

CARPATHO-RUSYN AMERICAN

A Newsletter on Carpatho-Rusyn Ethnic Heritage



FROM THE EDITOR

Last fall's issue of the *Carpatho-Rusyn American* (Vol. IV, No. 3, 1981) contained the concluding section of a review of Paul R. Magocsi's *The Shaping of a National Identity: Subcarpathian Rus' 1848-1948* by Professor Vasyl Markus and the concluding section of Dr. Magocsi's response. Both excerpts discussed the ethnic identity of Carpatho-Rusyns, ethnic terminology, and in particular the relationship between Carpatho-Rusyns and Ukrainians in this country as well as the work of the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center. In each of the issues for 1982, including this one, we have printed a series of commentaries from readers on the Markus-Magocsi dialogue. The commentaries were submitted by Americans and Canadians of Carpatho-Rusyn and Ukrainian descent as well as by others interested in the problem. Some commentaries were solicited, some not. Naturally, not all commentaries received could be accommodated in this four-part series, nor do the printed commentaries represent the only individuals concerned with these questions — or the only viewpoints. Although we are completing this series in the present issue, by no means are we closing the discussion. Letters and comments from readers are more than welcome and will be printed at appropriate times.

The purpose of this series was less to formulate any conclusions than to explore the views of interested and concerned persons, to taste a variety of opinions, and to try to understand why people make particular choices and hold fast to certain ideas. If any conclusions are forthcoming, they will emerge in their own time. The major task of the newsletter continues to be to provide information to our readers and to serve as a forum for the airing of views on what have traditionally been sensitive issues.

These are also the goals of a series of face-to-face discussions by small groups of Rusyn Americans and Ukrainian Americans that began last fall in Pittsburgh, at the initiative of John Y. Hamulak, Secretary of the Ukrainian Engineers Society of America. I attended the first meeting. While it was clear that our separate historical experiences still provide a source of differences, we also all agreed that the exchange of views between individuals of two Slavic peoples so close in their spirit and culture was both exhilarating and informative. The following information is drawn from press releases on the meetings held in Pittsburgh, New York, and Cleveland.

During the past several months, there have been articles from time to time in the Carpatho-Rusyn and Ukrainian press which have discussed the two communities in the United States. The idea of Rusyn-Ukrainian cooperation is not new, although past efforts have not been successful. Another modest attempt at cooperation, or at the very least communication, began on November 17, 1981, in Pittsburgh when several persons from each group met to discuss concerns of mutual interest. Then, on May 1 and June 12, 1982, two groups of Carpatho-Rusyns and Ukrainians met in New York and Cleveland, respectively. All three meetings were attended by representatives of the clergy (Catholic and Orthodox), fraternal societies, the press, and university professors.

In Pittsburgh, the Carpatho-Rusyns were represented by Reverend Peter Buletza (American Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church), Jerry Jumba (cultural worker, Byzantine Catholic Diocese of Parma), Reverend Robert Karl (Byzantine Catholic Diocese of Pittsburgh), Frederick Petro (editor, *Greek Catholic Union Messenger*), Dr. Patricia Krafcik (editor, *Carpatho-Rusyn American*), Dr. Paul R. Magocsi (president, Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center), and John Righetti (director, Carpathian Youth Dancers of Monessen). The Ukrainians were represented by Reverend John Beck (Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the United States), Msgr. Stepan Bilak (Ukrainian National Association), Kateryna Dowbenko (Plast Ukrainian Youth Organization), John Y. Hamulak, Dr. George Kyshakewych (Ukrainian Medical Association), and Dr. Bohdan Wytwycky (author).

