

CARPATHO-RUSYN AMERICAN[®]

A Forum for Carpatho-Rusyn Ethnic Heritage



FROM THE EDITOR

It is with great pleasure and enthusiasm that I once again resume the editorship of the *Carpatho-Rusyn American*. While the task of editing this unique publication was transferred to equally capable hands in the winter of 1984 as I moved from the position of chief editor, I have never been far from its production. I served as consulting editor while Patricia A. Onufrak was chief editor beginning in winter 1984, and continued in this capacity from spring 1987 when John A. Haluska replaced Pat. Let me offer a hearty thanks to both of them for their excellent work!

During my first term as editor, Pat Onufrak had already made a fine contribution to the *C-RA* with a three-part series of articles on researching genealogies (Spring, Summer, and Fall 1984). In the course of her own tenure as editor, the *C-RA* continued to grow in size so that every other issue was twelve rather than the usual ten pages. Likewise, our readership expanded. In the *C-RA* Pat continued a series of fascinating articles by the ethnographer and folklorist Mykola Mušynka of Prešov, Czechoslovakia, concerning Carpatho-Rusyn folk traditions and customs connected with various saints' days, birth and baptism, the wedding, and the funeral. She supplemented these with articles by ethnographer Viktor Soštak from Užhorod, USSR, on folk instruments.

Further, Pat also offered the fourth installment of her genealogical series and included both Dr. Paul R. Magocsi's commentary on the Carpatho-Rusyn emblem and flag and his article "East Slavs in America," which examined the place of Carpatho-Rusyns in the whole world of East Slavic immigration to the United States. This last article provoked a lively response from Canada's York University professor of history Orest Subtelny entitled "East Slavs: Made in the U.S.A." In addition, recent events in the Carpatho-Rusyn community and a description of publications in Carpatho-Rusyn studies through 1982 also continued as important sections in the *C-RA*. Under Pat Onufrak, then, the *C-RA* prospered, strengthening its reputation as a publication unafraid of airing a variety of differing and even opposing views, unafraid of controversy.

Few publications of our size can boast of such an international group of contributors, and this aspect of the *C-RA* was emphasized as John Haluska undertook the editorship in 1987. As part of a series on Lemko Rusyns initiated by John, articles by scholars in Poland and the USSR fill the publication's pages. The editorial board of the *C-RA* agreed with John that because 1987 represented the fortieth anniversary of the forced removal of Poland's Lemkos from their Carpathian homeland, the entire year ought to be devoted to the subject of Lemko Rusyns. After presenting an introductory article on Lemkos by Dr. Magocsi, John selected for publication relevant articles on Lemko domestic architecture, icons, traditional women's clothing, and on the Regional Ethnographic Museum (Lemko) in Nowy Sącz, Poland. An impassioned commentary on today's Lemkos by Jaroslav Hunka printed in the Winter 1987 issue was followed in the Spring 1988 issue by a series of controversial responses to Hunka representing different national orientations.

Our additional rationale for devoting the 1987 issues to the Lemkos of Poland is the Lemko Rusyn revival now taking place there. In connection with this revival, John requested that I write a guest editorial for the Spring 1988 issue to discuss the nature of this revival and to suggest how Rusyn

Americans might support the attempts of our Rusyn brothers and sisters in their striving to preserve their ethnic heritage in a non-Rusyn environment. Two projects which are presently being undertaken by Lemkos in Poland are the compilation of a dictionary standardizing the Lemko-Rusyn language, sponsored by the Department of Slavic Languages of Jagellonian University in Cracow, and the preparation of an anthology of Lemko-Rusyn poetry and prose by poet and playwright Petro Trochanovskij.

In my guest editorial, I stressed that readers of the *C-RA* could actively support these projects by tax-deductible donations to the Rusyn Cultural Fund established by the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center. A report on the contributors and the contributions which have been received so far can be found in the present issue. Other projects are also possible, but require support from those of us who care enough to see our Rusyn heritage emerge strong and vital in east central Europe after years of suffering and an attempted obliteration of the culture.

Among the numerous articles on the Lemkos in Poland, John as editor included already in his first issue a questionnaire soliciting information from our readers concerning both the form and content of the *C-RA*. Readers were asked, for instance, if they wished to learn more about a number of subjects: Carpatho-Rusyn past or present history, literature, folklore and folk customs, immigration, and so on. They were also asked about the possible establishment of a group of "Friends" of the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center, whereby donations of an amount higher than the \$12.00 subscription fee would include an annual subscription to the *C-RA*, a 10 percent discount on books sold by the C-RRC, and other benefits. John considered the response from over 12 percent of our readers to be significant given that free response surveys such as ours usually result in a far lower percentage of return. John then discussed the general outlines of the responses in his editorial in the Fall 1987 issue.

One concrete result of the questionnaire has been, in fact, the establishment of the Friends of the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center, described in detail in a flyer included in John's last issue as editor of the *C-RA* (Summer 1988). The three levels of members, Associate (\$30 per year), Sponsor (\$50 per year), and Patron (\$100 per year), all receive subscriptions to the *C-RA*, plus a number of other benefits and gifts. All funds donated by the Friends go toward the production of the *C-RA*, as well as toward promoting and encouraging research in Carpatho-Rusyn studies, sponsoring cultural and academic exchanges, publishing and distributing books and other materials on Carpatho-Rusyn history and culture, and so on. At this moment, the Friends organization is growing, and this is exciting and encouraging news to all of us, including me as I now resume editorship of the *C-RA*.

As editor of the *C-RA*, I have before me a publication which is now larger than the one I first edited from 1978 through 1984. Our evolution in terms of content has led also to a change in our subtitle from "A Newsletter on Carpatho-Rusyn Ethnic Heritage" to "A Forum on Carpatho-Rusyn Ethnic Heritage" in order to reflect more accurately the nature of the publication. We have clearly strengthened our interests beyond Carpatho-Rusyns in immigration to Carpatho-Rusyns in the homeland, and we have a good deal of exciting material awaiting publication in coming issues. There is no denying that we are both a vital and enthusiastic people, and I am glad to be back!

JAN HÚSEK (1884-1973)

Perhaps no other event in post-World War I Europe raised so many moot questions as the incorporation of Subcarpathian Rus' into Czechoslovakia in 1919. There were appreciably different views as to the ethnic identity of the indigenous population, its language, culture, religion, and social organization. One of the most hotly debated questions, that of the ethnic frontier between the Slovaks and the Rusyns, attracted the attention of a number of scholars as early as the nineteenth century. However, no one attempted to approach the solution of this question as profoundly as Jan Húsek.

