

THE BYZANTINE CATHOLIC PROVINCE OF PHILADELPHIA:
A HISTORY OF THE UKRAINIAN CATHOLIC CHURCH IN THE U.S.A.

by

Bohdan P. Procko

Dissertation presented to the Faculty of
Arts of the University of Ottawa through
the Department of History as partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

*degree conferred
May 1964
Ethnicity
Secret: grad. Division*



Villanova, Pa., U.S.A., 1963

UMI Number: DC53630

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform DC53630
Copyright 2011 by ProQuest LLC
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis was prepared under the direction of the Chairman of the Department of History, Professor Alfred R. Vanasse. For his patience, understanding, and advice I am sincerely grateful. In addition, the writer is indebted to many other individuals and institutions for their varied contributions to this study.

Special gratitude is owed to the Administrative Council of the Byzantine Rite Archdiocese of Philadelphia (composed of the late Metropolitan Constantine Bohachevsky, Bishop Joseph M. Schmondiuk, Very Rev. Basil Holowinsky, Very Rev. Msgr. Jaroslav Gabro, Rev. George Pasdrey and Rev. Michael Pyrih), for interviewing the writer and for approving the projected study; to the present Metropolitan, the Most Reverend Ambrose Senyshyn, for granting an audience to the writer and extending his support for the work begun during the episcopate of his predecessor; to the Chancellor, Very Rev. Msgr. Michael Poloway, and to the Archdiocesan Economist, Very Rev. Basil Holowinsky, through whose cooperation the writer made use of the Archdiocesan Archives.

Special thanks is also due to Messrs. Anthony Dragan, Editor-in-Chief, and Bohdan Krawciw, Editor, of Svoboda, Jersey City, N. J.; to Michael Roman, Editor-in-Chief of the Amerikansky Russky Viestnik, Homestead, Pa. (now called the Greek Catholic Union Messenger); To

Michael Pasika, Editor of America, Philadelphia, Pa., to John R. Dudish, Retail Advertising Manager of the Evening Herald, Shenandoah, Pa.; and to Oleksa H. Hankewych, Custodian of Archives at the Ukrainian Museum, Chicago, Ill.

In addition, the writer is thankful to Professors Constantine Bida, Chairman of the Department of Slavic Studies, and to Richard A. Lebrun, Department of History, the University of Ottawa. Their critical reading of the manuscript led to changes which, it is believed, have improved this work. He is also grateful to the Library Staffs of The University of Ottawa, Villanova University, Villanova, Pa., Haverford College, Haverford, Pa., Columbia University and New York Public Library, and St. Charles Seminary, Overbrook, Pa., for their services.

Finally, the writer is indebted to his wife, Margaret, without whose sacrifice this study could not have been completed.

To those who cannot be individually listed because of lack of space, the author expresses his sincere gratitude.

THE CURRICULUM STUDIORUM

Bohdan P. Procko was born on July 18, 1922 in Rychyiv, Galicia, Poland.

He obtained his Bachelor's degree in History from Albright College, Reading, Pa., in 1945 and his Master's degree in Modern Eastern European History from Columbia University in 1946. The title of the Master's thesis was "Michael Dragomanov and Ukrainian Nationalism."

Mr. Procko is an Assistant Professor in the Department of History at Villanova University, Villanova, Pa.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	page
INTRODUCTION	ix
I. IMMIGRATION, ORGANIZATION, AND CONFLICTS .	1
1. Historical Background	1
2. First Ruthenian Colonization	7
3. Expansion	21
4. Factional Conflicts	28
5. Conflicts with Latin Bishops	34
6. New Conflicts and Solution	41
II. ADMINISTRATION OF BISHOP ORTYNSKY	51
1. Pioneering Hardships of a New Bishop	51
2. Beginnings of his Episcopal Administration	60
3. Organizational Accomplishments	71
4. Creation of an Independent Diocese	79
5. War Developments and Ortynsky's Death	87
III. ADMINISTRATION OF VERY REV. PONIATISHIN . .	92
1. The new Administration and its Struggle with Russian Orthodoxy	92
2. Educational, Financial, and Other Concerns	103
3. Special Problems Resulting from the War	109
4. Metropolitan Sheptytsky's Second Visit	120
IV. EARLY ADMINISTRATION OF BISHOP BOHACHEVSKY.	128
1. Organization and Reaffirmation of Authority	128
2. New Internal Conflicts	135
3. Attempts to Improve the Bishop's Position	142
4. Education - Key to Diocesan Growth	146
V. THE ROAD TO MATURITY	155
1. Accomplishment to Second World War	155
2. Effects of the War on the Diocese	162
3. Post War Expansion	168
4. The Years of Fulfillment	180
CONCLUSION	199
BIBLIOGRAPHY	202

	page
Appendix	
1. RUTHENIAN PRIESTS, THEIR ORIGIN, AND THEIR PARISHES IN 1896	216
2. NUMBER OF RUTHENIAN PRIESTS AND CHURCHES IN 1904	217
3. ABSTRACT OF <u>The Byzantine Cath. Prov. of Phila:</u> <u>A History of the Ukr. Cath. Church in the U.S.A.</u>	218

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AER,	American Ecclesiastical Review (Ecclesiastical Review from 1908 through 1943).
Almanakh Svobody,	Iuvileiny Almanakh Svobody, 1893- 1953.
Almanakh Tserkvy,	Iuvyleiny Almanakh Ukrainskoi Hreko- Katolytskoi Tserkvy u Zluchenykh Derzhavakh, 1884-1934.
APS,	Acta Apostolicae Sedis.
ASS,	Acta Sanctae Sedis.
CD,	Catholic Directory.
CE,	Catholic Encyclopedia.
Dictionary of Races,	U.S. Congress, Senate. Dictionary of Races or Peoples.
ECQ,	Eastern Churches Quarterly.
HPL,	Homilitic and Pastoral Review.
Kalendar Sojedinenija,	Kalendar Greko Katoliceskaho Sojedinenija.
Kalendar Soyuza,	Kalendar Ukrainskoho Narodnoho Soyuza.
Knyha Kaledza,	Propamiatha Knyha Ukrainskoho Katolytskoho Kaledza.
Knyha Katedry,	Propamiatna Knyha Ukrainskoi Katolytskoi Katedry.
Knyha Soyuza,	Propamiatna Knyha Ukrainskoho Narodnoho Soyuza, 1894-1934.
Pershy Kalendar,	Pershy Rusko-Amerykansky Kalendar.
Shipman Memorial,	A Memorial of Andrew J. Shipman (C.B. Pallen, ed.).

St. Michael's Book,	St. Michael's Diamond Jubilee Book (Shenandoah)
Tserkva sv. Iura,	Piatdesiatlittia Ukrainskoi Katolytskoi Tserkvy sv. Iura.
Ukrainian Directory,	Directory of the Byzantine Rite Ecclesiastical Province of Philadelphia. Before 1958, Directory of the Byzantine Rite Apostolic Exarchate of Philadelphia.
Ukrainska Mytropolia,	Ukrainska Katolytska Mytropolia v Zluchenykh Derzhavakh Ameryky.
Ukrainstsi u Sviti,	Ukrainstsi u Vilnomu Sviti: Iuvilena Knyha Ukrainskoho Narodnoho Soyuzu, 1894-1954.
Viestnik,	Amerikansky Russky Viestnik.
Visty,	Eparkhialny Vistnyk, Eparkhialni Visty from 1924, and Archeparkhialni Visti from November 1958.

INTRODUCTION

The year 1963 marks the Fiftieth Jubilee since the establishment of the first Byzantine-Slavonic (Ruthenian) Catholic diocese in the United States, and Seventy-nine years since the arrival of the first Ruthenian priest. This study is a chronological history of the Ruthenian Church in the United States from its difficult beginnings in 1884 to 1916 (when it was divided into two separate administrations), and of the Ukrainian Catholic Church from 1916 to the establishment of an independent Ecclesiastical Province of Philadelphia for the Ukrainians in 1958 and its expansion to the present.

Until 1916 when the Ruthenian Church in the United States was divided into separate administrations; one for the Ukrainian immigrants from Austrian Galicia, the other for the Rusins, Slovaks, Magyars, and Croats from Hungary, the history of the Byzantine Rite Catholic Church in the United States was the common heritage of all "Ruthenian Catholics" originating from Austria-Hungary. The first two chapters of the thesis, therefore, deal with the development of the church organization of Ruthenian Catholics as a whole. Chapter I is concerned with the historical background and with the nature of the internal and external conflicts faced by the immigrants prior to the arrival of the first Ruthenian Bishop in 1907. The second chapter

describes the jurisdictional problems that Bishop Ortynsky faced in his attempt to build an effective administrative system for the Ruthenian church. Beginning with Chapter III, the study directs all its attention to the Ukrainian part of the Ruthenian diocese during the long interregnum between the death of Bishop Ortynsky in 1916 and the arrival of Bishop Bohachevsky in 1924. The fourth Chapter describes Bishop Bohachevsky's early episcopate during which his energetic attempts to reorganize the long-orphaned Ukrainian church were met by an unduly strong opposition. The final chapter discusses the successful organizational developments in the Ukrainian Church since 1935, culminating in the establishment by the Holy See of an independent Byzantine Ecclesiastical Province in 1958.

The chief sources for this study were: the Archives of the Byzantine Rite Archdiocese of Philadelphia; the official diocesan organ, the Eparkhialni Visty; the Roman Acta Sanctae Sedis and its successor Acta Apostolicae Sedis; and the Ruthenian newspapers, Svoboda and the Amerykansky Russky Viestnik.

The Archives of the Byzantine Archdiocese did not yield the major sources for the period prior to 1902 because there was no central administration for the Ruthenian Church prior to that time. The indispensable sources for this earliest period are two small Ruthenian newspapers, Svoboda and Amerykansky Russky Viestnik. They were founded by priests in the early 1890's and were the

major means of communication between the Ruthenian priests and the immigrants. The Svoboda was the actual organ of the priests from Austrian Galicia, whereas, the Amerykansky Russky Viestnik was the spokesman for those from Hungary. Even after the arrival of the first Bishop in 1907, the two papers continued to be the means by which the Bishop's official announcements, regulations, and directives were channeled to the clergy and the people.

The Byzantine Archdiocesan Archives were of greatest value for the period between 1902 and 1930. In the absence of any official diocesan organ prior to Bishop Ortynsky's arrival, and during the irregular appearance of such a publication after his arrival, the voluminous (and very loosely catalogued), correspondence of the Administrators and Bishops was extremely valuable. Very frequently this correspondence was concerned with internal or inter-rite conflicts. After discussing the nature of these problems and conflicts, and illustrating them with specific examples (frequently in footnotes), the writer endeavored to adhere to the main objective of this thesis - to trace the development of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in the United States from its beginnings to the formation of an independent ecclesiastical province.

Since 1933, the official diocesan organ, the Eparhialni Visty (which first made its appearance in 1914 under a smaller format), has been published regularly by the Ordinariat to the present day, consequently, it pro-

vices the best primary source for the chronological development of the Ukrainian Church during the last thirty years.

Finally, the Acta Sanctae Sedis and its successor the Acta Apostolicae Sedis were the major source for the official Papal documents concerning the Byzantine-Slavonic Church in the United States from its beginnings to the present time. For the entire period under investigation, frequent cross-reference was possible (among official publications, letters, recollections, almanacs, newspapers, etc.), whereby the writer was able to check the accuracy of his sources and the information they contained.

CHAPTER 1

IMMIGRATION, ORGANIZATION, AND CONFLICTS

1. Historical Background

Due to serious social, economic, and political hardships, large numbers of people from Eastern Europe, particularly from the Austro-Hungarian Empire, began to migrate to the new world in the second half of the nineteenth century. Most of them came to the United States, thus introducing new and unfamiliar cultures, traditions, and languages into American society. Conditions in Eastern Europe following both World Wars tended to continue and even expand the migration of peoples. Consequently, for over two-thirds of a century now, Americans of various Eastern European origins have been contributing their cultures and customs to the melting pot which is America - a melting pot of peoples and cultures not found anywhere else in the world on a comparable scale and democratic basis. Hence, the customs of the peoples of Eastern Europe became intermingled with those of the West to a greater degree than they ever have been in Western European society prior to World War II. One of the cultural traditions that many Americans of Eastern European origin are most proud of is the Byzantine religious customs which they helped to introduce to the new world.

The religious traditions of Americans of Eastern European background were being formed in the tenth century. It was from missionaries sent from Constantinople (Byzantium) that Saint Vladimir the Great and the people of Kievan Rus, (the first major political organization amongst the Eastern Slavic tribes), accepted Christianity officially in 988. It is important to bear in mind, however, that although customs differed in the two administrative centers of the Christian world, both Rome and Constantinople were in communion with one another. It was not until the middle of the eleventh century and the permanent break-up of the medieval religious unity that the primacy of the Bishop of Rome was not recognized by all of Christendom.

When the religious break between Rome and Constantinople in 1054 proved to be permanent, most areas culturally influenced by the Eastern civilization of Constantinople were, in time, drawn away from their ties with Rome into the Greek Orthodox Church, governed by the Patriarch of Constantinople.¹ The ancestors of modern Ukrainians, for instance,

¹To the misinformed it sometimes appeared that all peoples except those following the forms of worship used by the Church of Rome were outside the Catholic Church and of the authority of Rome. As centuries passed and reconciliations failed, Catholicism and Latinism became synonymous to many people. Historically, that position cannot be sustained. The Italo-Greek-Albanians in South Italy and Sicily, and the Maronites in Syria, both of the Eastern Rites, never left the Roman Church. See Donald Attwater, The Christian Churches of the East, (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1948), I, 10-11. On the other hand, many of those that did break their ties with Rome have since returned to the fold of the Church retaining, however, their traditional Eastern Rite religious customs.

continued their relations with Rome until about the beginning of the twelfth century, when finally the cultural influence of Byzantium diverted the majority of them from their ties with Rome. Those ancestors occupying the extreme southwestern areas of the old Kievan Rus state, however, have continued their relations with the Papacy, although with serious and lengthy interruptions, to the present day. For example, in 1253, Pope Innocent IV's legate Opizone crowned Prince Daniel King of Galicia (Halich). Again in 1439, at the Council of Florence, Isidore, Metropolitan of Kiev, promised to conserve Catholic unity under the primacy of Rome. Finally, by the Union of Brest in 1596, millions of the ancestors of modern Ukrainians again reunited with Rome, and this union has continued without interruption to the present day.²

It was from these territories of modern Western Ukraine, politically speaking under the control of Austria-Hungary, from whence came the mass immigration to the United States in the second half of the nineteenth century, and consequently, virtually all those immigrants were Catholics of the Byzantine Rite. (The Byzantine Rite is the name applied to the sum of the prescribed forms and laws devel-

²In 1946, after these western Ukrainian territories were added to the Soviet Union, the Byzantine Rite Catholic Church was officially destroyed and Russian Orthodoxy officially established. Consequently, the new world descendants from these territories together with those who have fled to Western Europe since World War II represent the bulk of the Catholics following the Ruthenian discipline or sub-rite of the Byzantine Rite at the present time.

oped and used by the Church of Constantinople and later adopted by other areas influenced by its Byzantine civilization. With the passage of time, the different groups of the Byzantine Rite developed particular rules and regulations independently from one another; consequently, different disciplines or subrites of the same Byzantine Rite emerged. Numonically, the Ruthenian discipline is the most important within the Byzantine Rite of the Catholic Church, and most of the groups following this discipline use Church Slavonic as their language of worship.) Emigration from the eastern Ukrainian territories, that is, that part under Russian political control, was practically impossible; therefore, there was almost no representation of the Orthodox faith amongst the early immigrants.

The immigrants who introduced the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite of the Catholic Church to the United States more than seventy-five years ago were generally known as Ruthenians, a term the medieval Latin sources usually applied to the western groups of the Eastern Slavs. The name is a Latinization of the Slavic Rusini, which is derived from Kievan Rus and clearly distinguished from Muscovite Russia (Rossia).³ Since the end of the sixteenth century, the

³Oscar Halecki, Borderlands of Western Civilization, (New York: Ronald Press, 1952), p. 34. For a useful discussion of the terminology used in Papal documents to distinguish between the Ruthenians and the Muscovites see the introductory remarks of P. Athanasius G. Welykyj (ed.), Documenta Pontificum Romanorum Historiam Ucrainae Illustrantia (Rome: Basilian Fathers, 1953), I, xiii-xvi. For a discussion of the historical development of the terms "Rus,"

term has been used by the Papacy as a common name for those peoples of the Byzantine Rite who inhabited a region of Europe situated roughly between Lithuania in the North and Carpathian mountains in the South."⁴

With the rise of national consciousness in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries the peoples of this region became generally known by national names such as: Ukrainians, Byelorussians (Byeloruthenians), Rusins,⁵ Carpatho-Russians, and Slovaks. The particular discipline or subrite of the Byzantine Rite that these people followed

"Russia," and "Ukraine" see, e.g., George W. Simpson, The Names "Rus," "Russia," "Ukraine" and their Historical Background (Winnipeg, Man.: UWAM, 1951), pp. 10-18; Nicholas Chubaty, "The Meaning of 'Russia' and 'Ukraine'", Readings in Russian History, ed. Sidney Harcave (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1962), I, 9-21; and the most recent scholarly discussion on the delimitations of Russian History by Omeljjan Pritsak and John S. Reshetar, Jr., "The Ukraine and the Dialectics of Nation Building," Slavic Review, XXII (June, 1963), 224-245.

⁴Victor J. Pospishil, Interritual Canon Law Problems In The United States and Canada, (Chesapeake City, Md.; 1955), p. 15. This is a very useful work.

⁵Most of the American descendents of the Ruthenian immigrants from Pod-Carpathia in Hungry (Subcarpathia - the southern slopes of the Carpathian mountains) accept the name Rusin. Although the ancestors of the Pod-Carpathian Rusins were anthropologically and linguistically related to the ancestors of the Ukrainians, cultural and political differences have developed between their descendants due to the dissimilar socio-economic and political fortunes of the Rusins under Hungarian control and of the Ukrainians under Austrian rule.

continued, however, to be referred to as the Ruthenian Rite.⁶

Until the formation of separate ecclesiastical administrations for the Ukrainians and others from Austrian Galicia and Bukovina, and for the Pod-Carpathian Rusins and others from Hungary in 1916, the early history of the Byzantine Rite in the United States was largely the common history of the Ukrainian and Rusin immigrants. The early Ruthenian parishes were characterized by mixed congregations,

⁶The faithful of the Ruthenian subrite of the Byzantine Rite are often referred to as "Greek Catholics." Although technically correct, the term has proven to be very misleading in the United States and Canada and therefore its use is not desirable. (Father Hrushka was one of the first to realize how misleading the term was and strongly recommended that it be dropped from use as early as 1893. See Svoboda "Poznaima Sia," (Jersey City), October 15, 1893, p. 1). It is often associated either with the Greek Orthodox or with the Greek nationality. The facts are that the members of the Ruthenian discipline are in communion with the church of Rome and they are neither of the Greek nationality nor do they use Greek as the Liturgical language. Their Liturgical language is Church Slavonic. Ecclesiastically speaking, the term Ruthenian has been extended to include also such Byzantine Rite people as the Hungarians and the Croats. A useful general discussion of the problem of ecclesiastical terminology is to be found in Clement C. Englert's "Consistent Oriental Terminology," Homiletic and Pastoral Review, XXXXIII, (September, 1943), 1077-1082, whereas, Professor Roman Small-Stocki's "Terminological Problems of Eastern European History," Milwaukee, n.d. (copy of a typewritten article in the possession of the writer) is an excellent discussion of the problems involved in the elaboration of an English scientific terminology for Eastern Europe in general.

presided over by priests from different sections of Austria-Hungary. Consequently, the "umbrella" term Ruthenian will often be used in discussing the early history of the Byzantine Rite in America wherever national names could possibly lead to misunderstandings.⁷

2. First Ruthenian Colonization

Ruthenian immigrants began arriving from Austria-Hungary at least as early as 1860,⁸ however, mass immigration did not start until 1877 when agents of Pennsylvania mining companies in the anthracite region succeeded in recruiting Ruthenians and Slovaks⁹ from Pod-Carpathia in

⁷The national consciousness of many of the Ruthenians did not fully develop until the current century, consequently the term Ruthenian also found its place in the American Immigration Records, thus adding to the confusion about the national origin of the immigrants so listed. The term should not be used in reference to modern-day national-political groupings. The national name Ukrainian is used by the descendents of the Ruthenian immigrants from Austrian Galicia and Bukovina, while the name Rusin, is acceptable to the descendents of the immigrants from Hungary's Pod-Carpathia.

⁸Julian Chupko, "Obrazky z Ameryky", Svoboda, March 19, 1896, pp. 1-2 (cont. on pp. 1-2 of the next two issues) provides interesting first-hand illustrations.

⁹About one third of the early Slovak immigrants were of the Ruthenian sub-rite. See P. V. Rovnianek, "The Slovaks in America", Charities, XIII (December 3, 1904), 240. Rovnianek was editor of a Slovak Daily and an organizer of a National Slovanic Society.

north-central Hungary for the lowest paying jobs. Quickly the news spread to neighboring Lemkivschyna in Austria's western Galicia. Thus, it was from the mountainous border districts between Austria and Hungary, from Pod-Carpathia and from neighboring western Galicia, that the earliest mass Ruthenian immigration to the United States originated.¹⁰

Eastern Galicia and Bukovina did not contribute to this immigration until the 1890's,¹¹ and the Ukrainian immigration from the Russian empire remained relatively insignificant to the first World War.¹²

¹⁰The effects of the new immigrant labor on the Anthracite region of Pennsylvania is discussed in detail by Professor Frank J. Warne, "The Slav Invasion and the Mine Workers, (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1904). Unfortunately, however, Professor Warne applies the term Slav to all non-English speaking immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe, consequently the work contributes only limited information regarding the Ruthenians, almost all of whom in the beginning worked in and about the coal mines.

¹¹Julian Bachynsky, Ukrainska Immigratsia v Ziedynenykh Derzhavakh Ameryky, (Lviv: J. Bachynsky and Ol. Harasevych, 1914), p. 88. This is a very useful secondary source for the early history of the Ruthenian church in America.

¹²Immigration reports indicate that in the twelve fiscal years from 1899 to 1910 inclusive, 98.2% of the Ruthenians admitted to the United States came from Austria-Hungary. See U.S. Congress, Senate, Dictionary of Races or Peoples, Reports of the Immigration Commission, Doc. No. 662, 61st Congress, 3d. Session, 1911, IX, 118. Hereafter cited as Dictionary of Races.

The early Ruthenian immigrants were entirely of the village class whose economic condition was so hopeless, particularly in Galicia, that the tales of the opportunities in America were sufficient to prompt the more adventurous amongst them to seek a new life.¹³ After facing numerous difficulties the poverty-stricken peasants finally made their

¹³For a useful discussion of economic and other causes of emigration by a very active Ruthenian pioneer see John Ardan, "The Ruthenians in America," Charities, XIII, 246-252. In addition, the U. S. Immigration Commissions reports contain statistical information concerning the causes of emigration from Austria-Hungary and the characteristics of that immigration to the United States. See U.S. Congress, Senate, Emigration Conditions in Europe, Doc. No. 748, 61st Congress, 3d, Session, 1911, XII, 361-384.

way to America¹⁴ where, they were immediately confronted with serious cultural and linguistic problems not faced by their earlier counterparts from the countries of western Europe. This proved to be particularly serious since the

¹⁴According to M. J. Hanchin, former editor of the Pod-Carpathian Amerikansky Russky Viestnik (Munhall, Pa.), hereafter cited as the Viestnik, the first Ruthenian immigrants from Hungary came from the counties of Zemlin, Sarys, Spys, and Abauj. Later they came from Uza, Berega, Ugoci, Maramarose, etc. See "Istoria Sojedinenija iz pervych lit", Kalendar Greko Kaftoliceskaho Sojedinenija, 1937, (Homestead, Pa: Greek Catholic Union Press), p. 42. According to Nestor Dmytriv, a very active Galician priest in immigrant affairs from 1895, the early immigrants from Pod-Carpathia settled primarily in Pennsylvania and in lesser numbers, in Minnesota, Colorado, and Montana. They were employed as coal, silver, and gold miners, as lumber jacks, as laborers in the building of railroads, and in steel mills, brick factories, and saw mills. The Lemky from Galicia (mostly from Novy Sanch, Horlytsi and Krosno Counties,) settled, in groups, primarily in Pennsylvania communities like Shenandoah, Shamokin, Mt. Carmel, Hazleton, Lansford, Freeland, Olyphant and Mayfield and in Jersey City, New Jersey, Yonkers and Troy, New York, and Ansonia and New Britain, Conn. See "Pershi Roky Emigratsii Ukraintsiv v Zluchenikh Derzhavakh piv. Ameryky", Kalendar Provydinia 1924, (Philadelphia: Providence Association), pp. 161-162. A useful statistical skeleton of the source and distribution of the new immigration (also its political, economic, and educational characteristics), based on the report of the Commissioner of Immigration, is provided by an editor for the U.S. Census Bureau Kate Holloday Claghorn in "Slavs, Magyars, and Some Others in the New Immigration," Charities, XIII, 199-205.

early Ruthenian immigration did not have any representation from the educated classes¹⁵ (until the arrival of their priests), a representation that might have made the period of transition less difficult by providing a more qualified leadership. Lacking proper leadership when it was badly needed, the Ruthenian immigrants often fell prey to unscrupulous agents of one sort or another.¹⁶

¹⁵The first educated immigrant of whom there is available record was a political exile from the Russian empire, Agapius Honcharenko, a Ukrainian Orthodox priest, who arrived in 1865. However, he moved to San Francisco in 1867 and was not seriously involved with the mass Ruthenian immigration which began in the later 1870's.

¹⁶For a discussion on the social, economic, and moral problems faced by the Ruthenian immigrants and an illustration of how a Ruthenian priest attempted to rectify the situation through practical and educational means, see Professor Emily Balch's report of her interview with Father Paul Tymkevich entitled "A Shepherd of Immigrants", Charities, XIII, pp. 193-194. Father Tymkevich, for example, formed an association which erected a model tenement house, housing thirty-nine families, which was markedly superior to those in the neighborhood. Even more important was another of his undertakings. In 1904 he had gathered under his roof in Yonkers, New York, eight boys from Ruthenian, and Slovak families in different parts of the country, in order that they could be educated in the superior schools of that city, with the hope that after obtaining an American education and standards, they might provide future leadership for their people. The social, economic and educational problems of the Ruthenians are also profitably discussed in the same issue of Charities, by the Congregational Minister and scholar, Peter Roberts, in "The Slavs in Anthracite Coal Communities," pp. 215-222, by Mary Buell Sayles, a tenement house inspector, in "Housing and Social Conditions in a Slavic Neighborhood," pp. 257-261, and Professor Warne, op. cit., pp. 113-116, comments on the most common exploiters of the Slavs. The above authors, incidentally, are examples of early American scholars to become deeply interested in the problems of the new immigrants from Eastern Europe. The December 3, 1904 issue of Charities, a weekly review of general philanthropy, represents an early attempt by an American journal (non-ecclesiastic) to provide a comprehensive and authoritative coverage of the new immigrants.

Thrust in unfamiliar and sometimes hostile surroundings, the Ruthenian immigrants soon felt the need for their own familiar institutions, above all their own church, which had been the center of their social life in Europe. Obviously, until a sufficient number of immigrants had settled in close proximity to one another, serious action towards that end could not be taken.¹⁷ By 1882, however, there were about sixty to seventy Ruthenian families in Shenandoah,¹⁸ and it was these immigrants who in 1884 made the first attempt to obtain a Ruthenian priest from Europe. With the help of Carol Rice,¹⁹ himself an immigrant from

¹⁷Until the arrival of their own priests and the organization of their own churches, the Ruthenians attended the Latin Rite churches, particularly those of their European neighbors like the Poles, Slovaks, or the Hungarians. Those who remained in the Latin churches eventually lost their national identity.

¹⁸K., "Istoriia Pershoi Ruskoi Tserkvy v Shenandoah, Pa.", Pershy Rusko-Amerykansky Kalendar, ed. Nestor Dmytrov, (Mt. Carmel, Pa.: Ruthenian National Association, 1897), p. 134.

¹⁹The immigrants had come in contact with Rice at the travel and exchange agency he operated, where they frequently made arrangements for mailing money to their relatives in Europe. From these business relations Rice learned of their religious needs and aspirations.

Lithuania, the Shenandoah immigrants sent a signed petition to the Metropolitan of Galicia, the Most Reverend Sylvester Sembratovich, Archbishop of Lviv (Lemberg), requesting that a priest be sent to minister to their religious needs.²⁰ By a letter dated October 24, 1884,²¹ Metropolitan (later Cardinal) Sembratovich technically provided the Ruthenians in America with their first priest with the appointment of Reverend John Voliansky, from the Archdiocese of Lviv, as their pastor. However, it was not until Father Voliansky's arrival in Shenandoah on December 10, 1884,²² that the formal organization of Ruthenian churches began in America.

²⁰The immigrants letter quoted in Svoboda, October 10, 1894, p. 1, (article entitled "Pro Rusku Emigratsiiu").

²¹Letter of Metropolitan Sembratovich cited by Isidore Sochockyj, "Ukrainska Katolytska Tserkva Vizantyisko-Slovianskoho Obriadu v ZDA", Ukrainska Katolytska Mytropolia v Zluchenykh Derzhavakh Ameryky, (Philadelphia: Byzantine Rite Archeparchy of Philadelphia, 1959), pp. 200-201.

²²K. Persky Kalendar, p. 134, lists the following individuals as working most diligently to raise money for Father Voliansky's passage to America: George Huretiak, Paul Matiash, Andrew Kosar, Stephen Shvets, Michael Kushvara, Simeon Kotsur, Andrew Bishko, S. Krajniak, Simeon Kuryla, Wasyl Mizhik, Alex Fedorchak. Collectors visited the Pennsylvania communities of Shenandoah, Shamokin, Excelsior and Hazleton.

Father Voliansky's missionary work was by no means an easy task, and numerous obstacles confronted him, as he indicates in his "Recollections from By-Gone Years".²³ Misunderstandings with the Latin Rite hierarchy and clergy were, unfortunately, part of the problems facing him. On his arrival in the United States Father went to Shenandoah to acquaint himself with his people. After this he immediately made a courtesy call on the Archbishop of Philadelphia, the Most Reverend Patrick J. Ryan, who, Voliansky states, had already been notified of his coming by the Polish priest in Shenandoah. The Archbishop's Vicar General, who received Father Voliansky, refused to accept his credentials and forbade him to perform his priestly functions, saying

²³ John Voliansky, "Spomyny z davnykh Lit", Svoboda, September 5, 1912, p. 4. Other very useful early sources, although sometimes conflicting in detail, on the problems and accomplishments of Father Voliansky are: "A Noted Character, An American Priesthood of One and What He Has Accomplished", Evening Herald, (Shenandoah), May 30, 1887, p. 4; Michael Pavlyk, "Pochatky Ukrainskoi organizatsii na Chuzhyni" (excerpts of Pavlyk's article published in 1888), Kalendar Ukrainskoho Narodnoho Soyuzu, 1920, (Jersey City, 1919), pp. 52-54, Hraf Lelyva, "Polozhenie Rusynov v Spoluchenikh Derzhavakh Povnochnoy Ameryky", Pershy Kalendar, p. 47-67. Wherever conflicts occurred the writer relied on the statements of Father Voliansky.

that there was no room for a married priest in America.²⁴
A comparable reception was also accorded Voliansky by the three pastors in Shenandoah. Although it was true, as Father Heuser explained in 1891, that there was never an occasion nor the necessity for the American student of theology to familiarize himself with the usages of the Byzantine Rite prior to the arrival of the Ruthenians,²⁵ nevertheless, it seems probable that a little more willingness in the beginning to understand each other's problems would have helped to prevent more serious misunderstandings later on.

From Shenandoah Reverend Voliansky telegraphed Metropolitan Sembratovich informing him of his difficulties and stating that he would begin his priestly functions based on the jurisdiction given him by the Metropolitan. When a

²⁴Voliansky, Svoboda, September 5, 1912, p. 4.
According to the Byzantine Rite traditions, married men were also ordained to the priesthood.

²⁵H. J. Heuser, "Greek Catholics and Latin Priests", American Ecclesiastical Review, IV (March, 1891), 195-196.
Father Heuser, professor at St. Charles Seminary at Overbrook, Pennsylvania, and editor of the AER, was one of the first Latin Rite priests to acquaint himself thoroughly with and write about the Ruthenian Catholics in America.

prohibitive reply from his superior was not forthcoming, Voliansky rented a hall on Main Street for the purpose of holding religious services.²⁶ Thus it was in Kern Hall that the first Byzantine Rite Catholic service, Vespers, was celebrated on Wednesday evening, December 18, 1884, with Gregory Dolny serving as Father's first Cantor. The temporary chapel in this hall was dedicated to the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary.²⁷

Early in 1885 the parishioners elected a Committee to take charge of the church building program. To finance the project each family was assessed ten dollars plus one dollar monthly dues, whereas single persons were expected to contribute half that amount. Subsequently two lots were purchased on the north side of Center Street for \$700.00, and the construction of the church began in the spring.

²⁶For the first month or two Father Voliansky also rented two small rooms in this hall until more suitable living quarters were located in a house on Coal Street.

²⁷The first child baptized in the Chapel was Maria Marusyn, daughter of Machael and Anna Marusyn on December 25, 1884; the first marriage took place on January 9, 1885, between Michael Pringel and Maria Ivanko, children of John and Maria Pringel and Simeon and Dorothy Ivanko, from Saros, Hungary; the first funeral service was held for Maria Fedorczaak, a child of Alexander and Maria Fedorczaak from Ripky Sanok, Galicia, on January 25, 1885. See St. Michael's Diamond Jubilee Book, (Shenandoah: St. Michael's Ukrainian Church, 1959), p. 9 (unnumbered). Hereafter cited as St. Michael's Book.

Before the building was completed the roof collapsed, due to structural imperfections, making extensive rebuilding necessary, thus delaying completion of the church until the fall of 1886 and raising the total cost to above \$20,000.²⁸

On November 21, 1886, this first Byzantine Rite Catholic Church in the United States, dedicated to St. Michael the Archangel, was blessed by its pastor Rev. John Voliansky.²⁹

²⁸There are divergent reports as to the exact total cost of the church. For example: the Shenandoah Evening Herald, October 20, 1886, p. 1. reports that the church was erected at a cost of probably \$12,000, however, reference is made to the fact that, although services were held in the new building for a few months, it was not completed. On November 26, 1886, p. 4, the same paper relates that the church has now been completed at a cost upwards of \$20,000. However, on May 30, 1887, p. 4, the cost of building the church is given as over \$12,000. A reasonable conjecture is that the original figure was about \$12,000 and that after the necessary rebuilding the final cost reached about \$20,000.

The church was built above the ground level in order to provide for a meeting hall and temporary quarters for the priest under the church. An interesting description of the interior of St. Michael's Church, as well as of a wedding ceremony held there, is provided in Ibid, May 29, 1886, p. 1.

²⁹St. Michael's Book, 1959, p. 9. Apparently due to the long delay in the completion of the church and its use for services prior to its completion, conflicting dates are given for its formal blessing. For example: Kalendar Sojedinenija, 1900, p. 203, lists November 20, 1885; Pershy Kalendar, 1897, p. 135, lists St. Michael's Day in 1886; and Pavlyk (writing in 1888), Kalendar Soyuz, 1920, p. 53, provides December 6, 1887 as the date of blessing. The last date appears to be a typographical error.

Father Voliansky's missionary work was not limited to Shenandoah alone. Although a great number of the Ruthenian immigrants settled in the coal regions of Pennsylvania, a substantial number was also found in many other states.³⁰ Realizing that he would need help, Voliansky petitioned Metropolitan Sembratovich for a priest to aid him. Thus in March of 1887, Rev. Zenon Liakhovich arrived to assist Voliansky, together with Vladimir Simenovich, a university student from Lviv, the first

³⁰ Prior to 1899 the United States Immigration records listed only the country from which the immigrants came and not their nationality. During the fiscal years of 1899 to 1910 inclusive, when there were 147,375 Ruthenians designated in immigration statistics, their principal destination continued to be Pennsylvania with 73,449 Ruthenians, almost half of the immigrants listed, naming that state as their destination. New York was the destination of 31,307 Ruthenians and New Jersey third with 16,615. The states of Ohio, Connecticut, Illinois, and Massachusetts followed in that order, all of which were listed as the point of destination by more than 3,600 immigrants but by less than 5,000. Missouri, with 1,136 Ruthenians was the only other State with more than 1,000 although Rhode Island was close with 975. At least one Ruthenian was listed by the immigration records, during this twelve year period, in every State of the Union with the exception of Georgia, Tennessee, and Nevada. See U. S. Congress, Senate, Statistical Review of Immigration 1820-1910, Reports of the Immigration Commission, Doc. No. 756, 61st Cong. 3d. Sess. 1911, XX, 289-292.

educated Ruthenian layman to settle in the United States. Until the church building program was completed in Kingston, Voliansky assigned Liakhovich to Shenandoah while he himself set out on a protracted visitation of Ruthenian colonies, ministering to their religious needs, organizing congregations and church committees for the building of future churches, etc. He travelled through most of the important Ruthenian colonies from New York to Colorado. On his return he again fixed his residence in Shenandoah and Father Liakhovich moved to Kingston when the second Byzantine Rite church in the United States was completed. The untimely death of Liakhovich in Wilkes-Barre in November of 1887, however, left Voliansky alone again;³¹ consequently, in the summer of 1888 he sent Simenovich to Galicia with a petition for a replacement for the late Father Liakhovich. Before the year came to a close Simenovich returned with a new assistant for Voliansky, the Rev. Constantine Andrukhovich, who made Kingston his residence. (By this time, incidentally, a third church was completed in Freeland, Pennsylvania). Within a year, however, primarily as a result of the continued misunderstandings with the Latin Rite Hierarchy, Metropolitan Sembratovich recalled Voliansky to Galicia. By June, 1889 Father Voliansky returned to his native land after almost five years of pioneering work in the United

³¹ Father Liakhovich was the first celibate priest in the United States. He was also the first Ruthenian priest to be buried on American soil - in St. Michael's Church Cemetery in Shenandoah.

