

CARPATHO-RUSYN AMERICAN

A Newsletter on Carpatho-Rusyn Ethnic Heritage



FROM THE EDITOR

In the Fall 1985 issue of the *Carpatho-Rusyn American*, I discussed at length 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 event, held in the summer of 1975, was indeed a momentous occasion. It marked the first time scholars devoted to the study of Carpatho-Ruthenia had gathered together with interested Rusyn Americans to share information, present ideas, and discuss their hopes for the future.

Recently, I had the opportunity to discuss this Uniontown event with Dr. Magocsi, currently at the University of Toronto in Canada. I was especially interested in hearing his views on that seminar since I had not been in attendance.

Dr. Magocsi mentioned that his expectations for the *Cultural Seminar on Carpatho-Ruthenia* had been exceeded and that he had been pleasantly surprised by the size and enthusiasm of the audience. After all, this was the first time that a general overview of all aspects of Carpatho-Rusyn culture had been made both understandable and accessible to the public. He emphasized that although the setting was a Byzantine Catholic convent, no particular religious or national point of view was emphasized. In fact, four of the six speakers were of non-Byzantine Catholic background.

Dr. Magocsi also said that it proved to be invaluable that the proceedings were recorded and released so that a much larger audience has subsequently had access to the information imparted. (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, New Jersey 07022.)

The most important result of the seminar, Dr. Magocsi felt, was the realization on the part of the speakers and the participants that Carpatho-Rusyn culture in the homeland and in North America is a serious subject worthy of all the attention and scholarship that has been devoted to most other national or ethnic groups. He mentioned that, as a result of the seminar, concrete efforts were undertaken to remedy the lack of English-language material available in this field. Since then, numerous books, pamphlets and other educational materials have been produced and consumed by the Rusyn-American public in great volume. The need for knowledge about their heritage had begun to be met. A new educational age was begun for Rusyn Americans. The spark — the seminar — had ignited a flame that has burned for ten years.

In commemoration of the importance of that first seminar, the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center will be co-sponsoring an anniversary seminar this spring (1986). At this time, a part of the information conveyed will include an appraisal of what has been accomplished in the first basic stage of the cultural revival of Carpatho-Rusyns in the United States and what should be undertaken during the next decade. This upcoming seminar will feature new scholars, including at least two who are of non-Rusyn descent, had previously never even heard of Carpatho-Rusyns, and had become interested in the subject simply by reading the publications distributed by the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center.

Speaking with Dr. Magocsi caused me to stop and think. Virtually all of our readers and most of the staff of the *Carpatho-Rusyn American* did not attend that momentous Uniontown seminar in 1975. Therefore, we are by no means the initiators of the recent cultural revival, but rather the product of that revival.

Looking back at 1975, I realized that, at the time, I had been a teenager with little knowledge of my Carpatho-Rusyn heritage. (Actually, I had been under the impression that I was Russian.) Growing up as an ethnic individual in the suburbs of Washington, D.C. was a lonely experience. An important part of my life was foreign, indeed totally incomprehensible to most of my "americanized" friends. Within such an environment, it is understandable that one might grow up without an awareness of one's own ethnic identity.

Recently, I expressed these feelings to John Righetti, assistant editor of the *Carpatho-Rusyn American*, and to my surprise, he not only understood my feelings of ethnic isolation but related similar feelings. Despite growing up in western Pennsylvania, an area with a large Slavic population, he had felt that his only contact with fellow Rusyn Americans was at church. And even most of his church contacts were not aware of their Rusyn heritage. We agreed that these feelings had been echoed many times by our readers in their letters and through other contacts with the staff of the *Carpatho-Rusyn American*.

The upcoming seminar, this time in Philadelphia, is vital in continuing the scholarly interest in Carpatho-Rusyn studies encouraged by the first seminar held ten years ago. It will also provide an opportunity for Rusyn Americans to increase further their knowledge of their own heritage.

