The Influence of the *Habitus* on Translatorial Style:
Some Methodological Considerations Based on the Case of Yorgos Himonas' Rendering of *Hamlet* into Greek

Vasso Yannakopoulou (University of Cyprus)

The subject of style in Translation Studies is a comparatively underdeveloped area. Due to the long-standing tendency towards the translators' invisibility, most of the interest in the topic has focused on the style of the source text and the degree in which it is transferred in the target text. Nevertheless, style in translation inevitably encompasses the translators' own style as well, in other words the choices translators make that are not dictated by the source text or the target language and culture, but are particular to their own writing. Bourdieu has shown that matters of taste, aesthetic appreciation and production, including linguistic production, can be the result of strong dispositions generated by the *habitus*. It is the claim of this paper that habitus can constitute the theoretical tool to account both for the manner in which translators interpret their source texts as readers and the particular choices they make during the actual translation production as writers. Methodologically, a combination of macrolevel contextual factors that take into consideration the translators' whole life trajectory, with microlevel textual ones will be proposed. Furthermore, it will be claimed that the existence of patterns of translation choices, as well as cases of deviance from the expected translation practices constitute strong indicators that these choices are motivated by the translators' habitus, instead of being random or idiosyncratic. The above points will be tested against the case study of Yorgos Himonas' rendering of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* into Greek (1988).

Keywords: *habitus*, Bourdieu, style, interpretation, choice, macro-micro, *patterns*, *deviance*, Shakespeare, Yorgos Himonas

1. Style in Translation

It is a truism that if the same source text (henceforward ST) is given to two translators, even in the same sociocultural and historical context in which the same norms apply, they are bound to come up with more or less different target texts; sometimes strikingly different. If that is the case, it is important to ask what the factors that shape these differences are and what constitutes each translator's distinctive style. As it is, not much work has been done in the direction of translation stylistics and even less regarding translatorial stylistics.[1]

But what is style? For the needs of this paper, let it suffice to borrow Verdonk's (2002: 5) definition of style as "motivated choice" and K. Wales' definition as "the perceived distinctive manner of expression".[2]

In the case of translation, style might be seen to include the style of the ST, the degree in which it is transferred to the target text (henceforward TT), as well as the style of the TT *per se*.[3] Until very recently, whatever work was done on style in Translation Studies (henceforward TS) showed a lopsided interest towards the first two of the above aspects primarily driven by translation quality assessment or translator training purposes.[4] Little has been done in the direction of studying the style of the TT *per se*. Baker attributes this partial interest to the fact that "translation has traditionally been viewed as a derivative rather than creative activity" and that therefore "a translator cannot have, indeed *should not* have, a style of his or her own, the translator's task being simply to reproduce as closely as possible the style of the original" (2000: 244; emphasis in the original).[5] However, as she quite correctly says, "it is as impossible to produce a stretch of language in a totally impersonal way as it is to handle an object without leaving one's fingerprints on it" (ibid.).[6] Similarly, Hermans uses the term "Translator's voice" to refer to the "second" voice that is always present in translated narrative discourse and may be "more or less overtly present". According to him "it may remain entirely hidden behind that of the Narrator, rendering it impossible to detect in the translated text. It is most directly and forcefully present when it breaks through the surface of the text speaking for itself, in its own name" (Hermans 1996: 27). Although Hermans mainly refers to cases in which the TT draws attention to itself as being a voice different from that of the original, e.g. cases of cultural embedding, linguistic self-referentiality, contextual overdetermination, meta-linguistic notes and comments, and the like, I wish to adopt the term here to refer to other cases in which the translator's narrative discourse "breaks through" and becomes evident, and particularly cases in which the translator inserts elements that do not correspond to elements of the ST and are not imposed by the norms or linguistic constraints of the target language (henceforward TL), in other words pertain to the translators' own style of writing.

In what follows I will be looking at two facets of translation stylistics, namely the degree in which translators transfer the stylistic features of their STs, which is a reflection of their *interpretation* of the ST as readers, and their own style in their TTs as writers, which is directly linked with the element of translation *choice*.[7]

2. The Translator as Reader and the Element of *Interpretation*[8]

Since the 1970s there has been a growing interest in textual interpretation in the form of theories such as hermeneutics, the aesthetics of reception, reader-response criticism, semiotic theories of interpretative cooperation, and decon-

struction.[9] According to Eco

> the basic assumption underlying each of these theories is that the functioning of a text can be explained by taking into account not only its generative process but also (or, for the most radical theories, exclusively) the role performed by the addressee and the way in which the text foresees and directs this kind of interpretive cooperation. (Eco 1990: 45)

In his attempt to oppose the distinction imposed by the literary institution "between the producer of the text and its user, between its owner and its customer, between its author and its reader" (Barthes 1974: 4), Barthes proclaimed the "death of the Author".[10] He saw this as a necessary motion for the beginning of "writing", which was his way of describing the shift of textual interpretation from the author to the reader. He believed the distinction between reader and author to be but a historic one and wished to reclaim the text for the sake of the interpretive freedom of the reader. That is why he favoured what he called "writerly" texts, which were those texts that were characterized by a plurality of significations, as opposed to "readerly" ones which were univocal, such as classic literature (1974: 45). Discussing the question of conflicting interpretations between the author and the reader, Eco says that

> by giving life to a form, the artist makes it accessible to an infinite number of possible interpretations – possible because "the work lives only in the interpretations that are given of it," and *infinite* not only because of the characteristic fecundity of the form itself, but because this fecundity will inevitably be confronted with an infinity of interpreting personalities, each with its own way of seeing, thinking, and being. (Eco 1989: 165)

Similarly, according to Verdonk, "the meaning of a text is not intrinsic to it, but [is] always negotiable" (2002: 70).

