

CARPATHO-RUSYN AMERICAN

A Newsletter on Carpatho-Rusyn Ethnic Heritage



FROM THE EDITOR

In the last issue, we discussed what has been done to preserve our Carpatho-Rusyn heritage, what we, as cultural activists in our communities, have done to increase knowledge of our own heritage and retain our ethnic identity in this country. We have come a long way — dance groups, publications, exhibits, and television appearances have all served to increase our visibility among ourselves and among the general public. However, with this increased visibility comes increased responsibility.

The issue of visibility before the general public brings to mind an incident which took place this past year. I was attending a large folk festival in western Pennsylvania and thoroughly enjoying a performance by a Carpatho-Rusyn folk group attired in authentic Carpathian dress. I approached a member of the group and, curious as to what her answer might be, I asked: "Who are the Carpatho-Rusyns?" I was astonished by her answer. "Well, it's kind of hard to explain. We aren't Slovak and we aren't Ukrainian." Further probing proved to be futile. Here was a member of a fine Rusyn dance group dressed in authentic costume and she was unable to tell me in a few sentences who she was ethnically.

Curiosity piqued, I set out to determine whether this was a rare occurrence or whether it was more widespread. Numerous inquiries later, I was disappointed to discover that there was indeed a problem. The teens in the dance group, the ladies serving food, the people at the exhibit (with the exception of a few individuals) had difficulty articulating any meaningful information about the nature of our ethnic identity.

I should not have been surprised. I had encountered this problem before — at church picnics and other folk festivals. But my disappointment was more acute in this case, due to the high degree of talent and the professional performance of the group participating in this equally well-run folk festival.

When we represent our national heritage at folk festivals, church picnics, and other events, we are obligated to have the minimal knowledge necessary to answer the most basic of questions — *Who are the Carpatho-Rusyns?* Any Rusyn in authentic costume, serving Rusyn food, participating at an exhibit, or representing Rusyns in any other way must take the time to brief him/herself in order to answer such inquiries.

Although it would be helpful to be able to go into more depth for the more knowledgeable festival-goer, a few short sentences may be sufficient. Something such as, *Carpatho-Rusyns are an East Slavic people numbering nearly 1,700,000 in Europe and America. Our people live near the Carpathian Mountains, which today are within the borders of the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, and Poland. Rusyns also live in some regions of Yugoslavia and Romania.* Frequently, the individual will ask — "What is your religion?"; "Aren't you just like the Russians?"; or similar questions. With some anticipation of possible questions as well as some preparation, we can address these inquiries in an intelligent manner. And then there are always books and other publications we can depend on, such as the recent volume by Dr. Paul R. Magocsi, *Our People*, which provides easy-to-understand information accompanied by numerous maps and photographs.

The issue seems so obvious, yet many Rusyn-Americans have not been able to provide even basic information to festival-goers and other interested people. Festival-goers should not be expected to understand the difficulties encountered by our people in the past in learning about our heritage. "It is difficult to explain" is not a satisfactory answer to the question, *Who are the Carpatho-Rusyns?* We owe it to ourselves as proud Carpatho-Rusyns to present ourselves and our rich and beautiful culture in the best possible way — as knowledgeable, articulate people.

AN APPEAL TO OUR READERS

In the winter 1983 issue, we turned to you our readers and asked for your help regarding the column, "Rusyn Forum." The column is a chronicle of Carpatho-Rusyn activity in many spheres — in society, the community, the church, and in academia, both in Europe and America. A second and equally important purpose is to keep our readership informed of such activities so that they may become more aware of Rusyn activity in the community and also so that they may have the opportunity to participate in events which are of interest to them.

For this column to achieve its dual purpose successfully, we asked our readers to help by sending information about Rusyn events in their parish and in their community. To date, we have received little in this regard.

Our small, geographically dispersed staff cannot by itself acquire information about such activities. It is also difficult for the author of the column, the assistant editor, to keep informed of the many activities taking place in communities across the country.

