It was a warm summer morning, August 11, 1975, to be exact, and a group of people were gathering in a small town in western Pennsylvania. These people were eagerly waiting to hear a group of scholars and cultural activists speak on their ethnic heritage, a heritage that had been hidden away by previous generations in an attempt to display a loyalty to a new home — America. This was a heritage which was emerging once again, this time to be viewed with fascination and pride by a new generation of Americans, a generation separated from the land of their forefathers by an ocean.

The American passion for ethnicity has been attributed to Alex Haley's *Roots*, an historical novel published in 1976. But this group of people, one which would swell to over 250 in number by the end of the second day, had never heard of Alex Haley or his forebear Kunta Kinte. They only knew of mothers and fathers, *babu* and *didu* (grandmothers and grandfathers), who had made the arduous trip by boat to the land of promise, bringing with them their hopes, dreams, and a love of their people which would be passed on from generation to generation. Representatives of this second and third generation were present here, anxious to learn more about their people, *our people* — the Carpatho-Rusyns.

This year marks the tenth anniversary since the *Cultural Seminar on Carpatho-Ruthenia*, organized by Dr. Paul R. Magocsi and sponsored by the Sisters of St. Basil the Great at their Motherhouse in Uniontown, Pennsylvania. This two-day seminar at Mount Saint Macrina will always be remembered as a milestone in the development of cultural awareness by Carpatho-Rusyns in the United States. Indeed, the interest exhibited by those in attendance encouraged the establishment of numerous performing folk ensembles, the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center, and ultimately, the *Carpatho-Rusyn American*.

Scholars and activists came from all over the east coast to participate in this important seminar. One scholar came from as far away as Oregon. Their personal backgrounds were varied — several were not Rusyns and two were European-born, but they were united by a high level of scholarship and motivated by a desire to share this knowledge with the eager group assembled in this picturesque Pennsylvania town.

The two-day seminar began early Monday morning with an introductory talk by the late Msgr. Gino C. Baroni, President of the National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs in Washington, D.C. Msgr. Baroni, using anecdotes and exhibiting emotion and insight, spoke on the current revival of ethnicity in America in his talk, "The Ethnic Factor in American Life."

Dr. Paul R. Magocsi, then of Harvard University, followed with "The Historical Context of Subcarpathian Ruthenia." In his lecture, he pointed out that Rusyns have always been dominated by stronger powers — both political and ecclesiastical — accounting for their lack of national consciousness.

After a short break, Rev. Dr. Athanasius Pekar, OSBM, then a professor at the Byzantine Catholic Seminary of Saints Cyril and Methodius in Pittsburgh, spoke on "Highlights in the Development of the Church in Subcarpathian Ruthenia."

The final lecture held that evening was "Social and Economic Life in Carpatho-Rusyn Immigrant Communities," delivered by Prof. Richard Renoff, Department of Sociology, Nassau Community College, State University of New York. Renoff's lecture dealt with the adjustment of these new immigrants to life in America and their survival despite severe economic discrimination (Rusyn miners were the lowest paid workers of all the nationalities). He also brought attention to the fact that the sense of community among Rusyn immigrants led to the creation of numerous mutual support groups: boarding houses, newspapers, mutual aid societies, and a strong Greek Catholic Church.

Seminar participants returned early the following day to hear additional lectures by Dr. Magocsi: "Carpatho-Ruthenian Language and Literature" and "Carpatho-Ruthenian Art and Architecture."

Professor Stephen Reynolds, Department of Religion, University of Oregon, followed with "Carpatho-Ruthenian Liturgical Music" in which he detailed the history and form of Carpathian plain chant. Since Professor Reynolds is not of Rusyn background, his dedication to the study and preservation of Carpathian plain chant was especially inspirational.

In the "Future of Carpatho-Ruthenian Studies in the United States," Edward Kasinec, then a librarian at Harvard University, made a moving appeal for additional interest in and support of current studies on Subcarpathian history and culture. Noting that much invaluable archival material had already been inadvertently discarded, he stressed the need to preserve these remnants of the past.

Later that evening, Maria Magocsi performed Carpatho-Ruthenian folk dances. Mrs. Magocsi had been a member of the Dukla Song and Dance Ensemble, Prešov, Czechoslovakia.

The seminar concluded with the showing of Mychajlo Kocjubyns'kyj's film, "Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors," a Hutsul love story. The picturesque surroundings of Mount Saint Macrina further enhanced viewer pleasure.

In conjunction with the seminar, there was an exhibit of books reflecting the topics which were discussed.

The *Cultural Seminar on Carpatho-Ruthenia* was successful both for the information imparted to the participants and for the momentum it gave to the Carpatho-Rusyn revival in the United States. We commend all those who were involved with the seminar on their great contribution to the study of Carpatho-Rusyn history and culture.

We would like to invite those who participated in this seminar, as well as our readers and the Rusyn community in general, to join us in celebrating the tenth anniversary since the *Cultural Seminar on Carpatho-Ruthenia*. We are planning a conference, to be held in the spring of 1986, to mark ten years of cultural activity since the Uniontown event. Details of that conference will be discussed in the next issue. We hope that you will join us in celebrating this anniversary of this milestone in the development of cultural awareness by Carpatho-Rusyns in America.

A set of four cassettes featuring the lectures from the Cultural Seminar on Carpatho-Ruthenia are available for $16.95 from the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center, 355 Delano Place, Fairview, N.J. 07022.
Perhaps the most active and certainly the most consistent Rusyn-American cultural activist in the first half of the twentieth century was the Reverend Joseph P. Hanulya. Among his many achievements were the publication of the first Carpatho-Rusyn grammar, the first reader for Rusyn-Americans, and the initiation of the first Rusyn-American cultural organization.

