——————— I ———————

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.'[1] 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,

[1] Tibor Baráth, '"Kárpát-Európa" vagy "Kelet-Európa"' (1940), in Iván T. Berend, ed., *Helyünk Európában*, 2 vols., 2nd edn (Budapest, 1986), vol. I, 506–8 (see 508).

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,

[2] Lonnie R. Johnson, *Central Europe: Enemies, Neighbors, Friends* (New York and Oxford, 1996), 3–12; Georges Castellan, *Histoire des peuples de l'Europe centrale* (Paris, 1994); Chantal Delsol, Michel Maslowski and Joanna Nowicki, eds., *Mythes et symboles politiques en Europe centrale* (Paris, 2002); Peter J. Katzenstein, ed., *Mitteleuropa: Between Europe and Germany* (Providence, RI, 1997); André Sellier and Jean Sellier, *Atlas des peuples d'Europe centrale*, new edn (Paris, 1995); Ferenc L. Lendvai, *Közép-Európa-koncepciók* (Budapest, 1997); Mária Ormos, *Közép-Európa: Volt? Van? Lesz?* (Budapest, 2007), 9–21; Gérard Beauprêtre, ed., *L'Europe centrale, réalité, mythe, enjeu, XVIIIe–XIXe siècles* (Warsaw, 1991); 'Europe centrale. Mitteleuropa', *Revue germanique internationale* 1 (1994) (entire issue, and especially Krzysztof Pomian, 'L'Europe centrale: essais de définition', 11–23); Jacques Le Rider, *La Mitteleuropa* (Paris, 1994); George Schöpflin and Nancy Wood, eds., *In Search of Central Europe* (Cambridge, 1989); 'Central Europe: ten years after', issue 6, 1 (1999), *European Review of History/Revue Européenne d'Histoire*; Robin Okey, 'Central Europe/Eastern Europe: behind the definitions', *Past and Present* 137 (1992), 102–33; Przemysław Urbańczyk, ed., *Origins of Central Europe* (Warsaw, 1997); Ferenc Fehér, 'On making Central Europe', *Eastern European Politics and Societies* 3, 3 (1989), 412–47.

[3] Peter Jordan, 'A subdivision of Europe into larger regions by cultural criteria', United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names, Working Paper no. 48, 23rd session, Vienna, 28 March–4 April 2006, unstats.un.org./unsd/geoinfo/gegn23wp48.pdf (accessed 7 Jan. 2010).

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

---

[4] Examples include: Ormos, *Közép-Európa*, 10, 269; Le Rider, *Mitteleuropa*, 75–91; Johnson, *Central Europe*, 6; Philip Longworth, *The Making of Eastern Europe: From Prehistory to Postcommunism*, 2nd rev. edn (London, 1997), 5–6; Czesław Miłosz, 'Central European attitudes', in *Cross-Currents: A Yearbook of Central European Culture* 5 (1986), 101–8, repr. Schöpflin and Wood, eds., *In Search*, 116–24; Jacques Rupnik, 'Central Europe or Mitteleuropa?', in Stephen R. Graubard, ed., *Eastern Europe . . . Central Europe . . . Europe* (Boulder, CO, 1991), 233–65, esp. 235–8.

[5] Frank Hadler, 'Mitteleuropa – "Zwischeneuropa" – Ostmitteleuropa. Reflexionen über eine europäische Geschichtsregion im 19. und 20. Jh.', *Geisteswissenschaftliches Zentrum für Geschichte und Kultur Ostmitteleuropas Berichte und Beiträge* (1996), 34–63; Richard G. Plaschka, Horst Haselsteiner, Arnold Suppan, Anna M. Drabek and Brigitta Zaar, eds., *Mitteleuropa-Konzeptionen in der ersten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhundert* (Vienna, 1995); Le Rider, *Mitteleuropa*; Peter Bugge, 'The use of the Middle: Mitteleuropa vs Střední Evropa', *European Review of History – Revue Européenne d'Histoire* 6, 1 (1999), 15–35. Egon Schwarz, 'Central Europe – What it is and what it is not', in Schöpflin and Wood, eds., *In Search*, 143–56, lists many older works.

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.[6]

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.[7] 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).[8] 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.[9]

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

[6] E.g. Okey, 'Central Europe', 103–4; László Péter, 'Central Europe and its reading
into the past', *European Review of History – Revue Européenne d'Histoire* 6, 1 (1999),
101–11, on 101: 'The nationality of the map-maker rather than some principles of
geography determine the location of "Central Europe".'

