



The Substrate of Culture: Central Europe as Intellectual Space

Daniel Pratt

McGill University

Corresponding author email: daniel.pratt@mcgill.ca

Abstract: There have been numerous definitions of Central Europe, from Friedrich Naumann who defined Mitteleuropa as the widest extent of "German" holdings to Milan Kundera who argued that Central Europe contained all the countries "boxed in by the Germans on one side and the Russians on the other." Others have argued that there is no such thing as Central Europe other than the remnant left when Europe is divided into East and West, a useful shorthand for a region with no real coherence. This article takes a new approach and defines Central Europe as the area grounded in Germanophone philosophy. I use Germanophone here because it was not just "Germans" who used the language for philosophy, and I am using scare quotes around the term German, since there have been many, differing definitions of that nationality as well. Germanophone philosophy created an intellectual arena different than that of English, French, or Russian in Central Europe from Christian Wolff through the Second World War. This philosophical grounding created what I call a substrate of soil, a layer upon which artists, thinkers, and writers grew in a myriad of different ways, while still having a rich connection to the Germanophone tradition.

Keywords: Mitteleuropa, Central Europe, Milan Kundera, Germanophone, Philosophy, Franz Kafka

Citation suggestion: Pratt, Daniel. "The Substrate of Culture: Central Europe as Intellectual Space". *Transilvania*, no.6-7 (2026): 21-34.

<https://doi.org/10.51391/trva.2026.6-7.03>.



"Die einen sagen, das Wort Odradek stamme aus dem Slawischen und sie suchen auf Grund dessen die Bildung des Wortes nachzuweisen. Andere wieder meinen, es stamme aus dem Deutschen, vom Slawischen sei es nur beeinflusst. Die Unsicherheit beider Deutungen aber läßt wohl mit Recht darauf schließen, daß keine zutrifft, zumal man auch mit keiner von ihnen einen Sinn des Wortes finden kann. // Natürlich würde sich niemand mit solchen Studien beschäftigen, wenn es nicht wirklich ein Wesen gäbe, das Odradek heißt." ["Some say the word Odradek is of Slavonic origin, and try to account for it on that basis. Others again believe it to be of German origin, only influenced by Slavonic. The uncertainty of both interpretations allows one to assume with justice that neither is accurate, especially as neither of them provides an intelligent meaning of the word. // No one, of course, would occupy himself with such studies if there were not a creature called Odradek"].—Franz Kafka

"Who owns Kafka?" Judith Butler asks in the title of her article on the legal dispute between the Israeli government and the heirs of Esther Hoffe, Max Brod's assistant, over the inheritance of several boxes of Franz Kafka's papers.¹ Although the trial itself concerned the details of Brod's will, for Butler, as well as many others, the heart of the matter is where Kafka's papers rightly belong, either in the National Archive in Jerusalem or the German Literature Archive in Marbach.² On the one hand, Kafka wrote in German, making him a lasting part of German literature. On the other hand, he grew up in the Jewish community in Prague and spent much of his time with the German-speaking, Jewish literary community, which included Brod as well as Felix Weltsch, both of whom emigrated to Mandatory Palestine during the Second World War.

Butler's question echoes Benjamin Paloff's 2004 article entitled "Who owns Bruno Schulz?" about a suit regarding Israel's Holocaust memorial organization, Yad Vashem, moving murals from Schulz's hometown of Drahobycz, Ukraine to Jerusalem.³ The Schulz trial also focused on the ownership of the cultural objects, but once again scholars focused on the appropriate place for the writer's heritage. Is it more appropriate to house the murals in Israel, as they had been created by a Jewish man under Nazi pressure, or to keep them in Ukraine, where they would memorialize the Jewish creative presence in Central Europe? The scholarly articles about these two trials point

1. Judith Butler's "Who Owns Kafka?," *London Review of Books* 33, no. 5 (2011): 3–8.

2. In addition to Butler's essay, see Antony Lerman, "The Kafka legacy: who own Jewish heritage?" *The Guardian*, July 22, 2010. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2010/jul/22/kafka-legacy-israel>; Florian Illies and Stefan Koldehoff, "Wem gehört Kafka," *Die Zeit*, November 19, 2009. <http://www.zeit.de/2009/48/Kafka>.

3. Benjamin Paloff, "Who Owns Bruno Schulz," *Boston Review* 29, no. 6, December 1, 2004, 22–25.

to the consistent problem of narrowing Central European intellectuals into singular ethnic or national traditions.

Because of shifting borders, slippery ethnicities, and changing constructions of nationality in Central Europe, which includes Slavs, Germans, Hungarians, and Jews among many others, placing such intellectuals as Kafka and Schulz into a single national cannon does not accurately portray the wealth of influences on their work. Kafka wrote in German, but his father was a Jewish man who at times identified more with the Czechs than Germans, even going to the only Czech speaking synagogue in Prague.⁴ Kafka himself knew Czech, as well as some degree of Yiddish and Hebrew, and it is clear that he knew the literature of all of these traditions.⁵ Correspondingly, Schulz wrote primarily in Polish, but he sent a novel in German to Thomas Mann, now sadly lost, and he was active in the Yiddish literary movements of the early twentieth century.⁶ Concerning Schulz's ethnicity, Paloff writes: "Poles see him as entirely Polish and entirely Jewish at the same time, making him both mysteriously alien and wholly native, an enticingly exotic member of their own family."⁷ In a famous letter to Felice Bauer, Kafka himself remarked on his reviewers calling him sometimes Jewish sometimes German: "A difficult case. Am I a circus rider on two horses? Alas, I am no rider but lie prostrate on the ground." "Ein schwerer Fall. Bin ich ein Cirkusreiter auf 2 Pferden? Leider bin ich kein Reiter sondern liege am Boden."⁸ On the one hand, Schulz is entirely both Polish and Jewish, and on the other Kafka feels that he can be neither Jewish nor German.

Associating Kafka only with German intellectual history would remove the influence of both the Czech and Jewish sides of his heritage. For Schulz, taking his murals to Israel removes them from the site of his life, a place which "epitomized a robust 'multiculturalism' against which contemporary variants pale in comparison," but housing them at the site of his senseless murder in a country whose language he did not speak is problematic as well.⁹ The world in which Kafka and Schulz inhabited cannot be adequately described by limiting them to any one heritage, just as Odradek in the quote above cannot be made sense of through either Czech or German on its own. Etymologically, the word *Odradek* relies not only on the Czech language, but also on a historical interaction with German. The prefix and suffix (od- and -ek respectively) are clearly Czech, but the root of *Odradek* is *rada*, a Czech word meaning advice or advisory council, derived from the German *Rat*, with the same meaning.¹⁰ The word can only be understood through the historical interdependence of both languages. A similar interdependence of heritages, a tapestry which cannot be unwoven, gave rise to the works of Kafka and Schulz, where no one side can give them "intelligent meaning." In order to provide such an intelligent meaning and not unravel the tapestry of influence and inspiration, to allow both Schulz and Kafka to come from several traditions at once, I suggest that these authors be called Central Europeans.

One of the major pitfalls of using the term Central Europe is that it can effectively mean nothing; it is by and large a region which has only been defined negatively. After Friedrich Naumann defined *Mitteleuropa* in a work of the same name of 1915 as the widest extent of "German" holdings, Central Europe has been described through the lack of any good definition.¹¹ In the early post-war era, Oskar Halecki defined "East-Central Europe" as the regions of Central Europe which is "neglected in the writing and teaching of general and European history, as well as in the interpretation of the subject matter."¹² A similar approach was taken up in the waning years of Communism, when Milan Kundera, Czesław Miłosz and György Konrád developed a notion of Central Europe as the small states "[b]oxed in by the Germans on the one side and the Russians on the other," meaning that Central Europe is only defined through its historical geography and its lack of military agency.¹³ More recently, the term has been even more mitigated, with scholars claiming that "The term 'East Central Europe' is arbitrary. It arose out of a need to define a region that is neither wholly Western nor Eastern, but represents a 'middle zone' or 'lands in between,' as some authors have entitled their works on the subject."¹⁴ Central Europe is merely the remnant, "what remains after you

4. Nicholas Murray, *Kafka* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), 8, 18-9.

5. Kafka's Czech was quite good, see Nicholas Murray, *Kafka*, 70. For more on other languages, see Frederick Robert Karl, *Franz Kafka, Representative Man* (New York: Ticknor & Fields, 1991), 83-4. His role in Zionism is debated, see Sara Loeb, *Franz Kafka: A Question of Jewish Identity: Two Perspectives* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2001).

6. Jerzy Ficowski, *Regions of Great Heresy: Bruno Schulz, a Biographical Portrait* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2003), 221.

7. Paloff, "Who Owns Bruno Schulz."

8. Franz Kafka, *Kritische Ausgabe: Briefe* (Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer, 2005), Band III, 250. Author's translation.