Joseph P. Hanulya was born in 1874 in a Carpatho-Rusyn village located in the Prešov Region of what is today northeastern Czechoslovakia. After ordination to the Greek Catholic priesthood, Hanulya served in several local parishes in the diocese of Prešov before being sent in 1904 to serve Rusyn immigrants in the United States. First assigned to a parish in Allegheny, Pennsylvania, in 1914 he was transferred to Holy Ghost Greek Catholic Church in Cleveland, Ohio, where he remained pastor for almost half a century until his death in 1962.

Besides his pastoral duties, Hanulya had a passionate concern for the cultural and educational needs of Rusyn Americans. He realized that the strength of the church and the individuals who comprised its flock could only be assured if each person had a clear understanding of his or her secular as well as religious cultural heritage. Such cultural proselytism was already evident on the pages of the newspaper Rusin—The Ruthenian (Philadelphia; Allegheny; Pittsburgh, 1910-1916), of which Hanulya was the founding editor.

But Hanulya knew that it was young people who ultimately would determine whether the Carpatho-Rusyn heritage could be maintained in the New World. Therefore, for the network of Rusyn schools (Rus'ka škola), which were widespread in the northeast United States during the early years of this century, Hanulya wrote the first Grammar for American Rusyns (Hrammatyka dlja amerykanskih rusynov, 1918) and compiled the first Reader for American Rusyns (Cytanka dlja amerykanskoj rus'koj molodeži, 1919, 2nd ed. 1935). Realizing that English would soon become the dominant if not sole language among the descendants of the early immigrants, he also prepared the first and still to this day the only general history in English of Rusin Literature (1941).

Throughout the many religious controversies that wracked the Rusyn-American community during the first half of the twentieth century, Hanulya remained loyal to the Greek/Byzantine Rite Catholic Church. Nonetheless, he was at the same time a staunch defender of the particular traditions of the Eastern Church, speaking out forcefully for the maintenance of eastern Christian practices, whether on the pages of his and other newspapers, on radio talk shows in the Cleveland area, as a member in the 1930s of KOVO — Committee for the Defense of the Eastern Rite — or in his two-volume study, The Eastern Ritual (1954).

However, the eastern orientation toward the religious and cultural heritage of Rus' did not lead Hanulya to confuse his people with Russians. He frequently urged young people not to call themselves Russians, nor for that matter Ruthenians, but to preserve the traditional national name of their ancestral Slavic forebears from the Subcarpathian region — Rusyn.

In order to assure that such attitudes be carried on, Hanulya initiated, in 1927, the establishment of the Rusin Elite Society. Based in Cleveland, this first cultural society among Rusyns was intended to attract the American-born second generation community members. With its stress on diffusing Carpatho-Rusyn cultural awareness, the Rusin Elite Society published an illustrated bilingual Rusyn and English monthly magazine, Vozd — The Leader (Lakewood, Ohio, 1929-30).

Among Hanulya's last achievements was his contribution toward the erection of the first public monument in the United States to a Carpatho-Rusyn historical figure, the statue of "national awakener" Aleksander Duchnovyc in the Rusin Cultural Garden within Cleveland's Cultural Gardens. As president of the Rusin Cultural Garden Association, Hanulya joined together with Bishop Basil Takach to unveil the monument in June 1952. (On the unfortunate demise of the Rusin Cultural Garden, see the Carpatho-Rusyn American, Vol. VI, No. 1, 1983).

The intense activity for over half a century of the Reverend Joseph P. Hanulya reveals the extent to which some Rusyn-Americans have always sought to preserve their distinct heritage on these shores. In a sense, the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center is a spiritual descendant of Hanulya, and we hope to be able to carry on further the fine model that was set by him.

Philip Michaels
The wedding, no doubt, has the dominant position among the domestic customs of the Rusyns. Historically, there developed at different times five basic types of weddings among Rusyns: (1) abduction of the bride; (2) “buying” the bride; (3) the so-called “exchange”; (4) prystaštvo (the man’s marrying into his bride’s parents’ house); and (5) the “mainstream” type of wedding.

Abduction of the bride (vykradanja) as a means of starting a marriage is mentioned in Nestor’s Chronicle of the eleventh century, one of the oldest histories of the area. The continuation of this practice is attested in another important historical document, the book Description d’Ukraine, written in 1650 by the French traveller G. Beauplan. It is worth noting that the abduction of one’s future wife was fairly widespread and generally tolerated.

The custom of “kidnapping” the bride was retained in the mountainous areas of Subcarpathia as late as the nineteenth century. It survived longest among the Rusyns settled in what is now a part of southwestern Romania. In the village of Scejuš, in the county of Timişoara, I met a Rusyn woman who was “kidnapped” by her lover from her husband as recently as the late 1940’s. The chief reason for the abduction of the bride (with her consent!) was that her parents would not agree to the marriage for some reason. The couple usually found asylum with relatives or friends in another village, and after several days or weeks, they returned to their parents’ homes to get “properly” married — though without the usual wedding feast. Both the parents, who clearly had no other choice, and the society tolerated this unconventional manner of establishing a family. Some of the less affluent parents even welcomed it, for it absorbed them of financing the costly wedding feasts.

Certain elements of the abduction of the bride are still present today in the Carpatho-Rusyn folk wedding ritual, though few people realize their connection with the “real thing” of the past.

