SENDEBAR

Original Articles · Artículos originales

The Translation of Verse Form. A Revision of Holmes' Model Based on the Spanish Translations of Shakespeare's *Sonnets*

La traducción de la forma del verso. Una revisión del modelo de Holmes basada en las traducciones al español de los sonetos de Shakespeare

Tanya Escudero 🄳 0000-0001-9509-7439

Tallinn University

ABSTRACT

While an essential component of poetry, form has been frequently overlooked in research on poetry translation or has been addressed under rather prescriptivist approaches, with notable exceptions (Holmes 1994, Jones, 2011, among others). This paper deals with the translation of the poetic form from a descriptivist perspective from a corpus of 69 Spanish translations of Shakespeare's Sonnets published between 1877 and 2018. It addresses, particularly, the outer form or macrostructure of the poems using one sonnet of each translation as a prototype. This analysis will serve as a basis for classifying these translations according to James S. Holmes' metapoem forms and for proposing a revision of this model. While there are certain forms or patterns repeated throughout, the diverse solutions show that there is no single favoured way of rendering these sonnets, not even during a specific period (beyond the preference for verse over prose).

Keywords: poetry translation, metapoem, rhythm, rhyme, poetic form

RESUMEN

Pese a ser un componente esencial de la poesía, la forma ha sido frecuentemente ignorada en la investigación sobre traducción poética o ha sido abordada bajo enfoques más bien prescriptivistas, con destacables excepciones (Holmes 1994, Jones, 2011, entre otros). Este trabajo aborda la traducción de la forma poética desde una perspectiva descriptivista a partir de un corpus de 69 traducciones al español de los Sonetos de Shakespeare publicadas entre 1877 y 2018. Trata, en particular, la forma exterior o macroestructura de los poemas utilizando un soneto de cada traducción como prototipo. Esto permitirá clasificar dichas traducciones según las formas del metapoema de James S. Holmes y proponer una revisión de este modelo. Si bien ciertas formas o patrones se repiten, las diversas soluciones demuestran que no hay una forma predilecta para traducir estos sonetos, ni siquiera durante un período específico (más allá de la preferencia por el verso sobre la prosa).

Palabras clave: traducción poética, metapoema, ritmo, rima, forma poética

1. Introduction

The aim of this article is to shed light on the way formal poetry is translated into Spanish, using a corpus of Shakespeare's translations into this language and providing a descriptive analysis of the form used in these translations. To classify the results, I will use Holmes' metapoem categories (Holmes 1994), in which the starting point is always the search for formal versus semantic resemblance.

Much has been written about certain content-related aspects of poetry and their translation, such as metaphors or puns. However, although it is broadly accepted that a poem is an indissoluble union of content and form, the latter is frequently overlooked, and it is more common to find insights into form in the prefaces or notes written by translators themselves than in scholarly papers. However, such reflections from translators are frequently charged with great prescriptivism and scholarly papers on the matter are often written from the same perspective and frequently substantially biased (e.g. Bly 1982; Etkind 1982; and, to some extent, Lefevere 1975), especially until the last few decades, when some important work was published (see, among others, Bassnett 1998b; Koster 2000; Boase-Beier 2006, 2015; Jones 2011a; Boase-Beier and Holman 2016), focusing not on revealing the correct way to translate poetry, but on describing and interpreting various elements related to it, such as the style or the agents involved.

Avoiding the prescriptive tradition typical of his time, James S. Holmes presented a paper at the 1968 International Conference on Translation as an Art, held in Bratislava, on "Forms of Verse Translation and the Translation of Verse Form", in which he explained the potential forms of a translated poem or 'metapoem'. Barely a month earlier, Holmes had introduced the notion of metapoem at the International Conference of General and Applied Linguistics, in Antwerp. The revised text of this paper defines it as "the poem intended as a translation of a poem into another language" (Holmes 1994: 10). Discussing this concept, he suggests that "it might be helpful if for this specific literary form, with its double purpose as metaliterature and as primary literature, we introduced the designation 'metapoem'" (1994: 24). Although the field of Translation Studies has undergone major changes and grown exponentially since 1968, this concept has not had a significant impact on research on poetic translation, despite the advantages to be discussed in this article.

It is somewhat customary to begin an article on poetry translation with a question about the plausibility of the act itself; the stifling idea of fidelity weighs heavily on the practice. However, it is not the rendition of poetry into another language—doing so has been common practice for centuries—but the use of the word 'translation' that still keeps scholars up at night. Although the notion of metapoem could quieten the controversy to some extent, we might again encounter the obstacle Holmes tried to overcome by defining the term as "the poem *intended* as a translation" (Holmes 1994: 10, emphasis added). That solution was similar to the one later proposed by Gideon Toury under the guise of 'assumed translations'—"all utterances in a (target) culture which are presented or regarded as translations" (Toury 1995: 17)—a solution not without critics (Halverson 1997: 224; Pym 2014). Rather than defining what is or is not translation, Toury splits responsibility between the producers and the recipients of those texts; for Holmes, only the producer is accountable. While the verdict for Toury arrives after the product has been *presented* or *regarded*; for Holmes, *intention* is what matters.

Still, how can we be sure of a translator's intentions? Although sometimes statements on the matter are found in the paratexts, this is not always the case. Moreover, even for translators, the line between translation and interpretation can be blurred (Escudero 2021). Since the aim of this paper is not just rescuing the term metapoem but also categorising the ways in which it has been cast in this corpus, it being defined by the translator as translation, adaptation or imitation is futile. As Susan Bassnett recognises, the category of translation is "vague and unhelpful"; she regrets "all the quibbling about determining the difference between 'adaptations' and 'versions' and 'imitations', all the arguing about degrees of faithfulness or unfaithfulness and the obsessive concern with the idea of an 'original'" (1998c: 38), which acts as a burden in poetic translation.

As such, considering a translator's intention does not sidestep the problem and I have, hence, excluded intention in favour of an alternative which can help delimit the scope of the metapoem, proposing a definition which simultaneously frees us from the constraints of fidelity and allows for intralingual possibilities. Metapoem is, in this sense, *a poem that, taking another poem as a point of departure, creates a new piece of poetry in which some semantic and/or formal features resemble those of the source text.*

In his paper, Holmes describes a range of possibilities for approaching a poem, with metapoem being just one of seven meta-literary forms. Among the other six, three are within the scope of 'interpretation' (in an analytic rather than creative sense): critical essay in the language of the poem, critical essay in another language, and prose translation (which Holmes does not integrate within the metapoem, as he considers it a 'nil-form solution'). The other three forms interpret "by enactment" (1994: 11, 24), and, therefore are considered by Holmes as poetry; these are imitation, poem about poem, and poem inspired by poem (being the degree of correspondence with the source text their main difference).

Following the definition introduced before, this new notion of metapoem would include all four forms that Holmes regards as poetry, that is, those which interpret by enactment. Given that my main interest lies in establishing a classification of metapoetic forms, the degree of correspondence with the source text is of little importance. Moreover, defining the border between translation and interpretation would be a futile task; as Koster observes, "there is not one specific way to characterize the relationship between these two concepts" considering that "any such characterization would depend on the point of view from which they are related" (2000: 35); hence the difficulty of drawing a line between the two.

2. Holmes' Metapoem and Other Classifications of Poetry Translation

Upon delimiting the concept of metapoem—as verse translation—Holmes classifies it establishing four categories divisible into three main groups: the first derives from form (comprising mimetic and analogical forms); the second derives from content (organic form); and the third does not derive from either content or form (extraneous form):

The *mimetic form* allows the translator to "imitate the form of the original as best as he can" (1994: 26).

The *analogical form* enables the translator to cast the poem in a form that fills a parallel function within their "poetic tradition" (1994: 26).

The *organic form* begins with the content, meaning the translator builds a new shape as they manipulate the poem (1994: 27).

The *extraneous form* does not derive from either the content or form of the original poem; accordingly, the translator creates a mould which is unrelated to the primary text (1994: 27).

Although this is not the only extant attempt at classifying poetry translations, most divisions have focused on the dichotomy between fidelity and creativity. For Jorge Luis Borges, a translation may be either literal or paraphrased, with the first being typical of romantic thinking (which venerates the artist) and the second constituting a more classical mentality, for which the priority is the work of art (1997: 257-258). According to Jiří Levý, "two norms apply in the evolution of reproductive art—the reproduction norm (i.e., the requirement to capture the original faithfully) and the 'artistic' norm (i.e. the requirement of beauty)" (2011: 60). Similarly, Efim Etkind proposes classifying translations into four groups: two focusing on the semantic material—either in prose ('traduction en prose d'information') or verse ('traduction versifiée d'information') —and the other two focusing on the artistic qualities of the text, also through either prose ('traduction en prose artistique') or verse ('traduction artistique en vers') (Etkind 1982: 211-212).

