

CARPATHO-RUSYN AMERICAN[®]

A Newsletter on Carpatho-Rusyn Ethnic Heritage



FROM THE EDITOR

Many of our readers are aware of the nationally reported controversy which surrounds the closing of the school at St. Mary's Byzantine Catholic parish in Joliet, Illinois (see FROM OUR READERS, this issue). Simply put, Bishop Andrew Pataki of the Parma Byzantine Catholic Diocese has ordered the school's closing and the transfer of Father Gregory Petruska. Father Gregory is not only the parish's pastor, but serves as the school's principal, a teacher, and even a janitor. While dealing sensitively with the concerns of his inner-city community, he has also actively supported an educational program which includes instruction in Carpatho-Rusyn song, dance, and ethnic heritage.

The parishioners have petitioned the Catholic hierarchy all the way to the Vatican, have rallied support from the community of Joliet, have received national news media attention, and have engaged their bishop in a series of legal challenges in their fight to save their school. The people are adamant that their school remain open because it is fiscally sound, financially self supporting, and academically excellent. This unique school is irreplaceable within the community, and the parents are certain that its closing will mean the end of the parish. The bishop is just as firm that his decision is purely an exercise of episcopal authority, not to be questioned or challenged, that the school will indeed close, and that he need not explain his decision to the pastor, parishioners, or anyone else.

Though our entire Carpatho-Rusyn community may be faced with and perplexed by a bad decision poorly implemented, a final resolution of the issue rests within the authority of the Byzantine Catholic Church. It is true, however, that this unfortunate matter precipitates reflection on the challenges our community faces in maintaining its institutions and their inherent ethnicity, challenges that have dogged us for a century now, challenges that usually have come from without, but in this instance come from within. As a people we must learn to manage the outside challenges we cannot avoid, limit conflict within our community, and wherever possible resolve our disputes within our respective families without resorting to tactics that weaken rather than strengthen the institutions we rely on. There is something amiss when a bishop will not talk with his people, driving them instead to seek outside solutions for matters better resolved within their own family. It seems at times that we will never learn.

St. Mary's parish in Joliet was founded as a Byzantine Catholic parish serving a Carpatho-Rusyn community in an inner-city environment. Due to typical demographic forces, the community surrounding the parish has changed and has lost much of its East European character. A strong Hispanic component has emerged and many of its members have become actively involved in the Christian community of St. Mary's. As in so many of our parishes, the original families have dispersed to the suburbs and their sons and daughters have moved across the country to other cities. Nevertheless, the parish has found hope by embracing the changing community around it, and in return Joliet has embraced St. Mary's.

Many of our parishes would have followed the exodus to the suburbs, or would have hung on as long as possible, dying in the end with a whimper. Some would have folded in the face of the first sign of adversity. St. Mary's could have experienced any one of these fates, but it chose instead to

meet the challenge it found and through sacrifice, hard work, and a willingness to share what it had of value — its church, its school, and its traditions — it survived and has even prospered.

The parish was aided immensely by its possession of an asset unique among our people which kept many of the original parishioners loyal, interested, and caring. This is the school which tied the children to the parish regardless of their geographical dispersal around the city. The parish shares its school proudly with the new community which has sprung up around it. The school and the role it has played in the life of the parish and of the city is of inestimable value also to the entire Carpatho-Rusyn community for it passes on to our children and their non-Rusyn peers elements of our heritage. The school shows our friends and neighbors that we as Americans of Carpatho-Rusyn background have much to be proud of, and that what we have and what we are is worth sharing.

Our future promise is measured in our children and the strength of knowledge and of pride in our heritage that we are able to pass on to them. A school such as St. Mary's, with its vital program of instruction in Carpatho-Rusyn music, dance, and traditions, is a unique vehicle for the passing on of our heritage. The closing of the school no doubt means that many of the people will lose both faith and ethnic identity and yet another of our communities will be lost, for in Joliet it is indeed the school that is the glue of the parish. We have enough challenges from outside our community and do not need one from within. Surely there must be some mechanism within the Byzantine Catholic Church for resolving this dispute in the best interest of the Carpatho-Rusyn and local communities without any more self-inflicted wounds on either side.

A Publication on Carpatho-Rusyn Heritage

THE CARPATHO-RUSYN AMERICAN

The Carpatho-Rusyn American (ISSN 0749-9213) is a quarterly publication of the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center, Inc., a non-profit cultural organization whose purpose is to promote knowledge about all aspects of Carpatho-Rusyn culture through the publication and/or distribution of scholarly and educational material about the Carpatho-Rusyn heritage in Europe and America.

All communication concerning this publication, including content, letters to the editor, subscriptions, and changes of address should be directed to:

Carpatho-Rusyn American
P.O. Box 227
Cambridge, Minnesota 55008

Editor: John A. Haluska
Associate Editor: Jerry Jumba
Consulting Editor: Patricia A. Krafcik
Business Manager: Steve Mallick

Annual Subscription is \$12.00

One of the leading contemporary Soviet ethnomusicologists, Volodymyr Hošovskij not only pioneered the practical use of computers in musical folklore scholarship, but also laid foundations for a new branch of science, cybernetic ethnomusicology. His system of UNSACAT (Universal Structural Analytic Catalogue) is capable of solving even the most complex problems of research into folksongs. This, however, is not the only sphere of his interest. Hošovskij is also the founder of another discipline, musical Slavic studies, and is both the compiler of the most important collection of Transcarpathian Rusyn folksongs since the Second World War, and the editor of selected studies of K. Kvitka, a Ukrainian ethnomusicologist. He has also conducted research into Transcarpathian folklore, the ecclesiastical music of that region, and many other topics. Apart from that he has authored a number of scholarly studies published both in the Soviet Union and abroad. In spite of all these many-sided scholarly activities Hošovskij's name remains relatively little known to the general public.

He was born on September 22, 1922, in Užhorod in the then Czechoslovakian province of Subcarpathian Rus'. His Carpatho-Rusyn father was a lawyer, his Armenian mother a pianist. He spent his childhood and early youth in Transcarpathia in immediate contact with the rich cultural traditions of the area. On graduation from high school in the first year of the Second World War, he took up the study of musicology and philosophy at Charles University in Prague. After the war he returned to this native Transcarpathia where as a researcher at the Transcarpathian Regional Museum he devoted himself to collecting local folk songs. Out of the almost 1600 songs he gathered, a small sample was published in the volume *Z al'bomu zbiraciv narodnych piseň* (From the Album of Folk-Song Collectors) in Kiev in 1963. It includes among others the song, "*Čom ty ne pryšov?*" (Why Didn't You Come?), which in the interpretation of the Marenyči trio became well known all over the world.

In 1950, Hošovskij became an amateur student of guitar at the music college in L'viv. His folklore fieldwork as well as his theoretical abilities secured for him the position of assistant professor at the Department of the Theory of Music and Composition at the college. Here Hošovskij founded in 1962 the Office for the Study of Musical Folklore which under his management became one of the chief study centers of Rusyn and Ukrainian folksongs. During the period of his activity at the L'viv music college he collected some 3,000 more songs which created a sufficient empirical basis for his theoretical efforts.

