

The Translation of Puns and Allusions: A Case Study of the Chinese Translation of Shakespeare's Play Script on *Hamlet*

Yi-Ling Liu

譯評之書名：莎士比亞四大悲劇（上）
原著：The Tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark
譯者：卞之琳
原文作者：威廉·莎士比亞 (William Shakespeare)
出版社：臺北，貓頭鷹出版社
出版日期：2004 年 5 月
總頁數：411 頁
ISBN：986-7879-78-3
售價：新臺幣 320 元



Received: July 8, 2015; Revised: September 11, 2015; Accepted: July 1, 2016

Introduction

Translation can be viewed as a communicative device that brings together aspects from a variety of relevant fields, including literary and cultural studies, psychology and linguistics (Gutknecht, 2002). For literary translation, translators need to deal with figure of speech, puns, wordplay, and cultural expressions that involve multiplicity of meanings. Drama translation is a specific area in translation studies. Among other genres of literature, drama is not only written to be read but also to be staged. In translating Shakespeare's play, translators may face the challenge of conveying the playful effects of puns and allusions.

Puns and allusions play an extremely important role since they are intended for dramatic effects, and are expected to evoke immediate responses among the audiences. Due to the asymmetry of language systems, Chinese and English, and cultures (western and eastern), it occurs some linguistic difficulties (e.g. the semantic or pragmatic effects) in shifting one language into another language to achieve the equivalent dramatic effects in translation. An effective translation depends on whether the target readers can make sense of the dramatic effects of pun and allusion conveyed in the translations. The translation strategies that translators used also influence target readers' understanding of the text.

This paper adopts Delabastita's model of translation techniques for pun and Leppihalme's approaches for rendering allusions to discuss the translation of Shakespeare's play script on *Hamlet* by Bian Zhi-lin (卞之琳). This paper pays particular attention to the analyses of the specific linguistic art works of pun and allusion, and what their possible effects are in the Chinese translation.

Analysis and Discussion

Pun

Puns are one form of rhetoric employed to attain a humorous effect by exploiting the multiple meanings of words or phrases, and it can reflect an essential characteristic of the linguistic system. McMillan Dictionary (2015) explains that pun is “a humorous use of a word that has two meanings, or of words with the same sound but different meanings.” To put it more plainly, pun is a means of creating a strong rhetorical effect by the confrontation of two meanings. The main purpose of using puns is for the intended humorous or rhetorical effects of the texts. The effect of a pun should be communicatively significant; it can be humorous, attention getting, or persuasive.

In categorizing puns, one should consider the textual phenomena for how the effects of a pun are exploited. Delabastita (1993) linguistically categorized wordplay in English into four types: homonymy, homophony, homography, and paronymy. Homonymy refers to the situation where two words have the same sound and spelling but different meanings (e.g. “present”). Homophony occurs when two words, which have different meanings, have identical sounds but are spelled in a different way (e.g. “bear” and “bare”). Homography indicates that words are different in pronunciation but identical in writing (e.g. “record”). Paronymy are words slightly different in both sounds and spelling, and the ambiguities arise from the graphemic and phonemic similarities (e.g. “fig” and “pig”).

Furthermore, on the aspect of syntactic relationship, he suggested that a pun can be either vertical or horizontal. The vertical puns carry at least two levels of meaning, the surface meaning and the underlying meaning, which are layered in the single expression of the ambiguity of words or phrases. While a

vertical pun holds one pivot term that creates double meanings, the horizontal pun has two. That means the two similar linguistic components occur one after another in the text, and the second meaning is created by the repetition of the words.

According to Delabastita's studies (1993 & 1997), he found that the usual translation techniques could not entirely apply to the linguistic- and cultural-specificity of puns; therefore, he presented the following possible translation strategies for wordplay:

1. PUN→PUN: transferring the source text (in the following referred to as ST) pun into target text (in the following referred to as TT) pun
2. PUN→NON-PUN: transforming an ST pun into non-punning manner in the TT
3. PUN→RELATED RHETORICAL DEVICE: substituting the ST pun with other related rhetorical devices such as repetition or metaphor in the TT
4. PUN→ZERO: omission of the ST pun in the TT
5. PUN ST = PUN TT: direct copying the ST pun in its translation
6. NON-PUN→PUN: compensating the loss of the ST pun by adding a new TT pun
7. ZERO→PUN: creating a totally new pun in the TT
8. EDITORIAL TECHNIQUES: providing greater description of the ST pun by editorial techniques such as footnote and commentary

In the field of drama translation, the discussion of translating wordplay from one language to another language is of great value since wordplay vehicles dramatic effects. With the criterion of Delabastita's model of translation puns, the following examples are given to show how the translator manages to render the diverse types of pun in *Hamlet*.