Húsek, who was of Moravian (Czech) origin, was born into a peasant family on October 17, 1884, in Moravian Slovakia (i.e., the southeastern area of the Czech-speaking part of Czechoslovakia, bordering on southwestern Slovakia). Even as a student of philosophy and of Czech and French philology at Charles University in Prague from 1904, he demonstrated his interest in ethnic studies by writing, and later even publishing, an extensive seminar thesis on the dialect of his native village. In 1915, he was invited by the famous ethnographer Lubor Niederle to coauthor with him a two-volume monograph on Moravian Slovakia.

Following World War I and the establishment of the Czechoslovak state, Húsek moved to the Slovak capital Bratislava where he worked as an ethnographic researcher at Comenius University and where he received his doctorate in 1922. His advisor, Professor Karel Chotek, stimulated in him a deep interest in the question of the ethnic composition of Subcarpathian Rus' and the Prešov Region of Eastern Slovakia. This interest became so strong that Húsek decided to settle in Slovakia where he worked for twenty years as a teacher at various Bratislava high schools.

During the summer of 1922, he toured on foot the whole disputed territory from Poprad to Užhorod, examining the language, ethnic consciousness, and folk culture of practically every village along his route. With his knowledge of the problem bolstered by extensive study of all the available literature, Húsek undertook another study trip to Eastern Slovakia and Subcarpathian Rus' in the summer of 1923 to pit his own findings and hypotheses against those of previous researchers. The main results of his research from the two study trips found their expression in a paper he delivered at the First Congress of Slavic Geographers and Ethnographers in Prague in 1924, and which was subsequently published in the volume of the congress' proceedings. However, this was only a prelude to his full-length study of over five-hundred pages entitled *Národopisná hranice mezi Slováků a Karpatorusy* (The Ethnic Frontier Between Slovaks and Carpatho-Rusyns), published in Bratislava in 1925. This work remains in all respects an unsurpassed analysis of the ethnic situation in the territory in question.

In the first three out of the book's fifteen chapters, Húsek examines the history of the settlement, culture, and religion of Subcarpathian Rus'. In the remaining chapters he deals with the language, anthropology, and mentality of the people, as well as with the folk arts as reflected in architecture, clothing, customs, artisan activities, etc. He also pays attention to the occupational structure of the population, to its family and social life, its ethnic consciousness, and lastly to the reassessment of official statistical data. Each chapter is filled with a wealth of facts derived both from personal observations and from literature. Appended to the monograph is a



detailed map showing in different colors Rusyn, Slovak, and Slovakized or mixed localities.

Although Húsek did not ignore official statistics about the ethnic composition of the area's population, his estimates of the number of members of the various ethnic groups were clearly more objective and precise. This was due to the fact that he took into consideration simultaneously a whole complex of criteria which were not always taken into account in the official statistics: language; ethnic or tribal consciousness of the populace; religion; historical development; mentality; anthropological, and other idiosyncracies. The pioneering application by Húsek of all these sociological criteria in resolving the issue of the ethnic identity of the population in the area between the Poprad and Užhorod districts, led him to the following conclusion: in 1923-24, there lived in this region "approximately 550,000 Slovaks, roughly 155,000 Rusyns, and about 200,000 members of other ethnic groups (Hungarians, Germans, Poles, Jews, and others). Out of the 155,000 Rusyns, about 94,000 lived in the Prešov Region of Eastern Slovakia, while the remaining 61,000 lived in the Užhorod district of Subcarpathian Rus'." (p. 497)

Obviously, some of Húsek's views or terminology may be disputed today or appear outdated; for instance, that the Russians, Ukrainians (including Rusyns), and Byeloruss-

sians are basically one nationality. Nevertheless, his view of the ethnic identity of Carpatho-Rusyns indicates Húsek's knowledge of the necessity for some differentiation among the East Slavic groups. Húsek's way of setting apart Rusyns from the other "Russians" corresponds with the prevailing present-day view that they are a part of the Ukrainian ethnic nation: "There is no doubt that the Russian people living in Eastern Slovakia and Subcarpathian Rus' belong to the Ukrainian branch of the Russian ethnic nation." (p. 14) Húsek, of course, did not and could not ignore the fact of a gradual Slovakization of one part of the Rusyns. Unless this Slovakization was of a violent character (and this was rarely the case), he saw it as more or less an inevitable and by no means a tragic development. What mattered to Húsek most was the fact that both the Rusyns and the Slovaks were members of brotherly Slavic peoples who for centuries had persistently resisted Magyarization and remained Slavs first and foremost.

One of the interesting aspects of Húsek's monograph are his speculations about the ethnic future of the Carpatho-Rusyns. Since the ethnic consciousness of the Rusyns was at that time neither clear nor unified, Húsek did not exclude any possible development of the Rusyn ethnic identity. He did not even rule out the possibility of the establishment of a separate Carpatho-Rusyn nationality which in his opinion would be culturally more central European than eastern European, and which would form a sort of bridge between the East and West Slavs. It would be preposterous to criticize Húsek for these speculations as unrealistic or utopian. In fact, there seemed then to be many factors in operation that might conceivably have led to precisely such an eventuality. At the beginning of the 1920s, Húsek could, of course, hardly have foreseen the incorporation of Subcarpathian Rus' into the Soviet Union after World War II or the resulting trend toward a Ukrainian ethnic consciousness. Nor could the development of the ethnic identity of Rusyns living in Eastern Slovakia be predicted in the 1920s with any clear idea of the present-day situation.

In spite of the Czechoslovak government's efforts to boost the Ukrainian cultural orientation of the local Rusyns, the rapidity with which many Rusyns of Eastern Slovakia became Slovaks is revealed in the 1980 census when only 37,312 people declared themselves as Ukrainians. According to Húsek's findings from 1923-1924, there were then in Eastern Slovakia 311 "ethnically Rusyn" villages and 278 "linguistically Rusyn" villages. ("Ethnically Rusyn" villages were, according to him, those which regarded themselves as Rusyn, even though some of them may have already been linguistically Slovakized. On the other hand, "linguistically Rusyn" villages were those which spoke Rusyn dialects, even though they may have declared themselves as Slovak.) These numbers have hardly diminished by now, but in the 1980 census only the population of 66 villages declared itself to be Ukrainian in its majority. This makes one of Húsek's predictions ring true about the inevitable Slovakization of the Eastern Slovak Rusyns surrounded by a Slovak majority.

Húsek's 1925 monograph met with an extremely favorable response in scholarly circles, even though it was also subjected to politically motivated criticism. His decision to tell the truth about the ethnic situation, regardless of its popularity or lack of it in various political circles, is yet another indication of his scholarly seriousness.

Húsek dealt with the question of the Rusyn-Slovak ethnic frontier and its implications in a number of subsequent articles and studies in both popular and scholarly periodicals. They were focused mainly on two questions: the status of ethnic consciousness among the Rusyns in the Prešov Region and Subcarpathian Rus', and the possibility for the evolution of a distinct nationality.