However, the most notable classification of poetry forms is probably André Lefevere's (1975), who—based on comparisons of Catullus' 64th poem and its English translations—delineated seven strategies used by translators: phonemic translation, literal translation, metrical translation, poetry into prose, rhyme, blank verse and interpretation. He also described two modes of interpretation: version and imitation. Thus, his categorisation is descriptive—unlike that of Holmes, which was not based on any particular corpus—and deals with 'strategies', as some of them can be applied simultaneously. For example, a translation can be both metrical and rhymed, or it can imitate the original while using blank verse. Following Toury, Lefevere demonstrated what a translation "is" while Holmes showed what it "can be" (Toury 1995: 19).

Although Holmes' classification is more theoretical than descriptive and based not on a specific corpus but on his experience as a researcher of poetic translation and as a poet and poetry translator, I believe his model's strength is its being derived from a content/form dualism. Although, as mentioned, these two elements are bound together—and even more so in poetry—it seems clear that translators often begin with this dichotomy (albeit possibly in an illusory manner for they are indissoluble). Thus, their decisions are often based on the search for semantic or formal similarity, or a combination of both, and Holmes' model could prove useful for the analysis of this corpus' translations. As such, this paper analyses the formal structure of these sonnets—according to syllable count, rhythm and rhyme, as well as some visual aspects—to recognise and understand how the prototypical form of the Shakespearian sonnet has been translated into Spanish; in the process, I will demonstrate (where appropriate) how the approaches taken fit into the categorisation of the metapoem forms proposed by Holmes (when an overlap is indeed possible).

3. Corpus and Method

My analysis includes sixty-nine Spanish translations of Shakespeare's *Sonnets*, published in Spain and Latin America between 1877 and 2018 (listed in the References section under "Primary Sources"). One poem from each translation has been used as a prototype. As most of these translations are partial and do not include the 154 sonnets of Shakespeare's sonnet sequence, the criterion for choosing a prototype has been the recurrence of the sonnets in the whole corpus, being Sonnet 18 the most recurrent. Considering some translators did not render this sonnet into Spanish, I have used alternatives, based once again on their recurrence. The translators who did not translate Sonnet 18 are listed below with the number of the sonnet used as a prototype in its place:

• Matías de Velasco y Rojas, 1877: Sonnet 2
• José Pablo Rivas, 1916: Sonnet 2
• Rafael Pombo, 1917: Sonnet 2
• Ángel Johan, 1945: Sonnet 2
• Juan Rodolfo Wilcock, 1949: Sonnet 73
• Alfredo Rodríguez López, 1997: Sonnet 2
• Demetrio Fábrega, 2004: Sonnet 73
• José Siles Artés, 2006: Sonnet 116
• Pablo Ingberg, 2007: Sonnet 73
• Gabriel Jiménez Emán, 2016: Sonnet 2

Considering this article focuses on the translation of the outer form, the fact that the analysis is based on different sonnets is not a concern, as in Shakespeare's work, each of these four sonnets (18, 2, 73 and 116) feature the same macrostructure or outer form. They all comprise three quatrains (with an alternate rhyme scheme which is different in each stanza) and a couplet (ABAB CDCD EFEF GG). The verses use iambic pentameters. Additionally, as indicated below, almost all of the sonnets use masculine rhymes[1] (with the exceptions of verses 5 and 8 in Sonnet 116, where 'shaken' is rhymed with 'taken'). Nonetheless, this tendency is of limited relevance to Spanish poetry because most words in Spanish are polysyllabic, with the stress rarely falling on the last syllable. Therefore, in translation, masculine and feminine rhymes can be combined (See Annex).

To conduct the analysis, I have considered the following parameters, which configure the outer form to which Holmes refers:

• use of prose or verse;
• syllabic count;
• regular rhythm (stress pattern);
• rhyme type (consonant, assonant or hybrid), and
• rhyme scheme.

First, I will provide a quantitative analysis in table form allowing observation of these parameters for each of the translations. Then, a qualitative analysis using different examples from this corpus illustrates the translators' solutions; here, I also refer, where relevant, to the arrangement of the poem on the page (i.e., the visual division into stanzas).

4. Results

According to the parameters mentioned above, the formal decisions made by the translators of this corpus can be seen in Table 1 below:

Table 1. Analysis outer form

Translator, year	Prose/ verse	Syllable count	Rhythm	Rhyme type	Rhyme scheme (stanzas)
M. de Velasco y Rojas, 1877	Prose	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
J. de Armas y Cárdenas, 1915	Verse	11	x.6.10	consonant	ABAB CDCD EFE FGG
J. Pablo Rivas, 1916	Verse	11	Variable	consonant	ABABCDCDEFEFGG
R. Pombo, 1917	Verse	11	Variable	consonant	ABBA CDDC EFE FGG
F. Maristany, 1918	Verse	11	x.6.10	consonant	ABAB CDCD EFEF GG
M. de Vedia y Mitre, 1929	Verse	14	Variable	consonant	ABAB CDCD EFEFGG
L. Astrana Marín, 1929	Prose	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
P. Gannon, 1940	Verse	11	Variable	consonant	ABAB CDCD EFG EFG
E. Dieste, 1944	Verse	Free	Variable	N/A	N/A
A. Damians de Bulart, 1944	Verse	11	Variable	consonant	ABAB CDCD EFEF GG
Á. Johan, 1945	Verse	11	x.6.10	consonant	ABABCDCDEFEFGG
M. Manent, 1947	Verse	14	Variable	N/A	N/A
J. R. Wilcock, 1949	Prose	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
M. de Vedia y Mitre, 1954	Verse	11	Variable	consonant	ABABCDCDEFEFGG
A. Martínez Howard & M. Howard, 1961	Verse	11	Variable	consonant	ABBA CDDC EFF EEF
M. Mujica Lainez, 1963	Verse	11	Variable	N/A	N/A
O. de Bingham Powell, 1964	Verse	Free	Variable	N/A	N/A
A. García Calvo, 1974	Verse	13	Variable	consonant	ABAB CDCD EFEF GG
F. Auad & Pablo Mañé, 1975	Verse	Free	Variable	N/A	N/A
J. Méndez Herrera, 1976	Verse	11	Variable	consonant	ABBA ABBA CDC DEE
J.F. Elvira-Hernández, 1977	Verse	Free	Variable	consonant	ABABCDCDEFEFGG
E. Sordo, 1982	Verse	Free	Variable	N/A	N/A
P. Vives Heredia, 1985	Verse	11	Variable	consonant	ABAB CDCD EFEF GG
C. Pérez Romero, 1987	Verse	14	Variable	assonant	ABABCDCDEFEFGG
M. Bros, 1987	Verse	14	Variable	assonant	—A—A —B—B —C—C DD
C. Pujol, 1990	Verse	14	3.6/3.6	N/A	N/A
G. Falaquera, 1993	Verse	14	Variable	N/A	N/A
J. Arecha, 1997	Verse	Free	Variable	N/A	N/A
A. Rodríguez López, 1997	Verse	11	Variable	N/A	N/A
M. Jofré, 1997	Verse	11	Variable	consonant	ABABABABCDDCEE
M. Reyes Suárez, 1998	Verse	11	Variable	consonant	ABBA ABBA CCDEED
J. Capriata, 1999	Verse	Free	Variable	N/A	N/A
J. M. Álvarez, 1999	Verse	Free	Variable	N/A	N/A
J. R. Blanco & G. Freijo, 1999	Verse	Free	Variable	N/A	N/A
A. Carugati, 1999	Verse	Free	Variable	N/A	N/A

