FROM THE EDITOR

Every one of us participates in the saga of all mankind, but a part of that saga is very specifically our story. Whether life seems wonderfully dramatic or peculiarly quiet at any given moment, that personal story of ours is always and ever evolving. The threads running through it link us in an infinite number of ways, visible and invisible, extraordinary and simple, to our own ancestors. With time, the more we become aware of ourselves and our role in the saga of life in general as well as within our personal story, the greater our curiosity becomes about who we are and why we are the way we are. At different times in life, certain events or needs or discoveries may spur us on to a new awareness about ourselves.

In this regard, it is important to remember that ethnicity, an ethnic background, even fairly remote, may serve as a particularly powerful force in our lives, and a growing awareness of its influence can reveal much about each of us which might otherwise escape our understanding. Not long ago, I received a letter from one of our readers relating an event which represents precisely this kind of growing awareness in terms of ethnic consciousness. The following excerpt is from his letter:

Dear Editor: I hasten to write and let you know how much I appreciate your efforts to publish the Carpatho-Rusyn American. My grandfather, Peter Hudanics, was born in a small village near Palagy, not far from Ungvár (Užhorod) in 1872. Thirty years later, he arrived in West Virginia with his wife, Barbara (nee Marcin), and three children, Maria, George, and Peter. My father, John, was the first of his children born in the United States. Grandfather Peter never saw his fiftieth year; he died of overwork and worry in Perth Amboy in 1918 or 1919, leaving Barbara with ten children. The family was very poor, and it seemed to suffer a severe lack of direction and cohesion after Peter's passing. Barbara, I am told, was a good-hearted person, but completely without the strength to manage her children as they were growing up. In the poverty and anarchy of those early years, Peter's surviving children grew up with nothing at all like a sense of pride in their Old World heritage.

For some reason, I alone of all the dozens of grandchildren and great-grandchildren born on American soil have shown an interest in this heritage. I'm the only one who has ever manifested a sustained curiosity about our roots. My own father was no help at all. Once I asked him what our nationality was in Europe. His answer was that we were Greek Catholics. When I protested that this sounded more like a religion than a nationality, he replied, "Well, if you known so damn much about it already, what in hell are you asking me for?"

Uncle George, who was actually born in the Austro-Hungarian Empire, didn't have much to say either. In response to my questions, he asked, "Why are you interested in all that stuff? It'll never put a nickel in your pocket!"

Over the years, however, I persisted in gathering information from various sources, so that by now I have a sketchy picture of the region from which we came, although my knowledge of specifics concerning my own family is still pretty nebulous. The most significant piece of information was a document entitled "Keresztelesi és Bermalási." It was loaned to me by Peter's youngest child, Uncle Michael, under some interesting circumstances, which I shall now share with you . . .

I was stationed at the Defense Language Institute in Monterey, California, from October 1963 to April 1965. At the time I was an Army private studying Russian. Once I took a three-day pass to visit my Uncle Mike in the Los Angeles area. Mike was just an infant when his father died, but he did have in his possession a copy of the aforementioned document. It was in Hungarian, which none of us could read, but Mike reluctantly agreed to let me take it back to Monterey with me and let the Hungarian Language Department have a crack at translating it. Of course, they were more than happy to help.

I learned that the document was an extract from the parish records of the Palagy Greek Catholic parish. The extract itself was dated November 6, 1913, but the original entry in the parish records had been made in June 1872. That original entry concerned the baptism and chrismation of one Peter, the legitimate son of Miklos Hudanics and Juliana Tamas, both Greek Catholics. George Szockey and Juliana Kondas were the godparents. The priest was Kalman Fejer. Miklos Hudanics' occupation was given as "szolga" (steward). Of course, I was delighted to find all these bits of information in one document. But Uncle Mike was NOT. He'd been told all his life that our family was well off in the old country, that we had had servants, etc., and the translation suggested humbler circumstances. He preferred to believe in the stories he had heard rather than in the translation, and he was quick to cast aspersions on the integrity of the Hungarian Department. He even mentioned something about a "Commie Plot" . . . I returned the original document to Uncle Mike, keeping only a copy of it to the present day.

Just last Sunday my family and I were watching "Roots." The final installment of Alex Haley's story brought him back to the very village in Africa wherein his ancestor Kunta Kinte, was born. We were all moved by Haley's emotional encounter with his own past, and my eldest son, Stefan (13), seemed particularly animated. He confronted me with questions about our own roots. I was delighted, because previously he had shown interest only in football and the Bee Gees.