Example 1

[William Shakespeare: Act 1 Scene 2]

POLONIUS: He hath, my lord, wrung from me my slow leave by laborsome petition, and at last upon his will I sealed my hard consent:

[Bian's translation]

波：陛下，他苦苦哀求，舌敝唇焦，好容易挖出我嘴裡「可以」兩個字，我在他決心上蓋下了生硬的「同意」。

Example 1 shows the wordplays on vertical homonymic: will and hard. For the vertical homonymic puns, according to the context, the words “will” and “hard” involves double meanings. For the first layer of meaning, “will” refers to wish or desire, and “hard” means reluctant and unwilling. Based on the word “sealed,” the two words also bring another meaning, “will” can also refer to legal document or testament, and “hard” is implied as physically hard since signet-ring is used in sealing document.

In Bian's translation, the ST pun “will” was translated as “決心” and kept the similar textual effect of the ST. The phrase “在決心上蓋下……” turned the abstract idea “決心” into a concrete object like a document. For the second ST pun “hard,” Bian rendered them in a non-punning manner, whereas the double meanings of the ST pun “hard” remained in the translation. In the technique of “Pun to Non-pun,” as Delabastita (1993) mentioned, it could be divided into two subtypes: selective non-pun and non-selective non-pun. In the former case, one of the two linguistic meanings was selected depending on the coherence of the context. For non-selective non-pun, the two layers of meaning were reserved in the TT. When the ST pun was vertical type, Delabastita (1993) suggested that the translator had the possibility of rendering both meanings syntactically as shown in Bian's translation. Bian tried to keep the double meaning of “hard” by distributing the ambiguous senses of lexical item over

two or more lexical units. In Bian's translation, the phrase “生硬的同意” (a reluctant permission) showed the permission from Polonius is not easily granted as the surface meaning of “hard,” and the word “生硬的” (firm) could refer to the second meaning of “hard” as the ST does.

Furthermore, in order to compensate the loss of the ST puns, Bian integrated another translation technique to recreate the dramatic effect of the context. Bian adopted the technique of “Non-pun to Pun” by adding a new TT pun of “可以” (agreement) and “同意” (consent), which the punning effect arose from the phonemic similarity of the sound “以” (yǐ) and “意” (yì). Then Bian reproduced a similar playful effect as the ST pun. For target readers, they could easily recognize the playful effect of the new punning words in the translation by the hint of the quotation marks of the two words “以” (yǐ) and “意” (yì).

Example 2

[William Shakespeare: Act 1 Scene 2]

KING: But now, my cousin Hamlet, and my son,—

HAMLET: Not so, my lord; I am too much i' the sun

[Bian's translation]

王：得，哈姆雷特，我的侄兒，我的兒—

哈：陛下，太陽大，受不了這個熱勁「兒」。

註「太陽」也指滿廷的光輝，原文中「晒太陽」還有被逐出戶、享受不到合法權利的寓意。

Example 2 illustrates the wordplays on horizontal homophonic pun: son and sun and vertical homonymic: sun. This horizontal pun is based on the phonemic similarities between “son” and “sun” that Hamlet uses to mock at what King said to him. The phrase “in the son” implies that the relationship

between Hamlet and the King from uncle and nephew to stepfather and son. The phrase “in the sun” refers to all Hamlet’s behaviours are in the glare of publicity, moreover, it is used as an irony by Hamlet to satirize the King is hypocritical.

Bian’s translation showed how the TT contained a pun that could be identified as one translation approach to the ST pun. The horizontal homophonic pun (sun and son) was turned into horizontal homonymic pun “兒” (ér) in the translation that had both same phonic and spelling forms but differed in meaning. For the first word “兒” (ér), it referred to the son, and the second one worked as function word for describing the heat of sun. By doing so, the translation was achieved the similar dramatic effect as the original had. However, it needed to spend some time to figure out the intended playful effect of the translation, therefore, the translation might not evoke the strong readers’ response as the original.

