



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

«A sanguine bunch». Regional identification in Habsburg Bukovina, 1774-1919

van Drunen, H.F.

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

van Drunen, H. F. (2013). «A sanguine bunch». Regional identification in Habsburg Bukovina, 1774-1919

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <http://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

2.1 Historical Claims

Romanian Speakers in Bukovina

In a time in which national, ethnic and racial parameters were presumed to be clearly defined, Bukovinian Romanian speakers were remarkably vaguely defined by their contemporaries. Lemberg school teacher Jandaurek cautiously noted that their dark skin seems to be caused more by the weather than by race',³⁷ Franzos saw them as 'a diverse and a very mixed race' and observed how 'one can travel the countryside for days without finding Romanians of pure blood (*reinblütig*)'.³⁸ Only a few years later, however, Mittelmann presented a radically different picture and concluded that 'it took them a long time to develop into their own race, but now all Romanians, no matter where they live, are clearly identical'.³⁹ Interestingly, Franzos seems to have regarded 'race' and 'pure blood' as a precondition, the 'raw material' of ethnic identity, while Mittelmann presumed it to be the end product of a process.⁴⁰

Readers of Wilhelm Schmidt's account from 1887, describing the migration of Magyar/Csángó settlers in young Bukovina were left with a rather uninviting image of the natives the newcomers had to come to terms with:

*[However] the roses on which those poor souls looking for a new home land strolled were not without thorns, if, in spite of the military government protection, they strolled on roses at all, even if the Vlachs or Romanians from the year dot came up with neither hegemony thoughts, nor confessional hostilities and were not inciting national hatred as they are today, even if there had been cultural contacts with Germans and Poles since a hundred years, the morally and intellectually relatively very low standing, so-called 'indigenous' have learned nothing decent and still supply the major share to criminal statistics.*⁴¹

Whereas the author, tempted as he seems to be, cannot revert to antedated accusations of Romanian nationalism, he depicts the 'natives' as criminal barbarians nonetheless.⁴² Schmidt, a Gymnasium teacher from Suczawa, seemed to have adopted a clearly pro-Hungarian view,

³⁷ Jandaurek 1884, pp. 172-177.

³⁸ Franzos 1901, p. 260.

³⁹ Mittelmann 1907/08, pp. 12-13.

⁴⁰ These contradictory observations suggest that the debate between modern scholars whether the nation precedes nationalism or vice versa is not as new as it is often thought to be.

⁴¹ Schmidt, Wilhelm, *Die magyarischen Colonieen der Bukowina - Eine Plauderei*, in: *Ungarische Revue*, 1887, VIII-IX, 672-683, p. 677.

⁴² Ironically, it is the Magyar residents from Andrásfalva whom the Radautz District Captain portrays as 'people who enjoy not the best reputation anyway and keep the Criminal Division of the District Court only too busy' [Leute, welche sich ohnehin nicht des besten Rufes erfreuen und die Strafabtheilung des Bezirksgerichtes nur allzusehr beschäftigen], *District Captain's Message to Governor's Office on Magyar emigration from Bukovina*, report 18AV, p. 3, Radautz, 10 March 1883/ DACHO, Viddil 1, Fond 3, Opis 1, spr. 4745. Şafran came to similar conclusions: "Im allgemeinen waren diese ungarischen Siedler sehr arm und konnten sich nur schwer behaupten. Es kann einen daher nicht wundernehmen, wenn sie weit in der Runde einen üblen Ruf hatten. Aus Armut dürften sie einen Teil der Diebstähle, die ihnen zugeschrieben wurden, tatsächlich begangen haben. Jedenfalls hatte die Regierung, wie schon an anderer Stelle erörtert wurde, öfters Anlass gegen sie einzuschreiten". He added that their national pride had often been cause for conflicts with neighbours and government agencies. Şafran 1939, p. 101.

which he had probably acquired during his time in Transylvania. In his fervour to dismiss of the Romanian nationalism of the late 1800s, Schmidt did not even hesitate to invoke the assassination of Huguenots in sixteenth-century Paris, only to call into question the tolerance which has always been the core of Bukovinian imagology, and not in the discourse of Romanian nationalists alone.

The popular saying of the Romanians, acting as Cicero's great-grandsons: 'Cine nu este Rumîn, nu are obras', meaning: 'He who is not Romanian, has no human face', this saying of arrogance, if not of nonsense of a Little Thumbling of parvenus, prematurely acting on its own, eagerly awaited culture state, is as little familiar to the Bukovina Magyar as the dictum served up only recently in a Romanian newspaper, suffering from internal contradictions and smelling very strongly of the Saint Bartholomew's Massacre of the 24th August 1572: 'If the Romanians in the land were not as tolerant as they are, Bukovina would be populated by adherents of the Orthodox faith dogmas alone'.⁴³

First of all, it is doubtful whether belligerent nationalist discourses contrive any useful information on Romanian speakers in Bukovinian and how there were perceived at the time. When Schmidt invoked his 'great-grandsons of Cicero' as he did, he probably did not even refer specifically to Bukovinian Romanian nationalists, but to Romanian nationalists in general.

A more personal account originates from descendants of those first settlers and goes back to the first difficult days of Magyar migration to Bukovina:

The harsh Bukovinian winter set in quickly, and around Christmas a [unit of] corn already equalled the price of two geese. The inhabitants of the surrounding Romanian villages took advantage of the situation of the Magyars living in distress and drastically raised the prices of the corn and potatoes, which are usually cheap in this area.⁴⁴

The problem with this anecdote is that it relies heavily on oral transmission, with all the risks of having been modified over the years. Especially the bitter Romanian-Hungarian nationalist disputes of later years might have added a far stronger 'anti-Romanian' twist to it later on. Contemporary Bukovinian sources paint a decidedly more harmonious picture of intra-communal relations. For instance, when the Magyar colony Józseffalva was struck by fire, village priest Drusbaczky (referred to by Schmidt as 'the venerable Father Družbacki'⁴⁵) reported on the various initiatives by Bukovinian Orthodox church authorities - and not by them alone - to assist the victims:

On 4 October 1866, 56 residential buildings burned down in Józseffalva in addition to the existent fruit stock [...] Orthodox landowner Alecu Popovici from Stupka gave 200 pieces of

⁴³ Ibid., p. 682.

⁴⁴ "A kemény bukovinai tél hamar beköszöntött, és karácsony táján egy merce málé (kukorica) már két liba árába került. A környező fálvak román lakossága, kihasználva a szorultságban levő magyarok helyzetét, nagyon megdrágította az ezen a vidéken általában olcsó gabonát és pityokát (burgonyát)". Fazekas, István, *Hetediziglen: Bukovinai székelly család krónika*, Polis, Kolozsvár/Cluj 2005, p. 37.

⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 679.

*logs to everybody, the distinguished Orthodox priest Andruhovici from Dragojestie gathered various kinds of fruit for the poor affected Magyars of Józseffalva and sent these to them.*⁴⁶

Similar cordial relations are suggested by the coverage in *Czernowitzer Tagblatt* of a local folk costume competition, hosted by Baron Kapri in the village of Jakobestie, locally known by its Hungarian name Fogadjisten:

*Taking a trip to Itzkany, one will see on a gentle hill from the Milleschoutz railway station the castle of Baron Kapri of Jakobestie, which stands out effectively with its red roof from its framing of green forest and which rules the wide Suczawa valley all the way to Solka. Jakobestie is home to the Magyars, the surrounding areas to the Romanians and all are known to dress up in vividly coloured costumes. The costumes of the women in particular show not only the usual embroidery at the shoulders (altiță), they also show richly-coloured adornments on chest and sleeves, which are painstakingly embroidered by busy hands during the long winter evenings. Council Kolbenheyer, who has always greatly cared for this branch of Bukovinian domestic industry and who will publish a study on the domestic embroidery of Bukovina in the near future, found yield for his studies in the areas around Jakobestie and wasted no opportunity to assist the people with advice and encouragement regarding their artistic work. In this endeavour, Council Kolbenheyer found in the landlord of Baron Georg Jakobestie Kapri a kindred sponsor who hosts a harvest festival at his castle every year and bestows awards upon the most beautiful costumes. This year's harvest festival was held at Jakobestie Castle Sunday on the first of this month in the presence of the district chief, Administrative Council Von Tarangul and his wife and with the participation of more than 500 peasants from neighboring villages in groups, all in their Sunday best. First in line was the gypsy band from Gurasolcze, then came the girls, boys, men and women until the wide square in front of the castle was filled by an immense crowd of happy faces, tanned by harvest labour. Council Kolbenheyer never tired to check every single costume, sometimes to praise, sometimes to rebuke and selected the most beautiful embroidery in order to submit it for awards: 16 girls received prizes of 10 Crowns from the hands of the charming castle lady Baroness Luzza Kapri while the country folk cheered. After the award ceremony a 'Hora mare' united all participants in a joyful dance, and only late in the evening these beautiful, weather-blessed festivities ended, owing its success particularly to the young and very likable Baron Emanuel Kapri.*⁴⁷

Not a word in this account suggests that the competition was organised along national lines, and the description of the costumes involved does not make clear if a distinction between 'Magyar' and 'Romanian' costumes could be made at all; on top of that, none of the participants seems to have taken offence when asked to participate in a typical 'Romanian' *Hora mare*.

⁴⁶ "Im Jahre 1866 am 4. Oktober sind in Jóseffalva 56 Wohngebäude nebst dem vorhandenen Fruchtvorrath verbrannt, [...] Aleko Popovics griechisch-orientalischer Gutsherr in Stupka hat jedem 200 Stück Holzstämme gegeben, Andruhovits der ausgezeichnete griechisch-orientalische Pfarrer in Dragojest sammelte verschiedene Fruchtgattungen für die armen abgebrannten Magyaren in Jóseffalva und übersandete denselben". Drusbaczky, Bonaventura, *Auszug aus dem Gesuche der Gemeinde Jóseffalva in Bukovina um einen Geldbeitrag ex 6838.1868*, addressed to The Hungarian Parliament in Budapest, Józseffalva 1866/ DACHO, Viddil 1, Fond 3, Opis 1, spr. 2881.

⁴⁷ *Volkstrachtenkonkurrenz in Jakobestie*, Czernowitzer Tagblatt, 11.09.1912, p. 3.

By sampling just a few cases of the ‘Magyar’ view on ‘Bukovinian Romanians’, operating principles are challenged and reports of day-to-day relations seem to contradict the views generally promoted by the likes of Schmidt. The final case also illustrates the difficulty when operating a distinction like ‘the other’: in the Jakobestie/Fogadjisten example, the juxtaposition ‘Magyar-Romanian’ initially sets the tone, but once the correspondent shifted his attention to the tool meant to underline this difference, ‘folk costume’, he only referred to ‘Bukovinian embroidery’. The earlier example of Father Drusbacky’s reports on how the Orthodox clergy had rendered assistance to the residents of Józseffalva showed similar signs of ‘national blindness’: knowing the dominant position of Romanian-speakers in the Orthodox church and their prevalence in the south of Bukovina, Drusbacky could easily have labeled them ‘Romanians’. Yet he did not. The only source to have mentioned Magyar-Vlach/Romanian tensions in Bukovina is Schmidt, who refused to substantiate his claims and reserved his bitter comments for Romanian nationalism in general without specific reference to Bukovinian-Romanian nationalism.

‘Outsiders’, non-Bukovinians or those addressing an outsider audience, obviously, are a richer source of stereotyping. To this day, most publications on Bukovinian ethnography stick to the traditional division of ‘nationalities’ or ‘ethnotypes’. This categorisation and its subsequent stereotyping even facilitates interpretations of history as is shown as recently as 2002 with the statement relating to the Austrian annexation of Bukovina, that ‘the peaceful and conciliatory nature of the Romanian made him a devoted citizen of the newly installed order, defending his rights with words instead of weapons’ and that ‘newcomers enjoyed more freedom among the tolerant Romanians than in their regions of origin’⁴⁸. Only an author like Şafran, who from his Romanian-nationalist point of view must have felt uneasy presenting an all-too-tolerant ‘native’ attitude towards the large numbers of emigrants after the Austrian annexation, claimed that ‘the native Romanian population managed to acquire only very cool relations (*ein ganz kühles Verhältnis*) with the new migrants’.⁴⁹

The image of the ‘peaceful and tolerant’ Bukovinian Romanian appears throughout the existence of Austrian Bukovina, and, as shown above, long thereafter. When Herman Mittelmann tried to lure tourists to his beloved Bukovina in the early twentieth century, he recommended his Romanian compatriots for being ‘peaceful, orderly and courageous’ and added that ‘a lively temperament, endurance, loyalty and gratitude were the distinguishing features inherent in the entire nation’,⁵⁰ which was also ‘very inclined to peaceful cohabitation with foreign co-nationals (*mit fremden Nationsgenossen*)’.⁵¹ A more detailed, but not dissimilar description comes from a governor in Bukovina, Baron Bourguignon, who reported to Vienna in an effort to explain several tumultuous incidents surrounding Czernowitz

⁴⁸ Olaru, Marian and Purici, Ştefan, ‘*Bucovinism*’ şi ‘*homo bucovinensis*’, in: *Analele Bucovinei*, 2002, IX, vol. 2, 367- 374, p. 368.