9. Denise V. Powers, "Fresco Fiasco: Narratives of National Identity and the Bruno Schulz Murals of Drogobych," *East European Politics and Societies* 17, no. 4 (2003): 623.

10. See Jiří Rejzek, *Český etymologický slovník* (Praha: Leda, 2001). Interestingly, the root *rada* occurs in Czech, Slovak, Polish, Ukrainian and Byelorussian, all areas with at least parts in Central Europe.

11. Friedrich Naumann, *Central Europe* (London: King, 1916), 3. Naumann was not the first to introduce such a concept of Central Europe. The geographer Rohrbach produced the first conception of the region a few years earlier.

12. Oskar Halecki, *Borderlands of Western Civilization: A History of East Central Europe*. (New York: Ronald Press Co., 1952), 4.

13. Milan Kundera, "The Tragedy of Central Europe", *New York Times Review of Books* 31, no. 7, April 26, 1984. Translated by Edmund White.

14. Piotr Stefan Wandycz, *The Price of Freedom: A History of East Central Europe from the Middle Ages to the Present* (London: Routledge, 1992), 1.



have taken away 'Western' and 'Eastern' Europe."¹⁵ Ultimately, it has been argued, the multitude of cultures, nations, ethnicities, as well as the various mixtures makes the basis of Milorad Drachkovitch argument that Central Europe is "an area with no geographic or cultural unity."¹⁶ An additional problem, and one which further complicates the lack of meaning cited above, is the consistent political usage of the term, from the initial German Imperial motivations to the assertions of "Europeanness" of Milan Kundera, Jenő Szűcs, Czesław Miłosz, and György Konrád.

One rather consistent objection to the postwar definitions of Central Europe has been the omission of German-speaking lands from the region.¹⁷ The German language was the centripetal force in Central Europe, or what Pope and Neubauer call the "glue, [the] integrating force among the various ethnic groups."¹⁸ The position of German as the language of the bureaucratic, political, and educational language in Central Europe ensured that German was understood by the educated classes; speaking "German—even without having an ethnic German family background—was considered to be a sign of 'good breeding', whereas the 'native' languages did not possess as much symbolic capital."¹⁹ By and large, "German had been the second language of the cultured and influential middle class in Central and Eastern Europe before the Second World War."²⁰ Knowledge of German allowed for ideas to spread throughout Central Europe, especially through the German and Jewish diasporas, which Scott Spector has called the mediators or translators, creating a readerly intellectual space.²¹

Acknowledging the influence of German language texts, I argue that the spread of the Germanophone philosophical discourse defines the intellectual space of Central Europe. As Robert Pippin argues, the "issues in philosophy often simply express most economically and dramatically a variety of issues that pervade the social and cultural fabric, and philosophical language, if nothing else, can be an economical way of discussing a number of these issues."²² Philosophical ideas were used by intellectuals in Central Europe in order to understand their own society and culture, and they can be used by us to understand the history of ideas and intellectual movements. Germanophone philosophy also had wide-sweeping influence on culture and society in Central Europe, from Herder's discussions of the nation to Marx's critique of capitalism, from Fichte's enormous influence on Romanticism to Ernst Mach's criticism of Newton, a foundation for Einstein's theory of relativity. Philosophy then plays a dual role in this paper, both as a way of understanding the historical discourse in Central Europe and as an influence on that very discourse.

Germanophone philosophy provided the ground, or what I will call a substrate, for philosophical and cultural discourse in Central Europe from the end of the Thirty Years War to the Second World War. During this period, Germanophone philosophy was read, studied, discussed, accepted and resisted from Zürich to Lviv, from Königsberg to Trieste.²³ The German language, effectively the *lingua franca* of the region, connected the various cultures, nations, and ethnicities through its use in politics, education, and in print. Because the educated classes knew German, out of economic, educational, and political necessity, Germanophone philosophy could be read by far more than those who identified as German.²⁴ Philosophy, unlike literature, could be written in a *lingua franca* for wider distribution regardless of the nationality of the author; philosophy was viewed more as a scientific arena, so using German was less demonstrative of national or ethnic allegiance than realms considered more cultural, where the Herderian conception of nation pushed the arts, and especially literature, towards nationalization.²⁵ Knowledge of German helped disseminate philosophical

15. Krisham Kumar, "The 1989 Revolutions and the Idea of Europe," *Political Studies* XL (1992): 442.

16. Robert F. Byrnes, "East Central Europe: Present situation and Principal Trends", in *East Central Europe: Yesterday=Today=Tomorrow*, ed. Milorad M. Drachkovitch, (Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution press, Stanford University, 1982), 19.

17. As is clear from Halecki's use of *East-Central Europe*, his conception of the region focused on the non-German section, but he did not exclude Germans from Central Europe.

18. Marcel Cornis-Pope and John Neubauer, *Towards a History of the Literary Cultures in East-Central Europe: Theoretical Reflections*, ACLS Occasional Paper, no. 52 (New York: American Council of Learned Societies, 2002), 7.

19. Jenny Carl and Patrick Stevenson, *Language, Discourse and Identity in Central Europe: The German Language in a Multicultural Space* (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 3.

20. Michael Clyne, *The German Language in a Changing Europe* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 7.

21. see Chapter 7, "Middle Ground: Translation, Mediation, Correspondence," in *Prague Territories: National Conflict and Cultural Innovation in Franz Kafka's Fin de Siecle* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000).

22. Robert Pippin, *Modernism as a Philosophical Problem* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 1999), 8.

23. That Germanophone philosophy was rejected by many still demonstrates its influence, compared to the lack of attention outside the region.

24. Even after German lost some ground as the primary language of education in the Habsburg Empire, it was still required as a second language. See Rosita Rindler Schjerve, ed., *Diglossia and Power: Language Policies and Practice in the 19th Century Habsburg Empire*, Language, Power, and Social Process 9 (Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2003), 288.

25. As examples, the majority of František Tomáš Bratránek's work (1815-1884) was written in German, although he did also write in Czech, as was the work of Józef Gołuchowski (1797-1858), a Pole who wrote *Die Philosophie in ihrem Verhältnisse zum Leben ganzer Völker und einzelner Menschen*, and Augustin Smetana (1814-1851), the Czech Hegelian philosopher, wrote primarily in German. For more modern examples, Roman Ingarden (1893-1970) wrote in German until the Second World War and then switched to Polish, Kazimierz Twardowski (1866-1938) wrote in both German and Polish, and Jan Patočka (1907-1977) wrote in both Czech and German. The language did not even translate to the intended audience, as Andrzej Walicki claims that "although [Gołuchowski's] book was published in German, it was, in fact, intended for Poles." Andrzej Walicki, *Philosophy and Romantic Nationalism: The Case of Poland* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 103.

and literary works throughout the region without the need of translation; moreover literary, moral, philosophical, and scientific journals flourished after the Thirty Years War, spreading these ideas even further, also outside the confines of academia. Within Central Europe, Germanophone philosophic methods created what I refer to as a 'substrate' for cultural production, critical responses, and the development of national cultures, not at the expense of the unique cultural achievements of individual nations and cultures. Germanophone philosophy creates a ground for growth, a basis upon which to build, shaping but not defining the worldview of the region, which is why I use the term substrate. A substrate of soil feeds the plants, which use that soil to grow and eventually die and decompose creating a new substrate for further generations. Outside the region, on the other hand, Germanophone philosophy was relegated to a secondary position and mediated through domestic traditions, if it was regarded at all.²⁶

For the most part, there have been two major methods of tracing the history of Germanophone philosophy, one based around the metaphysicians in Prussia, with Kant and Hegel as prime examples, and one around the Vienna circle and Brentano's school in Austria, coming from Bolzano in Prague. Usually, the first is described as "German" philosophy, linking the philosophical school to the national heritage, which for some of the group, such as Fichte, whose nationalism is well known, is merited. More recently, the second history has been called Central European philosophy, as the debt to Czech and Polish philosophers in particular has been better acknowledged.²⁷ For many years, the two sides, the German and Austrian, have been separated; however, the link between the two is strong and dividing the two branches is not entirely appropriate. The fundamental relationship "can be illustrated very clearly in the case of Edmund Husserl, the great German-speaking Jewish-Austrian philosopher from Habsburg Moravia, whose newly published correspondence reveals a thinker who conceived himself as the legitimate heir of the *German* culture of Lessing, Herder, Schiller and Goethe."²⁸ This displays a long standing philosophical connection between the two German powers of the nineteenth and twentieth century, even as they appear in the thinking of a Jewish philosopher from a small Moravian town.²⁹ To think of Germanophone philosophy as merely a single canonical line associated with German nationalism belies the richness of the discussions in Central Europe, as well as the longstanding exchange of ideas between the various capitals.