Believe me, I played it for all it was worth. The next day I took Stefan and the faded copy of Peter Hudanics' "Keresztelesi és Bermalási" to Eugene, Oregon, to meet with Stefan Zeltway, who had been born in Užhorod and completed the cantors' school there before the Second World War. The elder Stefan can read Hungarian, and he was happy to translate the document for the younger Stefan. I could have given much the same information, but I thought a dramatic encounter like this would make a lasting impression on my son. Whether or not this is so remains to be seen. But my Stefan did say he was going to save his money so that when he gets to be seventeen, he and I can go back, as Haley did, and stand on the very soil that had received the blood and sweat of our ancestors for centuries. A beautiful thought!

John Hudanish
Woodburn, Oregon
GREGORY I. ZSATKOVICH (1886–1967)

In the three decades prior to World War I, tens of thousands of Carpatho-Rusyns emigrated to the United States. But none was to become as successful and influential as Gregory Zsatkovich.

The young Gregory (whose last name is sometimes spelled Zatkovic) was born in the Rusyn village of Holubyne (Bereg county) in what is today the Transcarpathian oblast of the Soviet Ukraine. He was brought to the United States at the age of five. His father, Pavel, was editor of the leading Rusyn-American newspaper, the *Amerikansky Russky Viestnik*. Gregory became a classic American success story: he attended high school in New York City, college in New York and Pittsburgh, and finally the University of Pennsylvania law school. Soon he became a lawyer for General Motors in Pittsburgh.

In 1918, after four years of devastating war, the old order in Europe was about to collapse. Anticipating the great political and social changes that were about to occur, Carpatho-Rusyns followed the example of other immigrant groups and began to organize meetings to discuss the fate of their respective homelands. The most important of these meetings occurred on July 23, 1918, in Homestead, Pennsylvania, where the American National Council of the Uhro-Rusyns was formed. Within a few weeks the Council invited Zsatkovich to serve as its spokesman in negotiations with the other ethnic groups and the United States government.

They could not have made a better choice. In October 1918, the young Zsatkovich met in Washington, D.C., with President Woodrow Wilson and future Czechoslovak president Tomáš G. Masaryk; then in November he led a Carpatho-Rusyn delegation to the Mid-European Union in Philadelphia. There in Independence Hall, where America’s Declaration of Independence was signed in 1776, Zsatkovich and other eastern European leaders signed a proclamation demanding independence for their peoples. At the Philadelphia meeting, Zsatkovich succeeded in having Carpatho-Rusyns (Uhro-Rusins as they were called at the time) recognized as a distinct nationality worthy of political independence, or at least complete autonomy within another state. American government leaders urged Zsatkovich to seek autonomy, and he reached an agreement whereby Carpatho-Rusyns would join the new democratic state of Czechoslovakia.

To assure that this goal would be achieved, Zsatkovich journeyed to Subcarpathian Rus’ in February 1919. Following his lead, local Rusyns declared in Uzhhorod on May 8 that they would unite with Czechoslovakia. Zsatkovich then spent the summer months negotiating with Czech leaders in Prague and with representatives of the great western powers at the Paris Peace Conference being held at the Versailles Palace.

In recognition of his diplomatic success, the Czechoslovak government named Zsatkovich the first governor of Subcarpathian Rus’ in April 1920. However, his understanding of local autonomy was met with opposition by the Czechs, and within less than a year (March 21) he resigned his post and returned to the United States. At first he published several pamphlets attacking Czechoslovak policy in Subcarpathian Rus’, but soon he avoided immigrant politics and concentrated on his private law practice.

World War II brought new troubles to the Carpatho-Rusyn homeland and Zsatkovich was impelled to enter the political fray once again. He reversed his anti-Czechoslovak stance, became chairman of the American Carpatho-Russian Central Conference, and edited a journal called *The Carpathian* (1941–1943), which supported the resurrection of a Czechoslovak state made up of three equal peoples: Czechs, Slovaks, and Carpatho-Rusyns. However, Zsatkovich and his supporters were not to be successful as they were in 1918. The Red Army arrived in Subcarpathian Rus’ in September 1944, and within less than a year the region was incorporated into the Soviet Union.