⁴⁹ Şafran 1939, p. 31.

⁵⁰ Mittelmann, Herman, *Illustrierter Führer durch die Bukowina*, Verlag der Buchhandlung Romuald Schally, Czernowitz 1907/8, p. 29.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

University memorial ceremonies for the deceased Crown Prince Rudolph in 1889⁵² and described the different faculties, their professors and students:

*Firstly, as regards the theological faculty, the professors hired there are all native Bukovinians and of the Orthodox denomination. According to their nationality, they are Romanians [...] and members of the here existing Club for Romanian Literature and Culture, but all in all they are politically very moderate and very tolerant of other nationalities and confessions. They are aspiring teachers throughout, quiet men who enjoy public esteem at the same time, perfectly satisfied with their status and position, which have improved significantly since the conversion of the former ecclesiastical diocese institution in a theological faculty; in their faculty, there has hitherto never been a conflict, they live in peace and harmony with each other and with the professors of the other faculty.*⁵³

Bourguignon not only underscored aspects of peace and harmony within the theological faculty, but, strikingly, only referred to its members' Romanian nationality after having designated them as Bukovinians and Orthodox - the latter being rather self-evident at an Orthodox theological faculty.

Not all stereotyping regarding Bukovinian Romanians is as positive as those in the 'tolerance/hospitality' category. Mittelmann's travel guide noted that 'they needed strong leadership'⁵⁴. In his volume on Galicia and Bukovina, Julius Jandaurek pointed at the Romanian fear of vampires and further claimed that 'Romanians did not eat much and did not need much, their tendency to drink not taken into account', but added that he had never seen a Romanian woman drunk⁵⁵, while Franzos observed that Romanians 'had a lot of natural dignity - as long as they are sober'.⁵⁶

Already in 1823, when Emperor Franz I visited Bukovina, the local district captain praised the German subjects for their diligence. However, 'the Vlachs - he said - grow corn, and in case of a bad harvest, they would be in dire straits'.⁵⁷ A reputation of being bad farmers, especially

⁵² For more on these incidents, see paragraph 3 of Part III: The Empire, the Nation and the Region: Competing Identifications in Bukovina/ 3.2: Bukovinians and the Habsburg dynasty/ Bukovinians and the Extended Habsburg Family.

⁵³ "Was zunächst die theologische Fakultät anbelangt, so sind die an derselben angestellten Professoren sämtlich Bukowinaer Landeskindern und gr.or. Confession. Nach ihrer Nationalität sind sie Rumänen, [...] sind Mitglieder des hier bestehenden Vereins für rumänische Literatur und Cultur, jedoch in politischer Beziehung sämtlich sehr gemässigte und sehr tolerant gegenüber anderen Nationalitäten und Confessionen. Es sind dies durchgehends strebsame Lehrer, dabei ruhige der allgemeinen Achtung sich erfreuende Männer, sie sind mit ihrer Stellung und Lage, welche sich seit der Umwandlung der früher bestandenen geistlichen Diözesenanstalt in eine theologische Fakultät wesentlich gebessert hat, vollkommen zufrieden; in ihrer Fakultät hat es bisher niemals einen Conflict gegeben, sie leben in Frieden und Eintracht miteinander und mit den Professoren der anderen Fakultät". Bourguignon, Friedrich, *Bericht des Landespräsidenten an den Minister für Cultus und Unterricht*, 482 Pr., Czernowitz, 27 March 1889/ ANR, Fond 'Guvernământul Bucovinei', MCÎ, XCIII/9.

⁵⁴ Mittelmann 1907/8, p. 14.

⁵⁵ Jandaurek, Julius, *Das Königreich Galizien und Lodomerien und das Herzogthum Bukowina (Die Laender Oesterreich-Ungarns in Wort und Bild – 10)*, Graef, Vienna 1884, pp. 172-177.

⁵⁶ Franzos 1901, p. 260.

⁵⁷ Wagner, Rudolf, *Reisetagebücher des österreichischen Kaisers Franz I [des Ersten] in die Bukowina (1817 und 1823)*, Der Südostdeutsche, Munich 1979, pp. 80-81.

when compared to the German immigrants, would continue to stick stubbornly to Romanian-speaking Bukovinians. Even as recent as 1993, Bukovinian-born Adolf Katzenbeisser stated that ‘Romanians were sometimes referred to as lazy by the Germans. Eastern Europeans with their different mentality and way of life could in no way compete with the able, ambitious and performance-minded Germans, who calculated output’.⁵⁸

Philipp Menczel equally implied the superiority of German discipline in his memoirs when he recalled that ‘the Romanians, who were the neighbours of [these] Germans, had assimilated: their settlements contrasted favourably with the purely Romanian villages (...).⁵⁹ According to August Nibio, these feelings of superiority were overtly displayed, since ‘the Romanians were almost consistently called Vlachs by the Germans, always in a somewhat contemptuous sense, but mostly ‘stinking Vlachs’, also ‘sheepskins’ (*cojoci*) or eagle, golden eagle’.⁶⁰

Not surprisingly, such attitudes offered a welcome opportunity for Romanian nationalists to bewail how the ‘natives’ were being humbled by ‘strangers’. In an anonymous publication (signed only ‘A Bukovinian’) against the alleged ‘Ruthenisation of Bukovina and other reasons for the denationalisation of the Romanian people’, the author described what supposedly happened when a Bukovinian Romanian entered the home of his German daughter-in-law:

“Out, you peasant, you stinking Vlach! What does this smelly peasant want from you, I don’t want to see him in my house, otherwise I will kick him out with you!” This way, the father of the man is treated by the lovely and cultured foreign (Swabian) woman. But the Romanian husband is not treated any better. There is no escape for him from epithets like: ‘you Vlach peasant’, ‘Your father is a smelly peasant and so are you’, ‘you stupid Vlach’ etc. ..., all this they assign to their men, all this true Swabian gentleness, grace and finesse, as an influx of culture from a nation that claims to be a superior race. Because here in Bukovina, a foreign woman, especially a Swabian one, believes that she is superior to the Romanian man, and that no matter how poor and wretched she might be, she has still performed a grand gesture by suffering a Vlach.⁶¹

Matters were made worse by the fact that educated Romanian girls ‘would do everything to marry a stranger, no matter how stupid, alcoholic he might be’, the same anonymous author grumbled. This way, the brides in question implicitly acknowledged ‘foreign superiority’.⁶² In 1913, the Romanian nationalists of *Viața Nouă* were outraged when a certain Hellmann, alleged to ventilate his dissatisfaction with his new home and its residents liberally, was appointed as a teacher to Gymnasium no. 3 in Suczawa:

⁵⁸ Katzenbeisser, Adolf, *Geboren in der Bukowina. Geschichte eines Lebens. Geschichte einer Zeit*, author’s edition, Vienna 1993, p. 69.