In New York, the Carpatho-Rusyns were represented by Nicholas Benyo (president, United Slavonic American Association), Reverend Evan Lowig (St. Vladimir's Orthodox Seminary), Dr. Magocsi, Msgr. Raymond Misulich (chancellor, Byzantine Catholic Diocese of Passaic), Dr. Richard Renoff (Nassau Community College), Msgr. Basil Shereghy (director, Heritage Museum, Byzantine Catholic Archdiocese of Pittsburgh), Reverend Nicholas Smisko (archimandrite, American Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church), and businessman Albert Stegun. The Ukrainians were represented by Roma Hadzewych (editor, *Ukrainian Weekly*), John Y. Hamulak, Dr. Roman Ihnytzky (author), Jurij Kostyuk (president, Carpathian Alliance), Dr. Vincent Shandor (Carpathian Alliance), Msgr. Peter Skrinkosky (chancellor, Ukrainian Catholic Diocese of Stamford), Reverend M. Tkachuk (Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the United States), and Dr. Wytwycky.

The Carpatho-Rusyns in Cleveland were represented by Sigmund T. Brinsky (general counsel of the Greek Catholic Union), Jerry Jumba, James Senderak (Carpathians folk ensemble), Carrie Oris (Kent State University), and Dr. Magocsi. The Ukrainians were represented by Dr. Myron Kuropas (supreme vice president, Ukrainian National Association), Dr. R. Palazij and Dr. M. Deychakiwsky (Ohio Chapter, Ukrainian Medical Association), Dr. Osyk Martyniuk (Kent State University), Dr. Lubomyr Wynar (editor, *Ukrainian Historian*), Mstyslaw B. Dolnycky (editor, *America*), attorney Volodymyr Bazarko, and Dr. Basil Ivanovchik (Carpathian Alliance).

A small working committee in each city was delegated with the task of promoting further discussions and proposing concrete ways for positive interaction between the two communities.

Should you have any ideas or concrete proposals for programs in your area, such as jointly sponsored lectures, dance and music programs, folk arts and crafts displays, courses in Easter-egg painting, or any other related interests, write to us and we will see that your request reaches the appropriate Rusyn-Ukrainian working committee. It is our hope that these meetings with Ukrainians may have some useful results and be followed by discussions with Slovaks and all other groups whose cultural interests may interact with Carpatho-Rusyns in America. Reports on any subsequent developments will be provided in future issues of the *C-RA*.

Writers have traditionally played an important role in society. The best writers are often able to sum up the human concerns of a specific environment or a particular era. Besides such analytical capacities, many writers also create images that subsequently become part of a nation's collective psyche for decades and even centuries to come. To create such fictionalized symbols, writers most frequently turn to the history of their own country or region. In fact, much of what we think we know about history is really what the great novelists, poets, and playwrights have told us — whether it be medieval times as in the works of William Shakespeare, Walter Scott, and Victor Hugo, early Americana as created for us by James Fenimore Cooper, Washington Irving, and Mark Twain, or the barbarities of the twentieth century in the brutal realism of Alexander Solzhenitsyn.

Eastern Europe has also produced a large number of writers who have turned to history as a source of images for the creation of national ideals. Among Carpatho-Rusyns, this approach was already employed in the nineteenth century by the national awakener, Aleksander Duchnovyč, and by his successors. But it was not until the twentieth century that the past of the Carpatho-Rusyns was to be used extensively in a creative and inspiring manner. This was done through the works of Vasyli' Grendža-Dons'kyj.

Vasyli' Grendža-Dons'kyj was born in 1897 in the Carpatho-Rusyn village of Volove, high in the mountains of Maramaroš county, now in the Transcarpathian oblast of the Ukrainian SSR. Son of a poor Hutsul peasant, the young Vasyli' had only a few years of elementary education. He read avidly, however, and from the earliest age embarked on a process of self-education that was to continue until his very last years. After being wounded in service during World War I, he recuperated in Budapest, where he was also able to attend a commercial academy and art school. With this practical commercial training, Grendža-Dons'kyj returned to his homeland in 1921 (by then within the new republic of Czechoslovakia) and was able to support himself as a clerk in the Subcarpathian Bank in Užhorod.