States during which time churches were built in Shenandoah, Kingston, Freeland, and Shamokin, all in Pennsylvania, and in Jersey City and Minneapolis.³² At his Shenandoah parish he organized the first Ruthenian brotherhood, that of St. Nicholas, on January 18, 1885; the first choir; the first reading room; and the first Ruthenian evening school in the United States. In addition, Voliansky founded the first Ruthenian newspaper, America,³³ the first issue of which appeared on August 15, 1886, and he was also the prime organizer of the fraternal organizations and of the co-operative general stores which were founded for the benefit of the Ruthenian workers and their families. Obviously, the recall of the very capable and energetic Father Voliansky to Galicia was a serious loss to the Ruthenian Church in America. An interesting tribute to the first Ruthenian missionary and his dedicated work was supplied by a Shenandoah reporter in an article about Rev. Voliansky in 1887.

³²Voliansky, Svoboda, September 5, 1912, p. 4.

³³The exact transliteration would be Amerika, however, due to the very close similarity to the normal spelling of America the latter will be followed throughout the Thesis.

...Although young, barely more than 30 years of age, tall and slim, though compactly built, and fairly good looking, Father Voliansky has no superior as a worker. He scarcely permits himself any rest, so thoroughly is his soul in his work. If life and health stands the test, his religious standing and that of his church will in a decade or two of years rank high and firm in America, and he will then be able to enjoy with ease the honors he will have richly earned.³⁴

Father Voliansky did return for a brief period in 1890 in an attempt to clear up the misunderstandings that had developed in connection with the building programs in some parishes and with the operation of the cooperative stores. However, without succeeding in disentangling the mismanagement of his successor, Rev. Andrukhovich, Voliansky returned to Europe, never to set foot on American soil again.³⁵

3. Expansion

From 1889 priests began to arrive from Europe in greater numbers. By then, the majority of them were coming from Pod-Carpathia in Hungary rather than from Austrian Galicia. In March of 1889 the fourth Ruthenian priest arrived, the first from Hungary, Rev. Alexander Dzubay, who settled in Wilkes-Barre. In the fall he was followed by

³⁴Evening Herald, May 30, 1887, p. 4.

³⁵The misunderstandings unfortunately led to serious internal conflicts which resulted in costly court proceedings lasting many years.

another Pod-Carpathian, Rev. Cyril Gulovich, O.S.B.M. the first Basilian Monk in the United States, who took up residence in Freeland, and later by Rev. Gregory Hrushka from Galicia who settled in Jersey City. The entire territory populated by Ruthenian Catholics was divided into four districts. Father Andrukhovich, to whom Voliansky had turned over his responsibilities, along with Fathers Gulovich and Hrushka agreed on the following boundaries for their respective parishes: Shenandoah, with twenty-one surrounding communities, was to be pastored by Andrukhovich; Freeland, with eighteen surrounding areas, was to be the pastoral area of Gulovich; Jersey City with nine adjoining settlements, including New York City,³⁶ was to be ministered

³⁶The first Byzantine Rite Mass in New York City was celebrated in the basement of St. Brigid's Church on Avenue A, on April 19, 1890, but there was no Ruthenian Church in Manhattan until the opening of St. George's Church in 1895. See Andrew J. Shipman, "Greek Catholics in America," Catholic Encyclopedia, VI, (1909), 748. Shipman was one of the first American authors to become intimately acquainted with the problems of the Slavic immigrants. His activities in behalf of the Ruthenian immigrants and their church should not be overlooked. In 1895, for instance, he helped to organize St. George's Church on East 20th Street. The Parish later moved to East 7th Street, between Second and Third Avenues, where the property was bought for \$90,000 with the entire transaction handled by Shipman as council for the Church. Partially for the dedication of the new church on East 7th Street, Shipman prepared and later published a translation of The Holy Mass According to the Greek Rite (New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons, 1912). This pamphlet of forty-four pages containing double columns, the Slavic version and Shipman's English version, was the first English translation of the Byzantine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom ever made. The high esteem with which Shipman was held by the Ruthenians is illustrated by the following two examples: a long biographical article on Shipman in the Svoboda, September 8, 1910, p. 4 gives Shipman full credit for informing the Ameri-

by Father Hrushka; and Olyphant, with eight neighboring towns, was left without a pastor, with the three priests agreeing to visit this territory in regular rotation. Father Dzubay did not participate in this arrangement and worked independently in Wilkes-Barre which was, geographically speaking, within the Olyphant Parish district.³⁷ The above arrangement did not work out well. Before the priests could make a complete round of their extended parishes a number of new priests arrived thereby rendering the original parish divisions obsolete. Before 1889 came to a close Father John Zapototsky and Victor Tovt arrived from Hungary and Rev. Theophan Obushkevich, from

can public about the Ruthenians. Secondly, upon Shipman's death in 1915, after a Solemn Requiem Mass in New York's St. Patrick's Cathedral, a burial service was conducted by Bishop Soter Ortynsky, the first Ruthenian bishop in the United States. This was the first time, incidentally, that a Byzantine Rite burial service was seen in a Latin Rite Church in the United States. See Conde B. Pallen's interesting "Biographical Sketch of Andrew J. Shipman" in A Memorial of Andrew J. Shipman, ed. Conde B. Pallen, (New York: Encyclopedia Press, Inc., 1916) pp. elv-lxv.

³⁷ Bachynsky, op. cit., p. 288.

Galicia. In 1890³⁸ Fathers Stephen Jackovich, Alexis Tovt, (Toth), Nicephor Khanat, Eugene Volkay, Gabriel Vislotsky, and Cornelius and Augustine Lawrysin came from Hungary. Soon they were followed by additional priests from Pod-Carpathia. Father Andrukhovich finally returned to Galicia at the beginning of 1892, being recalled by Metropolitan Sembratovich due to the serious misunderstandings he had with his colleagues and with the Latin hierarchy. The following year Fathers Ambrose Poliansky and John Konstankevich arrived from Galicia, the former making his residence in Pittsburgh and the latter establishing himself in Shamokin. Thus in 1894, with over twenty Ruthenian Catholic priests in the United States only four were from Galicia.³⁹ When the first

³⁸At the time of his inquiry, in 1890, Rev. Heuser reported that there were nine properly accredited Ruthenian priests in the United States:

1. Rev. Theophan Obushkevich (from Galicia) at Shamokin, Shenandoah, and Mahonoy City, Pa.
 2. Rev. Alexis Tovt (Hungary) at Minneapolis, Minn.
 3. Rev. John Zapototsky (Hungary) at Kensington, Pa.
 4. Rev. Gregory Hrushka (Galicia) at Jersey City, N. J.
 5. Rev. Alexander Dzubay (Hungary) at Wilkes-Barre, Pa.
 6. Rev. Eugene Volkay (Hungary) at Hazleton, Pa.
 7. Rev. Gabriel Vislotsky (Hungary) at Olyphant, Pa.
 8. Rev. Cyril Gulovich (Hungary) at Freemont, Pa.
 9. Rev. Stephen Jackovich (Hungary) at McKeesport, Pa.
- See AER, IV (March, 1891), 197-198 (footnote).

³⁹Svoboda, November 21, 1894, p. 1.

Ruthenian book was published in the United States (an Almanac for 1897 edited by Rev. Dmytriv) it listed a total of 29 priests in good standing, 24 of whom came from Pod-Carpathia and five from Galicia⁴⁰ (see appendix one). They served a Ruthenian population estimated at about 200,000.⁴¹

⁴⁰Pershy Kalendar, pp. 168-169. Except for the fact that several of the priests seceded to the Russian Orthodox Church the total number of Ruthenian priests would be greater.

⁴¹The Ruthenian immigration figures are particularly inaccurate. Many of the immigrants from Austria-Hungary were listed as Austrians, Hungarians, Poles, Slovaks, Russians, etc. The Viestnik indicates on page one of its March 6, 1894 issue that it was read in the United States by 250,000 Byzantine Catholic Ruthenians. Another important Ruthenian newspaper, the Svoboda, October 10, 1894, indicates that the Ruthenian immigration in the United States was about 200,000. Fourteen months later, however, (December 5, 1895) the same paper provides 300,000 as the estimate of the Ruthenian population at that time, which would appear to be too great an increase over the previous figure. Considering that the immigration statistics indicate a steady growth of immigration up to the First World War, and taking into consideration the immigration figures which indicate that during the twelve fiscal years 1899 to 1910 inclusive 147,375 Ruthenians were admitted to the United States (Dictionary of Races, 1911, p. 118), it would appear that the estimate of 200,000 Ruthenians in the mid 1890's, after twenty years of ever increasing immigration, is a reasonable one. Obviously the estimated 500,000 Ruthenians in the United States as shown by a chart on page 118 of the Dictionary of Races, indicating the number and distribution of Ruthenians in 1897, is a typographical error.

It was with the arrival of so many new priests that a great church building program got under way, with individual business men very often taking the initiative.⁴²

Wherever a number of immigrants were domiciled in close proximity of one another they soon gave serious thought to building a church in the hope that they might be able to obtain a priest that much quicker. In the beginning of the church building costs were nominal. Small wooden chapels and churches were often built for as little as three to eight thousand dollars.⁴³ Although there was no uniformity in the building style, the tendency was to build churches more or less according to their appearance in the old country - with cupulas.⁴⁴ The early churches were frequently raised a whole story from the ground to allow for a hall under the church for meetings and for an evening school. Beginning in 1896, incidentally, some congregations, like those in Lay-

⁴² Even business men who were not Catholic nor Ruthenian would, for business purposes, become organizers of Ruthenian Catholic congregations and the leaders of their church building programs. See Svoboda, November 21, 1894, p. 1.

⁴³ Bachynsky, op. cit., p. 264.

⁴⁴ The construction of properly proportioned cupulas has remained a problem for Byzantine Slavonic Rite Congregations and for the builders of their churches to the present day.

sering and Mayfield, Pennsylvania, built separate school buildings.⁴⁵ Whether held in the church halls or in separate buildings, the church evening schools operated, pedagogically speaking, under extremely unfavorable conditions; nevertheless, these schools provided the all-important means by which the children of the Ruthenian immigrants could become acquainted with their European heritage.⁴⁶

The funds for the support of the church, school, priest, and the cantor (who at the same time taught in the church school), came from a single tax towards a building fund, monthly dues, and the plate collection during church services. Besides these regular sources, the church committees and organizations held picnics, concerts, banquets, etc., from which the churches might benefit financially. The congregations that did not have their own priests would make an agreement with a neighboring priest to visit them on Sundays or perhaps every other Sunday to celebrate Mass.

⁴⁵Bachynsky, op.cit., p. 386.

⁴⁶It is interesting to note that in 1899 the evening school of the Shenandoah Church, the first Ruthenian school to be organized by Father Voliansky, was reported to have the substantial enrollment of 52 children. See Kalendar Sojedinenija, 1900, p. 203.

Unfortunately, the arrival of so many new priests led not only to a great church building program,⁴⁷ but also to a shameful competition among priests and parishes. Thus began a series of scandals, in some instances leading to the organization of a second or even a third parish in the same community. In the small town of Hazleton, Pennsylvania, for example, there were three Ruthenian parishes, each with a priest and a church.⁴⁸ On more than one occasion these misunderstandings and conflicts unfortunately had to be settled by the courts.

4. Factional Conflicts

It is imperative, at this point, to provide the reader with an historical background to the internal conflicts amongst the Ruthenian immigrants and their priests, without which it is extremely difficult to understand the conflicts themselves.

In the seventeenth century the old name Ukraine (border-land) took on a special meaning when the eastern territories of modern Ukraine became the center of a new national life under the leadership of the Ukrainian Kossaks. The

⁴⁷According to the figures in Ibid., p. 204, there were 55 Ruthenian Catholic Churches in the United States in 1899 which were served by 39 priests. Twenty-one of the priests came from Muncacs and nine from Presov in Hungary whereas there were only six from Peremeshl and two from Yaroslav in Galicia. In addition there was also a Basilian Father from Hungary.

⁴⁸Bachynsky, op. cit., p. 290.

Ukrainian literary revival of the nineteenth century accepted the new name as representing its own national life. Consequently, with the end of the nineteenth century the words "Ukraine" and "Ukrainian" were being more and more widely used in Ukrainian and other literatures, thus pushing out other names, including the old traditional name of Rus from the Kievan period. However, in the western areas of Ukraine, in Galicia and in Pod-Carpathia whose political life differed from that in the east, the old words Rus and Rusin were retained much longer. In the first place, these lands were not in immediate danger of denationalization by the Russian Empire's policy of Russification, as were the Ukrainian lands in the east, consequently there was no urgency to break with a name which was also claimed by the Russians. Secondly the Austro-Hungarian governments fought the use of the new name in their lands in order to prevent the Ruthenians in Galicia and Pod-Carpathia from associating themselves ethnically with the Ukrainians in the Russian Empire.⁴⁹ Since the

⁴⁹ Sochockyj, Ukrainska Mytropolia, p. 200. For a discussion of the Ruthenians in the Habsburg lands of Galicia, Pod-Carpathia, and Bukovina in the second half of the nineteenth century, see Robert A. Kann's The Multi-national Empire. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1950), I, 318-332. For a general discussion on the Ruthenians see Shipman's "Ruthenians", CE., XIII (1912), 278-280.

early Ruthenian immigrants came from Galicia and Pod-Carpathia where the old name Rusin (latinized to Ruthenian) was commonly in use, there were, broadly speaking, two major Ruthenian groups in the United States. Each of these groups, however, was further sub-divided into various factions. First there were the Ruthenians from Austrian Galicia who were divided into the "Ukrainians" and the "Moscophiles." The Ukrainians stood for the interest of the Ukrainian people as distinct from the Russians and desired to develop the Ukrainian language, literature, and race along their own individual lines as opposed to the Russian. The Moscophiles imitated all things Russian, and looked toward Moscow as the seat of Slavic culture.⁵⁰ Secondly, there were the Ruthenians from Hungary's Pod-Carpathia among whom three distinct factions existed: (1) the Rusins who were sympathetic to the Hungarians; (2) those who claimed cultural communion with Russia; and finally, (3) those that claimed cultural communion with the Ukrainians.⁵¹ To a great extent

⁵⁰ Shipman, CE, VI (1909), 749.

⁵¹ Stephen C. Gulovich, "The Rusin Exarchate in the United States," Eastern Churches Quarterly, VI, (October-December, 1946), 463.

the conflicts among the Ruthenians in America were inherited from the factional differences which were born in Europe. The factional conflicts amongst the Ruthenian Catholics during their early years in America may be loosely paralleled, states Shipman, in the history of the Irish Catholics in the United States between 1815 and 1850.⁵²

The differences between the Galician and the Pod-Carpathian immigrants, it would seem, certainly were not insurmountable. After all, in the beginning, the Galician immigrants were for the most part Lemky, the immediate neighbors of the Pod-Carpathians.⁵³ As a matter of fact, greater cooperation amongst the Ruthenians appeared to be in prospect when on February 14, 1892, as a result of the efforts of both Pod-Carpathian and Galician priests, a federation of the fraternal brotherhoods was organized in Wilkes-Barre. That organization, the Sojedineniye Greko-Kaftoliceskich Russkich Bratstv,⁵⁴ began publishing its news-

⁵²Shipman, "Immigration to the United States," Shipman Memorial, p. 92.

⁵³Galician Lemkivschyna was the territory on the northern slopes of the Carpathians whereas the Pod-Carpathia was the region of the southern slopes of the same mountains.

⁵⁴An illustration of the major role of the clergy in the organization and administration of the Sojedineniya is provided in the "Istorija Greko Kaft. Sojedineniya", Kalendar Sojedineniya, 1942, pp. 39-74.

paper, the Amerikansky Russky Viestnik on March seventeenth of that year. (The organization and its paper is better known today by its English names: The Greek Catholic Union and the Greek Catholic Union Messenger.) However, in the 1890's neither the Galician nor the Pod-Carpathian priests displayed the necessary tact, patience and understanding towards each others' views; consequently, as a result of various misunderstandings the Galicians under the leadership of Rev. John Konstankevich left the organization in 1893 and a second federation, the Rusky Narodny Soyuz was formed in Shamokin on February 22, 1894.⁵⁵ The newspaper Svoboda (Liberty), organized and first published by Rev. Hrushka in Jersey City on September 15, 1893, became the official organ of the Soyuz on May 30, 1894. Thus, from 1894 the conflicts between the Galician and the Pod-Carpathian tended to increase with each fraternal federation through its organ playing a major role. The Sojedinenija and its Viestnik represented the Pod-Carpathian pro-Hugarian faction, whereas the Soyuz and its organ the Svoboda represented the Galician Ukrainians. (The Soyuz is known today as the Ukrainsky Narodny Soyuz - the Ukrainian National Association). Other organizations, newspapers, and publications followed, each representing some faction

⁵⁵An excellent account of the role of the clergy in the organization and administration of the Soyuz is provided by Nestor Dmytriw, "Korotkyj Nacerk Istoriji Rozvoju Ruskoho Narodnoho Soyuzu", Kalendar Soyuz, 1914, pp. 36-101.

amongst the Ruthenians in America.

It was as a result of the bitter conflicts that the Galician immigrants began to organize separate parishes for the Ukrainians from Galicia. The formation of separate parishes was not difficult for between 1895 and 1898 six young celibate priests imbued with the spirit of Ukrainian national revival arrived from Galicia.⁵⁶ They were to play an unusually important role in the cultural and national development of the Ukrainian immigrants in the United States.

The first of these priests to arrive was Nestor Dmytriw who settled in Mt. Carmel early in 1895, and who soon became the editor of the Svoboda. He was joined in midyear by Rev. Michael Stefanovich who, after a few months in Buffalo, settled in Pittsburgh, and, before the year ended, by Rev. John Ardan who made Jersey City his residence. Early in 1897 Rev. Stephen Makar, and toward the end of the year Fathers Anton Bonchevsky, and Michael Pidhoretsky joined their former classmates in the New World. Father Makar went to Mt. Carmel to replace Dmytriw who left for Canada in the Spring to aid in the material and spiritual needs of the new Ukrainian immigration from Eastern Galicia and

⁵⁶ While seminarians in Lviv, they had formed themselves into the so-called "American Circle" with the hope of doing missionary work among the Ukrainian immigrants in America after their ordination.

Bukovina. Bonchevsky fixed his residence in Ansonia, and Pidhoretsky settled in Jersey City, replacing Ardan who moved to Olyphant. In 1898 Rev. Paul Tymkevich arrived, another of the young Galician priests. He soon left for Alberta, Canada, where he remained for almost a year. By the end of 1898, however, both Tymkevich and Dmytriw returned to the United States permanently, with the former taking up residence in Yonkers and the latter in Troy.

5. Conflicts with Latin Bishops

The major problems facing the early Ruthenian priests was the lack of any official status for the Byzantine Rite in the United States and the absence of any normal church organization. Ever since Father Voliansky's departure in 1889, there was an increasing number of Ruthenian priests coming to our shores with rights of jurisdiction from their bishops in Europe. However, once in the United States, they frequently worked independently of one another and of the local Ordinary organizing parishes within the territorial limits of one or of several Latin Rite dioceses. Naturally this state of affairs lead to internal confusion as well as to serious conflicts with the Latin bishops in whose diocesan territories the priests worked. As previously stated, the majority of the Latin hierarchy and clergy in the United States were unfamiliar with the usages of the Byzantine Rite. Particularly foreign to Americans was the custom of married clergy. The early Ruthenian priests, in turn, partially due

to their unfamiliarity with the English language, were unable to inform properly the Latin clergy of their Byzantine traditions. The result was often outright hostility on the part of individuals, which led to numerous conflicts. The bishops felt that, in order to prevent the undermining of their own authority and the development of chaotic conditions, the Ruthenian priests in the United States must be celibate and subject to them - and they frequently petitioned the Holy See towards that end.

In an attempt to end the near-chaotic conditions, on October 1, 1890, the Papacy came out with its first decree relative to the Ruthenian Church in America.⁵⁷ In accord

⁵⁷Letter of Cardinal Ledochowski, Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of the Propagation of Faith for the Oriental Rites, to Cardinal Gibbons of Baltimore, dated May 10, 1892, advising the bishops of the United States of the instructions addressed to the Ruthenian bishops in Austro-Hungary in 1890, AER, VII, 66-67. Earlier decrees were not made, most likely, because the Ruthenian immigration was deemed to be of a temporary nature. According to Bachynsky, op. cit., p. 89, however, contrary to general opinion, the early Ruthenian immigration was not of a temporary nature but a permanent one. Almost 90 percent of these immigrants remained permanently in the United States. Bachynsky admits that it was true that originally these workers thought of going back to the old country after working a year or two. However, the fact remains that for the most part these intentions were changed while in America, and the vast majority of them never returned to their homeland. The change in character from a temporary to a permanent type of immigration was particularly evident from about the middle 1890's according to Ardan, Charities, XIII, 249.

with the new decree, newly arrived priests were to report, receive their jurisdiction, and remain under the jurisdiction of the Latin Rite Ordinary in whose territory they had arranged to reside. Equally important was the requirement that Ruthenian priests in America were to be celibate, and that the married ones were to be recalled to Europe.⁵⁸ The above decree, however, did not produce the desired effect, instead it added to the difficulties between the two rites. Some of the Ruthenians read into the regulations an attempt to destroy the autonomy of the Byzantine Rite and to Latinize the Ruthenians. Consequently, with the growth of radical leadership amongst the Ruthenians in the 1890's, many of the congregations chose to retain the ownership of their churches and refused to sign them over to the bishops, although, canonically speaking, until 1907 all Byzantine Rite churches belonged de jure to the bishops in whose diocese they were located. Thus, a troublesome situation developed where the priests received their jurisdiction from the local bishop on the basis of the documents they carried from Europe, however, the bishop might not have legal ownership of the Church to which he might wish to assign a particular priest. Hence, a priest assigned to a church owned by the congregation found himself in the difficult position of being responsible to two, often conflicting, authorities. This situation of course, contributed to furthering the

58

Letter of Cardinal Ledochowski, AER, VII, 67.

already serious internal conflicts amongst the Ruthenians - all to the great detriment of the spiritual development of the Byzantine Church in the United States. Consequently, on October 29, 1890, twenty-eight days after the Papal decree regarding the Ruthenians, the first gathering of the Ruthenian clergy was held in Wilkes-Barre, where eight of the nine accredited priests in the United States met and decided to petition Rome that, in view of the difficulties between the Rites, a Byzantine Vicar General be appointed with authority over all Catholics of the Byzantine Rite in America.⁵⁹ In December of 1891 another important gathering of the clergy was held in Hazleton, where a memorandum regarding the position of the Byzantine Church in the United States was formulated and delivered to the Apostolic delegate by a committee headed by Father Khanat. One result of this memorandum was the appointment of Khanat as the acting administrator of the Ruthenian church the following year.⁶⁰ His position was mainly that of an intermediary between the Ruthenian priests and the Latin Bishops as well as between the conflicting factions amongst the Ruthenians themselves.

⁵⁹Heuser, op. cit., p. 198. Cardinal Ledochowski's letter, AER, VII, 67, also makes specific reference to the petitions by some of the Ruthenian priests for permission to remain in the United States, as well as to their seeking the establishment of an Apostolic Vicariate of their Rite.

⁶⁰Bachynsky, op. cit., p. 296.

The factional conflicts amongst the Ruthenian priests were now reaching scandalous proportions, with factional meetings becoming more numerous. Although Father Khanat continued his duties until 1896, his position was more nominal than real. The young "radical" priests from Galicia⁶¹ finally gave up hope of any cooperative action with the priests from the Muncacs Diocese in Hungary.⁶² Early in 1896 specific appeals and recommendations were made by these priests for the formation of their own church administrative organization which would control the priests and their activities, bring order to the Ruthenian Church in America, and protect it from the Russophile propaganda of the Russian Orthodox Mission.⁶³ Finally, on May 30, 1901,

⁶¹The term "radical" was applied to the young Galician priests by their opponents.

⁶²According to Bachynsky, *op. cit.*, p. 296, the priests who originated from the Muncacs Diocese were pronounced sympathizers of the Hungarian cause. Generally speaking, they had succeeded in gaining most of the bigger and wealthier parishes. The priests from the Diocese of Presov were of less aristocratic background than those from Muncacs and represented the opposite Pod-Carpathian faction generally claiming a cultural communion with the Ukrainians from Austrian Galicia and Bukovina.

⁶³*Svoboda*, March 5, 1896, p. 1, also May 14, 1896, p. 1., illustrate the strong tone of these appeals.

clerical and lay delegates met in Shamokin and formed an association of the Ruthenian Church Congregations in the United States and Canada headed by a general committee of three priests and three laymen. The stated goal of the association was "to obtain good priests, to see that in every parish there be order, schools, choirs, reading rooms, and that the poorer chapels obtain the services of a priest at least from time to time, etc."⁶⁴ Upon request for a priest from newly organized congregations, the Association's Clerical Committee of six members was to make appointments of priests arriving from Europe, who had to obtain their jurisdiction from the local Latin Bishop. Although only fifteen parishes and ten priests,⁶⁵ out of a total of about sixty churches and forty-four priests,⁶⁶ accepted the administration of this general committee (the Pod-Carpathian Group soon began its own church or organization), nevertheless, it was the first serious attempt to introduce lay control over the church, a principle which troubled the Ruthenian Church in the United States for many years to come. The height of the movement was reached at the second convention

⁶⁴Ibid., June 6, 1901, p. 2. June 13, p. 2 and June 27, p. 2, provide additional information by the leading priests of the Association.

⁶⁵Ibid., June 6, 1901, p. 2.

⁶⁶Ibid., February 21, 1901, p. 2.

held in Harrisburg on March 26, 1902, where the official name of the association became the Ruthenian Church in America.⁶⁷ The characteristic elements of this organization, which lasted until the arrival of the first bishop and the settlement of the religious matters that were canonically the prerogative of the bishop, was its radicalism towards the Latin bishops in particular and towards the hierarchy of the Church in general.⁶⁸ The extreme views of some of the young "radical" priests even led to their excommunication and to court fights over churches.⁶⁹

⁶⁷ Ibid., April 10, 1902, p. 2 and May 15, p. 4., contain an extended report of the Convention's radical discussions and resolutions.

⁶⁸ The radical views of the association of the Ruthenian Church in America towards Rome, Metropolitan Sheptytsky, and towards the American hierarchy are well illustrated in the association's booklet Unia v Amerytsi, (New York: T.R.T.A. 1902), which explains their position in reply to Metropolitan Sheptytsky's letter of August 20, 1902. The document is concluded with the signatures of the chairman of the association's general committee, and the chairman of the clerical committee. The Pod-Carpathian faction strongly opposed this Association. See, for example, the Viestnik editorials, March 7, p. 4; March 14, p. 4; and March 21, 1902, p. 4.

⁶⁹ The outstanding example is the case of Rev. John Ardan of Olyphant and his excommunication by Bishop Michael J. Hoban of Scranton by a letter dated February 22, 1902, following Ardan's strongly anti-Rome article entitled "Skazhim sobi pravdu v ochy", Svoboda, February 13, 1902, p. 2. Numerous reports on Ardan's excommunication and the court fight over the Olyphant Church are found in Svoboda, especially in the April to June issues of 1902. The Viestnik took the opposite view of these events from that of the Svoboda. See, for instance, Viestnik editorial, March 28, 1902, p. 4.

6. New Conflicts and Solution

The internal conflicts and the misunderstandings with the hierarchy provided the Russian Orthodox Mission an opportunity for very lively propaganda amongst the Ruthenians. Taking advantage of the attitude of some of the priests, the Orthodox Mission beginning in 1891, succeeded in establishing itself on a large scale in the eastern states when individual priests and some of their congregations passed over to Orthodoxy. In March of 1891, the Pod-Carpathian priest Alexis Tovt (Toth) in Minneapolis, became the first Ruthenian priest to turn Orthodox,⁷⁰ and in December of 1896

⁷⁰Rev. Tovt disobeyed instructions of Archbishop John Ireland of St. Paul and submitted to the Russian Orthodox Bishop Nickolas in San Francisco. By his own admission, Tovt became an energetic advocate of the Russian Orthodox Church among the Ruthenians in America and a bitter opponent of Catholicism. (See "Vozsoedinenie z Pravoslavnoiu Tserkoviiu Minneapolisago prikhoda", Kalendar Pravosl. obshch. Vzaimopomoshchi, 1901, cited by A. Levkov in "Tsareslaviie a Rusyni v Amerytse," Svoboda, April 11, 1901, p. 4.) It is said that he was the cause of nearly 10,000 Ruthenian Catholics seceding to the Orthodox Church. (See Andrew J. Shipman, "Greek Orthodox Church in America," CE, VI, 1909, pp. 772-773. Tovt's aggressive attempts to transfer Ruthenian Catholic Churches to Russian Orthodox control is illustrated by the long struggle for the control of the Ruthenian Catholic Church in Wilkes-Barre, Pa. which started in 1893 and was not concluded until 1900 when the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania finally upheld the decision of the Court of Common Pleas of Luzerne County in favor of the Ruthenian Catholics. (See Greek Catholic Church v. Orthodox Greek Church, 46, Atlantic Reporter: 72-77 (1900). It should be made clear, however, that most of the Ruthenian priests that passed into Orthodoxy eventually returned to the Catholic Faith.

Rev. Hrushka of Jersey City became the first Galician priest to do the same.⁷¹ Thus, by the opening of the current century, the chief problem facing the Ruthenian Catholic priests was combatting the Russian Orthodox propaganda financed by the Tsarist Government, which saw in the Ruthenian Church in the United States an important element of the Ukrainian movement.⁷² The Mission's proselytizing amongst the Ruthenians brought considerable results. By 1901 the Russian Mission had succeeded in converting thirteen Ruthenian Catholic congregations and as many churches to Orthodoxy, with a total population of 6,898 faithful, of whom 2,448 were Galicians, and 4,450 Pod-Carpathians.⁷³

⁷¹ Rev. Hrushka returned to the Catholic Faith in 1901.

⁷² Numerous articles by Ruthenian priests and laymen in Svoboda, particularly during 1901-1902, refuting the Russian Orthodox Mission's claims, assailing the immorality of their clergy, and censuring Ruthenian "Moscophiles" illustrate the bitterness of the struggle.

⁷³ Unia v Amerytsi, p. 20. The same figures are given for the number of Ruthenian converts by the Russian Orthodox Kalendar Pravosl., 1901, cited by A. Levkov in Svoboda, April II, 1901, p. 4.

The seemingly unending conflicts with the Latin bishops and the resultant spread of the anti-Roman feeling among the Ruthenian "radical" priests, which reached its climax in 1902, also provided open opportunity for proselytizing by the Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Baptist and other Protestant groups.⁷⁴ Thus, for instance, in the first decade of the current century Ruthenian Presbyterian congregations were established in Pittsburgh, Newark and in New York, and a Baptist congregation was organized in Scranton.⁷⁵

The many serious problems facing the Ruthenian Catholics, and the numerous letters and memorandas sent to the authorities by the Pod-Carpathian Ruthenians requesting the appointment of a Vicar General or a Bishop steeped in the Hungarian tradition, prompted the Holy See to seek a

⁷⁴According to Professor Warne, op. cit., p. 101-102, the Presbyterians were the most energetic in their colportage work among the slavic immigrants at this time. The report of the Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church to the Chairman of the Immigration Commission, dated New York, November 22, 1910, illustrates the extensiveness of the Presbyterian colportage work among the new immigrants, including among the Ruthenians. See U.S., Congress, Senate, Statements by Societies Interested in Immigration, Reports of the Immigration Commission, Doc. No. 764, 61st Cong. 3d. Sess., 1911, XXIII, 297-301.

⁷⁵Shipman, Shipman Memorial, p. 96-99.

definite solution. Accordingly on April 29, 1902, the Right Rev. Andrew Hodobay, Titular Abbot and Canon from the Diocese of Presov (Eperies) in Hungary, arrived in the United States as the "Apostolic Visitor" to the Ruthenian Catholics.⁷⁶ Father Hodobay's duties of overseeing all matters pertaining to the Ruthenian Church in America, with the cooperation of the Latin Bishops, proved to be difficult to carry out because of the serious split amongst the Ruthenian

76

Early in 1901, there were rumors that the future Apostolic Visitor would be a Pod-Carpathian from Hungary. (Svoboda editorial, February 21, 1901, p. 2.) Seven months before Hodobay's arrival, the "radical" priests made it known that if the appointment of the future Visitor was the result of the Hungarian Government's influence, then they would have little faith in such an appointee. (Svoboda, September 19, 1901, p. 2.) Thus, the Galician priests strongly opposed Father Hodobay as the official Visitor on the ground that his appointment had the full support of the Hungarian government which feared that the Ruthenians from Hungary would be swayed by the spirit of Ukrainian nationalism diffused by the "radical" priests from Galicia. (See Unia v. Amerytsi, pp. 35-44). On the other hand, the Viestnik editorial, April 17, 1902, p. 4. indicated obvious satisfaction when it informed its readers that official notification of Father Hodobay's appointment as Vicar for the Ruthenian Catholics had been received. On May 8, 1902, pp. 1-2, the Viestnik contains an account of the arrival of Hodobay and his secretary Rev. John Korotnoky at Hobokin, New Jersey, their welcome, as well as a long biographical sketch of the new Apostolic Visitor.

clergy, the new principle of lay control of the Church, and the continued misunderstandings with the Latin bishops.

Incidentally, the Ruthenian Church had by now reached considerable size and extent in the United States. According to a census made by Father John Korotnoky who was secretary to Father Hodobay, as of January 11, 1905 there were 89 Byzantine Rite congregations and 68 priests. Of these congregations, 83 had their own church buildings, four had only chapels, and two held services in Latin churches. In addition, 79 of the communities had parish homes, and 69 provided some form of catechetical instructions to a total of about 7,000 children.⁷⁷ According to a 1905, Almanac of the Sojedinenija, however, there were 95 Ruthenian congregations located in ten different States and 67 priests.⁷⁸ (See appendix 2). Although an obvious minor discrepancy exists between the two sources in the total number of congregations and priests (due to differences in time of census, arrival and departure of priests, and the fluid condition of some of the congregations), they provide a very close approximation of the size and extent of the Ruthenian Church during Hodobay's mission in the United States.

Shortly after his arrival, Father Hodobay announced that a Convocation of priests would be held in Brooklyn on

⁷⁷Gulovich, op. cit., p. 470.

⁷⁸Kalendar Sojedinenija, 1905, p. 160.

May 21, 1902. The Convention which was to decide on local statutes for the Ruthenian Church proved to be ineffective since it was attended only by the 32 priests originating from Muncacs and eight from Presov.⁷⁹ The Galician priests were not included in this convocation nor in the succeeding one which was held in Scranton, July 22, and attended only by 19 of the Pod-Carpathians.⁸⁰ The friendly relations which existed between the priests from Hungary and Father Hodobay upon his arrival quickly cooled off and became increasingly hostile. A bitter conflict ensued with the Muncacs priests and the Sojedineniya leading the fight against Father Hodobay.⁸¹ Increasingly, they looked upon Hodobay as an "exponent of Hungarian political interests rather than an organizer of the Ruthenian Catholic Church!"⁸² In addition, unfortunately, since the majority of the Pod-Carpathian priests were from Muncacs and considered them-

⁷⁹Viestnik, May 29, 1902, p. 2. which also summarizes the agenda of the Convention.

⁸⁰Svoboda, August 7, 1902, p. 4.

⁸¹ See, for example, Viestnik, July 10, 1902, p. 1; July 17, p. 2.; July 24, p. 2.; July 31, p. 2., etc.

⁸²Hanchin, Kalendar Sojedineniya, 1937, p. 46.

selves of somewhat aristocratic background, Hodobay's fault was that he was only a "plain priest from Presov."⁸³ At the same time his Magyar tendency⁸⁴ and his slightening of the unfriendly Galician priests⁸⁵ precluded the possibility of obtaining the support of the Galicians.