An additional benefit of such a gathering is that it offers Rusyn Americans the opportunity to meet with others in our national community. It is rare that we have the opportunity to gather together outside local parishes to share ideas with other ethnically-aware Rusyn Americans. Those who have had the opportunity have found the experience to be both exhilarating and motivating.

For these reasons, I encourage all Rusyn Americans and others to take advantage of this rare opportunity and join us at the seminar, *Carpatho-Rusyn Studies: New Research and New Sources, A Decade of Work — 1975-1985*. The staff of the *Carpatho-Rusyn American* and the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center looks forward to seeing you there.

In commemoration of the tenth anniversary of the Carpatho-Rusyn cultural and educational revival in the United States, the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center and the Center for Soviet and East European Studies at the University of Pennsylvania present

**CARPATHO-RUSYN STUDIES:
NEW RESEARCH AND NEW SOURCES,
A DECADE OF WORK — 1975-1985**

Saturday, April 19, 1986
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

BASIL TAKACH (1879-1948)

For nearly a quarter of a century, Basil Takach was one of the most influential leaders among Carpatho-Rusyns in America. As bishop of the Ruthenian Greek Catholic Church from 1924 to 1948, he represented for some the very symbol of that church's survival in America; for others he became the leading representative of those forces that ostensibly wanted to undermine the age-old religious and cultural traditions of the Carpatho-Rusyn people.



If the years before World War I can be described as the pioneer era in Rusyn-American history when thousands of immigrants arrived on these shores, the decades from World War I through World War II may be considered the era of consolidation, when the various religious and national factions took the form in which, for the most part, they remain today. Consolidation did not come easily, however, and the costs in divisiveness and dissension from the highest organizational to the intimate familial level were often very high. It was precisely in the midst of this era of "consolidation" that Basil Takach was called to serve his people.

Basil Takach was born in 1879 in Vučkove, a Carpatho-Rusyn village in the old Maramaroš county of the Hungarian Kingdom that is today in the Transcarpathian oblast of the Ukrainian SSR. The eldest son of a Greek Catholic priest, the young Basil was educated at the gymnasium and then eparchial seminary in Užhorod. After ordination to the priesthood in 1902, Takach served for nearly a decade as a parish priest before returning to Užhorod to serve in various posts in the administrative and educational facilities of the Diocese of Mukačevo — as director of the eparchial printing society Unio, director of the eparchial dormitory Alumneum, and professor at the female Pedagogical School.

Takach's ecclesiastical career in the homeland was suddenly interrupted in 1924, when, with the approval of the new Czechoslovak government, he was consecrated bishop and sent to minister to fellow Carpatho-Rusyns in the United States. The structure of the Greek Catholic Church in the New World was at the time finally becoming stabilized. In 1916, two separate administrations had been set up, one for Greek Catholics from the Hungarian Kingdom (Carpatho-Rusyns, Slovaks, Magyars, Croats), the other for those from Austrian Galicia (Ukrainians). Then, in 1924, those administrations were raised to eparchies, each with its own bishop. The first bishop for the Greek Catholic (Byzantine) Ruthenian Church to serve Carpatho-Rusyns and others from old Hungary was Basil Takach.

With jurisdiction over 155 churches and nearly 300,000 parishioners, Bishop Takach began his episcopacy on a positive note. His arrival was favorably greeted by the Rusyn Greek Catholic priesthood and faithful, and he immediately began setting up an administration and the groundwork for an episcopal see to be based in Homestead, Pennsylvania, a suburb of Pittsburgh. However, this promising and stabilizing beginning was shattered in 1929 when a papal decree was issued, precipitating the so-called celibacy controversy which was to last for the next eight years.

Because Greek Catholics were of the Eastern Byzantine Rite, in the European homeland they were canonically permitted to retain certain traditions, including a married clergy. Under pressure from American Roman Catholic hierarchs, however, the Vatican declared as early as 1890 that only celibate priests could function in the United States. Although such a restriction was reiterated in 1908, the shortage of celibate Greek Catholic priests made the decree impractical. Married priests continued to arrive, and even Takach ordained married clergy during the first years of his episcopacy. But in 1929, the Vatican decided to repeat again the celibacy restriction, despite Takach's concern for the potential damage this would cause.

