

# CARPATHO-RUSYN AMERICAN

---

A Newsletter on Carpatho-Rusyn Ethnic Heritage

---



## FROM THE EDITOR

As announced in the summer issue, this fall issue is special. In addition to the biography and recent publications, it is minus some of the sections usually found in our newsletter. This issue deals with an article written as a book review of the most comprehensive study done up to now on the history of Subcarpathian Rus'. The article is relevant to us because it brings into question our interests and concerns. I feel it necessary to offer first some background information before presenting excerpts from the review and the author's response.

The historian, whether writing on contemporary or past events, chooses from a vast number of facts and describes them as he perceives them. His selection of facts and conclusions are influenced by his education and intelligence, and also by preconceived patterns of thought or beliefs, some so deeply engrained that he himself may be unaware of their power on his thinking. This explanation is simply meant to indicate how difficult it is to write about history. The processes involved in such writing are eminently complex, and particularly when they concern an area and people characterized by years of foreign domination and struggles about identity and where a variety of forces are in conflict.

Publications on the history of Subcarpathian Rus' provide a case in point. They are surprisingly numerous, written over decades and in many languages. Some publications are based on good scholarship; many, however, range from mediocre to bad, depending on factors such as the kinds of sources available to the writer, the writer's own abilities and biases, and so on. A large number obviously express exclusive views of one or another of the various political or religious persuasions prevalent in Subcarpathian Rus', and they must be read with great caution by the conscientious historian as well as by the layperson seeking reliable information.

The first solidly-trained modern scholar to examine the complex history of the nationality question in Subcarpathian Rus' is Dr. Paul R. Magocsi of the University of Toronto. His book, *The Shaping of a National Identity: Subcarpathian Rus' 1848–1948*, first emerged as a doctoral dissertation at Princeton University, and after some ten years of additional research and writing at Harvard University, it was published by Harvard University Press in 1978. Now in its second printing, it has been the subject of numerous reviews from all over the world. As with all good scholarly works, the study has been both praised and criticized, although an examination of informed opinion in the reviews shows more of the former than the latter.

The most extensive and detailed review is of particular importance to us. It appeared in *Sučasnist'* (Vol. 20, no. 6, June 1980), the leading Ukrainian-language journal of literature and politics published in the West, and is entitled "Sproba novitnoji istoriji Zakarpattja" (An Attempt at a Modern History of Transcarpathia). Its author, Loyola University professor of political science Vasyl Markus, is a native of Subcarpathian Rus'. He lauds Magocsi's book as "solid in breadth, scholarly apparatus and methodology," asserting that it shows "exemplary scholarly exactitude" and "a proper assessment of facts and sources." He notes Magocsi's "relatively generous measure of objectivity" and stresses his use of "more sources than any other who has researched this topic."

From here on, Markus discusses what he judges as

weaknesses in the work. He questions the "scholarly schema" of the book which he perceives as Magocsi's premise that the Subcarpathian Rusyns were and are a separate entity for whom the question of national allegiance could have had any of three solutions (autochthonous Rusyn, Rusynian, Ukrainian) until the mid-20th century. Markus disagrees with Magocsi's use of nomenclature such as "Rusyn" for Subcarpathians, including some today, and "Ukrainophile" for Subcarpathians who began recognizing themselves as Ukrainians in the period under discussion. He criticizes Magocsi's examination of Subcarpathian Rusyn social and historical development and of the process of national self-determination, insisting that Magocsi should have stressed more what he, Markus, defines as "already national consciousness" among the Transcarpathian and greater East Slavic community long before 1848.

Markus then raises several minor issues, and finally discusses the Rusyn-American situation today, including the existence of the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center and the *Carpatho-Rusyn American* newsletter. He confronts the issue of Rusyn-Ukrainian relations in the United States, warning that Rusyn-Americans must recognize themselves as Ukrainians in order to continue to exist with an ethnic identity.

