

Texts and the Dynamics of Cultural Transfer – Translations as Events*

Ton Naaijken

Universiteit Utrecht

Ton.Naijken@let.uu.nl

Abstract:

The notion of a moveable text involves projection – projection in the form of interpretation, projection also in the form of translation, so that something like a double movement comes into being. Translations constitute a special case of cultural dynamics as, in a sense, they both repeat and change what was written before. They function and are effective in a new environment. Their outcome is not wholly a new original, such as writers produce, but neither a noncommittal reaction or detached study, such as critics deliver. In translations we see the workings of cultural dynamics *in optima forma*. In order to interpret these dynamics and the receptional afterlife of a text, a distinction should be made between reception events and reception incidents. The author of the article suggests that there is a strong case to award translations the status of event.

Key words: cultural dynamics, translations, moveable text.

Resumen:

La noción de texto movable implica proyección en la forma de interpretación, proyección también en la forma de traducción, se da una especie de movimiento doble. Las traducciones constituyen un caso especial de dinámica cultural en el sentido en que ambas repiten y cambian lo que se había escrito antes; funcionan y son efectivas en nuevos ambientes. Sus resultados no son totalmente originales, como lo que producen los escritores, pero tampoco se trata de una reacción no concomitante o de un estudio aislado, como el presentado por los críticos. En las traducciones vemos el trabajo de la dinámica cultural. Para tratar de interpretar esas dinámicas y la recepción en la sobrevivencia de un texto, debemos hacer una distinción entre eventos e incidentes de recepción. El autor del artículo sugiere que hay una tendencia fuerte a dar a las traducciones el estatus de evento.

Palabras clave: dinámica cultural, traducciones, texto movable.

Résumé:

La notion de texte changeante implique de la projection dans la forme de l'interprétation, de la projection aussi dans la forme de la traduction, une sorte de mouvement double. Les traductions constituent en cas spécial de dynamique culturelle dans le sens que les deux répètent et changent ce qui avait été écrit avant. Elles fonctionnent et elles sont effectives dans des ambiances nouvelles. Leurs résultats ne sont pas tout à fait originaux, comme ceux d'un écrivain, il ne s'agit pas non plus d'une réaction non concomitante ou d'une analyse isolée, comme celui présenté par les critiques. Dans les traductions nous voyons le travail de la dynamique culturelle. Pour essayer d'interpréter ces dynamiques et la réception dans la survivance d'un texte, nous devons distinguer les événements des incidents de réception. L'auteur de l'article suggère qu'il existe une forte tendance à donner aux traductions le statut d'événement.

Mots clés : dynamique culturelle, traductions, texte changeante.

*This article makes part of a research on cultural change and translation that the author is carrying out at Utrecht University.

Preamble

Are texts able to move? An absurd question, many would say, even in our computerized times, but literary scholars, at any rate, are capable of presuming that something like textual mobility does exist. I am no exception. In many an article I have used phrases such as ‘the poem likes to be read as’ or spoke of ‘the paths of translation’ (Naaijkens 2003). In all cases I considered the springing to life of a non-living and abstract object as self-evident. At the same time, of course, I realized that my object was animated, that I attributed meaning to lines of poetry, and considered translations as texts transferred in space and time. The notion of a moveable text involves projection – projection in the form of interpretation, projection also in the form of translation, so that something like a double movement comes into being. But in all cases a text is realized only in its processing.

When one wishes to speak of textual mobility and the dynamics of cultural transfer another problem arises, as the moving objects are doubled: it is not just the text that moves, but also the culture. Again it is a matter of mysterious dynamics, as both the originator of the transfer and the object of transfer remain vague. Do texts transfer culture by themselves? Do texts want something with and from culture? Should ‘paths’ be available to texts for the transfer of culture?

Metaphors are a nuisance, indeed, but they do point to an essence of meaning. In this case the essence is cultural dynamics, in which text production, transfer, integration and representation form a fascinating yet intricate whole. Moreover, the unravelling of each of these processes requires considerable and diverse knowledge, which we have only in part. Where are we to find the material, and what condition is it in? How are we to explore it? Besides, the gathering of data should take place systematically: it presupposes a theory, comparatism, a double view of more than one culture, a concept of translation, a definition of culture, it presupposes a method – how are these cultural dynamics to be accounted for and systematically mapped and explained, and by what means?

