a great deal of resistance from the affected local communities. After a time Kotański changed his approach, contacting local parish priests and meeting members of the local community and engaging in a direct, often painful dialogue. It is not difficult to guess which approach was more effective. What is discouraging is the fact that Zięba had to reach so far back to find a positive example.

Finally, Zięba maintains that, however powerful, negative trends are not destiny. Currently, he doubts they can be reversed, but hopes they can be minimized. Despite the sobering social analysis it contains, all things considered, Ale nam się wydarzyło projects a voice of hope, and one sorely needed in the Poland of today. Poles who share Zięba’s concerns can only hope his is not a voice calling in the wilderness.

Christopher Garbowski
Maria Curie-Skłodowska University


With the appearance of this volume, the Hrushevsky Translation Project of the Peter Jacyk Centre for Ukrainian Historical Research at the University of Alberta, Canada, has passed the midpoint in its publication of the English translation of Hrushevsky’s ten-volume (in twelve books) Istoria Ukrainy-Rusy. Volume 1 of his history in this series appeared in 1997, volumes 7 through 9, between 1999 and 2010, with the remaining volumes projected for the near future. (Only volume 8 and volume 9, part 1, were reviewed in this journal (see vol. 49, no. 2 and vol. 50, no. 4.) When complete, this multiyear undertaking will represent a historical and cultural achievement of which the whole Ukrainian community can be justifiably proud, but which also represents a major monument in scholarship. (One can only wish that the resources similar in scope to those behind this project might someday be dedicated to the appearance of a full scholarly translation of the greatest work of medieval Polish historiography, the Annales seu Cronicae incliti Regni Poloniae of Jan Długosz; the 1997 abridged English translation from the Polish, not the Latin, by Maurice Michael [belatedly reviewed in this journal, vol. 49, no. 3], was a valiant, but flawed, effort.)

This volume of Hrushevsky’s history, published originally in 1907, constitutes the third of three devoted to what has become known in Ukrainian historiography—due largely to the influence and impact of Hrushevsky’s own work—as the transitional Lithuanian-Polish period, which falls between the Kievan era and the Cossack age. The decay of the Rus’ state was marked by the growing intervention in Galician-Volhynian territory by Piast Poland under kings Władysław Łokietek (d. 1333) and...
Casimir the Great (d. 1370) and by late Gediminid Lithuania. In his fourth volume, Hrushevsky provided a narrative of political and diplomatic developments roughly to the end of the sixteenth century; the fifth volume considered legal aspects of social and cultural relations; and this volume continues this thematic approach, treating economic, cultural, and national issues. His overriding theme is, as he put it in his opening remarks to volume 1 of his history, that in this cycle of Ukraine’s past “Byzantine influences gave way to those of the West. . . . A privileged higher stratum enslaved the common folk [and] became increasingly separated from the people in terms of culture and nationality.” Eventually, the “awakening of resistance and of national self-defense before the threat of impending national death . . . was initially manifested in the cultural and religious national movement” in which the Ukrainian people were able to preserve an organic continuation from Kiev to the Cossack age and beyond (p. 15).

The focus in the first of its six chapters is upon economic life, particularly trade and urban manufacture. To Hrushevsky, this was a period of urban decline, accelerated by the manorial system, grounded in the privileges of the nobility, which was imposed by both Poland and Lithuania in the region. In addition, the interests of merchants in cities such as Kraków overrode competition from Lviv. Conversely, he saw the status of the rural economy in both the eastern and western lands of Ukraine, the subject of his second chapter, as being enhanced and reflecting vigorous growth. It was, however, an economy that also carried with it negative effects for those in rural villages. As he put it, “agriculture and manufacture controlled by the nobility served as a stimulus to the endless destruction of the natural wealth of the land and the limitless subjugation of the peasant stratum” (p. 183). In the third chapter, Hrushevsky examines cultural and national relations in an attempt to analyze the national and ethnic composition of society in Ukraine. Here he was interested in the varied processes by which Polonization and Catholicization had their impacts in the various territories of the region, in particular the way in which the ethnic composition of the noble order changed and the processes by which Polonization became the model for administration.