⁵⁹ Menczel, Philipp, *Trügerische Lösungen. Erlebnisse u. Betrachtungen eines Österreicherers*, Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, Stuttgart, Berlin 1932, p. 34.

⁶⁰ Nibio, August, *Über den Einfluß von Sitten und Sprache der Rumänen auf die Deutschen in der Bukowina*, Bukowiner Volks-Zeitung, 07.04.1912, p. 2.

⁶¹ NN, *Rutenisarea Bucovinei și cauzele desnaționalizării poporului român*, Minerva, Bucharest 1904, p. 179.

⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 180.

He calls the Romanians 'pig barons' (Schweinebarone) and says that Suczawa rather resembles a region of Siberia - which is meant to imply that we are all culturally backward and wild as those on the Siberian plains, to where the Russians send their biggest bandits and wrongdoers. Obviously, the German was thinking of his own ordeal when he saw that the Ministry had decided Suczawa to be his penal settlement, and therefore to him a kind of Siberia. (...) The newspaper of those same local nationalist Germans, 'Bukowinaer Nachrichten', allowed itself the other day to ridicule us and our language in such a way that another German newspaper, 'Volksfreund', felt obliged to severely box the impertinent ears of those of the 'Nachrichten', requesting that the little Germans do not behave so arrogantly towards us, the native people.⁶³

Whether it is questionable if the authors were insulted in their capacity as Romanians or as Bukovinians, 'the Austrian Siberians', remains unclear. As in many cases, it was probably a bit of both, and for those Bukovinian Romanian nationalists who regarded Bukovina as their exclusive historical cradle, there was no distinction between the two. As will be discussed in Part III, the feeling among Bukovinians that their crownland was regarded as a 'penal colony' within the Empire was a constant factor in public debates.

Not only ethnic/nationalist German circles regarded 'the natives' with some disdain. In a study on Jewish identity in Czernowitz, it is noted that Jews considered Romanians and Ruthenians culturally inferior⁶⁴ and that Romanians were well aware of this.⁶⁵ The sensitivity of the matter is aptly illustrated by a minor incident from 1908, when a group of young men was accused of having stolen flour from a freight train and some Czernowitz newspapers subsequently mentioned that the suspects were Bukovinian Romanians. Nationalist newspaper *Voința Poporului* responded venomously to the insinuation:

So now the Romanians from Bukovina are a nation of thieves and bandits, a bunch of wild men, who thus have to be called to order, even with arms if possible. This the Jewish newspapers from Czernowitz have established. How else could be explained that some youngsters - we do not know to which nationality they belong since they have not been caught yet - who surely live in very good circumstances, and are surely not peasants or better said peasant labourers, exploited by Jewish usurers and innkeepers, had the boldness to enter a freight train and steal flour!⁶⁶

Apart from the Romanian nationalist frustration of being portrayed as uncultured, these few lines from *Voința Poporului* reveal a number of intertwined issues of Habsburg Bukovina: anti-Semitism, economic hardship and usury, in this case enhanced by the fact that all prominent (and therefore German-language) newspapers were in Jewish hands.

⁶³ Sentinela, *Obrăznicie nemțască*, Viața Nouă, 64, 09.03.1913, p. 3. The 'pig baron' insult may well have been inspired by Johann Strauss II's *The Gypsy Baron* (*Der Zigeunerbaron*) is an operetta *The Gypsy Baron* (German: *Der Zigeunerbaron*) which had premiered on 24 October 1885. The libretto was based on a story by Mór Jókai and set in Transylvania.

⁶⁴ Heymann, Florence, *Le crépuscule des lieux - Identités juives de Czernowitz*, Stock, Paris 2003, p. 46.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 90.

⁶⁶ *Voința Poporului*, 36, 06.09.1908, p. 3.

Romanian Nationalists and Their Frustrations

An even bigger annoyance to Bukovinian Romanian nationalists was the threat from within: The local elite were noticeably willing to embrace both German culture and language. As noted above, women regarded marrying a 'foreigner' as status-enhancing and such views were shared by many of the upper class. Boyars sent their sons to Vienna to be educated and were considered friends of the German culture and language. The latter was even dubbed 'their second mother tongue' (*zweite Muttersprache*).⁶⁷ A much-cited incident occurred in the 1890s, when the Romanian King Carol I was passing through Czernowitz and was greeted at the railway station by a delegation of Bukovinian dignitaries. *Bukowinaer Rundschau* depicted the scene as follows:

At the reception of the Romanian king in Czernowitz railway station a very amusing incident took place, which for more than once reason deserves to be rescued from oblivion. Baron Nicholas Mustatza was introduced to the king as well, in fact as a particularly 'good' Romanian, an honour befitting the head of the national party. The King of Romania, who sincerely believed he was dealing with a whole-blood Romanian, addressed Baron Mustatza in Romanian and was utterly surprised to be answered in German by the leader of the Bukovinian Romanians. "We have received a German education here!" ("Wir sind hier deutsch erzogen!"), the national hero begged to excuse his ignorance regarding the Romanian language. Hurriedly, the introduced Baron Mustatza was put aside again, the young Baron Hurmuzaki PhD then addressed the King in German, the Baron replied in Romanian, the King assessed Baron Mustatza with a quick glance and smiled. The attending Romanians however had turned bright red with shame.⁶⁸

According to Iorga, the incident 'earned the Baron an Austrian award, much Austrian sympathy and the disapproval of all Romanians in Bukovina who truly cared for their nation'.⁶⁹ Nistor observed that 'Bishop Hacman's Bukovinist⁷⁰ concept was shared by many Romanian and foreign proprietors' and 'was expressed most clearly by the response of Nicholas Mustatza, descendant of a Greek leaseholder in Bukovina, made baron by de Austrians for supplying their army during the Napoleonic wars'.⁷¹ It is not difficult to imagine the embarrassment felt by Romanian nationalists. It explains why Iorga tried to imply a kind of Viennese conspiracy behind Mustatza's clumsy performance and why Nistor accused the baron of 'Bukovinism', probably the nastiest insult he could think of. Obviously, Nistor readily emphasised Mustatza's 'foreign' roots and - incorrectly - suggested the baron owned his title solely to services rendered to the Habsburgs.⁷² Moreover, he argued that Mustatza had

⁶⁷ Simiginowicz-Staufe, Ludwig Adolf, *Die Völkergruppen der Bukowina*, Czopp, Czernowitz 1884, p. 34.