Getting to grips with dynamics stemming from an actual text is not easy. Writers follow their own paths, take detours without scruples, and ridicule everything through their characters, even the medium itself. Literary scholars must work out the implications of the way in which the historical and cultural reality is represented in texts and discourse. Translators especially, however, put language and reality in motion. It is important to check on the paths that lead to and from translation, whether they go back to the source or head for another, more distant destination. Translations constitute a special case of cultural dynamics as, in a sense, they both repeat and change what was written before. They function and are effective in a new environment anyway. Their outcome is not wholly a new original, such as writers produce, but neither a noncommittal reaction or detached study, such as critics deliver. A translation is both at the same time: it forms new material *and* comments on what another person has said in relation to a certain idea or topic; it contains both the projection of the author and that of the translator. The particular property of translations is that at the same time they provoke a new reaction – of an interpretative, socio-cultural or aesthetic nature. What these new sources and their effect embody, reveals much about the perspective a culture applies. In translations we see the workings of cultural dynamics *in optima forma*.

It is important to take note of this particular property of translations, for example when a translation coincides with the introduction of a work into another culture. The Dutch author Cees Nooteboom once described the problems involved in introducing an author into a foreign-language culture. Ultimately, it is only the oeuvre itself that matters, he claims, ‘all the rest is [...] conversation, chatter from the upper layer, the noise that surrounds every

author's life. As long as this noise takes the shape of letters, polemics, feuilletons, it belongs to the landscape, if only to accentuate the peaks' (Nooteboom 2005, 8-9). Nooteboom has an ugly name for his metaphor of noise, too: anecdotage. Indeed, he does not deny that the secondary, the noise, is necessary 'to reach the peaks. Every great novel is surrounded by a planetary system of other texts.' But he is speaking of translations. And although Nooteboom often breaks a lance for a more prominent position for translations, he here in fact denies the actual impact of translations, also texts surrounding a source; in his view the original remains the genuine thing.

It is my assumption that there is a high degree of strategy and control in the introduction of literary works in a target culture, and at the same time that it is necessary to stress the moments of control, selection and influence in cultural, receptional, and translation-historical studies. First and foremost is the question which works were neglected and why. And, in a larger perspective: what were those 'peaks' or key moments, and of what nature was the 'noise' in the lowlands of the literary landscape, the discourse accompanying the presence of a foreign-language literature in translation? In all instances – selection, tendency, and influence – the key question is obviously: why did it happen like this? And what was the precise impact of the introduction of new works, new ideas, new culture through the medium of translation?

1. Cultural Encounter and Translation

Literature develops not only within a culture, it is also dynamic as a result of exchange and dialogue with other literatures. Traces of cultural exchange can be found in literary texts when they are exposed to a new target culture. The process of exchange involves a lot of mediation. Writers, publishers, critics and others all contribute to the transliterary dynamics in their own way. Research into the dialogue between literature reveals much about cultural dynamics. But in order to observe these dynamics, literary-historical frameworks limited to one type of national literature need to be broken open and to be put into a transliterary perspective. Instead of studying one fixed, stable source researchers of culture need to take a comparative approach.

The material may be diverse, but in fact it constitutes the tangible traces of other cultures and/or literature: intellectual debates (academic studies, journalistic reviews), concrete contacts (personal contacts, correspondences, institutional meetings, conferences, festivals, etc.), publications in book form (e.g. in anthologies), demonstrable 'influence' of a cultural-historical, ideological or literary nature in debates and discussions. An enormous conglomerate in fact. In this string of documents translations form a separate category, as they – almost by definition – embody cultural exchange. In short, translations are a prominent form of reception and cultural encounter.

This is not a novel idea. In the view of someone like George Steiner any kind of reception of a meaningful form in the field of languages, the arts and music was by definition comparative. In nearly all his publications he departs from three 'focuses' of study: 1) the dynamics of cultural transfer, in relation to texts mainly the reception of literary works 'in time and space', 2) comparatistic thematic studies and 3) studies of translations (Steiner 1975, 1998³). Besides the effects, the mechanisms and motives forming the basis of the cultural encounter should be described as well, but translations remain a case in point.

