FROM THE EDITOR

In the present issue, we are continuing a series of commentaries in response to the Markus-Magocsi discussion excerpted in the Carpatho-Rusyn American, Vol. IV, No. 3 (Fall 1981) as it applied to the activities of the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center. As in the last issue, our writers are again of extremely varied backgrounds, professions, and views. George Y. Shevelov is an emigre from Soviet Ukraine, a brilliant scholar, a former editor-in-chief of the important Ukrainian journal Suchasnist’, a professor-emeritus of Columbia University, and president of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the United States. In his commentary, he concentrates particularly on Carpatho-Rusyns in the homeland, offering both scholarly and personal observations. As a linguist, he perceives language as the most important factor in defining the ethnicity of Carpatho-Rusyns as Ukrainian. At the same time, he acknowledges the significant cultural divergence of the Transcarpathian area from the mainstream Ukraine. Finally, he encourages friendly contacts and cooperation between Ukrainians and Rusyns in the context of the United States.

Our second writer, Rev. Evan Lowig, is a recent graduate of St. Vladimir’s Orthodox Seminary in New York. He considers Ukrainians and Carpatho-Rusyns at best “cousins.” His views are based on extensive contacts with Ukrainian and Carpatho-Rusyn immigrants and their second and third generation descendents in Canada and the United States. He emphasizes the quality of change in a people’s national identity and warns against any view which states that nationality is “eternal and unchanging.” Like Professor Shevelov, Rev. Lowig is in favor of an openminded dialogue between the Ukrainian and Carpatho-Rusyn communities.

Our third writer, Orestes J. Mihaly, Assistant Attorney General of the State of New York, was himself the subject of a feature story in the C-RA, Vol. III, No. 1 (Spring 1980). In the present issue, he offers a brief, powerful statement on the Markus-Magocsi discussion and on the issues which it concerns. He insists on the “separate identity” of the Carpatho-Rusyn immigrants and their descendents which survived, although not without losses, the pressures of surrounding Slavic groups in immigration.

The call of Orestes Mihaly’s statement is also echoed in another letter we received not long ago. Margaret Murvay, a subscriber to the newsletter from Berlin Center, Ohio, sent a donation of $25 to the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center and accompanied the gift with a note expressing simply and beautifully what so many of our readers have experienced. While her letter is not an intentional commentary on the Markus-Magocsi exchange, we thought it enlightening to consider her remarks in the context of the diverse views we have been presenting. Margaret Murvay lived in Subcarpathian Rus’ until a few years before the outbreak of World War II. Unlike the majority of Rusyn immigrants who are from today’s Slovakia, Margaret comes from a region which became part of Soviet Ukraine after the war. Her identity, she says, is Rusyn — “Rusnak.” Her “national anthem” is well-known among Rusyn immigrants in this country, whether their roots are in Rusyn areas of Subcarpathia or eastern Slovakia. Yes, her letter is a kind of commentary on the issues of the Markus-Magocsi discussion, so we print it here along with a warm thank you for her generous gift.

Dear Editor:

Thank you for giving me roots.

I was born in Chust, Marmaros, Subcarpathia, in today’s Soviet Union. My dear late father immigrated to Canada in 1929, and my mother and I left our homeland in 1934. I was raised in Sudbury, Ontario, Canada; met my husband during World War II; and have lived in Ohio for the past 35 years.

In Chust, I attended the first two grades of school. Although we were part of the Czechoslovak Republic, I remember being taught the Russian [Cyrillic] alphabet and singing the national anthem that went “Podkarpatkski Rusny.” My parents spoke Rusnak and related Slavic languages, as well as fluent Hungarian. Since there were practically no Rusnaks in the Sudbury area, I found it difficult to relate to any of the various nationalities that dominated our ethnic neighborhood. I used to wonder, as I grew up, why my family or I were unable to form strong ties to any of the clubs or groups that organized around us.

My grandparents and parents were forced to live with many changes of government, laws, and languages. That is why they left their native land, and in the moving lost the security of belonging.

The seeds of our ancestors are planted within all our souls. Time and age nourishes them, and in the growing we learn about the present, but yearn for the past. Through much reading and listening, I have come to know that the Carpatho-Rusyns are a gentle people who love God, are very generous, and are always ready to help any who ask for it.

I am enclosing a check toward your work, and thank you again.

