The Nobel Prize and the European Dream. Harry Mulisch's European Authorship from a National and an International Perspective[1]

Sander Bax, Tilburg University

Abstract: There is a great difference between Harry Mulisch's international reputation as a politically committed public intellectual with a European focus and his national reputation as a well-known literary celebrity. The public intellectual should be taken quite seriously, for he even has a certain political influence. The literary celebrity, on the other hand, can be considered a harmless figure who is there just to entertain us. This different classification of Harry Mulisch' authorship therefore points at an important schism in the evaluation of the importance of his authorship. The complexity of this problem comes to the fore when we consider his proclaimed candidature for winning the Nobel Prize. Although this candidature was a reality, it soon turned into a gimmick in the Dutch media. In this article I will try to show how this ambivalence in reception and evaluation is the result of Mulisch's own postures. Furthermore, this case study brings to the fore some essential problems of public authorship.

Keywords: European Literature, Central Europe, Public Authorship, Public Intellectual, Literary Celebrity, Nobel Prize, Harry Mulisch

Introduction

Towards the end of 2011, several German newspapers published a manifesto for reviving the 'European Dream'. German writers Peter Schneider and Hans-Christoph Buch, along with their French colleagues André Glucksmann and Bernard-Henri Lévy, argued in favour of a new European dream. This dream was needed to prevent the ongoing economic crisis from destroying the idea of a united Europe: 'Wir brauchen nicht weniger, sondern mehr Europa, nicht weniger, sondern [5] mehr Demokratie.'[2] ('We don't need less Europe but more, not less democracy but more') In their manifesto, the authors referred back to the writer's conference 'Ein Traum von Europa' ('A Dream of Europe'), which took place in Berlin in May 1988. At this conference, several European writers got together to think about a future for Europe. Their efforts included an 'open letter' to the European leaders in which they asked them to allow European citizens to travel freely all over the continent.

Glucksmann, Lévy, Schneider and Buch consider this open letter to be of great importance. It had a political effect, in their opinion it preluded the fall of the Berlin Wall: 'Damals wurde in Berlin die Öffnung der Mauer vorweggenommen – von Harry Mulisch, Susan Sontag, Horst Bienek, Libuše Moníková, Jiri Gruša und anderen Autoren, die nicht mehr unter uns sind.'[3] ('It was in Berlin that the fall of the Wall was anticipated – by (...) and other authors who are no

longer with us') The name of the recently deceased Dutch author Harry Mulisch is mentioned as one of the authors who played a key role in this 'writers' movement'. Glucksmann, Lévy, Schneider and Buch apparently consider him to be one of the important writers of the group. They are right in doing so because Mulisch was the author who took the initiative for the letter. In this context, Mulisch represents a specific type of European authorship: the writer as a public intellectual with political influence and as an important literary voice in the European public sphere.

This case tells us something about Harry Mulisch's international reputation. In Germany and France, some intellectuals consider him to be a writer of international importance. The relevance of his authorship is connected to his appearance as a public intellectual at an international writers' conference: his international colleagues regard Mulisch as an author with a political and philosophical message. This is interesting because in the Dutch literary context the general image of Mulisch's authorship tends to be two-fold: in the Dutch literary field, Mulisch's literary works are mostly received from a literary-critical position best described using the concept of autonomy of literature; in the Dutch media, journalists tend to present Harry Mulisch as a literary celebrity, rather than as a public intellectual.[4] In this article, I will examine this remarkable difference between Mulisch's international self-image and his national self-image.

Public Authorship

To understand this paradoxical situation, we have to take into account the fact that Mulisch's authorship turned into a public authorship from the 1960s onwards. The phenomenon of authorship has changed substantially over the last fifty years.[5] In the second part of the twentieth century, some literary writers have become public (media) figures with great societal prestige. They are welcomed on television shows to discuss or take part in debates on current political events; they speak at political conferences and write polemical essays on societal [6] developments. At the same time, some have become literary celebrities.[6] Their regular appearance in the mass media sometimes results in popularity and even fame. As a result, literary writers can no longer be judged or analyzed solely on the value of their literary works. Their reputation is also built on the reception of a wide range of public performances. To understand authorship today, the literary theorist has to take these developments into account.

Of course, public authorship itself is not something new. The history of the literary writer as a public intellectual has commonly been traced back to Zola's interventions in the Dreyfus Affair and Jean-Paul Sartre's posture during the postwar period.[7] The history of the literary celebrity goes back even further. In the nineteenth century, several authors went on book tours and sold tickets for readings. Authors such as Byron and Dickens have been described as touring celebrity writers.[8] Public authorship is a phenomenon with a long tradition, but its manifestations changed considerably over the years. In the heyday of modernism (late nineteenth and early twentieth century), the literary field was dominated by the conventions of autonomy of literature.[9] These dominant norms, which can be associated with the autonomous or objectivist conception of literature, contrasted with the phenomenon of public celebrity and were sometimes at odds with literary commitment.[10] For most of the twentieth century, public authorship was therefore highly problematic and often had a negative impact on an author's reputation within the literary field.

The rise of mass media and television culture changed this situation rather dramatically. From the 1960s onwards, authors began to play on (at least) two different fields. Although changing itself, the literary field and its autonomous norms were still there (and still exist today), but writers started to operate within the broader public sphere of the mass media as well.[11] In this public sphere, they were evaluated and judged according to an entirely different set of norms. Literary writers had to change their strategies of self-presentation as well as their aesthetic strategies in order to secure their status in both fields at the same time. This put many writers in a difficult position. The same held for other players in the literary field: critics, publishers, educators and literary scholars all had to adjust to the new situation. The difficulties that result from playing simultaneously on two, at times incompatible, fields often evoke a sense of crisis in the players: it is here that we find the reason for the endless proclamations of the death, the end or the suicide of literature. It is not literature that died, but a certain way of *doing literature* was replaced by a newer, more difficult one.

This new way of engaging in literature thus means that – in order to be successful – the literary writer has to 'perform' his own specific version of public authorship as a 'posture' that deals with the specific tensions that come with public authorship.[12] Recent research in the field of Dutch literature has revealed two almost entirely different forms of public authorship, related to two different ways of evaluating the fact that authors went public. Let us start with the most [7] positive one. From one perspective, certain literary writers are regarded as public intellectuals.[13] Although the writer is not an expert in political theory or history, his views on politics and society are considered to be relevant for the discussion in the public sphere.[14] From this perspective, literary writers play an important role in our media culture, and it is important that they do so as literary writers.