Magocsi has written a response to the Markus review, entitled "Misreading History: A Reply," which will appear as well in *Sučasnist'* (No. 7, 1981). Magocsi denies that he had any preconceived notions about the "separateness" of Subcarpathian Rusyns, and he reiterates that it is simply an objective historical fact that the Subcarpathian Rusyns indeed had a choice of national orientation in the century 1848–1948. He also denies the validity of thinking which says that because Subcarpathian Rusyns (especially in Soviet Transcarpathia) are Ukrainians today, they always were so in the past. His approach, which he insists ought to be the historian's proper approach, is a *tabula rasa*; that is, "the historian applies his analytical tools to a situation without any preconceived notions."

As for nomenclature, Magocsi defends his use of the term "Rusyn" by stating that "the name used to describe any group should be that employed by the group itself." The national awakener, Aleksander Duchnovyč, and others, used the term "Subcarpathian Rusyns" (Podkarpatskí Rusyný) and that is sufficient support for its usage. Many of today's immigrants from Rusyn areas in Czechoslovakia, Magocsi asserts, identify themselves as Rusnaks. With "Ukrainophile" (as with Russophile or Rusynophile), Magocsi insists that there is nothing insulting intended: Ukraino-, Russo-, Rusyno- being a national prefix, -phile a suffix meaning "supporter of." He simply chose this terminology as the most appropriate when analyzing conflicting national ideologies and their proponents.

In like manner, Magocsi addresses each of Markus's arguments, including the latter's last section on the "ideological aspect of the work." While it would be impossible for us to publish in full both Markus's lengthy review and Magocsi's lengthy response, the final sections of each are reproduced here *verbatim* because of their immediate relevance for us in the C-RRC and as writers and readers of the newsletter. Both passages speak for themselves. Readers are welcome to respond with their impressions. Let us hope that through such discussions we may come to a better understanding of ourselves, our history, and our close Slavic kin.

## ALEKSANDER PAVLOVYČ (1819–1900)

Next to Aleksander Duchnovyč, the “national awakener of the Carpatho-Rusyn people,” Aleksander Pavlovyč is perhaps the best-known and most popular Carpatho-Rusyn poet. He was born in Čarno, a small mountain village near Bardejov in the Prešov Region of what is today northeastern Slovakia. His father, Ivan Pavlovyč, a Greek Catholic priest, died when Aleksander was only four; his mother followed her husband to the grave a few years later. Thus, the young boy was left an orphan in the care of relatives.

He was first sent to live with his maternal uncle north of the Carpathians in Galicia. There Aleksander began school and learned German and Polish. In 1834, at age 16, he returned to the Hungarian Kingdom, and after completing his Latin and Magyar secondary schooling in four different cities, he entered the Theological Seminary in the western Slovak town of Trnava. It was during his stay in Trnava (1843–1847) that Pavlovyč became acquainted with the Slovak national movement under the leadership of L’udovít Štúr. As a result of this experience, he felt the need to work for the interests of his own Carpatho-Rusyn people and in the best way he knew—through literature.

In 1847, Pavlovyč returned to the Prešov Region. He was ordained a Greek Catholic priest and was assigned to work in the episcopal offices in Prešov, where he became close friends with the already culturally-active Duchnovyč. These were times of change, and one year later—1848—revolution broke out in Austria-Hungary. Pavlovyč greeted the revolution, especially because it finally liberated the Carpatho-Rusyn masses from serfdom. During the immediate post-revolutionary years, Pavlovyč worked with Duchnovyč to establish the first Rusyn cultural organization, to publish the first Rusyn literary almanacs and other publications, and later to serve as secretary of the society of St. John the Baptist, founded in Prešov in 1862 to help support the education of young students.