Hošovskij was the first ethnomusicologist to use a geographical method in his study of Carpathian folksongs. He first expounded his theory in his studies "The Music Culture of Transcarpathia" (1957) and "On the Question of Musical Dialects in Transcarpathia" (1958), and he demonstrated it on actual material in his anthology *Ukrajinskije pesni Zakarpattja* (Ukrainian Songs of Transcarpathia) published in Moscow in 1968. In his extensive introduction to this anthology, Hošovskij defines eight separate musical dialects of Transcarpathia into which he divides the 262 folksongs included in the volume, all of which were collected by himself. Each individual song is accompanied by a comprehensive scholarly commentary. The notes to the anthology include nine registers, of which the register of tonality systems is the first



of its kind in world folklore studies. It is probably the most accomplished regional collection of folksongs to be found in the entire Slavic world.

While active in the L'viv Office for the Study of Musical Folklore Hošovskij was also the first scholar to compile a complex catalogue of Ukrainian folk songs, which he has since further improved. Nevertheless, Hošovskij's ideas on the dialectological approach to the folksong, and especially on the use of linguistic-mathematical methods in the research into folksongs, were only gradually accepted. Hošovskij first spelled out his views on the use of computer technique in his study "Folklore and Cybernetics," published in the journal *Sovetskaja muzyka* (Moscow 1964, Nos. 11 and 12). Already in this study Hošovskij outlined the main directions which in his opinion modern ethnomusicology should take, especially the establishment of a universal system of cataloguing folksongs. A sort of summary of his research and findings appeared in his book, *At the Sources of the Folk Music of the Slavs*, published in Moscow in 1971 and in an extended version in Czech in 1976. In the collection of both analytic and synthetic studies, Hošovskij defined the objectives and methods of a new scholarly discipline — studies in Slavic music.

In February 1975 Hošovskij moved from L'viv to Yerevan, the capital of Soviet Armenia, where he had better opportunities to work on his project of a computer-made universal catalogue of folk songs.

In 1983 Hošovskij published a little book called *Gorani: On the Typology of an Armenian Song*, which is the first scholarly work in the field of ethnomusicology based on the use of computers. Recently, Hošovskij applied his computer method also to the folksongs of his native region. The results of this work were described in his study, *Melody Paradigms in the Folksongs of the Slovak-Rusyn Border Area* (published in Czech in Brno in 1984).

In 1986, he retired and returned to his native Transcarpathia in order to continue work to which he had devoted more than 30 years of his life. One of his plans is to process on computer the extensive archives containing his notations of Transcarpathian Rusyn folksongs. Let us wish him much happiness and health. *Mohaja i blahaja lita.*

Mykola Mušynka
Prešov, Czechoslovakia

TRAUMA AND SURVIVAL: A UNIATE RETURN TO ORTHODOXY

The author of this extensive review, Archpriest Serge R. Keleher, was born of Roman Catholic Irish background in New York City. It was his encounter there as a youth with local Carpatho-Rusyns that led to an interest and eventual conversion to Eastern Christianity. He attended St. Vladimir's Theological Seminary (Orthodox Church in America), and since 1971 has been a priest in the Ukrainian Catholic Eparchy of Toronto. He is also a scholarly associate of the Chair of Ukrainian Studies at the University of Toronto.

In keeping with the author's preference, the term Uniate (with no derogatory implication) is at times used as a synonym for Greek Catholic. In keeping with the practice of the Carpatho-Rusyn American, the editor has used Carpatho-Rusyn to describe the ethnic group in question. However, the official terms Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Church and Byzantine Ruthenian Catholic Church are used when referring to specific churches or dioceses. — Editor.

Good Victory, Metropolitan Orestes Chornock and the American Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Diocese, by Lawrence Barriger, Brookline, Massachusetts: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1985, 187 p.

Two recent articles in the *Carpatho-Rusyn American* gave brief biographical sketches of Bishop Basil (Takach) and Metropolitan Orestes (Chornock), the two leading figures during the "celibacy struggle" of the 1930s in the Greek Catholic Church in the United States. The Reverend Barriger's book gives much more of the history of the events and personalities of that conflict, which shook the Carpatho-Rusyn community in the United States to its foundations and resulted in a religious division that persists to this day.

The bitterness of that division has lasted far too long. The community must come to terms with its own history and strive for a dispassionate understanding of what happened and why, to see what lessons can be learned from the experience, and to lay the animosities to rest in favor of future cooperation.

Moreover, people who are interested in the relationships between Eastern Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism need to know this history. The problem that it presents must be understood if ecumenical progress is to be made. In essence, the Roman authorities did not understand the dichotomy of the Unia, and this lack of understanding was responsible for a situation which led to the emergence of a new diocese, first on an "independent Greek Catholic" basis and then as a Carpatho-Russian Orthodox diocese within the Ecumenical Patriarchate.

The Reverend Lawrence Barriger's account of the struggle is the best in print and it is a valuable and welcome contribution to the literature on the history of the Eastern Churches in North America. Yet, there is still more that could be told. The book is hardly a definitive history of the period it covers. It fails to record or to analyze the seriousness of the difficulty the Carpatho-Rusyns have experienced in assimilating into the Orthodox community; it has no index and no bibliography; the footnotes are not well done (which is a particularly serious problem in covering highly controversial events); and there are numerous maddening typographical errors. Holy Cross Press is, unfortunately, not known for the quality of its editing.

A full scholarly history of this whole affair is certainly needed, and one would hope that this could be done with the cooperation of all sides. Such a history must include the complete texts of all the relevant documents. Although many can be found in the Reverend John Slivka's *Historical Mirror: Sources of the Rusin and Hungarian Greek Rite Catholics in the United States of America 1884-1963* (Brooklyn, N.Y. 1978), this invaluable book is unfortunately not widely available. Moreover, it does not give all the documents necessary, and the translation is of an uneven quality. But as Father Lawrence says in his own book, everyone interested in these events owes a special debt of gratitude to the Reverend Slivka for his labor and his courage.

With regard to documents, the court cases and their records are an unedifying but important factor, and any thorough history must list them all, with an abstract of each and relevant references for their transcripts. It became apparent in the court proceedings that the "identity problem" was the real point at issue.