From another perspective, public authors are regarded as literary celebrities.[15] Those referring to writers as 'celebrities' tend to have a rather negative opinion of their public performances, the predominant idea being that writers operate in the public sphere to become famous and this fame helps to sell their books. By performing in the public media, they blur the differences between the specificity of literary authorship and the public performances of other types of celebrities (journalists, movie actors, former soccer players). In recent years, the concept of the literary celebrity has been receiving more attention in literary studies. Researchers point to the controversial status of this model of authorship. Franssen, for instance, points out that the literary celebrity embodies a clash of two different socio-aesthetic configurations: literary authorship and public celebrity.[16] Classical (modernist, autonomist) conventions of authorship sometimes clash with the activities a public celebrity has to undertake. In Franssen's account of the literary celebrity, we can recognize the tension between the two fields that authors have to operate in. This same tension arises in discussions about the public intellectual. Following Habermas, Odile Heynders is not certain how to evaluate the current status of the public intellectual:

> The contributions of intellectuals can no longer constitute a 'focal point', although Habermas realizes that it is premature to assert that the electronic revolution is destroying the stage for 'the elitist performances of conceited intellectuals'. As far as television is concerned he points to the element of self-promotion that can be part of public appearance and will inevitably influence the judging public. The intellectual becomes a celebrity; justification becomes less important than staged performance.[17]

The same problem holds for Harry Mulisch's performance as a European public intellectual. He chose to perform this role on the stage that suited him best: his lectures in front of international literary conferences. It is a posture that is 'performed' in what we might call the European literary field and that is directed at the people who attend these conferences: writers, critics, publishers, journalists. When Mulisch appeared in the Dutch public media, he chose to perform another posture, one that differs quite substantially from his international self-image. It takes elements from his international image and turns them into a gimmick, which creates the impression that the author is doing injustice to his own authorship. This difficulty is brought about by the paradoxical status of being both a public intellectual and a literary celebrity at the same time. On the one hand, the [8] rise of the media democracy in the sixties and seventies created the public intellectual, on the other hand it immediately transformed him into an impossible figure. To detach oneself, to watch things from the side line, does not go well with a need to perform in the public media. Certain characteristics of the public intellectual are clearly at odds with the demands of the modern media democracy. Surprisingly enough, however, this impossible figure of the public intellectual can be seen everywhere. He travels between the elitist sphere of specialists (science, politics, literature, philosophy) and the public sphere of the media. In doing so he has to make use of the populist discourses of the public media which by their very nature are the opposite of elitism and specialisation.

Here we arrive at the paradoxical heart of public authorship today. To be a public intellectual one has to be a public celebrity as well. But as a public celebrity one mainly has to play a recognizable and predictable role on the stage of the mass media. The public intellectual, on the other hand, seeks to make himself heard in a more creative and a more critical fashion. To overcome this paradox, every public author has to invent a new 'performance' of his authorship. In the case of Harry Mulisch, he chose to keep the two postures separate. In his essays and lectures, he performs the public intellectual in front of a public that is willing to hear about his political ideas (ironically, this was mostly an international public of intellectuals and writers); in his television appearances and mass media interviews he performed the star author with the fixed image, almost a parody of himself.

'Ein Traum von Europa'

Let us go back to May 1988. The initiative for the conference came from a number of writers from Berlin (Peter Schneider, Anna Jonas, Hans Joachim Sädlich, Hans Christoph Buch). They wrote to several European authors, inviting them to come together to think about the many different dreams that are dreamt throughout Europe. Was it possible to develop a collaborative project amongst writers?

> Läβt sich aus diesem Stimmengewirr ein vernünftiges Projekt entwickeln? Mindestens eine europäische *res publica* der Schriftsteller? Oder haben wir die politische Teilung Europas längst auch in unserem Denken und in der Literatur nachvollzogen?[18]

The conference organization was inspired by György Konrád, author of *Antipolik. Mitteleuropäische Meditationen*, and by Milan Kundera, author of the essay 'The Tragedy of Central Europe'. With these works, Konrád and Kundera set the stage for a new discussion of European identity. The organizers wondered whether literary writers could come up with historical and cultural traditions that could help [9] bridge the European divide and create a new European identity. How could literary writers contribute to this political debate? The

invitation letter contained questions like these: 'Sind Schrifsteller geeignet, auf solche Fragen zu antworten? Wie unterschieden sich Ihre Antworten von denen der Politiker und warum werden sie nicht Politik?'[19] ('Are writers qualified to answer questions like these? How do their answers differ from those given by politicians, and why don't they become political?')

A special issue of the literary magazine *Literaturmagazin* gives us some information on the conference itself.[20] The conference addressed the following seven themes: 'The European House', 'Yalta and its Consequences', 'From Autodafé to Holocaust', 'Society versus State', 'Europe as Open Air Museum', 'Exile' and 'One Europe and Many Democracies'. The titles show that the aim of the conference was to rethink the concept of European identity, despite the reality of a divided Europe. In Central and Eastern Europe, of course, the discussion about the powers of the state and the effects of exile literature dominated the agenda; in Western Europe the remembrance of the Holocaust took precedence when thinking about European identity.

It is also clear that the issue of Central Europe was at the heart of this conference.[21] In 'The Tragedy of Central Europe' Kundera addresses this issue when speaking of Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Poland as 'culturally in the West and politically in the East'.[22] For the inhabitants of these countries 'European' was synonymous with 'Western' and 'Western' with 'culture'. Kundera claims that westerners should not consider the uprisings in Central Europe (Hungary 1956, Czechoslovakia 1968, Poland 1956, 1968, 1970) as 'a drama (tragedy) of Eastern Europe'. Instead, they should be seen as a 'drama of the West'.[23] In his essay, Kundera paints a broad overview of the way 'the West' has treated Central Europe:

> History, that goddess of Hegel and Marx, that incarnation of reason that judges us and arbitrates our fate – that is the history of conquerors. The people of Central Europe are not conquerors. They cannot be separated from European history; they cannot exist outside it; but they represent the wrong side of this history; they are its victims and outsiders.[24]

Kundera sounds a warning bell to the other European countries. In these globalizing times, every European nation state is at risk of becoming a small nation and ending up as a victim of history.

But what role could the literary writer play in this? In his lecture, Kundera mentions Franz Werfel's dream of a 'World Academy of Poets and Thinkers', an academy that sets itself the task of confronting the politicization and barbarization of the world. Although this proposal was ridiculed, Kundera makes clear that it reveals 'the desperate need to find once again a moral authority in a world [10] stripped of values. It reveals the anguished desire to hear the inaudible voice of culture, the voice of Dichter und Denker.'[25] This need and desire have only grown since the status of artists diminished rapidly in the second half of the twentieth century:[26]

> To be sure, there were great painters, playwrights, and musicians, but they no longer held a privileged place in society as moral authorities that Europe would acknowledge as its spiritual representatives. Culture no longer existed as a realm in which supreme values were enacted.[27]

This is the negative side of the story. On the other hand there are the uprisings in Central Europe. They were – for obvious reasons – not fed by newspapers, radio or television, but they were 'prepared, shaped and realized' in novels, poems, plays, historiography and philosophy published in Samizdat. Kundera points to the importance of 'contemporary creative effort' in these revolts. A nation's cultural life tends to become more intense when its cultural identity is

threatened. In countries under state control, culture maintained an important value that had disappeared elsewhere. This is also why the Russian invaders immediately undertook a 'massacre of culture'. When this massacre took place, the people were embarrassed as well as angry.

Kundera concludes from this that Central Europe has to deal with two problems, Russian oppression being only one of them. The other problem is the lack of memory in Western Europe. People have forgotten that Central European countries share with them the Western tradition and they have forgotten about the value of culture in general. The result of this is a striking lack of concern for Central Europe's culture.