Grendža-Dons'kyj's real love, however, was reading and writing, and in the democratic environment of Czechoslovakia, he embarked on a career as a writer. Already in 1923, his first collection of poetry appeared under the title *Flowers With Thorns (Kvity z ter'nom)*. The very title of this work summed up Grendža-Dons'kyj's outlook. In the midst of nature's stunning and in some instances primeval beauty, the Carpathian region also had the thorns of poverty, starvation, and death that continued to ravage the Rusyn people.

Besides several harsh critiques of contemporary social conditions — the most outstanding being his novel about a twentieth-century Rusyn "Robin Hood," *Il'ko Lypej: A Carpathian Brigand (Il'ko Lypej: karpats'kyj rozbijnyk, 1936)* — Grendža-Dons'kyj also tried to inspire his people by looking to the historical past. Thus, he tried his hand at historical poems and dramas like *The Red Cliff (Červona skala, 1930-31)* and *Petro Petrovyč (1937)*, describing the ostensible glories of the Rusyn people during medieval times, and *For the Freedom of the Silver Land (Za volju Sribnoji Zemli, 1935-36)*, depicting the Hutsul struggle for independence



just after World War I. In these and his other works, Grendža-Dons'kyj strove to write in standard literary Ukrainian, the language he felt was most appropriate for the Carpatho-Rusyns whom he considered to be Ukrainian.

On the eve of World War II, when the Hungarians invaded and occupied Subcarpathian Rus' (1939), Grendža-Dons'kyj was among those who were arrested. Imprisoned by the Hungarians, he was thought by some to be dead, and a literary necrology in praise of his "passing" even appeared in 1939. He survived, however, and finally managed to make his way to Bratislava in western Slovakia, where he was to remain until his death several decades later. Despite some difficulties in postwar Communist-ruled Czechoslovakia, Grendža-Dons'kyj was by the 1960s lauded as that country's leading Ukrainian writer. Yet the accolades he received could not make up for the fact that he was destined to live far from his birthplace. Nevertheless, this fervent national patriot, who through his prolific pen was able to inspire pride in so many of his countrymen, was never to forget his native Carpathian homeland and its capital Užhorod. This love was perhaps best summed up by the concluding lines of one poem:

Oh, Užhorod, of age-old glory,
How my people praise you.
What is Paris or even Prague,
For me there is only Užhorod!

Philip Michaels

OUR READERS SPEAK

The following remarks are in response to articles by Professors Vasyl Markus and Paul R. Magocsi published in the Carpatho-Rusyn American, Vol. IV, No. 3 (1981). This series of responses to the Markus-Magocsi discussion was initiated in Vol. V, No. 1 (1982). Although this is the final installment, the questions discussed here will be dealt with in future issues as well. — Editor

Dear Editor:

The Markus-Magocsi debate deals with the highly emotional historical concept of "nationalism," a force that is, unfortunately, an extremely important if not dominant aspect in the contemporary world. In the words of Professor Louis L. Snyder, "While the leaders of the world speak grandly of growing cooperation, they invariably place their own nation foremost in any list of priorities" (*Varieties of Nationalism*, p. viii).

As Professor Krafcik's introduction to the relevant excerpts of the debate indicate, "the historian, whether writing on contemporary or past events, chooses from a vast number of facts and describes them as he perceives them." Thus, historians are always ready to disagree with one another about the meaning of objective historical facts. Despite their sincere inquiries for the whole truth, historians, as other honest leaders, have not succeeded in being wholly objective. The Markus-Magocsi debate underlines the fact that the century-long issue of the nationality of the Subcarpathian Rusyns, reason and logic notwithstanding, is still current, and still a very sensitive topic bathed in controversy.

In my view, a group must feel that it makes up a "nation," or that it is part of one. Thus, a sense of "nationality" is a viable phenomenon and not simply the historical past. Although intellectual theorizing alone about the nationality of a particular group will not make it so, it can, in conjunction with activist popularizers and practical politicians, influence immeasurably the eventual thinking and feelings of a group about itself.

