputation by finding "scapegoats" for him, putting across the idea that he was only "obliged" to include bad jokes and obscenities so as to gratify the vulgar stratum of his audience (Bridges, 1966: 2). Some even proposed that the "low stuff" was only interpolated by actors after Shakespeare's death. Over the past four centuries, Shakespeare was praised but also condemned; remained popular but continued to be the target of censorship. Even today, when bowdlerization has already died down and moral standards have changed, expurgation of sensitive ideas like sexuality and ethnicity in his work still continues to exist in the West (Govind, 1998).

In another part of the world, when the original texts of Shakespeare were first rendered into Chinese in the early 1920s, the Bard had not yet drawn much attention[2] (Meng, 2002: 116), but he was already considered by certain Chinese critics as a "literary giant" (Li, 1991: 9). Starting from the 1930s, Shakespeare's name was frequently bandied around and abundant new Chinese versions of Shakespeare's works began to appear around China (Li, 1991: 9-10). Shakespeare was then enshrined atop the cultural canon. As suggested by Liang Shiqiu's essay which was written in the early 1930s, "the Bard was often idolized by ordinary people who thought that the impropriety would most possibly detract from the work of the great author" (Liang S.Q., 2002: 17). Few Chinese critics tried to pick faults, like Samuel Johnson, by pointing out that Shakespeare "wrote without moral purpose" (Fang P., 1995: 20). However, the lack of heated controversies does not necessarily mean that no problem came up in the transposition of Shakespeare's bawdy language. On the contrary, since Shakespeare enjoyed such an exalted status in China, it is reasonable for us to state that a similar conflict between the "lighter" (beautiful status) and the "darker" (ugly and foul) side of the

Bard which is found in the Western world is likely to happen when his work is carried abroad to China. Sexual and scatological themes of all kinds which are widespread throughout Shakespeare's plays and sonnets might also compound problems for the translators.

In the Chinese translations of Shakespeare, different attitudes and strategies of the translators can be observed in their handling of the bawdy language. Some who were not willing to accept the "immoral language" reshaped and refined Shakespeare's works to their own personal standards. As a result, the offensive material which pervades the plays was suppressed or deleted. This type of translation strategy is particularly noticeable in the work of some early Shakespearean translators. One of them is Zhu Shenghao, who is arguably the most renowned Chinese translator of the Bard's plays, but also the one who filtered by far the largest amount of obscenities due to the constraining environment that prevailed in the country at the time of his work:

> One of the major disadvantages of Zhu Shenghao's translations is that he did not faithfully render a large amount of foul language in Shakespeare's works. He often filtered the contentious elements or made his version more elegant when dealing with this kind of language. If we consider the *guoqing* [national condition] that prevailed in Zhu's time, his translation approach is actually understandable (Zhu J.G., 1998: 26).

However, how did other translators under the same national condition handle the same situation? Are there any other underlying factors affecting the decisions of different translators? Even for the word "condition", further clarification and elaboration is needed to make the discussion of the subject more meaningful.

1.2 Previous Studies of Shakespeare's Bawdiness in China

In the field of Shakespearean studies in China nowadays, the problems regarding the translation of Shakespeare's bawdy language are seldom addressed in any detail. Fan Shen, in his article "Shakespeare in China: *The Merchant of Venice*", regarded sexual themes as being an "obvious taboo area" of Shakespearean criticism in China:

> The recent period is the most active period of Shakespearean criticism in China; critics have touched upon almost all the perspectives on Shakespeare's plays explored by Western scholars. But there is one obvious taboo area that Chinese critics do not touch: sex (Fan, 1988: 35).

Until the present time, Chinese literary criticisms that deal with sexual mores in Shakespeare are still very limited. A general review on the subject can occasionally be found in books and journals. For example, Professor Simon Chow of the Hong Kong Baptist University, who examined in depth the six Chinese versions of *Hamlet* in *Hanyi Hamuleite* [A Critical Study of the Chinese Translations of *Hamlet*], did include in his work a small section of three to four pages relating to the translations of bawdy language in *Hamlet* (Chow S., 1981: 289-292). Some other articles have appeared periodically, which lightly touched upon the topic in question, such as Liang Shiqiu's short essay on "Shakespeare and Sex" (Liang S.Q., 1990: 9-12), Fang Ping's review on "Shakespeare's Vulgarity" (Fang P., 1995: 17-25), Bai Liping's article which analyzed the rendering of ribaldry in Shakespeare's *Sonnet* 151 (Bai L.P., 2002: 169-180) and Shen Lin's attempt in examining the translation of bawdiness in *Romeo and Juliet* (Lin, 1989: 173-201). Most of these studies gave an overview and discussed the generalities of the subject. Yet, no systematic study of the topic has ever been undertaken. The present research therefore intends to show specifically how the practice of translation might be influenced by the

various modes of bawdy innuendoes within texts by examining the corresponding sections in the Chinese renderings of Shakespeare's works. In writing this thesis, I have adopted a descriptive approach, with the primary aim of finding reasons and explanations for the changes which have been made to the original after undergoing the translation process. The second chapter is an introductory discussion about the definition of the term "bawdy", the nature and characteristics of Shakespeare's bawdy language and the overall theoretical framework of the research. In chapter three and four, I will move on to present findings of a contrastive analysis of the bawdy innuendoes in Shakespeare's texts and their translations, from the macro- and micro angle respectively. The implications of such results are then further examined in the final chapter, where I seek to embed translated literature into a larger cultural context and evaluate the occurrence of specific translation behaviour by uncovering a variety of the "norms" that govern the translators' preferences and determine the kind of translation relations.

2. Definition and Methodology

2.1 The Definition of "Bawdy"

Since this thesis aims at studying the translations of Shakespeare's bawdy language, a problem with terminology must be addressed in the initial stage. The term "bawdy" is actually often adopted by Western scholars to categorizing Shakespeare's crude words, and according to the *Collins Cobuild English Language Dictionary*, it commonly denotes "a story or a joke that contains humorous references to sex" (Sinclair, 1987: 107). Apart from being humorous, "a bawdy piece of talk or writing also has to have behind it the intention to startle or shock, even if only fleetingly or mildly". Another aspect is that bawdy often pertains to "an exercise of wit" and it is often "indirect, metaphorical or allusive" (Colman, 1974: 2-3). Its origin is difficult to trace, but it appears to originate from the old French word "baud", meaning lively, merry and bold (Ayto, 1993: 55). After the transfer from French to English in the fourteenth century, "bawd" was also applied to "prostitute" or "procuress". The word does appear in Shakespeare's plays—the "bawd's house" (*MM*, 2.1.76) is a whorehouse, and when Mercutio cries out "A bawd, a bawd, a bawd" (*R&J*, 2.4.128), he is referring to a "hare" and hinting at a "procuress" (Levenson, 2000: 236).

The Chinese phrase *weixie yu* [indecent language] is often being taken as the equivalent of "bawdy". But very much like the English adjectives "licentious", "lewd", 'indecent" and "obscene", it tends to be more pejorative. Thus, in the rest of this thesis, comparatively neutral terms such as "bawdy", "ribaldry" or "suggestive language" will mostly be used in referring to Shakespeare's sexual or scatological references. Before the textual comparison of translation with its original text comes into play, a brief historical survey of Shakespeare renditions in

China will first be included to provide a clearer background to the overall picture of the research, followed by a discussion on the steps in selecting useful empirical data for the present study.

2.2 Chinese Translations of Shakespeare's Works: An Overview

Shortly after the Opium War in 1840, the Chinese started to realize that China was not the strongest centre of the world. However, what they took notice of at the very beginning was only the military strength and advanced technology of the West. It was not until the Sino-Japanese War of 1895, in which China was defeated by a country whose culture had been supposedly inferior but was more westernized, that they started to shift their focus of attention to Western culture. From that time on, a large amount of translations concerned with foreign literature were brought into China after 1895. Lin Shu (1852-1924), one of the most celebrated and prolific translators in the early twentieth century, was the first to translate a significant number of Western novels into classical Chinese prose and opened the eyes of the Chinese readers to the foreign life styles, societies and arts.

The name "Shakespeare" was first introduced by a British missionary named William Muirhead (Mu Weilian) who, in 1856, briefly mentioned the playwright's name "Shekesibi" in his Chinese translation of Thomas Milner's *The History of England: From the Invasions of Julius Caesar to the Year A.D. 1852* (Li, 1991: 1). Since then, a number of missionaries and Chinese intellectuals referred to Shakespeare in their works, even though the transliteration of his name at this early phase had not yet been standardized. At least ten versions could be found, including "Shekesibi", "Shasipi'er", "Shaisibi'er", "Xiasipi'er" and so on. "Shashibiya", the transliteration which is now widely accepted and commonly

adopted in the Chinese world, was rendered by Liang Qichao in his work *Yinbingshi Shihua* [*Talks on Poetry in the Yinbing Studio*] published in 1902 (Li, 1991: 4).

In 1903, the plays of Shakespeare first became known to Chinese readers, although they were not translated from the originals, but from a selection of stories based on Charles and Mary Lamb's *Tales from Shakespeare*. The Chinese version was entitled *Xiewai Qitan* [Wonderful Stories from beyond the Seas] and numbered ten stories, which were adapted by an anonymous writer. The complete Lamb's Tales *Yinbian Yanyu* [Swallow Talks] rendered by Lin Shu and Wei Yi was published one year later in 1904. Although Lin Shu had no knowledge of foreign languages at all and he only succeeded in translating the Western works with the aid of his assistants (people who interpreted the original works for him), his translations of Shakespeare were so renowned that he contributed greatly in acquainting the Chinese people with the great playwright. Lin's *Tales from Shakespeare* had exerted a greater influence and was far more important than the other adaptations because almost all of the Shakespearean stage performances presented in the Chinese theatres at the beginning of the Republic of China relied on his version.

The New Cultural Movement initiated by Hu Shi in 1919 marked a new era in Shakespearean translation. Tian Han, one of the most famous modern playwrights in China, was the first translator who attempted to translate an entire Shakespearean play into modern vernacular Chinese. Tian originally intended to render nine of the plays, but eventually only completed two of them. His prose translations of *Hamlet* and *Romeo and Juliet* were published in Shanghai in 1921 and 1924 respectively. During the ten years between 1920 and 1930, at least twelve Chinese versions appeared (Chow S., 1981: 7), including *Maikepeisi* (*Macbeth*) translated by Dai Wangshu; *Ruyuan* (*As You Like It*) translated by Zhang Caizhen; *Ruomiao Jiuniao Xin Tanci* (*Romeo and Juliet*) translated by Deng Yizhi and so on. It is

noteworthy that there were no complete renditions of Shakespeare's plays within China during this period and thus the translators did not have any base to draw on whilst doing their translations. They simply rendered one or two plays, without any clear plan to finish the whole collection of Shakespeare's works.

In the 1930s, a large-scale translation of Shakespeare was undertaken, despite the fact that China was actually fighting a war of resistance against Japan and later a full-blown civil war. It was then that three of the prominent translators of the time—Zhu Shenghao, Cao Weifeng and Liang Shiqiu—tried to render the complete works of Shakespeare and their translations have greatly influenced the later Shakespeare renditions up to the present day.

Cao Weifeng was the first translator who planned to render the entire collection of Shakespeare and he began his work in 1931. But he did not actually achieve his goal owing to the difficult living and working conditions at the time (Zhang, 1993: 112; Cao W.F., 1954: 32). Eleven of his translations were published by Guiyang Wentong Press in 1943, with the title of *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*. His works were then reprinted by the Shanghai Cultural Cooperation Ltd. as *Cao's Translation of Shakespeare* in 1946.

The second translator Zhu Shenghao was a young editor who worked in the Shanghai World Publishing House after graduating from the Hangzhou Zhejiang University in 1933. In 1935, at the age of twenty-four, he set himself a target to render all of Shakespeare's works and viewed his goal as a "patriotic act" (Zhu H.D. & Wu J.M., 1989: 107) because many world masterpieces at the time were not available in Chinese. As told by his wife Song Qingru, Zhu Shenghao suffered from poverty and sickness throughout his life and his original manuscripts were destroyed twice in the Sino-Japanese War, so much of his translated work had to be rewritten. Zhu worked under very difficult conditions for around nine

years, until he was bedridden and died of tuberculosis in 1944. Only six and a half plays were untranslated. Zhu's renderings were published by *Shijie Shuju* [The World Book Store] in 1947, three years after his death.

The third translator Liang Shiqiu took up the task of translating Shakespeare in 1931, when he was invited by Hu Shi, who was the Chairman of the Translation Committee of the China Educational and Cultural Foundation, to be part of the committee (other members include Wen Yiduo, Xu Zhimo, Zhen Dongbo and Ye Gongchao) and participate in a big Shakespeare translation project. But the actual situation deviated from their initial plans as one of the members Xu Zhimo died accidentally in a plane crash and the others refused to take part in the project. Liang was then the only translator left to take on this formidable task.

Since Zhu Shenghao died at the young age of thirty-two and only managed thirty-one and a half of Shakespeare's plays, whilst Cao Weifeng completed a mere fifteen of them (most of which were comedies)—Liang was therefore the first translator to finish rendering the whole collection of Shakespeare's works. Spanning thirty-three years, from 1936 to 1969, his project was finally and successfully completed. Even to this day, Liang is still the only Chinese scholar who accomplished the task single handedly.

After 1949, some Shakespearean translators preferred to work on the existing editions, especially Zhu's. Yu Erchang, who was one of Zhu's university classmates, carried on the unfinished work of Zhu by rendering six of the remaining histories and all the sonnets. The "Zhu Shenghao/Yu Erchang" collection was then published by The World Book Store in Taipei in 1957 and was titled the *Complete Works of William Shakespeare*. In mainland China, Zhu's project was also edited and enlarged with the addition of his unfinished works by other translators including Fang Ping, Fang Zhong, Wu Xinghua and Zhang Yi. The

complete works were then published in a set of eleven uniform volumes in Beijing in 1978 by the *Renmin Wenxue Chubanshe* [People's Literature Publishing House], which has been widely praised and considered as a monumental achievement in Chinese Shakespearean studies.

On the other hand, new translations continued to emerge. They sought to fill in the gaps and make amendments to the past translations which they saw as insufficient. Some even managed to escape from past influences and broke through the traditional framework of the previous generation, in order to give a full view of Shakespeare's works. For example, a change of genre can be observed in some of the translations. Most of Shakespeare's plays were written in blank verse. They were, however, being rendered into prose by Zhu and Liang, which upset several scholars such as Qiu Ke'an, Fang Ping and Taiwan translator Peng Jingxi, who proposed to translate the complete collection of Shakespeare again in verse (Du C.N. & Wen J., 1994: 348). Qiu Ke'an even claimed that the study of Shakespeare in China could not move a single step forward if scholars were just content with the existing prose translations (Qiu K.A., 1991). Since the 1980s, translators such as Bian Zhilin and Sun Dayu published their poetic renderings of the *Four Tragedies of Shakespeare* (including *Hamlet, Othello, King Lear* and *Macbeth*). A third collection of the *Complete Works of Shakespeare*, translated in poetry by Fang Ping and other hands[3], was also published by *Hebei Jiaoyu Chubanshe* [Hebei Educational Press] in year 2000.

2.3 The Selection of Data

In this research, empirical material of two kinds can be distinguished, namely, the "textual" and "extratextual" sources (Toury, 1995: 65).

2.3.1. Textual Sources

2.3.1.1. Source Texts

To assist in the selection of relevant source text material, a word list was first compiled in order to count the actual number of bawdy innuendoes in Shakespeare's works, their exact locations in the source texts and the characters who actually spoke the suggestive lines. The citations were identified predominantly on the basis of Eric Partridge's pioneering study, *Shakespeare's Bawdy*, first released in 1947, which is recognized not only as "the first comprehensive listing of the bawdy uses of Shakespeare in comparatively forthright terms" (Williams, 1997: 10), but also "a fairly reliable guide in this domain" (Delabastita, 1993: 150). The systematic study, in Stanley Wells' words, also "helped to lead a way towards a new freedom and honesty in responding to the sexual resonances of Shakespeare's vocabulary" (Wells, 2004: 27). Aside from Partridge's book, other studies concerning themselves with Shakespeare's bawdy language that are consulted in the present research also include: *The Dramatic Use of Bawdy in Shakespeare* (Colman, 1974); *William Shakespeare: Spacious in the Possession of Dirt* (McCall, 1977); *Shakespeare's Animal (And Related) Imagery: Chiefly in the Erotic Context* (Webb, 1988); *Shakespeare's Erotic Word Usage: The Body, its Parts, Analogues and Images* (Webb, 1989); *A Dictionary of Shakespeare's Sexual Puns and Their Significance* (Rubinstein, 1989); *The Wordsworth Dictionary of Obscenity, Taboo and Euphemism* (McDonald, 1996)[4]; *A Dictionary of Shakespeare's Sexual Language* (Williams, 1997); *Naughty Shakespeare* (Macrone, 1997); *Bawdy and Soul: A Revaluation of Shakespeare's Sonnets* (Pointner Erik, 2003). The word list helps to keep a record for the ranking of Shakespeare's works from the bawdiest to the cleanest by the number of citations, with reference to the number of Chinese translations available for each text.

Following Partridge's analysis, *Measure for Measure* and *Othello* are "Shakespeare's most sexual and most bawdy of plays" (Partridge, 2000: 46). Then again on the other hand, there is *Richard II* which is a "remarkably chaste one, with only a single sexual reference worth mentioning" (Partridge, 2000: 45). Generally speaking, the Histories are sexually the purest when compared to the Comedies, whereas the Tragedies belong to a class of their own due to their high level of bawdiness (Partridge, 2000: 44). Among the many works by Shakespeare, ten plays and all of the sonnets were taken as primary texts. The selected plays include *Measure for Measure, Othello, Romeo and Juliet, Hamlet, Antony and Cleopatra, The Merry Wives of Windsor, King Lear, Much Ado About Nothing, The Comedy of Errors* and *Troilus and Cressida.*

These texts were chosen mainly because their ranking in the word list is high, which indicates that they are comparatively rich in ribaldry. Despite a certain amount of suggestive language, however, some of the semi-bawdy texts were not selected owing to their limited number of Chinese translations. The availability of translated texts is thus the second criterion for source-text selection. The data gathered in the word list indicated that more than 700 citations could be recognized in the source texts already mentioned. The present research, however, did not take into account all these citations owing to the following grounds: The first consideration pertains to Shakespeare's literary techniques and how he disguised his use of bawdy instances, in order to "circumvent the Elizabethan restraints on coarse language" (Hughes, 1998: 108). The ironic circumstance is: during a period considered to be marked by emancipation, there were still works that infringed on the restrictions concerning profanity, and were considered "unacceptable" for public consumption. The main law governing profanity spoken on the Elizabethan stage was the "Act to Restraine Abuses of Players" passed in

1606. As declared in the Act, no person may "in any Stage play, Interlude, Shewe, Maygame, or Pageant jestingly or profanely speak or use the holy name of God or of Christ Jesus, or of the Holy Ghost or of the Trinity" (See Hughes, 1998: 103; Rawson, 1989: 5). Anyone who violated the law would be punished by a fine of ten pounds, which was a huge sum of money at the time. The countermove to this Act was that "minced oaths avoiding direct reference to foul or profane language grew in profusion" (Hughes, 1998: 103). Circumvention was greatly encouraged by using the writer's own ingenuity. Due to the specific situation, a complex variety of coded evasions, *double entendres*, euphemisms, images and allusions were employed by Shakespeare in his plays and sonnets.

This kind of swearing, although characterized by its exuberant creativity, has posed some thorny issues in its interpretation. With the linguistic features of the English language changing continuously over the past four centuries, it became an even more perplexing problem for scholars to detect or guarantee the existence of a pun[5], since "much of Shakespeare's verbal humour has irretrievably been buried beneath a mounting drift of semantic, orthographic and phonological change" (Ellis, 1973: 9). As a result, a part of Shakespeare's use of bawdy language is actually in dispute. Criticisms reflected that a number of the sexual innuendoes chosen by Partridge in *Shakespeare's Bawdy* are actually inadequately or unreasonably supported by his examples[6] (Colman, 1974; Macrone, 1997). Some of his selection of indecency was challenged for "going overboard without providing any explicit defense" (Colman, 1974: 12-13), or simply being too implicit and indirect, which raised questions as to whether they should have been studied in this research at all.

A second concern is related to the "norm of understanding" (Martin, 2001) that affects the analysis of the source text and hence the accuracy of the target text. A portion of the sexual innuendoes in Shakespeare were left untranslated or

mistranslated only because they were not noticed by the Chinese translators. This may be a weakness concerning the translator's state of knowledge or language competence, or due to the inadequacy of research material available to the translators, as it is highly likely for them to encounter problems in decoding the "secret language" of the source text. Difficulties in grasping Shakespeare's use of bawdy language may arise owing to the bad living and working conditions of some translators, thus hindering and inhibiting them from doing much deeper research on the virgin script (He X.L., 1981). For example, Zhu Shenghao rendered Shakespeare's works between 1936 and 1944: an era belonging to a period of continuous war when life in China was profoundly disrupted by the Japanese invasion. The reference books available to Zhu are very limited—the only tools he had were two dictionaries: one the *Oxford English Dictionary* and two the *Ying-Han Siyong Cidian* [*A Four Purpose English-Chinese Dictionary*] published by The World Book Store (Zhu H.D. & Wu J.M., 1989: 129)—which to a certain extent "contributes to many of the inaccuracies in his translated texts" (He X.L., 1981: 86). In fact, anxiety over the lack of research material did not only happen to Zhu. Other translators such as Liang Shiqiu and Sun Dayu also claimed it was extremely difficult to gather reference material and various annotated editions of Shakespeare's works when China had been in a state of war for some years (Liang S.Q., 1967: 76-77; Sun D.Y., 1991: XV; 2003: 15).

In view of the above-mentioned problems, only those entries that fulfill certain selection criteria stated as follows will be shortlisted for the present study:

1. The annotations and commentaries of various editions of the source texts are compared so as to avoid bawdy instances which are not adequately supported. The consulted editions are chiefly *The Oxford Shakespeare, The Arden Shakespeare* and *The Riverside Shakespeare.*

2. Attention will also be given to the edition of source text(s) studied by the Shakespeare translators and the explanatory notes provided by these texts. This procedure serves to explore whether the translators were aware of the bawdy innuendoes in the source text. Basically, if sexual sense is made clear to all in the *Oxford English Dictionary* (*OED:* 1933), it is mostly assumed that translators would most probably notice them.

3. If the bawdy meaning of a citation is not explicitly explained in the editor's notes or the *OED*, it will then be situated in the overall context to see if the connotation is revealed, since the judgment of bawdiness also depends on the dramatic context in addition to the possible dictionary meanings and etymological roots of the words. Colman had made some suggestions on how the near-bawdy lines could possibly be weighed:

    i. Keywords or phrases are occasionally repeated to give the readers or audience time to grasp double meanings.

    ii. One can also get the connotation from the attitudes and responses of a character. The speaker of a bawdy line will sometimes hesitate over what he says or apologize for it in advance.

    iii. The validity of possible bawdy ambiguities can also be determined by looking into the atmosphere of the speech, the nature of the character speaking or whether the potentially indecency appeared in rapid succession or not.

    (Colman, 1974: 11-21)

    iv. Finally, I believe if the abandonment of a bawdy connotation leads to an unclear context and hinders understanding—while including

that particular connotation would make the process of comprehension run smooth—it is hypothesized that the sexual or scatological connotation of that word or phrase is not only necessary but also essential.

After that, the filtered items (a total of 210 bawdy instances) are further grouped in categories. Shakespeare's bawdy in the present context will be divided into two kinds—"sexual" and "non-sexual". A major category of bawdy language in Shakespeare's works consists of sexual words and phrases that are widely distributed throughout his texts. Hence, under the heading of "sexual bawdy" are expressions having to do with the genitalia and certain bodily parts that display sexual sensitivity, ranging from commonly used euphemisms such as *weapon*, *tool*, *sword* which denote a "penis" to other witty allusions specifically invented by Shakespeare. Apart from male and female bodily parts, a vast range of activity characterized by its sexual nature and topics with regard to syphilis will also be subsumed under the same section. A minor category, namely the "non-sexual bawdy", will also be touched upon. This group consists of words designated for the elimination of bodily processes. References to feces and elimination can be singled out—*make water*, *turd*, *breaking wind* and the like—most of which are either cursory or humorous.

2.3.1.2 Target Texts

Another kind of empirical data in the present research is the Chinese translations of Shakespeare. Apart from those which cannot be accessed or obtained from major libraries (marked with an asterisk in the table shown below), all notable translations of the chosen plays and sonnets will be analyzed, including the Cantonese translations produced on request for the theatre. The translations

studied are primarily based on a comprehensive list from *A Historical Survey of Shakespeare in China* (Meng X.Q., 1994: 110-137) and other bibliographies, catalogues and indexes of Chinese translated literature, such as *A Comprehensive Bibliography of the Republican Period: 1911-1949* (Beijing Library, 1987), *A Classified Catalogue of Current Chinese Books* (Shanghai Booksellers, 1935) and *A Bibliography of Chinese Translations of Western Language Publications during the Last Hundred Years* (Beijing Library, 1958).

From the above sources, it was found that there were seventeen translators who had rendered one or more of the selected source texts and the total of target texts is sixty-two in number. The translators whose renderings of Shakespeare's plays will be investigated are: Tian Han 田漢 (1898-1968), Zhou Zhuangping 周莊萍/ Zhou Ping 周平 (?-?), Zhu Shenghao 朱生豪 (1912-1944), Liang Shiqiu 梁實秋 (1902-1987), Fang Ping 方平 (1921-), Cao Yu 曹禺 (1910-1996), Cao Weifeng 曹未風 (1911- 1963), Bian Zhilin 卞之琳 (1910-2000), Sun Dayu 孫大雨 (1905-1997), Ying Ruo- cheng 英若誠 (1929-2003) and Peng Jingxi 彭鏡禧 (1945-). For Shakespeare's *Sonnets* the translators are Liang Zongdai 梁宗岱 (1903-1983), Tu An 屠岸 (1923-), Liang Shiqiu, Shi Yongzhou 施穎洲 (1919-), Gu Zhengkun 辜正坤 (1951-), Yu Erchang 虞爾昌 (1904-1984) and Yang Xining 楊熙齡 (1927-1989). Basically, a different group of translators are involved in the translation of sonnets, except Liang Shiqiu, who remains constant for both the plays and sonnets. Below is a list of the textual sources which will be dealt with. As one translation taken from different publishers will not be used, only the editions adopted for this study will be noted:

Fig. 1   The Translators and Translations of Ten Shakespeare's Plays and the Sonnets

Translators	Translated texts	Publishers	#1 Year	#2 Year
Hamlet				
1.　田漢	哈孟雷特	上海中華書局	1922	1921
2.　周莊萍	哈夢雷特	上海啟明書局	1938	1938
3.　梁實秋	漢姆萊特	內蒙古文化出版社	1996	1938
4.　曹未風	漢姆萊特	上海新文藝出版社	1955	1944
5.　朱生豪	漢姆萊脫	世界書局	1996	1947
6.　卞之琳	哈姆雷特	貓頭鷹出版社	1999	1956
7.　孫大雨	哈姆雷特	聯經出版事業公司	1999	1991
8.　方平	哈姆雷特	河北教育出版社	2000	2000
9.　彭鏡禧	哈姆雷	聯經出版事業公司	2001	2001
Romeo and Juliet				
10.　田漢	羅密歐與朱麗葉	上海中華書局	1924	1924
11.　鄧以蟄	*若邈久�新彈詞	---	---	1928
12.　曹禺	柔蜜歐與幽麗葉	人民文學出版社	1979	1942
13.　曹未風	羅米歐及朱麗葉 (曹譯莎士比亞全集 34)	上海文化合作公司	1946	1943
14.　朱生豪	羅密歐與朱麗葉	世界書局	1996	1947
15.　梁實秋	羅密歐與朱麗葉	內蒙古文化出版社	1996	1964
16.　孫大雨	蘿密歐與琚麗曄	上海譯文出版社	2003	1998
17.　方平	羅密歐與朱麗葉	河北教育出版社	2000	2000
Othello				
18.　梁實秋	奧賽羅	內蒙古文化出版社	1996	1936
19.　朱生豪	奧瑟羅	世界書局	1996	1947
20.　曹未風	奧賽羅	上海文藝出版社	1958	1958
21.　方平	奧瑟羅	河北教育出版社	2000	1980
22.　卞之琳	威尼斯摩爾人奧瑟羅悲劇	貓頭鷹出版社	2000	1988
23.　孫大雨	奧賽羅	聯經出版事業公司	1999	1999
King Lear				
24.　朱生豪	李爾王	世界書局	1996	1947
25.　梁實秋	李爾王	內蒙古文化出版社	1996	1936
26.　曹未風	李耳王	文化合作公司	1944	1944

27.	孫大雨	黎琊王/李爾王	聯經出版事業公司	1999	1948
28.	卞之琳	裏亞王	貓頭鷹出版社	1999	1988
29.	方平	李爾王	河北教育出版社	2000	2000
Antony and Cleopatra					
30.	邱存真	*安東尼與枯婁葩	---	---	1946
31.	朱生豪	女王殉愛記	世界書局	1996	1947
32.	梁實秋	安東尼與克莉奧佩特拉	內蒙古文化出版社	1996	1965
33.	曹未風	安東尼與克柳巴	上海譯文出版社	1983	1959
34.	方平	安東尼與克莉奧佩特拉	河北教育出版社	2000	2000
Much Ado About Nothing					
35.	朱生豪	無事煩惱	世界書局	1996	1947
36.	張常人	*好事多磨	---	---	1947
37.	方平	捕風捉影	河北教育出版社	2000	1953
38.	曹未風	*無事生非	上海文藝出版社	1962	1962
39.	梁實秋	無事自擾	內蒙古文化出版社	1996	1965
Measure for Measure					
40.	邱存真	*知法犯法	---	---	1944
41.	朱生豪	量罪記/一報還一報	世界書局	1996	1947
42.	梁實秋	惡有惡報	內蒙古文化出版社	1996	1957
43.	方平	自作自受	河北教育出版社	2000	2000
44.	英若誠	請君入甕	中國對外翻譯出版社	1999	1982
The Merry Wives of Windsor					
45.	繆覽輝	*戀愛神聖	---	---	1929
46.	朱生豪	溫莎的風流娘兒們	世界書局	1996	1947
47.	梁實秋	溫莎的風流婦人	內蒙古文化出版社	1996	1967
48.	方平	溫莎的風流娘兒們	河北教育出版社	2000	1979
Troilus and Cressida					
49.	朱生豪	特洛埃圍城記	世界書局	1996	1947
50.	梁實秋	脫愛勒斯與克萊西達	內蒙古文化出版社	1996	1967
51.	方平	特洛伊羅斯與克瑞西達	河北教育出版社	2000	1979
The Comedy of Errors					
52.	朱生豪	錯誤的喜劇	世界書局	1996	1947
53.	梁實秋	錯中錯	內蒙古文化出版社	1996	1965
54.	曹未風	錯中錯	上海譯文出版社	1983	1944

55. 方平	錯盡錯絕	河北教育出版社	2000	2000
The Sonnets				
56. 辜正坤	莎士比亞十四行詩集	北京大學出版社	1998	1998
57. 梁實秋	莎士比亞全集	臺北遠東圖書公司	1979	1979
58. 梁宗岱	莎士比亞十四行詩集	四川人民出版社	1983	1942
59. 施穎洲	莎翁聲籟	皇冠出版社	1973	1973
60. 楊熙齡	莎士比亞十四行詩集	內蒙古人民出版社	1980	1980
61. 屠岸	莎士比亞十四行詩集	上海譯文出版社	1988	1950
62. 虞爾昌	十四行詩	臺北世界書局	1996	1957

* Chinese translations of Shakespeare's works which cannot be accessed from major libraries.

#1 The publishing year of the Chinese translation used in the present study.

#2 The year when the Chinese translation was first published.

2.3.2 Extratextual Sources

The third type of data, after the source and target texts, is "secondary texts" which are largely semi-theoretical and critical statements made by translators, editors, publishers and critics. This kind of data usually appears in newspaper reviews, literary magazines, translator's biographies or diaries and so on. In most circumstances, the translators would also include a preface or afterword which explained their intentions for the translation, what they wanted to achieve with their works and their preferences as well as describing some of the problems they encountered during the translation. Though worth looking into, secondary formulations should be treated with caution, as sometimes there may be inconsistencies between arguments of the secondary sources and the actual behaviour observed in the translations: discrepancies between what is "said" about translations and what is actually "done" in translations do exist (Pym, 1998: 111-112). Even under some circumstances when translators made certain declarations of their intentions, what they claim does not necessarily concur with

their product, which can explain why some researchers prefer to work on translations. In spite of their pitfalls, however, these secondary texts can still provide useful data for the analysis of translation behaviour and thus play a "supportive" role rather than being totally ignored or abandoned. To avoid being distorted by misinterpretations, the status of each secondary text should be clarified; various formulations compared with one another and the findings should as often as possible be checked against the actual behaviour in the translation products (Toury, 1995: 66). This will reaffirm that certain translation behaviour does not occur incidentally.

Secondary texts used in this research include materials concerning the personal backgrounds of individual translators, such as *Zhu Shenghao Zhuan* [*Biography of Zhu Shenghao*]; other books or articles written by the translators, such as *Yashe Tan Shu* [*A Cottager's Discussion on Books*] composed by Liang Shiqiu; as well as criticisms and prefaces to all translations that may involve the awareness of translators or explain why they have made certain decisions. These texts can serve as supplementary materials in determining the constraints faced by the translators and provide justifications for the adoption of certain strategies.

2.4 Shakespeare's Bawdy: Modes of Translation

According to David Frantz's *Festum Voluptatis: A Study of Renaissance Erotica*, sexual innuendos are basically inseparable from the literary works in the Renaissance period:

> It would be only a small exaggeration to say that almost all of the 'fiction' of the English Renaissance (poetry, drama and prose fiction) contains some element of erotica, be it the bawdy, the obscene or the erotic. Sidney's *Astrophel and Stella*, Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis* or his "Will" sonnets, Spenser's *Bower of Bliss*—the mind boggles at what might be included (Frantz, 1989: 208).

Even though Shakespeare's plays or even his *Will* sonnets could hardly be classified as "erotica", they still to a certain extent share some facet of it. It is therefore not possible for one to avoid erotica in studying plays of the era. For a more thorough understanding of Shakespeare's plays and sonnets, knowledge of the language of sexuality is essential, as it is used masterfully by the dramatist to develop characters, themes, plots and so on. The various types of "dramatic functions" achieved by Shakespeare's use of bawdy were illustrated in minute detail in Colman's critical study *The Dramatic Use of Bawdy in Shakespeare*.

As referred to in the previous subsection, many of the sexual or scatological themes in Shakespeare are introduced by the use of indirect means or in a roundabout fashion. Four letter words commonly used today such as "fart", "fuck", "shit", "cunt", "arse" and explicit descriptions of sexual acts are conspicuously absent from the Bard's texts (McDonald, 1996: vii; Delabastita, 1993: 150). Shakespeare did not actually use the word "fuck" (Sheidlower, 1999: xix), but his plays do contain several instances of probable puns or references to the F-word. The French word *foutre* appears in *2H4*, 5.3.92, which is the literal equivalent of "fuck"; and a raft of wordplays or euphemisms like—*focative case* in *MW*, 4.1.47, punning on "the vocative case used for direct address" (Sheidlower, 1999: xix); *firk* in *H5*, 4.4.26, with a legitimate sense "to beat" (Greenblatt, 1997: 1502) and *foot* in *MW*, 2.1.117, the surface meaning being "to walk" (Greenblatt, 1997: 1248)—can be found in his plays (McDonald, 1996: xix-xx; McCall, 1977: xi). It is not easy to dig out the bawdy elements since they usually appear in an ambiguous form, "mostly expressed through wordplays, especially puns" (Liang S.Q., 1990: 12). *Double entendres*, sometimes triple or even quadruple, pervade his work and can seldom be avoided. In *Sonnets* 135 and 136, for instance, Shakespeare

toyed with the vagueness of the word *will*, which carries up to six senses and even possibly more: 1. what one wishes to have or do; 2. the auxiliary verb indicating futurity and/or purpose; 3. lust and carnal desire; 4. the male sex organ; 5. the female sex organ; 6. the name "William" which can be an abbreviation of the poet's first name or the name of the speaker's friend and/or the dark lady's husband (Booth, 2000: 466; Partridge, 2000: 218-219; Williams, 1997: 337-339; Macrone, 1997: 208). Hyland added the seventh meaning: a "testament", "something one bequeaths to another" (Hyland, 2003: 177). Apart from the sonnets, the character Pistol also plays on the same word in *MW*, 1.3.47-48: *He* (Falstaff) *hath studied her well and translated her will* (Craik, 1998: 98).

Puns referring to bawdy matters are so common that "hardly a play goes without mentioning the *cuckold*'s horns or the male *codpiece*" (Liang S.Q., 1981: 349). Shakespeare's fondness for making puns while conveying sexual and scatological themes is partly related to his culture's delight in verbal games. During the eighteenth century, when propriety and correctness became the ultimate concern, Samuel Johnson complained bitterly about Shakespeare's addiction to the play on words, criticizing that:

> A quibble, poor and barren as it is, gave him (Shakespeare) such delight, that he was content to purchase it, by the sacrifice of reason, propriety and truth (Johnson, 1765: preface[7]).

Back to the Renaissance period, however, puns and other forms of wordplay did not carry such moral charge. There was great interest in the richness of language during the Elizabethan period. Instead of focusing on a morally appropriate expression, the ornate was highly appreciated. Much vocabulary is borrowed and adapted from foreign languages and a general attention to wordplay is clearly observed in writings of the day. Shakespeare and his contemporaries took

advantage of puns not only to entertain the Elizabethan play-goers, but also to demonstrate the ambivalence of human behaviour in the real world, as "words, like the human actions they describe, are subject to multiple interpretations" (McDonald, 1996: 188-189). Besides, Shakespeare also fully exploited equivocation in bringing up bawdy topics because it "allows text producers to communicate sexual meanings without overtly transgressing the existing social taboos" (Delabastita, 1993: 307). Due to the cleanliness of the surface meaning, the teller of the pun can presume innocence by leaving it up to the listener to connect the innocent and bawdy meaning. One can therefore challenge the taboos of his/her community, while remaining "guiltless" by hiding behind the mask of the superficial meaning. In spite of the fact, when this kind of objectionable play of language is transferred to the target texts, the three notions "translation", "wordplay" and "bawdy" seem to connect with each other in a complicated manner. Linguistic wordplays have long been viewed as root problems in translations. It is "almost impossible to reproduce a play on words" (Nida, 1964: 194), as "the semantic field of a word, the entire complex network of meanings it signifies, never exactly matches the semantic field of any one word in any other language" (Holmes, 1988: 9). "Wordplay" is therefore arduous, if not well-nigh impossible to translate. Noticeable shifts in terms of formal structure, semantic structure or even textual function have to be involved in order to render a source-text pun into the "host" language. That being the case, the richness of ambiguity within Shakespeare's work would most probably be the reason to explain why his work loses so much in the translation process. When "bawdy" is added to the wordplay formula, which means that one of the layers of meanings is found to contain bawdy themes, the whole issue becomes even more intricate. At least two types of constraints are simultaneously acting on the translator in rendering bawdy

lines which are expressed through puns—linguistic constraints pertaining to the "translatability" of wordplay and cultural norms pertaining to the "acceptability" of taboo matters. In other words, when the wordplay is bawdy, the effects of a particular constraint would become not as distinct and more difficult to access. It is, however, obviously necessary to ponder over these bawdy wordplays as "the untranslatability of the pun may easily become the foolproof pretext for toning down the sexual content" (Delabastita, 1996: 135). Rather, they should be carefully dealt with in a new, separate category, distinguished from the bawdy non-puns which are free of *double entendres*.

In this research, the bawdy instances in Shakespeare's works were separated into two aspects for identification and description of the relationships between translation solutions and their source-text counterparts: First, the rendering of "bawdy puns"; and second, the rendering of "bawdy non-puns". Bawdy features of the source and target texts were examined and compared to find out if there are any similarities and differences between a translation and its original form, so as to identify shifts between the source and target texts. The exploration of translation shifts can "provide insights into the translation process as well as into the function the translation seeks to fulfill in the target language culture" (Leuven-Zwart, 1989: 154). In Leuven-Zwart's words, therefore, detecting shifts can "serve as a basis for hypothesizing the translational norms". The hypothetical modes of translation shifts can be summarized into possible relationships between the punning STs-TTs. These ST-TT relationships are required since the concept of translation in this context is viewed as a selection or decision-making process in which a translator needs to choose an option from a number of alternatives available to him. The set of decisions or translation methods actually employed will in turn determine the final shape of the whole text and they most often vary due to a variety of factors

such as the particular socio-cultural parameters and so on.

2.4.1 Delabastita's Model of Pun Translation

Ten possible ST-TT relationships in rendering Shakespeare's bawdy puns were selected with reference to the theoretical possibilities put forward by Dirk Delabastita. Delabastita's theory was thoroughly developed in his in-depth study of the possible modes of wordplay translation titled *There's a Double Tongue: An Investigation into the Translation of Shakespeare's Wordplay with Special Reference to Hamlet* (Delabastita, 1993: 191-221). A similar theoretical framework was also suggested in his article "Translating Puns: Possibilities and Restraints" (Delabastita, 1987: 148-150) and in the introductory section of *Wordplay and Translation* (Delabastita, 1996: 134). Most of his illustrations came from *Hamlet* and other Shakespearean plays and many of their Dutch, French and German translations. The nine categories located by Delabasitita, as listed below, "serve as a starting point" and are "certainly open to further refinement" whenever necessary (Delabastita, 1993: 191). In some cases, two or more translation techniques can also be combined—for example, a bawdy pun is being suppressed, with a footnote explaining what was left out and with a compensatory bawdy pun inserted elsewhere (Delabastita, 1996: 134):

> *1. Pun translated into the same pun (same type)*
> The translator has been able to find a pun in the target language that exploits corresponding means to make the same two meanings intersect.
> *2. Pun translated into the same pun (other type)*
> Same as strategy 1, save that there is a shift from one formal category to another, eg. From vertical to horizontal wordplay[8].
> *3. Pun translated into other pun*
> The source-text pun is "replaced" by another instance of wordplay which does or does not share its formal characteristics with the source-text pun. One of the original two meanings may be retained or approximated, or they may both be approximated.

4. Pun translated into non-pun
The pun is rendered by a non-punning phrase which may salvage both senses of the wordplay but in a non-punning conjunction, or select one of the senses at the cost of suppressing the other. The original pun may also be substituted by some wordplay-related rhetorical device such as repetition, alliteration, rhyme, referential vagueness, irony, paradox and so on, which aims to recapture the effect of the source-text pun.

5. Non-pun translated into pun
The translator introduces a pun in textual positions where the original text has no wordplay, by way of compensation to make up for source-text puns lost elsewhere, or for any other reason.

6. Introduction of new punning text material
A new pun is introduced without any immediate source-text counterpart.

7. Zero-translation
The portion of text containing the pun is entirely omitted.

8. Editorial Techniques
The group of editorial techniques includes explanatory footnotes or endnotes, comments provided in translators' forewords, the 'anthological' publication of different solutions to the same source-text translation problem.
The portion of text containing the pun is entirely omitted.

9. Non-translation
The source-text pun is untranslated and reproduced in its original formulation.

<div align="right">(Delabastita, 1987: 148-149; 1993: 191-221; 1996: 134)</div>

Delabastita's classification offers a number of advantages. First, his descriptive categories emphasized "relevance" from a translation perspective and were specially designed for the purpose of translation research. Typological approaches to pun rendering which solely focus on linguistic shifts in morphological structure, semantic structure or syntactic structure, for example, the shift from "homograph" (same spelling, different meaning) to "homonym" (same sound and spelling, but different meaning), can hardly contribute to the advancement of our understanding of wordplay translation (Delabastita, 1994: 232-233). The purely linguistic similarities or variations which are restricted to the lexical aspects, have also been found to be ineffective in helping us to study a particular cultural approach to wordplay translation and the poetics of individual translators. Delabastita's theoretical model, in contrast, can help to make

generalizations that are useful in revealing the translator's inclination towards the treatment of bawdy puns. For instance, if a translator often omits the sexual puns and is in favour of picking out or majoring on the sexually innocent meaning of the ST pun without leaving the slightest trace or footprint of any of the original bawdy—yet never make use of any compensatory devices elsewhere—it is reasonable to consider that it is intended to play down the bawdy aspect of the wordplay[9].