Margaret Murvay

ANATOLIJ KRALYC’KYJ (1835-1894)

The nineteenth century witnessed national revivals among numerous peoples in both western and eastern Europe. These revivals were a time when a small group of leaders known as the intelligentsia took upon themselves the task of discovering and codifying the language, literature, folklore, and history of their respective peoples or national groups. The intelligentsia then proceeded to educate the people whom they represented, in order to make them aware of their own cultural heritage and to give them a national identity. Among Carpatho-Rusyns, the most outstanding national awakener was Aleksander Duchmovych (see his biography in the Carpatho-Rusyn American, Vol. I, No. 1, 1978), who was active during the 1850s and 1860s. The next generation of Rusyn intelligentsia also played an important role in the national revival during the last decades.
of the nineteenth century. Among the leaders at that time was Reverend Anatolij Kralyc'kyj.

Kralyc'kyj was born in 1835 in the Carpatho-Rusyn village of Čabiny, in what is today the Prešov Region of northeastern Slovakia. After attending elementary school at the nearby monastery of Krasny Brod, the young Aleksander (his name at birth) attended gymnasium in Prešov, where he first met his life-long mentor Duchnovyc. Under the latter's influence, Kralyc'kyj became a Basilian monk, adopting as his monastic name Anatolij; and after graduating from the Užhorod Theological Seminary, he was ordained a Greek Catholic priest in 1858.

Kralyc'kyj began his career away from home as a teacher at the Greek Catholic monastery at Mariapocs. Although he was not immediately among his Rusyn people (Mariapocs on the Hungarian plain was the religious center of Hungarian and magyarized Rusyn Greek Catholics) Kralyc'kyj nonetheless maintained contact with his homeland, becoming in 1866 secretary of the first Carpatho-Rusyn cultural society, the Society of St. Basil the Great in Užhorod, and writing for the first Carpatho-Rusyn newspaper, Svit (Užhorod, 1867-70). Finally, in 1869, Kralyc'kyj returned home, after he had been chosen archimandrite of the historic St. Nicholas Monastery at Černeča Hora near Mukačevo, a post he held until his death in 1894.

Because of his monastic calling, Kralyc'kyj was not directly involved in Carpatho-Rusyn public life. His name is remembered, however, because he wrote numerous literary, historic, and ethnographic works that instilled in his readers a sense of pride in their rich past and thereby helped to preserve the Carpatho-Rusyn national heritage. Kralyc'kyj's emphasis on the importance of historical awareness was poignantly expressed in the opening paragraph to his first published work of prose, The Shepherd in the Highlands (Pastyr v poloninach, 1860):

"Come here, sons of glorious Rus' and stand around me . . . . A magnificent thing is revealed to the eyes of our native son when, in the embrace of holy ecstasy, his eyes look into the depths of the past, into the antiquity of his people."

To be sure, Kralyc'kyj lived and worked at a time when his message was difficult to convey and unlikely to be accepted. This is because during the last decades of the nineteenth century, the Hungarian Kingdom—that multinational state in which Carpatho-Rusyns lived—set out on a political course whose aim was to magyarize, if possible, all its inhabitants. Therefore, most educated Rusyns gave up their mother tongue and customs and became instead assimilated Hungarians. Kralyc'kyj fought against this trend, even if it meant publishing his works elsewhere, as in neighbouring Galicia to the north. In study after study, whether in scholarly-like descriptive works or impressionistic literary writings, Kralyc'kyj pointed out the distinctiveness of Carpatho-Rusyn language and folklore, and he stressed that their historical and religious roots are derived from the East. In this regard, his most famous work, Prince Laborec', (Knjaz' Laborec' 1863), stressed two themes dear to the hearts of all Carpatho-Rusyn patriots: (1) that the semi-legendary ninth-cent-
Dear Editor:

I grew up, received my formal education, and started my teaching and scholarly career in Kharkiv, far away from Transcarpathia. I never set foot in that remote land. I have several good friends among Americans of Transcarpathian descent, all of Ukrainian convictions. To my shame, I never met or talked to any American of Transcarpathian descent of different convictions, except on occasions with Professors Magocsi and Krafcik.

Nevertheless, I was pleased indeed to have gotten an invitation from the editor of Carpatho-Rusyn American to express some of my impressions and thoughts in connection with the Markus-Magocsi discussion (the beginning of which I prompted by publishing, as former editor-in-chief of Sucasnist', the first article by Dr. Markus). The motivations for my conclusions regarding the issues at hand emerge from my opinions as a scholar and my convictions as an individual person.

