I remember first meeting him. It was during a reception held in the spring of 1978 across from the Metropolitan Museum of Art on Manhattan’s upper east side in a marvelous old stone mansion which now houses both the Ukrainian Institute of America and the Carpathian Research Center. I was immediately struck by the stately carriage of this elderly man, by the warm glow in his dark eyes and the gracious manner in which he lifted my hand to his lips in a beautiful gesture of old-style respect no longer observed in our modern society. His broad Slavic face was lined with the wisdom of age and reflected the full, rich, courageous, and often dangerous life he had led in his youth and middle years as a political activist in Subcarpathian Rus’. Before moving on to greet other visitors, he invited me back to his home overlooking Fifth Avenue—to come and talk whenever I could drop in—and I knew his was a sincere welcome.

But it was only at the beginning of this year that I finally did return to the stone mansion and came to know Julian better. Although his active role in the politics of his homeland had ceased, Julian possessed a passionate interest in the unresolved problems of his people—the social, political, ethnic, and national problems. He had pursued his activities in the era after World War I into the agonizing days on the brink of the World War II. He was a pragmatic man and had sought the best, freest possible life for his people. He had lived and observed intensely, learning much in his seventy-nine years, and experienced acutely the desire to give of himself and his knowledge to us of the younger generations that we might better grasp our origins and understand the tempestuous history which scattered so many of our people far from their homeland. Julian had conceived the idea of holding a symposium to discuss the recent book, The Shaping of a National Identity: Subcarpathian Rus’ 1848-1948, by Dr. Paul R. Magocsi, to whom he had been a mentor and a dear friend. He asked me to help plan the symposium, and our frequent meetings for this purpose provided me with the opportunity of getting to know him on a close, personal level.

Stepping off the hectic sidewalks of New York City, I would be greeted by Julian’s warm smile and ushered into the cool darkness of the old stone mansion with a ‘welcome home!’ In the afternoons, Julian might be finishing up a meeting with others who had come to talk—visitors, friends who had dropped by, and often students. When we met in the evenings, he never failed to bring out a tray of refreshments, himself enjoying a glass of wine as much as his thirsty guest. We would speak seriously, planning our symposium, Julian often reminding me not to forget this or that, always concerned for the sensitivities of others, urging us to exert our ultimate efforts, encouraging us to take pride in our people. And he was never without a genuine and subtle sense of humor. Whether the day was gloomy, overcast, or dancing with city sunshine, I always left feeling somehow richer in my soul for those few minutes spent with him.

I spoke with Julian by phone slightly more than a week before the symposium scheduled for the sixth of May in order to verify last-minute details. After we exchanged the traditional Paschal greeting—Christos voskres! Vo istinu voskres! (Christ is risen! Truly He is risen!)—Julian, with a smile in his voice, said that it was time for me to start addressing him as ‘Uncle Julian’ rather than Mr. Revay. Ah, I thought, his is a true Slavic soul which abhors unnecessary distances between friends. And but three days later, an accidental fall on a staircase released that wondrous Slavic soul to the Lord, and Julian Revay passed away.

Saturday morning, the fifth of May, dawned with a most brilliant spring sunshine. St. Mary’s Byzantine Catholic Church where Julian had been a choir member and a much-beloved parishioner quickly filled to overflowing. All around me, I caught subdued snatches of the gentle tones of the language my grandparents had spoken. The entire eastern wall of the church, a maze of large pieces of colored glass depicting scenes from the life of Christ, was bathed in sun, and as the sunlight filtered through the glass, it was both tempered in its brightness and enriched by the flaming reds, vivid yellows, and serene blues. Julian’s casket was brought into the church and, as is customary, was placed in the center aisle at the front. I noted with a start that the glowing yellows of the glass icon of the resurrection fell squarely over the very casket as if embracing it.

The combined liturgy and funeral service commenced. Melodies of the hymns and plainchant unique to Carpatho-Rusyn Christians rose and fell like the Carpathian mountains and valleys native to the region. The funereal ‘Alleluia, alleluia, alleluia’ was sung not in a heavy minor mode but in a major key, hauntingly poignant at this moment of mourning. The Alleluia surged over and over, breaking the tyranny of the measured bar of music, tearing free, wafting to the ceiling and beyond, mingling with the sweet incense and the colors of the spring morning.