Nonetheless, historians have not forgotten the achievements of the young Rusyn-American lawyer in 1918–1919. Commenting on those years, the distinguished Slovak-American professor Victor S. Mamatey wrote: “The Carpatho-Rusyn immigrants in America did determine the fate of their compatriots at home—a unique case of the influence of an immigrant group in America on the political history of Europe.”

Yet it is sad to record that no biography of Zsatkovich has been written. Even more tragic is the fact that he left no published memoirs and that soon after his death in Pittsburgh in 1967 all his papers were sent to an incinerator for complete destruction. Hopefully, today and in the future, Carpatho-Rusyn immigrants and their descendants will be more sensitive and appreciative of their rich cultural heritage and of people like Gregory Zsatkovich who fought so hard to preserve it.
THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT
OF THE CARPATHO-RUSYNS

In Part 5 of this article, the author dealt with the problem of nationalism and national identity, and noted the way in which these phenomena have evolved among numerous European peoples, including the Carpatho-Rusyns. He also provided a list of Rusyn intellectuals of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries who could have contributed to the development of national consciousness in Subcarpathian Rus', but chose to pursue their careers outside of their native land.—Editor.

(Part 6: Conclusion)

The first real stirrings of a Subcarpathian national movement came only with the revolution of 1848. While Adol'f Dobrianski promoted Carpatho-Rusyn political interests in Austrian imperial circles, Aleksander Duchnovyc was active in cultural endeavors, establishing the first Rusyn cultural and literary society in Prešov, writing the national hymn, and publishing the first literary almanac. Just after Duchnovyc's death in 1865, another cultural organization, the Society of St. Basil the Great, was founded in Užhorod. This was followed by the first newspapers for Rusyns: Svit, Nový svit, Karpat, and Listok. The Subcarpathian leaders who were active at this time, figures like Dobrianski, Ivan Rakovskij, Aleksander Mitrak, Ivan Šil'vaj, and Evgenij Fencik, identified themselves with Russian culture. They strove to write in Great Russian—with varying degrees of success—and identified themselves and all Subcarpathians as being part of the Russian nationality. Moreover, they maintained close contact with those Rusyns in Galicia who felt the same way. It was only at the very beginning of the twentieth century that a few Subcarpathians, like Avhustyn Volosyn, Michail Vrabel', and Hijador Stryps'kyj, began to write in their own Rusyn dialect and to talk about the existence of a Carpatho-Rusyn nationality.

But what were the actual programs of the Subcarpathian nationalist intelligensia? Basically, three orientations or factions existed: the Russophiles, Ukrainophiles, and Rusynophiles. (1) The Russophiles argued that Subcarpathians were part of one Russian nation that stretched from the Carpathian Mountains to the Pacific Ocean. (2) The Ukrainophiles countered with the explanation that Subcarpathians were linguistically, ethnographically, and culturally a part of the Ukrainian people, who represented a nationality distinct from the Russians. (3) The Rusynophiles responded that Subcarpathians were a separate East Slavic nationality, neither Russian nor Ukrainian. Two other attitudes existed from time to time. The older Magyarones felt Rusyns were part of the Hungarian nation, and were distinguishable only by their dialects and religion; according to them, Rusyns were simply Greek Catholic Magyars. There also were some Slovakophiles, especially in the Prešov Region of eastern Slovakia, who argued (and continue to argue today) that the local Rusyns, called Rusnaks, are simply Slovaks of the Greek Catholic religion.

After the Czechoslovak regime was established in 1919, the first three orientations were the most evident. The Russophiles had their own organization, the Duchnovyc Society, founded in 1924, with a national home in Užhorod that opened in 1932. The Ukrainophiles were led by writers like Andrej Karabeleš and Michail Popović and by politicians like Stepan Fencik, Governor Antonij Beskid, and Senator Edmund Batčinskij. The Ukrainophiles had their own Prosvita Society, founded in 1920, which also had a national home in Užhorod that opened its doors in 1928. Their ideology was best represented by the writers Vasyi' Grendza-Don'skyj, Julij Boršoš-Kumjats'kyj, Avhustyn Vološyn, and the politicians Julij and Mychajlo Braščajko and Julian Revay. Finally, the Rusynophile movement had no organization of its own, but expressed itself in the newspaper Nedilja, edited by Emyiopian Bokšaj, and in the local patriotism of men like Governor Gregory Zatkovich, Governor Konstantin Hrabar, the historian Vasyiľ Hadzega, and church leaders like Bishops Pavel Gojdić, Petro Gebej, and Aleksander Stoja. The Czechoslovak government tolerated, and at various times supported, all these orientations. By 1938, the Ukrainian movement had made the most rapid success, as revealed in its dominance during the short period of Subcarpathian autonomy in late 1938 early 1939, but the other orientations were still alive and well. It is also important to note that one of the strongest political parties in the region—the Communist Party—after 1926 supported the Ukrainian orientation.