⁸³Ibid. p. 46

⁸⁴Hodobay's use of the Magyar language in his correspondence to the Pod-Carpathian priests was an illustration of his Magyarization tendency, and was strongly resented by the Galician priests. An excerpt of Hodobay's letter sent from Scranton to the Pod-Carpathian priests on July 1, 1902 (prior to the Convention that he had called for July 22nd in that city), is to be found in Svoboda, July 10, 1902, p.4. Father Hodobay's great interest in expanding the number of Magyar congregations is also indicated in his correspondence relative to the organization of new Hungarian parishes, as exemplified by the following: letter from the Bishop of Pittsburgh, March 22, 1905; letter from the Chancellor of the Pittsburgh diocese, July 5, 1905; Hodobay's letter to the Bishop of Pittsburgh, July 13, 1905; or the letter from the Apostolic Delegate, August 12, 1905, all of which are in the Archives of the Byzantine Archdiocese of Philadelphia.

⁸⁵The Galician priests were not invited to either the Brooklyn or Scranton Conventions and did not participate in the discussions to adopt statutes for the Ruthenian Church in America. Although uninvited, the Galician priest Nestor Dmytriv was present at the Scranton meeting and asked why the Galicians were not invited. Father Hodobay's answer was that he didn't know if he would be accepted by the Galicians. Dmytriv's report of the Convention and the above conversation is found in Svoboda, July 24, 1902, p. 4, and July 31, p. 4.

The inability of Father Hodobay to gain and keep the support of all Ruthenian priests, and to control effectively their activities, made even more difficult his relations with the Latin Bishops who feared that the chaotic conditions among the Ruthenians within their dioceses might lead to a deterioration of their episcopal authority.⁸⁶ Thus Hodobay's mission, to bring order to the Ruthenian Church, was doomed almost from the start.⁸⁷ With increasing protests and com-

⁸⁶The correspondence between Father Hodobay and the Latin Bishops provide clear illustrations of the complexity of the jurisdictional problems faced by Hodobay. For example; a misunderstanding over an appointment of a priest to a Ruthenian mission precipitated a series of strongly worded letters between Hodobay and the Bishop of Erie, as illustrated in Hodobay's letters of June 24, August 1 and August 27, 1904, and by the letter from the Bishop, August 26, 1904; the question of the transfer of church property was the occasion of an extremely sharp letter from the Bishop of Syracuse, August 30, 1904; while the problem of married priests and their changing parishes without permission of the Bishop occasioned a lecture-like letter from the Chancellor of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia (on the instructions of the Archbishop), November 12, 1904. These letters, as well as others cited in the following two footnotes, are in the Archives of the Byzantine Archdiocese of Philadelphia.

⁸⁷Incidentally, contributing to the chaotic conditions during Father Hodobay's period was the continued arrival in greater numbers of married priests, contrary to regulations, for whom Hodobay was unable to obtain jurisdiction from the local Latin Ordinaries. Some Bishops, or their Chancellors, made specific requests that Hodobay not recommend married priests to work in their diocese, stating that such priests would not be admitted. For example: letter from the Chancellor of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia, November 12, 1904, or the letter from the Bishop of Cleveland, September 6, 1904. These priests, however, carried on parish duties with only the jurisdictions they obtained in Europe or with none at all, thus greatly contributing to the very unfavorable opinions that some Latin Bishops had of the Ruthenian priests. This is illustrated in correspondence such as the letter from the Bishop of Erie, August 26, 1904, or that of the Bishop of Syracuse, August 30, 1904.

plaints against Hodobay to the authorities in Europe, Father Hodobay's mission finally ended with his recall to Europe in 1907.⁸⁸

From subsequent legislation, however, there is little doubt, according to Gulovich, that Father Hodobay's report to Rome included reference to the following as the major contributing factors in the chaotic conditions amongst the Byzantine Catholics in the United States: (1) control of Church and properties by laymen; (2) the scandalous means by which some priests tried to obtain and hold parishes; and (3) the almost general disregard for ecclesiastical authority.⁸⁹ On the basis of the insistence of the Ruthen-

⁸⁸In addition to his official responsibilities relative to the Ruthenian Catholics, Father Hodobay was also often involved in the problems of other Eastern Rite Catholic groups in the United States. This is illustrated, for instance, by the following correspondence: Hodobay's letter to the Archbishop of Boston, October 16, 1906, requesting jurisdiction for the Syrian Byzantine Rite Catholic priest, Rev. Hananias Bouri, O.S.B.M.; letter from Shaheen Haddad, November 1, 1906 (with thirteen signatures), containing an appeal by the Syrian Byzantine Rite Catholic people of Boston for help in obtaining a priest; Hodobay's reply, November 21, 1906, stating that he will submit the matter to the Apostolic Delegate; Hodobay's letter to the Apostolic Delegate, November 6, 1906, requesting aid in the matter of obtaining the necessary jurisdiction for Rev. Bouri, recently sent by the Byzantine Catholic Patriarch of Antioch and by the Superior General of the Order of St. Basil the Great for the Syrian Byzantine Rite Mission of Lawrence and Boston, Mass.

⁸⁹Gulovich, op. cit., p. 474.

ian bishops in Europe, particularly by the Most Reverend Count Andrew Sheptytsky, the Metropolitan of Galicia, as well as on the basis of the reports of Rev. Hodobay, and of the Apostolic Delegate in Washington, ⁹⁰ Pope Pius X made his decision to name a bishop for the Ruthenians in America. In 1907, the Ruthenian Church in the United States entered the second phase of its development with the appointment of Monsignor Soter Ortynsky, O.S.B.M., as the first Ruthenian Bishop in America.

⁹⁰ Letter of Cardinal Gotti, Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of the Propagation of Faith for the Oriental Rites to Father Hodobay, dated March 8, 1907, advising him that he is relieved of his duties as Apostolic Visitor to Ruthenians in America. Amerykansky Russky Kalendar, 1908, (Uzhgorod, Hungary: Foldesi Gyula, 1907), p. viii.

CHAPTER II

ADMINISTRATION OF BISHOP ORTYNSKY

1. Pioneering Hardships of a New Bishop

The appointment of a bishop for the Ruthenians in America altered a traditional principle of the Roman Catholic Church in the West, that all Catholics domiciled in a given territory fall under the jurisdiction of a single Ordinary in that territory. In Eastern Europe, the Near East, and the Middle East, where several different rites of the Church existed in the same territory, dual and triple jurisdictions developed; in Western Europe, however, there was a tradition of almost nineteen hundred years of a single territorial jurisdiction, which naturally filtered to America. It is understandable, therefore, that the American bishops considered it impractical and even unthinkable for the establishment of a Byzantine Rite diocese in the United States. Herein, incidentally, lies an important cause of the persistent conflicts between the Ruthenian priests, who petitioned for their own separate jurisdiction, and the Latin hierarchy, who could not reconcile themselves with such an intrusion and steadfastly petitioned Rome against such an unorthodox innovation. That the decision to appoint a Ruthenian bishop was finally made by Pope Pius X was pri-

marily the result of the persistent requests, over a period of several years, by Metropolitan Sheptytsky of Galicia.¹

In 1907, Pope Pius X appointed the Metropolitan's candidate, Monsignor Soter Stephen Ortynsky, O.S.B.M., as first Byzantine Rite bishop in the United States.

Stephen Ortynsky, who was born in the village of Ortynysi in Galicia on January 29, 1866, entered the monastic order of St. Basil the Great (O.S.B.M.) in 1884 where he accepted the religious name of Soter. His philosophy and theology studies were completed at Graz University in Cracow where he also earned his doctoral degree in Sacred Theology. Ortynsky was ordained a priest by Metropolitan Sembratovich at St. George's Cathedral in Lviv on July 18, 1891. In succeeding years, his duties included teaching,

¹Rev. Leo I. Sembratovich, secretary to the Metropolitan during these years, provides us with a good general account of the role of the Metropolitan in influencing: 1) the Pope's decision to appoint a bishop for the Ruthenians, 2) the appointment of his candidate as most suited to and the chaotic conditions, 3) the acceptance of his candidate by the Austrian and Hungarian authorities interested in keeping the loyalty of their former subjects. It was particularly difficult to obtain the approval of the Hungarian government which feared that its former subjects, who made up the majority of the Ruthenian Catholics in the United States, might be swayed either towards Ukrainophilism or towards Moscophilism. See "Iak pryishlo do imenovania nashoho pershoho Epyskopa V Amerytsi", Iuvyleny Almanakh Urkainskoi Hreko-Katolytskoi Tserkvy u Zluchenykh Derzhavakh, 1884-1934 (Philadelphia: Jubilee Committee, 1934), pp. 103-107.

the priorship of a monastery, and missionary work. His reputation as a Ukrainian patriot, a dedicated missionary, and a talented preacher spread throughout Galicia. On March 8, 1907, he was appointed bishop for the Ruthenians in America and named titular bishop of Daulia by Pius X, being consecrated by Metropolitan Sheptytsky in St. George's Cathedral on May 12, 1907.²

The Bishops' first pastoral letter to his priests, dated from Lviv, June 25, 1907 and received in America on August seventh, outlined the new Bishop's jurisdiction and his plans for the future.

As you are aware, my priests, I am a bishop without a diocese. All the Ruthenian Catholics living in the United States have been placed under my jurisdiction and I have been made dependent on the Apostolic Delegate, and through him directly on the Apostolic See.... Our earnest efforts shall be directed towards the creation of a full diocese in the shortest possible time which, with God's help, and your wise, honest, and patient collaboration, we will surely attain. I feel that it can not be different at present, because first it will be necessary for me to become an American citizen and only then can we fairly establish the Ruthenian Church and obtain the privileges due her.³

Upon his arrival on August 27, 1907, Bishop Ortynsky and his secretary, Rev. Vladimir Petrivsky, were

²A good biographical outline of Bishop Ortynsky's background can be seen in America (Philadelphia), April 4, 1916, p. 2.

³Full text quoted in Svoboda, August 15, 1907, p. 4., and in the Viestnik, August 22, 1907, p. 4.

met at Hoboken, New Jersey, by a delegation of priests and laymen led by a committee headed by Revs. Cornelius Lawrisin, Gabriel Chohey, and Joseph Chaplynsky.⁴ The Bishop was escorted to New York's St. George's Church at 332-334 East Twentieth Street, where a Moleben (Matins) service was held and where the following morning Bishop Ortynsky offered his first Pontifical Mass in the United States. On August 29, Ortynsky was escorted to Philadelphia, where the bishop's residence was to be established, and the next day to Washington for an introduction to the Most Rev. Archbishop Diomedede Falconio, the Apostolic Delegate. On September 1, the bishop went to South Fork, Pennsylvania, to bless St. Michael's Church on the following day, a duty he had accepted before leaving Europe.⁵ Since the bishop had neither a residence nor a Cathedral, the priest at South Fork offered his house to the bishop until suitable

⁴The Bishop's arrival and the official ceremonies held in his honor in New York on August 27th and 28th, are reported in detail by both the Svoboda and the Viestnik in their respective issues of September 5, 1907, p. 4.

⁵St. Michael's was the first Church to be blessed by a Ruthenian Bishop in the United States. The Bishop's day to day schedule from his arrival through October 29, as outlined by the director of the Chancery, Rev. Vladimir Petrivsky, can be seen in the Viestnik, September 26, 1907, p. 4.

quarters could be arranged. Thus, South Fork became the temporary residence of Ortynsky.⁶ Early in November the bishop announced the transfer of his residence to North Sixty-third street in Philadelphia.⁷

The difficulties that Bishop Ortynsky faced in his attempt to organize a Byzantine-Slavonic Rite diocese were, to put it mildly, numerous and serious. In addition to the generally undisciplined habits of the Ruthenian priests and congregations (habits acquired from being without a spiritual head for many years), the new bishop was also confronted with: Moscovite and Orthodox propaganda of Tsarist Russia, Protestant sectarian influence, increased factional conflicts, and continued misunderstandings with the Latin Hierarchy. All these problems had to be met and solved before a strong foundation could be established for the

⁶The bishop's official notice of his temporary address appeared in Svoboda, for the first time, September 5, 1907, p. 1, and in the Viestnik the same date, p. 4. In the absence of an official clerical Bulletin, the Bishop's notices and regulations appeared in both papers. Ortynsky's long pastoral letter (Poslanie Pastirske Sotera Ortynsko), of January 11, 1908, p. 9, also specifically refers to South Fork as his temporary address upon his arrival in the United States. The above letter henceforth referred to as Poslanie.

Byzantine Rite in the United States.⁸

Unfortunately, however, the Apostolic letter Ea Semper,⁹ of June 14, 1907, concerning the position and powers of the new bishop, and the general regulations (constitution) of the Byzantine Slavonic Rite in the United States, when published by the Apostolic Delegate on September 16, 1907, had the unintended effect of intensifying the problem. The papal letter did not create a Byzantine diocese in the United States; consequently it did not provide for any diocesan powers or authority. Although the new bishop received his primary jurisdiction immediately from Rome, he was to exercise that jurisdiction as an auxiliary to the Latin bishops in whose territories Ruthenians were domi-

⁸Literally hundreds of letters between Bishop Ortynsky and the Apostolic Delegate in Washington, numerous Latin Bishops, and various other persons, provide ample illustrations of these problems. The writer will limit his references to those letters which have a direct bearing on the historical development of the Ruthenian Church organization which is the main theme of this work. The letters are in the Archives of the Byzantine Rite Archdiocese of Philadelphia and were examined by the writer.

⁹Acta Sanctae Sedis, (Rome, 1908) XLI, 3-12 or AER, XXXVII (VII), (November, 1907), 513-520. H. J. Heuser's "The Appointment of a Greek Bishop in the United States," pp. 457-466 of the same number of the Review, contains a good discussion of the principal provisions and regulations of this papal letter. Acta Sanctae Sedis hereafter cited as ASS.

ciled.¹⁰ In addition, the privilege of the Byzantine Rite priests administering the sacrament of Confirmation at Baptism was to be withheld.¹¹ Also married men were not to be ordained in America, nor were priests to be sent here without approval.¹² To many Ruthenians, Ea Semper appeared to be an attack on their Rite and an obvious victory of the American hierarchy.¹³ At the same time the inferior position of Bishop Ortynsky tended to lead to even greater factional conflicts amongst the Ruthenians.¹⁴

The news that Monsignor Ortynsky, a Ukrainian patriot from Galicia, was appointed Bishop stunned the Pod-

¹⁰ ASS., XLI, p. 4. Early in his administration Bishop Ortynsky visited Latin Bishops in whose territories numerous Ruthenians were domiciled (the bishops of Altoona, Scranton, and Pittsburgh for example) concerning the administration of the Ruthenian Church. One of the important points agreed upon was that no Ruthenian priest be given jurisdiction within the territory of the Latin Ordinary without an understanding with Bishop Ortynsky. See Viestnik, September 26, 1907, p. 4.

¹¹ ASS., XLI, 7.

¹² Ibid., p. 6.

¹³ See Svoboda editorial, November 21, 1907, p. 4.

¹⁴ Ibid., December 12, 1907, p.4.

Carpathians from Hungary.¹⁵ Most of the priests from Hungary refused to accept him because he was Ukranian, and they accused him of Latinization and of betraying them, because he agreed to be subject to the Latin Bishops.¹⁶ The Galician priests, most of whom recognized Ortynsky,¹⁷ were strongly opposed to the regulations of the letter and prepared petitions for full independent powers for their bishop.¹⁸ Thus, the Ruthenian dissatisfaction over the

¹⁵ Hanchin, Kalendar Sojedinenija, 1937, p. 52. According to Hanchin who was present at the welcoming banquet in New York for the new Bishop, the President of the Sojedinenija, in strong words, warned Bishop Ortynsky that his organization and the people will never allow a policy intended to foster Ukrainian partisan objectives. See also Svoboda, September 5, 1907, p. 4.

¹⁶ Bishop Ortynsky in his Poslanie of January 11, 1908, p. 15, made it clear that he did not know about the papal letter until several weeks after his arrival in the United States, when he was informed of it by the Apostolic Delegate. He considered the new regulations unjust to the Ruthenian Church and its people, and immediately protested against it.

¹⁷ The Galician "Moscophile" minority opposed Ortynsky. Svoboda, September 26, 1907, p. 2., lists the leading Moscophiles.

¹⁸ Ibid., December 26, 1907, p. 1.

Papal letter contributed in the development of a bitter pro-Ortynsky and anti-Ortynsky battle.¹⁹ The struggle was fanned by the factional organizations, newspapers, lectures,

¹⁹ Attacks on the Bishop appeared in the Viestnik immediately upon his arrival. For example: the editorial on August 29, 1907, p. 4., represents a relatively mild attack, whereas, on September 5, p. 2., a very harsh attack was made where, amongst other things, the Bishop is accused of Latinization because he wore a "Polish Velum." On the other hand, Svoboda, September 19, 1907, p. 4, contains an early and strong indictment of the Pod-Carpathians for these attacks on the Bishop, and the Galicians in general. It should be made clear that not all of the Pod-Carpathian priests were opposed to Ortynsky, nor did they endorse attacks on him. Those opposed to Ortynsky, like Revs. Cornelius Lavrisin, Nicholas and Gabriel Chopey, Nicholas Jackovich, Alexander Dzubay, Alexis Holosnyay and others, were mostly from Muncacs and traditionally strongly Magyarized in their outlook. (Hanchin, Kalendar Sojedinenija, 1937, pp. 53-54). There were also Pod-Carpathian priests that backed Ortynsky, such as, Revs. Gorzo, Hanulya, Mirossay, V. Balogh, Goidics, and Volensky. (Viestnik, December 15, 1910, p. 5.) Rev. V. Balogh, for example, in a letter to the Svoboda entitled "Amer. Russkomu Viestnikovi do Vidomosti" protested strongly against Viestnik's (September 5, 1907, p. 2.) attack on Ortynsky "in the name of the Pod-Carpathian priests and people," and requested that the "editors retract articles which insulted our bishop." (See Svoboda, September 26, 1907, p. 4.)

etc., until most of the faithful became involved in these
 20
 unfortunate proceedings.

2. Beginnings of His Episcopal Administration

Since the bishop's authority was not accepted by all the priests and under pressure from this opposition, Bishop Ortynsky called a convention of priests, and another of parish delegates, to introduce himself officially and to hear their thoughts concerning the organization of a diocese. The official notices, dated from South Fork September 28, 1907, invited the priests to convene on October 15-16 in St. George's Church in New York City and the parish delegates

²⁰The literature explaining the fight against Bishop Ortynsky continues to be polemic. In the Kalendar Sojedinenija, 1942, p. 47, for example, one may read that "...because of his Ukrainophil policy and latinization a 'struggle' began, which continued until his death in 1916..." The statement is an oversimplification of the problems involved. Rev. Stephen C. Gulovich, on the other hand, in his excellent article suggests that Bishop Ortynsky had two strikes against him before he set forth on any policy. "As for the Rusins," Gulovich writes, "Who by this time could boast of a commanding majority, Bishop Ortynsky was guilty of an 'unpardonable crime': he came of Ukrainian stock!" (See Gulovich, op. cit., p. 475). The Poslanie of January 11, 1908, referred to above, provides a clear picture of Bishop Ortynsky's interpretation of the struggle against him.

were to meet there on the succeeding two days.²¹ It was hoped that these steps would help nullify the major internal problems. The bishop's agenda for both Conventions illustrate the specific internal administrative problems faced by the new bishop.

1. Stabilization of boundaries for the existing parishes.
2. Organization of new parishes.
3. The security of priests in old age or in event of illness.
4. Division of all Churches into Deaneries.
5. Division of all parishes into classes.
6. Missionary priests and Chapels.
7. Parish schools and Ruthenian-American textbooks and Catechisms.
8. Schools for Cantors.
9. Normalization of salaries and religious ceremonies.
10. Home for orphans and the poor.
11. Sisters, and Wards for children.
12. Residence (bishop's), Cathedral, and a Ruthenian-American Seminary.
13. Election of a Committee for the preparation of:
 - a) a History of the Ruthenian Church in America.
 - b. Schematism (List of Churches, membership, organizations, etc.) for 1908.²²
14. The material security of the Ruthenian Bishop.

²¹The Bishop's official announcements appeared in Svoboda, October 2, 1907, p. 1, under the titles: "Do vidomesty vsim hr. -kat. sviashchenykh Spoluchenykh Derzhav Pivnichnoi Ameryky" and "Do vidomosty vsim Deliegatam hr.-kat hromad Tserkovnykh v Spoluchenykh Derzhavakh". The announcements also appeared in the Viestnik, October 3, 1907, p. 4.

²²Svoboda, October 2, 1907, p. 1.

Although there was some criticism that there was insufficient time to prepare for the gathering,²³ the Convention, attended by seventy-six priests,²⁴ did have beneficial results for the bishop in that it voted specific and favorable action on each of the topics on the agenda. For example, the Bishop's material position was improved when the Convention voted a five per-cent cathedraticum (brutto) for the support of the bishop. The administration of the Church was further centralized when the Convention voted to divide the territory of the United States into nine Deaneries, namely: Shenandoah, New York, Ansonia, Philadelphia, Wilkes-Barre, Pittsburgh, Boston, Chicago and Cleveland.²⁵

The bishop's announcement of the meeting of Parish Delegates included the following subject matter for the Conference.

²³Viestik, October 3, 1907, p. 4.

²⁴Official report of the Priests' Convention from the Bishop's Chancery, Svoboda, November 7, 1907, p. 3.

²⁵Ibid, The report, dated from Philadelphia on October 26, 1907, and signed by the bishop's secretary Rev. Vladimir Petrivsky, details the proceedings and decisions of the Convention.

1. Churches, registered and non-registered.
2. Religious education of children, their higher education, and a school scholarship fund.
3. The support of the Bishop.
4. Cathedral, residence (bishop's) and the Ruthenian-American Seminary.
5. Parish Schools.
6. Orphanage for the poor and crippled.
7. Sisters, and Wards for children.
8. Schools for Cantors.
9. The building of new churches with the approval of the Bishop only.
10. Unauthorized collections in the local parish for all sorts of purposes.
11. Slander in the newspapers.
12. Ruthenian Organizations.
13. The Rights of Citizenship.²⁶

As in the case of the priest's Convention, the gathering of the Parish Delegates²⁷ also had beneficial results for the bishop. For example, the delegates also voted for the five per-cent cathedraticum, and they recommended that all Ruthenian Churches be signed over to the jurisdiction of Bishop Ortynsky.²⁸ (It is interesting to note that the Delegates of this Convention went on record

²⁶The Bishop's official announcement, Ibid., October 3, 1907, p. 1.

²⁷The Parish Delegates Conference was actually held at Arlington Hall, St. Marks Place, New York City.

²⁸Official report of the Parish Delegates Convention from the Bishop's Chancery, dated from Philadelphia on October 26, 1907, Svoboda, November 7, 1907, p. 3.

with the recommendation that Ruthenians who did not intend to return to Europe should attempt to become American citizens.)

The practical application of these and other principles accepted by both Conventions was another matter, however, and the problems of jurisdiction continued to a lesser or greater degree throughout Bishop Ortynsky's episcopate.²⁹ At the beginning of 1908, there were about 120 Ruthenian churches in the United States, twenty-four of these (mostly Pod-Carpathian) were under the jurisdiction of Latin Bishops,³⁰ while the remainder, and about an equal number of priests, remained independent of the Latin bishops, but were willing to accept Ortynsky's jurisdiction.³¹ The juris-

²⁹The Bishop's official four page announcement to his priests, (Vsechestneishym oo. Dudhovnim do vedomosty i zaistosovania), of Oct. 1, 1912, clearly indicates, as an illustration, that all churches were not yet properly signed over to the Bishop, that many churches were not paying the cathedraticum, and that some priests were leaving or accepting parishes without the Bishop's approval.

³⁰Ortynsky's Poslaniie, January 11, 1908, p. 19-20.

³¹Ibid. p. 17. There were three types of Ruthenian churches in the United States, administratively speaking, at the time of Ortynsky's arrival: churches and priests under Latin bishops, independent churches and priests, and independent churches with priests under Latin bishops.

dictional problem thus actually became more complicated as some of the Ruthenian churches refused to recognize the authority of Bishop Ortynsky. Consequently a situation developed whereby within the territory of a particular Diocese Bishop Ortynsky had control of some of the Ruthenian Churches whereas the local Ordinary had jurisdiction over others. This situation resulted in a divided jurisdiction which often led to chaotic conditions.³² Under the circumstances it seemed certain that the legal transfer of all Ruthenian Church property to the jurisdiction of Bishop Ortynsky, which in itself was a complicated procedure, would relieve the mis-

³²A series of letters by the Bishop of Altoona to Bishop Ortynsky, for instance those dated May 4, 1908; July 5, 1908; September 10, 1908; and March 27, 1911, illustrate the jurisdictional difficulties faced by the two bishops and the amicable attempts to solve them. Conversely, a series of letters from the Bishop of Trenton to Bishop Ortynsky, for example those dated March 30, 1911; June 18, 1912; March 12, 1913; and March 24, 1913, as well as Bishop Ortynsky's draft (undated) in reply to the above mentioned letter of March 30, 1911, and his draft of March 19, 1913, in reply to the letter of March 12, 1913, referred to above, illustrate the extremely strained relations that sometimes developed as a result of the intolerable conditions of divided jurisdiction. The above letters, as well as those referred to in the following footnote, are in the Archives of the Byzantine Archdiocese of Philadelphia.

understandings arising out of the divided jurisdiction.³³ Despite the many serious obstacles confronting the bishop, Ortynsky commenced to bring order into the Byzantine Church in the United States by laying the groundwork for strong Diocesan organization.

At first the Bishop became the rector of the Holy Ghost Church at 1925 W. Passyunk Ave., in Philadelphia.³⁴ Next he chose the little church of St. Michael the Archangel at Ninth and Buttonwood Sts.,³⁵ which incidentally was much nearer to his residence at 1105 North 63rd Street. Finally,

³³The transfer of Ruthenian Church property from the corporation of a Latin Rite Bishop to a legal Corporation of Bishop Ortynsky was often a long drawn out process requiring the attention of the bishops involved, the Apostolic Delegate, and of course of legal counsels. In the case of the transfer of property located in the territory of the Trenton Diocese, Bishop Ortynsky's attorney corresponded frequently with the Bishop regarding the progress of the Bill of Incorporation for the Ruthenian Church in the State of New Jersey, as illustrated by his letters, dated between January 28, 1913 and May 8, 1914. Similarly the two Bishops involved in this transfer as well as the Apostolic Delegate corresponded with one another, sometimes in strong language, as shown by the letters of the Bishop of Trenton, dated February 27, 1913, and of Bishop Ortynsky, dated March 20, 1913 to the Apostolic Delegate, and by the letters of the Delegate to Bishop Ortynsky, dated May 2, 1913 and December 18, 1914.

³⁴The Official Catholic Directory, 1908, (Milwaukee: M. H. Wiltzius Co.), p. 153. From 1912 the Directory has been published in New York by the P. J. Kenedy & Sons. Hereafter cited as CD.

³⁵Ibid., 1909, p. 153.

late in 1908, Bishop Ortynsky bought an Episcopal Church in the 800 block of North Franklin Street which, after refitting, was consecrated as the Cathedral of the Immaculate Conception.³⁶ The adjoining building, at 816 North Franklin Street became the Bishop's permanent residence. Thus, Franklin Street was soon to become the center of the religious life of the Ruthenians in the United States as the town of Shenandoah was its original center in 1884-1885. The new cathedral was solemnly consecrated in elaborate services on October 2, 1910 by Metropolitan Sheptytsky and Bishop Ortynsky, assisted by 16 Ruthenian priests, and participated in by distinguished members of the Latin hierarchy and priesthood, about 50 other Ruthenian priests, other dignitaries, and great numbers of the faithful. In

³⁶See Propamiatna knyha Ukrainskoi katolytskoi katedry, 1942, (Phila: America Press, 1942), pp. 11-17, which contains several informative recollections by early immigrants concerning the organization of the first two Ruthenian churches in Philadelphia, their internal conflicts, and the establishment of the present Cathedral by Bishop Ortynsky. Pages 33-34 list the pastors and curates of the cathedral to 1942. Hereafter cited as Knyka Katedry. See also, Peter Isaiv, "Istoriya Katedralnoi Parokhii", Shliakh (Philadelphia), November 26, 1950, pp. 10-14, for a useful summary of the history of the Ukrainian Cathedral, written on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of its blessing. The entire Ukrainian section of this issue of the Diocesan newspaper is devoted to the history of the Cathedral.

its comprehensive account of the consecration ceremonies, The Catholic News reported that,

It was a sight never before seen in America in which a Greek Archbishop and Bishop, as consecrating prelates, as well as the Apostolic Delegate, Archbishop Diomede Falconio, Cardinal Vannutelli, Archbishop Ryan, Bishop Prendergast, and others took part. It was a mingling of the Greek Catholic and Roman Catholic hierarchy and priesthood in one solemn ceremony, such as has never before been witnessed in the United States.³⁷

The above report of the ceremonies also includes the following description of the interior of the new cathedral, especially of the Altar and its tabernacle, which the writer feels would interest the modern reader.

It is the only episcopal home of the Ruthenian Greek Catholics in America, and has been lavishly decorated with mural paintings by a fine Ruthenian artist. The Altar itself is of the Greek style, perfectly square and so arranged that the clergy can easily pass all around it in procession. The tabernacle, situated somewhat in the centre, is in the form of a miniature Greek church in the Byzantine style, whose domes and cupola were surmounted with tiny electric lights.³⁸

The Eucharistic Congress which was held in Montreal, Canada on September 6-12, 1910, provided Metropolitan Sheptytsky with the opportunity to visit the United States and to

³⁷The Catholic News (New York), October 22, 1910. p. 8. This is an extremely valuable report, almost the entire newspaper page, containing every conceivable detail connected with the Consecration ceremonies, including the names of many of the participating Latin and Ruthenian clergy, and other dignitaries. (Cardinal Vincenzo Vannutelli, incidentally was the Papal Legate to the Eucharistic Congress in Montreal.)

³⁸Ibid., p. 8

acquaint himself with the problems facing his friend Bishop Ortynsky. As previously indicated, Ortynsky was experiencing great difficulties at this time, particularly the strong opposition from many of the Pod-Carpathian clergy. According to Brother Joseph Grodsky, O.S.B.M. who accompanied the Metropolitan in his visit, Bishop Ortynsky himself, among others, requested that the Metropolitan come to America since he alone was considered able to solve the problems that seemed to defy solution.³⁹ Thus, on August 23, several weeks before the Eucharistic Congress was to meet, the Metropolitan arrived and was met at the Hoboken pier by a large delegation of the Ruthenian faithful and clergy, and by Bishop Ortynsky.⁴⁰ After a hotel reception and dinner in New York, the Metropolitan was escorted to St. George's Church where Moleben services were held by the Metropolitan, assisted by Bishop Ortynsky and other priests.

The Metropolitan's arrival was a joyous event for American Ruthenians. However, the hope that the great dignity of Sheptytsky would bring about an end to the opposi-

³⁹Grodsky, "Vidvidyny Ameryky Mytr. A. Sheptytskym v 1910 rotsi." Kalendar Provydinia, 1927, p. 104. This is a very valuable first hand report of the Metropolitan's visit to the United States and Canada by the Metropolitan's secretary who accompanied him on the entire four month tour.

⁴⁰The Metropolitan's arrival created a lively interest. See the report on Sheptytsky's arrival in the New York Times, August 24, 1910, p. 6.

tion to Bishop Ortynsky did not materialize. In an audience with the Metropolitan in Philadelphia on November 30th, 36 of the 46 Pod-Carpathian priests that had signed a petition voiced their strong dissatisfaction with Bishop Ortynsky, and requested that the Metropolitan aid them in obtaining their own bishop.⁴¹ Sheptytsky's reminder that he doubted if his attempts to obtain another Bishop for them would have serious influence in Rome, considering their treatment of Bishop Ortynsky, did not materially improve the relations between most of the Pod-Carpathian priests and the Bishop.⁴² Moreover, the Sojedenenije and its publication the Viestnik continued their attacks.

The Metropolitan made several official visitations to Ruthenian parishes in the East, such as Buffalo and Syracuse, before leaving with Bishop Ortynsky for the Eucharistic Congress in Montreal, where they represented the Ruthenian Church. Upon the completion of the Congress, Sheptytsky and Ortynsky visited Ruthenian parishes farther west like those in Chicago, Whiting, Indiana, Cleveland, Pittsburgh and

⁴¹Viestnik., December 15, 1910, p. 4.

⁴²Within the year, for example, on August 31, 1911, 46 priests, the vast majority of whom originated from Pod-Carpathia, signed a long complaint addressed to the Pope, which contained a bitter attack on Bishop Ortynsky. The letter is in the possession of Very Rev. John D. Taptich, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

McKeesport, Penna., before returning to Philadelphia.⁴³

After blessing the site of the proposed seminary in Yorktown, Virginia on October 4, the Metropolitan left the States returning to Canada where he remained until the end of November. In Canada, the Metropolitan continued his serious discussions with the Canadian bishops concerning the possibility of the appointment of a Byzantine bishop for the Canadian Ruthenians.⁴⁴

3. Organizational Accomplishments

The first major institution that Bishop Ortynsky established in the United States was an orphanage for the care of Ruthenian children. In 1911, partially with his own personal funds, the Bishop bought a building at 7th and Parrish Streets for that purpose and requested Metropolitan Sheptytsky's aid in obtaining the Sisters of St. Basil the Great to direct it. Mother Helen (Lanhevyeh) from the Convent in Yavoriv, Galicia, was the first to volunteer for this missionary work. Mother Helen, together with Sisters Euphemia and Paphutia and two candidates arrived in New

⁴³ Grodsky, Kalendar Provydinia, 1927, pp. 112-117.

⁴⁴ Metropolitan Sheptytsky's discussions proved fruitful for it was mainly on his recommendations that, on October 13, 1912, Pope Pius X nominated Rev. Nykyta Budka as the first Byzantine Rite Bishop in Canada, who, incidentally, received full episcopal jurisdiction.

York on December 2, 1911.⁴⁵ The need for more sisters soon became obvious and Mother Helen's request for additional sisters, through the Metropolitan, brought about the arrival, in November of 1912, of Sisters Apolinaria and Myrodora from the Convent in Yavoriv and Sister Makryna from the Convent in Slovitsky, both in Galicia. Mother Helen also accepted several candidates, thus with this extra force the work progressed so rapidly that in the fourth year of operation there were 121 children in St. Basil's orphanage.⁴⁶ To help support the sisters and the orphanage, the bishop founded a church supply store, a printing press, book store, and eventually a rug and carpet shop. It was hoped that these associated institutions would eventually become a source of permanent income and thus relieve the sisters from begging for their support and the support of the orphans as well as to reduce the Bishop's financial burden.⁴⁷ In 1912

⁴⁵ For a good summary of the history and accomplishments of the Sisters of St. Basil (from Galicia) in the United States, see America, September 28, 1961. The entire issue is dedicated to the Sisters of St. Basil on the occasion of their Fiftieth Anniversary in America.

⁴⁶ Eparkhialny Vistnyk, II (December 20, 1915), p. 10. This is the official Diocesan Bulletin for the clergy founded by Bishop Ortynsky in 1914. Hereafter cited as Visty.

⁴⁷ See Ibid., pp. 10-12, for a detailed list of the Orphanage properties, the yearly cost of operation, and the financial burden sustained by the Bishop since the founding of the Orphanage in 1911, through October 1915.

the Bishop bought a farm in Chesapeake, Maryland, where the small orphans spent their summer vacations.

The orphanage became an important source of future vocations to the priesthood. The older boys were soon removed from the tutelage of the sisters and moved to the Bishop's house and placed under the supervision of Rev. O. Kulmatytsky and Messrs. V. Semotiuk and J. Lysak.⁴⁸

Facetiously, Ortynsky liked to call this boys' orphanage his "minor seminary". From the very beginning the Bishop had realized the need for the establishment of a Seminary for the training of an American Ruthenian priesthood, as recommended, incidentally, in the Apostolic letter Ea Semper in 1907. In 1910 plans were formulated to build a Seminary in Yorktown, Virginia.⁵⁰ Apparently, however, the Bishop changed his plans, and considered establishing a Seminary in Washington, D. C., affiliated with Catholic University. Bishop Ortynsky even thought of gaining the financial support of the Hungarian Government for the pro-

⁴⁸Zachary Orun, "Misionarska shkola im. Sv. Apostola Pavla v Filadelfii", Kalendar Provydinia, 1918, p. 235. Father Orun was the Director of the boys from 1917 until his death in 1918.

⁴⁹ASS. XLI, 6.

⁵⁰In addition to the Seminary, an Orphanage, and a vocational school were to be erected at the Yorktown site. See Svoboda, August 18, 1910, p. 1.

ject. Count Tisza, the Hungarian Prime Minister, however, was strongly against the project, fearing that the Ruthenians from Hungary's Pod-Carpathia might thereby become estranged from their mother country. The Count wanted certain assurances from Ortynsky,⁵¹ commitments which the Bishop was not willing to make.⁵² These relations were interrupted by the First World War. Finally, the sudden death of Bishop Ortynsky in 1916 brought to an end the hope of establishing a Seminary in the immediate future.