At this point, two questions arise: firstly, whether the text can be interpreted in infinite ways, and secondly, whether interpretation is merely idiosyncratic or, if not, what affects it. Concerning the first question, I agree with Eco, who, in his book *The Limits of Interpretation*, claims that "the interpreted text imposes some constraints upon its interpreters" (1990: 6). He argues that the notion of unlimited semiosis does not lead to the conclusion that interpretation has no criteria and tends to take a more "moderate" standpoint on the matter (1990: 45–46).

As for the second question, according to Barthes, the interpreting experience for the "scriptor" is in the *here and now*.[11] But if, with Parks (2007: 9), the text is open to "a range of possible but not definite or exclusive meanings", how does a translator interpret his/her ST? How is one meaning rather than another activated in his/her mind? Can a translator-*cum*-reader be seen outside his/her

socio-historic environment? I believe that textual interpretation cannot be considered merely idiosyncratic, but is influenced by socio-historical factors, including the translator's whole life trajectory, which influences the way s/he interprets his/her cognitive input, as I will attempt to show below.

From a cognitive standpoint, Boase-Beier says that stylistic choices do not merely "represent different ways of saying the same thing but different ways of saying which reflect different ways of seeing" (2006: 112). She disagrees with Verdonk on the issue of the "passivity of the reader" and employing the Reader-Response Theory, views the translator as an "active participant in the reading of the source text" (2006: 73).[12] She stresses the fact that the translator infers from the text the intentions of the assumed author, what she describes as the "pretense of translation" (2006: 108).[13] What the translator actually comes up with is the "translator's meaning" of the "inferred author". As a result,

> because of the translator's role as active participant in creating a textual reading, different readers will read the same text differently, will engage with its implicatures differently and will produce different translations reflecting aspects of the mind behind the text. (2006: 114)

Her cognitive approach to the translation of style is interesting in that she encompasses on the one hand the translator-*cum*-reader, moving from "the meaning *implied* by the text" to "the meaning *inferred from* the text by the translator", and on the other hand the translator-*cum*-writer (Boase-Beier 2006: 74). This brings us to the productive part of translation, the actual translation process, which is where most of the translator's *choices* take place.

3. The Translator as Writer and the Element of *Choice*

As a producer of a new text the translator is by default a writer. In *The Open Work*, Eco describes form as "the culmination of a process of figuration and the beginning of a series of successive interpretations. As the product of a process of figuration, form is the cessation of the forming process which has reached its conclusion" (Eco 1989: 163). And he goes on to explain that "this theory of interpretation acquires full meaning only if style is defined as a way of forming" (ibid.: 164). Therefore, the form that the translator chooses to activate is a direct reflection of his/her interpretation of the text and is crystalized in stylistic choices. Style is not just a different way of saying the same thing, but conveys meaning that is different according to each reader.

Again two questions are worth asking here. Firstly, is there a creative part in the translators' work? And secondly, if style is directly linked with *choice*, the question rises as to the mechanism through which these choices are made.

As concerns the creative part of the translator's work, Scott (2012) perceives the translator not as an "executant, but [as] a composing performer" (ibid.: 46) who "endlessly re-improvises the text" (ibid.: 54). He proposes two models of translation, that of transmission, which serves the purpose of giving access to the ST to those that don't speak the source language (SL), and that of survival (in accordance with Benjamin's *Überleben*), which is addressed to readers who are well acquainted with the ST and in which "the translator can freely insert himself/herself into the ongoing progress of the text" (ibid.: 100–102). According to him, "its task is to make what we might have thought we knew into something unknown, linguistically disestablished, which must therefore be re-assimilated, re-acculturated, in some form or other" (ibid.: 102). In this sense, the ST infinitely acquires 'afterlives' as it is relocated in time and space.

> In other words, these images belong to the poem as part of its projection of itself into new futures, and belong to me as a reader whose available image-bank spontaneously and unavoidably re-inflects, or re-metabolises, the poem, inserting it into new intertexts and other fields of reference. (Scott 2012: 63)

Scott's approach is in accordance with what Barthes (1977: 161) was claiming when he saw the original writer as but belonging to the past of the text, the present and future being constantly reshaped.

As concerns the second question, according to Verdonk, *choice* is the cornerstone to the study of style because "it rests on the fundamental assumption that different choices will produce different styles and thereby different effects" which "depend on the reader assuming that these features are a matter of motivated choice on the part of the writer, that they are designed to be noticed" (2002: 6, 9). These claims can, of course, readily be seen to apply to the stylistic choices of the translator as well. So out of the numerous options they have at their disposal, how do translators make their translation choices? In my opinion, the translators' whole life trajectory partakes in the shaping of their aesthetic, linguistic, and evaluative criteria, a position which I will elaborate on below. In what follows, a short introduction to Bourdieu's sociological approach to taste in *Distinction* (1984) can be seen to offer itself for application in matters of translational style. *Habitus* will be proposed as a theoretical concept to address both the manner in which translators *interpret* their STs and *make* their personal stylistic *choices* in their TTs.

4. Bourdieu, *Habitus*, and the Sociology of Taste

In *Distinction*, Bourdieu presents an in-depth study of the social factors that influence taste and of how aesthetic sense functions as a sense of distinction. It

goes without saying that Bourdieu viewed taste as a social construct. Thus, taste is influenced by one's class, education, and whole life trajectory, which makes it a complex and multifaceted notion. Bourdieu defines the habitus as follows:

> [T]he habitus is both the generative principle of objectively classifiable judgements and the system of classification (*principium divisionis*) of these practices. It is in the relationship between the two capacities which define the habitus, the capacity to produce classifiable practices and works, and the capacity to differentiate and appreciate these practices and products (taste), that the represented social world, i.e., the space of lifestyles, is constituted. The habitus is not only a structuring structure, which organizes practices and the perception of practices, but also a structured structure: the principle of division into logical classes which organizes the perception of the social world is itself the product of internalization of the division into social classes. (Bourdieu 1984: 170)

In what is of interest to us here, habitus constitutes a theoretical tool with which to address both the manner in which translators as agents perceive and appropriate reality while *interpreting* their STs, and how they generate classifiable practices as they write their TTs in the form of their translation *choices*.