Moreover, Bian offered extra information about the ST pun by using footnote, and it was one types of what Delabastita (1993) called editorial techniques. According to the footnote in Bian’s translation, the “sun” in the ST could reflect to the idiom “out of heaven’s blessing into the warm sun” that meant someone was stepping into much rough life from a good condition of life. It was used to infer that Hamlet was out of home and disinherited from the Crown. In this case, the phrase “in the sun” also belonged to vertical homonymic pun, yet Bian’s translation lost the implied meaning of “in the sun” for describing Hamlet’s rough condition. Footnote could offer greater information about the ST to readers, but this kind of translation technique might decrease the performability of the play. Moreover, the target readers would respond to the TT until they read the footnote.

Example 3

[William Shakespeare: Act 1 Scene 2]
HAMLET: [Aside.] A little more than kin , and less than kind .
[Bian's translation]
哈：親上加親，越親越不相親！

Example 3 plays on horizontal paronymic pun: “kin” and “kind.” As the horizontal paronymic pun, the “kin” and “kind” are nearly but with different in spelling and pronunciation, and the ambiguity of the meaning arises from the graphemic and phonemic similarity of two words. In the source text, the word “kin” signifies that Hamlet and his uncle, the King, become closer relatives through incestuous marriage between his mother and the King. But they still do not belong to the natural paternity as Hamlet and his father, the previous King.

Bain had succeeded in creating a TT pun by exploiting the phonemic and graphemic similarity of word “親” (qīn). In the line “親上加親，越親越不相親” (qīn shàng jiā qīn yuè qīn yuè bù xiāng qīn), the use of words “親” (qīn) was classified as horizontal homonymic pun with slightly semantic change to meet its immediate context. The first “親” (qīn) referred to the relation of Hamlet and his uncle, and the second one implied the incestuous relationship between Hamlet’s uncle and his mother. For the third word, “親” (qīn) meant their relationship become much closer through the marriage between his uncle and his mother. The last “親” (qīn) became the verb describing that they were not deeply attached to each other.

The translation not only produced the similar dramatic effect as “kin” and “kind” did in the ST, but also increased another playful effect of the text by the repetition of the word “親” (qīn). Apparently, the target readers could notice the ironic effect of the translated phrases “親上加親” and “越親越不相親” since the implied meanings of these two phrases are contradictory to each other overtly. The former one always refers to good thing, whereas, the later is

used for describing something negative. Therefore, by adopting the technique of “ST pun to TT pun,” Bian had achieved to render the horizontal paronymic pun in the ST as horizontal homonymic pun in the TT.

Example 4

[William Shakespeare: Act 5 Scene1]

FIRST CLOWN: A' was the first that ever bore arms.

SECOND CLOWN: **Why, he had none.**

FIRST CLOWN: What art a heathen? How dost thou understand the Scripture? The Scripture says Adam digged: could he dig without arms? I'll put another question to thee: if thou answerest me not to the purpose, confess thyself—

[Bian's translation]

甲：他是開天闢地第一個裝起門面、掛起「家徽」來的。

乙：啊，他連衣服都不穿，還講究什麼「家灰」「家火」的！

甲：怎麼，你是個邪教徒嗎？你連聖經都不懂嗎？聖經上說亞當掘地：掘地不用「傢伙」嗎？他的「傢伙」就是他的「家徽」。
我再考你一個問題。要是你回答不上來，乾脆認招

Example 4 displays Shakespeare's wit in playing with words. In the ST pun the horizontal homonymic relation of the word “arm” is exploited. In the original context, the first occurrence of the word “arm” refers to heraldry that represents one's status as a gentleman, but the second one is intended as the upper limbs of the body. According to Zuber (1980, as cited in Chung, 2008, p. 46), “a play is dependent on the immediacy of the impact of the audience.” Therefore, the language of drama should be translated in a way that carries the dramatic effects to evoke the immediate responses among the audience.