J. Basileo Acuña, 1999	Verse	11	Variable	consonant	ABABCDCDEFEFGG
A. Gómez Gil, 2000	Verse	Free	Variable	N/A	N/A
J. Adúriz & A. Adúriz Bravo, 2000	Verse	Free	Variable	N/A	N/A
A. Rupérez, 2000	Verse	Free	Variable	N/A	N/A
T. Gray, 2002	Verse	11	Variable	consonant	ABBAABBAABBACC
L. Rutiaga, 2002	Verse	11	x.6.10	N/A	N/A
F. Marrufo, 2002	Verse	11/14	Variable	consonant	ABABCDCDEFEFGG
G. Vives, 2003	Verse	11	x.6.10	assonant	ABAB CDCD EFEF GG
M. A. Montezanti, 2003	Verse	11	x.6.10	consonant	ABABCDCDEFEFGG
D. Fábrega, 2004	Verse	11	x.6.10	consonant	ABAB CDCD EFEF GG
A. Rivero Taravillo, 2004	Verse	11	x.6.10	consonant	ABAB CDCD EFEF GG
C. Gardini, 2004	Verse	11	Variable	N/A	N/A
A. L. Tacoronte, 2005	Verse	11	Variable	assonant	ABABCDCDEFEFGG
M. Pellegrini, 2006	Verse	11	Variable	Hybrid	ABABCDCDEFEFGG
J. Siles Artés, 2006	Verse	Free	Variable	Hybrid	—A—ABCBCA—A—DD
E. Gallardo Ruiz, 2007	Prose	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
P. Ingberg, 2007	Verse	14	variable	N/A	N/A
P. Pérez Prieto, 2007	Verse	11	Variable	consonant	ABAB CDCD EFEF GG
C. Law Palacín, 2009	Verse	11	x.6.10	N/A	N/A
A. Ehrenhaus, 2009	Verse	11	Variable	assonant	ABABCDCDEFEFGG
I. Gamen, 2009	Verse	14	Variable	assonant	ABAB CDCD EFEF GG
J. M. Santamaría López, 2010	Verse	Free	Variable	N/A	N/A
R. Gutiérrez Izquierdo, 2011	Verse	14	Variable	Hybrid	ABAB CDCD EFEF GG
M. A. Montezanti, 2011	Verse	11	Variable	consonant	ABABCDCDEFEF GG
L. García García, 2013	Verse	14/15	Variable	consonant	ABAB CDCD EFEF GG
B. Santano Moreno, 2013	Verse	11	x.6.10	consonant	ABAB CDCD EFEF GG
J. Talens, 2014	Verse	14	Variable	N/A	N/A
A. García, 2014	Verse	11	Variable	assonant	ABAB CDCD EFEF GG
W. Ospina, 2016	Verse	14	Variable	consonant	ABABCDCDEFEFGG
S. D. Insa, 2016	Verse	Free	Variable	consonant	ABAB CDCD EFEF GG
G. Jiménez Emán, 2016	Verse	Free	Variable	N/A	N/A
M. Casillas de Alba, 2017	Prose	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
E. Scott, 2018	Verse	Free	Variable	N/A	N/A
A. Ehrenhaus, 2018	Verse	5-7-5	N/A	N/A	N/A

Despite the wide variety of forms used by the translators, there is a clear tendency to use verse to translate the sonnets; more than 90% of the metapoets that comprise this corpus have opted for a verse translation. Having presented this quantitative overview, I now turn to the decisions taken regarding different formal aspects in relation to the poem's macro-structure: namely, syllable count, rhyme scheme and stress pattern. Additionally, I refer to certain aspects related to the textual arrangement, which often depend on the rhyme pattern chosen.

Although these translations clearly diverge with regard to verse length, it is possible to observe four main approaches, with some variations. First, free verse, which, although not

the most frequent approach, was chosen by eighteen translators. Although there was rarely an explanation for this decision in the prefaces, those justifying it—such as Enrique Sordo (1982: 10) and Ángel Rupérez (2000: 52)—usually argue that they have given priority to transferring the content, thus complying with metre restrictions would have prevented the transfer of the meaning present in the original poems; others are likely to state, plainly, that it is impossible to transfer the phonic dimension. For example, Jorge Capriata claims that "the music of that text is unrecoverable in a translation" (1999) and Edgardo Scott defends having tried with his translations to recreate "the spiritual breath of its creator" (2018: 9). Whatever the argument, it seems clear that, for the translators who chose free verse, the content of the original poem is more important than the form.

Among those who have chosen a fixed syllable count for their verses, the hendecasyllable seems to be the obvious winner. According to the translators, this decision was based not only on the search for 'fidelity' (see, for example, Rivas 1916: 262, and García García 2013: 37)—but also on the desire to present the sonnets in a form as similar as possible to the original. This is certainly the Spanish verse most closely resembling the English pentameter, despite the differences between the two metres. In fact, many translators allude to this affinity in their prefaces, including Luis Rutiaga (2002: 11), Ariel Laurencio Tacoronte (2005: 13) and Pedro Pérez Prieto (2007: 14); they sometimes refer to this as 'equivalence'. As explored in greater detail later in this paper, this formal similarity is achieved using different rhyme patterns, which arise for different reasons.

Although the hendecasyllabic verse was most widely used, thirteen translators preferred a longer verse, usually a fourteen-syllable *alejandrino* (with the exceptions of García Calvo and Insa, who used thirteen syllables). The reason generally given is that, because the English language is highly monosyllabic and Spanish is mostly polysyllabic, adjusting to a lower number of syllables would imply synthesising the message of the source text and, therefore, neglecting some of the original content (see, among others, García Calvo 1974: 26-27; Ramón Gutiérrez Izquierdo 2011: 22; and Talens 2014: 41-42). Sometimes, even those translators who chose the *alejandrino* maintain that they would have preferred to stick to an eleven-syllable line because of its similarity to the pentameter (see, for example, Ingberg 2007: 37-39 and Ospina 2016: 13). For Ignacio Gamen, for instance, this decision "was a pity" because he appreciates "the sonority and elegance of the hendecasyllable" (2009: 29).

In only one case none of these was used as a fixed metre: the translation by Andrés Ehrenhaus published in 2018, in which he translates Shakespeare's sonnets into haikus. In doing so, he applies the most frequent structure for the translation of this Japanese composition into Spanish, a poem comprising three lines of, respectively, five, seven and five syllables.

However, the length of the line is not always obvious. Sometimes, translators rely on excessively forced hiatuses or diaereses to achieve the desired number of syllables. Although natural practice when reading a verse, as in the oral language, demands joining the final vowel of one word with the initial vowel of the next, this behaviour can be reversed. To do so, the poet (or metapoet) must provide the reader clues, such that their ear makes the division unconsciously; this is generally achieved through the mechanism of regularity. For example, if the reader has previously read six lines of eleven syllables, it is more likely that, in a line that could be interpreted as a decasyllable or hendecasyllable, they unconsciously break one of the

synalephas of that line to produce a result similar to the previous lines, a result which sounds pleasant to the ear. In the same way that, when encountering a poem that always uses the same rhythmic pattern, the brain makes the necessary adjustments (such as stressing unstressed vowels and creating diaeresis) so that a verse follows the same pattern even if, in theory, it does not. As suggested, this is achieved by creating a regularity or consistency that implants the pattern in the reader's mind. Still, this requirement is not always met.

For example, although Carlos Gardini (2004) claims to have used the hendecasyllable in his translations, the number of hiatuses or diaereses that the reader has to make for this is so extreme that perception of this length is easily lost. Certain lines of his translation are presented below, including the caesuras that would be necessary to perceive such a verse (where there is only one possible alternative, it is indicated with two slashes [//]; where there are several possibilities, just one slash is used [/]):

> *y / el verano tiene / un plazo corto*
> *en que el ojo del cielo arde en exceso*
> *o bi/en su tez á/urea palidece,*
> *y toda // hermosura se marchita*
> *por azar o designio de Natura.*
> *Mas no tendrá fin tu / estío / eterno,*
> *ni la posesi//ón de tu belleza:*

Meanwhile, Alvaro García's translation (2014) requires a syneresis in the first line to produce the hendecasyllable:

> *¿Te comparo con un d**ía** de verano?*

Here, the 'í' and 'a' should be pronounced on the same syllable to produce eleven syllables. Elsewhere, the twelfth verse of the same poem requires several vowels to be almost impossibly joined together:

> *Cuando alcanzas al tiemp**o_e**n poes**ía_e**terna*

Occasionally, even these mechanisms do not allow the metapoet to maintain the desired metre. In his preface, Luciano García García states that he used the *alejandrino*, although he had made it 'more flexible' to avoid it dividing into hemistiches, which would have made it too rigid (36). However, the sixth verse of his translation of Sonnet 18 (*Y otras veces su complexión dorada se oscurece*) exceeds fourteen syllables, even when possible synalephas are considered:

> *Y_o/tras / ve/ces / su / com/ple/xión / do/ra/da / se_os/cu/re/ce*

Furthermore, despite García García's attempt to avoid the caesura in his fourteen-syllable lines, some scholars, such as Antonio Quilis—who is both a philologist and, more importantly, a phonetician—claim that this is not possible. Quilis states that all verses in Spanish of twelve or more syllables are compound lines (*versos compuestos*)—that is, they comprise two simple verses—and defends this division as not "arbitrary nor capricious" but as responding to certain phonetic tendencies. He goes on to note that, "when we speak or read, the number of syllables that we utter between two pauses, or phonic group, normally oscillates between eight and eleven", with eleven being the maximum average phonic group (*grupo fónico medio máximo*)

(Quilis 2013: 46). If this is true, what is achieved by varying the rhythm of the *alejandrino* is that the rupture is not produced in the middle of the verse (hemistich). However, it would not be possible to avoid the caesura, considering the maximum number of syllables that can be produced between two pauses is only eleven.