In the seventeenth century, the Orthodox Eparchy of Mukachevo in Carpathian Rus' entered into a religious union with the Roman Catholic Church known as the "Union of Uzhorod." Later, the Empress Maria Theresa of Austria (reigned 1740-1780) coined the term "Greek Catholic" to describe these "Uniate" Christians as the Orthodox Churches united to Rome are often called), and the Greek Catholic Church became the most important component of the Carpatho-Rusyn identity which the people brought with them when they emigrated to the United States in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

By its nature, Greek Catholicism is an ambiguous arrangement, with a constant tension resulting from the double tie: the traditions which bind the Uniates to the Eastern Orthodox Church on the one hand, and the canonical arrangement and theological education which bind the Uniates to the Roman Catholic Church on the other. The Reverend Barriger states the problem in these terms:

What exactly did it mean to be a member of the Greek Catholic Church? . . . the turmoil of the 1930s was centered on the spiritual identity of the Greek Catholic Church. Both sides insisted that they were the 'true Greek Catholic Church' yet their viewpoints differed considerably. *Was a Greek Catholic someone who belonged to the Roman Catholic Church and merely used the 'Greek' Rite to worship as opposed to the Latin [Rite]? Or was a Greek Catholic someone who belonged to a church that was separate from the Roman Church and only bound to it by the contract of 'Union'? (pp. 123-124)*

This ambiguity continues to be a problem for the Uniate Churches. Melkites and Ukrainians often pose the same question in almost the same words, and one can easily find the same controversy as well within the Byzantine-Ruthenian Catholic Church in the United States. Even the specific issue of the celibacy of the clergy remains bitterly controversial. So the crisis of the 1930s is well worth close study and analysis.

However, the identity problem is not resolved by a simple "return" to Orthodoxy. If the relationship of the Byzantine Catholic Church to the Roman Catholic Church is sometimes ambiguous and painful, the relationship of newly "returned" Greek Catholics to the Orthodox Church is also sometimes ambiguous and painful. This dichotomy is

graphically portrayed by photograph 22 in *Good Victory*, which shows the Ecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras of Constantinople standing with Bishop Orestes. The Patriarch is dressed in the typical *rasso*, *klobuk*, and *Panagia* of any Orthodox hierarch; Bishop Orestes is dressed in the house cassock, hooked-up pectoral cross, sash, ring, and zucchetto of a Roman Catholic bishop. Anyone who saw this photograph casually would naturally assume that it showed an ecumenical encounter rather than a meeting of two hierarchs of the same church! For decades this sort of phenomenon caused many other Orthodox to look askance at the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Diocese.

The Carpatho-Rusyns find themselves with a double problem concerning their liturgical tradition. The authentic practice of the Greek Catholic Church in Galicia and Subcarpathian Rus' is the Old Kievan recension of the Byzantine Rite, suppressed by Patriarch Nikon in the seventeenth century and retained (in a Muscovite variant) by the Old Ritualists or Old Believers. So already the Carpatho-Rusyns had a liturgical tradition which was divergent from general Orthodox usage. But in the Unia, this Old Kievan tradition had been severely overlaid with foreign ideas and practices borrowed from the Roman church. Indeed, these borrowings from Rome are superficial and can be removed without damage to the structure of the liturgy, but they are nonetheless very noticeable and have often been the occasion of much unfavorable criticism. There has been almost no scholarly effort to distinguish these two disparate elements in contemporary Carpatho-Rusyn worship, but the practical result is a liturgical model which causes tension between the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Diocese and other Orthodox Churches.

The same problem affects the Byzantine Ruthenian Catholic Church. Even though Rome itself has ordered the "Ruthenians" to adopt an official text and rubrics which would bring their liturgical practice into much closer conformity with normal Orthodox usage, many bishops and clergy of the Pittsburgh Metropolia have fiercely resisted Rome's instructions in the matter.

So the Carpatho-Rusyns have not been entirely comfortable liturgically in either church. In moving toward a resolution of this dilemma, there is a need for scholarly research into the authentic Old Kievan liturgy, presenting that tradition from the early seventeenth century so that both the Carpatho-Rusyns and others who are the heirs of the Old Kievan tradition (the Ukrainians, the Belorussians, and the Muscovite Old Ritualists) will have a firm scientific foundation for liturgical theory and practice.

The same is true with liturgical chant. Carpatho-Russian *prostopinije* (plain chant) is a precious link with a long tradition of Church Slavonic liturgical chant, but in Carpatho-Rusyn parishes which joined the Russian Orthodox Church, *prostopinije* was almost entirely suppressed in favor of the very recent *prostoje* of Bakhmetiev. In the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Diocese, *prostopinije* is still in common use, but in the liturgical transition from Church-Slavonic to English, with the almost complete disappearance of professionally qualified cantors, and with the general tendency of the Eastern Churches in North America to liturgical reductionism, knowledge and use of *prostopinije* is dwindling. Bishop Nicholas (Smisko), the present Ruling Bishop of the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Diocese, is a great lover of *prostopinije*, and it is to be hoped that His Grace will encour-

age serious study of this chant tradition.

The creation of a hybrid church is the real offense of the Unia. And this aspect of the Uniate phenomenon requires much more attention than it has so far received. The late Melkite Archimandrite Orestes Kerame (who played a great part in the activity of the Melkite hierarchy during Vatican II) often remarked that while Roman Catholic ecumenists frequently apologize to the Orthodox for the existence of the Unia, it never seems to occur to the Roman Catholic authorities that it is the Uniates themselves who have been most damaged by the reality of the Unia, and that it is the Uniates themselves to whom Rome ought to apologize for the creation of this hybrid *tertium quid* (third entity)!

Toward the end of the nineteenth century there was a strong movement in the European homeland (what is now Eastern Slovakia and Soviet Transcarpathia) to assert the identity of the Carpatho-Rusyns, both in terms of religion and in terms of nationalism. (Since practically everyone active in this movement was a priest, it would be very difficult to apply the artificial distinction between religion and politics). When the Carpatho-Rusyns came to the United States, they set about organizing churches, which they viewed as the bastion of their religious and ethnic identity. However, they immediately encountered trouble with the Roman Catholic hierarchy. The Roman Catholic bishops in the United States had with great difficulty just suppressed the demands of the German Catholics for a separate hierarchy; they were in the process of refusing a separate status for the Poles (unlike the Germans, a significant number of Poles resisted and formed the Polish National Catholic Church); and they were in the throes of the "Americanist" theological crisis. The last thing the American Roman Catholic bishops wanted was yet another group demanding special status.

Hence, it was not an auspicious moment for the Greek Catholics to appear, with such incredible characteristics as a non-Roman liturgy not celebrated in Latin and a married priesthood! It is possible, although by no means a certainty, that the American Roman Catholic clergy, in the course of what passed for a theological education, had heard of the existence of "Eastern Rites" in some faraway place, but whatever they had been taught was not sufficient to prepare them for the clergy and people who actually arrived.

The records are not complete, but several different Roman Catholic bishops are said to have told Greek Catholic priests applying for faculties that the bishop did not recognize such a priest as a Catholic, and was excommunicating the priest and forbidding him to function in the bishop's diocese. One would like to have been able to ask such bishops why they would trouble to excommunicate a priest if they did not recognize that such a priest was a Catholic in the first place!?

Never mind. The American Roman Catholic bishops wrote to Rome, demanding that it recall these priests and not allow any more to come to the United States, so that the Greek Catholics should be assimilated into the Roman Catholic structure. The authorities in Rome took the position that the Greek Catholics who came to the United States might retain their strictly ritual tradition (with certain modifications), but might not retain certain other distinguishing characteristics, such as married clergy.