We suggest that each dance group, parish, or other active Rusyn group ask their publicity director to send information about the group's activities or even a copy of any article written about the event. If your group does not have a publicity chairperson, perhaps some of our readers would be willing to take it upon themselves to perform this vital service. To do this would provide valuable publicity for your group or function as well as keep our readership informed.

Once again, we ask you to send information about recent, as well as future events, taking place in the Rusyn community. Please tell us what type of event it is, when it occurred or will occur, the location, and the name and telephone number of the person who may be contacted for further information. To publicize a future event, we need the information well in advance of the issue date in which it is to be included. We look forward to your contributions and thank you for your help in this important matter. Send information to: John Righetti, 197 Shiloh Avenue, #404, Pittsburgh, PA 15202.

OUR FRONT COVER

"Mother With Child," graphic print from the cycle *Black and White* (1959), by the distinguished contemporary Carpatho-Rusyn artist from the Prešov Region, Orest Dubay.

ALEXANDER DZUBAY (1857-1933)

In this second of four biographies about leading churchmen in Rusyn-American history, we turn to the Reverend Alexander Dzubay, who was to follow in the footsteps of the Reverend Alexis G. Toth, described in the last issue of the *Carpatho-Rusyn American* (Vol. VIII, No. 1).

Like the Reverend Toth, Alexander Dzubay was born into a Greek Catholic priestly family in 1857 in Kal'nyk, a Carpatho-Rusyn village in Bereg county, part of the former Hungarian Kingdom and now the Transcarpathian oblast (Subcarpathian Rus') of the Ukrainian S.S.R. The young Alexander was educated in various secondary schools (Užhorod, Budapest, Sárospatak, and Spišská Nová Ves) before attending the Greek Catholic Seminary in Užhorod, which he completed in 1880. A year later, he married and then was ordained to the priesthood. Within less than a year, however, his wife died. The widowed priest then served in several parishes throughout Subcarpathian Rus' until 1889, when he was sent to America to minister to the Carpatho-Rusyn immigrants in the New World.

Although the Reverend Dzubay was the fourth Greek Catholic priest to arrive in the United States, he was the first to come from the Hungarian Kingdom. Because of this, he later was to consider himself the senior spokesman in America for the Carpatho-Rusyn clergy from south of the mountains. Indeed, Dzubay was a natural-born leader and an effective missionary. First based in Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, he helped to organize before World War I numerous other Greek Catholic parishes in the northeast, including Hazleton, Scranton, Johnstown, and Pittsburgh in Pennsylvania; Passaic and Trenton, New Jersey; Brooklyn, New York; and Minneapolis, Minnesota. He also hosted at his Wilkes-Barre parish the first "congress" of American Greek Catholic priests, held in 1890 to protest the recent Vatican decree concerning restrictions placed on Greek Catholic clergy in America, as well as another meeting of lay and religious leaders in 1892, which resulted in the establishment of the Greek Catholic Union (Sojedinienie).

Like most other Greek Catholic priests at the time, Dzubay hoped for the appointment of a bishop for Greek Catholics in America. That hope was finally fulfilled in 1907, with the appointment of Bishop Soter Ortynsky (1866-1916). However, the new bishop's authority was limited, and many Carpatho-Rusyns were displeased because he was from Galicia and of a Ukrainian national orientation. In order to mitigate such discontent among Carpatho-Rusyns, in 1913 Ortynsky designated Dzubay to be his diocesan vicar-general. The following year Dzubay's influence among the laity rose even further, when he was elected spiritual director of the influential and by then powerful fraternal society, the Greek Catholic Union.

Therefore, when Bishop Ortynsky unexpectedly died in March 1916, it seemed most natural to the supporters of Dzubay — as well as to Dzubay himself — that he would become the new Greek Catholic bishop. The Vatican decided, however, not to make any episcopal appointment, but rather to designate two administrators — one for Carpatho-Rusyns from Hungary and one for Ukrainians from Galicia — and in both cases Dzubay was entirely passed over. Frustrated with this turn of events, the ambitious Dzubay petitioned and was accepted into the Russian Orthodox



Church. Things now moved quickly, and during the summer of 1916 Dzubay was tonsured a monk (July 30), made archimandrite of St. Tikhon's Orthodox Seminary (July 31), and consecrated as Bishop Stephen (August 20) of the recently-created Orthodox "Carpatho-Russian Sub-Diocese of Pittsburgh." As Bishop Stephen, Dzubay renewed his missionary activity, this time effecting the "return" of several Greek Catholic parishes into the fold of Orthodoxy.