While most translators follow a specific syllable count, the rhythm—based on a combination of stressed and unstressed syllables—is often varied. Only Carlos Pujol (1990) uses the same metre throughout the whole poem. His translation is written in *alejandrinos* which are clearly divided into hemistiches with anapaestic rhythm; that is, two unstressed syllables followed by one stressed syllable (3.6/3.6). A transcription of Pujol's translation of Sonnet 18 follows (the separation into hemistiches is marked with two slashes and the stressed syllables are highlighted using bold font):

> *¿QUIZÁ **pu**ede que **se**as // como un **dí**a de es**tí**o?*
> *No, hay en **ti** más be**lle**za // y tam**bién** más tem**plan**za;*
> *broncos **vien**tos sa**cu**den // los ca**pu**llos de **ma**yo*
> *y es muy **bre**ve ese **tie**mpo // conce**di**do al ve**ra**no*
> *Brilla el **o**jo del **cie**lo // con un **fue**go exce**si**vo*
> *cuando **no** se ensom**bre**ce // su sem**blan**te do**ra**do,*
> *lo que es **be**llo algún **dí**a // mengua**rá** su hermo**su**ra*
> *por el **cur**so cam**bian**te // del a**zar** o del **tiem**po.*
> *Mas tu es**tí**o pe**ren**ne// no po**drá** marchi**tar**se,*
> *ni per**der** la be**lle**za // que ahora **tie**nes, y **nun**ca*
> *va a jac**tar**se la **muer**te // de que es**tás** a su **som**bra*
> *cuando en **ver**sos e**ter**nos // con el **tiem**po per**du**res.*
> *Mientras **al**guien a**lie**nte // y haya **luz** en sus **o**jos*
> *vivi**rán** mis pa**la**bras // para ha**cer**te inmor**tal**.*

Although only Pujol uses a fixed metre, other translators regularly stress the sixth and tenth syllables. The length of the verse—in this case, hendecasyllabic—demands the latter. Spanish poetry dictates that the penultimate syllable is always stressed in simple verses; if the line ends with an acute word (*verso agudo* or *verso oxítono*), one more syllable is added to the final count, while if the last word is proparoxytone (*verso esdrújulo* or *verso proparoxítono*), one syllable is subtracted from the final count. Therefore, the last stress on the tenth syllable, called *acento estrófic*o (Quilis 2013: 26) or *acento final* (Domínguez Caparrós 2016: 19-20), is shared by all hendecasyllabic verses. What may differ, therefore, are the first and second stressed syllables of the line. For example, translators such as Miguel Ángel Montezanti (2003), Luis Rutiaga (2002), Gema Vives (2003) and Christian Law Palacín (2009) always stress the sixth and tenth syllables with a varying first stress. This translation by Montezanti serves as a useful example:

*Si a un **día** de ve**ra**no te com**pa**ro*	2.6.10
*tú **e**res más tem**pla**do y placen**te**ro:*	2.6.10
*deja el **vien**to al ca**pu**llo sin am**pa**ro*	3.6.10
*y el **pla**zo del verano es pasa**je**ro;*	2.6.10
*el sol del **cie**lo al**gu**na vez cal**ci**na*	4.6.10
*y otras **ve**ces o**pá**case su **o**ro,*	3.6.10
*toda be**lle**za al**gu**na vez de**cli**na:*	4.6.10
*o na**tu**ra o a**zar** causan des**do**ro.*	3.6.10
*Mas tu e**ter**no ve**ra**no no ha de a**jar**se*	3.6.10
*ni perde**rás** do**mi**nio en tu hermo**su**ra;*	4.6.10
*de **som**bras no po**drá** muerte jac**tar**se*	2.6.10
*cuando en **lí**neas te **guar**de edad fu**tu**ra.*	3.6.10
*Mientras que el **o**jo **ve**a, y hombre a**lien**te.*	4.6.10
***es**to pervivi**rá** y te hará vi**vien**te.*	1.6.10

Note that, while the stress on the sixth syllable is obvious to the reader, implying a regularity throughout the poem, some lines could be read with the stress on a different syllable from the one I have highlighted here, with the exception of certain cases—such as in the second line—where it is necessary to stress the first syllable of *eres* so that the synalepha between this word and *tú* is broken and a regular length is preserved[2].

It is also common for the second stressed syllable to be either the sixth or eighth. Antonio Rivero Taravillo explains this approach: "when one is about to read a cultured 16th century poem, one expects only eleven syllables with either the sixth or eighth syllable stressed" (2004: 17). Pérez Prieto (2008: 16) also defends this practice, common to multiple other translators—such as José Basileo Acuña, Mario Reyes Suárez, Tomás Gray and Pérez Prieto—and exemplified here by Manuel Mujica Lainez:

*¿A un **día** de ve**ra**no compa**rar**te?*	2.6.10
*Más hermo**su**ra y suavi**dad** po**se**es.*	4.8.10
*Tiembla el **bro**te de **ma**yo bajo el **vien**to*	3.6.10
*y el es**tío** no **du**ra casi **na**da.*	3.6.10
*A **ve**ces dema**sia**do brilla el **o**jo*	2.6.10
*so**lar**, y otras su **tez** de oro se a**pa**ga;*	2.6.10
*toda be**lle**za al**gu**na vez de**cli**na,*	4.6.10
*a**ja**da por la **suer**te o por el **tiem**po.*	2.6.10
*Pero e**ter**no se**rá** el verano **tu**yo.*	3.6.10
*No perde**rás** la **gra**cia, ni la **Muer**te*	4.6.10
*se jacta**rá** de ensombre**cer** tus **pa**sos*	4.8.10
*cuando **crez**cas en **ver**sos inmor**ta**les.*	3.6.10
*Vivi**rás** mientras **al**guien vea y **sien**ta*	3.6.10
*y esto **pue**da vi**vir** y te dé **vi**da.*	3.6.10

Whereas more than half of this corpus' translators (38) use rhyme in their poems, translation into rhymed verses has often been seen as an obstacle to poetic translation. For example, Lefevere suggests that if the demands of metre and rhyme already interfere with the task of constructing a poem for the source poet, when translators impose rhyme and metre restrictions on themselves, "the search for a satisfactory solution is doomed to failure from the start" (1975: 49). This is why Lefevere, like Robert Bly (1982: 87), is determined to not reproduce rhymes in translated poems. Considering rhyme is, in many literatures, an intrinsic part of poetry, not all translators agree. For instance, Judith Moffett criticises Bly's disdain for certain formal mechanisms, defending such devices by stating that "nobody's arguing that poets are willing to see their images and meaning sacrificed in translation for the sake of keeping rhyme and metre. Where Bly goes astray is in assuming that keeping rhyme and metre invariably results

in a massacre" (Moffett 1999: 84). Levý (2011) describes rhyme as—rather than an isolated feature—"a component in the complex interplay between the acoustic and the semantic values of a poem", stating that this nature fulfils three functions in a poem: semantic (serving as a link between rhymed words and between corresponding verses), rhythmic ("highlight[ing] the conclusion of the line"), and euphonic (being based on a repetition of sounds pleasing to the ear) (Levý 2011: 232). Perhaps it is these qualities that led Willis Barnstone to categorically state that "if one disapproves of rhyme in poetry, as many do, one should not translate poems that rhyme" (1984: 50). Although rhyme is seen as a constriction by some scholars and practitioners, Barnstone recognises it as a mechanism for freeing oneself "from dull literalness, from the tyranny of the obvious" (1984: 51) and a way of forcing the translator "into the obligatory freedom of imaginative leaps" (1993: 50).

As mentioned, rhyme has been frequently favoured in this corpus. Although most cases use a consonant rhyme, some poems chose an assonant or even hybrid (combining the other two forms) rhyme. For example, throughout his translations Gutiérrez Izquierdo (2011) follows the principle of alternating the assonant and consonant rhyme in the quatrains and joining the final couplet with a consonant rhyme:

> *¿Podría compararte a una primav**era***
> *si en ti es más constante y grácil la hermos**ura**?*
> *En mayo rudos vientos agitan tiernas y**emas**,*
> *y el plazo de ese tiempo un breve instante d**ura**.*
> *El ojo de los cielos a veces se ilum**ina**,*
> *y a veces se oscurece su gran fulgor dor**ado**,*
> *y aún lo más hermoso algún día decl**ina**,*
> *por la naturaleza, o el puro azar, aj**ado**.*
> *Mas no verás marchita tu eterna primav**era**,*
> *ni perderás tampoco lo bello que en ti cr**ezca**,*
> *ni alardeará la muerte de que una sombra s**eas**,*
> *cuando en eternos versos tu nombre preval**ezca**.*
> *Mientras respire un hombre y el ojo no lo imp**ida**,*
> *tendrán vida estos versos, y te darán más v**ida**.*

Regarding the rhyme scheme, we may speak of three main groups: translators who follow the Elizabethan sonnet rhyme scheme (three quatrains and a couplet), those who use the Spanish or Petrarchan sonnet (two quatrains—typically rhymed as ABBA—and two tercets with varying rhyme patterns) and those translators who have not employed rhymes. Nonetheless, members of the latter group (Mujica Lainez, 1963, Rutiaga, 2002, Gardini, 2004, and Law Palacín, 2009) divide their poems (visually) into three stanzas of four lines and one of two lines (4/4/4/2), which might lead to their structure being identified with the Elizabethan sonnet.