The bishop was now caught in a dilemma: should he join certain priests and laymen in open protest, or should he comply with the orders of the Catholic Church's highest authorities? Reminding his priests that canonical obedience is the greatest virtue of clergy, Takach decided to stand firm on the side of the Vatican decree. The result was fierce criticism on the part of several priests and lay organizations, leading to the creation of a new body independent of Rome that eventually came to be known as the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Diocese.

Throughout the difficult decade of the 1930s, Takach did remain steadfast, so that by the time of his death in 1948, the Byzantine Ruthenian Catholic Church survived and remained the largest single religious body for Carpatho-Rusyns in America. The era of consolidation was not an easy one for Rusyn Americans, but with leaders like Takach, the important religious structures for the community were able to weather the storm and subsequently to flourish.

Philip Michaels

FOLK CUSTOMS OF CARPATHO-RUSYNS THE WEDDING — PART II

Oholoskŷ (the banns): In the past, the church was the only institution authorized to contract and register marriages, so the young couple had to inform the local priest of the forthcoming marriage at least three weeks before the ceremony. The priest would then test their basic knowledge of religion. If the couple's answers failed to satisfy him, as they often did, the young couple had to attend the priest's special classes for several days. Only then would the priest announce in the course of three Sunday services the decision of the couple to enter marriage.

The preparation for the wedding: After the betrothal, the families of the two young people prepared intensively for the ceremony. The young man hired the musicians, the groomsmen, and other functionaries. The bride and her girlfriends embroidered decorative towels, stripped feathers for the featherbed, finished her wedding dress, and completed her trousseau. The preparations reached their peak during the last week before the ceremony. Special attention was paid to the baking of the wedding cake (*korovaj, balec, kuch*).

On the eve of the wedding, the guests would bring gifts, usually a basket of food. The nearest relatives would also give the young couple some articles of clothing and things for the household.

Pleščynŷ or zahudovankŷ (the bachelors' dance): On Saturday evening, the day before the wedding, the young man staged the bachelors' dance in which he said his last goodbye to bachelorhood and to his friends whom he was now "leaving" for the marital bond. It began with the bachelors' dance of the bridegroom and the groomsmen, followed by a party. At the end of the bachelors' entertainment, the bride came to part company with her single girlfriends.

Weaving of the head wreaths: On Saturday night the bridesmaids came to the house of the bride's parents. They would then go with the *maršalko* or *nastavnyk* (one of the chief organizers of the wedding on the bride's side) to the woods or to the backyard where they would stay until sunrise. There they would pick *barvinok* (periwinkle), an evergreen plant which was regarded as a symbol of everlasting affection. The bridesmaids would then make a little wreath out of the periwinkle with which to decorate the head of the bride at the wedding. Also, the shape of the wreath was believed to have a symbolical meaning: it was round like the sun and was thought to assure the newlyweds of fertility and good luck. With the wreath on her head, the bride would be dressed in her wedding costume.

The wedding procession to the bride: In the meantime, in the house of the bridegroom, the *svaškŷ* (the female members of the wedding party on the bridegroom's side) were busy making the *zastava* (wedding flag). Usually this consisted of a flagstaff or a trunk of a small coniferous tree decorated with ribbons. It was held at the front of the procession by the *zastavnyk* (flagbearer), usually the bridegroom's godfather. It was his duty to protect the flag from getting "stolen." If he was not attentive enough, and the flag was "stolen" by practical jokers, the godfather had to buy it back from the "thieves" at a high price. At about nine o'clock in the morning, the bridegroom's parents gave their son a blessing for a "long journey," and the wedding procession proceeded to the bride's house. The flagbearer was followed by the *starosta* (one of the chief organizers of the wedding on the

bridegroom's side), the groomsmen, the musicians, and the other members of the wedding party. Outwardly the wedding procession gave the impression of a military expedition. In some villages the groomsmen rode on horseback, shot off rifles in the air out of fun, and generally made quite a row. The house of the bride's parents was locked up "out of fear" of the unruly procession, and only after a ritual conversation between the bridegroom's *starosta* and the bride's *maršalko* was the house unlocked for the bridegroom's party.