Meanwhile, neither the clergy nor the faithful were pre-

pared to be excommunicated and assimilated by Roman Catholics all at the same time. The priests wrote to their own bishops in the "old country" accounts of what was happening. In the end, they served anyway, presumably on the principle that the people needed them — *salus animarum suprema lex*, or the salvation of souls is the supreme law. But the whole situation remained precarious and unstable.

In 1889, in Minneapolis, after an unproductive encounter with Archbishop John Ireland, the Reverend Alexis Toth led the parishioners of St. Mary's Church out of the Unia and into the Russian Orthodox Diocese of the Aleutian Islands and North America. Within twenty years, more than twenty-five thousand people and several priests had followed suit, and the movement continued. The present Orthodox Church in America and the Patriarchal Parishes in the USA are both the beneficiaries of Toth's movement. It would be interesting to investigate what connection (if any) this had with Marcel Popel and the assimilation of the Greek Catholic Eparchy of Chełm/Cholm into the Russian Orthodox Church in 1875 (the territory of the Eparchy of Chełm at the time of these events was in the Russian Empire).

Rome began to realize that there was trouble in the United States and belatedly took action. In 1890, Rome decreed that married priests could not come to the United States, and those who had done so must return to Europe. But the latter option was impossible, because there were not enough celibate priests available in Europe to replace them. In 1902, Rome sent the Reverend Andrew Hodobay to be "Apostolic Visitor" for Greek Catholics in the United States. He stayed five years and accomplished virtually nothing, but he did recommend that a bishop be sent to America. Meanwhile, more and more clergy, parishes, and faithful joined the Orthodox movement, so that in 1905 the Russian Orthodox Church moved its headquarters from California to New York City, closer to the new and growing flock.

In 1907, the Vatican finally appointed the Reverend Soter Ortynsky to be the first Greek Catholic bishop in the New World. Bishop Ortynsky was consecrated in Saint George's Cathedral in L'viv by Metropolitan Andrej Šeptyc'kyj, and at the Metropolitan's invitation, the sermon was preached by the Reverend Ivan Voliansky, the first Greek Catholic priest in the western hemisphere who, in 1887, founded the original parish in Shenandoah, Pennsylvania.

The Reverend Voliansky was also the first victim of the American Roman Catholic bishops; as a married priest, he had been excommunicated by Archbishop Patrick Ryan of Philadelphia.

Bishop Ortynsky was not given jurisdiction over the Greek Catholics. Instead, he was expected to ask for faculties from the local Roman Catholic bishop each time he wished to visit a parish or perform any function. This arrangement satisfied no one, and to make matters worse, the new bishop was also expected to enforce the *Ea Semper* decree issued by the Vatican in 1908, which renewed the prohibition of married clergy and even forbade the Greek Catholic priests "to consign the baptized with Holy Chrism" (article 14). Various other provisions of the *Ea Semper* reveal a distinct preferential option for the Roman Rite. The result was a storm of protest among Greek Catholics and more clergy and faithful joined the Russian Orthodox Church.

If the Greek Catholics felt that they were being discriminated against, Roman Catholics often felt that these peculiar

newcomers were being given far too much. In his book, the Reverend Barriger gives lengthy quotes from an article, "Some Thoughts on the Ruthenian Question," published in the Roman Catholic *American Ecclesiastical Review* in January 1915. The opening sentence and the last sentence of the article express the prevailing Roman opinion in the United States very well: "Compared with the Latin Rite, the Byzantine is and always will be in a state of inferiority . . . The Church protects the national rite in its own home, but she has no reason for keeping it up artificially amid surroundings to which it is foreign." As the Reverend Barriger points out, this article "illustrates the wall of ignorance and prejudice that the early Greek Catholic faithful and clergy were confronted with in facing the American Roman Catholic Church" (p. 22). It is perhaps no wonder that a good many of the Greek Catholics decided, as it were, to "leap over the wall."

In 1913, Bishop Ortynsky finally received full episcopal jurisdiction, and the objectionable provisions of *Ea Semper* were allowed to lapse quietly. In fact, the bishop actually ordained some married priests. But in 1916, the bishop suddenly died. Europe was in the throes of World War I, and nobody had time to worry very much about the Greek Catholics in North America. It was to be eight years before another Greek Catholic bishop was appointed for the United States.

On the other hand, Greek Catholics who became Orthodox still had an identity problem. Bishop Ortynsky's Carpatho-Rusyn vicar general, the Reverend Alexander Dzuby, joined the Russian Orthodox Church shortly after Ortynsky's death, and he was consecrated Bishop of "Pittsburgh and the Carpatho-Russians" at Saint Nicholas Cathedral in New York City. But Bishop Stephen (to use Alexander Dzuby's monastic and episcopal name) never succeeded in organizing a Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Church. Among other things, in 1917 the Russian Revolution cut all subsidies from St. Petersburg to the Orthodox Church in the United States, and the radical changes in Russia plunged American Orthodoxy into a jurisdictional chaos from which it has still not recovered. After consecrating Bishop Adam (Philipovsky), Bishop Dzuby eventually returned to the Roman obedience and lived in strict retirement at Graymoor. Bishop Dzuby is buried in a Catholic cemetery in Trenton; his tombstone makes no mention of his episcopal status, although very recent necrologies of the Pittsburgh Metropolia have alluded to it. To be sure, his story is yet to be researched and written.

Meanwhile, Bishop Philipovsky attempted to organize a "Carpatho-Russian Diocese," which was eventually recognized by the Patriarchate of Moscow. Bishop Philipovsky used the term "Carpatho-Russian" primarily to designate Russophile Galicians, who made up the bulk of his faithful (it has been suggested that they were mostly Lemkos). He and his movement also require an historian. Bishop Philipovsky died over three decades ago, although his jurisdiction had disintegrated before that. His papers were lost after his death, but some of his clergy are still living. Among these, the Reverend Michael Barna in Detroit would be a particularly important source of information to any interested student.

Note: *In our next issue we will complete this review by Serge, Keleher, and publish a response to it by Lawrence Barriger.*

FROM OUR READERS

To the Editor:

I am writing you as a parishioner of St. Mary's Assumption Byzantine Catholic Church in Joliet, Illinois. I am a parent of four sons, three of which are students at St. Mary's Assumption School. We are a fourth generation practicing Byzantine Catholic family at St. Mary's Assumption. I am writing because on December 17, 1987, Bishop Pataki of the Parma Diocese announced that he was closing our school, the only Byzantine Catholic school in Illinois, in June of 1988; also, he stated that he is dismissing our priest, Reverend Gregory Petruska. I am writing because perhaps you can help the parishioners, parents, and community friends of St. Mary's in our appeal of this sad situation.

Our church and school are both financially stable. Our school, upon the request of Bishop Pataki, has been evaluated during this 1987-88 school year. The result of the evaluation was an award for excellence in education. The award was given by the Roman Rite evaluation team under the leadership of Reverend David Franco, the Superintendent of Schools. I have nearly ten years of teaching experience in the Joliet Public Schools. I know my children are getting the best in social, religious, and educational development at St. Mary's Assumption School. Byzantine children deserve an education in their Byzantine heritage. St. Mary's Assumption School under two excellent educators, Father Gregory Petruska and Ms. Angelica Villarín, provide this service. The dedication of Father Gregory and Ms. Villarín have enhanced individuals to develop to their highest God-given potential. Their efforts have provided the Joliet community with many productive citizens — teachers, doctors, accountants, business executives, etc.