When the Hungarians occupied Subcarpathian Rus' in early 1939, they drove into exile or underground the Ukrainophiles, tolerated for awhile the Russophiles, but argued and taught in the schools that Subcarpathians comprise a distinct Uhro-Rusyn nationality which was for centuries loyal to Hungary. However, the dictatorial methods of Budapest did not make this orientation successful, and it gained few adherents by the time the Soviet Army arrived in 1944. For the Soviets, the nationality question was not a problem: they argued in the international forum that the reason for accepting this strategically valuable territory into the Soviet Union was because its inhabitants were Ukrainians who wanted to join their brethren in a united Soviet Ukraine. So naturally, the Slavic inhabitants of the region were declared Ukrainian, and the Ukrainian language was introduced into schools; and for official purposes, alongside Russian, it has become the predominant language in Soviet Transcarpathia. In effect, their policy has basically been successful, and younger people in Soviet Transcarpathia today identify themselves as Ukrainians.

The situation among the Rusyns in the Prešov Region of eastern Slovakia is a bit more complex. After the Second World War, the population was, according to the Soviet model, declared to be of Ukrainian nationality, but actually until 1950, Great Russian, not Ukrainian, was taught in the schools and used for cultural purposes alongside Slovak, the official language in that part of Czechoslovakia. Then suddenly in the early 1950's, a full-fledged Ukrainianization policy was implemented. Throughout all these official changes, the majority of the populace remained unimpressed and considered themselves as simply Rusnaci, or Rusyns. During the short-lived liberalization period in Czechoslovakia known as the "Prague Spring" of 1968, there was a public outcry for recognizing the people as Rusyns, and for using
local dialects, not Ukrainian or Russian, in the schools. Unlike in Soviet Transcarpathia, the situation in the Prešov Region is still in a state of flux, with the intelligentsia identifying itself as Ukrainian or Slovak, and the people as Rusyns or as Slovaks.

One final word on the situation among Carpatho-Rusyn immigrants in the United States. When they came to America, for the most part before the First World War, they identified themselves as Rusyns, or sometimes as Hungarians, because they came from what was then the Hungarian Kingdom. Later, immigrant leaders—whether newspaper editors or fraternal lodge officers—began to say that they were Carpatho-Russian, and indeed by the 1930’s some Carpatho-Rusyns felt they were like the Great Russians. Others simply called themselves Slavish or Byzantine, terms which for all intents and purposes have no national connotation whatsoever.

Only in the most recent years, in part as a result of the ethnic revival that was associated with the American Bicentennial celebration in 1976, have Subcarpathian immigrants and their descendants begun to designate themselves by their correct historic name—Rusyn. In a real sense, they are becoming aware of their roots and fulfilling the precepts laid down in the opening lines of the most famous poem of Aleksander Duchnovyc: “I was, am, and will remain a Rusyn.”

Paul R. Magocsi

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

With this issue, we continue our survey of recent publications. These are from 1976 and will be listed alphabetically. Many of these works are from Eastern Europe and are difficult to obtain. Most, however, can be found in research libraries of major universities (California, Harvard, Indiana, Yale) or in institutions like the Library of Congress, New York Public Library, and Cleveland Public Library. Local libraries can often obtain these works through interlibrary loan. Titles which can be purchased will be designated as such.

—Editor


On the basis of considerable archeological research undertaken since 1945, the authors of this illustrated booklet provide fresh evidence about the settlement and material culture of people who lived in Subcarpathian Rus’ during the Stone Age as well as during the coming of the Slavs (sixth to thirteenth centuries).


Oleksa Borkanjuk was the most popular native-born Communist leader in Subcarpathian Rus’ during the 1930s. He was executed in 1942 for participating in partisan activity against the Hungarian regime; after the Second World War he was made into a national hero by the Soviet government. This is the first comprehensive collection of his writings and speeches, compiled by the historian Ivan M. Hrančak.