Although, in most cases, there is a straightforward correspondence between the form of these poems and that of the English or Spanish sonnet, Mario Jofré (1997) uses a somewhat peculiar rhyme scheme:

> *¿A un día de estío te compararía? **A***
> *- Mejor índole tienes, más amable; **B***
> *- Cuando en cólera él monta, al suelo envía **A***
> *Los capullos que acuna; es irritable. **B***
> *- Brilla en su cielo el sol con gran porfía, **A***

> *Y pronto apaga su oro: es inestable.* **B**
> *Y es lo mismo que flor que dura un día:* **A**
> *Su belleza es caduca y vulnerable.* **B**
> *Pero tu estío sin que desfallezca* **C**
> *Su esplendor nunca, vencerá la muerte,* **D**
> *Que no podrá alardear de ser tan fuerte* **D**
> *Que estos eternos rasgos desvanezca.* **C**
> *Que en tanto en forma humana alma resida* **E**
> *Habrán de perdurar dándote vida* **E**

As can be observed, Jofré uses the alternate rhyme for the first two quatrains, but an enclosed rhyme for the third quatrain. Nonetheless, the poem ends with an indented couplet, which visually connects it to the Shakespearean sonnet. As such, I have considered him to have used this form for his translation.

This analysis has been conducted using a single sonnet because, as stated, most of the translators follow the same metre and rhyme scheme in all of their poems. However, some, including Marcelo Pellegrini (2006) and Jofré (1997), alternate forms across their translations. Fernando Marrufo is also unusual in that the last verse of some of his poems exceeds eleven syllables; he acknowledges this in his preface. In contrast, Rivero Taravillo suggests that only in Sonnet 18 he has used the rhyme "to experiment" and because he believed that the original allowed it (2004: 16); his other translations use blank verse.

5. Classifying Translations According to Holmes' Typology

On the basis of the analyses of the poems and the divisions demonstrated—in addition to the translators' statements regarding their reasons for choosing a particular formal approach—it is now possible to recognise overlap with the divisions Holmes proposes as metapoem forms. Following Holmes, 'form' describes "only the surface framework […], the outward or mechanical form of rhyme, metre (and/or rhythm), verse length, stanzaic patterning and division, and the like" (Holmes 1994: 31). Therefore, I am not addressing syntactic or morphological features which do not affect these elements. Having observed Holmes' dividing of metapoem forms into four categories—one derived from the source poem's content, two derived from its form, and one not derived from either element—I now identify how the forms used by the translators comprising this corpus could be grouped according to these categories:

• **Organic form:** For Holmes, "the translator pursuing this approach does not take the form of the original as his starting point […], but starts from the semantic material, allowing it to take on its own unique poetic shape as the translation develops" (1994: 27). This is clearly the case with the translations in blank free verse, which would have been assembled while the poem is being created from the poem's meaning; that is, they contain no pre-existing structure in terms of line length, rhythm or rhyme.

• **Mimetic form:** The first of the form-derivative categories imitates the form of the source poem with the highest level of similarity possible. The poem, then, is created within these formal constraints. To achieve this, "the translator […] looks squarely at the original poem when making his choice of verse form, to the exclusion of all other considerations". Holmes prefers to avoid the term "identical form", as "no verse form in any one language can be

entirely identical with a verse form in any other, however similar their nomenclatures and however cognate the languages" (1994: 26). In this category, I have included those translations that make use of the hendecasyllable (that which bears the closest formal resemblance to the pentameter, including for our translators according to their prefaces) following the rhyme pattern of the Elizabethan sonnet; that is, ABAB CDCD EFEF GG (both assonant and consonant).

- **Analogical form:** Translators taking this approach have "traditionally looked beyond the original poem itself to the function of its form within its poetic tradition, then sought a form that filled a parallel function within the poetic tradition of the target language" (1994: 26). There seems to be a clear correspondence between the Elizabethan and the Spanish sonnet. Although both forms originate from the Petrarchan sonnet, they have followed different paths and had major impact on their own literatures, with influence that is sustained in the present day. While the English or Elizabethan sonnet consists of three quartets with alternate rhymes (ABAB CDCD EFEF) and a final couplet (GG), the Spanish or Castilian sonnet includes two quatrains with enclosed rhyme (ABBA ABBA) and two chained tercets (CDC DCD), although other combinations were used for the tercets, such as CDE CDE, CDD CDD, and CDE DCE (López Hernández 1998: 9-12). Therefore, I must include in this category those translations that use different schemes, given that the Spanish sonnet is written following various patterns. Here, I again consider the arrangement of text on the page and include—as analogical forms—not only the sonnets of Rafael Pombo, Maggie Howard de Martínez and Alfredo Martínez Howard, José Méndez Herrera and Reyes Suárez, written in two enclosed-rhyme quatrains and two tercets, but also those of Patricio Gannon, which, despite starting with two quatrains featuring alternate rhymes, ends with two tercets and complies with the traditional arrangement of the Spanish sonnet (4/4/3/3).
- **Extraneous form:** According to Holmes, "this form does not derive from the original poem at all"; to produce it, the translator "casts the metapoem into a form that is in no way implicit in either the form or the content of the original" (27). This is undoubtedly the least frequent form in this corpus; furthermore, it is probably the least common for poetic translation into Spanish in general. However, we have one distinct example, that of Ehrenhaus' translation, which was published in 2018 and renders the sonnets as haikus. This translation obviously does not begin only from the content—of which it encapsulates as much as possible—yet nor does it choose a form resembling the original or which fulfils the same function in the target literature, given that the haiku is not even a composition traditionally used in Spanish or Latin-American literature, but rather a fairly recent import from Japanese poetry.

There remain translations of the sonnets into non-hendecasyllabic verses, mainly *alejandrinos*. Despite many of them featuring a close formal similarity to the source poems, the reason for not having included them in any of the previous groups can be found in Holmes' definition of the mimetic and analogical forms. In them, the starting point is clear: the greatest formal similarity is sought, either with the original poem or with its historical or functional 'equivalent' in the target literature. However, many of the translators choosing a longer line admit that the hendecasyllable—which is also used by Spanish and Latin-American sonneteers—would have been most similar to the source text. They confess that, despite this preference, they chose the *alejandrino* to better accommodate the semantic component of the source text, in the belief that fitting the content into an eleven-syllable line would greatly complicate the

task of transferring the sense of the original poem (given Spanish words are generally longer than English words). Nonetheless, they do not abandon rhyme or a fixed metrical pattern. This attitude, halfway between the form-derivative form and the content-derivative form, clearly indicates a desire to compromise by seeking a balance between preferences for either element, for form or content. It could be argued that this conciliatory translation is contained within Holmes' organic form. However, in this case, the metapoet does not start "from the semantic material" (ibid.), as would do when opting for an organic form, but from the features of his own language, choosing a form that—while not being what he or she considers 'equivalent' to the one of the original poem (or a mimetic form)—is better able to represent the original content while resembling the original shape. The form provides room for the content, and the content creates space for form, producing a result between the form-derivative and content-derivative forms.

It might be possible to include these forms within Holmes's typology by broadening the definition of one or more of his categories. However, just as Holmes proposes a category for those poems written following a structure not derived from either form or content, this classification allows for a new category which can accommodate an intention to combine the two of them, where this implies yielding to both the formal and semantic dimensions. Moreover, considerations of both content and form and of the need to a balance the two are recurrent in the metatranslational discourse of the prefaces preceding this corpus (Escudero 2021). This hybrid solution is referred to in this article as the 'conciliatory form' (Table 2).