More concretely, in what concerns the translators' *interpretation* of their STs one can discern two aspects. On the one hand, translators as agents perceive reality differently in accordance with their habitus. Thus, translators-*cum*-readers interpret their STs differently having a different understanding of the implicatures in them through the mediation of their habitus. Bourdieu has shown that even in the case of common words, "different classes either give them different meanings, or give to apparently neutral words the same meaning but attribute opposite values to the things named" (1984: 194). Language is not "an ethical organon common to all classes", but "is both common to the different classes and capable of receiving different, even opposite, meanings in the particular, and sometimes antagonistic, uses that are made of it" (ibid.). On the other hand, habitus is directly linked with the translators' aesthetic appreciation of their ST, which Bourdieu has also shown to be socially conditioned. The "reading" of a work of art, what Leech and Short (1984: 49) call "stylistic competence", is not the same for all recipients:

> A work of art has meaning and interest only for someone who possesses the cultural competence, that is, the code, into which it is encoded. The conscious or unconscious implementation of explicit or implicit schemes of perception and appreciation which constitutes pictorial or musical culture is the hidden condition for recognizing the styles characteristic of a period, a school or an author, and, more generally, for the familiarity with the internal logic of works that aesthetic enjoyment presupposes. (Bourdieu 1984: 2)

And he goes on to say that the beholder of a work of art

> cannot move from the "primary stratum of the meaning we can grasp on the basis of our ordinary experience" to the "stratum of secondary meanings", i.e. the "level of the mean-

ing of what is signified", unless he possesses the concepts which go beyond the sensible
properties and which identify the specifically stylistic properties of the work. (Ibid.: 3)

He cautions us that "[t]he encounter with a work of art is not 'love at first sight'
as is generally presupposed", but "implies the implementation of a cognitive
acquirement, a cultural code" (ibid.).

This "cultural code" is directly linked with the translators' *cultural capital*
built through long years of acquaintance with and internalization of that code.
The translators' "stylistic competence" cannot be seen as limited to their pro-
fessional formation, but is also the result of their whole life trajectory. This is
true because the translators' habitus does not solely consist of their *professional
habitus* through the internalization of their training and the positions they have
taken in their field(s) of activity,[14] but also of their personal habitus, which is
shaped through their whole life trajectory, their class background, their educa-
tion, their ideological positioning, and their cultural capital. I fully agree with
Meylaerts when she says that "a socialized individual cannot be reduced to a
profession" and that translators "are always more than mere translators" (ibid.:
94).[15] Especially when dealing with the work of individual translators rather
than schools or genres, it is of utmost importance to consider the translator's
whole life trajectory if one is to seek causation behind particular translation
choices.

On the level of translation production, i.e. the actual writing process, habi-
tus, being a disposition to act in a certain manner, also offers itself as a descrip-
tive tool as it can be directly linked with translatorial *choice*. Bourdieu has
shown habitus to be the motivation behind aesthetic *choices*:

> […] the different inherited asset structures, together with social trajectory, command
> the habitus and the systematic choices it produces in all areas of practice, of which the
> choices commonly regarded as aesthetic are one dimension […]. (Bourdieu 1984: 260)

The translators' habitus, which is a structuring structure, urges them to make
particular translation *choices* rather than others, including stylistic ones, as if
these were the only natural course of action. Bourdieu describes this as an "il-
lusion of spontaneous generation which this cultivated disposition tends to pro-
duce by presenting itself in the guise of an innate disposition" (Bourdieu 1984:
99). Speaking of the influence of the habitus on taste, he says that:

> "De gustibus non est disputandum" […] because each taste feels itself to be natural –
> and so it almost is, being a habitus – which amounts to rejecting others as unnatural
> and therefore vicious. (Bourdieu 1984: 56)

The translators' habitus influences their stylistic *choices* on the level of pro-
duction. The translators' "stylistic competence", by which they are able to dis-

cern various stylistic features of the ST, also serves them in the reproduction of these features in the TT or the production of their own stylistic features in it. The greater the translators' cultural and educational capital, the greater their acquaintance with and ability to discern even the subtlest stylistic features in order to reproduce them in the TT. The translators' lexical armoury and their mastering of tropes, their abiding by or transgression of linguistic rules, their use of register, their acquaintance with translation strategies may all be seen as part of their "stylistic competence". According to Bourdieu:

> Linguistic ease may be manifested either in the tours de force of going beyond what is required by strictly grammatical or pragmatic rules, making optional liaisons, for example, or using rare words and tropes in place of common words and phrases, or in the freedom from demands of language or situation that is asserted in the liberties taken by those who are known to know better. (Bourdieu 1984: 255)

Of course, habitus does not function in a deterministic unidirectional manner, but is always open to a "field of possibles" which are more or less strong in each individual according to their class position (Bourdieu 1984: 110).[16] Bourdieu explains that the aesthetic sense functions as a sense of distinction. "[I]t unites and separates. […] [I]t distinguishes [and] […] classifies" (1984: 56). Style is a manner through which the translator is placed within the social space. Tastes, says Bourdieu, are "asserted purely negatively, by the refusal of other tastes" (1984: 56). In other words, translators may be seen as belonging to one school rather than another and their personal style may be approached through their rejection of other alternatives.

All in all, the translators' habitus is involved in the whole translation process, from the interpretation of the ST to the writing of the TT, from the choice of author and ST, the reading and aesthetic appreciation of the ST, to the translation choices made on the microlevel while actually producing the TT.