This is the first biography of the Carpatho-Rusyn national leader, Rev. Emilij Kubek (1857–1940), who was born near Svidník and then spend more than 35 years in the United States. The author of this Slovak-language biography mentions in passing Kubek’s writings, including the monumental Old Slavonic-Magyar-Rusyn-German polyglot dictionary (1906), but for some reason he omits any reference to Kubek as a leading participant in the Carpatho-Rusyn community in the United States as well as his role as the most outstanding (1 novel, numerous short stories, poems, and plays) Rusyn-American belletrist.

Duklja, Vol. XXIV, Nos. 1–6 (Prešov, 1976), 80 p. each issue.

This volume of Duklja not only contains new writings by Prešov Region authors (Ivan Hryc’-Duda, Mychajlo Drobnjak, and Fedir Ivančov are especially well represented), but one issue (No. 5) is devoted entirely to recent literature from the neighboring Transcarpathian Oblast’. Among the more analytic studies are: Ju. Baleha’s discussion of recent Transcarpathian literature, M. Boldyžar’s study of the anti-religious campaign of the Communist Party in Subcarpathian Rus’ between 1921 and 1939, and biographical portraits of the talented Prešov Region painter, Dezyderij Myllyj (Desider Milly) and the writers, I. Hryc’-Duda and M. Drobnjak.


This is a collection of letters first published in 1842 and 1844 by the influential Galician Russophile cultural leader, Jakiv Holovac’kyj (1814–1888). All of the letters were written in 1839 and provide a good description of life in the Carpathians at the time. Six of the letters deal with Subcarpathian Rus’ and describe the life of the peasants, shepherds, students, the Mukáčevo castle, Hungarian lords, and the local intellectual leader, M. Lučkaj.
ZNAMENNYJ CHANT IN THE CARPATHO-RUSYN PROSTOPINIE

(Part I)

The Carpatho-Rusyn Slavonic plainchant (prostopinije) is a typical and distinctive feature of Rusyn culture. Where did it come from? No single answer can be given, because the prostopinije is a composite chant system, including elements from various sources. The oldest of these is the znamennyj chant, and it is remarkable that this chant, which has almost disappeared in Great Russian church singing, is preserved in a few still-living traditions: the chant of the Russian Old Believers, the “Ukrainian Chant” of Galicia and other western Ukrainian provinces, and the Carpatho-Rusyn prostopinije.

After the conversion of the rulers of Kievan Rus’ to Christianity (late 10th century), the Greek “Byzantine” chant was adapted to Slavonic texts (we do not know to what extent this may already have been done among the Balkan Slavs). The chant melodies were written with signs called neumes; these were applied to the Slavonic text. The Greeks had two styles of neumes at that time, and these produced two styles also among the Slavs of Kievan Rus’: the “kondakarian” notation was applied to melodies used for kondaks (short hymnic stanzas that vary according to the day, sung at Matins and at the Liturgy) and to several other categories of hymns, mostly sung at Matins; the “stolp” notation was applied to the melodies used for stichiry (hymns accompanying psalm verses, sung at Vesper and Matins), for irmosy and stepenny (based on canticles or psalms from the Bible and sung at Matins), and so on. Manuscripts containing these two forms of chant have survived from the end of the 11th century.

In the 13th century, the Tatars (Mongols) destroyed Kiev and most of the other important centers of Kievan Rus’. The kondakarian chant vanished from use entirely, but the stolp notation and the znamennyj chant to which it was applied flourished, particularly in Belorussia and in Novgorod and the Russian northwest, and were further developed in the 15th century. After the Muscovite takeover of Novgorod and Pskov (late 15th century), the North Russian (Novgorod region) chant tradition was adopted throughout the Grand Duchy of Moscow, developing separately from what we may call the “Ruthenian” chant tradition, that is, the chant employed in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, the Kingdom of Poland, and the Kingdom of Hungary. But the znamennyj chant remained basic to both, and remained essentially the same in both traditions despite some differences in interpretation. The Ruthenian chant was collected in a single volume, the Irmologion, in which the znamennyj chant was the dominant element.