As a Greek Catholic priest, Pavlovyč spent most of his years in two Carpatho-Rusyn parishes—in Beloveža, near Bardejov, from 1851 to 1863, and then in Svidník, from 1864 until his death. It was during this half century of close contact with his people that Pavlovyč learned to experience the trials and tribulations of Carpatho-Rusyn life, an experience he then recorded so vividly in his lyric poetry. Most of his poetry is in fact filled with themes of economic hardship, starvation, and sadness over the fact that such conditions continued to exist even after the revolution of 1848 and that they forced his people to leave their homeland, especially bound for America. As he wrote in one poem, “A Song”:

There where once houses were many  
Today they are empty, everywhere is empty,  
The land and meadows have remained  
And wild bushes have grown  
through everything.

To help instill pride in his people, Pavlovyč also wrote a whole series of patriotic poems filled with expressions of love for the Beskyd Mountains (a range of the Carpathians) and especially for the local Makovycja region—the area between Bardejov and Svidník. In his “Song of the Subcarpathian Rusyn,” Pavlovyč addressed his homeland (*Rus’ Podkarpatska*):

Your land is pure,  
Even if it does not give nourishment.



But your sense of love  
Is rich and fruitful.  
And in the faith of your fathers  
You are strong in deed,  
Not simply in word!

Despite his prolific pen, Pavlovyč succeeded in publishing only one small book of poems (1860) during his lifetime. Instead, most of his works appeared on the pages of local newspapers, as well as in publications for Austria-Hungary’s Rusyns that were printed in Vienna and in neighbouring Galicia. However, since 1920, three collections of Pavlovyč’s writings have appeared. And finally, in 1969, on the 150th anniversary of his birth, a statue of the “Makovycja Nightingale”—as Pavlovyč came to be known—was erected in the main square in Svidník. A fitting tribute to the memory of a man who worked so hard to capture the essence of late nineteenth-century Carpatho-Rusyn life.

## AN ATTEMPT AT A MODERN HISTORY OF TRANSCARPATHIA

*The following is the entire last section of the review article by Vasył Markus in Sučasnist', No. 6, 1980, pp. 120–122. —Editor*

Notwithstanding the solidity of his research and the sound scholarly methodology that Magocsi applies, the political and ideological underpinnings of his work are clearly evident, and the intention of demonstrating the separate identity of the "Subcarpathian Rusyns," or, at least, of emphasizing the lost opportunity of this ethnic group to become a separate people, runs like a red thread throughout the work.

Although the author admits that this opportunity is past for Transcarpathia, nevertheless he attempts to adapt his historiographic schema and conception to the possibilities for ethnic development of the Transcarpathian immigrant population in America. In Magocsi's case this is not merely a theoretical effort. Along with a group of the younger third or fourth generation intelligentsia of the Transcarpathian immigration in the USA he founded the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center, which has already issued several publications of unequal merit. The founders obtained the sympathy and support of the church leadership (the hierarchy and some priests), proposing an alternative to the ethnic-nationalist ideology—an autonomous Rusyn cultural and national consciousness in counterbalance to the Russophile (which endured for a time among the American Transcarpathians), the Ukrainian (which has only an insignificant influence), but especially in counterbalance to the non-national "Byzantine" orientation which, moreover, has quite strongly dominated Catholic Church circles over the past twenty-five years and spelled complete loss of ethnic identity for this group.

This social and intellectual current required a theoretical basis in history, culture and linguistics. Whether Magocsi wanted this or not, when he began working on the book under review, it potentially (along with other publications) provided and provides such a basis for the Rusyn renaissance in America. We suppose that in time Magocsi quite consciously entered this movement and accepted the role of its intellectual mentor. There is no reason to see anything wrong in this, and the author has no need to deny such a practical purpose, as he occasionally does for some reason. For how else can one explain extrascholarly activities such as the compiling of the dialect phrasebook *Let's Speak Rusyn*?