Despite Dzubay's successes in the service of Orthodoxy, he was unable to secure a fully independent Carpatho-Rusyn diocese within the Russian Orthodox Church. Therefore, he tried another approach. Taking advantage of jurisdictional difficulties following the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 and the rise of Soviet power in the Russian homeland, Dzubay proclaimed himself in October 1922, the "acting head" of the whole Russian Orthodox Church in America.

This time Dzubay's ambition seemed to have gone too far. Frustrated once again in his attempt to achieve the highest ecclesiastical posts, Dzubay renounced his Orthodox bishopric in 1924 and returned to the Greek Catholic Church. His stormy career was effectively over, so he spent his remaining years in seclusion at the Roman Catholic Monastery at Graymoor in Garrison, New York. Despite his own unfulfilled bid for power, the Reverend Alexander Dzubay did help to establish numerous parishes which continue to function today as part either of the Byzantine Ruthenian Catholic Church or the Orthodox Church in America.

FOLK CUSTOMS OF CARPATHO-RUSYNS BIRTH AND BAPTISM

Until recently, the number of children in Rusyn families was fairly high. The average was four or five per family, but even ten to fifteen children were not considered extraordinary. At the same time, a high mortality rate due to infantile diseases decreased their numbers. The only exception to this pattern could be found among the Rusyns in the Bačka region of northeastern Yugoslavia. As early as the nineteenth century, they established the so-called "one-child system," in order to prevent progressive division of inheritance.

Childlessness was regarded among Rusyns as God's punishment. Society treated childless women with disdain: they could not sit on a church bench; when at a wedding, they were forbidden to put the marriage cap on the bride's head; they were not allowed to join their family at the table, and so on. However, a pregnancy occurring too soon after the wedding was not desirable either. In order to put it off, women used several "magic" tricks: a bride returning from the wedding ceremony sat down on as many of her fingers for as many years as she did not want to have children. Alternatively, she could make the appropriate number of bundles on her *parta*, a ribbon-like decoration on the bride's head.

Pregnant women were generally held in high esteem. They were exempt from hard work, fed better than normally, and their wishes were satisfied generously. On the other hand, pregnant women had to respect a number of "magic" restrictions. They did not bake bread so that the child would not have a consuming "fire" in its body. They did not dry hemp and thus avoided tuberculosis (in Rusyn: *suchoty*, literally a "drying-up disease"). They did not eat hare meat so that the child would not suffer from harelip. They did not bathe in a stream so that the child would not drown. Other similarly motivated restrictions included leaping across fire or across a rope or shaft-bar, sitting on a grave or a log, looking into the sun, or watching something ugly. Pregnant women were also forbidden to stroke dogs, to touch an oven, to eat rotting food, to drink water after sundown, to steal, to become angry, to curse, and so on. In some villages, women in advanced pregnancy were forbidden to go into the fields for fear of hail destroying the crops. On the other hand, it was believed that if a pregnant woman walked around a burning house three times, the fire would cease to spread, or if she walked around a fruit tree, the yield would be higher.

The pregnant woman was expected to protect herself from so-called "unclean spirits." For that purpose, she would wear or hold close to herself a piece of garlic, a knife, or another object made of iron. In order to make sure that the child would be attractive, the pregnant woman often looked at holy pictures. Even today some young pregnant women continue the practice, carrying instead, a photograph of a popular actor.

The childbirth itself was connected with a number of other customs. Normally, it took place at home with the assistance of a *babka* or *povitucha*, a midwife. When the childbirth was difficult, all the locks in the household were unlocked and all knots were loosened. If this was not "effective" enough, the woman was massaged, bathed in an extract of camomile, given wine or walked around the house, or even shaken in a trough.

