Optimality Theory Applied to the Analysis of Verse Translation

Richard M. Mansell

University of Sheffield / Universitat de les Illes Balears

1. Optimality Theory

Optimality Theory (Prince and Smolensky 1993) is a theoretical framework, currently most influential in the field of phonology; for a concise history of the theory, see Dols 2000.

The theory proposes a grammar in which constraints, and not rules, determine the well-formedness of an output.

> **Structure of Optimality-theoretic grammar**
> a. Gen (In$_k$) $\rightarrow$ {Out$_1$, Out$_2$, ... }
> b. H-eval (Out$_i$, 1≤i≤∞) $\rightarrow$ Out$_{real}$
> (Prince and Smolensky 1993:4).

Based on an input, the *Gen* function (short for Generator) generates a number of candidate outputs between one and infinity. Then, the *H-Eval* function (short for Evaluator) evaluates the candidates by means of a notion that is central to OT; a parametric hierarchy of violable and universal constraints. A constraint can be violated, but only to avoid violating constraints at a higher-level in the hierarchy. The candidate with the fewest number of violations of the highest ranked constraint is judged to be the winner: the optimal output. So, the constraints are the same for all languages, but their position within the hierarchy, and thus the possibilities of violating them, differ according to each language.

2. Applying Optimality Theory to the analysis of verse translation

2.1. Precedents

Verse translation is here considered to be a translation in syllabic, accentual or free verse, of a poem from a source language into a target language[1]. We believe that the concept of the translational process as an interaction of violable and universal constraints brings a new and innovative point of view to the analysis of verse translation.

Verse translation is unique with regards to the interaction of form and content, and there have been many proposals of how to approach this challenge. Oliva insists that "the translation of a literary work (above all a poem) is a process of creation identical to that of the creation of the original" (1995:90, my translation). About this creative process, he paraphrases Ransom (1941), saying that "the two qualities, sound and sense, are not directly related, and to create a poem is to choose between these two qualities" (Oliva 1995:90, my translation). We believe that the concept of choice – choosing from amongst all possibilities – is central to translation: there is no one way to translate, and it has been shown that if the same source text (ST) is given to twenty translators, they will produce twenty different target texts (TTs). James S. Holmes has also remarked that a verse translation "can never be more than a single interpretation out of many of the original whose image it darkly mirrors" (1968:30). Other options are available, and so there is more than one possible translation. We suggest however that the translator has chosen the *optimal* text in agreement with the situation: in a different situation, the result would be a different text.

Furthermore, the notion of choice interaction is not new:

> Of course, solutions to translation problems are rarely a case of 'right' versus 'wrong' [...]. Translation problems are usually interrelated; they form networks or hierarchies in which the solution to one problem influences the way others are tackled.
>
> (Nord 1997:74-75).

---

[1] For now visual poetry and prose poetry will be put to one side; the latter does not make use of the conventions of line and stanza, and with the former "we must take into account not only linguistic factors [...] but also artistic factors, since visual poetry is a combination of literary expression —words— and plastic expression —images" (Molas and Bou 2003:46, my translation). So, these genres would need different faith and markedness constraints to those presented here.

This functionalist view of translation coincides with our own view from OT: every time a translator makes a choice new paths are opened up, but that is at the cost of others. One of the theory's objectives is to reveal how these choices interact, and if the relationships are systematic.

This article's hypothesis, that the situation in which a translation occurred can be explained by means of (and perhaps be reduced to) the interaction of universal and violable constraints, is conceptually similar to Umberto Eco's recent theoretical soundings: "many current concepts in translation studies (equivalence, adherence to the *skopos*, faithfulness or translator's initiative) can be placed under the heading of *negotiation*" (2003:17, his emphasis, my translation). His 'negotiation', however, does not have a solid theoretical grounding; "*this is not presented as a book on translation theory* (it does not have the methodicalness)" (Eco 2003:15, his emphasis, my translation); instead it is based on his experiences as a translator and a translated author, and his work often offers advice to translators on what to do in particular situations, what is 'right' and what is 'wrong'. Furthermore, the present article proposes not only an analysis of the ST aspects that have been prioritized (or "negotiated", in Eco's terms), but also a look at the constraints that have been broken to achieve this – *the price of what has been done*.

2.2. Procedure

Firstly, in analysing an ST-TT pair, the TT is considered to be optimal, having beaten all other possible candidates. Thus the analysis is a tool to conjecture the hierarchy in which the translation is considered optimal.

Dols and Sampol (in press) propose the following constraints, divided into two families; faith constraints and markedness constraints. The definitions of each constraint and all examples from *Os Lusíadas* are theirs[2]. In all examples, the ST is on the left and the TT on the right, and the underlined text is where the violation is incurred.

2.2.1. Faith constraints

---

[2] The Catalan translation of *Os Lusíadas* is by Guillem Colom and Miquel Dolç (1964). The translations of the constraint definitions are mine.

Faith constraints control the relationship between the input and output, which in translation are the ST and TT.

MAXST-TT: Do not elide ST material.

Mais do que prometia a força humana,   més del que prometia força humana,

(From *Os Lusíadas*).

DEPST-TT: Do not add material that is not in the ST.

Em perigos e guerras esforçados,   en tants perills i guerres decidits,

(From *Os Lusíadas*).