Second, the descriptive apparatus proposed by Delabastita is both complete and meticulous. His comparative framework has covered most of the possible methods in pun translation. In comparison, the theoretical approaches to pun rendering suggested by some Chinese scholars are not as detailed, since they tend to focus on the rendering from pun to pun, whether of the same type or not (Chang N.F., 2004: 177). Some of these translation criticisms mentioned the use of footnotes (Lü J., 1983: 34; Hwang, 1974: 76), but seldom did they acknowledge "deletion" as an existing method of pun translation, a tendency which can be observed in many Chinese approaches to pun rendering such as the typology put forward by Mao Ronggui (1992: 48-52), Xu Zhongbing (1988: 9-12) and Lü Jun (1983: 32-34). This is most probably because many of the Chinese scholars have adopted a prescriptive approach in their analysis and at the same time rule out "deletion" as one of the strategies of translation, whereas Delabastita only tried to present the possible options "without reflecting any order of preference" (Delabastita, 1993: 191). Guided by their own value judgment, the hard fact that omission in reality does exist is mostly ignored by the Chinese translation critics. On the other hand, other descriptive categories offered by some Western scholars, such as the six techniques propounded by Malcolm Offord[10] in rendering Shakespeare's punning, are also criticized as "rudimentary" and "incomplete"

(Delabastita, 1994: 233). Clearly, the theoretical model of Delabastita is more exhaustive, presenting a full range of the potential solutions in dealing with the ST puns. Each strategy in his model is also adequately defined and unambiguous, which minimizes the shortcoming of overlapping between strategies. Finally, Delabastita's framework is not confined to a specific language-pair. That means, it is not only applicable to the rendering of puns between European languages (which forms the basis of his illustrations), but also to that between Chinese and English. Owing to the above-mentioned advantages of his model, it is therefore chosen as the foundation to measure translation shifts of Shakespearean bawdy innuendoes.

2.4.2 Translating Bawdy Puns and Non-Puns: An Adjusted Model

Nevertheless, in order to work out the different translation possibilities which are specifically applicable to the rendering of "bawdy" instances, several adjustments have been made to Delabastita's hypothetical list. What follows in the table below is a brief comparison between the original model and the adjusted model applied in this study:

Fig. 2   A Comparison between Delabastita's Model and the Adjusted Model

Delabastita's model	The adjusted model
1. Pun translated into the same pun (Of the same type)	(A1) Bawdy pun translated into bawdy pun with the same double meanings
2. Pun translated into the same pun (Of other type)	
3. Pun translated into other pun	(A2) Bawdy pun translated into bawdy pun with different double meanings
	(A3) Bawdy pun translated into innocent pun
4. Pun translated into non-pun:	(B1) Bawdy pun translated into non-pun which mentions both the innocent and bawdy sense

a. Pun→Non-selective non-pun b. Pun→Selective non-pun	(B2) Bawdy pun translated into non-pun which only preserves the innocent sense
c. Pun→*Punoid* (wordplay-related device)	(B3) Bawdy pun translated into non-pun which only preserves the bawdy sense
5. Non-pun translated into pun	(C) Non-bawdy non-pun translated into bawdy pun
6. Introduction of new punning text material	
7. Zero-translation	(D) Omitting the bawdy pun
8. Editorial Techniques	(E) Editorial techniques and stage instructions
9. Non-translation	(F) Reproducing the bawdy pun in its original form

Firstly, strategy 1 "Pun→Same Pun (same type)" and strategy 2 "Pun→Same Pun (different type)" of Delabastita's model are combined into one category, since the minute changes of the underlying formal or linguistic structure of a pun— for example, from a vertical to a horizontal pun— are distantly related to the translation of bawdy language and thus go beyond the scope of this study.

Strategy 3 "Pun→Other Pun" is split into two subcategories, so as to investigate whether the other pun replaced by the translator is "bawdy" or "innocent" in nature. For strategy 4, when the pun is rendered as a non-punning conjunction, the adjusted model, similar to Delabastita's framework, basically investigates whether one of the two linguistic meanings of the ST pun has been singled out, or in a second circumstance, both senses S1 and S2 are disconnected and rendered in a non-pun. But again, the focus here is to explore if the translator displayed both the bawdy and innocent senses or he actually favours one of them at the cost of sacrificing the other.

Further, an additional element, "stage instructions", since it is adopted as one of the compensation devices in rendering bawdy puns, is supplemented under strategy 8, the "editorial techniques", which originally comprise of "footnotes (or endnotes), parentheses within the primary text and the 'anthological' publication of different target texts" (Delabastita, 1993: 218).

Strategy 9 "Non-translation" (direct copying of the ST pun), although being regarded as "a rarely adopted strategy" and is "generally inapplicable to English- Chinese translation" (Chang N.F., 2003: 32; 2004: 178), is preserved in the proposed amended framework. In the rendering of Shakespeare's bawdy innuendoes into Chinese, it is found that some translators resort to this approach when they encountered letter puns or Latin wordplays present in the source text. The various theoretical possibilities in the adjusted model are further elaborated as follows:

The translation of bawdy non-puns:

(A) Retaining the bawdy non-pun

The ST bawdy non-pun is retained and revealed as such in the TT.

(B) Rendering the bawdy non-pun into an innocent expression

The bawdy meaning of the non-punning conjunction is diluted or understated in the TT by replacing the suggestive words with less offensive terms.

(C) Omitting the bawdy non-pun

This category involves the omission of ST bawdy non-puns.

(D) Editorial techniques

Supplementary footnotes or stage instructions are added in the translation to explicate the hidden meaning of the bawdy non-pun.

The translation of bawdy puns:

(A1) Bawdy pun translated into bawdy pun with same double meanings

The ST bawdy pun is rendered by a TT bawdy pun, which consists of the same two layers of meanings S1 and S2 as the original wordplay.

(A2) Bawdy pun translated into bawdy pun with different double meanings

Again, the ST bawdy pun is rendered by a TT bawdy pun, but one or both of the two meanings S1 and S2 of the TT pun do not belong to the two semantic fields in the ST pun.

(A3) Bawdy pun translated into innocent pun

A wordplay still exists in the TT fragment, but there is a clear translation shift of the bawdy sense to an innocent one. The sexual or scatological isotopy in the TT is simply deleted by the translator.

(B1) Bawdy pun translated into non-selective non-pun

The ST bawdy pun is rendered into two expressions which mentions both the innocent and bawdy sense.

(B2) Bawdy pun translated into selective non-pun (innocent meaning)

The ST bawdy pun is rendered by a non-punning phrase which only majors on the innocent layer of meaning, while the other has been erased.

(B3) Bawdy pun translated into selective non-pun (bawdy meaning)

The ST bawdy pun is rendered by a non-punning phrase which only selects the bawdy layer of meaning, at the cost of deleting the other.

(C) Non-bawdy non-pun translated into compensatory bawdy pun

The translator introduces or creates a bawdy pun in the surrounding textual positions where the original text contains no wordplay, so as to "compensate" for the ST bawdy pun lost somewhere else in the TT.

(D) Omitting the bawdy pun

The ST bawdy pun is entirely omitted in the TT.

(E) Editorial techniques and stage instructions

Additional footnotes, endnotes or stage instructions are provided, as another sort of compensatory device, to elucidate the bawdy domain that was left out in the TT and why it was left out.

(F) Reproducing the bawdy pun in its original form without "translating" it

In this technique, the translator reproduces the bawdy pun in its original form without actually "translating" it, which means that the bilingual wordplay is copied directly from the ST and inserted as such in the TT (Delabastita, 1993: 210).

Owing to the vague and indirect nature of Shakespeare's bawdy puns, it is not an easy task to prove or offer conclusions on this issue. But then, on the basis of the distribution of usage for different techniques which is derived from a series of ST-TT comparisons, obvious translation tendencies or an overall pattern can still be traced from the findings. In order to obtain an even more accurate and reliable result, one can concurrently investigate the translation of other semantic wordplays which are free of sexual or scatological elements, so as to cross-examine the individual's overall strategy in tackling Shakespeare's puns.

3. The Treatment of Shakespeare's Sexual Bawdy by Translators

As suggested in the previous section, different translation methods were open to the translators in rendering Shakespeare's bawdy innuendoes. In the following survey, the distribution of strategies will be presented in the form of a table, followed by a description of the general findings. Some relevant textual examples will also be given for each of the subcategories. The discussion will first deal with the treatment of sexual- bawdy puns, and afterwards, the sexual-bawdy instances which are free of wordplay; whereas the non-sexual bawdy will be the subject of discussion in the next chapter.

From among all of the translations, I will concentrate particularly on the three complete renderings of Shakespeare's works (the shaded area of figure 3). They are— Zhu Shenghao's translations and their revised versions; Liang Shiqiu's works, which is to date the first and only full collection accomplished single handedly; and Fang Ping's new renderings that were most recently published in the millennium year of 2000.

3.1 Sexual-Bawdy Puns

Fig. 3　The Total Number and Distribution of Strategies in Dealing with Sexual-Bawdy Puns

in Shakespeare's Plays

Notes
A1: Bawdy pun translated into bawdy pun with the same double meanings
A2: Bawdy pun translated into bawdy pun with different double meanings
A3: Bawdy pun translated into innocent pun
B1: Bawdy pun translated into non-pun which mentions both the innocent and bawdy sense
B2: Bawdy pun translated into non-pun which only contains an innocent sense
B3: Bawdy pun translated into non-pun which only contains a bawdy sense
C: Non-bawdy non-pun translated into compensatory bawdy pun
D: Omitting the bawdy pun
E: Editorial techniques and stage instructions
F: Reproduce the bawdy pun in its original form without "translating" it

	Tian H.	Zhou Z.P.	Zhu S.H.	Liang S.Q.	Fang P.	Cao W.F.	Bian Z.L.	Sun D.Y.	Cao Y.	Peng J.X.	Lai J.	Ying R.C.
A1	1 (2.1%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.8%)	12 (9.2%)	30 (23.1%)	4 (5.6%)	1 (5.0%)	5 (8.6%)	10 (26.3%)	1 (11.1%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (6.3%)
A2	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.8%)	1 (0.8%)	9 (6.9%)	3 (4.2%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.7%)	6 (15.8%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
A3	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.8%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (20.0%)	0 (0.0%)
B1	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (3.8%)	1 (1.4%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (6.3%)
B2	38 (80.9%)	8 (88.9%)	62 (47.7%)	85 (65.4%)	53 (40.8%)	56 (78.9%)	10 (50.0%)	46 (79.3%)	18 (47.4%)	2 (22.2%)	3 (60.0%)	8 (50.0%)
B3	1 (2.1%)	1 (11.1%)	2 (1.5%)	7 (5.4%)	10 (7.7%)	3 (4.2%)	1 (5.0%)	1 (1.7%)	1 (2.6%)	1 (11.1%)	0 (0.0%)	6 (37.5%)
C	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.8%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.6%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (20.0%)	0 (0.0%)
D	6 (12.8%)	0 (0.0%)	64 (49.2%)	1 (0.8%)	3 (2.3%)	4 (5.6%)	3 (15.0%)	1 (1.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
E	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	21 (16.2%)	17 (13.1%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (25.0%)	3 (5.2%)	1 (2.6%)	5 (55.6%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
F	1 (2.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (1.5%)	2 (1.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.7%)	1 (2.6%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Totals	47	9	130	130	130	71	20	58	38	9	5	16

Notes

A1: Bawdy pun translated into bawdy pun with the same double meanings
A2: Bawdy pun translated into bawdy pun with different double meanings
A3: Bawdy pun translated into innocent pun
B1: Bawdy pun translated into non-pun which mentions both the innocent and bawdy sense
B2: Bawdy pun translated into non-pun which only contains an innocent sense
B3: Bawdy pun translated into non-pun which only contains a bawdy sense
C: Non-bawdy non-pun translated into compensatory bawdy pun
D: Omitting the bawdy pun
E: Editorial techniques and stage instructions
F: Reproduce the bawdy pun in its original form without "translating" it

	Yu E.C.	Tu A.	Liang S.Q.	Liang Z.D.	Gu Z.K.	Shi Y.Z.
A1	2	0	2	0	6	5
	(10.0%)	(0.0%)	(10.0%)	(0.0%)	(30.0%)	(25.0%)
A2	0	0	1	0	0	0
	(0.0%)	(0.0%)	(5.0%)	(0.0%)	(0.0%)	(0.0%)
A3	0	0	0	0	0	0
	(0.0%)	(0.0%)	(0.0%)	(0.0%)	(0.0%)	(0.0%)
B1	0	0	1	0	2	0
	(0.0%)	(0.0%)	(5.0%)	(0.0%)	(10.0%)	(0.0%)
B2	18	19	12	19	8	15
	(90.0%)	(95.0%)	(60.0%)	(95.0%)	(40.0%)	(75.0%)
B3	0	0	0	0	3	0
	(0.0%)	(0.0%)	(0.0%)	(0.0%)	(15.0%)	(0.0%)
C	0	0	1	1	0	0
	(0.0%)	(0.0%)	(5.0%)	(5.0%)	(0.0%)	(0.0%)
D	0	0	0	0	0	0
	(0.0%)	(0.0%)	(0.0%)	(0.0%)	(0.0%)	(0.0%)
E	0	1	3	0	1	0
	(0.0%)	(5.0%)	(15.0%)	(0.0%)	(5.0%)	(0.0%)
F	0	0	0	0	0	0
	(0.0%)	(0.0%)	(0.0%)	(0.0%)	(0.0%)	(0.0%)
Totals	20	20	20	20	20	20

3.1.1 Reproducing or Recreating Bawdy Puns

The first subcategory includes those occasions when the translator succeeds in bringing out "both" meanings of the bawdy puns. Preliminary findings indicated that Cao Yu, who only rendered one Shakespearean play (*Romeo and Juliet*), was the most inventive and was logged as using the largest amount of suggestive puns in his renderings. He has reproduced bawdy puns in 10 of the 38 cases, which comes to 26.3% in total. Fang Ping and Liang Shiqiu invented bawdy puns less often than Cao Yu: 23.1% and 9.2% of the occasions respectively; whereas in contrast, Zhu Shenghao recreated only in 2 of the 130 cases (a mere 1.6%), and not even a single bawdy pun can be found in the translation of Zhou Zhuangping[11]. In the following example taken from *Measure for Measure*, two of the low characters Mistress Overdone and Pompey, exchanged witticisms loaded with puns concerning why Claudio was arrested. Liang unveiled the sexual sense of *do*, which means "to copulate with" (Colman, 1974: 191; Williams, 1997: 101; Partridge, 2000: 95):

ST:
Mistress Overdone: Well, what has he <u>done</u>?
Pompey: A woman. (*MM*, 1.2.86-87)

TT:
Liang Shiqiu
歐: 他<u>幹</u>了什麼?
龐: 一個女人。
[Mistress Overdone: What did he do?
Pompey: A woman.][12]

In Chinese, *gan* 幹 [do] is a colloquial word for "make love" or "do it" (Wang J., 1994: 27). Thus, in Liang Shiqiu's translation, *ganle sheme* 幹了什麼 can mean "what he did", but when the reply is: *(ganle) yige nüren* (幹了)一個女人, it then refers to "having sexual intercourse with a woman". The surname of *Mistress*

Overdone also plays on the same sexual undertone. For similar examples, see *Appendix* 1: Bawdy Puns 3 *mettle* (Fang P.), 4 *Inch* (Fang P.), 22 *stuff* (Liang S.Q.), 27 *sound* (Fang P.), 28 *burn* (Fang P.), 42 *nothing* (Peng J.X.), 48 *respected* (Liang S.Q.), 89 *tool* (Zhu S.H., Sun D.Y., Cao Y. and Fang P.), 90 *naked weapon* (Sun D.Y., Cao Y. and Fang P.), 93 *raise a spirit* (Cao Y.), 106 *tale* (Fang P.), 111 *occupy* (Liang S.Q.) and 130 *cliff* (Fang P.).

As for the sonnets, Gu Zhengkun and Shi Yongzhou reproduced Shakespeare's technique in 30% and 25% of the cases respectively. For example, when dealing with *Sonnet* 151, probably the crudest and most vulgar sonnet of Shakespeare (Hecht, 1997: 134), Shi attempted to render the verbal play on *con-science* (cunt knowledge), which refers to both "moral sense" and "carnal knowledge" (Williams, 1997: 80; Greenblatt, 1997: 151; Booth, 2000: 526; Partridge, 2000: 84-85):

> ST:
> Love is too young to know what <u>conscience</u> is;
> Yet who knows not <u>conscience</u> is born of love? (*SON* 151)

> TT:
> Shi Yongzhou
> 愛太年輕，不解甚麼是<u>性</u>；
> 但是誰不知道<u>性</u>生於愛？
> [Love is too young to understand what sex is
> But who doesn't realize that sex comes from love?]

Shi suggested that the sexual pun is best translated as *xing* 性 [sex], which can mean *xingqing* 性情 [inborn nature or disposition], as well as *xingyu* 性慾 [instinctive sexual desire] (Shi Y.Z., 1973: 16). Although the use of the character *xing* alone is likely to pin down the meaning to indecency, Shi's approach actually sought to make variant readings feasible so that ambiguity in the source text can be preserved. By contrast, Tu An and Liang Zongdai never adopted the techniques

within the range of category A (ie., translating from pun to pun).

3.1.2 Majoring on the Innocent or Bawdy Meaning

Generally speaking, over 70% of Shakespeare's bawdy ribaldry was actually lost in the translation process. The most common strategy adopted by the translators is to major on the superficial or innocent meaning of the pun and ignore the underlying bawdy meaning (ie., to major on technique B2). On nearly half of the occasions (62 examples in total), Zhu Shenghao solely selected the clean sense of the pun (see his renderings of Puns 1 *nose*, 4 *inch*, 22 *stuff*, 70 *will* and 90 *naked weapon*); again Liang Shiqiu stuck to the same strategy for over 60% of the time (see his renderings of Puns 3 *mettle*, 4 *inch*, 23 *sheet*, 42 *nothing* and 89 *tool*). One of the examples is Mistress Quickly's ludicrous misuse of the word *erection* when she means "direction" in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, which is a typical malapropism[13] playing on the phonological similarity between two words (Colman, 1974: 192; Williams, 1997: 116; Partridge, 2000: 101). Zhu Shenghao adhered to presenting the primary meaning of the wordplay:

> ST:
> Mistress Quickly: She does so take on with her men; they mistook
> their <u>erection</u>. (*MW*, 3.5.38-39)

> TT:
> Zhu Shenghao
> 桂: 她太相信她那兩個僕人啦，誰想得到他們竟會誤會了她的<u>意思</u>。
> [Mistress Quickly: She trusts her two servants too much. Who would have
> thought that they actually misunderstood her?]

Much less frequently than the former strategy, some of the translators would prefer to pick out the bawdy undertone and ignore the innocent one. Part of these occurrences can be observed in Ying Ruocheng's *Qingjunruweng* (*Measure for Measure*) (technique B3: 37.5%) and the renderings of Fang Ping (technique B3:

7.7%). In the following case, *Mistress Overdone* is the surname of a bawd (pimp) in *MM*, at the same time playing on the secondary sense of being "worn out" in sexual activities:

> ST:
> Escalus: Your mistress's name?
> Pompey: Mistress <u>Overdone</u>.
> Escalus: Hath she had any more than one husband?
> Pompey: Nine, sir: <u>Overdone</u> by the last. (*MM*, 2.1.199-202)
>
> TT:
> Ying Ruocheng
> 埃斯卡魯斯: 你的老闆娘叫什麼？
> 龐培: 「<u>幹過頭</u>」太太。
> 埃斯卡魯斯: 她嫁過不止一個丈夫了吧？
> 龐培: 九個，大人；最後一個<u>幹過頭</u>了。
> [Escalus: Your mistress' name?
> Pompey: Mistress "worn-out".
> Escalus: She was married to more than one husband?
> Pompey: Nine, sir, worn-out by the last.]

Ying Ruocheng's translation *gan guotou* 幹過頭 [overdo] gives priority to the secondary or bawdy sense of the original text. Other typical examples of technique B3 can be found in Puns 11 *lie* (Fang P.), 30 *plain dealer* (Fang P.), 39 *cock* (Cao W.F.), 59 *french crown* (Ying R.C.) and 62 *Mistress Kate Keepdown* (Fang P.).

3.1.3 Omissions

This strategy is frequently employed in Zhu Shenghao's renderings. He adopted technique D and ignored almost 50% of the sexually suggestive puns (64 of the 130 cases) in Shakespeare's plays. Apart from Zhu's works, large-scale omissions are rarely found in other translations, though some suggestive speeches are occasionally removed. One of the examples being Cao Weifeng's omission of around seventeen lines with sexual words like *thrust*, *stand*, *weapon*, *tool* in the boastful and bawdy exchanges of the Capulet servants Sampson and Gregory

during the opening scene of *Romeo and Juliet*:

> ST:
> Gregory: That shows thee a weak slave, for the
> weakest goes to the wall.
> Sampson: 'Tis true, and therefore women, being the
> weaker vessels, are ever thrust to the wall. Therefore I
> will push Montague's men from the wall and thrust
> his maids to the wall.
> Gregory: The quarrel is between our masters and us
> their men.
> Sampson: 'Tis all one, I will show myself a tyrant: when
> I have fought with the men, I will be civil with the
> maids—I will cut off their heads.
> Gregory: The heads of the maids?
> Sampson: Ay, the heads of the maids, or their maiden-
> heads. Take it in what sense thou wilt.
> Gregory: They must take it in sense that feel it.
> Sampson: Me they shall feel while I am able to stand,
> and 'tis known I am a pretty piece of flesh.
> Gregory: 'Tis well thou art not fish; if thou hadst, thou
> hadst been Poor John. Draw thy tool. Here comes of
> the house of Montagues. (*R&J*, 1.1.13-32)
>
> TT:
> Cao Weifeng
> 格：那才能證明你是個無用的奴才；因為祇有最無用的才貼著牆走
> 路……拔出劍來；有兩個蒙泰格家人來了。
> [Gregory: That proves you are a useless servant; because only the most
> useless ones walk along the wall… draw your sword; two of the
> Montague's men appeared.]

Other remaining cases highlight obvious suppression of the suggestive puns, such as in Bian Zhilin's rendering of Puns 43 and 44 (the "thing joke" in *LR*, 1.5.49-51), where neither meanings of the sexual pun can be traced in the target text.

3.1.4 Editorial Notes and Stage Instructions

Results of the findings reveal that Peng Jingxi, Liang Shiqiu and Fang Ping all used the highest number of footnotes in elaborating on the bawdy sense of the pun in Shakespeare's plays (55.6% for Peng, 16.2% for Liang and 13.1% for Fang);

but translators like Zhu Shenghao, Cao Weifeng and Ying Ruocheng never resorted to editorial techniques. The following quote shows how Fang Ping explicates the bawdy wordplay in footnotes:

ST:
Cleopatra: I would I had thy <u>inches</u>; thou shouldst know
There were a heart in Egypt. (*A&C*, 1.3.40)

TT:
Fang Ping
埃及女王：但願我也像你<u>多長出那麼幾寸</u>，好叫你看看咱埃及
也有顆勇敢的心。
注：多長出那麼幾寸，原文 "I would I had thy inches"，語義雙
關：1.指身高而言（可譯做 "多長高那麼幾寸"）；2.指男性器官。
女王意謂，如果她身為男子漢，受了安東尼的侮辱，定要找他
決鬥。
[Queen of Egypt: I do wish I could grow a few inches more like you,
so as to let you see there's such a brave heart in Egypt.
Note: "Grow a few inches more": the original text is "I would I had
thy inches". A phrase with double meaning: 1. Refers to one's height
(can be translated as "grow a few inches taller"); 2. Refers to the male
sex organ. The queen seemed to say: if she was born as a man, she
would definitely fight with Antony when insulted by him.]

A few of the more adventurous translators such as Cao Yu and Fang Ping, did in some instances even creatively invented stage instructions which were not present in the original editions. The main purpose of these additional stage instructions is to combine the dramatic language and the gestures of the actors, so as to assist the audience in understanding the suggestive puns. Take Mercutio's lines in *Romeo and Juliet*, followed by Cao Yu's translation:

ST:
Mercutio: Good gi' good morrow, fair gentlewoman.
Nurse: Is it good e'en?
Mercutio: 'Tis no less, I tell ye, for the bawdy hand of
the <u>dial</u> is now upon the <u>prick</u> of noon.
Nurse: Out upon you! What a man are you? (*R&J*, 2.4.108-112)

TT:
Cao Yu
墨故求: (嘲弄) 您中午好啊，太太，漂亮的太太。
奶媽: 都中午啦?
墨故求: 可不是，(粗野) 我那長針正指著十二點。
奶媽: (懂得他的玩笑，勃然) 去你的，什麼人哪你是!
[Mercutio: (Sneering) Good afternoon, gentlewoman, fair gentle-woman.
Nurse: It's already afternoon?
Mercutio: Yes, indeed. (Coarsely) My prick is now pointing at noon.
Nurse: (Realizes that he is making fun of her, suddenly becoming angry)
Damn it! What kind of man you are!]

In translating sexual puns like *dial* (with an image of female genitals) and *prick* (representing penis) (Partridge, 2000: 93, 167), Cao Yu's tactic was to render part of the dialogue into stage instruction (as shown in brackets) so that some flavour of the bawdy jokes can be preserved. The audience in the theatre can also immediately understand and appreciate Shakespeare's play with the help of the actor's body language. As Cao Yu stated: "one of his intentions is to let his readers get as close as possible to Shakespeare and the added stage instructions aim at assisting the readers to 'interpret' Shakespeare, rather than to misinterpret him" (Fang P., 1979: 696).

3.1.5 Other Translation Strategies

Some rarely adopted techniques include code C (creating *compensatory* bawdy puns) and F (non-translating). The purpose of technique C is to "make up for the loss of those ST puns that the translator has felt unable to render sufficiently adequately in their original positions" (Delabastita, 1993: 215). An example of such compensatory device is demonstrated in Liang Shiqiu's rendering of the last line of *Sonnet* 151:

ST:
No want of conscience hold it that I call her 'love', for whose dear love I
rise and fall. (*SON* 151)

TT:
Liang Shiqiu
我<u>喊她做</u>"愛"，為她<u>興起而衰落</u>。
[I call her 'love' ('to make love'), for her I rise and fall.]

When the poet *rise and fall* for his love, he obeys her every command, but the *rising and falling* is also signifying male sexual desire, implying tumescence and detumescence (Duncan-Jones, 2003: 418; Burrow, 2002: 682). Liang shifted the focus and inserted a new TT pun in *wo han ta zuo ai* 我喊她做"愛", which can be read as *wo han ta zuo—ai* 我喊她做──"愛" [I call her—"love"] or *wo han ta—zuo'ai* 我喊她──做"愛" [I call her—"to make love"], depending on how one splits up the sentence.

Technique F is also most uncommon and seldom ever adopted by any translator when handling Shakespeare's bawdy innuendoes. A few of the exceptions observed were from Liang Shiqiu and Fang Ping's direct copying of the original text when they came up with Latin equivocations which are associated with a series of bawdy connotations. In order to circumvent laws against profanity on stage, Shakespeare was "adept at using foreign language as a vehicle for obscene puns" (Hughes, 1998: 107). The language lesson in *The Merry Wives of Windsor* (similar to the naughty grammar lesson in *H5*, 3.4.22-51) is a scene which "used multilingualism to create a context for sexual humour" (Delabastita, 2002: 310):

ST:
Evans: Show me now, William, some declensions of
your pronouns.
William: Forsooth, I have forgot.
Evans: It is <u>qui, que, quod</u>. If you forget your <u>qui's</u>,
your <u>quae's</u> and your <u>quod's</u>, you must be
preeches. Go your ways and play; go. (*MW*, 4.1.69-74)

TT:
Liang Shiqiu

哀: 現在你說說看，威廉，代名詞的語尾變化。
威: 我忘記了。
哀: 那就是 qui, quae, quod; 如果你忘記了你的 qui, 你的 quae, 你的 quod, 你就要挨鞭子打。你去玩罷; 去罷。
[Evans: William, talk about it now, the declensions of pronouns.
William: I have forgotten.
Evans: That is qui, quae, quod; If you forget your qui, your quae, your quod, you must be whipped. Go and play; go.]

Qui's, quae's, quod's are pronounced as "keys, case, cods" in Latin, with "keys" a euphemism for "penis", "case" a term for "vagina" and "cods" slang for "testicles" (Kökeritz, 1953: 119; Greenblatt, 1997: 1273; Charney, 2000: 193). Delabastita indicates that the "Direct copy: Pun S.T.=Pun T.T" strategy can be helpful for translators who feel embarrassed by the sexual frankness of the source text jokes (Delabastita, 1993: 211). However, in the present circumstance, it is more likely a method used by the translators in breaking through the foreign language barriers rather than circumventing sexual frankness. Other than one or two examples, such as the letter pun on *R* ("snarl" vs. "arse": Colman, 1974: 211; Vázquez, 2003: 3-4) in *R&J*, 2.4.204-206, technique F (Pun S.T.=Pun T.T) is by and large not employed by the translators, and is generally less applicable to English-Chinese translation (Chang N.F., 2003: 32), given that a striking linguistic difference is observed between the two languages and that their writing systems are totally dissimilar.

3.2 Sexual-Bawdy Non-Puns

Fig. 5   The Total Number and Distribution of Strategies in Dealing with Shakespeare's

Sexual-Bawdy Non-Puns

Notes
A. Retaining the bawdy non-pun
B. Rendering the bawdy non-pun into an innocent expression
C. Omitting the bawdy non-pun
D. Editorial techniques

	Tian H.	Zhou Z.P.	Zhu S.H	Liang S.C	Fang P.	Cao Y.	Bian Z.L.	Sun D.Y.	Cao W.F.	Ying R.C.	Peng J.X.
A	6 (40.0%)	4 (57.1%)	23 (46.0%)	39 (78.0%)	35 (70.0%)	21 (75.0%)	14 (70.0%)	22 (78.6%)	3 (37.5%)	3 (50.0%)	5 (71.4%)
B	4 (26.7%)	3 (42.9%)	20 (40.0%)	10 (20.0%)	13 (26.0%)	7 (25.0%)	6 (30.0%)	6 (21.4%)	4 (50.0%)	3 (50.0%)	2 (28.6%)
C	5 (33.3%)	0 (0.0%)	7 (14.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (12.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
D	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.0%)	1 (2.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Totals	15	7	50	50	50	32	20	28	8	6	7

3.2.1 Retaining the Sexual-Bawdy Non-Puns

The Chinese translators show different characteristics when it comes to treating Shakespeare's bawdy non-puns. Half of the translators studied retained over 70% of the bawdy non-puns (including Liang S.Q., Fang P., Cao W.F., Bian Z.L. and Sun D.Y.). As for Zhu Shenghao, 46% of occasions are preserved (as compared with just 0.8% of bawdy puns in figure 3). Take, for example, Zhu's translation of the phrase *taste her sweet body* ("to have sexual enjoyment of"—Partridge, 2000: 198) in *Othello*:

> ST:
> Othello: I had been happy, if the general camp,
> Pioneers and all, had <u>tasted her sweet body</u>,
> So I had nothing known. (*OTH*, 3.3.361-363)
>
> TT:
> Zhu Shenghao
> 奧: 要是全營的將士，從最低微的工兵起，都曾<u>領略過她的肉體的美趣</u>，只要我一無所知，我還是快樂的。
> [Othello: If the entire general in the camp, privates and all, had tasted her sweet body, I was still happy as long as I knew nothing about it.]

In general, when double meanings are not involved, the translators are keener in revealing the bawdy message of the source text. Other examples that retained the sexual- bawdy non-pun can be located in some renderings of Non-Puns in *Appendix* 2: 14 *tumble* (Zhu S.H.), 26 *set to't* (Fang P.) and 48 *womb of death* (Tian H.).

3.2.2 Omissions

Omissions of bawdy non-puns can scarcely be found (in most cases below 5%). Even if we look at Zhu Shenghao, who cut out almost half of the bawdy puns, but only removed 14% of the non-puns (7 of the 50 cases). The difference of strategy in working with bawdy puns and non-puns is most probably due to

linguistic constraints as well as the translator's own perception on the dramatic function of bawdy wordplays, which will be further analyzed in later sections.

3.2.3 Rendering into Innocent Expressions

Some portions of Shakespeare's bawdy non-puns are played down by several of the translators. Zhu Shenghao (40%), Zhou Zhuangping (42.9%) and Cao Weifeng (50%) all tended to adopt this method more often than any of the others. For instance, the use of explicit sexual language such as words like *make love* is avoided in Zhou's translation:

> ST:
> Hamlet: Nay, but to live
> In the rank sweat of an enseamed bed,
> Stew'd in corruption, <u>honeying and making love</u>
> Over the nasty sty! (*HAM*, 3.4.93-96)

> TT:
> Zhou Zhuangping
> 哈: 這要什麼緊，只消在油漬汗臭的床上度日，在淫穢裡而薰蒸著，倚在那汙濁的豬爛上去<u>說說情話</u>。
> [Hamlet: This is not so important, you only need to pass the day in a greasy and sweat stained bed, steaming in obscenity, leaning by the filthy sty, talking with sweet language.]

Zhu also cleaned up the source text when he came across content related to emasculation, for example, in *Measure for Measure*, when the pimp Pompey asked Escalus about his wish to stamp out prostitution in Vienna:

> ST:
> Pompey: Does Your Worship mean to <u>geld</u> and <u>spay</u>
> all the youth of the city? (*MM*, 2.1.229-230)

> TT:
> Zhu Shenghao
> 邦: 你老爺的意思是打算把維也納城裡的年輕人都<u>關起來</u>嗎?
> [Pompey: What your master mean is that he intends to incarcerate all the young people in the city of Venice?]

Pompey carefully distinguished between male and female castration when he used *geld* for the castration of male animals and *spay* meaning to remove the ovaries of female animals (Partridge, 2000: 112-113, 187; Williams, 1997: 139, 285). In Zhu's version, however, the idea of castration is completely concealed, substituting in its stead *guan qilai* 關起來 [incarcerate]. For similar renderings, see Non-Puns 2 *the best turn i'th bed* (Zhu S.H.), 6 *fortunate bed* (Zhu S.H.), 15 *come to my bed* (Zhu S.H.), 22 *motion generative* (Zhu S.H.) and 38 *tasted her sweet body* (Liang S.Q.).

The above figures and percentages in general depict an overall picture of the translation shifts occurring to the selected bawdy innuendoes. The discussion of these findings, from another perspective, can also be described and summarized according to the size of linguistic unit, that is, whether shifts take place in the macrocontext (sentence level or above) or microcontext (word or phrase level).

3.3 Macro-level Shifts

Translation shifts on the macro-structure of the text seldom occurred in the rendering of Shakespeare's sexual-bawdy puns and non-puns, with the exception of some early translations between the 1920s and 1940s, particularly in Zhu Shenghao's works, which to the fullest extent suppressed references to sexual acts and bodily functions or secretions. In Zhu's version, sexually or scatologically suggestive passages relating to the essentials of the narrative were retained and preserved, while those comparatively non-essential digressions and stylistic devices thought unimportant or irrelevant to the main plots were suppressed or discarded by him. Omissions on the macro-level in the ten plays were mainly the sexually suggestive innuendoes of the low comic characters—one of the major examples being Romeo's friend "Mercutio" in *Romeo and Juliet*.

Mercutio's speeches can be taken as the most offensive lines in *Romeo and Juliet,* or even arguably the bawdiest among all of Shakespeare's plays. Even today, when the play is taught to American high-school students, Mercutio's crude sexual humour is either silently excised or left unexplained for what the *open-arse* or *pop'ring pear* might possibly stand for (Smith, 1991: 99). However, one cannot deny that Mercutio was an interesting figure who is characterized by exceptional vitality, so witty and appealing that he somehow nearly overpowers the romantic hero of the play. That is why Dryden claimed that "he was forced to kill Mercutio in the third act, to prevent being killed by him" (Dryden, 1672)[14], or probably to prevent him from "killing" Romeo. In act two, after the masked ball held at the Capulet's house, both Mercutio and Benvolio went searching high and low for Romeo. Then, using the guise of "invoking Rosaline" to "conjure up" the absent Romeo, Mercutio steers the puns and imagery towards one of his favourite topics: sex. He then delves into a series of *double entendres* describing sexual intercourse. After Mercutio mentions Rosaline's *quivering thigh* and the *demesnes* nearby (i.e., her buttocks and genitals), what follows in the passage is vocabulary allusively pointing to the sexual organs:

> ST:
> This cannot anger him. 'Twould anger him
> To raise a spirit in his mistress' circle
> Of some strange nature, letting it there stand
> Till she had laid it and conjured it down;
> That were some spite. My invocation
> Is fair and honest, in his mistress' name
> I conjure only but to raise up him. (*R&J*, 2.1.24-30)

Mercutio imagines Romeo raising a spirit in Rosaline's circle, until she lays it and brings it down. Here, *spirit* refers to a "supernatural being or creature", with a sexual double meaning "penis" (Williams, 1997: 284-285; Booth, 2000: 441-443);

while *circle*, similar to *ring* and the letter pun *O*, can be taken as a "magical circle" (in which séances are conducted to summon spirits), but also a mistress' circle, "vagina" (Colman, 1974: 187; McDonald, 1996: 24-25; Williams, 1997: 70). To *conjure it down* means "to make the spirit return from whence it came", with sexual double meaning: "made the erection disappear by giving him an orgasm" (Silverbush, 2002: 751-752). He then explored other puns on *medlar* and *pop'ring pear*:

> If love be blind, love cannot hit the mark.
> Now will he sit under a medlar tree
> And wish his mistress were that kind of fruit
> As maids call medlars when they laugh alone.
> Oh, Romeo, that she were, oh, that she were
> An open-arse, and thou a pop'ring pear. (*R&J*, 2.1.34-39)

Medlar is a fruit which has a suggestive shape being "a deep depression at the top, surrounded by the remains of the calyx lobes" (Williams, 1997: 204-205), thus it hints at "either pudend or podex or the pudend-podex area (the lower posteriors and the crutch)" (Partridge, 2000: 147). The word also puns on *meddler*, referring to someone "with a penchant for fooling around sexually" (Silverbush, 2002: 752). *Pop'ring pear*, a fruit that came from the Flemish town of Poperinghe, was thought to resemble the male genitalia. Its shape perfectly fits the *medlar*, thus makes it clear that it implies "penis+scrotum" (Partridge, 2000: 164-165), with an additional homonymic pun on "pop her in" (Williams, 1997: 230-231). Unlike most double meanings which are more subtle and covert, the sexual content of Mercutio's earthy jokes is blatant and obvious (Silverbush, 2002: 754). But the above-mentioned monologue which involves the insinuation of genitalia and copulation, together with the other carnal catalogues of Mercutio (including *R&J*, 2.1.23-42; 2.3.50-97; 2.3.122-131) were completely left out by Zhu Shenghao. As

such, the image of this character is almost invisible in his translation. Also rendered in the 1940s, Cao Yu's version of Mercutio's jokes appears to be tainted with bawdiness:

TT:
Cao Yu
墨故求:
這引不了他的氣，引得起來他愛人圈圈裡那一點火。
這火可來得怪，教那個東西直挺挺!
直等到他的愛人圈夠了它，才把它哄得低頭。
這真要費點勁! 我的咒語老老實實，
我用他情人的名字招魂，也是為著喚出他的挺勁。
如果愛是盲目的，愛人就射不中那箭靶。
現在他睡在那"桃兒"樹下面，
想著他的情人就是一個桃，
桃兒是女兒們在一起玩笑指著什麼才用的字眼，
哦，柔密歐，希望你的愛人是啊，
是一個開了口的桃兒，你是一個香蕉。
[Mercutio:
This cannot anger him, but only stirs up a spark of flame in his mistress' circle.
This flame comes in a strange manner and makes that thing to erect! Until his lover makes enough circles around it, coax him to bend his head.
This really requires a great deal of effort! My invocation is true and honest, I conjure him in his mistress's name only but to call up his strength to stand.
If love be blind, love cannot hit the target.
Now he is sleeping under that peach tree,
Thinking that his lover were a peach,
Peach is the word used by girls to point at a certain thing when they giggle together.
Oh, Romeo, wish your lover is oh,
Is an open-mouthed peach. You are a banana.]

Similar to the original text, a number of bawdy wordplays exist in Cao Yu's translation, such as *yidian huo* 一點火 [a spark of flame] refers to both "the flame of fury" and "the flame of lust", while *airen quanquan* 愛人圈圈 [mistress' circle] also implies the female pudend. Other phrases such as *jiao na dongxi zhitingting* 教那東西直挺挺 [makes that thing to erect] and *huanchu ta de tingjing* 喚出他的挺

勁 [call up his strength to stand] are all sexual puns. The fruit images are more difficult to retain, since the brown apple-like medlar and the Flemish pop'ring pear grow in Europe but not China, so the same picture of copulation cannot be projected on the target texts. Faced with an element of the source culture which is absent from the target culture, Cao Yu tried to reconcile them by substituting a "banana" for the missing "pop'ring pear", and the "medlar" fruit is replaced by an "open-mouthed peach". Instead of proposing an exact correspondence between the source and target texts, he aimed primarily at reproducing the message and chose a "dynamic equivalent"[15] which serves "the same purpose or function in the target language as the original text served in the source language" (Jin & Nida, 1984: 90-91). The banana, with its curved shape, has long been taken as an obvious phallic symbol. The peach was often linked with feminine beauty in early Chinese poetry. With its velvety skin, juicy flesh and aroma, the fruit "most closely approaches the quality of human flesh" (Davidson, 1999: 589), and it has also been associated by the Chinese with ripe sexuality. A banana and an open-mouthed peach therefore naturally produced an erotic effect as in the original context. Aside from Mercutio's bawdy speeches, many of the Fool's sexual allusions, such as the "codpiece song" and "thing joke" were also erased in Zhu Shenghao's rendering of *King Lear*:

> Codpiece song:
> Fool: He that has a house to put his head in has a good
> headpiece.
> > The <u>codpiece</u> that will house
> > Before the head has any,
> > The head and he shall louse;
> > So beggars marry many.
> > The man that makes his toe
> > What he his heart should make
> > Shall of a corn cry woe,
> > And turn his sleep to wake.
> For there was never yet fair woman but she made

mouths in a glass.

<div align="right">(LR, 3.2.25-36)</div>

Thing joke:
She that's a maid now, and laughs at my departure,
Shall not be a maid long, unless <u>things</u> be cut
<u>shorter</u>.

<div align="right">(LR, 1.5.49-51)</div>

Even in his translation of *Othello*, where large-scale omissions did not occur conspicuously when compared with the other plays, the Clown's gross wordplay on *tail* (a common Elizabethan and later a colloquial for the sexual organs)[16] in *OTH*, 3.1.8-11 was filtered by Zhu. Superficially, both of these so-called secondary figures or "bit part" comic characters seem to be brought in merely as farcical interludes and thus do not exert significant influence on the overall impact of the plays. The main plots seem to go on uninterrupted with or without the bawdy exchange of these marginal characters. Hence Zhu chose to make ample use of his scissors in reducing and removing the obscenity of the entertainers so that they would not "shock" the common readers and soil the beautiful pages of a world classic. It is also quite obvious that Zhu insisted on a "comprehensible" language for his readers; and working towards this direction, stylistic features were also intervened to safeguard and enhance the clarity of his translation. Zhu tended to reduce the complexity of the source texts by ignoring or even erasing the various images, "double tongues" and wordplays contained in them. The humorous language, particularly gags and the impromptu comic gestures and remarks made by the actors, together with the sexually suggestive lines were simplified or completely stripped away, as Zhu believed that "omissions at this particular level would not necessarily affect the overall aim or the identity of the source text" (Zhu H.D. & Wu J.M., 1989: 129). Nevertheless, in reality, Zhu's deletions did contribute to a loss of the original work. The Fool's sexual remarks in

<div align="right">55</div>

King Lear, being cut out by Zhu, appear to be nonsense, but these commentaries actually "reach out to encompass a large problem within the play and create echoes of things past and hints of things to come" (Videbæk, 1996: 130). The erasure of the clown's speeches and rhetorical devices might also stem from the fact that they are more difficult to render. As suggested by Pugals: "one of the major obstacles of translating Shakespeare were the seemingly unimportant passages: the lesser details, absolute allusions and play of words" (Pugals, 1975: 28).