While plans for a seminary were in progress, Bishop Ortynsky chose to send his seminarians to St. Mary's Seminary of the Sulpician Fathers in Baltimore to provide the highest training for his future priests. The candidates attended the Seminary's St. Charles College after which they continued Theology at St. Mary's, the Seminary proper. The director of the Ruthenian Seminarians at St. Mary's was the Ruthenian pastor of St. Michael the Archangel's Church in Baltimore. It was Ortynsky's wish that the pastor of the

⁵¹Letter to Bishop Ortynsky from the Imperial and Royal Austro-Hungarian Consulate in Philadelphia, No. 53, June 26, 1915. Cited by Willibald M. Ploechl, "The Slav-Byzantine Seminary in Washington, D. C." ECQ, VI (October-December, 1946), 490. Rev. Ploechl who was professor of Canon Law at Catholic University had first hand contact with the Ukrainian Seminary in Washington and its students who attended the University.

⁵²Draft of Bishop Ortynsky's reply to the Austro-Hungarian Consulate in Philadelphia. n.d. Cited by Ploechl, Ibid, p. 490.

Baltimore parish should be a priest who could direct the Seminar-⁵³ians in the spirit of the Byzantine Rite. The pastor would have to teach the Ruthenian students the history of the Ruthenian Church, the Church Slavonic language, rites, and church music. To this important task, the Bishop appointed Rev. Constantine Kuryllo.

Shortly after his arrival in the United States, Ortynsky saw the great need for cultural and educational organizations and publications to further the enlightenment of the generally uneducated Ruthenian immigrants. In the beginning, the Bishop took an active role in the work of the existing organizations, particularly in the friendly Soyuz. In 1908 the bishop was made the patron of the Soyuz. This show of good will, however, inadvertently led to a misunderstanding between the Soyuz and the Bishop. It seemed inappropriate for a Catholic Bishop to be the patron of an organization to which non-Catholics belonged. Thus the idea was born to change the Soyuz into an organization for Catholics only.⁵⁴ On the advice of the bishop's Consultors,

⁵³ Joseph Dzendzera, "Ukrainski Bohoslovy v Dukhovnim Semynary v Boltymor," Kalendar Provydinia, 1918, p. 237. Rev. Dzendzera was the Director of the Seminar-ians from 1917.

⁵⁴ Poniatishin, "Ukrainska Tserkva i U.N. Soyuz", Propamiatna Khyha Ukrainskoho Narodnoho Soyuzu, 1894-1934 (Jersey City: Ukrainian National Association, 1936), p. 290.

according to Rev. Poniatishin (one of the consultants) an attempt was made to change the Soyuz into an organization for Catholics during the eleventh Convention held in Cleveland on September 20-23, 1910.⁵⁵ These events created much trouble among the Galician Ruthenians and, incidentally, led to harsh literary polemics between the supporters of the bishop and of the Soyuz. Although the change was approved by the majority of the delegates, it was not put into effect due to legal technicalities, according to the organizations' officers.⁵⁶ Bishop Ortynsky was naturally displeased with the result; he left the Soyuz, and decided to form separate religious organizations. Consequently, several new religious organizations and publications were begun or supported by the bishop.

⁵⁵ Poniatishin, "Z moikh Spomyniv," Ukrantsi u Vilnonou Sviti: Iuvileina knyha Ukrainskoho Narodnoho Sozuza, 1894-1954 (Jersey City: Ukrainian National Association, n.d.), p. 35, Rev. Poniatishin was a Delegate to this Convention.

⁵⁶ Svoboda, November 10, 1910, p. 1., contains the official explanation by the officers of the Soyuz for not putting into effect the change in the name of the organization.

In 1912, Ortynsky founded one of his most successful organizations, a new purely Catholic beneficial association, the Provydinia (Providence). He was greatly aided in the organization by Rev. Nicholas Pidhorecky, of New York, and Rev. O. Ulitsky, from Jersey City, who did the spade work in bringing the organization to life by organizing local branches, first in New York, then in Newark, Jersey City, and Yonkers, and by Rev. Eronim Barysh from Pittsburgh, who wrote the first statutes which united the several branches into a single organization called the Providence Association. Important contributions to the formation of the Providence were also made by Revs. Peter Poniatishin, Roman Zalitach, O. Pavliak, Vladimir Dovich and others. Rev. Barysh became the new organization's first President; however, he became ill and was soon succeeded by Rev. Pidhorecky. The headquarters of the new organization remained in New York until 1914, when they were moved to Philadelphia, the residence of the Bishop. Several reasons prompted the move: it was felt that the organization's growth potential would be limited if it remained in New York, since all of the local branches in the vicinity were already brought into the organization; the State of Pennsylvania offered more favorable charter provisions; moving its headquarters to the city of the Bishop's domicile would give the organization added prestige; and the belief that without its own publication the growth of the association would

thereby also be limited.⁵⁷ The founding of its own paper was financially impossible. However, in Philadelphia, the Sisters of St. Basil the Great published, since 1914, the weekly paper America⁵⁸ which became the publicity agent of the association. From the time that the Providence moved to Philadelphia it began to pay part of the expenses for the publication of America, and in return the paper became its official organ.⁵⁹ Thus, the Providence Association was chartered by the State of Pennsylvania in 1914 with Bishop Ortynsky, M. K. Kullo, Joseph P. Loftus, and Revs. V. Stetsiuk and V. Derzyruka as the chartered organizers.⁶⁰ Until 1916 the Providence Association remained predominately localized, but the move to Philadelphia provided the impetus for expansion into a strong national organization, although it was still financially dependent on the Bishop.

⁵⁷Anton Tsurkovsky, "Desiatlitny yuvyley Provydina," Kalendar Provydina, 1924, p. 2 Tsurkovsky was editor of America from 1914 and later the Recording Secretary of the Providence Association.

⁵⁸The America was first published in 1912 at Hartford, and then in New Britain, Connecticut, by a press owned by Revs. R. Zalitach, Pavliak, Dohovych and others. For a summary of the history of this paper see the fifty-year jubilee edition of America, October 25, 1961.

⁵⁹Tsurkovsky, Kalendar Provydina, 1924, pp 8-9.

⁶⁰Ibid., p.4.

4. Creation of an Independent Diocese

Despite the important accomplishments of the Bishop there remained a major obstacle in his attempts to establish discipline and order amongst the Ruthenian Catholics. That obstacle was the lack of an independent Byzantine Rite Diocese which, practically speaking, meant that Bishop Ortynsky was hindered in his work amongst the Ruthenians because his powers of jurisdiction were incomplete. This situation was rectified by the decisions of the Holy See on May 28, 1913 when the Holy Father conferred upon Ortynsky full and ordinary jurisdiction over all the faithful and clergy of the Ruthenian discipline of the Byzantine Slavonic Rite in the United States.⁶¹ The American Ruthenians were thereby granted complete independence from the American Latin Hierarchy.⁶² Rev. Josphy F. X. Healy wrote in 1935 that the founding of the new diocese

⁶¹Letter of Apostolic Delegate, Archbishop Bonzano, dated August 25, 1913, notifying the American clergy of the Holy See's decision, AER, XLIX (October, 1913), 473-474.

⁶²On May 26, 1963, Metropolitan Ambrose Senyshyn opened the Fiftieth Jubilee Year, with a Mass of Thanksgiving in the Cathedral of the Immaculate Conception, honoring the fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the Philadelphia Byzantine Rite Diocese.

...was intended by the sovereign Pontiff as a mark of especial grace toward a people which, holding fast to the Roman allegiance despite terrific opposition, had built up a splendid ecclesiastical organization in a foreign land. It was designed also as the most expeditious means of forestalling complexities likely to rise through insufficient familiarity with the laws and customs of the Eastern Church.⁶³

According to official statistics, the newly created Byzantine Diocese, with its seat in Philadelphia,⁶⁴ contained 152 churches with resident priests, 43 missions, and a total of 154 priests serving an estimated 500,000 Ruthenian Catholics.⁶⁵ Although Ruthenian churches or missions were to be found in eighteen different states, 103 of them were concentrated in Pennsylvania. Nineteen congregations were listed in the State of New York, 13 in Ohio,⁶⁶ and 11 in New Jersey. None of the remaining 14 states in which Ruthenian churches are listed (Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri,

⁶³Healy, "Our Catholic Ruthenians," AER, XCIII (July, 1935), 79.

⁶⁴Philadelphia and its immediate vicinity contained five Ruthenian churches or chapels at this time. Besides the Cathedral of the Immaculate Conception on North Franklin Street, and the Holy Ghost parish at Passyunk Avenue, there were the chapels Michael's at 9th and Buttonwood, and S.S. Peter and Paul on Penn Street, Clifton Heights. (See CD. 1914, p. 819).

⁶⁵Ibid., pp. 823.

⁶⁶It is interesting to note that Cleveland was the only other city, beside Philadelphia, which contained five Ruthenian congregations at this time. All are listed incidentally, as parishes. (See Ibid., p. 823.)

New Hampshire, North Dakota, Rhode Island, West Virginia, and Wisconsin), had more than five congregations within their borders.⁶⁷ The new diocese was divided into the following eleven deaneries, the location of which provide additional indication of the importance of Pennsylvania in the early history of the Ruthenian Church in the United States.

<u>Deanery</u>	<u>Dean</u>
Boston	Rev. Stephen Vashchyshyn
Chicago	Rev. Valentine Balogh
Cleveland, Ohio	Rev. Demetrius Dobrotvor
Homestead, Pennsylvania	Very Rev. Alexander Holoshnay
New York	Very Rev. Nicholas Pidhorecky
Philadelphia	Very Rev. Augustine Komporday
Pittsburgh	Very Rev. Vladimir Dovichovich
Scranton	Very Rev. Michael Jackovich
Shenandoah	Rev. Leo Levitsky
South Fork, Pennsylvania	Rev. Elias Goidics
Syracuse	Rev. Alexander Prystay ⁶⁸

The Bishop appointed Very Rev. Alexander Dzubay as his Vicar General, and named the Very Revs. Valentine Gorzo, Nicholas Pidhorecky, Victor Mirossay, Peter Ponia-tishin, Nicholas Chohey, and Vladimir Dovichovich as the Diocesan Consultors.⁶⁹ Other leading officials named to the various curias of the new diocese were Very Revs. John Konstankevich, Joseph Hanulya, Alexander Ulitsky, Alexander Holoshnay, Michael Jackovich, Joseph Chaplinsky, Augustine

⁶⁷Ibid., pp. 818-823.

⁶⁸Ibid., p. 823.

⁶⁹Visty, I (April 28, 1914), 1.

Komporday, Nicholas Strutynsky, and Philemon Tarnavsky.⁷⁰

The formal installation of the various officials of the new diocese were held at the Cathedral of the Immaculate Conception on March 26, 1914.⁷¹

After receiving his full ordinary powers Bishop Ortynsky prepared to make his episcopal visit to Rome. Before his departure the Bishop named the Vicar General as the administrator of the diocese in his absence, and the Very Rev. consultor, Augustine Komporday, as the Chancellor.⁷²

On June 2, 1914, the Bishop left for Europe, with Rev. Vladimir Derzeruka accompanying him as his secretary.⁷³

During the Bishop's sojourn in Europe the First World War suddenly erupted, consequently the Bishop was forced to cut short his visit. The Bishop returned to the United States in August, the same month that the details of the new relationship between the Latin Catholics and the

⁷⁰CD., 1914, p. 819

⁷¹Visty, I (April 28, 1914), p. 1. Pages 1-3 contain a detailed list of the officials of the new diocese.

⁷²Ibid., I (May 22, 1914), p. 1.

⁷³Shortly before Ortynsky left for Rome the Pod-Carpathian priests had again requested that Ortynsky aid them to obtain a bishop from Pod-Carpathia.

Ruthenians were clarified. These relations were spelled out by the Apostolic Constitution Cum Episcopo,⁷⁴ dated August 17, 1914, and which was to remain in effect for ten years. Although this decree has since been superceded, many of its basic regulations remain effective to the present day. The new regulations contained in 'Cum Episcopo' made a serious effort to bring to an end the practical difficulties which often led to jurisdictional differences between the Latin and the Byzantine Rites by clarifying the issues involved. For example: The Ruthenians were prohibited from changing their Rite without the permission of the Sacred Congregation of the Propagation of Faith for Oriental Rites;⁷⁵ the children of families of mixed rites automatically belong to the rite of the father;⁷⁶ and baptism by another rite did not change the status of the baptized person.⁷⁷ Obviously, these and other specific regulations were at least partially intended to safeguard the Byzantine Ruthenian minority from being overwhelmed by the Latin Character of American Catholicism. Understandably, the new regulations did not

⁷⁴Acta Apostolicae sedis, (Rome, 1914), VI., 458-463, or AER, LI (November, 1914), 586-592. Acta Apostolicae sedis hereafter cited as APS.

⁷⁵APS., VI, 462.

⁷⁶Ibid., p. 463.

⁷⁷Ibid., p. 463.

automatically bring to an end all the jurisdictional difficulties between the Latin and the Ruthenian Catholics in the United States. They did, however, lay down the legal basis for an equitable solving of the complex relations between the Rites. Thus, the first Papal Constitution for the Ruthenians in the United States, Ea Semper, issued by Pope Pius X in 1907 on the occasion of the appointment of the first Byzantine Rite Bishop, and which had evoked general disappointment from the Ruthenians, was now superseded by a new constitution, Cum Episcopo, on the occasion of the creation of an independent Byzantine Rite Missionary Diocese in 1913.

Like its predecessor, the new constitution did not meet with universal approval. The establishment of an independent Byzantine diocese meant an obvious improvement in the relations with the Latin hierarchy. However, some writers, such as Foraneus, continued to voice strong dissatisfaction with the autonomy accorded to the Ruthenians.⁷⁸ Their arguments, mostly relative to the superiority of the Latin Rite, usually created resentment and fear on the part of the Ruthenian minority, of the dominant Latin Catholicism, even though most of those arguments can be dissolved

⁷⁸ Foraneus, "Some Thought on the Ruthenian Question in the United States and Canada", AER, LII (January, 1915), 42-50, also "The Ruthenian Question Again", AER, LII (June, 1915), 645-653.

by a single sentence from a well-known writer on the Eastern Churches. "The prevailing Latin uniformity of today is simply the result of historical events: it might just as well have been Greek; in another two thousand years it may be Chinese."⁷⁹ Nevertheless, the strong views of Foraneus, as well as of other writers, helped to continue and even to spread misunderstanding between the Latin and Ruthenian Catholics in the United States long after the publication of Cum Episcopo.

The misunderstandings between the Latin hierarchy and the Ruthenians was an important factor in the schism of many Ruthenians into Orthodoxy since the 1890's. With the arrival of Bishop Ortynsky in 1907 the spread of internal conflicts as well as the intense Orthodox proselytizing amongst the Ruthenians increased the number of Ruthenian Catholics seceding to the Russian Orthodox Church. The struggle with the Russian Orthodox, particularly over the attempts to appropriate Ruthenian Catholic Churches, took the most serious proportions, even involving the use of excommunication⁸⁰ and court suits.⁸¹ The secession move-

⁷⁹ Attwater, op. cit., p. 19.

⁸⁰ Svoboda, October 10, 1907, p. 1.

⁸¹ Ibid., April 21, 1910, pp. 2,3,6, continued in subsequent issues.

ment reached its apogee in 1916 when the Russian Holy Synod decided to consecrate the Very Rev. Alexander Dzubay as the first dissident bishop. Rev. Dzubay had seceded shortly after Bishop Ortynsky's death and on August 19, 1916 was consecrated Bishop of Pittsburgh by the Russian Orthodox Metropolitan, Prince Evdokim Meschersky, in St. Nickolas Russian Cathedral in New York City.⁸²

The importance of the Ruthenians in the growth of the Russian Orthodox Church in America is not to be overlooked. According to Russian Orthodox sources, in 1914, shortly after Bishop Ortynsky received his full ordinary powers over the Ruthenian Catholics in the United States, 43,000 Ruthenians from Galicia, Hungary, and Bukovina were registered members of the Russian Orthodox Church in America, which had a total membership of 100,000.⁸³ Virtually all of the 43,000 from Austria-Hungary were former Ruthenian Catholics who passed into Orthodoxy because of the quarrels with the Latin hierarchy or with Bishop Ortynsky (or other internal conflicts) and the increased propagandizing activities of the Russian Orthodox Church. Archbishop Evdokim, for example, taking advantage of the serious differences between Bishop Ortynsky and many of the Pod-Carpathian priests sent a

⁸²See below, ch. 3. pp. 99-100.

⁸³Pravoslavni Russko-Amerikaskii Kalendar, 1915, (New York; Svet, 1914), p. 119.

letter to the Viestnyk, which was leading the fight against Ortynsky, in which he attempted to lure the Pod-Carpathian people into Russian Orthodoxy.⁸⁴

5. War Developments and Ortynsky's Death

With the outbreak of the First World War, for the first time the Ruthenians in the United States found themselves in a position of leadership in the affairs of the Ruthenian people as a whole. Bishop Ortynsky, for instance, was of the opinion that the American-Ruthenians must take the lead in the affairs of the Ruthenian people, at least until that time when those in their native lands could act in their own behalf.⁸⁵ Consequently, he activated a general collection of funds to aid the victims of the war, and he was primarily responsible for the organization of the Ruthenian National Rada (council) at a gathering of delegates from Galician and Pod-Carpathian parishes held on December 8, 1914, in Philadelphia. The Council was to coordinate the efforts of all the Ruthenian Catholic organizations in behalf

⁸⁴ Archbishop Evdokim's letter, dated February 24, 1916, appeared in the Viestnik on July 28, 1916, pp. 4-5., four months after Ortynsky's death. The letter is also cited in Svoboda, August 8, 1916, p. 3.

⁸⁵ Bishop Ortynsky's pastoral letter dated October 8, 1914, cited by Sochockyj, Ukrainska Mytropolia, p. 226.

of their people in Europe who were suffering because of the war.⁸⁶

Thus, as a result of the events taking place in the European lands of their origin during the First World War the first impetus was provided for the founding of national political organizations amongst the American-Ruthenians. Particularly was this in evidence with those originating from Galicia which, ever since the middle of the 19th century, had been a piedmont of Ukrainian national revival. It was in 1914, for instance, that the leading organization of American Ruthenians from Galicia, the Ruthenian National Association (Soyuz), officially changed its name to the present Ukrainian National Association. Even the least politically conscious American Galicians now embraced the national name "Ukrainian" in place of the old name "Ruthenian," by which they were commonly known.⁸⁷

⁸⁶Thousands of dollars, as well as quantities of medical supplies, and gift packages were sent to help reduce the plight of Ruthenian war victims. See, for instance, the Bishop's notices in Visty, II (May 24, 1915), 3, Ibid., III, (March 8, 1916), 9-10.

⁸⁷The growing Ukrainian national consciousness amongst the American Ruthenians from Austrian Galicia was part of the reason for the opposition to Bishop Ortynsky by Ruthenians from Hungary's Pod-Carpathia.

The hard work, the endless difficulties and fights against him, strained the Bishop's nerves and undermined his health. On March 16, 1916, Bishop Ortynsky became ill with pneumonia, for the fourth time, and passed to his eternal reward eight days later. The immediate area surrounding the Bishop's cathedral and residence on North Franklin Street in Philadelphia, the quadrangel formed by Brown, Seventh, Parish and Eighth Streets, was deeply saddened. Here were located the Sisters of St. Basil's Convent, the Orphange, the Orphanage press, the Providence Association, the newspaper America, and the homes housing many of the people having direct relations with these and other institutions founded or supported by the Bishop.

On March 30th the final funeral services were held at the Immaculate Conception Cathedral in the presence of the Apostolic Delegate, Archbishop Prendergast of Philadelphia, three Bishops, Monsignori, numerous clergy, and other honored guests, with an estimated 10,000 to 15,000 people jamming Franklin Street outside the Cathedral for a glimpse of the funeral ceremonies.⁸⁸ There were numerous Ruthenian

⁸⁸ Svoboda, April 1, 1916, p. 2, Also America, April 3, 1916, p. 2. A very interesting little pamphlet entitled Zhytie, smert i pokhorony S.S. Ortynskoho, (Scranton, Pa: Narodna Volia, 1916), p. 8 (unnumbered), indicated that in addition to the Ruthenian and the Latin Rite clergy and a Syro-Maronite (Antiochene Rite) bishop, there were also Presbyterian, Methodist, and Episcopalian ministers, a Jewish Rabbi, and a Orthodox priest present at the funeral. (p. 12). The pamphlet contains some excellent photographs of the funeral procession and the great throngs outside the Cathedral.

organizations represented, including Zhoda Bratstv from Olyphant and Sojedinenije from Munhall, Pa. Bishop Nykyta, Budka, the Ruthenian Bishop from Canada, whom many thought would succeed Bishop Ortynsky, was to have been the celebrant of the Requiem Mass. In his absence, however, Very Rev. Alexander Dzubay, the Vicar General, was the celebrant with Revs. Levitsky and Chorniak serving as the deacons. Eulogies were preached by Rev. Joseph Chaplinsky, former superior of the Bishop; Rev. Valentine Gorzo, a Pod-Carpathian priest; Monsignor Michael J. Lavelle representative of the Archbishop of New York, who had, incidentally, welcomed Bishop Ortynsky on his arrival in the United States in 1907; and Rev. Nicholas Pidkorecky, who thanked the gathering for their participation in the funeral rites.⁸⁹

Following the Mass and the final procession, the Bishop's remains were laid to rest under the side altar of St. Josephat in the Cathedral of the Immaculate Conception.

The more important accomplishments of Bishop Ortynsky have been reviewed. It should be added that, in spite of the almost constant internal opposition and the strong Orthodox and Russophile propaganda against him the Bishop succeeded in bringing about greater discipline within the Ruthenian Church, and a great increase in the number of churches and priests under his jurisdiction, from about 120

⁸⁹ Svoboda, April 1, 1916, p. 2., Also America, April 3, 1916, p. 2.

churches and priests in 1908⁹⁰ to 152 churches with resident priests (in addition to many missions) and 161 priests in 1916.⁹¹ In short, a strong foundation had been erected upon which Ortynsky's successor could continue to build.

Upon Bishop Ortynsky's death, the Apostolic Delegate, Archbishop Bonzano, telegraphed for instructions concerning the steps to be taken relative to the naming of an administrator of the Diocese. The action taken changed the administrative character of the Ruthenian Church in the United States and laid the foundations for the creation of separate dioceses for the people originating from Austria and those whose origin was Hungary.

⁹⁰See above, ch. 2. p. 64.

⁹¹CD., 1916, p. 789.

CHAPTER III

ADMINISTRATION OF REV. PONIATISHIN

1. The new Administration and its struggle with Russian Orthodoxy.

Following the death of Bishop Ortynsky the Apostolic delegate, the Most Reverend John Bonzano, proposed that the Diocesan consultors choose two candidates for diocesan administrators, one candidate for the Ukrainians and others from Galicia and the second for the Pod-Carpathian Rusins and others from Hungary. The Ukrainian members of the diocesan consistory at the time were: Very Revs. Peter Poniatishin, Nicholas Pidhorecky, Vladimir Dovhovich, and Alexander Ulitsky. The Pod-Carpathian members were: Very Revs. Alexander Dzubay, Vicar General of the diocese; Valentine Balogh, Chancellor of the Diocese; Valentine Gorzo, Nicholas Chohey, and Victor Mirossay.¹ The Pod-Carpathian consultors chose Rev. Gabriel Martyak, pastor from Lansford, Pennsylvania, as their candidate, whereas the Ukrainian consultors elected Rev. Peter Poniatishin, pastor in Newark, New Jersey.

On April 11, 1916, Revs. Martyak, Poniatishin and V. Balogh, the chancellor, met with the apostolic delegate

¹CD., 1916, p. 782.

in Washington, D. C. who advised them that the Holy See had appointed for the Ruthenian Church in the United States two administrators, although, the diocese was to remain one. It was obvious that the creation of two separate diocesan administrations was a move on the part of the Papacy to help satisfy the wishes of the Pod-Carpathian priests who for many years had been dissatisfied with a bishop of Ukrainian stock and had often requested for their own bishop. Each administrator received episcopal jurisdiction, with the exception that neither had the privilege of ordaining candidates to the priesthood nor the privilege of blessing Holy Oils. Rev. Poniathishin's jurisdiction was over the Faithful who originated in Galicia, whereas Rev. Martyak's powers extended over those who originated from Hungary.² In mixed parishes of Ukrainians and Pod-Carpathians the two administrators were to agree between themselves regarding the appointment of pastors and other matters of parish administration. In the event that the administrators could not agree, then the Apostolic Delegate was to make the decision.

²Incidentally, nine Magyar Congragations later associated themselves with Rev. Poniatishin's Administration. Since Poniathishin did not speak Hungarian, he administered them by appointing as their Dean Rev. Victor Kovalytsky, the Hungarian priest from Perth Amboy, New Jersey, who spoke both Ukrainian and Hungarian. (See Father Poniatishin's "Iz chasiv administratsii Eparkhii", Almanakh Tserkvy, p. 111). Rev. Poniatishin's various recollections are extremely valuable to the history of the Ukrainian church in the next eight and one half years. We will frequently rely on them in this chapter which deals exclusively with the administration of Father Poniatishin.

The Apostolic Delegate instructed the administrators to remain in their present parishes, for it was unknown how long the administrations would continue. From the conversation with the delegate it could be construed that it would not be long before the appointment of a new Bishop.³ The two new Administrators instructed the clergy to continue to refer all administrative matters to the diocesan chancery at 818 North Franklin Street, where Rev. Michael Guryansky, appointed secretary of the Diocese by Bishop Ortynsky before his death, would continue his duties.⁴ The seemingly temporary administrations lasted eight years and five months, finally ending with the arrival of new bishops in August of 1924.

With the appointment of two administrators and the creation of two separate ecclesiastic administrations for the Ruthenian church in 1916, the attention of our history will turn specifically to the further developments within that half of the diocese under the administration of Very Rev. Poniatishin, whose jurisdiction applied to American Ukrainians originating from Austrian Galicia. It was from this administrative half of the Ruthenian diocese that the Papacy, in 1958, created the Byzantine Rite Ecclesiastical Province of Philadelphia. That half of the diocese which was administered by Rev. Martyak, whose jurisdiction in-

³Ibid., p. 111.

⁴Visty., III (May 17, 1916), p. 4.

cluded the American Rusins, and others, originating from Hungary, developed into the Byzantine Rite Diocese of Pittsburgh. Consequently, the history of the administration of Rev. Martyak as well as of the later Pittsburgh diocese is outside the scope of this particular study since the Byzantine Province is composed only of the Ukrainian dioceses. Thus beginning with this chapter, the terms "Ukrainian" and "Ukrainian Church" will be frequently employed since these national terms are useful synonyms.

The administrator for the American Ukrainian Catholics, Very Rev. Peter Poniatisin was born in Galicia on July 15, 1877. After finishing his secondary education in Tarnopol, he entered the Seminary in Lviv where he completed his studies in Philosophy. He continued his studies in Theology in Innsbruck, Freiburg, and later in Paris, (where he worked on additional research for four and a half months). He was ordained to the priesthood by Metropolitan Sheptytsky in Lviv on July 11, 1902. Father Poniatisin arrived in the United States in 1903 and served as pastor in Ramey, Pennsylvania, until 1907. For three years he was pastor in Elizabeth, New Jersey, until he was transferred to Newark, New Jersey in 1910. In addition, Rev. Poniatisin was very active in the affairs of the American Ukrainians, contributing articles and serving in editorial and directorial capacities of a newspaper and journal. As prev-

iously cited, he became a diocesan consultor under Bishop Ortynsky.⁵

The major problems facing the new administration of Father Poniatishin were, in many ways, those with which Bishop Ortynsky was greatly concerned. The official report of the Convention of the Ukrainian priests which was held on October 10, 1916, in New York lists the problems of schism, the Seminary, schools, orphanage, and people's politics, as the major topics discussed.⁶ The convention unanimously accepted the following resolutions:

1. To organize a Missionary Association under the patronage of Sts. Peter and Paul to defend our Church against our enemies.
2. To create a School Commission.
3. To publicize the need of a Seminary.
4. To make a collection each month in all parishes for the Orphanage. In addition each priest to contribute \$3.00 each month.
5. Whereas, the present political situation demands the unified efforts of all the people in a dignified and conscientious work, and since the Federation of Ukrainians in the United States is leading a narrow partisan policy, harmful to the Church and the people, the General Convention of Ukrainian priests decided to organize the Ukrainian Rada in America.⁷

⁵Svoboda, April 15, 1916, p. 2. contains a good biographical sketch of its former director and the newly appointed Dicesan Administrator.

⁶Ibid., October 24, 1916, p. 2.

⁷Ibid., p. 2.

In addition, the Convention also voted several requests, for instance, a plea to petition the Papacy through the Apostolic Delegate for an early nomination of a bishop, and a proposal to contribute \$1.00 a month to the administration for the support of ailing priests.⁸

According to Rev. Poniatishin himself, the most serious concern of the Ukrainian Church at this time, as it had been since the 1890's, was the very active Russian Orthodox Mission,⁹ which through the material aid of the Russian Holy Synod in St. Petersburg, now stood on firm ground in the United States. According to the census of religious bodies in the United States, prior to the fall of the Tsarist regime in 1917, the Holy Synod of Russia spent \$77,850 annually from the Tsar's Treasury for the support of the Russian Orthodox Mission in America.¹⁰ The Mission's

⁸Ibid., p. 2.

⁹Poniatishin, "Spohad iz chasiv syrytstva Ukr. Kat. Eparkhil v Amerytsi", Knyha Katedry, p. 46.

¹⁰U.S. Bureau of the Census, Religious Bodies: 1926, II (1929), 514. Incidentally, this official government report, which presents 213 different denominations in the United States, fails to list the relatively numerous Byzantine Rite Catholic Churches under any category whatsoever. The only reference to their existence that this writer found in the voluminous report was on pp. 512-513 where the point is made that in the more recent immigration, large numbers have come to the Russian Orthodox Church from the old Austria-Hungary, "who belonged to what are known as the Uniat churches."

activities were directed primarily in the direction of the Ruthenian Catholics from Austria-Hungary.

After the death of Bishop Ortynsky, the activities of the Russian Mission among the Ruthenian Catholics were increased. Consequently, the conduct of the Russian missionaries helped to decide the program of Poniatishin's administration which, according to Rev. Poniatishin himself, was "to defend our church by all means before Russian inroads amongst our people."¹¹

As an illustration of the seriousness and the character of the struggle with the Russian missionaries, the Administrator points to the case in Butler, Pennsylvania, where the Russian Mission attempted to take control of a Ukrainian Catholic Church by appointing an Orthodox priest as Pastor when a vacancy occurred. To remove the Orthodox priest from their church the Ukrainian Catholics appealed to the courts where the litigations continued for over two years finally ending in a victory for the Ukrainian Catholics.¹² That court decision helped to deter further overt attempts to usurp Ukrainian Catholic Churches. In addition, after the Russian Revolution broke out in March of 1917, Russian Orthodoxy in the United States became greatly weakened internally for lack of financial aid from St. Petersburg,

¹¹Poniatishin, Almanakh Tserkvy, p. 111.

¹²Ibid., p. 111.

consequently it stopped being as serious a problem to the Ukrainian Church as it had been before.¹³ At the same time, Rev. Poniatishin's success in obtaining an amendment to the religious corporation law in the State of New York relative to the incorporation of Ruthenian Catholic churches, which became law on May 3, 1917,¹⁴ was a major step in protecting church property from usurpation in that State. Incidentally, the Latin bishops were very sympathetic and helpful to Father Poniatishin in the passage of the law, particularly Bishop Thomas F. Kusack of Albany and Bishop Thomas F. Hickey of Rochester.¹⁵

It appeared that the Ukrainian Catholic Church would now grow and develop without any serious hindrances. That was not the case, however, for in addition to the weakened Russian Orthodox activity amongst the American Ukrainian Catholics there now began a Ukrainian Orthodox movement.¹⁶

¹³Ibid., p. 111.

¹⁴New York, Laws of New York (1917), II, c. 353, pp. 1155-1159.

¹⁵Poniatishin, Almanakh Tserkvy, p. 111.

¹⁶The problem of secession to Orthodoxy also led to bitter conflicts amongst the Pod-Carpathians at this time. See for example, Viestnik, August 3, 10, and 17, 1916, p. 1.

An important contributor to the development and the spread of the movement was the Pod-Carpathian priest Very Rev. Alexander Dzubay who, apparently dissatisfied that he did not become one of the administrators of the Diocese,¹⁷ allowed himself to be consecrated an Orthodox bishop in August 1916.¹⁸ As bishop, Dzubay ordained numerous priests with doubtful qualifications. These events helped to demoralize the Ukrainian Catholic cantors¹⁹ many of whom now turned to Bishop Dzubay as a means of attaining the priesthood without satisfying the usual prerequisites of that position. These new Orthodox priests in turn tried to

¹⁷Poniatishin, Almanakh Tserkvy, p. 111.

¹⁸Father Dzubay was also known by the name of Stephen, however, official sources like the diocesan Visty and also the Catholic Directory use the name Alexander. For useful background on Father Dzubay becoming an Orthodox Bishop see America, August 11, 12, 16, 19, and 24, 1916, p.2. Later Dzubay repented and returned to the Catholic Church, living in seclusion in St. Paul's Friary, Graymoor, New York.

¹⁹The term "cantor" needs additional explanation for the reader not familiar with the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite. A cantor is a layman trained to lead the congregation in responses to the priests prayers in the Liturgy and in other religious services. In the Byzantine Rite the responses are often involved, consequently, whenever possible each parish hires a cantor who, because of his training and position in the parish, often has considerable influence among the parishioners.

gain the support of their Ukrainian Catholic friends as a means of gaining for themselves the parishes to which their friends belonged.²⁰ Father Poniatishin was forced to publish letters in certain localities to warn the people against these machinations,²¹ and he made personal visits to distant colonies of Ukrainian Catholics to prevent their falling unwittingly into Orthodoxy.²²

As a result of the above developments Poniatishin began to organize new parishes, even in those areas where there were only a small number of Ukrainian Catholic families. Not to do this, he felt, would run the risk of having those families organized into Orthodox congregations by the newly ordained former cantors. Thus, during Poniatishin's administration 24 such small parishes were organized.²³ The Administrator's zeal for organizing new parishes to help preserve the faith of the isolated Ukrainian families and to protect them from new Bolshevik propa-

²⁰Poniatishin, Almanakh Tserkvy, p. 112.

²¹See, e.g., Poniatishin's letter dated September 30, 1916, published in Catholic News, October 7, 1916, and reproduced in Svoboda, October 28, 1916, p. 3.

²²Poniatishin, Knyha Katedry, pp. 48-49.

²³Poniatishin, Almanakh Tserkvy, 1934, p. 112.

ganda did not diminish with the years.²⁴ In order to insure that all these small congregations would receive the frequent services of a Catholic priest, Poniatishin formed a "Missionary Fund" in 1922 from which the priests serving such small parishes might receive necessary support, and from which funds might be available to defend existing churches, by court procedures if necessary. (A few of their churches, according to Poniatishin, still remained in Orthodox hands.)²⁵ Rev. Vladimir Lotowycz from Brooklyn, whom Poniatishin appointed as treasurer of the Missionary Fund Committee, was a great aid to the Administrator in putting his plan into effect.

²⁴In his letter of September 15, 1922, to the pastor in Altoona, Poniatishin suggests that the priest organize a parish in Uniontown, Pa., which is located over 100 miles southwest of Altoona. In another letter dated March 12, 1923, to the same priest, then in New Kensington, Pa., Poniatishin suggests that he hold services in neighboring Vandergrift and Leechburg. In Leechburg, according to Poniatishin's information, there were 50 Ukrainian families which had completely fallen under Bolshevik influence and who would possibly return to their faith with the help of a priest. The above letters, as well as the letter referred to in the following footnote, are in the possession of the writer.

²⁵Official form letter from Poniatishin to the priests under his administration, dated December 5, 1923, announcing the "Missionary Fund" regulations.

2. Educational, Financial, and other concerns.

It must be kept in mind that during the entire administration of Father Poniatishin there was a great shortage of priests, and the added responsibility of the newly organized parishes made the situation even more serious. As a result of the great War, and finally due to the direct American participation in that conflict, there was no longer any possibility of getting new priests from Europe, for "all ties with the dioceses of origin in Austro-Hungary were broken."²⁶ Thus, the second major concern of Poniatishin was educational in nature. The late Bishop's statement that "the future of our Ruthenian people and Church in America lies in the school"²⁷ was now starkly real. With priests no longer arriving from Europe, the problem of educating future priests became more important than ever.

The Ruthenian Seminarians were trained at St. Mary's Seminary in Baltimore since the arrival of the late Bishop. The total number of seminarians (Ukrainians and Rusins combined) in 1917 was ten. Of that number, according to their Spiritual Director, Rev. Joseph Dzendzera, only John Kolcun, George Chegin, and Yaroslav Skrotsky were studying

²⁶ Temporary Diocesan Statutes of the Byzantine Rite Apostolic Exarchy of Philadelphia, (Philadelphia: Bishop's Chancery, 1953), I. 9.