Translation-historical research could focus on the impact of translations as an impulse to change and could thus form a starting point from which to examine the different ways in which translations are received in different cultural settings and at different times. This would open up the possibility to discuss ideas that have influenced the target-cultural world. Some

cultures, especially the Dutch, are inconceivable without mediation between foreign and national characteristics, without translation in short. A good description of the historical dynamics of import and export would reveal how a foreign-language culture enters or entered our literature, how it functions or functioned in this different culture, and how the exchange between different literary works takes or took place from the viewpoint of the target culture.

2. Translations and Reception History

In fact, what I am saying is: do not consider translations a *quantité négligeable* without effect, but award translations a special place in the discussion on the transfer and integration of foreign literature. The question, of course, is *how*? For an answer to the question of the tangents between cultural and translation history, we should not only turn to historians of culture and philosophy, but also to translators and translation scholars. The philosopher and language historian Walter Benjamin is a case in point. In his essay ‘Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers’ (The Task of the Translator) he points three times to a characteristic of texts mentioned earlier, namely that they are able to move, or, as he calls it, ‘live’. Firstly, in the best known sentence of his essay (in which, by the way, he accounts for a translation): ‘Ist doch die Übersetzung später als das Original, und bezeichnet sie doch bei den bedeutendsten Werken, die da ihre erwählten Übersetzer niemals im Zeitalter ihrer Entstehung finden, das Stadium ihres Fortlebens’ (‘Since a translation comes later than the original, and since the important works of world literature never find their chosen translators at the time of their origin, their translation marks their stage of continued life.’) (Benjamin 1923, 1973², p. 159). Subsequently this ‘Fortleben’ is given a name, it is not ‘noise’, as Nooteboom called it, but more than that: ‘Die Geschichte der großen Kunstwerke kennt ihre Deszendenz aus den Quellen, ihre Gestaltung im Zeitalter des Künstlers und die Periode ihres grundsätzlich ewigen Fortlebens bei den nachfolgenden Generationen. Dieses Letzte heißt, wo es zutage tritt, Ruhm. Übersetzungen, die mehr als Vermittlungen sind, entstehen, wenn im Fortleben ein Werk des Zeitalters seines Ruhmes erreicht hat. Sie dienen daher nicht sowohl diesem, wie schlechte Übersetzer es für ihre Arbeit zu beanspruchen pflegen, als daß sie ihm ihr Dasein verdanken. In ihnen erreicht das Leben des Originals seine erneute spätestes und umfassendste Entfaltung’ ‘The history of the great works of art tells us about their antecedents, their realization in the age of the artist, their potentially eternal afterlife in succeeding generations. Where the latter manifests itself, it is called fame. Translations that are more than transmissions of subject matter come into being when in the course of its survival a work has reached the age of its fame. Contrary, therefore, to the claims of bad translators, such translations do not so much serve the work as owe their existence to it. The life of the originals attains in them to its ever renewed latest and most abundant flowering.’ (p. 158-9). Finally, Benjamin takes the decisive step in his argument, when he describes the actual value of this ‘Fortleben’ of a text in his translation: ‘Denn in seinem Fortleben, das so nicht heißen dürfte, wenn es nicht Wandlung und Erneuerung des Lebendigen wäre, ändert sich das Original.’ ‘For in its afterlife – which could not be called that if it were not a transformation and a renewal of something living – the original undergoes a change.’ (p. 160)

What it comes down to is that Benjamin awards translations a significant characteristic: the translation *alters the original*. Thus, any discourse on an original influenced by its translation changes into a different discourse, namely a discourse on a different text. This is the case as soon as a text has gone the way of translation and has entered a different, target-cultural setting. Therefore we must conclude that a reception history that limits itself to the noise of criticism and disregards the moments of translation, offers only restricted information. Another important point made by Benjamin is, that the alteration of the original is seen as a change for the better, otherwise he would not have used the word ‘Entfaltung’, or ‘flowering’

(Zohn). It is this ‘flowering’, or ‘development’ (cf. Jakobson 1959), that marks the difference between consumptive, more or less arbitrary reception without effect, and productive, effective and in some sense ‘real’ reception.