Húsek's interest in the boundaries between neighboring Slavic ethnic groups, which in his view not only separated but also connected them, was not limited to the ethnic frontier between Rusyns and Slovaks. With the same fervor he attempted to establish with definitive exactitude the boundary between Czechs and Slovaks in a second monograph entitled *Hranice mezi zemí moravsko-slezskou a Slovenskem* (The Frontier Between Moravia-Silesia and Slovakia, Prague, 1932). The problem of mutual interaction among Slavic ethnic groups is also the focus of Húsek's more specialized studies, such as those dealing with Croatian settlers in southern Moravia, with Bulgarian market gardeners in Slovakia, or the ethnography of the Slovak village. Just how great the scope of Húsek's scholarly effort was is demonstrated by the fact that in the course of his life he published as many as one hundred eighty works in the fields of ethnography, dialectology, and sociology.

Húsek was, however, not only a scholar, but also an active and patriotic citizen. During World War II, he and his family became actively involved in the anti-Nazi resistance. From 1943 until the end of the war, he was, along with his wife and two sons, imprisoned in Nazi concentration camps. One of his sons lost his life in the camp at Sachsenhausen. After the liberation of Czechoslovakia in 1945, Húsek worked as a high school teacher in Moravia and as a part-time lecturer in ethnography at the universities of Brno and Olomouc. He also worked together with many folklore groups, helped to organize a number of folklore festivals, was a member of a number of scholarly and cultural institutions, and lectured frequently on the radio. These time-consuming activities prevented Húsek from continuing with his concentrated scholarly pursuits which might have led to some synthesizing works. However, in view of his extensive pre-war scholarly activities, it seems quite unfair that Húsek's death in Brno on December 6, 1973 passed almost unnoticed. One of the authors of the few obituaries, the leading Czech ethnographer, A. Robek, pointed out another unfair treatment of Húsek: "Many articles, studies, and even books authored by Professor Húsek have not been published as yet. But the contribution of all these works is unique, and it should not be forgotten. . . ." (*Český lid*, no. 3, 1974, p. 185)

Still today, over a decade since Húsek's death, the words of that obituary are unfortunately still true. Not a single line of Húsek's unpublished works has been published, and the centenary of his birth passed virtually unnoticed. Let us hope, nevertheless, that the tendency to forget Húsek will one day be reversed. If there is a work among the many Húsek left behind which would be of most value to print, it is certainly *The Ethnic Frontier Between Slovaks and Carpatho-Rusyns*. This is so not only because it is his largest work and now practically unavailable, but also because it is his greatest study which has much to say even to present-day Rusyns.

Mykola Mušynka
Prešov, Czechoslovakia

TRAUMA AND SURVIVAL: A UNIATE RETURN TO ORTHODOXY CONCLUSION

This is the conclusion to a two-part review of Father Lawrence Barriger's book Good Victory, Metropolitan Orestes Chornock and the American Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Diocese by Archpriest Serge R. Keleher. — Editor.

Had acceptable Greek Catholic bishops with a serious pastoral program and full recognition from the Roman Catholic Church been assigned to the United States just after the World War I, they might have regained many of the lost parishes and clergy. But the collapse of Austria-Hungary, the Polish-Ukrainian war and subsequent "pacification" in Galicia, the uncertainty over the status of Subcarpathian Rus' (which was incorporated into Czechoslovakia), and other complications made America seem far away to bishops who were in a situation of looking out for their own survival. The Vatican had many drastic problems (including near bankruptcy), so that the Greek Catholics in the United States were hardly high on the agenda.

Eventually, in 1924, two Greek Catholic bishops were sent to America: Bishop Constantine (Bohachevsky) for the faithful from Galicia and Bukovina, and Bishop Basil (Takach) for the faithful from the former Hungarian Kingdom, that is, mostly the Carpatho-Rusyns in what is today Soviet Transcarpathia and the Prešov Region of Eastern Slovakia.

It has been stated that three priests, Orestes Chornock, Stephen Varzaly, and Joseph Hanulya met Bishop Takach on his arrival in New York and asked him point-blank to give an assurance that he would ordain married clergy. It was also made clear to the bishop that if he planned to enforce celibacy he would do well to take the return boat to Europe. Whatever was said or promised the day of his arrival, Bishop Takach did in fact ordain several married priests in the first years of his episcopate, including the Reverend Peter E. Molchany, who became acting rector of Bishop Takach's cathedral, Saint John's, in Munhall, Pennsylvania. The Reverend Molchany was later to become an important leader in the anti-celibacy struggle and ultimately vicar general of the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Diocese. Bishop Takach also confirmed the Reverend Chornock in his positions as dean and pastor of Saint John the Baptist Greek Catholic Church in Bridgeport, where he had been since Bishop Ortynsky had appointed him there in 1911. There was peace for a while.

Many disparate elements within the Pittsburgh Exarchate of Bishop Takach could have led to trouble. The large and powerful fraternal insurance society, the Greek Catholic Union, gave the laity an experience of organization and control which they had not had in the old country. Parishes were legally incorporated in many different ways. The bishop and some of the clergy were anxious to change these charters in order to tie the parishes legally to the bishop, but the lay people often resisted. Then from the old country there remained a smoldering conflict between the clergy from the Prešov (Eperjes) diocese and those from the Užhorod (Ungvár) diocese. Finally, as always, the question of the identity and hence the future of this unique church within American Catholicism was lurking under the surface. In his book, Barriger explores some of these problems, especially the differences between the two groups of clergy.

There is no way to tell whether Bishop Takach could ever have resolved these matters, because in 1929 Rome issued a new decree, the *Cum Data Fuerit*, which once again demanded that "the priests who wish to come to the United States and stay there must be celibates." [article 12] At the same time, Bishop Takach was informed that Rome did not permit him to ordain any more married candidates to the priesthood.

This decree plunged the Greek Catholic Church into chaos that was to last for the next eight years. The struggle began when several seminarians from America arrived home after completing their theological studies in Europe. Bishop Takach refused to ordain them because they were married. In reaching that decision, the bishop was faced with a choice: he could lead the opposition to the decree, which would pit him against the Roman authorities; or he could enforce the decree, which would pit him against many of his own clergy and faithful. He chose to enforce the decree.

Controversy erupted in virtually every parish. The Greek Catholic Union fraternal society organized the Committee for the Defense of the Eastern Rite known by its Carpatho-Rusyn acronym KOVO, which gradually became the nucleus of a new diocesan structure. For several years, the leadership expected that in the end they would be able to require the Roman authorities to abide by the terms of the 1649 Union of Užhorod which guaranteed the Greek Catholic Church the right to ordain married priests. This was not to be.

