

The Fourth Rus': A New Reality in a New Europe

Paul Robert Magocsi^{*}

In May 2006 an international scholarly conference took place in Przemyśl, Poland, under the title “Does a Fourth Rus' Exist?” Reviewing the conference program, it became obvious that the title was basically a euphemistic substitute for an otherwise rhetorical question: “Are Carpatho-Rusyns a Distinct Nationality?”

For those who have long been skeptical about Soviet propagandistic “scholarship” on that topic, such a question may have had some validity during the height of the Cold War in the 1970s. And it was certainly a legitimate question to ask after the revolutions of 1989, when the profound political changes taking place throughout central and eastern Europe brought in their wake the re-emergence of former independent states and the reassertion of identities among seemingly forgotten stateless peoples, including Carpatho-Rusyns. But we are already well into the twenty-first century, by which time Carpatho-Rusyns have de jure or de facto become recognized as a distinct nationality in Poland, Slovakia, Romania, Hungary, Serbia, Croatia, and the Czech Republic.¹ They have been recorded in the official censuses of those countries and also in Ukraine,² the only country that still does not recognize formally their status as a nationality.³

Much of the scholarly world has also recognized this new reality. In the past decade alone, numerous publications have appeared in which Carpatho-Rusyns are described

^{*} I am grateful to Dr. Bogdan Horbal of New York Public Library for his very useful comments on an earlier version of this essay.

¹ In Slovakia, Romania, Hungary, Serbia, and the Czech Republic, Carpatho-Rusyns are classified as a nationality. In Poland, Lemko Rusyns are classified (along with Karaites, Roma/Gypsies, and Tatars) as an ethnic group, although Polish law states that there is no substantive difference between how ethnic groups and nationalities are treated; see <www.msw.gov.pl/portal/pl/178/2958/Ustawa_o_mniejszosciach_narodowych_i_etnicznych_oraz_o_jezyku_regionalnym.html>.

² The national censuses of 2001 and 2002 produced the following results regarding the number of persons who indicated that their nationality was Carpatho-Rusyn: Slovakia—24,000; Serbia—16,000; Ukraine—10,000; Poland—5,900; Croatia—2,300; Hungary—1,100; Romania—200. All of these national censuses, except Ukraine's, also asked a question about native language. The figures for Carpatho-Rusyn as native/mother language were quite similar to the nationality response in all counties except Slovakia, where nearly 55,000 persons responded that Carpatho-Rusyn was their native language.

³ This blanket statement is now technically incorrect. On 7 March 2007 the Transcarpathian Oblast Council adopted by an overwhelmingly favourable vote (71 for, 1 against, 2 abstentions) a resolution recognizing Carpatho-Rusyns as a distinct nationality (*natsionalnist*) in the Transcarpathian oblast and requires that the category “Rusyn” is entered in the official list of nationalities in the oblast. The resolution also called on Ukraine's Verkhovna Rada to recognize Carpatho-Rusyns as a distinct nationality at the national level. That request has not yet been fulfilled.

as a distinct nationality and culture. Among these are five volumes of what might be called a “national bibliography,” containing 4,242 annotated entries of mostly scholarly literature about Carpatho-Rusyns published during the last quarter of the twentieth century; two editions of an encyclopedia with over 1,100 entries on Carpatho-Rusyn history and culture worldwide; and a scholarly series commissioned by an international committee on Slavic languages based in Poland that recognizes Carpatho-Rusyn as one of the fourteen Slavic languages that exist today.⁴ Consequently it would seem superfluous to speculate on the existence of a “fourth Rus’.” The discipline of Carpatho-Rusyn studies, however, does face problems and challenges that warrant discussion. I will focus here on a few conceptual and terminological issues.

As strange as it may seem, there is not yet a consensus about what to call the territory, or historic homeland, inhabited by Carpatho-Rusyns. There is confusion about the meaning of the names Subcarpathian Rus’, Transcarpathia, and Carpatho-Ukraine. For some writers these names refer to only one part of Carpathian Rus’, but for others they refer to all of the lands Carpatho-Rusyns inhabited on the southern slopes of the Carpathians. Less problematic are two other terms: Lemkovyna (the Lemko Region), which generally refers only to Carpatho-Rusyn-inhabited lands within present-day southeastern Poland (although there is debate about Lemkovyna’s eastern border); and the Prešov Region, which refers to Carpatho-Rusyn-inhabited lands within present-day northeastern Slovakia. There is also a part of Carpathian Rus’ located south of the Tysa (Tisa) River in present-day Romania. I would suggest referring to this area as the Maramureș Region, using the Romanian form of the name in order to distinguish it from pre-1918 Maramorosh (Hungarian: Máramaros) county, most of which was located north of the Tysa River in present-day Ukraine.

Unfortunately, those who write about Carpatho-Rusyns (whether or not they are of Carpatho-Rusyn orientation) tend to forget two important principles: that there is a difference between states and peoples, and that a given people may live within the boundaries of one state or several states. We should also never forget that states come and go, but peoples remain. It is not the Carpatho-Rusyns’ fault that their historic homeland, Carpathian Rus’, has at times been within the framework of one state and at other times divided between several states.⁵ As the “land of the Carpatho-Rusyns,” Carpathian Rus’ is defined by the numerically dominant people or nationality that lives on its territory, not by the states that may have ruled the area at one time or another.