Omissions on the macro-level also include passages of the so-called VD jokes (jokes related to venereal disease). These references to sexual potency and syphilis were standard fare on the stage during the sixteenth and seventeenth century. Venereal disease became a topic often touched upon by writers during Shakespeare's age—

> During the sixteenth century, when venereal disease was a consuming social problem for all classes of society and treatment was relatively futile, writers found this particular affliction a target for mordant wit and a convenient metaphor for corrosion and corruption. Many contemporary euphemisms for the disease, its symptoms, and its treatment were exploited by Shakespeare (Rubinstein, 1989: 70).

In fact, if we pay attention to so many different accepted portraits of Shakespeare, what we do find in common is the receding hairline of the bard. Johannes Fabricius, a scholar who devoted himself to studying syphilis in Shakespeare's England and his drama, even attempted to draw relationships between the pathological clusters of images pervaded in Shakespeare's works and his "mid-life crisis" (Fabricius, 1994: 231-254). Fabricius argued that the symbolic imagery of "sickness, disease and medicine" and especially the Bard's heightened awareness of the "foul disease" at some time around the turn of the seventeenth century revealed that he might have contracted syphilis at the time. There are also

new criticisms which pointed out that strong syphilitic symbolism does not particularly exist in Shakespeare's "darker" period and more mature plays, but also in the "sunnier" work like *The Comedy of Errors* (Harris, 2004: 29-51). Thus, most of his plays brim with venereal puns with a satiric undertone and syphilitic symptoms such as baldness, hollow bones, aching bones, worned eyes and so on. Among all these visible symptoms, "Alopecia" (the loss of hair, eyebrows, eyelashes and beards) was the most commonly joked about side-effect of the disease (Harris, 2004: 46). When men's "hair" was discussed in Shakespeare's words, it was associated not only with old age, infirmity or wit, but also as a typical symptom of the "French disease" (Keevak, 2001: 88-89). In *The Comedy of Errors*, there is a lengthy exchange between the Syracusian Dromio and Antipholus (*CE*, 2.2.71-88) who joke about a common effect of syphilis, that is, the loss of hair in sexual pleasure. Nearly fifty lines of the dialogue disappeared in Zhu's rendering, part of which was cited as follows:

> Syr.Dro: There's no time for a man to recover his hair
> that grows bald by nature.
> Syr.Ant: May he not do it by fine and recovery?
> Syr.Dro: Yes, to pay a fine for a periwig and recover
> the lost hair of another man.
> Syr.Ant: Why is Time such a niggard of hair,
> being, as it is, so plentiful an excrement?
> Syr.Dro: Because it is a blessing that he bestows on
> beasts, and what he hath scanted men in hair he hath
> given them in wit.
> Syr.Ant: Why, but there's many a man hath
> more hair than wit.
> Syr.Dro: Not a man of those but he hath the wit to
> lose his hair.
> Syr.Ant: Why, thou didst conclude hairy men
> plain dealers, without wit.
> Syr.Dro: The plainer dealer, the sooner lost. Yet he
> loseth it in a kind of jollity. (*CE*, 2.2.71-88)

Besides *The Comedy of Errors*, there are also large-scale omissions of VD jokes in *Measure for Measure*, when Lucio and two other young gentlemen are exchanging wisecracks in a vulgar tone. Around twenty lines were deleted by Zhu Shenghao (see *MM*, 1.2.29-55). Similarly, in *Troilus and Cressida*, the voice of Pandarus[17] in the final soliloquy, addressing to all "traders in flesh" (bawds), faded in Zhu's translation (refer to *T&C*, 5.10.45-56).

In Liang Shiqiu's translations of Shakespeare, which were made from the 1930s to 1960s, editorial notes[18] were often adopted to describe and explain sexually suggestive innuendoes that might cause problems in comprehension. Most of these annotations are "linguistic notes" which help to clarify the double or multiple senses embedded in the bawdy wordplays, such as to explain the two meanings of *tub* in *Measure for Measure*. The word has a connotation of "the vessel in which syphilitics were sweated as part of their treatment" (Williams, 1997: 315) where it superficially means the "bath tub":

> ST:
> Pompey: Troth, sir, she hath eaten up all her beef, and
> she is herself in the <u>tub</u>. (*MM*, 3.2.56-57)
>
> TT:
> Liang Shiqiu
> 龐: 她把她的牛肉都吃光了，她自己也跳到桶裏去了。
> 注: 原文 tub 雙關語: (一) 醃牛肉的桶，(二) 浴桶，裡面加鹽，使人發汗，可癒花柳病。故 in the tub 即患花柳病之謂。
> [Pompey: She has eaten up all her beef, and she also jump into the tub.
> *Note*: The source text 'tub' is a pun: (1) tub for salted beef, (2) bath tub, with salt added, induce perspiration, can cure syphilis. Thus to be 'in the tub' means to contract syphilis.]

In a few cases, Liang would also site other references related to the text and commentaries of Western critical editions, such as the long historical note for Dromio's pun on French "hair" or "heir" (Partridge, 2000: 120; Williams, 1997: 149; Whitworth, 2002: 133):

ST:
Antipholus of Syracuse: Where's France?
Dromio of Syracuse: In her forehead, armed and reverted,
making war against her <u>hair</u>. (*COM*, 3.2.125-127)

TT:
Liang Shiqiu
西安: 法蘭西在哪裡?
西德: 在她的前額上，一片瘡痍，毛髮脫落，在和王位繼承人作戰。
注: In her forehead; armed and reverted, making war against her heir. 此句意義複雜。首先 heir 與 hair 音相近。Wilson 注云: armed and reverted, a reference to the "French disease", (即花柳病), (a) in the body politic of France, ie. the civil war between Henry IV, the "heir", and the "reverted" League. (b) ie. venereal disease, "armed"= with eruptions and "reverted"= receding because of the loss of hair. 按一九五九年法國的信奉新教的 Henry of Navarre 被 Henry 指定為法國王位繼承人，當時天主教的 the Holy League 即武裝抵抗，內戰發生，但於一五九四年二月終於登上王位，是為亨利四世。奈爾的前額遍處瘡痍，表示戰績猶新，毛髮脫落，表示擊退叛軍。英國對於法國內戰亦感興趣，並未袖手旁觀，一五九一年伊利沙白女王曾派軍援助亨利。
[Antipholus of Syracuse: Where's France?
Dromio of Syracuse: In her forehead, battlescarred, with hair loss, at war with the heir to the throne. *Note*: In her forehead; armed and reverted, making war against her heir. The meaning of this sentence is complicated. First, 'heir' and 'hair' are phonologically similar. According to Wilson's notes: armed and reverted, a reference to the 'French disease' (syphilis). (a) in the body politic of France, i.e. the civil war between Henry IV, the 'heir' and the 'reverted' League. (b) i.e. venereal disease, 'armed'=erruptions and 'reverted'=receding because of the loss of hair. The Protestant Henry of Navarre of France was designated heir to the throne in 1589. The Catholic Holy League began armed resistance, and the civil wars commenced. But in February 1594, he ascended to the throne as Henry IV. Navarre's forehead was battlescarred, as if the military successes were recent. The hair loss indicates that the rebellious troops were defeated. England was also interested in the civil wars in France and did not watch with folded arms. In 1591, Queen Elizatbeth sent troops to the aid of Henry.]

One additional point to note is that Liang Shiqiu participates actively in the elucidation of bawdy innuendoes. The judgments of the commentators were not accepted and applied uncritically. Rather, Liang did ponder over the reliability of some annotations provided by the Western critics, especially when the meaning of a citation in the text is either contested or subject to a multiplicity of readings. In his translation of *Troilus and Cressida*, Liang questioned Eric Partridge's reading of

"sunburnt" as a wordplay implying "infected with venereal disease" (Partridge, 2000: 194).

> ST:
> Aeneas: The Grecian dames are <u>sunburnt</u> and not worth
> the splinter of a lance. (*T&C*, 1.3.282-283)
>
> TT:
> Liang Shiqiu
> 伊: 希臘的女人都是些鄉下姑娘，不值得動矛動槍。
> 注: 原文 sunburnt 為膚色紅黑之意。但新集注本註解引述 Partridge (Sh.'s Bawdy. 1947, p.198) 的意見云: there is a Pun on son (man)-burnt…i.e., infected with venereal disease. 似不足采信。
> [Aeneas: The women of Greece are country girls, they are not worth fighting for with weapons.
> *Note*: The source text "sunburnt" means deeply tanned skin. But the new critical edition quotes Partridge's idea (Sh.'s Bawdy. 1947, p.198): there is a Pun on son (man)-burnt…i.e., infected with venereal disease. This appears to be unreliable.]

Liang's own interpretation is revealed as he made a brief comment towards the end of his note, pointing out that Partridge's understanding of the bawdy innuendo "appears to be unreliable". Similarly, Liang would also show agreement by making comments such as *sizuo* 似鑿 [it seems valid] or *po zhide zhuyi* 頗值得注意 [it should be noted].

3.4 Micro-level Shifts

3.4.1 Expressions Tied up with Erotic Passion

Zhu Shenghao deemed it desirable to smoothe over bawdy interpretations that are intimately tied up with sexual relationships or erotic passion. One of the typical examples is the word *bed*, which appears twelve times in the selected works. In the works of Shakespeare, a bed "evokes the vision of a bridal bed or a bed of love-making" (Partridge, 2000: 64). Thus, for instance, in dealing with the following lines, a clear tendency to "spiritualize" the language of sex can be

observed in Zhu's translation. In the example below, Zhu, who did his translation in the 1930s and 1940s, euphemized *a highway to my bed* as "a bridge to lead the way for the lover's yearning", while Fang Ping, who took on the work between the 1950s and 1990s, does not scruple to say "climb up onto my bed":

> ST:
> He made you for <u>a highway to my bed</u>,
> But I, a maid, die maiden-widowed. (*R&J*, 3.2.134-135)
>
> TT:
> Zhu Shenghao
> 他要借著你做<u>接引相思的橋樑</u>，可是我卻要做一個獨守空閨的怨女而死去。[He made you a bridge to lead the way for the lover's yearning. But I have to die as a widow.]
>
> Fang Ping
> 他本要借你做捷徑，<u>登上我的床</u>；可憐我這處女，守活寡，到死是處女。
> [He originally made you a short cut to climb up my bed; but I, a pitiful virgin, have to remain a widow until I die.]

A second instance which indicates Zhu's suppression of the word "bed" is a quotation from *Antony and Cleopatra*, when the Messenger brings the news of Antony's marriage to Octavia, and replies to Cleopatra with a sexually suggestive sense of "turn":

> ST:
> Messenger: Free, madam? No, I made no such report:
> He's bound unto Octavia.
> Cleopatra: For what good turn?
> Messenger: For the <u>best turn i'th'bed</u>. (*A&C*, 2.5.57-60)
>
> TT:
> Zhu Shenghao
> 使者：自由，皇后！不，我沒有這樣說；他已經被奧克泰薇霞約束住了。
> 克：什麼約束？
> 使者：他們已經締結<u>百年之好</u>。
> [Messenger: Free, queen! No, I haven't said so; He's restrained by Octavia.
> Cleopatra: What kind of restraint?
> Messenger: They have a harmonious union which lasts for a hundred

years.]

Fang Ping
使者：自由，娘娘？不！
這話我沒說呀。他被屋大維婭管住啦。
埃及女王：這有什麼好？
使者：<u>在床上好得不得了</u>呀。
[Messenger: Free, queen? No!
I haven't said so; He's controlled by Octavia.
Cleopatra: What's so good about this?
Messenger: Extremely good in bed.]

For the *best turn i'th'bed* (*A&C*, 2.5.60), which means "sexual bout" and is "used allusively for copulation" (Williams, 1997: 316), tends to be carefully handled by Zhu. He neutralized the possible bawdy interpretations by turning it to an expression acceptable to the traditional Chinese ethics: *tamen yijing dijie bainian zhi hao* 他們已經締結百年之好 [They have a harmonious union that lasts for a hundred years]. Again, in contrast, Fang rendered the bawdy association in a straightforward manner: *(tamen) zai chuangshang haode budeliao ya* (他們)在床上好得不得了呀 [(They are) extremely good in bed].

Zhu's tendency to tone down the concept of "bed" can further be observed in his translation of *Hamlet*, where *sate itself in a celestial bed* (*HAM*, 1.5.57) was softened to *yajuan yu tianshang de changsui zhi le* 厭倦於天上的唱隨之樂 [sate with the happiness of singing together in the sky]. In the same play, one of the lines in Ophelia's song *An thou hadst not come to my bed* (*HAM*, 4.5.67) was also replaced by *shuiliao rujing bei ni qizha* 誰料如今被你欺詐 [Who would have thought that I am now cheated by you]. The same situation happens in the comedy *Much Ado About Nothing*, when the *fortunate bed* (*ADO*, 3.1.45) was completely removed in Zhu's rendering.

The second expression characterized by its sensitivity is the word *lap*, which

in the ordinary sense points to "the front portion of the body from the waist to the knees of a person seated" (*SOD*, 1539), but the word "seems to have always borne a sexual connotation" (Partridge, 2000: 19), with an "implied localization in the pudend" (Partridge, 2000: 132). *Lap* is also defined as the "general area of thighs and groin on which a woman may support a lover who tends to acquire a vaginal focus" (Williams, 1997: 182). In Zhu's version, the taboo meaning of the original text is diluted and understated by replacing the questionable expression with less offensive terms. In *Much Ado About Nothing*, for instance, Benedick's reflections about *dying in Beatrice's lap* (there is also a sexual pun on *die*) have undergone remarkable translation shifts through directing the thoughts of target readers to more innocent areas of the female anatomy, such as Beatrice's arms or bosom:

> ST:
> Benedick: I will live in thy heart, <u>die in thy lap</u>, and be
> buried in thy eyes... (*ADO*, 5.2.95-96)

> TT:
> Zhu Shenghao
> 裴: 我願意活在你的心裡，<u>死在你的懷裡</u>，葬在你的眼裡。
> [Benedick: I am willing to live in your heart, die in your arms, buried
> in your eyes.]

Similarly, when Hamlet asks to *lie in your lap*, Zhu Shenghao made an adjustment in his rendering and changed it to *lie in your arms* so that the conversation between Hamlet and Ophelia can be suited in the Chinese context:

> ST:
> Hamlet: Lady, shall I <u>lie in your lap</u>?
> Ophelia: No, my lord.
> Hamlet: I mean, my head upon your lap?
> Ophelia: Ay, my lord. (*HAM*, 3.2.110-113)

TT:
Zhu Shenghao
哈: 小姐，我可以<u>睡在你的懷裡</u>嗎?
莪: 不，殿下。
哈: 我的意思是說，我可以把我的頭枕在您的膝上嗎?
莪: 嗯，殿下。
[Hamlet: Lady, shall I lie in your arms?
Ophelia: No, my lord.
Hamlet: I mean, shall I put my head on your knees?
Ophelia: Ay, my lord.]

Another part of the human body closely linked to erotic desire is the "liver", which during the Renaissance period was thought to be the "seat of passion" (Crystal, 2002: 265), especially sexual passion (Williams, 1997: 191; Webb, 1989: 70-71). The word appeared five times in Shakespeare's works, for example in *The Merry Wives of Windsor: With liver burning hot*. The three Chinese translations of the line are as follows:

ST:
Ford: Love my wife?
Pistol: With <u>liver</u> burning hot. (*MW*, 2.1.111-112)

TT:
Zhu Shenghao
傅: 愛上我的妻子!
畢: 他<u>心裡火</u>一樣的熱呢。
[Ford: Fall in love with my wife!
Pistol: His heart-fire is also hot.]

Liang Shiqiu
福: 愛上了我的妻!
皮: <u>愛</u>得正在火熾。
[Ford: Fall in love with my wife!
Pistol: Love is burning hot.]

Fang Ping
傅德: 看中我的老婆!
火槍: 他的<u>肝臟火</u>在燒呢。注: 當時以為情慾生於肝臟
[Ford: Take a fancy to my wife!
Pistol: His liver-fire is burning.
Note: Sexual passion was thought to originate from the liver at the time.]

The "carnal desire" of *liver* was spiritualized to "love" in Liang Shiqiu's translation *ai de zhengzai huochi* 愛得正在火熾 [love is burning hot]. In contrast, Fang Ping literally translated the "burning liver" and provided a footnote for the specific Elizabethan sense. The necessity of providing readers with such a footnote on this occasion is most probably to avoid a clash with the existing expression in the target language which has a meaning different from what is intended by the original sender. If the phrase is directly rendered as *ta de ganhuo zai shao* 他的肝火在燒 [his liver-fire is flaring up] without any further explication, the bawdy message attached cannot be transferred to the target receivers. To the Chinese receivers, *ganhuo* 肝火 [liver-fire] refers to anger, whereas *ganhuo sheng/ganhuo wang* 肝火盛/肝火旺 [hyperactivity of liver-fire] describes someone who is irascible. "His liver-fire is flaring up" will thus be understood as a person filled with rage instead of being preoccupied with sexual desire. In Zhu's case, he simply replaced *ganhuo* 肝火 [liver-fire] with *xinhuo* 心火 [heart-fire], where heart seemed more likely to be the seat of erotic desires, thus eliminating the "strangeness" of the Elizabethan culture.

3.4.2 Male and Female Sexual Organs

This section will be restricted to discussing the translation treatment of male and female sexual organs in Shakespeare. For the female genitals, ie. the vagina and the womb, they were to Shakespeare "of considerably greater importance, and significance singly than all the rest of woman's sexual features collectively" (Partridge, 2000: 21). This can most probably account for the comparatively higher number of synonyms to female pudend[19]. One of the most explicit references to the female genitals is *maidenhead*, which is generally used as a

synonym for "virginity", but it is still intimately related to its second meaning, "the hymen or virginal membrane stretched across external orifice of the vagina" (Williams, 1997: 200). The second sense is obviously displayed when Sampson (in *Romeo and Juliet*) threatens to cut off the maids' "heads":

ST:
Sampson: I will be civil with the maids,
I will cut off their heads.
Gregory: The heads of the maids?
Sampson: Ay, the <u>heads</u> of the maids, or their <u>maidenheads</u>,
take it in what sense thou wilt. (*R&J*, 1.1.21-25)

Liang Shiqiu adopted the archaic sense of *maid* (which means "a virgin") and rendered their conversation as follows:

TT:
Liang Shiqiu
薩: ……對他們的女人也不留情; 我要切她們的頭。
格: 處女的頭?
薩: 對，<u>處女頭</u>，或<u>處女膜</u>; 隨便你怎麼解釋。
[Sampson: …I won't be lenient to their women; I want to cut their heads.
Gregory: The heads of virgins?
Sampson: Yes, the virgin head, or virginal membrane; explain whatever you like.]

The bawdy pun is lost, but Liang tried to recreate similar textual effects by the use of other wordplay-related devices, in this context, "repetition" on *chunü* 處女 [virgin]. This technique is defined by Delabastita as "Pun→Punoid", which constitutes one of the subcategories of "Pun→Non-Pun". Repetition, imagery, alliteration, assonance, rhyme, irony and allusion are all "punoids" that could become serviceable when translating puns (Delabastita, 1993: 207-208). Cao Yu skips over the sexual pun on women's *heads* and focuses on the sexual undercurrent of *cut off* in the surrounding text:

Cao Yu
酒嵩: ……我還要跟女人們淘一下，我要幹掉她們的"腦袋"。
力高: (恫嚇) 幹掉她們的腦袋?
酒嵩: (霎霎眼) 嗯，幹掉，這"幹"字你怎麼講都成。
[Sampson: …I'll be hard to the women and do off with their heads.
Gregory: (threatening) Do off with their heads?
Sampson: (blinks) Yes, do off, and you are free to interpret the word "do".]

Cao makes use of the phrase *gandiao* 幹掉, which literally means "to kill" or "to get rid of". But similar to its English equivalent "do"/"do it", it is also used as a word/phrase for "sexual intercourse" (Ayto, 2000: 67). Alternatively, Zhu Shenghao offers a new wordplay to substitute for *maidenhead*:

Zhu Shenghao
桑: ……對娘兒們也不留情面，我要割掉她們的頭。
葛: 割掉娘兒們的頭嗎?
桑: 對了，娘兒們的頭, 或是她們的奶奶頭，你愛怎麼說就怎麼說。
[Sampson: …I won't be lenient to the women; I want to cut off their heads.
Gregory: Cut off their heads?
Sampson: Yes, the heads of the wenches, or their nipple heads, whatever you like to say.]

Zhu's translation approach, in Shen Lin's words, to a certain extent "acquires an inadvertent deflection of sadism" (Lin, 1989: 176). The target version underwent shifts from the strongest sexual taboos associated with the female genitals (the maidenhead) to secondary sexual characteristics (the nipple) which are only "semi-taboo" (McDonald, 1996: ix). The word *womb* also seems to be avoided by some of the translators. Zhu omitted it a few times: for example, he skipped over the *womb of death* in *Romeo and Juliet* and neutralized *her plenteous womb* to "her body" in *Measure for Measure*:

ST:
Romeo: Thou detestable maw, thou womb of death,
Gorged with the dearest morsel of the earth... (*R&J*, 5.3.45-46)

TT:
Zhu Shenghao
羅: 你無情的泥土，吞噬了世上最可愛的人兒。
[Romeo: You heartless mud, gobble up the loveliest girl in the world.]

ST:
Lucio: …even so <u>her plenteous womb</u>
Expresseth his full tilth and husbandry. (*MM*, 1.4.43-44)

TT:
Zhu Shenghao
路: 令弟的辛苦耕耘，終於在她的身上結起果實來了。
[Lucio: The hard work of your brother has eventually born fruits in her body.]

Liang and Fang occasionally opted for a more general and early sense of *womb* which refers to "belly, stomach or bowels" (McDonald, 1996: 163), such as Liang's translation of the *womb of death* as *siwang de dupi* 死亡的肚皮 [the belly of death]. Fang has created a new Chinese pun for the word *clef* (Pun 130) which successfully conveys the original bawdiness. When Ulysses remarks about Cressida's skill in sexual sight- reading, he jokes on *sing*, which also means "to coit with" (Partridge, 2000: 183; Williams, 1997: 278):

ST:
Ulysses: She will sing any man at first sight.
Thersites: And any man may sing her, if he can
take her <u>clef</u>. She's noted. (*T&C*, 5.2.9-11)

In response, Thersites continues with his wordplay and adds: "And any man may sing her, if he can take her clef". A second pun can be found on *clef*, originally refers to a musical symbol indicating the pitch of notes to be played but allusively it points to the "vulva" (Colman, 1974: 188; Williams, 1997: 70-71). The translations of Zhu and Fang are cited as follows:

TT:
Zhu Shenghao
尤: 她會向任何那個初次見面的男人唱歌。……
[Ulysses: She will sing to any man at first sight…]

Fang Ping
烏利西斯: 對任何男人她都是一見調情。
忒西忒斯: 任何男人對她也是一見調情，如果他能捅開她的<u>宮門</u>的話。她是頗有情調的。
[Ulysses: She will flirt with any man at first sight.
Thersites: Any man will flirt with her at first sight, if he can push open her palace door. She is quite sentimental.]

Thersite's reply to Ulysses was omitted in Zhu's version, whereas Fang attempted to recreate his own musical bawdy by playing on the vagueness of *tongkai ta de gongmen* 捅開她的宮門 [push open her door of palace]. In musical terms, *gong* 宮 [palace] is a note on the ancient Chinese five-tone scale "Gong, Shang, Jiao, Zheng, Yu", corresponding to "doh" in the Western "doh, ray, me" musical scale. Physiologically, however, the character also means "womb or uterus". The pun *gongmen* also appears in Gu Zhengkun's translation of *Sonnet* 151:

"To stand in thy affairs, fall by thy side." (*SON* 151)

To stand in thy affairs superficially projects a military image: to take up an offensive position against an enemy. But its embedded sexual image is also noteworthy. While *stand* refers to "penis erectus", *affairs* can be stretched to mean "vagina". Gu Zhengkun rendered the line as *tingli yu ni de gongmen, bing leidao ni shen* 挺立於你的宮門, 並累倒你身 [standing in your door of palace, and tiredly lying on your body]. Again, the same Chinese bawdy wordplay is applied to the vagina. A *bird's nest* is another euphemistic reference to the "pudend and pubic hair" (Partridge, 2000: 66), when the Nurse tells Juliet—

To fetch a ladder, by the which your love

Must climb a <u>bird's nest</u> soon when it is dark. (*R&J*, 2.5.73-74)

While most of the Shakespeare translators rendered the *bird's nest* as a non-ambiguous instance *niaochao* 鳥巢, the genital idea attached to the phrase is implicitly suggested in Fang Ping's translation of the sexual reference:

Fang Ping
去拿軟梯來，天黑了，好讓你的情人爬進<u>小鳥兒的窩</u>。
[Go and fetch the soft ladder, it's getting dark, so that your lover can climb into the bird's pit.]

Likewise, the Chinese character *wo* 窩 [pit] is adopted by Liang Shiqiu to imply the woman's genitals in his translation of *Sonnet* 144, in which the poet suspects the friend of being inside the Dark Lady's "hell" (slang for vagina). The origin of the sexual slang can be traced back to medieval illustrations, which suggest that "the gate of hell may represent the vulva; hence the vagina is hell itself, with an analogy of hell-fire and syphilitic pain" (Webb, 1989: 60-61):

ST:
I guess one angel in another's <u>hell</u>. (*SON* 144)

TT:
Liang Shiqiu
我猜一個必已轉進另一個的<u>窩</u>。
[I guess one must have moved into the pit of another.]

An additional note is provided by Liang to explain the background information and hidden sexual connotation of the slang: "the term *hell* is quoted from Boccaccio's story of Rustico and Alibech (See *Decameron*, III, 10), =*female sexual organ*". For the representations of male sexual organs, the most frequently exploited expression in the translations is *jiaohuo* 傢伙 [the thing]. Take the following example:

ST:
Gregory: Draw thy <u>tool</u>. Here comes of
the house of Montagues.
Sampson: My <u>naked weapon</u> is out. Quarrel, I will back
thee. (*R&J*, 1.1.31-34)

TT:
Cao Yu
力高: ……<u>操傢伙</u>! 猛泰家裡來了人了，兩個!
酒嵩: (不在意下，抽出劍來) 小子，<u>硬傢伙</u>拿出來了。來，熊他! 我
幫你，在你後頭。
[Gregory: …Fuck things! There are people coming from the house of the
Montagues, two!
Sampson: (drawing the sword inattentively) Fellow, the hard thing was out.
Come, be ferocious! I'll help you, right at your back.]

As suggested by McDonald in his *Dictionary of Obscenity, Taboo and Euphemism*, "there is an ancient and widespread association between sex and violence", and this association is "reflected in many names for weaponry that are also applied to the genitals" (McDonald, 1996: 159). In the above context, *tool* and *weapon* are thrusting instruments which provide analogues for the penis (see Webb, 1989: 118-119, 127; Williams, 1997: 310, 334; Partridge, 2000: 202, 215). *Naked weapon* signifies the "drawn sword or rapier" (Webb, 1989: 127) but also "the male organ in an aggressive state" (Macrone, 1997: 206-207), whereas the word *tool* is applied to a sword. Cao Yu rendered both terms as *jiahuo*, a slang that functions within most places in China. He also applied the offensive vulgar *cao* 操 which means "to have sex with" and is "an equivalent of 'screw' and 'fuck' in English" (Wang J., 1994: 27). *Nahuar* 那話兒 [that story/that thing] is another commonly used Chinese term for penis. Fang Ping played on the vagueness of *nahuar* when he rendered the sexually suggestive jokes between Benvolio and Mercutio:

ST:
Mercutio: Thou desirest me to stop in my <u>tale</u> against

the hair.
Benvolio: Thou wouldst else have made thy <u>tale</u> large.
(*R&J*, 2.4.93-95*)*

TT:
Fang Ping
牟克休: 你要我硬是把<u>話兒</u>縮回去?
班伏柳: 免得你把<u>話兒</u>越拉越長呀。
[Mercutio: You force me to withdraw my huar?
Benvolio: So that you won't drag your huar longer and longer.]

A pun with *tale* on the phonological level can be found the above quote: the surface and innocent *tale* refers to a "narrative or story", whereas its homonym *tail* is the bawdy undertone that directly gives reference to the "genital areas" (Partridge, 2000: 197-198). In Fang Ping's translation *huar* 話兒, originated from *nahuar* 那話兒 (a Chinese euphemism for penis), he succeeds in capturing the double meanings of the ribaldry. In rendering the forbidden words related to the male sexual organs, Liang Shiqiu used the symbol XX to substitute *codpiece* in *King Lear*. In Shakespeare, *codpiece* denotes "a bag-like flap which, in front of breeches, covers the penis and scrotum" (Partridge, 2000: 81; Macrone, 1997: 184; Williams, 1997: 73), and frequently the "penis" itself, as in the following example when the Fool sings on Lear's folly in *LR*, 3.2.25-36 (see section 3.3):

TT:
Liang Shiqiu
有間屋子藏頭的人就是有個好頭腦。
頭還沒有地方藏,
<u>XX</u> 先要找住房(1)。
頭和 <u>XX</u> 都生蝨
多少乞丐娶新娘。
注(1):
原文 codpiece 原為男人褲上容納陽物之一部，此處即指陽物而言。
[A man who has a house to hide his head has a good head
Still having nowhere to hide his head
He first finds a house for his XX
There is a louse in his head and his XX
So many beggars marry.

Note(1):
The source text *codpiece* originally means the part of a man's trousers which holds his penis. In this context, it simply refers to the penis.]

The use of XX is a kind of rhetorical device which indirectly expresses subjects regarded as taboo and supposed to be concealed (Lin L.L., 1994: 144). In this case, Liang adopted this symbol for the privates.

3.4.3 The Bawdy Punning Names

In view of Shakespeare's and his culture's fondness for wordplay, it is not at all surprising to find a group of names and nicknames exploited for that purpose. The punning names of many Shakespearean comic characters "cleverly sum up the person in question and provide, directly and indirectly, a clue to his social status or his function in the play" (Kokeritz, 1950: 240)[20]. The group is rather small, comprising only thirteen characters in all of Shakespeare's plays.

For instance, *Abhorson*, a secondary character in *Measure for Measure*, has an obvious pun on "abhor" and "ab whoreson", meaning "son from a whore" (Partridge, 2000: 55; Williams, 1997: 23). Further such semantic puns in the same play also include *Mistress Overdone*: a bawd whose surname *Overdone* simultaneously plays on the second sense of "being 'worn out' in sexual activities" (Partridge, 2000: 156) or "sexually debilitated" (Williams, 1997: 223) since she was said to have been wed nine times. *Mistress Kate Keepdown* was one of *Mistress Overdone*'s acquaintances and therefore most probably being a whore or at least a wanton. *Kate*, punning on "cat", is a name commonly associated with whores; while *Keepdown* is a joking surname to imply her profession: "she kept men down on the bed" (Partridge, 2000: 129) or "she is the one who keeps on lying down" (Bawcutt, 1998). Doctor *Caius*, the French physician in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, is "a

fanciful respelling of Keys" (Rubinstein, 1989: 43), and "Key" in turn was a slang expression for the penis which provides a broad hint of the doctor's specialization (Kokeritz, 1950: 241). In *The Merry Wives of Windsor, The Second Part of Henry IV* and *Henry V*, *Pistol* is not only a name that reveals the explosive temperament of Ancient Pistol, but also stands for an obsolete vulgarity "pillicock" (Macrone, 1997: 197) and one of the many English names for weapons (such as "sword", "gun", "pike" and so on) that are used for male genitals. *Doll Tearsheet* of *The Second Part of Henry IV* was another suggestive name. *Doll* is "a common name for prostitute" (Williams, 1997: 102) which derived from *Dorothy*, with a "strong implication that the woman is a plaything" (Rawson, 1989: 14); and the character was named *Tearsheet* either because "she tore the bed-sheets in her amorous tossings or because her partners did so while consorting with her" (Partridge, 2000: 198). *Jane Nightwork* (*2H4*, 3.2.210) may as well be a wordplay that again hinted at the lady's profession.

Confronted by a group of punning and bawdy names, "transliteration" is almost the only method adopted by Zhu Shenghao to indicate the similar pronounciation. For example, *Abhorson* was rendered by him as *abaosheng* 阿鮑生; *Mistress Overdone* as *aofudong taitai* 奧弗東太太; Pistol as *bisiduo* 畢斯多; Doll Tearsheet as *duo* 多 and so on. Zhu even erased two of the comparatively insignificant bawdy nicknames in *Measure for Measure*: Pompey's pet name *Bum* (which refers to the "rump": see McDonald, 1996: 19)[21] in *MM*, 2.1.216 and *Madam Mitigation* (who helps to "mitigate the pangs of desire": Bawcutt, 1998: 93) in *MM*, 1.2.43. *Mistress Kate Keepdown* mentioned in the same play was also simplified by Zhu as *yige guniang* 一個姑娘 [a girl]:

ST:
Mistress Overdone: <u>Mistress Kate Keepdown</u> was with
child by him in the Duke's time… (*MM*, 3.2.194-195)

TT:
Zhu Shenghao
奧: 公爵老爺在朝的時候，他把<u>一個姑娘</u>弄大了肚皮……
[Mistress Overdone: When the duke was in power, he made a girl
pregnant…]

Liang Shiqiu obviously realized the bawdy nature of some punning names,
as he did acknowledge the underlying sexual meanings of *Mistress Overdone* and
Pistol in a footnote:

MM, Act 1, note 12:
原文 "what has he done?" 其中的 do 字涵有淫穢意。歐佛頓太太 (Mrs.
Overdone) 的姓也涵有此意義。[The source text is: "what has he done?".
"Do" in the context contains salacious connotations. The surname of
Mistress Overdone also plays on the same sexual undertone.]

2H4, Act 2, note 48:
皮斯圖原文為 Pistol，本義為 "手槍"，故云。但 Delius 指出所謂 "兩
顆子彈" 系猥褻之雙關語，如不誣，則所謂 Pistol 亦猥褻之雙關語。
魁格來太太似不解。[The source text of "pisitu" is Pistol, which literally
denotes a "firearm". But Delius points out that the "two bullets
discharged" aforementioned is a bawdy pun. If so, the name "pistol" may
also be a bawdy pun. It seems that Mistress Quickly did not understand.]

However, in most circumstances, Liang chose to sacrifice the bawdy sense
of the names, and footnotes turn out to be his only resort. In contrast, some
translators seem more zealous in preserving the sexual equivocations. Some of the
bawdy punning names are skilfully retained in the translations of Fang Ping and
Ying Ruocheng. For example, Fang figuratively rendered *Abhorson* as *Abiaosheng* 阿
婊生 [borne by a "whore" (*biaozi* 婊子)]. He creates a homonymic/phonetic pun,
Ye Laizhen 葉來珍, for *Jane Nightwork*, since *ye lai* 葉來 shares the same sound
with *ye lai* 夜來 in Chinese, which literally means "to come at night", while *Zhen*

珍 is the transliteration of *Jane* and it also refers to *zhengui* [precious]. Thus, the name can be read as "to become precious at night".

If a pun can neither be retained nor created, Fang and Ying would rather evoke the bawdy association in some cases. Two of the examples include *Dian Dir* 墊底兒 [mattress on the bottom] (*Kate Keepdown*) and *Gan Guotou* 幹過頭 [overdo] (*Mistress Overdone*), which are apparently not usual names of the Chinese, but they do successfully preserve the hilarious nuances of a play and their comical effects are particularly desirable when pronounced on the stage. Some hidden connotations of the bawdy names seem not to be recognized by all of the translators, such as the underlying meaning of *Doctor Caius*, *Pandarus* and even *Bottom*[22].

3.4.4 The Syphilitic Puns

Quite a number of syphilitic puns are also neutralized, if not excised, by the Chinese translators. A common Elizabethan term alluding to the effects of syphilis is "burn" (Colman, 1974: 186; Williams, 1997: 59-60). For instance, when Dromio plays on the syphilitic nature of prostitutes in *The Comedy of Errors*:

> ST:
> Dromio of Syracuse: It is written, they appear to men like angels of light;
> light is an effect of fire, and fire will burn; ergo, <u>light
> wenches will burn</u>. Come not near her. (*CE*, 4.3.53-55)

Light wenches refer to women of loose morals, or prostitutes, who will *burn* a man with venereal disease (Partridge, 2000: 74; Whitworth, 2002: 149; Crystal, 2002: 59). The colloquialism *burn*, which is widespread in Elizabethan England, implies syphilitic infection (Harris, 2004: 44). However, the burning mode of venereal transmission is simply disappeared in the translations of Zhu and Liang:

TT:
Zhu Shenghao
大特: 她是個母夜叉，扮做婊子迷人。不要走近她的身邊，<u>她身上有火</u>。
[Dromio of Syracuse: She is a hag, pretending to be a whore to infatuate people. Don't go near her, there is fire on her body.]

Liang Shiqiu
西德: 據書上記載，她們是以光明天使的姿態在男人面前出現: 光是火的產物，火是能傷人的; 所以，<u>蕩婦能傷人</u>。不要挨近她們。
[Dromio of Syracuse: According to the records in books, they appear to men as bright angels: light is the product of fire, fire can hurt people; so, dissolute women will also hurt people. Don't stay close to them.]

Fang Ping borrowed a disease name *liuhuo* 流火 [erysipelas at the shank]

(Xia Z.N., 1999: 2545) from the traditional Chinese medicine to suggest syphilitic

infection:

Fang Ping
小德洛米奧: 可是在男人眼裏，她們卻成了閃閃發光的天使——這是寫在書上的。亮光就是火光，引火就要燒身，這麼說，<u>招惹了叫人眼亮的婊子可要得流火</u>啊。千萬離她遠一點。
[Dromio of Syracuse: But in the eyes of men, they became shining angels—this is written in books. Bright light is firelight, lighting a fire will burn one's body. This said, anyone who troubles the eye-catching whores would contract erysipelas at the shank. Be sure to stay away from them.]

The same terminology is adopted again by Fang in another reference to

syphilis in *King Lear*: "No heretics burned but wenches' suitors" (*LR*, 3.2.84). In

both cases, he included a footnote to clarify that "erysipelas at the shank, in this

context, refers to the venereal disease".

4. The Treatment of Shakespeare's Non-Sexual Bawdy by Translators

4.1 Scatological Bawdy

As compared with the sexual bawdy, the translators effect fewer changes when they come across scatological instances in Shakespeare's plays. A few direct references to urine and urination, including Non-Puns 5 *stale of horses* in *A&C*, 1.4.63; 28 *make water/urine* in *MM*, 3.2.107 and 35 *knog your urinals* in *MW*, 3.1.13 are basically retained by all translators. Take an example:

ST:
Evans: I will knog his <u>urinals</u>
about his knave's costard… (*MW*, 3.1.13-14)

TT:
Zhu Shenghao
修: 我恨不得把他的<u>便壺</u>摔在他那狗頭上。
[Evans: How I wish I could throw the chamber pot on his dog head.]

Liang Shiqiu
哀: 我有機會的時候我要拿他的<u>尿壺</u>砸他的混帳的腦袋。
[Evans: If given the chance, I will take his chamber pot and crush it on his ridiculous head.]

Fang Ping
牧師: 我恨不得舉起他的<u>便壺</u>朝準他這個奴才的葫蘆頭上摔。
[Evans: How I wish I could raise up his chamber pot and throw it accurately on his gourd head.]

The translators do not seem to be so squeamish when they come across words denoting bodily secretions. But their performance is rather different if a wordplay is involved in the scatological reference. In *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, for instance, the French physician Dr. Caius' pronounes *third* as *turd* (Kökeritz, 1953: 150):

ST:
Doctor Caius: If there be one or two, I shall make-a the <u>turd</u>. (*MW*, 3.3.215)

Turd (Pun 77) literally means "a piece of excrement" (Partridge, 2000: 207). The word used to be Standard English, but since the eighteenth century, it is considered to be "improper" and has been "avoided in the polite society" (McDonald, 1996: 150). Both Zhu and Liang majored on the innocent sense *third* of the scatological pun, thus concealing and correcting the mistake Dr. Caius made; while Fang created a scatological pun on *fen* 份 [member], which can also be pronounced as *fen* 糞 [dung]:

> TT:
> Zhu Shenghao
> 凱: 要是只有一個兩個人去，我就是<u>第三個</u>。
> [Dr. Caius: If only one or two people go, I'm the third one.]
>
> Liang Shiqiu
> 凱: 有一個人去，我就算是<u>第三個</u>。
> [Dr. Caius: If one person goes, I'm the third one.]
>
> Fang Ping
> 大夫: 要是有了一份子、二份子，我來做個<u>三份子</u>。
> [Dr. Caius: If there is member one, member two, I'll be member three.]

Apart from urination and defecation, "flatulence"[23] is also "the source and the target of humour and wit among all classes" in Shakespeare's days (Partridge, 2000: 10). Frankie Rubinstein pointed out that Shakespeare himself does not actually use the word "fart", but "he puns on the flatus and on the anus as a 'wind-instrument'" (Rubinstein, 1989: 96-97). In *The Comedy of Errors*, punning jokes on *wind breaking* (Puns 31 and 32) can be found in the conversation between the Dromios who are standing on either side of the door:

> ST:
> Dromio of Syracuse: Break any breaking here, and I'll break your knave's pate.
> Dromio of Ephesus: A man may break a word with you, sir, and words are but wind,

Ay, and break it in your face, so he <u>break it not behind</u>.
Dromio of Syracuse: It seems <u>thou want'st breaking</u>. Out upon thee, hind!
Dromio of Ephesus: Here's too much 'Out upon thee!' I pray thee, let me in. (*CE*, 3.1.75-78)

There is a wordplay on *wind*: "words on the one hand, flatulence on the other" (Partridge, 2000: 10; McDonald, 1996: 161-162). *To break wind* therefore does not only mean to "break a word", but also "to relieve flatulence the anus way" (Partridge, 2000: 70). The translations of Zhu Shenghao and Liang Shiqiu are presented in below:

TT:
Zhu Shenghao
大特：你要是打壞了什麼東西，我就打碎你這混蛋的頭。
……
小特：好了好了，請你讓我進來吧。
[Dromio of Syracuse: If you break anything, I will break you scoundrel's head.
Dromio of Ephesus: Well, well, please let me in.]

Liang Shiqiu
西德：若想打進來，我要打破你的腦殼。
哀德：說句話總不要緊，話只是耳邊風：
而且不是<u>在背後嘀咕</u>，是當面講明。
西德：<u>你大概是想挨揍</u>：滾，你這混蟲!
哀德：你說了太多的"滾"，請你把我放進。
[Dromio of Syracuse: If you want to break in, I will break your skull.
Dromio of Ephesus: It's unimportant to say a word, words are only rumours to be disregarded: not murmuring behind, but stating clearly and personally.
Dromio of Syracuse: It seems that you want to be beaten: scram, you nitwit!
Dromio of Ephesus: You mentioned too many 'scrams', please let me in.]

Zhu obviously cleaned up the scatological jokes for his prospective readers, as the entire joke on *wind breaking* is simplified into one sentence: "if you break anything, I will break your scoundrel's head", while the other parts are missing. Liang Shiqiu also seems to be unaware of the hidden vulgarity: he renders *break it not behind* (break a word vs. farting) of the original version with the purely innocent

sense "not murmuring behind"; whereas *it seems thou want'st breaking* ("want to be beaten" vs. "want to fart") is rendered as "it seems you want to be beaten". In both cases, the indelicate layer of meaning is cast aside by Liang, but in Fang Ping's version, the scatological humour of the Dromios' talk is revealed:

> Fang Ping
> 小德洛米奧：你打破了門，我打破你奴才的頭!
> 大德洛米奧：他盡是說空話，少爺，空話像空氣，
> 他當面說大話，無異後面在放屁。
> 小德洛米奧：我可要打得你屁滾尿流？給我滾!
> 大德洛米奧：老是"給我滾"! 求求你，放我進去吧。
> [Dromio of Syracuse: If you break the door, I'll break your slave's head.
> Dromio of Ephesus: All he said are empty talks, young master, empty talks
> are like empty air, he tells a barefaced lie, the same as farting behind.
> Dromio of Syracuse: I may beat the shit out of you, scram!
> Dromio of Ephesus: Always "scram"! Please, let me in.]