[7] István Bibó, 'A Kelet-Európai kisállamok nyomorúsága' (1946), in Bibó, *Válogatott
Tanulmányok*, ed. Endre Nagy and István Vida, 4 vols. (Budapest, 1986–90), vol. II,
185–265; French tr. *Misère des petits états d'Europe de l'Est* (Paris, 1986, 2nd edn 1993).

[8] E.g. Longworth, *Making of Eastern Europe*; Robert Bideleux and Ian Jeffries, *A
History of Eastern Europe: Crisis and Change*, 2nd edn (London, 2007); various
authors, 'Historiography of the countries of Eastern Europe', *American Historical
Review* 97, 4 (1992), 1011–1117, includes Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary,
Romania, Yugoslavia and Bulgaria.

[9] David Turnock, *The Making of Eastern Europe: From the Earliest Times to 1815*
(London and New York, 1988).

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

---

[10] Quotation from George H. Hodos, *The East-Central European Region: An Historical Outline* (Westport, CT, and London, 1999), 19; Oskar Halecki, *Borderlands of Western Civilization: A History of East Central Europe* (New York, 1952, 2nd edn ed. by Andrew L. Simon, Safety Harbor, FL, [2000?]); Jerzy Kłoczowski, *L'Europe du Centre-Est dans l'historiographie des pays de la région* (Lublin, 1995); Kłoczowski et al., *East-Central Europe's Position within Europe: Between East and West* (Lublin, 2004); Kłoczowski, with Hubert Łaszkiewicz, eds., *East-Central Europe in European History: Themes and Debates* (Lublin, 2009); Klaus Zernack, 'Zum Problem der nationalen Identität in Ostmitteleuropa', in Helmut Berding, ed., *Nationales Bewußtsein und kollektive Identität* (Frankfurt am Main, 1994), 176–88; Jacques Rupnik, 'In search of East-Central Europe: ten years after', in *Central and Southeastern Europe in Transition: Perspectives on Success and Failure Since 1989*, ed. Hall Gardner (Westport, CT, 2000), 5–19; Paul Robert Magocsi, *Historical Atlas of East Central Europe* (Seattle, 1993); Alan Palmer, *The Lands Between: A History of East-Central Europe since the Congress of Vienna* (London, 1970); Werner Conze, *Ostmitteleuropa von der Spätantike bis zum 18. Jahrhundert* (Munich, 1992); Piotr S. Wandycz, *The Price of Freedom: A History of East Central Europe from the Middle Ages to the Present* (London and New York, 1992); Anna Adamska and Marco Mostert, eds., *The Development of Literate Mentalities in East Central Europe* (Turnhout, 2004); Piotr Górecki and Nancy Van Deusen, eds., *Central and Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages: A Cultural History* (London and New York, 2009), who use the two terms in the title, and 'East Central Europe' in the introduction and conclusion, focusing on the three kingdoms of Bohemia, Hungary and Poland; J. W. Sedlar, *East Central Europe in the Middle Ages, 1000–1500* (Seattle, 1994), and the whole series of which it is a part, *A History of East Central Europe*, edited by Peter F. Sugar and Donald W. Treadgold (Seattle, 1974–); Florin Curta, ed., *East Central and Eastern Europe in the Early Middle Ages* (Ann Arbor, 2005); Natalia Aleksiun et al., eds., *Histoire de l'Europe du Centre-Est* (Paris, 2004); Rudolf Jaworski, 'Ostmitteleuropa. Zur Tauglichkeit und Akzeptanz eines historischen

the area of German economic, social and cultural influence, a symbiosis with German culture, and is used sometimes for Bohemia.[11] 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.[12] 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'.[13] 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'.[14] 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

Hilfsbegriffs', in Winfried Eberhard, Hans Lemberg, Heinz-Dieter Heimann and Robert Luft, eds., *Westmitteleuropa Ostmitteleuropa. Vergleiche und Beziehungen. Festschrift für Ferdinand Seibt zum 65. Gesburtstag* (Munich, 1992), 37–45; Ferdinand Seibt, 'Zwischen Ost und West. Versuch einer Ortsbestimmung,' in Seibt, ed., *Die böhmischen Länder zwischen Ost und West. Festschrift für Karl Bosl zum 75. Geburtstag* (Munich and Vienna, 1983), 1–16.