⁴ See Paul Robert Magocsi, comp., *Carpatho-Rusyn Studies: An Annotated Bibliography*, vol. 1, 1975–1984 (New York: Garland, 1988), and vols. 2–5, 1985–1994, 1995–1999, 2000–2004, 2005–2009 (New York: Columbia University Press/East European Monographs, 1998–2006); idem and Ivan Pop, eds., *Encyclopedia of Rusyn History and Culture* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002, rev. ed. 2005); and Paul Robert Magocsi, ed., *Rusynsky iazyk*, 2d, rev. printing (Opole: Uniwersytet Opolski, Instytut Filologii Polskiej, 2007).

⁵ Until 1772 Carpathian Rus’ was divided between the Polish Kingdom and the Hungarian Kingdom. From 1772 to 1918 it was entirely within the Habsburg Monarchy or Austro-Hungarian Empire (i. e., Austrian-ruled Galicia and the Hungarian Kingdom). From 1919 to 1938 it was divided among Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Romania; from 1939 to 1944 among Nazi Germany, Slovakia, and Hungary; from 1945 to 1991 among Poland, Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union, and Romania; and from 1991–93 to the present day among Poland, Slovakia, Ukraine, and Romania.

At this point it may be useful to address the misplaced belief, or myth, that has come to dominate the mindset of some Carpatho-Rusyns—namely, that Subcarpathian Rus' (Ukraine's present-day Transcarpathian oblast) is the homeland of *all* Carpatho-Rusyns and, therefore, that Carpatho-Rusyns in Poland (the Lemko Region), Slovakia (the Prešov Region), and elsewhere should show deference to Subcarpathian Rus'. Such views are not tenable on either historical or demographic grounds. For example, Carpatho-Rusyns living south of the Carpathians were not divided by international borders until as recently as 1939. Moreover, the earliest and most influential figures connected with the first national awakening (Aleksander Dukhnovych and Adolf Dobriansky) were based in the Prešov Region, not in Subcarpathian Rus'. Even more important is the demographic factor. In 1910, a time when political manipulation regarding census data was relatively limited, there were 1,102 villages in which at least fifty per cent of the inhabitants were ethnic Carpatho-Rusyns. Of these villages, fewer than half—forty-six per cent—were in Subcarpathian Rus', while nearly the same proportion, forty-four per cent, were in the Lemko and Prešov regions.⁶ Why, then, should we speak of the Lemko and Prešov regions as some kind of appanage to the “historic homeland” of Subcarpathian Rus'?

Scholars and other writers on Carpatho-Rusyn topics not only need to keep in mind the distinction between states and peoples; they should also not allow their research agendas and conceptual understanding to be determined by the existence of present-day political boundaries. The one homeland of the Carpatho-Rusyn people is Carpathian Rus', a territory that straddles the slopes of the Carpathian Mountains roughly from the Poprad River in the west to the upper Tysa River in the east. At the present time it is divided among four countries—Poland, Slovakia, Ukraine, and Romania; or perhaps it would be just as reasonable to say that (as of the year 2011) it is divided between only two political entities—the European Union and Ukraine.

Like any territory, Carpathian Rus' has regions within it. Specifically there are four such regions, which happen to coincide more or less with state boundaries: in Poland, the Lemko Region, or Lemko Rus'; in Slovakia, the Prešov Region, or Prešov Rus'; in Ukraine's Transcarpathia oblast, Subcarpathian Rus'; and in Romania, the Maramureș Region.

It is true that one of these regions, Subcarpathian Rus', had the status of an autonomous territory at certain periods in the twentieth century, although its self-rule was quite limited and certainly not the equivalent of sovereignty or statehood, as some authors would have us believe.⁷ Another region, Lemko Rus', claimed to function as

⁶ A list of all Carpatho-Rusyn villages and the administrative entities within which they were located throughout the twentieth century is found in my book *Our People: Carpatho-Rusyns and Their Descendants in North America*, 4th, rev. ed. (Wauconda, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci, 2006), 110–206. The figures here are based on my map *Carpatho-Rusyn Settlement at the Outset of the 20th Century with Additional Data from 1881 and 1806*, 3d ed. (Glassport, PA: Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center, 2011), which indicates all villages where Carpatho-Rusyns lived between 1806 and 1920.

⁷ It is interesting to note that a recent history of Subcarpathian Rus' by Ivan Pop, *Podkarpatská Rus* (Prague: Libri, 2005), appeared in a series by a respected Czech publisher (*Lidové noviny*) devoted to the history of states (*Historie států*). Subcarpathian Rus' came into existence in 1919 and was promised autonomy within the framework of Czechoslovakia. But real political autonomy was not granted to the region until October 1938. That autonomy came in the wake of the Munich

a republic for several months after the First World War, but its “independence” came to an abrupt end as soon as the authorities in Warsaw decided to give greater attention to integrating under its rule that part of interwar Poland.⁸ Then there was the much heralded symbolic “republic for a day” of Carpatho-Ukraine (March 1939), and later Transcarpathian Ukraine. The latter entity, which functioned for about seven months in 1944–45, proclaimed from the very outset its intention to unite with Soviet Ukraine. Therefore, it can hardly qualify as an entity that achieved independent statehood in reality or as a goal.⁹