Calling the bride out of hiding: The bride's relatives regarded the bridegroom's party as "adversaries," and behaved toward them accordingly. They hid the bride in a closet or in the neighbor's house. Asked by the *starosta* to show the bride to the procession, the bride's people would initially show them a false one — an old woman, a Gypsy woman, or even a boy dressed as a girl. All these actions of feigned distrust in the bridegroom and his companions, and the resulting practical jokes, had a more serious, rational aspect. They reflected the age-old fears of parents of marriageable daughters that their offspring would be forcibly kidnapped by strangers. Only after a long "bargaining" session did the bride's people bring in the real bride. The *maršalko* then gave a touching speech in which he thanked the bride's parents for her upbringing. The bride responded by kneeling in front of her father, mother, grandparents, and brothers and sisters. She gave each of them a kiss and asked them through the *maršalko* for forgiveness. Her nearest relatives would then give her their blessings. The bridesmaids joined the ritual by singing melancholy songs about parting from one's parents.

Upon receiving the blessing, the bride decorated the hat of the bridegroom with a wedding sprig of rosemary. The *starosta* and the bridegroom's nearest relatives were then decorated by the bridesmaids with embroidered towels, and the remaining relatives were decorated with sprigs of periwinkle.

Going to the wedding: When the bride said her goodbye to her parents, the bridegroom's party and the bride's party joined together, and, accompanied by the musicians, went to the church to participate in the ceremony. The bride was led by the senior groomsmen and the bridegroom was led by the senior bridesmaid. The mother doused all of the members of the procession with consecrated water and sprinkled them with grain. On their way to the church the members of the procession sang emotional wedding songs. In some villages, the parties of the bride and bridegroom met only at the front of the church.

At the church door, the bride joined her bridegroom, and they entered together. Interestingly enough, it was believed that the one who stepped into the church first would have the first and last word in the family's affairs. It is worth noting that among Carpatho-Rusyns, the customary church wedding ritual was mixed with many elements of the folk wedding rooted in an older, mainly pagan past: the exchange of wreaths and rings; walking around the tetrapod (center table) with a burning candle; drinking wine from one cup; and so on. Also, when the priest was marrying the couple, the senior *svaška* (the senior female member of the bridegroom's party) held above the couple's heads a loaf of bread bound over with yarn.

The return from the wedding: When the wedding ceremony was over, the bride sprinkled the guests standing in front of the church with grain. She would give candy to the children so that her own married life would be "sweet." The

procession then returned to the bride's parents' house in the same arrangement as it had left for the church. The only change was that the newlyweds went together this time. At the bride's home, the couple and the guests were ceremoniously welcomed and offered festive dishes. The wedding feast was opened by the *starosta* with a speech ornamented with stories from the Bible. He then called on the guests to join in a common prayer in which he blessed the food. Symbolically, the newlywed couple had to eat from one plate (often with one spoon) and to drink from one cup. The wedding feast consisted of several courses. Among the obligatory dishes were *mačanka* (mushroom soup), chicken soup, meat, and *holubkŷ* (rolled cabbage leaves stuffed with meat and rice). The guests ate from mutually shared bowls and drank from one cup which circulated among them together with the bottle. At the same time they continued singing and dancing.

The bride goes to the bridegroom's house: In the evening, when the festive meal was over, the bride, her eyes filled with tears, said her final goodbye to all the members of the wedding party on her side, including small children. She gave each of them a kiss, and in return they put money into her apron. The last to kiss and bless the bride were her parents who provided her with the ritual bread for the walk to the bridegroom's house. The *starosta* then thanked the bride's parents in the name of the bride for her good upbringing. Sometimes the bride's parents gave their blessing to their son-in-law also. The whole ritual took place against the background of the guests singing sad wedding songs.