The problem reflects much broader issues. Roman Catholic theologians are not even certain whether the Holy See is capable of entering into a binding agreement (on the theory that the Pope is the supreme judge and cannot be bound by anyone). In any case, there is certainly no tribunal on earth to which the Pope can be called to account for violating such an agreement, because a first principle of Roman Catholic canon law is *prima sedes a nemine iudicatur* — the First See is judged by no one.

In 1936, KOVO reorganized itself into "The Carpatho-Russian Greek Catholic Diocese," and elected the Reverend Orestes Chornock to be apostolic administrator until a bishop could be elected. He was "installed" at Saint John's Church in Bridgeport on March 3, 1936. Through the Vatican's Apostolic Delegate in Washington, the Reverend Chornock made a final effort to keep his new diocese in communion with Rome. Rome's response was to excommunicate Reverend Chornock, Reverend Molchany, and several other priests. It became increasingly clear that the clergy and faithful of the "Carpatho-Russian Greek Catholic Diocese" either had to submit to Bishop Takach — and accept mandatory celibacy for future clergy — or finally break their ties with the Roman Catholic Church.

Individual priests did re-submit to Bishop Takach. But in the course of 1937, the Reverend Chornock and those who remained with him gradually determined to lead the new diocese into the Orthodox Church. In view of the response from Rome, there seemed nowhere else to go. There was a great shortage of priests (although some Orthodox priests joined the clergy) and no bishop to ordain more (Barriger states that bishop Philipovsky ordained a few priests for the new diocese, but does not give names).

However, the Reverend Chornock and his collaborators did not wish to join the Russian Orthodox Church. They were anxious to retain their cohesiveness as a group and their

distinct Carpatho-Rusyn identity, and previous experience made it seem unlikely that this could be done within the context of the Russian church. Besides, before the Union of Užhorod, the Carpatho-Rusyn Eparchy of Mukačevo had belonged to the Metropolitanate of Kiev, which itself was part of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople. Thus, there was still a dim memory of Constantinople in the Carpatho-Rusyn consciousness. One also suspects that lingering papalist sentiments found a certain satisfaction in the thought of affiliation with the universal (*vselenskyj*) Patriarch. Among other things this meant that the liturgical commemoration of the Pope could be adapted at one stroke to the Ecumenical Patriarch.

In the midst of these developments, the Reverend Chornock's wife died in May 1937. This meant that the administrator was now eligible for election to the episcopate. The new diocese called a "National Church Congress" in Pittsburgh, and on November 23, 1937, the priests unanimously elected the Reverend Orestes Chornock to be the new bishop (as he was the only candidate, one assumes that he did not cast a ballot).

Negotiations began with the Ecumenical Patriarchate, asking Constantinople to accept the new diocese and to consecrate the Reverend Chornock to the episcopate. Some aspects of the matter are still unclear. In his book, the Reverend Barriger states that: "Through the offices of Archbishop Athenagoras, the minutes of the November 1937 *Sobor* at which the Unia was abrogated [Father Lawrence mentions no formal act of the 1937 National Church Congress to leave the Unia, although that was certainly its practical effect] and Fr. Orestes elected to be the episcopal candidate were forwarded to the Synod of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, *along with a memorandum outlining the liturgical life of the Carpatho-Russian Church.*" (p. 119) This memorandum has never been published, and although it is frequently claimed that the Ecumenical Patriarchate authorized the Carpatho-Rusyns to retain their unique liturgical practices, no supporting document for this claim has ever been produced. Likewise, the Reverend Barriger states that: "On September 19, 1938, the 'Carpatho-Russian Greek Catholic Diocese of the Eastern Rite of the USA' was canonized as a diocese of the Ecumenical Patriarchate by Patriarch Benjamin I in patriarchal decree 1379." (page 120)

But where is this decree? The Reverend Barriger's statement is commonly met in the literature of the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Diocese; it is repeated every year in its *ACRY Almanac* at the head of the clergy directory. But we have never seen a copy or translation of decree 1379, although such a document should have been featured prominently in *Good Victory*. Instead, the author provides the certificate of consecration of Bishop Chornock in three languages, Greek (the original, in photocopy showing the signatures), English, and Carpatho-Rusyn. This certificate is a welcome and important document. However, it is not signed by the Ecumenical Patriarch, only by the three Metropolitans who consecrated Bishop Chornock. Moreover, it makes absolutely no mention of a "Carpatho-Russian Greek Catholic Diocese of the Eastern Rite of the USA," but speaks simply of "the Reverend among Presbyters Orestes Chornock, one of the clergymen of the Orthodox Carpatho-Russian Communities in America, who has been elevated to the office of Bishop by canonical votes of the Holy and Sacred Patriarchal Synod, with the honorary title of Bishop of the once

illustrious Holy Diocese of Agathonikeia." (cited on page 121)

In *Good Victory*, the author reproduces off-prints of an Encyclical Letter of the Greek Orthodox Archbishop Michael of New York, "To All of the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Clergy and Laity in America," as well as an Encyclical of Patriarch Athenagoras I, "To the Reverend Clergy and the Laity of the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Church in America." Both these encyclicals were written in 1950. Neither the Patriarch nor the Archbishop refer to a specific Carpatho-Russian Diocese. But the Patriarch *does* refer to "the Holy and so beloved to us Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Church," which is a canonically significant expression.

Obviously, the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Diocese exists. It has existed from the time of its founding as an independent body, and it has been Orthodox at least from the enthronement of Bishop Chornock by Archbishop [later Patriarch] Athenagoras in Saint John's Church in Bridgeport on Thanksgiving Day, November 24, 1938. That is not in question. But the exact canonical position of the Carpatho-Russian Diocese in relationship to the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the Greek Archdiocese in the Americas is interesting.

We do not wish to be misunderstood. We are not implying any deception. The Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Diocese has all the theological and ecclesiological requirements of any normal diocese. It has its own canonical bishop, consecrated and enthroned with the utmost propriety; it has a body of presbyters and deacons who are clearly responsible to their bishop; and it has parishes and faithful. It is in full, unequivocal communion with the Orthodox "Local Churches," and suffers from no defect whatever along these lines. Indeed, for all these years the Ecumenical Patriarchate has treated the Carpatho-Russian Diocese as virtually an autonomous church, requiring only the ratification of the Ecumenical Patriarch and Holy Synod in the election of bishops and requiring the bishop to receive the Holy Chrism from Constantinople. As custom is the highest law in such matters, we may take this quasi-autonomy as ratified by the Ecumenical Throne.

Yet, the bishop of the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Diocese never takes part in a meeting of the Holy Synod of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, nor does he bear a title of any city located within the territory of the diocese. These oddities have no effect on the church life of the Carpatho-Russian Diocese and go unnoticed by clergy and laity alike, but they are anomalies and they should be resolved.