The fourth chapter of this volume concentrates upon everyday life and culture, with particular reference to family ties and networks, which Hrushevsky saw as increasing in importance in this period. This development was to him especially significant, since political activities had become subordinated to the Polish or Lithuanian state (or, after 1569, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth). The final two chapters are devoted, respectively, to sixteenth-century cultural and religious movements leading to the Union of Brest in 1596 and to struggles after the union in support of it and against it, as reflected in both the activities of individuals and the body of literature, much of it polemical, produced in this tumultuous period. Hrushevsky judges western influences and models, mediated especially through Poland, to have been particularly stifling. He begins his fifth chapter with this observation: “[T]he sociocultural and spiritual movement of the sixteenth century in Poland had [a] great influence on the evolution of Ukrainian life. To be sure, the effect was more
negative than positive” (p. 321). He does, however, see instances where local traditions were combined with western norms and produced results that were creative. But the larger effect of the Reformation and Catholic (or Counter-) Reformation had a profoundly negative effect upon, especially, the Orthodox Church. The battles over the eventual Union of Brest were crucial. Sometimes they evoked a conservative response that tried to preserve the old religion but which served merely to prevent distinctive indigenous reforms. But sometimes the result was the growth of a more progressive response, such as the school of Petro Mohyla in Kyiv. Even this was criticized by Hrushevsky, however, because in his judgment it was simply a channel for western culture mediated through Poland. Much more important to him was the development of the Brotherhood Movement, a lay phenomenon among burghers that heightened cultural and national awareness in positive ways. The last chapter concludes with a survey of the polemical literature occasioned by the Union of Brest, which was deeply divisive and had to be overcome in later generations. “Thirteen Notes,” which follow, are essentially bibliographical essays (to which the most important subsequent scholarship has been editorially appended).

The foregoing provides an overview of the contents of this volume. On its own it is an important part of a historiographical achievement—the *Istoria Ukrainy-Rusy*—that helped create a national consciousness among the Ukrainian intelligentsia and in broader circles, without which the modern state of Ukraine would be significantly diminished. While his work does not fully meet contemporary historiographical standards, it is still the starting point for the study of Ukrainian history. Hrushevsky’s interpretation—a populist one, in which the nation (*naród*) not the state is the governing organizational principle—may not any longer be fully accepted, but it is by no means fully superseded. The challenge to his conclusions, especially for this volume and the two preceding ones by Poles, but including others of his contemporaries, served to stimulate scholarship that has continued to be vital to this day. Moreover, there have been archival materials unknown to Hrushevsky that have become known since he wrote, and modern critical historiography has moved beyond the nationalist framework within which, to a large degree, he worked.

But the importance and usefulness of the volume is greatly enhanced by the editorial contributions that accompany it. These include Frank Sysyn’s characteristically insightful Editorial Preface, especially with regard to terminology in translation, and Myron Kapral’s Introduction (skillfully translated by Uliana Pasicznyk), which sets this volume in context, provides a sure guide through its themes, points out the strengths and weaknesses of its content, and presents a brilliant analysis of its reception in the early twentieth century and of subsequent scholarship that has confirmed, challenged, modified, and, in some instances, recast the Hrushevsky contribution. One of his comments about the contributions of this history is particularly apposite:

1. See, for example, the edited volume by Thomas Wünsch and Andrzej Janeczek, *On the Frontier of Latin Europe. Integration and Segregation in Red Ruthenia, 1350–1600* (Warsaw: Institute of Archaeology and Ethnology of the Polish Academy of Sciences, 2004).
“It was in Hrushevsky’s work that, for the first time in historiography, the eastern and western Ukrainian lands divided between Poland and Lithuania in medieval times were treated as a single conjoined subject of historical research. For Hrushevsky, that subject’s unifying factor was the Ukrainian people, which in the Lithuanian-Polish period preserved an ‘organic continuation’ from the princely period to the Cossack epoch” (p. xxxi). The translation by Leonid Heretz of Hrushevsky’s text is fluid and colloquial; the glossary and maps are helpful; Hrushevsky’s own bibliography has, as with previously published volumes in the translation project, been provided with fully checked and complete information; the appendices on monetary units and units of measure are detailed and complemented with bibliography; and the tables of hetmans and rulers are complete and accurate. Readers who have missed reviews of previous volumes, some of which contain much more detail than is possible to present here with respect to historiography and technical matters and some of which are many pages long, can find a complete listing at the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press Web site (www.ciuspress.com) by clicking on each individual published volume. In sum, the high standards of the Hrushevsky Translation Project have been superbly sustained in this volume, and all who are interested in the history of this region are deeply indebted to the editorial team involved. (They include many not named on the title page but who are identified by Sysyn in his preface.)

Paul W. Knoll

University of Southern California, Emeritus


It is hard to remember a book on Polish and central European history that has received as much attention and praise in the United States as Iron Curtain, and no wonder. Anne Applebaum is, without question, the leading American journalistic commentator on that corner of the globe, a part-time resident of Poland, and famously connected to high places in the government of the country. She is the author of two previous books dealing with the region, and the winner of a Pulitzer Prize for her superb Gulag.¹ Now Iron Curtain, her engrossing, unsparing account of the first dozen years of Communist rule in the zone of Europe satellitized by the Soviet Union after World War II, has won its author exposure in media forums normally reserved for best sellers, and made the short list for a National Book Award.

While Iron Curtain has many strengths, it is a safe bet that the key to its broad appeal is that it is aimed primarily at the serious reading public, rather than the narrower circles of specialists, and that it reintroduces to this larger audience a subject that once was something like common knowledge, but with the passage of time has receded from memory: the unhappy lot of the “captive nations” of middle Europe at