5. On Methodology

The fact that a single term, *habitus*, can address both the reception and the production of texts renders it a useful descriptive tool for TS. But could we use habitus as a tool to account for the motivation behind translatorial decisions? How can we methodologically address the issue of translatorial style? Many translation scholars have acknowledged that contextual factors influence the translators' choices without actually using the term habitus. Translation Studies is by nature interdisciplinary, therefore, instead of re-inventing the wheel and coming up with yet another term, I propose to borrow the already well-established notion of habitus. What is actually needed is not another term, but a way

of understanding the very complex factors that influence the translator as an agent during the process of translation.

The methodology proposed is the macro-micro approach, in other words a combination of macrolevel contextual research, along with microlevel stylistic study.[17] Both levels are indispensable if we are to reach any sound conclusions as to the motivation behind translatorial *choices*. Contrasting with the strictly text-based approach of New Criticism,[18] which denied any interpretation outside the text itself on the one hand, and the contextual approach of the culturalist paradigm which tended to disregard the text at large, I believe both are indispensable. Wolf quite convincingly warns of "the danger of a sociology of translation existing without translation" (2007: 27) and she reminds us that "[i]n fact Bourdieu himself stressed the necessity of combining these two levels, a methodological move which enables a comprehensive explanation of the functional logics in the field."[19]

More concretely, the researcher is to look into the translators' life trajectories[20] and then study their TTs under that light. Evidence to reconstruct the translators' trajectories might include anything from the historical backdrop within which they worked, their family and class background, their position in their field(s) of activity, any schools of thought or ideology they were influenced by, their original work and style in the case they were writers themselves. To these we should add any declarations by the translators themselves in introductions, footnotes, articles, original works, although the latter should be dealt with tentatively,[21] because, as the habitus functions on an unconscious level, it is not uncommon for translators to claim one thing and do quite the contrary, or follow a translation strategy for reasons other than what they themselves believe they have.

Very often, precisely due to the long-standing tendency towards the translator's invisibility, it is difficult to obtain information on the translators' life trajectories unless they are known for other things, such as being writers or politicians. This makes the gathering of data extremely difficult, if not impossible. Nevertheless, the study of the TT itself against the backdrop of other contextual data can also give us valuable information. The work of Caroline Spurgeon (1935), who attempted to reconstruct aspects of Shakespeare's life and thought through the study of his use of imagery in his plays, is exemplary in this respect.

The contextual study then is to be triangulated with the study of the TT itself. Such a study can lead to surprises, as the findings from the microlevel study of a TT may be quite contrary to what one might expect by limiting one's research to contextual factors. But stylistic choices may include an impressive array of elements ranging from the choice of original writer and ST – in the cases that the choice was the translators' and they weren't commissioned to do

the translation – to the overall translation strategy, the use of paratextual features, such as the use of prefaces, footnotes or endnotes, down to microlevel lexical and morphosyntactical choices. So, how are researchers to decide which of the innumerable aspects of the text are stylistically significant and worth studying? The answer, I propose, lies in the notions of *patterns* and *deviance* which "foreground" translation *choices*, in other words make them more salient, thus indicating that they are "motivated" and "designed to be noticed", as Verdonk suggests (2002: 6, 9).

Recurrent translation behavioural *patterns*[22] are strong indicators that a phenomenon is not random or idiosyncratic, but is a conscious (or unconscious) choice resulting from the habitus. Theoretically, this can be explained by Bourdieu's claim that

> systematicity is found in the opus operatum because it is in the modus operandi. […]
> It is found […] in all practices in which agents manifest their distinction, […] because
> it is in the synthetic unity of the habitus, the unifying, generative principle of all prac
> tices. (Bourdieu 1984: 173)

In other words, we can see systematicity in the translators' practice because there is systematicity in the organizing principle, which is none other than their habitus. Thus, by studying their systematic practices, in other words *patterns*, we might glimpse at their habitus in action. Patterns can include anything from the choice of STs to microlevel morphosyntactic choices.

Another strong indicator of the work of the habitus is *deviance*[23] from the expected practice, as well as from the style of the ST, because this again is a strong indicator of motivated stylistic choices.[24] Deviance is proposed in the framework of the study of translation style and refers to difference from either the style of the ST or the norms of the target culture (TC) for the particular text type.[25] Unlike *patterns*, *deviance* can include one-off instances that may be of stylistic interest.

The above approach is not without risk of subjectivity as it is always a matter of the research questions set, which is true for any scientific method, though. Verdonk's (2002: 74, 78) concern that there is always the danger of the researcher's subjectivity biasing the outcome of the research is not unfounded.[26] That having been said, the search for *patterns* and *deviance* can help weed out the most salient stylistic features, and the macro-micro method proposed is bound to offer sounder conclusions than either of its components in isolation can do.

In what follows, I will attempt to test the validity of the proposed methodology against the case of Yorgos Himonas' rendering of *Hamlet* into Greek (1980).

6. Yorgos Himonas' Rendering of *Hamlet* (1988): A Case Study

Yorgos Himonas (1938–2000) was active both as a writer and a psychiatrist. Although he was of petite bourgeois origin, it seems that his habitus was decisively shaped by his studies in France and the French literary, aesthetic, philosophical, as well as socio-political developments that took place in the 1970s, when he was a student there. The fact that Himonas had been studying in France until the eve of the May 1968 uprising should by no means be overlooked. The ideological debates and the literary trends that were in vogue in Paris and which had deep reverberations shaking the whole value system of Europe at the time had a definite and profound influence on the formation of his habitus. The writings of theoreticians such as Derrida and Blanchot seem to have had a deep influence on his own views. He was also deeply affected by the work of Lacan, whose lectures he attended as a psychiatry student at the university.