Whether the Subcarpathian Rusyns survive in the homeland or for that matter in America, depends on numerous factors, not the least of which are political ones over which the Rusyns may have little influence. Modern history provides ready examples of outside political forces playing major roles in the formation of nations. The existence of two political entities among the German people today, for instance, was not primarily determined by the Germans themselves. Nevertheless, the longer the West Germans and the East Germans remain separated politically, economically, and culturally, the greater the probability that two separate nations will evolve as the Austrian nation had evolved earlier.

Outside forces may eventually play a key role in determining whether the Subcarpathian Rusyns survive, and under what name. But, as in the case of their kinsmen, the Ukrainians, the Rusyns will, in the last analysis, decide for themselves their national identity. As for the proper nomenclature, I feel that (as expressed by one of the debate

participants), "the name used to describe any group should be that employed by the group itself."

Bohdan P. Procko
Professor of History
Villanova University

Dear Editor:

Both Markus and Magocsi understand the nature of their disagreement: it is not the facts of history, but the interpretive aspect of history which is in dispute. Ukrainian scholars' views of national ethnic identity are static. The best illustration of that concept is: "Rusyns are Ukrainian and always have been." On the other hand, Professor Magocsi even in the title of his work suggests a dynamic process — the *shaping* of a nationality. I find that on this point I must agree with him.

Ukrainian scholars suggest that when the Rusyns were awakening to a national consciousness, they perceived two choices: they could choose to identify with Russians or Ukrainians and it became obvious to them that they were Ukrainian. Professor Magocsi suggests that there were three choices and that they could also be Rusyn. In my doctoral thesis, *The Rusin Question in Eastern Europe and in America* (Minnesota, 1976), I came independently to the same conclusion as he had.

The best period for examination of evidence in support of that point is the period from 1848 to about 1860 or 1865. The materials that should be examined are the journals, newsletters, and communications that passed between the Galician Rusyns in L'viv and the leaders of the Subcarpathian Rusyns. During that time, I think this body of literature suggested that a significant portion of the Rusyn leaders did not look beyond the Austro-Hungarian Empire for the focus of their national identity.

Finally, I must disagree with both Magocsi and Markus on the use of terminology. Both professors would like to adopt or impose uniform terminology in the use of such words as Magyarophile, Ukrainophile, or Russophile and a whole host of other words, but they disagree on their usage. While I agree with Professor Magocsi on many points, I do not always use his terminology even though he has suggested that I should. I think that my terminology and indeed that of all informed writers expresses nuances of differences in interpretations that in fact are better expressed by the selection of terms than by being spelled out in detail. Even the variations in spelling of *Rusyn* and *Rusin* do in fact say something about the author's perspective. The fact that I used *Rusin* exclusively ten years ago and now am willing and perhaps even inclined to use *Rusyn* does suggest a slight change in my perspective which no one would be able to notice if I did not feel free to select my own terms of expression.

I shall make one final point; the ethnic status of Rusyn Americans is even more complex. I suppose that it is possible for a young person today to identify him/herself as Ukrainian knowing that all of the grandparents were associated with the Greek Catholic Union and were consciously hostile

to the concept of Ukrainian nationality. It seems to me, though, that such a person would have an incomplete identity and that is where the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center is relevant. Even if a Carpatho-Rusyn American is now a Ukrainian, one should not have to leave a "black hole" in one's identity.

Keith P. Dyrud
St. Paul, Minnesota

Dear Editor:

The major issue in the Markus-Magocsi debate is the process by which an ethnic group acquires a consciousness of its unique identity. Although neither writer argues that a single economic, historical, linguistic, political, or sociological factor is sufficient to produce this consciousness, both seem to look for necessary preconditions. The case of the Rusyns can contribute to a more general theory of national consciousness along with the cases of other groups whose consciousness developed in great part in America. Below I shall summarize my impression of this development among Rusyns and will note the different emphases of Professors Markus and Magocsi.