For the scholar of linguistics who specializes in Slavic languages in general and in the Ukrainian language in particular, Transcarpathia is a fascinating land. The variety of Transcarpathian dialects is unique in the entire Ukrainian language territory. Their historical ties with the Ukrainian dialects on the other side of the Carpathians enable the scholar to shed light on many aspects of the linguistic and general history of that area as well as of many other Ukrainian areas. Attempts at creating a common standard language in Transcarpathia, independently of their outcome, are of major interest to anyone who studies the problems of the formation of standard (literary) languages. And what a wealth of linguistic and human aspects in these historical ups and downs! One finds comic situations: as in every language discussion, the judgments and demands of some laymen inadvertently are quite funny. There are also tragic episodes as, for instance, the annihilation of Aivistyn Volosyn, who was not only the president of the short-lived regional government, but foremost an active participant in long-lasting language conflicts. Recently, in 1981, I went in detail through the history of the language question in Transcarpathia in the years 1900-1945. While this is not the place to expound my findings, suffice it to say that the work was engrossing.

As a person and as a Ukrainian patriot (of which I do not want to make any secret), I am deeply interested in these matters, too. Both Markus and Magocsi agree that, as of now, the question of the national identity of the Rusyns of Transcarpathia — if we name them holding to historical tradition — has been decided in their country in favor of Ukrainian. Let us be aware that the price paid for that is high: the destruction of most regional cultural traditions is but one of the losses. Let us also be aware that to the Soviet government the promotion of the Ukrainian language is nothing more than a step toward Russification in which the Transcarpathians are to share in their destruction as a specific community with the rest of the Ukrainian people. In that sense, the language struggle in Transcarpathia is not a closed issue after 1945. In light of the decisions of the Tashkent conference of May 22-24, 1979, the general bilingualism of all non-Russians is a step toward Russian monolingualism. Since then, these decisions have been enforced most aggressively and ferociously. The language conflicts in the Ukraine, including Transcarpathia, are being pushed relentlessly toward a final and possibly tragic showdown. An eloquent document of the situation is the desperate appeal of the Transcarpathian Jurij Badzio, written — though forbidden — in Kiev and published in Sucasnist'.

But by no means are all historical processes irreversible. The future is unknown to us. And therein lies a possibility which may be open to American Ukrainians and American Transcarpathian Rusyns. We know the important, perhaps decisive role the American Rusyns played in the shaping of the political and cultural situation of the region after the end of World War I. Such a situation may be repeated. Viewed from this angle, the present abyss between the rest of the American Ukrainians and the Transcarpathian Rusyns is not in the interest of both groups.

As a linguist I have no doubt that Transcarpathians are Ukrainians. I also am aware of serious cultural differences which have existed in the past. They have ceased or are ceasing to exist in the regions of our origin. Kharkiv and Uzhhorod now are in the same boat. But here, thank God, there is no danger that cultural differences will be forcefully eradicated under conditions of American democracy. Mutual acquaintance, friendship, and understanding are possible now in all fields and on all levels — from ecclesiastic and cultural to political and economic — and they will be beneficial for both parties. The long feud is devoid of its motivation now. It lasts only by virtue of blind tradition and irrational stubbornness. I cannot but join Magocsi's appeal for such openness and cultural exchanges on both sides of that imaginary barricade. Not for merger do I opt, not for destruction of various regional traditions, but for their fostering and flourishing, not in isolation but in friendly contacts and mutual support, which may and should, on appropriate occasions, lead to common actions.

Herein I see the sense of the Markus-Magocsi discussion.

George Y. Shevelov, President
Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences
in the United States
Dear Editor:

Attempts are now being made to initiate an on-going process of dialogue between the Carpatho-Rusyn community in America and its Ukrainian counterpart. Writing as a Czech with unashamedly Rusynophile convictions, I must say that I sincerely hope this enterprise does not turn into a Trojan Horse for the Ukrainian cause. This is my considered opinion, not because I am opposed to a rapprochement between these two related but distinct ethnic groups, nor because I am anti-Ukrainian. Rather, it is because, on the basis of both extensive personal experience and research, I have come to the conclusion that while Carpatho-Rusyns who would deny the existence of a Ukrainian national identity and above all of the existence of a Ukrainian language are a tiny, unrepresentative minority within their own ethnic group, Ukrainians in America en masse are taught (as part of the Ukrainian ideology) that Carpatho-Rusyns are merely backward Western Ukrainians who need to be enlightened about their origins and that the vernacular of the Carpatho-Rusyn people is a family of dialects which belongs to Ukrainian. The violent attacks the Ukrainian academic community has periodically made on Paul R. Magocsi are testimony to that.