In Chinese, *fangpi* 放屁 [fart] is generally applied in two ways: it indicates either "passing gas" or "someone's nonsensical talking", quite similar to the phrase *hushuobadao* 胡說八道 [talk nonsense or rubbish] (Wang J., 1994: 53-54). Fang Ping tactfully plays around the two possible interpretations of *fangpi*. So, in his translation, a double message is conveyed when the Dromio of Ephesus said: "he tells a barefaced lie, the same as farting behind". In dealing with the second equivocation *thou want'st breaking*, Fang adopted another Chinese colloquialism, *da de ni pigunniaoliu* [beat the shit and piss out of you], where *pigunniaoliu* usually describes somebody who is "frightened to death" (Lin Y.T., 1972). Strictly speaking, the original pun is lost, but Fang obviously succeeds in preserving the coarse effects that the source-text pun seeks to achieve. Further such scatological wordplay, also related to *wind* (flatulence), is uttered by the Clown in *Othello*. In the opening scene of act three, the Clown plays on the "anal" *wind instrument* (Pun 85), adding *thereby hangs a tail* (here *tail* and its homonym *tale* both applied to the "male

genitals") (Williams, 1997: 300; Macrone, 1997: 203):

ST:
Clown: Are these, I pray you, <u>wind instruments</u>?
A Musician: Ay, marry, are they, sir.
Clown: O, thereby hangs a tail.
A Musician: Whereby hangs a tale, sir?
Clown: Marry, sir, by many a <u>wind instrument</u> that I
know. (*OTH*, 3.1.6-11)

Zhu Shenghao attempts to erase a significant part of the bawdy exchange:

the *tail/tale* wordplay is erased and the scatological overtone of *wind instrument* is

not put foward either. The comic dialogue becomes rather monotonous:

TT:
Zhu Shenghao
丑：請問這些都是<u>管樂器</u>嗎?
樂工甲：正是，大哥。
丑：啊！原來如此……
[Clown: May I ask, are these wind instruments?
First Musician: Exactly, my big brother.
Clown: O! I see…]

In Liang Shiqiu's version, the sexual remarks are also suppressed, but it

seems that he tries to offer his potential readers a scatological suggestion in *fang*

shui 放水 [to let out water or to urinate], though not necessarily the same as the

original wordplay, to substitute for the *wind instrument*:

TT:
Liang Shiqiu
丑：我請問你，這些是不是<u>吹奏的樂器</u>？
樂師甲：是的，先生。
丑：哦是了，怪不得旁邊生尾巴。
樂師甲：你說在什麼旁邊,先生？
丑：就是在<u>放水的那東西</u>的旁邊呀。
[Clown: May I ask you, are these wind instruments?
First Musician: Yes, sir.
Clown: O yes, no wonder that a tail is grown at the side.
First Musician: You said at the side of what, sir?
Clown: Right at the side of the thing that let out water.]

Bawdy quibbling on the word "fart" itself also occurs in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, as "an error for 'virtuous'" (Craik, 1998: 130; Crystal, 2002: 169), when Mistress Quickly claimed that Mistress Page is *"as fartuous a civil modest wife…as any is in Windsor"* (*MW*, 2.2.92-94). Here, I set out the three target versions of the bawdy line:

TT:
Zhu Shenghao
她是位賢慧端莊的好娘子。
[She is a virtuous and dignified wife.]

Liang Shiqiu
她是頂溫柔有禮的一位太太。
[She is the most gentle and courteous wife.]

Fang Ping
她可真算得是個又文靜又賢慧，又「瘦胡桃」的娘兒。
注: 應說「守婦道」。
[She can really be regarded as a quiet, virtuous and "thin walnut" wife. *Note*: Should have said "conform to womanhood"]

The pun on *fartuous* was discarded in the translations of Zhu and Liang. Fang's approach is to present the innocent sense "virtuous", at the same time creating a new malapropism *shou hutao* 瘦胡桃 [thin walnut] with a pronounciation resembling that of *shou fudao* 守婦道 [conform to womanhood], though the bawdiness of the double reference in the original becomes invisible in Fang's version. Another example of loss appears in the rendering of *sirreverence*, which is "a catch phrase uttered when one comes upon a lump of excrement" (Partridge, 2000: 183) or "an exclamation traditionally used when a turd is encountered in a public place" (McDonald, 1996: 133). It is a corruption of the phrase *save your reverence*, "used apologetically before any unseemly expression or incident" (Partridge, 2000: 184), much similar to modern expressions like "excuse

me" or "sorry". The word appears twice in the chosen plays, one in *The Comedy of Errors*, when Dromio portrayed a distasteful woman as "such a one as a man may not speak of without he say 'sir-reverence'" (*CE*, 3.2.90-91). Its use as a euphemism for human excrement is even more explicit in act one of *Romeo and Juliet*, as Mercutio applies this expression figuratively and coarsely to degrade love (Levenson, 2000: 182): "If thou art dun, we'll draw thee from the mire of—save your reverence—love, wherein thou stickest up to the ears" (*R&J*, 1.4.41-43). Zhu Shenghao, Liang Shiqiu and Cao Yu all chose to display merely the apologetic sense, rendering with Chinese equivalents such as *shu wo shuo zheyang de hua* 恕我說這樣的話 [excuse me for saying so], *qing yuanliang wo zheyang shuo* 請原諒我這樣說 [please forgive me for saying so] and *duibuqi* 對不起 [sorry] respectively; while in the other translated texts (of Fang P., Cao W.F. and Sun D.Y.), this scatological pun simply disappeared without a trace.

4.2 Other Types of Offensive Oaths

4.2.1 Religious Cursings

Shakespeare was censored during his own period, but the target of censorship, for some of the time, is neither the sexual nor the scatological. The list of profanities prohibited in the Act to Restrain Abuses of Players (1606) also focused on offensive oaths that are religious in nature and intimately related to Christianity: they are the terms which offend the holy name of God. According to Marlene Carpenter's definition of "religious cursing" in his book *The Link Between Language and Consciousness*: "whenever anyone takes a word out of a religious context, and uses that word with a negative tone to express a negative attitude, it is a sign of irreverence" (Carpenter, 1991: 26). This kind of swearing occurred

regularly in Shakespeare's plays and was one of the targets of censorship. Macrone's study indicates that: most phrases censored in the *First Folio*, the official collection of Shakespeare's works published in 1623, were profanities. The list of words include: *'Zounds, 'Sblood, 'Slid, 'Slight, 'Swounds, By the mass, By the Lord, By God's lid, O Jesu, God's body* and so on (Macrone, 1997: 89-92; Crystal, 2002: 435-439). These negative uses of religious themes were considered far more offensive than the lewd lexicon at the time.

Undoubtedly, Christianity dominated the Western world for almost two thousand years and had uniquely determined the path of Western development. Being influenced by its religious background, many English swearwords are inextricably linked to God's and his attributes (Crystal, 2002: 435-439). However, Christianity did not enter China on a large scale until the late nineteenth century. The Chinese people who are unacquainted with the minutiae of Christian doctrine would hardly swear with religious notions. Instead, Chinese vulgarity commonly concerns subjects associated with our daily lives, such as "devils" (*duanminggui* 短命鬼 [short lived devil], *taozhaigui* 討債鬼 [devil asking for repayment], *jian gui* 見鬼 [to see the devil]); "dogs" (*xia le gouyan* 瞎了狗眼 [blind in your dog's eyes], *goupi* 狗屁 [dog's fart]) or "mother" (*tama de* 他媽的 [damn his mother], *gouniang yang de* 狗娘養的 [raised by a bitch]) (Bao H.N., 2001: 170). The cultural barriers involved in the transposition of religious cursings in the Elizabethan texts are evident. In order to acculturate Shakespearean plays, most of these cursings are usually replaced by street language of a Chinese style, if not being totally cast aside. One of the typical examples is the cursing *'sblood*, the shortening of "God's blood" (Honigmann, 2002: 115; Macrone, 1997: 87-88), which appeared once at the beginning of *Othello* and twice in *Hamlet*. Let us take one of the examples and

compared the three translations of Zhu, Liang and Fang:

ST:
Hamlet: <u>'Sblood</u>, do you think that I am easier
to be played on than a pipe? (*HAM*, 3.2.368-369)

TT:
Zhu Shenghao
哈: <u>哼</u>! 你以為玩弄我比玩弄一支笛子容易嗎?
[Hamlet: Tut! You think playing with me is easier than playing with a flute?]

Liang Shiqiu
漢姆萊特: <u>哼</u>，你以為我比簫容易玩弄嗎?
[Hamlet: Tut! You thought I am easier to toy with than a piccolo?]

Fang Ping
哈姆雷特: <u>見鬼去吧</u>，你以為玩我比玩弄一支笛子容易嗎?
[Hamlet: Go to see a ghost, you think playing with me is easier than playing with a flute?]

Fang Ping adopted the Chinese vulgarity *jian gui qu* 見鬼去 [go to see a ghost] so as to convey the profanity of the original text, while Zhu Shenghao and Liang Shiqiu rendered *'sblood* as *heng* 哼 [tut], which is an auxiliary indicating mood and emotion. In this case, the Chinese character expresses exasperation or displeasure.

A second example is the profanity *'zounds*, meaning "God's wounds" (Crystal, 2002: 435, 509). Seven occurrences can be detected in the chosen texts, twice in *Romeo and Juliet* and five times in *Othello*. It is observed that the Chinese translators tend to adopt a different expression every time when they encounter the same cursing, depending on the nature of context. *'Zounds* was occasionally rendered into the swearing *tama de* 他媽的 [his mother's] or *pei* 呸 [pfui], mostly when the characters were stirred up in heated scenes:

ST:
Mercutio: <u>Zounds</u>, "consort"! (*R&J*, 3.1.48)

TT:
Zhu Shenghao
邁: <u>他媽的</u>! 到處拉唱!
[Mercutio: His mother's! Singing everywhere!]

Liang Shiqiu
墨: <u>混賬</u>! 沿街賣唱!
[Mercutio: Damn it! You rascal! To sing as minstrel along the street!]

Fang Ping
牟克休: <u>呸</u>，一搭一擋!
[Mercutio: Pfui, performing and blocking off!]

In less emotional cases, auxiliary word which indicates mood was often used to substitute *'zounds*:

ST:
<u>Zounds</u>, sir, you are one of those that will not serve God, if the devil bid you. (*OTH*, 1.1.106)

TT:
Zhu Shenghao
埃: <u>嘿</u>! 先生，您也是那種因為魔鬼叫他敬奉上帝，而把上帝丟在一旁的人。[Aha! Sir, you are also the kind of person who cast God aside because the devil asked him to obey God.]

Liang Shiqiu
依: <u>瞎</u>! 先生，你這樣的人，本來要做好事，可是惡魔吩咐你要做好事，你就不肯做了。[Aha! Sir, a person like you, want to do a good turn, but when the devil asked you to do good, you refuse.]

Fang Ping
伊阿哥: <u>哎唷</u>，太爺，你就是那種不明是非的人，只因為魔鬼叫你尊敬上帝，就連上帝也不要了。[Yow! Old master, you are the kind of person who cannot distinguish between right and wrong.]

The blasphemy *'zounds* in *OTH*, 2.3.141 was sometimes removed in all of the Chinese translations, most probably because it was already censored in the *Folio* text (Honigmann, 2002: 191), and thus the cursing disappeared in the original versions followed by Zhu and Liang. The same situation might have happened to

the treatment of *'zounds* in *OTH*, 3.4.99, where the profanity was substituted by *away!* in the English editions followed by Zhu and Liang (Honigmann, 2002: 247).

4.2.2 Ethnic Slurs

Finally, let me illustrate two examples of the "ethnic slurs" and how they were presented in their Chinese translations respectively. As Michael Macrone suggested: "a host of other nations and ethnic groups are regular butts of Shakespearean slurs and jibes" (Macrone, 1997: 107), especially the Turks, who are "treated with particular vitriol, partly because they were Muslims, and partly because of their long history of aggression against the Christian West". Take, for instance, the references to the Turks in *Othello*. In the example shown below, Iago protested that he is telling the truth *or else I am a Turk*:

> ST:
> Iago: Nay, it is true, <u>or else I am a Turk</u>:
> You rise to play and go to bed to work. (*OTH*, 2.1.114)
>
> TT:
> Zhu Shenghao
> 埃: 不，我說的話兒千真萬確……，你們起來遊戲，上床工作。
> [Iago: No, what I said is absolutely true, you get up to play and go to bed to work.]
>
> Liang Shiqiu
> 依: 不，是真的，<u>否則你可以罵我是異端</u>：你是下床就玩耍，上床就把活兒幹。
> [Iago: No, it is true, or else you can scold me as a heretic: you get off the bed to play, get on the bed to work.]
>
> Fang Ping
> 伊阿哥: 不，是實話；要不，<u>算我是土耳其人</u>；
> 你們起身就玩，上床才幹活。
> [Iago: No, it is true; If not, I am Turkish;
> You get up to play, and go to bed to work.]

The phrase *or else I am a Turk* exposes Shakespeare's discrimination towards the Turkish. The quoted phrase which expresses ethnic insensitivity was erased in

the translation of Zhu, whereas in Liang's version, he only mentioned the *yiduan* 異端 [heresy] but concealed the "race" of the heretics. Again, a comparison between the source and target texts for another ethnic slur in *Othello* also reveals that Fang is the only translator who faithfully reflected the ethnic vituperation of the original text:

> ST:
> Othello: Why, how now, ho! From whence ariseth this?
> Are we turn'd Turks and to ourselves do that
> Which heaven hath forbid the Ottomites? (*OTH*, 2.3.52)
>
> TT:
> Zhu Shenghao
> 奧：怎麼，怎麼！為什麼鬧起來的？難道我們都變成野蠻人了嗎？
> [Othello: What, what! Why did the quarrel start? Have we all turned to savages?]
>
> Liang Shiqiu
> 奧：這是什麼回事，哦？這是怎麼鬧起來的？莫非我們都變成異教徒了，以至於天上不准回教徒做的事我們反拿來對自己做？
> [Othello: Oh! What is all this? Why did the quarrel start? Have we all turned to heretics, and do what the heaven forbids the muslims to do?]
>
> Fang Ping
> 奧瑟羅：嘿，怎麼一回事？怎麼鬧起來的？大家變了蠻子了嗎？上天不許土耳其人來侵犯我們，我們卻幫著蠻子來向自己行兇!
> [Othello: Aha, what is all this? Why did the quarrel start? Have we all turned to savager? The sky above does not permit the Turkish to invade us, but we are helping the savage to rob ourselves?]

Zhu is extremely cautious in handling the ethnic slur and only rendered the overall gist of the thought, *yemanren* 野蠻人 [the savage]. Likewise, Liang generalized the *turk* and *ottomites* as *yijiaotu* 異教徒 [infidel] and *huijiaotu* 回教徒 [muslim].

5. Bawdy, Translation and Norms

The next hurdle to tackle after discussing the distribution of strategies was: why were certain translations turned out in certain ways? Why did some translators tend to be in favour of a particular mode of translation, or why did they foreclose certain options when coping with the same and/or similar problems (Hermans, 1999b: 51)? Apart from a pure description of the translators' options, I will look into the corpus and seek to explain the occurrence of certain translation tendencies. From the preliminary findings of the contrastive study of bawdy innuendoes in Shakespeare's texts and their translated versions, I will then move on to uncover the underlying reasons for such changes that have been made to the original text. The present chapter will first discuss some strictly linguistic constraints of pun renderings and the fluctuating interpretation problems which have been experienced by the translators, followed by a brief overview of the concept of "norms" and an analysis of the variety of norms that govern the translation of Shakespeare's suggestive language.

5.1 The Fluctuating Interpretation of Bawdy Overtones

As shown in the present corpus, the frequency of "Bawdy Pun➔Bawdy Pun" (strategy A1 or A2) translations is rather low. Quantitatively, the number of bawdy puns is significantly smaller in the translated texts than in their source texts. A simple count indicates that around half of the bawdy puns in the selected plays and sonnets have *never* been rendered into puns of a bawdy nature by any of the Chinese translators. Consider the following examples in *Appendix 1*: Puns 1, 2, 35, 36, 64 and 76. In other words, the translators have landed on a strategy other than "Bawdy Pun➔Bawdy Pun" in roughly half of the encounters. Among this

particular group of bawdy puns in the sample, almost half of them have been subject to a "Bawdy Pun→Zero" (strategy D) or "Bawdy Pun→Innocent Non-Pun" (strategy B2) technique by *all* of the translators, such as Puns 14, 15, 16, 33, 34 and 51. Taking into account that the bawdy meanings of the above listed puns are mentioned by *none* of the translators and do not exist even in the newly published translations, one may reasonably assume that this tendency is at least partially due to the fact that the "bawdiness" involved in the puns had not been successfully perceived or even realized by the targeted group of Chinese translators. Of course, if the bawdy puns in the source text are not recognized, then they should not have been rendered.

This potential constraint leads one to the fundamental question concerning the fluctuating interpretation of Shakespeare's bawdy implications, which has been briefly brought up in the second chapter. Identification of bawdy innuendoes is most often a complicated business, as "bawdy is often in the ear of the beholder" (Delabastita, 2002: 311). Whilst some of the Western commentators were fairly enthusiastic in glossing the potential bawdiness, many others simply failed to grasp such erotic humour, or some may even choose to dismiss them right away, concluding that the suggestive innuendoes actually proceeded from the lewd thoughts of the interpreters themselves rather than from Shakespeare. For instance, Stanley Wells, in his study *Looking for Sex in Shakespeare*, published in 2004, raised the basic question about "who is making the pun—the author or the interpreter?" (Wells, 2004: 27) and contended that "the lewdness of interpretations in certain recent discussions of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* derives not from the text or from meanings that it might have held for Shakespeare's contemporaries but purely from the minds of the interpreters" (Wells, 2004: 30-31). In the past, the comedy was thought to be one of the most innocent plays of Shakespeare (Partridge

considered it as a "safe" play[24]). Theatrical interpretation is indeed changing, but it is an extremely problematic task to make a clear distinction or draw up boundaries between "authentic" readings most probably intended by the Bard and "inauthentic" innuendoes which are likely to have originated from the receivers' imaginations, thus, in Delabastita's words, "showing the hopeless difficulty of the hermeneutic balancing act between under-reading and over-reading" (Delabastita, 2002: 311).

When this area of contention regarding the understanding of sexual and scatological overtones extends to the practice of wordplay translation, it is most often a domain so obviously neglected or overlooked in the theoretical discussion. Leppihalme, in his essay "Caught in the Frame: A Target-Culture Viewpoint on Allusive Wordplay", argued that the identification of source-text puns and their corresponding functions in the relevant context is a crucial point that we need to take into consideration, and he concluded that:

> Part of the practical problem of translating allusive wordplay is an inability to identify the point as worth special attention in the first place. In the translation process, this precedes (both logically and chronologically) the difficulty of choosing a suitable method or strategy for the problematic point. Needless to say, if the translator misses the joke, he or she is hardly likely to try to find a creative translation for it (Leppihalme, 1997: 207-208).

This inability to spot instances of bawdy puns in the preparatory stage of translation, as suggested above, did happen to the Shakespearean translators, provided that they are also readers who experience the original individually. Malcolm Offord in his article "Mapping Shakespeare's Puns in French Translations" examined in depth Francois-Victor Hugo's translations of puns in *Love Labour's Lost* on the basis of the catalogue (of 224 puns) compiled by Herbert Ellis (1973). Offord did not neglect the interpretation problem involved in his

study, as he repeated from time to time that "many of the puns identified by Ellis were not common knowledge at the time Hugo produced his translation and that some of them are not certain, by Ellis' own admission" (Offord, 1997: 251, 254). The Chinese Shakespeare translator Cao Yu also admitted that he came across many obstacles in comprehending the source text during the process of translation:

> In fact, there are quite a number of deep connotations in Shakespeare's plays which I am unable to translate, or to take it further, that I am unable to decipher. This dramatic text, can only be said to have rendered part of the implications and subtexts in Shakespeare's play (*Romeo and Juliet*)… (Cao Y., 1979: 1).

Most often, the difficulty in understanding is due to the lack of an adequately annotated edition. Since most of the Chinese translators largely relied on the extensive annotations of the Western Shakespearean scholarship, the interpretation of bawdy wordplay is intimately related to the identity and instability of the editorial traditions of the source texts. Delabastita suggested that most Shakespearean translators "prefer to start from the current critical editions of Shakespeare's texts rather than the original quartos and folios", which means that "many translations somewhat belatedly reflect the trends in English text editing" (Delabastita, 1999: 20). If the annotations of a particular Shakespeare series are more detailed, the translators who work according to that collection would be more aware of certain subtleties of Shakespeare's verbal textures: such as wordplay, imagery, malapropism and the like (one may also add "bawdy" to the list).

In this case, the factor of interpretation is not confined to the category of bawdy puns which have never been rendered or revealed, but also possibly to some other puns and individual translators. More recent editions have obviously been contributing to a new conception of Shakespeare's words and the translators'

growing awareness of bawdy instances in the source text. The fact that different translators depended on various critical editions in turn leads to the heterogeneity of theatrical interpretations. The gradual changing editorial and critical traditions are guiding the Chinese translators in their understanding of Shakespeare's language. That is to say, when one translator revealed the bawdy meaning of a pun, while the other did not, the hidden reason behind might not be the case that the translation behaviour of the former is "avant-garde" and the latter "dated" (Toury, 1999a: 28). Not as one might suppose, this kind of differentiation occasionally happens only because the critical edition that was followed by the former translator contained the exposition of the bawdy layer of meaning.

One of the typical examples that springs to mind is Pun 4 (Fang P., Liang S.Q.) in *Appendix* 1, an instance tainted with sex in Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra*: "I would I had thy inches". Fang Ping consulted David Bevington's *Complete Works of Shakespeare* which was recently published in the 1990s and translated Cleopatra's words as *danyuan wo ye xiang ni, duo zhangchu name ji cun* 但願我也像你,多長出那麼幾寸 [I do wish I could grow a few inches more like you]. He then explicated in note form that "inches" in this context refers to both the "height" and the "length of penis". However, the edition(s) which form the basis of or referred to by Liang Shiqiu—basically W.J. Craig's *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*[25] edited in the 1930s and other annotated versions such as the *Arden Shakespeare* and *New Cambridge Shakespeare* edited in the 1950s and 1960s—have not highlighted any bawdy implications of the word "inches". Liang Shiqiu's text only rendered the innocent layer of that meaning: *duanyuan wo you ni nayang de gaoda de tige* 但願我有你那樣的高大的體格 [I do wish I could be as tall as you], and his translation behaviour in this instance can most probably be linked with the editions

used by him which affect his interpretation of the sexual line. Hence, the inconsistency of Western critical traditions is a type of constraint that is worth special attention when researching on the rendering of Shakespeare's bawdy puns.

5.2 Linguistic Constraints and the Change of Vocabulary

Apart from the constraints during the stage of perception, there are some other cases, where the ST bawdy pun is perceived but cannot be transferred. This brings us to the second issue concerning the "translatability" of bawdy wordplay. As noted in chapter two, some translation scholars considered wordplay as simply "untranslatable" because the source and target languages are structurally different. Seldom can we find a Chinese character whose denotative and connotative meanings are exactly the same as those of its English equivalent. J.C. Catford, in *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*, recognized this as "linguistic untranslatability" (Catford, 1965: 93-103), which occurs when there is no formally corresponding feature in the target language to substitute for the source- language item. This category of untranslatibility "occurs typically in cases where an *ambiguity* peculiar to the SL text is a functionally relevant feature, that is, in SL puns" (Catford, 1965: 94).

These linguistic constraints, for instance, can be observed in such cases where the bawdy pun is *never* revealed in its ambiguous form, but can be presented in bawdy non-puns or editorial notes. The following bawdy puns in *Appendix* 1 belong to this category: eg. Puns 11, 23, 25, 30, 35, 36, 39, 41, 57 and 59. Suggestive wordplays such as the word *lie* (Puns 11) can be read as "to tell lies" and "to lie down and to recline in sexual intercourse" (Partridge, 2000: 136; also see Williams, 1997: 187; McDonald, 1996: 86). The punning of these two senses of *lie* in the target language would be very hard to achieve and the hidden sexual sense is

mostly sacrificed[26]. Shakespeare's favourite punning on *cock* (Pun 39: refers to a "corruption of God" but also a "penis"), *overdone* (Pun 60: a "surname" which also means "sexually debilitated") and *fishmonger* (Pun 36: both a "fish seller" and a "bawd") all posed a formidable challenge to the Shakespeare translators.

In fact, the rendering of the play on words has for a long time been considered as an "ultimate nightmare" (Lombardo, 1993: 139), as it is such a monstrous task to find an exact correspondence in the target text. In one of his letters, Tian Han clearly indicated that the transposition of Shakespearean wordplay is a sound barrier for all translators to break down:

> The play of words is a critical situation for all Shakespearean translators, as you are likely to encounter it no matter which play you are dealing with. For example, the first scene of *Romeo and Juliet* started with a play on the words *coals*, *colliers*, *choler* and *collar* (Tian H., 2000: 511).

Tian Han and the other Chinese translators therefore encountered constraints resulting from incompatibilities or lack of parallelism between the Chinese and English language systems. Shakespeare's enthusiasm for inventing word games, neologisms and hanging around with suggestive puns makes this sort of technical problems simply unavoidable in the process of rendering his works. To explain the bawdy implications, it seems that the insertion of annotations is, in particular cases, the only method to tackle the translation problem, as Fang Ping stated:

> When Hamlet called Ophelia's father the "fishmonger", how can the picture of a "pimp" appear in the minds of Chinese readers? When Hamlet asked Ophelia to go to a "nunnery", how can the Chinese readers realize that "brothel" is actually the hidden meaning of "nunnery"? It seems that all these gaps can only be filled with the aid of notes (Fang P., 1998: 218).

Beneath Liang's "faithful" version of Shakespeare, it seems that he was fond of "annotating" the licentious passages rather than "translating" them.

Liang's translation approach may also be linked with the linguistic constraints confronted by him, though he once noted a high possibility in generating puns in Chinese: "there are only 420 syllables in putonghua, but at least 4000 characters exist, which indicates that many homonyms can be exploited to produce puns and witty repartee" (Liang, S.C., 2004: 57). But he also admitted that "in translation puns present great difficulties and they are almost untranslatable" (Liang, S.C., 1981: 352). To simply set them aside would be unfaithful to the source text, so a last resort is to clarify them with a footnote. Even for Bian Zhilin, who claimed in his translator's preface that he would "strive hard to achieve the humour and vitality of source-text puns and assonances" (Bian Z.L., 1999: 7), in the following examples only acknowledged the bawdy wordplay in a footnote: Puns 35, 36, 81, 82 in *Appendix* 1.

Elaborating puns by means of footnotes is actually a common practice used by translators of plays when they discover, to the best of their ability, that a pun is so-called "untranslatable". However, since the stage has footlights but not footnotes (Lombardo, 1993: 139), annotations for puns (or any other untransferable words, metaphors, allusions and historical events) can be meaningful to the researchers, actors or directors, but not to the target audiences who are watching a drama. Unlike the readers who can reread a word several times if necessary, a theatre audience has no second chance and must immediately perceive the meaning of the play. A translator like Cao Yu intended to translate the dramatist's work for the stage instead of the page. His aim to perform Shakespeare's text is mirrored on the preface to his translation:

> Reading Shakespeare is one thing, but performing Shakespeare, making it understandable to the audience (especially the Chinese audience) is another thing. My intention is to perform, so I strive for smoothness whilst reading (Cao Y., 1979: 1).

Being a leading dramatist and playwright in China, Cao was specially invited by his close friend Zhang Junxiang and was commissioned to translate *Romeo and Juliet* for *Shenying Jutuan* [The Divine Eagle Company] in 1944 (Cao S.J. & Sun F.L., 1989: 106). The Chinese rendering was finished speedily in a little more than month's time. Guided by an intention to provide a translation for the stage, Cao Yu has creatively invented stage instructions to clarify bawdy ambiguities of the original text, instead of relying on heavy annotations, take Pun 113 as an example. As noted by Fang Ping, "Cao Yu is most probably the first person who consciously combines the Shakespearean drama with stage performance: an approach which is in line with the trend of Shakespearean criticism" (Fang P., 2000a: 493), while Cao Weifeng also claims that "the translation of Cao Yu can perfectly be performed on stage without making many amendments" (Cao S.J. & Sun F.L., 1989: 108), which is why his translation of *Romeo and Juliet* is also being regarded as different from the others.

Apart from the translatability of word games, another factor that has most likely influenced the translation strategies is that the denotation and connotation of Shakespearean vocabulary are subject to change along the passage of time. Over the centuries, Shakespeare's "Early Modern English" has acquired an archaic flavour it did not savour of originally. To illustrate this linguistic difficulty, Liang Shiqiu had once cited some examples of words which will easily be confused by the translators because their Elizabethan and modern senses are different, such as *speak* which sometimes mean "to fight or exchange blows", *clown* occasionally points to a "bumpkin" but not a "buffoon", and *paint* often refers to "rouge" instead of a "drawing" (Liang S.Q., 1981: 352-353). The same situation happens to the sex-related vocabulary. As mentioned in section 2.4, four-letter words such as

fuck, shit, piss, fart commonly used nowadays were scarcely spotted in Shakespeare's language, whereas there are also expressions which were considered to be "dirty" in the Bard's period but are now obsolete or clean. McCall had made a list of the vocabulary in his study *William Shakespeare: Spacious in the Possession of Dirt*:

> hobby-horse, hold-door trade, medlar, stale, minions, callets, occupy, stewed prunes, luxury, pox, conversation, liver, die (very frequently can be interpreted to mean intercourse) (McCall, 1977: xi).

Let me take two of the listed words for further illustration. Firstly, *die* (Pun 2, 127), in Shakespeare's day, does not only mean "a loss of life". There was a "close, delicately-plotted concordance between orgasm and death" (Steiner, 1965: 15) and according to Elizabethan physiology, "each act of sexual intercourse shortened the lover's life by a minute or so" (Epstein, 1992: 119-120). In Elizabethan literary works, therefore, "die" can very frequently be understood as "to experience sexual climax" (Evans, 1997: 1398) or "to have orgasm" (Neill, 2000: 160). The second example *liver* (Non-Puns 4, 33) again presents a similar case. During the Renaissance period, "liver" was "part of the body thought to be at the seat of sexual passion" (Crystal 2002: 265; also see Williams, 1997: 191-192), but now the connotation is already lost even in the Western world. One of the most confusing instances from the present corpus, which is not included in McCall's list, is the phrase *making love* (Non-Pun 13). Its meaning in Shakespeare's time is much milder than today's usage. The contemporary sense of the phrase refers to "have sexual intercourse" (*SOD*, 2002), while its archaic sense only means "the use of endearing words" or "to talk fondly and sweetly of" (*OED*, 1933). According to McDonald's *The Wordsworth Dictionary of Obscenity and Taboo*: "Not so very long ago 'make love' meant 'to woo' or 'to pay court', but within the last twenty years it has gained favour as the genteel euphemism which it now is. This shift of meaning

often leaves the younger generation confused when they hear the term used in books, plays and films from before the 1960s" (McDonald, 1996: 88).

In view of the discrepancies between the Elizabethan and modern senses, a translator who renders Shakespeare's works should "turns his attention to 'the meaning' exploited by Shakespeare", borrowing Liang Shiqiu's words (Liang S.Q., 1981: 352). Carelessly applying the superficial meaning of modern English terms in rendering Shakespeare would simply lead to striking discrepancies in textual meaning between the source and target versions. As revealed by He Xianglin's essay "Appreciations, Doubts and Expectations: A Criticism on Zhu's Translations of Shakespeare's Plays", many of the mistakes made in Zhu Shenghao's works were due to the fact that the translator misunderstood the meaning of words in the original. The translator might be confused by the multiplicity of meanings in the polysemants, or in another case, due to the different senses of vocabulary between the archaic and modern, he can only perceive the modern sense of a vocabulary item, while neglecting the alternative meaning which actually existed during Shakespeare's time (He X.L., 1981: 88).

While it is true to say that some of the bawdy puns may not have been detected by the Shakespearean translators owing to the "camouflaged bawdiness", and some of the meanings can easily get lost through linguistic change, it is put forward that part of the "Bawdy Pun→Zero" (strategy D) or "Bawdy Pun(Non-Bawdy Non-Pun" (strategy B2) translations are not due to the objective restrictions stated above. This can mainly be supported by four arguments:

    i.   Some of Shakespeare's bawdy puns are in fact so obvious and explicit that even the least sensitive text receivers would have recognized them. Take, for example, puns 43, 44, 61 in the corpus. If the sexual or scatological layer of meaning is indeed perfectly

accessible to the translators, then why are some of these readings simply omitted or softened without any further acknowledgement? Even if the translators are confronted by linguistic constraints, they can choose to reveal one of the meanings (ie., strategy B2) or both meanings in the form of a non-pun (strategy B1). Why then did they choose to eliminate the bawdy puns in question?

ii. Next, when the two readings of the bawdy pun are fully available, why did many of the Chinese translators prefer to select the "innocent" sense consistently rather than the "bawdy" layer of meaning? Even if we exclude the bawdy puns where "fluctuating interpretation" is very likely to be the "culprit" constraining the translator, how can one explain the still high proportion of "Bawdy Pun(Innocent Bawdy Pun" renderings?

iii. As Delabastita pointed out that "there is apparently nothing in the nature of punning itself that could hamper the use of techniques such as "Zero(Pun" or "Non-Pun(Pun" (Delabastita, 1993: 231) or notes, why are these approaches rarely adopted by the translators to compensate for the original bawdy puns which cannot be transferred owing to the different linguistic constraints?

iv. If we refer back to another section of the corpus (Appendix 2), which is an examination of the original bawdy non-puns, it is clear that supposedly there was little or even no interpretation or linguistic problem involved in translation, but a number of these bawdy non-puns are still found to be softened or even omitted by the Chinese translators. Why?

These unsolved questions actually manifest the need to explore other kinds of constraints apart from the purely interpretative, linguistic and technical barriers that we have examined up to this particular point. The explanatory hypothesis I would like to put forward is that: the Shakespearean translators of bawdy puns were most likely to be influenced by the "norms pertaining to the acceptability of bawdiness" and the "norms which regulate translation practice in general" at the time.

Before we analyse the two sets of norms, their variable degrees of stringency and the interplay between norms, it is first necessary to take a preliminary glance at the concept of "norms", which has been frequently discussed in the field of Translation Studies during the past decades. My aim, in section 5.3, is to first deal with some aspects of the nature of norms, their various types, and their contributions to the understanding of translation as a whole. In sections 5.4 and 5.5, I will further apply the notion in finding reasons and explanations for the shifts that have appeared during the process of translation, and the "regular patterns of behaviour" that can be observed in the research findings.

5.3 Norms in Translation

On the basis of Even-Zohar's polysystem hypothesis, which drew concepts from the Russian formalism of the 1920s, Toury contributed a theory that analyses the nature and function of norms in translation and examines how these norms can possibly be studied. In his tripartite model describing translation behaviour, a norm was posited in the middle ground between two extremes. On one end there are "absolute rules" which imply sanctions if one fails to comply, while on the other end are "pure idiosyncrasies" which are individual ways to behave (Toury,

1995: 54). Norms, in turn, constitute "a graded continuum". Some of them are more rule-like, whereas some lean towards the idiosyncratic pole (Toury, 1999a: 16). This concept is regarded by Toury as being central to the event of translating, and that all subsequent choices or decisions made during the course of a translation process are considered to be "norm-governed". Norms, as Gideon Toury defines them, imply:

> The translation of general values or ideas shared by a community—as to what is right or wrong, adequate or inadequate—into performance instructions appropriate for and applicable to particular situations (Toury 1995: 55).

Rather than being innate, norms are inculcated upon an individual's mind. During the process of education or socialization, individual members of an established group, including translators, acquire and internalize these performance instructions, or norms, and make them our guidelines of action. That is to say, norms can simply be construed as the "internalized behavioural constraints which embody the values shared by a community" (Schäffner, 1999: 5), which appear to exert pressure on an individual. It may seem, to some scholars, that norms are often associated with some sort of prescriptive function; concerning what one "should" or "shouldn't" do; as if translators are only "rule-following robots" deprived of free choice since they are subject to the "pressure" of the norms (Chesterman, 1999: 91). This kind of deduction was rejected by Toury, who further explicated that although norms have the power to compel people to abide by them and that norm-breaking behaviour involves the risk of disapproval or sanctions, the translator still has the autonomy to make his own decisions. They can always choose not to follow prevailing norms, provided that they are willing to bear the consequences and pay the price for non-conformity. It is this

norm-breaking process that in turn leads the path towards renegotiations of existing norms and as a result the emergence of new norms.

The crucial importance of the concept of "norm" in Translation Studies can mainly be summarized from two perspectives: First of all, since traditional theories of translation tend to be source-text oriented, norms serve to shift our attention to concentrate on the target texts and the variety of factors governing the choices that determine the type and extent of equivalence between source and target texts in a particular culture at a particular period. Second, norms do not only help to provide explanations for why translators decided as they did or why translations take the form they do, but also, in Toury's words, act as "explanatory hypotheses" which guide scholars and researchers to predict future characteristics of translation behaviour.

Though being extremely critical of equivalence, Toury did not actually hollow out the entire notion. Instead, he expressed a clear wish to work with the existing term, but only attempted to change "equivalence" from a largely prescriptive concept to a historical one and provided a new definition to it. Here, unlike the linguistic approaches, which considered "equivalence" to be "a relationship between the source and target text which is based on an identity of meaning", Toury directed the notion from being an a priori requirement to being a result of the translator's decisions and adopted the term to mean "any relation which is found to have characterized translation under a specified set of circumstances" (Toury, 1995: 61).

Translation norms were subdivided by Toury into three types: "preliminary norms", "initial norms" and "operational norms" (Toury, 1980: 53). Here, the third category "operational norms" can further be differentiated into "matricial norms" and "textual norms". Toury's norms are generally classified according to the

behaviour during several stages of the translation process. This notion of norm has become a useful and practical category for the descriptive analysis of translation phenomena. However, while Toury focused on the development of a systematic descriptive branch for Translation Studies, he omits to outline in detail the social-cultural dimension that lies behind various translation phenomena. In other words, in his discussion of norms, he only mentioned the linguistic and literary aspects, without situating them in the overall polysystem of cultural norms and codes (Heylen, 1993: 11).

Toury's norm also takes into account the comprehensive and heterogeneous nature of a societal group. A norm does not exist as a monolithic and unchanged entity. It is, instead, characterized by its "multiplicity" and "instability". The validity and relative strength of norms are bound to change over time, according to the fluctuating external circumstances, which can explain the reason why some norms that used to dominate the centre within one system will lose their force and become "old fashioned" and remnants of the past, while other sets of norms hovering in the periphery may sooner or later move to the centred position and become the "mainstream". At a certain time, for example, during the point of intersection when the new replaces the old, several types of norm can coexist simultaneously. This brings us back to the second feature of a norm: its "multiplicity". Being exposed to a variety of norms within a culture, translators have to decide whether they posit themselves along the axis of the "dated", "mainstream" or "avant-garde" (Toury, 1999a: 27-28). However, the translators' decision is not so much as completely free as constrained. As suggested by Toury:

> It is often people who are in the early phases of their initiation as translators, whether young or not so young of age, who behave in the most epigonic way. Insecure as most of them understandably are, they like to play it safe and tend to perform according to dated, but still valid norms.

> One way to explain this is to realize that a beginner's deviant behaviour would more readily be regarded by the society as "erroneous" rather than "innovative" […] No wonder that revolutions—i.e. Large-scale changes of paradigm— have often been made by experienced translators who had, moreover, attained considerable prestige by behaving "appropriately", i.e. according to mainstream norms (Toury, 1999a: 28).

Summing up, what complicates the situation where norms operate within a polysystem here is the fact that, besides the factual existence of the three types of "competing norms", the selection of norms by translators is a determining factor as well. Even though translators' choices are "often" subject to their professional status, as depicted above, there is still room for non-normative, or even norm-breaking, behaviour to take place. Toury suggests that "non-normative behaviour is always a possibility" (Toury, 1995: 64), yet a price should be paid for selecting such an atypical option. The consequences may range from, in a minor case, the revision of the end product to the deprivation of the recognition as a translator in serious circumstances. Thus, the effect of norms on the production of a translation is primarily determined by the type of norms in existence, and secondly, given the background of individual translators, how they behave (whether to conform or reject) when being guided by certain norms.

Considerably influenced by Toury, Andrew Chesterman developed his own norm theory with special attention to those norms that are named by Toury as "operational norms" and "initial norms". "Preliminary norms," as the remaining ones of Toury's trio, fall outside the focus of Chesterman's study Memes of Translation: The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory, due to the fact that such norms, unlike the other two, do not come into play during the actual translation process and thus not of his interest. Only the norms which direct the act of translation itself are his major concerns. Regarding the classifications proposed by Chesterman, norms can be categorized into two types: "product norms" and

"process norms". In comparison, Toury's operational norms primarily correspond to product norms as they both "regulate the form of the final product" (Chesterman, 2000: 63).

Chesterman went on to rename "product norms" as "expectancy norms", which are "norms established by the expectations of receivers of a translation concerning what a translation (of this type) should be like and what a native text (of this type) in the target language should be like" (Chesterman, 2000: 64). A specific target language readership may have expectations about a wide range of textual features, including the style, register, collocations, lexical choice and so on. As translators do not render for themselves, the type of target readers whom a translator bears in mind most probably serves to explain their translation tendency. Besides, "process norms" were renamed as "professional norms", and in categorizing "professional norms", he further distinguished three such norms, including "accountability norms" (ethical norms), "communication norms" (social norms) and "relation norms" (linguistic norms). The following table clarifies his categorization:

Chesterman's Norms			
Product (Expectancy) norms	Process (Professional) norms		
	Accountability (ethical) norms	Communication (social) norms	Relation (linguistic) norms

According to Theo Hermans, Chesterman's product and process norms are "a clear advance on Toury's list, since they bring other perspectives (such as the expected readership) apart from the translator's into the picture" (Hermans, 1999a: 79). Not- withstanding difference between the two on the ways of perceiving norms, both of them consider norms as "constraints" (Toury, 1995: 54; Chesterman, 2000: 56). Having said that, Toury rejects the idea of undermining

translators as "rule-following robots", as mentioned earlier on. With respect to this point, Hermans was on the same line as Toury, yet he went one step further to state that Toury ignored the role of his norms as "templates in offering ready-made solutions" (Hermans, 1999a: 79) to translation problems and so attached less importance to translators' agency. Norms, in Herman's theory, "act as constraints on behaviour by foreclosing certain options and choices" (Hermans, 1999a: 82). These choices, however, still remain available in principle. Translators' agency can be made palable by their actions that represent particular options, each of which being taken from a bunch of available possibilities (Hermans, 1999a: 87). Put it in another way, translators are said to act with intent in rendering a piece of text, provided that in such an occasion there are options to choose from and that they have made a selection out of them. Exclusions, or the available options that were open but not chosen, do "allow us to glimpse the agenda behind the choices that are made." (Hermans, 1999a: 88)

Hermans treats norms as normative as well as cognitive expectations (Hermans, 2000: 10; Schäffner, 1999: 57) and, as depicted, pays special attention to the selectivity of the translators' act. In fact, in addition to his focus on translators' agency, Hermans' norms also differ from Toury in terms of the structure of the graded continuum. Whereas Toury's continuum ranges from "rules" to "idiosyncracies", Herman's concept of norms extends from "rules" to "conventions". After comparing the two, Chesterman prefers the latter one, stating that since norms are by definition social, subjective (or personal) idiosyncracies are out of the scope of the definition of norms (Chesterman, 1999: 91). As for the classification proposed by Hermans in his article "Translation and Normativity" (presenting the case of De Buck's rendering of Boethius), translation is governed by at least three normative levels:

1. General cultural and ideological norms which may be held to apply throughout the larger part of a community;
2. Translational norms arising from general concepts of translatability and cross-lingual representation alive in that community; and
3. Textual and other appropriateness norms which prevail in the particular client system for which individual translations cater.