The “purchase” of the bride usually took place at the “girls’ fairs” discussed in the article on Whitsun customs (Carpatho-Rusyn American, Vol. VII, No. 2, 1984). The “girls’ fair” held at Krásny Brod, near the town of Medzilaborce, was the most well known. The purchase of brides was not the only purpose of these fairs. They were primarily a pretext for the meeting of Rusyn shepherds and peasants living throughout the year in small, isolated hamlets and villages scattered across Subcarpathian Rus’. But, as was natural for young people who otherwise had little opportunity to get married in their sparsely populated communities, many agreed to marriages at these fairs. Since each member of the patriarchal family was an indispensable participant in the economic endeavor, the bride’s family thought it appropriate to demand of the parents of the bridegroom a certain compensation for losing a member of its “labor force”. This “purchasing” of the bride is reflected in many rituals of the present-day Rusyn folk wedding in Subcarpathian Rus’, such as the bridegroom’s “purchase of a heifer” when he is courting the bride, his “purchasing” his bride during the course of the wedding procession, his buying the wedding crown or parta (a decoration with ribbons for the bride’s head) for the bride, and so on.

The third form of contracting a marriage was the so-called “exchange” (obmin, čerjana). According to this custom, a brother and a sister from one family got married simultaneously to a sister and a brother from another family. In such cases, neither of the two families involved demanded the otherwise customary marriage dowry. The economic advantage of this kind of wedding, especially for the poorer people, was further enhanced by the fact that the families held only one wedding feast for the two couples. However, the “exchange” wedding, like the “abduction” or the “purchase” types of wedding, became very rare as early as the nineteenth century, and in the twentieth century, they are the exception.

The fourth form of entering the marital bond was the prystaštvo (the bridegroom’s marrying into the house of his bride’s parents). The most frequent reason for this kind of marriage was that the bride had no older brothers, and the bridegroom’s helping hands were needed in this household, while the household of the man’s parents could do without his help. This kind of wedding was rather disadvantageous for the prystaš (the man who married into his bride’s parents’ house). In theory, he could inherit the property of his wife’s parents (or at least a part of it), but in practice this hardly ever happened. Moreover, the bride’s parents or brothers could disinherit the prystaš any time they pleased. The uncertain position of the man who married into the house of his bride’s parents is best summed up in the folk saying: Prystaševa torba vse na klynku vysyt’ (literally, “the bag of the prystaš is always hanging on a hook.”) The meaning is that the prystaš could be driven out of the house at any time, picking up his basic “chattel” from the “hook” and leaving.

The most widespread form of wedding, however, has always been that of the bride’s marrying into the house of her bridegroom’s parents. This occurred on the basis of mutual agreement between the future spouses and their parents. Let us now have a closer look at this most typical type of Rusyn wedding.

It is perhaps appropriate to say that the Carpatho-Rusyn folk wedding was a complex “theatrical” form comprising elements of song, dance, music, spoken word, and even artistic design. These elements, along with the rational and “magic” undercurrents present in the “performance,” developed over time into a harmonious “play” with firmly established rules. Each of the participants had a particular role in the folk wedding.

The chief protagonist of the “play” was, of course, the bride (molodyca, moloda). She was dressed in a special wedding costume which, as late as the beginning of the twentieth century, had to include a fur coat, regardless of the time of year. The bridegroom (molodyh) had to wear a long linen coat, the so-called čuha or guba. Both the fur coat and the čuha were to demonstrate the couple’s affluence, and their wearing them at the wedding ceremony was also to signify their future prosperity. There were also other indispensable aspects of the couple’s appearance at the wedding: the bride was to wear a small periwinkle (barvinok) wreath on her head, the bridegroom had to put a “feather” of rosemary in his hat. Important roles were played by the “wedding” father and the “wedding” mother of both the bride and the bridegroom. Should any of them be deceased at the time of the wedding, their role would be taken by one of the nearest relatives.

The two chief organizers of the wedding were the starosta
(representing the bridegroom's side) and the maršalko or nastavnyk (representing the bride's side). They were to see that all tradition was carefully followed. The outward signs of their function were specially embroidered towels and a special kind of mountain axe, the so-called topirec. The "cast" of the wedding "play" also included the bridesmaids and the groomsmen. The respective godfathers usually played the role of zastavnyký (flag-bearers). The bridegroom's godmother was the senior svasačka (the senior female member of the wedding party on the bridegroom's side), and the bride's godmother was the senior prydannyc (the senior female member of the wedding party on the bride's side). Other relatives played the parts of ordinary svaty and svaský (male and female guests on the bridegroom's side) and of prydannyký and prydannycy (male and female guests on the bride's side). There was a special ritual prescribed for the invitation of the people who were to serve as "functionaries" at the wedding, as well as a special ritual for their inauguration into these functions.

The most popular time of the year in which to hold a wedding was in late winter or early spring, the period of fašynky or maslenycja (roughly between Christmas and the start of the Great Lent before Easter). Even though each village had its own variations of the wedding customs, the basic pattern was common to the entire Subcarpathian region. This pattern consisted of the following stages:

Rozvydyjny (the "reconnaissance"): In past generations of Carpatho-Rusyns (almost until the middle of the twentieth century), mutual affection among prospective spouses was not necessarily the main factor in contracting the marriage. Often the matchmaking decision was left up to the respective parents whose considerations were more rational than emotional. When choosing a partner for their child, they especially considered economic status, morality, character, health, industriousness, and so on. The initiative in the "reconnaissance" usually came from the parents of the bridegroom. The mission to determine the "marriageability" of the prospective bride was entrusted to an "envoy," usually one of the bridegroom's relatives. If his findings were favorable, an "official delegation" of the bridegroom's family was sent to the bride's parents' house.