I am not arguing that Germanophone philosophy was the only influence in the area; certainly French thought was significant, especially in Poland, as were English ideas.³⁰ But the rejection of Germanophone philosophy outright outside of Central Europe and the immediate access to it within the realm of Central Europe through various journals, newspapers, books and translations creates the substrate of Central Europe. Whether intellectuals agreed with the streams of Germanophone philosophy or not, they were still significantly more engaged with it than those in other regions. Jan Śniadecki, for example, felt the need to react to Kantian philosophy, whereas Auguste Comte, roughly his contemporary, did not.³¹ Moreover, if an intellectual did not read Germanophone philosophy, which would be rare given the academic structures in Central Europe, his friends and colleagues would likely have read it, making this philosophy at the very least a latent participant in Central European culture.

Pointing to German as the link between the various groups of Central Europe is not an entirely new approach. When Friedrich Naumann defined *Mitteleuropa* in a work of the same name in 1915, it was part of the German imperial campaign across the continent, indicative of several conceptions in the first half of the twentieth century. Naumann defined Central Europe as the area that "extends from the North and Baltic Seas to the Alps, the Adriatic

26. As a few examples of how Germanophone philosophy was ignored, Kant and Hegel's reception beyond the confines of Central Europe can be used. For a discussion of Kant's reception in England, see René Welleck, *Immanuel Kant in England* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1931), for Hegel in England, see Muirhead, J.H. "How Hegel Came to England," *Mind* 36 no. 144 (1927): 423-447, for Hegel in France, see Descombes, *Le Même et l'autre: quarante-cinq ans de la philosophie française* (Paris: Minuit, 1979), Michael S. Roth, *Knowing and History: Appropriations of Hegel in Twentieth-Century France* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1988), and for a more nuanced version which includes discussions of Hegel's early influence (very much limited to forms of logic) see Bruce Baugh, "Limiting Reason's Empire: The Early Reception of Hegel in France," *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 31, no. 2 (1993): 259-275.

27. See especially Barry Smith's "The Neurath-Haller Thesis: Austria and the Rise of Scientific Philosophy," in K. Lehrer and J. C. Marek, eds., *Austrian Philosophy: Past and Present: Essays in Honor of Rudolf Haller* (Dordrecht/Boston/Lancaster: Kluwer, 1996), 1-20. I am particularly indebted to Smith's conception for my term "Germanophone."

28. Keith Lehrer and Johann Christian Marek, *Austrian Philosophy*, 10

29. It should not be forgotten that it was Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk, the first Czechoslovak president, who encouraged Husserl to move to Vienna to study with Franz Brentano.

30. Andrzej Walicki argues that in Poland the "favorite idea was that Poland might and should create a kind of synthesis between German philosophy and French socio-political ideas, or, as it was usually put, between German 'thought' and French 'action.'" *Philosophy and Romantic Nationalism: The Case of Poland*, 91.

31. There has been some debate about Comte's knowledge of Kant, see Mary Pickering *Auguste Comte: An Intellectual Biography Volume 1* (Cambridge University Press, 1993), 292; but the more important part of the argument here is that Comte felt no need to take on Kant publicly, which would be impossible to avoid in Central Europe. Kant as well as other Germanophone philosophers was read occasionally outside of Central Europe, Victor Cousin being a prime example. However, these are few and far between in comparison to Central Europe, and much of Germanophone philosophy in France was read through the French tradition. For an example of reading a Germanophone philosopher through the French tradition, see Jacques le Rider, *Nietzsche en France: De la fin du XIXe siècle au temps présent*.



Sea and the Southern edge of the Danubian plain," based on the widest extent of "German" holdings.³² This concept was based on Joseph Partsch's work, also called *Mitteleuropa* (1904), in which Partsch claimed "All of Central Europe belongs, knowingly or unknowingly, to the sphere of German civilization."³³

Although I use Germanophone philosophy to describe the area, I want to avoid arguing that all of Central Europe is the "sphere of German civilization." First, Germanophone philosophy cannot be equated to German civilization due to the number of non-Germans who were involved; and second, influence does not mean derivation. Germanophone philosophy was a rich source of discussion and argument, one that cannot be described in a single clean line of progress and so did not create a single hegemonic structure of control; rather, it provided a source of influence and inspiration, creating a fertile ground, or *substrate*, for discourse. The opposing arguments, which existed at any point in the history of Germanophone philosophy, created a dialogic foundation for cultural creation and the successive generations of thinkers and cultural creators. Each successive generation rose out of the previous arguments, not in any predictable way, but still based in the rhetoric of the previous generation's arguments. Influence, in other words, does not function in a linear fashion, where a line from one thinker to the next can be clearly and exactly drawn; rather the process is a cyclical structure building off of the previous generations, not progressively towards a single ultimate goal, but in an iterative structure of building and decaying.

To use an organic metaphor, this cyclical process works like a rich forest, where flora grow, feeding on the past generation, only to die and become a new generation's sustenance as a soil substrate. Thinkers are the plants which grow up in a generation, only to die and feed the next: each new generation changes the soil, first by taking some of the nutrients from the different substrates and later by creating a new layer of soil as it decays. Some are giant oaks, whose roots spread over a wide area, influencing the future and the present to a great degree, such as Immanuel Kant, and whose decay will give nourishment to a wide variety of flora afterwards. Others will remain within only a smaller sphere of influence, such as Józef Hoene-Wroński, whose influence never stretched far beyond Poland, but nonetheless exerted significant indirect influence through his relationship with Adam Mickiewicz, the great Polish Romantic poet. Each new growth takes some of the nutrients out of a substrate, changing it forever, exemplifying how interpretations of the past shape our present understanding, just as Kant's understanding of Wolff as "the great Dogmatist" changes our understanding, or Wolff's interpretation of Leibniz shaped the understanding of Leibniz until more of the latter's works were uncovered. The environment plays a role in the shaping of the soil structure, striking down trees before they're fully grown, just as Novalis died so young. Central Europe can be thought of as a forest whose substrates are defined by the discourse of each successive generation, not immune to some outside influences, with the roots of other climates entering and influencing the growth of the region through war, intellectual and cultural creativity, and simple expansion, but nonetheless maintaining some consistency through its own history of rich substrates.

The intellectual soil of Central Europe influenced culture as well as philosophy, especially written culture. Literature was deeply influenced by the substrates, mixing the philosophical background with aesthetic ideals and national languages, growing from the same soil as philosophy, and exerting its own influence over both philosophy and literature. Literature further enhanced the spread of philosophic ideas by bringing them to a wider audience in a multitude of languages.³⁴ The educated people in Central Europe not only read Germanophone philosophy in universities, where it was commonly taught, but also in monographs on German philosophy and in debates published in journals, which included essays and critical responses to philosophy alongside literary articles and works of literature.³⁵ Because Germanophone philosophy was taught in universities, even if someone did not read Germanophone philosophy, he would nonetheless be exposed to the arguments through his educated milieu, as well as through literature which had already incorporated elements of Germanophone philosophical thought. The dispersal of ideas is not always direct, being at times mediated by more popular philosophers, literary accounts of philosophy, philosophical literature, and journal articles written for non-academics, but Germanophone philosophy nonetheless creates a substrate for comparative work in intellectual and literary history.

The intellectual sphere was not a utopian picture of intellectuals lovingly using the German language in order to

32. Friedrich Naumann, *Central Europe* (London: King, 1916), 3.

33. This work was translated into English and included in a work *The Regions of the World* in 1904, p. 142.

34. I believe that Germanophone philosophy influenced other realms of cultural production, but as a literary scholar I will limit myself to the area I know best. A discussion on the links of Germanophone philosophy to other art forms certainly deserves more discussion, but I leave that to another writer.

35. Philosophy was printed and discussed in journals such as *Der Teutsche Merkur* (Weimar, 1773-1810). Karl Leonhard Reinhold published his *Briefe über die Kantische Philosophie* (Letters on the Kantian Philosophy, 1786-1787) in this journal, which served to popularize Kant's philosophy, along with making Reinhold a well-known philosopher in his own right. See Karl Ameriks' introduction to Karl Leonhard Reinhold, *Letters on the Kantian Philosophy* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2005). For more information on this journal in the Austrian lands, including Hungary and Bohemia, see Thomas Clyde Starnes, *Der Teutsche Merkur in den Österreichischen Ländern* (Wien: Turia & Kant, 1994).

communicate with a Central Europe they considered to be their home. First, before the twentieth century, there was no conception of Central Europe; Central Europe has become an intellectual space for the period after the Thirty Years War through the end of the nineteenth century only through retrospective analysis. Second, as nationalism grew in the nineteenth century, using German as a *lingua franca* became more and more controversial, due in part to German nationalism, but also to the agendas of other nations.³⁶ Because the line between Germanophone writing and German nationalistic writing blurred, writers affiliated with the other nations of Central Europe began using their own national tongues more and more exclusively.³⁷ The use of smaller national languages among the intelligentsia produced smaller intellectual collectives, although even their conversations were shaped by the Germanophone philosophical narrative. At first, the intelligentsia used national tongues primarily in literature, but its use spread eventually to philosophy as well, although many philosophers would write in more than one language.³⁸ Participation in this Germanophone philosophic culture thus did not create an idyllic common public sphere, where all cultures felt equally validated, but it was still the arena in which one could reach the most people within the tenuously shared cultural space.