The Carpatho-Rusyn masses lacked national consciousness until they began to travel outside their native villages and encounter members of other ethnic groups. In America, this occurred in the factories, mines, and mills of the major northeastern cities. Carpatho-Rusyns learned that they were different not only from non-Slavic-speaking peoples, but also from Slavic groups such as Poles, Slovaks, and Ukrainians. As Professor Magocsi notes, Rusyn churches, fraternals, and the press were organized very early in the immigration. These fostered interaction of Rusyns with other Rusyns and strengthened their consciousness of a separate identity.

Professor Markus bases his pessimism about the Rusyn Renaissance on the Ukrainization that has occurred in Transcarpathia and Eastern Slovakia. I cannot fathom how this can affect the American English-speaking third and fourth generation, most of whose ancestors came from Slovakia where the Ukrainian identification around 1918 was weakest and who developed a Rusyn identity *prior* to the Czechoslovak interwar period. In the United States, this group possesses a number of non-Ukrainian cultural symbols; for example, Rusyn publications using the Latin alphabet with Slovak orthography as in the *Greek Catholic Union Messenger* and other publications, and separate churches, newspapers, and fraternal societies — all founded long ago. Separate Rusyn and Ukrainian ecclesiastical jurisdictions were set up in 1916, and the newspapers and fraternal societies were founded during the 1890s. They originated due to separate national identifications and they function to perpetuate this separation today. The crux of Professor Markus's prognosis is this: if the Rusyns of America identify with Ukraine, they will become a fully conscious nationality. He seems to think that because the groups possess similar cultures (I think Rusyn Americans are much more different from Ukrainian Americans than Markus suggests), there is

an immanent consciousness waiting to unfold within the Rusyn people leading them to identify with the Ukrainians. However, if "anything is contrary to the processes and effects" of the past, it is the hope that Rusyns will become Ukrainians in America, for the estrangement is too longstanding and is reinforced by structures which are very viable.

Professor Magocsi convincingly demonstrates that a national consciousness can develop in America without a political or territorial base in the old country while Professor Markus believes the existence of a territory is necessary. Most likely a unifying symbol is necessary, but it need not be political or territorial. For the Rusyns in Europe, the Greek Catholic Church functioned both as a symbol and as a physical setting where interaction with one's own people took place.

Sadly, in America the churches have fostered assimilation and have experienced tragic schisms. The nadir of Rusyn consciousness was probably during the 1960s when the Byzantine Catholic hierarchy consciously latinized the architecture, liturgy, and priests' vestments, while the clergy of the Russian "Metropolia" had succeeded in convincing large numbers of Rusyns that they were Russian. Latinization and Russification have ceased, only to be replaced by the non-ethnic "Byzantine" and "Orthodox" designations which both writers deplore.

Both the Byzantine Catholic and Orthodox churches in America may yet provide the setting for a Rusyn renaissance. Most congregations are ethnically pluralistic with a Rusyn majority. The parishes and seminaries could provide the opportunity for Rusyns to deepen their consciousness by contrasting their culture to that of others. At present, some Byzantine Catholic bishops and priests and some younger Orthodox clergymen are studying their "roots" and encouraging this among their parishioners. The American Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Church has steadfastly preserved Carpatho-Rusyn culture.

Ad hominem arguments and polemics will only widen the alienation between the groups. A Rusyn-Ukrainian dialogue ought to take place and could be organized by the intelligentsia within the churches, fraternal societies, and universities [see *FROM THE EDITOR*]. Despite his criticism of Transcarpathian Ukrainophile émigrés, Magocsi recognizes the indispensibility of the intelligentsia for a national movement.

