INTRODUCTION: DID CENTRAL EUROPE EXIST IN THE MIDDLE AGES?

THE CONCEPT OF CENTRAL EUROPE

‘It is time that some scholarly institute of ours ... decides, in the end, which historical region we live in: Western Europe or Eastern Europe; Central Europe or Central-Eastern Europe; Carpathian Europe or the Danubian area; or elsewhere.’ This irritated outburst highlights the difficulties of determining whether Central Europe exists, and if so, where, even in modern times. Because the concept of Central Europe is a modern rather than a medieval one, it is necessary to look at its origin, meanings and implications in modern history before discussing its relevance to the Middle Ages.

Searching for a definition reveals a multitude of divergent ones. Based on claims of common identity, history or culture, ‘Central Europe’ at its narrowest can include the so-called Visegrád group (initially Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Poland, but since the ‘velvet divorce’, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovakia), but alternatively it can mean these countries and some or all of the following: Austria, Germany, Liechtenstein, Slovenia, Switzerland, Croatia, Romania, Serbia and Ukraine. The reason for such discrepancy, apart from the historically changing borders of various states, is that the criteria which determine inclusion in ‘Central Europe’ vary widely. They can be cultural, political,
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socio-economic, historical or a combination of these, and past- or present-oriented.

For example, Central Europe has been defined as the area of German cultural influence; the area closest to and under the strongest Western influence; the area of the Habsburg Empire; the area of the Polish-Lithuanian commonwealth; the area whose eastern limits correspond to the eastern frontiers of medieval kingdoms, in turn corresponding to the frontier between Catholic West and Orthodox East; the area where East and West meet; the easternmost area that has a Western cultural orientation; a cultural zone; the countries that joined the EU in 2004 or are on track to join; a community of destinies in times of crisis alone; and an area shaped by a whole host of historical developments. The historically changing meaning of Central Europe has also been emphasized.\(^2\) No more or less precise is the recent United Nations definition of ‘a cultural region called Central Europe’, based on eight factors including aspects of religious, cultural, social, economic and political development, many of them in a comparative perspective with Western, South-Eastern, Eastern, Southern and Northern Europe.\(^3\) Other definitions focus on modes of self-perception and include multiculturality and multilingualism,
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the area of coffee-house culture, strudel and spritzer, marked by Ashkenazi Jewish culture, seen by some as the principal representative of a Central European culture. Even ‘love of poetry, idealism and cynicism’ have been cited as defining characteristics of the region.4

Historically, Mitteleuropa was significant among such designations. Sometimes this is translated as Middle Europe. It usually refers to the areas under strong German cultural influence prior to the First World War, and can thus be invoked as a region with – at least in many respects – a common culture, although the area it designates can be the region between the Rhine and the Vistula or the much larger zone between the Rhine and the Dnieper. The term also has a geographical meaning, but is no more objective or precise than ‘Central Europe’; there never existed one sole concept of Mitteleuropa.5

In case it would seem that the obviously ‘right’ solution is for the term ‘Central Europe’ to cover the geographical centre of Europe, it is necessary to emphasize – as has been demonstrated many times – that definitions of ‘geographical’ subregions of Europe have very little to do with geography. Moreover, there is in fact absolutely no consensus about where the geographical centre of Europe is. That in itself depends on how one defines the borders of Europe, notably whether islands are included or not. Therefore many places lay claim to being Europe’s centre, including places in Austria, Lithuania, Hungary, Slovakia, Estonia and Belarus. These places go as far west as Frauenkirchen, Austria, at 47°50’N 16°55’E, and as far east as Purnuškės in Lithuania, at 54°54’N 25°19’E. One calculation even
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locates Europe’s centre in southern Norway, 60°00′N 07°30′E. One cannot unambiguously and factually determine what exact area ‘Central Europe’ should contain, based on geography. To make matters even more complicated, the terminology itself is debated, some scholars preferring Eastern Europe, rather than Central Europe, for the countries under investigation in this book, with yet others choosing East-Central, Central-Eastern or other designations. Some, notably István Bibó, used Eastern Europe to indicate the three states of Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Poland. More often, however, Eastern Europe includes in one category everything east of the Rivers Elbe and Saale, thus encompassing a much larger area than treated in this book (including East German and Austrian, Czech, Slovak, Hungarian, Polish, Lithuanian, Romanian, Ukrainian, Belarusian, Russian, Bulgarian, Croat and Serb lands). Eastern Europe has also been characterized in historical geography as a march-land or shatterbelt territory, where independent antagonistic powers emerged, and where conflicting great power interests, impulses and influences from East and West clashed, a region that cannot be unified either in itself or as part of one of the contending powers.