<div align="right">(Hermans, 1999b: 59)</div>

In his categorization, Hermans directly and explicitly puts forward the general cultural and ideological norms. But he did not further explain the three types of norms that he proposed. As Chang Nam-fung suggested, the respective values of Herman's norms and their interrelations remain unanswered (Chang, 2001: 318).

5.4 Norms Pertaining to the Acceptability of Bawdiness

In some cases, it seems that the deletion or modification of bawdy puns is not mainly related to any technical difficulties, but rather to the acceptability of bawdy matters in the target-culture system. This tendency was not only reflected on Zhu Shenghao's renderings, which were taken as a sanitized Shakespeare version translated in the 1940s China (Liang S.Q., 1990: 9-12), but also on the behaviour of other Chinese translators, which can be traced back, in a microscopic point of view, from the strategies they selected. According to the findings of the study, it is shown that nearly all translators adopted strategy B2 most frequently, that is, to major on the innocent sense of the pun and ignore the bawdy meaning, without leaving the slightest trace. Consider Liang Shiqiu and Cao Weifeng, both of whom worked on Shakespeare between the 1930s and 60s. They decided to use the innocent meaning of the source-text pun in over 60% and 70% of the bawdy puns respectively. Early translators such as Tian Han, who rendered in the 1920s, selected the innocent sense in over 80% of the cases. In view of the above

phenomenon, some may question whether the translators are bound to the pure linguistic constraints involved in pun translation. But as indicated in the theoretical framework of the present study, there are other choices open to the translators. So, why did they choose not to major on the bawdy meaning, and why did they refrain from inserting footnotes or rendering both senses of the bawdy pun in a non-punning phrase? There were alternatives available to the translators which could also help them to overcome the structural obstacles. The final decision to discard these options should not be taken as purely linguistic one and at least partly confirmed that the translators highly preferred to major on the clean layer of meaning at the expense of sacrificing the other. In fact, some bawdy meanings even occupied the "primary sense" of the pun, which refers to the first meaning that comes to mind. But in reality, the predominant bawdy layer of meaning, which should originally have been prioritized, were simply swept away by the translators. Consider, in *Appendix 1*, most renderings of Puns 21, 39, 43 and 44; Zhu Shenghao's treatment of Puns 31, 32, 55, 61, 88, 89, 90, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97 and 105; and Cao Weifeng's translations of Puns 86, 87 and 88. Generally speaking, it is shown that there is a much stronger suppression of the sexual innuendoes than the scatological ones in the target system, and the most stringent aspect of sexuality in Chinese culture is mostly associated with explicit references to male and female genitals.

The existence of norms pertaining to the acceptability of bawdy matters can again be supported by some other examples concerning the treatment of bawdy non-puns, where nearly no central linguistic constraints in the translation of bawdy from English to Chinese would force the translator to delete or understate the sexual innuendoes. Translators like Zhu Shenghao, Cao Weifeng or Liang Shiqiu tended to tone down and render a number of the non-punning bawdy

instances into innocent expressions, that is, to major on strategy B. As exhibited by the examples in *Appendix 2* of the corpus, there were many cases which showed that in dealing with bawdy instances in the non-pun category, Zhu simply suppressed or eradicated them, which reveals that he did conform to the norms which prescribes the minimization of bawdy innuendoes (See Zhu's treatment of Non-Puns 3, 18, 21, 26, 32 and 34). Even for Liang, who claimed to have submitted the entire bawdy in a faithful manner, still rather chose the soft option in 20% of the cases (chapter 3.2, figure 5). For some typical examples, see his rendering of Non-Pun 38 "taste her sweet body", which was reduced to *changguo ta de wenrou* 嘗過她的溫柔 [taste her gentleness]. In representing the bawdy *codpiece* (Pun 45) in *King Lear*, which refers to the "male sex organ", Liang also indistinctly adopted the euphemistic symbol XX in his target text and only at the footnote did he convey the true bawdy meaning of XX. All these evidence, when taking into account together, confirmed the effects, or at least the existence of sexual norms that restrict the bawdy language of Shakespeare in the target-culture system.

5.4.1 Sexual Descriptions in China

It is obvious that sex is a sensitive topic in China. The tendency to moralize literary works and to regard sex as taboo has been firmly rooted in Chinese culture from past to present. The sexual history can be retraced from R.H. Van Gulik's classic study *Sexual Life in Ancient China*, an overview of Chinese Sex and Society from 1500 B.C. till 1644 A.D.. According to Van Gulik's illustration, Chinese culture before the thirteenth century was generally characterized by positive and open sexual attitudes (Van Gulik, 2003). But the trend started to change during the Song dynasty, when sexual attitudes gradually became negative and repressive. The crucial change was initiated by several representatives of Neo-Confucianists,

including Cheng Hao, Cheng Yi, Zhou Dunyi and Zhu Xi, who is regarded as "the father of Neo-Confucianism".

From Zhu Xi's point of view, *cun tianli, qu renyu* [human desires have to be discarded, so as to retain the heavenly principles] and *wan e yin wei shou* [among all evils, sexual lust is the worst]. The conservative attitude towards sex as a taboo has become a sort of "rule", which was further strengthened in the succeeding dynasty, Yuan, thus eradicating erotic content that crossed over the boundary of moral norms held by contemporaries (Ruan, 1991: 96-97).

This tendency is fully reflected in Chinese literary works. There have always been some "expectations" that literature needs to serve or fulfill a moral purpose, as reflected by a Chinese traditional saying *wen yi zaidao* [writings are for showing the Way]. The saying implies that writings should aim at conveying ethical notions and stepping over the line is disallowed. Only those which follow the maxim were considered as good pieces of work. Otherwise, they would be condemned as "pornographic" and their authors were very likely to be blamed for their perceived misconduct or even subject to severe reprimand or punishment. The restriction on sexuality can be proved by the repeated bannings and burnings of erotic literature (if not the political titles) within China, particularly during the Qing dynasty (1644-1910), when numerous lists of erotic books were banned (Wang, B., 1999), and "a commoner who was involved in printing a banned book was beaten and exiled" (Ruan, 1991: 97).

The same situation can be applied to translated literature, which is considered as a system within the literary polysystem (Even-Zohar, 1978: 117-127). Academic research reveals that descriptions of sex in translations are also offensive to the central ideology of China. A typical case of ethical interference can be found in Yang Zilin's translation of *Joan Haste* (*Jiayin Xiaozhuan*, around 1900), in

which some descriptions of male and female relationships were written off, particularly plot details regarding premarital pregnancy of the protagonist. After making amendments, the protagonist was then portrayed as an "unpolluted" character and slotted into an ethically acceptable frame of the traditional Chinese culture. Lin Shu, who later translated the "forbidden parts", was fiercely condemned by the Chinese critics as well as the general public (Wang D.F., 1998: 8), despite the fact that his translation approach does not necessarily indicate nor imply his affirmation on the female protagonist's "immoral actions" (Guo L.S., 1999: 75). Further such cases of shaping the original to meet the standards of the target culture are suggested, for example, by Chang Nam-fung, in his essay "Polysystem Theory: Its Prospect as a Framework for Translation Research", which adduces that at least twenty passages of sexual descriptions have been deleted in the Chinese translation of David Lodge's *Small World* published in the PRC, while some "mistranslations" appear to be intended by the translator. All of these distortions revealed the existence of cultural norms that disapproved of descriptions pertaining to sex in Chinese translations (Chang, 2001: 326).

While many of the Western jokes exploited sex-related topics as their major source of humour, sex is often thought as a crude topic in the Chinese society, which is very hard to put into words, especially to the educated, who "have a distinct aversion to writings about sex" (Ke, 1999: 13). Being influenced by target-culture norms in China which prescribes a certain approach to the bawdy language, translators sometimes need to avoid using terms which are unacceptable to their receiving culture, although they might actually be aware of the sexual connotations therein. As noted by He Qixin, in a Shakespearean performance staged in the 1980s, five hundred lines were expunged from the stage dialogues, most of which were the conversations between comic characters and lines

associated with the themes of adultery, prostitution and so on:

> *Measure for Measure* was staged by the Beijing's People's Art Theatre from April to June 1981, translated and directed by Ying Ruocheng. In his performance of *Measure for Measure* (1981), all the scenes in the original play are preserved, but sixty-two different passages totaling over 500 lines are left out. A glaring omission involves the 240-line interrogation of Elbow, Froth and Pompey in II. i. 41-280, which is dropped entirely in performance. In most cases, the lines omitted refer to adultery (I. ii. 79-85), prostitution (II. i. 41-280; III. ii. 19-20, 22-24, 43-46, 49-58), and religion (II. ii. 71-79; II. iii. 31-34)…" (He, 1986a: 23, 157-158)

Further reflected and elaborated in Fang Ping's article "Profundity in Vulgarity: Contemplation of a Shakespearean Translator", bawdy innuendoes in Shakespeare's works did violate the target-culture norms. Also in the 1980s, hugging and kissing, or pronouncing coarse words on the stage performance of *The Merchant of Venice* were rebuked severely as being "contrary to public morals and harmful to the atmosphere of the society":

> *The Merchant of Venice* was staged by the Chinese Youth Art Theatre in September, 1980 in Beijing (based on Fang Ping's version). The performance was a success. But unexpectedly, a cadre's letter was published in Beijing Evening Paper on 7th September, criticizing that the comedy is contrary to public morals and harmful to the atmosphere of the society (pointing to the fact that the male and female protagonists hugged and kissed in public). Another letter was published on the 13th September, criticizing the stage dialogue of the comedy for being so earthy and unspeakable (Fang P., 1995: 20).

To make a retrospection, Fang Ping further related these cultural norms to the translation behaviour of Zhu Shenghao and suggested that it is quite natural to find Zhu being disturbed by the psychology of "sexual suppression" or "sex as a taboo" that is rooted in his own culture, as China has long been proud of being *liyi zhi bang* [the land of ritual and righteousness] (Fang P., 1995: 21). Fang Ping believes that if cultural shackles could not fade into oblivion even in the minds of Chinese translators in the 1980s, it is quite natural that Zhu, who lived forty years

ago, was deeply influenced by traditional Chinese culture, and as such hesitated to present in a straightforward manner when he encountered bawdy elements of Shakespeare's works. As a result, a general tendency to weaken the elements of sexuality was actually demonstrated in Zhu's works and one can actually view the "differences between Chinese and Western culture" from his renderings (Fang P., 1995: 22). Even for the Chinese translator Gu Zhengkun, who translated Shakespeare's *Sonnets* during the late 1990s, openly stated that he had to handle the bawdy wordplay cautiously when he came across them in the sonnets:

> Shakespeare loves to use puns in his sonnets, especially the bawdy ones. This is the most difficult part in the translation process. If this characteristic is totally erased from the text, the real 'Shakespeare' is to a certain degree being distorted. At the same time, the characteristic can also reflect the society and customs of the Elizabethan period. This element, however, if exaggerated, will be found to be really offensive in the eyes of the ordinary Chinese society. I therefore tried to cautiously handle this problem. For example, I tended to use more indistinct or implicit puns to imitate the sexual suggestiveness of Shakespeare's sonnets and I also considered the acceptability of the Chinese readers (Gu Z.K., 1998: 4).

Obviously, Gu, as with some other Chinese translators, found himself in a dilemma. On one hand, he clearly understands that the richness of the bawdy puns contributes heavily to the originality of Shakespeare's works. But on the other hand, there is also a need to keep an eye on the offensive elements that are likely to be harmful to his society's moral standards. The translators also have to carefully consider the acceptability factor of the text in its target environment and avoid using obscene or strong words that are unacceptable or disrespectable to the prospective readership, since failure to fulfill reader expectations may be regarded as a breach of norms which in turn implies disapproval or potential negative sanctions. One point which should be noted, however, is that these "reader expectations" are activated by the translator himself, and they are preferences

which he assumes others in the community will share.

Even though it is reasonable and thoughtful for Fang Ping to relate Zhu's minimization of Shakespeare's bawdy to the traditional Chinese culture and literature, some may question the foundation of such a relationship, as there is substantial supporting evidence indicating that not all Chinese literary works refrain from sexual descriptions. Indeed, a considerable amount of sexual content can easily be extracted from Chinese fiction such as *Jin Ping Mei* [Golden Lotus], or dramas like *Mudan Ting* [Peony Pavilion] and the *Xixiang Ji* [Romance of Western Chamber]. Descriptions of sex did exist in Chinese literary works to a noticeable degree, particularly from the Ming period and onwards, when so much explicit eroticism was displayed and in circulation around China.

The major problem, however, also constitutes the ways sexuality is treated and displayed by the Chinese writers, since there are different norms of sexual description in different cultures. Mao Dun, in his book *Sexual Descriptions in Ancient Chinese Fiction* written in the 1920s, pointed out that sexual descriptions in Chinese literature are most often naturalistic (Mao D., 1993: 19). Instead of being comical, farcical and humourous in nature, most of them are purely factual descriptions which are both explicit and stark-naked. Moreover, the topic of sexuality is fundamentally set out as problematic or regarded as being synonymous with "obscenity". A basic and recurrent theme of forewarning and admonition, which proclaimed that "excess sexuality is dangerous and unhealthy" can be outlined (Mcmahon, 1987: 218)—people who indulge in sexual activities will be punished in retribution for his own sins (Mao D., 1993: 29; Zhou S.Y., 1991: 31). This characteristic in the Chinese sexual description may partly account for the reason why Zhu Shenghao omitted the comical, bawdy jokes which appear to be irrelevant and unrelated to the main plot of a play. Notwithstanding the fact that

Zhu did not personally provide any justifications or pretexts for the "biases" in his translations, his wife Song Qingru did drop some hints on Zhu's preferred choice. As Song claimed in the *Biography of Zhu Shenghao*, coarse elements erased in the renderings of Zhu were actually in no way interfering with the aim or identity of the original (Zhu H.D. & Wu J.M., 1989: 129). In other words, according to Song, Zhu was inclined to believe that the coarse words are distantly related to the theme of a play. Hence, the dropping, minimization or euphemization of these offensive words did not necessarily trespass on the central idea, and the changes brought about by him would not contribute to a great loss of the original text. The justification offered by Zhu's wife presented a typical case in point of underestimating the dramatic function of comic dialogue and bawdy elements in literary works. This condition can be linked to the norm in Chinese literary traditions, which did not favour the presentation of sex as comical, ludicrous and laughter provoking, at least when compared to the Elizabethan bawdy, which to a certain extent explained why there tended to be more omissions in Zhu's translations of Shakespeare's comedies, or the comical plots in the tragedies and histories.

An additional point to note is a strange phenomenon in Chinese literary texts, that is, the treatment of sex often involves a split between "love" and "sex" (Chen J.C., 1999: 29). Love is entirely absent in sexual relationships, whereas sex is also set apart from pure love. This tendency occurred in the *Honglou Meng* [Dream of the Red Chamber], where love relationships between the male protagonist Jia Baoyu and his two cousins Lin Daiyu and Xue Baochai are described as completely "spiritual", while in the "love of clouds and rains" (*yunyuqing*, a typical Chinese metaphor for sexual intercourse: Lung, 2003: 258) between Jia and his maid Xiren is completely "sexual" (Chen J.C., 1999: 29-30). This dichotomy between spiritual

attraction and sexual enchantment might possibly suggest a reason for the behaviour of some translators, who gave preference to the innocent sense while rendering the bawdy innuendoes spoken by the fourteen- year-old Juliet in the love story *Romeo and Juliet*.

Nonetheless, one would possibly question, whether the deletion or suppression of vulgarity and sexuality really makes no major difference to the source text? In fact, the translation deviation noted in Zhu's works, which shows a great deal of loss in bawdy innuendoes, did negatively affect the underlying motive of Shakespeare's plays. Take *Romeo and Juliet* as an example, the erasure of a large portion of Mercutio's bawdy speeches contributed to a misrepresentation of the main theme of the play. This point of view is supported by John Dover Wilson's remarks:

> Such (bawdy) passages… are as essential to the tone of the play as the characters which speak them are to the play's structure. Once again the magician is assuring us of reality. He is proving that the marvelous blossom of love which forms the main theme of the story is not a mere poet's dream, a pleasing fancy, but a piece of real life rooted deep in the crude common soil of human nature, the nature we all know so well (Wilson, 1933: 225).

With the loss of Mercutio's bawdiness, love between the male and female protagonists "floats off to a remote idealistic plane" (Colman, 1974: 74), broke with the human reality of their passion and becomes "a mere dream". Similarly, as cited before, sexual puns in the Fool of *King Lear* are comparatively few, but like every remark the Fool makes, these comments hinted at a large problem within the play and foreshadow what will happen later on. Here, bawdy is used to "counterpoint serious situations or themes" (Colman, 1974: 94); and the Fool actually plays the part as an "ironical commentator or interpreter", who points out the real situation to the king through satirizing him (Lin, 1985: 265, 268). Thus,

with the isolation of the Fool's bawdy jokes, the literal as well as the figurative context in which King Lear speaks becomes incoherent and fragmented (Green, 1972: 259-274). Zhu's omission of the dialogues which were seemingly arbitrary, unrelated to plot details and frequently thought to perform solely the function of "comic relief", actually to a great extent interferes with plot developments. In addition, bawdy language was also used as a significant element of characterization. As Colman puts it: "for characters like Falstaff, Pompey or Lucio, strip them of their indecency and they will virtually cease to exist" (Colman, 1974: 64). The omission of bawdy instances in the translations, as a result, also weakened the delineation of characters.

5.4.2 Diachronic Development of Sexual Norms

As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, the stringency of norms is bound to change over the course of time. The same also applies to the norms which govern the acceptability of bawdy language. A trendline can be drawn by comparing translations across periods covering the span of translation activities concerned which last for around eighty years. Although the duration of time is relatively short when compared to Chinese history, it is marked by astonishing cultural changes which have scarcely any parallels to its past. It is therefore reasonable to subdivide the translations into groups according to three main periods, which may offer some clues to figuring out the overall tendency of the changes to sexual norms which govern Shakespearean renderings in China. The three stages of the historical division are: *Early period* (1920-1949); *Middle period* (1950-1979) and *Late period* (1980-today). The method of drawing boundaries embodies the differences between the preliminary stage when Shakespeare's works were first rendered and the latest development up to the present moment.

The early period (1920-1949) began from the May-Fourth literary revolution and ended in the founding of the PRC in 1949. The first full text play of Shakespeare was translated into Chinese by Tian Han in 1921. This period was politically marked by constant warfare, especially when the country was torn by the Sino-Japanese war and the civil wars between the Nationalist army and the Communist forces. Shakespearean translators who worked under the direst circumstances include Zhou Zhuangping, Zhu Shenghao, Liang Shiqiu, Cao Yu, Cao Weifeng and Sun Dayu. Three of them (Cao W.F., Liang S.Q. and Zhu S.H.) aimed at preparing the translation of Shakespeare's complete works.

During the second period (1950-1979), stretching from the founding of the PRC to the reopening of China to the world at large, when the cultural environment of the country was highly politicized and underwent significant changes in various aspects, and the interpretation of Shakespeare was no exception. Most of Liang Shiqiu's translations were published within this period. Other notable renderings accomplished before the 1980s included Fang Ping's *Much Ado About Nothing* (1953), *The Merry Wives of Windsor* (1979); Tu An's version of *Shakespeare's Sonnets* (1950); and Bian Zhilin's *Hamlet* (1956). The first Chinese version of Shakespeare's complete works, which mainly based on the renderings of Zhu Shenghao, was also published in 1978[27].

In the third period, starting from the 1980s, China became more receptive to Western values and the political shadows gradually faded. Chinese scholars were "better informed and more liberated in their interpretation of Shakespeare" (Wang S.H., 1993: 63). More attention was directed to a wide range of apolitical aspects of Shakespeare which were not touched upon in the previous stage. Bian Zhilin's verse translation of *Shakespeare's Four Tragedies* was published in 1988, while Sun Dayu's version was also released in 1995, with the title *The Four Great Tragedies of*

Shakespeare. A new translation of the entire collection of Shakespeare was also completed under the leadership of Fang Ping in year 2000. Other individual translations of the Bard's works accomplished after the 1980s also included Ying Ruocheng's *Measure for Measure* (1981), Peng Jingxi's *Hamlet* (2002) and Jane Lai's *The Comedy of Errors* (1988).

In the following table, the translation techniques are summarized into a few groups and presents the percentages by which a bawdy pun is rendered in the three periods (*early period*, *middle period* and *late period*) outlined above. In order to obtain a more accurate trend, the bawdy puns most likely to be overlooked by the translators (ie., the puns which have been subject to a "Bawdy Pun→Zero" (strategy D) or "Bawdy Pun→ Innocent Non-Pun" (strategy B2) technique by *all* of the translators) are temporarily excluded from the counts:

	A1 & A2	B1 & B3	B2	D	E
1920-1949	9.9%	3.7%	58.8%	23.9%	1.6%
1950-1979	18.9%	7.3%	47.5%	0.8%	21.3%
1980-	26.6%	15.3%	38.7%	3.3%	14.7%

If we try to compare the above figures among the three time periods, what can be traced is a general decrease in the percentage of omissions (strategy D: Bawdy Pun →Zero) as well as some other techniques which were characterized by the loss of bawdy sense (eg: strategy B2: Bawdy Pun→Non-Bawdy Non-Pun). Although the percentage of omissions increases slightly in the third period, the difference is so trivial that it is hardly significant. On the contrary, there is a steady increase in strategies which attempt to render the bawdy puns (strategy A1: Bawdy Pun→Same Bawdy Pun; A2: Bawdy Pun→Different Bawdy Pun; and E: Bawdy Pun→Footnotes) or preserve the bawdy sense (B1: Bawdy Pun→Non-Selective

Non-Pun; B3: Bawdy Pun➔Bawdy Non-Pun). Most translators who were particularly prim and squeamish in handling Shakespeare's bawdy innuendoes belong to the early period (such as Tian Han, Zhu Shenghao and Zhou Zhuangping) and worked between the 1920s and 1950s, while translators in the 1980s and 1990s were generally less inhibited in dealing with the suggestive overtones. It appears that the relative potency of sexual norms is gradually weakened, given the more open and permissive atmosphere of the Chinese society and culture to sex-related issues from the 1980s. Signs of change that highlight a special concern on sexuality in China are seen, for example, in the "surge of publication of several voluminous studies of the Chinese sexual culture" (Ho, J., 1997: 2), such as sociologist Liu Dalin's *Contemporary Sexual Culture of China* (1992), Pan Suiming's *The Presence of Sexuality in Contemporary China* (1993) and *Current Conditions of Sexuality in China* (1995), which are taken as "the first serious attempts by Chinese scholars to win respectability for the study of sexuality through linking it with scientific methods".

Nevertheless, despite the overall weakening of the norms as time passed, the translation methods used to handle Shakespeare's bawdy instances are not perfectly in line with the modern history of sexual description in China. Particular attention should also be devoted to the second period (1950-1979) in which the influence from the political environment is omnipresent. It is widely assumed that sexual repression, especially in Chinese literary works, was at an all-time high. Chen Jiachun referred to this particular period as that of "unprecedented asceticism" (Chen J.C., 1999: 41). From 1950 to 1979, the blanket suppression of sex in society determines the emergence of a literature destitute of sex and love. Within the entire Chinese literary field, the culture- specific norm which had originally restricted the expression of sex virtually turned into a rule that discarded love

altogether, with many young authors being harshly criticized simply because their texts involve descriptions of love (which is utterly non-sexual). Almost no erotic material could be found in the whole country at that time, except restricted editions for a very limited readership (Ruan, 1991: 98). The sexual descriptions in the Shakespearean renderings during this period were supposed to have suffered the same fate. However, discrepancies can be observed from the figures. The second row of the table basically exemplifies this feature. Startlingly, translation strategies that lead to the disappearance of bawdy sense in puns (strategies B2 and D) do not augment on a large scale. Even more astonishing is the continual existence of bawdiness in the target texts (eg.: strategies A1 and E). In addition, when a translator's performances in different periods are compared against one another, it is shown that the strategies adopted and the treatments of bawdy innuendoes are generally consistent.

These symptoms reveal that the social and political climate that forbids sexual elements seems to have a less effect on the translators than one might have predicted. They highlight the very special status that Shakespeare's works achieved within the new China, which is in turn a product of the labeling effect which was fed by the politically- driven ideology. Since the founding of the PRC in 1949, political ideology took centre stage and inevitably controlled the Chinese culture and society in all its aspects, including the understanding of Shakespeare. The ideological norms at this stage took full effect and overruled the other types of norms such as those which concern the traditional Chinese ethics. Taking into account the intimate relationship of the PRC and the "Soviet Big Brother" which was particularly noticeable during the 1950s and 1960s, Chinese Shakespeareans in the period faithfully and mechanically followed the analytical models of their Russian brothers. The perception of Shakespeare in China was also guided by the

commentaries and evaluations of the founders of Marxist ideology on the English dramatist. Among all the Western literary figures, Shakespeare was "one of the few 'safe' playwrights" (Li, 1999: 365) since he was cited by Marx and Engels as a "Renaissance giant", a "realistic playwright" (Li, 2003: 46), and was "liberally referred to, paraphrased and quoted in their writings" (Levith, 2004: 25). In other words, he was placed on a pedestal by two of the founder fathers and became a "proper" subject to be studied or translated. From the early days of Marx and Engels all the way through to the period of the Soviets, Shakespeare enjoyed prestigious status; and since the founding of the PRC, the same situation prevailed in China. The Bard's image was actually reshaped and reconstructed in the specific historical context. Shakespeare, who was repeatedly praised for his "anti-feudalistic stance" and his "humanist ideas" (Wang S.H., 1993: 13), entered the approved area within the field of Chinese literary translation and "fell within the scope of 'permissible' or 'legitimate' options" (Cha M.J., 2001: 72).

5.5 Translation Norms

From the above analysis, it comes to light that the translation techniques of Zhu Shenghao and other Chinese translators were circumscribed by the norms of the target cultural environment, despite the fact that a wide range of theoretical possibilities were actually available to them. Being cultural entities, the validity and stringency of these target-culture norms are also subject to change over time—different translators would prefer different forms of behaviour under different cultural circumstances. However, under certain cultural conditions of a single period, would it always be the case that all translators tended to conform to the target-culture norms to the same extent? At least this was not happening in the Chinese translations of Shakespeare's bawdiness, as various approaches in working

124

with sexually suggestive language can be clearly recognized in the translations of Zhu Shenghao, Liang Shiqiu and Cao Yu, all of whom were active in China during the 1930s and 1940s. Consider almost half of the erotic elements which have been cleansed in Zhu's Chinese versions (1947), a relatively low proportion of "Bawdy pun→Zero" renderings are recorded in Liang's translations (*Othello*, 1936; *King Lear*, 1936; *Hamlet*, 1938) and there is clearly no omission in Cao Yu's translation of the bawdy puns (*Romeo and Juliet*, 1942). While the influence of cultural norms might to a noticeable degree be powerful in elucidating why a translator played down the bawdy instances, the divergence of translation behaviour and the coexistence of different forms of translation alongside each other under the same cultural conditions seems to unveil the fact that the strength of culture-specific norms experienced by different individuals are not identical and there also exists other types of norms, pulling and pushing translators in different directions. It is proposed that the treatment of bawdy language is also regulated by the translation norms of the target system, which combine and interplay in various ways with the norms pertaining to bawdiness. In what follows I will first deal with a "preliminary" aspect of the translation policies, which concerns the selection of original texts for translation; and afterwards concentrate on the "operational" translation norms involved in the decision-making process, that is, those which affect the overall structure and formulation of the target texts.

5.5.1 Preliminary Norms

As defined by Toury, translators are governed by "preliminary norms", which are operating before the stage of actual text analysis and formulation. They mainly involve two sets of considerations: the existence of a "translation policy" and factors concerning the "directness of translation" (Toury, 1995: 58).

Translation policy refers to the aspects that govern the choice of works to be translated at a particular point in time (Toury, 1995: 58). In the case of Shakespeare's bawdy and its Chinese versions, the background of Shakespearean translation in China may furnish us with some clues. The entire text of a Shakespearean play was first introduced to China in the 1920s, soon after the May-Fourth Movement. During that period the Chinese intellectuals began to import a considerable number of Western literary works, including dramatic texts, with an aim of pouring new thoughts into the literary field or even Chinese culture as a whole. Only within three years between 1918 and 1921, a total of thirty-two translations of dramatic plays popped up in China (Cao S.J. & Sun F.L., 1989: 82). Shakespeare, who was considered to be a predominant figure of the Western canon, naturally became the target figure of translation. That is to say, the determining factor contributing to the Bard's dramas being chosen for translation is not because it is interesting, amusing or entertaining, even though these qualities are justifiably attributed to them. The paramount concern is the Bard's literary status and that his plays are the treasures of world literature, which "marked the first Chinese copy of the cult of Shakespeare" (Chu, 1970: 157). Thus, it is not at all surprising to find that the two noted translators of Shakespeare's classics, Zhu Shenghao and Liang Shiqiu, both intended to render Shakespeare in the 1930s as they unanimously regret deeply that there is a complete collection of Shakespeare in Japanese, but not in Chinese. They contended that China should have its "own" translations (Liang S.Q., 1967: 75; Zhu H.D. & Wu J.M., 1989: 107-108). To Zhu and Liang, the act of translating Shakespeare's works is a pioneering mission to be accomplished. The "solemn" nature of their goal will doubtlessly influence the transposition of textual elements which are humourous, yet thought to be "low class". The seeking of high culture will also be in conflict with the marketplace

language pervading the original texts.

Secondly, considerations regarding "directness of translation", which involve "the decision to work directly from the source language or from an existing translation in another language other than the source language" (Toury, 1980: 53) also affect the form of translation product. The effect of "directness of translation" on the Chinese translators can primarily be illustrated by the renderings of Tian Han, who is "the pioneer of Shakespeare translation in China" (Jiao Y.F., 1926: 360). Quite a number of deletions can be discovered in the two plays (*Hamlet*, 1921 and *Romeo and Juliet*, 1924) translated by Tian in the 1920s, most of which were censored due to its utter bawdiness, according to Liang Shiqiu (Liang S.Q., 2002: 17). The bawdy instances omitted in Tian Han's version include Puns 39, 40, 41, 42, 101, 102 in *Appendix* 1 and Non-Puns 10, 12, 13, 14, 15 in *Appendix* 2. The erotic dialogue where Hamlet sat by Ophelia and asked, Shall I lie in your lap? (*HAM*, 3.2.110-119) was completely removed. Reasons for these changes are difficult to pinpoint, since Tian did not provide any reason for his chosen strategy. It may well have been Tian's own decision to amend the original text, rubbing out all the bawdy parts; or, in Liang's words, Tian simply translated with only references from some school editions which were expurgated and he was totally unaware of the so-called "deletions" (Liang S.Q., 2002: 17). In fact, there can also be a further speculation that Tian Han, who became familarized with Shakespeare's works when he studied in Japan (Cao S.J., 1995: 60), did not work directly from the original text—he actually rendered from an intermediate language, according to the Japanese translations. This phenomenon is called "indirect translation" or "second-hand translation". As proposed by Sun Dayu, instead of using English editions of the original text, the foundation of Tian Han's renderings was actually the work of Shoyo Tsubouchi[28] (1895-1935) (Sun D.Y., 1993: 21),

who is one of Japan's prominent Shakespeare translators and also a "Kabuki" writer. Another Chinese translator Zhou Zhuangping, who rendered *Hamlet* the 1930s, also wrote in his preface to translation, that apart from the original English versions, he had also "consulted the Japanese translations of Shoyo Tsubouchi and Uraguchi Bunji", and claimed that the thorough investigation made by the latter had offered great help for the Chinese translator (Zhou Z.P., 1938: 2-3). If the case of indirect translation indeed happened, then the omission of bawdy innuendoes in Tian's renderings probably only reflect the strategy applied in the intermediate translation(s), which implied that those sexual words might have already been chopped off in the Japanese versions. In this situation, the directness of translation and the very nature of the groundwork that translators use to base their translations on form a fundamental role in accounting for the "adequacy" or "inadequacy" of their translations.

To take it further, the norm which governs the selection of the groundwork is not limited to the adoption or avoidance of intermediate translations. In the present context, the adoption of a particular English-text edition or Western critical edition of Shakespeare's texts may also embody a norm that prescribes a translator's decision at the preliminary stage. The norm here, which favours a certain type of annotated edition, however, should not be mixed up with the above-mentioned restraint on the availability of well-footnoted editions. As was indicated above, text editing plays an important role in the interpretation of bawdy language. As a result of advancement in understanding bawdy terms, different editions may vary in the amount of suggestive words explained through the passage of time. But this historical answer, after all, is not the be-all and end-all explanation contributed by the edition factor. A Shakespearean translator can also be a decision-maker in choosing his preferred

edition. Not all the translators are passive recipients of whatever critical edition that comes up to them. As pointed out by Liang Shiqiu[29], the first problem that confronts a translator in rendering Shakespeare is to choose a suitable and reliable edition (Liang S.Q., 1967: 76). Liang continued to elucidate that:

> Textbook versions of Shakespeare's plays used by most schools are not that useful, firstly because they can rarely be gathered as an entire collection, and secondly, there are too many omissions of the so-called bawdy passages in these texts. Imagine that two or three hundred lines of a play are deleted owing to its bawdiness: you cannot say it looks all different, but it is already not the real appearance of Shakespeare (Liang S.Q., 1967: 76).

Liang, who translated Shakespeare between the 1930s and 1960s, probably did not know that even the Oxford version he chose to base on is also lacking in explanations, at some instances, with regard to the embedded bawdy connotations which popped up in subsequent editions available well beyond his time of translation. But let alone this historical limitation, Liang has actually made a decision in choosing edited texts by excluding those that are bowdlerized. Indeed, most school editions, together with some other early editions of Shakespeare's works, such as *The Family Shakespeare* edited by the Bowdlers in 1818, have also been cleansed of crude words and phrases. Thomas Bowdler and his sister Harriet, who chose to hide behind him as a secret editor, omitted "those words and expressions which cannot with propriety be read aloud in a family" and promised to add nothing but remove everything from Shakespeare's works that would "raise a blush to the cheek of modesty" (Bowdler, 1818)—which turned out to be approximately ten percent of what Shakespeare wrote (Perrin, 1992: 62). Bowdler's inspiration of *The Family Shakespeare* was explained in the preface to the first edition:

My first idea of *The Family Shakespeare* arose from the recollection of my father's custom of reading in this manner to his family. His family can listen with delight to *Hamlet*, *Othello*, without knowing that those matchless tragedies contained words and expressions improper to be pronounced (Bowdler, 1818).

Bowdler believed that it was not a difficult task to filter the indecent from the decent lines; and by removing these "stains", readers would be able "to view the picture not only uninjured, but possessed of additional beauty" (Bowdler, 1818). *The Family Shakespeare* was not the only cleaned-up version of Shakespeare's works. Other significant expurgators apart from the Bowdlers included Charles and Mary Lamb, who totally expunged the bawdy language from their tales of Shakespeare; while John Hows' also emasculated the last two acts of Shakespeare's *Othello* and completely removed the comic figure "Falstaff" from *Henry IV* (Perrin, 1992: 60-86).

These bowdlerized editions came to exist long before the time when Liang Shiqiu rendered Shakespeare. But any of them, if ever known to him, was naturally in his exclusion list. On the contrary, if such "clean" versions were adopted, whether intentionally or accidentally, by any of the Shakespeare translators as their groundwork, it is very likely that their final product would not fully represent the original image of Shakespeare. In the present study, no obvious evidence suggests the use of bowdlerized versions by the Chinese translators, with Tian Han being the only possible exception, if taking into account Liang Shiqiu's speculation (Liang S.Q., 2002: 17). Zhu Shenghao, whose large-scale omissions and euphemization lies within the boundary of possibility that bowdlerized works might have been adopted, is also generally believed to be based on the unabridged Oxford edition of Shakespeare (Zhu S.H., 1947: 2; Wu J.M. & Zhu H.D., 1989: 129).

Nevertheless, Liang's emphasis on the selection of a reliable edition together with his assertion that school series of Shakespeare are not useful do reflect an idea as to which kind of critical edition should be chosen by a translator. On the basis of this value judgment, it is reasonable to supplement and augment Toury's theoretical framework by proposing another set of considerations that has to do with the preliminary norms: those related to the choice of edited texts, in addition to translation policy and directness of translation. Concerning the rendering of Shakespeare's texts in China, three subcatagories of the preliminary norm are involved, as given in the table below:

	Translation policy	*Directness of translation*	*Critical edition*
Major concerns	Why choose the works of Shakespeare?	Is an intermediate translation (eg. in Japanese) consulted?	Is a bowdlerized or expurgated edition used as the groundwork?

Accordingly, it is proposed that preliminary norms which govern source-text selection have to do with two major sets of considerations propounded by Toury ("translation policy" and "directness of translation"), plus an additional consideration, the "preference of critical edition", which is added to the previous remarks in view of the translation of Shakespeare's bawdy language in the Chinese world.

5.5.2 Ethical Norms and Communicative Norms

The translation of bawdy wordplay in the present corpus is regulated by various translation norms: some of them prescribe the selection of source texts, while others govern the direct actual decisions made by a translator during the act of translation itself. As in the case of Liang Shiqiu, he was affected by the target culture which found bawdy instances unfavourable to Shakespeare's texts, but he

was also inclined towards another type of "ethical" norm, the translation norm of faithfulness, which assumes that a translator did not have the right to make omissions or alterations in the original text no matter whether they agree or disagree with the stated content. This corresponds to what Chesterman called the accountability norm, which is defined by him as "the demands of loyalty with regard to the original writer, the commissioner, the prospective readership and any other relevant parties" (Chesterman, 1993: 8; 2000: 68-69). A similar "principle of loyalty" was well raised by Christiane Nord, who put forward the "translator's responsibility to both the ST sender and TT recipient in a communication process" (Nord, 1991: 94-95). Liang Shiqiu promises his target readers a faithful reconstruction of Shakespeare's original text, as he stated in the foreword that he acted without any constraint and "did not restrict himself by any taboos or inhibitions" (Liang S.Q., 1981: 349-350) in translation. He insisted so much on maintaining the spirit and manner of the original that some Chinese critics even claimed that "Liang's translations were already the utmost of what a 'human being' could do in terms of faithfulness" (Ye S., 1968: 55). One can no doubt realize that Liang really paid much heed in preserving the truthfulness of the source language, as he voiced his own viewpoint on translation:

> Translators should not please the readers by trying hard to increase the readability of his target text, or take the risk of splitting the source text into pieces. Many years ago, I was assigned to read critically a famous translation of Edward Gibbon's *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. After I flipped through a few pages, I was much impressed by the fluency of the work. But when I tried to compare it with the original, I was so surprised to see most of the detailed descriptions were excised… large-scale omission of one to two hundred lines of the original text is simply irresponsible behaviour (Liang S.Q., 2004: 125).

In Liang's case, the norms prescribing loyalty towards the original author and text appear to overrule the norms such as the socio-cultural ones that forbid

sexual descriptions in Chinese literary works. But a closer examination of his translation behaviour indicates that a "break" can clearly be observed between what he claimed as his translation strategy and how he behaved in practice, since to all intents and purposes he still tended to suppress and understate some of the sexual innuendoes in Shakespeare. What characterizes Liang's version as "unfaithful" can be observed from some of the bowdlerized bawdy instances in his translations, and also the adoption of many metalinguistic comments "to resolve the conflicts between text models that he could not reconcile within the actual text of the translation" (Delabastita, 1993: 339). These extra footnotes are usually claimed to be a kind of compensatory device accompanying a "Bawdy Pun→Non-Bawdy Non-Pun" (strategy B2) rendering. But looking at it from a different angle, by deferring the suggestive puns from one textual level to another, Liang's translation behaviour can also be interpreted as making a tactful effort to keep the bawdy puns a distance away from the target readers. Thus, to be more accurate, Liang himself did not totally escape from the effects of culture-specific norms, only that the influence that pressured him is not as far-reaching as compared to the translators such as Zhu, who occupied the centre of the cultural norm. The relative position of a translator, according to Toury and Hermans, is intimately correlated to his individual status in a given community (Toury, 1999: 28; Hermans, 2000: 11). For this case in point, Liang Shiqiu was a Harvard-educated scholar and celebrated literary figure invited to take part in a big translation project. Undoubtedly, he enjoyed a high prestige when compared with the personal status of Zhu Shenghao, who was only a young editor unknown to the public at his time of translation. Liang therefore tended to be more ready to deviate from the mainstream cultural norms and was more "innovative" in rendering Shakespeare's bawdy language.

Another type of norm that highlights the translator's role as a "communicator", is also regulating the translation of Shakespeare's bawdiness. This norm assumes that "a translator should act in such a way as to optimize communication between the original writer and/or commissioner and the prospective readership" (Chesterman, 2000: 69; 1993: 8-9). During the 1930s and 1940s, most literary translations were writings difficult to read aloud as they were rendered mechanically and without regard to specific conditions (Fang P., 2000b: 505). Pointing exacting against these shortcomings, Zhu attempted to communicate his ideas clearly in fluent and comprehensible Chinese and he expressed disagreement towards "word for word" translation:

> I strive to reveal the author's ideas and completely restructure the source texts whenever it is incompatible with Chinese grammar, in order not to stumble when I come across obscure meanings. Every time I finished translating a paragraph, I would read it as if I were a reader to make sure there were no ambiguities in the translation, and I also considered myself a stage actor to examine whether the tone of my translation is harmonious or the rhythm was agreeable (Zhu S.H., 1947: 2).

Whilst Liang followed closely the ethical principles, spending much effort in studying and verifying the various Shakespearean editions, Zhu's behaviour conformed to the general communicative maxims to facilitate communication between the original writer and the prospective readership. Zhu emphasized so much on the clarity of his translation that he in fact neglected there was a need for dramatic language to be "ambiguous". Borrowing Alan Dessen's opinion in his book *Elizabethan Drama and the Viewer's Eyes*: "by reshaping what he considers to be a comprehensible language for his readers, the translator may then be burying the original language which the playwright had incorporated into his own play" (Dessen, 1977: 30).

To take it further, different translators might also expect a certain target of communication. As suggested by He Qixin, the target receivers of Shakespeare's works in China can at least be divided into four major groups given as below. In addition, I have also tried to give some examples of the version(s) intended for each group of receiver:

1. General readers of the mass markets who can only understand the meanings of Shakespeare through reading the translations
   (eg. Zhu Shenghao)
2. Students who intend to learn English or increase their knowledge of Western literature through studying the translations of Shakespeare
   (eg. Cao Weifeng, Bian Zhilin[30])
3. Directors or scriptwriters who wish to use the Chinese translations of Shakespeare for stage performances
   (eg. Cao Yu, Ying Ruocheng, Fang Ping)
4. Scholars, who are doing academic research on the original text of Shakespeare, but secure assistance of the Chinese translations (eg. Liang Shiqiu)

(He, Q.X., 2004)

Differing target readers require various kinds of translated versions to meet their requirements. For Zhu Shenghao, it is most evident that his translation strategy was targeted towards the mass market, as he sought to "popularize the great poet among general Chinese readers" (Zhu S.H., 1947: 3). Not surprisingly, specific production line characteristics of translations for the mass market outlined by John Milton, such as the elimination of stylistic devices, slang, sexual references, religious elements and so on (Milton, 2001: 43-69), did appear in Zhu's versions. On the other hand, Liang Shiqiu's approach belongs to what is called a "scholarly translation", which refers to "a type of translation, the emphasis of which is to reproduce the academic environment in which the source text is produced" (Chan, 2004: 200). Such "academic" translation that aims to be of use in research or literary teaching, generally seeks to "provide target readers of an extended introduction to the source text, annotations of terms and expressions, textual

analysis and criticism of the work". Another similar notion is "thick translation", which is defined by Appiah as a translation "that seeks with its annotations and its accompanying glosses to locate the text in a rich cultural and linguistic context" (Appiah, 1993: 817). In general, these terms are applied to a target text that contains a large amount of explanatory material to enhance better knowledge and deeper respect for the source culture in question. The translator sees his duty as a scholar to provide his target readers with a "complete translation" as faithful to the original as possible.