The area that used German as its philosophical *lingua franca* in opposition to the areas that used French, English or Russian, can be considered an intellectual space. Vienna, Berlin, Warsaw, Budapest, Vilnius, Königsberg, Jena, Prague, Krakow, Leipzig, Zürich, Weimar and Frankfurt each gave rise to their own cultural inventions, but each of these intellectual capitals used German to create a shared cultural understanding, which was discussed, tempered, and modified through the smaller cultural lenses and in different languages. Because power was not located in a single place, as Paris held power for France, London for Britain, or St. Petersburg for Russia, Central Europe created a society of letters, disseminated along the lines of the German and Jewish diaspora. Journals published in Jena or letters from Weimar could quickly reach Berlin, Prague, Vienna and Lviv, creating a readerly world of influence.³⁹ Moreover, philosophers regularly moved from one city to another, bringing ideas with them, aiding in the spread of scholarship.

The creation of a readerly world allows for the spread of ideas beyond national lines, because the intellectual space only focuses on the reading knowledge of German. Relying on national allegiance has been shown to be deeply problematic in Central Europe in recent scholarship; to be Czech, for example, in the nineteenth century or especially earlier did not preclude one from being a German speaker, or in many ways from being German.⁴⁰ The situation is especially blurred when considering the difference between the language of philosophical works and the language of everyday interaction. František Tomáš Bratránek (1815-1884), the Hegelian philosopher who worked in Brno, Lviv, and Cracow, found the question of his nationality spurious because he was influenced by both Czech and German culture, as well as Polish later in his life, although he found this balance to be harder after the revolutions of 1848.⁴¹ He was as fully German as he was fully Czech, but he could be as easily, and perhaps more appropriately, called Viennese or Cracovian. He wrote his philosophical works in German, but certainly spoke Czech, German, and Polish, depending on his interlocutor. The nation is an arbitrary standard established in regions more defined by nation states; for much of Central European history it would be more accurate to define individuals by their city instead of nation or even in terms of the larger region, Central Europe itself.⁴²

There are of course examples to the contrary, people who identified exclusively with one nationality over all others; I by no means want to dispute any claim to an identity. Even those who espoused a single nationality or ethnicity, however, were influenced by the multicultural world in which they lived, whether they expressed this opinion or not. Simply living in the region, where national politics played a key role, where neighbors spoke different languages, where various cultures butted up against each other, meant that influence spread across the cultures. Moreover, if earlier canonized authors and thinkers were influenced by Central Europe, then the later authors can be said to have been at least indirectly influenced. The methodology

36. Florian Coulmas, "Germanness: Language and Nation," in *The German Language and the Real World: Sociolinguistic, Cultural, and Pragmatic Perspectives on Contemporary German* (Oxford: New York: Clarendon Press; Oxford University Press, 1995), 55–68.

37. The story of the decline of German as a scientific *lingua franca* and the development of other language's scientific vocabulary is well told in *The Nationalization of Scientific Knowledge in the Habsburg Empire, 1848–1918*, ed. Mitchell G. Ash and Jan Surman (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).

38. See for example even Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk whose first works were published in German. For more on the topic, see Jan Surman, "Science and Its Publics: Internationality and National Languages in Central Europe" in *The Nationalization of Scientific Knowledge in the Habsburg Empire, 1848–1918* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 30–56.

39. In addition to *Der deutsche Merkur* cited above, Christian Thomasius, a contemporary of Christian Wolff, published several journals, the brothers Schlegel produced their influential *Athenaeum*, *Berlinische Monatsschrift* published Kant's article "Was ist Aufklärung?", and *Die Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung* published works from Kant, Fichte, Goethe, and Schiller out of Jena.

40. For a discussion of the problems with limiting people to being German or Czech, see Gary B. Cohen, *The Politics of Ethnic Survival Germans in Prague, 1861–1914*, 2nd ed., rev., Central European Studies (West Lafayette, Ind.: Purdue University Press, 2006.).

41. See Eugeniusz Klin, *František Tomáš Bratránek: Ein Polonophiler Mittler Zwischen Den Nationen* (Zielona Góra: WSP, 1987).

42. For a rich analysis of this very problem see Jeremy King, *Budweisers in Czechs and Germans: A Local History of Bohemian Politics: 1848–1948* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002) and Pieter M. Judson *Guardians of the Nation: Activists on the Language Frontiers of Imperial Austria* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006).



of examining Central European cultures only through their own national lens, however, excludes the connections between these groups, as well as limiting the effect of the multicultural towns and cities where these people lived.

The notion of Central Europe as a multicultural space has been used before, but most often to the exclusion of the German lands. In opposing the inclusion of the German lands in his conception, Halecki argued that although East-Central Europe was a cosmopolitan region, Germany to the west was an "ethnically homogeneously German section."⁴³ However, Germany was not a unified state until the end of the nineteenth century, and even then that state was based on the so called "Kleindeutschland" model. The north-south divide amongst German-speakers, between Prussia and Austria, is well known, but before this bifurcation these lands were by no means unified into a single culture. If the old expression, "a language is a dialect with an army and a navy," holds true, then after the Thirty Years War, when the smaller states across what is now Germany were given the right to declare war and make peace, there was not even a single German language.⁴⁴ The widely differing regions located their history and understanding more in the local than in the national, a situation which Naumann bemoans even in the early twentieth century: "If we go nowadays into our German Reichstag we notice that it is only for certain minor affairs that Prussians, Bavarians, Saxons, Wurttembergers, Hessians, Hanoverians or Mecklenburgers sit together."⁴⁵ When we also consider the broader German diaspora even into the Volga region, the idea of a single German nationality becomes even more difficult to maintain, as the German forces who encountered them during the Second World War were forced to admit.⁴⁶

By the early nineteenth century, there were already movements directed towards a united Germany in a more modern sense of the word, but before then and for a good amount of time afterwards, thinking of them, as Halecki argues, as an "ethnically homogeneously German section," betrays our modern attitudes at the expense of the diversity across the different states, as anyone who visits Nuremburg and Cologne even to this day can readily acknowledge. If we look back further than the most recent century, then we must consider Germany to be a set of smaller states loosely confederated into various overarching political structures, from the Holy Roman Empire to the German Confederacy and finally to the German Empire, which lasted until the modern borders of Germany established after the First World War (or at least a rough estimate of them). The same is true for both the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the various forms of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. All of Central Europe, including the German-speaking lands, then can be thought of as a conglomeration of smaller states that only in recent years have become more or less unified nation-states.

Nationalism did present a good deal of problems in the region. Arguing against some of the more idealistic conceptions of Central Europe as a cosmopolitan space, Robert Bideleux writes, "It is also not easy to reconcile Kundera's idealization of 'Central Europe' as a bearer and custodian of supposedly higher or more civilized Western values with the role of Central and East Central Europe as a crucible of extremely illiberal ideas, projects and doctrines, culminating in pan-German imperialism, Nazism, mass genocide and Auschwitz."⁴⁷ Omitting the German lands from Central Europe does not solve the problem, since such ethnic tension cannot be blamed entirely on the Germans, with the horrific example of the mass expulsion of Germans from Central Europe after the Second World War, effectively destroying the German communities throughout the region, as well as eradicating other minority groups throughout Central Europe.⁴⁸ This example does not even include the years of tension before the Second World War concerning Jews, Roma, and other minorities in the region.

However, the disparagement of Central Europe as a merely backwards place filled with only rampant nationalism is also one-sided. Central Europe has often been seen as the land between the completely uncultured, totalitarian East and the civilized, democratic and multicultural West, referring back to the region as a zone in-between. There was a general lack of urbanization in comparison with Western Europe, which resulted from a re-feudalization of the land in Central Europe in the seventeenth century to sell excess food to Western Europe which, in switching to manufacturing and maritime ventures, had a desperate need for food supplies.⁴⁹ The cities that did exist were significantly smaller than ones in Britain or France. Several scholars have used French and British travelogues to describe the living conditions of the people in Central Europe, who were shocked at the poverty they witnessed.⁵⁰

Central Europe's economic development certainly did not match that in the West, especially in the century

43. Oskar Halecki, *Borderlands of Western Civilization: A History of East Central Europe* (New York: Ronald Press Co., 1952), 10.