Immediately after the birth, the midwife sprinkled the child with consecrated water and laid it on a sheep's skin so that it would be healthy. Special precaution was taken not to lay the child with its feet pointing toward the door, for it was feared that this could lead to an early death. A list of appearance traits in the newborn interpreted in a superstitious manner could go on for pages: for instance, curly hair was believed to signify future wealth; clenched fists indicated tight-fistedness, and eyebrows grown together marked a future sage. A child born with a caul or "cap" on the head was expected to have good luck; whereas hair grown in the shape of two little wreaths was believed to foreshadow widowhood, and so on. Sometimes a newborn son was taken to the stable to be "introduced" to the cattle.

Great importance was attached to the child's first bath. The parents would throw a coin, a grain, or a piece of garlic into the bath. Next to the tub they would lay a book, a pen, an axe, a scythe, a hammer, or a plowshare. If the baby was a girl, the parents would put a spindle, a needle, and a piece of thread into the water. This was believed to arouse a love of work and learning in the child from the very first moment. In order to make the child hardened against the cold, a pair of goose legs were dipped into the water before the bathing. The money taken out of the first bath was used as a reward for the midwife. The water from the first bath was spilled into the manure heap or into a place not frequented by people. This was also the place where the parents would bury the placenta.

When the bathing was over, the midwife usually made little "corrections" of the imperfections in the child's appearance. She would shape the head, straighten the legs, make a dimple on the chin and on the cheeks. Then she would dress the child in a new shirt, or wrap it in a diaper and put it on the floor or under the table from where the father would pick it up and lay it on the table. This act was a symbolic manifestation of his fatherhood.

The mother's bed was usually located in a corner of the room and curtained off with a piece of canvas. Here the mother was confined for six weeks after the birth, or at least until the baptism of the child. Prior to the baptism, a number of restrictions were in effect. Nothing could be taken out of the room, the mother could not turn her back on the child, nor could she leave it alone in the room because, it was feared, the "unclean spirits" would take the child and leave another in its place. Subcarpathian folklore includes a number of tales about "changelings" (*odminy*). In these tales, a good child was exchanged by a witch (*bohynka*, *bosorka* or *povitruľja*) for a bad one. In order to prevent such an exchange, the child's identity was marked by a piece of red thread bound on its wrist.

If the mother died in or after childbirth, the relatives usually wished that the child also die. They put the child to its dead mother's breast or lay it next to her. If the child remained alive, it was believed that the ghost of the mother came in through the window at night to rock, bathe, and feed the child, so they left the window open, put water into the tub, and so on.

Immediately after childbirth and in the following weeks, the mother was visited by neighbors and close relatives who brought into "her corner" the best food available, such as chicken soup, meat, and cakes. In order to "fortify" herself if necessary, the mother kept in her corner a bottle of wine or even homemade brandy. Unlike the mother, the newborn child could be seen only by close relatives. They were ex-

pected to spit upon the child symbolically and say something critical about it, for instance, "How ugly the child is!" Any praise of the child was feared to bring misfortune.

The birth of a child was naturally a reason for festivities. A little feast arranged by the father followed the first bathing. But the big feast took place only after the baptism (*chrestynj, krstynj*) where the most esteemed guests were the godfather and the godmother. Sponsorship was a highly respected institution and it turned the godparents into nearest kin. To underline their respect for the godparents, the parents even ceased to address them with the informal *tj* (thou) and turned to the more ceremonious *vj* (you). To reject the privilege of becoming godparents was regarded as extremely improper. The godparents of the first-born child were then usually godparents of subsequent children. The godparents were changed only if "their" child died. If several children died in succession, the mother went to give birth in a household of strangers, and the sponsorship was offered to the humblest of people: to a tramp, a gypsy, or simply to the first person the parents met when bringing the child to the baptism.