On a humorous and practical note, Benjamin puts forward a third aspect that is involved: *fame*. Apparently Benjamin’s rather text-oriented, minute and meticulous approach – in which he is recognized to be what he really is, namely a translator – has a different side to it. A much more worldly side, as fame can also detach itself from achievements; in cultural history fame may evolve separately from texts. Benjamin situates translation more prominently ‘in the fame’ than Nooteboom did ‘in the noise’; translation is not a random reaction, but stands midway ‘between poetry and doctrine’. Its products are less sharply defined, says Benjamin, ‘but it leaves no less of a mark on history’. He speaks in absolute terms about the relation between history and translation, probably as a result of his own involvement in translation, but perhaps historians who are not translators think differently about the place of translation in history. In their opinion, does translation occupy such a central position as Benjamin suggests?

3. Translations as a Litmus Test

In her study *The World Republic of Letters* Pascale Casanova tries to get to grips with what she calls the literary space. No doubt the metaphor ‘space’ is related to Bourdieu’s metaphor ‘field’, in the sense that a spatial axis is placed upon the temporal axis of historiography in order to explore the contextual and institutional situation. Casanova maps the literature of the world, and in the world-wide space she creates there is a perpetual exchange of ideas and texts. Her use of the word ‘exchange’ is derived from the French author Ramuz, who described the literary system as a ‘universal bank of foreign exchange and commerce’ (2004, p. 100). Casanova advocates the outline of a literary map of the world and provides an initial impetus for such a map. Her point of departure is that literature develops locally, yet evolves from a combination of national and international forces. The world of letters should be interpreted as ‘a composite of the various national literary spaces, which are themselves bipolar and differentially situated in the world structure according to the relative attraction exerted upon them by its national and international poles, respectively’ (p. 107).

According to Casanova, translations play a key role in the construction of the map of world literature: they are ‘essential elements in the unification of literary space, assisting the diffusion of the great revolutions carried out in the center and so sharing in the universal credit of the innovations they help transmit’ (p. 100). Ultimately, she considers translations to be ‘an essential measure of the scale and effectiveness of consecration’ of writers and the literary innovations they transmit’ (p. 167). The historian Peter Burke, too, pleads for a place for translations in the historical space: ‘I should like to argue that history deserves a large place in Translation Studies and that studies of translation deserve a large place in history. Translation is actually central to cultural history’ (2005, p. 3). Burke draws attention to the key role played by translators and translations in the encounters between cultures, cultural movements and the exchange of ideas and knowledge. ‘Translation may be regarded as a kind of litmus paper that makes the process [of decontextualization and recontextualization] unusually visible’ (p. 4). Burke stresses the importance of ‘cultural translators’, i.e. culture changing translators, key figures in the encounters between cultures. Consequently, his focus is on the ideological, politico-historical and religious impact of the transfer of ideas. He takes a broader view of the term ‘exchange’ and uses it to denote a process in which ideas and meanings in the broadest sense of the word are *transferred*. When he speaks of texts that move, they are always secondary to larger historical movements. His perspective is very wide,

typical of an historian who wishes to trace the broad lines of relevance. It differs completely from the perspective of a literary historian, for example, who usually wishes to penetrate into texts or even sentences or clauses: that's where his Grail is, the enigma that reveals how an individual experiences the world. In one respect Burke's view is stimulating: it is generous and has the effect of a breath of fresh air. You are inclined to recommend his line of approach to the study of literature. But does he provide enough to hold on to?

Burke provides no more than a framework, I would say, as there is no denying that literary-reception and translation historians are focussed mainly on texts and their impact. What they want with these literary texts is an essential question, however. What do they wish to find in these texts: the internal, literary technique and the impulsive reaction of others to it, or the importance of the literally composed, existential experience and the viewpoint of others on it? When Burke speaks of gain and loss in translation, for example, he means gain and loss of cultural heritage. He does not reason in terms of translation mistakes etc., as translations, good or bad, may always set fire to the powder of social and cultural change. But Burke takes position, as he confronts translation studies with the following: 'Even today, though, workers in this field have less to say about the contrasts between cultures than between individual translators, less about long-term trends than about short-term processes, and less about the history of practice than about the history of theory' (2007, p. 3). Burke wants to close the gap between historians and translation scholars, and for this reason it is worth the effort to use his definition of translation: 'Central to such a dialogue is the notion of translation between cultures as well as between languages, in other words the adaptation of ideas and texts as the pass from one culture to another' (p. 3). It is the duality of text and idea, suggested casually, that makes his definition so interesting.