The future of Rusyn consciousness in America is uncertain. It could be strengthened by external events such as an influx of refugees from Czechoslovakia or Lemkian Poland, the example of cultural and political movements of other American ethnic groups, or a Rusyn backlash due to a Vatican appointment of a Ukrainian patriarch to administer a Rusyn metropolia. History can make us optimistic because the Rusyns of Europe and America have withstood Latinization, Magyarization, and Russification for hundreds of years. In my opinion, they will reject Pan-Ukrainianism because it is misdirected.

Richard Renoff
Professor of Sociology
Nassau Community College

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Dear Editor:

We have been receiving your publication for some time now and I take this opportunity to commend you on the fine quality of the publication and its excellent content. Concerning Ukrainian-Ruthenian dialogue, the following may be of interest to you as well as to your readers.

For the past four years the cooperation between the Ruthenian Offices of Religious Education and the Ukrainian Offices of Religious Education has developed to such a degree that members from these offices meet thrice yearly in order to develop catechetical programmes for their respective churches. One must also add that this is not an exclusive fraternity since these Offices have come together with other Churches (eg. Melchite) in order to form an umbrella organization called Eastern Catholic Diocesan Directors (ECDD). Since we in the Ukrainian Catholic Church have our own unique concerns, we have formed a North American organization called the Ukrainian Catholic Religious Education Association (UCREA).

I must stress that the spirit of cooperation, fraternity, and charity is the most edifying characteristic of ECDD. Knowing and acknowledging the fact that the Ukrainian language is used in catechetical instruction, ECDD gave permission to UCREA to translate the GOD WITH US Catechetical Series into Ukrainian. At this time Grades One, Two, and Three are being used in Ukrainian, as well as the remainder up to Grade Eight in English. An interesting observation may be made here: this is the first time in the history of the Ukrainian, Ruthenian, and Melchite Churches that a common catechism is being used in each Eparchy. If this does not demonstrate dialogue and cooperation, I do not know what would.

I wish you and your publication continued success.

Father T. Lozynsky
UCREA Coordinator
Weston, Ontario

RECENT PUBLICATIONS (1978 concluded)

Sabol, Sevastijan S. *Holhota hreko-katolyc'koji cerkvy v Čechoslovaččyni* (The Calvary of the Greek Catholic Church in Czechoslovakia). Ukrajins'ka duchovna biblioteka, no. 49. Toronto and Rome: Vyd-vo 00. Vasylijan, 1978. 352 p.

Sevastijan Sabol, a monk in the Basilian Order, is a native of the Prešov Region who, writing under the pen-name Zoreslav, had by the 1930s become one of the leading Ukrainian-language writers in Subcarpathian Rus'. During and after World War II, he lived in the Prešov Region until he fled to the West on the eve of the Communist-inspired destruction of the Greek Catholic Church in Czechoslovakia in 1950.

This history describes how Greek Catholicism was liquidated first in Subcarpathian Rus' (1947-1949) and then in the Prešov Region (1950), resulting in the imprisonment and eventual death in 1960 of Bishop Pavel Gojdič. This Ukrainian-language volume also includes some valuable historic photographs and a brief résumé in English. Reverend Sabol begins his story after World War II and he provides a kind of eyewitness memoir by a leading member of the Greek Catholic Church. It is unfortunate that he does not tell us

anything about his career during the 1930s and about Carpatho-Rusyn life in the Slovak state during World War II. (Available for \$8.00 from the Basilian Press, 286 Lisgar Street, Toronto, Ontario M6J 3G9).

Slivka, John. *Historical Mirror: Sources of the Rusin and Hungarian Greek Rite Catholics in the United States of America, 1884-1963*. Brooklyn, N.Y., 1978, 341 p.

This collection represents the most ambitious effort of Reverend John Slivka, who has for decades been interested in chronicling the history of Carpatho-Rusyns in the United States. More than 160 articles and decrees, most of which were previously published in Rusyn-American newspapers and almanacs, trace the history of the community between the years 1890-1963. Almost all the material focuses on the controversies within the group, especially the struggle of the Greek Catholic Church with the Vatican and the Orthodox movement. Only articles favorable to the Greek Catholic position are included. Despite numerous typographical errors and mistranslations, the book still is a useful collection of a wide variety of otherwise difficult-to-obtain materials. (Available from Rev. John Slivka, 143 Kent Street, Brooklyn, N.Y. 12222 for \$15.00).