Certainly Carpathian Rus' as a whole has never had independence of any kind. But the fact that it never achieved statehood does not make Carpathian Rus' any less real. After all, Friesland, Flanders, Catalonia, or Lombardy have also never (if ever) functioned as states in the modern era, yet no one questions their existence. Like Friesland, Wallonia, Occitanie, and the numerous other stateless regions of Europe, Carpathian Rus' is inhabited by a people with a distinct historical, linguistic, literary, musical, and artistic heritage that has been and continues to be the subject of an increasingly sophisticated scholarly and popular literature. The very names and concepts of Carpathian Rus' and Carpatho-Rusyns are not anything new. As a geographic concept, Carpathian Rus' was used by the early twentieth-century historian Nykolai Beskyd, and it was the term used by Carpatho-Rusyn activists who put forth political demands to the Paris Peace Conference in 1919.¹⁰ And with regard to the appropriate ethnonym for the group, we should not forget that the renowned nineteenth-century national awakener, Mykhailo Luchkai, entitled his six-volume magnum opus *A History of Carpatho-Rusyns*.¹¹

Pact, which marked the first stage in the dismantling and eventual destruction of Czechoslovakia (and short-lived autonomous Subcarpathian Rus' as well) in March 1939. That Subcarpathian Rus' could not be considered a state at this time is made clear in the article “Autonomy” in Magocsi and Pop, *Encyclopedia of Rusyn History and Culture*, 22–23.

⁸ The most comprehensive study of the little-known Lemko republics (there were two) is by Bogdan Horbal, *Działalność polityczna Łemków na Łemkowszczyźnie, 1918–1921* (Wrocław: Arboretum, 1997).

⁹ A good example of the tendentious effort to link all these short-lived experiments (excluding the Lemko republics) and to argue that their existence allegedly justifies speaking about Carpatho-Rusyn statehood is found in Petro Hodmash and Ivan Turianytsia, comps., *Od avtonomnoi Podkarpatskoi Rusy do suverennoi Zakarpatskoi Ukrainy* (Uzhhorod: Obshchestvo podkarpatskykh rusynov, 1996).

¹⁰ As early as in the 1870s the Galician Rus' scholar Yakiv Holovatsky also used the term “Carpathian Rus',” although he understood the term to mean all Rus'-inhabited lands in the Habsburg Empire, i.e., eastern Galicia, northern Bukovyna, and Subcarpathian (“Hungarian”) Rus'.

¹¹ The work, written in Latin, was completed in 1843 but not published in the original language (together with a Ukrainian translation) until the second half of the twentieth century, first as *Historia Carpato-Ruthenorum/Istoriia karpatskykh rusyniv* in several volumes of *Naukovyi zbirnyk Muzeiu ukrainskoi kultury u Svydnyku* (1983–99), then separately as Mykhailo Luchkai, *Istoriia karpatskykh rusyniv: Tserkovna i svitska, davnia i nova azh po nash chas, napysana na materialy dostovirnykh avtoriv, korolivskykh hramot ta arkhivnykh dokumentiv Mukachivskoi ieparkhii*, 6 vols. (Uzhhorod: Zakarpattia, 1999–2011).

Let us move from names to content. In other words, what are the criteria that justify our use of the concept Carpathian Rus' and what distinguishes Carpatho-Rusyns as a people from their neighbours?

Carpathian Rus' is the name of a territory comprised of settlements (mostly villages), fifty per cent or more of whose inhabitants at the outset of the twentieth century were Carpatho-Rusyns. It is certainly true that, like many other historic regions, not all the inhabitants were adherents of the "titular" nationality. Hence, throughout Carpathian Rus' there lived several other peoples (numerical minorities), who in some cases formed a plurality, or even a majority, of the inhabitants in certain villages and towns.¹² As for the "titular" group, the criterion used here for determining who was a Carpatho-Rusyn is self-ascription—namely, persons who answered on three decennial censuses (1900, 1910, 1920) conducted in the former Austro-Hungarian Empire and the successor states of Poland and Czechoslovakia that either their mother tongue or their nationality was Carpatho-Rusyn.¹³

In order to not be accused of proposing a circular argument—that is, Carpathian Rus' is where Carpatho-Rusyns live, therefore Carpatho-Rusyns exist because there is a place defined as Carpathian Rus'—it seems appropriate to address the proposition that Carpatho-Rusyns are a distinct people. When, in the course of the nineteenth century, ethnographers and linguists began turning their attention to Carpathian Rus', there arose a debate about the relationship of its inhabitants to neighbouring peoples. It was relatively easy to draw distinctions between, on the one hand, the East Slavic Carpatho-Rusyns and, on the other, the West Slavic Poles and Slovaks to the north and west, the Finno-Ugric Magyars to the south, and the Latinate-speaking Romanians to the southeast. More problematic was to determine the relationship between Carpatho-Rusyns and other East Slavs living north and east of the mountain crests in what were then the Habsburg-ruled Austrian crownlands of Galicia (east of the San River) and Bukovyna. The East Slavs in these two crownlands also called themselves Rusyns, although during the first decades of the twentieth century an ever increasing number began to identify as Ukrainians. Today virtually all East Slavs in eastern Galicia and northern Bukovina consider their identity and language to be Ukrainian. Only in Carpathian Rus' is the term "Rusyn" (with its variants "Rusnak" and "Lemko") still used as an ethnonym by large numbers of East Slavs, a certain percentage of whom consider themselves as belonging to a distinct nationality.¹⁴

¹² On these groups and their relationship to Carpatho-Rusyns and Carpathian Rus', see "Czechs," "Germans," "Gypsies/Roma," "Jews," "Magyars," "Poles," "Romanians," "Russians," "Slovaks," and "Ukrainians" in Magocsi and Pop, *Encyclopedia of Rusyn History and Culture*, 83–87, 135–36, 217–21, 314–16, 387–89, 418–19, 429–31, 464–67, and 511–14.