These influences profoundly affected both Himonas' own writing and his translation practice. His professional translations appeared rather late in life. His translation theory was also indelibly formulated under the influence of New Criticism views concerning the self-determinacy of the text and its independence from the writer and Barthian views on the "death of the Author" as well as the postmodernist reappropriation of tradition and free use of intertextual borrowing. In the following extract, Himonas' claims show a clear influence by the poststructuralist idea of the "death of the Author":

> The artist does not exist outside his writing. His work develops to the detriment of the self; the writer never existed; instead of him there are his writings. […] Whatever happens must happen while the text lasts. All must have finished when the text finishes. (Himonas 1995: 71, 57–58; here and hereafter: my translation)

The above theories decisively influenced his translation strategy. In his speech at the Goulandris-Horn Foundation on February 6, 1992, entitled "The faithful translation and the incredulous translator", Himonas explains his translation theory more clearly than anywhere else (1995: 141–51). To an accusation against him that he distances himself from the foreign text and "appropriates the original text, urged by his [...] need to somewhat expand his own personal language", he pleads "guilty", and goes on to defend himself differentiating between what he calls "appropriation", which he considers to be immoral, and what he describes as "expansion" (ibid.: 142), introducing parameters of interpretation. Influenced by the postmodern reappropriation of tradition, he perceives the text as a palimpsest and describes his translation strategy as an "excavation" aimed at "liberating" its true meaning:

> [...] the ethics imposed by the translational excavation which attempts to impose the liberation of the hidden living functions that are keeping the body of tragedy alive. Definitely not by changing its form. But helping it as much and in any way he can to breathe better. This is the fidelity I am talking about, its spaciousness. (Himonas 1995: 147)

The premise behind this liberal approach to his ST stems from his understanding of every text as self-sufficient and open to interpretation. This is a creative approach that is very close to what Scott proposes as the "survival model".

Himonas chose to render five tragedies altogether, all of which were among the most prominent canonical texts that have shaped the formation of Western drama as such, namely Shakespeare's *Hamlet* (1988) and *Macbeth* (1994), Sophocles' *Electra* (1984), and Euripides' *Bacchae* (1985) and *Medea* (1989). His choice of STs was driven by his postmodern interest to return to tradition in a new manner. Furthermore, Himonas' appropriation of Shakespeare's classic texts can be seen in the light of Bourdieu's (1984: 282) reference to owners of works of art. The appropriation of a classic text seen in a new manner gives the beholder the status of *aficionado*. The "owner's" unique personality can come through by means of his "unique mode of appropriation" of the classic ST. "Liking the same things differently" can be a strategy to achieve symbolic power. Therefore, Himonas distinguished himself by opposition to Shakespeare (see Bourdieu 1984: 52).

Form was, of course, of utmost importance in his venture.[27] What he aimed at was rendering the text in a language that would differ from the norm for tragedy up to then. Instead of aiming at fidelity on the surface level and formal equivalence, he took liberties to destabilize the text in an attempt to "excavate" what he perceived as the true meaning underneath. He considered Shakespeare's Elizabethan style to be outdated and pompous and too elaborate for modern audiences, so he attempted to transfer the unadorned bare essence of what he thought was the true core of the play by employing a very pithy, succinct, laconic style.[28] Unsurprisingly, this was the very style he used in his own original writing. In fact, his translations are stylistically much closer to his own writing than to Shakespeare's Elizabethan style. Extracts 1–3 (Table 1) are randomly picked out of the overall *pattern* of succinct rendering throughout his TT.

In extract 1, he eliminates the metaphor and, in extract 2, the whole image of the spirit walking at a specific time. In extract 3, apart from a *deviance* in style, there is an important *deviance* in the propositional meaning in his TT as well. This extract is the Queen's retort when Claudius informs her that Polonius is about to reveal to them the cause of Hamlet's distress. Whereas in the ST, Gertrude attributes his distress to "his father's death and [their] o'er-hasty marriage", in Himonas' rendering ["death   and marriage"], the distress is caused not by the particular death and marriage, but by the abstract concepts of death

and marriage, thus becoming much more existential. His *interpretation* of the play is obviously affected by his habitus at this point.

Table 1

No	Shakespeare (Arden)	Himonas	Backtranslation
1	(1.4.1) Ham: The air bites shrewdly, it is very cold.	Κρυώνω	I am cold
2	(1.4.5–6) Hor: It then draws near the season | Wherein the spirit held his wont to walk.	Τότε | Είναι η ώρα	Then | it is time.
3	(2.2.56–67) Queen: I doubt it is no other but the main, | His father's death and our o'er-hasty marriage.	Φοβάμαι ότι το ξέρουμε κι εμείς | Ο θάνατος κι ο γάμος	I am afraid we know it, too | Death and marriage

Apart from the succinct style, Himonas employs his own deviant spelling, punctuation, and syntax. He also introduces stage directions that affect the interpretation of the tragedy, as well as other elements in the TT that are absent in the ST and reflect his own ideological positionings. All these are instances in which, according to Hermans, the translator's voice "breaks through the surface of the text, speaking for itself".

Table 2

No	Shakespeare (Arden)	Himonas	Backtranslation
4	(2.2.431–433) Ham: - for the play, I remember, pleased not the million, 'twas caviare to the general.	Το έργο εκείνο δεν άρεσε στον κόσμο. Όμως εγώ το αγάπησα. Γιατί η τέχνη δεν είναι για τους πολλούς Ούτε είναι για τους λίγους, είναι πάντα για τον καθένα χωριστά.	That play was not of the people's liking. But I loved it. Because art is not for the multitude Nor is it for the few, it is always for each person individually.

In extract 4 (Table 2, p. 175), for example, Himonas introduces his own view that art is open to personal interpretation and appreciation, which is quite different from Shakespeare's view on the matter. Evidently this deviates from his own overall succinct style, as instead of shortening the text he adds text of his own in the TT, "expanding" it to interpret the ST by means of his own ideological positionings.