Carpatho-Rusyn cantors continued to write manuscript Irmologian until the second half of the 19th century; in western Ukraine, printed editions of the Irmologion began to appear in 1700. The chant remained essentially the same; the biggest change was that beginning around 1600 the neumatic notation was abandoned for notation with a 5-line staff and square note heads. Bokšaj’s Cerkovnoje prostopinije (Church Plainchant), first published in 1906, employs modern notation with round note heads; most of the irmosy, and a number of other chants, are still sung to the traditional znamennyj melodies in this collection, although Bokšaj does not refer to them by that name. So the Carpatho-Rusyns have preserved the old znamennyj chant down to the present as the oldest element in their traditional prostopinije.

A znamennyj chant melody from a Carpatho-Rusyn manuscript Irmologian of the late 18th century. Bars have been added to mark off the musical phrases; these same phrases are found in many other melodies of Hlas 1.
The melodies of the znamennyj chant are organized into 8 tones or modes (hlasy). Each chant text is assigned to one of these hlasy, and must be sung to a melody of that tone. The melodies are composed by the same method used by Byzantine chant; they are built up out of standardized melodic phrases. Each hlas contains a large number—up to several hundred—of these phrases. The melody applied to a given text is composed by applying to each phrase of the text a melodic phrase, chosen from the total number of melodic phrases of the prescribed hlas. The melodic phrase can be shortened or expanded, depending on the number of syllables in the text. The rhythm of the melodic phrase is free, in the sense that it cannot be divided into bars or measures; there is no time-signature. Nevertheless, there is a definite rhythmic structure; long notes are balanced by groups of two short notes, or some multiple of two, so that there is a definite “tactus”—unlike the usual interpretation of Gregorian chant, in which all notes are given an equal rhythmic value.

A skillful cantor, even in the 20th century, will know many znamennyj melodic phrases. When the chant books were still written in neumes, every cantor had to know many hundreds by heart.

The impression made by the znamennyj chant upon the hearer is often described in terms of great nobility, objectivity, and dignity, combined with an ability to express and enhance the emotions evoked by the text. This is no doubt a major reason why so many people find the prostopinije both movingly beautiful and profoundly peaceful.

(To be continued)

Stephen Reynolds
University of Oregon

FOLK LIFE AND LORE

One of the most important, nutritious, and beloved foods for our grandparents and great-grandparents in the old country was the potato. Potatoes were prepared in a variety of ways, but one of the favorites was the potato cake, sometimes called simply baba and probably known by other names in different villages. The baba can be served at both lenten and non-lenten meals, as an accompaniment for a main dish of meat or fish, along with a tossed green salad, or as a tasty snack by itself. Try it using the following recipe:

5 potatoes
1 onion
2 eggs
½ pound prunes or
½ pound bacon fried and crumbled
3 tablespoons flour
salt and pepper

Grate potatoes and onion, add eggs, chopped prunes or bacon bits (or neither), flour, salt and pepper to taste. Mix well. Put in greased pan 9x10x2 or 9x13x2. Bake in 350° oven for 15 minutes, rub shortening (butter or margarine) on top, and put back in oven to bake one hour longer. When baked, cut in squares and serve, like potato pancakes, with butter, sour cream, or apple sauce.

RESEARCH IN PROGRESS

Before leaving New York City, I had an opportunity to make the acquaintance of an interesting, warm, and energetic man, Dr. Herman Dicker, a retired Army Chaplain and presently the Head of Reader Services at the Jewish Theological Seminary. Like many of us who have roots in Subcarpathian Rus’, Dr. Dicker possesses a vital interest in the old country, and particularly in the history and life of the Jewish community there. His own family is from the Jasinja area. Dr. Dicker’s interest began long ago, but was recently fueled by questions concerning genealogy raised by members of his family. The task of finding answers to these questions fell to Dr. Dicker.

While in the process of exploring his family’s genealogy, he found that he was tapping quite a rich topic, and decided to expand his work into a book. In the process of being completed, Dr. Dicker’s book is entitled Jews from the Carpathians, and is a potpourri of information. It contains a basic historical outline, excerpts from Jewish literature and folklore from the area, photographs, maps, and interviews. Dr. Dicker told me that one interview cited in the book took place last spring when he spent an enjoyable evening reminiscing with the Honorable Julian Revay (recently deceased), a man who was much respected in Jewish circles in Subcarpathian Rus’.

We look forward to the publication of this book which should in many ways complement the work which has already been done on the history and culture of Subcarpathian Rus’.

Patricia Krafcik
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