I closed my eyes and tried to visualize Julian as I had seen him last. But the elderly man was gone! In his place, I saw rising before me a youthful man, his thick brown hair tossed by a mountain breeze, his dark eyes flashing, searching the green hills in the distance, his broad shoulders held proudly, his heart bursting with love for his people. And I knew then that while we here in New York City sang our Alleluias for the deceased man in the casket, the real Julian was already far away. Indeed, he had returned home.

Patricia Krafcik
Julian Revay was one of the most active and popular leaders in Subcarpathian Rus’ before World War II. He was born in the small Rusyn village of Mirca (Ung county), about 20 miles north of Uzhhorod, in what is today the Transcarpathian oblast of the Soviet Ukraine. His father was a teacher, who had instilled in him the importance of education. Julian had just finished gymnasium (high school) in Uzhhorod and had begun to teach in an elementary school when World War I came to a close. In a few months time (May 1919), his homeland became part of the democratic Czechoslovak Republic. Under the new regime, Revay took an active part in the new teacher’s organizations, and in 1923 he was appointed supervisor of the economic and administrative section of the Ministry of Education in Uzhhorod. He subsequently served as a school inspector, secretary of the Pedagogical Society, editor of the official teacher’s journal, Ucytel’, and an active member of the Teacher’s Assembly (Hromada), the Prosvita Society, and the Plast scouting organization. He also co-authored an elementary language primer which went through two editions (1931 and 1937) as well as a Rusyn-Magyar (1923) and Magyar-Rusyn (1928) dictionary. These early writings were all in Rusyn vernacular, although by the 1930s Revay began to write only in literary Ukrainian.

Revay’s political career began as early as 1914, when as a teenager he attended political meetings with his older brother Fedir, who operated a printshop in Uzhhorod. It was also under his brother’s influence that Revay joined the Subcarpathian branch of the International Socialist Party, which in 1920 evolved into the Social Democratic Party. The Social Democrats chose Revay to represent them as their Subcarpathian deputy in the Czechoslovak Parliament in Prague (1935-1938).

By the 1930s, Revay’s political credo had become fixed: he was committed to the view that Subcarpathian Rusyns were part of the Ukrainian nationality, but he believed their future would be best secured if they gained autonomy and remained under Czechoslovak rule.

In October 1938, Czechoslovakia was transformed into a federal state and Subcarpathian Rus’ received its long-awaited autonomy. The influential Revay was appointed Minister of Commerce and Public Works in the first autonomous government (October 1938). In the following months, he authored the Czechoslovak bill for Subcarpathian autonomy, represented the region in negotiations for economic agreements with Germany, and was elected to the new Carpatho-Ukrainian provincial diet. Under the pressure of foreign events, the Carpatho-Ukrainian government declared its independence (which was to last for one day—March 15, 1939) and Revay was chosen Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs. Revay was already in Prague when the Hungarian Army invaded the region (March 16). He was never again to see his homeland, spending the years of World War II in Prague and, when the Soviet Red Army arrived in the Czech capital, fleeing to the American forces in May, 1945. After a few years in West Germany, he came to the United States in 1948.

The ever-active Revay continued to be a community leader in the New World. Living in New York City, he became director of the Ukrainian-American credit association Samopomich, director of the office of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, and administrative director of the Ukrainian Institute. Despite his activity in Ukrainian affairs, he never forgot his Subcarpathian homeland. He founded the Carpathian Research Center in New York City and tried, if not always successfully, to find a common ground between the older Rusyn-American community and the post-World War II Ukrainian immigrants from the region. Until his accidental death in April 1979, just a few months before his eightieth birthday, Julian Revay remained a staunch supporter of the Carpatho-Rusyn American and hoped that it would succeed in bringing the heritage of his homeland to the descendants of the early Rusyn immigrants in America.
THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF THE CARPATHO-RUSYNS

In Part 4 of this article, the author discussed the emergence of Subcarpathian Rus’ as an individual province within Czechoslovakia after World War I; the development of the region’s autonomous government in 1938-1939; and finally the post-World War II division of the Carpatho-Rusyns between eastern Slovakia and the Transcarpathian Oblast’ of Soviet Ukraine. — Editor.