ORDER: Do not alter the order of ST elements.

E entre gente remota edificaram   i edificaren dins remotes gents

(From *Os Lusíadas*).

IDENTITY: Do not change ST elements (This can be split into SEMANTIC IDENTITY and LEXICAL IDENTITY).

Que, da Ocidental praia Lusitana,   que, de l'extrema riba lusitana,

(From *Os Lusíadas*).

Note that there are two violations here.

ALIGN: Do not break the relationship between semantic chain and line break in the ST.

Et je vois tour à tour s'étaler sur ton teint   y descubro en tu tez una veces locura
La folie et l'horreur, froides et taciturnes.   y otras veces terror, taciturnos y fríos.

(From "La muse malade" by Baudelaire).[3]

SYNTAX: Do not alter the ST syntactic structure.

Que não tenham enveja às de Hipocrene.   que ja no envegin més els d'Hipocrene.

(D'*Os Lusíadas*).

Two examples are enough to demonstrate violations of the remaining faith constraints and the markedness constraints, and they will follow the presentation of the constraints. First, the faith constraints:

---

[3] Spanish translation by Enrique López Castellón.

F/ACCENT1: Do not change the place of the primary ST accent.

F/ACCENT2: Do not change the place of the secondary ST accent.

F/METRE: Respect the ST metre.

F/RHYME: Respect the ST rhyme structure.[4]

2.2.2. Markedness constraints

Markedness constraints ensure the well-formedness of the output with respect to its system.

ACCENT 1: The TT line must have a primary accent that is acceptable in the target culture.

ACCENT 2: The TT line must have a secondary accent that is acceptable in the target culture.

METRE: The TT metre must be acceptable in the target culture.

RHYME: The TT rhyme structure must be acceptable in the target culture.

The examples are two French translations of the beginning of Hamlet's soliloquy (III.i.56-60), both by Voltaire (1761, in Hermans 1999:38-9). First is the more literal of the two.

To be, or not to be, that is the question:-	Être ou n'être pas, c'est là la question,
Whether 'tis nobler in the mind, to suffer	S'il est plus noble dans l'esprit de souffrir
The slings and arrows of outrageous fortune;	Les piqûres et les flèches de l'affreuse fortune,
Or to take arms against a sea of troubles,	Ou de prendre les armes contre une mer de trouble,
And by opposing them end them? To die, to sleep,	Et en s'opposant à eux, les finir? Mourir, dormir,

All TT verses apart from the fifth are decasyllables, the TT is in blank verse and the primary accents of the original are respected. That, however, violates the markedness constraints, because this form – blank decasyllables – was not acceptable in mid-eighteenth century French theatre. So, Voltaire proposed a second text:

---

[4] Note that this constraint is not limited to the use of rhyme in the TT when it is used in the ST and vice-versa: it also incorporates the type of rhyme used. For example, the use of half-rhyme in an English ST could be imitated in a Catalan TT. This faithfulness, however, would incur a violation of RHYME, because half-rhyme is not an acceptable device in Catalan poetry.

To be, or not to be, that is the question:-	Demeure, il faut choisir, et passer à l'instant
Whether 'tis nobler in the mind, to suffer	De la vie à la mort, et de l'être au néant.
The slings and arrows of outrageous fortune;	Dieux justes, s'il en est, éclairez mon courage.
Or to take arms against a sea of troubles,	Faut-il vieller courbé sous la main qui m'outrage,
And by opposing them end them? To die, to sleep,	Supporter ou finir mon malheur et mon sort?

The rhyming alexandrines satisfy the markedness constraints, but violate the faith constraints for accents, metre and rhyme seen before.

Dols and Sampol's criteria present problems, possibly obscured by the proximity of Catalan, Castilian and Portuguese, the languages of their case study. First, the present criterion of a maximum of one violation of ORDER per line does not correspond with the fact that the input is the whole ST, just as the output is the whole TT. The division into lines is irrelevant as far as this constraint is concerned.

Second, there should be a clear definition as to what incurs a violation of SYNTAX. For example, obligatory structural changes are not of interest, because they do not represent a choice on the part of the translator. This article suggests a modification of "transposition", that is "the use of a lexeme from a grammatical category different to that of the ST lexeme that expressed the same content" (Ainaud et al. 2003:25), one of the procedures of translation proposed by Vinay and Darbelnet (1958). However, as a procedure this is unsatisfactory; it does not state when or why the procedure is used, and so it is not really a procedure at all, but a decontextualized difference between languages. Within the framework outlined in this article, though, one can see when this constraint is violated to avoid violating a higher-ranked constraint, thus contextualizing the translator's choice.

Third, what exactly incurs a violation of F/METRE? It has been said before that "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 their languages" (Holmes 1968:26). For example, would a violation of F/METRE be incurred in translating English accentual-syllabic verse into Catalan using syllabic metre, the dominant metre in

Catalan poetry?[5] Holmes' definition of a mimetic form is that "the translator will imitate the form of the original as best he can, constructing German hexameters for Greek, or English *terza rima* for Italian" (Holmes 1968:26, his italics). This definition is not wholly satisfactory, since Holmes does not provide any criteria as to how this form is achieved; but it is accepted here as a working definition. All the same, we promise future investigations to resolve doubts in these three fields.