In order to recreate the humorous effect occurring in the ST, the technique of “Non-pun to Pun” was used by Bain. Bian added two more sound punning words “家灰” (jiāhūi) and “家火” (jiāhǔo) to echo the translation

of “arm,” “家徽” (heraldry; jiāhūi) and “傢伙” (tools; jiāhǔo) in Chinese. The new TT puns “家灰” (jiāhūi) and “家火” (jiāhǔo) were added right after the sentence “why, he had none.” Bain made the semantic shift of “手臂” (arm) into “傢伙” (tool; jiāhǔo) to rise the phonemic similarity with “家火” (jiāhǔo). The horizontal puns, based on the phonemic similarities between “家徽” (jiāhūi), “家灰” (jiāhūi), “家火” (jiāhǔo), and “傢伙” (jiāhǔo), were exploited in the TT to echo with the dramatic effect of the ST pun. Moreover, the sentence “他的「傢伙」就是他的「家徽」” (the tool is his heraldry) was added for highlighting the punning effect of words.

In this case, Bian’s translation showed the analogue effect of the ST by way of the tongue twister-like texts. It was humorous that could make readers laugh, whereas, the overuse of punning words in the translation might make the whole text become verbose. Therefore, some readers might think the effect of the translated text was not effective enough.

Allusions

Allusion is an implied reference especially used in literary works. It is based on the common belief, historical or cultural events, and literary heritages that are shared with the writer and the readers. In literary works, the allusions can not only help to explain the meaning of the text, but also to intend the conventions that the author works (Ruokonen, 2010). Moreover, Chris Baldick (as cited in Chung, 2008, p. 108) mentions that “the technique of allusion is an economical means of calling upon the history or the literary tradition that author and readers are assumed to share” since it can enrich the works without redundant explanation for the implication to be inferred.

Leppihalme (1992 & 1997) classified allusions into two main types: proper name (PN) and key-phrase (KP) allusions. Proper name allusions can be real-life or fictional figures, names of well-known people such as writers, artists,

or celebrities, and name of the places, and so on. This type of allusions is sometimes borrowed from myths or Bible. For key-phrase allusions, it is usually originated from the slogans of advertisements, the lines of movies, cliché or proverb, popular beliefs, and the stories.

In addition, Kirillov (2003) and Sahebbonar (2006, as cited in Khadem & Vahid Dastjerdi, 2012) proposed that allusions could also be divided into diverse thematic groups, such as religion allusions, literary allusions, mythological allusions, and historical allusions. For religion allusions, it can refer to the verse from Holy Scripture, or the proper names related with specific religion such as the name of holy places. Literary allusions intend to the indirect references to another literary works that it can overtly understand by the readers. Mythological allusions are borrowed from the myths which contain large tales of gods, goddesses, and heroes, their births and spirit. Applying names or events from social customs, history, well-known places or celebrities form a group of cultural and historical allusions.

Since allusions seems to be culture-bound items and be understood by people who belong to that culture, for translators and readers, without being aware of the implicit reference, it will be hard for them to figure out the implied meaning here, then, the effect of allusion will be lost. Leppihalme (1997) proposed several potential translation strategies for allusions and those were summarized below. She made the distinction between proper name allusions and key-phrase allusions since the two groups of allusions required slightly different approaches for rendering it.

Strategies for translating proper name allusions:

1. Retention of name: remaining the PN allusion in the TT, it can be either in its original form nor in conventional TT form; furthermore, it includes two subcategories as follows:

- A. only use the PN allusion without any explanation

- B. providing greater information about the PN allusion by additional guidance or editorial devices such as footnote
- 2. Replacement of PN allusion with another ST name or TT name that are more familiar to the TT readers
- 3. Omission of PN allusion in the TT: it can be either completely omitted the allusive name in the TT nor transfer the sense of the allusion by other means such as a common noun

Possible strategies for translating key-phrase allusions:

- 1. Use of a standard translation, if it is available
- 2. Literal translation: rendering the meaning of KP allusion without regarding the contextual or connotative meaning
- 3. Providing further information of the KP allusion by extra-allusive guidance in the text, or by footnotes , endnotes, or other additional explanation outside the text
- 4. Simulated familiarity or internal marking the allusion: introducing the textual features that indicates the presence of the KP allusion in the text
- 5. Replacement by a preformed TT item
- 6. Rephrasing the allusion with an overt explanation of its meaning
- 7. Recreating the effect of the KP allusion by the creative construction of a passage that implies the connotation of the allusion
- 8. Omitting the KP allusions in the TT

Based on the principles of rendering allusions by Leppihalme (1997), the following examples are shown to analyze how Bain dealing with such specific linguistic items.