Of necessity, representatives of the two sides will have to discuss historical issues. The shaping of both national identities is included among these. It seems fairly common among Ukrainians to be very anachronistic concerning their self-perception and, therefore, to regard the existence of the Ukrainian nationality as virtually eternal and unchanging. For this reason, in order for a Rusyn-Ukrainian dialogue to be fruitful, I believe that the participants must examine thoroughly the literary movement of the nineteenth century in both Galicia and Great Ukraine, and above all the political, national, and social revolution of 1917-1921 which more than any other factor contributed to the universal acceptance of Ukrainianism by the Ukrainian people themselves. In this connection it is imperative that the Ukrainian ethnic and linguistic solution for Subcarpathian Rus’ also be examined. Last but not least, a long hard look should be taken at the evolution of the Ukrainian community in America (particularly during the crucial years 1876-1914), keeping in mind that mind that Ukrainian-Americans are predominantly Galician, which means that not too long ago they would have been identified as Rusyns and that their own native dialects are somewhat removed from literary Ukrainian.

In conclusion, let me say that discussion and dialogue between the Rusyn and Ukrainian communities might be mutually beneficial, but only if openmindedness prevails on both sides. No doubt, both Rusyns and Ukrainians in America stand to gain from a new understanding of their common heritage and an appreciation of the significant cultural and linguistic factors that make each community a separate entity. Rejecting a priori the melting pot as a viable model for ethnic groups in the United States, I believe that we can call on the Rusyn and Ukrainian people in America to form a strategic alliance for the advancement of their interests. If this call is to become a reality, however, the last remnants of reactionary anti-Ukrainianism should be laid to rest by the Rusyn community. But above all, Ukrainians must recognize the integral existence of their “cousins” the Carpatho-Rusyns.

Reverend Evan Lowig
Orthodox Church in America

Dear Editor:

The Markus-Magocsi exchange typifies the debate that has existed as far back as my memory allows. It is incredible that so much energy is expended by our dear Ukrainian friends of every station in life to make “our people” something which they are not. In America, we have been able to survive with a separate identity in spite of the tremendous pressures to conform and to become either Slovak, or Ukrainian, or Russian, something akin to the peer pressure that leads our children into habits and customs both good and bad.

Our forefathers here in America, while struggling with nomenclature, nonetheless preserved the identity of their people perhaps even better than in the old country. It was with the appearance of Dr. Magocsi on the American scene, however, that our people were finally able to read in English the involved historical evolution of our people in the Carpathians and to begin to understand it from an unbiased scholar and historian.

I agree with Dr. Markus that Dr. Magocsi is the “intellectual mentor” of our people. By a stroke of luck he is unaffiliated with either the Byzantine or Orthodox faiths and their establishments and thus can be objective in his approach and conclusions. A century later he becomes another “Duchnovyč” of our people, whether he denies it or not.

America has been called great because it is the melting pot of peoples. However, it is great precisely because the cauldron’s work was not completely successful. It is the ability to preserve and foster ethnic identities of all sorts in the greater American culture that makes America — “America the Beautiful.” Suppression of identity should not be our goal, but rather the understanding and appreciation of each other’s strengths and weaknesses. Indeed, was it not the Soviet desire to acquire the Carpathian mountain passes for military purposes which led to the annexation of our lands into the Ukraine at the end of World War II that suppressed a non-Ukrainian identity there? Let us cease the debates and strive for understanding!

Orestes J. Mihaly
Assistant Attorney General of the State of New York
RECENT PUBLICATIONS 1978 (continued)


Stepan Kločurak was a Hucul from Jasynja, the eastern-most corner of Subcarpathian Rus', who in 1919 led a group of local Rusyns that drove out the Hungarian gendarmes and set up an independent "Hucul Republic." This republic lasted for six months, until the Romanians occupied the region in June 1919, and then turned it over to Czechoslovakia one year later.