²⁷ Visty, I (October 8, 1914), 2.

theology, whereas John Taptich, Roman Kachmarsky, Stephen Sklepovich, John Hundiak, George Simchak, John Zavala, and Michael Morris were still in the philosophy curriculum. In addition there were six candidates at the seminary's St. Charles College: Joseph Fetsko, Theodore Volkay, Nicholas Voloshuk, Andrew Rudakevich, John Loya, and Michael Rapach.²⁸

Early in 1918, Father Poniatishin seriously considered buying property in South Orange, New Jersey, for the establishment of a Diocesan Seminary affiliated with Seton Hall College.²⁹ However, according to church regulations the diocesan Administrator cannot introduce any new policies. His administration is merely a transitional one. Consequently, after discussing the matter with the Apostolic Delegate it was decided that it would be wiser to wait until a new bishop was appointed.³⁰ The matter was further complicated by the fact that the diocese was administered by two administrators and it was impossible to know whether in the future the diocese would be united or

²⁸Dzendzera, op. cit., p. 237.

²⁹See, e. g., Msgr. James Mooney's letter from Seton Hall College to Father Poniatishin, dated April 5, 1918, and also Poniatishin's undated draft to Msgr. Mooney in reply to the above letter. Both letters are in the Archives of the Byzantine Archdiocese of Philadelphia.

³⁰Poniatishin, Almanakh Tserkvy, pp. 113-114.

split in two.

From time to time the few seminarians who completed their theological studies at St. Mary's in Baltimore, or at other seminaries, were ordained to the priesthood by the Most Rev. Nykyta Budka, the Ukrainian bishop in Canada. Due to the extreme shortage of priests Fr. Poniatishin also accepted into the diocese several former Orthodox priests.³¹ Despite these difficulties not a single church was lost during the entire time according to Father Poniatishin, and as already stated, twenty-four new churches were organized during the same period.³²

The chief source of vocations for the priesthood was the so-called "minor seminary" which Bishop Ortynsky founded for the older orphanage boys. After Bishop Ortynsky's death, Rev. Max Kinash, the pastor of the Cathedral, was forced to request additional aid from Rev. Poniatishin for the upkeep of the "minor seminary." Finally in October 1916, at the suggestion of Rev. Zachary Orun, the Ukrainian priests formed an Association of Sts. Peter and Paul which was, among other things, to concern itself with these minor seminarians. Thus from September 1917, all responsibility for the boys in the newly styled St. Paul's Boys' Missionary Institute passed to the priests' association and to a parallel association of

³¹Ibid., p. 112.

³²Ibid., p. 112.

laymen interested in aiding the missionary school.³³ The boys attended St. Peter's school or St. Joseph's High School in Philadelphia. All except three of the twenty-seven students in this "minor seminary" were orphans.³⁴

Father Poniatishin was also greatly concerned with the status of the parish evening schools in the Diocese. With the exception of Philadelphia, where the school was conducted by the Sisters of St. Basil the Great, all the Parish schools were directed by the Cantors. Considering the demoralization caused by the activities of the dissident Bishop Dzubay, Poniatishin gladly backed the Cantors interest in revitalizing the Association of Cantors, which was originally organized in 1914.³⁵ Among the goals of the Association were such objectives as a unified system of schools, school supervision, proper texts, qualified candidates for Cantors, and Cantors' conferences.³⁶ Obviously,

³³Orun, op. cit., p. 236.

³⁴Ibid., p. 236.

³⁵Visty., I (October 8, 1914), 4.

³⁶Poniatishin, Knyha Katedry, p. 49.

such ideals, if put into practice, would naturally lead to improved parish schools.

A third major problem, according to the administrator, was the jumbled financial situation at the Cathedral in Philadelphia.³⁷ Bishop Ortynsky had decided to organize a Ukrainian Bank in Philadelphia (chartered by the State on May 12, 1915),³⁸ and savings of the parishioners were accepted. Some of the money was invested in the buildings surrounding the Cathedral. When the Bishop died the depositors virtually made a run on the bank. Naturally there were insufficient funds on hand to satisfy all the depositors. However, the buildings could not be sold because according to the Bishop's will the properties were to pass to his successor the new bishop. Thus Father Poniatishin, although administrator of the diocese, could not sell the diocesan property to repay the depositors who demanded their money. In the end there was no alternative except to ask the Bishop's brother Joseph, who was the beneficiary of the Bishop's \$50,000 insurance policy for help.³⁹ Eventually the Bishop's brother turned over the entire insurance money to repay the Philadelphia de-

³⁷Poniatishin, Almanakh Tserkvy, p. 112.

³⁸Visty, II (May 24, 1915), p. 1

³⁹Poniatishin, Almanakh Tserkvy, p. 112.

positors and thus he saved the Cathedral and other properties from eventual court litigations.⁴⁰ Thus, the wording of the bishop's will, unfortunately, added to many difficulties for Father Poniatishin.⁴¹ When he attempted to get new loans, or extend old ones, the banks, relying on the bishop's testament often did not want to recognize Poniatishin's signature. They demanded the signature of a bishop.

It is obvious that internally, as well as externally, the Administration's position was an extremely difficult one. Discipline within the Diocese again became more lax after the death of the bishop. To aid in the spiritual life of the clergy Rev. Poniatishin provided for yearly retreats which were usually conducted by Rev. Joseph Chaplinsky. In 1922, incidentally, the retreat was directed by Metropolitan Sheptytsky during his second visit to America. In addition, the Administrator was forced to spend considerable time and energy in curbing the autonomy of the Church Committees, which frequently failed to appreciate that the Church was to be administered by Church Law. The financial position of the Administration was further weakened because some parishes fell seriously behind in the payment of the

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 112.

⁴¹ A letter from a law office in Pittsburgh to Father Poniatishin, dated May 9, 1922, (thus late in his administration) illustrates the difficulties still experienced in placing building contracts because of the title being in Bishop Ortynsky's name. The letter is in the Archives of the Byzantine Archdiocese of Philadelphia.

Cathedraticum which was the major support of the Administration.⁴² After a few years, however, the Administration did succeed in re-establishing again greater respect for the law.

3. Special problems resulting from the War.

It has been indicated in the preceding chapter that the American Ruthenians, cut off from their European contacts by war, began in 1914 to form political organizations to help their native land and their relatives suffering from the war.⁴³ Particularly active in that respect were American Ukrainians who originated from Austrian Galicia. Since Rev. Poniatishin's Administration was during the war years, the years during which the Ukrainian problem came to the foreground, the Administrator did not shirk what he felt was his responsibility. Consequently, the church played a leading role in this important national and humanitarian work.

After the death of Bishop Ortynsky when the Byzantine diocese was divided into two parts, the Ukrainian clergy sensed the need to consolidate their efforts in behalf of the distressed Ukrainians in Europe with that of a general national organization called the Ukrainian Federation of the

⁴²For example, in his letter to the newly appointed pastor in New Kensington, Pa., dated Newark, N. J., December 28, 1922, Poniatishin points out that the high Cathedraticum debt of the pastor's new church represents at least partial arrears in payment during the entire period of Poniatishin's Administration, since the death of the Bishop in 1916. Letter in the possession of the writer.

⁴³See Ch. 2, pp. 85-86.

United States. On October 10, 1916, however, the Ukrainian clergy met in New York and resolved that since the Federation was carrying on a radical and a narrow partisan policy unfriendly both to the Church and the people and since the political situation demands the united efforts of all Ukrainians, they would organize a Ukrainian Rada (council) for that purpose.⁴⁴ At the same time the Soyuz, at its annual convention held on October 9-11, also decided to leave the Federation for similar reasons.⁴⁵ Thus, on November 1, 1916, a committee of the Ukrainian clergy met with delegates from the Soyuz, Providence Association, and Zhoda Bratstv⁴⁶ and organized the Ukrainian National Alliance which was to carry out the work decided upon by the All Ukrainian Congress of October 30, 1915.⁴⁷

⁴⁴See Ch. 3, p. 96, resolution #5.

⁴⁵The official letter, dated November 2, 1916, declaring the withdrawal of the Soyuz from the federation was published in Svoboda, the organ of the Soyuz, on November 7, 1916, p. 2. A detailed explanation for the withdrawal is found in Ibid., December 16, 1916, p. 2.

⁴⁶Zhoda Bratstv (Compact of Brotherhoods), was another organization of American Ukrainians organized in Olyphant, Pennsylvania in 1913.

⁴⁷The official notification of the organization of the Alliance on November 1, 1916, published in Svoboda, December 5, 1916, p. 1.

It must be clarified at this time that upon becoming the administrator of the Ukrainian part of the Ruthenian diocese, Father Poniatishin took practical steps to end successfully the misunderstanding that existed between the Church and the Soyuz since 1910.⁴⁸ The renewed friendly relations between the Church and Soyuz had excellent results in the humanitarian and national political work of the American Ukrainians during and after the war. The Ukrainian Alliance (the Ukrainian National Committee from late 1918), was an organization of political and humanitarian character that became the unofficial intermediary between the Ukrainian aspirations and the government in Washington.⁴⁹ At the Alliance's first general convention, held in December 25-26, 1916, in New York, the delegates representing the Ukrainian part of the Byzantine diocese, the Soyuz, the Providence Association, and Zhoda Bratstv elected Rev. Vladimir Dovhovich the organization's first

⁴⁸

Poniatishin, Knyha Soyuz, p. 293.

⁴⁹

A letter from a Second Assistant Secretary in the State Department to Poniatishin, chairman of the Ukrainian National Committee, dated December 16, 1918 (in reply to Father Poniatishin's letter of November 18, 1918) indicates that the State Department was glad to utilize the committee's medium through which to acquire information regarding the Ukraine, but that it was not prepared to recognize it as an official spokesman of the Ukrainian people. Letter in the Archives of the Ukrainian Museum in Chicago.

president.⁵⁰ The role of the Alliance in publicizing the Ukrainian national aspirations and providing material aid to the victims of war should not be under-estimated. A major part in this work was played by the diocese through its administrator, Father Poniatishin.

The greatest accomplishment of the Ukrainian Alliance was its work leading to the proclamation of a Ukrainian Day in 1917, by President Wilson. Greatly influenced by the fact that the Jews, Lithuanians, and Armenians succeeded in obtaining a special proclamation from the President in 1916, naming a special day for the collection of funds in the United States for each of these peoples suffering as a result of the circumstances of the war, the Ukrainian Alliance decided in December of the same year to attempt a similar proclamation for the Ukrainians. The responsibility for obtaining such a proclamation was placed on the shoulders of the administrator of the diocese, Rev. Poniatishin.⁵¹

Together with the attorney for the diocese, William J. Kearns, Poniatishin discussed the problems with Congress-

⁵⁰ Protocol from the first general convention, America, December 30, 1916, p. 3.

⁵¹ Rev. Poniatishin discusses in detail the steps leading to the proclamation of the Ukrainian Day in "Ukrainska Sprava v Amerytsi," Iuvileiny Almanakh Svobody, 1893-1953, (Jersey City: Ukrainian National Association, 1953), pp. 67-70. Hereafter cited as Almanakh Svobody.

man James A. Hamill of New Jersey⁵² who joined them in discussing the matter with the president's secretary, Joseph P. Tumulty, in January 1917. The Secretary made it clear that since similar requests were being made by endless individuals and groups, it would be impossible for the President to make such proclamations in the future. The only possibility for such a proclamation by the President, he suggested, would be an emergency resolution passed by both houses of Congress unanimously. In spite of such odds the officers of the Ukrainian Alliance went to work on such a resolution.

It is interesting to note that in preparing such a resolution for Congress the question of terminology became a major problem. The officers of the Committee involved in the preparation, Rev. Poniatishin, Vladimir Lototsky, and Rev. Vladimir Dovhovich held the opinion that the text of the resolution must contain the term "Ukrainian," the proper name for their people. On the other hand, Congressman Hamill, in whose Washington office the resolution was being prepared, called their attention to the fact that the term "Ruthenian" could not be omitted from the resolution for he doubted if there were even a few Congressmen who ever heard of a people

⁵² Congressman Hamill in his remarks in the House, on February 21, 1917, reviews the specific contacts with Father Poniatishin which brought to his attention the humanitarian objectives of the Ukrainians. See U.S., Congressional Record, 64th Cong., 2d Sess., 1917, LIV, Part 6 (Appendix part 1-5), 522.

called "Ukrainian." This fact had to be taken into consideration by the framers of the resolution trying to envision its passing unanimously.⁵³ Finally the natural solution that the word "Ukrainian" be included in parentheses after the word "Ruthenian," was incorporated into the text. After much work by Rev. Poniatishin, his Committee, Congressman Hamill, and others, to gain Congressional support the resolution was finally passed by the Senate on February 7,⁵⁴ and by the House on February 22, 1917.⁵⁵ President Wilson approved the Joint Resolution of Congress on March 2, 1917, and his proclamation designating April 21, 1917, as Ukrainian Day appeared on March 16, 1917.⁵⁶ The proclama-

⁵³The unusual difficulties that Father Poniatishin and his colleagues had to overcome in their efforts to obtain a Ukrainian Day proclamation is indicated in the following illustrations. Father Poniatishin writes that even highly educated public officials in Washington like the Director of Public Information "on hearing the name Ukrainian for the first time thought it was some kind of musical instrument from the Hawaiian Islands." A Congressman, on the other hand, thought that "the Ukraine was in the Balkans." Almanakh Svobody, p. 69.

⁵⁴U. S., Congressional Record, 64th Cong., 2d Sess., 1917, LIV, Part 3, 2751-2752.

⁵⁵Ibid., part 4, 3909.

⁵⁶U.S., Statutes at Large, XL, part 2, 1645-1646.

tion of a Ukrainian Day by President Wilson was considered by Ukrainian leaders to be their greatest accomplishment since the beginning of Ukrainian immigration to America.⁵⁷

This was the first time that the name "Ukrainian" was used in a United States Government document,⁵⁸ and the President's proclamation represented an official public recognition by Congress and the President that there was such a people as "Ukrainians" in the world. From this time on the old name "Ruthenian" began to pass rapidly out of use in the United States and the national name of "Ukrainian" to take its place in American usage.

At the same time that the Ukrainian Alliance was carrying on its work to obtain a Ukrainian Day, serious efforts were also made by Father Poniatishin and the Alliance to free Metropolitan Sheptytsky who was exiled to Russia since the beginning of the War. Poniatishin wrote to Congressman Hamill on December 27, 1916 requesting that the United States government attempt to obtain Sheptytsky's release. In his letter Poniatishin remarked of his need of the Metropolitan's presence in the United States, and guaranteed to provide for his support as well as to bear the

⁵⁷ According to Father Poniatishin, the American Ukrainians are indebted to Congressman Hamill, President Wilson's Secretary Tumulty, and attorney Kearns, who understood their aspirations and through whose influence the Ukrainian Day became a reality. See Almanakh Svobody, p. 76.

⁵⁸ Ibid., p. 76.

expense for Sheptytsky's passage to the United States by way of either Archangel or Norway.⁵⁹ Congressman Hamill thought it wise to start action and together they brought the matter to the attention of the State Department. As a result, several cablegrams were written to the American Ambassadors in Vienna and St. Petersburg. With no replies forthcoming, Poniatishin and Hamill visited Tumulty who, after a visit to the President's office, informed them that if replies were not received in three weeks that the President would write personally to the Tsar.⁶⁰ In the meantime the Russian Revolution broke out, the Metropolitan was released and thus American intervention in the matter ended.

After the armistice in November 1918, Rev.

Poniatishin and his colleagues felt that their committee had an opportunity to aid their people in Europe by starting action in Washington towards Washington's recognition of an independent Ukrainian state. With the aid of Congressman Hamill, Poniatishin was given an audience with Secretary of State Robert Lansing regarding this matter.⁶¹ Obtaining little satisfaction, the committee prepared a memorandum to

⁵⁹ Copy of Father Poniatishin's letter to Congressman James A. Hamill, dated December 27, 1916. Letter in the Archives of the Ukrainian Museum in Chicago.

⁶⁰ Poniatishin, Almanakh Svobody, p. 71.

⁶¹ Ibid., p. 73.

President Wilson, who headed the American Paris Peace Delegation.⁶² After the American Delegation left for Paris, Congressman Hamill brought up a joint Resolution in Congress on December 13, 1918, which if passed would have recommended that the American Delegation apply Wilson's self-determination of nations principle to the Ukrainians.⁶³ Although the resolution did not pass, it did inform Congress about the hopes of the Ukrainians.

The Ukrainian Alliance (now reconstituted as the Ukrainian National Committee) also sent a delegation to the Peace Conference of Paris to aid the official Ukrainian delegation. The motive was to aid the Ukrainian cause by influencing the official American Delegation headed by President Wilson. The failure of the Ukrainians to obtain their political aspirations at the Paris Peace Conference also resulted in a loss of prestige of the Ukrainian Committee in America. Thus, the committee was finally dissolved after nearly five years of important activity. Through its ties with similar organizations of other stateless peoples, its various deputations, memoranda, petitions, publications, and letters, the committee publicized the Ukrainian aspirations before the American Government and

⁶²Ibid., p. 73

⁶³U. S., Congressional Record, 65th Cong., 3d Sess., 1918, LVII, Part 1, 434.

public.⁶⁴ Writing in 1934, Father Poniatishin stated that never before or since have American's of Ukrainian descent been so united and active in aiding the national organizations of their people in Europe. Through its work the committee gained great respect and influence not only in the American press, educational circles, humanitarian and political organizations, but also among the political and military leaders in Washington who turned to it as the spokesman and representative of Americans of Ukrainian descent for information regarding the Ukrainian matters.⁶⁵ A major force behind this work was the Church. "The Church and the

⁶⁴The following examples illustrate the significant role of Father Poniatishin and of his committee in their attempts to bring aid to the Ukrainian people in Galicia. In a letter to the Executive Committee of the National Catholic War Council, in Washington, D.C., dated October 30, 1919, Poniatishin pointed out that Metropolitan Sheptytsky, the Primate of Galicia, was interned by the Polish authorities, that about 200 of his priests were held in the notorious Brigitta prison in Lviv(Lemberg), that relief work had not penetrated into Galicia, and again requested an investigation of conditions and aid for the Ruthenians in East Galicia. In a five page memorandum to the United States Secretary of State, dated September 7, 1920, Poniatishin Vigorously complained about Polish atrocities against Ruthenian Catholics in Eastern Galicia, such as, the closing of three theological seminaries, internment of bishops, and the shooting of 11 priests, and begged the United States to use her influence to put an end to these conditions. Finally, a letter from the Department of Foreign Affairs of the Galician Republic in exile, dated from Vienna, November 10, 1921 and signed by Gregory Myketey, officially thanked Poniatishin for taking the first politico-diplomatic action to inform the United States government and President Wilson about the Ukrainian viewpoint concerning Galicia. The above letters are in the Archives of the Ukrainian Museum in Chicago.

⁶⁵Poniatishin, Knyha Soyuz, p. 294.

Soyuz," states Rev. Poniatishin, "actually created the Ukrainian national movement in America and educated the masses in it." Were it not for the Church and the Soyuz the greatest portion of our immigrants would have been scattered among Polish, Russian, Hungarian, and other Churches and organizations, and would have been lost to the Ukrainian nation. They are two great fortresses of Ukrainian consciousness in America.⁶⁶ In essence, Poniatishin states, it was the result of the united efforts of the Church and Soyuz during the war years that Americans of Ukrainian descent began to understand that an appreciation of their national heritage was an important sign of cultural maturity of any people.⁶⁷

In October, 1922, within a year after the dissolution of the Ukrainian National Committee, the United Ukrainian Organizations of the United States was founded under the inspiration of Dr. Luke Myshuga. Rev. Leo Levytsky became the new organizations first President. It continued the activities formerly carried on by the Alliance and its successor the National Committee.⁶⁸ The Church con-

⁶⁶Ibid., p. 299.

⁶⁷Ibid., p. 299.

⁶⁸For the immediate concerns and objectives of the United Ukrainian Organizations see e.g., America, October 30, p. 2; November 15, p. 1.; December 6, p. 1; December 8, p. 3; December 11, 13 and 15, p. 1; and December 27, 1922, p. 2.

tinued to support the new organizations efforts to aid the afflicted in Europe. When the Allied Ambassador's Council finally decided in March of 1923, that Eastern Galicia should remain as part of Poland, all hopes of an independent Ukraine were brought to an end. The results were also felt among the Ukrainian immigrants in the United States who fell into political apathy and despair,⁶⁹ a condition that was to be taken advantage of by Bolshevik propaganda. This propaganda in turn helped to create new administrative difficulties for the Church.

4. Metropolitan Sheptytsky's second visit to the diocese.

The Ukrainians in Galicia faced grave hardships following the great War. Metropolitan Sheptytsky poignantly expressed the plight of his people in a letter of December 18, 1920 to Father Poniatishin when he wrote: "our life is sorrow, gloom, silence, misery, grief - blood and tears."⁷⁰ Having received an invitation from Poniatishin to be a formal guest of the diocese, the Metropolitan made his second visit to the United States in November of 1921 primarily to seek relief for his distressed people. The Metropolitan had two main objectives while in the United States. He wished to collect funds for the war orphans in Galicia and he also

⁶⁹ Poniatishin, Knyha Soyuz, 1934, p. 297.

⁷⁰ Sheptytsky's letter to Poniatishin, dated from Lviv, Galicia, December 18, 1920, in the Archives of the ~~Ukrainian Museum in Chicago.~~

hoped for an audience with President Warren G. Harding, Secretary of Commerce Herbert C. Hoover, and Secretary of State Charles E. Hughes, with whom he wished to discuss the plight of the Ukrainians in Galicia.⁷¹

The administrator made a special request that collections be made in all the Ukrainian Churches for the war orphans and that they be mailed to the Metropolitan who was temporarily residing at the late Bishop's residence in Philadelphia. On January 30, 1922, the Metropolitan informed Poniatishin by letter that he had already received a total of \$2,534.83 from 42 of the parishes.⁷² Eventually, hardly a Church did not contribute to this collection, with St. Joseph's in Frankford, Penna. (whose pastor was Rev. Vladimir Petrivsky), contributing \$900.00, the highest amount on a percentage basis.⁷³ In addition, voluntary contributions were made by the clergy. The Metropolitan also attempted to get financial aid from the Latin Catholics during his visit to various members of the hierarchy in whose territory Ukrainian churches were located. However, due to the post-war circumstances, aid from this quarter was hardly possible. The American bishops were deluged with requests

⁷¹Poniatishin, Ukrainci u Sviti, pp. 21-22

⁷²Metropolitan's letter to Poniatishin, dated from Philadelphia, January 30, 1922, in the Archives of the Ukrainian Museum in Chicago.

⁷³Poniatishin, Ukrainci u Sviti, p. 28.

for aid from various European nations devastated by war, consequently, they just could not handle the situation. For example, Monsignor Michael J. Lavelle, pastor of New York's St. Patrick's Cathedral and a great friend of the Ukrainians, told Rev. Poniatishin that so many requests from Europe were received at the Chancery that to satisfy them it would be necessary to arrange collections for every Sunday for several years in advance.⁷⁴ If the Metropolitan had arrived during the war, or even a year earlier than he did, then the entire matter of aid would have appeared in a different light. In his recollections, written many years after these events, Rev. Poniatishin was of the opinion that upon leaving the United States the Metropolitan could not have had more than \$15,000, from all sources, for the Galician orphans.⁷⁵

Shortly after his arrival, the Metropolitan inquired about the possibility of an audience with Washington Officials. To arrange an audience with the President, Rev. Poniastishin turned to friends that he had made in Washington during his work leading to the Ukrainian Day proclamation in 1917. Eventually, with the aid of Senator Frelinghuysen from New Jersey and from President Harding's Secretary, the Metropolitan, together with Rev. Poniatishin and the diocesan attorney Kearns, spoke with the President for a few minutes prior to the President's weekly public

⁷⁴Ibid., p. 28.

⁷⁵Ibid., p. 30.

reception. During the brief audience the Metropolitan attempted to inform the President about the cruel military occupation of Eastern Galicia by the Poles. Next the Metropolitan wished to see Secretary Hoover, who had been in Lviv in the Summer of that year as the American relief Administrator. Again, Senator Frelinghuysen arranged an audience. In the presence of Poniatishin and attorney Kearns, the Metropolitan thanked Hoover, in the name of the Ukrainian people, for the American relief in Galicia. He also explained the unfair treatment of the Ukrainian needy by the Polish occupational authorities in distributing the American relief packages as well as the general political misfortune of the Ukrainians. When the audience ended the Metropolitan left Hoover's office in a dejected mood for he realized, according to Poniatishin, that his audience would not result in any substantial improvement of conditions for Ukrainians in Galicia.⁷⁶

In March of 1922 the Metropolitan left the States for an extended tour of Ukrainian colonies in Brazil and Argentina⁷⁷ after which he returned to the United States in August.⁷⁸ In October, when the Metropolitan was convalesc-

⁷⁶Ibid., p. 27.

⁷⁷America, March 15 and 20, 1922, p. 1.

⁷⁸Ibid., August 11, 1922, p. 1.

ing from his serious illness in Chicago, he requested Rev. Poniatishin to arrange an audience with the Secretary of State, Hughes.⁷⁹ Again with the help of Senator Frelinghuysen a meeting was arranged for early November. Accompanying the Metropolitan to the audience were Dr. Luke Myshuga (the representative of the Western Ukrainian government in exile, who prepared a memorandum about the Polish occupation of Eastern Galicia and her persecution of the Ukrainian Church, clergy, etc.), and attorney B. Pelekhovich. After thanking the Secretary for America's hospitality, the Metropolitan explained the reason for the visit. He then asked for America's influential intervention at least in the matter of the persecuted Ukrainian Church and clergy. The Secretary promised to study the prepared memorandum carefully.⁸⁰

During his stay in the United States, both before and after his trip to South America, Metropolitan Sheptytsky naturally made many episcopal visitations to diocesan churches,

⁷⁹ Sheptytsky's letter to Poniatishin dated from Chicago, October 29, 1922, in the Archives of the Ukrainian Museum in Chicago.

⁸⁰ Address by Myshuga in Newark, N. J., November 18, 1945. Excerpts cited by Poniatishin, Ukrainci u Sviti, pp. 32-33.

as well as visits to different Latin Ordinaries,⁸¹ and on September 4-8, 1922 he directed a retreat for the priests of the diocese at the Catholic Home in Bernardsville, New Jersey. The retreat was attended by 53 Ukrainians and 22 Pod-Carpathians.⁸² In the evening of September 7, after the last retreat services, the priests of both administrations held a joint meeting, the first since the death of Bishop Ortynsky, to discuss the problem of filling the episcopal chair in Philadelphia. They decided to send a telegram concerning this matter to Rome. They also sent a delegation to the Metropolitan urging him to use his influence in this matter when in Rome.⁸³

Metropolitan Sheptytsky left New York on November 12, 1922,⁸⁴ returning to Canada from where, together with Bishop Budka, he sailed for Europe two days later. Although he

⁸¹See e.g., Sheptytsky's letters to Poniatishin dated October 18 and 29, 1922, and his undated letter from Philadelphia during the 1921-1922 Christmas Season. The letters are in the Archives of the Ukrainian Museum in Chicago.

⁸²America, September 12, 1922, p. 2., lists the names of all the clerics attending the retreat.

⁸³Ibid., September 11, 1922, p. 1.

⁸⁴For a report on the official farewell festivities held on November 7, 9 and 10 in honor of Metropolitan Sheptytsky, See America, November 15, 1922, p. 2.

did not succeed in his political mission of obtaining aid for his people through the intervention of the American Government, no one could have accomplished more. Sizeable funds were collected for Galician war orphans, and his numerous parish visitations provided him with first-hand knowledge concerning the condition of the orphaned Byzantine Rite Diocese in the United States.⁸⁵ Upon his return to Europe, the Metropolitan reported on his observations in America at an audience with Pope Pius XI. It was primarily through the influence and the recommendations of Metropolitan Sheptytsky that finally in 1924, after countless letters and memorandas by both the Ukrainian and the Pod-Carpathian Rusins for a bishop, the Ruthenian Church in the

⁸⁵ The Metropolitan's extended visit naturally buoyed up the spirits of the Ukrainian Catholics in the United States, America, November 15, 1922, p. 2. reported optimistically that it was now a certainty that the matter of a bishop in the United States will soon be decided.

United States obtained two bishops.⁸⁶ The early administration of the new bishop for the American Ukrainians will be the subject of our next chapter.

⁸⁶The Pod-Carpathians were particularly interested in obtaining their own bishop. For example; on May 11, 1916, 74 priests originating from Hungary met and petitioned for a bishop of their nationality. (See Viestnik, August 10, 1916, p. 1.) In a reply to a cablegram from the Sojedinija, Bishop Anthony Papp of Muncacs notified the President of the Sojedinenija by a letter dated February 10, 1924, that within three months a bishop would be appointed for the Rusins. (See Ibid., August 7, 1924, p. 8.) Finally, Rev. Constantine S. Roskovich, the spiritual director of the Sojedinenija, in his report at the 18th Convention of that organization stated that as a result of many discussions and letters with Metropolitan Sheptytsky, and the Chancery of Cardinal Hayes of New York, and with their help, the wishes of the Rusins from Hungary, for their own bishop, are about to be realized. (See Protokol XVIII Konvencii Sojedinenija Greko Katoliceskich Russkich Bratstv, 1924, (Homestead, Pa.: Gr. Kaft. Sojedinenija), p. 14. Also in Viestnik, July 17, 1924 p. 5.)

CHAPTER IV

EARLY ADMINISTRATION OF BISHOP BOHACHEVSKY

1. Organization and Reaffirmation of Authority.

The temporary division of the Ruthenian Church in the United States into two administrative halves, following the death of Bishop Ortynsky in 1916, became permanent in 1924 when the Papacy decided to create separate dioceses out of each Administration. Father Basil Takach, the Spiritual Director of the Seminary in Uzhorod, Hungary, was appointed Bishop for the Rusins, Slovak, Hungarians, and Croats, from Hungary and Yugoslavia, who, since Bishop Ortynsky's death had been under the temporary administration of Very Rev. Gabriel Martyak. Bishop Takach's See was to be Homestead, Pennsylvania (suburb of Pittsburgh). At the same time, Father Constantine Bohachevsky, the Vicar General of the Peremyshl Diocese in Galicia, was appointed Bishop for the Ukrainians from Galicia and Bukovina, who, since 1916, had been under the administration of Very Rev. Peter Poniatishin. Bishop Bohachevsky's See was to be Philadelphia, the seat of the late Bishop Ortynsky. At this time the Ruthenian Church in the United States was composed of a total of 299 churches and 231 priests. With the division into two separate Dioceses, overlapping in territory, the Rusin diocese re-

ceived 155 churches, 129 priests, and 288,390 faithful¹ and the Ukrainian diocese contained 144 churches, 102 priests, and 237,495 members.² As pointed out in the preceding chapter the Byzantine Rite Province in the United States is composed of the Ukrainian dioceses only, consequently any discussion of the Pittsburgh Byzantine Rite Diocese under the jurisdiction of Bishop Takach and his successors is outside the scope of this work.

Bishop Bohachevsky was born in the village of Manaiv, Galicia, on June 17, 1884. He completed his secondary schooling in Stry, and his philosophical and theological studies were carried on at the Universities of Lviv and Innsbruck. Bohachevsky was ordained in Lviv on January 31, 1909 by Metropolitan Sheptytsky, after which he was able to return to Innsbruck where in 1910 he attained his doctoral degree in Sacred Theology. Father Bohachevsky was also privileged to receive a leave of absence from his duties as lecturer at the University of Lviv and prefect in the Seminary to study the writings and lives of the Fathers of the Eastern Church at the University of Munich. During the war, Bohachevsky served as a Chaplain in the Austrian Army at the Italian front. Following the war, he held varied posts including that of vice-Rector of the Seminary in Lviv, pastor of the Cathedral in Peremyshl, and Professor at the

¹CD., 1925, p. 759.

²Ibid., p. 754.

Seminary. While pastor of the Cathedral he was interned by the Polish government for his work in behalf of the Ukrainians and was freed only after the intervention of the Papal Nuncio, who later was to become Pope Pius XI. Father Bohachevsky was Vicar General of the Peremyshl Diocese when appointed, on May 20, 1924, titular Bishop of Amisus and Ordinary for the Ukrainians in the United States. Bishop-elect Bohachevsky was consecrated in Rome on June 15, 1924 by the Most Reverend Josaphat Kotsylovsky.

Although news reached America in June 1924 that two Ruthenian Bishops were consecrated who were destined for the United States, it was not until August 14, 1924 that both bishops arrived. The two new Ordinaries were welcomed at the pier by Bishop Budka from Canada, Revs. Martyak and Poniatishin, and Monsignor Carrol, representing Cardinal Hayes of New York, together with numerous Ukrainian and Rusin priests and faithful.³ Both Bishops were then-escorted to New York's Pod-Carpathian Church on 13th Street and then to the Ukrainian Church on 7th Street for prayers of Thanksgiving. A welcoming banquet was then held at the Pennsylvania Hotel with Bishop Budka, seated between the newly arrived bishops, as the toastmaster, and at which the Ukrainian and Pod-Carpathian clerical and lay leaders expressed their heartfelt greetings to their long awaited Bishop.⁴

³Viestnik, August 21, 1924, p. 1. Also Svoboda, August 16, 1924.

⁴Ibid. p. 1.

On the following day Bishop Bohachevsky left for Philadelphia the seat of his Diocese.⁵

The work of reorganizing a diocese, which for eight and one half years lacked the leadership that only a bishop could provide, required great energy and determination. The strong will of the new bishop can be discerned from the bishop's first pastoral letter to his priests and faithful.

My task is to serve God, to be concerned for the glory of God, for the welfare of our Holy Catholic Church, and for the salvation of the souls of the flock entrusted to me. I desire to be a good Shepherd, and a good Shepherd must constantly have before his eyes the best interests of his people, who have transplanted themselves to a new homeland where, as in the old country, they must love and serve God, for only then will they become a great and glorious people.

Along with this, we can not be indifferent to the fortunes of our homeland, and, therefore, our efforts will be, with your help Reverend Fathers and my beloved faithful, to provide speedy aid to the country of our origin.

Entrusting our common tasks that await us to your prayers my dear Fathers and beloved faithful, I rejoice in the hope that the Almighty God will bless you--Brothers--and my undeserving person in our undertaking for His glory, for the good of our people, and for the salvation of our souls.⁶

Bishop Bohachevsky turned his immediate attention to the reaffirmation of clerical and lay discipline, and

⁵The arrival of Bishops Takach and Bohachevsky ended the eight and a half years administration of both Administrators who returned to their respective parish duties.

⁶Eparkhialni Visty, (Philadelphia), V (October, 1924), 2. Hereafter cited as Visty.

the re-establishment of Church authority. The Bishop re-activated the official diocesan bulletin, Eparkhialni Visty,⁷ beginning with the October 1924 issue, through which his official announcements could be made known and through which educational and theological instructions could be passed down to the priests of the Diocese. On November 12, 1924, the Bishop notified his clergy that beginning in January 1925, the regulations of the Church Council of Lviv (1891), relative to the competitive clerical examinations in theological subjects would be put into effect,⁸ and in February of the following year he notified the clergy that the appointment of priests to pastoral positions would depend on the results of the examinations.⁹ In rapid succession, a whole series of directives dealing with all

⁷Originally Bishop Ortynsky founded the Eparkhialny Vistnyk in 1914, however, after his death it was discontinued until it was reestablished, on a larger scale, by Bishop Bohachevsky in October 1924, as the Eparkhialni Visty. This is a most important primary source

for the history of the Byzantine Ecclesiastical Province of Philadelphia. Since the formation of the Philadelphia Archdiocese in 1958 it is called the Arkhieparkhialni Visty.

⁸Visty, V (November, 1924), 5.

⁹Ibid., V (November, 1924), p. 6.

phases of Ukrainian Church life in America emanated from the Bishop's Chancery. The new Bishop lost little time, for example, in reminding the clergy of the canonical regulations which prohibit pastors from building churches, parish homes, schools, etc., without the explicit approval of the Bishop's Ordinariat. The pastors were informed that the Ordinariat will demand strict compliance with those regulations.¹⁰

Upon becoming aware of the limited Ukrainian Catholic literature that was available in the United States, the Bishop was prompt to suggest European, and the few existent American publications, which he felt would be useful to the clergy and the faithful. Thus, for the priests he recommended, among others, the clerical quarterly Bohoslovia, from Galicia and the monthly Dushpaster from Pod-Carpathia. For both the faithful and the clergy, he commended the Misionar, published monthly within his own diocese, as well as another monthly with the same title from Galicia, and also Holos Izbavytelia from Canada. For the children, the Bishop suggested the monthly Nash Priiatel from Galicia.¹¹ In addition, Bishop Bohachevsky directed the pastors to make every effort to ensure that the parents send their children to Catholic Schools,¹² and he also called the pastor's

¹⁰ Ibid., V (November, 1924), p. 6.

¹¹ Ibid., pp. 7-8.