Example 5

[William Shakespeare: Act 1 Scene 2]

HAMLET: [...] Or that the Everlasting had not fixed his cannon 'gainst
self-slaughter! O God! O God!

[Bian's translation]

哈：[...] 但願天經地義並沒有一條嚴禁自殺的戒律！上帝啊！上帝
啊！

Example 5 serves as an example of religion KP allusion. The phrase “against self-slaughter” originates from the Ten Commandments in Holy Scripture. The Ten Commandments has been a set of disciplines for Christians to follow in their lives. And the main concept of the Ten Commandments is widely spread around the world that even non-Christians can get the ideas. Moreover, the discipline of “against self-slaughter” can be also found in other religious doctrines.

In this case, the concept of the KP allusion was familiar to both western and eastern culture. Bain tried to render the KP allusion “against self-slaughter” (自殺的戒律) in a standard translation manner which what Leppihalme (1997, p. 127) mentioned “a preformed TT version of a common ST.” Furthermore, Bian used the technique of recreation to increase the effect of the allusive phrase. Bian translated the word “everlasting” into “天經地義” (unalterable principle) as an internal marking in the TT to confirm the absolute standard of the Ten Commandments. By doing so, the target readers could easily gain the idea of the TT.

Example 6

[William Shakespeare: Act 1 Scene 2]

HAMLET: [...] So excellent a king; that was, to this, **Hyperion** to **a satyr** [...] A little mont, or ere those shoes were old with which she followed my poor father's body, like **Niobe**, all tears [...] My father's brother, but no more like my father than I to **Hercules** [...]

[Bian's translation]

哈：[...] 這樣好的一位國王，比起這一位簡直是海庇亮比薩徒；[...] 短短一個月，她像淚人兒一樣給我父親送葬去穿的鞋子還一點都沒有穿舊呢 [...] 我這個叔父可絕不像他的哥哥，正如我不像赫勾列啊！ [...]

註1 海庇亮，希臘神話中的太陽神，號稱最美的男性神祇；薩徒，山精，形狀是半人半馬，以淫佚著名，因此後世也常以此名稱色鬼。

註2 這裡並非表明哈姆雷特是文弱的；他也武藝高強，只是並非赫勾列（希臘神話中的大力士英雄）型的大漢。

Example 6 displays mythological PN allusions: Hyperion, a satyr, Niobe and Hercules. “Hyperion,” “a satyr,” “Niobe,” and “Hercules” are the names from mythology. All these belong to proper name of mythological allusions. In Greek literature, “Hyperion” is one of the twelve Titans and is ascribed as “God of watchfulness, wisdom, and light.” “Satyr” is most commonly described in Greek Mythology as having the upper half of a man and the lower half of a goat creature living in the mountain, including a goat-tail and goat-like ears. And it is always with the features of licentiousness, loving wine and woman. Hamlet uses such two opposite expressions of two characters to build the images of his father, the dead King, and his uncle, the present King.

In Bian's translation, the two ST allusive proper names “Hyperion”

(hǎibìliàng, 海庇亮) and “Satyr” (sàtú, 薩徒) were retained via transliteration in the TT with the detailed explanation of the characters in Greek Mythology outside the text by footnote. By using the technique of footnoting, the TT readers could gain more knowledge of the unfamiliar culture-bound items that might help them to comprehend the whole context. The same technique was used for translating the following proper name of mythological allusion, Hercules. Hercules is the Roman name for the Greek divine hero Heracles. He is famous for his strength and the far-ranging adventures. Here, Bian rendered it as “赫勾列” (hègōuliè) through transliteration. In the footnote, Bain not only provided the information of the Greek mythological hero, but also explained the reason for comparing Hamlet and Hercules.