> The real tragedy for Central Europe, then, is not Russia but Europe: this Europe that represented a value so great that the director of the Hungarian News Agency was ready to die for it, and for which he did indeed die. Behind the iron curtain, he did not suspect that the times had changed and that in Europe itself Europe was no longer experienced as a value. He did not suspect that the sentence he was sending by telex beyond the borders of his flat country would seem outmoded and would not be understood.[28]

Tony Judt speaks of 'collective cultural amnesia' when it comes to the disappearance of Central Europe from the consciousness of the Western intelligentsia after 1945.[29] It is surprising to see how during the eighties the issue of Central Europe returns to the intellectual agenda. Judt points out that Milan Kundera's performances as a public intellectual in particular made this possible. Between 1981 and 1985, Kundera wrote several articles for American, French and British journals, in which he focused on Central Europe and Western ignorance. Judt highlights [11] what preceded Kundera's outburst and he shows how Kundera initiated 'a veritable baggage train of Central European writers.'[30]

It is clear that the *Ein Traum von Europa* conference not only addressed all the issues that are discussed in Kundera's essay, but that the organizers and participants also tried to create something along the lines of a 'world academy of poets and thinkers'. The conference organizers seemed to be attempting to restore something of the literary moral authority. In any event, it can be said that the speakers at the conference reflected a broad international literary platform. Apart from the organizers many literary writers gave lectures at the conference, including Agnes Heller, Claudio Magris, Lars Gustafsson, Susan Sontag, Tzvetan Todorov, Joseph Brodsky, Horst Bienek and György Konrád. A glance at the list of participants reveals that there were writers present from most European countries, enlarging the scope of Kundera's ideas to a broader group than merely 'Central European writers'.

The Concept of 'European Literature'

The European writers gathered at this conference were working towards what is nowadays labeled as 'world literature.'[31] Pascale Casanova provides us with an unexpected theory of European literature as a space that can be located between the national literary fields and the global sphere of world literature. She focuses on the 'conflicts and competitions that pitted Europe's national literary spaces against one another in relentless and ongoing rivalry.'[32] Coming from a Pierre Bourdieu-inspired background in cultural sociology, Casanova acknowledges that the production, distribution and reception of literary authors and texts mainly functions on a national scale. These national literary fields work as autonomous entities (with their own systems of production, distribution and reception), while there is no such thing

as a well-defined European field of literary institutions. Furthermore, she claims that the appearance of autonomous literary fields is directly linked to the introduction of the nineteenth-century nation states. Casanova concludes from this that 'the European literary world can be regarded as a space in the making, in other words that it does not actually exist as such on a world literary stage, that it cannot yet be recognized as an autonomous totality in terms of literature.'[33]

In her research, Casanova focuses on 'literary capitals' (such as Paris, London, Berlin and New York) that are 'national resources, dependent on national languages and school systems, which rely exclusively on national institutions for their inventory, maintenance and reproduction.'[34] Casanova observes that we are witnessing a growing number of 'semi-conscious attempts [...] to amass the literary heritage without regard for national and linguistic divisions.'[35] She points at several anthologies for European literature. Casanova prefers a way of thinking about European literature as comprising 'the set of texts (and authors) which [12] surpass definition in terms of nations and can be defined – by virtue of their zone of circulation, their reception beyond the national borders, their influence, the number of times they have been translated – as trans-national and therefore as "European", as opposed to "national" texts.'[36] The writer of European literary history ought not compare several national literatures in an overarching period concept, but should instead focus on the way authors function in both the national literary field and in a zone of circulation that is trans-national. Main focus points then are: the national and international (critical) reception of an author, the national and international influence of the author on other authors and the number of translations. This type of research should lay bare the power relations at work between the national and the international zones of circulation. To what extent does success on the European or even the world stage influence the capital of an author in the national literary field?

We could compare this with an observation made by another theorist of world literature, David Damrosch: 'the crucial stage in a work's movement from a national context to the sphere of world literature is its reception within a different cultural and linguistic realm, [...].[37] Damrosch points out that literature is both local ('nations and subnational regions continue as crucial venues of literary production and reception today') and global: 'By opening up the longue durée of literary history, a global history could reveal the broader systemic relations between literary cultures, not opposing world literature to national literatures but undertaking to trace the cocreation of literary systems that have almost always been mixed in character, at once localized and translocal.'[38] This double status of literature as both national and trans-national has its political consequences. Emily Apter recalls Pierre Bourdieu's opinion that a trans-national literary zone can function as an escape from the national newspapers and reviews by creating a collective intellectual space.[39] Casanova, however, argues that in this collective space, power relations are at work too. In order to function as a European writer, according to Casanova, one has to be accepted in one of the 'major legislative centers of the literary planet': London, Paris or Frankfurt. She concludes with the observation that this European zone of circulation is an unequal world. The strategies devised by authors in their literary struggle against these forms of literary dependence should be investigated.

In this article, I will examine Harry Mulisch's literary behaviour as a European writer from two perspectives. The first perspective looks at Mulisch's position in the European zone of circulation: which self-image does Mulisch bring to the fore while operating in this 'trans-national zone'? The second perspective focuses on how the image of Harry Mulisch's European authorship is constructed within the national context, in the literary field as well as in the Dutch

media system. In this article, the emphasis will thus be on the way Mulisch takes up a position in two different fields.[40] I will therefore focus on what Jerôme Meizoz calls 'posture': 'Posture is not uniquely an author's own construction, but an [13] interactive process: the image is co-constructed by the author and various mediators (journalists, criticism, biographies) serving the reading public.'[41] Posture consists both of behaviour (public presentation of the self in media appearances) and of discourse (the textual self-image). By analyzing and interpreting these postures we might gain insight into the strategies authors use to function in two different literary fields.

Before I concentrate on the self-narratives Mulisch provides us with, I would like to raise the factual question whether Mulisch can indeed be regarded as an international author, if we take into account the above-mentioned theories. No systematic research has as yet been done on Mulisch's reception in an international context. In the course of the eighties and nineties, Mulisch started to be recognized (nationally and internationally) as an international author. We can conclude this from the simple fact that his books have been translated into at least nineteen languages, among which Albanese, Chinese, Finnish, and Esperanto. Twenty-one books have been translated into German (almost all his important books), ten into English and nine into French. (The other important languages are Greek, Hebrew and Italian). Apart from four German translations and one English one, most of these translations began to appear in the second half of the 1980s.

This important number of translations does indeed indicate that Mulisch's works were internationally recognized as important. Furthermore, his works have been well received in the German, American and French literary systems. These are precisely the three national literary fields where we find Casanova's international literary capitals: Frankfurt, Paris and New York. An important moment in the international classification process is the 1993 Frankfurter Buchmesse. Dutch literature was the main theme of the Messe that year, which resulted in Cees Nooteboom's novel *Rituals* and Mulisch's *The Discovery of Heaven* topping the bestsellers charts in Germany in the autumn of 1993.[42] In the years that followed, Mulisch travelled across Europe to promote Dutch literature in several literary capitals: Paris (1994), Barcelona (1995), Moscow and St. Petersburg (1996).[43] Apart from the positive reception by critics and readers, Mulisch was also awarded several international literary prizes.[44] Furthermore, his works sold extremely well in Germany, France and the United States, movies based on his novels were successful, he regularly attended international writers' conferences and went on reading tours through Germany and the United States.