Svetlosc (Enlightenment), Vol. XVI, Nos. 1-6 (Novi Sad, 1978), 935 p.

This volume of the cultural journal for the Vojvodinian Rusyns of Yugoslavia contains primarily new poetry, prose, and drama by Rusyn writers. Rusyn translations of literary works by contemporary Hungarian and Slovak authors from the Vojvodina, and essays on social problems in Yugoslavia today. Of particular interest to Vojvodinian Rusyn cultural history are several previously unpublished early poetic works and letters (Nos. 1-3) by the first important national leader Havryjil Kostel'nyk (1886-1948) and a study (No. 6) on literary works by a more recent author, Mykola Kočyš (1928-1973).

Truchan, Miroslaw Georg. "Der Kleinkrieg in der Karpato-Ukraine 1938-1939" (The Little War in the Carpatho-Ukraine), *Mitteilungen der Arbeits- und Förderungsge-meinschaft der Ukrainischen Wissenschaften*, No. 15 (Munich, 1978), pp. 84-95.

This brief German-language study based on secondary sources discusses the interest of Poland and Hungary in Subcarpathian Rus' during its period of autonomy (1938-1939) as well as the Carpathian Sich army under local Ukrainianophile leaders which was established to defend the region.

Tvorčosc: hlasnjik družtva za ruski jazik i literaturu (Works: Organ of the Society for Rusyn Language and Literature), Vol. IV (Novi Sad, 1978), 88p.

This issue contains two extensive articles by Aleksander Duličenko, the Soviet specialist on the language of the Vojvodinian (Backa) Rusyns. One deals with Mykola Kočyš (1928-1973), who before his untimely death played a dominant role in formulating a standard Vojvodinian Rusyn language after 1945. Duličenko's second study focuses on the syntactical history of Vojvodinian Rusyn. Other articles deal with Rusyn language and literature, the use of first names among Rusyns in the Vojvodina, and a chronicle of the Society's activity in 1978 and its program for 1979.

RECENT ACTIVITIES

Užhorod, USSR. On August 4, Dr. Paul R. Magocsi, professor of history and political science at the University of Toronto, delivered a lecture at the University of Užhorod in Soviet Transcarpathia (Subcarpathian Rus'). Dr. Magocsi was a guest of the distinguished linguist and specialist on Carpatho-Rusyn dialects, Dr. Josef Dzendzeliv's'kyj. During the discussion period, at which over thirty professors from the Užhorod faculty were present, Dr. Magocsi also spoke about Carpatho-Rusyns in the United States and about the activity of the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center.

Vienna, Austria. One of the oldest and most distinguished publishing houses in Vienna, Wilhelm Braumüller University Publishers, founded in 1783, has just published a beautiful book devoted to the traditional architecture of the Carpatho-Rusyns. Entitled *Wooden Churches in the Carpathians*, the volume includes 240 high-quality photographs taken during the early 1920s by a Czech art historian Florian Zapletal. Included are stunning views of wooden churches, domestic dwellings, iconostases, and people in traditional dress. Large-scale maps depict every site where the objects photographed now stand or once stood. The texts are in English and German with an introductory essay by the volume's compiler, Dr. Paul R. Magocsi. *Wooden Churches in the Carpathians* is available from the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center for \$24.50.