¹³ I give priority to Austro-Hungarian statistical data (1900 and 1910), because census-takers asked the question about mother tongue. For example, and by way of contrast, interwar Czechoslovak censuses asked the question about nationality. This often led to confusing results, whereby traditionally Carpatho-Rusyn-inhabited villages may have had very few Carpatho-Rusyns in one census (1921), but many more in another (1930), the "missing" ones having identified themselves as Czechoslovaks—which they certainly were according to citizenship.

¹⁴ While it is true that the term "Rusyn" is widespread as a self identifier, we know that some persons consider it to indicate a distinct East Slavic nationality, while others believe it is only an older or regional name for the Ukrainian nationality. Some limited but instructive sociological research has been done precisely on this topic for Ukraine's Transcarpathian oblast—Aleksandr

The problem of the relationship between Carpatho-Rusyns and other East Slavs was reflected in the manner that scholars classified the inhabitants of Carpathian Rus'. Most literature published during the twentieth century refers to the East Slavic ethnographic groups living along both slopes of the Carpathian Mountains as Lemkos, Boikos, and Hutsuls. This tripartite formulation is repeated without reflection, effectively as if it were a litany, in a wide body of scholarly and non-scholarly publications. But does this repetition of the tripartite litany, even by scholars who have no political agenda, necessarily mean that it is a correct or reasonable reflection of reality?

In fact, the earliest scholarly studies about Carpatho-Rusyns that date from the second half of the nineteenth century speak of four, not three, groups who were differentiated by their dialectal speech, material culture, and cultural values. These groups, roughly from west to east, included the Lemkos, Krainiane, Dolyniane, and Verkhovyntsi. It is instructive to note that these terms were not used by the inhabitants themselves, but were given to them by their neighbours. Instead the East Slavs of Carpathian Rus' traditionally described themselves simply as Rusnaks, Rusyns, or as the people of the Rus' faith (*rus'ka vira*). During the first decades of the twentieth century some local leaders managed to convince Rusnaks living on the northern slopes of the Carpathian Mountains (and west of the Oslawa River) that they should call themselves Lemkos, a term that became the group's ethnonym after a few decades.¹⁵

Some combination of the four ethnographic subdivisions listed above was adopted by scholars of various political and national persuasions, including the Austrian Hermann Bidermann,¹⁶ the Russians Grigorii De-Vollan and Timofei Florinsky,¹⁷ the

Pelin, "Dinamika mezhetnicheskikh otnoshenii Zakarpattia 1995–1998 gg.," *Uchenye zapiski Simferopolskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*, 1999, no. 11: 76–84; and for eastern Slovakia—Mária Homišinová, "Nazory na etnickú identifikáciu a etnonym rusínskej/ukrajinskej minority na Slovensku," in Marián Gajdoš et al., *Rusíni/Ukrajinci na Slovensku na konci 20. storočia: K vybraným výsledkom historicko-sociologického výskumu v roku 2000* (Prešov: Universum, 2001), 90–96.

¹⁵ The term "Lemko" first began to be used to describe an ethnolinguistic group in the 1820s, but it took more than a century before it became widespread among one group of Carpatho-Rusyns—those living north of the mountain crests in western Galicia. Until well into the twentieth century, Poles referred to all Ukrainians as "Rusini." Not wanting to be confused with Ukrainians in eastern Galicia, the intelligentsia speaking on behalf of East Slavs living in Galicia west of the Oslawa River proposed the term "Lemko" as an ethnonym. By the 1920s most of the East Slavs in the area now known as the Lemko Region had adopted "Lemko" instead of "Rusnak" or "Rusyn" as a self-designation. For details, see Ivan Teodorovich, "Lemkovskaia Rus'," *Nauchno-literaturnyi sbornik Galitsko-Russkoi Matitsy* (Lviv) 8 (1934): 11–13; and Bohdan O. Struminsky, "Nazva liudei i kraiu," in *Lemkivshchyna: Zemlia – liudy – istoriia – kul'tura*, vol. 1: 11–22, ed. Bohdan O. Struminsky, vol. 206 (1988) of *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva im. Shevchenka* (New York).

¹⁶ Hermann Ign. Bidermann, *Die ungarischen Ruthenen, ihr Wohngebiet, ihr Erwerb und ihre Geschichte*, vol. 1 (Innsbruck, 1862), 71–100. Bidermann spoke of three groups: Verkhovyntsi, Dolyshnians (or Bl[i]akhy), and Slovakized Rusyns ("slovakisirten Ruthenen"). He did not consider the Hutsuls part of the "Hungarian Rusyns."

¹⁷ G. A. De-Vollan, *Ugro-russkaia narodnyiia piesni* (St. Petersburg, 1885), 5–26. De-Vollan spoke of three groups: Verkhovyntsi, Dolyniane, and, together, Spishaky (the Carpatho-Rusyns of Spish county) and Krainiane (referring to the Rusnaks of present-day northeastern Slovakia). Timofei Florinsky, in his *Slavianskoe plemia: Statistiko-etnograficheskii obzor sovremennago*

Galician Ukrainophile Vasyl Lukych,¹⁸ the Bukovinian Russophile Hryhorii Kupchanko,¹⁹ and the Subcarpathian Rusynophile Yurii Zhatkovych.²⁰ These writers also agreed that the most important group in terms of numerical size and geographical extent were the Dolyniane, and that the second numerically largest groups were the Krainiane (that is, the Rusnaks of present-day eastern Slovakia) and the Lemkos. At the same time they pointed out that the Verkhovyntsi and Hutsuls were peripheral in terms of their small numbers and location along the edges of Carpathian Rus'. In the literature that appeared before the First World War, only one author, the Hungarian scholar of Carpatho-Rusyn background Antal Hodinka, considered some Hutsuls as part of the Rus' people of Subcarpathia.²¹