Sprosyny (the asking for the bride's hand): The above-mentioned delegation consisted of two or three relatives of the bridegroom. At least one of the delegates was to be an experienced man and a convincing orator. Usually this man later became the starosta. The delegates (sprostary, literally, "the askers") came to the bride's parents' house unannounced. It was not appropriate for them to come directly to the point. In a roundabout way they started to speak of themselves as pilgrims or shepherds looking for a lost sheep, or as hunters chasing a deer, or as merchants looking for a helper to purchase. The response of the bride's parents was in a like manner. If they found the prospective bridegroom to be a good partner for their daughter, they would answer: "We do have the sheep (deer or helper) here; except we are not sure if she is the one you are looking for." If for some reason they disliked the prospective son-in-law, their answer would be: "There is no such animal at this house." This metaphorical conversation had a particular purpose: it was to divert the attention of the "unclean spirit" away from the real event (the planned wedding), and thus insure that the wedding proceed without any difficulties.

If a basic agreement was reached between the delegates and the bride's parents on the mutual "compatibility" of the two young people, the delegates were invited to the table by the parents. After a little "fortification" of the two sides with a few slugs of homemade brandy brought by the delegates, the bargaining over details was begun. This was usually rather difficult — the main bone of contention obviously being the amount of the marriage dowry. When an agreement was reached on that matter, the future bride who was hiding in the closet or in a neighbor's house, was sent to the inn to bring some more brandy to seal the preliminary contract. This was also a sign to the whole village that the girl in question had been "asked for her hand".

Rukovyny (engagement): A week or two later, the closest relatives of the two young people, including the bridegroom himself, met in the house of the bride's parents to formally conclude the agreement. The bride was again in hiding, and when the bridegroom's starosta (the former head of the delegation, now one of the chief organizers of the wedding) ceremoniously asked the bride's parents to introduce the bride to the young man, they would not comply with his wish immediately. For the first and second time they would bring an old woman, a strange girl, or a boy dressed in girl's clothing into the room. Only the third time would they introduce the real bride.

The starosta would then ask the young couple to shake hands with each other (thus, the engagement ceremony received its Rusyn name — rukovyny or zarucyny, meaning holding hands or handshaking), to go around the table, and to exchange rings. The bride then decorated her future husband with a "feather" of rosemary which the bridegroom wore either on his hat or on the lapel of his coat until the wedding day. In addition, she gave him a decorative towel, embroidered by herself, and a shirt also made by herself. Both gifts were a demonstration of her skill and industriousness. She also gave a decorative towel to the starosta and to some other guests. The youth of the village would gather under the window of the betrothed girl's house and sing joking songs in an attempt to dissuade her from marrying.

Vuhlyny (the visit of the bride's parents to the bridegroom's parents): About a week after the engagement (most often on a Sunday afternoon), the bride's parents would visit the house of the future son-in-law in order to get better acquainted with the bridegroom's family and its economic status. Since it was customary for the bride's parents to closely inspect all the "corners" (vuhly) of the bridegroom's parents' house, the visit was thus called vuhlyný. This visit also offered the opportunity to resolve all remaining practical questions concerning the wedding ceremony: the day of the wedding, the number of guests, the expenses, and so on. (To be continued)

Mykola Musynka
Prešov, Czechoslovakia
THE CYMBALY

This article, written by Victor Šostak, specialist on Carpatho-Rusyn folk instruments and a curator at the Užhorod Historical Museum, is the second in a series on folk instruments. — Editor

A large gray tempestuous cloud covered the sky. The mountain, covered by a forest of fir-trees, was still, waiting for the storm. A few sporadic raindrops fell out of the gray sky, pounding the rooftops of the Verchovyna village. Suddenly the sky was illuminated by lightning and a loud clap of thunder was heard.

"Hurry up," Petro said to himself as he put on his cap and rubber boots. He quickly grabbed his axe and went to the mountain.

The old master craftsman went through the forest looking for the wood that was to become his cymbaly. He was hunting for a tree with resonant wood — a white maple, beech, or hazelnut that had matured while standing in the path of the wind and had been warmed by the sun. A tree that had been struck by lightning (hromovicja) was considered to be the best choice.

He was in a hurry to find the tree. Streams of rainwater covered his face. The soft ground clung to his boots, making them very heavy. Climbing up the hill was difficult.

He had worked in the lowlands and had seen the misfortune and suffering of his people. He had always dreamed of making the instrument that could help make a difficult life happier. He made his first cymbaly when he was a boy. He always smiled when he remembered that cymbaly. Now he was a well-known craftsman. Many musicians and ensembles wished to own a cymbaly made by his hands. He had made so many cymbali — the Verchovyna harmonic and rhythmic cymbaly, the Hutsul cymbaly, and the large chromatic cymbaly.

The Verchovyna cymbaly is very popular in the Mžhirja and Volovec' districts. This trapezoid-shaped instrument, measuring 50 to 70 centimeters in length and 25 to 30 centimeters in width, is light, portable, and produces a resonant sound. A group of three strings is called a bunt. There are six bunts on each side of the cymbaly. Each bunt is divided in the middle and supported by a specially carved wooden bridge called a kobylika. The bass strings do not have a kobylika. The sound is produced by striking the open strings with balcaty (mallets made of maple or thornwood). In the popular musical trio Trojisty Muzyky, the Verchovyna cymbaly adds harmony and rhythm to the musical sound, and sits between the husly (violin) and the baraban (drum).

The Hutsul cymbaly, popular in Transcarpathia, comes in two sizes — large and small. The small Hutsul cymbaly has ten bunts with three strings each. The bass strings, having two or three bunts with two strings each, are tuned in octaves. The other strings have a diatonic, or major scale order, and are limited in their tonal possibilities. The large Hutsul cymbaly is capable of performing all of the musical functions in the orchestra. It can play melody, rhythm, or harmony, and gives the best tonal foundation for the orchestral sound.