44. It is not surprising that the expression comes from Yiddish, a decisively Central European language.

45. Naumann, *Central Europe*, 35.

46. See Elizabeth Harvey, *Women and the Nazi East: Agents and Witnesses of Germanization* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003).

47. Robert Bideleux, *A History of Eastern Europe: Crisis and Change*, 2nd ed. (London: Routledge, 2007), 12.

48. See R. M. Douglas, *Orderly and Humane: The Expulsion of the Germans After the Second World War* (Yale University Press, 2012).

49. Jaroslav Miller, *Urban Societies in East-Central Europe, 1500-1700* (London: Routledge, 2008), 234 and throughout.

50. See *Inventing Eastern Europe* and David Worthington, *British and Irish Experiences and Impressions of Central Europe, C.1560-1688, Politics and Culture in Europe, 1650-1750* (Farnham, Surrey [England]: Ashgate, 2012).

following the Thirty Years War, which ravaged the countryside and wiped out a significant percentage of the population of Central Europe. However, from Leibniz onward, Central Europe remained at the forefront of scientific discovery, philosophical investigation and cultural production in all realms, although without the acknowledgement of France or England until the late nineteenth century. The Habsburg Empire maintained a multi-ethnic, -cultural, and -linguistic army far before any Western country dreamed of such an institution. Polish republicanism arose far earlier than in any other European country, and their liberal movements were crushed at the hands of "Enlightened Monarchs."⁵¹ If backwardness is defined by lack of industrialization, urban population, and a centralized government located in one significant city, then Central Europe would qualify, but this definition favors one form of development over all others.

One startling aspect of this understanding, so prevalent in more recent scholarship, is the forgotten condescension of France and England towards Germany itself. An example of this can be seen in the first English translation of Goethe's *Wilhelm Meister's Apprenticeship*, in which Thomas Carlyle writes, "in our ancient aristocracy of intellect, we disdain to be assisted by the Germans, whom, by a species of second sight, we have discovered, before knowing anything about them, to be a timid, dreaming, extravagant, insane race of mortals."⁵² August Schlegel himself bemoaned the same lack of knowledge of German literature in his essay "Overview of the European Conditions of German Literature" (*Abriß von den Europäischen Verhältnissen der Deutschen Literatur*) written for English readers in 1825.⁵³ From the Enlightenment until the middle to end of the nineteenth century, Germany and the Habsburg Empire, in addition to the other centers of Central Europe, were not seen as major parts of intellectual Western Europe, regardless of their significant contributions to our present understanding of Europe. In many ways this is still true of several countries in Central Europe, especially Halecki's East-Central Europe, whose cultural achievements remain unknown to the general population of the West to this day. The depiction of German lands fully participating in the broader European discussions during that period has only occurred in the last century in retrospective analyses, and it is past time that the rest of Central Europe be incorporated into those same discussions.

With respect to these various accusations of backwardness, I should make it clear that I have no interest in casting judgment on the relative cultural contributions of one region of Europe over another or in making the case to exclude any country from European culture. When I exclude Russia from my concept of Central Europe, I do so in the same manner that I do France, merely as representatives of another cultural region, not in any attempt to ostracize any country from European culture or Orientalize it. Russia's geographical location is in the Eastern part of Europe, and thus not outside its scope; its location does not supplant the great influence it has had over the shape of European history and culture. My aim is not to denigrate any culture by exclusion, but rather to study the cultural contributions of one region.

The claim to Central European backwardness does point to a particularly important moment in Central Europe becoming its own region. The Thirty Years War, which resulting in vast devastation, effectively separated Central Europe from Western Europe, as the latter embarked into the era of colonialism. Peter H. Wilson estimates that between 5 and 8 million people died due to the war and disease, which corresponds to 20-32% of the population, making it by far the most destructive war in European history.⁵⁴ It was during the rebuilding and re-Catholicization of the Habsburg Empire that German began to be the *lingua franca* of the entire Central European region, although it would not be named such until later.⁵⁵ The lack of a strong central government in the region gave rise to multiple educational, economic, and political centers, where German was used as the primary method of communication. Poland's independence from German influence steadily faded in this period, and it became more and more dependent on its Germanophone neighbors, finally being ruled by Saxon kings for most of the eighteenth century before the final partition of its lands in 1793. With the consolidation of cultural and political power in the region under Germanophone control, my definition of the region begins.

From Christian Wolff (1679-1754) forward, German was the language of philosophy in Central Europe. France and England had already developed philosophical language by this point, with Descartes writing in French and Francis Bacon writing in English, but it was not until the beginning of the eighteenth century that Wolff developed a standardized German philosophic language. Wolff's systematic approach became the standard throughout Central Europe, with his students and followers filling out departments from Zürich to Warsaw, estimated at a total of 112 positions by Carl

51. Walicki, *Philosophy and Romantic Nationalism*, chap. 1, II "Republicanism versus Monarchism."

52. Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, *Wilhelm Meister's Apprenticeship*. (New York: Collier Books, 1962), 15.

53. August Wilhelm von Schlegel, *August Wilhelm Von Schlegel's Sämmtliche Werke*, vol. 8 (Leipzig: Weidmann, 1846), 207-219.

54. Peter H. Wilson, *The Thirty Years War: Europe's Tragedy* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2009), 787. Compared to the Soviet losses in World War II at 12% of the population even the lower estimate of 20% is staggering.

55. It is Joseph II who makes German the official *lingua franca*.



Ludovici, and textbooks developed from his philosophy becoming the standard.⁵⁶ By the middle of the eighteenth century, Hume's skepticism had refuted some of the main principles of Wolff's work, and the attempts at a solution to the general problems of the Enlightenment from luminaries such as Kant, Herder, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel and their antagonists, Herder, Jacobi, and Bolzano, provided new ground for the future of Germanophone philosophy, as well as profoundly influencing the literature of the entire region. Their work, however, was not fundamentally separated from Wolff's initial forays into metaphysics, as his philosophy had permeated almost every area of Germanophone scholarship; in order to work in Germanophone philosophy it was necessary to work with Wolff's language and consider his positions to develop new ones. As Lewis Beck sums up the situation: "But in Germany for forty years, if not Wolff whom would one read? [...] Let us then give Wolff his due: he was indeed *praeceptor Germaniae*, and most good things in German philosophy in the early eighteenth century came from [him]."⁵⁷

These philosophical discussions differed starkly from what was happening in France and England, where German philosophy was largely ignored until the late nineteenth century. The fundamental reason for the difference between these schools lies in Central Europe's philosophical relationship to theology. Due to the cataclysmic effects of the Thirty Years War, philosophies that countered religion were not looked upon favorably by governments. Unlike the situation in France and England, where the majority of philosophers worked outside of academia, garnering themselves a degree of intellectual freedom, almost every major philosopher in Central Europe worked at academic institutions, providing the government with a great deal of control over the central tenets of what was taught and published.⁵⁸

Because philosophers worked at universities, governmental censors had significant control over the ideas presented. Several philosophers suffered exile and censorship for speaking against the religious convictions of the state. Wolff was famously given forty-eight hours to leave Prussia or be hanged after his lecture on the rational discovery of morals in Chinese philosophy, only to be invited back a few years later by Frederick the Great. The pantheist debate over the place of Lessing provides yet another example of how deeply the place of religion was considered among the leading philosophers of the time. This debate between Jacobi and Lessing did not end the issue either, with yet another major dispute arising when Friedrich Jacobi accused Fichte of being an atheist, which led to Fichte's retirement from the University of Jena. Bernard Bolzano was also dismissed from his post at Charles University in Prague for his political and religious views.⁵⁹ Although in the case of Bolzano, the dismissal only allowed him to write more, but he could have been relegated to the margins of history had Husserl not rediscovered and championed him.⁶⁰

The atmosphere of religious stricture and censorship created a particular ground for Central European art and philosophy through which even outsiders were interpreted. Kant for example claims it was Hume, that doubting Scot far removed from Kant's milieu, who "interrupted [him] his dogmatic slumber."⁶¹ Kant's solutions to Hume's skepticism, however, are firmly rooted in the Central European philosophical structure (Christian Wolff, Leibniz), and his work served as the basis for another generation of Central European thinkers (Schelling, Schopenhauer, and in opposition, Bolzano and Śniadecki). Kant's Hume, unlike France's or England's, was not a religious *skeptic*, rather he "was seen as a defender of the rights of faith against reason."⁶² And this was not true for only Kant; for example, Johann Georg Hamann, an antagonist of Kant, also saw Hume as the protector of the faith. The deeply religious foundation of Germanophone philosophy, rooted in Scholasticism until the mid-eighteenth century, combined with the governmental influence over the university system, where the majority of Germanophone philosophers worked, provided the ground for the reinterpretation of foreign thought.