In the meantime, the groomsmen and the bridesmaids paid a symbolic sum to "buy" from the younger sister or brother of the bride the appropriate trousseau: a *lada* (a kind of wardrobe) with apparel, feather-beds, cushions, and various other items for the household. In western Subcarpathian Rus', the members of the wedding party had the right to "complement" the agreed-upon dowery by "stealing" from the bride's parents' pots and pans, bowls and plates, and even hens. The members of the bride's family inevitably had to be on their guard to protect their house from too much stealing, even though it was done for the bride. On the other hand, things which were once "successfully" stolen for her, were regarded by all to be the bride's rightful property. If the bride's parents insisted on getting them back, they had to pay the members of the wedding for them in kind — usually with homemade brandy.

Those villagers who were not invited to the wedding added to the humorous side of the festivities by stopping the procession. They did so by putting a hurdle (*perejma* or *š'abant*) on the road. They removed it only after being treated with brandy. Even that was not enough if the bridegroom was from another village. He would then have to add some "ransom" money in addition to the brandy. This, a mere practical joke in more civilized times, was no doubt another reflection of the origin of many wedding traditions in an older, rougher past.

In the house of the bridegroom: Here the wedding procession was welcomed by the mother of the bridegroom. She was dressed in a fur coat turned inside out. She offered the bride a piece of bread and an egg which she let slip down the bride's bosom — so that she would bear children easily. As for the other guests, the bridegroom's mother sprinkled them with consecrated water and grain. She ushered the bride into the house by pulling her by her embroidered wedding towel. Both women walked three times around the

festive table, whereupon the mother seated the bride on the most honored seat next to her son. When offered the first glass of brandy, the bride poured it out behind her seat. The second glass she offered to her husband. It was only the third glass of brandy which she emptied herself.

The newlyweds were then joined at the table by the remaining guests, and the festivities, comparable to those which were held at the bride's house, lasted until late into the night.

The newlywed couple's first night: In the evening, the female members of the wedding party on the bridegroom's side made the bed for the couple in a loft or in a closet. Under the bed they would put a yoke, a harrow, a plow, an axe, or another object made of iron. With the accompaniment of music, the *starosta* and the members of the wedding saw the couple off to their bedroom. This prelude to the wedding night was highly ceremonious. First went the *starosta* with a mountain axe held upright in his hand, followed by two women holding burning candles (*svitylkŷ*). The newlywed couple also held burning candles. Then came another of the practical jokes: the senior groomsman lay down on the bed, demanding of the husband "compensation money." Upon receiving it, he blessed the bed with the mountain axe and laid it under the cushion. Next to the bed the members of the wedding who were present put a piece of the wedding cake (*korovaj*).

When the couple was left alone, the bride took off her husband's shoes where she found a few coins for good luck. At this time, he helped her take off her wedding dress.

In the meantime, the festivities in the house were becoming even rowdier. There were performances of jocular plays and the guests started singing erotic songs. If the newlyweds spent their first night in the loft, the groomsmen jokingly "supported" the ceiling with straw so that it would not "fall through" under the couple.

Taking the wreath off the bride's head and putting on the married woman's bonnet: According to custom, the bride was to be the first person to get up the morning after the wedding night. She whitewashed the oven (the seat of "the good spirit of the house") with clay, and she cleaned the room. With the room tidied up, the bridegroom's parents and the female cooks arrived to arrange another stage of the wedding festivities. At about nine o'clock in the morning, the members of the wedding on the bridegroom's side gathered in the room, and after a treat they engaged in another ceremonious act — the taking off of the bridal wreath and its substitution with a married woman's bonnet.

Mykola Mušynka
Prešov, Czechoslovakia



A SPECIAL THANK YOU

The *Carpatho-Rusyn American* gratefully acknowledges the generous contribution of \$200 from Greek Catholic Union Lodge 665 of Linden, New Jersey. This contribution is a fine example of how community organizations can support the work of the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center.