The child was usually baptized two or three weeks after its birth, or sooner if it was sick. The godparents would bring a child's shirt (*križmo*), a cap, and a piece of linen to the baptism. Into the swaddling clothes of the child they would put a piece of garlic and bread. The child was brought to the baptism by either the midwife or the godmother. Sometimes the child was taken out of the house not through the door, but through the window, in order to "outwit" the "unclean spirits." The first child was usually named for the father or mother. The girl's name was usually determined by the father. The most frequent male names were: Jurij, Mychajlo, Petro, Ivan, and Mykola. The most frequent female names were: Marija, Hanna, Kateryna, and Paraska. If the newborn child was illegitimate, its name would be determined by the priest. Often the name was unusual in the given locality, and thus marked the child for the rest of its life.

When the child was at the baptism, its cradle was filled with bread so that the "vacancy" would not be filled by the "unclean spirits." The baptism itself was connected with another series of superstitions. The crying of the child during the baptism signified a long and cheerful life; a candle that died out in the hand of the godmother, or a pit dug in the cemetery adjoining the church, was believed to foreshadow the early death of the child.

When the parents returned from the baptism with the child, they would lay the child near the oven or on the table, and the midwife would recite a customary wish, such as the following one recorded in the village of Kurov near Bardejov in the Prešov Region of northeastern Slovakia. (The translation of this verse and all subsequent verses is literal, omitting the original rhythm and rhyme.)

*Vzajaly zme vam pohanča,
Priňesly zme chrystyjanča,
Žebj ono roslo komu tomu,
Sameperše Bohu Ocu Nebeskomu,
A tak nanjovi, mami, didovi, babi
Na radist', na potichu,
A chresným rodičom na dobru odsluhu.
Žebj ono do cerkvi chodylo,
Ale i korčmi nezabývalo.*

We took away from you a pagan,
We have brought you a Christian,

So that it would grow up for many,
Especially for God, our Heavenly Father,
And also for the father, mother, grandfather and
grandmother
For their joy and pleasure,
And also to reward its godparents.
So that it would go to church,
But that it would not shun the tavern either (so
that it would be sociable).

If the baby was a girl, the wish would continue as follows:

*Žebj z nej byla v polju robotnyca,
V tanci tanečnica,
Do učynja šikovna,
I do ljubynja sposobna.*

So that she would be a good worker in the field,
A good dancer,
Able to learn,
And able to love.

The baptized girl would then be passed from one set of hands to another so that, when grown up, she would go from the hands of one young man to those of another at a dance.

If the baby was a boy, the wish would end like this:

*Bj mu zdravja ne chýbovalo,
Ale i pinjazi nebrakovalo,
Žebj znal oraty—sijaty,
Ale i pirkó v rukach trymaty.*

So that he would not be poor in health,
Or lack money,
So that he would be able to plow and sow,
But also to hold a pen.

The baptismal feast usually took place on Sunday afternoon. The meals served were usually quite simple such as mutton, cheese, or *mačanka* (a mushroom sauce with meat), boiled meat, and cakes. The drinks usually included wine and brandy. The cups had to be emptied to the last drop so that the child would not be tearful. At present, the fare at the baptismal feast is usually made in a restaurant. Instead of traditional baptismal cakes, the guests eat desserts and store-bought cakes. The guests at the feast usually include the godparents, close relatives, and neighbors. Each of the women present bring a baptismal gift, usually flour, sugar, coffee, rice, a chicken, or cakes. Sometimes the parents invited a musician to the feast. The most opulent feasts were held for the first-born son.

An important part of the baptismal feasts were songs for the occasion. Cheerful feasts with merry songs were believed to foreshadow a happy and contented life for the child, whereas baptismal feasts without much singing would predict a sad fate for the child. According to one of the songs recorded in the village of Kurov:

*Ani toto kresna
Vesele nebude,
Ked' mu chresna maty
Spivaty nebude.*

The baptized child
Won't be cheerful
If its godmother
Does not sing for it.