¹² Ibid., V (April, 1925), p. 6.

attention to their responsibility to arrange for a mission each year in every congregation under their care.¹³ Nor did the vigorous young bishop overlook worthy civic causes. For instance, he directed the pastors to celebrate memorial services each year for the Ukrainians killed in the War and to announce collections for Ukrainian war invalids and orphans in Europe.¹⁴ In fact one can not read through the official diocesan Visty during the early years of Bishop Bohachevsky's episcopate without being impressed with the energy with which the Bishop attacked the administrative problems he faced.

The Bishop's directives were at the same time accompanied by important administrative appointments. For instance: Very Rev. Stephen Vashchyshyn, pastor in Frankford, Pennsylvania, was nominated Chancellor of the Diocese effective September 1, 1924;¹⁵ in the Fall of 1926 Very Revs. Stephen Vashchyshyn, John Kutsky, Anthony Lotowycz,

¹³ Ibid., VI (February, 1936), p. 10.

¹⁴ Ibid., VI (October, 1925), pp. 2-3.

¹⁵ Ibid., V (October, 1924), 4.

John Ortynsky, Paul Procko, Alexander Pyk, and Leo Chapelsky, were appointed the Bishops Consultors;¹⁶ while in the Spring of 1927, Very Rev. Vashchyshyn, was appointed the Bishop's Vicar General,¹⁷ with Very Rev. Alexander Pyk, succeeding him as Chancellor.¹⁸

2. New Internal Conflicts

Unfortunately, however, the 1920' were characterized by extremely serious internal conflicts amongst the American Ukrainians which also affected religious matters. The bishops hope, expressed in his first pastoral letter, "that the relationship established between us by the will of God, shall grow progressively closer, and that you will feel an ever greater need to gather near the episcopal throne and thus with united efforts we may strive towards our common goal,"¹⁹ was not immediately realized. On the contrary, the early years of Bishop Bohachevsky's administration were

¹⁶Ibid., VII (November, 1926), 5.

¹⁷Ibid., VII (May, 1927), 1.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 2.

¹⁹Ibid., V (October, 1924), 2.

characterized by an all out struggle against the new Bishop.

A brief historical summary of the conditions after the War is necessary for an understanding of the difficulties Bishop Bohachevsky faced after his arrival.

The decision of the Allied Council of Ambassadors on March 15, 1923, that Western Ukraine be attached to Poland, also affected the conditions amongst the American Ukrainians. Many western Ukrainians fearing Polish rule left for the United States, thus creating in America the first purely political Ukrainian immigration. Some of these political exiles found it difficult to accomodate themselves to American conditions.

In the strictly religious sphere, prior to the War, the Ukrainian religious life in the United States centered almost exclusively in the Catholic Church. It has been pointed out, however, that since the 1890's the Russian Orthodox Mission had some successes in converting Ukrainian Catholics to Russian Orthodoxy. When with the fall of the Tsarist regime, the Russian Orthodox Mission lost its material support from St. Petersburg, some of the Russian Orthodox priests (former Ukrainians) now tried to form their own diocese and obtain their own bishop. Some of the Ukrainian Catholic exiles went along with what appeared to be a Ukrainian patriotic movement in exile. When on February 13, 1924, Archbishop John Teodorovich arrived from the Soviet Ukraine to become the first bishop of the American Ukrainian Orthodox Church he received a substantial

support from Ukrainian patriotic circles.²⁰ At the same time a movement developed among these patriotic circles that the people should control the Church. Since the leaders of the movement were also the leaders of the United Ukrainian Organizations of the United States, they were in an excellent position to propagate their views among the Ukrainian communities. To win support, they began to accuse the Hierarchy of disloyalty to the idea of the independence of Ukraine and for serving a foreign and unfriendly political power. Thus the Polish-Vatican Concordat of February 1925, which normalized the religious relations in Poland, was brought to the foreground by the opponents of the Ukrainian Catholic authority in the United States. The spark grew into a great conflagration.

²⁰ Undoubtedly the Archbishop's glowing report of the political and religious developments in the Ukraine since the Soviet government came to power contributed to this support. The Archbishop's views are extensively reported in Sveboda, February 19, 1924, page 3, by a representative of that paper who interviewed the Archbishop. The essence of the Archbishop's opinions is as follows: 1) the Ukrainian Soviet Government was bringing about complete Ukrainianization; 2) the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church, which is controlled by the people themselves, has become the spokesman of the Ukrainian national movement; 3) at the present time the most important goal was to organize within the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church all those who, as a result of the internal church fights, are now without the benefit of religious solace. Obviously the Archbishop's strongly democratic and patriotic sentiments would impress the politically disturbed Ukrainian patriots in exile. Incidentally, the Archbishop's name is given as "Khvedorovich" rather than the commonly used "Teodorovich."

"In practice," according to a witness of these events, "this was a Ukrainian 'war of everybody against everybody' which lasted ten full years, and the effects of which are still being felt by the present American-Ukrainian generation."²¹

The struggle against the bishop which began in 1925, produced a polemic literature of great proportions. Dr. Luke Myshuga, editor of the Svoboda led the fight against the Bishop, whereas, Dr. Osyp Nazaruk, editor of America, strongly supported the Bishop. The war on the bishop had practical effects on the Church and would have, if successful, led to complete chaos.²² The ludicrous attacks on the Bishop, such as, that he was a tool for Polish goals; that he wanted to curtail if not to stop all aid to the patriotic Ukrainian organizations in Europe; that he wished to replace patriotic European priests with priests to whom national

²¹Demydchuk, "Naslidyk Ukrainskoho Derzhavnytstva na ridnykh zemliakh", Tserkva sv. Yura, p. 75. Demydchuk was a Ukrainian War exile from Europe who became an important participant in Ukrainian affairs in the United States.

²²The leaders of the opposition, for example, claimed that within a year 18 churches fell away from the Diocese and that more than 20 thousand changed their faith. See the official call for action by the opposition to Bishop Bohachevsky in Svoboda, December 3, 1926, p. 3.

interests would be foreign; etc.,²³ appealed to many recent Ukrainian immigrants, who were deeply disappointed with the failure of the Ukrainian national movement in Europe. They became particularly gullible with regard to patriotic slogans especially against Poland. Even some of the priests became supporters of the opposition, thus contributing to the serious administrative problems of the Bishop. Some parishes denied the Bishop's authority and supported the opposition, others were on the verge of becoming Orthodox.²⁴ Thus Bishop Bohachevsky's energetic attempts to reorganize his diocese and bring order and discipline into the Ukrainian Church were attacked and bitterly assaulted by the partisan extremists.

The struggle reached its peak in 1926-27, when the opposition called for a Church Congress to be held in December 1926. In his letters, sermons, and official

²³ Official notice signed by the leaders of the opposition dated from Philadelphia, November 29, 1926, Ibid., p.3.

²⁴ The Recollections of Joseph Krupka, 1959 (in the files of the Byzantine Archdiocese of Philadelphia), contain very interesting illustrations of specific events and persons participating in this struggle. Krupka, an eyewitness of these events in the mid-West, credits Dr. Osyp Nazaruk for convincing the large Ukrainian communities in Hamtramck, Detroit, and Chicago to remain loyal to the Bishop by his lecture in Hamtramck in the Fall of 1925 (pp.10-20). He also, incidentally, credits the "Hetmantsi" of the Sich organization with generous support of the Church and Bishop Bohachevsky in this conflict. (P.20). The support of the Bishop by the Sich is attested to, e.g., by the letter of Dr. Stephen Hrynevetsky, the chief officer of that organization, dated from Chicago, December 14, 1926, which included a substantial contribution toward the Seminary and future High School, and by the Bishop's grateful acknowledgement. See Visty, VII, (January, 1927), 2-5.

announcements, the Bishop appealed to his flock warning them against the danger to their faith. In the November 1926 issue of the Visty, the priests were officially put on notice by the Bishop that he was not convening a Church gathering of any kind,²⁵ and a regulation dated December 19, which was read in all the churches, warned the faithful of the anti-church propaganda and of the organization of the so-called Church Congress. The regulation underscored the fact that according to Church Law there are no other Church Conventions except those called by duly authorized ecclesiastical representatives. It warned all the faithful against such an action and forbade them to take part in the proposed Congress and at the same time made it clear that in the event the regulations were disregarded that appropriate penalties would be placed on the guilty according to the Canons of the Church.²⁶

The opposition Congress, attended by 130 delegates from 81 parishes,²⁷ met in Philadelphia on December 29, and organized an independent Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church in the United States.²⁸ For cooperating in the preparation of

²⁵Visty, VI, (November, 1926), p.5.

²⁶Ibid., (January, 1927), pp. 5-6.

²⁷Protocol of the Congress, Svoboda, January 11, 1927, p. 4.

²⁸For the discussions and the decisions of the Congress, see the Protocol of the Congress, Ibid, January 8, 1927, p.5, and January 10, 11, and 12, 1927, pp. 4.

the prohibited Congress or for participating in its decisions, at least three priests suffered suspension²⁹ and nine lay leaders who led in the fight against the Church or organized and participated in the illegal Congress were excommunicated.³⁰

On January 23, 1927, in his sermon at the Cathedral, the Bishop publicly answered and refuted the charges against him and the church by the opposition.³¹ The chief points that the Bishop discussed were: the demands for a church Charter which would place the control of the churches in the hands of the people, the complaint about abuses within the church, the opposition to the support of diocesan schools,³² and the hostility toward the Vatican-Polish Concordat. Incidentally, from the very beginning the Concordat evoked both strong opposition and strong support. The opposition held that it sold out the Ukrainian Church to the Poles, and

²⁹ Visty, (November, 1926), p. 5; VII, (January, 1927), p. 10; VII, (April, 1927), p. 8., etc.

³⁰ The Bishop's regulation dated January 6, 1927. See Visty, VII, (January, 1927), pp. 6-7.

³¹ See the Protocol of the Congress in Svoboda, January 10, 1927, p. 4 for the charges made by the opposition and the matters which they considered most important.

³² Visty, VII, (March, 1927), pp. 1-2.; and (April 1927), pp. 2-4. At the same time the Bishop charged that the leaders of the opposition "in return for the ruin of Holy Church and rebellion against her lawful authority - promise a Ukraine, and rebellion and ruin they call patriotism." See Ibid., (April, 1927), P. 4.

the supporters insisted that actually it protected the Ukrainian Church in Poland and assured the clergy equality with the Polish clergy.³³

3. Attempts to Improve the Bishop's Position.

As the struggle raged about him, Bishop Bohachevsky continued in his attempt to bring order into the diocese. In 1927, due to the Bishop's efforts, the monks of St. Basil the Great (O.S.B.M.) were permanently established in the United States. Actually, since 1921 missionaries of this Order visited the United States from Canada and directed occasional missions and retreats in various parishes. In 1927 Bishop Bohachevsky obtained an agreement with the superiors of the Order whereby the Very Rev. Epephanus Theodorovich, O.S.B.M., who was in the United States while on route from Canada to Europe, would remain in the United States. Thus Father Theodorovich settled in Philadelphia where, with Bishop Bohachevsky's blessing, he began editing a newspaper entitled Katolytsky Provid. Later Rev. Theodorovich moved to near-by Chester, Pennsylvania, where he also carried on pastoral duties. On August 22, 1932, Revs. Sylvester Zhuravetsky, O.S.B.M., and Andrew Trukh, O.S.B.M. arrived in

³³See, for instance, Andrew Khlystun, "V spravi Konkordatu Polshchi z Rymom," America, September 5, and 10, 1925, p. 2, in support of the Concordat, and the editorial in Svoboda, March 23, 1925, p. 2, in opposition to it.

New York and joined Rev. Theodorovich in Chester. Bishop Bohachevsky, under whose jurisdiction the missionaries were placed, proposed to the three Basilians that they take over the responsibility for St. Nicholas Church in Chicago, the largest Ukrainian Church in the United States, which was on the verge of being sold at public auction to satisfy the payment of its debts. St. Nicholas', due to the chaotic conditions resulting from the fight against the Bishop, and more recently due to the depression, was on the brink of bankruptcy. Thus on October 1, 1932 the three Basilians arrived in Chicago, with Rev. Theodorovich as the superior, Rev. Zhuravetsky as the pastor, and Rev. Trukh as the missionary and organizer of the youth. New life was breathed into St. Nicholas and parish life soon began to revive. In 1933 two additional missionaries arrived from Europe thus making possible even a greater recovery. The first to arrive was Rev. Ambrose Senyshyn, O.S.B.M. (the present Ukrainian Archbishop-Metropolitan in the United States), who was followed by the Rev. Maxim Markiv, O.S.B.M. Shortly thereafter Father Trukh was transferred to Canada, while the others remained in the United States. - From their headquarters in Chicago the Basilian Fathers spread their missionary work throughout the United States.³⁴

³⁴See Vladimir Gavlich, O.S.B.M. "Vasyliiany u Zluchenykh Derzhavakh Ameryky" Pamiatka Novoi Provintsii oo. Vasylian (New York: 1949), Basilian Fathers, pp. 18-22, for a useful summary of the establishment of the Basilian Fathers in the United States.

In 1929, Bishop Bohachevsky's position was to be further improved, both in regard to his internal opposition as well as in regard to the ordinary problems of inter-rite relations, with the publication on March 1 of the Papal decree Cum Data Fuerit³⁵ which superseded and slightly modified the decree Cum Episcopo of 1914. The revised constitution defined more precisely the Byzantine Bishops' full powers of jurisdiction and helped to clarify the major practical problems that frequently resulted in inter-rite misunderstandings between the Latin and the Byzantine clergy. For example: Article 29 of the new constitution specifically states "that attendance of Greek Ruthenians at Latin Rite Churches, even if it be continuous, does not effect a change of Rite." Furthermore, "in order to be transferred to another Rite, Greek Ruthenians must send a petition to the Apostolic Delegate," preferably through their own ordinary, "and set forth the true canonical reasons which seem to make such a transfer recommendable."³⁶ Article 30 states that "Latin Rite priests are not allowed to induce any Greek-Ruthenian to transfer to the Latin Rite contrary to, or aside from, the canonical provisions which govern the change

³⁵ AER, LXXXI (August, 1929), 167-176.

³⁶ The translation of articles cited is that of the Canonist Rev. Pospishil, op. cit., p. 207.

of Rite."³⁷ Article 36 stipulates that "to avoid inconvenience which might accrue to Ruthenians, they are given permission to observe holy days and fasts according to the customs of the places in which they are staying; but such observance does not effect a change of Rite."³⁸

The decree is equally specific on marriage regulations between the faithful of mixed Rites. For instance, article 41 declares that "persons born in the United States of North America of parents of different Rites are to be baptized in the Rite of the Father."³⁹ Article 42 stipulates that "Baptism received in another Rite on account of grave necessity, -- that is, when the child was near death, or was born at a place where, at the time of birth, his father's own pastor was not present--does not effect a change of Rite; and the priest who performed the baptism must forward a certificate of baptism to the proper pastor."⁴⁰

³⁷Ibid., p. 207.

³⁸Ibid., p. 208.

³⁹Ibid., p. 209.

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 209.

Obviously these and other regulations were intended to protect the Byzantine Rite Catholics from being swallowed up by the predominantly Latin Rite character of Catholicism in the United States. There can be no doubt that Cum Data Fuerit contributed to a more cordial relationship between the Latin and Byzantine Rites in the United States, although individual instances of misunderstanding were by no means ended.

4. Education--Key to Diocesan Growth.

Despite the serious opposition to Bishop Bohachevsky and the disruptive consequences of that struggle among the Ukrainian Catholics⁴¹ which continued to the mid 1930's, the Bishop, nevertheless, energetically went ahead with the reorganization of his diocese. The key to the reorganization and revival was to be education.

When Bishop Bohachevsky arrived in August 1924, not a single seminarian from the Diocese was in any of the Latin Rite seminaries and the arrival of new priests from Europe had almost stopped completely.⁴² Clearly, the training of

⁴¹In a relatively short period of time, according to the former diocesan Administrator, 26 congregations separated themselves from the Diocese. See Poniatishin, Tserkva sv. Yura, p. 144.

⁴²Paul Procko, "Pochatky i rozvytok Ukrainskoho Semynaria y zluchenykh Derzhavakh", Propamiatna Knyka Ukrainskoho Katolytskoho Kaledzha, 1940, (Philadelphia: America Press), p. 23. Father Procko was Rector of the Diocesan Seminary from 1926 to 1941.

young priests was of the utmost importance. Consequently, before the year came to an end the Bishop announced the re-establishment of the "minor seminary" or St. Paul's Boys' Missionary Institute, which had first been established by Bishop Ortynsky at 818 North Franklin Street, next to the Bishop's residence. The Seminary opened on September 1, 1925, with Rev. Michael Kuzmak as its Rector. A total of 31 preparatory students from the first grade through High School were in the "minor seminary" that year. In addition three seminarians were now studying in Rome.⁴³ Obviously the two small homes at 816-818 North Franklin Street, even after remodeling, could serve only as a temporary location for the Seminary.⁴⁴ To the Bishop, the building of a semin-

⁴³ Visty, VI (December, 1925), p. 5-6.; ibid., (November, 1925), p. 6. lists the students in the Philadelphia Seminary for 1925-26, and the Seminarians in Rome.

⁴⁴ Father Procko, the Rector of the Seminary, lists the following seminarians who were sent from Philadelphia to Rome and who later returned to the diocese as priests: Revs. Stephen Tykhansky, Dr. Basil Fedish, Dr. Stephen Knap, Michael Bobersky, Leo Pelensky, Michael Skorodinsky, Joseph Shmondiuk (the present Ukrainian Bishop of Stamford), John Babiak, and Dr. Stephen Hryniokh, (. 23.)

ary and a high school for the training of future priests was the most important immediate duty.⁴⁵

The year 1925 also marked the opening of the first permanent day school by the Ukrainian Catholics in the United States.⁴⁶ The Sisters of St. Basil in conjunction with their orphanage in Philadelphia opened the first school on September 8, 1925, at 702 Parish Street, with about 70 children divided into the first three classes.⁴⁷ Each year an additional class was to be added so that by the end of the fifth year a complete eight grade grammar school would be completed. The school, attended by the children of St. Basil's orphanage and the children of the Cathedral parishioners, graduated its first class of fifteen students in June of 1930. Although the school was originally called St. Joseph's grammar school, the name was later changed to St. Basil's School at the request of Monsignor Bonner, superintendent of Catholic Schools, to prevent misunderstandings since there were several St. Joseph's schools of the Latin Rite in the city.

⁴⁵Visty, (September, 1925), p. 6.

⁴⁶A Day school was opened by the Sisters in Philadelphia, in 1916, however, with the death of Bishop Ortynsky the school, which had no financial support except that provided by the bishop, was forced to close.

⁴⁷America, September 10, 1925, p. 1. The new school was solemnly blessed on November 29, by Bishop Bohachevsky, See Ibid., December 1, 1925, p. 1.

The early 1930's saw the fruition of the Bishop's educational plans for his diocese. In September of 1931, St. Basil's Academy for girls was opened by the Sisters of St. Basil the Great at their new Mother House in Fox Chase, Pennsylvania. A total of 12 students, most of whom were candidates for the sisterhood, were enrolled that year in the Freshman and Sophomore years of High School. The following year a third class was added, and in 1933-34 the addition of the Senior grade completed a full four-year High School.

The announcement by the Bishop's chancery in February of 1933 that a building had been purchased in Stamford, Connecticut, for a Minor Seminary and a High School for boys,⁴⁸ marked the beginning of the end of a long struggle for a major goal. The establishment of a Minor Seminary had been an important objective of the first Bishop, Soter Ortynsky, and it was a serious problem with which Father Poniatishin wrestled during the difficult years of his administration. Finally, the goal was to be realized by Bishop Bohachevsky in 1933, nine years after his arrival in the United States. "In the last nine years our community has lived through a great spiritual and intellectual crisis," wrote Bishop Bohachevsky. "It has become clear to us that the periodic outbreaks of conflicts, of everybody against everybody, amongst our immigrants arise from the fact that we lack our own schools which would spread our culture."⁴⁹

⁴⁸Visty, VIII (February, 1933), 10.

⁴⁹Ibid., (May, 1933), p. 19.

The cultural importance of this project to the Bishop's administration is obvious. The broad significance of this event in the history of the Ukrainian Catholics in the United States was almost prophetically foreseen by America, in a welcoming article on the occasion of the forthcoming Grand Opening of the Seminary and High School.

Perhaps for once it will be possible for us to develop from within ourselves a sense of authority? Perhaps we will realize, that it is not for all of us to lead and stand at the head, but every one must find for himself an appropriate place in the work of the people?...

Perhaps from this very solemnity of the opening of the school we will be inspired to great deeds in the future?...⁵⁰

There is no doubt that the opening of the Minor Seminary and High School in Stamford, Connecticut, in 1933 ushered in a new and brighter era in the history of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in the United States. It marked the beginning of the end of that long history of struggles, of doubts, and uncertainties, concerning the future of the Byzantine Rite in the United States. The American-Ukrainian Catholics could now look boldly to the future. No wonder that the formal blessing and opening of the Stamford institution was carried out on a grand scale.

The festivities began during a continuous downpour on Labor Day, September 4, 1933, with the Right Rev. Basil Ladyka, the Ukrainian Bishop from Canada, celebrating an open air Pontifical High Mass with Bishop Bohachevsky and the Rusin

⁵⁰ America, August 29, 1933, p. 1.

Bishop, Basil Takach from Pittsburgh presiding. The co-celebrants of the Mass, which was held under the rotunda at the entrance of the beautiful and castle-like building situated on seven acres of the former Glen Eden Estate, were Very Revs. Peter Poniatishin from New York City and Philemon Tarnavsky from Chester, Pennsylvania. A great throng of about four thousand people, including numerous clerical and civil dignitaries, participated in this historic ceremony in Stamford.⁵¹

Thus, the "minor seminary" in Philadelphia was transferred to Stamford, with Very Rev. Paul Procko, the Rector of the seminary in Philadelphia since 1926, becoming the first Rector of the new Ukrainian Catholic Seminary and its associated High School, the St. Basil's Preparatory School. Classes began in September of 1933 with 22 students. The following year the enrollment more than doubled. According to diocesan statistics 45 students were enrolled for the 1934-1935 school year, with 28 of these being resident students.⁵²

It must be added that in the same year the Diocese also had a total of 17 seminarians studying abroad, 12 of whom were in Rome, and five in Stanislaviv, Poland.⁵³

⁵¹ Ibid., September 7, 1933, p. 1.; September 9, 1933, p.2.

⁵² Visty, IX, (September, 1934), 63.

⁵³ Ibid., (November, 1934), p. 63.

It should also be noted that the great majority of both the diocesan seminarians abroad and the students in Stamford were supported by the Diocese.⁵⁴

The growing enrollment in Stamford soon necessitated an expansion of the Seminary and High School facilities. In July 1935 the Bishop acquired three additional buildings adjoining the Seminary property⁵⁵ which provided a new classroom building, a gymnasium, and rooms for a Library and Museum. A Ukrainian Catholic Library and Museum, to be housed on the Seminary grounds in Stamford, was planned early in 1935,⁵⁶ and Very Rev. Leo Chapelsky was appointed shortly thereafter as the Director.⁵⁷ In addition, as early as 1935, Bishop Bohachevsky intended to expand the Seminary institutions in Stamford to include a College.⁵⁸ His plans were

⁵⁴Ibid., p. 63; (September, 1934), p. 63.

⁵⁵Ibid., X (August, 1935), 34.

⁵⁶Ibid., VIII (May, 1933), 23.

⁵⁷Ibid., (June, 1933), p. 35.

⁵⁸Ibid., X (November, 1935), 44.

to create at the Seminary in Stamford a cultural center for Ukrainian Catholics in the United States.⁵⁹

During the chaotic conditions of the mid-twenties some of the Ukrainian intellectuals in the United States were of the opinion that the Ukrainian immigrants were leaving their traditional Churches mostly for cultural reasons.⁶⁰ Now in the mid-thirties Stamford was to become a Ukrainian Catholic cultural center where important religious and cultural events were to be held. Thus, for example, the Seminary in Stamford became a frequent site of the yearly recollections of the diocesan clergy, it was the place of various conferences and celebrations, such as the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in the United States which was held on Labor Day, 1934.

The opening of the Seminary and High School in Stamford, Connecticut, illustrates the educational and organizational emphasis of the diocese in the 1930's. As a matter of fact, on the same day of the great festivities in Stamford in 1933, the third parochial day school in the Ukrainian diocese was opened in Pittsburgh. (Only Philadelphia and Olyphant, Pennsylvania, had established day schools at an earlier date.) The hope was expressed .

⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 45.

⁶⁰ See e.g., Osyp Nazaruk, Kalendar Syrytskoho Domu, 1926, p. 67.

at that time that perhaps the opening of the third day school on the same day as the opening of the first diocesan High School might serve as the beginning of a systematic organization of diocesan schools in the future.⁶¹

Bishop Bohachevsky's thorough organization of his diocese and its continued growth since the middle 1930's, culminating in the erection of the First Byzantine Rite Province in the United States, will be the subject of our concluding chapter..

⁶¹America, September 19, 1933, p. 2.

CHAPTER V

THE ROAD TO MATURITY

1. Accomplishments to Second World War.

Although the Ukrainian Catholic Church in the United States had good cause in the mid 1930's to look boldly to the future, nevertheless, the immediate outlook was still not too bright. The internal difficulties were not yet at an end and, in addition, the Ukrainian Catholics were still isolated to a deplorable degree from the overall life of the Catholic Church in the United States. This was poignantly expressed by Rev. J. X. Heally of Boston, Massachusetts, in 1935.

... Here is our midst is an element, Greek in Rite, Roman in fealty, battling unaided against the common enemies of us all, and we are hardly aware of its very existence. With naught but culpable ignorance to plead in defense of our aloofness, we extend no hand of fraternal greeting, offer no word of encouragement. Years of constant association have convinced me that of all the ills now afflicting our Catholic Ukrainians, there is not one which could not be rendered the more tolerable by our charitable cooperation. Hence I submit that their present lamentable plights is attributed in no small measure to indifference and lack of sympathy on the part of their fellow Catholics of the Latin Rite.¹

¹Heally, "Our Catholic Ruthenians", AER, XCIII (July, 1935), 78-79.

These conditions were still common despite the fact that Pope Pius XI, in his Encyclical Rerum Orientalium, issued on September 8, 1928, insisted on "charity toward those who, in the diversity of rites, intimately adhere heart and soul to the Roman Church and to the Vicar of Christ," and in which he voiced his desire that "the first elements of the Oriental questions" be taught in all theological seminaries.² It is well to remember, however, that the entire decade of the 1930's was a transitional one for the American Ukrainian Catholics, a period during which such writers as Father Heally and others were making important contributions toward changing the unfortunate conditions referred to. Rev. Desmond A. Schmal, S. J., from Mundelein, Illinois, for instance, demonstrated a great understanding of the nature of the inter-rite frictions, and displayed a most charitable understanding of the grievances of the Ruthenian Rite Catholics.

The Ruthenians' grievance against us--and it is not without foundation--is that we fail to recognize in them true brethren in the faith; that we look askance at their rite; and that at times we fail to observe the very prescriptions of ecclesiastical law which are meant to safeguard them in their devotion to ancient customs and privileges which the Holy See urges them to preserve. Their grievance we can remove only

²An Encyclical Letter of Pope Pius XI on the Eastern Churches. A translation of Rerum Orientalium, (Washington, D.C.: Catholic Near East Welfare Association, (n.d.), p. 8.

by associating ourselves heart and soul with the Pope's sentiments toward the Oriental Catholics and by showing forth that association, practically, in our obedience to whatever the Church has prescribed for our dealings with them.³

The most serious obstacle to a spirit of fraternity between the Latin and Byzantine Rite priests was the fact that the majority of the latter at this time were married men. The reaffirmation of the old regulation (which was not always enforced) against the immigration of married priests from Europe by the decree Cum Data Fuerit in 1929, and its enforcement, contributed greatly to the development of the spirit of fraternalism among the Latin and Byzantine clergy. It also helped to bring about a change in the character of the Byzantine Rite clergy in the United States; from primarily a married clergy of European origin, to a celibate and American-born clergy.

Although Bishop Bohachevsky's enforcement of the celibacy rule resulted in a flare up of the fight against him, the great majority of the clergy gave their steadfast

³Schmal, "The Ruthenian Question in the United States," AER., XCVIII (November, 1937), 456. Although this article is dated, the writer recommends it most highly to everyone interested in improving his understanding of the Ruthenian Rite Catholics in the United States.

support to their Bishop.⁴ In the long run the celibacy rule meant a greater emphasis on the need of an American-born Ukrainian clergy, which in turn, led to a much improved inter-communication between the Latin and the Byzantine Rite branches of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States. A native American source of future clerics was indispensable if the Church was to prosper in the future. The reaffirmation of discipline and reorganization of existing institutions, as well as the founding of new ones, characterized the bishop's administration in the next decade and a half.

Thus in 1935, at the invitation of Bishop Bohachevsky, Sisters Servants of Mary Immaculate (S.S.M.I.), arrived from Canada to establish a permanent residence in the diocese. With Sisters Servants as well as the Basilian sisters available to staff parochial schools, the Bishop placed an even greater emphasis on the organization of day schools.⁵ By September of 1940, the number of parish day

⁴The reader should be aware that celibacy is a law which does not bind all the priests of the Catholic Church. The majority of the secular priests of the Oriental Church were married men. The introduction of the celibacy rule among the Ruthenian Rite priests in the United States was the result of the different conditions found in America from those in their homeland in Europe.

⁵Visty, XI (November, 1936), 69.

schools had jumped to 16, with seven of this number being opened for the first time in 1940.⁶ In 1937, the Sisters Servants opened their first Home for the Aged in Philadelphia at Brown and Franklin Streets, and two years later they established the St. Mary's Villa Academy, a High School for girls, adjoining their convent in Sloatsburg, New York.

Beginning in 1937 frequent diocesan Eucharistic Congresses were organized.⁷ The Congress held in Chicago in June 1941, organized under the direction of Very Rev. Ambrose Senyshyn, the superior of the Basilians in Chicago, was an outstanding success and attracted national attention to the Byzantine Rite in the United States.⁸ The Congress was attended by an estimated 50,000 people and had the participation of the Apostolic Delegate, Archbishop Cicognani; Archbishop Stritch of Chicago and his auxiliary, Bishop O'Brien; the four Byzantine Rite Bishops in the new world; and of course numerous clergy of both rites.⁹

⁶Ibid., XV (August, 1940), 34.; November, 1940, p.47. For a list of all the schools operated by the Basilian Sisters and Sisters Servants in 1940, as well as for the statistical information concerning these schools, see Knyha Kaledza, p. 51.

⁷Visty, XII (May, 1937), 16; XIII (August, 1938), 30; (November, 1938), pp. 42-43, pp. 51-53.

⁸Ibid., XVI (November, 1941), 43-44.

⁹Ibid., p. 44.

The reader should be aware that in addition to and parallel with the important and effective diocesan organization taking place during this period, there was also the continuation of some of the difficulties resulting from the recent internal conflicts referred to in the preceding chapter.

For instance, the long struggle for the control of St. Michael's Church in Woonsochet, Rhode Island, between the diocese and the opposition claiming independence for that church, was to continue into 1938. After 11 years of disputation and court litigation, the Supreme Court of that State finally decided on January 25, 1938 that St. Michael's was to remain a Catholic Church under the jurisdiction of Bishop Bohachevsky.¹⁰ The Court's decision was based on the fact that St. Michael's was a Catholic Church under the jurisdiction of the Byzantine Catholic Bishop from the very beginning of its founding. Bishop Bohachevsky's Administration considered this decision, and the motives behind it, extremely important to the continued progress of the diocese.¹¹ Let us return, however, to our main theme.

Early in 1939, for more efficient administration, the diocese was redivided into the following seven Deaneries

¹⁰St. Michael's Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church of Woonsocket, R.I. v. Bohachevsky, 196, Atlantic Reporter, pp. 796-812 (1938).

¹¹Visty, XIII (November, 1938), 43-44.

extending over the entire United States: Scranton, with 25 communities included in the deanery; Pittsburgh, 25 communities; Philadelphia, 20; New York, 14; New England, 14; Chicago, 16; and Buffalo with 15 communities.¹² The Deans of the new Deaneries were Very Revs.: Nicholas Simenovich for Chicago; Anthony Lotowycz, New York; Alexander Rotko, New England; Michael Kuziv, Buffalo; Michael Oleksiv, Scranton; and Vladimir Ulianytsky for Philadelphia.¹³ In the Fall of 1939, a new high in the Bishop's educational drive was reached with the opening of a Ukrainian Catholic College, a drive which was to culminate in 1941 with the opening of St. Josaphat's Major Seminary. At a meeting of the Bishop's Consistory in Philadelphia on October 18, 1938, it was officially decided to found a College in Stamford, Connecticut.¹⁴ Rev. Stephen Pobutsky, pastor of Auburn, New York, was named the director of the campaign toward that end. In March of 1939 a special legislative act of the State of Connecticut authorized the Ukrainian Catholic Seminary to

¹²Ibid., XIV (May, 1939), 28-29.

¹³Ibid., p. 29. The Pittsburgh deanery remained vacant temporarily. (See CD., 1940, p. 639).

¹⁴Ibid., XIII (November, 1938), 42.

conduct a College and to confer Academic degrees.¹⁵ Classes at the newly opened St. Basil's College began in September, 1939, with 17 students enrolled.

2. Effects of the War on the Diocese.

The opening of hostilities in Europe on September 1, 1939, had an immediate effect on Bishop Bohachevsky's educational plans as well as on his diocese in general, which depended on European seminaries for the training of its young priests. The war altered the plans of the Bishop and forced him to hurry the long intended opening of a Major Seminary.

In August of 1939, according to Bishop Bohachevsky's official explanation,¹⁶ the first group of the diocesan seminarians left for Europe and reached their destination in the first days of the War. In September, ten seminarians arrived in Stamford to prepare for their departure for St. Josaphat's College in Rome. Because of the hostilities the latter were refused permission to go abroad. Shortly thereafter, considerable funds were required for the return passage of 30 diocesan seminarians who were either in Rome or Innsbruck.¹⁷ Thus, the Bishop, who had announced in a pastoral letter in January , , 1940 his plans of purchasing

¹⁵Connecticut, Special Laws (1939), XXIII, Part 1, 300.

¹⁶The bishop's announcement dated March 5, 1941, in Visty, XVI (May, 1941), 16.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 16.

substantial property in the vicinity of Philadelphia for the establishment of St. Josaphat's Major Seminary,¹⁸ was forced by the circumstances of War to alter these plans.

The Seminarians studying theology were sent to St. Mary's Seminary in Baltimore while those in philosophy attended St. Basil's, the diocesan College in Stamford. Finally in April of 1941 construction began on a new Seminary building in Stamford to help accommodate the philosophy students. In the Fall of the same year St. Josaphat's Major Seminary for the diocesan theology students was opened in Washington, D. C. in a rented home on Lincoln Road, N. E., simply because the diocese could not afford to buy or erect its own building.¹⁹ The Seminarians residing at St. Josaphat's attended near-by Catholic University. Thus after many years of planning, by two Bishops and an administrator, the Philadelphia Byzantine Rite diocese succeeded in establishing its own Major Seminary thereby completing the institutions for the training of its own clergy.

Another unusual after-effect of the War on the Ukrainian diocese in the United States was the appointment of Bishop John Buchko, auxiliary of Metropolitan Sheptytsky of Galicia, as the temporary auxiliary to Bishop Bohachevsky. Buchko, who was in South America visiting Ukrainian Colonies

¹⁸Visty, XV (February, 1940), 3.

¹⁹Ibid., XVI (November, 1941), 42-43.

when the war started, was unable to return to Galicia due to the Soviet occupation of Eastern Poland. Early in 1940, in answer to Bishop Bohachevsky's request, the Holy See appointed Bishop Buchko as the auxiliary bishop for the Ukrainian Diocese in the United States.²⁰ Bishop Bohachevsky named his auxiliary the Vicar General of the Diocese as well as the pastor of St. George's Church in New York City.

When early in 1942 Bishop Buchko returned to Europe, to become the Apostolic Visitor to Ukrainian refugees in Western Europe, Bishop Bohachevsky was again left without an auxiliary. On July 6 of the same year, however, Pope Pius XII appointed Very Rev. Ambrose Senyshyn, O.B.S.M., as titular Bishop of Maina and the new auxiliary to Bohachevsky. The far reaching significance of this permanent appointment was readily understood by the Bishop's administration: to provide for continued episcopal authority in the event of the unexpected death of the Ordinary.²¹ The Administration was well aware of the difficult period that followed in the history of the Ukrainian Church in the United States after the sudden death of Bishop Ortynsky in 1916. Despite the efforts of the administrator, during the eight and a half years that the church remained without a Bishop, the diocesan debts grew and the authority of the church

²⁰ Ibid., XV (May, 1940), 14.

²¹ Ibid., XVII (August, 1942), 24.

declined. These conditions in turn contributed to the difficulties that Bishop Bohachevsky had to face during the early years of his administration. Thus, the appointment of Bishop Senyshyn as the auxiliary loomed very important.