The author of this article, as a Ukrainian community activist of Transcarpathian origin, sincerely sympathizes with the efforts of Magocsi and his associates to revive the ethnic consciousness of the greatly denationalized Transcarpathian immigration in the USA and to give them, in addition to a "Byzantine" or "Orthodox" religious consciousness, a "Rusyn" national consciousness. Whether this succeeds in greater or lesser degree, it will still be an advance on the ethnic nihilism of the preceding "Byzantine" generation of activists. I personally think that it would be far better for the group itself in America, as well as for their relatives in Transcarpathia, if some sort of Rusyn ethos were preserved here. From the tone and content of the publications and statements of people connected with the Center it would

seem that Magocsi and his associates are preparing to revive this Rusyn ethos upon an undefined but popular basis, following in the footsteps of the populist activists of the twentieth century.

But the author of this article has his reservations about this initiative. First, one must recognize that this will be an attempt to do something only for those of Transcarpathian descent in America, who, regardless of their theoretical numbers (approximately 500,000 persons of Transcarpathian origin), can provide only a small number of new members for this new movement. Second, this movement cannot have a significant influence on the "old country" either now or in the future. Within the Ukrainian SSR today, Transcarpathia has quite clearly defined itself as part of the Ukrainian ethos. This has also occurred in the Prešov Region, but, unfortunately, with great losses. Thus, the Rusyn movement in the USA, spiritually and conceptually torn from its roots, is finally losing its *raison d'être*. It will not be able to draw the desired spiritual support or replenish its numbers from the fatherland if it is alienated from the Ukrainian ethos.

The Rusyn Bačka and Srim regions (where the old term "Rusyn" has been preserved among 25,000 Rusyns) cannot be substitute fatherlands, because such a hybrid group cannot inspire the whole movement. In addition, the ideology of this "ethnic group" in Yugoslavia is not at all what Magocsi conceives it to be, if only in this particular work. What exists there is a regional identity, whose bearers more or less affirm some kind of connection with Ukrainianism and Ukrainian culture. It would be pointless to adopt the written language of the inhabitants of Bačka in the USA, for it would be even less comprehensible than literary Ukrainian or Slovak. Also, it has little in common with the dialects spoken by modern Transcarpathian immigrants. The language of *Let's Speak Rusyn* is different from the language of *Ruske Slovo (Rusyn Word)* in Novi Sad. In addition to the local speech variants that Magocsi has proposed, we could propose another dozen on the basis of Transcarpathian dialects. The question then arises on what basis could a Rusyn culture in America be built?!

It makes no sense to create something contrary to the processes and effects of the last sixty years in Transcarpathia, for life itself condemns such an initiative to failure. Still, such a movement could have a more promising outlook if its supporters did not present it as an alternative to the "Ukrainianism" of Transcarpathia, but instead found themselves a niche as an autonomous regional unit within this larger conception. As a regional variant, even if the old and respected names "Rusyn" and "rus'kyj" are retained, the ethnic consciousness of Transcarpathians in America can properly develop in the forms of a written dialect literature and the cultivation of local traditions and folklore. However, they would have to find their place and value within the greater Ukrainian national conception. In fact, Transcarpathian populism in the Czechoslovak period took this form and, by means of its own natural dynamic, merged with the general Ukrainian process. The unification of Ukrainian lands facilitated and accelerated this development, but did not determine it. Ukrainian elements were already present in the popular movement itself and in the cultural elements of Transcarpathian regionalism.

Regardless of its overemphases and shortcomings, Magocsi's book could assist the development of such a

realistic orientation. The unbiased reader is not obliged to accept the author's alternative as stated in the book, where it is subtly argued in analyses and conclusions. He may equally well come to the conclusion that was stated above, that is, he may become convinced that the Transcarpathian Ukrainians have travelled the complex route to national consciousness, which the Right-Bank Ukrainians and the Galicians completed somewhat earlier, and that the possibility of creating a separate people from only one of its territorial branches was not realized, and that there is no chance of its being realized today.