⁶⁸ *Glückliche Katastrophe*, Bukowinaer Rundschau, 2789, 29.07.1898, p. 1.

⁶⁹ Iorga 1905/2006, p. 236.

⁷⁰ For more on 'Bukovinism', see Part III, paragraph 4.

⁷¹ Nistor 1991, pp. 208-209.

⁷² According to the International Association of Nobility, Theodor Mustaca arrived in the second half of the 18th Century in Moldavia. Soon after he purchased the estate Sadagora and on 5 November 1794 he was knighted (Ritter) with the title 'of Sadagora'. In 1821 he was promoted to baron (Freiherr). Source: www.edelleute.eu, retrieved on 21 May 2010.

replied ‘haughtily’ (*tanțoș*),⁷³ which puts the scene in a light quite different from that of the awkwardness at the railway station as depicted by *Bukowinaer Rundschau*. The air of lofty superiority attributed to Mustatza would prove hard to shake off. In 2004, Corbea-Hoisie provided the following interpretation:

*This cultural integration above social classes and even nations was pushed very far because in the 1890s during a visit by the Romanian sovereign in Czernowitz, a representative of one of the most prominent aristocratic families refused to answer the King’s salutation in Romanian, and told him in German that he was educated in that language. This was a consequence of the consistent and continuous education policy in the Josephinist spirit implemented by the Austrian authorities on the territory of the new province in the early years of the military administration.*⁷⁴

The element of ‘refusal’ here together with the presumed far-reaching cultural integration under the flag of Josephinism provide practical reasons to question this interpretation of events as well as the one given by *Bukowinaer Rundschau*, which, by the way, served as an introduction to an article which harshly attacked the person of Baron Mustatza and thus had not intended to make nobleman look more sympathetic. The only consistent elements in all versions are the arrival of the King, his salutation in German and Mustatza’s answer. Whether he answered the sovereign ‘haughtily’ or ‘blushingly’ can no longer be determined, nor can be established if he ‘refused’ to answer or ‘begged to excuse his ignorance’. However, it seems unlikely that the well-bred nobleman would snub a crowned head of state or that he would be unable to answer even one question in Romanian. An aspect so far ignored is the common cultural background both protagonists shared: as a born Hohenzoller, the King’s mother tongue was obviously German. In an effort to show courtesy, and most likely to demonstrate that Bukovina was not just a backward province, the Baron just might have wanted to show off his decent upbringing. After all, his reply does not refer to language alone, but to his education as a whole. An extreme, all-compassing cultural integration under the influence of Josephinism, as suggested by Corbea-Hoisie, might here be reduced to the fact that German was the *lingua franca* of the Habsburg Monarchy and for a family like the Mustatzas, with their close political ties to its power centre Vienna, a proper command of its language and familiarity with its culture were a given.

The railway station incident does not alter the fact that the eager embrace of German culture by the elites, who at the same time felt a growing pressure from nationalists to profile themselves firmly as ‘Romanians’, faced heated debates and attacks. Accordingly, the earlier quoted ‘Bukovinian’ deplored that

(...) it is hardly surprising if today the Romanian cultural elite of Bukovina, with very few exceptions, does not know Romanian and does not have love for or a more profound or true sense of the language and the nation, when this language of theirs, which they use now and then, is, with little exceptions, only a Romanian-Swabian (‘romano-șvăbesc’) dialect. Today, only the Romanian peasant, who still exists however decimated, is the one who still speaks

⁷³ Nistor 1991, p. 209.

⁷⁴ Corbea-Hoisie, Andrei, *La Bucovine - Éléments d'histoire politique et culturelle*, Institut d'Études Slaves, Paris 2004, p. 20.

pure Romanian while the cultural elite occupies itself exclusively with the German language and literature. It is therefore hardly surprising that everywhere you go to a so-called Romanian club, association or party, nearly everybody, Romanian language teachers, so-called Romanian men of letters, catechists and even the learned members (learned in regard to collected editions of popular poetry and literature, compiled for them by their students) of the Romanian Academy of Bucharest employ in their conversations, their toasts and even at home with their families preferably the German language, that our ladies and damsels, even those who are members of the 'Association of Romanian Ladies' and have the mission to spread the national mindset among their tender Romanian scion, among our daughters, so that they become true Romanian mothers (adevărate mame române), the most splendid mission for our girls, use the German language exclusively and with the greatest pleasure in all their business (even in family business) on all occasions, on the road, in shops, on the market, while shopping, whenever they go out, in short everywhere and amongst their own whenever they meet. Indeed, they do this with an exceptional pride because they want to show in this way that they are cultured, well-bred and that they are worth a lot more than those who do not know how to fart in Swabian (a părțai la șvăbește). Because of this complete lack of national mindset of our Romanian ladies it happens sometimes, even regularly, that if a single Swabian, Polish etc. woman comes to their association, even if only to ask for help or to beg for money, and the conversation had so far by chance been in Romanian, it switches completely to German, Polish or even Russian.⁷⁵

Worse, Romanian ladies apparently did not need 'foreign' ladies in their presence in order to choose German-language publications over Romanian ones. In 1913, Vasile Greciuc complained that in most Bukovinian Romanian families, the women rather read *Leipziger-Illustrierte-Zeitung* or *Das Buch für Alle* than *Luceafărul* or *Junimea Literară*.⁷⁶

In a different tone of voice, these phenomena were echoed by *Bukowinaer Rundschau*, in a piece previously published in *Gazeta Bucovinei* and in the Viennese *Rumänische Revue*:

Those who know us better (...) know exactly that perhaps none of the non-German Austrian tribes is as responsive to German culture as the Romanians of Bukovina. They learn the German language with particular preference already in elementary school, they learn it in secondary school etc. In the homes of the nobility, the clergy and the rest of Romanian intelligence they delight in speaking German, but in most cases to the detriment of the mother tongue. No matter how numerous a Romanian social circle is, its members will immediately switch to German as the language of conversation when only a single German is among them, a favour that neither the Germans, nor the Poles would do a single, nay, not even a dozen of Romanians. The German theatre in Czernowitz was built with large sums of money coming from Romanian hands and again it is the Romanians who visit it most often and most regularly.⁷⁷

In order to refute claims that Bukovinian Romanians fostered anti-German sentiments, the author plainly attempted to depict the mentioned Germanophilia as a positive trait in the framework of which Romanian nationalism should be allowed to flourish without being

⁷⁵ NN, Rutenisarea etc. 1904, p. 152.

⁷⁶ Greciuc, Vasile, *Cultura românească în Bucovina*, Societatea tipografică bucovineană, Czernowitz 1913, p. 30.