Cambridge, Mass. The Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute was commissioned several years ago to compile an encyclopedic handbook on the Lemkians, meaning Carpatho-Rusyns in the Lemkian Region of former Galicia (now in Poland) as well as in the Prešov Region of present-day northeastern Czechoslovakia. One of the contributors to the yet unpublished volume, Ivan Hvat (himself a native of the Prešov Region), is presently a visiting research fellow at Harvard. During the month of October, he gave a series of lectures on the Lemkians of Poland since 1939, with special attention to their forced deportation from the Carpathian homeland to other parts of Poland and to the Soviet Ukraine in 1947. Mr. Hvat, who is a doctoral candidate at the Ludwig-Maximilian University in Munich, West Germany, spoke on the Lemkians in New York, Chicago, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Toronto, and Montreal.

New York, N.Y. On October 17, Dr. George Y. Shevelov, Professor Emeritus at Columbia University, delivered a lecture on the "Language Question in the Transcarpathian Ukraine (Subcarpathian Rus'), 1919-1939." One of the world's leading Slavic linguists, Dr. Shevelov traced the difficulties faced by the Carpatho-Rusyn intelligentsia in trying to formulate an acceptable literary form — whether Russian, Ukrainian, or a distinct Carpatho-Rusyn language.

Pittsburgh, Pa. On October 29, Josef Staša, Architect and Planning Officer at Harvard University, delivered an illustrated lecture on "Eastern Rite Wooden Churches of the Subcarpathian Rusyns in Eastern Slovakia," as part of the biennial meeting of the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences in America, held this year in the Cathedral of Learning at the University of Pittsburgh. Mr. Staša, who

recently returned from a visit to Carpatho-Rusyn villages in northeastern Czechoslovakia, accompanied his remarks with handsome color slides that were greatly appreciated by the audience, some of whom were for the first time exposed to the beauties of Rusyn religious architecture.

REQUESTS FROM READERS

I would like to correspond with anyone having knowledge of the availability of the following Byzantine Catholic parish histories: Holy Ghost, McKees Rocks, PA, 50th Anniversary (1957?); Holy Ghost, Charleroi, PA, 60th Anniversary (1959); and Holy Spirit, Pittsburgh, PA, 50th Anniversary (1957). John Schweich, 6043 James Ave. S., Minneapolis, MN 55419.

I am a third generation Carpatho-Rusyn and am very interested in our culture and our ties with our former homeland. I have a seventeen-year-old daughter who will be going to Arizona State University, and who will hopefully maintain a line back to Carpatho-Rus'. Are there any other people like myself in the Greater Phoenix area — so that we can at least establish something to keep our culture going? Michael M. Kreta, P.O. Box 818, Mesa, AZ 85201-0140.

WITH APPRECIATION

The Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center expresses its appreciation for unsolicited donations from John and Margaret Murvay (Berlin Center, Ohio) — \$25.00; David M. Piatak (De Kalb, Illinois) — \$5.00; Stephen Dubos (Campbell, Ohio) — \$15.00; George Shanta (Toronto, Ontario) — \$20.00; Josephus Beskid (Pacifica, California) — \$25.00; and an anonymous donation of \$150.00. These and any other tax-deductible donations are being used to further our publication program.

PUBLICATION SCHEDULE

We often receive several inquiries when issues of the *C-RA* are seemingly late. The voluntary nature of our work and the geographic distances that separate our associates sometimes cause delays. To be sure, issues may also be lost in the mail. Please let the business manager know if you have not yet received your copy by the following dates: Spring issue (April 15), Summer issue (July 15), Autumn issue (November 1), Winter issue (January 15). Your patience and understanding is appreciated.

OUR FRONT COVER

Church of St. Nicholas, Zboj, 1766, transferred in 1967 to Bardejovské Kúpele (Eastern Slovakia). Photograph taken from *Wooden Churches in the Carpathians* (Vienna, 1982).

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

THE CARPATHO-RUSYN AMERICAN

A Newsletter on Carpatho-Rusyn Ethnic Heritage

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

Editor: **Patricia A. Krafcik**
Artistic Editor: **Miloš Janovsky**
Business Manager: **Steve Mallick**

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 American
5485 Forest Glen Road
North Madison, Ohio 44057