Men of good will and clear understanding, especially those who do not read history from the standpoint of pious hopes, should come to understand that the only possibility of countering complete denationalization is to reconcile the branches of the same people in America, psychologically

alienated from one another for centuries, and to find a formula for uniting the all-Ukrainian community with regional particularity, for only this can assure the relative endurance of any ethnicity at all in the Transcarpathian immigration. Only by means of this bridge—in community with the rest of the Ukrainian immigration in America—can Transcarpathians develop their powers and potential, improve their condition, strengthen our great and united community in the USA, and serve their wider and narrower communities in the fatherland. Without this, there may still be intermittent bursts of effort by idealistic individuals, there may be good ideas and small initiatives, but there will be no great movement, no profound development capable of involving all concerned to the depths of their being; there will be no secure future for the Transcarpathian community as an ethnocultural entity.

Vasyl Markus

---

## MISREADING HISTORY: A REPLY

*The following is the last section of the response by Paul R. Magocsi in Sučasnist', No. 7, 1981. —Editor*

The last part of Professor Markus's review article is entitled: "the ideological aspect of the work." In essence, this section has nothing to do with the text of the *Shaping of a National Identity*, but rather with what Professor Markus perceives to be the impact of the book on the Carpatho-Rusyn community in the United States. According to him, my book and other publications have supposedly provided "a basis for a Rusyn renaissance in America," and I have become the "intellectual mentor" of that "movement."

First of all, Professor Markus has his chronology wrong. *The Shaping of a National Identity* was conceived first as a doctoral dissertation as long ago as 1968, and the text of the revised and expanded manuscript was basically completed by 1975. Only after that did other works on the subject, both of a popular and scholarly nature, begin to be produced. The point is that the *Shaping of a National Identity* was conceived and completed before the recent "Rusyn renaissance in America" began.

Secondly, Professor Markus' use of the term "movement" is, to say the least, an overstatement. In reality, there are no more than a handful of people who, through the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center (a non-profit corporation registered in the State of New York) make it possible that publications about the homeland be made available to members of the Rusyn-American community. To already existing scholarly studies have been added a few popular works: two versions of a Rusyn-English phrasebook (the Prešov Region and Transcarpathian editions—not one as Professor Markus incorrectly asserts), and since 1978 a quarterly newsletter, the *Carpatho-Rusyn American*, edited by Professor Patricia A. Krafcik of the University of Pittsburgh. And what is the purpose of "this movement"? Simply to fulfill the needs of those Americans of Carpatho-Rusyn descent who have been infected by the post-1975 "roots fever" and who want to know something about the origins of their parents.

Professor Markus applauds these efforts, especially since they provide the only realistic alternative to the Russophile or the de-ethnicized Byzantine or Orthodox religious identities that previously dominated and unfortunately still predominate among most members of the group. However, he criticizes such efforts because they are limited to the group in the United States and cannot have any impact on the "old country," where for the most part a Ukrainian identity has come about. He also assumes (without any basis) that the Rusyn movement in the United States, as he calls it, is based on the experience of Rusyns in Yugoslavia. His prognosis: "It makes no sense to create something contrary to the processes and results of the last sixty years in Transcarpathia, for life itself condemns such an initiative to failure."

Here Professor Markus the critic has become prophet. But like his analysis of the *Shaping of a National Identity*, which we have seen is full of extrapolations based upon misinterpretations and misreadings, so, too, are his prophetic predictions completely misplaced.

Indeed, the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center is by design concerned exclusively with Carpatho-Rusyns in the United States. It is only the frustrated émigré politician or intellectual dreamer who thinks that the highly verbal but essentially powerless diaspora in the West can have any serious impact on developments in the homeland. And to his criticism that the "Rusyn movement in the USA, spiritually and conceptually torn from its roots, is finally losing its *raison d'être*," I can only respond that there are other groups who have survived in the United States without any spiritual support from the homeland.