Niobe is another female character in Greek Mythology, who is punished for her hubris by Leto, who sent Apollo and Artemis to kill her children. With the sorrow of loss all her children, she turns into stone and, as she tears unceasingly, water starts to come from her petrified figure. In the ST, the image of Niobe’s iconic tear corresponded to the Queen’s sorrow of for the dead King. Here, Bian used another technique to deal with the PN allusion. The mythological allusion was omitted in the TT but he translated the sense of the allusion, Niobe, into the common noun “淚人兒” (a person was in floods of tears).

In this example, Bian used two different kinds of techniques in dealing with the mythological PN allusions. For the technique of retention ST allusion with detailed explanation outside the text, readers could gain greater information of the allusion. However, in some way, footnotes might distract readers’ attention from reading and the intended playful effect of the allusion may be decreased. In contrast, replacing the ST allusion with another TT name may not be fidelity to the ST but efficacy that the implicit sense of allusion can be easily recognized by the TT readers.

Example 7

[William Shakespeare: Act 4 Scene 5]

OPHELIA: There's **rosemary, that's for remembrance**: pray you, love, remember: and there is **pansies, that's for thoughts**.

LAERTES: A document in madness; thoughts and remembrance fitted.

OPHELIA: There's **fennel** for you, and **columbines**: there's **rue** for you: and here's some for me: we may call it herbs of grace o' Sundays: O, you must wear your rue with a difference. There's a **daisy**: I would give you some **violets**, but they withered all when my father died: they say he made a end

[Bian's translation]

莪：這點花是迷迭香，表示記憶的。愛人，你要記好。這是三色堇，表示相思的。

萊：瘋話裡有教訓！相思和記憶恰好合適。

莪：這點巧嘴茴香花給你，還有這點邪眼漏斗花。這點苦芸香花給你，留一點給我自己。我們到禮拜天可以叫它慈悲草。噢，你戴起來跟我的戴法不同！這是騙人精雛菊。我本想給你們一點堅貞的紫羅蘭，可是我父親一死，全枯了。人家說他得了一個好收場

註1 迷迭香和三色堇一般解釋是給萊阿替斯的，因此莪菲麗亞誤認為他是情人了。

註2 茴香花據說代表諂媚，漏斗花代表忘恩或私通，一般解釋都是給克羅迪斯的；芸香花代表愁苦與悔恨，給王后，也給她自己，兩人同苦而各有「不同」。雛菊代表欺騙，威爾孫解釋是給她自己的（與三色堇一起），以誌警惕。紫羅蘭代表堅貞，威爾孫解釋她覺得都完了，沒人可給了。

Example 7 is related to the cultural and historical KP allusions, the language of flowers. The language of flowers, so called floriography, is the means of communication via the use of flower. The use of the language of

flowers has been practiced in some traditional cultures throughout Europe, Asia, and the Middle East. The symbol for each type of flowers is varied from cultures to cultures. The sentiment of flowers spreads widely in Britain during the Victorian Era. Some specific floral arrangements are used as the means of cryptological communication that allow people to express their feeling that cannot speak aloud in public. In western culture, many writers, poets, and artists use lots of emblematic meanings of flowers in their works for carrying themes as shown in this example.

The first two kinds of flower, rosemary and pansies, the symbolized meanings were already shown in the original lines, remembrance and thoughts; thus, the translation was in the standard TT form manner. In addition, Bian provided more detailed information about the reason why Ophelia said that to Laertes.

Contrasts to the former two alluded words, the following languages of flowers, fennel, columbines, rue, daisy, and violets, were not shown overtly in the ST. If the translation of those names was in the same technique mentioned above, then it would lose the function of allusion, moreover, for some TT readers might not truly understand the words by Ophelia. Bain had achieved the effect of the ST allusions by translating them with the additional guidance, the brief phrase suggesting connotations, to meet its immediate context. Also, with the additional explanation outside the text (i.e. footnote), the TT readers got greater information about the implied meaning of what Ophelia said.