His definition comes close to another definition, in which translation 'entails trading between cultures, between different ways of imagining the world, involving both diachronic shifts and delicate synchronic adjustments' (Neill 2000, p. 400). One could say that finally, it all depends on whether a translation plays a crucial or a minor role in the whole process of transfer and integration. Crucial are translations which are decisive for a special moment in the integration process: for example, because they bring about a reception (of whatever kind), or because they are central to a public, cultural or literary debate. A minor role is reserved for translations which accompany or illustrate a reception process: for example, when they are the result of the attention for a certain idea or a certain author, or when they are among all and sundry reactions to an idea or work, e.g. critiques, reviews, descriptions in school books, reference books or academic discourse. I would like to examine this last matter further: the major or minor role of translations in reception-historical research issues.

4. Translation as Event

The term history has two meanings, as we know. It denotes the research carried out by a historian, but it also points to 'the series of actual events in the past which are subject to his/her enquiry' (Baker 1998, p. 100). But what are these *events*? And are all *events* important? It is clear that not all reactions and mentions play a role in the formation of an image, and thus a distinction should be made between indistinct, tacit reactions and key moments. One could think of the first moment the work of an author is commented on in the target culture, of influential translations, of heated debates and of forms of social change. An additional question is where translations really belong. Are they to be classified as tacit reaction or key moments? Or, to speak in Nooteboom's terms, as peaks in the cultural landscape or as noise? Or, to expound on Benjamin, vegetating, 'fortleben', living on or reviving – or fame? When, to speak of Burke, does a translation constitute no more than a moment of reception and when does it represent a cultural change?

In order to distinguish between events and incidents, a broader collection of data is needed. Here methods developed in sociology may be of importance. It seems advisable relate developments within reception history once more, as this discipline sees history more as a sequence of ‘effects’ and less as a sequence of literary works. The danger of relapsing into positivistic data gathering has diminished, as the electronic availability of all kinds of sources enables us to gather information more easily and also to classify it more easily, i.e. distinguishing between event and incident. The enormous amount of data should also enable us to recognize patterns and repertoires more easily.

I see a few opportunities to come closer to a definition of ‘events’. In any case, all possibilities to gather and map empirical data should be used (sources and bibliographies in the first place). Next, it is important to look at the socio-cultural context marking the contours of those events (the role of institutions, publishers, agents, schooling systems); Burke’s definition of ‘culture translations’ and Benjamin’s principle that an original alters anyway as soon as it enters someone else’s mind or is cast in a different shape, could be guiding here. Besides, it could be helpful to look at events in which the reception of a work switches over to new literary production and in which one could speak of ‘real’, actual *Wirkung* (adaptations, stagings, theatre adaptations, intertextuality) to arrive at a workable definition of an important event. I would like to add that there is a strong case to award translations the status of event. And I am tempted to say that in the gathering and weighing of data, translations should be given a much more prominent place than has happened until now. The dynamics of cultural encounters are especially made visible by translations.

5. Case I: Schnitzler’s Texts and Ideas

In 2006 I made two attempts to apply the above to concrete research. In a reception-historical sketch I tried to describe the presence of the Austrian writer Arthur Schnitzler in the Netherlands in the 1920s, analyzing the range of ideas he represented in the eyes of an audience that must have regarded the Viennese world of the fin-de-siècle as quite exotic (Naaijkens 2006a). It turned out that Schnitzler was brought to bear upon several debates in the Dutch-speaking world of the first half of the twentieth century, and not just literary debates. The appreciation of his work fluctuated and he acted as a spokesman in numerous circles, in which he was either admired or condemned. The author was widely noticed, especially in the 1920s, was frequently translated and published by more than one publishing house. His plays were (and are) performed often, both in the more serious theatres and, initially, in the vaudeville theatres. He enjoyed a good reputation as a storyteller and a novelist, but also crops up in the gossip columns of newspapers and magazines. He was read widely, both by the large public and by important critics, who had an opinion of him, an opinion that was sometimes secondary though to the issues of the day. The presence of Schnitzler in the Netherlands and Flanders was documented in detail by Hans Roelofs in his dissertation about Schnitzler and the Netherlands in the period 1895-1940. The data he collected made it possible to explore and compare the facts. However, his study proved to require deepening and conceptualization, chiefly because he does not distinguish between reception events and reception incidents. Consequently, it still remained a challenge to position Schnitzler in more detail in the Dutch cultural field. Another reason was that Roelofs concentrated mainly on reactions in the press and neglected the impact of the translations of Schnitzler’s works, as he hardly considered them an ‘event’. In general, making the relation with the cultural, moral and literary debate was hampered by the fact that Roelofs chose for a simple enumeration of facts. Moreover, he focussed mainly on the possible importance of the Schnitzler reception for the German-language culture. In his book quotes of Dutch mediators consistently appear in a German translation, which made it quite awkward to distil the