Where, one might legitimately ask, are the homelands of the Acadians, Amish, Germans from Russia, Pennsylvania Germans, or for that matter Yiddish-speaking Jews? These have either never existed in Europe or have been destroyed. Nor do I make such an analogy simply to justify the possibility for survival of the supposedly isolated existence of Carpatho-Rusyns in the United States. Although Professor Markus correctly asserts that the Subcarpathian homeland has since World War II become part of the Ukrainian ethos, it is still a fact that a good number of immigrants arriving

in recent years (as from Czechoslovakia during 1968) proclaim themselves as Rusnaks, and they often bring this message to the Byzantine Catholic or Orthodox communities which they join. Thus, the Rusyn-American community is neither as cut off nor as nationally out of step with the homeland as Professor Markus implies.

Finally, Professor Markus talks about our having created something which will eventually fail. This self-assured statement is not only incorrect, it is insulting as well. The Carpatho-Rusyn community has existed in the United States since the last decades of the nineteenth century. At least during the first half century of that existence, it established several vibrant fraternal organizations, churches, schools, cultural societies, sports clubs, and publications. All of these were founded well before the *Shaping of a National Identity* and the post-1975 "renaissance" ever came onto the scene, and many still exist today, often in a financially secure situation. Moreover, from the very outset, these Rusyn-American institutions were all actively estranged from the Ukrainian community in the United States. Professor Markus knows very well the reality of such a situation that was created long ago—a situation in which Rusyn Americans and Ukrainian Americans live basically in the same places but have little or no contact with each other.

But why? Ukrainian Americans generally believe that Rusyn immigrants remained Rusyns (that is, they did not become conscious Ukrainians), because they came from a culturally and economically backward region, and as a result they did not have the educational wherewithal to realize the value of belonging to a larger Ukrainian ethos. Even those who obtained an education invariably became Magyarized, and that any subsequent talk of a Rusyn identity could only be considered a latent but camouflaged form of Magyarism. It is in this context that the last of *Svoboda's* Ten Commandments published in that Ukrainian-American newspaper as early as April 20, 1894, read: "Do not seek the purse of the haughty Magyarophiles because it is empty; . . . neither seek their bigotry nor their fox-like shrewdness." In subsequent years, especially after World War II, Rusyn Americans came to hold a low place within the Ukrainian pecking order. Many Ukrainian Americans who know or care at all about the issue feel varying degrees of sorrow, even pity, for their Subcarpathian brethren, whom they consider to have lost or never obtained a Ukrainian identity, to be ignorant of their true origins, and to speak, if at all, a corrupt dialectal form of Ukrainian.

For their part, Rusyn Americans resent what they consider Ukrainian condescension toward them. Such condescension more often than not takes the form of flaunting titles like *pan doktor*, or *pan inžener*, or *pan magister*, and of "correcting" Rusyns when they speak (as if the Galician "Polish lisp" is in any way a more attractive form of Ukrainian). The Rusyn's resentment is all the more pronounced, since as part of an older immigration which functions more easily (financially as well as psychologically) in American society, they find it difficult to accept admonitions from Ukrainian *panove* with inflated titles from Europe.

It is unfortunate, but true, that the psychological gap between the two groups is deep. And what does Professor Markus propose? That the Rusyn-American community

become aware of an ethnic identity (even if they call it Rusyn, or Carpatho-Rusyn) and that they then find "themselves a niche as an autonomous regional unit within this larger Ukrainian conception."

To be sure, Rusyn and Ukrainian immigrants and their descendants in the United States should not remain separated to the degree that they have in the past and are still at the present. But for separation to be overcome, mutual respect on both sides has to be the basic precondition. Mutual respect, however, precludes putdowns about the so-called Rusyn lack of national consciousness or incorrect use of Ukrainian. It requires instead understanding and an effort at learning and teaching each other. The Ukrainian community, at least through its leading newspapers and journals (*Svoboda*, *Ameryka*, *The Ukrainian Weekly*, *Sučasnist'*), should inform its readers of activity in the Carpatho-Rusyn community, especially if in theory they consider the group part of the "larger Ukrainian ethos." For instance, the Ukrainian press has not even once mentioned the existence of the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center and its publication activity. Hardly a good omen for mutual respect and understanding.