After Wolff, whose ideas led philosophic inquiry until the middle of the eighteenth century, Kant's ideas became the main stream of thought in Central Europe. In Poland, there was some resistance to Kant, particularly as

56. For a lengthy list, see Lewis White Beck, *Early German Philosophy: Kant and His Predecessors*. (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1969), 226-8. Also see Carl Ludovici's *Ausführlicher Entwurf einer vollständigen Historie der Wolffischen Philosophie* (1738).

57. Beck, *Early German Philosophy*, 274-5.

58. The exceptions to this rule are precisely those who reacted most strongly to religion itself (Schopenhauer and Nietzsche).

59. See Bernard Bolzano, *Wissenschaft Und Religion Im Vormärz; Der Briefwechsel Bernard Bolzanos Mit Michael Josef Fesl, 1822-1848*. (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1965), 28; Jaromír Loužil, *Bernard Bolzano* (Prague: Melantrich, 1978), especially chapter 2, "Bolzanův proces." For more information on his biography in general in addition to this episode see the introduction to Bernard Bolzano, *Selected Writings on Ethics and Politics* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2007), and pp. 11-12 for his removal from the university.

60. Bolzano is still not well known in the West, and very few of his works have been translated into English. *Selected Writings on Ethics and Politics* is the major philosophical exception (some of his mathematical writings have been published). In addition, his complete works is still being published, with some 90 volumes finished, but another 35 still to be published. See Bernard Bolzano, *Bernard Bolzano-Gesamtausgabe* (Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Friedrich Frommann Verlag (Günther Holzboog), 1969).

61. Immanuel Kant, *Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics That Will Be Able to Come Forward as Science: With Selections from the Critique of Pure Reason* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 10.

62. Beck, *Early German Philosophy*, 366. Italics in original.

mentioned earlier by Jan Śniadecki (1756-1830), who famously claimed, "To correct Locke and Condillac, to want to pursue things *a priori*, that can only be understood through human nature from effects, is a sickness of the mind, worthy of pity." "Poprawiać Locke'a i Condillaca chceć dochodzić rzeczy *a priori*, co tylko przez naturę ludzką pojęte być może ze skutków, jest to chorobą umysłu, wartą politowania."⁶³ However, Józef Szaniawski (1764-1843) studied in Königsberg and brought Kant into the mainstream of Polish philosophy. Kantianism then spread into two different fields: first it was combined with Scottish philosophy, as was the case with Jędrzej Śniadecki (1768-1838), the younger brother of Jan, and secondly it developed along with Hegelianism and the philosophy of Schelling into Polish Messianism.

Kant's work spread into the Austrian lands significantly more quickly. Already in 1798 the High Commission of Study (*Studienhofkommission*) officially added Kant's system to the university curriculum, even establishing a position for Kant studies in Vienna. The Viennese philosopher Karl Leonhard Reinhold (1757-1823) did much to publicize Kant in both the German and Austrian lands with his *Briefe über die Kantische Philosophie* (Letters on the Kantian Philosophy, 1786-7) published in *Die Deutsche Merkur*. Reinhold became the first critical chair in Jena, to which he invited several Austrian thinkers, such as Franz Paul von Herbert (1759-1811), who spread Kantianism in Trieste, and Kajetan Tschink (1763-1813), who brought Kantian thought to Olomouc, Samuel Fuchs (1770-1817), the Slovak/Hungarian philosopher from Lečova, and Anton Kreil (c1757-1838), who worked in Pest.

Although there were major Kantians throughout the Habsburg lands, it is perhaps the anti-Kantians who are the most important for the history of philosophy in the Southern part of Central Europe. Bernard Bolzano (1781-1848) founded a new line of philosophy which would eventually develop into Logical Positivism and Phenomenology. He was an ardent critic of Kant, whom he had read avidly throughout his university years.⁶⁴ František Přihonský, one of his most devoted student, entitled his work on Bolzano's philosophy, *Neuer anti-Kant* (The New Anti-Kant, 1850). Bolzano preferred a return to Leibnizian philosophy and pursued a distinctly anti-Idealist stance; however, his engagement with the northern Germanophone philosophers cannot be doubted, precisely from the moniker given him by Přihonský as the anti-Kant.

Germanophone philosophy deeply influenced literature in the early nineteenth century, as can be seen in Romanticism. The Romantic project relied a great deal on Germanophone philosophy, especially on Herder's conception of the nation, the transcendentalism of the German Idealists, and the aesthetics of Kant. The Jena Romantics (or *Fruhromantik*), in particular August and Friedrich Schlegel, Novalis, and Friedrich Hölderlin, all read German Idealist philosophy intently. Polish Romanticism received these ideas directly from the Jena Romantics as well as from philosophers such as the Schellingian Józef Hoene-Wroński, who exerted a large influence over Adam Mickiewicz in particular. Karel Hynek Mácha, the great Czech Romantic, studied philosophy in Prague and continued to read philosophical journals, such as the Hegelian *Jahrbücher für wissenschaftliche Kritik*. The legacy of these canonical authors, which certainly lasts to the present, demonstrates the lasting influence of Germanophone philosophy on the literatures of Central Europe.

This era of philosophy can also be strongly connected to the rise of nationalism. Herder's connection to nationalism is well known and his influence stretched over the entire Central European region. The resurgence of folk tales in the early nineteenth century is a direct result of his work, which can be seen in Grimm's fairy tales and Erben's *Kytice*, which both served as a foundation for national identity (as well as Václav Hanka's notorious faked manuscripts). Fichte's lectures to the German nation after the invasion of Napoleon added to the rising nationalism of the time, as did František Palacký, who argued with Bolzano in Prague over the future of the Bohemian Crown Lands. Palacký's teacher in Bratislava was Pavol Jozef Šafárik, a Slovak historian and philosopher, who had studied in Jena in 1813-1815, where he was exposed to Herder and Fichte. In Poland, Messianism developed out of Schelling's philosophy and maintained a strong influence over conceptions of the nation for many years.⁶⁵

The wide spread influence of Wolff, Kant, *Fruhromantik* ideology, and nationalism is enough to justify the discussion of Central Europe as an intellectual space, but the connections continued well into the twentieth century. The University of Vienna became a major institutional space for Central European ideas, especially with the influence of Franz Brentano. Among Franz Brentano's students were Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk, first president of Czechoslovakia, Edmund Husserl, founder of phenomenology, Kazimierz Twardowski, father of the Lwów-Warsaw school of logic, and Sigmund Freud. Among Brentano's colleagues was Ernst Mach, who taught in Prague at Charles University for most of his career before moving to Vienna in 1895, but whose work inspired among others Rudolf Carnap, Ludwig

63. Tatarkiewicz, *Historia Filozofii*, 186.

64. Werner Sauer, *Österreichische Philosophie Zwischen Aufklärung Und Restauration: Beiträge zur Geschichte des Frühkantianismus in der Donaumonarchie* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1982), 138.

65. Walicki, *Philosophy and Romantic Nationalism*, 101-107.



Wittgenstein, and Albert Einstein.⁶⁶ These philosophers and thinkers spread their ideas throughout the Central European region, and eventually far beyond, continuing the intellectual space begun with Christian Wolff.

Perhaps the best example of how philosophical thought continued to influence ideas in Central Europe is Jan Patočka (1907-1977). Patočka studied philosophy in Freiburg under Husserl and Heidegger, one of the former's last students. His work, especially *The Natural World as Philosophical Problem* (Přirozený svět jako filosofický problém, 1936), made him the most famous Czech philosopher of his generation. In the sixties and seventies, he became a spokesperson for the dissident movement, providing the philosophical background to much of Václav Havel's *Power of the Powerless*, (Moc bezmocných, 1978), and he was one of the writers of Charter 77. His tragic end due to a lengthy interrogation at the hands of State Security agents in 1977 became a rallying point for the dissident movement.

There are numerous such examples, and creating a rubric for them is the ultimate goal of this essay. Although writers such as Kundera and Miłosz have argued for a Central European literature, and there is even a recently formed prize for Central European writers, there has been no consensus of how to connect the various cultures, languages, ethnicities, and histories, especially when not comparing one Central European culture to German. Because Germanophone philosophy created only the substrate, examining different cultures through that lens demonstrates the varied interpretations offered by intellectuals in several languages, demonstrating both the originality of cultural groups and their interconnectedness, between Hungary and Poland, or Slovenia and the Czech lands.

In returning to my first examples, I called Kafka and Schulz Central Europeans, and the influence of Germanophone philosophy, from Hegel to Martin Buber, from Nietzsche and Kant, is well-documented.⁶⁷ Even comparing the two at the beginning, based in this case on a similar response to the suits over their materials, demonstrates the need for a conception of Central Europe, as does the several other analyses of the two writers.⁶⁸ Born at the far ends of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Kafka and Schulz are not merely similar because they were both Jews, but rather because they understood and interpreted the contemporary Germanophone discourse. The resulting literature is not at all the same, with Kafka using minimal descriptions of his world, and Schulz using rich accounts to describe his fantastic creations, but their literature displays two different interpretations of the same substrate, exemplifying the literature of Central Europe.