Furthermore, ACCENT1 and ACCENT2 will be treated for the time being as "theoretically acceptable", whereas METRE will be treated as "acceptable" according to target culture norms. For example, a fourteen-syllable line with caesura is not acceptable in Catalan poetry (*art major* does not normally go beyond dodecasyllables). If this line did exist, however, it would be constructed from two heptasyllabic hemistichs, with a primary accent on the fourteenth syllable and a secondary accent on the seventh (Oliva 1992:306-7). Such a verse would violate METRE, but not ACCENT1 and ACCENT2.[6]

Dols and Sampol propose the following hypothesis: if the markedness constraints dominate the faith constraints, the result will be a substitutive translation; vice-versa, the result will be a subsidiary translation. At first glance, this opposition resembles the binarism that has dominated translation theory in the past and present: a translation, like a translator, can be on one side or the other, but not on both sides at the same time. Pym states that one of the origins of this fundamental binarism is Schleiermacher, and that the same concept has survived in many studies and receives many names:

> [...] 'formal' versus 'dynamic' (Nida), 'semantic' versus 'communicative' (Newmark), 'anti-illusory' versus 'illusory' (Lévy), 'adequate' versus 'acceptable' (Even-Zohar, Toury), 'overt' versus 'covert' (House), 'documentary' versus 'instrumental' (Nord), 'resistant' versus 'transparent' (Venuti), [...]. On the surface [...] it seems translators should look one way or another, since there is no room for a middle term corresponding to the position of the translators themselves.
>
> (Pym 1998:181).

---

[5] Indeed, a weight-sensitive metre is not impossible in Catalan. The Mallorcan poet Costa i Llobera published in 1906 the collection *Horacianes*, in which he adapted the classical quantitative metre to Catalan, using combinations of stressed and unstressed syllables to construct feet.

[6] The theoretical possibility of this line also opens the way for a weak claim to METRE.

This article proposes that substitutive and subsidiary strategies do not have to be mutually exclusive: in fact, traditional binarism is difficult to apply to strategies for the translation of verse.

If we look at Nord (1997:48-51), she calls the two blocks "documentary" and "instrumental" translation. This typology is based on a functional approach, where a documentary translation has a metatextual function, whereas an instrumental translation has a "referential/ expressive/ appellative/ phatic function and/ or subfunctions" (1997:51). Nord places verse translation in the "instrumental" domain. If a translation presents two or more functions, it is the main function that determines the place of the text within the typology. This analysis, however, does not reflect reality.

To resolve this doubt it is convenient to revive Holmes' idea of translation as a set of Wittgensteinian "family resemblances": a form of translation x resembles another form y, which in turn resembles another form z, without x and z resembling each other in the same way. For example, Holmes (1968:23-4) considers that a set of "family resemblances" links (in order): 1) a critical essay in the language of the poem; 2) a critical essay in a different language; 3) a prose translation of a poem; 4) a verse translation; 5) an imitation[7]; 6) a poem about a poem; 7) a poem inspired by a poem. Verse translation is where interpretation (1-4) overlaps with the use of verse as a medium (4-7), resulting in the verse translation having two functions: metatextual and poetic. That is why he calls a verse translation a "metapoem" (Holmes 1968:24). This simultaneous double-function undermines traditional binarism, which does not allow for a posture between the two extremes nor a posture that includes elements from both extremes.

This article proposes that Optimality Theory offers a theoretical framework for the "family resemblances" between the many forms of translating a poem, and it is thus a useful tool in the analysis of verse translations, especially when comparing TTs amongst themselves. To aid this objective, some modifications are made to Dols and

---

[7] In Dryden's sense "where the translator (if now he has not lost that name) assumes the liberty not only to vary from the words and sense, but to forsake them both as he sees occasion; and taking only some general hints from the original, to run division on the ground-work, as he pleases" (Dryden 1680:268).

Sampol's base. The first modification is to subdivide the faith constraints. These subdivisions are **content faith constraints**, **form faith constraints**, and **alignment faith constraints**. The first group includes MAXST-TT, DEPST-TT, ORDER, IDENTITY and SYNTAX, and the second gathers together F/ACCENT1, F/ACCENT2, F/METRE and F/RHYME. ALIGN is for now the sole member of the alignment faith constraints. Alignment is the point of interaction between form and content, and so it is advanced that there will be a special relationship between ALIGN and the other faith constraints, above all, when translating in languages with a relative distance between them, such as English and Catalan, as opposed to Portuguese and Catalan. If the TT form and content are faithful to their ST counterparts, there will be more violations of ALIGN. If the form faith constraints and ALIGN are dominant, there will probably be more violations of the content faith constraints. If these and ALIGN dominate, more violations of the form faith constraints will be incurred.

It is now that a first draft of a typology of translations can be advanced. If the form faith constraints are dominant, a mimetic form is expected. If the markedness constraints dominate, the result will be a poetic form acceptable in the target culture, but which does not necessarily have anything to do with the ST form. If ALIGN and the content faith constraints dominate the form faith constraints, the result will tend to be a translation of the sort often used in "bilingual" or "parallel" texts, where a regular poetic form is forsaken in order to reproduce faithfully the semantic content and information structure of the ST.[8] It is important to remember that "there is an extremely close relationship between the kind of verse form a translator chooses and the kind of total effect his translation achieves" (Holmes 1968:30). This creates the function of the TT, and it is the interaction of individual constraints or groups of constraints that provides the theoretical framework for the explanation of "family resemblances".