And people like Professor Markus do have an important role to play. He is a representative of that portion of immigrants from Subcarpathian Rus' who after World War II came to the West with a fully formed Ukrainian national consciousness. Besides Professor Markus, that group includes individuals like Dr. Joseph Danko, Professor John Fizer, Dr. Vincent Shandor, Professor Peter G. Stercho, and Michael Terpak, all of whom have played and continue to play leading roles in the Ukrainian-American community. These talented individuals experienced firsthand the crisis of national identity in the Subcarpathian homeland and, theoretically, they should have understood the problems of their people in the immigration.

But what have they done for the Rusyn-American community? Nothing. If they were so convinced of the national identity of the Subcarpathian immigrants, why didn't they attempt to work with the group? And today, why don't they make their views known through organs like the *Carpatho-Rusyn American*? Instead, they have associated solely with Ukrainian Americans and have nothing to do with the Rusyn-American community. And it certainly does little good to pontificate on the pages of *Sučasnist'*, as Professor Markus has done, about how the recent efforts of the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center to create a basis for mutual understanding are, as he says, condemned by "life itself. . . to failure."

At the outset I suggested that the article by Professor Markus was a disappointment. It was a disappointment not only because of his misinterpretation and misreading of the *Shaping of a National Identity*, it was even more disappointing because in the end it revealed the degree to which Professor Markus the prophet is so alienated from that about which he is prophesizing. With regard to the Rusyn-Ukrainian issue in the United States, it is a shame that after almost three decades in this country, Professor Markus has learned so little.

Paul R. Magocsi

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS 1977 (continued)

Mayer, M. "Adatok a századforduló ruszin (kárpatukrán) értelmiségének elmagyarosodásához" (Data on the Magyarization of the Rusyn/Carpatho-Ukrainian Intelligentsia at the Turn of the Century), *Történelmi szemle*, XX, 2 (Budapest, 1977), pp. 260–279.

This short but comprehensive article written in Hungarian sums up the extensive scholarship of Mária Mayer, an academician in Budapest who has studied in depth the activity of the pro-Hungarian, or Magyarone, Rusyn intelligentsia active at the end of the nineteenth and outset of the twentieth centuries. She discusses the establishment of a Greek Catholic parish in Budapest and several church related and student organizations, all of which were set up by Rusyn leaders with the express purpose of assimilating the group into Hungarian culture.

Mayer, Mária. *Kárpatukrán (ruszin) politikai és társadalmi törekvések 1860–1910* (Carpatho-Ukrainian/Rusyn Political and Social Aspirations between 1860 and 1910). Budapest: Akadémiai kiadó, 1977, 256 p.

This is the first book-length study by the contemporary Hungarian academician, Mária Mayer, who is a specialist on Carpatho-Rusyn society during the last half century of Hungarian rule. Based on archival sources, Mayer discusses the little-known activity of the Rusyn intelligentsia in Budapest, most of whom favored assimilation of their people with Magyars. The role of the church and relations with Carpatho-Rusyn immigrants in the United States is also discussed. It is a pity that this important study has no résumé in a foreign language and hopefully it can be translated into English.

Mayer, Mária. "Some Aspects of the Development of the National Movement Amongst the Ruthenes of Hungary (Sub-Carpathian Ruthenia) 1849–1914," in Keith Hitchens, ed. *Studies in East European Social History*, Vol. I (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1977), pp. 177–191.

This short article is especially valuable in that it is the only work in English by the contemporary Hungarian academician, Mária Mayer, who specializes in Carpatho-Rusyn developments during the late 19th century. Here she focuses on the nationality issue and the activity of the competing Russophile, Rusynophile, and Magyarone tendencies of the local intelligentsia.

*Naukovyj zbirnyk Muzeju Ukrajins'koji Kul'tury u Svydnyku* (Scholarly Anthology of the Museum of Ukrainian Culture in Svidník), Vol. VIII (Svidník, Bratislava, and Prešov, 1977), 420 p.