All contributions, whether small or large, help us to continue publishing the *Carpatho-Rusyn American*. They are, of course, tax-deductible and very much appreciated.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS 1981 (concluded)

Rudlovčák, Olena. *Bilja džerel sučasnosti: rozvidky, staty, narysy* (Close to the Sources of Today: Studies, Articles, and Surveys). Bratislava and Prešov: Slovac'ke pedahohične vydavnyctvo, viddil ukrajins'koji literatury, 1981, 420 p.

Olena Rudlovčák of the Šafárik University in Prešov is perhaps the foremost Subcarpathian literary historian today. This collection of fourteen studies represents the best of her scholarly production which has previously appeared in a wide variety of Ukrainian publications in Czechoslovakia and has now been conveniently brought together in one volume.

Rudlovčák's scholarship is marked by an extensive use of archival sources about Subcarpathian Rus' that are found in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, the Ukraine, and Russia. Her primary interests have been in literary history; the development of journalism, scholarly publications, cultural institutions, and scholarship about Subcarpathian Rus'; and the work of nineteenth-century Carpatho-Rusyn cultural leaders, especially the dominant figure of Aleksander Duchnovyč.

All of these themes are represented in this collection, which begins with an extensive biography of Duchnovyč (perhaps the best that is available anywhere), as well as a detailed survey of the Prešov Literary Association that he founded in the 1850s. There are also biographical surveys of other cultural leaders (Petro Kuz'm'jak, Josyf Rubij, Konstantin Kustodiev); a survey of the earliest primers published for Carpatho-Rusyn schools; an analysis of nineteenth-century Hungarian studies of Carpatho-Rusyn ethnography and folklore; and histories of Carpatho-Rusyn journalism in the Prešov Region, the Rusyn-Ukrainian language radio studio since the 1930s, and the post-World War II Ukrainian National Theater in Prešov.

Rusynko, Mykola, ed. *Muzej ukrajins'koji kul'tury u Svydnyku: putivnyk po ekspozycji* (The Museum of Ukrainian Culture in Svidník: A Guide). Svidník: Muzej ukrajins'koji kul'tury, 1981, 108 p.

The Museum of Ukrainian Culture in Svidník was established in 1956 as a center to preserve and display the cultural achievements of the Carpatho-Rusyn population (officially designated as Ukrainian-Rusyns) living in present-day northeastern Slovakia. This guide, with parallel texts in Ukrainian and Slovak and brief résumés in Russian, German, and English, describes three aspects of the museum's permanent display: (1) history of Carpatho-Rusyns from earliest times to World War II; (2) ethnography (traditional farm implements, dress, embroidery, painted eggs, icons), including the new outdoor museum of reconstructed village houses; and (3) achievements of socialist society after 1948.

Each of the sections contains a detailed description written by members of the museum's staff. There are also numerous color photographs. The high quality of the design and printing in this book make it the best illustrated publication to be produced for Carpatho-Rusyns in Czechoslovakia, and it is hoped that it will serve as a model for future publications.

Sandor, Vikentij. "Beneš v ekzyli i karpats'ki ukrajinci" (Beneš in Exile and the Carpatho-Ukrainians), *Sučasnist'*,

XXI, 2 (Munich, 1981), pp. 61-66.

After the Munich Pact of September 1938, Czechoslovakia was transformed into a federative republic and Subcarpathian Rus' (later renamed Carpatho-Ukraine) received its long-awaited autonomy, until the whole state was dismantled in March 1939. Former Czechoslovak president Edvard Beneš went into exile where he worked for the restoration of his country according to its pre-Munich boundaries.

This brief article by an official representing the Carpatho-Ukrainian government in Prague during its few months of autonomous existence in 1938-1939 is an inconclusive account of how he was approached during the war by a member of the Czechoslovak underground. The results of the meeting are not spelled out and seem to have had no significance.

Shereghy, Basil. *The Byzantine Catholics*. Pittsburgh, Pa.: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1981, 44 p.

This brief, popularly-written booklet describes the historical and liturgical aspects of Byzantine Catholicism and then concludes with a short history of Carpatho-Rusyns in Europe and the United States.