Edward Said has claimed that, "all cultures are involved in one another; none is single and pure, all are hybrid, heterogeneous, extraordinarily differentiated, and unmonolithic."⁶⁹ The point is well taken here, but the question remains: which cultures create the multicultural arena? It is not true that all cultures are the same, nor do all cultures have the same level of influence in every region; in other words, multiculturalism does not equal omniculturalism. In viewing Germanophone philosophy as the substrate of culture, a comparative space is opened through which Central European intellectuals can be studied, so Kafka can be compared to Schulz, as well as to Karel Čapek, based on their being influenced by the contemporary discourse. The power of the comparison is not that they arrive at the same ends, but rather that they begin by considering the same sources, creating valuable contributions to how we understand literature, intellectual history, and their world. So much of the writing today about Central Europe divides the region according to today's nationalities, which has some merit, but the cross-cultural influences have been little discussed.⁷⁰

The sad fate of Bruno Schulz leads me to the end of my conception of Central Europe. The foundation of my definition begins to erode in 1938; following the Second World War, German lost its role as the language of philosophy, as well as its status as the general *lingua franca* in Central Europe. Brod and Felix Weltsch, two of Kafka's closest friends in Prague, like many other Jewish intellectuals, fled the Nazis and eventually landed in Mandatory Palestine; others went to a variety of locales across the globe. Several thinkers, such as Roman Ingarden, stopped writing in German out of principle, and his later ideas suffered from obscurity for writing in a 'minor' language. Some, like György Lukács, still used German but it was no longer the required language of academia. The Nazis'

66. It is often forgotten that Einstein was a professor in Prague, although in the German section (Karl-Ferdinands-Universität).

67. See Arnold Heidsieck, *The Intellectual Contexts of Kafka's Fictions: Philosophy, Law, Religion*, 1st ed. (Columbia, SC: Camden House, 1994). Schulz's philosophical readings have not been compiled as well as Kafka's, but Karen Underhill has argued for Schulz's place among the Jewish philosophers of his time in Karen Underhill, "Ecstasy and Heresy: Martin Buber, Bruno Schulz, and Jewish Modernity," in *(Un)making Bruno Schulz: New Combinations, further Fragmentations, Ultimate Reintegrations*, eds. Dieter de Bruyn and Kris Van Heuckelom (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2009), 27-46, and there are references to Germanophone philosophy in Schulz's letters. See for example, Bruno Schulz, *Księga listów*, 147.

68. For example, David Wiley, "Divinity and Denial in Franz Kafka's *The Metamorphosis* and the Complete Fiction of Bruno Schulz," *Canadian-American Slavic Studies* 31, no. 2 (1997): 171-76; Jacques le Rider "Bruno Schulz et Franz Kafka," *Europe-Paris-Revue Littéraire Mensuelle* 84, no. 923 (2006): 245-52; and Russell E. Brown, "Bruno Schulz and Franz Kafka: Servant Girls and Other Temptations," *Germano-Slavica* 6, no. 1 (1988): 29-47.

69. Edward Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (London, 1993), xxix.

70. See as an example Michel Masłowski, Didier Francfort and Paul Gradwohl, *Culture et identité en europe centrale* (Paris, Brno: Institute d'études slaves, Masarykovo Univerzita, 2011). One of the few exceptions is Marcel Cornis-Pope and John Neubauer's edited volumes *History of the Literary Cultures of East-Central Europe* (John Benjamins Publishing Company: Amsterdam: 2004). These four volumes hint at the kind of comparison available, but much more work is possible.

actions destroyed the Jewish diaspora's connections throughout the region, forced many German speakers into exile, and undermined the role of German in the region. The forced repatriation of German speakers after the war added to the decline of this structure; there no longer was such an easy mode of connection between the groups of Central Europe. Some remnants of this period of Germanophone philosophy still exist today, as can be seen in the more phenomenological tendencies in Central European scholarship compared to what is outside of the region, but the links along this line are fading.⁷¹ There may well be another way to connect Central Europe, perhaps through the literary realm, but the use of German as the language of philosophy cannot be the driving force in connecting the Central European lands much after the Second World War.

One intellectually positive outcome of the war's devastating destruction is that the movement of Germanophone philosophers after the Second World War expanded the area that acknowledged the value of their work into much of the rest of Europe, as can be seen in French philosophy in the last sixty years.⁷² The "West," however, comes out of a much different tradition, and the works of Central Europe lose their context in other regions. Wittgenstein's *Tractatus*, for example, has been interpreted as an ethical work in Central Europe, but a linguistic and logical one outside of it.⁷³ Germanophone philosophy has been connected only to Germany and to a lesser degree Austria, with the rest of Central Europe still separate from this stream of ideas. Studying Central European thinkers, especially those from understudied East-Central Europe in that context, has much wealth to reveal. The cultural advancements of Central Europe can expose that context and offer further insights into both Germanophone thinkers as well as those working in less commonly studied languages. Thinking of Germanophone philosophy as such a substrate can conquer the reigning approach to Germanophone philosophy and explore what is being written in Central Europe through this lens, and thereby creating a new, supranational context in which to view and discuss Central European literature as a whole, from Zürich to Lviv, from Vilnius to Trieste.

Central Europe in my construction does not deny the value of the individual nations within. The region can be studied not at the expense of the nation, but to its advantage. In November of 1968 after the Warsaw Pact invasion of Czechoslovakia, the Marxist-Heideggerian philosopher Karel Kosík defended Central Europe as the only way the Czechs and Slovaks could have agency in their history: "Central Europe is not a geographic concept; it is a historical reality. We are a political nation only to the extent that we participate in the creation of Central Europe. Central Europe exists only to the extent that the nation continues to exist as a historical subject."⁷⁴ Central Europe then is created by the individual nations, but also serves to give them the space for agency. For Kafka, this means instead of "lying prostrate on the ground" as those around him define him as either German or Jewish, he is given agency as a Central European to be both. Of course, like Odradek, no one "would occupy himself with such studies if there were not a creature called" Kafka.

Bibliography

- Ameriks, Karl. "Introduction." In *Letters on the Kantian Philosophy*, by Karl Leonhard Reinhold, edited by Karl Ameriks, translated by James Hebbeler, ix–xxxv. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Ash, Mitchell G., and Jan Surman, eds. *The Nationalization of Scientific Knowledge in the Habsburg Empire, 1848–1918*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
- Baugh, Bruce. "Limiting Reason's Empire: The Early Reception of Hegel in France." *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 31, no. 2 (1993): 259–75.
- Beck, Lewis White. *Early German Philosophy: Kant and His Predecessors*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1969.
- Bideleux, Robert, and Ian Jeffries. *A History of Eastern Europe: Crisis and Change*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2007.
- Bolzano, Bernard. *Bernard Bolzano-Gesamtausgabe*. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog, 1969–.
- Bolzano, Bernard. *Selected Writings on Ethics and Politics*. Translated by Paul Rusnock and Rolf George. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2007.
- Bolzano, Bernard, and Michael Josef Fesl. *Wissenschaft und Religion im Vormärz: Der Briefwechsel Bernard Bolzanos mit Michael Josef Fesl, 1822–1848*. Edited by Eduard Winter and Wilhelm Zeil, with Liane Zeil. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1965.
- Brown, Russell E. "Bruno Schulz and Franz Kafka: Servant Girls and Other Temptations." *Germano-Slavica* 6, no. 1

71. See *Phenomenology and Analysis: Essays on Central European Philosophy*, eds. Arkadiusz Chrudzinski and Wolfgang Huemer (Ontos Verlag: 2004).

72. See Descombes, *Le Même et l'autre: quarante-cinq ans de la philosophie française*, and Michael S. Roth, *Knowing and History: Appropriations of Hegel in Twentieth-Century France* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1988).

73. See introduction to Allan Janik, *Wittgenstein's Vienna* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1973).

74. Robin Alison Remington, ed., *Winter in Prague: Documents on Czechoslovak Communism in Crisis* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1969), 396–7.