It is heartening to know that since 1976 the *Naukovyj zbirnyk* has begun to appear more regularly. This issue includes 18 articles (in Ukrainian, Slovak, and Russian) on the history, culture, ethnography, and language of Rusyns living in eastern Slovakia. Among the more important contributions are I. A. Slepcev's description of the Russian tsarist army south of the Carpathians in 1915; M. Sopoliga's illustrated study of architectural design in traditional village houses; and Zuzana Hanudel's analysis of Carpatho-Rusyn

terminology for household utensils (including 16 linguistic maps). The volume is indexed.

*Nova dumka* (New Idea), Vol. VI, Nos. 13–16 (Vukovar, 1977), 144, 112, 104, and 120 p.

This year *Nova dumka* came out with four issues, instead of its regular two. Among the more significant contributions are: V. Byl'nja's study of Subcarpathia's incorporation into Czechoslovakia in 1919; a Vojvodinian-Rusyn language translation of Ivan Franko's 1896 tract against Magyarization ("Y my u Evropy"); O. Milanović-Jović's analysis (in Croatian) or Rusyn ecclesiastical art in Ruski Krstur; and O. Myšanyč's study (in Croatian) of Subcarpathian book culture during the 16th to 18th centuries.

Palek, Vasyľ V. et al. *Imeni Komunista Lokoty* (In the Name of the Communist Lokota.) Užhorod: Karpaty, 1977, 112 p.

Ivan Prokopovyč Lokota (1884–1942) was a member of the Subcarpathian Communist Party during the interwar period and senator from the region to the Czechoslovak parliament. He was a native of Velykyj Byčkov, where a chemical factory was built already in 1896. This study includes a brief biography of Lokota followed by a history of the factory from its establishment to the present.

Pekar, Athanasius. "Historical Background of the Carpatho-Ruthenians in America," *Ukrajins'kyj istoryk*, Vol. XIII, no. 1–4 (New York, Toronto and Munich, 1976), pp. 87–102 and Vol. XIV, no. 1–2 (1977), pp. 70–84.

This essay concentrates on the early years of the immigration, c. 1890s to 1924. The author argues that Carpatho-Rusyn and Galician Ukrainians formed one ethnolinguistic community and that only the intransigence of some Carpatho-Rusyn leaders and the intrigues of the Hungarian government forced a permanent division between the two groups.

Pekar, Athanasius. *Our Martyred Bishop Romzha (1911–1947)*. Pittsburgh, Pa.: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1977, 32 p.

This latest pamphlet by Father Pekar is a sympathetic and moving account of the life of the last Greek Catholic Bishop of the Diocese of Mukačevo, who died in mysterious circumstances after the Soviet regime had come to power.

---

## OUR FRONT COVER

Statue of Aleksander Duchnovyč, Prešov, Czechoslovakia. This statue, by the Carpatho-Rusyn sculptress Olena Mondyč (1800–1900), was erected in 1933 on the main square at the entrance to the inner city of Prešov. It stood on its original spot until 1977, when it was removed as part of a renovation program to construct a new Slovak National Theater. In 1980, it was reerected, this time on a square overlooking the Torysa River in Prešov. Photographed by Anton Žižka, 1981.

Non-Profit Org.  
U.S. Postage  
PAID  
Madison, Wisconsin  
Permit No. 974

## THE CARPATHO-RUSYN AMERICAN

---

A Newsletter on Carpatho-Rusyn Ethnic Heritage

Published four times a year by the  
Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center, Inc.

Editor: **Patricia A. Krafcik**  
Artistic Editor: **Miloš Janovsky**

Communications concerning content should be sent to:

Patricia A. Krafcik, Editor  
Department of Slavic Languages  
University of Pittsburgh  
Loeffler Building 120  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260

Annual subscription: \$5.00  
To subscribe, send check or money order to:

Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center  
355 Delano Place  
Fairview, New Jersey 07022