⁷⁷ *Die Bukowiner Rumänen und das Deutschtum*, *Bukowinaer Rundschau*, 1232, 27.12.1892, p. 1.

accused of being disloyal to the Habsburg Empire. The anonymous 'Bukovinian' on the other hand, who had published his work in Bucharest, was obviously not - or in any case less - troubled by censorship or matters of disloyalty to the Habsburg Throne and could in this way blatantly denounce 'Swabian farts' and other 'foreign' elements as a direct threat to Romanian culture in Bukovina.

The readiness of Romanian Bukovinians to switch from Romanian to any other language at the slightest provocation proved to be an enduring component of the image created by themselves (auto-image) as well as by others (hetero-image). Shortly after the collapse of the Monarchy and the unification of Bukovina with Romania, *Glasul Bucovinei* revealed 'that about fifteen years ago professor Iorga was the dinner guest of a Bukovinian Romanian and that he was completely neglected once a university professor imported from the West came into the house, because in his narrow-mindedness the Bukovinian only noticed what came from the West, from Vienna, whereas he ignored and even despised the achievements of his own culture and literature'.⁷⁸ What only years before had been presented as a 'favour' by the Romanian Bukovinians to the non-speaking people around them, had changed into 'narrow-mindedness' and 'disdain for one's own culture' once Austrian censors had left the stage. This paradigm shift is consistent with the different ways in which Baron Mustatza's quoted performance was assessed over the years.

Meanwhile, linguistic adjustment was not seen as a feature of the Romanian-speaking élites exclusively. Quite unlike the cases argued above, Romanian nationalists claimed that lower-class Bukovinians were targets for Ruthenian rather than German manipulation:

*The Romanian peasant with his extreme fondness of foreign languages, and his language talents - which in this case should actually be labeled a national misfortune - easily and quickly picks up the very simple and grammatically primitive Slavic dialect (Mundart) of the neighbouring nation, while the Ruthenian, partly as a result from innate stubbornness, partly a result of planned agitation evoked by agitation, usually does not learn a new language at all.*⁷⁹

The malleable Romanian peasant becoming Ruthenian in the blink of an eye was a cornerstone of the 'Ruthenisation theory' of Romanian nationalists, although it was denied and ridiculed within their own circles as well: Aurel Onciul skitted upon educated Romanian nationalists who lamented that 'peasants went to sleep as Romanians and woke up as Ruthenians', accusing them of having lost all confidence in the ability of Bukovinian Romanians to defend their proper national identity.⁸⁰ Still, within the Bukovinian context it is one of the best examples of a presumed regional characteristic consistently applied in political bickering between nationalists - Romanian and Ruthenian in this case. Enviously, *Deșteptarea*

⁷⁸ *Vom Tage: Aus der Bukowinaer Presse - Glasul Bucovinei*, Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung/Czernowitzer Tagblatt, 04.04.1919, p. 3.

⁷⁹ (Zota, Iancu), *Die Slavisierung der Bukowina im 19. Jh. als Ausgangspunkt grosspolnischer Zukunftspolitik. Ethnographische und politische Betrachtungen*, Gerolds, Vienna 1900, p. 14.

⁸⁰ Onciul, Aurel Constantin, *Aurel Ritter von Onciul und der nationale Ausgleich in der österreichischen Bukowina: eine wissenschaftliche Dokumentation*, author's edition, Nuremberg 1999, p. 63.

claimed that Romanians in Transylvania had managed to maintain language and ‘purity’ since they never married members of other ethnic groups:

With us Bukovinians, things are different: with us, you see a poor Romanian lad take a girl from another nation, who does not speak Romanian. With us, you see a Romanian girl marry a foreign lad, who does not speak Romanian either. And what happens in these cases? The spouses speak either both languages, Romanian and Ruthenian for instance, so that they will not know what they are, Romanians or Ruthenians, or they speak only Ruthenian, which is the bigger shame, because this way their children will think of themselves as Ruthenians. This is very bad and in Transylvania such things do not occur. Over there Romanians have not defiled their blood with that of another nation and it is the Holy Lord who made them act in this fine way. (...) We can go to church with strangers of the same denomination, but we should not marry them.⁸¹

The author’s evident resentment towards Romanian Bukovinians indicates that loyalty questions such as ‘region vs. nationality’ were a serious point of discussion. At the same time, Romanian nationalists saw their views reflected in contemporary scholarly publications like in Weigand’s description of dialects in Bukovina and Bessarabia, in which the author concluded that in the Kucurmare area ‘it can be observed in general that the Romanians in this area are very easily Slavicised’ and that ‘in mixed communities, they all speak good Ruthenian, even where they are by far the majority, and although the clergy as well as the school is working consistently to promote Romanian’.⁸²

Similarly, the track record of Romanian nationalist community building seems modest when compared to other ethnically defined groups in Austrian Bukovina. Village reading rooms as established by Ruthenian activists were unknown.⁸³ Romanian nationalists were well aware of this and envied their Ruthenian adversaries in this respect.⁸⁴ Urban cultural associations popular among Ruthenians and Jews were less numerous and less actively supported in Romanian national circles.⁸⁵

Still, the degree of active support at the time is hard to measure and consequently evaluated differently by different sources. Turczynski for example equals the strong community sense of the Romanians to that of the Jews.⁸⁶ In his famous lamentation “The Theft of Bukovina”, Kogălniceanu assesses that ‘among the many qualities we Romanians lack is the one of being solidly united, of knowing how to support each other in times of need and want’.⁸⁷ A similar

⁸¹ Deșteptarea, 20, 15.10.1893, p. 153.

⁸² Weigand, Gustav, *Die Dialekte der Bukowina und Bessarabiens. Mit einem Titelbilde und Musikbeilagen*, Barth, Leipzig 1904, p. 15.

⁸³ A claim to the contrary can be found with Iacobescu quoting Sbiera. Here the phenomenon of the ‘travelling teacher’ is described, who, following an ancient Romanian custom, went from village to village to gather young boys in one of the larger dwellings in order to teach them to read and write in Romanian (“*după o Bucoavnă tipărită la Buda (...) apoi Ceaslovul, Orogierul și Psaltirea, mai rar Biblia*”) Iacobescu 1993, pp. 285-86.

⁸⁴ See for instance Apărarea Națională, 16, 01.03.1908, p. 1.

⁸⁵ Hausleitner 2001, p. 59.

⁸⁶ Turczynski 1993, p. 180.