East-Centre Europe, East-Central Europe, Central-Eastern Europe and the German Ostmitteleuropa (since 1918) have all been proposed as designations of the whole area between the Baltic, Adriatic, Aegean and Black Seas in the broadest definition, or for the area between Germany and Russia, or just for the countries treated in this book. (Thus the terms can cover only Czech and Slovak lands, Hungary and Poland, or also Romania, Slovenia, Croatia, Albania, Austria, Bosnia and so on.) The extent of the
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territory included in the definition partly depends on the period which serves as its basis. For example, if the designation is based on the later medieval kingdoms of Bohemia, Poland–Lithuania and Hungary, that, in modern terms, translates to the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary, Poland, Lithuania, Belarus, Ukraine, Croatia and Transylvania (i.e. part of Romania). For the purposes of this book, it is important to point out that the union of Poland–Lithuania happened much later than the period we cover, and the eastern areas were not part of the kingdom of Poland.

The terminology, itself suggestive of a ‘middle’ position, is often linked to the characterization of the area as lands in between, where East and West meet, a meeting conceived of in a variety of ways (for example, in one formulation the region is a ‘child of the West who later married the East’, while elsewhere it is a mixture of Eastern and Western).

\(^{10}\) Westmitteleuropa is much rarer, designating
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the area of German economic, social and cultural influence, a symbiosis with German culture, and is used sometimes for Bohemia. The term Zwischeneuropa, implying a region open to be dominated by neighbouring great powers, appeared in the early twentieth century but was not widely adopted. Along with Europe médiane, it is also sometimes used instead of Central or East-Central Europe by those who see the in-between status of these countries as their main characteristic. A few other terms have been coined by medievalists for the countries covered in this book, such as ‘younger Europe’, ‘newcomers’ to Europe or ‘third Europe’. The same areas, therefore, can be designated by a variety of different names, sometimes as synonyms, other times as carriers of a distinct meaning, while the same term can mean a different area for each scholar.

All students of history know that terminological debates can be infertile. In this case, however, it is very pertinent to ask ‘what’s in a name’. Regional and national identity as seen from inside and as imposed from outside are at stake. The two, in the modern period, can be radically different from each other. The diversity of terms and seeming word-games relate to political and other interests, and to questions of identity. Thus, the origin of the concept of Mitteleuropa is strongly linked to German economic and political interests, and hence been rejected by many as a disguise or justification for German domination. The term had sporadic seventeenth-century precedents, and was used in the early nineteenth century as a geographic label. It quickly acquired economic and political significance with Friedrich List in the first half of the nineteenth century. Mitteleuropa was
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Otto Forst de Battaglia, Zwischeneuropa. Von der Ostsee bis zur Adria (Frankfurt am Main, 1954).


Wandycz, Price of Freedom, uses this as the title of his Introduction, 1.
connected to a role Germany envisioned for itself in Europe, namely a desire for economic and political expansion and hegemony, sometimes linked to a German self-representation as the ‘middle’, that is, centre, of Europe. German unification was seen as a first step to uniting Europe or parts of Europe from the ‘centre’ (Germany), especially from the middle of the nineteenth century. Although France, Belgium, the Netherlands and Scandinavian countries were also often included among regions to be brought under German economic and political dominance, eastern and south-eastern areas of Europe were thought by many to be ‘natural’ spheres of German influence, civilizing mission and cultural hegemony.

Diverse proponents of the Mitteleuropa concept before the First World War meant different regions by this term. An economic association, the Mitteleuropäischer Wirtschaftsverein, was founded in 1904 in Berlin, but the real father and popularizer of the concept was Friedrich Naumann, who called for the establishment of an economic federation centring on Germany and Austria-Hungary, with the voluntary adhesion of smaller states. Although he did not advocate domination by force, unlike many others who referred to Mitteleuropa, his ideas have been interpreted variously as the forerunner of the concept of a more democratic federation, or as a proposal simply for a different form of German domination. By the time of the First World War, Mitteleuropa and its translation in local languages was used by many not only in Western Europe, but also in the region itself. After the end of the First World War, the new or newly re-emerging states of Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Poland came to be the focal point of the concept. Both British and French power politics had a role for Central Europe, and a French Europe centrale idea emerged (although in a geographical sense the term was used already in the middle of the nineteenth century) as a means of counter-balancing German power – an attempt that failed.

German plans for a German-led Central Europe did not disappear during the period between the two world wars. With Hitler gaining power, trade agreements with various central and east European countries were put in place in 1934. Nazi Germany associated German Lebensraum with Mitteleuropa and turned it into a ‘natural’ sphere of expansion towards Russia (as early as the nineteenth century some authors used the term in a context of German superiority). This

15 Mitteleuropa (Berlin, 1915).
compromised the term in the eyes of many German-speakers (who now prefer Ostmitteleuropa or Zentraleuropa), as well as in the eyes of people affected by Nazi policies of expansion. Others, however, reclaimed the term as a scholarly concept on par with terms such as Central Europe or Ostmitteleuropa.  