Despite these earliest writings on the subject, during the first half of the twentieth century Ukrainian scholars adopted another analytical schema. They divided Carpathian Rus' from west to east into only three ethnographic and linguistic regions—Lemko, Boiko, and Hutsul—each of which included territory on the northern and southern slopes of the mountains. This tripartite categorization allegedly proved that the East Slavs on the southern slopes of the Carpathians were the same as those on the northern slopes. In other words, they were Ukrainian. The most influential scholar to propose the tripartite schema was the Galician-Ukrainian linguist Ivan Pankevych. This conceptual framework has been subsequently adopted in Ukraine by regional ethnographers (e.g., Yurii Hoshko) and historians of wooden church architecture, and it dominates in all Ukrainian and some non-Ukrainian encyclopedic literature.²²

Subsequent research (including that of the Russophile linguist Georgii Gerovsky, his Ukrainian contemporary Ivan Zilynsky, and the Transcarpathian Ukrainian ethno-

slavianstva (Kyiv, 1907), 41–42, refers to five groups: Lemkos, Verkhovyntsi, Dolyniane, Krainiane, and “a few” Hutsuls.

¹⁸ Vasy Lukych, “Uhorska Rus',” in *Vatra: Literaturnyi sbornyk* (Stryi, 1887), 177–83. Lukych also omitted the Hutsuls and spoke of three groups: Verkhovyntsi, Dolyniane, and, together, Krainiane and Spyshaky.

¹⁹ Hryhorii Kupchanko, *Uhorska Rus' y ey russky zhytely* (Vienna, 1897), 46–62. Kupchanko referred to three groups: Verkhovyntsi, Dolyniane, and Krainiane-Spyshaky.

²⁰ Yurii Zhatkovych, “Zamitky etnografichni z Uhorskoi Rusy: Podil uhorskykh rusyniv,” in *Etnografichniy zbirnyk Naukovoho tovarystva im. Shevchenka*, vol. 2 (Lviv, 1896), 1–2. Zhatkovych spoke of three groups: Verkhovyntsi, Bliakhy (or Dychky), and Dolyshniaky (or Namuliaky).

²¹ Anton Hodinka, “Die Ruthenen,” in *Die österreichisch-ungarische Monarchie in Wort und Bild*, vol. 5, pt. 2 (Vienna, 1900), 401–18.

²² Already in the nineteenth century Lukych (see note 18) used the Lemko-Boiko-Hutsul classification when referring to language. The tripartite schema formed the conceptual framework for Ivan Pankevych's major monograph on Carpatho-Rusyn dialects, *Ukrainski hovory Pidkarpatskoi Rusy i sumezhnykh oblastei*, no. 9 (Prague, 1938); see esp. pp. 356–98. His linguistic classification was subsequently adopted as an ethnographic concept, and it has continued to appear in all Soviet and non-Soviet Ukrainian-language reference works. It is elaborated upon in encyclopedic works for each region: Yurii H. Hoshko et al, eds., *Hutsulshchyna: Istoryko-etnografichne doslidzhennia* (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1987); idem, *Boikivshchyna: Istoryko-etnografichne doslidzhennia* (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1983); Struminsky, *Lemkivshchyna*, 2 vols (1988); Yurii Hoshko, ed., *Lemkivshchyna: Istoryko-etnografichne doslidzhennia*, 2 vols. (Lviv: Instytut narodoznavstva NAN Ukrainy, 1999–2002); and the Soviet-Marxist historiographical work that praises “progressive scholars” for having decisively undermined the view that Carpathian Rus' is distinct from the rest of the East Slavic world: Roman F. Kyrchiv, *Etnografichne doslidzhennia Boikivshchyny* (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1978).

grapher Mykhailo Tyvodar) suggests that the tripartite Lemko-Boiko-Hutsul classification schema cannot be supported by either linguistic or ethnographic data.²³ It therefore seems appropriate to return to a variant of the subdivisions first proposed in the late nineteenth century and continued by a few scholars since then.²⁴ This would suggest that Carpatho-Rusyns are divided into two basic groups, western and eastern, separated more or less along the Oslawa and Laborec rivers.

The western group consists of the Lemkos on the northern slopes of the Carpathians (present-day southeastern Poland) and the Rusnaks on the southern slopes (northeastern Slovakia). Until World War II the Lemkos inhabited 179 villages and the Rusnaks 283 villages, which together accounted for 44 per cent of all villages in Carpathian Rus'. Despite living on both sides of the Carpathian crests, the Lemkos and the Rusnaks have maintained close contact over the centuries. Such contacts were enhanced by the fact that the Carpathian ranges are at their lowest precisely between the Poprad and Oslawa/Laborec rivers along the Polish-Slovak border. In particular, it was the Lemkos who went southward for employment as annual summer-season agricultural workers (in the Hungarian plain) and also to participate at various times of the year in pilgrimages and other religious festivals at sites in Carpatho-Rusyn-inhabited northeastern Slovakia. One result of such social interaction was frequent intermarriage between Lemkos and Rusnaks as well as wide-ranging mutual cultural and linguistic relations between these two subdivisions of the western group of Carpatho-Rusyns.²⁵