⁸⁷ (Kogălniceanu, Mihail), *Răpirea Bucovinei*, Minerva, Bucharest 1907, p. 55.

observation is made by Ion Drăgușanul with reference to the situation in Bukovina shortly after the Austrian occupation:

With us, there has always been a tradition of rushing for foreign aristocratic titles, especially Polish, in such a way that the chance of obtaining one of those incites pride and detachment from one's roots. Nobility, merchants and leaseholders, all are allured by titles like flies by honey. Everyone wants security, wealth and a nobleman's life, so to get as much as possible from the inherited estates, they colonise them extensively with foreigners without pondering on future risks.⁸⁸

Not only greed and ambition were seen as a hindrance to the nationalist project: unlike their Czech and Polish peers, the Bukovinian Romanian educated elite was reluctant to bridge class distinctions and typically steered clear of general nationalist gatherings:

Only in our case, the learned classes, who were always invited to these meetings, with few exceptions deemed it proper to stay away entirely. Only with us Romanians, caste spirit flourishes like it did in the past. This will have to stop. Workers will only have confidence in us if we do not trivialise them, but give them a friendly welcome and dwell lovingly in their midst. It is not about becoming their drinking mates, but about befriending them, listening to their bitterness and giving them good advice. Then their confidence in the learned classes will be great and infinite.⁸⁹

Identification with the Romanian national idea was more firmly entrenched within the cordial yet competitive sphere of society events such as the national balls. After having organised the first of such events in 1864 (as mentioned before when discussing Ion Nistor's work in the literature survey of this thesis), Romanian nationalist organisations had confidently established their position in this respect by the turn of the century. This was reflected in a regional novel of the time, written by Bukovinian Anna Pawlitschek, who let one of her characters fret about the upcoming German ball in Czernowitz:

You must know, the ball should become a huge success. The Romanians must be trumped! Remember their fabulous New Year's feast on 12 January! It is crucial for us Germans to stick together.⁹⁰

Unsurprisingly, these events were reserved for the upper crust and hence disclosed little to nothing with regard to a possible all-encompassing sense of community among Romanian speakers in Bukovina. And, ironically, just like the Romanian learned classes were accused of ignoring the common people, social climbers among those very learned classes like the 'democratic priest' quoted below, felt ignored and humiliated by their own aristocracy at national balls:

⁸⁸ Drăgușanul, Ion, *Identități deturnate – o istorie anecdotică a Bucovinei*, Grupul editorial Mușatinii, Suceava 2000, p. 64.

⁸⁹ *Apărarea Națională*, 16.02.1908, p. 1.

⁹⁰ "Du musst wissen, der Ball soll glänzend ausfallen. Die Rumänenpartei muss übertrumpft werden! Denke an ihre brillante Sylvesterfeier am 12. Jänner! (...) Da gibt's jetzt, dass wir Deutschen zusammenhalten". Pawlitschek, Anna, *Ob ich dich liebe. Roman aus dem Kleinstadtleben der Bukowina*, Konegen, Vienna 1897, pp. 26-27.

*About five years ago, boyars were even ashamed to go to the 'Junimea' ball together with the Romanian intelligence which could not boast of being of boyar origin, but rather went with haughty soldiers and hussars from other nations, and it agreed even less with spoiled little lords like our boyars to work for the poor landfolk.*⁹¹

Ruthenian speakers in Bukovina

Just like Bukovina's Romanian speakers, its Ruthenian speakers were the subject of an elaborate catalog of images and stereotypes. In his travel guide for Bukovina, industrious Bukovina promoter Mittelmann depicted Bukovinian Ruthenians as being 'of strong character, lively and easily excited', while 'their loyalty, devotion and their courage, which easily turned into recklessness, were proverbial'.⁹² This image of 'recklessness' was not shared by those deeming the Ruthenian suspicious towards anyone, but mostly towards clergyfolk, including his own priest, 'for he knew that every time he visited him, it would cost him a chicken or at least an egg'.⁹³ Ruthenians were said to be true to their independence, their kin and their land (and therefore seldom migrated) and though 'they did not accept orders, with a friendly word one would get them to do anything'.⁹⁴

Poverty was an overall trait, leading to alcohol abuse and subsequently to even more misery. Splény had already complained about this 'Ruthenian vice' as well as about the role Jewish usurers played here. A century later, the situation seemed to have remained unchanged, however some attention was paid to the ambiguous and symbiotic relations between usurer and borrower: 'No matter how the Jew is made a target of mockery, an object of ridicule, the centre of a truly rich treasure of anecdotes and stories, the peasant still gladly returns to him'.⁹⁵ 'Free farmers' (the so-called *Reseschenadel*, which had received noble titles after the Austrian annexation and were thus entitled to add 'de' to their names) were just as poverty-stricken and were ridiculed by their fellow villagers since they were 'numerous like poppyseed - but with lice the size of beans'.⁹⁶ Polish-speaking Bukovinians were said to have called Ruthenian speakers 'pigs' ('*Co Rusyn, to swinia*').⁹⁷

Budai-Deleanu set a trend when he noted that 'the Moldavians are smarter and funnier than the Rusnyaks'.⁹⁸ A lack of intellect and education was stubbornly attributed to Ruthenian speakers, while it was asserted that they lived on a culturally low level because their fathers were reluctant to send their offspring to school 'since they had always survived without any

⁹¹ *Chestiunea economică și organizarea clerului*, Voința Poporului, 37, 09.09.1904, p. 7.

⁹² Mittelmann 1907/8, p. 29.

⁹³ Simiginowicz-Staufe 1884, pp.44-45.

⁹⁴ Budai-Deleanu in Grigorovici 1998, p. 382 (Ab. 13).

⁹⁵ Simiginowicz-Staufe 1884, pp. 42-43.

⁹⁶ Nibio, August, *Vom Volkswitz und den Spitznamen in der Bukowina*, Bukowiner Volks-Zeitung, 07.04.1912, p. 2.

⁹⁷ Nibio, August, *Vom Volkswitz und den Spitznamen in der Bukowina*, Bukowiner Volks-Zeitung, 14.04.1912, p. 1.