(Part 5)

Let us now turn to the problem of nationalism and national identity. At the outset, it should be stressed that individuals are not born with a sense of national consciousness. Rather, nationalism is an ideology which has to be learned like any other. Such learning usually takes place in school. What does all this mean for peoples who live in large states with many nationalities? Well, quite simply that when a person is growing up, as in eastern Europe, he or she often has a choice of one or more nationalities with which to identify. Let us take a young Slovak speaker living during the nineteenth century; he might have identified himself as a Slovak or a Magyar or a Czech. Similarly, a native of eastern Galicia might have considered himself to be a Slovak, or a Magyar, or a Russian, or even an Austrian, since Galicia was a province within the Austrian part of the Empire. Of course, the choices were not limitless. The Slovak speaker, for instance, could not become a Frenchman or Chinaman.

The point is that national identity is not an absolute, and that there is often a degree of choice involved. This is especially the case within border areas, that is, within territories that are between two or more civilizations. Historically, Alsatians might have become Germans or Frenchmen; Luxembourgers: French, German, or remain Luxembourgish; Macedonians might have become conscious Serbians, Bulgarians, Greeks, or remain Macedonians. I could go on, but I think the point is clear. Carpatho-Rusyns have also had several choices open to them; namely, to remain conscious Rusyns, or to become Magyars, Slovaks, Ukrainians, or Russians. To be sure, the decisive factors influencing this choice of national affiliation are as much dependent on the attitudes of individuals and their particular social and cultural level, as on external forces such as the designs of one or more political states.

Modern nationalism, as we know it today in Europe, got its start during the late eighteenth century. Before then, and in some places even still today, people if asked would usually identify themselves as being from this or that village, or as a member of a specific religious community. Like most ideologies, nationalism was at first propagated by a small group of educated elite—an intelligentsia—and it was their task to try to convince people to identify themselves as part of a larger group who may have lived in one territory, have spoken similar or related dialects, have had similar customs, and perhaps have been of the same religion. One by one the nationalities of Europe went through this reeducation process: first the English and French, with the help of existing states; then the Germans, Italians, Poles, Czechs, Serbs, and other European peoples under the guidance of their own intelligentsias. This development basically took place during the nineteenth century, but some people, like the Macedonians and the Carpatho-Rusyns, did not really experience nationalism on a large scale until the twentieth century.

This does not mean they had no nationally-conscious leaders before then. They did. In fact, one could argue that as early as the eighteenth century, Rusyns had their own nationalists, like the renowned Bishop of Mukačevo, Andrej Bačins’kyj, who set up Rusyn elementary schools, introduced Rusyn as the official language in church administration, and who tried to unite the Rusyns of Galicia and Hungary into one Greek Catholic Diocese. But in the decades before 1848, a Carpatho-Rusyn national movement never really got off the ground, even though these were decades when the immediate neighbors—the Slovaks, Magyars, and Galician Rusyns (later Ukrainians)—were experiencing national revivals. Were there not perhaps enough educated Rusyns to act as leaders at this time? Not really. After all, there were talented writers like the philosopher Vasyl Dovhovyć, and the historiáns and linguists Michail Lučkaj and Ivan Fogarasj. But these were isolated individuals; to implement a viable national movement, many more leaders would be needed. And although some had existed, they often left the homeland, usually for Galicia, the Ukraine, or Russia. The East became a kind of cultural safety-valve, where the Subcarpathian intelligentsia could escape the social or political pressures they might have felt at home.

Among the many who left their homeland were: Ivan Orlaj, an influential physician in Russia; Michail Baludjanskij, the first rector of St. Petersburg University; and Petro Lodij, surgeon to the tsarist court. Then there was the young Jurij Venelin who went to Moscow to become a physician, but who became even more famous by writing the first scholarly study of the Bulgarian people, who in turn regard him as the father of their nation. Nor did the exodus eastward stop during the nineteenth century, another famous Subcarpathian being the painter and art critic Igor Grabar, who became director of the famed Tretjakov Gallery in Moscow and later director of the Institute of the History of Art at the Soviet Academy of Sciences in Moscow. In these individuals, there was excellent material for a Rusyn nationalist intelligentsia, but instead their talents were used in other lands. (To be continued)

Paul R. Magocsi

This extensive study is an English translation of a work that first appeared in Slovak in the Československý časopis historický (1973). It traces the foreign designs of Hungary and Poland toward Subcarpathian Rus' before the Munich Pact of September 1938, then it outlines German policy toward the region during its five months of autonomy (October 1938-March 1939). The author is critical of the Subcarpathian leadership and he often overemphasizes the influence of Hitler's Germany on local Ukranophile politicians.