It is fair to say that Mulisch established himself as a European author in the course of the eighties and nineties. But these facts function only as my point of departure. When we focus on the way Mulisch portrays his international authorship, we can distinguish two distinct self-narratives. Mulisch created these narratives himself, although they were influenced by the context in which he narrated them. He constructed two different images of his authorship in such a manner that they were suitable for the contexts in which he had to narrate them (in this [14] case: the context of international public lectures and the context of national mass media interviews).

We have already caught a glimpse of one of them: the one Mulisch himself created on the international stage, and that was echoed in the reactions by Glucksmann, Lévy, Schneider and Buch with which I started the article. In the eighties and nineties, Mulisch starts to perform his authorship on a stage lying mainly outside the Netherlands. He lectures in front of an international audience and travels through Europe doing interviews. Some of his lectures

appear in German and French newspapers. If we look at the way he positions himself there, we can see him presenting himself as a public intellectual, now working on a European platform. In this context, Mulisch uses his international success to gain more political influence as a literary writer. Over the years, Mulisch's international success also became part of the Dutch Media Myth that Mulisch had been building in the years before. The writer himself, as well as the public media, constructed a carefully wrought cliché out of these new facts: an image that came into being as a result of endlessly repeated questions about Mulisch's surmised nomination for winning the Nobel Prize for literature. In this sense, Mulisch started to use his international success as a building block for his star image as a celebrity too.

In the eighties and nineties, Mulisch's international success became an important topic in Dutch newspapers and weeklies. The positive reviews in Germany and the United States were presented as 'important news'. The Dutch media were preoccupied with the international success of their star author. Thus, for example, in 1996 the Amsterdam newspaper *Het Parool* ran a news item opening with the following header: 'America has discovered the new Homer and his name is Harry Mulisch.' The article discussed the positive reception of Mulisch's novel *The Discovery of Heaven* in the Wall Street Journal and the Washington Post, focusing on the comparison with Homer, Dante and Milton. From that moment onwards, several media kept claiming that Mulisch was a serious candidate for winning the Nobel Prize. One of the first times Mulisch mentions the Nobel Prize himself in a public interview is in 1986. He explains to the interviewer what it takes to win the Nobel Prize: 'If you have the ambition of becoming a world-famous writer and winning the Nobel Prize, you have to push hard. That's the only way to succeed. But that is not my ambition at all. My ambition is to write the books that I want to write.'[45] Distancing himself from the idea, he nevertheless mentioned it, and in doing so he introduced a new narrative thread for the media story of his authorship.

Interviewers keep asking him about the Nobel Prize. In 1992 for instance, former publisher Martin Ros notices that Mulisch has won most Dutch literary prizes. Surely he was due another prize. 'People called it a joke, but maybe it was really true: Harry personally went to the Frankfurter Buchmesse to speak with the Swedish delegation in order to prevent them from giving the Nobel Prize to Hugo [15] Claus. He didn't want him to ruin his party.'[46] In the following years, journalists bring up the Nobel Prize again and again. Mulisch formulates a standard answer: 'I just hear what you hear: sometimes they mention my name, amongst a whole range of other names. You should not forget that there are a lot of good writers in the world that didn't get the Nobel Prize: John Updike, Norman Mailer, Günter Grass, Mario Vargas Llosa... and I can think of ten others.' [47] In 1998, the title of one of the interviews is: 'Harry Mulisch is Waiting for the Nobel Prize.'[48] In the course of time his answer remains unchanged, although the names he refers to do change (also because some of the writers he had mentioned earlier did in fact win the prize): 'I would be honoured to win that prize. But if I don't get it, I feel honoured too. Just think of the ones who didn't receive the prize: Proust, Kafka, Tolstoy, Nabokov.'[49] In 2009, a Dutch television show had a reporter visiting Mulisch at his home address on the day the winner of the Nobel Prize was to be announced.[50] Mulisch and the reporter were sitting in front of the camera waiting for the phone to ring. Then his publisher called to tell him that once again he had not won it.

This offers an interesting example of how Harry Mulisch used his international status to construct his image as a literary celebrity. On the one hand, he is never modest about his proclaimed candidature; on the other, he plays an ironic game with it. It is a game he plays in many interviews. He makes clear that his candidature for winning the prize indicates that he

still is an important writer, but at the same time he plays down his international authorship by turning it more or less into a gimmick. This creates the overall impression fed by the Dutch media that Mulisch's international authorship was all about the battle over the Nobel Prize. By creating this star image, Mulisch prevented the Dutch public from seeing that there was something else at stake too: in the eighties and nineties Mulisch wanted to be seen as a public intellectual when performing on an international stage. For some reason, Mulisch played two different games simultaneously.

Harry Mulisch as a European Public Intellectual

Let me now return to the conference of May 1988 for a second time. Harry Mulisch was the only representative of the Dutch speaking countries. His lecture 'Lof van het niemandsland' (In Praise of No Man's Land) dealt with the subject of 'The European House. Attempts at a Mitigation', and featured alongside lectures by Peter Schneider, Claudio Magris and Agnes Heller. A short version of the text was published in the German newspaper *Die Tageszeitung* (30 May 1988), in the Dutch weekly *Vrij Nederland* (18 June 1988) and in the French magazine *Lettre* (18, autumn 1988). The full-length version was published in the aforementioned special issue of *Literaturmagazin* in 1988 and in the 1990 collection of essays called *De zuilen van Hercules* (The Pillars of Hercules). [16]

Mulisch opens his lecture with a statement on his identity as a writer. He says he never considered himself as a Dutch writer, but instead that he regards himself as a European writer. To explain this statement, he points at his family history. He is the product of a family that can be situated almost everywhere in Europe, but that is located mainly within the realms of Central Europe. His father was of Czechoslovakian descent, but lived in Poland and Austria as well. His grandparents came from Czechoslovakia and Germany. His mother was a Jewish woman born in Belgium, whose family can be traced back to Hungary, Austria and Germany. After World War I, his parents settled in the Dutch city of Haarlem. His father died in Holland, but his mother moved to the United States after she had left his father. Whereas his mother had as many as five different passports in her life, Mulisch himself only ever had one. However, Mulisch does not consider himself as being specifically Dutch. He concludes that only Europe can be his 'homeland'. This becomes apparent in the next quotation:

> Writers such as Nabokov, Beckett, Ionesco, Canetti, Kundera, who changed their country and their language, are probably dealing with the same difficult situation. And apart from these few colleagues of mine we can find in Europe today a huge number of immigrants that are dealing with it too.[51]

These writers do not operate in their 'homelands', but they consider Europe as such:

> I can imagine no other homeland than Europe. And people like me share this with the members of that international royal family that managed to divide Europe ingeniously for centuries into people they owned and of which they themselves were barely part.
>
> Their 'we' was never local. The proletarians of all countries have never been able to unite themselves, but the monarchs of all countries have never been divided in that sense.[52]

Mulisch is doing two things at once here. Firstly, he places himself in the category of 'immigrant writers'. Although it is true that he referred to his complex family history in earlier essays, he had never explicitly called himself a European author before the 1980s. But in the course of the eighties, he repeats this statement in several other lectures. He uses the public lectures at the end of the eighties to reshape his authorship and to place himself in a new literary context. It is important to note that Mulisch not only feels connected to the theme of the conference – the problems surrounding the cold war play a key role in his literary œuvre – but that this conference also gives him an opportunity to stage a new construction of his authorship. In another lecture, 'We World Writers', Mulisch deals with the same issue. He gives a new interpretation to Goethe's term 'world [17] literature'. World writers are writers who enter a certain literature from the outside and who add something 'extra-national' to the national literature. 'In every European country this cosmopolitan category of writers consisting of first and second generation nomads will increase rapidly.'[53]

This strategy is characteristic of literary writers on the European stage. Because of the absence of an institutionalized public sphere, literary writers first have to create the sphere before they can act in it. In the absence of a well-structured European literary field or system, it is these kinds of conferences that – for the time being – create the platform literary writers want to perform on.[54] Mulisch repeats this strategy on an individual level: since there is no category of European writers, Mulisch makes this category up in his lecture, mainly to position himself as a member of the group.