The main topic of the baptismal feast songs was praise for the mother, as in this song recorded in the town of Medzilaborce, also in the Prešov Region:

*A naša kumička
Jak jasna zornička
U polozi ležyt',
Dribných rybok bažyt'.
Chocbý sja mi pryšlo
Po pas namočity,
Ja kumočci mušu
Rybok nalovyty.*

And so our dear woman
Like a clear morning star
Lies after the birth,
And wants to eat little fish.
Even if I were
To get wet up to my waist,
I much catch for her
Some fish.

Sometimes the songs make gentle fun of the godparents, as in this song recorded in the village of Kružlov, near Bardejov, in the Prešov Region:

*Kresnýj otec zaspal,
Krsna zadrimala,
Škoda tej paradý
Že sja tak prybrala.*

The godfather fell asleep,
The godmother is dozing too,
So why did she bother to put on
That luxurious dress.

The baptismal feast usually lasted until night. If the guests were still singing on their way home, it was a sign to the village that the feast was a success.

According to church rules, the *vývid* (the mother's leaving her after-birth confinement) took place six weeks after the birth. However, many women tried to shorten this period and return to ordinary life and work as soon as possible. When the mother had given birth for the first time, she was accompanied to the ceremony of the *vývid* by the midwife or mother-in-law. If the child was not the first-born, the mother would go to the ceremony by herself with the child. The usual recommendation to the mother going to the *vývid* ceremony was to put on her petticoat upside down. In that case the "unclean spirits" would have no access to her. At present, the *vývid* ceremony is usually connected with the baptism.

The birth of a child was also connected with other folk beliefs. It was believed that the next child would be of the same sex as the first person the mother met when going to the *vývid*. If the mother did not wish to have any more children, she would dig an axe without a handle into the earth, or she would throw a closed lock without a key into a well.

At present, the pattern of childbirth in Subcarpathian Rus' (Transcarpathia), the Prešov Region, as well as in the Bačka in Yugoslavia, is considerably different than in the past. Childbirth usually takes place in maternity hospitals with the assistance of doctors. However, some of the old customs and superstitions are still alive. In the countryside, even today, most parents have their child baptized in church, even if those parents are otherwise not church-goers. In such

cases, the baptism is usually arranged by grandparents or other relatives. More widespread nowadays are the state-promoted ceremonies "welcoming the children to life," organized by local authorities. These ceremonies represent an interesting symbiosis of old folk customs with present-day tendencies. Even at this "non-church baptism" godparents are chosen and traditional songs are sung at the subsequent feasts.

Mykola Mušynka
Prešov, Czechoslovakia

RECENT PUBLICATIONS 1981 (continued)

Dzendzelivs'kyj, J. O. "Stan doslidžennja henezy ukrajins'kich dialektiv" (The Status of Research on the Genesis of Ukrainian Dialects), *Movoznavstvo*, XV, 1 (Kiev, 1981), pp. 45-51.

This brief article in Ukrainian by the leading specialist on Carpatho-Rusyn speech presents a revised classification scheme for dialects in Soviet Transcarpathia. Based primarily on lexical data, the author speaks of four Carpatho-Rusyn dialectal sub-groups in Transcarpathia: (1) Už dialects—between the Už and Latorycja valleys; (2) Boržava dialects between the Latorycja and Rika valleys; (3) Maramaroš dialects—between the Rika and Sopurka valleys; and (4) Verchovyna dialects—northernmost mountainous regions of western and central Transcarpathia. Of these four sub-groups, the author argues that the Maramaroš dialects are the oldest.

Fedaka, Pavel M.; Tivodar, Michail P.; and Mazjuta, Michail A. *Zakarpatskij Muzej Narodnoj Architektury i Byta: putevoditel'* (The Transcarpathian Museum of Folk Architecture and Ethnography: A Guidebook). Užhorod: Karpaty, 1981, 96 p.

The outdoor museum of folk architecture adjacent to the castle in Užhorod is a rich and easily accessible source of knowledge about life in traditional Carpatho-Rusyn villages. This guidebook in Russian (with 32 color illustrations and résumés Hungarian and Slovak) provides a good description of the various traditional houses transported from each region in the Transcarpathian oblast. Also included in this model village is a water mill, a tavern (*korčma*), and—the most impressive structure—the beautiful wooden church from Šelestovo (eighteenth century), complete with iconostasis.