Also aiming to bridge the gulf between Shakespeare's texts and the Chinese readers, the group of target receivers intended by translators, like Cao Yu and Ying Ruocheng, were not the same as that of Zhu's or Liang's. Whilst creating a translated version for stage performances, Cao, perhaps China's most noted dramatist, worked in accordance with the target requirements of theatrical expediency, thus retaining any constitutive features which may be effective on the stage for one reason or another. In a similar case, Ying is a famous actor and director with extensive experience in stage acting. He was thus consciously aware of the situation that crowds at the Elizabethan theatre were made up of "common people or even the illiterate, but definitely not the civilized" (Shen H.H., 2001: 604). As such, the plays of Shakespeare were not intended to be studied or appreciated by great scholars and they should be "admired by scholars and laymen alike" (Ying R.C., 1981: 38). Bearing in mind the true nature of Shakespeare's audiences, Ying had therefore devoted much attention to representing the marketplace language of his stage dialogue, particularly the humourous and coarse speeches of comic characters, even though most of the suggestive instances were only presented in the form of non-puns which only contain the bawdy sense, such as his rendering of Puns 48, 56, 57, 59, 60 and 61.

6. Concluding Remarks

The research findings of a contrastive analysis revealed that the transposition of the Bard's bawdiness, in the Chinese context, involves a rich combination of underlying factors that exert influence on the translation choices of Shakespearean translators. Firstly, some of the original bawdy wordplays were buried in the early phase of perception. In other words, they are simply overlooked by the translators. This leads us to the perplexing problem of the fluctuating theatrical interpretations, and that the gradual changing editorial and critical traditions are actually guiding the Chinese translators in their understanding of Shakespeare's suggestive overtones. A number of renderings in the present corpus obviously belong to this group.

Secondly, even if a translator perceived the bawdy sense of a pun successfully, he was still deterred by the linguistic restraints arising during the transference of ribaldry. Shakespeare's bawdy wordplays represent a peculiar problem to translators. Owing to the ambiguous nature of these textual features, they are considered as untranslatable, or extremely difficult to translate.

However, while it is true that the imperceptibility of bawdy puns and the strictly technical barriers did contribute to the distortion in translation, these two factors alone cannot fully account for the regularities and irregularities observed in the corpus. As I have demonstrated in chapter five, the rendering of suggestive puns is governed by "norms", which are implicitly agreed-upon standards of what is considered a "correct" way to render a certain text. In the particular case of the translation of Shakespeare's bawdiness into Chinese language, there exists a target-culture norm that prescribes the suppression or minimization of bawdy elements, the sexual ones in particular.

If we consider the cultural norm from a historical perspective and compare the translations of Shakespearean bawdiness across three periods (*early period*: 1920-1949; *middle period*: 1950-1979; *late period*: 1980-), it is indicated that there is an overall decrease in the strategies which were characterized by the loss of bawdy sense and a steady increase in strategies which attempt to preserve the bawdy puns. Translators appear to be more eager in bringing to the fore the suggestive layer of meaning along the three periods. But the translation treatments of Shakespeare's bawdy wordplay are not very much in line with the modern history of sexual description in China. Moreover, when comparing a translator's performance across different periods, it is demonstrated that the approaches adopted are basically consistent. No dramatic change in translation behaviour is observed.

Although the cultural norm in question is not the most dominant factor to have restrained the translators' practices in this study, it seems that it is still an area which should not be neglected or ignored, as the norm proves to be a strong pressure on some of the sensitive puns in the corpus. Instead of being a stable and monolithic entity, the cultural norm in general became less stringent as time passed, and it interplayed with other types of translation norms of the target system, such as the ethical norms and communicative norms, thus exerting a joint effect on the decisions of translators and their final products.

Notes

---

[1] Ben Jonson (1572-1637) wrote in his poem *To the Memory of My Beloved the Author, Mr. William Shakespeare*: "He was not of an age, but for all time!" (Johnston, 1954: 286)

[2] According to Meng, China began to receive Shakespeare's works from 1921 onwards. But the Bard was not given special attention in China's New Cultural Movement (1919), which indicated a considerable difference from Shakespeare's reception in Europe during the 19th century, where he played a key role in European literary movements (Meng X.Q., 2002: 116-117).

[3] Apart from Fang Ping, other translators who contributed to the *New Complete Works of Shakespeare* published in 2000 include Ruan Kun, Zhang Chong, Wu Xinghua, Tan Lilan, Tu An and Tu Di.

[4] The *Dictionary of Obscenity and Taboo* was rendered by He Jintao and Jiang Lingyun into Chinese, under the title of *Yingyu Zhuangci Jinjiyu Cidian* (2001).

[5] The Bard's slang, puns and *double entendres* were a lot more obvious in the Elizabethan period than they are now. Most everyone in his audience got the point——they were so well–trained in the art of listening that they could hear a complicated joke on "hour" and "whore". While today, Shakespeare's archaic terms for sexual and scatological functions are apt to be mistaken (Chute, 1949: 102; Macrone, 1997: 149).

[6] Colman pointed out that: "the possible bawdy ambiguities must be weighed carefully if their value is to be judged at all accurately. On one hand there is the risk of reading past them; on the other, there is the risk of being so determined to grasp at every innuendo that we proceed to read in to the text lewd meanings which its wording and phrasing will not reasonably support" (Colman, 1974: 11).

[7] Raleigh, Walter. "Preface to Shakespeare". In *Johnson on Shakespeare*, 1931, 9-63.

[8] "Vertical puns" involve a single occurrence of the word and evoke more than one meaning on the basis of either homonymy (two words with the same form) or polysemy (one word with two or more meanings); "horizontal puns" present two or more occurrences of the original word, with a different meaning at each occurrence, again based on either polysemy or homonymy (Offord: 1997: 234).

[9] Refer to "*Appendix* 1" for a comparison between the strategies adopted by Zhu Shenghao and Cao Yu in translating bawdy puns in *Romeo and Juliet*.

[10] Malcolm Offord mentioned that six strategies are open to the translator when dealing with Shakespeare's wordplay: (1) ignore the pun completely; (2) imitate Shakespeare's technique; (3) major explicitly on the primary or surface meaning; (4) major explicitly on the secondary, underlying meaning; (5) mention both meanings and (6) create new wordplay (Offord, 1990: 104-140).

[11] As pointed out by Zhou Zhaoxiang, Zhou Zhuangping's translation of *Hamlet* is so similar to Liang's that it is likely to be an adaptation of Liang's work (Zhou Z.X., 1981: 8). See Zhou's rendering of Puns 34-42 in *Appendix* 1.

[12] I have translated back into English the Chinese translations from the editions mentioned in fig. 1. The back translations are quoted in square brackets "[ ]".

[13] Malapropism: "ludicrous misuse of words, especially in mistaking a word for another resembling it; an instance of this" (*OED*, 2002: 1679).

[14] Saintsbury, George (ed.) "The Conquest of Granada. Second Part. Defence of the Epilogue" In *John Dryden: Three Plays*, 1957, 171.

[15] In Nida's work *Towards A Science of Translating*, he proposed two basic orientations of translating: ie.: between "formal equivalence" (FE) and "dynamic equivalence" (DE) (Nida, 1964: 159-160). While a FE translation is oriented towards the "form and content" of the source text, a DE translation is based on "the principle of equivalent effect" (Nida, 1964: 159), where "the receptors of the message in the receptor language (should be able to) respond to it in substantially the same manner as the receptors in the source language" (Nida and Taber, 1969: 24).

[16] *Tail* and its homonym *tale* provided Shakespeare with a rich source of ribald ambiguity (refer to McDonald, 1996: 144-145).

[17] "The name *Pandarus* was popularised through Chaucer's celebrated poem "Troilus and Criseyde" (c. 1385). *Pandarus* was the character who acted as a go-between on Troilus's behalf to secure Criseyde's affections. In the sixteenth century, a pandar was initially 'one who arranged illicit love affairs', and then 'a pimp' (Flavell, 1995: 192).

[18] On the basis of Old Testament translations, Dr. Robert G. Bratcher identifies nine basic types of marginal notes, or foonotes, which may be used for the purpose of providing the kind of information that will help the reader understand the text more fully. They are (1) *textual*: notes that show the more important textual variants or alternative readings on which the translation is based;

(2) *translational*: notes that provide other possible translations of the same Hebrew reading; (3) *linguistic*: notes that explain plays on words, popular derivations of meaning, or the meaning of technical words and phrases; (4) *cultural*: notes explaining ancient beliefs, customs, rituals, or festivals; (5) *people*: notes identifying important personalities and explaining their significance as far as the immediate text is concerned; (6) *historical*: notes identifying important events and explaining their significance in the context of the immediate text; (7) *places*: notes identifying important geographical locations and explaining their significance; (8) *dates*: notes identifying the dates of events and people as accurately as possible; and (9) *references*: notes referring to other passages in the Bible, particularly in the New testament.

[19] Following Partridge's study, sixty-eight synonyms were used by Shakespeare in referring to the female sexual organs, ranging from implicit to explicit references. There are fewer descriptions of the male sex organs. But still, forty-five synonyms can be found.

[20] An overview of Shakespeare's bawdy names can be found in the essay written by Helge Kokeritz (1950), titled "Punning Names in Shakespeare".

[21] This indecent meaning was "considered distinctly improper by the British for about a century and a half, starting around 1790" (Rawson, 1989: 65).

[22] See Epstein, 1992: 119: "In *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, the word has a triple meaning: it is the name of a character; it means the buttocks, or ass, which is also a pun on the beast that Bottom turned into."

[23] Flatulence, the currently accepted term for wind, is derived from the Latin *flatus*, a word which also meant 'a blowing' or 'breathing' (McDonald, 1996: 161-162).

[24] Refer to Partridge's general comments on each play (Partridge, 2000: 44-46).

[25] *The Complete Works of Shakespeare* edited by W. J. Craig during the 1930s only provides a simple glossary at the end of the whole text without clarifying any of the obscenity and imprecation occurring in Shakespeare's works.

[26] Gu Zhengkun and Wang Dongfeng proposed to render the bawdy pun *lie* as *hunong* 糊弄 [to fool] or *wannong* 玩弄 [to dally with]. See Gu's translation of Pun 149 in *Appendix 1* and Wang's article "On Venuti's Dissident Translation Studies: Deconstructing Fidelity" (2004, 6: 4-5)

[27] The suggestive passages omitted by Zhu Shenghao were also supplemented by other hands when the Complete Works of Shakespeare was published in 1978.

[28] Shoyo Tsubouchi was the first Japanese translator who attempted to render a Shakespearean play *Julius Caesar* in 1884 (Anzai, 1999).

[29] Lin Tongji also pointed out that the first problem confronted by a translator is to choose an appropriate critical edition (Lin Tongji, 1982: preface).

[30] According to Chen Xiu, Bian Zhilin's translation is "an obligatory work on many university booklists for language study purposes" (Chen, 2002: 49). Zhang Manyi of The Hong Kong Chinese University also used Bian's *Hamlet* as teaching material in her translation courses (Bian Z.L., 1999: 6).

Bibliography

English:

Andersson, Lars & Trudgill, Peter. (1990). *Bad Language.* Oxford, UK.

Anzai, Tetsuo. (1999). "A Century of Shakespeare in Japan: A Brief Historical Survey". In *Shakespeare in Japan.* Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellon Press, 3-12.

Appiah, Kwame Anthony. (1993). "Thick Translation" In *Callaloo* 16 (4). Johns Hopkins University Press, 808-819.

Ayto, John. (1993). *Dictionary of Word Origins.* New York: Arcade Publishing.

--- (2000). *Dictionary of Euphemisms.* Bloomsbury Publishing Plc.

Bartsch, Renate. (1987). *Norms of Language: Theoretical and Practical Aspects.* London: Longman.

Bawcutt, N.W. (ed.) (1998). *Measure for Measure.* Oxford University Press.

Ben-Ari, Nitsa. (2000). "Ideological Manipulation of Translated Texts". *Translation Quarterly* 16&17. Hong Kong Translation Society, 40-52.

Berry, Edward. (1988). "Teaching Shakespeare in China". In *Shakespeare Quarterly* 39 (2). Washington: Folger Shakespeare Library, 212-216.

Bly, Mary. (1996). "Bawdy Puns and Lustful Virgins: The Legacy of Juliet's Desire in Comedies of the Early 1600s". In *Shakespeare Survey* 49. Cambridge University Press, 97-109.

Booth, Stephen. (2000). *Shakespeare's Sonnets.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Bowdler, Thomas. (1883). *The Family Shakespeare.* London: Longmans, Green and Co.

Bridges, Robert. (1966). *The Influence of the Audience on Shakespeare's Drama.* New York: Haskell House.

Brinkworth, E.R.C. (1972). *Shakespeare and the Bawdy Court of Stratford.* London and Chichester: Phillimore & Co. Ltd.

Burrow, Colin (ed.) (2002). *The Complete Sonnets and Poems.* Oxford University Press.

Carpenter, Marlene. (1991). *The Link Between Language and Consciousness: A Practical Philosophy.* University Press of America.

Catford J.C. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation.* Oxford University Press.

Chan, Sin-wai. (2004). *A Dictionary of Translation Technology.* Hong Kong: Chinese University Press.

Chang Nam-fung. (2000). "Towards a Macro-Polysystem Hypothesis". In *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology* 8 (2). University of Copenhagen, 109-123.

--- (2001). "Polysystem Theory: Its Prospect as a Framework for Translation Research". In *Target* 13 (2). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 317-332.

Charney, Maurice. (2000). *Shakespeare on Love and Lust.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Chen, Xiu. (2002). "The Necessity of Retranslating Classic Literary Works". In *Translation Quarterly* 26. Hong Kong Translation Society, 13-55.

Chesterman, Andrew. (1993). "From 'Is' to 'Ought': Laws, Norms and Strategies in Translation Studies". In *Target* 5 (1). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1-20.

--- "Description, Explanation, Prediction: A Response to Gideon Toury and Theo Hermans". In Schäffner (ed.) (1999). *Translation and Norms.* Clevedon; Philadelphia, Pa.: Multilingual Matters, 90-97.

--- (2000). *Memes of Translation: The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Chesterman, Andrew & Williams, Jenny. (2002). *The Map: a Beginner's Guide to Doing Research in Translation Studies*. Manchester; Northampton: St. Jerome Publishing.

Chu, J. Rudolph. (1970). "Shakespeare in China: Translations and Translators". In *Tamkang Review* 1 (2). Taiwan: Graduate School of Western Languages and Literature, Tamkang University, 155-182.

Colman, E.A.M. (1974). *The Dramatic Use of Bawdy in Shakespeare*. London: Longman.

Craig, Charlotte M. (1989). "A.W. Schlegel's Rendering of Shakespearian Wordplays". In Kenneth E. Larson & Hansjoerg R. Schelle (eds.) *The Reception of Shakespeare in Eighteenth-Century France and Germany* 15 (2), 215-225.

Craik, Thomas Wallace (ed.) (1998). *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. Oxford University Press.

Crystal, David & Crystal, Ben. (2002). *Shakespeare's Words: A Glossary & Language Companion*. London; New York: Penguin Group.

Davidson, Alan. (1999). *The Oxford Companion to Food*. Oxford University Press.

Delabastita, Dirk. (1985). "Shakespeare's Sonnets in Translation: A T.T.-Oriented Approach". In Hermans, Theo (ed.) *Second Hand: Papers on the Theory and Historical Study of LiteraryTranslation*. ALW, Antwerp, 106-127.

--- (1987). "Translating Puns: Possibilities and Constraints". In *New Comparison* 3. British Comparative Literature Association, 143-159.

--- (1993). *There's a Double Tongue: an Investigation into the Translation of Shakespeare's Wordplay, with Special Reference to Hamlet*. Amsterdam; Atlanta: Rodopi.

--- (1994). "Focus on the Pun: Wordplay as a Special Problem in Translation Studies". In *Target* 6 (2). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 223-243.

--- (1996). *Wordplay and Translation*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

--- (1997a). "Shakespeare Translation". In Baker, Mona (ed.) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London; New York: Routledge, 222-226.

--- (1997b). *Traductio: Essays on Punning and Translation*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

--- (1998). "I Will Something Affect the Letter: Shakespeare's Letter-Puns and the Translator". In Peter Bush & Kirsten Malmkjaer (eds.) *Rimbaud's Rainbow: Literary Translation in Higher Education*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 145-156.

--- (1999). "Shakespeare in Translation: A Bird's Eye View of Problems and Perspectives". In José Roberto O'Shea (ed.) *Revista Ilha Do Desterro* 36. Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, 15-27.

--- (2002). "A Great Feast of Languages: Shakespeare's Multilingual Comedy in 'King Henry V' and the Translator". In *The Translator* 8 (2). Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 303-340.

Dessen, Alan. (1977). *Elizabethan Drama and the Viewer's Eyes*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Donner, H.W. (1974). "Some Problems of Shakespearian Translation". In *Shakespeare Translation* 1. Tokyo: Yushudo Shoten, 1-14.

Duncan-Jones, Katherine (ed.) (2003). *Shakespeare's Sonnets*. London: Arden Shakespeare.

Ellis, A. Herbert. (1973). *Shakespeare's Lusty Punning in Love's Labour's Lost: With Contemporary Analogues*. Mouton & Co. N.V., Publishers, The Hague.

Epstein, Norrie. (1992). In *The Friendly Shakespeare: A Thoroughly Painless Guide to the Best of the Bard*. New York: Viking.

Evans, G. Blakemore (ed.) (1997). *The Riverside Shakespeare*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Even-Zohar, Itamar. (1978). "The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem". In Holmes, Lambert & Broeck (eds.) *Literature and Translation: New Perspectives in Literary Studies*. Leuven: Acco, 117-127.

Ewbank, Inga-Stina. (1995). "Shakespeare Translation as Cultural Exchange". In *Shakespeare Survey* 48. Cambridge University Press, 1-12.

Fabricius, Johannes. (1994). *Syphilis in Shakespeare's England*. London; Bristol, Pa.: Jessica Kingsley.

Fan, Shen. (1988). "Shakespeare in China: The Merchant of Venice". In *Asian Theatre Journal* 5 (1). University of Hawaii Press, 23-37.

Farrer, James. (2002). *Opening Up: Youth Sex Culture and Market Reform in Shanghai*. The University of Chicago Press.

Fawcett, Peter & Heathcote, Owen (eds.) (1990). *Translation in Performance: Papers on the Theory and Practice of Translation*, Bradford Occasional Papers 10, Bradford: University of Bradford, Department of Modern Languages, 104-140.

Flavell, Linda & Roger. (1995). *Dictionary of Word Origins*. Kyle Cathie Limited.

Frantz, David O. (1989). *Festum Voluptatis: A Study of Renaissance Erotica*. Ohio State University Press.

Gentzler, Edwin. (1996). "Translation, Counter-Culture, and The Fifties in the USA". In Álvarez & Vidal (eds.) *Translation, Power, Subversion*. Clevedon; Philadelphia: Mutilingual Matters, 116-137.

Govind. (1998). "Shakespeare Censored" [online], I. Available from:

http://ccwf.cc.utexas.edu/~govind/shakespeare/

Gramm, Andreas. "Sexual Allusions in the Works of William Shakespeare" [online], I. Available from:

http://page.inf.fu-berlin.de/~gramm/essais/ShakespearesBawdy.htm

Green, Jonathan. (1999). *The Big Book of Filth*. London: Cassell.

Green, Lawrence D. (1972). "'Where's My Fool?': Some Consequences of the Omission of the Fool in Tate's Lear". *Studies in English Literature* 12 (2), 259-274.

Green, Martin. (1974). *The Labyrinth of Shakespeare's Sonnets: An Examination of Sexual Elements in Shakespeare's Language*. London: Charles Skilton Ltd..

Greenblatt, Stephen (ed.) (1997). *The Norton Shakespeare*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Gulik, Robert Hans van. (2003). *Sexual Life in Ancient China*. Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden.

Hammond, Paul. (2002). *Figuring Sex between Men from Shakespeare to Rochester*. Oxford University Press.

Harris, Jonathan Gil. (2004). *Drama, Mercantilism and Disease in Shakespeare's England*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Hasan, Ghazala. (2002). "The Translator's Dilemma with Bias". In *Babel* 48(2), 147-161.

Hatim, Basil. (1997). *The Translator as Communicator*. London; New York: Routledge.

--- (2001). *Teaching and Researching: Translation*. Harlow; New York: Longman.

He, Qixin. (1986a). *Shakespeare Through Chinese Eyes*. Kent State University.

--- (1986b). "China's Shakespeare". In *Shakespeare Quarterly* 37 (2). Washington: Folger Shakespeare Library, 149-159.

Hecht, Anthony. (1997). "The Sonnet: Ruminations on Form, Sex and History". In *The Antioch Review* 55 (2).

Hermans, Theo. (1991). "Translation Norms and Correct Translations". In Leuven- Zwart & Naaijkens (eds.) *Translation Studies: the State of the Art*. Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi, 155-169.

--- (1993). "On Modelling Translation: Models, Norms and the Field of Translation". *Livius* 4, 69-88.

--- (1996). "Norms and the Determination of Translation: A Theoretical Framework". In Álvarez & Vidal (eds.) *Translation, Power, Subversion*. Clevedon; Philadelphia: Mutilingual Matters, 25-51.

--- (1999a). *Translation in Systems: Descriptive and Systemic Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

--- (1999b). "Translation and Normativity". In Schäffner (ed.) *Translation and Norms*. Clevedon; Philadelphia, Pa.: Multilingual Matters, 50-71.

--- (2000). "Norms of Translation". In *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation*, 10-15.

--- (2002). *Crosscultural Transgressions: Research Models in Translation Studies*. Manchester; Northampton: St. Jerome Publishing.

Heylen, Romy. (1993). *Translation, Poetics, and the Stage: Six French Hamlets*. London; New York: Routledge.

Hibbard, G.R. (ed.) (1998). *Hamlet*. Oxford University Press.

Ho, Josephine. (1997). *Sexuality in Contemporary Chinese Culture*. [online], I. Available from:

http://sex.ncu.edu.tw/members/ho/speech/SexualityInChineseCulture.pdf

Hoenselaars, Ton. (2004). *Shakespeare and the Language of Translation*. London: Arden Shakespeare.

Holder R.W. (2003). *Oxford Dictionary of Euphemisms*. Oxford University Press.

Holmes, James S. (1988). *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Homem, Rui Carvalho & Hoenselaars, Ton. (2004). "Translating Shakespeare for the Twenty-First Century", In *DQR Studies in Literature* 35. Amsterdam; New York: Rodopi.

Honigmann, E.A.J. (ed.) (2002). *Othello*. The Arden Shakespeare.

Hughes, Geoffrey. (1998). *Swearing: A Social History of Foul Language, Oaths and Profanity in English*. Penguin Books Ltd.

Hulme, Hilda M. (1977). "The Less Decent Language of the Time". In *Explorations in Shakespeare's Language: Some Problems of Word Meaning in the Dramatic Text*. London: Longmans, 89-150.

Hunt, Lynn. (1993). *The Invention of Pornography: Obscenity and the Origins of Modernity, 1500-1800*. New York: Zone Books.

Hwang, Meishu. (1974). "Translating Puns for the Stage". In *Renditions* Autumn. Chinese University of Hong Kong, 73-78.

Hyland, Peter. (2003). "'Will' and the Poet". In *An Introduction to Shakespeare's Poems*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 175-181.

Jin, Di & Nida, Eugene Albert. (1984). *On Translation: With Special Reference to Chinese and English*. Beijing: Chinese Translation & Publishing Corporation.

Johnson, Samuel. (1765). *The Plays of William Shakespeare*. London.

Johnston, George Burke (ed.) (1954). *Poems of Ben Jonson*. Routledge and K. Paul.

Kao, George. (1994). "Euphemism: Its Interpretation and Translation". In *Translation and Interpreting: Bridging East and West: Selected Conference Papers*. Honolulu, HI: College of Languages, Linguistics and Literature, University of Hawaii: East-West Centre, 171-179.

Karjalainen, Markus. (2002). *Where Have All the Swearwords Gone: An Analysis of the Loss of Swearwords in Two Swedish Translations of J.D. Salingers Catcher in the Rye*. University of Helsinki.

Ke, Ping. (1999). "Cultural Presuppositions and Misreadings". In *Meta* XLIV, 133-143.

Keevak, Michael. (2001). *Sexual Shakespeare: Forgery, Authorship, Portraiture*. Wayne State University Press.

Kökeritz, Helge. (1950). "Punning Names in Shakespeare". In *Modern Language Notes* 65 (4). Johns Hopkins Press, 240-243.

--- (1953). *Shakespeare's Pronunciation*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Lefevere, Andre. (1992a). *Translating Literature: Practice and Theory in a Comparative Literature Context*. New York: Modern Language Association of America.

--- (1992b). *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London; New York: Routledge.

Leppihalme, Ritva. (1997). *Culture Bumps: An Empirical Approach to the Translation of Allusions*. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters, 1997.

Leuven-Zwart, Kitty M. (1989). "Translation and Original: Similarities and Dissimilarities I". In *Target* 1 (2). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 151-181.

--- (1990). "Translation and Original: Similarities and Dissimilarities II". In *Target* 2 (1). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 69-95.

Levenson, Jill (ed.) (2000). *Romeo and Juliet*. Oxford University Press.

Levine, Suzanne Jill. (1991). *Subversive Scribe*. Graywolf Press.

Levith, Murray J. (1998). "The Bard and the Dragon: Shakespeare in China". In *Shakespeare: Readers, Audiences and Players*. University of Western Australia Press, 64-73.

--- (2004). *Shakespeare in China*. London; New York: Continuum.

Li, Ruru. (1991). "Shakespeare Translation in China". In *Leeds East Asia Papers* No. 4. University of Leeds: Department of East Asian Studies.

--- (1995). "The Bard in the Middle Kingdom". In *Asian Theatre Journal* 12. University of Hawaii Press, 50-84.

--- (1999). "Shakespeare on the Chinese Stage in the 1990s". In *Shakespeare Quarterly* 50 (3). Washington: Folger Shakespeare Library, 355-367.

--- (2003). *Shashibiya: Staging Shakespeare in China.* Hong Kong University Press.

Li, Ruru & Jiang, David. (1997). "The 1994 Shanghai International Shakespeare Festival: An Update on the Bard in Cathay". In *Asian Theatre Journal* 14. University of Hawaii Press, 93-119.

Lin, Fuhung. (1985). "The Role of the Fool in Shakespeare's *King Lear*". In *Journal of the College of Law and Commerce* 20. Taiwan: National Chung Hsing University, 263-276.

Lin, Shen. (1989). "Translating Bawdy in *Romeo and Juliet*: Notes on Linguisitc and Cultural Convergencies and Divergencies". In *Shakespeare Worldwide: Translation and Adaptation.* Tokyo: Yushudo Shoten.

Lombardo, Agostino. (1993). "Translating Shakespeare for the Theatre". In Robert Clark & Piero Boitani (eds.) *English Studies in Transition.* London; New York: Routledge, 138-146.

Lung, Rachel. (1999). "On Mistranslating Sexually Suggestive Elements in English-Chinese Screen Subtitling". *Babel* 44 (2), 97-109.

--- (2003). "Translating Sensitive Texts". *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology* 11 (4). University of Copenhagen, 255-268.

Macrone, Michael. (1997). *Naughty Shakespeare.* Kansas City: Andrews & McMeel.

Manchester, P.T. (1931). "Macbeth in the Hands of French and Spanish Translators". In *The Modern Language Journal* 16 (1), 1-13.

Martin, Alice. (2001). "A Translator's View of Translation Norms" [online], I. Available from: http://www.eng.helsinki.fi/hes/Translation/a_translator.htm

McCall, J. (1977). *William Shakespeare: Spacious in the Possession of Dirt.* Washington, D.C.: UP of America.

McDonald, James. (1996). *A Dictionary of Obscenity, Taboo and Euphemism.* London: Sphere Books Ltd.

--- (2001). "Double Talk". In *Shakespeare and the Arts of Language*. Oxford University Press, 137-163.

Mcmahon, Keith. (1987). "Eroticism in Late Ming, Early Qing Fiction: The Beauteous Realm and the Sexual Battlefield". In *T'oung Pao* LXXIII. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 217-264.

Meng, Xianqiang. (2002). "The Reception of Shakespeare in China". In Tam Kwok-Kan, Parkin Andrew & Yip Siu-han Terry (eds.) *Shakespeare Global/Local: The Hong Kong Imaginary in Transcultural Production*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 115-130.

Milton, John. (2001). "Translating Classic Fiction for Mass Markets: The Brazilian Clube do Livro". In *The Translator* 7 (1). Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 43-69.

Montagu, Ashley. (2001). "Swearing in Shakespeare". In *The Anatomy of Swearing*. University of Pennsylvania Press, 136-153.

Muir, Kenneth (ed.) (1998). *Troilus and Cressida*. Oxford University Press.

Munday, Jeremy. (2001). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. London; New York: Routledge.

Murray, James. (1933). *The Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Neill, Michael (ed.) (2000). *The Tragedy of Anthony and Cleopatra*. Oxford University Press.

Newmark, Peter. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. Prentice Hall.

Nida, Eugene Albert. (1964). *Toward a Science of Translating: With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

--- (1969). *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Nord, Christiane. (1991). *Text Analysis in Translation*. Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi.

--- (1997). *Translating as a Purposeful Activity*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Offord, Malcolm. (1990). "'Translating Shakespeare's Word Play". In Peter Fawcett & Owen Heathcote (eds.) *Translation in Performance: Papers on the Theory and Practice of Translation*, Bradford Occasional Papers 10, Bradford: University of Bradford, Department of Modern Languages, 101-140.

--- (1997). "Mapping Shakespeare's Puns in French Translations". In Delabastita (ed.) *Traductio: Essays on Punning and Translation*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 233- 260.

Osborn, Noel. (1982). "Basic Types of Footnotes for Old Testament Translations". In *The Bible Translator* 33 (4). London: United Bible Societies, 414-418.

Pan, Suiming. (1993). "A Sex Revolution in Current China". In *Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality* 6 (2). New York: Haworth Press, 1-15.

Partridge, Eric. (1961). *A Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English*. London: Routledge & Paul.

--- (2000). *Shakespeare's Bawdy*. London; New York: Routledge.

Pequigney, Joseph. (1985). *Such is My Love: A Study of Shakespeare's Sonnets*. University of Chicago Press.

Perrin, Noel. (1992). *Dr. Bowdler's Legacy: A History of Expurgated Books in England and America*. Boston: David R. Godline.

Pointner Erik, Frank. (2003). *Bawdy and Soul: A Revaluation of Shakespeare's Sonnets*. Heidelberg: Universitatsverlag Winter.

Pugals, Esteban. (1975). "On Translating Shakespeare into Spanish". In *Shakespeare Translation* 2. Tokyo: Yushudo Shoten, 16-29.

Pym, Anthony. (1998). *Method in Translation History*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

--- (1999). "Okay, So How Are Translation Norms Negotiated?". In Schäffner (ed.) *Translation and Norms.* Clevedon; Philadelphia, Pa.: Multilingual Matters, 106-112.

Rawson, Hugh. (1989). *Wicked Words: A Treasury of Curses, Insults, Put-downs, and Other Formerly Unprintable Terms from Anglo-Saxon Times to the Present.* New York: Crown Publishers.

Robinson, Douglas. (1999). "Looking Through Translation: A Response to Gideon Toury and Theo Hermans". In Schäffner (ed.) *Translation and Norms.* Clevedon; Philadelphia, Pa.: Multilingual Matters.

Ruan, Fangfu. (1991). *Sex in China: Studies in Sexology in China Culture.* New York: Plenum Press.

Rubinstein, Frankie. (1989). *A Dictionary of Shakespeare's Sexual Puns and their Significance.* 2nd edition, London: Macmillan.

--- (1989). "There Were Not Such Good Years". In *Shakespeare Quarterly* 40 (1). Washington: Folger Shakespeare Library, 70-74.

Schäffner, Christina. (1999). "The Concept of Norms in Translation Studies". In *Translation and Norms.* Clevedon; Philadelphia, Pa.: Multilingual Matters, 1-8.

Schmitz, John Robert. (1998). "Suppression of References to Sex and Body Functions in the Brazilian and Portuguese Translations of J.D.Salinger's The Catcher in the Rye". In *Meta* XLIII (2), 242-253. Also available from: http://www.erudit.org/revue/meta/1998/v43/n2/004046ar.html

Sheidlower, Jesse. (1999). "About the F-word". In *The F-word.* London: Faber and faber, xi-xxxi.

Silverbush, Rhona. (2002). *Speak the Speech!: Shakespeare's Monologues Illuminated.* New York: Faber and Faber.

Sinclair, John. (1987). *Collins Cobuild English Language Dictionary.* William Collins Sons & Co Ltd.

Smith, Bruce R. (1991). "Book Reviews: *Shakespeare's Mercutio: His History and Drama* by Joseph A. Porter". In *Shakespeare Quarterly* 42 (1). Washington: Folger Shakespeare Library, 99-102.

Steiner, George. (1965). "Night Words". In *Encounter* XXV (4). London: Encounter Ltd., 14-19.

Toury, Gideon. (1980). *In Search of a Theory of Translation.* Tel Aviv: Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics, Tel Aviv University.

--- (1995). *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

--- (1999a). "A Handful of Paragraphs on 'Translation' and 'Norms'". In Schäffner (ed.) *Translation and Norms.* Clevedon; Philadelphia, Pa.: Multilingual Matters, 9-31.

--- (1999b). "Some of Us Are Finally Talking to Each Other. Would it Mark the Beginning of a True Dialogue? Comments on Responses". In Schäffner (ed.) *Translation and Norms.* Clevedon; Philadelphia, Pa.: Multilingual Matters, 129-140.

--- (2000). "The Nature and Role of Norms in Translation", *The Translation Studies Reader.* London: Routledge, 198-211.

Traub, Valerie. (1992). *Desire and Anxiety: Circulations of Sexuality in Shakespearean Drama.* London; New York: Routledge.

Vázquez, Adolfo Luis Soto. (2003). "Shakespeare's Use of Malapropisms and their Reflection in Spanish Translation". In *Babel* 49 (1), 1-22.

Viaggio, Sergio. (1999). "The Limitations of the Strictly Socio-Historial Description of Norms: A Response to Theo Hermans and Gideon Toury". In Schäffner (ed.) *Translation and Norms.* Clevedon; Philadelphia, Pa.: Multilingual Matters, 122-128.

Videbæk, Bente A. (1996). *The Stage Clown in Shakespeare's Theatre*. Greenwood Press.

Wang, James J. (1994). *Outrageous Chinese: A Guide to Chinese Street Language*. San Francisco: China Books.

Wang, Shuhua. (1993). *Politics into Play: Shakespeare in Twentieth-century China*. The Pennsylvania State University.

Webb, J. Barry. (1988). *Shakespeare's Animal (And Related) Imagery: Chiefly in the Erotic Context*. The Cornwallis Press.

--- (1989). *Shakespeare's Erotic Word Usage: The Body, its Parts, Analogues and Images*. The Cornwallis Press.

Weisstein, Ulrich. (1974). *Comparative Literature and Literary Theory: Survey and Introduction*. Indiana University Press.

Wells, Stanley (ed.) (2001a). *The History of King Lear*. Oxford University Press.

--- (2001b). *Shakespeare and Sexuality*. Cambridge University Press.

--- (2003). *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide*. Oxford University Press.

--- (2004). *Looking for Sex in Shakespeare*. Cambridge University Press.

Whitworth, Charles (ed.) (2002). *The Comedy of Errors*. Oxford University Press.

Williams, Gordon. (1997). *A Glossary of Shakespeare's Sexual Language*. Athlone Press Ltd.

Wilson, John Dover. (1933). *Aspects of Shakespeare, Studies by Members of the Shakespeare Association*. Oxford Clarendon Press.

Zhang, Xiaoyang. (1993). *Shakespeare and Traditional Chinese Drama: Shakespeare in Chinese Culture—A Comparative Study in Cultural Materialism*. Southampton University.

Chinese:

Bai Liping 白立平，「莎士比亞十四行詩第一五一首中猥褻雙關語的翻譯」，《世界文學》（台灣），2002，2，169-180。

---，「『贊助』與翻譯——胡適對梁實秋翻譯莎士比亞的影響」，《中外文學》（台灣），2001，30（7），159-177。

Bao Huinan 包惠南，《文化語境與語言翻譯》，北京中國對外翻譯出版社，1991。

Bian Zhilin 卞之琳，「關於我譯的莎士比亞悲劇《哈姆雷特》: 無書有序」，《外國文學研究》，1980，1，38-50。

---，「譯本說明」，《莎士比亞四大悲劇》，貓頭鷹出版社有限公司，1999，5-9。

Bian Zhilin, Ye Shuifu, Yuan Kejia & Chen Shen 卞之琳、葉水夫、袁可嘉、陳燊，「十年來的外國文學翻譯和研究工作」，《文學評論》，1959，5，41-77。

Cao Shujun 曹樹鈞，「田漢與莎士比亞的戲劇創作」，《理論與創作》，1995，3，60-62。

Cao Shujun & Sun Fuliang 曹樹鈞、孫福良，《莎士比亞在中國舞台上》，1989。

Cao Weifeng 曹未風，「莎士比亞在中國」，《文藝月報》，1954，4，29-34。

---，「翻譯莎士比亞札記(1-6)」，《外語教學與翻譯》，1959。

Cao Yu 曹禺，「前言」，《柔蜜歐與幽麗葉》，人民文學出版社，1979，1-6。

Cha Mingjian 查明建，「意識形態、翻譯選擇規範與翻譯文學形式庫——從多元系統理論角度透視中國五十-七十年代的外國文學翻譯」，《中外文學》，2001，30（3），63-91。

Chang Nam-fung 張南峰，「Delabastita 的雙關語翻譯理論在英漢翻譯中的應用」，《中國翻譯》，2003，1，30-36。

---，「德拉巴斯替塔的雙關語翻譯理論在英漢翻譯中的應用」，《中西譯學批評》，清華大學出版社，2004，168-185。

Chen Jiachun 陳家春，《慾魘的透視: 中國當代小說與性文化》，香港教育圖書公司，1999。

Chow Simon 周兆祥，《漢譯哈姆雷特研究》，中文大學出版社，1981。

Du Chengnan & Wen Jun 杜承南、文軍，《中國當代翻譯百論》，重慶大學出版社，1994。

Fang Ping 方平，「譯者的話」，《捕風捉影》，平明出版社，1953，1-35。

---，「譯後記」，《莎士比亞喜劇五種》，上海譯文出版社，1979，691-700。

---，「戲劇大師翻譯的戲劇——談曹禺譯《柔蜜歐與幽麗葉》」，《翻譯通訊》，1984，11-14。

---，「從粗俗中見博大精深——一個莎劇譯者的思考」，《中國莎學年鑒》，長春東北師範大學出版社，1995，17-25。

---，「莎士比亞的社會問題劇」《自作自受》」，《外國文學評論》，1997，2，122-127。

---，《謙遜的真理》，遼寧教育出版社，1998。

---，《新莎士比亞全集·關於體例》，河北教育出版社，2000a，487-503。

---，《新莎士比亞全集‧後記》，河北教育出版社，2000b，504-519。

Ge Baoquan 戈寶權，「莎士比亞的作品在中國」，《世界文學》，1964，136-143。

Gu Zhengkun 辜正坤，「關於莎士比亞十四行詩的翻譯問題」，《莎士比亞十四行詩集》，北京大學出版社，1998，4-8。

Guo Lisha 郭麗莎，「現代西方俗文學的引介──論林紓翻譯的哈葛德小說」，《思想戰線》，1999，3，73-77。

He Qixin 何其莘，「漢譯莎劇的力作──評梁實秋譯《莎士比亞全集》」，引自: http://www.prcedu.com/exam/text/file02/0815190.htm (2004 年 1 月)

He Xianglin 賀祥麟，「讚賞、質疑和希望──評朱生豪莎劇若干劇本」，《外國文學》，1981，7，85-91。

Jiao Yinfu 焦尹孚，「評田漢君的莎譯──羅密歐與茱麗葉」，《洪水》，1926，1，356-360。

Lai Shouzheng 賴守正，「情色文學與翻譯」，《西洋情色文學史》（Histoire de la littérature érotique），城邦出版集團，2003，9-42。

Lan Renzhe 藍仁哲，「莎劇的翻譯: 從散文體到詩體譯本──兼論方平主編《新莎士比亞全集》」，《中國翻譯》，2003，24（3），40-44。

Li Guoqiang (ed.) 李國強編，《94 上海國際莎士比亞戲劇節論文集》，上海文藝出版社，1996。

Liang Shiqiu 梁實秋，「翻譯莎士比亞全集後記」，《書目季刊》，1967，2（1），75-79。

---，「關於莎士比亞的翻譯」，《翻譯論集》，香港三聯書店，1981，343-357。

---，《雅舍散文》，九歌出版社，1986。

---，「莎士比亞與性」，《梁實秋讀書札記》，中國廣播電視出版社，1990，9-12。

---，「莎翁名著《哈姆雷特》的兩種譯本」，《雅舍談書》，九歌出版社，2002，15-20。

---，《梁實秋雜文集》，中國社會出版社，2004。

Lin Lunlun 林倫倫，《中國言語禁忌與避諱》，香港中華書局有限公司，1994。

Lin Yutang 林語堂，《當代漢英辭典》：

http://www.arts.cuhk.edu.hk/Lexis/Lindict/

Liu Huiying 劉慧英，「當代的文化死角: 無愛的性和無性的愛」，《明報月刊》，1991 年 8 月，43-49。

Lü Jun 呂俊，「談雙關語的漢譯英問題」，《翻譯通訊》，1983，7，32-34。

Lu Xun 魯迅 (1934)，「莎士比亞」，引 自:

http://www.grassy.org/Book/BKContent.asp?BookID=1273 (2000 年 7 月)