But Mulisch uses this lecture for another purpose too. He starts a discussion on nationalism and immigration, thus contributing to an important political debate. In the second part of the lecture, Mulisch discusses the problem of European identity. It is 1988 and the author is naively positive about political progress: he claims that Europe will soon become a cultural unity. He even proclaims the 'end of nationalism'. In the coming years, he argues, nation states like France, England and the Netherlands will achieve the same picturesque status as Prussia, Saxony and Bavaria. 'Thank god, at the end of the twentieth century in Western-Europe, nationalism is turning into provincialism.'[55] We now know of course that Mulisch was far too positive back then, but we need to realize that the political landscape in 1988 was completely different from the way it looks today. The division of Europe in a Western and an Eastern part was still tangible, although the first signs of its demise could be felt in Eastern Europe. In this lecture, Mulisch dreams of a Great Europe consisting of both parts.

> That is the real dream. The existence of these two blocks is the unintended creation of Adolf Hitler; if we see it that way, we may consider this wall to be the monument on his grave. Isn't it significant that it runs exactly over the place where that creature finally ended himself?'[56]

In this quotation, Mulisch goes back to the origins of the Berlin Wall. It is the 'unintended creation of Adolf Hitler' because the division of Europe happened in the aftermath of the Second World War. Mulisch ironically speaks of the wall being a 'monument on his grave'. From this one might conclude that it would be a good thing to destroy the wall, but Mulisch has a different idea. He wonders about the status of the wall itself. The space of the wall itself does not belong to either Moscow or to Washington. It is in fact the only European place that is not dominated by one of the two superpowers. [18]

> It is clear now what we Europeans should do. We should not bring down the wall, but extend it. We should enter into the wall from both sides and then make it wider, discreetly but wisely: we must expand the west side to the west, towards the Atlantic Ocean, and the east side to the border of the Soviet Union. It is only then that we will be where we want to be; Great Europe will then have become the wall between the superpowers, without being either.[57]

Mulisch encourages European citizens to enter the wall from both sides. By making the wall wider until it covers all of Europe, they could enlarge this utopia that is in fact an *atopia*, a place that avoids the existing power relations. This would be the one great united Europe that could function as a bulwark against the two Cold War factions without becoming one of them. It is interesting that Mulisch does not want Hitler's monument to be destroyed (what could be expected at that time), but that he instead wants the European citizens to reappropriate it. Mulisch creates this powerful image of a Great Europe as a giant expansion of the Berlin Wall. It is clear that Mulisch regards both the Soviet Union and the United States as the superpowers that threaten Europe's future. This image of Europe as the wall between superpowers can also be regarded as an image for the European public sphere the contributors to this conference are trying to create.

But then Mulisch makes a third important move. He not only creates this utopian image, he also calls for action. He suggests writing a letter to the 25 leaders of the national governments in Eastern and Western Europe. It is the task of literary writers, he claims, to provide the politicians with advice they did not ask for. It seems that his suggestion was endorsed by others. Several writers, from different countries (Poland, Algeria, Portugal, Hungary, Great Britain, Belgium, Yugoslavia, West Germany and the United States), sign the letter. The most famous amongst them are György Konrad and Susan Sontag. The letter ends as follows:

> It is time the inhabitants of this collective European house can move freely from one room to the next. They should be allowed to leave the house too. As writers and readers we have to deal in particular with freedom of speech, with the abolition of censorship and of any criminalization of literary work.
>
> *Don't you think too, that it is time to address the European problems in an intelligent way, so humanity can finally deal with far more important problems, such as poverty, hunger and pollution?*
>
> Please, answer us![58]

In this letter, the contributors create another image: they speak of a European house in which every inhabitant can move freely and is free to leave whenever he wants. First of all, we should interpret this metaphor in concrete terms: the writers of the letter make a plea for a free Europe without suppressing state control. [19] This is of course the utopia of that generation. Secondly, the image of the house again functions as a metaphor for the European public sphere. Not only should the inhabitants of Europe be able to move freely, also the ideas, the arts and speech should be allowed to move freely. And with this letter, the European writers are paving the way for this change.

This conference as a whole and this letter in particular can be considered to be a direct response to the questions Milan Kundera raised in 'The tragedy of Central Europe'. These

writers are seeking to become a European focal point and they appeal to the concept of 'humanity'. They want to create a European 'academy of poets and thinkers'. As long as there is no real European union, the intellectuals can at least create it on a performative level. By lecturing at this conference and taking the initiative for political action, Mulisch makes clear that he wants to play a role in the formation of this European public sphere, which can give authors a stage on which to perform their authorship on an international level. In the eighties and nineties, Mulisch seems to believe that this category of 'world writers' can meaningfully contribute to world politics. By taking action, he once again performs the role of 'committed writer' or public intellectual, a role that he has intensively played in the sixties and early seventies.[59]

Conclusion

The two different postures Mulisch uses when it comes to his international authorship can be interpreted as representing two opposing postures of public authorship: the public intellectual on the one hand and the literary celebrity on the other. In his international lectures, Mulisch created the posture of a politically committed writer who wants to contribute to contemporary debates. He reflects on European unity, on the war in Yugoslavia and wants to take direct political action. On a national platform, Mulisch performs the posture of the literary celebrity. Why would such a writer strive for an international career? Only to be the best writer in the world: to win the Nobel Prize.

What exactly has this case study taught us about the construction of European literature? It is clear that Mulisch and the other writers at the Berlin conference were aiming at codifying a new European literary space, neither national nor global. By taking the lead in the construction of a European public sphere, Mulisch steps out of the Dutch literary field towards the global zone of circulation. What does that tell us about the ideas of Casanova and Damrosch about the double status of literature? There are two answers. On the one hand, we can see how Mulisch's international success became a cornerstone of his canonisation as important Dutch literary writer. This observation is in line with the view that the national literary fields are dominated by the European or global zone of circulation. The Dutch literary canon cannot be regarded as a strictly national construction, for it appears to be also shaped by international influences.[60] [20]

On the other hand, however, Mulisch uses the differences between both zones of circulation. In the international zone, he stages a form of authorship he had not performed in the Netherlands since the 1960s. His postures as a committed writer in that decade lead to severe criticism.[61] In the 1970s, Mulisch made a clear-cut distinction in his performance of authorship. He chose to invest in his status as a literary celebrity in the Netherlands. In the mass media, he created a monological celebrity image that became the dominant way to think and speak of Mulisch's authorship in the Netherlands until today. It can be argued that this narrative of Mulisch as the celebrity author eventually overshadowed the various other self-narratives created by Mulisch in lectures, essays and novels. It seems that Mulisch sought to hide these other postures behind the dominant media myth. When it came to questions about his international status, Mulisch always steered the interview in the direction of the Nobel Prize.