The problem of authority was bound to arise in the new Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Diocese. Papal authority had been rejected, and the hierarchy of the Ecumenical Patriarchate was a strange, unknown quantity even to the clergy — let alone the laity. A serious division arose in the period after World War II, and a number of parishes entered the Russian Orthodox "Metropolia," as the present Orthodox Church in America was then called. The Metropolia even erected at the time a special "Carpatho-Russian Administration" for these parishes, which again meant recognizing the distinct national and religious identity of these people.

It is a tribute to the vitality of the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Diocese and the strength of its leadership that the diocese ultimately overcame this division. Virtually all the defecting parishes returned, and the rival "Carpatho-Russian Administration" in the Metropolia has long since ceased to exist. There were two small splits in the 1960s (two parishes

joined a Ukrainian Orthodox jurisdiction, and a small group of priests became Uniates), but neither movement seriously threatened the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Diocese.

It is a pleasure today to contemplate the success of the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Diocese. Bishop Chornock reigned more than forty years — from 1936 (as administrator) until his repose in 1977. He was succeeded by Bishop John (Martin), who had served as auxiliary bishop since 1966. When Bishop Martin died suddenly in 1984, he was succeeded by Bishop Nicholas (Smisko), who was himself ordained to the priesthood by Bishop Chornock. After half a century, the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Diocese is firmly rooted. Bishop Smisko, who is the first bishop raised and educated in the Carpatho-Russian Diocese, has renewed peaceful contacts with the Byzantine Ruthenian Catholic Church, noting that God will ask an accounting for what is done or left undone in resolving the division amongst “our people.”

Recently, Jan Cardinal Willebrands, head of the Vatican Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, writing on the subject of relations between the Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox Churches, stated: “The union for which we search, then, is not the absorption of one by the other, or the domination of one over the other, but the full communion between Churches which share the same faith and the same sacramental life” [letter to Metropolitan Juvenaly of Krutitsy and Kolomna, 22 September 1979, text in *Ecumenical Documents I*, Paulist Press, 1982]. That was not the spirit with which Rome treated the Carpatho-Rusyn Greek Catholics in the United States in the 1930s. At that time, nothing but submission would do. We cannot foretell the future, but without predicting new structural arrangements, it is not too much to hope that peace may be restored on the basis of equality and mutual respect.

Yet one cannot forget the grief and tragedy which have accompanied the whole sad story of the Greek Catholics, entangled in the Orthodox-Uniate dynamic as they have been in their search for a place in North American church life. Perhaps the history of the Bridgeport parish may serve as an example.

In 1911, Bishop Ortynsky appointed the Reverend Orestes Chornock pastor of Saint John the Baptist Greek Catholic Church on Arctic Street in Bridgeport. Saint John's soon became the largest Greek Catholic parish in the United States. During the struggle of the 1930s, Bishop Takach took the parish before the civil courts to oust the Reverend Chornock, who, ironically, had many years previously registered the parish legally under the jurisdiction of the Roman Catholic Bishop of Hartford, in obedience to the wishes of Bishop Ortynsky.

Bridgeport's Saint John the Baptist Greek Catholic Church on Arctic Street became the cathedral of the new Carpatho-Russian Diocese. The Reverend Chornock was installed there as administrator of the diocese in 1936 and enthroned there as bishop in 1938. Meanwhile, the court proceedings dragged on through the years of World War II, and finally in 1946 the courts ruled in favor of the Unia. The church building on Arctic Street was given to Bishop Takach, who assigned a priest to serve those parishioners that remained Uniate.

Following the court decision, Bishop Chornock and the vast majority of the parishioners built a new church on Mill Hill Avenue, which they also named Saint John the Baptist



St. John the Baptist Church, Arctic Street, Bridgeport, Connecticut

Greek Catholic Church and which served as the cathedral for the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Diocese. However, in the hope of avoiding the problem which had arisen with Bishop Takach, and in the haste of moving, the legal entity which purchased the property and built the new edifice was a speedily-organized corporation titled “the American Sons and Daughters of Carpatho-Russia.”

In 1947, a quarrel broke out within the parish, and a majority of the trustees of this corporation “discharged” the priest and ultimately the bishop. The Carpatho-Russian Diocese considered renewed litigation, but it became clear that there was no recourse at law against this secular corporation which happened to own a building used for religious purposes. The church on Mill Hill Avenue then obtained a priest from the “Carpatho-Russian Administration” of the Russian Orthodox “Metropolia.”

Those parishioners who remained loyal to Bishop Chornock then built a third church — also named Saint John the Baptist — on Broadbridge Avenue, which remained within the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Diocese until 1963, when some difficulty arose between the bishop and the parish priest, who proved able to convince a substantial group within the parish to follow his lead. Saint John the Baptist Church on Broadbridge Avenue then also withdrew from the Carpatho-Russian Diocese, and now belongs to the Ukrainian Orthodox Church (Ecumenical Patriarchate).

In these circumstances, Bishop Chornock and his remaining Bridgeport faithful then organized Saint John the Baptist Church on Silver Lane in Stratford, Connecticut. The bishop remained nominal pastor of this small church until his death,

although he naturally had a curate as well.

In 1971, the second Saint John the Baptist Church in Bridgeport (the one on Mill Hill Avenue) withdrew from the Russian Metropolia and returned to the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Diocese, after twenty-five years.

Meanwhile, the original Saint John the Baptist Church on Arctic Street — which the courts had awarded to the Uniate Bishop Takach in 1946 — was eventually sold. It now serves some other congregation, but the Byzantine Ruthenian Catholic parish has built a new Saint John the Baptist Church in Trumbull, just outside Bridgeport.

So, for those who have lost count, the upshot of it is that from one parish there are now four parishes within five church buildings, each named Saint John the Baptist Church: one belongs to the Byzantine-Ruthenian Catholic Church; two belong to the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Diocese; one parish belongs to the Ukrainian Orthodox Church; while some utterly unrelated Protestant community has purchased the original building on Arctic Street.

All this happened in just *one* Carpatho-Rusyn Greek Catholic community. The reader may find it laughable. But so much incalculable human suffering, bitterness, and loss of faith necessarily accompanied this record of strife. There was nothing funny about it. Nor was it really the fault of the clergy and people involved. They were the victims, not the villains.