Ma Zhuorong 馬焯榮，「談"莎味"與"中國化"之爭」，《莎士比亞在中國》，1987，43-53。

Mao Dun 茅盾，《中國古代小說中的性描寫》，天津百花文藝出版社，1993。

Mao Ronggui 毛榮貴，「英語幽默語言漢譯漫談」，《外國語》，1992，1，48-52。

Meng Xianqiang 孟憲強，《中國莎學簡史》，東北師範大學出版社，1994。

Peng Jingxi 彭鏡禧，「莎劇中文譯本概述: 台灣篇」，引 自:

http://www-ms.cc.ntu.edu.tw/~theatre/perng/b-04.htm

（另載於《中外文學》1999 年 7 月）。

---, 「緒論」，《哈姆雷》，2001，vii-xc。

Qiu Ke'an 裘克安，「略議莎劇漢譯技巧」，《人民日報．海外版》，1991
年 6 月 13 日。

---, 「中譯莎士比亞全集的校訂和增補」，《中國翻譯》，1999，2，53-54。

Shen Huihui 申慧輝，「通藝術之道，傳名作之神——淺談英若誠的劇本翻
譯」，《英若誠譯名劇五種》，遼寧教育出版社，2001，602-611。

Shi Yongzhou 施穎洲，「譯詩的藝術——中譯『莎翁聲籟』自序」，《莎
翁聲籟》，台北皇冠雜誌，1973，5-18。

Sun Dayu 孫大雨，「序言」，《黎琊王》，1948，1-17。

---, 「譯序」，《罕穆萊德》，上海譯文出版社，1991，I-XVI。

---, 「莎譯瑣談」，《中外論壇》，1993，4，21-24。

---, 「譯序」，《哈姆雷特羅密歐與朱麗葉》，2003，4，3-15。

Sun Jinren & Sun Jiashi 孫近仁、孫佳始，「說不盡的莎士比亞」，《群言》，
1993，4，21-23。

---, 《耿介清正: 孫大雨紀傳》，太原: 山西人民出版社，1999。

Sun Qin'an 孫琴安，《中國性文學史》，臺北市桂冠圖書股份有限公司，
1995。

Sun Yifeng 孫藝風，「翻譯規範與主體意識」，《中國翻譯》，2003，24
（3），3-9。

Suo Tianzhang 索天章，「英若誠譯《請君入甕》」，《外語教學與研究》，
1984，2，70-74。

Tian Han 田漢，《田漢全集．第 18 卷》，花山文藝出版社，2000。

Wang Bin 王彬，《清代禁書總述》，北京中國書店，1999。

Wang Dongfeng 王東風，「論翻譯過程中的文化介入」，《中國翻譯》，

    1998，5，6-9。

---，「韋努蒂的反調譯論: 解構 "忠實"」，《中國翻譯》，2004，6: 3-9。

Wang Shijun & Sun Li 王士俊、孫麗，「略論莎士比亞作品中的猥褻語」，

    《'94 上海國際莎士比亞戲劇節論文集》，上海文藝出版社，1996，

    284-299。

Wang Yucun 王玉川，「莎士比亞戲劇中之雙關語」，《高雄師大學報》，

    高雄國立高雄師範大學，1991，2，252-278。

Xia Zhengnong 夏征農，《辭海》，上海辭書出版社，1999。

Xie Pengxiong 謝鵬雄，《文學中的性》，九歌出版社，1994。

Xu Zhongbing 徐仲炳，「從朱生豪譯《莎士比亞全集》中雙關的處理談英

    語雙關的翻譯」，《中國翻譯》，1988，6，9-12。

Ye Shan 葉珊，「梁譯莎劇的印象」，《純文學》，1968，19，52-62。

Ying Ruocheng 英若誠，「《請君入甕》譯後記」，《外國文學》，北京外

    國教學與研究出版社，1981，7，37-38。

Zhang Jinzhong 張錦忠，「戲劇的翻譯: 以台灣晚近莎劇新譯為例」，《中

    外文學》，2001，7，197-210。

Zhang Jing'er 張靜二,「『莎劇崇拜』在臺灣」,《中國現代文學理論季刊》,

    1996，2，270-282。

Zhang Siyang 張泗洋，《莎士比亞大辭典》，北京商務印書館，2001。

Zhao Ning 趙寧，「Gideon Toury 翻譯規範論介紹」，《外語教學與研究》，

　　2001，33（3），216-219。

Zhongguo Shashibiya Yanjiuhui (ed.) 中國莎士比亞研究會編，《莎士比亞在

　　中國》，上海文藝出版社，1987。

Zhou Siyuan 周思源，「論《紅樓夢》的性意識」，《明報月刊》，1991

　　年 8 月，31-36。

Zhou Zhuangping 周莊萍，「序」，《哈夢雷特》，上海啟明書局，1938，

　　1-3。

Zhou Zhaoxiang & Zhang Canhui 周兆祥、張燦輝，「樂而不淫的中國傳統

　　性觀念」，《信報財經月刊》，1985，9（7），106-112。

Zhu Hongda & Wu Jiemin 朱宏達、吳潔敏，「朱生豪和莎士比亞」，《外

　　國文學研究》，1986，2，16-21。

---，「朱生豪與莎士比亞（續）」，《外國文學研究》，1986，3，39-42。

---，《朱生豪傳》，上海外語教育主版社，1989。

Zhu Jungong 朱駿公，「朱譯莎劇得失談」，《中國翻譯》，1998，5，24-26。

Zhu Shanggang 朱尚剛，《詩侶莎魂──我的父母朱生豪、宋清如》，上海

　　華東師範大學出版社，1999。

Zhu Shenghao 朱生豪，「譯者自序」，《莎士比亞戲劇全集》，上海世界

　　書局，1947，1-3。

---，「前言」，《莎士比亞全集》，北京人民文學出版社，2003。

---，《朱生豪情書》，上海社會科學院出版社，2003。

Appendix 1: The Translation of Shakespeare's Bawdy Puns

	Shakespeare's bawdy puns The presenting and underlying senses	Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code	Cao W.F.	Code
1.	*A&C* **Nose** "If you were but an inch of fortune better than I, where would you choose it? Not in my husband's nose." S1: proboscis S2: penis	不是在我丈夫的鼻子上	B2	不是好在我的丈夫的鼻子上 +注	E	不要因為我丈夫的鼻子長了幾分 +注	E	反正不希望它長在我丈夫的鼻子上	B2
2.	*A&C* **Die** "Cleopatra, catching but the least noise of this, dies instantly…" S1: loss of life S2: sexual orgasm	克莉奧佩屈拉衹要略微聽到了這一個風聲,就會當場死去	B2	克利歐佩特拉,得到這一點點風聲,立刻會要死	B2	只要讓克莉奧佩拉略微聽到一點風聲,她就會當場死去 +注	E	克柳巴,只要讓她聽見一絲風聲,她馬上就會死	B2
3.	*A&C* **Mettle** "I do think there is mettle in death, which commits some loving act upon her…" S1: sexual potency/vigour S2: courage	----	D	死對於她一定有一點什麼魅力	B2	我看死神倒是挺勁十足的情哥兒呢	A1	我真以為死神都有些野心	B2

	Shakespeare's bawdy puns The presenting and underlying senses	Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code	Cao W.F.	Code
4.	*A&C* **Inch** "I would I had thy inches; thou shouldst know there were a heart in Egypt." S1: height S2: penis length	我希望我也長得像你一樣高	B2	我願我有你那樣的高大的體格	B2	但願我也像你多長出那麼幾寸	A1	我但願我也能和你一樣高	B2
5.	*A&C* **Sword, lay to bed** "She made great Caesar lay his sword to bed." S1: retire from war S2: to fornicate	怪不得我們從前那位凱撒為了她要無心軍旅了	B2	她使得偉大的西撒解下了他的劍放在床上	B2	她能叫偉大的凱撒解下了佩刀,上她的床	B1	她讓偉大的該撒摘下寶刀到了床上	A1
6.	*A&C* **Affection** "That, being unseminar'd, thy freer thoughts May not fly forth of Eypgt. Hast thou affections?" S1: love S2: passionate desire	你也有愛情嗎?	B2	你也有愛情麼?	B2	你也有情欲嗎?	B1	你也有情欲嗎?	B1
7.	*A&C* **Plough'd** "He plough'd her, and she cropp'd." S1: husbandry S2: to copulate	----	D	他給她播種 +注	E	他下種 +注	E	他賣了力氣	A2
8.	*A&C* **Cropp'd** "He plough'd her, and she cropp'd." S1: husbandry S2: bear children	----	D	她有了收穫 +注	E	她結出果實 +注	E	她得到了收成	A2
9.	*A&C* **Sword** "She has robbed me of my sword." S1: weapon S2: a phallic term	她把我的劍也偷去了	B2	她把我繳械了	B2	她把我的劍——男子漢的氣概——偷走了	B1	她把我的蓋世英明都斷送了	B2

	Shakespeare's bawdy puns The presenting and underlying senses	Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code	Cao W.F.	Code
10.	*A&C* **Boggler** "You have been a boggler ever…" S1: waverer, equivocator S2: a fickle woman	你是一個朝秦暮楚的人	B2	你一向是三心二意的	B2	你從來就是個水性楊花的女人	B3	你一直是個朝三暮四的人	B2
11.	*A&C* **Lie** "I heard of one of them no longer than yesterday: a very honest woman, but something given to lie…" S1: tell lies S2: to recline in sexual intercourse	是一個很老實的女人,可是她也會掉幾句謊的	B2	是個很忠實的女人,只是有一點好說謊	B2	一個規規矩矩的女人,但也免不了幹下那不規矩的勾當	B3	一個非常老實的女人,可是有時候也會撒點謊	B2
12.	*A&C* **Die** "…how she died of the biting of it, what pain she felt." S1: loss of life S2: sexual orgasm	她就是給它咬死的,死得才慘哩	B2	我聽說她就是被蛇咬死的,死時有如何的苦痛	B2	她怎麼給那好傢伙一口咬得死了過去,可憐她著實吃了些苦頭	B2	她怎麼被它咬死的,她受了多少苦	B2
13.	*A&C* **Worm** "Truly, she makes a very good report o' the worm." S1: an insect S2: a phallic creature	她把這條蟲兒怎麼咬她的情形活靈活現地全講給人家聽啦	B2	她證實了這蛇很靈驗	B2	她給那條渾蟲兒增添了好名聲	A1	她把這條蟲子詳細說了一番	B2

	Shakespeare's bawdy puns The presenting and underlying senses	Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code
14.	*ADO* **Mountanto** (nickname for Benedick in *ADO*) "I pray you, is Signior Mountanto returned from the wars or no?" S1: upward thrusting in fencing S2: with phallic suggestion	那位劍客先生是不是也從戰場上回來了?	B2	仰刺先生可從戰場上回來了麼?	B2	那位"擺花架式"大爺從戰場上回來了沒有?	B2
15.	*ADO* **Put down** "You have put him down, lady, you have put him down." S1: to defeat in argument S2: to lay a woman down for sexual intercourse	----	D	你已經打倒他了,小姐,你已經打倒他了	B2	你佔了他的上風啦,小姐,你佔了他的上風啦	B2

	Shakespeare's bawdy puns The presenting and underlying senses	Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code
16.	*ADO* **Come over** "To have no man come over me!" S1: to overcome (someone) S2: to top (someone) sexually	----	D	沒有一個人超越我!	B2	再沒哪個男子能夠高攀得上!	B2
17.	*ADO* **Swords** "Give me the swords; we have bucklers of our own." S1: weapons S2: penis	----	D	給我們刀劍	B2	把劍交上來	B2
18.	*ADO* **Bucklers** "Give me the swords; we have bucklers of our own." S1: small shields S2: pudend	----	D	我們有我們自己的盾牌	B2	盾牌我們自己有	B2
19.	*ADO* **Pikes** "If you use them, Margaret, you must put in the pikes with a vice." S1: the weapon of war S2: penises	----	D	你一定要用螺絲裝上那幾個尖釘子	B2	這傢伙最會闖禍	A1
20.	*ADO* **Vice** "If you use them, Margaret, you must put in the pikes with a vice." S1: a screw S2: pudend and closed thighs	----	D	你一定要用螺絲裝上那幾個尖釘子	B2	----	D
21.	*ADO* **Lap** "I will live in thy heart, die in thy lap, and be buried in thy eyes." S1: skirt from waist to knees S2: the vulva or vagina	死在你的懷裡	B2	死在你的懷裡	B2	死在你的懷裡	B2
22.	*ADO* **Stuff** "A maid, and stuffed! There's goodly catching of cold." S1: the nasal passage is blocked because of a cold S2: the vaginal passage is blocked	怎麼,你傷了風嗎?	B2	一位小姐,而被堵塞起來了!這傷風可倒傷得好	A1	一個塞住了鼻子的大姑娘!這年頭流行的是傷風	B2

	Shakespeare's bawdy puns The presenting and underlying senses	Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code
23.	*ADO* **Sheet** "O, when she had writ it and was reading it over, she found Benedick and Beatrice between the sheet." S1: sheet of paper S2: in reference to a love-making bed	發現裴尼狄克跟琵特麗絲兩個名字剛巧寫在一塊兒	B2	發現滿紙是班耐底克與壁阿垂斯	B2	發覺班尼迪貝特麗絲兩個兒一起在那張紙裡 +注	E
24.	*ADO* **Stables** "If your husband have stables enough, you'll see he shall lack no barns." S1: a standing place for horses S2: penis erection	----	D	如果你的丈夫有的是馬房	B2	將來哪個男人娶了你	B2
25.	*ADO* **Barns** "If your husband have stables enough, you'll see he shall lack no barns." S1: Barns, repositories of corn S2: Bairns, the old word for children	----	D	也不會缺乏倉庫 +注	E	快替他養一馬房的馬駒子吧	B1

	Shakespeare's bawdy puns The presenting and underlying senses	Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code	Lai J.	Code
26.	*CE* **Low (countries)** "Where stood Belgia, the Netherlands?" "Oh, sir, I did not look so low." S1: in geographical terms S2: genital regions	那種地方太低了,我望不下去	B2	我沒有往那麼低的地方看	B2	那是塊窪地,太低了,我望不下去	B2	脾呀?我冇望下便喇	C
27.	*CE* **Sound** "For what reason?" "For two, and sound ones too." "Nay, not sound, I pray you." S1: the validity of reasons S2: the health of genitality	----	D	有兩個理由;而且是健全的理由 不能說是健全	B2	理由有兩條,條條都是繃硬的 我看硬不起來了吧	A1	有兩個。 「好極啦!」 唔好話「好」啦	B2

	Shakespeare's bawdy puns The presenting and underlying senses	Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code	Lai J.	Code
28.	*CE* **Burn** "They appear to men like angels of light: light is an effect of fire, and fire will burn; ergo, light wenches will burn." S1: to glow with heat S2: to infect with venereal disease	她身上有火	B2	蕩婦能傷人	B2	招惹了叫人眼亮的婊子可要得流火	A1	壞女人會「合合慶」著火焚燒	B2
29.	*CE* **Against her hair** "Where France?" "In her forehead, armed and reverted, making war against her heir." S1: an allusion to contemporary French politics S2: the rapid loss of hair because of venereal disease	從那蓬蓬鬆鬆的頭髮,我看得出這是一個亂七八糟的國家	B2	在她的前額上,一片瘡痍,毛髮脫落,在和王位繼承人作戰 +注	E	在她的額頭上呀,硬是跟她的頭髮過不去,有你沒有我 +注	E	法(髮)丫馬?咪係頭度囉 但係冇梳頭,所以「立立亂」	A3
30.	*CE* **Plain dealer** "The plainer dealer, the sooner lost; yet he loseth it in a kind of jollity." S1: lacking wit S2: one who has sexual dealings with women	----	D	越沒有頭腦,頭髮掉得越快	B2	玩女人的傢伙頭髮掉得最快	B3	愈蠢鈍、愈甩得快亞啲頭髮	B2
31.	*CE* **Break wind** "A man may break a word with you, sir, and words are but wind; Ay, and break it in your face, so he break it not behind." S1: break a word S2: to relieve flatulence the anus way	----	D	說句話總不要緊:話只是耳邊風:而且不是在背後嘀咕,是當面講明	B2	他盡是說空話,少爺,空話像空氣,他當面說大話,無異後面在放屁	A1	噏吓之馬,噏風啫。風呢,就對住你噏嗰啲好過背住你放出嚟嗰啲囉	A1
32.	*CE* **Breaking** "It seems thou want'st breaking." S1: to be beaten S2: to break wind	----	D	你大概是想挨揍:滾,你這混蟲!	B2	我可要打得你屁滾尿流?給我滾!	B1	你係攞打㗎嘞,我打到你跳	B2

	Shakespeare's bawdy puns The presenting and underlying senses	Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code	Lai J.	Code
33.	*CE* **Sirreverence** "A very reverend body; ay, such a one as a man may not speak of without he say 'sir-reverence'. S1: an apology S2: excrement	----	D	誰要是提起他來,須要先說一聲"罪過罪過"	B2	要是她是個男人,人家提到他,總得添上一句"他老人家"	B2	人人見到都會話"睇吓佢吖"咁㗎	B2

	Shakespeare's bawdy puns The presenting and underlying senses	Tian H.	Code	Zhou Z.P.	Code	Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code	Cao W.F.	Code	Bian Z.L.	Code	Sun D.Y.	Code	Peng J.X.	Code
34.	*HAM* **Toy (in blood)** "For Hamlet, and the trifling of his favor, hold it a fashion and a toy in blood." S1: an object to play with S2: penis erection	只能當他是一時的高興和少年血氣的遊戲	B2	祇能當作一時的高興,逢場作戲	B2	必須把他認作一時的感情衝動	B2	只可當做一時的高興,逢場作戲	B2	只當是學時髦的小伙子逢場作戲	B2	要把它當做隨便玩玩的事,一陣高興	B2	要認清那只是趕時髦,做感情遊戲	B2	把它當趨騖時尚,調情的奇想	B2	只當作一時衝動,短暫的愛情	B2
35.	*HAM* **Nunnery** "Get thee to a nunnery" S1: a convent of nuns S2: a brothel	你最好到尼菴裡去	B2	到尼姑菴去罷	B2	進修道院去吧	B2	到尼姑庵去吧	B2	給我進女修道院去吧	B2	你趕快進個尼姑修道院吧	B2	你去進尼姑庵吧 +注	E	你進個修道院去吧	B2	你去修女院吧 +注	E
36.	*HAM* **Fishmonger** "You're a fishmonger." S1: seller of fish S2: seller of women	你是個魚販子	B2	你是一個魚販子	B2	你是一個賣魚的販子	B2	你是一個魚販子	B2	你是魚販子一個呀	B2	你是個販魚的	B2	你是個魚販子 +注	E	你是個魚販子 +注	E	您是賣魚的 +注	E

	Shakespeare's bawdy puns The presenting and underlying senses	Tian H.	Code	Zhou Z.P.	Code	Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code	Cao W.F.	Code	Bian Z.L.	Code	Sun D.Y.	Code	Peng J.X.	Code
37.	*HAM* **Keen** "You are keen, my lord, you are keen." S1: sharping satirical in speech S2: sexually sharp-set	您說話真利害,真利害	B2	你說話好尖刻,好尖刻	B2	----	D	你說話好尖,殿下,你好尖	B2	殿下的一張嘴真尖利,真尖利	B2	你又調皮,我的大人,你又調皮了	A2	殿下真尖刻,殿下真尖刻	B2	您太尖刻了,殿下,您太尖刻了	B2	您很尖刻,大人,很尖刻 +注	E
38.	*HAM* **Abstinence** "Refrain tonight; and that shall lend a kind of easiness to the next abstinence." S1: to restrain or hold back S2: to withhold from sexual intercourse	那麼下一次的禁慾就容易了	B3	下次節制就容易些	B2	下一回就會覺得這一種自制的功夫並不怎麼為難	B2	下會節制就容易些	B2	第二夜要壓制慾火,就不那麼難了	B3	下一次的節制也就能產生一種容易的感覺	B2	下一次節制也就並不太難	B2	下回的節制相形之下,就不很為難	B2	那麼下次要克制就會比較容易	B2
39.	*HAM* **Cock** "Young men will do't, if they come to't; By Cock they are to blame." S1: corruption of 'God' S2: penis	----	D	噯,這是他們的錯	B2	----	D	噯,這是他們的錯	B2	都怪他那股親熱勁	B2	憑著雞巴,是他們的錯	B3	----	D	天啊,怪他們活現世	B2	到那節骨眼,少年郎就幹——基啊,都要怪他們 +注	E

	Shakespeare's bawdy puns The presenting and underlying senses	Tian H.	Code	Zhou Z.P.	Code	Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code	Cao W.F.	Code	Bian Z.L.	Code	Sun D.Y.	Code	Peng J.X.	Code
40.	*HAM* **Privates** "Then you live about her waist, or in the middle of her favour?" "Faith, her privates we." S1: private persons S2: the genitals	----	D	我們就住在她的私處	B3	我們是在她的私處	B3	我們就是他的私處	B3	私下接待過我們	B2	我們是她的私房里的人呢	B2	我們是她親信的私底下人	B2	是她親信的私人	B2	我們是她的小兵 +注	E
41.	*HAM* **Country (matters)** "Do you think I meant country matters?" S1: rustic doings S2: *count*ry, the sexual terrain in woman, ie. sexual matters	----	D	你以為是我撒村嗎?	B2	您以為我在轉著下流的念頭嗎	B3	你以為我撒野嗎?	B2	你以為我是在動什麼壞主意嗎?	B2	你是不是想我的意思是指的那不能說的事?	B2	你想到我是說野話嗎?	B2	你以為我在說野話嗎?	B2	你想我剛才要做下流事嗎?	B3
42.	*HAM* **Nothing** "What is, my lord?" "No thing." S1: not anything S2: the female genitals	----	D	沒有什麼	B2	沒有什麼	B2	沒什麼	B2	沒說什麼	B2	沒有什麼	B2	沒有什麼	B2	沒有什麼	B2	不過是空洞洞那話兒	A1

	Shakespeare's bawdy puns The presenting and underlying senses	Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code	Bian Z.L.	Code	Sun D.Y.	Code	Cao W.F.	Code
43.	*LR* **Thing** "Shall not be a maid long, unless things be cut shorter." S1: an object, entity or circumstance S2: the sexual organ	----	D	除非那話削短些	A1	----	D	----	D	除非事情會變好	B2	除非令事情就此終止	B2
44.	*LR* **Shorter** "Shall not be a maid long, unless things be cut shorter." S1: length of a circumstance S2: innuendo-reference to length of penis	----	D	除非那話削短些	A1	----	D	----	D	除非事情會變好	B2	除非令事情就此終止	B2
45.	*LR* **Codpiece** "The codpiece that will house Before the head has any…" S1: a pouchlike covering for the male genitals S2: the penis	----	D	XX先要找住房 +注	E	那話兒先有了安樂窩	B3	吊袋兒先有了安樂窩 +注	E	「遮陽」若先有了地方住 +注	E	那頭盔就要裝的	B2
46.	*LR* **Cool** "This is a brave night to cool a courtezan." S1: to cool the heat S2: to cool the lust	----	D	這是很好的一夜,可以澆冷了娼婦的熱情	B2	難得碰到這麼一個黑夜,叫婊子都要打個寒噤!	B2	好一個叫婊子心冷的夜晚!	B2	好一個夜晚!——可以弄冷一個婊子底心	B2	這種夜晚去澆涼淫婦的慾火可算是夠勁了	B3
47.	*LR* **Burn'd** "No heretics burn'd, but wenches' suitors…" S1: to glow with heat S2: to infect with venereal disease	----	D	沒有異端被焚,除了梅毒	B3	並非火燒異教徒,是嫖客害流火 +注	A1	信邪教不燒死,追女人受折磨	A1	生大瘡的傢伙都逛過了媱子 +注	E	除了向村姑求婚的人不再燒異教徒	B2

	Shakespeare's bawdy puns The presenting and underlying senses	Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code	Ying R.C.	Code
48.	*MM* **Respected** "She was respected with him before he married with her." S1: respected S2: suspected	她就跟他清清白白過了	B2	她就被他敬過了	A1	那女的早已跟他不端不正了	B3	跟她不干不淨來著	B3
49.	*MM* **Clack-dish** "Yes, your beggar of fifty; and his use was to put a ducat in her clack-dish." S1: beggar's wooden bowl with noisy lid S2: female pudendum	佈施她一塊錢	B2	在她的木盒裡放進一塊錢	B2	把一枚金幣塞進她那討飯用的碗裡	B2	往她的討飯盤裡扔錢	B2
50.	*MM* **Know** "I am come to know your pleasure." "That you might know it would much better please me than to demand what 'tis. S1: to understand S2: to have carnal acquaintance with	我希望你自己已經知道,用不到來問我	B2	若能讓你知道我的意思, 比你來問我的意思, 將更能使我高興 +注	E	但願你已知道我準備怎樣打發你,不用我開口	B2	如果你不是來詢問,而是來滿足我的心意,我會更滿意	B2
51.	*MM* **Eye** "You that have worn your eyes almost out in the service." S1: an organ of vision S2: vagina	----	D	幾乎把眼睛都累壞了	B2	幾乎把眼睛都弄瞎了	B2	賣了一輩子的命	B2
52.	*MM* **Sciatica** "How now, which of your hips has the most profound sciatica?" S1: pain along the course of a sciatic nerve S2: syphilis	----	D	你的尻骨哪一邊痛得最凶? +注	E	你的屁股上哪一邊坐骨神經疼得更厲害? +注	E	今天您是哪一邊胯骨又酸又痛啊	B2

	Shakespeare's bawdy puns The presenting and underlying senses	Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code	Ying R.C.	Code
53.	*MM* **Tick-tack** "…I would be sorry should be thus foolishly lost at a game of tick-tack." S1: an old form of back-gammon scored by placing pegs into holes S2: copulation	我也不願意看見你為了一是玩耍,沒來由送了性命	B2	你為玩一回「雙陸棋」而糊裏糊塗的送掉命,我也覺得太可惜了 +注	E	你幹下風流韻事……卻毫沒來由地因而丟了命	B3	我可不願意你為了一時荒唐就送了命	B2
54.	*MM* **Head** "But if he be a married man, he's his wife's head, and I can never cut off a woman's head." S1: a woman's head S2: a married woman's maidenhead	叫我殺女人的頭,我可下不了這個手	B2	我永遠不能砍一個女人的頭	B2	叫我去砍一個女人的頭,我怎麼也下不了手啊	B2	我可說什麼也不能砍掉女人的頭啊	B2
55.	*MM* **Do** "What has he done?" "A woman." S1: an act S2: to copulate	他幹了什麼事? 關於女人的事	B2	他幹了什麼? 一個女人 +注	A1	他幹了什麼事啦? 牽連到一個女人	B2	她幹了什麼? 幹了個女人	A1
56.	*MM* **Beef** "Troth, sir, she hath eaten up all her beef, and she is herself in the tub." S1: meat S2: prostitutes who serve as the flesh-food.	她已經坐吃山空	B2	她把她的牛肉都吃光了	B2	他操這皮肉營生,落到連皮帶肉都吃光了	A1	她沒皮條可拉了	B3
57.	*MM* **(In the) tub** "Troth, sir, she hath eaten up all her beef, and she is herself in the tub." S1: the barrel in which beef is stored S2: a tub used in the cure of venereal disease	連褲子都當光	B2	她自己也跳到桶裏去了 +注	E	他自個兒泡進醃肉桶裏	B2	自己上陣了	B3

	Shakespeare's bawdy puns The presenting and underlying senses	Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code	Ying R.C.	Code
58.	*MM* **Piled** "Thou art good velvet; thou'rt a three-piled piece, I warrant thee. I had as lief be a list of an English kersey, as be piled as thou art piled for a French velvet." S1: cloth having a pile or nap S2: peeled, deprived of hair and bald (an effect of venereal disease)	----	D	我寧願是英國粗布的毛邊,也不願像你似的成為脫毛的法國絲絨 +注	E	我呢,寧可做一塊英國粗布,也不願像你那樣把頭髮掉得光光的,像光滑的絲絨	B1	我寧可當英國粗布的爛布頭,也不願意叫那種病害得頭髮掉光,冒充閃閃發光的法國絲絨	B1
59.	*MM* **French crown** "I have purchased as many diseases under her roof as come to-"… "Ay, and more." "A French crown more." S1: a gold coin minted in France S2: baldness caused by venereal disease	----	D	再加上一塊法國金幣 +注	E	再添上一個法國金克朗 +注	E	再多一樣, 法國式禿頭病	B3
60.	*MM* **Overdone** (A character in *MM*) S1: surname S2: sexually debilitated	奧弗東	B2	歐佛頓	B2	咬弗動	B2	幹過頭	B3
61.	*MM* **Bum** "What's your name?" "Pompey." "What else?" "Bum, sir." S1: nickname S2: buttocks	----	D	你叫什麼,酒保先生? 龐沛 還有什麼別的名字? 屁股,先生	B3	你叫什麼名字,酒保哥? 龐貝 還有別名嗎? 「大屁股」,老爺	A1	賣酒的這位,到這邊兒來;你尊姓大名? 龐培 還有呢? 屁股,大人	B3
62.	*MM* **Mistress Kate Keepdown** "Mistress Kate Keepdown was with child by him in the duke's time." S1: surname S2: kept men down on the bed	他把一個姑娘弄大了肚皮	B2	凱特吉普當就被他弄大了肚皮	B2	墊底兒姑娘的肚子就是給他弄大的	B3	路奇歐把一個姑娘凱特.奇波當弄大了肚子	B2

	Shakespeare's bawdy puns The presenting and underlying senses	Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code	Ying R.C.	Code
63.	*MM* **Madam Mitigation** "Behold, behold, where Madam Mitigation comes!" S1: nickname S2: to mitigate lust or sexual desire	----	D	救苦救難的太太來了	B2	那邊來了「救苦救難的奶奶」	B2	那位消愁解悶的大娘來了	B2

	Shakespeare's bawdy puns The presenting and underlying senses	Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code
64.	*MW* **(Mistook their) erection** "She does so take on with her men; they mistook their erection." S1: a quicklyism for "direction" S2: phallic erection	他們竟誤會了他的意思	B2	他們因誤會而做錯了事	B2	誰想到她的兩個僕人錯盡錯絕,聽不懂她話裏的意思	B2
65.	*MW* **Focative** "Leave your prabbles, 'oman!-What is the focative case, William?" S1: vocative S2: allusive of 'fuck'	----	D	呼喚格,怎麼說,威廉?	B2	「稱呼格」呢, 威廉?	B2
66.	*MW* **Jenny's case** "What is your genitive case plural, William?" "Genitive case?"… "Vengeance of Jenny's case!" S1: situation S2: female genital	----	D	所有格? 好一個珍妮的案子	B2	「所有格」! 去他媽的—「蘇蘇」有個「哥哥」	A3
67.	*MW* **Qui, que, quod** "If you forget your 'qui's, your 'que's, and your 'quod's, you must be preeches." S1: qui; S2: keys (penis) S1: que; S2: case (vagina) S1: quod; S2: cods (testicles)	----	D	如果你忘記你的 qui, 你的 quae, 你的 quod	F	要是你把你的 qui 忘了, quae 忘了, quod 忘了	F

	Shakespeare's bawdy puns The presenting and underlying senses	Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code
68.	*MW* **To hick and hack** "You do ill to teach the child such words. He teaches him to hick and to hack…" S1: drink and whore S2: to copulate	----	D	他教他飲酒嫖妓 +注	E	他教孩子念「喝呀」、 「喝呀」	B2
69.	*MW* **Board** "For, sure, unless he know some strain in me that I know not myself, he would never have boarded me in this fury." " 'Boarding' call you it? I'll be sure to keep him above deck." S1: assailed S2: to coit with/ sexually entered	他要不是在我身上看出了一點我自己也沒有察覺的不大規矩的地方,一定不會毫無忌憚到這個樣子	B2	若不是他在我身上發現了一些我自己也沒有覺察到的性格,他永遠不會這樣兇猛的向我進攻	B2	要不是在我身上除了連我自個兒也不知道的什麼缺口,他絕不敢如此猖狂,要想攻打我的城堡來了	B2
70.	*MW* **Will** "He hath studied her will, and translated her will——out of honesty into English. S1: wish, wilfulness S2: sexual desire, sexual parts	你果然把她的心理研究得非常透徹,居然把它一個字一個字翻譯出來	B2	他對她真有研究,把她翻譯得好,把貞操翻成了英文	B3	他可真是把她肚子裡的心事看到了底,而且用規規矩矩的英國話,給道道地地的翻譯出來	B2
71.	*MW* **Weapon** "I've appointed mine Host of de Jarteer to measure our weapon." S1: to referee S2: phallic weapon	我要叫嘉德飯店的老闆替我們做公正人	B2	我已經指定襪帶酒店的老闆作我們的公證人	B2	我要請吊襪帶客店的老闆來檢驗雙方的武器	B2
72.	*MW* **Charge** "'Tis a great charge to come under one body's hand." S1: burden S2: sexual	一個人做這許多事,那真太辛苦啦	B2	全由一手包辦,這負擔可不輕哩	B2	一個人兩雙手,要包下那麼些活兒來,可也真夠你忙的啦	A1
73.	*MW* **Abhorson** (a character in *MW*) S1: surname S2: son of a whore	阿鮑生	B2	阿伯霍孫	B2	阿婊生	A1

	Shakespeare's bawdy puns The presenting and underlying senses	Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code
74.	*MW* **Pistol** (a character in *MW*) S1: weapon, name S2: penis	畢斯多	B2	皮斯圖	B2	火槍	A1
75.	*MW* **Jane Nightwork** (a name mentioned in *MW*) S1: name of a whore S2: fornication or prostitution	簡娜華	B2	琴夜工	B3	葉來珍	A1
76.	*MW* **Dr. Caius** (a French physician's name in *MW*) S1: name S2: Caius is a Latin respelling of *Keys*, which is a slang expression for the penis, and thus gave a hint of the doctor's specialization.	凱	B2	凱	B2	大夫	B2
77.	*MW* **Turd** "If dere be one or two, I shall make-a the turd." S1: the third S2: a piece of excrement	要是只有一個兩個人去,我就是第三個	B2	有一個人去,我就算是第三個	B2	要是有了一份子、二份子,我來做個三份子	A1
78.	*MW* **Fartuous** "…and let me tell you in your ear, she's as fartuous a civil modest wife…" S1: error for "virtuous" S2: pun on "fart"	她是位賢慧端莊的好娘子	B2	她是頂溫柔有禮的一位太太	B2	她可真算得是個又文靜又賢慧,又「瘦胡桃」的娘兒	A3

	Shakespeare's bawdy puns The presenting and underlying senses	Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code	Cao W.F.	Code	Bian Z.L.	Code	Sun D.Y.	Code
79.	*OTH* **Board** "Faith, he to-night hath boarded a land carrack." S1: to enter or go aboard S2: to coit	他今天夜裡登上了	B2	他今天夜裡搶到了	B2	他今晚上登上了	B2	他今天晚上跳上了	B2	他今夜登上了	B2	他今夜登上了	B2

	Shakespeare's bawdy puns The presenting and underlying senses	Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code	Cao W.F.	Code	Bian Z.L.	Code	Sun D.Y.	Code
80.	*OTH* **Carrack** "Faith, he to-night hath boarded a land carrack." S1: a ship S2: Female pudendum, prostitite	一艘陸地上的大船	B2	一艘陸上的商船	B2	一條「船」,旱地上的一條大洋船 +注	E	一艘陸地大船	B2	一艘陸地運寶船	B2	一艘旱地大樓船	B2
81.	*OTH* **Tail** "O, thereby hangs a tail. Whereby hangs a tale, sir?" S1: animal's tail S2: penis	----	D	怪不得旁邊生尾巴	B2	怪不得掛了個尾巴	B2	所以這樣才有道理了	B2	難怪製造了一個話柄 +注	E	那上頭掛一條尾巴	B2
82.	*OTH* **Tale** "O, thereby hangs a tail. Whereby hangs a tale, sir?" S1: story S2: pun on 'tail'; penis	----	D	----	D	怎麼又掛了個「琵琶」啦,大哥	A2	為什麼所以才有道理了	B2	怎麼製造了一個話柄 +注	E	什麼上頭掛一條尾巴	B2
83.	*OTH* **Put up (the pipes)** "Then put up your pipes in your bag, for I'll way…" S1: to put away musical instruments in their cases S2: to insert penises	那麼把你們的笛子藏起來	B2	那麼把你們的笛子放進口袋裡去罷	B2	那麼把你們的笛子放進袋裡吧	B2	那麼就把傢伙裝在口袋裡吧	A1	那就把你們的笛子、管子都收拾進袋子	B2	那就把你們的喇叭裝進荷包裡去罷	B2
84.	*OTH* **Provocation** "What an eye she has! Methinks it sounds a parley of provocation." S1: incitement or challenge S2: a tempting or a stimulating to sexual desire or sexual activity	她的眼睛多麼迷人!簡直在向人挑戰	B2	她那眼睛多麼妙……像是吹起挑釁的喇叭一樣	B2	你瞧瞧她那雙眼睛!簡直像會說話似的在勾引人	B3	看她那對眼睛!看一眼就好像會說話似地撩人	B3	好一對媚眼!總是在挑逗人	B3	她那眼波兒多俏!我看來它逗得人欲火上升	B3

	Shakespeare's bawdy puns The presenting and underlying senses	Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code	Cao W.F.	Code	Bian Z.L.	Code	Sun D.Y.	Code
85.	*OTH* **Wind instruments** "Are these, I pray you, wind instruments?" S1: musical instrument S2: pun on "break wind" (farting)	請問這些都是管樂器嗎?	B2	我請問你,這些是不是吹奏的樂器?	B2	請教這些玩意兒都是吹的嗎?	B2	我請問你,這些傢伙都是管樂嗎?	B2	請教這些是叫管樂器嗎?	B2	我請問,這些可是吹奏樂器嗎?	B2

	Shakespeare's bawdy puns The presenting and underlying senses	Tian H.		Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code	Cao W.F.	Code	Cao Y.	Code	Sun D.Y.	Code
86.	*R&J* **Thrust to the wall** "I will push Montague's men from the wall and thrust his maids to the wall." S1: thrust aside into a position of neglect S2: ravish	還要叫他家的女子上天無路	B2	是女人我就把她們望著牆壁摔過去	B2	把他家的女人擠到牆邊去	B2	是女的,給我墊底兒	A2	----	D	把猛泰家的女人推進去玩	B3	把他家的女娘們逼得靠牆	B2
87.	*R&J* **Maidenhead** "The heads of the maids, or their maidenheads." S1: the head of a maid S2: hymen	那些使女們的腦袋,或是她們的"處女頭"	A1	娘兒們的頭,或是她們的奶奶頭	A2	對,處女頭,或處女膜	B3	對啦,頭破血流,或者呢,叫她們身破血流	A2	----	D	嗯,干掉,這「干」字你怎麼講都成	C	哎,女娘們的腦袋,或是搞掉他們的童貞奧袋	A2
88.	*R&J* **Stand** "Me they shall feel while I am able to stand." S1: remain upright S2: penis erectus	我祇要不死	B2	----	D	只要我能硬起來	A2	只要我挺得住	A1	----	D	我一硬起來	A2	只要我能挺得住	A1
89.	*R&J* **Tool** "Draw thy tool!" S1: an instrument S2: penis	抽出劍來	B2	拔出你的傢伙來	A1	拔出你的武器來	B2	快把你的「好傢伙」亮出來吧	A1	拔出劍來	B2	操傢伙	A1	拔出你的傢伙來	A1

	Shakespeare's bawdy puns The presenting and underlying senses	Tian H.		Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code	Cao W.F.	Code	Cao Y.	Code	Sun D.Y.	Code
90.	*R&J* **Naked weapon** "My naked weapon is out!" S1: unsheathed sword S2: (erect) penis	我的武器抽出來了	B2	我的刀子已經出鞘	B2	我的武器已經亮出來了	B2	我那好傢伙赤條條地亮出來了	A1	我的劍已經拔出來了	B2	硬傢伙拿出來了	A1	我的真傢伙出了鞘	A1
91.	*R&J* **Ladybird** "What, ladybird! God forbid!" S1: an endearment, sweetheart S2: wanton or prostitute	花金龜兒	B2	小鳥兒	B2	小瓢蟲	A1	小鳥兒	B2	小甲蟲	B2	小鳥兒	B2	小鳥兒	B2
92.	*R&J* **Prick** "Prick love for pricking, and you beat love down." S1: pierce S2: quell erection	他戳你時你也戳他,你就把戀愛打勝了	B2	它刺痛了你,你也可以刺痛它	B2	愛情刺你,你也刺愛情	B2	她刺你,你回刺她+注	E	你也用刺來回刺愛情	B2	愛刺了你,你為什麼不去刺她	B2	愛情刺痛你,你也刺它	B2
93.	*R&J* **(Raise a) spirit** "Raise a spirit in his mistress circle." S1: supernatural creature S2: penis/semen	招出一個什麼奇形怪狀的妖精	B2	----	D	喚起一個另外一個人的小精靈	B2	激發了他一股無名火	A2	拘來一個怪魔	B2	引得起來…那一點火	A2	喚起個心情異樣的精靈	B2
94.	*R&J* **Mistress circle** "Raise a spirit in his mistress circle." S1: the magical circle S2: pudend	他的情人	B2	----	D	情人的圈圈	A1	情人的那圈兒禁地	A1	他情人的圈子裡	A1	他愛人圈圈裡	A1	那情人的圈子裡頭	A1
95.	*R&J* **Stand** "Letting it there stand." S1: remain upright S2: penis erectus	牠總站在那裡	B2	----	D	讓他硬幫幫的立在那裡	A1	(向情人的那圈兒禁地)發洩	A2	令他聽在那裡	B2	教那東西直挺挺	A1	它在那裡一露臉	B2

	Shakespeare's bawdy puns The presenting and underlying senses	Tian H.		Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code	Cao W.F.	Code	Cao Y.	Code	Sun D.Y.	Code
96.	*R&J* **Lay it** "Till she had laid it and conjured it down." S1: to exorcise a spirit S2: cause an erection to diappear	使他的情人若不念咒語	B2	----	D	等著她來把它弄軟	A1	哄得他泄了氣	A1	除非等她也會唸咒	B2	直等到他的愛人圈夠了它	A1	由她去咒服它	B2
97.	*R&J* **Conjure it down** "Till she had laid it and conjured it down." S1: subdue a spirit S2: cause an erection to disappear	降伏牠	B2	----	D	把它馴服下來	A1	哄得他低下頭	A2	除非等她也會唸咒	B2	把它哄得低頭	A2	使它消隱掉	B2
98.	*R&J* **Raise up him** "I conjure him only but to raise up him." S1: to make him appear S2: to cause a priapism or erection	不過想招起他來	B2	----	D	不過把他挑逗出來	A1	激發他,讓他禁不住挺身而出	A1	祇不過要把他引逗出來罷了	A1	也是為著喚出他的挺勁	A1	咒召他出來	B2
99.	*R&J* **Hit (the mark)** "If love be blind love cannot hit the mark." S1: archery S2: achieve coitus with a woman	他也射不中靶子	B2	----	D	愛便無法射中目標	B2	他怎能把箭靶子射中	B2	他就不會射中紅心	B2	愛人就射不中那箭靶	B2	愛就射不中靶	B2
100.	*R&J* **Medlar (tree)** "Now will be sit under a medlar tree and wish his mistress were that kind of fruit." S1: fruit S2: pudend	他光景坐在一棵枇杷樹下	B2	----	D	他一定是坐在一棵枇杷樹 +注	E	他坐在桃樹下	A1	他大概是坐在一棵酸頓的蘋果樹下	B2	他睡在那桃兒樹下面	A1	他或許正坐在一棵歐楂樹下邊	B2

	Shakespeare's bawdy puns The presenting and underlying senses	Tian H.		Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code	Cao W.F.	Code	Cao Y.	Code	Sun D.Y.	Code
101.	*R&J* **Open-arse** "O, that she were an open-arse, thou a pop'ring pear!" S1: medlar fruit S2: pudend	----	D	----	D	真願她是爛熟的裂開的"那話兒" +注	E	但願她是——是一隻桃子	A2	盼望他的愛人似那樣的一枚果子	B2	希望你的愛人是一個開了口的桃兒	A2	但願她果真成了個你張口能吞的歐楂樹上的小紅果	B2
102.	*R&J* **Popp'rin' pear** "O, that she were an open-arse, thou a pop'ring pear!" S1: a fruit S2: penis and scrotum	----	D	----	D	你是一隻生硬的大青梨 +注	E	你呢,是一隻尖頭的荷蘭梨	A1	----	D	你是一個香蕉	A2	----	D
103.	*R&J* **Hit** "Thou hast most kindly hit it." S1: most truly guessed it S2: most truly sexually penetrated it	這真被你很懇切地猜中了	B2	----	D	你說得極對	B2	你說得倒好	B2	說得一點也不錯	B2	你猜個正對	B2	你說得非常合式	B2
104.	*R&J* **Goose** "Thou wast never with me for anything when thou wast not there for the goose." S1: water birds S2: prostitutes	你除了做鵝之外沒有一點使我佩服的	B2	----	D	你什麼事情也沒有跟上過我,除了爭著作笨鵝	B2	你喜歡騎著「野馬」來玩這玩意兒? +注	E	你除了胡調亂鬧,什麼時候也不與我相合	B2	你要不是去野去,你會找到我麼?	A2	你若不時在那裡跟我去追獵野鵝,你就不是跟我在一起幹什麼事	B2