In the words of its subtitle, Svetlosc is a quarterly "journal of literature, culture, and social questions." It is written entirely in the Vojvodinian (Bačka) Rusyn language of Yugoslavia. Besides new literary works by local Rusyn authors and translations from world literatures (including Pushkin and Tolstoy), this volume contains several essays in literary criticism, contemporary politics, book reviews, and scholarly studies by Arpad Lebl on the social structure of Rusyns in Yugoslavia and by Peter Király on the language of East Slovak/Carpatho-Rusyn speaking villages in present-day Hungary.


The present volume is a Ukrainian translation of a Hungarian volume that had appeared under the title A vaskorú Indzibaba: kárpátukrajnai népmesék (Budapest, 1970). The latter is actually a collection of 40 folk tales from all over Subcarpathian Rus’, written down during the 1860’s by Mychajlo Fincyc’kyj (1842-1916), who translated them from the Carpatho-Rusyn original into Hungarian just before his death. Jurij Škrobnyec’ has translated them from Hungarian into Ukrainian for this volume, although the publisher has unfortunately edited out those portions which were thought to be inappropriate for the modern reader as well as changing all references like magyar-orosz (Hungarian Russian), orosz (Russian), ruszin (Rusyn), rutén (Ruthenian), and kisorosz (Little Russian) to Transcarpathian Ukrainian.


This is the initial issue of the first journal to be published by Rusyns in Yugoslavia that deals exclusively with scholarly problems. It is edited by Djura Varga and is written entirely in Vojvodinian Rusyn, a standardized language internationally recognized as the fourth and newest East Slavic language. The issue includes 11 articles, mostly dealing with linguistic problems, and concludes with a list of the 229 members of the Society for Rusyn Language and Literature, as well as a list of its projects for the next five years (1976-1980).


This is the third issue of the newest Ukrainian-language scholarly journal in Czechoslovakia published by the Scientific Society (est. in 1968) of the Cultural Society of Ukrainian Workers (KSUT). It includes 12 articles and 1 review, the most important dealing with problems of the spoken and written language of the Rusyn population in the Prešov Region.

LANGUAGE

May I offer you something to drink?

Móže by ste dásto výpyly?
(Móh-zheh buh steh dám-shtoh vuh-ly-ly?)

Yes.

Hej.
(Hey.)

No.

Ny: Nyt.
(Ny. Nyt.)

Would you like something to eat?

Móže by ste dásto zajily?
(Móh-zheh buh steh dám-shtoh zah-yee-ly?)

What do you want?

Što chočete?
(Shtoh hoh-cheh-teh?)
Pittsburgh, Pa. On November 29, 1978, the “Living Heritage” Series broadcast on WYEP FM featured a program moderated by Mr. Marcel Kopp and devoted to the Carpatho-Rusyns. Representatives from five Rusyn cultural and performing groups in the Pittsburgh area participated. Discussed in the program were Carpatho-Rusyn history, immigration, culture, and the activities of the groups represented. Live and taped music from some of the groups’ recent performances was included.

Pittsburgh, Pa. In the mid-19th century, Aleksander Duchnovyc wrote to his people, “Subcarpathian Rusyns, arise from your deep slumber,” calling them to a national consciousness and a realization of their identity as a distinct ethnic group. American Carpatho-Rusyns, splintered into factions, split between churches, have long needed something or someone like Duchnovyc to make them “arise from their deep slumber.” In Pittsburgh, that something finally came along.

For seven weeks in February and March of this year, the Byzantine Catholic Archdiocese of Pittsburgh sponsored a lecture series entitled “The Carpatho-Ruthenians: Their History, Religion, and Culture.” The Director of the program was The Most Reverend John Bilock, D.D., Auxiliary Bishop of the Archdiocese, and the lectures on Subcarpathian Rus’ were presented by Monsignor Basil Shereghy, a priest and scholar within the archdiocese who serves as editor of the United Societies’ publication, Enlightenment-Prosvita, and is director of the Archdiocesan Heritage Museum. Open to the public, the lecture series attracted over one-hundred registrants.