In the following extract (Table 3), Himonas seems to be influenced by the historic context and superimposes on Hamlet the disillusionment with Himonas' own generation:

Table 3

No	Shakespeare (Arden)	Himonas	Backtranslation
5	(3.1.117–19) Ham: You shouldn't have believed me; for virtue cannot so inoculate our old stock but we shall relish of it. I loved you not.	Δεν έπρεπε να με πιστέψεις. | Το δέντρο έχει ξεραθεί δεν σηκώνει άλλο μπόλιασμα | Η γενηά μου γέρασε πριν την ώρα της. Καμμιά ζωή | Δεν θα την ξαναζωντανέψει. Από 'δω και πέρα | τίποτε δεν θα μας δίνει χαρά. Δεν σ' αγάπησα	You shouldn't have believed me. | The tree has withered away and cannot be grafted anymore | My generation has aged prematurely. No life | Can reinvigorate it. From now on | nothing shall give us mirth. I loved you not

Extract 5 is from 3.1, where Hamlet tells Ophelia that she shouldn't have believed him when he said he loved her. Shakespeare uses a horticultural metaphor, using *inoculate* in its etymological sense (=graft). According to the metaphor, a graft of virtue cannot change our original sinful nature to such an extent that we may not still have the flavour of it (Jenkins 2002: 282). Hence, the sense is 'I loved you not, the love I had for you was not love as we are all sinners'. Himonas grasps the opportunity to express his disillusionment with his generation in accordance with his views on the "end of time", as well as his disappointment with his own "lost generation". This must have been readily received as such when spoken on stage at the time, especially after the second post-Junta period.

Himonas also superimposes his own images and metaphors on Shakespeare's text, and in so doing he brings out important shifts to the content of the tragedy. The two most persistent images that he superimposes on the play

are those of death and sexuality. In *Hamlet*, more than in any other of his works, Shakespeare ponders death, the afterlife, including the famous soliloquy of (3.1) ("to be or not to be"), from the postulates and problematic of the Christian Renaissance man. In Himonas' *Hamlet*, on the other hand, the line between life and death is very thin, even indiscernible.

Table 4

No	Shakespeare (Arden)	Himonas	Backtranslation
6	(1.1.46–47) Bar: Looks a not like the King? Mark it Horatio. | Hor: Most like.	Βερ: Οράτιε. Δες. Η μορφή του βασιληά Ορ: Θεέ μου. Ο βασιλέας	Bar: Horatio. Look. The figure of the King. Hor: My God. The King
7	(1.5.9) Ghost: I am thy father's spirit,	Είμαι ο πατέρας σου.	I am thy father.

The above extracts (Table 4) are one-off cases of *deviance* from the ST that are strong indicators of motivated choices worth studying. In Himonas' version, instead of seeing his father's ghost, Hamlet actually sees his father. In extract 6, "most like" [the King], becomes "the King" in the TT. Even more tellingly, in extract 7, Himonas' ghost says "I am thy father", instead of Shakespeare's "I am thy father's spirit". Influenced by Maurice Blanchot, Himonas believed that the ultimate "absolute experience" is death. Thus his Hamlet is self-destructive. He does not ponder death, like his Shakespearean counterpart, but actually longs for it. Hamlet's famous dilemma in his "To be or not to be" soliloquy (3.1.56–88), in which he verbally flagellates himself on his cowardice, is rendered by Himonas as "To be. To be not". By eliminating the disjunctive conjunction "or" of the ST, he deprives the hero of any alternative. As if that were not enough, he actually adds the line "I want to die" in Hamlet's soliloquy (2.2.544–601). The final lines of the (3.1) soliloquy are also rendered in a sharp, unwavering style that decisively tilts towards "not being". The rhythm is hectic and almost urges himself, and by extension his reader/spectator, to take his own life, ending his misery with the following words (my backtranslation):

> You are gripped by fear   you stall
> And live. And the debacle continues living
> from your life. Finish this world
> Finish your life. This very minute. Now. With a dagger

Despite the fact that Himonas' translation practice of creatively destabilizing the ST was innovative and lay outside what had been the norm for the translation of drama at the time, his rendering was as remarkably well-received as was his original writing, both on page and on stage. His Shakespearean translations, namely *Hamlet* (1988) and *Macbeth* (1994), are being staged ever since despite the fact that there have been later renderings of the plays. The positive reception of his renderings continued uncontested even after his death. What made his work in general and his translations in particular so successful was the shift of the translation norm. Translation practices that would have been unthinkable a decade before became extremely successful. Himonas' avantgarde translation of *Hamlet* was instrumental in this shift in the norm.

To sum up, Himonas' habitus influenced his choice of text, his interpretation of Hamlet as a suicidal youth, his translation strategy of "excavation", his (non-)transference of the ST's Elizabethan style, as well as the employment of his own succinct style throughout.

7. Conclusions

In this contribution, the notion of habitus was proposed as a theoretical tool to account for the internalization of contextual factors by translators and the way these influence the manner in which they *interpret* their STs, as well as the way they make non-compulsory translation *choices* during the translation process in their TTs, from the choice of writer and ST, to microlevel stylistic choices. By studying the microlevel stylistic choices against macrolevel contextual factors within which the translation took place, including the translator's life trajectory, one sheds light on the causation behind these choices. Although I looked into one case, the claims would appear to be of wider validity. The method can be triangulated with other methodologies coming from other process-based and primarily cognitive approaches[29] and tested against larger corpora. Such approaches give the researcher access to different kinds of information, though not necessarily to the causation behind it. Finally, I believe that when it comes to literary translation, a "manual" microlevel study of the TT is indispensable as one-off cases are sometimes very revealing and it is up to the researchers keen eye to pick them out.[30] Through the study of instances in the TT of *patterns* and *deviance* from the ST or the norms of the time, one can weed out the stylistic features that are most salient and therefore motivated.