	Shakespeare's bawdy puns The presenting and underlying senses	Tian H.		Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code	Cao W.F.	Code	Cao Y.	Code	Sun D.Y.	Code
105.	*R&J* **Hide his bauble in a hole** "Love is like a great natural that runs lolling up and down to hide his bauble in a hole." S1: hide a fool's baton/toy in a pit S2: put his penis in a pudend	要把他的手杖藏到穴中間去	B2	----	D	把他的那根棍子藏在一個洞裡 +注	E	只想找洞眼兒,把他那做小丑用的棍子插進去	A1	想把它的玩意藏在一個洞裡	B2	只會把他那根棍插在洞洞裡	A1	要把他的玩意兒藏進一個窟窿裡去	B2
106.	*R&J* **Tale** "Thou desirest me to stop in my tale against the hair." S1: talk S2: penis	你要勉強打斷我的話嗎	B2	----	D	你想要我說到一半就強勉的停止住	B2	你要我硬是把話兒縮回去?	A1	你可是想在這緊要的關頭打斷我的話	B2	你叫我只把話說一半? 硬要我違背本性?	B2	你要我逆著本性不等把話說完就住口	B2
107.	*R&J* **Stop in** "Thou desirest me to stop in my tale against the hair." S1: cease S2: thrust	你要勉強打斷我的話嗎	B2	----	D	你想要我說到一半就強勉的停止住	B2	你要我硬是把話兒縮回去?	A2	你可是想在這緊要的關頭打斷我的話	B2	你叫我只把話說一半? 硬要我違背本性?	B2	你要我逆著本性不等把話說完就住口	B2
108.	*R&J* **Hair, against the** "Thou desirest me to stop in my tale against the hair." S1: inclination S2: pubic pair	你要勉強打斷我的話嗎	B2	----	D	你想要我說到一半就強勉的停止住	B2	你要我硬是把話兒縮回去?	B2	你可是想在這緊要的關頭打斷我的話	B2	你叫我只把話說一半? 硬要我違背本性?	B2	你要我逆著本性不等把話說完就住口	B2
109.	*R&J* **Large** "Thou wouldst else have made thy tale large." S1: lengthy S2: size of penis	若讓你把話端擴大,你又會尋別的話說	B2	----	D	否則你又要胡說八道了	B2	免得你把話兒越拉越長呀	A1	否則你的故事就越扯越遠了	B2	如讓你說下去, 你會越說越粗	B2	否則你會把話拉得太長	B2

	Shakespeare's bawdy puns The presenting and underlying senses	Tian H.		Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code	Cao W.F.	Code	Cao Y.	Code	Sun D.Y.	Code
110.	*R&J* **Short** "O, thou art deceived; I would have made it short." S1: to be brief, to keep the story short S2: to make the penis short	我正想把話端縮小	B2	----	D	我正要結束	B2	我的話兒很短	A1	我已經說完了我的話	B2	我已經說完了我的話	B2	我要把話說短	B2
111.	*R&J* **Occupy** "For I was come to the whole depth of my tale; and meant, indeed, to occupy the argument no longer." S1: carry on S2: to copulate with	不想再說下去了	B2	----	D	不想再搞下去了	A1	沒有什麼要說	B2	不再分辨下去了	B2	不預備再占你們的功夫了	B2	不再講下去了	B2
112.	*R&J* **Dial** "I tell you, for the bawdy hand of the dial is now upon the prick of noon." S1: a clock's dial S2: pudend	日規那隻邪淫的手	B2	----	D	日晷上那隻淫穢的手	B2	鐘面上那根不害臊的指針	B2	那日晷的淫蕩的針影	B2	那長針	B2	日規上的那娼家針	B2
113.	*R&J* **Prick** "I tell you, for the bawdy hand of the dial is now upon the prick of noon." S1: mark on the dial's circumference S2: penis	現在放在正午的度數上	B2	----	D	現在正模著正午那一點	C	直指著十二點鐘 +舞台指示	E	已經移到正午的時辰上了	B2	正指著十二點 +舞台指示	E	現在正指著子午度	B2

	Shakespeare's bawdy puns The presenting and underlying senses	Tian H.		Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code	Cao W.F.	Code	Cao Y.	Code	Sun D.Y.	Code
114.	*R&J* **Use me at his pleasure** "And thou must stand by, too, and suffer every knave to use me at his pleasure." S1: treat me as he pleases S2: treat me as a sexual partner	任意侮辱我	B2	把我欺侮	B2	隨意擺佈我	B2	欺侮我——愛把我怎麼樣,就怎麼樣來欺侮我	A1	開我的玩笑的玩笑	B2	愛把我怎麼樣,就怎麼樣	A1	隨意欺負我	B2
115.	*R&J* **Weapon** "If I had, my weapon should quickly have been out." S1: sword S2: penis	我的寶劍早已出了鞘	B2	一定會立刻拔出刀子來	B2	我一定很快的拔出我的武器	B2	我早就把傢伙亮出來	A1	我的光禿禿的利劍早就出鞘	B2	我的傢伙早拿出來	A1	保證會把傢伙拔出來	A1
116.	*R&J* **Bigger** "No less! Nay, bigger; women grow by men" S1: grow up S2: grow large with child	女子是靠男子發育的	B2	----	D	女人靠了男人會長得更大	B2	女人給男人弄大了+舞台指示	E	女人本來就靠著男人的滋補才能長大	B2	女人總跟著男人們發	B2	女人多得福	B2
117.	*R&J* **R** "R is for the--No; I know it begins with some other letter:--" S1: to snarl S2: arse	R是狗	F	----	D	R是代表	F	R,這就是說	F	羅, 是	B2	R—兒,這不像狗叫?	F	R是那條	F
118.	*R&J* **Bear the burden** "But you shall bear the burden soon at night." S1: work hard S2: support the weight of a man	您到了晚上那重擔子也夠得您擔哩	B2	----	D	但是今晚你將有重重的負擔	B2	可是今晚上,你要挑的擔子也不輕呢	B2	可是不久在夜裡你也要負起那樣沉	B2	不過快了,今天晚上你也有一個很重的擔負	B2	可是到晚上,你便得承受重負	B2

	Shakespeare's bawdy puns The presenting and underlying senses	Tian H.		Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code	Cao W.F.	Code	Cao Y.	Code	Sun D.Y.	Code
119.	*R&J* **Bird's nest** "…your love must climb a bird's nest soon when it is dark..." S1: Juliet's bedroom/shelter S2: pudend and pubic hair	你的情人,祇等天一黑便要由這個梯子爬到鳥巢裡來	B2	等到天黑的時候,你的愛人就可以憑著它爬進鳥巢裡去	B2	等到天一黑你的情人就爬上一個鳥巢	B2	天黑了,好讓你的情人爬進小鳥兒的窩	A1	以便你的情人在夜深以後攀到小鳥的巢裡	B2	一到天黑,你的愛就可以爬進愛鳥兒的巢房	B2	你的愛一等到天黑就可以攀登上鳥巢來	B2
120.	*R&J* **Mistress's case** "He is even in my mistress's case, just in her case!" S1: plight S2: vagina	正和我的小姐一樣	B2	像她一樣,同病相憐	B2	和我家的小姐情形一樣,和她完全一樣	B2	跟我家小姐一個樣兒,一模一樣	B2	簡直與我家小姐一樣	B2	就跟我們小姐一樣	B2	和我家小姐一個樣	B2
121.	*R&J* **Stand** "Stand up, stand up; stand, and you be a man… rise and stand." S1: remain upright S2: penis erectus	站起來	B2	起來,站起來	B2	起來,挺起來	B2	站起來	B2	起來,站起來	B2	站起來	B2	站起來,爬起來站著	B2
122.	*R&J* **O** "Why should you fall into so deep an O?" S1: groan S2: vagina	哼的這樣傷心	B2	傷心到這個樣子	B2	如此傷心	B2	唉聲嘆氣	B2	害得這樣痛苦	B2	叫得這樣可憐	B2	傷心得這樣天崩地塌	B2
123.	*R&J* **Hare** "An old hare hoar And an old hare hoar…" S1: rabbit S2: prostitute	老兔子	B2	----	D	老野鵝 +注	E	野兔子 +注	E	兔子肉	B2	兔婆婆	B2	老兔肉	B2

Shakespeare's bawdy puns The presenting and underlying senses	Tian H.		Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code	Cao W.F.	Code	Cao Y.	Code	Sun D.Y.	Code
124. *R&J* **Save your reverence** "If thou art dun, we'll draw thee from the mire of—save your reverence—love…" S1: used apologetically S2: euphemism for excrement	對不起	B2	恕我說這樣的話	B2	請願諒我這樣說	B2	----	D	----	D	對不起	B2	----	D

	Shakespeare's bawdy puns The presenting and underlying senses	Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code
125.	*T&C* **Rub on** "So, so; rub on, and kiss the mistress." S1: in bowls, to go on touching obstacles S2: in love-making, to go on fondling someone	----	D	好,好;往前滾,照直的去吻那目標 +注	E	好,好,往前滾,去吻那位小姐吧 +注	E
126.	*T&C* **Hit** "If I cannot ward what I would not have hit, I can watch you for telling how I took the blow; unless it swell past hiding, and then it's past watching." S1: archery S2: achieve coitus with a woman	----	D	我就要防止您來告發我是如何接受了那一擊	B2	我能防止您議輪我如何接受那一擊	B2
127.	*T&C* **Die** "These lovers cry 'O! O!', they die." S1: loss of life S2: sexual orgasm	啊!啊!啊! 這一回性命難逃	B2	情人們喊: 啊!啊! 他們不動啦 +注	E	情人們喊叫,啊啊, 他們疲乏了	A2
128.	*T&C* **Falling in** "No, she'll none of him. They two are twain." "Falling in, after falling out, may make them three." S1: reconciliation S2: falling into bed together, so as to produce a child.	----	D	吵架之後,又和好,可以使他們兩個變成為三個哩	B2	冷了一陣又熱乎起來,可以使他們兩個變成三個呢	B2

	Shakespeare's bawdy puns The presenting and underlying senses	Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code
129.	*T&C* **Sing** "She will sing any man at first sight." S1: to utter words in musical tones S2: to allure, to coit with	她會向任何那個初次見面的男人唱歌	B2	她對任何男人都會一見如故	B2	對任何男人她都是一見調情	B3
130.	*T&C* **Cliff** "And any man may sing her, if he can take her cliff. She's noted. S1: Clef, musical symbol indicating the pitch of the notes S2: Cleft, Cressida's vulva	----	D	如果他能把握住她的調門	B2	如果他能捅開她的宮門的話	A1
131.	*T&C* **Juggling** "What would you have me do?" "A juggling trick: to be secretly open." S1: to perform tricks S2: sexual dexterity, to copulate (a wordplay on 'juggler's balls' and 'testicles')	一個鬼把戲	B2	变鬼把戲	B2	做鬼把戲	B2
132.	*T&C* **Secrecy** "Upon my back to defend my belly, upon my wit to defend my wiles, upon my secrecy to defend mine honesty." S1: privacy S2: genitals	----	D	用我的秘密,保護我的貞操	B2	靠秘密保護我的貞操	B2
133.	*T&C* **Capocchia** "Ha ha! Alas, poor wretch. Ah, poor capocchia, hast not slept tonight?" S1: foreskin S2: prepuce	真是個傻丫頭	B2	一個可憐的蠢傢伙 +注	E	可憐的蠢傢伙 +注	E
134.	*T&C* **Do** "You naughty, mocking uncle! You bring me to do—and then you flout me too. S1: an act S2: to have sex	你自己害得我—現在卻來譏笑我	B2	你引我幹下了這事——你又來挖苦我	B2	你引我去幹——然後又來挖苦我	A1

	Shakespeare's bawdy puns The presenting and underlying senses	Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code
135.	*T&C* **Burning devil** "A burning devil take them!" S1: to glow with heat S2: to infect with venereal disease	渾身火焰的魔鬼抓了他們去	B2	讓火辣辣的惡魔來捉他們	B2	讓渾身著火的魔鬼把他們抓了去	B2
136.	*T&C* **Butt** "Why, no, you ruinous butt, you whoreson indistinguishable cur, no. S1: leaky tub S2: the buttocks	你這半橛兒的壞木頭	B2	你這個破爛酒桶	B2	你這爛酒桶	B2
137.	*T&C* **(Winchester) goose** "It should be now, but that my fear is this: Some gallèd goose of Winchester would hiss." S1: wild water birds S2: Prostitutes or customers afflicted with venereal disease	----	D	溫柴斯特的窯姐兒 +注	B3	溫切斯特鵝 +注	E

	Shakespeare's bawdy puns The presenting and underlying senses	Yu E.C.	Code	Tu A.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Liang Z.D.	Code	Gu Z.K.	Code	Shi Y.Z.	Code
138.	*SON 20* **Prick (thee out)** "But since she pricked thee out for women's pleasure…" S1: selected you from the list S2: equipped you with a 'prick' (penis)	然而自然既已選君以博婦女之歡愛	B2	既然她造了你來取悅女人	B2	她既然選中了你,要你討女人的歡心	B2	但造化造你既專為女人愉快	B2	既然造化造你是供女人取樂	B2	她既選你應付女人歡快	B2
139.	*SON 20* **Use (their treasure)** "Mine be thy love and thy love's use their treasure." S1: let them enjoy your love S2: let your love enjoy (sexually) the women's genitals.	君愛贈我,君愛之用請貽彼數妹輩	B2	給我愛,給女人愛的功能當寶	B2	把你的愛給我,把情慾送給她們	B1	讓我佔有,而她們享受,你的愛	B2	給我愛,但給女人做愛的寶藏	B3	給我以情,給予她們撫愛	B2

	Shakespeare's bawdy puns The presenting and underlying senses	Yu E.C.	Code	Tu A.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Liang Z.D.	Code	Gu Z.K.	Code	Shi Y.Z.	Code
140.	SON 42 **Approve** "Suff'ring my friend for my sake to approve her." S1: to put to the proof or test of experience S2: to try out sexually	而任你為我故一試彼貞	B2	而容許我朋友為了我而把她佔領	B2	讓我的朋友為我的緣故而把她看中+注	E	讓我的朋友替我殷勤款待她	B2	所以才讓我的朋友與她試享雲雨情	B3	讓我友人為我去試驗她	B2
141.	SON 92 **Vex** "Thou canst not vex me with inconstant mind…" S1: stir, agitate S2: a quibble on sexual motion	君若我負不能擾我心	B2	你反覆無常也不能再來煩惱我	B2	你三心兩意不能使我煩惱	B2	你的反覆再也不能使我頹喪	B2	我又何須自尋煩惱懼你覆雨翻雲	A1	你就三心兩意,我不受困	B2
142.	SON 129 **Spirit** "Th'expense of spirit in a waste of shame, Is lust in action" S1: soul, inner vitality S2: semen or penis	慾若得遂乃為心靈之力無恥之耗費	B2	生氣喪失在帶來恥辱的消耗裡	B2	肉慾的滿足乃是精力之可恥的浪費	B2	把精力消耗在恥辱的沙漠裡	B2	損神,耗精,愧煞了浪子風流	A1	精力消耗於無恥的浪費	B2
143.	SON 129 **Waste of shame** "Th'expense of spirit in a waste of shame…" S1: left in a desert of shameful moral decay S2: playing on "waist" of shame, ie: a prostitute's body (ejaculating into a shameful waist)	慾若得遂乃為心靈之力無恥之耗費	B2	生氣喪失在帶來恥辱的消耗裡	B2	肉慾的滿足乃是精力之可恥的浪費	B2	把精力消耗在恥辱的沙漠裡	B2	損伸,耗精,愧煞了浪子風流	B2	精力消耗於無恥的浪費	B2
144.	SON 129 **Enjoyed** "Enjoyed no sooner but despised straight." S1: pleasure S2: with reference to sexual fruition	慾之方遂即感其可鄙	B2	剛嘗到歡樂,立刻就覺得沒意思	B2	剛剛一滿足,立即覺得可鄙	B2	歡樂尚未央,馬上就感覺無味	B2	才嘗得雲雨樂,轉眼意趣休	B3	剛剛享受,馬上感覺下賤	B2

	Shakespeare's bawdy puns The presenting and underlying senses	Yu E.C.	Code	Tu A.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Liang Z.D.	Code	Gu Z.K.	Code	Shi Y.Z.	Code
145.	*SON* 129 **Hell** "As this the world well knows, yet none knows well To shun the heaven that leads men to this hell." S1: hell of guilt S2: slang for vagina	獨憐無一稔知應避導人入此地獄的天堂路	B2	去躲開這個引人入地獄的天堂	B2	對這引人下地獄的天堂加以規避	B2	逃避這個引人下地獄的天堂	B2	卻避不得偏往這通陰曹的天堂路兒上走	B2	避開引人下地獄的天堂	B2
146.	*SON* 135, 136 **Will** S1: wishes, futurity, testament, the name "William" S2: voracious sexual appetite, male and female sex organs	玩兒	A1	心願,意願,意圖,意欲,意指,意向,主意 +注	E	威廉,欲壑,慾望 +注	E	願,心願	B2	意欲,欲,欲界,欲海	B1	威兒,慾情	A1
147.	*SON* 136 **Things (of great receipt)** "In things of great receipt with ease we prive…" S1: stores of great quantity S2: sexual organs of great capacity	世有大量能包容	B2	我們容易在巨大的容量中看出	B2	我們有過經驗,對於數字大的帳目	B2	須知道宏大的容器非常便當	B2	說到大容器我們憑經驗可知	B2	量大之物,我們容易證明	B2
148.	*SON* 136 **Nothing (hold me)** (Hold that) nothing me "For nothing hold me, so it please thee hold That nothing me a something, sweet, to thee." S1: consider me a worthless thing/ take pleasure in thinking me S2: take me as a mere sexual object/ physically hold my sexual organ	蓋汝但以我「兒」為無物, 則此無物便將蒙汝青睞而成為汝所愛之某物	B2	請你來管管不能算數的我吧, 我對你可是個甜蜜的算數的東西	B2	你可以不必怎樣的重視我, 但你要承認我這區區是你的好東西	B2	把我看作微末不足道, 但必須把這微末看作你心愛的東西	B2	我的誠然渺小, 只望你柔情不減如膠似漆	B2	擁我如同無物,你會喜歡 擁有我這無物,予你舒爽	B2

	Shakespeare's bawdy puns The presenting and underlying senses	Yu E.C.	Code	Tu A.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Liang Z.D.	Code	Gu Z.K.	Code	Shi Y.Z.	Code
149.	*SON* 138 **Lie** "Therefore I lie with her and she with me." S1: tell lies S2: to recline in sexual intercourse	於是我騙彼騙彼我何翩翩	B2	所以,是我騙了她,她也騙了我	B2	所以我騙她,她也騙我	B2	因此,我既欺騙她,她也欺騙我	B2	於是我糊弄了她,她也糊弄了我	A1	所以,我瞞騙她,她瞞騙我	B2
150.	*SON* 144 **Hell** "But being both from me both to each friend, I guess one angel in another's hell." S1: religious S2: female sexual organ	二者相親,我恐一靈已入他靈之地獄	B2	我猜想一個進了另一個的地府	B2	我猜一個必已轉進另一個的窩	A2	一個想必進了另一個的地獄	B2	我敢說善精靈已進了另一個的陰間門	B2	我疑這個已進那個陰府	A1
151.	*SON* 144 **Fire my good one out** "Yet this shall I ne'er know, but live in doubt, Till my bad angel fire my good one out." S1: blasts my good angel to hell S2: gives my good angel the flaming irritation of venereal disease/blasts my friend's penis out of her "hell".	但當惡靈的烈燄未將善靈逐	B2	等待那惡神把那善神趕出來	B2	等著我的惡精靈傳給他一身惡疾 +注	E	除非是惡的天使把善的攆走	B2	除非是惡精靈用梅毒把善精靈嚇跑	B1	不到壞天使將好的射出	A1
152.	*SON* 151 **Conscience** "Love is too young to know what conscience is; Yet who knows not conscience is born of love?" S1: Moral sense S2: Carnal knowledge	戀神稚幼不知疚心為何物	B2	愛神太幼小,不知道良心是甚麼	B2	愛神太幼稚,本不解人事 +注	A1	愛神太年輕,不懂得良心是甚麼	B2	雖說愛神太幼小,不懂得甚麼叫良心 +注	E	愛太年輕,不解甚麼是性	A1

	Shakespeare's bawdy puns The presenting and underlying senses	Yu E.C.	Code	Tu A.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Liang Z.D.	Code	Gu Z.K.	Code	Shi Y.Z.	Code
153.	*SON* 151 **Flesh** "Flesh stays no further reason, but rising at thy name doth point out thee as his triumphant prize, proud of this pride." S1: body S2: penis	我肉聞言不待靈之口再啟； 而但聆汝之名迅興起	A1	肉體不愛聽高論， 只是一聽到你名字就起來	B2	那塊肉不再猶豫， 一聽到你的名字就振作起來	A1	肉體再不作聲， 一聽見你的名字就馬上指出	B2	而那一塊肉卻急迫地等不及聲明， 一聽到你的名字便昂首指向你	A1	肉體不再理論， 聽你名字昂然而起	B2
154.	*SON* 151 **Drudge** "He is contented thy poor drudge to be…" S1: a menial servant who performs tedious duties S2: a man who labours in a woman's bed	傲然得意遂豪甘為汝役	B2	十分甘心於做你的可憐的僕役	B2	他終歸做了你的可憐的奴隸	B2	死心塌地作你最鄙賤的家奴	B2	它多麼樂於做你可憐的奴隸	B2	他情願做你可憐的奴隸	B2
155.	*SON* 151 **Stand (in thy affairs)** "To stand in thy affairs, fall by thy side." S1: military, to take up an offensive position against an enemy S2: sexual, while "stand" refers to penis erectus, "affairs" can be stretched to mean "vagina".	為汝奮起	B2	情願站著伺候你	B2	為你效勞	B2	任你頤指氣使	B2	挺立於你的宮門	A1	挺立你處	B2
156.	*SON* 151 **Fall (by thy side)** "To stand in thy affairs, fall by thy side." S1: endure defeat while fighting on your behalf S2: detumesce in proximity to you	與汝共咎休	B2	倒在你身旁	B2	最後在你的身旁癱倒	B2	或倒在你身旁	B2	並累倒你身	A1	垂倒於你身旁	B2

	Shakespeare's bawdy puns The presenting and underlying senses	Yu E.C.	Code	Tu A.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Liang Z.D.	Code	Gu Z.K.	Code	Shi Y.Z.	Code
157.	*SON* 151 **Rise and fall** "No want of conscience hold it that I call her 'love', for whose dear love I rise and fall." S1: obeys her every command S2: sexually active, referring to tumescence and detumescence	為戀彼姝我與同起仆， 呼彼為愛勿以我為疚心無	B2	如果我把她叫作愛， 為了她的愛，我起來又倒下	B2	我喊她做「愛」， 為她而興起而衰落	C	所以我可問心無愧地稱呼她 做「愛」，我為她的愛起來又倒下	C	我當無愧地叫它作愛， 為了她那寶貝，我總是上下升沉	C	我叫她做「愛人」， 為她勃興垂倒	A1

Appendix 2: The Translation of Shakespeare's Bawdy Non-Puns

Notes:
A. Retaining the bawdy expression
B. Rendering the bawdy into an innocent expression
C. Omitting the bawdy
D. Editorial techniques

	Shakespeare's bawdy non-puns	Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code	Cao W.F.	Code
1.	*A&C* **Tumble on the bed** "Let us grant, it is not Amiss to tumble on the bed of Ptolemy."	即使我們承認淫亂多裏美王室的宮闕	A	倒在陶樂美的床上	A	由他在埃及女王的床上去打滾	A	即令我們承認在托勒美的床上打滾	A
2.	*A&C* **Turn i'th'bed** "For the best turn i'th'bed."	他們已經締結百年之好	B	要在床上盡義務	A	在床上好得不得了呀	A	結下了床上的那件最好的事	A
3.	*A&C* **Womb** "If every of your wishes had a womb…"	----	C	如果你每一慾望都有一個子宮	A	要是你的每一個慾望都有子宮	A	若是你的每一個心願都有一個子宮	A
4.	*A&C* **Heat my liver** "I had rather heat my liver with drinking."	那還不如喝酒痛快	B	我寧可用酒來溫暖我的肝 +注	D	我寧可喝酒來燃燒我這顆心	B	我還是去喝點酒來烘暖我的肝吧	B
5.	*A&C* **Stale of horses** "…thou didst drink The stale of horses, and the gilded puddle Which beasts would cough at…"	你喝的是馬尿和畜類嗅到了也會噁心的污水	A	你喝了馬溺和畜生都拒絕飲用的罩上一層金黃色浮渣的坑水	A	你把那馬尿,那金綠色的污水,野獸都嫌臭,喝下了	A	你真的飲下了馬尿,同黃臭的污水,禽獸看了都要作嘔	A

	Shakespeare's bawdy non-puns	Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code
6.	*ADO* **Fortunate bed** "Doth not the gentleman Deserve as full as fortunate a bed As ever Beatrice shall couch upon."	難道這位紳士就配不上琵特麗絲小姐嗎?	B	難道這位先生不配享受像壁阿垂斯那樣的一個新娘麼?	A	難道還怕這樣一位先生沒福消受白特麗絲,不配跟她同睡在一張合歡床?	A

	Shakespeare's bawdy non-puns	Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code
7.	*ADO* **Embrace** "…if I have known her, You will say she did embrace me as a husband…"	要是我已經跟她發生了肉體的關係,你就說因為她認定我是她的丈夫	A	如果是我玷污了她,你就要說她是已經把我當作丈夫	A	要是我真的跟她發生了曖昧的關係;你會說,她原是把我認做丈夫	B
8.	*ADO* **Heat of a luxurious bed** "She knows the heat of a luxurious bed."	她已經領略過枕席上的風情	A	她已經嘗試了床娛上的淫亂的滋味	A	她早已領略了火熱的枕席上的風情	A

	Shakespeare's bawdy non-puns	Tian H.	Code	Zhou Z.P.	Code	Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code	Cao W.F.	Code	Bian Z.L.	Code	Sun D.Y.	Code	Peng J.X.	Code
9.	*HAM* **Sate…in a celestal bed** "So lust, though to a radiant angel link'd, Will sate itself in a celestial bed."	也會坐在天床上抓肉屑喫	A	還是要到垃圾裡去取樂	B	也會有一天厭倦於天上的唱隨之樂	B	在天床上恣意尋歡也要感覺厭倦	A	天堂的婚床也會叫她倒了胃口	A	它也還是要在天床上感到厭倦	A	也會厭棄了至尊極樂的天床吃人家垃圾	A	還會在極樂的天床上感到饜足	A	也會厭膩於天堂的床第	A
10.	*HAM* **Secret parts** "In the secret parts of fortune? O, most true; she is a strumpet."	----	C	幸運女神的私處?	A	在命運身上秘密的那部份嗎?	B	幸運之神的私處?	A	進入了她那見不得人的私處?	A	在命運女神的私處嗎?	A	住在命運女神的私處?	A	待在命運女神的私處?	A	幸運之神的小穴?	A
11.	*HAM* **Incestuous pleasure** "When he is drunk asleep, Or in the incestuous pleasure of his bed…"	在他床上耽亂倫的淫樂的時候	A	或在床上淫樂的時候	A	或是荒淫縱慾的時候	A	或在床上淫樂的時候	A	正當他在床上翻滾,縱慾亂倫	A	或是當他在床上宣淫作樂的時候	A	等到他在床上放縱亂倫的欲情	A	或在床褥間縱情亂倫的時候	A	或是享受亂倫的床第之樂	A

No.	Shakespeare's bawdy non-puns	Tian H.	Code	Zhou Z.P.	Code	Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code	Cao W.F.	Code	Bian Z.L.	Code	Sun D.Y.	Code	Peng J.X.	Code
12.	*HAM* **Enseamed bed** "In the rank sweat of an enseamed bed…"	----	C	油漬汗臭的床上	A	汗臭垢膩的眠床上	A	油漬汗臭的床上	A	汗淋淋、油膩膩的床上	A	油垢的床榻的惡嗅撲鼻的汗臭當中	A	油膩的床上淋漓臭汗裡	A	油光滑膩、臭汗噁心的床上	A	在齷齪床鋪的汗臭裡面	A
13.	*HAM* **Honeying and making love** "Stew'd in corruption, honeying and making love."	----	C	在那污濁的豬欄上去說說情話	B	在汙穢的豬圈裡調情弄愛	B	在那骯髒的豬爛上蜜語做愛	A	守著骯髒的豬圈,又調情,又做愛	A	在骯髒的無比的豬圈上談情說愛, 賣弄風騷	B	守著豬圈來調情	B	在宣淫洩欲之間叫親親寶貝	B	卿卿我我在污穢的豬爛裡	B
14.	*HAM* **Tumble** "Quoth she, before you tumbled me, You promis'd me to wed."	----	C	你以前害了我,答應娶我同居	B	你曾答應婚嫁,然後再同枕席	A	你害我以前,答應娶我做新娘	B	你把我按倒前,本答應娶我做新娘	B	在你放倒我之前,你答應要娶我的啊	B	你把我弄到手以前答應過要結婚	B	想當初還沒要了我,您口口聲聲要我做新娘	A	你把我翻倒之前,答應過娶我入洞房	B
15.	*HAM* **Come to my bed** "So would I ha' done, by yonder sun, An thou hadst not come to my bed."	----	C	我發誓一定這樣做,你若沒有上我的床	A	誰料如今被你欺詐,懊悔萬千無及	B	我發誓必定這樣做,你若沒來上我的床	A	我心裡本這麼想,只怪你自己上門又上我床	A	我本是那樣想的,如果你不是先上我的床的	A	只怪你糊塗,自己來送上門	B	本來我就是這打算,誰叫你先上了床	A	本來我要實踐諾言,只怪你自己先跟我上床	A

No.	Shakespeare's bawdy non-puns	Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.H.	Code	Fang P.	Code	Bian Z.L.	Code	Sun D.Y.	Code	Cao W.F.	Code
16.	*LR* **Husband for her bed** "She grew round-wombed, and had, indeed, sir, a son For her cradle ere she had a husband for her bed."	這小子的母親沒有嫁人就大了肚子生下他來	B	在她的床上未有丈夫之前,搖籃裏先有了兒子	A	她搖籃裏已經有了個娃娃,她的床上卻還缺少個丈夫呢	A	她的床上還沒有丈夫呢,她的搖籃可先就又了兒子了	A	床上還不曾有丈夫,搖籃裡倒先有了孩子了	A	在她的床上還沒有丈夫之前,她的搖籃裡已經有孩子了	A

	Shakespeare's bawdy non-puns	Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.H.	Code	Fang P.	Code	Bian Z.L.	Code	Sun D.Y.	Code	Cao W.F.	Code
17.	*LR* **Sport (amorous)** "There was good sport at his making…"	在製造他的時候,曾經有過一場銷魂的遊戲	A	生他之前,我很享受了一番	A	造他出來的那段時光著實讓我受用了一番	B	製造他就經過一場歡喜的作樂	B	造他出來的那時節真好玩兒	B	在製造他的時候,那些日子真有趣極了	B
18.	*LR* **Dull, stale bed** "…within a dull, stale, tired bed, Go to the creating a whole tribe of fops, got'tween asleep and wake?"	----	C	在陳舊無謂的床上	A	在冷冰冰的床上	A	在沉悶,枯燥疲遝的床第	A	在遲鈍不靈,平凡陳腐,和困頓厭倦的床褥間	A	於昏沉,惡臭而無光的床上的	A
19.	*LR* **Lecher** "…the small gilded fly Does lecher in my sight."	金蒼蠅當著我的面前也會公然交尾哩	A	小金蠅也當著我面宣淫	A	小小的金蒼蠅當著我的面幹起那下流的事兒來	A	細小的小蒼蠅就在我眼前亂搞	A	細小的金蒼蠅就在我眼前宣淫	A	那個小發亮的蒼蠅,就在我面前舉起那猥褻的行為	A
20.	*LR* **Copulation** -sexual intercourse "Let copulation thrive…"	讓通姦的人多子多孫吧	A	讓交媾的事繁盛起來罷	A	儘管去幹那一套勾當吧	B	讓通姦興旺吧	A	讓交媾儘管去盛行	A	令交媾事多多發達	A
21.	*LR* **Got 'tween…sheets** "Gloucester's bastard son Was kinder to his father than my daughters Got 'tween the lawful sheets."	----	C	正當床第之間生出來的女兒們	A	在夫妻的合歡床上生下的女兒	A	在合法的床褥間生出的女兒們	A	合法的床褥間所生的女兒們	A	於合法的床第之間的女兒	A

	Shakespeare's bawdy non-puns	Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code	Ying R.C.	Code
22.	*MM* **Motion ungenerative** "He is a motion ungenerative, that's infallible."	他是個活動的木頭人兒	B	他是個不能人事的傀儡	A	原來他是個沒有生殖器的木偶呀	A	他不是活人,是木頭做的傀儡	B
23.	*MM* **Downright way of creation** "They say this Angelo was not made by man and woman after this downright way of creation…"	這個安哲魯不是像平常人那樣爺娘生下來的	B	這一位安哲婁不是普通的男女所生	B	這個安奇羅呀……他不是男女交配生下來的	A	這個安哲羅不是男人和女人照自古以來的辦法生下來的	B

	Shakespeare's bawdy non-puns	Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code	Ying R.C.	Code
24.	*MM* **Geld and splay** "Does your worship mean to geld and splay all the youth of the city?"	你老爺的意思是打算把維也納城裏的年輕人都關起來嗎?	B	你想把城裏的年輕人都閹割了麼?	A	難道老爺的意思是,城裏的小夥子都得把陽具割了,大姑娘都要把下身封起來嗎?	A	難道大人要把維也納的年輕人都閹了嗎?	A
25.	*MM* **Mutual entertainment** "The stealth of our most mutual entertainment With character too gross is writ on Juliet."	我們秘密的交歡,卻在裴麗葉身上留下了無法遮掩的痕跡	A	不幸我們倆情相悅,在茱麗葉身上留下了無法掩飾的幽會的痕跡	B	誰想到我們倆私下裏尋歡作樂,在茱麗葉身下留下這遮不住的痕跡	A	我們互相情願的暗中歡樂,卻在茱麗葉特身上留下了明顯的痕跡	A
26.	*MM* **Set to't** *To render a person lustful; *it* being sexual intercourse or the desire therefor. "I dare not for my head fill my belly; one fruitful meal would set me to't."	----	C	為了腦袋我不敢肚子;豐盛的一餐就會引起我的悲傷	B	要保全我的頭顱就不敢填飽我的肚子;大魚大肉我哪兒敢碰,只怕一嘗到肉味兒,我這嘴又饞得只想去嘗另一種肉味兒呀	A	一頓好飯,我可能就控制不住自己,犯克勞狄奧的錯誤,那就得幹掉腦袋啊	B
27.	*MM* **Possession (of Julietta's bed)** "Thus stands it with me: upon a true contract I got possession of Julietta's bed."	我因為已經和裴麗葉互許終身,和她發生了關係	A	我和茱麗葉訂婚之後,就和她同床共寢了	A	我跟茱麗葉定了婚,進展到登上了她的床	A	我們互相情願的暗中歡樂	A
28.	*MM* **Makes water/urine** "But it is certain that when he makes water his urine is congealed ice."	可是我的的確確知道他撒下的尿都凍成了冰	A	不過他小便的時候,他的尿都凝成冰,那倒是確實的	A	可千真萬確的是,他撒下的尿,是一條條冰棍子	A	有一條靠得住,他撒尿的時候,撒出來的都是冰	A

	Shakespeare's bawdy non-puns	Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code
29.	*MW* **Stone** "By gar, I will cut all his two stones…"	把他的兩顆睪丸一起割下來	A	把他的兩個睪丸都割下來	A	把他那兩顆彈丸兒都割下來	A
30.	*MW* **Enjoy (sexually)** "You shall, if you will, enjoy Ford's wife."	只要你立定決心,不怕傅德的老婆不到你的手裡	B	如果你願意你一定可以享有福德的老婆	A	傅德家的那個女人,只要你喜歡,您不用怕弄不到手	B

	Shakespeare's bawdy non-puns	Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code
31.	*MW* **Lie with** "…thou shalt lie with his wife."	你一定可以跟他的老婆睡覺	A	你一定可以和他的老婆睡覺	A	您一定能跟他的老婆睡覺	A
32.	*MW* **Gotton** "He was gotten in drink: is not the humour conceited?"	----	C	他是在他爹媽醉的時候成的胎	A	醉酒糊塗的爹娘生下這個窩囊廢	A
33.	*MW* **Liver (burning)** "With liver burning hot."	他心裡火一樣的熱呢	A	愛得正在火熾	B	他的肝臟火在燒呢 +注	D
34.	*MW* **Rut-time** "Send me a cool rut-time, Jove, or who can blame me to piss my tallow?"	----	C	給我一個冷靜的交配季節罷	A	讓我過一個涼快的交配期吧	A
35.	*MW* **Knog your urinals** "I will knog your urinals about your knave's cockscomb for missing your meetings and appointments."	我要把你的便壺摔在你的狗頭上,誰叫你約了人家自己不來!	A	我要用你的尿壺砸你的腦袋,你竟不按時赴約	A	看我不把你的便壺摔在你這奴才的狗頭上,約了日子,約了地點,到臨了卻不敢露面	A

	Shakespeare's bawdy non-puns	Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code	Cao W.F.	Code	Bian Z.L.	Code	Sun D.Y.	Code
36.	*OTH* **Tup** "An old black ram is topping with your white ewe"	一頭老黑羊在跟你的白母羊交尾哩	A	一隻大黑羊正和你的那只小白羊交尾呢	A	一頭老黑羊在跟你那小白羊交尾哪	A	一頭老黑羊長在糟蹋你那只小白羊呢	B	一隻老黑羊和你的小白羊交尾呢	A	有只黑老公羊趴在您那白的小母羊身上	A
37.	*OTH* **Unproper beds** "…there's millions now alive That nightly lie in those unproper beds…"	臥塌上容留過無數的生張熟魏	A	每夜都睡在不純粹屬於自家的床上	A	夜夜睡在別人睡過的床上	A	每天夜裏睡在那種靠不住的床上	A	夜夜躺在並非專有的床上	A	每夜躺在那床頭,不光自己睡,濫汗不堪	A
38.	*OTH* **Taste her sweet body** "…the general camp, pioneers and all, had tasted her sweet body…"	曾領略過她的肉體的美趣	A	嘗過了她的溫柔	B	摟過了她那雪白的肉體	A	嘗過她的美妙肉體的滋味	A	品過她香肌玉體	A	嘗到她可愛的肉體	A

	Shakespeare's bawdy non-puns	Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code	Cao W.F.	Code	Bian Z.L.	Code	Sun D.Y.	Code
39.	*OTH* **Used thee** "Othello: He hath confess'd. Desdemona: What, my lord? Othello: That he hath used thee."	承認他已經和你發生關係	A	他說他已經享用過你了	A	他跟你……有關係	B	說他已經用過你	A	說跟你有來往	B	他承認他已經用過你	A
40.	*OTH* **Cope your wife** "Where, how, how oft, how long ago, and when he hath, and is again to cope your wife"	跟尊夫人……重溫好夢	B	和你的妻通姦	A	他跟你的夫人搭上	B	和你的妻子私會	B	勾搭你的夫人	B	同您的夫人共衾枕	A
41.	*OTH* **Tup** "Cassio did tup her…"	凱西奧和她通姦	A	卡希歐和她通姦	A	卡希奧跟她勾搭上了	B	凱西歐幹過她	A	她私通凱西奧	A	凱昔歐登上她身子	A
42.	*OTH* **Lie (on)** "Lie with her! Lie on her!"	跟她睡在一床!睡在她的身上!	A	和她同睡!在她身上睡!	A	睡在一床!睡在她身上!	A	睡過她!幹過她!	A	同她睡覺?糟蹋她?	A	躺在她一起!躺在她身上!	A

	Shakespeare's bawdy non-puns	Tian H.	Code	Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code	Cao W.F.	Code	Cao Y.	Code	Sun D.Y.	Code
43.	*R&J* **Ope her lap** "She will not stay the siege of loving terms. Nor ope her lap to saint- seducing gold."	不張開圍裙來接你那聖人都愛的金銀	B	不願接受可以使聖人動心的黃金的誘惑	B	使聖徒受惑的黃金也不能使她張開她的懷抱	B	讓聖徒動心的金銀敲不開她情懷	B	不肯展開她的襟懷來接受那神仙也動心的黃金	B	黃金誘惑了多少聖賢,她看都不看一眼	B	莫說可以讓誘惑聖者的黃金打動她窈窕的心曲	B
44.	*R&J* **Lie on their backs** "This is the hag, when maids lie on their backs, that presses them and learns them first to bear."	趁女孩子們仰臥著時,壓在她們身上	A	在人家女孩子們仰面睡覺的時候壓在他們的身上	A	在大姑娘仰著睡的時候,壓在她們身上	A	壓在她們的身上	A	在姑娘們仰身而臥時壓著她們	A	當著大姑娘們朝天仰在床上,就要壓在她們身上	A	當大姑娘們仰面朝天睡時,她壓在她們身上	A

	Shakespeare's bawdy non-puns	Tian H.	Code	Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code	Cao W.F.	Code	Cao Y.	Code	Sun D.Y.	Code
45.	*R&J* **Quivering thigh** "By her fine foot, straight leg and quivering thigh…	顫巍巍的股	A	彈性的大腿	B	顫動的大腿	A	扭呀扭的大腿	A	顫動的大股	A	顫巍巍的兩股	A	震顫的大腿	A
46.	*R&J* **Enjoy (sexually)** "I have bought the mansion of love, but not possess'd, and, though I am sold, not yet enjoy'd."	雖賣給人家了,還沒有供人家使用	B	雖然我已經把自己出賣,可是還沒有被買主領去	B	雖然我已出賣,但尚未被人享受	A	我把自己賣了給人,可主人還沒讓我去伺候	B	而把我雖然已經售出卻還不曾被人享受	A	雖然我賣給了人,也還沒有給人享受著	A	我雖已將自己出售,但還未被買主所享用	A
47.	*R&J* **A highway to my bed** "He made you for a highway to my bed."	他安排把你做到我牀上來的大道	A	他要藉借著你做接引相思的橋樑	B	他使你作為通往我的床上的大路	A	他本要借你做捷徑,登上我的床	A	他本想將你化成一道捷徑,走上我的床	A	他原來把你用做走到新房的路	B	他把你們作為來到我新婚床上的大道	A
48.	*R&J* **Womb of death** "Thou detestable maw, thou womb of death."	你這死的子宮啊	A	----	C	你這死亡的肚皮	B	----	C	你這死亡的子宮	A	----	C	孕育著死亡	B
49.	*R&J* **Green-sickness carrion** "Out, you green-sickness carrion!"	你這不識羞的青病鬼	B	不要臉的死丫頭	B	你這臉色發青的死鬼	B	你這張死白臉兒	B	你這黃毛死丫頭	B	臉上都發了青的死肉	B	生你萎黃病的爛肉	B
50.	*R&J* **Take my maidenhead** "And death, not Romeo, take my maidenhead"	羅密歐縱不能來,死神啊,你做我的新郎吧!	B	把我的童貞奉獻給死亡	A	讓死神,不是羅密歐,作我的新郎!	B	是死神,不是羅密歐,來做我的新郎	B	令死神,不是羅密歐,佔有我的處女之身	A	是死神,不是柔蜜歐睡在新娘的身旁!	B	死亡,不是羅密歐,將接受我的童貞	A

	Shakespeare's bawdy non-puns	Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code
51.	*T&C* **Neapolitan bone-ache** *syphilis "Or rather, the Neapolitan bone-ache, for that methinks is the curse depending on those that war for a placket."	整個的軍隊都給我遭到災殃,或者讓他們一起害楊梅瘡	A	整個軍營都遭殃,或者都長楊梅瘡	A	整個的營地都遭殃吧!或是,讓他們全都生楊梅瘡吧!	A

	Shakespeare's bawdy non-puns	Zhu S.H.	Code	Liang S.Q.	Code	Fang P.	Code
52.	*T&C* **Maidenheads** "How now, how now! How go maidenheads? Here, you maid! Where's my cousin Cressid?"	啊,啊!其味如何?喂,你這位大娘子!	B	怎麼樣,怎麼樣!貞操什麼價錢?過來,你這位處女!	A	怎麼樣,怎麼樣,貞操出什麼事沒有?這兒,您這個閨女	A
53.	*T&C* **Tickle** "How the devil Luxury, with his fat rump and potato-finger, tickles these together!"	那個屁股胖胖的,手指粗得像馬鈴薯股的奢淫魔鬼怎麼會把這兩個寶貨撮在一起!	B	淫欲魔鬼,聳著他的肥股,伸著他的甜薯似的手指,竟逗起了這兩人的淫興!	A	淫欲魔鬼竟然扭著他的肥股和馬鈴薯手指頭。把這兩個人挑逗到一起!	A