In each lecture, Msgr. Shereghy examined a different aspect of the Carpatho-Rusyns and their existence. The first lecture gave a short overview of the history of the Carpatho-Rusyns, discussing the origins of the people and their name as well as their early presence in the Danubian Basin. The next two lectures dealt with the history of the Church in Subcarpathian Rus’ and the Union of Uzhhorod. These looked into the foundation of Eastern Christianity, the conversion of the Carpatho-Rusyns to Christianity, religious difficulties, and the eventual union of the Orthodox Carpatho-Rusyns with Rome.

Next discussed was the “Golden Era” of Subcarpathian Rus’—the 19th-century cultural renaissance. Msgr. Shereghy explained the awakening of the Carpatho-Rusyns to national consciousness during this period and enumerated their many prominent native sons from this age, including Duchnovyc, Adol’f Dobrianskij, and Michail Baludianskij.

Twentieth-century political and cultural changes were then covered, complete with the story of Subcarpathian Rus’ in Czechoslovakia and the struggle for dominance of this area by east European nations throughout this century.

The Carpatho-Rusyns in America was a topic of special interest to the audience which consisted of people who themselves lived through much of that history. Msgr. Shereghy described the organizations of the Carpatho-Rusyns, their church in America, and the numerous religious controversies which sent them in many directions and destroyed much of their national consciousness.

The final lecture covered the present situation of the Carpatho-Rusyns around the world as well as the future of American Carpatho-Rusyns. The large audience that had listened for the past six weeks to the saga of their people—sometimes in awe, sometimes in disbelief, often recognizing familiar customs and expressions—suggested and volunteered for a number of undertakings necessary for the preservation of Carpatho-Rusyn culture in America, hoping to elevate the study of the people, their language, and their culture to the university level. In seven short weeks, a national consciousness was revived, an identity was rediscovered. Again, Carpatho-Rusyns were arising from their “deep slumber.” Duchnovyc would have been proud.

John Righetti
Monessen, Pennsylvania

Philadelphia, Pa. On March 24, 1979, a conference was held in the hall of the Tryzub Ukrainian Sports Club marking the fortieth anniversary of the proclamation of the independence of Carpatho-Ukraine. Sponsored by a number of Carpatho-Ukrainian organizations, the conference was hosted by Dr. Petro Stercho who is the author of two books on the history of Carpatho-Ukraine in 1938-1939: Karpato-ukrajins’ka derzava (The Carpatho-Ukrainian State; Toronto, 1965) in Ukrainian and Diplomacy of Double Morality (New York, 1971) in English. Witnesses of the events of 1938-1939 delivered reports and read memoirs. These included the late Honorable Julian Revay, the Honorable Stepan Rosocha, Sydir Novakivsky, and Dr. Petro Stercho.

New York City. In honor of the fortieth anniversary of the independence of Carpatho-Ukraine, the Carpathian Research Center hosted an exhibit of paintings by Carpathian artists. The exhibit, cosponsored by the Heritage Institute of the Passaic Ruthenian Catholic Diocese of the Byzantine Rite, the Brotherhood of the Carpathian Sich, and the Tysa Society, was to last from March 18 until April 17, but was extended through May 6 by permission of Bishop Michael J. Dudick of the Passaic Diocese in order to be available for viewing by those who attended the symposium on Dr. Paul R. Magocsi’s book, The Shaping of a National Identity: Subcarpathian Rus’ 1848-1948. (see below)

The exhibit included works by two leading painters of the first distinct Subcarpathian school of painting—Adalbert Erdelj (1891-1955) and Josif Boksaj (1891-1975), as well as by Boreckyj, Jordan, Konratovyc, Manajo, Marton, Soltes, Šuba, and others. The paintings were on loan from...
the Heritage Institute and from individual collectors. An article dealing with the development of classical painting in Subcarpathian Rus' will appear in a future issue of the Carpatho-Rusyn American newsletter.