The eastern group of Carpatho-Rusyns consists of East Slavs living only on the southern slopes of the mountains. These include the Dolyniane and the Verkhovyntsi. The Dolyniane inhabit 401 villages, which account for thirty-eight per cent of the

²³ The Russophile linguist Georgii Geroivsky identified eight basic dialects and six transitional dialects in Carpathian Rus' south of the mountain crests. See his "Jazyk Podkarpatské Rusi," in *Československá vlastivěda*, pt. 3, *Jazyk* (Prague: Sfinx, Bohumil Janda, 1934), 460–80. Even earlier the Galician Ukrainian linguist Ivan Zilynsky indicated four dialectal groups (Lemko, Boiko, Central Transcarpathian, Hutsul) in Carpathian Rus'. He designated the largest dialectal region, which coincided with villages inhabited by the Dolyniane, as Central Transcarpathian and distinct from Boiko dialects in the highlands (Verkhovyna) and in Galicia. See his *Karta ukraïnskykh hovoriv*, in *Pratsi Ukraïnskoho naukovoïho instytutu* (Warsaw), vol. 14 (1933). Zilynsky's classification has been followed by subsequent Ukrainian linguists, including those who prepared the authoritative *Atlas ukraïnskoï movy*, vol. 2, *Volyn, Naddnistrianshchyna, Zakarpattia i sumizhni zemli*, ed. Ya. V. Zakrevska et al (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1988); see esp. map 4 therein.

²⁴ Aleksander Bonkalo, a Hungarian scholar of Carpatho-Rusyn origin, spoke of four ethnographic subdivisions: Lemkos, Dolynshniane, Boikos (who called themselves Verkhovyntsi), and Hutsuls. See Sándor Bonkáló, *A Rutének (Ruszinok)* (Budapest: Franklin-Társulat Kiadása, 1940), 70–90; and its English translation: Alexander Bonkáló, *The Rusyns* (New York: Columbia University Press/East European Monographs, 1990), 60–84. It seems remarkable, but even after Soviet rule was established in the region, one Soviet Ukrainian scholar, Hryhorii Stelmakh, argued that Transcarpathia should indeed be considered a distinct ethnographic region because both its highlanders (Verkhovyntsi) and lowlanders (Dolyniany) form a distinct people. See H. Iu. Stelmakh, "Etnohrafično-folklorna ekspeditsiia 1946 roku v Zakarpattia," *Naukovi zapysky Instytutu mystetstvoznavstva, folkloru ta etnohrafii AN URSR* (Kyiv), 1947, 300–303.

²⁵ For details on these close ties, see Roman Reinfuss, "Związki kulturowe po obu stronach Karpat w rejonie Łemkowszczyzny," in *Łemkowie w historii i kulturze Karpat*, vol. 1: 167–81, ed. Jerzy Czajkowski (Rzeszów: Spotkania, 1992).

total in Carpathian Rus'; they cover most of the Transcarpathian oblast (historic Subcarpathian Rus') of Ukraine from the Shopurka River in the east to the border with Slovakia and beyond (south of the Vihorlat Ridge). The Dolyniane are considered the oldest East Slavic settlers in Carpathian Rus', their ancestors having come from Polissia and Podillia sometime during the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Consequently the Dolyniane have retained some of the most archaic and distinctive forms of Carpatho-Rusyn speech. For centuries they were isolated from contact with other East Slavs to the north (Galicia) and east (Bukovyna); on the other hand, their material and spiritual culture as well as their language has been strongly influenced by the Magyars, with whom they share a common ethnographic boundary enhanced by easy access between the Carpathian foothills and the Hungarian Plain.²⁶

The Verkhovyntsi are a geographically peripheral group, inhabiting only sixty-nine villages along the upper slopes of the Carpathians in the northwestern and north-central part of the Transcarpathian oblast. Whereas they share many features with the Boikos living on the northern (Galician) slopes, the high mountain crests and few passes have rendered contacts with Galicia limited and difficult. Geography has clearly made a difference in relations between the inhabitants in this part of the Carpathians. In contrast to the mountain crests farther to the west, where Lemkos and Rusnaks have traditionally remained in close contact, the Boiko inhabitants of Galicia did not look southward, but rather were drawn by geography and communication routes northward and eastward toward the rest of Galicia.

Finally, there are Hutsuls who live east of the Shopurka River and in the valleys of the upper Tysa River and its tributaries (Chorna Tysa, Bila Tysa, and Ruskova). They inhabit only twenty-four villages, which represent a mere two per cent of all villages in Carpathian Rus', and are the most recent settlers in the region, with most of their villages dating from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. They have traditionally used the ethnonym "Hutsul" to distinguish themselves from the Dolyniane/Rusnak lowlanders and have maintained close contacts with the Hutsuls north and east of the mountain crests, in Galicia and Bukovyna respectively. There is yet no consensus whether Hutsuls—at least those living on the southern slopes of the mountains—should (or want to) be considered a Carpatho-Rusyn ethnographic group.