The Verchovyna and Hutsul cymbali are used at a number of special occasions, such as the traditional wedding procession and the farewell to the shepherds as they leave for the polonya (high pasture lands). On these occasions, the cymbalist stands while playing. A belt is connected to each side of the cymbaly and rests across the player's neck and shoulders. During a dance or a concert, the cymbaly rests on the player's knees. The cymbalist uses the palm of his hand to stop the strings from ringing at the end of the musical phrase.

The Hungarian chromatic cymbaly (sundiv's'kyj cymbaly) is larger than the other two types. Each bunt has groupings of either two, three, or four strings that have the same pitch. This cymbaly has 35 bunts. The strings progress chromatically for three octaves.

The variety of cymbali, the long tradition of folk performance, and the degree of craftsmanship needed to make the cymbaly all attest to the high musical culture of our Carpatho-Rusyn people. Yet, there was a time when folk instruments were not allowed at public performances. Now, the cymbaly is played throughout Transcarpathia in folk orchestras, and there are classes at musical colleges and schools for those who wish to learn how to play this instrument.

The tree which Petro had sought for so long suddenly came into view. The lightning bolt had split the tree from top to bottom. Petro touched the middle of the tree; it was still warm. With a feeling of anticipation, he tapped the tree with the handle of his axe and was thrilled by the results. The tree came back to life and the tapping sound resonated from the wood. He began to chop at the tree with his axe, but it would not be cut from the side. He had to pull the pieces toward himself, following the fibrous pattern of the wood.

On the table, there rested a new cymbaly whose color was a beautiful orange-brown hue. The sun's rays entered the room and were reflected from the polished surface of the wood. Petro, the craftsman, took his mallets and struck the silver strings and a charming melody resonated from the instrument.

Victor Šostak
Užhorod, USSR
SEARCH FOR ROOTS
Part IV — The Czechoslovak Archives

Shortly after we initiated the Search For Roots series, Michael Senko, a political officer at the United States Embassy in El Salvador and a Carpatho-Rusyn American subscriber, wrote to inform me of a unique opportunity for genealogical research at the Czechoslovak archives. Corresponding through the Embassy of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic in Washington, D.C., Mr. Senko succeeded in tracing his roots back several generations through the information he received from the Czechoslovak archives. We would like to thank Michael Senko for sharing this valuable information with us and we encourage other readers with suggestions and information to do the same. — Editor

The Embassy of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic sends requests for research to the appropriate archives in Czechoslovakia and returns the reports from the Czechoslovak archives to the applicant in the United States. The results of the research are in the form of information from original records or the officially certified individual vital statistics certificates, information which is basic to both the genealogist and the casual roots seeker searching for his ancestors.

To initiate the search, it is necessary to have the name of the person being sought, the place of birth, marriage, or death, the date of birth, marriage, or death; and in the case of birth certificates, the names of the parents, including the mother's maiden name, and the religion. In giving the place name, it is necessary to be precise. To state that a birth or death took place in Slovakia or in Austria-Hungary is not sufficient. You must indicate the name of the city, village, or town. (The correct spelling of these places as well as the districts in which they are presently located can be found in the extensive appendix "Root Seeker's Guide to the Homeland", in Paul R. Magocsí, Our People: Carpatho-Rusyns and Their Descendants in North America.)

Reports, information, or certificates are made in Czechoslovakia and are issued in the Czech or Slovak language. The Embassy is not in a position to assist in the translation of this material into English.

As with any genealogical research, obtaining this information requires many hours of work on the part of researchers in Czechoslovakia and administrators in this country. Thus, this information is not obtained without cost to the applicant. The deposit for securing vital statistics certificates is ten dollars per document. However, sometimes the fee can be higher due to the difficulty of the search, lack of information, or inaccurate information supplied by the applicant.

The fee for research depends on the amount of time spent. It is not possible to estimate the cost or the results in advance. Sometimes the research can be extensive and costly, but the results are limited. The fee is paid for research done, not for the results. The results of research can vary considerably. Some lines can be traced back in detail many generations. In other cases, few records can be located. This research is also time-consuming. Usually it takes several months before the document or report is received by the applicant in the United States. For research in the form of a running account, a non-refundable deposit of fifty dollars is required. You may choose to set a limit on the cost of the research. The Embassy suggests that the limit should be no less than one hundred dollars.

Mr. Senko wrote that he had assumed that records pertaining to his ancestors were either non-existent or had been destroyed, so he was both pleased and amazed at the results of the search. The Czechoslovak archives had succeeded in unearthing fifteen birth and marriage certificates going back to 1834, and the search is still going on. The cost, ninety dollars, seems reasonable considering the extent of the information received. However, genealogical research can be costly and the results are uncertain. It is up to the individual to determine how important this information is to him or her.

To receive more information about this unique service, including application forms, contact: Dr. Gabriel Brenka, Chief, Consular Division, Embassy of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, 3900 Linnean Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20008.

Patricia A. Onufruk
McLean, Virginia

RECENT PUBLICATIONS 1981


Dr. Josyp Dzendzelivs'kyj (b. 1921) is one of the leading linguists in the Ukrainian SSR and the foremost authority on Carpatho-Rusyn dialects. Although not a native of Subcarpathian Rus’, he has been a professor at the University of Uzhhorod since 1951 and has carried on the tradition of analyzing Carpatho-Rusyn dialects that was established by Ivan Pan'kevyč before World War II.