‘national’ differentiations they made when introducing this foreign author. The perspective of Roelofs’ study is in other words more oriented towards the author and his positioning in the history of German literature than towards what he provoked from and meant to the target culture and Dutch literary history. I tried to point out that the journalistic attention and the opinion of the literary public at large were indeed important for the image of the author, but that it is much more interesting to look for a pattern and tendency in the abundance of individual reactions. By including less canonized authors and non-literary reactions as well, it became easier to make a link with the cultural, ethical and political debate as it took place at that moment.

6. Case II: anthologies of translated poetry

In another essay (Naaijkens 2006b) I tried to analyse a difficult object of study, the anthology of translated poetry. The combination of anthology and translation reveals a number of mechanisms at play in the arena of cultural transfer, principally: selection & unlocking, representation & translation, commentary & criticism. The four roles that the German writer Enzensberger once ascribed to the editor of an anthology – those of explorer, translator, critic and essayist at the same time – reflect some of these mechanisms. With regard to the first two mechanisms, selection & unlocking, one could think of the choices made by an outsider – as a specialist or interested reader of that particular foreign literature – in studying or reviewing certain texts. Representation & translation point to the importance that is attached to a certain kind of poetry. One discovers the filters through which compilers and translators looked at the work of certain authors. The historical reception process of, say, Mallarmé’s poems in the Netherlands comes to mind, complete with previous translations, instances in which the author was mentioned and discussed by scholars, writers and critics in this country. All of these could be characterized as key moments of cultural transfer. Commentary & criticism are related to defining the genre. In the case of anthologies, the entire publication should be taken into account, including layout and accompanying texts, like prefaces or epilogues, footnotes, text-genetic patterns, incorporated translations, justification, the fact of their being monolingual or bilingual, etc. It is here where the traces of selection & unlocking and of representation & translation come to light and, in a more general sense, ‘barometers of taste’ can be found (cf. Hermans 2004). These can also be derived from any notable absentees, certain poets in other words whose presence could logically be expected, but who are missing. The pivotal act is that of reading these barometers, in terms of norms, values, political or ideological positions, literary, historical-literary and poetical principles.

In my opinion at least three aspects should always be gauged. Firstly, purpose and function of an anthology. A distinction should be made between thematic function, literary or historical-literary function, cultural or cultural-historical function, ideological, political or commercial functions. Naturally, these functions are not exclusive and might even overlap. Secondly, the character of the anthology. It is possible to distinguish between an author’s anthology, in which a predisposed choice is made from a certain perspective, a publisher’s anthology, in which other objectives, like acquisition and publicity play a role, and a translated anthology, in which translators, poets acting as translators, translators acting as poets or the poems themselves occupy centre stage. As a third aspect, a detailed definition of the object of study would prove valuable. This definition includes the selection of the poems themselves, the arrangement of the texts, or the effects of the anthology or accompanying texts, like prefaces and epilogues, annotation, biographies etc.

Conclusion

Anthologies of translated poetry deserve special consideration as both the activity of translating and that of anthologizing presuppose modification and selection with regards to a given piece of literature. This double filter causes the format of the whole, including the topical arrangement and the context, to impact the individual poems. In this sense, translating is also a form of anthologizing. Intercultural or interliterary anthologies, be it multilateral or bilateral, operate, to quote Anthony Pym, at ‘the intersection of translating and anthologizing’ thus forming a unique genre in which the ‘dominant concept of the original author’ should be seen in its proper perspective (Pym 1995). Pym draws attention to what he calls ‘the silent hands’, labouring away at transposing, translating and arranging texts.