Table 2. Revision of Holmes' model

Form-derivative forms		Hybrid form	Content-derivative form	Extraneous form
Mimetic form	Analogical form[3]	Conciliatory form	Organic form	

Although, as Jones states, "the risks and merits of recreating formal metre are less often debated [than those of recreating rhymes]—perhaps because they are less likely to cause semantic shifts" (2011: 170), in two languages as different in terms of syllabic count as English and Spanish, the metre can indeed produce significant semantic shifts, as some translators have explained. Similarly, Levý recognises that "a discrepancy in semantic density between source and target language forces the translator either to compact the semantic meaning into a concise expression or, in contrast, to resort to padding, with implications for the overall interpretation of the poem" (2011: 196). Since this is undoubtedly the case for both of the languages involved, I also consider those translations making use of rhymed free verse following the Elizabethan rhyme scheme to be conciliatory forms. As is the case with translations using *alejandrinos*, these are not constrained by the chosen metre (nor by a rhythmic pattern). Therefore, they aim for formal resemblance but adapt the form to the demands of the content. Needless to say, I have also included blank verse translations with a fixed syllabic count in this category, even when their arrangement resembles the structure of the Shakespearean sonnet; that is, where the poem is visually divided into three stanzas of four lines and a final stanza of two lines. After all, the rhyme scheme is precisely what allows a sonnet to be identified as such.

Table 3. Classification of verse translations as metapoem forms

Translator, year	Type	Metapoem forms
J. de Armas y Cárdenas, 1915	Castilian sonnet	Analogical
J. Pablo Rivas, 1916	Elizabethan sonnet	Mimetic
R. Pombo, 1917	Castilian sonnet	Analogical
F. Maristany, 1918	Elizabethan sonnet	Mimetic
M. de Vedia y Mitre, 1929	Alejandrino (Elizabethan rhyme scheme)	Conciliatory
P. Gannon, 1940	Castilian sonnet	Analogical
E. Dieste, 1944	Free blank verse	Organic
A. Damians de Bulart, 1944	Elizabethan sonnet	Mimetic
Á. Johan, 1945	Elizabethan sonnet	Mimetic
M. Manent, 1947	Blank alejandrino	Conciliatory
M. de Vedia y Mitre, 1954	Elizabethan sonnet	Mimetic
A. Martínez Howard & M. Howard, 1961	Castilian sonnet	Analogical
M. Mujica Lainez, 1963	Blank hendecasyllable (4/4/4/2)	Conciliatory
O. de Bingham Powell, 1964	Free blank verse	Organic
A. García Calvo, 1974	13 syllables (Elizabethan rhyme scheme)	Conciliatory
F. Auad & P. Mañé, 1975	Free blank verse	Organic
J. Méndez Herrera, 1976	Castilian sonnet	Analogical
J.F. Elvira-Hernández, 1977	Rhymed free verse (Elizabethan rhyme scheme)	Conciliatory
E. Sordo, 1982	Free blank verse	Organic
P. Vives Heredia, 1985	Elizabethan sonnet	Mimetic
C. Pérez Romero, 1987	Alejandrino (Elizabethan rhyme scheme)	Conciliatory
M. Bros, 1987	Alejandrino (Elizabethan rhyme scheme)	Conciliatory
C. Pujol, 1990	Blank alejandrino (4/4/4/2)	Conciliatory
G. Falaquera, 1993	Blank alejandrino (4/4/4/2)	Conciliatory
J. Arecha, 1997	Free blank verse	Organic
A. Rodríguez López, 1997	Blank hendecasyllable (4/4/6)	Conciliatory
M. Jofré, 1997	Elizabethan sonnet	Mimetic
M. Reyes Suárez, 1998	Castilian sonnet	Analogical
J. Capriata, 1999	Free blank verse	Organic
J. M. Álvarez, 1999	Free blank verse	Organic
J. R. Blanco & G. Freijo, 1999	Free blank verse	Organic
A. Carugati, 1999	Free blank verse	Organic
J. Basileo Acuña, 1999	Elizabethan sonnet	Mimetic
A. Gómez Gil, 2000	Free blank verse	Organic
J. Adúriz & A. Adúriz Bravo, 2000	Free blank verse	Organic
A. Rupérez, 2000	Free blank verse	Organic
T. Gray, 2002	Castilian sonnet	Analogical
L. Rutiaga, 2002	Blank hendecasyllable (4/4/4/2)	Conciliatory
F. Marrufo, 2002	Elizabethan sonnet	Mimetic
G. Vives, 2003	Elizabethan sonnet	Mimetic
M. A. Montezanti, 2003	Elizabethan sonnet	Mimetic
D. Fábrega, 2004	Elizabethan sonnet	Mimetic
A. Rivero Taravillo, 2004	Elizabethan sonnet	Mimetic
C. Gardini, 2004	Blank hendecasyllable (4/4/4/2)	Conciliatory
L. Tacoronte, 2005	Elizabethan sonnet	Mimetic
M. Pellegrini, 2006	Elizabethan sonnet	Mimetic
J. Siles Artés, 2006	Rhymed free verse	Conciliatory
P. Ingberg, 2007	Blank alejandrino (4/4/4/2)	Conciliatory
P. Pérez Prieto, 2007	Elizabethan sonnet	Mimetic

Translator, year	Type	Metapoem forms
C. Law Palacín, 2009	Blank hendecasyllable (4/4/4/2)	Conciliatory
A. Ehrenhaus, 2009	Elizabethan sonnet	Mimetic
I. Gamen, 2009	Alejandrino (Elizabethan rhyme scheme)	Conciliatory
J. M. Santamaría López, 2010	Free blank verse	Organic
R. Gutiérrez Izquierdo, 2011	Alejandrino (Elizabethan rhyme scheme)	Conciliatory
M. A. Montezanti, 2011	Elizabethan sonnet	Mimetic
L. García, 2013	Alejandrino (Elizabethan rhyme scheme)	Conciliatory
B. Santano Moreno, 2013	Elizabethan sonnet	Mimetic
J. Talens, 2014	Blank alejandrino (4/4/4/2)	Conciliatory
A. García, 2014	Elizabethan sonnet	Mimetic
W. Ospina, 2016	Alejandrino (Elizabethan rhyme scheme)	Conciliatory
S. D. Insa, 2016	Rhymed free verse (Elizabethan rhyme scheme)	Conciliatory
G. Jiménez Emán, 2016	Free blank verse	Organic
E. Scott, 2018	Free blank verse	Organic
A. Ehrenhaus, 2018	Haiku	Extraneous

Therefore, if we do not consider prose translations, of which there are only five in this 69-translation corpus, the forms most commonly used by translators are, according to this typology, the mimetic form (20 cases), which seeks the greatest formal resemblance to the original by using a rhymed eleven-syllable verse, and the conciliatory form (21 cases), which, despite reproducing certain formal regularities (such as a fixed syllable count, rhyme scheme, a particular rhythm or a combination of several of these factors), does not fully comply with the formal requirements for being considered most similar to the source poem. The analogical form (7 cases)—in this case, the Spanish sonnet—was less frequently observed, especially in recent decades, and only one of the translations used the extraneous form. The organic form —the free-verse translations—has been frequently used to render the Shakespearean sonnet (15 cases), and most of these translators not only recreate a new poem, but sometimes they do so in accordance with certain formal patterns such as a rhyme scheme. Table 3 details the categorisation of the forms chosen by the translators of this corpus according to my (revised) Holmes model, including, as does Holmes, only verse translations.

6. Conclusions

The translators of this corpus have addressed the formal structure of these sonnets deciding upon a wide variety of solutions, as we have seen. And these solutions seem to respond to their preferences, objectives and particular visions of poetic translation, in addition to a series of external factors (such as poetics, but also other resources such as time and skills). While certain forms appear more frequently than others during certain periods, it is difficult to describe trends or conventions for translation norms; although a widely used notion, especially within literary translation, such a notion does not seem adequate for explaining the variety of possibilities over more than a century of translations of Shakespeare's *Sonnets*. Toury states that "it is not all that rare to find side by side in a society three types of competing norms" and that these can operate at different levels, in the centre or on the periphery. He also recognises that "norms are also unstable, changing entities" (Toury 1995: 62). Thus, although such traits might serve as a basis for explaining the use of one form or another, the variety of solutions applied over

different periods in different countries (more or less frequently) would make interpreting the results in terms of translation norms more confusing than enlightening. Perhaps the only clear regularity in this corpus is the use of verse rather than prose for the translation of poetry; it might also be possible to talk about the use of rhyme as a trend. Still, it would remain to be seen how the use of the different forms outlined could be explained.

For Holmes, the mimetic form is the choice to be expected when "genre concepts are weak" and the target culture is more open to imports from external literatures, while the analogical form is more typical of literatures with highly developed genre concepts for which the only acceptable alternative is using a form already established within its system (1994: 27). Itamar Even-Zohar took a similar approach when discussing the role of translation in the literary system; that is, the weaker, the younger or the more peripheral the literary polysystem, the more esteemed the position of translation will be inside it (1990: 47). Without getting deeper into discussion about the appropriateness of terms like 'weak' and 'strong' being applied to literatures or cultures (see Bassnett 1998a: 127), I will expound on the idea behind it.