- (1988): 29–47.
- Butler, Judith. "Who Owns Kafka?" *London Review of Books* 33, no. 5 (2011): 3–8.
- Byrnes, Robert F. "East Central Europe: Present Situation and Principal Trends." In *East Central Europe: Yesterday–Today–Tomorrow*, edited by Milorad M. Drachkovitch. Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press, 1982.
- Carl, Jenny, and Patrick Stevenson, eds. *Language, Discourse and Identity in Central Europe: The German Language in a Multilingual Space*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
- Chrudzimski, Arkadiusz, and Wolfgang Huemer, eds. *Phenomenology and Analysis: Essays on Central European Philosophy*. Ontos Verlag, 2004.
- Clyne, Michael. *The German Language in a Changing Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Cohen, Gary B. *The Politics of Ethnic Survival: Germans in Prague, 1861–1914*. 2nd ed., rev. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 2006.
- Cornis-Pope, Marcel, and John Neubauer, eds. *History of the Literary Cultures of East-Central Europe: Junctures and Disjunctures in the 19th and 20th Centuries*. 4 vols. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2004–2010.
- Cornis-Pope, Marcel, and John Neubauer. *Towards a History of the Literary Cultures in East-Central Europe: Theoretical Reflections*. ACLS Occasional Paper 52. New York: American Council of Learned Societies, 2002.
- Coulmas, Florian. "Germanness: Language and Nation." In *The German Language and the Real World: Sociolinguistic, Cultural, and Pragmatic Perspectives on Contemporary German*, edited by Patrick Stevenson, 55–68. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- Descombes, Vincent. *Le même et l'autre: Quarante-cinq ans de philosophie française (1933–1978)*. Paris: Minuit, 1979.
- Douglas, R. M. *Orderly and Humane: The Expulsion of the Germans after the Second World War*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2012.
- Ficowski, Jerzy. *Regions of the Great Heresy: Bruno Schulz, a Biographical Portrait*. Translated and edited by Theodosia Robertson. New York: W. W. Norton, 2003.
- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von. *Wilhelm Meister's Apprenticeship*. Translated by Thomas Carlyle. New York: Collier Books, 1962.
- Gołuchowski, Józef. *Die Philosophie in ihrem Verhältnisse zum Leben ganzer Völker und einzelner Menschen*. Erlangen: J. J. Palm und E. Enke, 1822.
- Halecki, Oskar. *Borderlands of Western Civilization: A History of East Central Europe*. New York: Ronald Press Co., 1952.
- Harvey, Elizabeth. *Women and the Nazi East: Agents and Witnesses of Germanization*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003.
- Heidsieck, Arnold. *The Intellectual Contexts of Kafka's Fiction: Philosophy, Law, Religion*. Columbia, SC: Camden House, 1994.
- Illies, Florian, and Stefan Koldehoff. "Wem gehört Kafka?" *Die Zeit*, November 19, 2009.
- Janik, Allan, and Stephen Toulmin. *Wittgenstein's Vienna*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1973.
- Judson, Pieter M. *Guardians of the Nation: Activists on the Language Frontiers of Imperial Austria*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006.
- Kafka, Franz. *Briefe 1914–1917*. Edited by Hans-Gerd Koch. Vol. 3 of *Briefe, in Schriften, Tagebücher, Briefe: Kritische Ausgabe*. Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer, 2005.
- Kant, Immanuel. "Beantwortung der Frage: Was ist Aufklärung?" *Berlinische Monatsschrift* 4 (December 1784): 481–94.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics That Will Be Able to Come Forward as Science: With Selections from the Critique of Pure Reason*. Edited and translated by Gary Hatfield. Rev. ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Karl, Frederick Robert. *Franz Kafka, Representative Man*. New York: Ticknor & Fields, 1991.
- King, Jeremy. *Budweisers into Czechs and Germans: A Local History of Bohemian Politics, 1848–1948*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002.
- Klin, Eugeniusz, and Jaromír Loužil. *František Tomáš Bratránek: Ein polonophiler Mittler zwischen den Nationen*. Zielona Góra: WSP, 1987.
- Kumar, Krishan. "The 1989 Revolutions and the Idea of Europe." *Political Studies* 40, no. 3 (1992): 439–61.
- Kundera, Milan. "The Tragedy of Central Europe." Translated by Edmund White. *The New York Review of Books*, April 26, 1984. <https://www.nybooks.com/articles/1984/04/26/the-tragedy-of-central-europe/>.
- Le Rider, Jacques. "Bruno Schulz et Franz Kafka." *Europe* 84, no. 923 (March 2006): 245–52.
- Le Rider, Jacques. *Nietzsche en France*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1999.
- Lehrer, Keith, and Johann Christian Marek, eds. *Austrian Philosophy Past and Present: Essays in Honor of Rudolf Haller*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1996.
- Lerman, Antony. "The Kafka Legacy: Who Owns Jewish Heritage?" *The Guardian*, July 22, 2010. <https://www>.

- theguardian.com/commentisfree/2010/jul/22/kafka-legacy-israel.
- Loeb, Sara. *Franz Kafka: A Question of Jewish Identity: Two Perspectives*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2001.
- Loužil, Jaromír. *Bernard Bolzano*. Praha: Melantrich, 1978.
- Ludovici, Carl Günther. *Ausführlicher Entwurf einer vollständigen Historie der Wolffischen Philosophie*. Leipzig: Johann Georg Löwe, 1738.
- Masłowski, Michel, Didier Francfort, and Paul Gradwohl, eds. *Culture et identité en Europe centrale*. Paris: Institut d'études slaves; Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2011.
- Miller, Jaroslav. *Urban Societies in East-Central Europe, 1500–1700*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008.
- Muirhead, J. H. "How Hegel Came to England." *Mind* 36, no. 144 (1927): 423–47.
- Murray, Nicholas. *Kafka*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2004.
- Naumann, Friedrich. *Central Europe*. Translated by Christabel M. Meredith. London: P. S. King & Son, 1916.
- Paloff, Benjamin. "Who Owns Bruno Schulz?" *Boston Review*, December 1, 2004.
- Pickering, Mary. *Auguste Comte: An Intellectual Biography*. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Pippin, Robert B. *Modernism as a Philosophical Problem: On the Dissatisfactions of European High Culture*. 2nd ed. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1999.
- Powers, Denise V. "Fresco Fiasco: Narratives of National Identity and the Bruno Schulz Murals of Drogoibych." *East European Politics and Societies* 17, no. 4 (2003): 622–53.
- Reinhold, Karl Leonhard. *Letters on the Kantian Philosophy*. Edited by Karl Ameriks. Translated by James Hebbeler. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Rejzek, Jiří. *Český etymologický slovník*. Praha: Leda, 2001.
- Remington, Robin Alison, ed. *Winter in Prague: Documents on Czechoslovak Communism in Crisis*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1969.
- Rindler Schjerve, Rosita, ed. *Diglossia and Power: Language Policies and Practice in the 19th Century Habsburg Empire*. Language, Power and Social Process 9. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2003.
- Roth, Michael S. *Knowing and History: Appropriations of Hegel in Twentieth-Century France*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1988.
- Said, Edward W. *Culture and Imperialism*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1993.
- Sauer, Werner. *Österreichische Philosophie zwischen Aufklärung und Restauration: Beiträge zur Geschichte des Frühkantianismus in der Donaumonarchie*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1982.
- Schlegel, August Wilhelm von. *August Wilhelm von Schlegel's sämtliche Werke*. Edited by Eduard Böcking. Vol. 8. Leipzig: Weidmann, 1846.
- Smith, Barry. "The Neurath-Haller Thesis: Austria and the Rise of Scientific Philosophy." In *Austrian Philosophy Past and Present: Essays in Honor of Rudolf Haller*, edited by Keith Lehrer and Johann Christian Marek, 1–20. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1996.
- Spector, Scott. "Middle Ground: Translation, Mediation, Correspondence." In *Prague Territories: National Conflict and Cultural Innovation in Franz Kafka's Fin de Siècle*, 195–233. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.
- Starnes, Thomas Clyde. *Der deutsche Merkur in den österreichischen Ländern*. Wien: Turia & Kant, 1994.
- Surman, Jan. "Science and Its Publics: Internationality and National Languages in Central Europe." In *The Nationalization of Scientific Knowledge in the Habsburg Empire, 1848–1918*, edited by Mitchell G. Ash and Jan Surman, 30–56. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
- Underhill, Karen. "Ecstasy and Heresy: Martin Buber, Bruno Schulz, and Jewish Modernity." In *(Un)masking Bruno Schulz: New Combinations, Further Fragmentations, Ultimate Reintegrations*, edited by Dieter De Bruyn and Kris Van Heuckelom, 27–47. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2009.
- Walicki, Andrzej. *Philosophy and Romantic Nationalism: The Case of Poland*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.
- Wandycz, Piotr Stefan. *The Price of Freedom: A History of East Central Europe from the Middle Ages to the Present*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Wellek, René. *Immanuel Kant in England, 1793–1838*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1931.
- Wiley, David. "Divinity and Denial in Franz Kafka's 'The Metamorphosis' and *The Complete Fiction of Bruno Schulz*." *Canadian-American Slavic Studies* 31, no. 2 (1997): 171–76.
- Wilson, Peter H. *The Thirty Years War: Europe's Tragedy*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2009.
- Wolff, Larry. *Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1994.
- Worthington, David. *British and Irish Experiences and Impressions of Central Europe, c.1560–1688*. Politics and Culture in Europe, 1650–1750. Farnham: Ashgate, 2012.