Serge R. Keleher
Dublin, Ireland

AUTHOR'S NOTE ON TERMINOLOGY

The “Carpatho-Russians” originate in what is now Eastern Slovakia and Transcarpathian Ukraine. They speak various dialects of Ukrainian but generally do not care to be called Ukrainians. The term *Carpatho-Russian* is not very satisfactory: if it means Muscovite Russian, it is completely inaccurate; if it means “Rusyn,” then the Lemkos, the Galicians, and the Bukovinians who also live on the Carpathian Mountains are just as Rusyn as anyone else. No other group uses the term Carpatho-Russian any more, the clergy and faithful of the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Diocese have become accustomed to that name, preferring it to any other. They have suffered enough for their identity; surely they may call themselves what they like.

The term “Uniate” is somewhat controversial, but it is commonly used in scholarly circles and does not have any convenient synonym. The present writer is himself a Uniate priest, and neither finds nor intends the term to be pejorative.

The term “Greek Catholic” has developed four distinct and mutually exclusive meanings, which makes it practically useless. It can mean Uniate; it can mean Eastern Orthodox; it can mean “independent Christian of the Byzantine Rite” (these three definitions have all been adopted by the American courts in the controversies over church properties); or, of course, it can mean something or someone Greek by nationality and Roman Catholic by religious affiliation.

A RESPONSE TO THE REVIEW OF *GOOD VICTORY*

In response to Father Serge Keleher's review of *Good Victory*, I must begin by addressing several of his suggestions. As Father Keleher points out, *Good Victory*, while contributing to our knowledge of the era in question, is certainly not a definitive history, nor was it intended to be. The object of the book was to present the life and work of Metropolitan Orestes Chornock and the origins of the American Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Diocese.

It is to be hoped, as Father Keleher mentions, that someday a definitive history of the whole period can be written with cooperation from all quarters. Such a study would surely demonstrate that the struggle in the 1930s was not simply the work of several priests who were disgruntled with Bishop Takach, as some writers have suggested. A comprehensive history would, in fact, be a large volume, including the relevant court proceedings and an analysis of each case, along with other pertinent documents from both the Byzantine Catholic chancery in Munhall and the American Carpatho-Russian Orthodox chancery in Johnstown. Only time will tell whether or not the embers of the struggle, mislabeled as a “celibacy struggle,” have died down enough for such a work even to be considered.

First, let me apologize for the typographical errors in the book. The national organization of the American Carpatho-Russian Youth (ACRY) sponsored the work, and every effort was made to have it ready for their September 1985 convention. As a result, in order to meet printing deadlines, I had only a very short time to spend with the galley sheets. If the book is ever reprinted, corrections will be made, the footnotes will be expanded, and an index and bibliography will also be provided. These were planned, but time considerations prevented their inclusion.

To continue, I would like to state that the conflict in the 1930s grew out of an “identity crisis” that has always existed and always will exist to some degree in the Greek (Byzantine) Catholic Church. This identity crisis was a crisis of national identity only in as much as the Greek Catholic Church was the bearer of Carpatho-Russian culture. The real question raised was not whether our people were Carpatho-Russian, Rusyn, Uhro-Rusin, Ruthenian, and so on. This question was incidental to the larger question of the relationship of the Greek Catholic Church to Rome through the Union of Užhorod. Bishop Takach accepted the term “Ruthenian” because that is what the Vatican called him. Bishop Orestes Chornock used the term “Carpatho-Russian” from the word *karpatorusskij*, reflecting his traditional roots. Ultimately, it was one's answer to the religious question that determined the answer to the “nationality” question.

In his review, Father Keleher relates the following popular tradition: Bishop Takach was asked on his arrival in America by Fathers Chornock, Varzaly, and Hanulya for assurance that he would keep ordaining married men to the priesthood, and he was told that if he planned to enforce celibacy in America he should get back on the boat. I have no idea where or how this traditional “folktale” got started, but quite frankly I doubt its veracity. As I have related in *Good Victory*, Father Chornock and the others were not inimical to Bishop Takach until five years later; indeed Father Chornock served under Bishop Takach as dean of his deanery. In addition Bishop Takach visited the Bridgeport parish in the interim, presumably at the invitation of Father Chornock.

In a footnote in the book, I have also dealt with another "folktale" — that Father Chornock was himself seeking Bishop Takach's miter and had the backing of some of the priests of the Pittsburgh diocese, but that his subsequent excommunication by the Vatican scared off his followers, leaving him on his own. The fact is that Father Chornock was not eligible to be an episcopal candidate until the death of his wife in May 1937, over a year after his excommunication by Rome and almost three months after becoming the "Administrator" of the "new Carpatho-Russian diocese."

On another issue, Father Keleher brought to my attention that only the *hramota* or ceremonial document on the consecration of Bishop Orestes has been translated and printed, but not the Patriarchal Decree 1379 establishing the diocese. I brought this to the attention of His Grace, Bishop Nicholas, and efforts are now underway to procure and translate the document during this fiftieth anniversary year of the diocese. Hopefully, it can be included in the diocesan anniversary journal. The reason that Father Chornock is designated "a clergyman of the Orthodox Carpatho-Russian communities in America" in his consecration *hramota* is that the diocese was not canonized until the following day, September 19, 1938.

Father Keleher is correct in noting that the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox diocese was not accepted by the other Orthodox jurisdictions overnight and that it still retained many of the marks of the Uniate Church in its life, especially in its early days. Much of the animosity directed at the new church was perpetuated by the former Russian Orthodox Metropolia (today's Orthodox Church in America), which itself was made up of a majority of former Uniates whom its hierarchs were busy trying to Russify. In fact, seminarians leaving the Byzantine Catholic Church for Orthodoxy very often passed up the Carpatho-Russian diocese and went to the former Metropolia in search of a "purity" of ritual. But a church practicing a "pure" ritual did not and does not exist. The Byzantine Rite of Constantinople is itself a hybrid.

By now, however, at least two generations of clergy and faithful in the Orthodox Carpatho-Russian diocese have grown up without ever having been members of the Uniate Church and have no sentimental recollections of its life. These people have always associated themselves with the Orthodox Church and with Orthodoxy. As they have risen to positions of leadership and influence, both clerical and lay, in the Carpatho-Russian diocese, many of the Uniate elements that Father Keleher speaks of have been quietly falling by the wayside. For instance, one no longer sees in the Carpatho-Russian diocese the benediction of the blessed sacrament, although this was done in the 1950s. First Holy Communion has evolved into First Confession as the traditional Orthodox communing of infants and children becomes more commonplace. And I doubt that anyone would mistake Bishop Nicholas for a Roman Catholic prelate. Under the leadership of Bishop Nicholas, the diocese has printed and is still preparing liturgical texts in the best Carpatho-Russian tradition, discarding the blatant Latinizations of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Bishop Nicholas has also encouraged the propagation of the *prostapinije* or plainchant in English translation, not merely to preserve it as a relic of the past but to keep it alive as the source of spiritual strength that it was for our forebears.