In his international lectures of the 1980s and 1990s, however, Mulisch made room for the public intellectual to return to the heart of his authorship. He not only addressed important contemporary political issues, he also employed political action rhetoric. In 1988, he called for

an open letter to the leaders of Europe, in 1993 he made a plea for literary UN-missions and he asked writers, publishers and readers of all countries to unite.[62] Late 1980s, early 1990s, Mulisch attempted several times to set up an international community of 'world writers' that would operate in the European public sphere. These world writers were to act as public intellectuals, play a part in solving concrete political problems and get involved in contemporary political debates. From the examples I gave before, it appears that Mulisch wanted to create a new international identity as a literary writer.

These two rather contradictory self-narratives leave the researcher with the problematic issue of characterizing Mulisch's authorship in the eighties and nineties. Some critics ask themselves whether Mulisch should be called a public intellectual at all, while others wonder that this could be doubted. I hope to have shown that this contradictory appreciation is rooted in the material itself: Mulisch's self-conceptions allow us to consider him as an opportunistic and savvy media celebrity who alludes to his international success merely to enlarge his star image as Holland's One and Only Great Author, but they also allow us to regard him as an important public intellectual, a writer who has something important to tell us.

Notes

1. I would like to thank Odile Heynders, Geertjan de Vugt and the other members of the research group 'Literature and visual arts in the European public sphere' for their comments on an earlier version of this article. Furthermore, I would like to thank Hans Verhulst for correcting the English text and for translating some quotations. [21]
2. André Glucksmann, Bernard-Henri Lévy, Peter Schneider and Hans-Christoph Buch, 'Manifest: mehr Europa wagen', Der Tagesspiegel, 30 November 2011. Unless indicated otherwise, all translations are mine.
3. Ibidem.
4. Sander Bax, 'Harry Mulisch Witnessing the Sixties. Looking through the Eyes of the Public Intellectual and the Literary Celebrity', in Witnessing the Sixties. A Decade of Change in Journalism and Literature, I. van den Broek, M. Broersma and F. Harbers (forthcoming).
5. G.J. Dorleijn, R. Grüttemeier and L. Korthals Altes (eds), Authorship Revisited. Conceptions of Authorship around 1900 and 2000 (Leuven: Peeters, 2010), pp. 81-94.
6. G. Franssen, 'Literary Celebrity and the Discourse on Authorship in Dutch literature', Journal of Dutch Literature, 1 (2010), 1, 91-131.
7. G. Sapiro, 'Authorship and Responsibility. The Case of Emile Zola's Commitment in the Dreyfus Affair', in Authorship Revisited. Conceptions of Authorship around 1900 and 2000, ed. by G. Dorleijn, R. Grüttemeier and L. Korthals Altes (Leuven: Peeters, 2010), pp. 1-11.
8. G. McDayter, Byromania and the Birth of Celebrity Culture (New York: State University of New York Press, 2009); L. Rainey, Institutions of Modernism. Literary Elites and Public Culture (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998).
9. G. Dorleijn, R. Grüttemeier and L. Korthals Altes (eds), '"The Autonomy of Literature." To be Handled with Care', in The Autonomy of Literature at the Fin de Siècles (1900 and 2000). A Critical Assessment (Leuven: Peeters, 2007); F. Ruiter and W. Smulders, 'Van moedwil tot misverstand, van Dorleijn tot Vaessens. Kritische kanttekeningen uit het veld', Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse Taalen

Letterkunde 126 (2010), 1, 63-85; F. Ruiter and W. Smulders (eds), Alleen blindgeborenen verwijten de schrijver dat hij liegt (Amsterdam: De Bezige Bij, 2009).

10. For these dilemmas see T.W. Galow, 'Literary Modernism in the Age of Celebrity', in Modernism / Modernity 17 (2010), 2, 313-29, and B. Denis, 'Criticism and Engagement in the Belle Epoque. The Autonomy of Literature and the Social Function of the Writer during the Third Republic', in The Autonomy of Literature at the Fins de Siècles (1900 and 2000). A Critical Assessment, ed. by . G. Dorleijn, R. Grüttemeier and L. Korthals Altes (Leuven: Peeters, 2007), pp. 29-40.
11. See for instance G.J. Dorleijn, and C.J. van Rees (eds), De productie van literatuur. Het literaire veld in Nederland 1800-2000 (Nijmegen: Vantilt, 2006).
12. J. Meizoz, 'Modern Posterities of Posture. Jean-Jacques Rousseau', in Authorship Revisited. Conceptions of Authorship around 1900 and 2000, ed. by G.J. Dorleijn, R. Grüttemeier and L. Korthals Altes (Leuven: Peeters, 2010), pp. 81-94.
13. O. Heynders, 'Voices of Europe. Literary Writers as Public Intellectuals' (inaugural lecture, University of Tilburg, 2009); O. Heynders, 'The European Public Intellectual. The Case of H. M. Enzensberger', conference paper, 'Literary Scholarship and Social Sciences. Opportunities for Dialogue' (Moscow, 15-17 March 2012); T. Vaessens, 'Dutch Novelists beyond "Postmodern Relativism"', Journal of Dutch Literature 2 (2011), 1, 5-34; T. Vaessens, 'Dutch Literature. Stripping the Novel of its Harmlessness', in Reconsidering the Postmodern, ed. by T. Vaessens and Y. van Dijk (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2011), pp. 59-76. [22]
14. Melzer, A. M., 'What is an Intellectual?', in The Public Intellectual. Between Philosophy and Politics, ed. by A.M. Melzer, J. Weinberger and M.R. Zinman (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2003); J.R. Di Leo, 'Public Intellectuals, Inc.', Symploké 14 (2006), 1-2, 183-96; R.A. Posner, Public Intellectuals. A Study of Decline, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003); S. Fuller, The public Intellectual as Agent of Justice. In Search of a Regime', Philosophy and Rhetoric 39 (2006), 2, 147-56.
15. L. Glass, Authors Inc. Literary Celebrity in the Modern United States, 1880-1980 (New York: New York University Press, 2004); Franssen, 'Literary Celebrity and the Discourse on Authorship in Dutch Literature'; Galow, 'Literary modernism in the age of celebrity'; E. Praat, Verrek, het is geen kunstenaar. Gerard Reve en het schrijverschap (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Amsterdam, 2011).
16. Franssen, 'Literary Celebrity and the Discourse on Authorship in Dutch Literature'.
17. O. Heynders, 'The Public Intellectual as Autobiographer. The Case of Ayaan Hirsi Ali' (Tilburg, 2011 – forthcoming), p. 6.
18. 'Can this mish-mash of voices yield a project that makes sense? At the very least yield a European res publica of writers? Or have we long since allowed the political division of Europe to take place also in our thoughts and our literature?' H.C. Buch, 'Vorbemerkung', in Ein Traum von Europa. Literaturmagazin 22, ed. by H.C. Buch (Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1988), pp. 9-10.
19. Ibidem, pp. 9-10.
20. Ibidem.