Before presenting the analyses, there is a note about the methodology and two points to be borne in mind. The analyses make use of some OT conventions: violations are marked with an asterisk: if there is more than one violation of a constraint it must be noted: although the theory does not know how to count, it does differentiate presence

---

[8] For example, Oliva's recent (2003) translation of Shakespeare's sonnets, where in fact two translations are provided for each sonnet; one of the "parallel" text type described, and another in the form of a sonnet.

from absence, more from less, better from worse. The tableau has four columns: from left to right, the ST; violations of MAXST-TT; violations of all other constraints; and the TT. Since MAXST-TT picks up on missing ST material, it is impossible to say precisely where in the TT the violation is incurred, and so violations are marked by the side of the ST. All other violations can be linked to a point in the TT, and so a second column to mark violations is necessary. However, although on the tableau violations are marked by the side of each line (for clarity), the correspondence between input and output is not at the level of the line, but of the text. The input is *the entire ST*, just as the output is the entire TT.[9] The hierarchy evaluates the whole text, not isolated verses.

3. An example of the applied theory. Versions of "The Raven" by Edgar A. Poe

The case study presented is an analysis of several Catalan and Spanish translations of the first stanza of Edgar A. Poe's "The Raven". First, we shall look at Benguerel's first published Catalan version (1944):[10]

ST	VIOLATIONS	VIOLATIONS	TT
Once upon a midnight dreary, while I pondered, weak and weary,	***MAX (upon, while, and)	***IDENT (Temps ha < Once upon,[11] nit < midnight, desolada < dreary,), *ALIGN-R,[12] *METRE	Temps ha, una nit desolada, feble, cansat, l'oblidada
Over many a quaint and curious volume of forgotten lore —	*MAX (and)	*ORDER, ****IDENT (uns llibres < a volume, primicers < quaint, rars < curious), *ALIGN-L, **SINT estructura "saviesa d'uns llibres" < "volume of lore", morfema de plural 's' < many, *METRE	saviesa meditava d'uns llibres rars, primicers,
While I nodded, nearly napping, suddenly there	***MAX (nearly napping, suddenly)	****DEP (i, em va semblar que), ***IDENT (quan <	i quan la son m'abaltia, em va semblar que sentia

---

[9] Note that if the input were just a line of the ST, and the output were a corresponding TT line, it would be impossible to violate ALIGN. There are, however, constraints that are active at the level of the line (although within the context of the whole text): F/METRE, for example, works at the level of the line, stanza (combination of lines) and poem (combination of stanzas).

[10] Published in *Germanor*, Santiago de Chile. The ST is the definitive version of Poe's text, reproduced in Mabbot (1969:364-69).

[11] In fact here there is pragmatic identity, but not lexical nor semantic.

[12] The use of a weak form of the constraint ALIGN (ALIGN-LEFT and ALIGN-RIGHT) helps us see whether alignment takes place with elements greater than the line.

came a tapping,		while, [jo] < there, sentia < came), *ALIGN-R, *SINT (sentia < came [imp < pret]), *METRE	
As of some one gently rapping, rapping at my chamber door —	***MAX (As of, some one, rapping)	*IDENT (recés < chamber), *ALIGN-L, *SINT (suau < gently [adj. < adv.] , *METRE	un truc suau que colpia al portal del meu recés.
"'Tis some visiter," I muttered, "tapping at my chamber door —		***IDENT (algú < some visiter, vaig dir, muttered, recés < chamber), *SINT (serà < 'tis [futur < present]), *METRE	«Serà algú», vaig dir, «que truca al portal del meu recés—
Only this and nothing more."		**DEP (deu ser), *SINT [fragment < frase],	tan sols deu ser això i res més.»

From this analysis the following hierarchy can be extracted:

F/ACCENT1, F/ACCENT2, F/METRE, F/RHYME, ACCENT1, ACCENT2, RHYME
>> ORDER >> ALIGN >> SYNTAX >> DEP, MAX >> IDENTITY >> METRE.

Here are some examples of voluntary violations of content faith constraints to satisfy the dominant form faith and markedness constraints:

- **IDENTITY for RHYME and F/RHYME: "primicers" < "quaint", "recés" < "chamber"** — The TT does not violate RHYME and the form faith constraints, specially F/RHYME, since in the TT "primicers" and "recés" are at the end of a line, where rhyme is needed.

- **SYNTAX (and also IDENTITY) for RHYME and F/RHYME: "sentia" < "there came"** — Whilst the ST verb would normally be reproduced in the TT using the preterite tense, Benguerel uses the imperfect so as to maintain the internal rhyme structure. Thus there is an almost inevitable violation of MAX, because the adverb "suddenly" cannot qualify a verb in the imperfect tense. The following violations of DEP and SYNTAX are related to this.

- **DEP (and SYNTAX) for F/METRE: "deu ser"** — This addition creates a heptasyllable, although for prosodic reasons considerably more tense than the original. Also note that the TT line is a sentence, whereas its ST counterpart is a fragment.