Kločurak's Ukrainian-language memoirs, Do voli, provide for the first time much detail on this little-known chapter of modern Subcarpathian history. Included are texts of several protocols from the period. Unfortunately, Kločurak's memoirs end in late 1919, and nothing is said about the author's experiences as political activist during the years of Czechoslovak rule (1919-38), autonomy (1939-39), his imprisonment in the Soviet Union (1945-56), or his later years in Prague (since 1956).


Mykola Kočyš is undoubtedly the most important linguist among the Vojvodian (Bačka) Rusyns of Yugoslavia in the twentieth century. Through numerous scholarly studies, grammars, and other texts, he established the norms for the literary language used by the Vojvodinian Rusyns since World War II. Until his untimely death in 1975, he also held the first Chair of Rusyn Studies at the University of Novi Sad.

This collection consists of 46 articles, all but two of which appeared between 1965 and 1974 in various Yugoslav journals. The majority (39) of the articles are written in Vojvodinian Rusyn, the remainder in Serbo-Croatian. All deal with the Vojvodinian Rusyn language and are grouped in the following categories: history of the language and its present status, morphology, syntax, lexicography, stylistics, orthography, individual orthographic variants, onomastics, pedagogy, and textbooks. This book is essential for anyone wishing to know about Vojvodinian Rusyn, the youngest of the East Slavic languages.


The literary historian, Fedor Kovač, has with this volume contributed his most comprehensive analysis of post-World War II Ukrainian-language writers in the Rusyn-inhabited Prešov Region of eastern Slovakia. This monograph includes individual chapters on the poetry of V. Hajný, S. Makara, J. Zbihilej, P. Gula, S. Hostynjak, I. Halajda, M. Drobnjak, M. Nemet, M. Bobak, and M. Njachaj.


The Boikian Region is one of the three ethnolinguistic territories in the Carpathian Mountains. In Subcarpathian Rus', it covers the territory of former Ung (Úž), Bereg, and Ugoča (Ugoća) counties, including the cities and towns of Užhorod, Mukačevo, Svaljava, and Sevljúš. This Ukrainian-language monograph by Roman Kyrčiv traces the history of ethnographic research on the Boikian Region that was carried out by local Rusyn, Galician-Ukrainian, Hungarian, and Czech scholars during the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Although the book deals with the Boikian region on both sides of the Carpathian Mountains, several sections are devoted exclusively to Subcarpathian Rus'.


This extensive Czech-language article treats the much written about problem of the Subcarpathian Rusyn decision to unite with Czechoslovakia in 1919. Basing his study on Prague archival sources, the author focuses on the first two years of Czechoslovak rule. He stresses the activity of the Rusyn-American leader, Gregory Žátkovič (see biography in the C-RA, Vol. II, No. 3, 1979); criticizes the Prague government for not fulfilling its promises of autonomy; and claims the view that Rusyns voluntarily united with Czechoslovakia.


Sigismund of Luxembourg reigned as King of Hungary from 1387 to 1437. This French-language study discusses Sigismund's foreign policy in the east that brought him into contact with a prince from the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, Fedor Korjatovyc (see biography in the C-RA, Vol. V, No. 1, 1982). When the latter was forced to leave his homeland, Sigismund welcomed him and gave him land around Mukačevo. Korjatovyc fortified the castle of Mukačevo and was instrumental in promoting the development of the St. Nicholas Monastery on Černeča Hora near Mukačevo. As a result of this activity, Korjatovyc became one of the earliest and best-known Rusyn national heroes.


This is the first discussion in any language about the literary production of Carpatho-Rusyn immigrants. After a brief historical survey of the community, the author focuses on five themes that dominated immigrant literature: adjustment to American society, relations with the homeland, village life in the homeland, national allegiance, and religious concerns. The works of several authors are discussed, and Emilj Kubek, the only novelist, is considered the best. (Available from the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center for $2.50).

The problem of national identity among Rusyns has caused endless speculation and controversy. This widely-acclaimed encyclopedic work by Dr. Magocsi is the most comprehensive work to appear on the subject in any language. The first 275 pages of text comprise 14 chapters on history, politics, education, religion, and local, national and international politics. Then follows an appendix on the problem of nomenclature, biographies of 81 national leaders, an anthology of 25 texts illustrating various written languages used by Rusyns, 6 statistical tables, and 1,373 notes. Finally there are 6 maps and a comprehensive bibliography of 2,789 entries. This work has already become standard reading for anyone interested in modern Carpatho-Rusyn history. (Available from the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center for $21.00).