21. G. Schöpflin and N. Wood (eds), In Search of Central Europe (Totowa, NJ: Barnes & Noble Books, 1989); S.R. Graubard, Eastern Europe… Central Europe… Europe (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1991).
22. M. Kundera, 'The Tragedy of Central Europe', New York Review of Books 31, 7 (1984), 1.
23. Ibidem, 2.
24. Ibidem, 8.
25. Ibidem, 9.
26. See also M. Kundera, 'Die Weltliteratur', in The Curtain. An Essay in Seven Parts (London: Harper, 2007), pp. 29-56 and Slater, M. B., 'Shifting Literary Tectonic Plates. Kundera's Call for Supranational Literature and the World Literature in French Manifesto', MLN 125 (2010), 913-26.
27. Kundera, 'The Tragedy of Central Europe', 10.
28. Ibidem, 11.
29. T. Judt, 'The Rediscovery of Central Europe', in Eastern Europe… Central Europe… Europe, S.R. Graubard, p. 27.
30. Judt, 'The Rediscovery of Central Europe', pp. 23-58, p. 31.
31. F. Moretti, 'Conjectures of World Literature', New Left Review 1 (2000), 54-68; G.C. Spivak, Death of a Discipline (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003); D. Damrosch, What is World Literature? (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003); D. Damrosch, 'Scriptworlds. Writing Systems and the Formation of World Literature', Modern Language Quarterly 68 (2007), 2, 195-219; P. Casanova, The World Republic of Letters (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005); E. Apter, The Translation Zone. A New Comparative Literature (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006); 'Comparative Literature [23] / World Literature. A Discussion with Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak and David Damrosch', Comparative Literature Studies 48 (2011), 4, 455-85.
32. P. Casanova, 'European Literature. Simply a Higher Degree of Universality?', European Review 17 (2009), 1, 121-32 (p. 121).
33. Ibidem, 121-32 (p. 123).
34. Ibidem, 121-132 (p. 124).
35. Ibidem, 121-132 (p. 125).
36. Ibidem, 121-132 (p. 127).
37. D. Damrosch, 'Toward a History of World Literature', New Literary History 39 (2008), 481-495 (p. 484).
38. Ibidem, p. 490.
39. E. Apter, 'Untranslatables. A World System', New Literary History 39 (2008), 581-598 (p. 590). She refers to P. Bourdieu, Political Interventions. Social Science and Political Action, trans. by D. Fernbach (London: Verso, 2008).
40. J. Meizoz, 'Modern Posterities of Posture', p. 83.
41. Idem, p. 84.
42. M. Dings, 'Mulisch in München', HP / De Tijd, 14 May 1993.

43. O. Blom, Zijn getijdenboek (Amsterdam: De Bezige Bij, 2002), p. 268.
44. He received the French Prix Jean Monnet de Littérature Européenne 1999 for The Discovery of Heaven, the Prix européen des jeunes lecteurs for Siegfried and the Italian Nonino-prize 2007.
45. W. Kuipers, 'De Paus, die heeft ons een dienst bewezen', de Volkskrant, 10 January 1986.
46. M. Ros, 'Een pagode met het volk aan zijn voeten', HN Magazine, 31 October 1992.
47. B. Vanegeren, 'Harry Mulisch (70) alvast heilig verklaard', HUMO, 28 October 1997.
48. J. Vandenbroucke, 'Harry Mulisch wacht op de Nobelprijs', HUMO, 6 October 1998.
49. O. Blom, 'De mythe van Harry Mulisch. Harry Homerus', De Standaard, 25 July 2002.
50. De wereld draait door, 8 October 2009, VARA.
51. H. Mulisch, 'Lof van het niemandsland', in De zuilen van Hercules (Amsterdam: De Bezige Bij, 1990), p. 180.
52. Ibidem, p. 181.
53. H. Mulisch, 'Wij wereldliteratoren', in Bij gelegenheid (Amsterdam: De Bezige Bij, 1995), p. 28.
54. See Casanova, 'European Literature. Simply a Higher Degree of Universality?'
55. Mulisch, 'Lof van het niemandsland', p. 182.
56. Ibidem.
57. Ibidem, p. 183.
58. H. Mulisch, 'Open brief aan de regeringsleiders', in De zuilen van Hercules (Amsterdam: De Bezige Bij, 1990), p. 200.
59. S. Bax, 'De man die Carré ging bezetten. Het beeld van Harry Mulisch als geëngageerd schrijver', Vooys, 28 (2010), 2, 58-73; S. Bax and S. Beeks, 'Een artistieke guerillagroep. Hugo Claus, Harry Mulisch en de opera Reconstructie', Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse Taalen Letterkunde, 127 (2010), 390-419; S. Bax, 'The Loneliest Spot on Earth. Harry Mulisch's Literary Experiment in Criminal Case 40/61', Werkwinkel: Journal of Low Countries and South African Studies 7 (2012), 1. [60]
60. H. Brems, 'Bestaat de Nederlandse literatuur?', in Altijd weer vogels die nesten beginnen, H. Brems (Amsterdam: Bert Bakker, 2006), pp. 659-86.
61. S. Bax, 'Harry Mulisch Witnessing the Sixties. Looking Through the Eyes of the Public Intellectual and the Literary Celebrity', in I. van den Broek, M. Broersma and F. Harbers (eds), Witnessing the Sixties. A Decade of Change in Journalism and Literature (forthcoming).
62. H. Mulisch, Een spookgeschiedenis / Eine Gespenstergeschichte / A Ghost Story (Amsterdam: De Bezige Bij, 1993).

Bibliography

[Anoniem], 'Mulisch maakt furore in VS', Haagsche Courant, 4 November 1996.

'Comparative Literature / World Literature. A Discussion with Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak and David Damrosch', Comparative Literature Studies 48 (2011), 4.

Apter, E., 'Untranslatables. A World System', New Literary History 39 (2008). (The quotation is from: P. Bourdieu, Political Interventions. Social Science and Political Action, trans. by D. Fernbach (London: Verso, 2008).)

Apter, E., The Translation Zone. A New Comparative Literature (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006).

Bax, S., 'De man die Carré ging bezetten. Het beeld van Harry Mulisch als geëngageerd schrijver', Vooys, 28 (2010), 2.

Bax, S., and Beeks, S., 'Een artistieke guerillagroep. Hugo Claus, Harry Mulisch en de opera Reconstructie', Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse Taal-en Letterkunde, 127 (2011).

Bax, S., 'The Loneliest Spot on Earth. Harry Mulisch's Literary Experiment in Criminal Case 40/61', Werkwinkel: Journal of Low Countries and South African Studies 7 (2012), 1.

Bax, S., 'Harry Mulisch Witnessing the Sixties. Looking through the Eyes of the Public Intellectual and the Literary Celebrity', in Witnessing the Sixties. A Decade of Change in Journalism and Literature, I. van den Broek, M. Broersma and F. Harbers (forthcoming).

Blom, O., Zijn getijdenboek (Amsterdam: De Bezige Bij, 2002).

Blom, O., 'De mythe van Harry Mulisch. Harry Homerus', De Standaard, 25 July 2002.