Of note is the respect of the form faith constraints, and three of the four markedness constraints. The low rating of METRE, though, shows that Benguerel was not worried by the fact the fourteen syllable lines used were not acceptable in Catalan poetry, although they are theoretically possible. This first result confirms the hypothesis that if form faith constraints dominate, the TT form will be mimetic.

Yet the fact is that we do not need a theory to tell us that Benguerel's TT aims to imitate the form of the ST. The advantage of the theory is that it reveals the price that has been paid to achieve this form. Surprisingly, the high rating of ORDER shows that the order of the ST has been altered as little as possible, maybe because Benguerel wanted to maintain the ST's narrative. The price is, in fact, elision, addition and change. The local hierarchy of DEP, MAX >> IDENTITY highlights the true price of a mimetic form and a narrative function imitating that of the original. As a first procedure to satisfy the dominant constraints, Benguerel has changed the semantic elements of the ST. When this has not been possible, the translator has elided and added material. Although material has been added in fewer cases, it is difficult to show that MAX has been violated in favour of DEP.

The violations of ALIGN present a curious case. If the violations are looked at more closely, it can be seen that when a line (and hemistich) break is also the end of a clause, ALIGN is satisfied. When it is not, however, ALIGN is violated. This could be reflected in a new constraint, expressed like this: do not alter the relationship between a semantic chain and a line break, if the line break is also the end of a clause. This constraint, however, would be automatically satisfied if ALIGN were satisfied. Also, it would open the floodgates to an infinite number of constraints, unnecessarily complicating the theory. Instead of a new constraint, it is possible to speak of an interpretation of the constraint on the part of Benguerel, and thus a weak claim on ALIGN. Note that this weak form of ALIGN would be ranked higher in the hierarchy.

The next text is a translation from the following year, by the Mallorcan poet Miquel Forteza (1945):[13]

ST	VIOLATIONS	VIOLATIONS	TT
Once upon a midnight dreary, while I pondered, weak and weary,	***MAX (Once, upon, and)	**DEP (que, vetlava), ***IDENT (trista < dreary, que < while, entenebrit < weak), *ALIGN-D, *SINT ("mitja nit" esdevé objecte directe), *METRE	Una trista mitja nit, que vetlava entenebrit,
Over many a quaint and curious volume of forgotten lore —	***MAX (a, quaint, and)	*DEP (greu), *ORDER, *******IDENT (fullejant < I pondered, amb fadiga < weary, llibres < volume, vells < curious, i < of, antics < forgotten, papers < lore), *ALIN-L, ****SINT (fullejant < I pondered, amb fadiga < weary, morfema de plural 's' < many, i < of), *METRE	fullejant amb greu fadiga llibres vells i antics papers
While I nodded, nearly napping, suddenly there came a tapping,	**MAX (nodded, suddenly)	*ORDER, ******IDENT (i < while, em dormia < napping, a poc a poc < nearly, [jo] < there, vaig sentir < came, la < my), *ALIN-R, *METRE	i em dormia a poc a poc, vaig sentir a la porta un toc.
As of some one gently rapping, rapping at my chamber door —	****MAX (As, of, gently, rapping)	********DEP (I, sens, moure, 'm, de, el meu, lloc, cercar), **IDENT (ve a < rapping, recés < chamber), *ALIGN, *METRE	I sens moure'm del meu lloc: «Qualcú ve a cercar recés
"'Tis some visiter," I muttered, "tapping at my chamber door —	***MAX ('Tis, my, door)	****DEP (en, aquesta, hora, cercar), *ORDER, ***IDENT (vaig pensar < muttered, ve a < tapping, recés < chamber), *ALIN-L, *METRE	—vaig pensar— en aquesta hora, qualcú ve a cercar recés.»
Only this and nothing more."		*ORDRE	Això sols i no res més.

The hierarchy of constraints that evaluates this TT looks like this:

---

[13] Published in Palma, his edition appears with a false date of 1935, presumibly to avoid Francoist censorship. During Franco's dictatorship (1939-75), both Catalan culture and literature were harshly repressed. Translations were heavily censored, since they can represent relations between two cultures.

F/Accent1, F/Accent2, F/Metre, F/Rhyme, Accent1, Accent2, Rhyme >> Syntax[14] >> Order, Align, >> Dep, Max >> Identity >> Metre

This hierarchy is strikingly similar to the previous one, and this is not by chance. The TT form is also mimetic, although there is less respect for the ST order of elements. The violations incurred to achieve this objective are so great in number that, even evaluated by this hierarchy, Benguerel's TT may be optimal. Now is a good time to point out though, that despite Benguerel's six violations of Dep to Forteza's fifteen, it cannot be said that Forteza's TT is three times worse than Benguerel's. The theory cannot count, it only differentiates absence from presence, less from more; and the violations are deemed necessary in order to respect dominant constraints. Benguerel's TT could win because of "The Economy Property of Optimality Theory: Banned options are available only to avoid violations of higher-ranked constraints and can only be used *minimally*" (Prince and Smolensky 1993:27, their emphasis).