Grendža-Dons'kyj, Vasyl'. *Tvory Vasylja Grendži-Dons'koho*, Vol. I: *Poeziji* (The Works of Vasyl' Grendža-Dons'kyj, Vol. I: Poetry). Washington, D.C.: Carpathian Alliance, Washington D.C. Branch, 1981, xxvi and 456 p.

Vasyl' Grendža-Dons'kyj (1897-1974) was the most outstanding Ukrainian-language writer in Subcarpathian Rus' during the interwar years and one of the most prolific writers to have come from the region. This volume, compiled by the author's daughter Zirka Grendža-Dons'ka and with an introduction by Bohdan Romančuk, is intended as the first of a multivolume series that will reproduce most of the writer's creative corpus.

Included are reprints or typewritten reproductions of Grendža-Dons'kyj's first and most famous collections of poetry that appeared between 1923 and 1936 in Czechoslova-

Ukraine (Užhorod), Poland (L'viv), and the Soviet Ukraine (Khar'kov). There are also his poetic works from 1922 to 1974 that appeared in various publications. During his lifetime, Grendža-Dons'kyj continually revised his poems, some having as many as three or more variants. The compiler has wisely reprinted the original texts, although to observe the creative process of the writer the most recent reworked variants are appended as well to each collection. The volume concludes with a brief lexicon of dialectal words (with their Ukrainian equivalents) and an index.

(Available for \$21.00 from the Carpathian Alliance, Washington Branch, 5716 - 46th Avenue South, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55417).

Gustavsson, Sven. "Rusinerna i Jugoslavien" (Rusyns in Yugoslavia), *Nord Nytt*, XIX, 11 (Viborg, Denmark, 1981), pp. 67-76.

This general survey by the Swedish Slavist Sven Gustavsson provides a useful introduction to the Vojvodinian or Bačka Rusyns of Yugoslavia. There are sections on settlement patterns (with map), language, national identity, and contemporary developments.

Hanudel', Zuzana. *Linhvistyčnyj atlas ukrajins'kych horiv i kuchonoh načynnja* (Linguistic Atlas of the Ukrainian Dialects of Eastern Slovakia, Vol. I: Names for Food, Dishes, and Cooking Utensils). Bratislava and Prešov: Slovac'ke pedahohične vydavnyctvo, vidil ukrajins'koji literatury, 1981, 212 p.

Following the model and virtually exact format of Josyp Dzendzelivs'kyj's earlier linguistic atlases for the Transcarpathian oblast (Subcarpathian Rus'), Zuzana Hanudel' has produced the first linguistic atlas for the Carpatho-Rusyn dialects still spoken in the Prešov Region of northeastern Slovakia. The author has chosen 126 words all dealing with domestic cooking and has surveyed their various dialectal forms in 125 villages from Stráňany in far western Spiš to Nová Sedlica in the far northeast of the Prešov Region.

Each word has its own map with an indication of its spoken form in all 125 villages. There are also 7 isogloss maps, 26 pages of explanations for each map (in Ukrainian), an index of every dialectal form that appears, a list of all place names surveyed, a comprehensive bibliography (over 500 entries) of studies on Carpatho-Rusyn dialects in the Prešov Region, and an introduction by the leading Carpatho-Rusyn dialectologist in neighboring Transcarpathia, Josyp Dzendzelivs'kyj. This work is an excellent beginning for what plans to be a comprehensive codification of the rich, albeit rapidly disappearing, Carpatho-Rusyn dialects.

Herenčuk, Kalynk I., ed. *Pryroda Zakarpats'koji oblasti* (The Geography of the Transcarpathian Region). L'viv: Vyšča škola, 1981, 156 p.

The beautiful and in many areas untouched nature of the Subcarpathian region has for many decades attracted writers as well as geographers. This survey (in Ukrainian) provides an introductory description of the geological formations, climate, water resources, plants, soils, land use, and conservation in the Transcarpathian region. Included are 21 maps and illustrations and bibliography.