For some time, this approach has been customary for literary translation research. While it is commonly agreed that poetics is a central factor in literary translation, descriptive translation studies have traditionally focused on the target system, so, when referring to concepts such as 'dominant poetics' and the 'norms of the literary system', scholars in this field usually refer to the poetics and norms within the target culture. Nonetheless, although Spanish literature features a widely spread and established sonnet form, successfully developed over the last five centuries, many of this corpus' translators have chosen a form more reminiscent of the English sonnet—a mimetic form—in spite of the lack of popularity garnered by the latter in Spanish-speaking literatures, with the exception of several isolated cases mostly constituting poetic experiments conducted by major poets (e.g., Jorge Luis Borges, Antonio Machado and Juan Ramón Jiménez). That is, despite translated literature having often been used to fill a void in some cultures (e.g., certain minoritized languages, such as Galician, have tried using translated literature to fill the gaps generated by political restraints; see Figueroa 2001), that does not mean that the arrival of some new form, genre or trend is always deliberate. Are metapoets quasi-economists who, before introducing an external influence, value the gain their target literature can achieve? Or are they artists who, out of a desire to create, take all the elements they have within reach? If we consider metapoets as creators, we must also acknowledge that the craving for experimentation is an important part of their motivation, a motivation more frequent during periods of literary flourishing, where contact between different cultures and literatures is regarded as enrichment. In fact, the mimetic form is not necessarily the one to be used when there is a 'gap' in the target literature, but as Bassnett explains "for a translation to have an impact upon the literary system, there has to be a gap in that system which reflects a particular need" (1998b: 60). The 'needs' of the recipient literature, therefore, are not decisive for translators to choose one form or another in which to recreate their poems, but for this form to be accepted in that literature. Notably, Holmes himself recognises metapoem forms as not only period forms but also literary constants that have influenced translators throughout history (1994: 28), and this constant is more than visible from the results of the corpus studied in this work.

References

Primary Sources

Adúriz, J. and Adúriz Bravo, A. (Trad.) (2000). *Treinta sonetos* (William Shakespeare). Ediciones del Dock.

Álvarez, J. M. (Trad.) (1999). *Sonetos* (William Shakespeare). Pre-Textos.

Arecha, J. (Trad.) (1997). *Sonetos. Selección* (William Shakespeare). Página/12.

Armas y Cárdenas, J. de (Trad.) (1915). Varios Sonetos de William Shakespeare. *Cuba Contemporánea, Año III, Tomo IX*(1), 73-77.

Astrana Marín, L. (Trad.) (1929). *Obras completas* (William Shakespeare.). M. Aguilar.

Auad, F. and Mañé, P. (Trad.) (1975). *Poesía completa* (William Shakespeare). Ediciones 29.

Basileo Acuña, J. (Trad.) (1999). *Poemas y Sonetos* (William Shakespeare). Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú.

Blanco, J. R. and Freijo, G. (Trad.) (1999). *Canciones y poemas de amor* (William Shakespeare). Muelle de Uribitarte.

Bros, M. (Trad.) (1987). *Selección de los Sonetos de Shakespeare*. Albatros.

Capriata, J. (Trad.) (1999). *Los sonetos y Un lamento amoroso* (William Shakespeare). Hueso Húmero.

Carugati, A. (Trad.) (1999). *Sonetos* (William Shakespeare). Planeta.

Casillas de Alba, M. (Trad.) (2017). *Sonetos* (William Shakespeare). Bonilla Artiga.

Damians de Bulart, A. (Trad.) (1944). *Sonetos* (William Shakespeare). Montaner y Simón.

Dieste, E. (Trad.) (1944). *21 Sonetos de William Shakespeare*. Independencia.

Ehrenhaus, A. (Trad.) (2009). *Sonetos y Lamento de una amante* (William Shakespeare). Círculo de Lectores Galaxia Gutenberg.

Ehrenhaus, A. (Trad.) (2018). *Los 154 haikus de Shakespeare*. La Fuga.

Elvira Hernández, J. F. (Trad.) (1977). *30 Sonetos* (William Shakespeare). Sexifirmo.

Fábrega, D. (Trad.) (2004). *Sonetos de Camoens, Petrarca, Ronsard y Shakespeare*. Sibauste.

Falaquera, G. (Trad.) (2007). *Sonetos* (William Shakespeare). Hiperión.

Gallardo Ruiz, E. (Trad.) (2007). *Poemas* (William Shakespeare). Pigmalión.

Gamen, I. (Trad.) (2009). *Sonetos de amor* (William Shakespeare). Renacimiento.

Gannon, P. (Trad.) (1940). *Diez Sonetos de Shakespeare*. Francisco Colombo.

García Calvo, A. (Trad.) (1974). *Sonetos de Amor* (William Shakespeare). Anagrama.

García García, L. (Trad.) (2013). *Sonetos y querellas de una amante* (William Shakespeare). JPM.

García, Á. (Trad.) (2014). *Nueve sonetos de Shakespeare*. El Toro Celeste.

Gardini, C. (Trad.) (2004). Veinte sonetos de Shakespeare. *Ideas*, *1*(2), 45-75.

Gómez Gil, A. (Trad.) (2000). *Los sonetos de Shakespeare*. Edaf.

Gray, T. (Trad.) (2002). *Sonetos de Amor de William Shakespeare*. Al Margen Editores.

Gutiérrez Izquierdo, R. (Trad.) (2016). *Sonetos de Shakespeare*. Visor Libros.

Howard de Martínez, M. & Martínez Howard, A. (Trad.) (1961). *Doce sonetos de Shakespeare*. Burnichon.

Insa, S. (Trad.) (2016). *Sonetos de amor* (William Shakespeare). Poesía Eres Tú.

Jiménez Emán, G. (Trad.) (2016). Ocho sonetos (William Shakespeare). *Arquitrave*, *63*, 6–13.

Jofré, M. (Trad.) (1997). *Los sonetos* (William Shakespeare). Diógenes.

Johan, Á. (Trad.) (1945). *Siete sonetos* (William Shakespeare). J. M. Trujillo.

Law Palacín, C (Trad.) (2009). *Sonetos* (William Shakespeare). Bartleby.

Manent, M. (Trad.) (1947). *La poesía inglesa. De los primitivos a los neoclásicos* Lauro.

Maristany, F. (Trad.) (1918). *Las cien mejores poesías (líricas) de la lengua inglesa*. Cervantes.

Marrufo, F. (Trad.) (2002). *Sonetos* (William Shakespeare). Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Universidad Autónoma de Yucatán, Instituto de Cultura de Yucatán, Fundación Fernando Marrufo.

Méndez Herrera, J. (Trad.) (1976). *Sonetos* (William Shakespeare). Plaza & Janés.

Montezanti, M. Á. (Trad.) (2003). *Sonetos completos* (William Shakespeare). Longseller.

Montezanti, M. Á. (Trad.) (2011). *Sólo vos sos vos: Los sonetos de Shakespeare en traducción rioplatense*. Eudem.

Mujica Lainez, M. (Trad.) (1963). *Cincuenta Sonetos de Shakespeare*. Ediciones Culurales Argentinas.

Mujica Lainez, M. and Ingberg, P. (Trad.) (2007). *Sonetos*. (William Shakespeare). Losada.

Ospina, W. (Trad.) (2016). *Sonetos* (William Shakespeare). Navona.

Pellegrini, M. (Trad.) (2006). *Constancia y Claridad. 21 Sonetos de William Shakespeare*. RIL Editores.

Pérez Prieto, P. (Trad.) (2008). *Sonetos* (William Shakespeare). Nivola.

Pérez Romero, C. (Trad.) (1987). *Monumento de amor: Sonetos de Shakespeare*. Universidad de Extremadura.

Piedra de Bingham Powell, O. de la. (Trad.) (1964). Sonetos de Shakespeare. *Letras (Lima)*, *42*, 63-68.

Pombo, R. (Trad.) (1917). *Traducciones poéticas*. Imprenta Nacional.

Pujol, C. (Trad.) (1990). *Sonetos* (William Shakespeare). Comares.

Reyes Suárez, M. (Trad.) (1998). *Sonetos* (William Shakespeare). El Áncora.

Rivas, J. P. (Trad.) (1916). Lírica Inglesa: Sonetos (William Shakespeare). *Estvdio*, *XV*(44), 261-267.

Rivero Taravillo, A. (Trad.) (2004). *Sonetos* (William Shakespeare). Renacimiento.

Rodríguez López, A. (Trad.) (1997). *Sonetos de William Shakespeare*. Cuadernos de Traducción.

Rupérez, Á. (Trad.) (2000). *Antología esencial de la poesía inglesa*. Espasa Calpe.

Rutiaga, L. (Trad.) (2002). *Sonetos* (William Shakespeare). Grupo Editorial Tomo.