In recent years the animosity that existed between the Carpatho-Russian diocese and the former Russian Metro-

polia (an animosity that had its roots in the latter's "Carpatho-Russian Administration" during the late 1940s and 1950s) has largely subsided through the efforts of the hierarchs of both jurisdictions. There exists today a spirit of mutual cooperation. In addition, the descendants of the former Uniates in the Orthodox Church in America are becoming aware of their roots and their authentic Carpatho-Russian traditions, including *prostapinije*, and are no longer threatened.

In recent years as well, through Bishop John Martin and now through Bishop Nicholas, the ties of the diocese with the Ecumenical See of Constantinople have been strengthened. His Grace, Bishop Nicholas, studied at the Patriarchal School at Halki before it was closed by the Turkish government. Several years ago three prominent laymen of the Carpatho-Russian diocese were made Archons of the Ecumenical Throne by His Holiness, Patriarch Demetrios, the first time that this award has been given to non-ethnic Greeks. In addition several priests of the diocese have been accepted as members of the Orthodox Theological Society in America and are active in it. Finally, diocesan priests are actively involved in pan-Orthodox activities on the local level.

The end result of all of this is that Father Keleher's remarks about the non-acceptance of the Carpatho-Russian diocese by the other Orthodox jurisdictions in America, while certainly true twenty-five or thirty years ago, are almost out of date today, as the Carpatho-Russian diocese completes its fiftieth year.

Father Lawrence Barriger
Freeland, Pennsylvania

RUSYN CULTURAL FUND

We are gratified by the initial response to the guest editorial by Patricia A. Krafcik (*C-RA*, No. 1, Spring, 1988), which announced the creation of a Rusyn Cultural Fund to aid the linguistic and cultural projects currently being undertaken among the Lemko Rusyns of Poland. At the outset these funds are being used to purchase for the Lemko Rusyn dictionary project a Cyrillic typewriter, which has been imported from Yugoslavia.

Among the first donors to the Rusyn Cultural Fund are: Nick Abrams (New York, New York), \$25.00; Helen Aldrich (Bend, Oregon), \$50.00; Oleska-Myron Bilaniuk (Swarthmore, Pennsylvania), \$50.00; E. Wayles Browne III (Ithaca, New York), \$50.00; and Robert Uram (East Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania), \$50.00. Further funds received will be used to continue support for the Lemko-Rusyn dictionary.

Tax-deductible donations of \$50.00 or more will be gratefully received. Please send your checks to the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center, Inc., 355 Delano Place, Fairview, New Jersey 07022. Be sure to indicate on your check that it is intended for the Rusyn Cultural Fund.

OUR FRONT COVER

Rusyns from Volové.

OUR TENTH ANNIVERSARY

This year, 1988, the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center celebrates its tenth anniversary. At first glance, ten years does not seem long, but it is enough to give us some idea of where we have been and where — given a realistic projection of resources — we will be able to go.

In 1978, we became an incorporated body and a non-profit cultural organization registered in the State of New York. Our primary goal has been and still remains the publication and distribution of scholarly and popular reading materials on all aspects of the history and culture of Carpatho-Rusyns in Europe and America. As part of our educational activity, we have sponsored or co-sponsored scholarly conferences and have provided fellowships for Americans to study in the Carpathian homeland. We have as well provided support for individuals in the European homeland who are doing scholarly work on their cultural heritage.

The work of the C-RRC is directed by academics — President Paul R. Magocsi (Harvard/University of Toronto) and Secretary Patricia A. Krafcik (University of Pittsburgh/Dickinson College) — who are joined by a board of advisors from various parts of the country: Mary Ann Gaschnig (Dracut, Massachusetts), John A. Haluska (Cambridge, Minnesota), Mary Huzinec (New York, New York), Jerry Jumba (McKeesport, Pennsylvania), Edward Kasinec (Forest Hills, New York), Steve Mallick (Madison, Ohio), Orestes J. Mihaly (Armonk, New York), and Patricia A. Onufrak (McLean, Virginia). All are American-born second-, third-, or fourth-generation descendants of at least one Carpatho-Rusyn forebear.

From its beginning, the C-RRC has maintained good relations with many of the religious and lay organizations that serve Carpatho-Rusyns in the United States. Those relations have taken the form of access to diocesan and fraternal newspapers and, as is the case with several hierarchs, concrete support in the form of guaranteed purchase of our publications, thereby making them possible.

Nonetheless, the C-RRC is not affiliated with any of those organizations, nor does it represent any particular religious or national orientation. Our primary goal remains the promotion of knowledge about Carpatho-Rusyns as a distinct cultural entity within the Slavic world of Europe and as one of the many peoples that comprise the population of the United States.

The C-RRC has been part, and in many ways in the forefront, of the revival of interest in Carpatho-Rusyns that began slowly in the mid-1970s and expanded during the 1980s. When we came into being, very few Americans of Carpatho-Rusyn background had a clear notion of the heritage of their European forebears and, if asked, most would reply that their parents, grandparents, or great-grandparents were from somewhere in Eastern Europe. Further inquiry about ethnic identity might lead to self-description in terms of religion or to a vague answer such as “our people.”

Today that situation has changed substantially. The authoritative *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups* treats Carpatho-Rusyns as a distinct group; the U.S. Census Bureau recognizes Carpatho-Rusyns (although as yet has not classified them appropriately); and there has been a remarkable growth of serious new publications about all aspects of the group. These have made their way to thousands of individual readers and into the leading libraries throughout North America and Europe. For example, when the C-RRC began ten years ago, we had fewer than 800

supporters. Today our supporters number over 5,500.

Our statistics are impressive. In ten years, we have fulfilled nearly 8,000 book requests and sold over 15,500 publications. Alone, we have published 8 titles, helped to underwrite the cost of 5 more, and list in our current catalog over 30 titles. In addition, our quarterly, the *Carpatho-Rusyn American* (which has expanded from 8 to 12-16 pages), has appeared regularly throughout the past decade and now has a solid record of 40 issues. All this activity has been structured on a non-profit, break-even financial basis, and we are happy to report that after ten years our balance sheet indicates a positive picture.

While these statistics are significant, they tell us little of the quality of the works we distribute and activity we sponsor. Beyond the few specialized research tools (bibliographies, guides, phrasebooks) published by our center, all other publications in our catalog are by leading academic publishing houses — Harvard University Press, Columbia University Press, Wilhelm Braumüller in Vienna, University of Toronto Press, Multicultural History Society of Ontario.

With regard to other activities, we have sponsored scholarly conferences at the University of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia) and John Carroll University (Cleveland); have funded two research scholarships to Užhorod in Soviet Transcarpathia; have organized a publications booth at the annual convention of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies; and are currently supporting a project to standardize the Lemko Rusyn language.