The present volume is an unannotated bibliographical list of Dzendzelivs'kyj’s 264 publications that have appeared between 1951 and 1981. Many deal with Carpatho-Rusyn dialects, including his authoritative two-volume atlas of Carpatho-Rusyn dialects in the Transcarpathian Oblast (a third volume remains to be published). Also included is a list of over 300 works in which Dr. Dzendzelivs'kyj is mentioned.


This is a short history of a cultural society that functioned for a few years after World War II in Ruski Keresztur, the center of Vojvodinian Rusyn life in Yugoslavia. It includes as well valuable reproductions of the title pages of the rare annual almanacs published by the society during the years of its existence.

Kostelnik, Vlado, ed. Zbornik robotoch l. naukovoho sovitovania rusinosh i ukrainczech Horvatskej (Collection of Studies from the First Scholarly Conference on Rusyns and

This collection contains the proceedings of a conference held in June 1980 and devoted to two problems: (1) the formal presentation of Dr. Fedor Labas’ History of Rusyns in the Bačka, Sirm, and Slavonia, 1745-1918; and (2) an historiography of the participation of Rusyns and Ukrainians of Yugoslavia in World War II and the socialist revolution. The book’s title and most of its contents are in three languages — Vojvodinian Rusyn, Ukrainian, and Croatian.

Of the seven articles in this collection, of particular value are a comprehensive bibliography on Yugoslavia’s Rusyns and Ukrainians during World War II by Vlado Kostelný and a survey of the worker’s movement in Ruski Kerestur, Vojvodina — the largest Rusyn settlement in Yugoslavia — from the 1890s to 1920s by Janko Oljejar.


The author, a native of Podolia in the southwestern Ukraine, settled in Subcarpathian Rus after World War I. He lived there under Czechoslovak rule (1919-1938) and the autonomous Subcarpathian Rusyn/Carpatho-Ukrainian period (1938-1939), and was imprisoned by the Hungarians who returned to the region on the eve of World War II. After 1945, he emigrated to Paraguay in South America.

This book, written in Ukrainian, provides a brief historical background of the Subcarpathian Rusyns followed by a personalized account of events during the interwar period. Writing from the standpoint of a Ukrainian nationalist, Kuščyns’kyj is critical of the Czechoslovak regime and especially the Hungarians who occupied the area after 1939. The book’s main interest is its description of Subcarpathian life and political events in the far eastern Hutsul region, where the author worked as a teacher.


Like the first two years, the issues of Lemkivščyna for 1981 each contain brief articles in Ukrainian about Lemko life in the Carpathians before their departure from the region in 1946-1947. Of particular value are descriptions of Lemkos in present-day Poland (they live in the northern and western parts of that country far from their ancestral homeland), as well as reports on Ukrainophile Lemko organizations in North America.

Subscriptions are $8.00 per year and available from Lemkivschyna, P.O. Box 651, Cooper Station, New York, NY 10276.


The leading specialist on the Magyar language spoken by the more than 158,500 Hungarian inhabitants who live as a minority in the southern region of Soviet Transcarpathia has provided in this brief article lists of male and female Hungarian first names together with their equivalents in Russian (in practice, the official language of the Soviet Union).


This brief study traces the fate of Carpatho-Rusyns in the Prešov Region under the semi-independent Slovak state during World War II. During these years, the approximately 80,000 Rusyns were treated by some patriotic Slovak administrators as nothing more than a branch of the Slovak people. The only Rusyn cultural activity was stimulated largely by the Greek Catholic Church under Bishop Pavel Gojdić.


This anthology includes 332 texts of folk ballads, some with music, copied from villagers living in the Carpathian Mountains. The vast majority derive from the Transcarpathian oblast (Subcarpathian Rus’), but there are also a few from neighboring mountainous regions of the Ukrainian SSR (former southern Galicia and northern Bukovina).

The ballads, given in their original Carpatho-Rusyn dialectal forms, are arranged in five thematic groups: historical, familial life, love, social criticism, and individual life experiences. The compiler has also provided an introductory study in Ukrainian on the concept of the folk ballad and how it has developed in the Carpathians, as well as notes on each of the ballads (when, where, and from whom they were transcribed) and a list of Carpatho-Rusyn dialectal words with explanations in Ukrainian.

Naukovï zapysky KSUT (Scholarly Proceedings of the Cultural Society of Ukrainian Workers), No. 8-9 (Prešov, 1979-81), 175 p.

Before his untimely death, Professor Vasyl’ Latta (1921-1965) of the University of Bratislava was the leading specialist on Carpatho-Rusyn dialects in the Prešov Region (eastern Slovakia). This issue of the Naukovï zapysky is devoted entirely to Latta and includes 14 of his previously published articles (in Russian, Ukrainian, and Slovak), including his classification of Carpatho-Rusyn dialects in the Prešov Region and his project (never fully completed) for a dialectal atlas of the area.

Also included is an introductory analysis of Latta’s scholarly career by Josyp Dzendzelivś’kyj (pp. 5-17), a description of his unfinished atlas by Josef Štolc (pp. 164-175), and five dialectal maps.


Most of the material in this volume reports on current cultural developments among the Rusyns living in the Vojvodina (Bačka) and Srem regions of Yugoslavia. Of more general interest to Carpatho-Rusyn studies is a short article by István Udvari on Rusyn dialects as a source of knowledge for the history of the Hungarian language (No. 29) as well as a translation into Vojvodinian Rusyn of the Ukrainian-American scholar Vasyl’ Markus’ extensive critique of Paul R. Magocsi’s Shaping of a National Identity (Nos. 28 and 29), the last part of which appeared in English in the Carpatho-Rusyn American, (Vol. IV, No. 3, 1981).