Notes

1 In her seminal work *Stylistic Approaches to Translation*, Boase-Beier presents the state-of-the-art on the topic.

2 *Dictionary of Stylistics*. 2001. London: Longman. 371. Quoted in Boase-Beier (2006: 4).

3 For a more detailed taxonomy, see Boase-Beier (2006: 5). Baker distinguishes between the style of an individual writer or speaker (e.g. the style of James Joyce), linguistic features associated with texts produced by specific groups of language users and in a specific institutional setting (e.g. the style of newspaper editorials), or stylistic features specific to texts produced in a particular historical period (e.g. Medieval English, Renaissance French) (2000: 243).

4 See Baker (2000: 242).

5 Hermans attributes this illusion of the translator's invisibility to what Brian Harris called "the true interpreter's norm" or "the honest spokesperson's norm", which "requires that people who speak on behalf of others […] re-express the original speakers' ideas and the manner of expressing them as accurately as possible and without significant omissions, and not mix them up with their own ideas and expressions" (Harris 1990: 118; quoted in Hermans 1996: 23).

6 Baker (2000: 245) uses the term *thumb-print* to refer to the literary translator's style, expressed in linguistic, as well as non-linguistic features, such as his or her "choice of the type of material to translate, where applicable, and his or her consistent use of specific strategies, including the use of prefaces or afterwords, footnotes, glossing in the body of the text, etc". Mick Short (1996: 331) before her used the term "fingerprinting" to refer to the use of statistical data to count frequencies of items in order to account for a writer's personal style. Baker borrowed the approach to study the personal style of two literary translators based on data from TEC (the Translational English Corpus) at the Centre for TS (UMIST) Manchester.

7 For more on choice, see Boase-Beier (2006: 52). For style as motivated choice, see Verdonk (2002: 5).

8 For more on the translator as reader, see Boase-Beier (2002: 31–49).

9 For a historic overview of those theories, see Eco (1990: 44–46).

10 "[…] the voice loses its origin, the author enters into his own death, writing begins" (Barthes, "The Death of the Author" in Barthes 1977: 142–43).

11 "[T]he modern scriptor is born simultaneously with the text, is in no way equipped with a being preceding or exceeding the writing, is not the subject with the book as predicate; there is no other time than that of the enunciation and every text is eternally written *here and now*" ("The Death of the Author" in Barthes 1977: 145).

12 She quotes him from his "The Liberation of the Icon: A Brief Survey from Classical Rhetoric to Cognitive Stylistics" in *Journal of Literary Studies* 15(3/4): 295. Nevertheless, we should also mention the fact that Verdonk (2002: 68) also stresses the importance of the social reading and ideological positioning of the reader and its effect on interpretation, through which we become sensitized to the possibility of alternative readings linked to socio-political values.

13 Boase-Beier says that "[a] translator's work will proceed by 'pretending' s/he knows what the text (or by extension its author) is saying, just as the recipient of any act of communication will; that is, the translator will take implications found in the text to be implicatures (or intended implications). At the same time a stylistically-aware translator will know that s/he has constructed this view of the author and that the author is therefore an inferred author" (2006: 113).

14 On the translator's professional habitus, see Simeoni (1998), Gouanvic (2002), Inghilleri (2003), Sela-Sheffy (2005), and Meylaerts (2008).

15 Meylaerts is also right in saying that we need "a conceptualization of the human actor as a socialized individual. We need a sociology at the individual level, analyzing social reality in its individualized, internalized form". On this, also see Lahire (2003).

16 On the dynamic nature of habitus, see Sela-Sheffy (2005: 19), Meylaerts (2008: 94), and

Hekkanen (2009: 8–9).

17 Speaking of literary criticism and the study of style, Verdonk implies something similar when he says that "the fine-grained analysis of texture cannot of itself reveal these features of the fictional work. What it can do is to provide supporting evidence for interpretation by indicating how the macro features that the literary critic is concerned with might be reflected in the micro features of linguistic texture" (2002: 56).

18 New Criticism, structuralist and generative linguistics do text-based literary criticism. On the other hand, Boase-Beier reminds us that not all linguistic approaches to TS are decontextualized (2006: 9). Pragmatics for one is "concerned with the circumstances under which language is used, including their historical and sociological aspects" (ibid.).

19 Wolf (2007: 17) with reference to Bourdieu (1999: 362)

20 "During the translation procedure, the act of translating is incorporated through, and at the same time influenced by, the translator's habitus, which can be identified by reconstructing the translator's social trajectory" (Wolf 2007: 19).

21 Boase-Beier also agrees to this (2006: 50).

22 Baker has also stressed the importance of patterns in the study of style (2000: 245, 258) and Verdonk says that foregrounding can be seen to "include a distinct patterning or parallelism in a text's typography, sounds, word choices, grammar, or sentence structures" (2002: 6).

23 Leech and Short have used the term *deviance* to account for statistical "difference between the normal frequency of a feature, and its frequency in the text or corpus" (1984: 48).

24 Verdonk also mentions deviance as stylistically relevant (2002: 6).

25 Baker has rightly cautioned of the need to "distinguish stylistic elements which are attributable only to the translator from those which simply reflect the source author's style, general source language preferences, or the poetics and preferences of a particular subset of translators?" (2000: 261).

26 Bourdieu's self-reflexivity always serves as an excellent approach to address the researcher's subjectivity.

27 "The primacy of the mode of representation over the object of representation demands categorically an attention to form" (Bourdieu 1984: 3).

28 For an in-depth analysis on the sociological reverberations of stylistic simplicity, see Bourdieu (1984: 76, 177, and 226–227).

29 For cognitive-oriented research to translation and the state-of-the-art in research methods, including think-aloud protocols (TAPs), keyboard logging, screen recording, eye tracking and physiological measures, see O'Brien 2011.