Eastern Europe as a designation for the countries covered in this book is no less loaded or more objective a term. As Larry Wolff has shown, this ‘Eastern Europe’ was created by West Europeans during the era of the Enlightenment, as a barbaric and exotic complement to their own civilized countries. During the eighteenth century, the traditional north–south divide (Italy as the land of civilization, the north as the land of the uncouth barbarians) was replaced by a new east–west division. The imagery of the ‘barbarians’ itself was partly borrowed from earlier times – when it was used to describe northerners – but was now applied to ‘Eastern Europeans’. Such images were created as a counterpoint to what the philosophers and travellers of the west saw as their own culture. Real observation was often clouded by preconceptions, fantasy and desire, and the resulting construction of ‘Eastern Europe’ was not based on a factual analysis, even if it included elements of reality. Many components of this construct were perpetuated by the ideology of the ‘iron curtain’ and applied to the Soviet bloc.

Political events strongly influenced the changing denomination of the region, the acceptance or rejection of the term ‘Eastern Europe’, in the twentieth century. Historians from the region (notably Oskar Halecki) initiated the creation of a section dedicated to the history of


The concept of Central Europe

‘Eastern Europe’ at the International Historical Congress of 1923 in Brussels, which was subsequently established. The term’s meaning changed radically after the Second World War, when Eastern Europe became the almost exclusive name for the area, designating the whole Soviet bloc. The name itself was understood by some as a type of historical legitimization of Soviet dominance over the region, by labelling Russia and all the countries of the bloc as one historical region, although émigrés (notably Halecki) played a key role in militating against the terminology of a unified Eastern Europe. Such dissenters succeeded only in the 1980s, when other emigrants from the region (among them Milan Kundera, Czesław Miłosz and György Konrád) and dissidents within it (including Václav Havel and Adam Michnik) reintroduced Central Europe into political terminology as a way of distancing themselves and their countries from the Soviet Union and insisting on ties to the West, thereby questioning the status quo. Many local people resented and rejected the term ‘Eastern Europe’ as pejorative, defining themselves as inhabitants of Central Europe, culturally belonging to the West. At the same time, in Germany and Austria an increasing number of writers and conferences addressed the issue of Central Europe (Mitteleuropa) as a project in different ways, from political to cultural and anti-political. Thus Central Europe was coming back into vogue and readopted by Westerners, to emerge again strongly by 1989, linked to the influence of expatriates and dissidents, but also to internal intellectual developments in Western Europe.

G. Des Marez and F.-L. Ganshof, eds., Compte rendu du Ve Congrès International des Sciences Historiques Bruxelles 1923 (Brussels, 1923), 409. O. Halecki’s paper militating for the significance of the eastern half of Europe for the history of Europe as a whole, ‘L’histoire de l’Europe orientale: sa division en époques, son milieu géographique et ses problèmes fondamentaux’, is published in full in La Pologne au Ve Congrès International des Sciences Historiques, Bruxelles 1923 (Warsaw, 1924), 73–94. Here he was already arguing that part of eastern Europe was western in civilization. In his later work he preferred a clear distinction between eastern Europe and his two Central Europes; for more on this, see below. See also Jaroslav Bidlo, ‘Was ist die osteuropäische Geschichte? (Deren Inhalt und Perioden)’, in VIIe Congrès International des Sciences Historiques. Résumés des Communications présentées au Congrès, Varsovie 1933 (Warsaw, 1933), vol. II, 197–207.

Similarly, East–Central Europe (French Centre-Est), pioneered by emigrants from the region, has been used by locals in a bid not just to assert the independence of their countries, but also to investigate the past in that framework. Paternity of the term ‘East–Central Europe’ as an alternative to the German orientation of the term Mitteleuropa has been attributed to Tomáš Masaryk, designating the lands between Russia and Germany. On a conceptual level, he did argue for the role of the small nations between Russia and Germany in a new Europe, but he did not call them by this term; rather, he used ‘Eastern Europe’, ‘small nations’, ‘non–German nations in the East’. Between the world wars, such a subdivision appeared, for example in the title of the journal Archivum Europae Centro-Orientalis from 1935. From the 1940s, Halecki introduced the term in historical studies. After the Second World War, scholars originating in the region itself – although at first usually emigrants – increasingly used this term, which then (usually excluding Germany and Russia) became widespread both in the region itself and in Western scholarship.

Pre-1989 East–Central Europe (Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland) as one historical region (although with varying boundaries over time) was defined as the most troubled region of the Soviet bloc, distinguished by recurrent crises, a reformist communism, the most vigorous dissident culture and revolts. The view that East Central Europe is not just a construct, but reality, a historical and