The parishioners, parents, and community friends of St. Mary's Assumption Church and School in Joliet, Illinois would like our church and school to continue as a positive societal organization. We are a spiritual family which would like to continue to grow under our present leadership. We have written as individuals to Pope John Paul II of our plight. We have sent a petition with several thousand signatures appealing Bishop Pataki's decision. Our written efforts have been rerouted to Bishop Pataki instead of reaching our Pope to whom the letters were addressed. We are once again writing Vatican City but this time as a group. We will continue to work and with God's help we will keep our school open and retain our spiritual adviser.

Please inform our friends that we need help in spreading our message that **BYZANTINE CATHOLICS DESERVE A BYZANTINE EDUCATION**. Letters to Pope John Paul II, and Diocesan Bishops would help in our appeal. Your help is sincerely appreciated. God grant all Byzantine Catholics and friends many blessed and happy years.

Linda Linko
Joliet, Illinois

To the Editor:

I have read some of the issues of *Carpatho-Rusyn American* on Lemko issues with great interest. The description of the Lemko region in these issues puzzles me as to what is claimed at the "Carpatho-Rusyn homeland." Until recently, I had assumed that it consisted of the territories of pre-1918 Hungary and inter-war Czechoslovakia where various

Ukrainian dialects were spoken (Lemko, Bojko, Hucul, or Transcarpathian). Therefore I assumed the principle was historical-territorial, not linguistic, since no one dialect could be described as "Carpatho-Rusyn" and many dialects extend into regions of Galicia and even Bukovyna. In the new issue of *Carpatho-Rusyn American*, it appears that "Carpatho-Rusyn" is expanded to include speakers of the Lemko dialect in Poland, but not speakers of Bojko or Hucul dialects north of the Carpathians. This will mean that Lemko dialect speakers in former Galicia will now be considered to belong to one "Carpatho-Rusyn" people together with Bojkos and Huculs from former Hungary, but that they will be considered a different nationality from the Bojkos who lived a few miles from them in former Galicia.

This was my understanding until I looked at the maps in Paul Magocsi's *Our People: Carpatho-Rusyns and Their Descendants in North America*. There I discovered that the western Bojko regions in present-day Poland are also included in the "Carpatho-Rusyn homeland." This troubled me because it would mean that my grandfather and his sisters have now been assigned to different nationalities. His native village of Mšaneč is on the Ukrainian side of the border. His sisters married boys from the neighboring village which is now in Poland. Suddenly one Bojko family will have "nationality" problems. Since my aunts were later resettled to Odessa and Donetsk oblasts, we also have the paradoxical situation that they and their offspring in eastern Ukraine are now defined as "Carpatho-Rusyns" while their brothers and sisters and their children in the Carpathians can remain Ukrainians. This is unless the long-term goal is eventually to claim all Bojko and Hucul lands as the "Carpatho-Rusyn homeland".

My personal difficulties aside, I am troubled by the recent editorials in *Carpatho-Rusyn American*. While it is true that the majority of descendants of immigrants from the Transcarpathian oblast' of the Ukrainian SSR and the Prešov (Prjašiv) region of Czechoslovakia do not identify themselves as Ukrainian in the United States, this cannot be categorically asserted for Lemkos from present-day Poland in the United States. A very large constituency of Ukrainian parishes and organizations of the pre-World War I emigration settling in places such as Pennsylvania came from the Galician Lemko region. In addition, many more immigrants came to the United States after World War II from this area than from south of the Carpathians and in large part they viewed themselves as Ukrainians. While only careful statistical work can settle the issue, I believe it likely that the majority of descendants of immigrants from the Lemko region of Poland in the United States identify themselves as Ukrainians. Therefore it is entirely proper that "their" organizations, such as the Ukrainian National Association, sponsored Lemkovyna.

I am also troubled by certain political overtones of *Carpatho-Rusyn American* on the Lemko and other issues. Some years ago, I arranged with my good friend Patricia Krafcik that Andrew Sorokowski write an article on Josyf Terelja for *Carpatho-Rusyn American*. This heroic activist for religious freedom is surely one of the most prominent figures from the "Carpatho-Rusyn region" today. I fear the article did not appear because Terelja defines himself as a Ukrainian Catholic. This concern about political policies was increased by the description of the Lemkovyna concert tour (Winter, 1987, pp. 10). The account suggests that "it is

hoped that in the future some Rusyn-American organization (at the very least the Lemko Sojuz) will have the foresight to organize a similar tour which will not, because of the particular needs of the sponsors, have to provide a Ukrainian facade." Why is not the Society for the Defense of Lemkivščyna mentioned? Is it because this Lemko Organization, unlike the traditionally pro-Soviet, Russophile Lemko Sojuz, views Lemkos as Ukrainians? Finally, I note that recently Polish circles in Poland and the West have reactivated campaigns to propagate the concept of a Lemko nationality. Consequently, the activities of *Carpatho-Rusyn American* seem to be taking a definite political stance, somewhat similar to the Russophiles turning to Warsaw for support in the inter-war period. There is nothing wrong with *Carpatho-Rusyn American* becoming a political lobby, but I do hope it will adhere carefully to a policy of presenting the readers with the full situation and weigh carefully the consequences of its actions. The Lemko groups in Poland has already suffered too much, and while we debate issues in freedom in the United States, they do not in Poland.

We may all agree that the Lemkos should have the right to develop their regional culture and dialect as they choose. We cannot however change realities such as the Ukrainian linguistic affiliation of their dialect or the large numbers of Lemkos in the United States, the Ukraine, and Poland who do view themselves as Ukrainians. Also, as a historian, I find it difficult to see how their history can be divided so easily from that of the other "Rusyns" of Galicia or from cultural centers such as Peremyšl' and L'viv.

Frank Sysyn
Harvard University
Ukrainian Research Institute

FROM OUR CENTER

Dear Dr. Sysyn:

We read with interest your letter of March 30 and noted its inquiries about the series of articles dealing with the Lemko Region that appeared in the *C-RA* throughout 1987 and 1988. Some of your concerns are dealt with in the last issue of that series (Spring 1988), which appeared just after your letter. In that last issue we provide alternative views as well as our own summary. With regard to your letter, we shall address each of the problems you raise.

Our recent interest in the Lemko Region north of the Carpathian Mountains in Galicia is less an "expansion northward" than a response to readers in this country who consider themselves Carpatho-Rusyn and whose forebears came from the Lemko Region. Moreover, in dealing with the Lemkos as part of the Carpatho-Rusyn group in America, we are simply following the practice initiated in 1980 by the *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups* in its entry, "Carpatho-Rusyns," and elaborated upon subsequently in the book *Our People* by your former Harvard colleague, Dr. Paul R. Magocsi. In both those studies, it is amply clear that Lemkos from Galicia have from the earliest years of the immigration interacted in the same churches (especially Orthodox) and secular organizations, and that to treat them with fellow Rusyns from south of the mountains as one group in the United States simply reflects the reality of the American experience.