This volume, with texts in Russian and French, outlines the questionnaire being used in the preparation of the linguistic atlas to cover all languages spoken in the Carpathian Mountains, from Moravian Czech in the west to Romanian in the south. Indeed, the Carpatho-Rusyn inhabited territories of eastern Slovakia and the Transcarpathian oblast will be included in the data to be presented in the final work.


Despite its title, this is not only a history of Russians, but also of Rusyns in the Carpathians and in the Vojvodina (Bačka) region of Yugoslavia. The volume is a reprint of a small-format 158 page history that first appeared in 1934 under the imprint of the Russophile-oriented Vojvodinian Rusyn cultural society called Zarja.

Olejarov’s history presents the Russophile view of Rusyn history, beginning with Kievan Rus’ and continuing through all the tsars down to 1917. Separate sections treat briefly the history of Rusyns in Subcarpathian Rus’ and in Vojvodina. The Orthodox Church is praised and the hope expressed that the tsarist Russian Empire would be restored and unite all so-called “Russians,” that is, Russians, Belo-russians, Ukrainians, and Carpatho-Rusyns. The history, written in Vojvodinian Rusyn, is preceded by an introductory commentary by Julijan Kol’esarov.


Like the first issue of this “journal”, all the articles in this number are written by Julijan Kol’esarov and deal with various aspects of traditional folklore among the Rusyns of the Vojvodina (Bačka) in Yugoslavia.


This brief study comprises a reprint of a history first published in Serbian by R. Prica in 1972 and now including as well a parallel translation into Vojvodinian Rusyn. It surveys the Rusyn inhabitants of Sremska Mitrovica, a small town just south of Novi Sad in the Srem region of Yugoslavia, most of whose inhabitants emigrated from the Prešov Region and Lemkian Region before World War I. Also appended are several maps, illustrations, and commentary by Julijan Kol’esarov.


This short collection of seven essays provides a useful introduction to literature produced since 1945 in Ukrainian and Russian by writers in the Prešov Region of Czechoslovakia. Each essay is written in Slovak and provides a survey of various aspects of literary life, including a general introduction by Mychajlo Roman (pp. 12-20), poetry and prose by Fedir Kovač (pp. 21-56), drama by Olena Rudlovcák (pp. 57-76), memoirs by Marija Paraskova (pp. 77-82), translations by Jurij Kndrat (pp. 83-93), and literary criticism by Mychajlo Roman (pp. 94-99). Of particular interest is the description of the recent fate of Prešov Region writers whose careers were affected by the Prague spring of 1968 and its aftermath.

RUSYN FORUM

Washington, D.C. In March 1985, the Catholic University of America awarded a Doctor of Philosophy degree in music to Sister Joan L. Roccasalvo, C.S.J. Her doctoral dissertation was titled “The Plainchant Tradition of Southwestern Rus’: Kiev-L’viv-Subcarpathian Rus’” and is an analytical and historical examination of the contribution of southern Rus’ and the Carpatho-Rusyns to the field of eastern plain chant tradition.

Beltsville, Md. On March 23, 1985, Patricia A. Onufriak, editor of the Carpatho-Rusyn American, was the featured speaker at a workshop on family history at St. Gregory’s Byzantine Catholic Church. Her presentation dealt with genealogical research at the National Archives in Washington, D.C., primarily focusing on finding our Rusyn ancestors in the ships’ manifests preserved at the Archives. The group later went to the National Archives to conduct its own research.

East Pittsburgh, Pa. On April 5, 1985, John Righetti, assistant editor of the Carpatho-Rusyn American, presented “Transcarpathia Today”, a slide presentation and lecture on his recent trip to Soviet Transcarpathia. Speaking to over 100 people at St. John the Baptist Orthodox Church, he outlined everyday life in Transcarpathia and the ways in which the people are preserving and enriching their Carpathian heritage.

Pittsburgh, Pa. On April 20, 1985, the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center held its second annual meeting at the University of Pittsburgh. Center representatives from New York, Ohio, Pittsburgh, Washington, D.C., and Toronto were in attendance. A number of topics were discussed, including the development of cultural exchange programs with Carpatho-Rusyns abroad, the proposed printing of new and original works on Rusyns and their culture, the possibility of a University Chair of Carpathian Studies, and the creation of an educational conference in honor of the tenth anniversary since the Cultural Seminar on Carpatho-Ruthenia held at Mount Saint Macrina, Uniontown, Pennsylvania in 1975.

McKees Rocks, Pa. In April 1985, over 80 cantors completed the Advanced Cantor’s class sponsored by the Byzantine Catholic Metropolitan Archdiocese of Pittsburgh. The semester-long course, instructed by Jerry Jumba of McKees.
Toronto, Ontario. Four months after its appearance in late 1984, Our People: Carpatho-Rusyns and Their Descendants in North America by Dr. Paul R. Magocsi, had sold out its initial printing. Published by the Multicultural History Society of Ontario, the second printing was begun in May, with finished copies available in June 1985.

The revised edition includes a new preface by author, governmental advisor, and well-known syndicated columnist Michael Novak. Our People is the first book that deals with the history of the Rusyn-American immigrants and their descendants. Containing 86 historic photographs, 4 maps, and several charts, it is available for $20.00 from the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center, 355 Delano Place, Fairview, New Jersey 07022.

Uniontown, Pa. On May 18-19, 1985, Carpatho-Rusyn arts were a part of Uniontown’s annual National Pike Festival for the first time. The Ethnic Crafts Club of St. John the Baptist Byzantine Catholic Church in Uniontown displayed and sold a wide variety of Carpatho-Rusyn handmade goods, including embroidered Easter basket covers, wood-burned items, and pysanky.