Cambridge, Mass. Between March 22 and 25, 1979, the Ukrainian Studies Program at Harvard University celebrated its Tenth Anniversary. During the last decade that program also has contributed much to Carpatho-Rusyn studies. It sponsored a conference on Carpatho-Rusyn immigration (June 1974), organized the cultural seminar on Carpatho-Ruthenia at Mount St. Macrina (August 1975), sponsored several lectures at Harvard on Carpatho-Rusyns, and has built one of the richest collections of Rusyn books in the western world, including a first edition of Bishop de Camillis' *Catechism* (1698). Among associates in the Harvard Ukrainian Program who have worked on Carpatho-Rusyn problems are Dr. Zack Deal, James Evans, Edward Kasinec, and Dr. Paul R. Magocsi.

Cambridge, Mass. On April 19, 1979, Dr. Zack Deal presented a paper at Harvard University entitled, "Death and the Carpatho-Rusyn Immigrant in America." This is an outgrowth of a larger project on which he is working—volume two of the Guide to the Amerikansky Russky Viestnik: 1914-1937.

Dr. Deal shed light on the socioeconomic life of Carpatho-Rusyns prior to the Depression. An indirect way of illuminating the conditions under which people live is to study their death rates and the normal causes of death. As sources, Dr. Deal used death notices published in the Amerikansky Russky Viestnik, the organ of the largest Rusyn fraternal organization in the United States—the Greek Catholic Union.

By knowing the total number of members in the Greek Catholic Union, Dr. Deal was able to calculate the death rates of Carpatho-Rusyns in the fraternal. He also commented upon the typical causes of death and the average age of death for both males and females.

New York, N.Y. On Sunday afternoon, May 6, a symposium was held to discuss the controversial book by Dr. Paul R. Magocsi, *The Shaping of a National Identity: Subcarpathian Rus', 1848-1948* (Harvard University Press, 1978). The session was held in honor of the distinguished Subcarpathian national leader, Mr. Julian Revay, who had originally conceived the idea of the symposium. Because of Mr. Revay's unexpected death just one week earlier, the symposium began with tributes to his life and memory by Professor Vasily Markus, Edward Kasinec, and his pastor, Msgr. Raymond Misulich.

The symposium was chaired by Professor Patricia Krafcik (Columbia University) and featured four speakers, all of whom praised Dr. Magocsi's book, while at the same time that they raised questions of interpretation or pondered the implications of the book's appearance or wondered about the Rusyn ethnic revival in the United States today.

Professor Rado Lencek (Columbia University) spoke about the importance of the language question among Slavic peoples and among Subcarpathian Rusyns in particular. Professor Richard Renoff (Nassau Community College) discussed the treatment of the religious factor in the book and questioned if sympathy for the Rusyn orientation was a dominant feature of Magocsi's interpretation. Seminarian Evan Lowig (St. Vladimir's Orthodox Seminary) concentrated on the Carpatho-Rusyn community in the United States. He pointed out how the Orthodox Rusyns, who under the influence of Russophilism, have lost an awareness of their own ethnic heritage. Finally Professor Vasyl Markus (Loyola University of Chicago) raised several issues regarding perceptions and terminology in Magocsi's book, then he praised the impact of such writings on Americans of Carpatho-Rusyn descent who are now more able to acquire an understanding of their heritage and identity.

A discussion period followed in which several questions were raised dealing with problems in Europe and the United States both in the past and present. The author, who was present in the audience, was asked to give some reflections. He stressed that his primary aim is scholarly objectivity and that knowledge about the Carpatho-Rusyn homeland should be shared with all those interested in the subject.

The seminar was co-sponsored by the Carpathian Research Center and the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center, which mounted a display of its several new publications. The walls of the elegant Ukrainian Institute, where the event took place, were filled with fifty original paintings by Carpathian artists, most of them on loan from the Diocese of Passaic Heritage Institute.

More than 75 people came to the seminar. Among them were Professor Thomas Bird, head of the Ethnic Studies Program at Queens College; Jack Butchko, U.S. congressional assistant; Stepan Chemny, president of the Harvard Ukrainian Studies Fund; Dr. Herman Dicker, head librarian at the Hebrew Theological Seminary; Orestes Mihaly, Asst. Attorney General of the State of New York; Msgr. Raymond Misulich, Chancellor of the Byzantine Rite Diocese of Passaic; Archimandrite Victor Pospishil, Presiding Judge of the Ukrainian Archdiocesan Court; Professor Emeritus George Shevelov, editor of *Succasnist*; and Rev. Seraphim Surrency, Russian Orthodox Church (Patriarchal Exarchate).
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