When we turn to the European homeland, we have noted the Lemko-Bojko-Hucul ethnographic construct you mention, which ostensibly proves that there are no differences between the inhabitants living on both sides of the Carpathians. In fact, the Lemko-Bojko-Hucul construct reflects an artificial and antiquated set of categories created by scholars in the nineteenth century based on levels of knowledge that have subsequently been considerably enhanced in the twentieth century.

As a result of that research, the Lemko-Bojko-Hucul categories are today useless for analyzing the Carpathian region, whether on linguistic or historical grounds. Moreover, in the case of the so-called Lemko and Bojko regions, the categories have never had any meaning for the inhabitants themselves. Only among the Huculs is there both linguistic and ethnographic unity as well as self-perception by the inhabitants on the northern and southern mountain slopes that they form the same ethnographic group. Yet, even in the case of the Huculs, there has never been unity on historical-territorial grounds. The small Hucul area south of the mountains (in the far eastern corner of Subcarpathian Rus') has always been politically separated from the north, so that the Huculs in the south have traditionally felt closer to fellow Rusyns with whom they have lived for centuries — first in historic Hungary, then Czechoslovakia, and since 1945 in Soviet Transcarpathia. Today, the "southern" Huculs even share with their Slavic brethren in the rest of the Soviet oblast a strong dose of Transcarpathian patriotism that they like to think sets them off from the "rest of the Ukrainian world" beyond the Carpathians.

As for the so-called Bojko region, linguists have long ago stopped speaking of Bojko dialects south of the mountains, with the exception of a small territory in the high mountain areas (the Verchovyna). The vast portion of Subcarpathian Rus' (central and western Transcarpathia) is classified as speaking Transcarpathian dialects distinct from Bojko dialects in the north. Moreover, the Carpatho-Rusyns living throughout most of Subcarpathian Rus' have never called themselves Bojkos, but rather Rusyns or Rusnaks.

If by the above argument we have denied the validity of the north-south unity for the Hucul and so-called Bojko region, then it could be legitimately asked: why do we accept the north-south unity of the Lemko Region north of the mountains with the larger Carpathian Rus' homeland? This is because the unity in the Lemko Region and the Prešov Region just to the south (in present-day northeastern Czechoslovakia) is based on linguistic criteria, historical experience, and the self-perception of the people themselves, not on the dubious ethnographic categories mentioned by you.

Quite simply, the historic record shows that Rusyns living north of the Carpathians and west of the San River (that is, those Rusyns in what is known as the Lemko Region, but who only in the twentieth century began to call themselves Lemkos) have traditionally had stronger ties southward (the mountain crests are much lower between the Lemko and Prešov Regions) than they have had eastward beyond the San. In this area, the dialects on both sides of the mountains are basically the same and are classified as such by linguists. Moreover, Lemko leaders from the north have always felt that the national awakener from the south, Aleksander Duchnovyč, belongs to them as well. Finally, when given a political choice for the first time after World War I, the majority of Lemkos opted for union with their Rusyn brethren to the

south. It is from this period that the Lemkos themselves formulated the "north-south" territorial concept of Carpathian Rus', and it is the boundaries they devised that appear in the maps referred to in the Harvard encyclopedia, in *Our People*, and most recently with greater precision in the publication our center distributes: *Carpatho-Rusyn Studies: An Annotated Bibliography*, Vol. I: 1975-1984.

With regard to your concern that by accepting the above principles your ancestors may be assigned, as you say, to different nationalities, this may at first glance seem a paradoxical situation. In reality, it is not at all surprising and even normal for people living in borderland regions whether in eastern or western Europe.

In such areas, it is quite common to find people from neighboring villages, from the same village, even from the same family identifying with different nationalities. As a specialist in Ukrainian history, you certainly know this to be the case among many Ukrainians, some of whom have become distinguished national leaders. Among such cases that could be mentioned is the figure of Metropolitan Andrej Šepčyc'kyj, who became a Ukrainian, while his parents, all but one of his brothers, and all the family's descendants still consider themselves Poles.

We are pleased to discover as a result of this "paradoxical norm" that you could consider yourself, at least in part, of Carpatho-Rusyn heritage. Should you choose that option, we certainly would welcome you, so to speak, into the fold.

With regard to your point about the national orientation of immigrants from the Lemko Region in the United States, nowhere do we assert that the majority does not identify as Ukrainian. On the contrary, our lead article in the series, "The Lemko Rusyns: Their Past and Present," stated that "after World War II, there were a few thousand Lemkos who reached the United States and to a lesser degree Canada. The vast majority of these were pro-Ukrainian activists . . ." (*C-RA*, No. 1, 1987). As for the total number of Lemkos and their descendants, we agree with you that only careful statistical analysis can settle the issue. If you, like us, really believe this, then why in the next sentence do you state unequivocally that the "majority of descendants of immigrants from the Lemko region of Poland in the United States identify themselves as Ukrainians." How can you already be so sure before the statistical research you call for is done?

As for your last point about our so-called "political overtones," some of your concerns might be addressed in the last issue on the Lemko question (No. 1, 1988). For the record, the reason we have not yet run the article on Josyf Terelja has to do with our approach to complex subject matter.

Just as we would not have run any one of the articles in our Lemkos series in isolation — it took us five full issues to cover at least initially that problem — so, too, will we not discuss the status of religion in the Carpatho-Rusyn homeland before providing general background information, articles on the current status of the legal Russian Orthodox Church, the complicated status of Greek Catholicism and Orthodoxy in neighboring Poland and Czechoslovakia, as well as Josyf Terelja and the underground Greek Catholic Church in Soviet Transcarpathia. In fact, 1988 is the year when we will be featuring articles on the church both in the homeland and in the United States. We certainly intend to publish an updated version of the article on Terelja.

On the other hand, we find highly inappropriate your suggestion that we have adopted "a definite political stance, somewhat similar to the Russophiles turning to Warsaw for support in the inter-war period." Regardless of whether Polish governing circles may have favored a Lemko orientation during the interwar period, there were and are Lemkos who wished then and who wish now to be considered Lemko Rusyns, not Ukrainians or Poles. Neither we nor the Polish government created such people.

It seems particularly strange for a Ukrainian historian to question the legitimate desire for people to be what it wishes by insinuating that such a desire plays into the hands of the enemy camp. After all, it was not too long ago that statesmen and publicists denied that Ukrainians existed as a separate nationality, arguing that they were simply created by the Austrian or German foreign offices in an attempt to destroy "mother Russia." I am sure you do not wish to make use of the same kind of guilt-by-association argument against Lemkos and all Carpatho-Rusyns that were used against Ukrainians not too long ago.

Finally, with regard to your call to present our "readers with the full situation," it can easily be demonstrated that the *C-RA* is the *only* publication to have presented all sides of the Lemko issue. The lead article in the series talked about Lemkos who feel themselves to be Ukrainian as well as those who identify as Russians or as a distinct nationality. The last issue in the series is *devoted exclusively* to Lemko authors in Poland who support the Ukrainian point of view.