Joliet, Ill. In May 1985, St. Mary’s Byzantine Catholic School held its fourth annual Carpatho-Rusyn Song and Dance Workshop. Jerry Jumba, a Carpatho-Rusyn American choreographer, taught Carpatho-Rusyn songs and dances to over 50 school children at the event.

Pittsburgh, Pa. On May 24-26, 1985, Carpatho-Rusyns were well represented at the 26th annual Pittsburgh Folk Festival held at the David Lawrence Convention Center. The Slavjane folk ensemble of Holy Ghost Byzantine Catholic Church in McKees Rocks performed lively Carpatho-Rusyn dances and folk songs. Carpatho-Rusyn foods were served by the ensemble’s parent organization. A display booth, created as a tribute to the role of Rusyn women, displayed pysanky, embroideries, ceramics, Rusyn women’s folk costumes, and original artwork by noted Carpatho-Rusyn artists. The items were on loan from the collections of Jerry Jumba and Msgr. Basil Shereghy of McKeesport. In addition, Nicholas Kandravy and John Righetti of Pittsburgh demonstrated Lemko and Hutsul pysanky techniques.

This year, for the first time, booths selling ethnic items were incorporated into the festival. A Carpatho-Rusyn booth sold Rusyn goods, including religious articles, pysanky, and postoly (soft Carpathian highland leather slippers).

Mercer, Pa. On June 16, 1985, the American Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Diocese sponsored its annual Family Day at the diocesan Camp Nazareth. Families from throughout the diocese gathered and were enter-

tained by a performance of Carpatho-Rusyn dances by Vesely Krajane, an ensemble from St. Peter and Paul Orthodox Church in Windber, PA.

Pittsburgh, Pa. On June 24, 1985, the 61st annual American Carpatho-Russian Day was held at Kennywood Park. For over half a century, this event, sponsored by the Pittsburgh Deanery of the American Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Diocese, has served as an opportunity for Carpatho-Rusyns throughout the area to gather and celebrate their heritage. Traditional Carpatho-Rusyn foods were served by the Pittsburgh District of the American Carpatho-Russian Youth (ACRY). Carpatho-Rusyn folk dances were performed by Vesely Krajane of Windber. St. Nicholas Choir of St. Nicholas Orthodox Church in Homestead performed selections of religious hymns and Carpatho-Rusyn folk songs.

California, Pa. On July 11, 1985, Bonnie Balas of Uniontown, a Carpatho-Rusyn American folk artist, spoke on Carpatho-Rusyn culture, its value in the lives of Carpatho-Rusyn Americans, and how to begin the search for one’s roots. She spoke to graduate education students at California State University.

White Oak, Pa. On July 18-20, 1985, St. Angela’s Roman Catholic Church held its annual festival, which featured aspects of Carpatho-Rusyn culture. The Rusyny folk ensemble of St. Nicholas Byzantine Catholic Church in McKeesport gave a fine performance of Carpatho-Rusyn songs and dances.

Pittsburgh, Pa. On July 31, 1985, Byzantine Catholic Day (formerly Rus’kyj Den) was held at Kennywood Park. Sponsored by the Byzantine Catholic Metropolitan Archdiocese of Pittsburgh, the event featured Carpatho-Rusyn foods and a performance of Carpatho-Rusyn folk songs and dances by the Slavjane folk ensemble of McKeens Rocks.

McKeensport, Pa. On August 20-22, 1985, the city of McKeesport sponsored the 25th annual International Village at Renziehausen Park. Carpatho-Rusyns were represented by performances of the Rusyny folk ensemble of McKeensport. Traditional Rusyn foods were served by St. Stephen’s Byzantine Catholic Church of North Huntingdon. The festival is the second largest ethnic festival in western Pennsylvania.

Anyone with news of interest to the Carpatho-Rusyn American community is requested to submit it to: John Righetti, 704 Orchard Avenue, #305, Pittsburgh, PA 15202.
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Three musicians from Ust’-Čorna, Tjačiv district, Transcarpathian oblast, playing the violin (skrypka), cymbaly, and drum (buben).
DO YOU KNOW WHO YOU ARE?

A lot of Carpatho-Rusyn Americans don’t. Because for years, there were few places to which they could turn to learn the rich culture of their ancestors and how it has molded them into what they are today. For we are all the product of our heritage.

But now, there’s the Carpatho-Rusyn American, the only publication devoted exclusively to Carpatho-Rusyn culture in Europe and America. Four times each year, the Carpatho-Rusyn American brings fascinating, enlightening articles about your heritage into your home — articles that will remind you of things you have forgotten and teach you things you never had the chance to find out about your people and their beautiful heritage — the heritage that made you what you are today.

If you’re not already a subscriber, take this as a free introductory issue and subscribe, using the form below. You’ll receive this year’s two issues already in print and the upcoming winter edition in addition to this issue. Just $7.00 brings you four issues a year.

So subscribe now. Do it for yourself. And your children — so that when they’re asked “Do you know who you are?”; they’ll be able to answer with ease.

---

CARPATHO-RUSYN AMERICAN

Yes. I want to know more about my heritage by subscribing to the Carpatho-Rusyn American. Enclosed is my check for $7.00 (Includes two existing 1985 issues, this issue, and one more to come).

Enclosed is an additional $7.00 for the upcoming 1986 subscription.


Name _____________________________________________________________________

Address ___________________________________________________________________

City __________________________ State _________________ Zip __________

Please fill out this form and send it with your payment (U.S. currency only) to:

CARPATHO-RUSYN AMERICAN
5485 FOREST GLEN ROAD
NORTH MADISON, OHIO 44057
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