Hvat', Ivan. "Skil'ky ukrajinciv u Čecho-Slovaččyni?: pro manipulaciju v statystyčnych publikacijach ČSSR" (How Many Ukrainians are there in Czechoslovakia?: About Manipulation in the Statistical Publications of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic), *Sučasnist'*, XXI, 2 (Munich, 1981), pp. 82-88.

According to official Czechoslovak statistics, the number of Ukrainian-Rusyns in the Prešov Region of northeastern Slovakia has ranged from a low of 33,000 in 1961 to 41,000 in 1979, which is well below the 1930 census figure of 91,076. The author of this article attributes in part the problem of numerical fluctuation to the varying names given to the population—Ukrainian, Rusyn, Russian—designations which are not always combined in statistical calculations. This is also the first study to appear in a Ukrainian-language publication in the West, which points out that much of the problem stems from the forced implementation of a Ukrainian identity carried out upon the Carpatho-Rusyn inhabitants of the Prešov Region during the 1950's.

J.V.K. "Podkarpatská Rus a dokumenty k její anexi Sovětským Svazem v letech 1944-1945" (Subcarpathian Rus' and Documents Concerning its Annexation to the Soviet Union in the Years 1944-1945), *Československá cesta*, I, 3-4 (Kanata, Ontario, 1981), pp. 40-44.

This brief article and eight documents (all in Czech) from previously published works by F. Němec, V. Moudry, and J. Brugel are intended to underline Soviet territorial designs on Subcarpathian Rus' at the close of World War II.

Kandel', Volodymyr L. *Svaljava: putivnyk* (Svaljava: A Guidebook). Užhorod: Karpaty, 1981, 88 p.

Svaljava is a small town that lies in the foothills of the Carpathians, about 15 miles northeast of Mukačevo in former Bereg county (today the Transcarpathian oblast). This short guide with texts in Ukrainian and Russian and 32 photographs provides a brief historical background and description of the town at the present.

Kasinec, Edward and Bohdan A. Struminsky, compilers. *Byzantine-Ruthenian Antimensia in the Episcopal and Heritage Institute Libraries of the Byzantine Catholic Diocese of Passaic*. Passaic, N.J.: Episcopal and Heritage Institute Libraries, 1981, 55 p.

Antimensia are altar cloths used in Eastern Christian Churches either for portable use or in fixed placement on a consecrated altar. They usually have an embroidered representation, or icon, depicting the Deposition from the Cross or the Entombment of Christ. This handsome catalog shows 22 antimensia that belonged to the Greek Catholic bishops of the Carpatho-Rusyn dioceses of Mukačevo (1716-1924) and Prešov (1818-1960); the Hungarian diocese of Hajdudorog (1913-1972); the Croatian-Rusyn diocese of Križevci (1914-1940); and the Byzantine Rite Catholic Archdiocese in the United States (1907-present).

The catalog includes a photographic reproduction of each antimensium, followed by a transcription (in the original Old Slavonic with English translation) of the dedication that appears on each altar cloth. Introductions by the Reverend Archimandrite Januarius M. Izzo and by the compilers describe the general function of antimensia and their historic importance for Carpatho-Rusyn culture.

(Available from the Diocese of Passaic, Heritage Institute, 101 Market Street, Passaic, New Jersey 07055).

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

THE CARPATHO-RUSYN AMERICAN
ISSN 0749-9213

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. Onufrak**
Associate Editor: **Andrew G. Kovaly**
Assistant Editor: **John Righetti**
Consulting Editor: **Patricia A. Krafcik**
Business Manager: **Steve Mallick**

Communications concerning content should be sent to:

Patricia A. Onufrak, Editor
Carpatho-Rusyn American
1718 Linwood Place
McLean, Virginia 22101

Annual subscription: \$7.00
To subscribe, send check or money order to:

Carpatho-Rusyn American
5485 Forest Glen Road
North Madison, Ohio 44057