Everything points to the fact that something is not right. The hypothesis stated that all (definitive) TTs are optimal within their own hierarchy. Yet here Forteza's text may not be so, suggesting that other constraints come into play. In fact, all that is needed is a modification of an existing constraint: F/Metre. The metre that Forteza uses is an attempt to adapt a weight-sensitive metre to Catalan, employing trochaic feet made up of stressed and unstressed syllables. This satisfies F/Metre more than Benguerel's syllabic verse, if this constraint is understood as a family of sub-constraints: faithfulness of type of metre (accentual or syllabic); number of syllables or feet per line; type of foot or ground rhythm used; combination of lines; combination of stanzas. Since the ST uses a weight-sensitive metre (English syllabic-accentual metre), Forteza satisfies more sub-constraints of F/Metre than Benguerel, who uses syllabic metre. However, satisfying more sub-constraints implies more violations of low-ranked restrictions, confirming the hypothesis that everything has its price.

---

[14] Note that the many violations of Max mean that fewer ST elements survive to be evaluated by Syntax, and so the possibilities of violating Syntax are fewer. All the same, the solutions show that the translator has preferred to elide rather than alter the ST syntactic structure.

Perhaps there are external influences that explain Forteza's use of weight-sensitive metre: as a poet of the Mallorcan School, Forteza represents a more classic conception of poetry. Also, as has been said above, another Mallorcan poet, Costa i Llobera, had already carried out an experiment with weight-sensitive metre. These, however, are questions that correspond to a separate study. For now it is enough to state that the ST uses weight-sensitive metre, and in this respect, Forteza is closer to the original.

The next TT in the case study is Benguerel's definitive version (1982)[15], to see if the hierarchy of constraints changes. This is expected, since it would show that Benguerel wanted to alter something from the 1944 text. Remember that a different hierarchy, and therefore a different evaluation, would result in a different text.

ST	VIOLATIONS	VIOLATIONS	TT
Once upon a midnight dreary, while I pondered, weak and weary,	*MAX (and)	*ORDER, ****IDENT (nit < midnight, d'oratge < dreary, exhaust < weak, sense coratge < weary), *ALIGN-R, **SINT (d'oratge < dreary, sense coratge < weary), *METRE	Temps ha, en una nit d'oratge, mentre exhaust, sense coratge,
Over many a quaint and curious volume of forgotten lore —	*MAX (many (a))	*ORDER, *****IDENT (text < volume, insòlit < curious, savis < quaint, arcaics < forgotten, papers < lore), *ALIGN-L, *SINT ([allà on qualifica "savis" i "quaint"]), *METRE	meditava el text insòlit d'uns savis i arcaics papers,
While I nodded, nearly napping, suddenly there came a tapping,	***MAX (while, nodded, nearly)	****DEP (i, somorta, de, el picaporta), **IDENT (vaig abaltir-me < napping, l'armella < there), *ALIGN-R, *SINT (vaig abaltir-me < I ... napping), *METRE,	vaig abaltir-me i, somorta, l'armella del picaporta
As of some one gently rapping, rapping at my chamber door —	*****MAX (As of, some one, gently, rapping, rapping (at))	*DEP (isolat), *IDENT (recés < chamber), *ALIGN-L, **SINT (colpí < came a tapping, d'improvís < suddenly), *METRE,	colpí d'improvís la porta del meu isolat recés—

---

[15] Benguerel published four versions in his lifetime: 1944, 1974, 1979 and 1982. Despite this, the first stanza does not differ amongst the three most recent versions.

"'Tis some visiter," I muttered, "tapping at my chamber door —		***IDENT (algú < some visiter, vaig dir, muttered, recés < chamber), *SINT (serà < 'tis [futur < present], *METRE	«Serà algú, vaig dir, que truca al portal del meu recés—
Only this and nothing more."			tan sols això i no res més.»

The hierarchy presents differences to that of the 1944 text;

F/ACCENT1, F/ACCENT2, F/METRE, F/RHYME, ACCENT1, ACCENT2, RHYME >> ORDER >> ALIGN >> DEP >> SYNTAX >> MAX >> IDENTITY, METRE.

Here it is suggested that the promotion of DEP is at the expense of more violations of MAX and SYNTAX; the translator makes fewer additions, but makes more elisions and alters the ST syntactical structure. In fact, all of the violations of DEP, and all but two of MAX, are incurred in the third and fourth lines of the TT. If this is an isolated case, an analysis of the translation of the whole poem would reveal a slightly different hierarchy, with a promotion of MAX.

Since these lines are a focus of violations of MAX and DEP, it would be useful to look at the section of the TT where little has been added or elided; the other lines. It is here that the true price of maintaining more ST material can be seen: IDENTITY. More ST material has survived, but with more semantic changes.

So, we have seen that the theory provides information not only about one TT, but also about the evolution of TTs sharing the same ST. Next is the application of the theory to a "chopped-up prose" translation. The translation is by Condor and Falaquera (2000):[16]

ST	VIOLATIONS	VIOLATIONS	TT
Once upon a midnight dreary, while I pondered, weak and weary,	*MAX (Once)	*ORDER, *F/A1, *F/A2, *F/M, *F/R, *A2	En una taciturna medianoche, mientras débil y cansado cavilaba

---

[16] "Chopped-up prose" is Auden's term (1948:293). The Spanish prose appears "chopped-up" according to the ST lines, and so it makes use of the conventions of verse and stanza. However, there are no metrical –or any other– devices that allow us to talk of it as free verse.