30 The work of Tim Parks on literary style is exemplary in this effect.

References

Primary References

Shakespeare, William. 1988. *Hamlet*. (tr. Yorgos Himonas). Athens: Kedros.
Shakespeare, William. 2002 [1982]. *Hamlet*. (ed. Harold Jenkins) (The Arden Edition of the Works of William Shakespeare). London: Thomson.

Secondary References

Baker, Mona. 2000. 'Towards a Methodology for Investigating the Style of a Literary Translator' in *Target* 12(2): 241–266.

Barthes, Roland. 1974. *S/Z* (tr. Richard Miller). Malden, MA and Oxford: Blackwell.

—. 1977. *Image Music Text*. Essays selected and translated by Stephen Heath. London: Fontana Press.

Boase-Beier, Jean. 2006. *Stylistic Approaches to Translation*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984. *Distinction. A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste* (tr. Richard Nice). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

—. 1986. *Social space and symbolic power*. Lecture delivered at the University of California, San Diego, in March of 1986 (tr. Loïc J.D. Wacquant). A French version appeared in Bourdieu, Pierre. 1987. *Choses dites*. Paris: Editions de Minuit. 147–166.

—. 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power* (ed. John B. Thompson, tr. Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

—. 1999. *Die Regeln der Kunst. Genese und Struktur des literarischen Feldes* (tr. Bernd Schwibs and Achim Russer).

Eco, Umberto. 1989. *The Open Work* (tr. Anna Cancogni). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

—. 1990. *The Limits of Interpretation*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Gouanvic, Jean-Marc. 2002. 'A Model of Structuralist Constructivism in Translation Studies' in Hermans, Theo (ed.) *Crosscultural transgressions*. Manchester: St. Jerome. 93–102.

—. 2005. 'A Bourdieusian Theory of Translation, or the Coincidence of Practical Instances: Field, "Habitus", Capital and "Illusio"' in *The Translator* 11(2): 147–166.

Hekkanen, Raila. 2009. 'Fields, Networks and Finnish Prose: A Comparison of Bourdieusian Field Theory and Actor-Network Theory in Translation Sociology' in De Crom, Dries (ed.) *Selected Papers of CETRA Research Seminar in Translation Studies 2008*. On line at: http://www.kuleuven.be/cetra/papers/papers.html (last accessed 21 January 2014).

Hermans, Theo (1996). 'The Translator's Voice in Translated Narrative' in *Target* 8(1) 23–48.

Himonas, Yorgos. 1995. *Pion fovate i Virginia Woolf: dimosia kimena* [*Who is Virginia Woolf afraid of: public texts*]. Athens: Kastaniotis.

Inghilleri, Moira. 2003. 'Habitus, field and discourse. Interpreting as a socially situated activity' in *Target* 15(2): 243–268.

Jenkins, Harold (ed.). 2002 [1982]. William Shakespeare. *Hamlet*. (The Arden Edition of the Works of William Shakespeare). London: Thomson.

Lahire, Bernard. 2003. 'From the habitus to an individual heritage of dispositions. Towards a sociology at the level of the individual' in *Poetics* 31(5–6): 329–355.

Leech, Geoffrey N. and Michael H. Short. 1984 [1981]. *Style in Fiction. A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose*. London and New York: Longman.

Meylaerts, Reine. 2008. 'Translators and (their) norms: towards a sociological construction of the individual' in Pym, Anthony, Miriam Shlesinger and Daniel Simeoni (eds) *Beyond Descriptive Translation Studies: Investigations in homage to Gideon Toury*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 91–102.

O'Brien, Sharon (ed.) (2011). *Cognitive Explorations of Translation*. London and New York: Continuum.

Parks, Tim (2007). *A Literary Approach to Translation – A Translation Approach to Literature*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Pym, Anthony. 2009. 'Humanizing Translation History' in *Hermes* 42: 23–48. On line at: http://download2.hermes.asb.dk/archive/download/Hermes-42-3-pym_net.pdf (last accessed 21 January 2014).

Scott, Clive (2012). *Literary Translation and the Discovery of Reading*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Short, Mick. 1997 [1996]. *Exploring the Language of Poems, Plays and Prose*. London and New York: Longman.

Simeoni, Daniel. 1995. 'Translating and studying translation: the view from the agent' in *Meta* 40(3): 445–460.

—. 1998. 'The Pivotal Status of the Translator's Habitus' in *Target* 10(1): 1–39.

—. 2007. 'Between sociology and history. Method in context and in practice' in Wolf, Michaela and Alexandra Fukari (eds) *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 187–204.

Sela-Sheffy, Rafeket. 2005. 'How to Be a (Recognized) Translator: Rethinking Habitus, Norms, and the Field of Translation' in *Target* 17(1): 1–26.

Spurgeon, Caroline. 1935. *Shakespeare's Imagery and What It Tells Us*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Verdonk, Peter. 1999. 'The Liberation of the Icon: A Brief Survey from Classical Rhetoric to Cognitive Stylistics' in *Journal of Literary Studies* 15(3/4): 291–304.

—. 2002. *Stylistics*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Wolf, Michaela. 2007. 'Introduction. The emergence of a sociology of translation' in Wolf, Michaela and Alexandra Fukari (eds) *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 1–36.

—. 2009. 'The implications of a sociological turn – methodological and disciplinary questions' in Pym, Anthony and Alexander Perekrestenko (eds) *Translation Research 2*. Tarragona: Intercultural Studies Group. 73–79. On line at: http://isg.urv.es/publicity/isg/publications/trp_2_2009/chapters/wolf.pdf (consulted 08.11.2011).

—. 2010. 'Sociology of translation' in Gambier, Yves and Luc van Doorslaer (eds) *Handbook of Translation Studies*. Vol. 1. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 337–343.