Brems, H., 'Bestaat de Nederlandse literatuur?', in Altijd weer vogels die nesten beginnen, H. Brems (Amsterdam: Bert Bakker, 2006).

Buch, H.C., 'Vorbemerkung', in Ein Traum von Europa. Literaturmagazin 22, ed. by H.C. Buch (Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1988).

Casanova, P., The World Republic of Letters (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005).

Casanova, P., 'European Literature. Simply a Higher Degree of Universality?', European Review 17 (2009), 1.

Damrosch, D., What is World Literature? (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003).

Damrosch, D., 'Scriptworlds. Writing Systems and the Formation of World Literature', Modern Language Quarterly 68 (2007), 2.

Damrosch, D., 'Toward a History of World Literature', New Literary History 39 (2008).

Denis, B., 'Criticism and Engagement in the Belle Epoque. The Autonomy of Literature and the Social Function of the Writer during the Third Republic', in The Autonomy of Literature [25] at the Fins de Siècles (1900 and 2000). A Critical Assessment, ed. by G. Dorleijn, R. Grüttemeier and L. Korthals Altes (Leuven: Peeters, 2007).

Di Leo, J.R., 'Public Intellectuals, Inc.', Symploké 14 (2006), 1-2.

Dings, M., 'Mulisch in München', HP / De Tijd, 14 May 1993.

Dorleijn, G.J., and Rees, C.J. van (eds), De productie van literatuur. Het literaire veld in Nederland 1800-2000 (Nijmegen: Vantilt, 2006).

Dorleijn, G., Grüttemeier, R., and Korthals Altes, L. (eds), '"The Autonomy of Literature." To be Handled with Care', in The Autonomy of Literature at the Fin de Siècles (1900 and 2000). A Critical Assessment (Leuven: Peeters, 2007).

Dorleijn, G.J., Grüttemeier, R., and Korthals Altes, L. (eds), Authorship Revisited. Conceptions of Authorship around 1900 and 2000 (Leuven: Peeters, 2010).

Franssen, G., 'Literary Celebrity and the Discourse on Authorship in Dutch literature', Journal of Dutch Literature, 1 (2010), 1.

Fuller, S., The public Intellectual as Agent of Justice. In Search of a Regime', Philosophy and Rhetoric 39 (2006), 2.

Galow, T.W., 'Literary Modernism in the Age of Celebrity', in Modernism / Modernity 17 (2010), 2.

Glass, L., Authors Inc. Literary Celebrity in the Modern United States, 1880-1980 (New York: New York University Press, 2004).

Glucksmann, A., Lévy, B.-H., Schneider, P., and Buch, H.-C., 'Manifest: mehr Europa wagen', Der Tagesspiegel, 30 November 2011.

Graubard, S.R., Eastern Europe… Central Europe… Europe (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1991).

Heynders, O., 'Voices of Europe. Literary Writers as Public Intellectuals' (inaugural lecture, University of Tilburg, 2009).

Heynders, O., 'The Public Intellectual as Autobiographer. The Case of Ayaan Hirsi Ali' (Tilburg, 2011 – forthcoming).

Heynders, O., 'The European Public Intellectual. The Case of H.M. Enzensberger', conference paper, 'Literary Scholarship and Social Sciences. Opportunities for Dialogue' (Moscow, 15-17 March 2012).

Judt, T., 'The Rediscovery of Central Europe', in Eastern Europe… Central Europe… Europe, S.R. Graubard (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1991).

Kotterer, F., 'The discovery of heaven in de VS bejubeld'. In: Het Parool, 31-10-1996.

Kuipers, W., 'De Paus, die heeft ons een dienst bewezen', de Volkskrant, 10 January 1986.

Kundera, M., 'The Tragedy of Central Europe', New York Review of Books 31, 7 (1984).

Kundera, M., 'Die Weltliteratur', in The Curtain. An Essay in Seven Parts (London: Harper, 2007).

Marshall, P.D., Celebrity and power. Fame in contemporary culture. Minneapolis 1997.

McDayter, G., Byromania and the Birth of Celebrity Culture (New York: State University of New York Press, 2009).

Meizoz, J., 'Modern Posterities of Posture. Jean-Jacques Rousseau', in Authorship Revisited. Conceptions of Authorship around 1900 and 2000, ed. by G.J. Dorleijn, R. Grüttemeier and L. Korthals Altes (Leuven: Peeters, 2010).

Melzer, A.M., 'What is an Intellectual?', in The Public Intellectual. Between Philosophy and Politics, ed. by A.M. Melzer, J. Weinberger and M.R. Zinman (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2003). [26]

Moretti, F., 'Conjectures of World Literature', New Left Review 1 (2000).

Mulisch, H., 'Lof van het niemandsland', in De zuilen van Hercules (Amsterdam: De Bezige Bij, 1990).

Mulisch, H., 'Open brief aan de regeringsleiders', in De zuilen van Hercules (Amsterdam: De Bezige Bij, 1990).

Mulisch, H., Een spookgeschiedenis / Eine Gespenstergeschichte / A Ghost Story (Amsterdam: De Bezige Bij, 1993).

Mulisch, H., 'Wij wereldliteratoren', in Bij gelegenheid (Amsterdam: De Bezige Bij, 1995).

Overdiek, T., 'Harry Mulisch', de Volkskrant, 4 November 1996.

Posner, R.A., Public Intellectuals. A Study of Decline, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003).

Praat, E., Verrek, het is geen kunstenaar. Gerard Reve en het schrijverschap (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Amsterdam, 2011).

Rainey, L., Institutions of Modernism. Literary Elites and Public Culture (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998).

Ros, M., 'Een pagode met het volk aan zijn voeten', HN Magazine, 31 October 1992.

Ruiter, F., and Smulders, W., 'Van moedwil tot misverstand, van Dorleijn tot Vaessens. Kritische kanttekeningen uit het veld', Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse Taalen Letterkunde 126 (2010), 1.

Ruiter, F., and Smulders, W. (eds), Alleen blindgeborenen verwijten de schrijver dat hij liegt (Amsterdam: De Bezige Bij, 2009).

Sapiro, G., 'Authorship and Responsibility. The Case of Emile Zola's Commitment in the Dreyfus Affair', in Authorship Revisited. Conceptions of Authorship around 1900 and 2000, ed. by G. Dorleijn, R. Grüttemeier and L. Korthals Altes (Leuven: Peeters, 2010).

Schöpflin, G., and Wood, N. (eds), In Search of Central Europe (Totowa, NJ: Barnes & Noble Books, 1989).

Slater, M.B., 'Shifting Literary Tectonic Plates. Kundera's Call for Supranational Literature and the World Literature in French Manifesto', MLN 125 (2010).

Spivak, G.C., Death of a Discipline (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003).

Vaessens, T., 'Dutch Novelists beyond "Postmodern Relativism"', Journal of Dutch Literature 2 (2011), 1.

Vaessens, T., 'Dutch Literature. Stripping the Novel of its Harmlessness', in Reconsidering the Postmodern, ed. by T. Vaessens and Y. van Dijk (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2011).

Vanegeren, B., 'Harry Mulisch (70) alvast heilig verklaard', HUMO, 28 October 1997.

Vandenbroucke, J., 'Harry Mulisch wacht op de Nobelprijs', HUMO, 6 October 1998.