Školski slovnjiki (School Dictionaries), 15 vols. Novi Sad: Zavod za vidavanje učebnjikoch, 1980-81, 1206 p.

In its continuing effort to enrich the Vojvodinian Rusyn standard language used in the schools and in the administration of the Vojvodina (Bačka) and parts of Slavonia in Yugoslavia, local cultural leaders, with support from government funding, have published a new series of terminological dictionaries. Each of the small format Rusyn-Serbo-Croatian dictionaries is devoted to a different class of words and terms and each has its own compilers. The series as a whole is under the editorial control for Vojvodinian Rusyn by Amalija Chromis and Marija Čakan.

The volumes range from 64 to 116 pages in length; all 15 volumes have a total of 1,206 pages and list 24,511 terms. The subjects covered are: pedagogy; building and construction; woodworking industry; economics and commerce; electronics; health and medicine; administration; cultural and artistic professions; metallurgy; food industry; law; transportation; tourism; and the chemical industry.

Šlepec'kyj, Andrij. "Borec' Pidkarpattja" (A Fighter for Subcarpathia), in *Narodnyj kalendar 1981* (Bratislava and Prešov: Slovenské pedagogické nakladatel'stvo, odbor ukrajinskej literatury, 1981), pp. 73-75.

This popular historical survey traces briefly the life of the nineteenth-century national leader, Adol'f Dobrjans'kij, and his efforts on behalf of Carpatho-Rusyns living in Austria-Hungary. The focus is on a trial held in L'viv (Galicia) in 1882, when Dobrjans'kij and his daughter, Ol'ga Grabar, were put on trial together with several Galician Russophiles who were accused of treasonous activities on behalf of Russia. The defendants were acquitted, and Dobrjans'kij moved to Vienna and later Innsbruck.

Štefan, Avhustyn. *Za pravdu i volju: spomyny i deščo z istoriji Karpats'koji Ukrajinny vid davnich daven' do 1927* (For Justice and Freedom: Memoirs and Some Events from the

History of Carpatho-Ukraine from Earliest Times to 1927), pt. 2. Toronto: Carpathian Research Center and Toronto Free Press, 1981, 384 p.

This is the second book of memoirs by Avhustyn Štefan, who served as director of the Mukačevo gymnasium during the interwar years and minister of education during the short-lived period of Carpatho-Ukrainian autonomy in early 1939. Like the first part (which appeared in 1973), this volume is written in Ukrainian, and it includes both eyewitness accounts of certain events (especially during the revolutionary years 1918-1919) as well as historical descriptions of earlier eras.

Štefan's personal recollections are particularly valuable for their description of how Carpatho-Rusyns (clerical and non-clerical) were educated during the pre-1918 Hungarian Kingdom. Moreover, he has provided much heretofore unknown biographical data on a host of local leaders, all of whom he knew personally. Štefan himself was the grandson of the nineteenth-century cultural figure Evgenij Fencik, and cousin of the twentieth-century Russophile and pro-Hungarian politician, Štefan Fencik. This volume also includes numerous rare photographs of Subcarpathian personalities and events.

(Available for \$20.00 from Vilne Slovo, 196 Bathurst Street, Toronto, Canada M5T 2R8)

Stein, Howard F. "An Ethnohistory of Slovak-American Religious and Fraternal Associations: A Study in Cultural Meaning, Group Identity, and Social Institutions," *Slovakia*, Vol. XXIX, Nos. 53-54 (West Paterson, N.J. 1980-81), pp. 53-101.

This extensive and well-documented study discusses the changing function and problems faced by Slovak and Carpatho-Rusyn fraternal organizations in the United States from the last decade of the nineteenth century to the present. Despite the Slovak-American title, this work bases much of its data on two Carpatho-Rusyn fraternals — the Greek Catholic Union and United Societies.

With regard to the complicated question of religious and ethnic identity, the author correctly states that most immigrants developed a sense of ethnonational identity only *after* coming to the United States. He also describes the old world background and, with regard to the ethnic origins of immigrants from Eastern Slovakia, he observes that "had the great immigration taken place two centuries ago, virtually all the immigrants would have been of Byzantine Catholic or Orthodox faith and of Rusyn ethnicity!"