Santamaría López, J. M. (2010). Tiempo de Shakespeare: Vuelta de tuerca a la tarducción de sus sonetos. In R. Rabadán, T. Guzmán González, and M. Fernández López (Eds.), *Lengua, traducción, recepción: En honor de Julio César Santoyo* (pp. 13-38). Universidad de León.

Santano Moreno, B. (Trad.) (2013). *Sonetos* (William Shakespeare). Acantilado.

Scott, E. (Trad.) (2018). *Sonetos* (William Shakespeare). Interzona.

Siles Artés, J. (Trad.) (2006). *Poesía angloamericana: Antología bilingüe (siglos XIV al XX)*. Ajuntament de L'Eliana.

Sordo, E. (Trad.) (1982). *Sonetos* (William Shakespeare.). Los Libros de Plon.

Tacoronte, A. L. (Trad.) (2005). *Sonetos* (William Shakespeare). Editorial Arte y Literatura.

Talens, J. (Trad.) (2014). *Sonetos* (William Shakespeare). Cátedra.

Vedia y Mitre, M. de (Trad.) (1929). Sonetos de Shakespeare. Segunda serie. *Verbum*, *73*, 165-176.

Vedia y Mitre, M. de (Trad.) (1954). *Los Sonetos de Shakespeare*. Guillermo Kraft.

Velasco y Rojas, M. de. (1877). *Breve Estudio sobre los Sonetos de Shakespeare*. Galería Rembrandt.

Vives Heredia, P. (Trad.) (1985). *Los Sonetos de William Shakespeare*. Arauco.

Vives, G. (Trad.) (2003). *Shakespeare para recalcitrantes*. Jamais.

Wilcock, J. R. (Trad.) (1949). *Poetas líricos en lengua inglesa*. Jackson.

Secondary sources

Barnstone, W. (1984). Preferences in translating poetry. In William Frawley (Ed.), *Translation. Literary, Linguistic and Philosophical Perspectives* (pp. 49-53). University of Delaware Press.

Barnstone, W. (1993). *The Poetics of Translation: History, Theory, Practice*. Yale University Press.

Bassnett, S. (1998a). The translation turn in cultural studies. In S. Bassnett and A. Lefevere (Eds.), *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation* (pp. 123-140). Multilingual Matters.

Bassnett, S. (1998b). Transplanting the seed: Poetry and translation. In S. Bassnett and A. Lefevere (Eds.), *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation* (pp. 57-75). Multilingual Matters.

Bassnett, S. (1998c). When is a translation not a translation? In S. Bassnett & A. Lefevere (Eds.), *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation* (pp. 25-40). Multilingual Matters.

Bly, R. (1982). *The Eight Stages of Translation: With a Selection of Poems and Translations*. Rowan Tree Press.

Boase-Beier, J. (2006). *Stylistic Approaches to Translation*. St. Jerome Pub.

Boase-Beier, J. (2015). *Translating the Poetry of the Holocaust: Translation, Style and the Reader*. Bloomsbury.

Boase-Beier, J., and Holman, M. (2016). Introduction. Writing, rewriting and translation through tonstraint to treativity. In J. Boase-Beier and M. Holman (Eds.), *The Practices of Literary Translation: Constraints and Creativity.* (pp. 1-17). Routledge.

Borges, J. L. (1997). Las dos maneras de traducir. In J. L. Borges, *Textos Recobrados: 1931-1955* (pp. 256-259). Emecé.

Domínguez Caparrós, J. (2016). *Diccionario de Métrica Española* (Tercera edición). Alianza editorial.

Escudero, T. (2021). Metatranslational discourse in poetry translators' prefaces. *The Translator*. https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2021.1964217

Etkind, E. (1982). *Un Art en Crise: Essai de Poétique de la Traduction Poétique*. L'age D'homme.

Even-Zohar, I. (1990). The position of translated literature within the literary polysystem. *Poetics Today*, *11*(1), 45-51. https://doi.org/10.2307/1772668

Figueroa, A. (2001). *Nación, literatura, identidad: comunicación literaria e campos sociais en Galicia*. Edicións Xerais de Galicia.

Halverson, S. L. (1997). The concept of equivalence in translation studies: Much ado about something. *Target*, *9*(2), 207-233. https://doi.org/10.1075/target.9.2.02hal

Holmes, J. S. (1994). *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*. Rodopi.

Jones, F. R. (2011). *Poetry Translating as Expert Action: Processes, Priorities and Networks*. John Benjamins.

Koster, C. (2000). *From World to World: An Armamentarium for the Study of Poetic Discourse in Translation*. Rodopi.

Lefevere, A. (1975). *Translating Poetry: Seven Strategies and a Blueprint*. Van Gorcum.

Levý, J. (2011). *The Art of Translation* (P. Corness, Trans.). John Benjamins.

López Hernández, M. (1998). *El Soneto y sus variedades*. Ediciones Colegio de España.

Moffett, J. (1999). On formal translation. In S. Allén (Ed.), *Translation of Poetry and Poetic Prose*, 83-100. https://doi.org/10.1142/9789812815170_0009

Pym, A. (2014). *Exploring Translation Theories*. Routledge.

Quilis, A. (2013). *Métrica española*. Ariel.

Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. John Benjamins.

Notes

1. Referring to a rhyme that occurs only in stressed final syllables (Levý 2011: 238-239).

2. Verse can have several readings in terms of the stress pattern, given prosodic stress does not necessarily coincide with the stressed syllables in a line (Domínguez Caparrós 2016: 29). Therefore, for those verses in which there were multiple possibilities, I have interpreted a stress pattern that better matched the regular rhythm of the poem (provided one existed).

3. I consider analogical form to be a form with a similar value in the target tradition, whether this is due to their common origins, to their significance within their respective systems or to their common function in those respective systems.

Annex. Shakespeare's sonnets. Prototypes for analysis.

The source poems provided below are derived from the 1609 Quarto *Sonnets*, modernised by Helen Vendler (1999).

Sonnet 2

When forty winters shall besiege thy br**ow**,
And dig deep trenches in thy beauty's fi**eld**,
Thy youth's proud livery so gazed on n**ow**
Will be a tottered weed of small worth h**eld**:
Then being asked, where all thy beauty l**ies**,
Where all the treasure of thy lusty d**ays**,
To say within thine own deep-sunken **eyes**
Were an all-eating shame, and thriftless pr**aise**.
How much more praise deserved thy beauty's **use**,
If thou couldst answer, "This fair child of m**ine**
Shall sum my count, and make my old exc**use**,"
Proving his beauty by succession th**ine**.
This were to be new made when thou art **old**,
And see thy blood warm when thou feel'st it c**old**.

Sonnet 18

Shall I compare thee to a summer's d**ay**?
Thou art more lovely and more temper**ate**:
Rough winds do shake the darling buds of M**ay**,
And summer's lease hath all too short a d**ate**;
Sometime too hot the eye of heaven sh**ines**,
And often is his gold complexion d**immed**;
And every fair from fair sometime decl**ines**,
By chance or nature's changing course untr**immed**:
But thy eternal summer shall not f**ade**,
Nor lose possession of that fair thou **ow'st**,
Nor shall Death brag thou wand'rest in his sh**ade**,
When in eternal lines to time thou gr**ow'st**.
So long as men can breathe or eyes can s**ee**,
So long lives this, and this gives life to th**ee**.

Sonnet 73

That time of year thou mayst in me beh**old**
When yellow leaves, or none, or few, do h**ang**
Upon those boughs which shake against the c**old**,
Bare ruined choirs, where late the sweet birds s**ang**.
In me thou seest the twilight of such d**ay**
As after sunset fadeth in the w**est**,
Which by and by black night doth take aw**ay**,
Death's second self that seals up all in r**est**.
In me thou seest the glowing of such f**ire**
That on the ashes of his youth doth l**ie**,
As the death-bed whereon it must exp**ire**,
Consumed with that which it was nourished b**y**.

This thou perceiv'st, which makes thy love more str**ong**,
To love that well which thou must leave ere l**ong**.

Sonnet 116

Let me not to the marriage of true m**inds**
Admit impediments; love is not l**ove**
Which alters when it alteration f**inds**,
Or bends with the remover to rem**ove**.
O no, it is an ever-fixèd m**ark**
That looks on tempests and is never sh**aken**;
It is the star to every wand'ring b**ark**,
Whose worth's unknown, although his heighth be t**aken**.
Love's not Time's fool, though rosy lips and ch**eeks**
Within his bending sickle's compass c**ome**;
Love alters not with his brief hours and w**eeks**,
But bears it out even to the edge of d**oom**.
If this be error and upon me pr**oved**,
I never writ, nor no man ever l**oved**.