In stark contrast, the Ukrainian press in the United States has until now not once discussed adequately, if at all, the existence of Lemkos in Poland who do not wish to be Ukrainians, other than perhaps to mention superficially the phenomenon as part of a Polish plot to try once again to "tribalize" Ukrainians. As for the Ukrainian-oriented Organization for the Defense of the Lemko Region in the United States, its organ *Lemkivščyna* recently ran an article on the Lemkovyna Ensemble, wondering why its members acted so coldly toward their Ukrainian hosts in the United States and Canada. Did it ever cross their minds that members of that ensemble may not identify as Ukrainian and that they resented being used — to quote them — as instruments of extensive Ukrainian nationalist propaganda in the West. For instance, Jaroslav Hunka, whose moving statement appeared in our series (No. 4, 1987) is a long-time member of the Lemkovyna Ensemble whose views reflect well most of its members.

We challenge the Ukrainian press in North America to discuss such Lemkos and their desires to be a distinct group not as some kind of aberration from a desired Ukrainian norm, but as a legitimate phenomenon, because we agree with you that the "Lemko group in Poland has already suffered too much" and that it need not have to suffer more with false accusations in Poland and the United States of being either anti-Ukrainian or Russophile, or playing into the hands of the Polish government simply because they wish one thing — to be themselves. Yes, we challenge the Ukrainian press with your words: "to adhere carefully to a policy of presenting the readers with the full situation," and if that press does not wish to do so, then to "weigh carefully the consequences of its actions."

Since you, Dr. Sysyn, are in theory partly of Carpatho-Rusyn background, you might be the ideal person to urge the Ukrainian press to fulfill the desired goal of presenting all

sides of the Lemko issue and to convince its readers that being a Lemko or a Rusyn, whether in Poland, Czechoslovakia, or the United States, is a reality that has existed and will continue to exist, and that such an identity should be viewed as complementing not threatening the Ukrainian communities in those countries.

**IN REMEMBRANCE:
STEPHEN B. ROMAN
(1921-1988)**

On March 23, 1988, the Slavic world in North America lost one of its most outstanding sons, Stephen B. Roman. Three days later, nearly 3,000 friends and admirers joined family and government officials in Markham, Ontario in the nearly completed 25 million dollar Slovak Byzantine Catholic Cathedral in a grandiose ceremony that had all the trappings of a funeral for a head of state.

Roman was never a head of state, but he did found and preside over a world-wide corporate empire in uranium, oil, cement, and cattle breeding that employed 13,000 people and was estimated by international financiers to be at the time of his death worth between 2.5 and 5 billion dollars.

Roman epitomized the often told mythical "rags to riches" story. He came to Canada in 1937 at the age of sixteen, with a few dollars in his pockets. Half a century later he was a multi-billionaire. The Roman legend that included dealings with several Canadian prime ministers and American presidents as well as service to three popes of the Catholic Church from which he received the highest honor accorded a lay person (Knight Commander of the Order of St. Gregory the Great) has been the subject of books and numerous articles and will not be retold here. Rather, I should like to recall some of the numerous and extensive conversations I had with my friend Steve, as he liked to be called, in particular as they pertain to Carpatho-Rusyns.

As Steve once said, he had a soft spot in his heart for Rusyns. As well he should. He was born in the village of Vel'ký Ruskov (today Nový Ruskov) in far eastern Slovakia. This was — and still is — a linguistic and cultural border area between the East and West Slavs. Therefore, Steve was born into the Eastern Christian Greek Catholic Church and the first language he learned was a transitional East-West Slavic dialect, the very same dialect that during the twentieth century has in Yugoslavia been raised to the status of a distinct East Slavic language, Vojvodinian (Bačka) Rusyn, whose inhabitants consider themselves and are considered by others a distinct Slavic nationality.

The linguistic and national evolution took a different turn in Steve's native village. The inhabitants of Vel'ký Ruskov always described themselves as Rusnaks, and Steve, too, was fond of describing himself as a Rusnak. This was basically a religious term — meaning an Eastern Christian Slav. When the people were asked how they would describe their national identity, they responded differently. In fact, in the four census reports for which there is such data (1900, 1910, 1921, 1930), the inhabitants of Vel'ký Ruskov declared in two of the censuses that they spoke Rusyn or were of Rusyn nationality and the other two times that they were Slovak.

It was from this borderland environment of possible choice in terms of self-identity that Steve Roman came. I

never really learned when Steve made his choice regarding the nationality issue — although I do remember him proudly singing a few bars of *Ja Rusyn byl', jesm i budu* (I Was, Am and Will Remain a Rusyn) at the end of a luncheon in his elegant private dining room high above Toronto in his Royal Bank Plaza penthouse corporate headquarters. However, we do know that by the time of his early years in Canada, he had befriended Slovaks, participated in Slovak-Canadian organizations, and married a charming Slovak Canadian of Lutheran background. Whereas Steve never wavered in describing himself as a Rusnak, he did eventually accept the otherwise questionable premise that all Rusnaks were simply Eastern-rite Catholic Slovaks.

The question of self-identity always remained high on Steve's personal agenda. This is because the seemingly silly Rusyn-Rusnak-Slovak debate reflected a much deeper and serious concern — Steve's relationship to his God and the religious mode through which he maintained that relationship. This resulted in his increasing interest in the status of the Byzantine Rite Catholic Church. Steve was convinced that the Byzantine rite was minimally the equal, if not historically superior, to the Latin rite as a legitimate means to express one's Christian Catholicity. He was also convinced that the few Greek Catholic parishes in Canada made up of immigrants from eastern Slovakia (both Rusyns and Slovaks) needed to function independently, and not as they had been until recently within the jurisdiction of the Ukrainian Catholic Church of Canada.

Therefore, his first goal was to gain for his church separate diocesan status. However, the proposed "break" with the Ukrainians would have to be justified on the grounds that a separate ethnic/national entity had to have its own church body. Theoretically, that entity could have been Rusyn or Slovak. For Steve, however, by then founder and president of the Slovak World Congress, and convinced that all Rusnaks were Slovaks, the choice was clear. The new diocese was to be Slovak.

With his energy and influence, he was able to have the Eastern-rite "Slovak" issue placed on the Vatican agenda, and in 1982, a distinct Slovak Byzantine Catholic diocese came into being. This was crowned in 1984 when the monumental new diocesan Cathedral Church funded by Roman and built as a large-scale replica of the Greek Catholic Church in Steve's native Vel'ký Ruskov was blessed in a special ceremony before millions on network television by Pope John Paul II.

But what for others might be considered a crowning achievement was for Steve only the first step. During our second or third meeting — which actually were debates lasting an intense and spirited two or three hours — I asked: "Now that you have achieved so much, what are your life's goals, what is it you still want to achieve?" Steve answered without hesitation: "transform the Byzantine Catholic Church in the United States into a Slovak Byzantine church like we have in Canada." It was at this point that we really diverged. "Steve," I said, "you always pride yourself on being a builder; I can guarantee that should you pursue this line of activity you will go down in history not as a builder but as a destroyer."