Over many a quaint and curious volume of forgotten lore —		*IDENT (ante < over), *SINT (saberes pl. < sing.), *F/A1, *F/A2, *F/M, *F/R, *A2	ante algunos extraños y curiosos volúmenes de olvidados saberes,
While I nodded, nearly napping, suddenly there came a tapping,		*IDENT (se oyeron < came), *SINT (unos toques pl < sing), *F/A1, *F/A2, *F/M, *F/R, *A2	mientras cabeceaba, casi dormitando, de improviso se oyeron unos toques,
As of some one gently rapping, rapping at my chamber door —	*MAX (gently)	*DEP (estuviera), *IDENT (como si < as of), *SINT (frase < fragment), *F/A1, *F/A2, *F/M, *F/R, *A2	como si alguien estuviera llamando, llamando a la puerta de mi cuarto.
"'Tis some visiter," I muttered, "tapping at my chamber door —		*SINT (será fut < pres), *F/A1, *F/A2, *F/M, *F/R, *A2	"Será algún visitante — musité— llamando a la puerta de mi cuarto,
Only this and nothing more."		*F/A1, *F/A2, *F/M, *F/R, *A2	sólo eso y nada más."

The hierarchy evaluating this text is certainly different to those seen before:

(METRE,) RHYME, ACCENT1, ALIGN >> ORDER, DEP >> MAX, IDENT >> SINT>> F/ACCENT1, F/ACCENT2, F/METRE, F/RHYME, ACCENT2.

What does this mean? First, the deceptively high rankings of METRE, RHYME and ACCENT1 must be understood. The translation is presented in the form of free verse, an acceptable form in Spanish (and so no violations of METRE and RHYME) and also have a primary accent (and so no violation of ACCENT1). However, the lack of metrical devices does not permit us to talk of true free verse, and so these constraints should be ignored.

The high ranking of ALIGN (any violation is fatal) says a lot about this translational strategy: every ST verse corresponds to a TT verse. Teamed with the respect for ORDER, MAX, DEP and IDENTITY, this TT functions as a dictionary for the reader and does not intend to reproduce any elements of the ST's form. In this sense, we are in full agreement with Oliva:

> For example, a prose translation of Shakespeare's sonnets, thinking of a reader capable of more or less following the original text but who would use the translation instead of a dictionary, is perfectly licit.

(1995:81, my translation).

It also suggests some of the external influences that determine the TT, such as the *skopos*, and norms. We do not, however, agree that "Neither from a theoretical, nor strictly literary point of view, does this type of translation have any real interest" (Oliva 1995:81, my translation).

We propose that this translational strategy does have theoretical interest; it is one translation from the many possible, and thus is linked to others by the aforementioned "family resemblances". It helps highlight the "gains" and "losses" incurred by each translational strategy: this strategy is subsidiary, in agreement with the initial hypothesis, since it does not reproduce the poetic function of ST. Furthermore, it would be interesting to look at whether a culture prohibits or favours this strategy: this would provide information about the relationship between the source and target cultures.

The next case returns to a translation in verse, although to one that presents a curious problem. Gómez de la Serna's 1918 text takes the stanzaic form of seven pentametric lines and a refrain of three and a half trochees. Now is when the device of two columns for violations is particularly useful, since the number of lines in the ST is different to that of the TT.

ST	VIOLATIONS	VIOLATIONS	TT
Once upon a midnight dreary, while I pondered, weak and weary,	*MAX (a)	*IDENT (triste < dreary), *ALIGN-R, *F/A1, *F/A2, *F/M, *F/R, *MET	Una vez, en triste media noche,
Over many a quaint and curious volume of forgotten lore —	**MAX (Over, quaint)	*ORDER, ***IDENT (cuando < while, mustio < weak, examinaba < pondered), *ALIGN-L, *F/A1, *F/A2, *F/M, *F/R, *MET	cuando, cansado y mustio, examinaba
While I nodded, nearly napping, suddenly there came a tapping,	**MAX (nearly, a tapping)	**IDENT ('s' plural < many, infolios < volume), *F/A1, *F/A2, *F/M, *F/R, *MET	infolios raros de olvidada ciencia,
As of some one gently rapping, rapping at my chamber door —	*MAX (chamber)	*ALIN-R, *F/A1, *F/A2, *F/M, *F/R, *MET	mientras cabeceaba adormecido,
"'Tis some visiter," I	****MAX (tapping at, my,	***IDENT ([yo] < there, oí <	oí de pronto, que alguien

muttered, "tapping at my chamber door —	chamber, door)	came, que < as of), *ALIGN, *SINT (suddenly < de pronto, que < as of), *F/A1, *F/A2, *F/M, *F/R, *MET	golpeaba
Only this and nothing more."		*ORDER, *ALIGN-L, *F/A1, *F/A2, *F/M, *F/R, *MET	en mi puerta, llamando suavemente.
		**DEP (sin, duda), *IDENT (un < some), *F/A1, *F/A2, *F/M, *F/R, *MET	«Es, sin duda — murmuré—, un visitante...»
		*F/R	Solo esto, y nada más.