Despite the peripheral nature of the Verkhovyntsi and Hutsuls (whose villages together total only nine per cent of all villages in Carpathian Rus'), it is these two ethnographic groups that have received the most attention in scholarly writings. This is perhaps because their geographic isolation has prompted some scholars to believe that they represent the purest, or least corrupted, version of some earlier form of culture.²⁷ By the same token the Dolyniane, whose cultural characteristics represent a

²⁶ For details on the Dolyniane and on Carpatho-Rusyn–Magyar cultural and linguistic relations, see Alexander Bonkalo, "Die ungarländischen Ruthenen," *Ungarische Jahrbücher* (Berlin and Leipzig, 1921) 1: 318–341; and Petro Lyzanets's linguistic atlas in 3 vols.: *Magyar-ukrán nyelvi kapcsolatok* (Uzhhorod: Uzhhorodi Allami Egyetem, 1970), *Vengerskie zaimstvovaniia v ukrainskikh govorakh Zakarpattia: Vengersko-ukrainskie mezhiazykovye svyazi* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1976), and *Atlas leksychnykh madiaryzmiv ta ikh vidpovidnykiv v ukrainskykh hovorakh Zakarpatskoi oblasti URSR* (Uzhhorod: Uzhhorodskyy derzhavnyi universytet, 1976).

²⁷ Ivan Pop has argued that the populist interest in patriarchal societies, which allegedly preserved elements of a "true national culture" (*istynno narodnoi kul'tury*), is what motivates on-going interest in the Hutsuls and Verkhovyntsi at the expense of the numerically larger and more representative

kind of amalgam (bricolage) with their Magyar neighbours, are considered of less scholarly interest, even though they clearly comprise the numerically largest group of Carpatho-Rusyns.²⁸ The emphasis that scholars have given to the peripheral Verkhovynsi and Hutsuls, whose ethnographic and linguistic characteristics are more similar to the inhabitants living just north and east of the Carpathians, lends credence to the argument that allegedly all of the East Slavs of Carpathian Rus' are culturally and linguistically Ukrainian. More systematic study of the Dolyniane and Lemkos/Rusnaks shows, however, the fallacy of assuming that the periphery is representative of the whole.

Having just emphasized that the Verkhovynsi and Hutsuls living on the southern slopes of the Carpathians have characteristics that are more in common with inhabitants on the northern slopes, what justifies including them within the boundaries of Carpathian Rus'? Here one needs to look to geography and history as a determining factor.²⁹ Since the establishment of the first states in central and eastern Europe, the crests of the Carpathian Mountains formed an administrative boundary that separated the inhabitants on the southern slopes from those on the northern slopes. Those same Carpathian crests also coincided with a dividing line that determined different geographic spheres. The southern slopes are part of the Danubian Basin. There all rivers, transportation patterns, and centres of trade and commerce point southward. For nearly a millennium the dominant state structure in the Danubian Basin was the multinational Kingdom of Hungary, of which the Carpatho-Rusyn area was an integral part. Thus, while it is true that there may be some similarities in the language and religion of the East Slavic inhabitants on both sides of the Carpathian Mountains, those living on the southern slopes were part of an entirely different geopolitical sphere until as recently as 1945.

Within that geopolitical sphere, the inhabitants of Carpathian Rus' developed a common political culture and sense of historical tradition that was enhanced by developments connected with demands for political autonomy. For nearly a century, from 1849 to 1944, during every significant political crisis in central Europe Carpatho-Rusyns demanded—and most of those living south of the Carpathians were at times accorded—autonomy. Lemko Rusyns living north of the Carpathians also hoped to join their brethren to the south. It was in fact the Lemko Rusyns who were among the first to formulate maps (submitted to the Paris Peace Conference and other international bodies) that outlined the boundaries of Carpathian Rus' from the Poprad River in the west to the upper Tisza River in the east. Thus geopolitical, historical, and ethnographic characteristics, not to mention self-ascription, are the most important criteria in defining Carpathian Rus' as a territory and Carpatho-Rusyns as the numerically dominant—though not exclusive—people within its borders.

groups in Carpathian Rus'; that is, the Dolyniane, Rusnaks, and Lemkos. See his article "Ethnography," in Magocsi and Pop, *Encyclopedia of Rusyn History and Culture*, 107–12.

²⁸ The most systematic discussion of the Dolyniane is found in Mykhailo P. Tyvodar, "Etnohrafichne raionuvannia ukrainsiv Zakarpattia," *Carpatica-Karpatyka* (Uzhhorod) 6 (1999): 32–44. However, Tyvodar considers the Dolyniane, Hutsuls, Boikos, and Lemkos part of the Ukrainian ethnos.

²⁹ The following discussion is described in greater detail in my article "Mapping Stateless Peoples: The East Slavs of the Carpathians," *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 39, nos. 3–4 (September–December 1997): 301–31, esp. 312–18.

In conclusion, there are a few principles that warrant repeating for those of us who research and publish on topics of central and eastern Europe in general and in the field of Carpatho-Rusyn studies in particular. The subject of our discipline is the historic land called Carpathian Rus', a territory whose inhabitants, at least until 1920, were in the majority Carpatho-Rusyns. Scholarly projects may deal with Carpathian Rus' as a whole or with one or more of its component regions.

Those authors who decide to deal with a particular region, whether Subcarpathian Rus', Prešov Rus', Lemko Rus', or the Maramureș, should never forget that they are writing about only one region that is part of a larger whole—Carpathian Rus'. As for the appropriate ethnonym for the people who are the primary subject of our discipline, it is Carpatho-Rusyn. When writing about inhabitants in specific parts of Carpathian Rus', one might wish to use related terms like Lemkos, or preferably Lemko-Rusyns, Rusnaks (in reference to Carpatho-Rusyns in present day Slovakia), and Subcarpathian Rusyns for Carpatho-Rusyns in Ukraine (but certainly not the ethnically meaningless term *zakarpattsi* [Transcarpathians]).³⁰ If the subject of inquiry is immigrants and their descendants, it is most appropriate when dealing with Serbia and Croatia to speak of Vojvodinian Rusyns, Bachka Rusyns, or Srem Rusyns, and, in the case of North America to speak of American Rusyns or Canadian Rusyns. Finally, recognizing that English has become an important instrument of international communication, the appropriate terms to describe the subject of our inquiry in that language are: "Carpatho-Rusyn" or simply "Rusyn" (but not "Ruthenian"³¹) for the people, and "Carpathian Rus'" for their historic homeland.