In the years that followed we continued to debate this issue and the whole question of why national or ethnic distinctions needed to be considered so important in the realm of religion and faith. Steve remained convinced that ethnic

specificity was a God-given phenomenon and, therefore, His earthly structure — the church — should reflect this.

Despite our disagreements, or because of them, our friendship continued and grew deeper. Stephen B. Roman was a good man, an intelligent man, a man who could not only think but act with constructive results. I will never forget our hours of stimulating debate that went well beyond ethnicity, ranging to questions of historical theory, environmental protection, and of course religious faith. It is not surprising that at the end of the last discussion we had — six weeks before Steve's untimely death — his last topic was the impact of Marian theology among the Slavs.

As we departed, I told him of a book I wanted to give him. During a recent visit to the Rusyns of Yugoslavia, I brought back the first translation of the New Testament (the Gospels) to ever appear in Vojvodinian Rusyn. He was both deeply pleased and ironically bemused that the word of God was now made available to others in the speech that was so similar to his native Vel'ky Ruskov, and that elsewhere had been transformed into a literary language. I said I would bring him the Rusyn *Svjate Pis'mo* (The Holy Word) as soon as I got another copy. That copy did come — a week after Steve was no longer with us. May we then end here with excerpts from the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 6) in a form that was linguistically and spiritually close to Steve's heart:

Ne zberajce sebe bohatsva na žemi, dze ho ardza i mol' ničoži i dze ho kradoše potkopuju i kradnju. Ale sebe zberajce bohatsva na njebe . . . Bo dze vašo bohatsvo, tam budze i šerce vašo.

For the thousands of friends, admirers, and co-workers whom you touched, thank you, Steve, for letting us know you.

Vičnaja jomu pamjat!

Paul R. Magocsi
Toronto, Ontario

RECENT PUBLICATIONS 1984

With this issue we begin a new year in our on-going survey of recent publications. These are from 1984 and are listed alphabetically. Many are published in Eastern Europe and are difficult to obtain, but most can be found in research libraries of major universities (California at Berkeley, Harvard, Illinois at Champaign-Urbana, Indiana, Toronto, Yale) or in institutions like the Library of Congress, New York Public Library, and Cleveland Public Library. Although these places allow limited access, do note that many local libraries can obtain these works upon request through Interlibrary Loan. Titles which can be purchased will be designated as such.

For a description of each of the works listed here and in subsequent issues, see Paul Robert Magocsi, Carpatho-Rusyn Studies: An Annotated Bibliography, Vol. I: 1975-1984 (New York: Garland Publishers, 1988). — Editor

Annaly Lemkivščyny (Annals of the Lemko Land), Vol. IV, ed. Ivan Hvozda. New York: Fundacija doslidžennja Lemkivščyny, 1984, 256 p. Available from the Lemko Research Foundation, P.O. Box 651 - Cooper Station, New York, New York 10276.

Blaško, Štefan. *Miriam Teresa. Faithful in a Little: Demjanovich Roots*. Toronto: Maria Magazine, 1984, 208 p. Available from Maria Magazine, P.O. Box 70, Unionville, Ontario L3R 2L8.

Chudaš, M.L. "Do pytan'ja pochodžennja nazvy *huculy*" (On the Question of the Origin of the Name Huculs), *Movoznavstvo*, XVIII, 5 (Kiev, 1984), pp. 57-62.

Chymynec', Julijan. *Moji sposterežennja iz Zakarpattja* (My Observations From Transcarpathia). New York: Karpat's'kyj Sojuz, 1984, 189 pp.

Dovhanyč, Omeljan; Lend'el, Volodymyr; and Miščenko, Serhij O. *Užhorods'kyj Deržavnyj Universytet — Užgorodskij Gosudarstvennyj Universitet: narys* (Užhorod State University — A Survey). Užhorod: Karpaty, 1984, 128 p.

Duklja, Vol. XXXII, Nos. 1-6 (Prešov, 1984), 79 pages each issue.

Erdélyi, István. *Kárpátalja* (Carpathia). New York: Szerző kiadása, 1984, 28 p.

Grendža-Dons'kyj, Vasyľ. *Tvory Vasylja Grendži-Dons'koho*, Vol. IV: *dramatyčna tvorčist'* (The Works of Vasyľ Grendža-Dons'kyj, Vol. IV: Dramatic Works). Washington, D.C.: Carpathian Alliance, Washington, D.C. Branch, 1984, x and 378 p. Available from the Ukrainian Book Store, P.O. Box 1640, 10215 - 97 Street, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T5J 2N9.

Heller, Georg. *Comitatus Unghensis* (Ung/Už County). Veröffentlichungen des Finnisch-Ugrischen Seminars an der Universität München; Serie A: Die historischen Ortsnamen von Ungarn, Vol. XVII. Munich, 1984, 151 p. Available from the Institut für Finnougristik, Universität München, Ludwigstrasse 31, D-8000 München 22, West Germany.

Holenda, Jolana. *Anatolij Kralyc'kyj: rozvidka i vybrani tvory* (Anatolij Kralyc'kyj: An Analysis and Selected Works). Bratislava and Prešov: Slovac'ke pedahogične vydavnytvo, viddil ukrajins'koi literatury, 1984, 252 p.

Hošovskij, Vladimir. "Melodičeskie paradigmy pesen slovacko-ukrainskogo areala" (Melodic Paradigms in the Songs of the Slovak-Ukrainian Area), *Sbornik prací Filozofické fakulty Brněnské univerzity*, XIX-XX (Brno, 1984), pp. 33-44.

[Jumba, Jerry and Levkolic, William], comps. *Marian Hymnal*. Pittsburgh, Pa.: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1984, 59 p. Available from the Byzantine Seminary Press, P.O. Box 7626, 3605 Perrysville Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15214.

Kárpáti, László. "Egy borsodi ruszin énekeskönyv a 18. századból" (A Borsod Rusyn Songbook from the 18th Century), in Ernő Kunt, József Szabadfalvi, and Gyula Viga, eds. *Interetnikus kapcsolatok Északkelet-Magyarországon. A Miskolci Herman Ottó Múzeum Néprajzi Kiadványai*, Vol. XV. Miskolc, 1984, pp. 171-177.

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
MILWAUKEE
WISCONSIN
Permit No. 1744

Carpatho-Rusyn American
P.O. Box 227
Cambridge, MN 55008

IN THIS ISSUE

Editorial: St. Mary's School controversy, Joliet, Illinois.

Biography: Volodmyr Hošovskýj.

Feature: "Trauma and Survival: A Uniate Return to Orthodoxy." Part one of an extensive review by Serge Keleher of Lawrence Barriger's *Good Victory*.

From Our Readers: Linda Linko of St. Mary's in Joliet, Illinois; Frank Sysyn of Harvard University.

From Our Center: A response to Frank Sysyn.

In Remembrance: Stephen B. Roman.

Recent Publications: 1984

Our Front Cover: Returning from market, 1934.