**RECENT ACTIVITIES**

In October 1981, a new Carpatho-Rusyn ensemble “Kruzhok” was established in Greater Cleveland. “Kruzhok” is sponsored by St. Mary's Byzantine Catholic School through the efforts of the pastor, Monsignor Basil Smochko, and the school’s principal, Sister Monica Husovich, O.S.B. The group was established with the support of Bishop Emil J. Mihalik, who has long desired the formation of such an ensemble.

The instructor of “Kruzhok” is Jerry J. Jumba, a cultural worker for the Byzantine Catholic Diocese of Parma. Auditions, which Jumba held during the month of October for parishes in Greater Cleveland, resulted in a group of people who have a genuine love toward, and special ability for, singing, dancing, and performing. The role of “Kruzhok” is to develop each individual’s talents in the performing arts and to foster an awareness of the Byzantine Ruthenian Catholic Diocesan cultural roots in Subcarpathian Rus’.

In Rusyn dialects and in other Slavic languages, “Kruzhok” means “circle” and is replete with rich symbolism. The circle implies infinity and completeness at the same time. Seasons and all other important patterns of life have a circular rhythm. Genuine folk dances among many peoples are frequently done in circles and with a circular movement. Wedding bands signify the ideal of never-ending love and joy. When we sing, dance, and celebrate the joy of life together, we become a joyous circle—a veselý kružok. Thus the word kružok was considered the most appropriate name for the new group.

After seven months of rehearsals, “Kruzhok” made its debut in performances on June 13 at St. Mary’s Festival, Cleveland, and on June 27 at the Byzantine Diocese Heritage Day in Parma. Both audiences enthusiastically received this young and hard-working ensemble. The adult and junior group contingents performed both individually and together. The folk choir sang the Carpatho-Rusyn national anthem, “Podkarpatski Rusyny,” as well as “Ljuljaj” and “Cas do domu, cas.” There were several fine vocal soloists and four complete dance numbers.

We extend our warmest congratulations to “Kruzhok” and offer encouragement to the new group as they embark on their exciting cultural journey!

**OUR CONDOLENCES**

The Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center has with deep regret learned of the recent deaths of two scholars interested in Carpatho-Rusyn affairs—Dr. Andrew Perejda and Reverend Michael Lacko, S.J.

Dr. Andrew Perejda (1918-1981) was born in Ohio of Carpatho-Rusyn parents who had emigrated from the Presov Region in present-day eastern Slovakia. A specialist in Soviet geography, Dr. Perejda was a professor at Central Connecticut State College. He served as chairman of the Carpatho-Ruthenian Studies Foundation in 1976-1977, and he was the cartographer for the useful *Map of Uhro-Rus* (Passaic, 1979), which indicates every Rusyn village in the Carpathians. A more detailed obituary of Dr. Perejda is found in the *Eastern Catholic Life* (November 22, 1981).

Reverend Michael Lacko (1920-1982) was a native of Eastern Slovakia and a Greek Catholic priest of Slovak national persuasion. He headed the Slovak Institute in Rome and was editor of its scholarly journal, *Slovak Studies,* which under his direction published numerous studies on Slovaks and Carpatho-Rusyns, especially in the Presov Region. Reverend Lacko, who until his death was a professor at the Pontifical Institute for Oriental Studies in Rome, authored numerous scholarly studies, including the authoritative *Union of Uzhorod* (Cleveland, 1976). One of his last works is a commentary on the Markus-Magocsi debate, which will appear in the next issue of the *Carpatho-Rusyn American.*

Several tributes to Reverend Lacko recently appeared in the journal *Maria,* Vol. XXII, No. 5 (Toronto, 1982).

Both Dr. Perejda and Reverend Lacko were supporters of the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center. Their presence will be sorely missed. *Vičnaja jim pamjat’.*

**READER’S REQUEST**

A collector of Carpatho-Rusyn parish histories (both Byzantine Catholic and Orthodox) would like to communicate and perhaps trade with those who share the same interest.

Please contact John T. Schweich, 44 Hastings Street, Framingham, Massachusetts 01701.

**OUR FRONT COVER**

“Rusyns from Rachov,” watercolor by the Czech artist, Č. Čoček (circa 1934).