Bishop-elect Senyshyn, who at the time of his appointment was the superior of the Basilian Fathers in Chicago, was born in Stary Sambir, Galicia, on February 23, 1903.²² After obtaining his primary education in Sambir he continued his Secondary education in St. Josaphat's Institute in Lviv. In 1923 he entered the Order of St. Basil the Great. After completing his novitiate in Krekhov, he was sent to Lavrov, Debromyl, and Krystonopol, all in Galicia for his philosophy and theology studies. He was ordained in Krekhov on August 23, 1931 by Bishop Josaphat Kotsylovsky of Peremyshl. After a brief period at Krestynopol, Father Sensyshyn was assigned to the Byzantine Rite Church of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary in Warsaw. In 1933, he arrived in the United States to join the Basilian community established at St. Nicholas Church in Chicago. He was appointed Superior of the Chicago monastery in September, 1937, and it was under his direction that the very successful Eurcharistic Congress was held in Chicago in June of 1941.

Bishop Senyshyn's consecration, the first in the Byzantine Rite to be performed in the United States, was held in St. Nicholas' Church in Chicago on October 22, 1942,

²² Ibid., p. 24, contains an authoratative brief biographical sketch of Bishop Senyshyn.

with Bishop Bonachevsky as the consecrator, and Bishops Ladyka from Canada and Basil Takach from the Ruthenian Diocese of Pittsburgh as co-consecrators.²³ After his enthronement at the newly renovated Cathedral in Philadelphia on December 17, 1942, the auxiliary established his residence in the administration building of the Minor Seminary in Stamford.

Because the Ukrainian Press in Europe was interrupted by the war, the press of the Ukrainian Catholic Diocese in the United States was considered doubly important.²⁴ Consequently, with the beginning of 1940, a new diocesan weekly, The Way (Shlakh), began its publication. The Bishop's administration expressed the hope that the new paper, published both in Ukrainian and English sections, would find its way to the home of every parishioner within the Diocese.²⁵

Naturally, the war had also direct and personal effects on individual members of Bishop Bohachevsky's diocese, as it had on all citizens of the country. According to diocesan statistics, about 28,000 young men and women served in the military services up to about the middle of

²³For a detailed account of the Consecration ceremonies see Shlakh, October 31, 1942, p. 1.

²⁴America, October 17, 1940, p. 2.

²⁵Visty, XV (May, 1940), 20.

1945.²⁶ Although the above figure is not final, it represents a substantial percentage of the official total membership of 303,069 (men, women and children), as of 1945.²⁷

Lastly, due to the consequences of the struggles in Eastern Europe, between two and five million Ukrainians from Polish Galicia, Soviet Ukraine, and other areas of Eastern Europe, were scattered through western European lands, such as Germany, France, and Italy.²⁸ Bishop Bohachevsky's diocese attempted to provide material aid to these victims of war. For instance, on December 3, 1945, Bishop Bohachevsky mailed a check for nearly \$5,000.00 to the Apostolic Delegate, for transmittal to the Pope, to be used for relief among Ukrainian war victims in the three countries named above.²⁹ In 1946, a Ukrainian Catholic Relief Committee was organized under the direction of Auxiliary Bishop Senyshyn. The committee, which worked in conjunction with the Catholic Relief Service of the National Catholic Welfare Conference,

²⁶ Ibid., XX (August, 1945), 38.

²⁷ GD., 1945, p. 779.

²⁸ See David Martin's enlightening "Not 'Displaced Persons' - But Refugees," The Ukrainian Quarterly, IV (Spring, 1948), 109-114. Mr. Martin was the Secretary of the Refugees' Defense Committee.

²⁹ The Apostolic Delegate's letter thanking Bishop Bohachevsky for his letter of December 3 and the enclosed check appears in Visty, XXI, (February, 1946), 2.

sent Rev. John Stock as its representative to Europe, where he carried on the committee's work for six years. According to the Committee's representative at the N.C.W.C. offices in New York City, more than 100,000 Ukrainian immigrants left Europe for the United States and of that number close to 60,000 emigrated through the mediation of the Ukrainian Catholic Relief Committee.³⁰

3. Post War Expansion

The Ukrainian Catholic Church in the United States actually reached its maturity in the post World War II period. Practically speaking, the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Eastern Europe ceased to exist in 1946 with the arrest of the entire hierarchy, including Metropolitan Joseph Slipy of Galicia, and the official incorporation of the Church under the jurisdiction of the Orthodox Patriarchate of Moscow. The Byzantine Rite Catholic Church in the new world was now to become the sole source of spiritual and material leadership of that branch of the Roman Catholic Church. The post war growth of the Ukrainian Diocese in the United States, and its role of leadership, will be the subject of this section of our final chapter.

The expansion of monastic communities and institutions within the diocese was one phase of the diocesan

³⁰Bohdan Karpevich, "Pomich Bratovi z dalekoi dorohy" Tserkva sv. Yura, p. 184.

growth in this period. In October 1944, the Missionary Sisters of Mother of God (M.S.M.G.), were established by Bishop Bohachevsky who appointed his auxiliary Bishop Senyshyn to be the guide and Spiritual Director of the new Congregation. The Missionary Sisters were organized from a nucleus of the Ukrainian Franciscan Sisters who were brought into the diocese from Brazil in 1939 to take charge of the household duties at the Minor Seminary in Stamford.³¹ A reorganization, and a new Constitution, resulted in the founding of the new Congregation. Under the guidance of Bishops Bohachevsky and Senyshyn, the sisters opened the Mother of God Academy, a high school for girls, in September of 1945 on West North Street in Stamford adjoining their Convent at Hubbard Avenue. To take charge of the household duties at the Seminary in Stamford, and later at the Major Seminary in Washington and in Philadelphia, the Sisters of the Sacred Heart (PP.OO.SS.CC.), were brought into the diocese from Rome in 1948.

The Ukrainian Redemptorist Fathers (C.SS.R.) finally established a permanent residence in the United States in 1946 when, after many requests by Bishop Bohachevsky, they accepted the administration of St. John the Baptist Church

³¹See the diocesan paper, The Way, December 19, 1942, pp. 8-9 for background on the Sisters of St. Francis of Assisi.

in Newark, New Jersey. The Redemptorists from Canada had been directing missions in the United States for many years, now, from their center in Newark, they would be in a much improved position to continue and extend their work of missions and retreats for the clergy and the faithful of Bishop Bohachevsky's Diocese.³²

The Diocese gained a third congregation of monks to labor amongst its faithful when Bishop Bohachevsky invited Rev. Francis S. Duchala, O.F.M. the first American Latin Rite Franciscan to volunteer and work with the Byzantine Rite, to found an Eastern Rite Franciscan friary in his diocese. Father Duchala guided the first priory in Sybertsville, Pennsylvania, during the critical years of foundation from 1945 to 1948. Incidentally, Father (Emile) Josaphat Ananevich, the co-organizer of the Ukrainian Franciscan Sisters in Brazil in 1933, was the first Ukrainian priest to join this Byzantine Franciscan community. In January of 1948, an independent Byzantine Rite Franciscan Commissariat was established with Very Rev. Carol Talariko, O.F.M. becoming the first Superior. The headquarters of the

³²For background on Ukrainian Redemptorist Fathers see Michael Hrynchyshyn, C.S.S.R., "Redemptorists of the Ukrainian (Ruthenian) Rite," Jubilee Book of Redemptorist Fathers of the Eastern Rite (Yorktown, Sask: The Redeemers Voice, 1955), pp. 375-422.

of the new Commissariat were located in New Canann,
 Connecticut.³³

The growth of the Ukrainian Church in the post-war period was also to be seen in the expansion of the existing institutions and organizations. For instance, by a decree of July 23, 1948 an independent Monastic Province of the Basilian Fathers in the United States was created.³⁴ Very Rev. Nickolas Kohut, O.S.B.M. the first Superior General of the new Province with its center in New York,³⁵ was shortly thereafter succeeded by Very Rev. Max Markiv, O.S.B.M.

The year 1947 marked an important development in the diocesan Orphanage which is conducted by the Basilian Sisters. After 35 years of operation in the crowded quarters of North Seventh Street, the Sisters purchased eighteen acres at 1825 West Lindley Avenue, in North Philadelphia, as a site for the Orphanage. Although the new grounds were partially occupied by a limited number of orphans as early as 1948, due to extreme shortage of funds

³³Visty, XXIII (February, 1948), 10.

³⁴Decree from the general headquarters of the Basilian Order of St. Josaphat in Rome, dated July 23, 1948, and signed by Rev. Hlib Kinakh, O.S.B.M. Vicar General; and by Rev. Joseph Zaiachkivsky, O.S.B.M. General Secretary, in Pamiatka Novoi Provintsii oo Vasyliian (New York: Basilian Fathers, 1948), p. 7.

³⁵Visty, XXIII (August, 1948), p. 42.

It was not until June of 1953 that ground was broken for the construction of one-fifth of the original master-project, and it was late in 1954 that the new structure, containing the most essential needs of the orphanage, was finally solemnly blessed and dedicated. Thus the vision of Bishop Ortynsky to provide a spacious new orphanage on a farm in Chesapeake, Maryland, which was revived and revised after the arrival of Bishop Bohachevsky under the leadership of Very Rev. Mother Josaphat, (who guided the Basilian Sisters for 25 years), finally came to fruition under the direction of her successors Very Rev. Mothers Eusebia and Zenobia.³⁶ Incidentally, an interesting tangent in the history of the Orphanage is the fact that since the 1920's the orphans of St. Basil's have been entertained twice a year by the Bishop Newman Council of the Knights of Columbus. On Thanksgiving the Knights provide and serve a turkey dinner and entertain the orphans, and every June they take the children to an amusement park which the Knights reserve for their use that day.

Pedagogically speaking, by 1949, twenty-five years since the arrival of Bishop Bohachevsky, the Diocese was to contain a very impressive list of institutions. For in-

³⁶ Solemn Blessing and Dedication of St. Basil's Home, 1954, pp. 27-28. The official brochure published on the occasion of the blessing of the new orphanage.

stance, besides St. Basil's, the diocesan College in Stamford, the Sisters of St. Basil opened Manor Junior College for Women, adjoining their Mother House in Fox Chase, in 1947.³⁷ On the secondary level, five High Schools were now functioning within the diocese. In addition to St. Basil's Preparatory School, the diocesan High School in Stamford, the Basilian Fathers in New York opened St. George's High School for boys in 1946. Three High Schools for girls were conducted by the various congregations of Sisters, namely: St. Basil's Academy in Fox Chase, conducted by the Basilian Sisters; the Mother of God Academy in Stamford, operated by the Missionary Sisters; and St. Mary's Villa Academy in Sloatsburg, New York, which was founded by the Sisters' Servants. In addition, 25 parochial day schools were now operating within the diocese³⁸ under the direction of the sisters.

The whole diocesan education system was rounded out with the erection of a Theological Seminary building. In February of 1949, the Bishop announced that land had been

³⁷Mention must also be made of the College of the Basilian Fathers in Glen Cove, Pennsylvania, which the Basilians conducts for their own Seminarians.

³⁸Visty, XXIII (November, 1948), p. 65.

purchased for that purpose in Washington, D.C., near Catholic University.³⁹ Although the Bishop had hoped to erect the Diocesan Major Seminary building in 1950,⁴⁰ it was not until May 31, 1952 that the new Theological Seminary was completed and dedicated.⁴¹ After long years of planning and striving, the diocese had completed the necessary institutions for the training of its young priests.

The post war period also witnessed major legal developments. The necessity of a revised and unified Code of Oriental Canon Law was apparent for many years. To facilitate further smooth relations and church administration, Pope Pius XI formed a Commission for the codification of Oriental Canon Law in 1929, with the promulgation of the first section of the Law, a steady flow of regulations emanated from Rome which affected the Ukrainian diocese in the United States.

The first section of the Law, the motu proprio Crebrae Allatae, which contains the matrimonial law of the

³⁹Ibid., XXIV (February, 1949), p. 8.

⁴⁰Ibid., (November, 1949), p. 76.

⁴¹Visty, XXVII (August 1952), p. 78.

Oriental Church, was published on February 22, 1949 and went into legal force on May 2, of the same year.⁴² This was followed by the motu proprio Sollicitudinem Nostram, the Law on Court Procedure, published on January 6, 1950 and becoming effective on January 6, 1951.⁴³ A third section, the motu proprio Postquam Apostolicis, Law on Religious and on Church Property, was published on February 9, 1952 and went into force on November 21, 1952.⁴⁴ The Postquam Apostolicis contains a glossary of canonical terms including an enumeration of the following major Oriental Rites: Alexandrian, Antiochan, Byzantine (Constantinople), Chaldean, and Armenian (Can. 303, Part 1).⁴⁵ The newest section of the Code, the motu proprio Cleri Sanctitati, the Law on Persons, was promulgated on June 2, 1957 and went into legal force on March 25, 1958.⁴⁶ It is this latest part of the Code, incidentally, which defines the hierarchical structure of the Church according to the tradi-

⁴² AAS., XLI, 1949, 89-119.

⁴³ Ibid., XLII, 1950, 5-120.

⁴⁴ Ibid., XLIV, 1952, 15-150.

⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 144.

⁴⁶ Ibid., XLIX, 1957, 433-600.

tions of the East.

Along with the publication of the new sections of the Law Code various new liturgical regulations emanated from Rome in the post-war period. The new regulations were strictly enforced by Bishop Bohachevsky. Beginning in 1949, for example, frequent topics of discussion at Deanery meetings were concerned with the appearance of the churches according to the new rules.⁴⁷ In the official diocesan bulletin the Eparkhiialni Visty, the priests were often reminded of the proper style and appointment of the church interiors according to the Ukrainian discipline of the Byzantine Rite. They were reminded, for instance, that the proper form of the altar was square, and that the tabernacle was to be small.⁴⁸ Whether it be in the use of the new Rubrics⁴⁹ or in the erection of Ikonastasis⁵⁰ (the screen with icons which separates the faithful from the sanctuary), the Bishop stressed the new directives from Rome. One cannot read through the diocesan Visty, particularly from 1949 through 1952, without being impressed with the energy with which Bishop Bohachevsky enforced the new regulations.

⁴⁷Visty, XXIV (May, 1949), p. 41

⁴⁸Ibid., p. 33.

⁴⁹Ibid., XXVI (August, 1951), pp. 73-74.

⁵⁰Ibid., (November, 1951), p. 114.

Issue after issue of the Visty contains numerous and diverse directives,⁵¹ ranging from theological questions to be answered by the clergy,⁵² and inter-rite problems of jurisdiction,⁵³ to the administration of church property,⁵⁴ and diocesan honors and titles.⁵⁵

The need for appropriate norms for the particular conditions in which the Ukrainian Catholic Church functioned in the United States had been felt from the very beginning of the Diocese.⁵⁶ From 1950, particularly through discussions at Deanery meetings, the ground work was laid for the formal promulgation of Temporary Diocesan Statutes which would become effective throughout the diocese. The first volume of the Statutes was published in 1953, the fortieth anniversary of the Diocese.⁵⁷ This volume was a

⁵¹ See, for example, Visty, XXVII (May, 1952). This issue is replete with specific regulations to the clergy of the Diocese.

⁵² Ibid., (May, 1952), p. 51.

⁵³ Ibid., (February, 1952), pp. 19-24.

⁵⁴ Ibid., (May, 1952), p. 49.

⁵⁵ Ibid., (February, 1952), p. 25.

⁵⁶ Ibid., XXVI, (May, 1951), p. 45.

⁵⁷ Temporary Diocesan Statutes of the Byzantine Rite Apostolic Exarchy of Philadelphia (Philadelphia: Bishop's Chancery, 1953).

collection of 80 of the most important regulations of the Ordinariat which regulated matters of Faith, Sacraments, Liturgical regulations, Church discipline of clergy and faithful, and the administration of church property.⁵⁸

The post war period also marked the expansion of the Ukrainian Catholic Church to the west coast with the organization of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary Parish at Los Angeles in 1947. In addition, for a more effective administration, early in 1950 a new Cleveland Deanery was created when the Ohio parishes were separated from the Pittsburgh District. Very Rev. Dmytro Gresko of Cleveland, the Pittsburgh Dean, now became dean of Cleveland and Very Rev. Ignatius Halushka was named the administrator of the Pittsburgh Deanery.⁵⁹ Early the following year a Shamokin Deanery was also created by dividing the Scranton District. Very Rev. Vladimir Andrushkiw continued as the Administrator of Scranton and Very Rev. Emile Sharanevych was appointed the administrator of the newly created Deanery of Shamokin.⁶⁰

⁵⁸ Visty, XXVIII (November, 1953), p. 89.

⁵⁹ Ibid., XXV (February, 1950), p. 10

⁶⁰ Ibid., XXVI (February, 1951), p. 9.

The expansion of Bishop Bohachevsky's Diocese in the latter 1940's and the early 1950's was contributed to by the substantial new Ukrainian immigration from European displaced persons camps. Bishop Bohachevsky also accepted many displaced priests, particularly from the Archdiocese of Lviv and the Dioceses of Stanyslaviv and Peremyshl in Galicia,⁶¹ after their dioceses were disrupted by the Soviet Regimes. In 1946, for instance, the greater part of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Galicia was officially incorporated under the jurisdiction of the Russian Orthodox Patriarch of Moscow after its entire hierarchy, including Metropolitan Joseph Slipy, were arrested and sentenced to hard labor in Siberia.⁶²

⁶¹The arrival of displaced priests from Europe appears to have reached its peak in 1950, based on the official notices of new jurisdictions received which appeared in the diocesan Visty.

⁶²The Black Deeds of the Kremlin, Vol. I, Book of Testimonies, (Toronto, Canada: Ukrainian Association of Victims of Russian Terror, 1953) pp. 511-527, contains valuable information relating to these matters.

Only Metropolitan Slipy, whose release was unexpectedly announced on February 9, 1963, has survived that ordeal.⁶³

4. The Years of Fulfillment.

In the eight years between 1953 and 1961, the Ukrainian Catholic Church in the United States experienced a series of important developments leading to the legal maturity of the Church and her expansion to the present level. These developments began early in 1953 when Pope Pius XII named five priests of Bishop Bohachevsky's diocese as Private Papal Chamberlains, with the title of Very Rev. Monsignors. The priests so honored were: Joseph Batza, Nicholas Babak, Joseph Schmondiuk, Dmytro Gresko, and John Stock.⁶⁴ On April 5 of the following year, much to the gratification of all Ukrainian Catholics, the Pope raised Bishop Bohachevsky to the dignity of Titular Archbishop of Berce.⁶⁵

In October of 1954, Archbishop Bohachevsky's diocese sponsored a great National Eucharistic Marian Congress

⁶³The Catholic Standard and Times, (Philadelphia), February 15, 1963, pp. 1, 3 and 4 contain a biographical sketch of Metropolitan Slipy, as well as a summary of the vissitudes of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Europe since World War II.

⁶⁴AAS., XXXXV (1953), 522.

⁶⁵Ibid., XXXXVI (1954), 294.

of the Oriental Rites. The Congress was held in Philadelphia on October 22-24, under the general chairmanship of Auxiliary Bishop Senyshyn, with members of the Latin and Oriental Hierarchy in the United States, Canada, Europe, and the Near East participating.⁶⁶ The highlight of the very successful Congress, in the opinion of the writer, was the concelebration of Divine Liturgies (Holy Masses) in different rites at nine altars simultaneously, which took place in Philadelphia's Convention Hall on October twenty-third. The Apostolic Delegate, Archbishop Cicognani presided at the unusual concelebration which was witnessed by thousands of the faithful of the Latin and the Oriental Rites.

A great milestone was reached by the Ukrainian Church in the United States on August 8, 1956 with the establishment of a second diocese (exarchy) for Americans of Ukrainian descent.⁶⁷ The new diocese, with its seat in Stamford, Connecticut, comprised the New England States and

⁶⁶ National Eucharistic Marian Congress of the Oriental Rites (1954), a 36 page Program Brochure of the Congress, contains a very impressive list of the members of the Latin and Oriental Rites hierarchy and clergy participating in the great Congress.

⁶⁷ AAS., XXXIX (1957), pp. 116-118, contains the Apostolic Constitution Optatissimo unitatis, dated July 20, 1956, dividing the Philadelphia Diocese and creating the new Diocese in Stamford.

the State of New York, which up to that time were under the jurisdiction of Archbishop Bohachevsky. Bishop Senyshyn, the Auxiliary and Vicar General of Archbishop Bohachevsky, was named the first Ordinary (Exarch) of Stamford.⁶⁸

According to official statistics the new diocese contained 101 priests serving 53 parishes (excluding chapels and missions), and a total Catholic population of 86,324.⁶⁹

Bishop Senyshyn named Very Rev. Msgr. John Stock the Vice Chancellor of the new Diocese, and Very Rev. Msgr.

Nicholas Babak, and Very Revs. Stephen Balandiuk, Basil Klos, Basil Seredowych, Peter Skrincoosky, and Rev.

Nicholas Wolensky, were appointed as the diocesan Consultors.⁷⁰ The new Diocese was divided into seven Deaneries

with the following Deans: Brooklyn Deanery, Very Rev. Vladimir Andrushkiw; Hartford, Very Rev. Stephen Balandiuk; Boston, Very Rev. Balandiuk (temporary administrator); New York, Very Rev. Basil Klos; Syracuse, Very Rev. Basil Seredowych; Buffalo, Very Rev. Alexander Steranka; Albany, Very Rev. Bohdan Volosyn.⁷¹

⁶⁸ See the announcement of the creation of the new Diocese and the appointment of its first Bishop in the official Diocesan paper The Way, August 19, 1956, p. 1.

⁶⁹ CD., 1957, p. 726.

⁷⁰ The Way, October 21, 1956, p. 13.

⁷¹ Ibid., p. 9.

With the separation of the New England States and the State of New York from the jurisdiction of Archbishop Bohachevsky, his Philadelphia Diocese now contained 193 priests serving 122 parishes (excluding chapels and missions), and a total population of 219,720.⁷² In addition, a partial administrative reorganization of the Diocese was also necessitated. For instance, a New Jersey Deanery was created by Archbishop Bohachevsky comprising the parishes of that State, which were previously part of the New York Deanery.⁷³ Most important of course was the appointment of a new Auxiliary for the Philadelphia Diocese. On July 20, 1956, the Papacy appointed Very Rev. Msgr. Joseph Schmondiuk, pastor of the Immaculate Conception Church in Hamtramck, Michigan, Titular Bishop of Zeugma and Auxiliary to Archbishop Bohachevsky, who was soon to name his Auxiliary the Vicar General of the Diocese.⁷⁴ Finally, an Interdiocesan Council was created composed of the Archbishop and the Bishops of the Philadelphia and Stamford Ukrainian Dioceses and Very Rev. Dr. Basil Makuch, who was named as the temporary Secretary.⁷⁵

The new Auxiliary to Archbishop Bohachevsky, Bishop-elect Schmondiuk was the first native born American of

⁷²CD., 1957, p. 719.

⁷³The Way, August 19, 1956, p. 1. A total of 16 parishes and missions comprising the new Deanery is listed in Visty., XXXI (November, 1956), p. 101.

⁷⁴Visty, XXXI (November, 1956), 101.

⁷⁵Ibid., p. 100.

Ukrainian descent to be named a Catholic Bishop.⁷⁶ He was born in Wall, Pennsylvania, August 6, 1912 and orphaned five years later when his parents, Michael and Mary (Bocia) Schmondiuk, died in the influenza epidemic in 1917. Thus, he was reared at St. Basil's Orphanage in Philadelphia. When Bishop Ortynsky's so called "minor seminary" was re-organized after Bishop Bohachevsky's arrival, young Joseph Schmondiuk was one of the students attending eighth grade. Upon completing St. Joseph High School in Philadelphia he was sent to Rome for his philosophy and theology studies. He was ordained in Rome on March 29, 1936 by the Most Rev. Alexander Stoika, Byzantine Ordinary of Muncacs, Hungary. Upon his return to the United States Father Schmondiuk held parish assignments in Aliquippa, Pennsylvania, Rochester, New York and Passaic, New Jersey, prior to his assignment in Hamtramck. On January 28, 1953 Pope Pius XII raised Father Schmondiuk to the dignity of Very Rev. Monsignor. Bishop-elect Schmondiuk was consecrated in Philadelphia on November 8, 1956, by Archbishop Bohachevsky, assisted by Bishop Senyshyn, and Bishop Nicholas T. Elko of the Ruthenian Diocese of Pittsburgh.⁷⁷

⁷⁶The Way, November 4, 1956, pp. 9-10 contains the most useful of several biographical sketches of the new bishop-elect.

⁷⁷See The Way, November 18, 1956, pp. 9-10 for an account of the consecration ceremonies.

The appointment of the new Bishop and the creation of a new Diocese were indicative of the organizational progress made by the Ukrainian Catholic Church in the United States by the mid 1950's, as was the fact that now for the first time Ukrainian Catholics in the United States were obliged to follow a territorial parish membership. With two or more Ukrainian parishes organized in many cities, the problem of territorial membership became the obvious solution. Thus, for example, in an announcement of July 24, 1956, Archbishop Bohachevsky explained to his clergy that now that the Church had completed her organization and every parish been allocated a specific territory, the boundaries of which had been publicly announced, the time for individual choosing of parishes had come to an end and a territorial membership had become necessary. The faithful were obliged to belong to that parish in whose territory they lived. Should there be no parish in a particular area, then jurisdiction over that region was to be carried out by the pastor of the parish which was nearest to that area.⁷⁸

Obviously the Ukrainian Catholic Church in the United States was reaching maturity by the mid 1950's. By 1957, fifty years since the arrival of the first Bishop and 73 years since the beginning of organized religious life among the immigrants, a solid Church organization had been

⁷⁸ Visty, XXXI (November, 1956), pp. 101-102.

established. In his Pastoral Letter of November 1, 1957, Archbishop Bohachevsky supplied us with an excellent summation of the substantial accomplishments of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in the United States.

We have today 172 parishes and 11 missions, divided between two exarchies, not counting the separate exarchy for our brethren of the Pod-Carpathian regions. We have nearly 300 priests under the leadership of an archbishop and two bishops; rather than just one church, we have 223 churches and chapels. When we include in this three religious orders for men and the four religious orders and communities for women, two orphanages, three homes for the aged, the summer camp for youth, the major and minor seminaries, two colleges, four high schools, thirty all-day parochial schools, 256 classes of religious and catechetical instruction, the church choirs, the long line of religious brotherhoods and organizations, the Ukrainian Catholic Youth League, "Obnova," the Providence Association, the Catholic press and the publishing houses, then it becomes self-evident that the efforts of our clergy and faithful were not in vain. Our Ukrainian Catholic Church stands with a firm foot upon this land.⁷⁹

The year 1958 was a climactic one for the Ukrainian Catholic Church in the United States. In July of that year the Church's growth cycle was fulfilled when the Papacy created an independent Byzantine Rite Ecclesiastical Province of Philadelphia.⁸⁰ The Ukrainian Church had progressed to a

⁷⁹Ibid., XXXII (November, 1957), p. 74.

⁸⁰Two months earlier in May, the Holy See had honored three additional priests of Archbishop Bohachevsky's diocese as Papal Chamberlains, with the title of Very Rev. Monsignors. The priests so honored were Revs. Leo Adamiak, Stephen Chehansky, and Jaroslav Gabro. See AAS., L (1958), p. 754.

degree where a permanent ecclesiastical organization was created in place of the existing Apostolic Exarchies, which corresponded to the Apostolic Vicariates of the Latin Rite.

By the Apostolic Constitution Apostolic Hanc,⁸¹ of July 10, 1958, Pope Pius XII created an Ecclesiastical Province in the United States for the faithful of the Byzantine Rite, originating from Galicia, comprising of the Metropolitan See of Philadelphia (Arche-parchy-Arch-diocese) and the See of Stamford (Eparchy), which to that time had been Apostolic Exarchies. By two Papal Bulls, also dated July 10, the former Apostolic Exarchs were appointed to the new residential Sees. Thus Archbishop Bohachevsky became the first Metropolitan of the new Ecclesiastical Province with its seat in Philadelphia,⁸² and Bishop Senyhyn was named the first resident bishop of the Suffragan See of Stamford.⁸³ The solemn establishment of the

⁸¹ AAS., LI (1959), 156-157.

⁸² Papal Bull of July 10, 1958, appears in Ukrainska Mytropolia, pp. 45-46. (Also in Shlakh, November 1, 1958, p.2.)

⁸³ Ibid., pp. 55-56.

Province and installation of its first Metropolitan took place on November 1, 1958 in Philadelphia's Convention Hall. The solemn rites were performed by the Apostolic Delegate, Archbishop Cicognani, in the presence of fifteen Archbishops and Bishops, over 300 priests, and over twelve thousand of the Laity.⁸⁴

The Papacy's publication of the major portions of the Law for the Oriental Church prompted Archbishop Bohachevsky to convene a diocesan Synod to regulate such matters that were not specifically covered by the regulations of the Holy See and are therefore left to the jurisdiction of the local Ordinary.⁸⁵ Preparations for the proposed Synod began in 1957 and in the Spring of 1958 the first section of the proposed statutes were being reviewed by the Very Reverend Consultors.⁸⁶ However, the work on the statutes was somewhat prolonged by the preparations for the solemn establishment of the new Byzantine Province and the installation of Archbishop Bohachevsky as its first

⁸⁴ See The Way, November 12, 1956, p. 1-2, for a detailed account of the installation ceremonies.

⁸⁵ Canon 422 of the motu proprio Cleri Sanctitati of June, 1957, orders every diocese to hold a Convocation at least every ten years. See ASS, XLIX (1957), 558.

⁸⁶ The secretary's report of the Consultors meeting, Shlakh, April 30, 1958, p. 4.

Metropolitan, which was held on November 1, 1958. By the Spring of 1959, however, the projected new statutes which were prepared by Rev. Dr. Victor Pospishil, the Archdiocesan canon law expert and the General Secretary of the forthcoming convocation, were mailed to all the clergy for their careful study and recommendations.⁸⁷ Finally, in his letter dated May 2, 1959, Metropolitan Bohachevsky notified all the clergy that the Archdiocesan Convocation would be held at the Cathedral on October 7-8, 1959.⁸⁸ The Convocation, promoted by the Auxiliary Bishop Schmondiuk, was participated in by 95 priests of the archdiocese.⁸⁹ On October 8, Metropolitan Bohachevsky signed the Acts of the Convocation thereby promulgating the 650 Statutes which will govern the Byzantine Archdiocese of Philadelphia for the next ten years.

In 1960, to the gratification of the Ukrainian Catholics in the United States, Pope John XXIII appointed Metropolitan Bohachevsky a member of the Pontifical Commission on Oriental Matters, one of the preparatory com-

⁸⁷Visty, XXXIV, (May, 1959), 40.

⁸⁸Ibid., (August, 1959), 64. The letter also lists the appointed officials for the convocation.

⁸⁹Statutes of the Archeparchy of Philadelphia (Philadelphia: Metropolitan Chancery, 1960), pp VII-XVIII.

missions for the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council.⁹⁰ Before that year ended the Byzantine See in Philadelphia was again favored with the announcement from Rome that another of her priests, Rev. Victor Pospishil, had been named a Papal Chamberlain with the title of Very Rev. Monsignor.⁹¹ Suddenly, on January 6, 1961, the American Ukrainian Catholics were unexpectedly jolted out of their pleasant feeling of accomplishment and recognition with the grave news that their seventy-six year old Archbishop-Metropolitan Bohachevsky had died. His death closed an important phase in the history of the Ukrainian Church in the United States--a phase, extending over thirty-six years of episcopal labor, during which the church was lifted from its near chaotic disorganization in the 1920's to full ecclesiastical organization with the establishment of an independent Province. An excerpt from a eulogy written by Bishop Senyshyn of Stamford aptly summarizes the many faceted accomplishments of Metropolitan Bohachevsky.

The Lord was his firmament, his rock-fastness. As once the Emperor Constantine in the Sign of the Cross conquered the enemy, so our late Metropolitan Constantine, supported by the rock of Christian teaching and principles, overcame all difficulties and obstacles. When the late Metropolitan came to

⁹⁰AAS., LII (1960), 849.

⁹¹Ibid., LIII (1961), 285.

the United States, there were no seminaries, high schools or parochial schools. The number of clergy was small--not quite one hundred. With the help of God, Bishop Constantine initiated his many-faceted activities. He founded two seminaries; one in Stamford, Connecticut, the other in Washington, D.C. During his episcopacy there arose centers of learning: Saint Basil's Preparatory School and Saint Basil's College, Mother of God Academy at Stamford, Connecticut, academies for girls in Fox Chase, Pennsylvania, and Sloatsburg, New York, and a High School in Detroit, Michigan, and many parochial schools. In order to quicken missionary activity within the exarchy, the late Metropolitan invited the Basilian, Redemptorist, and Franciscan Orders. He favored the growth of the Basilian Sisters, he introduced the Sisters Servants of Mary Immaculate and the Little Worker Sisters of the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary. He was co-founder of the Missionary Sisters of the Mother of God at Stamford, Conn. He cared for the Ukrainian Catholic Press. He initiated the magnificent Eucharistic Congresses of Chicago in 1941 and Philadelphia in 1954. Under his guidance various impressive churches and schools were built. The welfare of the people--especially the welfare of the youth--was foremost in his heart. With his consent, the Ukrainian Catholic Refugee Committee which sponsored some 50,000 refugees was organized. He sheltered hundreds of Ukrainian Catholic priests. Briefly, under his guidance the Apostolic Exarchate made great strides in the fields of religion, Scholarship, charity, and community life. His undertakings were fruitful, yet never did he attribute his success to himself or to his talents, but in humility proclaimed that every gift came from God.

The Holy Apostolic See gave full recognition to the late Bishop, elevating him to the dignity of the Archbishopric, and, with the creation of the new Metropolitan See for Ukrainian Catholics, named Bishop Constantine the first Metropolitan for Ukrainian Catholics in the United States. After thirty-seven years in the episcopacy and fifty-two years in the priesthood, the All-Merciful Lord called him unto Himself. Today our Metropolitan enjoys eternal glory in heaven.⁹²

⁹²The Way, January 18, 1961, p. 3.

The final funeral rites for the Metropolitan were held in Philadelphia at the Immaculate Conception Cathedral on January 17, 1961. The Apostolic Delegate, Archbishop Egidio Vagnozzi presided at the requiem services witnessed by 21 archbishops and bishops, 25 monsignori, close to 160 priests, civil officials, and throngs of faithful. The Pontifical Requiem Mass was celebrated by Metropolitan Maxim Hermaniuk, the Byzantine Rite Archbishop of Winnipeg, assisted by the Very Rev. Basil Holowinsky and by Very Rev. Msgr. Jaroslav Gabro.⁹³ Following the funeral orations the Metropolitan's remains were laid to rest in the Cathedral crypt under the side altar of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

After serving the Ukrainian Catholics in the United States for over thirty-six years, Metropolitan Bohachevsky's death was indeed a shocking loss. Due to the strong ecclesiastical organization for which he was primarily responsible, however, the administration of the Philadelphia Byzantine Archdiocese continued smoothly. On January 9, 1961, the Very Rev. Consultors elected the Auxiliary Bishop, Joseph Schmondiuk, to be the administrator of the Archdiocese.⁹⁴ Those who recalled the difficult years follow-

⁹³Shlakh, January 25, 1961, p. 3-4.

⁹⁴Ibid., January 18, 1961, p. 4. See also Visty (February, 1961), p. 2.

ing the death of Bishop Ortynsky in 1916, however, anxiously awaited the permanent appointment by the Holy Father. The announcement, on August 14, 1961,⁹⁵ that Pope John XXIII named Bishop Ambrose Senyshyn of Stamford as the second Archbishop-Metropolitan of the Byzantine See of Philadelphia and that Bishop Schmondiuk was named the second Ordinary of the Stamford Diocese, was therefore greeted with a sigh of relief.

At the same time, much to the gratification of the Ukrainian Catholics, the Holy Father created a third Diocese and named a new Bishop for their Province. By the Apostolic Constitution of July 14, 1961,⁹⁶ a new Diocese of St. Nicholas in Chicago was created out of the vast western territory of the Byzantine Archdiocese of Philadelphia. It includes all of the United States west of the line formed by the western boundries of Ohio, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Mississippi, and includes the State of Michigan.⁹⁷

⁹⁵ Shlakh, August 23, 1961, p. 1. The Papal Bull of July 14, 1961, naming Bishop Senyshyn as the new Metropolitan appears in Ibid., November 15, 1961, p. 2.

⁹⁶ AAS., LIV(1962), 493-495.

⁹⁷ Shlakh, December 6, 1961, p. 2, contains a map directory of the new diocese, as well as the boundries of the Archeparchy of Philadelphia and of the Stamford diocese.

As Shepherd of the newly created See, the Pope appointed Msgr. Jaroslav Gabro, pastor of the Assumption of B.V.M. Church in Perth Amboy, New Jersey.

