

UKRAIŃSKI RUCH NARODOWY W GALICJI W LATACH 1830–1848. By
Jan Kozik. Cracow: Wydawnictwo literackie, 1973. 308 pp. 35 zł.

Although the Galician Ukrainians, compared with the Ukrainians within the Russian Empire, were late starters in affirming their nationality, the Galician movement established an institutional base which proved stronger than that of its Eastern counterpart. Kozik's work centers on the period, before the actual abolition of serfdom, when that broad peasant base was not yet available and when the direction of the nascent Ukrainian movement was not clearly enunciated. But the groping for a literary language and the arguments about the script to be used, although carried on in Polish, were aspects of the political formulation of the Ukrainian Galician issue at the time.

The Galician clergy-intelligentsia, even before 1848, argues Kozik, were conscious of the linguistic and historical unity of all Ukrainians. Since he is not hampered by the traditional Ukrainian hagiography of the national movement, he is able to stress the contributions of such relatively unknown persons as Rev. Ivan Mohylnytsky, who in 1817 and 1821 presented the Austrian government with arguments for a separate Ukrainian language, and M. Hoshovsky, who supplied Joseph Dobrovsky with information about the Galician Ukrainians. As a result of this focus, the drama of the "Rus' Trinity"—especially of Rev. Markian Shashkevych, who used the vernacular in pulpit and print, and of Rev. Vasyl Podolynsky, who was the first to formulate clearly the political possibilities of the Galician-Ukrainians—pales somewhat, but their historical position gains clarity. Kozik worked with a later summary of Podolynsky's original brochure, *Glos przestrogi*.

Kozik skillfully weaves into the narrative the inevitable discussion of the name of the Ukrainian-Galicians (Rusyn, Rusnak) and how it differed from what the Russians were called, the political hazards of the Ukrainian literary movement, and the peculiarities of the Galician-Ukrainian social structure (the Uniat clergy playing the role of the intelligentsia). His presentation of the Ukrainian Galician movement not only within the framework of the general Slavic reawakening but also within the context of personal interactions of the Slavs will be valuable for the historian of Eastern Europe.

Some of Kozik's views are questionable—for instance, the influence of Josyf Lozynsky on Shashkevych's use of the *hrashdanka* and the continued pervasiveness of progressive ideas in the Uniat seminaries. Others are inevitably polemical, such as the role of the Uniat church under Metropolitan Levytsky and the impact of the Poles on the Galician-Ukrainians. Sometimes his insight is helpful—for example, his comment that Goethe and Hegel were as responsible for the "Germanization" of Galicia as the Austrian administration. His discussion of the people who helped finance the crucial Ukrainian writing breaks new ground. And he presents a good recapitulation of the arguments between Ivan and Iakiv Holovatsky. The former maintained that the acceptance of a Latin script would be a useful way of speeding up the enlightenment of the people and of preventing a closer cooperation with reactionary Russia, while the latter saw in Russia the key to the future.

The work is based largely on published primary sources, but many of these have become very rare now. Kozik also consulted almost all available secondary sources. One misses, however, some discussion on the motivation for the actions of the early formulators of the Ukrainian movement. The book lacks a bibliography.

MARTHA BOHACHEVSKY-CHOMIAK
Manhattanville College