Bian put “fennel” into “巧嘴茴香花” (adulatory fennel) in Chinese, which brought about the implied meaning of fennel, obsequiousness. “Columbines” was turned into “邪眼漏斗花” showing the symbolic meaning of columbine as ingratitude. In Chinese, the word “邪眼” was used to describe a person treating others with a devilish mind. These two meanings of flowers were used to represent the betrayal that the King Claudius did to the previous King of

Denmark. “Rue,” a bitter-taste herb, could symbolize regret in literary works. Here Bain added the adjective “苦” (bitter) to refer the regretful feeling of the Queen and Ophelia. The common sentiments of “daisy” were related to positive thoughts such as loyal love or purity, but in this play, based on the story, the meaning was changed. Here, “daisy” referred to cheat, in this case, Bain used “騙人精” (a swindler) to carry the implied meaning of cheating. In the TT, the word “堅貞的” (faithful) is used to present Ophelia remaining consent to Hamlet till death.

By using the technique of providing extra-allusive guidance in the text, the translation not only offered clearer information to the TT readers, but also increased more dramatic effect than the ST. For instance, in the last sentence, the word “堅貞的” (faithful) and “全枯了” (wither) overtly showed the contradictory images of Ophelia’s belief and love to Hamlet and other people, therefore, the ironic effect of text was exploited.

When it comes to the effectiveness of the translation techniques, the extra-allusive guidance in the text would get more immediate responses from the target readers since they could notice the implied meaning of the ST allusion of the language of flowers instantly. For another extra-allusive guidance outside the text such as footnote, even it offers further information for better understanding the translated texts, readers need to be tolerant of the interruptions in reading.

Conclusion

The paper sheds light on the study on the play translation in the rhetorical aspects of linguistic reference, pun and allusion. As a language-specific rhetorical form, pun and allusion can reflect an essential feature of a linguistic system. The difficulties in translating puns and allusions may result from the

interlingual asymmetry of two different language systems and culture barriers. According to the analyses, it shows that integrating two or more translation strategies could increase the possibility of recreating the poetic effects of pun and allusion in the translation.

In translating puns and allusions, the effects of pun and allusions should be considered in relation to another extralinguistic aspect, that language not only has a structure of its own, but also is linked to the way people understand and shape the world. Therefore, the translation of puns and allusions should carry an image that the TT readers are familiar with. An effective translation depends on whether the target readers can make sense of the dramatic effects of pun or allusion conveyed in the translations.

Based on the previous analyses, it is hoped that this paper could offer help information for play translators in dealing with the challenging task of reproducing a cultural- and linguistic-specific art form in the translation of play.

Reference

英文文獻

- Chung, L. F. (2008). *A comparative study of Yu Kuang-chung's and Chang Nam-fung's Chinese translations of The Importance of Being Earnest by Oscar Wilde* (Master thesis). National Kaohsiung First U of Science and Technology, Taiwan.
- Delabastita, D. (1993). *There's a double tongue: An investigation into the translation of Shakespeare's wordplay, with special reference to Hamlet*. Amsterdam, Neiterlands: Rodopi.
- Delabastita, D. (1997). *Traductio: Essays on punning and translation*. Manchester, England: St. Jerome.
- Gutknecht, C. (2002). Translation. In M. Aronoff & J. R. Hayes (Eds.), *The handbook of linguistics* (pp. 692-703). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Khadem, A., & Vahid Dastjerdi, H. (2012). Key-phrase allusions and their translations: A focus on Mathnawi. *Asian Social Science*, 8(11), 178-185.
- Kirillov, A. (2003). Allusions as a means of political imaging in modern media. *CTIV*, 4, 102-111.
- Leppihalme, R. (1992). Allusions and their translation. *Acquisition of Language – Acquisition of Culture, AFinLA Yearbook*, 183-191.
- Leppihalme, R. (1997). *Culture bumps : An empirical approach to the translation of allusions*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Pun. (2015). In *McMillan Dictionary* online. Retrieved from http://www.macmillandictionary.com/dictionary/british/pun_1
- Ruokonen, M. (2010). *Cultural and textual properties in the translation and interpretation of allusions: an analysis of allusions in Dorothy L. Sayers' detective novels translated into Finnish in the 1940s and the 1980s* (Dissertation). University of Turku, Finland.

中文文獻

卞之琳（譯）（2004）。*莎士比亞四大悲劇：哈姆雷特、奧瑟羅*（二版）
（原作者：W. Shakespeare）。臺北市：貓頭鷹出版。（原著出版年：
1956）