Bishop-elect Gabro, the son of John and Catherine (Tymusz) Gabro, was born in Chicago on July 31, 1919.⁹⁸ After attending the elementary and secondary schools in Chicago, he continued his higher education at St. Procopius Seminary, Lisle, Illinois; St. Charles College, Cantonville, Maryland; and St. Basil's College, Stamford, Connecticut. His studies in theology were completed at St. Josaphat's Seminary and the Catholic University in Washington, D. C., whereupon he was ordained to the priesthood by Bishop Bohachevsky in Philadelphia on September 27, 1945. Since then Father Gabro served in parishes in Pennsylvania, Michigan, New York and New Jersey. He also served the Philadelphia Archeparchy as a consultant, a member of the Administrative Council, and since November 1958, as Dean of the New Jersey Deanery. On May 10, 1958, Pope Pius XII named Father Gabro a Papal Chamberlain, with the title of Very Rev. Monsignor. Bishop-elect Gabro was consecrated in Philadelphia on October 26, 1961 by Metropolitan Senyshyn, with Bishop Isidore Borecky of Toronto, Canada,

⁹⁸ Ibid., October 18, 1961, p. 1, contains the most informative of several short biographical sketches of Bishop Gabro.

and Bishop Schmondiuk of Stamford, as co-consecrators.⁹⁹

The formal establishment of St. Nicholas Diocese in Chicago and the enthronement of Bishop Gabro as the first Ordinary took place on December 12, 1961. The solemn rites were performed by the Apostolic Delegate, Archbishop Vagnozzi, at St. Nicholas Cathedral in the presence of 15 Bishops and Abbots, civil officials, and numerous clergy and faithful.¹⁰⁰

The official statistics of the new Diocese in Chicago indicated that it contained a total of 39 priests serving 31 parishes (excluding missions), with a total Catholic population of 20,439.¹⁰¹ In January 1962, Bishop Gabro announced the appointment of Very Rev. Walter Paska as Chancellor of the new diocese,¹⁰² as well as a Diocesan

⁹⁹ Ibid., November 1, 1961, p. 1,7. The consecration of Bishop Gabro and Bishop Augustine Hornyak, O.S.B.M., Exarch for the Ukrainian Catholics in England and Wales, was the first dual consecration of Ukrainian Catholic bishops in the United States.

¹⁰⁰ Shlakh, December 27, 1961, pp. 1,3.

¹⁰¹ Directory, Byzantine Rite Ecclesiastical Province of Philadelphia (Philadelphia: Archbishops Chancery, 1962), p. 218. (Hereafter cited as Ukrainian Directory.)

¹⁰² Shlakh, January 17, 1962, pp. 1,3.

Consultor, together with Very Rev. Dr. Stephen V. Knapp, and Revs. Michael Bochnewich and Peter Leskiw.¹⁰³ The vast territory of St. Nicholas Diocese was divided into four Deaneries and the following Deans were appointed: Very Rev. Knapp, Chicago Deanery; Rev. Bochnewich, Detroit Deanery; Rev. Leskiw, Northwest Deanery; and Rev. John Lazar, Southwest Deanery.¹⁰⁴ On March 17, 1962, the four members of Bishop Gabro's consistory were further honored by the Papacy when they were named Papal Chamberlains, with the title of Very Rev. Monsignors.¹⁰⁵

The formation of St. Nicholas Diocese out of the western territories of the Byzantine Archdiocese of Philadelphia naturally affected the latter's size. The official Directory now listed the Byzantine Archdiocese of Philadelphia as containing 141 priests serving 97 parishes (excluding 22 chapels and 3 missions), with a total Catholic population of 160,912.¹⁰⁶ Metropolitan Ambrose Senyshyn, who was solemnly enthroned at the Immaculate Con-

¹⁰³ The Way, January 31, 1962, pp. 1.4.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., p. 1, 4.

¹⁰⁵ AAS., LIV (1962), 749.

¹⁰⁶ Ukrainian Directory, 1962, p. 124.

ception Cathedral on October 26, 1961 by the Apostolic Delegate,¹⁰⁷ quickly turned his attention to the administration of his new See. Incidentally, on December 15, 1961 the Metropolitan See was again honored when the Pope named Very Rev. Michael Poloway, the acting Chancellor of the Archdiocese since 1959, a Papal Chamberlain, with the title of Very Rev. Monsignor.¹⁰⁸ The new Monsignor was named Chancellor by Metropolitan Senyshyn on February 5, 1962.¹⁰⁹

In brief, the Ukrainian Catholic Church in the United States had reached legal maturity in 1958 with the creation of an independent Ecclesiastical Province. In January of 1961, the new Province was deeply saddened by the death of its first Metropolitan who for more than a third of a century had directed the Ukrainian Church in the United States. In August of the same year the official announcement that Bishop Senyshyn of Stamford was named the second Ukrainian Archbishop-Metropolitan of Philadelphia assured the continuation of leadership in the new Province without serious delay. At the same time, the decision of Pope John XXIII to create a new diocese and a new bishop for the

¹⁰⁷See The Way, November 1, 1961, pp. 1, 7. The solemn occasion was graced by the attendance of five Archbishops, 24 bishops, civil officials, and numerous clergy and faithful.

¹⁰⁸AAS., LIV (1962), 539.

¹⁰⁹The Way, February 21, 1962, p. 4.

Province indicated that the growth process of the Ukrainian Church in the United States had not ended, and that new decisions and appointments would be forthcoming when continued growth intimated their need. Metropolitan Senyshyn revealed his faith in the future of the Byzantine Ecclesiastical Province, when he publicly announced in his sermon, on January 7, 1962, his plans to build an imposing new Cathedral for the Archdiocese of Philadelphia on North Franklin Street, almost adjoining the present Cathedral site.¹¹⁰

The future of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in the United States is brighter than ever before, and the soon to be erected Cathedral in Philadelphia¹¹¹ will be a fitting monument to all the pioneering bishops, clergy, and the laity, whose labors over a period of nearly 80 years made possible the creation and the expansion of the Byzantine Ecclesiastical Province of Philadelphia.

¹¹⁰Ibid., January 17, 1962, pp. 1-2. The writer learned about some of the specific plans concerning the new Cathedral in an interview with Metropolitan Senyshyn in Philadelphia on May 7, 1962.

¹¹¹The report in Ibid., April 21, 1963, p. 2. that the work on the new Cathedral would commence as soon as the analysis of the final borings was completed, was confirmed in an interview with Monsignor Poloway, the Chancellor of the Archdiocese, on June 19, 1963.

CONCLUSION

It is obvious today that the Ruthenian Rite Catholic Church which began its existence in the United States in 1884 has reached maturity and permanency. This development, however, couldnot have been predicted even twenty years ago, much less earlier.

The early factional conflicts, the serious misunderstandings with the Latin Bishops and clergy, the proselytizing by the Russian Orthodox Mission, etc., created near chaotic conditions that even the appointment of the first Ruthenian Bishop, in 1907, could not resolve. Even after the establishment of an independent diocese in 1913 the problems continued and there was no final solution in sight when Bishop Ortynsky died in 1916. The difficulty in solving the Ruthenian question is apparent from the fact that more than eight years elapsed before the appointment of Ortynsky's successors.

The temporary division of the Ruthenian Diocese which followed the death of Bishop Ortynsky was made permanent in 1924 with the creation of two Ruthenian Dioceses, one for the Ukrainians, the other for the Rusins, etc. Bishop Bohachevsky's energetic attempts to bring order and discipline into the long-orphaned Ukrainian Church were bitterly attacked by partisan extremists, and it was not until the post World War II period that the permanent

character of the Ukrainian Catholic Church definitely took form. It was due to the political conditions in Europe following the War that the Ukrainian Catholic Church in the United States entered a new era, an era when it would be called upon to supply missionaries to Europe - the source of its origin.

The Byzantine-Slavonic Church in the United States has indeed made great strides in seventy-nine years; whereas in the latter part of the nineteenth century few Latin Rite American Catholics had any knowledge of Eastern Rite Catholics, today there are few indeed who are still unfamiliar with their Eastern Catholic neighbors; whereas in the early years of the current century very few Latin Bishops or clergy were ready to accept a separate and independent Byzantine Rite Episcopate in the United States, today few Bishops, if any, begrudge the triple jurisdiction of a permanent nature that exists in the United States;*

*On July 31, 1963, the Apostolic Delegation in Washington announced that Pope Paul VI had divided the Ruthenian Exarchate of Pittsburgh into two jurisdictions, each with the status of an Eparchy. To form the new Eparchy of Passaic, New Jersey, the New England states and the remainder of the Atlantic Coast states, including some counties of Eastern Pennsylvania, were detached from the Pittsburgh diocese. In view of these developments, it is reasonable to presume that in the near future an Ecclesiastical Province will also be established for the Rusins and others from Hungary and Yugoslavia, thus making permanent the present triple jurisdiction that has existed on the territory of the United States since 1924.

whereas as late as the mid-1930's serious doubts existed concerning the future of the Byzantine Catholic Church in America, today such fears have been dispelled with the creation by the Holy See of the Independent Ecclesiastical Province of Philadelphia for the Ukrainian Catholics, the first Byzantine Rite Ecclesiastical Province in the United States; whereas prior to 1958 the Byzantine Church in the United States was still technically considered a missionary church dependent on European sources for its actual existence, in the late 1950's and in the sixties the Byzantine Province of Philadelphia became the source of newly ordained Bishops for the Ruthenian immigrants in such western European countries as England and Germany.

The Byzantine-Slavonic Church in the United States has indeed matured and has taken on permanent characteristics but, as in any other living organism, its growth and development will have to continue. Further progress will have to be made, particularly in that intangible area of unqualified acceptance by the overwhelming more numerous and influential Latin Rite.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

1. Manuscript Sources

Archives of the Byzantine Rite Archdiocese of Philadelphia.

Of special value were the correspondence of the Apostolic Visitor, Rt. Rev. Andrew Hodobay; Bishop Ortynsky; Very Rev. Peter Poniatishin, Administrator; and of Bishop Bohachevsky with the Apostolic Delegates; Latin and Byzantine hierarchy and clergy, lay associations and individuals, government institutions and officials, etc. Also memoirs of Ruthenian pioneers.

Archives of the Ukrainian Museum, Chicago. Correspondence of the Administrator, Very Rev. Peter Poniatishin, with government officials and Metropolitan Sheptytsky.

Collection of letters to and from the Administrator, Very Rev. Peter Poniatishin and Bishop Bohachevsky in the possession of the writer.

Primarily letters of appointment and directives illustrating the administrative difficulties of the administrator.

Collection of letters in the possession of Very Rev. John D. Taptich, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

Of special importance in illustrating the active opposition to Bishop Ortynsky, particularly by the Ruthenian priests from Hungary.

2. Printed Sources

Acta Apostolicae Sedis. Rome. 1909-1924, 1943-1963. An official publication of Papal documents since 1909, containing the basic papal letters, etc. concerning the Byzantine Rite in the United States.

Acta Sanctae Sedis. Rome. 1885-1908. The official Papal documents published prior to 1909 which have been superseded by the AAS above.

American Ecclesiastical Review, 1889-1963. Contains very significant official letters from the Vatican to the American hierarchy concerning

The Ruthenian Church in the United States dated as early as 1892. Key articles in this important journal will be listed under secondary sources.

Amerykansky Russky Kalendar, 1908. Uzhgorod, Hungary: Foldesi Gyula, 1907.

Contains a valuable letter from the Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of the Propagation of Faith for the Oriental Rites to the Apostolic Visitor for the Ruthenians, Rt. Rev. Andrew Hodobay.

Amerikansky Russky Viestnik (Homestead, Pa.) 1894-1924, irregular.

The newspaper of the Greek Catholic Union and the unofficial organ of the Pod-Carpathian priests. Contains official letters, protocols, announcements and directives, including those of Bishop Ortynsky. An extremely important source for the early history of the Ruthenian Church.

An Encyclical Letter of Pope Pius XI on the Eastern Churches. A translation of Rerum Orientalium. Washington: The Catholic Near East Welfare Association.

This letter illustrates the Papal solicitude towards Eastern Rite Catholics with recommendations to be followed by Latin hierarchy.

Atlantic Reporter. 200 vols. State Series, St. Paul: West Publishing Co.

Of special interest are volumes 46 and 196, which contain the most important court cases illustrating the problems faced by the Ruthenian Church in the U.S.

Connecticut. Special Acts and Resolutions, 1939, XXIII, Part 1, 300.

Contain the legislative act authorizing the Ukrainian Diocesan College to confer academic degrees.

Eparkhiialni Visty. Philadelphia. 1914-1916, 1924-1927, 1933-1963.

The official Diocesan Bulletin founded by Bishop Ortynsky in 1914 as the Eparkhiialny Vistnyk, reactivated by Bishop Bohachevsky in 1924 as the Eparkhiialni Visty, and since November 1958 known as the Archeperarkhiialni Visti. The official means of communication between the Bishops and their clergy. Obviously extremely valuable.

National Eucharistic Marian Congress of the Oriental Rites, 1954. Philadelphia: Bishop's Chancery, 1954.

Official program brochure of the Congress sponsored by the Ukrainian diocese in Philadelphia contains detailed information pertaining to the Congress and its participants.

New York. Laws of New York, 1917, II c. 353, pp. 1155-1159.

Contains the legislative act relative to the incorporation of the Ruthenian Catholic Churches.

Ortynsky, Soter. Poslaniie Pastirskie Sotera Ortinskoho, Philadelphia, January 11, 1908.

A most important pastoral letter of Bishop Ortynsky expressing his point of view concerning the fight against him early in his episcopate.

_____. Vsechestneishym oo Dukhovnim do vedomosty i zaistosovania. October 1, 1912.

Bishop Ortynsky's printed directive prohibiting priests to change parishes without permission, enlisting their full support in the development of parish schools and of the needs of the teaching sisters, etc. An illustration of the problems facing Bishop Ortynsky.

Pamiatka novoi Provintsi oo Vasylian, New York: Basilian Fathers, 1948.

Contains official letters and the decree from Rome creating an independent Monastic Province for the Ukrainian Basilian Fathers in the United States.

Protokol XVIII Konventcii Sojedineniia Greko Kafoliceskich Russkich Bratstv, 1924. Homestead, Pa.

The Protocol of the 18th Convention of the Greek Catholic Union contains valuable information regarding the attempts to obtain their own bishop, and Metropolitan Sheptytsky's aid in that direction.

Shlakh (Philadelphia), 1940-1963.

The Ukrainian section of the official newspaper of the Ukrainian Catholic Church containing frequent official announcements and regulations of the Bishops, as well as the Papal Bulls relative to the church.

Statutes of the Archeparchy of Philadelphia. Philadelphia: Metropolitan Chancery, 1960.

The official regulations promulgated by Metropolitan Bohachevsky at the Archdiocesan

Convocation on October 7 and 8, 1959.

Svovoda (Jersey City, N. J.) 1893-1933, irregular. The newspaper of the Ruthenian National Soyuz and the unofficial organ of the Galician priests. Contains official letters, protocols of meetings, announcements and directives, including those of Bishop Ortynsky. An indispensable source for the early history of the Ruthenian Church. Includes numerous eye-witness accounts and recollections, including those of the first missionary priest, Rev. John Voliansky, which are not listed as individual items in this selected bibliography.

Temporary Diocesan Statutes of the Byzantine Rite Apostolic Exarchy of Philadelphia. Philadelphia: Bishop's Chancery, 1953.

The official regulations of the Ukrainian diocese of Philadelphia prior to the Statutes promulgated in 1959.

Ukrainska Katolytska Mytropoliia v. Zluchenykh Derzhavakh Ameryky. Philadelphia: Archbishop's Chancery, 1959.

An official publication on the occasion of the creation of the first Byzantine Province in the United States. Among much useful material, it contains the Papal Bulls nominating the first Byzantine Metropolitan of Philadelphia and the first Bishop of Stamford, Conn.

Unia v Amerytsi. New York: T.R.Ts.A., 1902. The official position taken by the organization formed by the so-called "radical" priests from Galicia. Provides the views of an important group of pioneers concerning the numerous problems faced by the Ruthenian Church.

U. S. Bureau of Census. Religious Bodies: 1926. 2 vols. Washington: Department of Commerce, 1929.

Contains useful information concerning the funds expended by the Holy Synod of the Russian Empire in support of the Russian Orthodox Mission in the United States, whose efforts were primarily directed toward the Ruthenian Catholics.

U.S. Congressional Record. 109 vols. Washington: Government Printing Office.

Volumes LIV and LVII of special value relative to the Congress Resolution proclaiming a Ukrainian Day in 1917, a project headed by the Administrator, Father Poniatishin.

U. S. Congress, Senate. Reports of the Immigration Commission, 61st Cong., 3d Sess., 1911. 25 vols. Washington: Government Printing Office.

Volumes IX, XII, XX, and XXIII of special value relative to the characteristics of the Ruthenian immigration, including statistical information.

U.S. Statutes at Large. 123 vols. Washington: Government Printing Office.

Volume XL contains President Wilson's Ukrainian Day Proclamation, the result of the efforts of Fr. Poniatishin and his committee.

Way, The. (Philadelphia), 1940-1963.
English section of the official newspaper of the Ukrainian Church containing frequent official announcements, regulations, etc.

Guides

Directory of the Byzantine Rite Apostolic Exarchate of Philadelphia. Since 1958, Directory of the Byzantine Rite Ecclesiastical Province of Philadelphia. Philadelphia: Archbishop's Chancery, 1953-1963.

The official statistical information concerning the Ukrainian dioceses in the United States.

Official Catholic Directory, The. 1884-1963. Useful for statistical information concerning the Ruthenian Catholic Church and priests.

Persky Rusko-Amerykansky Kalendar. Edited by Nestor Dmytriv. Mt. Carmel, Pa: Ruthenian National Association, 1897.

This is the first Ruthenian Almanac and the first full size Ruthenian book published in the United States. Contains extremely valuable recollections, statistical information, and other historical data relative to the development of the church.

Smal-Stocki, Roman. "Terminological Problems of European History." Milwaukee, n.d. (copy of a typewritten article in the possession of the writer.)

A discussion of the problems involved in translating, and using slavie terms from the Cyrillic to the Latin alphabet which proved to be a useful guide to the writer.

Secondary Sources

1. Special Works

Iuvileiny Almanakh Svobody, 1893-1953. Jersey City: Ukrainian National Association, n.d.
Sixty years jubilee book of the Svoboda, containing articles and recollections including those of the former administrator of the diocese, Rev. Poniatishin, which are not listed as separate items in the bibliography.

Iuvyleiny Almanakh Ukrainskoi Hreko-Katolytskoi Tserkvy u Zluchenykh Derzhavakh, 1884-1934. Philadelphia: 1934.

A very informative official jubilee book of the church containing numerous historical articles relating to the Ukrainian Church in the United States. Includes valuable recollections by pioneers, including those by the Administrator of the diocese, Very Rev. Peter Poniatishin.

Jubilee Book of Redemptorists of the Eastern Rite, 1906-1955. Yorkton, Sask.: Redemptorist Fathers, 1955.
Contains excellent historical material on the role of the Redemptorists in America.

Kalendar Greko Kaftoliceskaho Sojedinenija. Munhall-Homestead, Pa: Greek Catholic Union. 1900-1962, irregular.

The Almanac of the oldest Ruthenian benevolent organization in the United States. Very important since the association was the unofficial spokesman of the views of the pioneer Pod-Carpathian priests. Contains valuable articles and recollections of participants.

Kalendar Provydinia. Philadelphia: Providence Association. 1918-1960.

The Almanac of the benevolent association founded by Bishop Ortynsky. Contains numerous recollections and articles by participants in church affairs which are not listed as separate items in this bibliography.

Kalendar Syrytskoho Domu. Philadelphia: Sr. of St. Basil the Great. 1916-1960.

The Almanac of the Orphanage Home founded by Bishop Ortynsky. Frequently containing historical information and recollections relating to the Church.

Kalendar Ukrainskoho Narodnoho Soyuzu (Kalendar Ruskoho Narodnoho Soyuzu to World War I). Jersey City,

N.J.: Ukrainian National Association. 1910-1960, irregular.
The Almanac of the second oldest Ruthenian benevolent association. Very useful since the association was the unofficial spokesman of the views of the pioneer Galician priests.

sv. Iura, Piatdesiatlittia Ukrainskoi Katolytskoi Tserkvy 1905-1955. New York: Basilian Fathers, n.d.
A fifty year jubille book of St. George's Church containing several valuable articles concerning the role of the church in the affairs of Americans of Ukrainian descent by the participants involved.

New York: Pravoslavonii Russko-Amerikanskii Kalendar na 1915.
Svet, 1914.
An Orthodox Almanac containing pertinent statistical information regarding the number of Ruthenian Catholics turning to Orthodoxy.

Propamiatna knyha sorokolitnoho iuvyleiu Ukrainskoho Narodnoho Soyuza, 1894-1934. Jersey City: Ukrainian National Association, 1936.
A fifty year Jubille book of the U.N.A. which contains very valuable articles and recollections concerning the church including those of the administrator of the diocese, Very Rev. Poniatishin.

Kaledzha, Propamiatna knyha Ukrainskoho Katolytskoho 1940. Philadelphia: America Press, n.d.
A remembrance book, published on the occasion of the opening of the Ukrainian Catholic College, containing historical information relative to the Ukrainian educational institutions in the United States, including signed articles by participants.

1942. Propamiatna Knyha Ukrainskoi Katolytskoi Katedry,
1942.
A remembrance book published on the occasion of the rededication of the Ukrainian Cathedral. Contains several useful recollections by pioneers, including those of the former Administrator of the diocese.

Home, 1954. Selemn Blessing and Dedication of St. Basil's
Home, 1954.
Official brochure published on the occasion of the dedication of the new Orphanage containing information relative to the history of the orphanage founded by Bishop Ortynsky.

St. Michael's Diamond Jubilee Book. Shenandoah, Pa: St. Michael's Ukrainian Church, 1959.

The 75th anniversary book of the oldest Ruthenian Church in the United States. Contains useful historical information relating to the organization of this parish.

Ukrainci u Vilnomu sviti: Iuvileina knyha Ukrainskoho Narodnoho Soyuza, 1884-1954. Jersey City: Ukrainian National Association, n.d.

An extremely valuable seventy year Jubilee book of the U.N.A. Contains many historically useful articles, also the very important recollections of the former diocesan Administrator.

2. General Works

Attwater, Donald. The Christian Churches of the East. 2 vols. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1948.

An excellent discussion of the history of the Eastern Rites by a well-known Latin rite author.

Bachynsky, Julian. Ukrainska Immigratsia v Ziedynenykh Derzhavakh Ameryky. Lviv: J. Bachynsky and Ol. Harasevych, 1914.

A very useful work containing a detailed historical account of the early Ruthenian immigration to the United States, and its background.

Black Deeds of the Kremlin, Book of Testimonies. Toronto, Canada: Ukrainian Assn. of Victims of Russian Terror, 1953.

Contains useful information concerning the destruction of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Europe, as a result of which refugee priests swelled the ranks of the Ukrainian Church in the United States.

Halecki, Oscar. Borderlands of Western Civilization. New York: Ronald Press, 1952.

Perhaps the best history of East Central Europe in English. Useful toward an understanding of the differences among the various Slavic peoples who emigrated from Austria-Hungary.

Halich, Wasyl. Ukrainians in the United States. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937.

A comprehensive work on the Ukrainians in the United States. Includes some useful information concerning the early church and its pioneers.

Kann, Robert A. The Multinational Empire, 2 vols. New York: Columbia University Press, 1950.

A discussion of the numerous peoples of Austria-Hungary in the 19th century, including the Ruthenians with whom this thesis is concerned.

- History, Harcave, Sidney. (ed.) Readings In Russian 2 vols. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1962. Contains a discussion of the delimitation of Russian history which was helpful to this study.
- Shipman, Pallen, Conde B. (ed.). A Memorial of Andrew J. Shipman. New York. Encyclopedia Press, Inc. 1916. A collection of the writings of Shipman, including those on the Ruthenian Catholics in the United States. Shipman was one of the earliest authorities on these people.
- Problems Pospishil, Victor J. Interritual Canon Law In the United States and Canada. Chesapeake City, Md: 1955. Important for the legal aspects of relations between Latin and Eastern Rite Catholics in North America by a Canon Lawyer of the Byzantine Archdiocese of Phila. Contains translations of several important Papal decrees.
- Greek Rite, Shipman, Andrew J. The Holy Mass According to the New York: P. J. Kennedy & Sons, 1912. Shipman's translation of the Byzantine Liturgy. The booklet also contains a brief historical summary of the U.S. Ruthenian Catholics.
- "Ukraine" Simpson, George W. The Names "Rus," "Russia", and Their Historical Background. Winnipeg, Man: UVAN, 1951. An account of the historical development of the terms "Rus", "Russia", "Ukraine" and their interrelation.
- Workers, Warne, Frank J. The Slav Invasion of the Mine. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1904. An early study of the immigrants from Eastern Europe almost all of whom in the beginning worked in and about the coal mines.
- Welykyj, P. Athanasius G. (ed.). Documenta Pontificum Romanorum Historiam Ucrainae Illustrantia, 2 vols. Rome: Basilian Fathers, 1953. A collection of Papal documents dealing with the Ruthenians, particularly the Ukrainians. Editors introduction provides useful terminological information.
- Scranton, Pa: Narodna Volia, 1916. Zhytie, Smert i pokhorony S.S. Ortynskoho. This booklet on the life and death of Bishop Ortynsky contains historical data and photographs of the funeral procession.
3. Articles
- Ardan, John. "The Ruthenians in America, "Charities" XIII, (December 3, 1904), 246-252. A discussion by one of the most active Ruthenian priests concerning the economic causes of

Ruthenian immigration and the conditions under which the early immigrants lived.

Balch, Emily G. "A Shepherd of Immigrants," Charities, XIII, (December 3, 1904), 193-194.
An informative report of an interview with a Ruthenian priest who expressed his ideas on the economic, moral and social problems facing the Ruthenian immigrants. Also includes his attempts to rectify the conditions.

Claghorn, Kate Holloday. "Slavs, Magyars, and Some Others in the New Immigration," Charities, XIII, (December 3, 1904), 199-205.
A statistical skeleton of the sources and distribution of the new immigrants, including the Ruthenian Catholics.

Englert, Clement Co. "Consistent Oriental Terminology," Homilistic and Pastoral Review, XXXXIII (September, 1943), 1077-1082.
An eminent authority on the Eastern Rites concerning terms with which this thesis is concerned.

Foraneus. "Some Thoughts on the Ruthenian Question in the United States and Canada," American Ecclesiastical Review, LII (January, 1915), pp. 42-50.
An informative although unfavorable discussion of the varied problems facing the Ruthenian Church, such as problems of jurisdiction, marriage, etc.

_____. "The Ruthenian Question Again," American Ecclesiastical Review, LII (June, 1915), pp. 645-653.
Another article by the same author on the same theme listed above.

Gulovich, Stephen C. "The Rusin Exarchate in the United States," Eastern Churches Quarterly, VI (October-December, 1946), 459-486.
A fine article providing excellent historical information on the early Ruthenian Church.

Healy, J.F.X. "Our Catholic Ruthenians," American Ecclesiastical Review, XCIII (July, 1935), pp. 76-81.
A favorable discussion of the Ruthenian Catholics concentrating on the early episcopate of Bishop Bohachevsky.

Heuser, H.J. "Greek Catholics and Latin Priests," American Ecclesiastical Review, IX (March, 1891), pp. 194-204.
Another good article on the relations between the

Ruthenian and Latin priests by an eminent authority.

_____. "The Appointment of a Greek Bishop in the United States," American Ecclesiastical Review, XXXVII (VII) (November, 1907), pp. 457-466.

An excellent discussion of the principal provisions and regulations of the Papal letter Ea Semper which was in effect a constitution for the Ruthenian Catholic Church in the United States.

Martin, David. "Not 'Displaced Persons' - But Refugees," Ukrainian Quarterly, IV (Spring, 1948), 109-114. An enlightening article concerning the displaced persons many of whom later helped to swell the numbers of the Ukrainian Catholic Diocese.

Pritsak, Omeljan & John S. Reshetar, Jr. "The Ukraine and the Dialectics of Nation-Building," Slavic Review, XXII (June, 1936), 224-255.

The most recent scholarly discussion on the delimitation of Russian history.

Ploechl, Willibald M. "The Slav-Byzantine Seminary in Washington, D.C.," Eastern Churches Quarterly, VI (October-December, 1946), pp. 487-496.

An informative documented article on the early plans and eventual completion of the Ukrainian Major Seminary.

Roberts, Peter. "The Slavs in Anthracite Coal Communities," Charities, XIII (December 3, 1904), 215-222. A consideration of the racial, social and cultural aspects of the Slavs, including references to the important cultural benefits provided the immigrants by their priests and their church.

Rovnianek, P.V. "The Slovaks in America," Charities, XIII (December 3, 1904), 239-244. Informative article by an editor of a Slovak newspaper concerning the early Slovak immigration. Useful for its discussion of the Ruthenian Catholic Slovaks.

Sayles, Mary Buell. "Housing and Social Conditions in a Slavic Neighborhood," Charities, XIII (December 3, 1904), 257-261.

An understanding discussion of the social conditions among the Ruthenian immigrants in Jersey City. The problem of terminology is also referred to.

Schmal, Desmond A. "The Ruthenian Question in the United States," American Ecclesiastical Review, XCVII (November 1937), pp. 444-461.

An excellent description of various phases of the Ruthenian religious practices. Very understanding of problems facing the Ruthenians.

Senyshyn, Ambrose. "The Ukrainian Catholics in the United States," Eastern Churches Quarterly, VI (October-December, 1946), 439-457.

A summary of the Ukrainian Church by Bishop Senyshyn.

Shipman, Andrew J. "Greek Catholics in America," Catholic Encyclopedia, VI (1909), 744-752.

An authoritative article about the Ruthenians and others by an eminent writer closely associated with them for many years.

_____. "Greek Orthodox Church in America," Catholic Encyclopedia, VI (1909), 772-773.

Concerning the effects of the work of the Russian Orthodox Mission on the Ruthenian Catholics.

_____. "Ruthenians," Catholic Encyclopedia. XIII (1912), 278-280.

One of the best short accounts available on the historical background of the Ruthenians in America.

4. Newspapers

America. (Philadelphia), 1916-1963, irregular. Official organ of the Providence Association, a benevolent association founded by Bishop Ortynsky. Contains much official material and numerous articles relative to the Ukrainian Church.

Byzantine Catholic World, The. (Pittsburgh), 1946-1963.

The official newspaper of the Pittsburgh Ruthenian diocese.

Catholic News, The. (New York). 1910, 1916. Official organ of the New York Roman Catholic Diocese, from which the writer utilized a letter and report concerning the Ruthenian Church.

Catholic Standard and Times, The. (Philadelphia), 1954-1963.

Official newspaper of the Philadelphia Latin Rite Archdiocese. Frequently contains useful information concerning the Byzantine Rite Archdiocese

of Philadelphia.

Evening Herald. (Shenandoah, Pa.), 1885-1888.
Contains several very informative articles concerning the Ruthenians in Shenandoah and their religious and cultural customs. Includes helpful references concerning the building of the first Ruthenian Church.

New York Times. 1910.

5. Interviews

Personal interviews with the late Metropolitan Bohachevsky and the present Metropolitan Senshyn, the Administrative Council of the Byzantine Archdiocese of Philadelphia, numerous Very Rev. and Rev. clergy and sisters in administrative positions, and several pioneers and their relatives.

Interviews contributing specific information to this work are enumerated in the appropriate footnotes.

APPENDIX I*

Ruthenian priests, their European origin, and the location of their American parishes in 1896.

Galician origin:

1. Theophan Obushkevich, Olyphant and Mayfield, Pa.
2. John Konstankevich, Shamokin, Pa.
3. Nestor Dmytriv, Mt. Carmel, Pa.
4. Michael Stefanovich, Pittsburgh, Pa.
5. John Ardan, Jersey City, Pa.

Pod-Carpathian origin, Muncacs diocese:

6. Nicephor Khanat, Scranton, Pa.
7. Eugene Volkay, New York City
8. Alexander Dzubay, New Haven, Conn.
9. Theodore Damjanovich, Trenton, N. J.
10. Cornelius Lavrisin, Shenandoah, Pa.
11. Augustine Lavrisin, Mahanoy City, Pa.
12. Eugene Satala, Passic, N.J.
13. John Hrabar, Philadelphia, Pa.
14. Basil Voloshyn, Yonkers, N.Y.
15. G. Dzubay, Johnstown, Pa.
16. Stephen Jackovich, Duquesne, Pa.
17. John Sabov, Lindsey, Pa.
18. Acacius Kaminski, Hazleton, Pa.: Pine Street
19. Victor Balogh, Trauger, Pa.
20. Nicholas Stecovic, Braddock, Pa.
21. Nicholas Sherehely, Streator, Ill.
22. Nicholas Ilashevich, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.
23. Dr. S. Sabov, Cleveland, Ohio
24. Ireneus Matyackov, Ramey, Pa.

Pod-Carpathian origin, Presov diocese:

25. Cyril Gulovich, Freeland, Pa.
26. Vladimir Molchanyi, Kingston, Pa.
27. Nicholas Molchanyi, McAdeco, Pa.
28. V. Martyak, Hazleton, Pa.
29. Gabriel Martyak, Lansford, Pa.

Note: Rev. Gregory Hrushka, previously pastor in Jersey City, and Rev. I. Zaklynsky from Old Forge, Pa. seceded to the Orthodox Church

* Pershy Kalendar, 1897, pp. 168-169.

APPENDIX II*

Number of Ruthenian Churches by States in 1904:

Pennsylvania	57
Ohio	10
New York	9
New Jersey	6
Connecticut	4
West Virginia	3
Indiana	2
Illinois	2
Massachusetts	1
Missouri	<u>1</u>
Total	95

Origin and number of Ruthenian priests in the United States in 1904:

Hungary:	
Muncacs	32
Presov	14
Galiccia:	
Lviv	8
Peremisl	6
Stanislav	3
United States:	
Scranton	2
Hungary:	
Basilian Father (OSBM)	1
Galiccia:	
Basilian Father (OSBM)	<u>1</u>
Total	67

*Kalendar Sojedenenija, 1905, p. 160.

APPENDIX III
ABSTRACT OF

The Byzantine Catholic Province of Philadelphia:
A History of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in the U.S.A.

This study is a chronological history of the Ruthenian Church in the United States from its difficult beginnings in 1884 to 1916 (when it was divided into two separate administrations), and of the Ukrainian Catholic Church from 1916 to the establishment of an independent Ecclesiastical Province of Philadelphia for the Ukrainians in 1958 and its expansion to the present.

Until 1916 when the Ruthenian Church in the United States was divided into separate administrations; one for the Ukrainian immigrants from Austrian Galicia, the other for the Rusins, Slovaks, Madyars, and Croats from Hungary, the history of the Byzantine-Slavonic Church in the United States was the common heritage of all "Ruthenian Catholics" originating from Austria-Hungary. The first two chapters of the thesis, therefore, deal with the development of the church organization of Ruthenian Catholics as a whole. Chapter I is concerned with the historical background and with the nature of the internal and external conflicts faced by the immigrants prior to the arrival of the first Ruthenian Bishop in 1907. The second chapter describes the jurisdictional problems that Bishop Ortynsky faced in his attempt to build an effective administrative system

for the Ruthenian church. Beginning with Chapter III, the study directs all its attention to the Ukrainian part of the Ruthenian diocese during the long interregnum between the death of Bishop Ortynsky in 1916 and the arrival of Bishop Bohachevsky in 1924. The fourth chapter describes Bishop Bohachevsky's early episcopate during which his energetic attempts to reorganize the long-orphaned Ukrainian church were met by an unduly strong opposition. The final chapter discusses the successful organizational developments in the Ukrainian Church since 1935, culminating in the establishment by the Holy See of an independent Byzantine Ecclesiastical Province in 1958.

It is obvious today that the Byzantine Rite Catholic Church which began its existence in the United States in 1884 has reached maturity and permanency. This development however, could not have been predicted even twenty years ago, much less earlier.

The early factional conflicts, the serious misunderstandings with the Latin Bishops and clergy, the proselytizing by the Russian Orthodox Mission, etc., created near chaotic conditions that even the appointment of the first Ruthenian Bishop, in 1907, could not resolve. Even after the establishment of an independent diocese in 1913 the problems continued and there was no final solution in sight when Bishop Ortynsky died in 1916. The difficulty in solving the Ruthenian question is apparent from the fact that more than eight years elapsed before

the appointment of Ortynsky's successors.

The temporary division of the Ruthenian Diocese which followed the death of Bishop Ortynsky was made permanent in 1924 with the creation of two Ruthenian Dioceses, one for the Ukrainians, the other for the Rusins, etc. Bishop Bohachevsky's energetic attempts to bring order and discipline into the long-orphaned Ukrainian Church were bitterly attacked by partisan extremists, and it was not until the post World War II period that the permanent character of the Ukrainian Catholic Church definitely took form. This permanency was crystalized when in 1958 the Papacy created an Independent Ecclesiastical Province of Philadelphia.

The chief sources for this study were: the Archives of the Byzantine Rite Archdiocese of Philadelphia; the official diocesan organ, the Eparkhialni Visty; the Roman Acta Sanctae Sedis and its successor Acta Apostolicae Sedis; and the Ruthenian newspapers, Svoboda and the Amerykansky Russky Viestnik.