Based on this analysis, the following hierarchy is proposed:

ACCENT1, ACCENT2, RHYME >> SYNTAX >> ORDER, DEP >> ALIGN >> MAX, IDENTITY >> METRE, F/ACCENT1, F/ACCENT2, F/METRE, F/RHYME

At first glance the high ranking of ALIGN is surprising, since faithfulness of alignment would be expected to fall by the wayside if a TT presents a different number of lines to its ST. In fact, if the object of ALIGN is taken to be the hemistich and the line, there is an astonishing correspondence between the ST and the TT. The first, second, fourth, sixth and seventh TT lines respect the alignment of ST hemistichs; the third and fifth respect the alignment of a line or two hemistichs; the TT refrain respects the alignment of the ST refrain. The second hemistich of the fifth ST line is elided.

So, Gómez de la Serna wanted to respect the relationship between semantic chains and line breaks of the ST, albeit in an arbitrary manner, and so some sort of constraint must reflect this. In this case, a weak version of ALIGN is proposed, expressed thus: the TT relationship between semantic chain and line break must respect an ST relationship between semantic chain and line or hemistich break. Note that this sub-constraint provokes multiple violations of MAX: for example, the translator elides the entire second hemistich of the fifth line. It also provokes two violations of DEP, so as to have enough material to form the seventh TT line from the first hemistich of the ST's fifth verse.

Any violation of this weak form of ALIGN is fatal, and so the form that Gómez de la Serna uses satisfies a dominant faith constraint. This, however, creates a problem; how

to classify it. According to Holmes' classification (1968), it is neither "form-derivative" nor "content-derivative". An apt name would be "alignment-derivative", since the form is derived from the alignment of semantic chains and line/hemistich breaks of the ST. This is a form that, undetected, sneaks through a crack between classical categories, but is accounted for by a concept of constraint interaction.

4. Conclusion

The applied system:

- helps to explain and classify forms of verse translation.
- highlights present deficiencies, both in the concept of interaction and interrelation and in typologies (Nord and the place of verse translation in a typology, and Holmes' categories of verse form).
- allows TTs to be compared amongst themselves.
- allows studies to be compared amongst themselves.

It is thus a way to approach the objective formulated by Mason:

> The translator is a receiver and producer of texts and, like other categories of text users, selects at every turn from among the many options which are available; the preferred options will tend to correspond to generic, discoursal and/or textual criteria. More empirical evidence of these processes at work is needed. The way is open for further research into the regularities of translational behaviour[.]
>
> (1994:71).

Not only the regularities, but also the irregularities, and the ingenuity of translators.

5. Bibliography

AINAUD, Jordi, Anna Espunya and Dídac Pujol (2003): *Manual de traducció anglès-català*, Vic, Eumo.

AUDEN, W. H. (1948): *The Dyer's Hand and other essays*, London, Faber and Faber.

DOLS SALAS, Nicolau A. (2000): "La determinació de la sil·labificació òptima a temps real. Aplicació de la taula de programació dinàmica", in *Revista Española de Lingüística*, 30, 2, pp. 427-444.

DOLS SALAS, Nicolau A. and Gabriel de la S. T. Sampol (in press): "La Teoria de l'Optimitat en l'anàlisi de traduccions: dos exemples a partir d'*Os Lusíadas*".

DRYDEN, John (1680): "Preface to *Ovid's Epistles Translated by Several Hands*", in John Dryden (1962): *Of Dramatic Poesy and Other Critical Essays*, ed. George Watson, 2 vols., London, Dent. Vol. I, pp. 262-273.

ECO, Umberto (2003): *Dire quasi la stessa cosa*, Milan, Bompiani.

HERMANS, Theo (1999): *Translation in Sysytems*, Manchester, St Jerome.

HOLMES, James S. (1968): "Forms of Verse Translation and Translation of Verse Form", in James S. Holmes (1994): *Translated!: Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*, second edition, Amsterdam/Atlanta, Rodopi, pp. 23-33.

MABBOT, Thomas Ollive (ed.) (1969): *Collected works of Edgar Allan Poe. Volume I. Poems*, Cambridge, Belknap.

MASON, Ian (1994): "Techniques of Translation Revisited: A Text-linguistic Review of 'Borrowing' and 'Modulation'", in Amparo Hurtado Albir: *Estudis sobre la traducció*, Castelló, Publicacions de la Universitat Jaume I, pp. 61-72.

MOLAS, Joaquim and Enric Bou (2003): *La crisi de la paraula*, Barcelona, Edicions 62.

NORD, Christiane (1997): *Translation as a Purposeful Activity: Functional Approaches Explained*, Manchester, St. Jerome.

OLIVA, Salvador (1992): *La mètrica i el ritme de la prosa*, Barcelona, Quaderns Crema.

— (1995): "Sobre els elements suposadament intraduïbles de la traducció literària", in Josep Marco Borillo: *La traducció literària*, Castelló, Publicacions de la Universitat Jaume I, pp. 81-92.

PRINCE, Alan and Paul Smolensky (1993): *Optimality Theory: Constraint Interaction in Generative Grammar*, Rutgers Optimality Archive version (2002), http//:roa.rutgers.edu

RANSOM, John Crowe (1941): "Wanted: an ontological critic", in *The New Criticism*, Greenwood Press, Westport, Connecticut, pp. 279-336.

VINAY, J. P. and J. Darbelnet (1958): *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais*, Paris, Didier.