[11] Eberhard, *et al.*, eds., *Westmitteleuropa*, ultimately going back to Halecki.

[12] Otto Forst de Battaglia, *Zwischeneuropa. Von der Ostsee bis zur Adria* (Frankfurt am Main, 1954).

[13] Jerzy Kłoczowski, *Młodsza Europa. Europa Środkowo-Wschodnia w kręgu cywilizacji chrześcijańskiej średniowiecza* (Warsaw, 1998); Jan M. Piskorski, 'After Occidentalism: the Third Europe writes its own history', in Piskorski, ed., *Historiographical Approaches to Medieval Colonization of East Central Europe* (Boulder, CO, 2002); Aleksander Gieysztor, *L'Europe nouvelle autour de l'an mil: la papauté, l'Empire et les 'nouveaux venus'* (Rome, 1997).

[14] 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.[15] 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*.[16]

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.[17] 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

[16] Le Rider, *Mitteleuropa*; Hans-Dietrich Schultz and Wolfgang Natter, 'Imagining
Mitteleuropa: conceptualisations of "its" space in and outside German geography',
European Review of History – Revue Européenne d'Histoire 10, 2 (2003), 273–92;
Piskorski, ed., *Historiographical Approaches*; Schwarz, 'Central Europe'; Stefan
Troebst, 'Introduction: what's in a historical region? A Teutonic perspective',
European Review of History – Revue Européenne d'Histoire 10, 2 (2003), 173–88;
Rudolf Jaworski, 'Zentraleuropa – Mitteleuropa – Ostmitteleuropa. Zur
Definitionsproblematik einer historischen Großregion', *newsletter MODERNE* 2,
1 (1999), 2–4. Local uses include e.g. Arnold Dániel, 'A középeurópai vámunió és a
magyar közgazdaság' (1915), and Zsigmond Kunfi, 'Középeurópa' (1916), the
latter rejecting the attempts to build a Central European union as imperialist:
both appear in I. Berend, ed., *Helyünk Európában*, vol. I, 55–62, 63–83,
respectively.

[17] Larry Wolff, *Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the
Enlightenment* (Stanford, 1994).

'Eastern Europe' at the International Historical Congress of 1923 in Brussels, which was subsequently established.[18] 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.[19]

---

[18] 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.

[19] Milan Kundera (on Russia kidnapping Central Europe), 'The tragedy of Central Europe', *New York Review of Books*, 26 April 1984, is political and rhetorical rather than historical. Le Rider, *Mitteleuropa*, ch. 9; Timothy Garton Ash, 'Does Central Europe exist?', *New York Review of Books*, 9 October 1986, 45–52, repr. in Schöpflin and Wood, eds., *In Search*, 191–215; Francesco M. Cataluccio, 'In

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

Search of Lost Europe', Introduction in Bronisław Geremek, *The Common Roots of Europe* (Cambridge, 1996), 1–16; Sven Papcke and Werner Weidenfeld, eds., *Traumland Mitteleuropa? Beiträge zu einer aktuellen Kontroverse* (Darmstadt, 1988); Ormos, *Közép-Európa*, 245–68; Timothy Garton Ash, 'Mitteleuropa?', in Graubard, ed., *Eastern Europe*, 1–21; Jacques Rupnik, 'Central Europe or Mitteleuropa?', in Graubard, ed., *Eastern Europe*, 233–65; Miroslav Kusý, 'We, Central-European East Europeans', in Schöpflin and Wood, eds., *In Search*, 91–6; Schöpflin's introduction in Schöpflin and Wood, eds., *In Search*, esp. 17–19; Sellier and Sellier, *Atlas des peuples d'Europe Centrale*, 7: 'depuis 1989, on ne parle plus d'Europe de l'"Est" mais – á nouveau – d'Europe "centrale"; Tony Judt, 'The rediscovery of Central Europe', in Graubard, ed., *Eastern Europe*, 23–58; Czesław Miłosz, 'Looking for a center: on the poetry of Central Europe', George Konrad, 'Letter from Budapest' 'Milan Kundera interview' with Alan Finkielkraut, Roman Szporluk, 'Defining "Central Europe": power, politics and culture', and Jan Triska, 'East Europe? West Europe? Both? Neither?', all in *Cross Currents: A Yearbook of Central European Culture* 1 (1982), 1–11, 12–14, 15–29, 30–8, 39–44; Krishan Kumar, 'The 1989 revolutions and the idea of Europe', *Political Studies* 40 (1992), 439–61.