By the outset of the twenty-first century Carpatho-Rusyn studies has certainly developed into a serious scholarly discipline in which a wide variety of scholars worldwide are directly or indirectly engaged.³² At the very least scholars within this community should promote a certain degree of terminological and conceptual consistency in their publications.

³⁰ It seems that during Soviet times those Carpatho-Rusyns in Transcarpathia (Subcarpathian Rus') who wanted to maintain some sense of distinctiveness could do so only by using the territorial designation "Transcarpathian." Consequently, there were—and still are in post-Soviet Ukraine—references in verbal discourse and in print to the "Transcarpathian people," "Transcarpathian songs," even the "Transcarpathian language" (*po-zakarpatsky*). Since the Transcarpathian oblast includes Magyars, Roma, Slovaks, Ukrainians, and Romanians, as well as Carpatho-Rusyns and other nationalities, the adjective "Transcarpathian" is meaningless in ethnic terms. Therefore one should not confuse "Transcarpathian" with ethnic categories and, where necessary, refer only to the Carpatho-Rusyn people, Carpatho-Rusyn songs, the Carpatho-Rusyn language, and so on.

³¹ Some authors still use the term "Ruthenian" as an ethnonym for Carpatho-Rusyns. The term derives from the Latin word for Rus' and is still used by the Vatican to describe the Greek Catholic Eparchy of Mukachevo in Ukraine and the Byzantine-rite eparchies in the United States. In the interest of impartiality, "Ruthenian" should be avoided, because in the eyes of many Orthodox it is associated (often negatively) with the Vatican and the Roman Catholic world.

³² For a list of over a hundred scholars whose publications confirm that they accept the view that Carpatho-Rusyns represent a distinct people and culture, see <www.rusyn.org/pdf/WARCListOfScholars.pdf>.

OLEH S. ILNYTZKYJ is a professor of Ukrainian literature at the University of Alberta and the former editor of *Canadian Slavonic Papers* (2001–2010). He is the author of *Ukrainian Futurism, 1914-1930: An Historical and Critical Study* (1997, Ukrainian trans. 2003) and of articles about Russian-Ukrainian unity myths and about the works of Nikolai Gogol, Taras Shevchenko, Mykhail Semenko, Mykola Khvylovy, and other Ukrainian modernist writers; and the co-author of *A Concordance to the Poetic Works of Taras Shevchenko* (2001) and *A Concordance to the Complete Works of Hryhorii Skovoroda* (2009).

ANATOLIY KRUGLASHOV is a professor and the head of the Department of Political Science and Public Administration at Chernivtsi National University; the director of the Scientific Research Institute of European Integration and Regional Studies there; and a professor at the European Humanities University (2006–2011) in Vilnius. He is the author of a monograph about Mykhailo Drahomanov's political ideas (2000) and of many articles dealing with Ukraine and European integration, Russian and Ukrainian political thought, Ukrainian politics and regional ethnopolitics, and Ukraine's relations with Romania, Moldova, and Belarus. He has edited numerous collections of articles, including the series *Politychni ta sotsiologichni studii*.

PAUL R. MAGOCSI has been the professor of Ukrainian history at the University of Toronto since 1980. Among his several hundred publications are over thirty books, including *The Shaping of a National Identity: Subcarpathian Rus', 1848–1948* (1978), *Galicia: A Historical Survey and Bibliographic Guide* (1983), *Ukraine: A Historical Atlas* (1985), *A History of Ukraine: The Land and Its Peoples* (1996, revised ed. 2010), *Historical Atlas of Central Europe* (2002), *Encyclopedia of Rusyn History and Culture* (co-editor, 2002), *The Roots of Ukrainian Nationalism: Galicia as Ukraine's Piedmont* (2002), and *Ukraine: An Illustrated History* (2007).

DAVID R. MARPLES is a Distinguished University Professor of history at the University of Alberta and the director of Stasiuk Program on Contemporary Ukraine at the CIUS. He is the author of sixteen books on twentieth-century Ukraine, Belarus, and Russia. The most recent are *Holodomor: Causes of the Famine of 1932–1933 in Ukraine* (2011), *Russia in the Twentieth Century: The Quest for Stability* (2011), *Heroes and Villains: Creating National History in Contemporary Ukraine* (2007), *The Lukashenka Phenomenon: Elections, Propaganda, and the Foundations of Political Authority in Belarus* (2007), and *Historia ZSRR: Od Rewolucji do rozpadu* (2006).

YOSHIE MITSUYOSHI teaches European history at Fukuoka University, Japan. She is the author of a Ph.D. dissertation on women in Western Ukraine in 1939–50 (University of Alberta, 2004) and articles in Japanese and European academic journals about Stalinist gender policies and historical memory in Ukraine.

COLIN NEUFELDT is an associate professor of history at Concordia University College of Alberta and a lawyer in Edmonton. He is the author of "The Fate of Mennonites in Ukraine and the Crimea during Soviet Collectivization and the Famine (1930–1933)" (Ph.D. diss., University of Alberta, 1999) and articles on related subjects in the *Journal of Mennonite Studies* and *The Mennonite Quarterly Review*.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.