References

- ANDRINGA, Els & SOPHIE, Levie en MATHIJS Sanders, 'Thema: de receptie van buitenlandse literatuur in de twintigste eeuw', inleiding tot een themanummer van *Nederlandse Letterkunde*, jaargang 2006 (ter perse).
- BAKER, Mona, *Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London/New York: Routledge 1998.
- BASSNETT, Susan and LEFEVERE, André, ed., *Constructing Cultures*. Clevedon/Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters 1998.
- BENJAMIN, Walter, 1923. 'Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers', zit. nach Störig, Hans Joachim. 1973. *Das Problem des Übersetzens*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, p. 156-169. Cf. Walter Benjamin, 'The Task of the Translator', translated by Harry Zohn, in: *The Translation Studies Reader*. Edited by Lawrence Venuti. London & New York: Routledge 200, p. 15-22.
- BURKE, Peter. 2005. *Lost (and Found) in Translation: Translators and Translation in Early Modern Europe*. Den Haag: Koninklijke Bibliotheek.
- and R. PO-CHIA Hsia ed. 2007. *Cultural Translation in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- CASANOVA, Pascale. 2004. *The World Republic of Letters*, translated by M.B. DeBevoise, Cambridge, Massachusetts/London, Harvard University Press.
- ESPAGNE, Michel, MIDDELL, Katharina, MIDDELL, Matthias Middell Hrg. 2000. *Archiv und Gedächtnis: Studien zur interkulturellen Überlieferung*. Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag.
- FOKKEMA, Douwe et al. 1999-2001. *Nederlandse cultuur in Europese context*. 5 delen. Den Haag: Sdu Uitgevers 1999-2001.
- HERMANS, Theo et al. 1991-2003. *Nederlandse beschouwingen over vertalen*. 7 delen. Den Haag: Stichting Bibliographia Neerlandica.
- , 2002. *Translation in Systems. Descriptive and System-oriented Approaches Explained*. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome Publishing.
- , 2004. 'Huydecoper verkoopt zijn huid. Over vertaalhistorie en vertalersironie', *Filter. Tijdschrift over vertalen*, vol. 11, nr. 3, pp. 33-50.
- HOENSELAARS, Ton ed. 2004. *Shakespeare and the Language of Translation*. The Arden Shakespeare Companion Series. London: Thomson Learning
- JAKOBSON, Roman. 1959. 'On Linguistic Aspects of Translation', in: Reuben Brower ed., *On Translation*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, p. 232-239.
- NAAIJKENS, Ton, 1998 *Lof van de verandering*. Nijmegen: Faculteit der Letteren.
- , 2002 *De slag om Shelley*. Nijmegen: Vantilt.
- , 2003. *De wegen van de vertaling*. Utrecht: Faculteit der Letteren.
- et al ed. 2004. *Denken over vertalen. Tekstboek vertaalwetenschap*. Nijmegen: Vantilt.
- 2006a. 'The World of World Poetry: Anthologies of Translated Poetry as a Subject of Study' in: *Neophilologus*, volume 90, number 3, July 2006, p. 509-520.
- 2006b. "Andere zenuwen, andere verlangens. Schnitzler in de ogen van zijn Nederlandse tijdgenoten", in: *Nederlandse letterkunde, themanummer Het buitenland bekeken. Vijf internationale auteurs door Nederlandse ogen (1900-2000)*, jg. 11, nr. 3 (september 2006), p. 211-234.
- NEILL, Michael. 2000. 'The World beyond: Shakespeare and the tropes of translation' in: *Putting History to the Question: Power, Politics, and Society in English Renaissance Drama*. New York.

- NOOTEBOOM, Cees. 2005. *Het behouden huis. Rede uitgesproken op de feestelijke presentatie ter gelegenheid van de verschijning van het eerste deel van de Volledige Werken van Willem Frederik Hermans*. Amsterdam: De Bezige Bij, 4 november 2005.
- PYM, Anthony. 1995. 'Translational and Non-Translational Regimes Informing Poetry Anthologies. Lessons on Authorship from Fernando Maristany and Enrique Díez-Canedo' in: Kittel, Harald (ed.). 1995. *International Anthologies of Literature in Translation*. Göttinger Beiträge zur Internationalen Übersetzungsforschung, Band 9. Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag, p. 251–270.
- STEINER, George. 1975. *After Babel. Aspects of Language and Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press 1975, 1992, 1998.
- . 1989. *Real Presences*. London/Chicago: Faber & Faber/University of Chicago Press.
- TYMOCZKO, Maria. 1999. *Translation in a Postcolonial Context*. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome Publishing.
- VODICKA, Felix. 1975. *Die Struktur der literarischen Entwicklung*. München: Fink.