Among our current publications projects is a translation series entitled “Classics in Carpatho-Rusyn Scholarship,” which will make available in English the best works in the history, language, literature, ethnography, religion, archeology, and other aspects of Rusyn culture that have appeared in various languages during the twentieth century. The first volume in this series — *Rusyn Easter Eggs in Eastern Slovakia* — appeared in 1987. Three more translations are already completed and in various stages of production.

Since we presently receive no grants or funding from outside sources, all our costs must be covered by the sale of our publications. This is done through systematic advertising, which includes mailings of thousands of flyers each year. Nonetheless, the costs of publishing, mailing, and sustaining subscribers for the *Carpatho-Rusyn American* quarterly continually increase, and we must be ever vigilant in balancing income with the increasing costs of high-quality scholarship.

In one sense, we began an experiment ten years ago. Did Americans of Carpatho-Rusyn background want to know themselves? Did other Americans of non-Rusyn background want to know about our people? Was it possible to sustain a purely educational organization through the sale of scholarly publications? Would there be enough income to support occasional scholarly conferences, fellowships, translations, and new publications. Ten years later, we know the answer to those questions. It is, yes!

Now that our initial decade of experiment is over, the next ten years have already brought new goals and challenges. While our publishing and distribution program will remain a central feature of our work, there are other kinds of activity that need to be implemented. These might include endowed library and research funds, graduate fellowships, a university chair of Carpatho-Rusyn studies, and a friends organization to help make these dreams a concrete reality. We trust that our readers will continue their support in order that we may achieve these new goals which will be of benefit to us all.

GREETINGS ON OUR TENTH ANNIVERSARY

It is with pleasure that I congratulate the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center on the occasion of its tenth anniversary. We are grateful to you personally for having initiated your organization and promoted its development. It has been successful in renewing interest in the cultural background of our Carpatho-Rusyn faithful.

With gratitude and with kind personal best wishes,

Bishop Michael J. Dudick, D.D.
Byzantine Catholic Diocese of Passaic

I congratulate the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center on its tenth anniversary. The center has rendered an important cultural service by providing Americans of Carpatho-Rusyn descent with a richer and more authentic understanding of their ethnic heritage. In doing so, it has also contributed yet another vivid strand to the splendid multi-colored tapestry which is pluralistic America.

Rudolph J. Vecoli, Director
Immigration History Research Center
University of Minnesota

On behalf of the officers and members of the Greek Catholic Union of the U.S.A., we extend this congratulatory message to the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center as you observe ten years of accomplishment and service to the Carpatho-Rusyn people.

The Center's achievements in those brief ten years are manifold, especially the exceptional catalog of publications, now numbering more than thirty titles. Add to this your outstanding newsletter, the *Carpatho-Rusyn American*, which provides scholarly and informative communication on an ongoing basis. Your forty quarterly issues are a testimony to your commitment to our heritage. And your vision for the future, with added research, fellowships, and projected programs, is further evidence of this commitment.

The Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center has enabled many, many persons to "rediscover" their national identity. Your work is a response to the need felt by many to seek their cultural roots. In this spirit, we of the Greek Catholic Union share a common interest. In 1892, our founders, immigrants from the Carpathian region of the former Austro-Hungarian Empire, organized a fraternal benefit society specifically for the Rusyn people.

Today, 96 years later, we are fully cognizant of our Carpatho-Rusyn background as we strive to be a viable, effective, and meaningful fraternal benefit society. Our focus is ever-widening, but we never lose sight of our origins and ancestral heritage.

We are specifically appreciative of the unique service the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center provides through its scholarly research, publications, and projects. We look forward to mutual cooperation in matters pertinent to our culture and beneficial to our members. And we welcome the opportunity to share resources as more and more Americans become aware of their Carpatho-Rusyn ancestry.

May this anniversary mark the first of many decades of progress and growth for the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center and for the increase of knowledge and awareness of the Carpatho-Rusyn people.

George N. Batyko, National President
Greek Catholic Union of the U.S.A.

RECENT EVENTS

Cleveland, Ohio. On May 1, 1988, the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center sponsored a conference at John Carroll University that focussed on the history of the American Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Diocese, which this year is celebrating its fiftieth anniversary. The conference was opened by the Academic Vice-President of John Carroll University, the Reverend Michael J. Lavelle, SJ.

The following papers were presented: "The Emergence of the New Diocese, 1929-1938," by the Reverend Lawrence Barriger; "Problems Facing the New Diocese and Their Resolution," by Archpriest Brian Keleher; and "Greek-Rite Catholic and Latin-Rite Catholic Clergy: Conflicting Roles," by Professor Richard Renoff. The discussant was Protospyter John Yurcisin, chancellor and historian of the diocese. The four presentations will be published in a volume now being prepared that contains recent research in Carpatho-Rusyn studies.

Washington, D.C. On May 26-28, the Library of Congress and the Kennan Institute of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars co-sponsored an international conference on the "Millennium of the Baptism of Rus'." More than 50 scholars world wide were invited to present papers, several of whom were from eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. The subject of Carpatho-Rusyns was dealt with in a presentation by Professor Paul R. Magocsi (University of Toronto), "Religion and Identity in the Carpathians," which discussed the recent status of the Greek Catholic and Orthodox churches in the Lemko Region of Poland and Prešov Region of Czechoslovakia.

Uzhorod, USSR. On June 16, Dr. Paul R. Magocsi represented the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center in talks with the Transcarpathian branch of the Ukraine Society and with the renowned novelist, Ivan Čendej, head of the committee to preserve cultural monuments in the region. Discussion focussed on an agreement that will allow the C-RRC to continue to receive recent Soviet publications about Carpatho-Rusyns and on plans by the Soviets to erect new monuments in the region, perhaps even one to the nineteenth-century national poet, Aleksander Duchnovyč.

Istanbul, Turkey. On September 7, Dr. Paul R. Magocsi represented the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center at the offices of the Ecumenical Patriarch of the Orthodox Church. He informed the patriarchal secretariat of the work of the C-RRC and presented its publications. The Ecumenical Patriarchate expressed a desire for further publications from our center. The meeting was arranged through the good offices of the American Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Diocese, which is under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Ecumenical Patriarch.

Washington, D.C. On September 17, 1988, Dr. Patricia Krafcik presented a paper at the 14th Congress of the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences in the U.S. entitled: "Some Aspects of Carpatho-Rusyn Emigration to the United States." Dr. Krafcik and Patricia Onufrak also represented the C-RRC at the Congress with an exhibit of books and other materials on Carpatho-Rusyns.

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

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

A Forum 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: Patricia A. Krafcik
Associate Editor: Jerry Jumba
Business Manager: John A. Haluska

Annual Subscription is \$12.00