Švetlosc, Vol. XIX, Nos. 1-6 (Novi Sad, 1981), 760 p.

Recent literary works by Vojvodinian Rusyn authors and by other Yugoslav authors (translated into Vojvodinian Rusyn) together with a few commentaries on contemporary Yugoslavia dominate this volume of *Švetlosc*. There are also four studies by Julijan Tamaš on the literary development of the contemporary Vojvodinian Rusyn writers Djura Papharhaj (No. 2), Štefan Čakan (No. 4), Miron Budinski (No. 5), and Mikola Skuban (No. 6); a series of recollections by local Rusyns on partisan activity during World War II compiled by Djura Latjak (Nos. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6); and an essay by Djura Latjak on the establishment of the Communist party in the Rusyn center of Ruski Kerestur during the interwar period (No. 4).

Tvorčosc: hlasnjik družtva za ruski jazik i literaturu (Works: Organ of the Society for Rusyn Language and Literature), Vol. VII (Novi Sad, 1981), 51 p.

The several brief studies in this issue of *Tvorčosc* provide useful data on the current status of the Vojvodinian Rusyn language. The Soviet sociolinguist Aleksander Duličenko (pp. 3-5) discusses how Rusyn is taught by the Chair of Rusyn Language at the University of Novi Sad (since 1973) and how it has recently been treated as a full-fledged Slavic language in recent Soviet publications. Julijan Tamaš (pp. 10-15) surveys the varying views put forth by scholars on the Vojvodinian Rusyn language, which consider it either as part of the Ukrainian, Slovak, or transitional East Slovak-Western Ukrainian linguistic spheres. He calls for the need to clarify this controversy. Also of importance in this issue is Havrijil Nad's annotated bibliography of studies about the Rusyn language published between 1945 and 1948 (pp. 16-21); Ljubomir Medješi's discussion of America as a theme in pre-World War I Rusyn folk literature (pp. 22-30); and several reports on the recent activity of the Society for Rusyn Language and Literature and its branches (pp. 34-48).

Vrabel', Mychajl Andreevyč, compiler. *Russkij solovej* (The Rusyn Nightingale). Užhorod: Kelet, 1890, 176 p. Photofacsimile Novi Sad: Ruske slovo, 1981.

Mychajl Vrabel' (1866-1923) was one of the few members of the Carpatho-Rusyn intelligentsia during the decades before World War I, who in the face of intense magyarization tried to preserve the traditional culture of Carpatho-Rusyns and to publish works that reflected the spoken language of the people. The most famous of these was an anthology of Carpatho-Rusyn folk poetry, collected from various villages (the Prešov Region, Lemkian Region, Subcarpathian Rus', Bačka), and published under the title *Russkij solovej*.

The collection has been republished in this handsome facsimile edition in the Vojvodina/Bačka (present-day Yugoslavia), where Vrabel' was born and worked as a school teacher. The dialectal texts have been reproduced as well as the original cover and frontispiece portrait of Aleksander Duchnovyč, the national awakener of the Carpatho-Rusyns. Although the collection contains primarily folk poetry, it opens with Duchnovyč's famous poem, "Vručanie" that begins with the words "Ja rusyn byl, esm' i budu" (I was, am, and will remain a Rusyn).

OUR FRONT COVER

Two Hutsul men of Jasynja, Rachiv district, Transcarpathian oblast, USSR.

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

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

THE CARPATHO-RUSYN AMERICAN

The Carpatho-Rusyn American is published quarterly by the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center, Inc., a non-profit cultural organization whose purpose is to promote knowledge about all aspects of Carpatho-Rusyn culture through the publication and/or distribution of scholarly and educational material about the Rusyn heritage in Europe and America.

All communications concerning content should be directed to:

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

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

SUBSCRIPTIONS . . .

New subscriptions or change of address should be directed to:

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

Annual subscription is \$7.00