⁹⁸ Budai-Deleanu in Grigorovici 1998, p. 382 (Ab. 13).

education themselves'.⁹⁹ For the sake of completeness, it should be added that Bukovinian Romanian nationalists complained about a similar reluctance expressed by the peasant population they tried to reach through their awareness campaigns themselves, as is illustrated by *Voința poporului* in 1905:

*Among many other flaws, we Bukovinian Romanians have an unforgivable one: we neglect the speech of our ancestors and use other foreign tongues. (...) I only wish to say now that we can achieve a pretty solid and Romanian growth within the family if parents assume this sacred obligation towards their children. (...) I think the poor peasant's answer when asked to send his child to school is known to each of us: "Don't think I'll turn him into a lord!" In this response, dictated by many needs which might arise from the loss of manpower, lies a lack of judgment: peasants do not think of the benefits that education might bring one day, but only of the needs of the moment.*¹⁰⁰

In search of an answer to the acclaimed assimilation of Romanians into Ruthenian communities, Romanian nationalists concluded that 'the smarter Romanian woman easily learned her husband's foreign language whereas the Ruthenian woman did not really learn Romanian, therewith imposing her language on the entire family'.¹⁰¹ In 1913, Aurel Onciul, the Bukovinian Romanian politician who was one of the architects of the 1911 Bukovinian Compromise and who was often attacked for dismissing the Ruthenisation theory, even presented a 'racial superiority theory' rejecting a Romanisation of Bukovinian Ruthenians because the inferior Ruthenian blood would eventually pollute the Romanian race.¹⁰²

Ruthenians circles were well aware of their reputation of being poorly educated. A Ruthenian author who tried to involve the German-speaking community of Bukovina in Ruthenian political matters was ahead of his target audience:

*Now some German readers will say: "I feel no need to know what kind of political parties the long-haired Ruthenian peasants and woodcutters have; these folks should first of all learn to read before they aspire to play a political role".*¹⁰³

⁹⁹ Șafran 1939, p. 89.

¹⁰⁰ *Reviste literare românești*, *Voința Poporului*, 3, 15.01.1905, p. 5.

¹⁰¹ Nistor 1991, p. 22.

¹⁰² "In Konkurrenz mit den Ruthenen werden aber die Rumänen als reicheres, intelligenteres und widerstandsfähigeres Element als die Ruthenen unbedingt Erfolg haben. Die einzige Sorge bleibt, daß sie zu erfolgreich sein werden und zu viele Ruthenen assimilieren, denn auch so ist das Blut der Bukowiner Rumänen mit zu viel ruthenischem belastet, was nach wissenschaftlichen Kriterien mindere Typen hervorbringt. Es zeigt sich eben, wie man es bei den Engländer feststellen kann, daß im Leben der Völker nicht eine größere Anzahl von Individuen maßgeblich ist für den Fortschritt, sondern die aus der Tugend hervorgegangene Qualität der Menschen. Diesem Kriterium wird in der Bukowina keine Aufmerksamkeit geschenkt, unsere Intelligenz, dem Wahn der Ziffern erlegen, weil sie glaubt, daß das Volk besser gedeiht, wenn seine Zahl größer ist, selbst durch Assimilierung minder hochstehenden Elemente (...)" Onciul 1999, pp. 67-68. *Das Rumänische Problem in der Bukowina* (translated into German by Aurel C. Onciul) was originally published in *Viața românească*, vol XXXI, Iași 1913 under the title *Chestia românească în Bucovina*.

¹⁰³ NN, *Res Ruthenicae*, Czernowitzer Buchdruckerei-Gesellschaft, Czernowitz 1897, p. 3.

Another telling example of such contempt is provided by the Roman-Catholic prelate Schmidt, who seemingly felt safe within the comfort zone of a ladies' tea party when he commented on the Ruthenian ambition to establish a Ruthenian university:

The Roman Catholic prelate Schmidt is not unknown in the Czernowitz high society. Where no unchristened or Ruthenian intruder disrupts the trusted circle, where in the afternoon the top fifty (...) decide over tea and sandwiches over the remaining 700,000 Bukovinians, the jokes of the esteemed prelate are often heard and the local society for ladies and damsels (...) applauds him cheerily. A few days ago, the Ruthenian university question was on the agenda of this society as well. Monseigneur Schmidt holds views different from those of Messrs Von Koerber and Von Hartel: "A nation of peasants and servants need not have a university in his view, or soon the gypsies will also demand one!" (...) The 'Society for Sandwich Obliteration and Other Useful Dawdle' cheered and we only marvel that there are hosts who tolerate such jokes at the expense of other nationalities in spite of their official positions and that there are Bukovinians among the guests who do not turn their backs on this kind of jesters! Or maybe the host has not heard this loudly articulated insult to an entire nation? In this case we bring it to his attention!¹⁰⁴

Ruthenian nationalists were aware like no other of the need for education and the eradication of illiteracy in order to effectively multiply their ideas. The creation of Ruthenian 'reading rooms' (читальні) in the villages was significant in this respect.¹⁰⁵

Whereas Romanian nationalists consistently - and with regard to public acceptance, successfully - claimed 'indigeneity' on Bukovinian soil, their Ruthenian adversaries encountered difficulties maintaining the same. In a pamphlet arguing against Ruthenian assertions, Ion Nistor argued that 'Bukovinian Ruthenians are not native to this land, but simple Galician wanderers sheltered in Bukovina only since the late 18th century as Greek Catholics'.¹⁰⁶ The religious element proved to be a useful weapon in the nationalist battle: no matter that many Ruthenians in Bukovina were Orthodox, those emigrated from Galicia were mostly Uniate. This enabled Romanian nationalists to generalise and tag Ruthenian 'foreignness' in two ways, national and religious:

Behind them stand papist monks, Jesuits, who teach them how to strike us Romanians even more fiendishly, but we are a people strong in our Orthodox faith which we will not abandon like the Ruthenians have, those nomads coming from Galicia. Since they are ready to defect to the Uniates at any time, these nomads are supported and encouraged by the regional administration, with the Jesuits standing behind them. All the other foreign peoples in this land are incited against us Romanians, like the Jews who live off our backs and who have

¹⁰⁴ *Wie man sich in unserer Gesellschaft amusirt*, Bukowinaer Post, 1263, 16.02.1902, p. 4.

¹⁰⁵ As a reaction to conservatism and Russophile tendencies among Ruthenian politicians, Young-Ruthenian (later called Ukrainian) nationalists established 'Prosvita' (Enlightenment) societies from the late 1860, first in Galicia and later in other regions such as Bukovina as well. A key focal point for community activities, 'Prosvita' initially set up a tightly-knit network of reading rooms in even the smallest villages, aiming at educating the illiterate masses by teaching them the vernacular they promoted as the 'authentic Ruthenian language' as well as their nationalist ideology. Gradually, 'Prosvita' expanded its activities to the establishment of schools, stores, small credit unions and warehouses.

¹⁰⁶ Nistor, Ion, *Românii și rutenii în Bucovina*, Edițiunea Academiei Române, Bucharest 1915, introduction.

*sworn irreconcilable hatred against us, equally like the Poles and the Germans, but most of all those Rusnyak nomads.*¹⁰⁷

Interestingly, such theories spread well beyond the circles of Romanian nationalists and were successfully linked to claims of Romanians assimilating into Ruthenian language communities, which were in turn supported by linguists like Gustav Weigand. Even Bukovina's most prominent contemporary mouthpiece Karl Emil Franzos assessed its Ruthenians this way:

*Toughly and persistently, they have conquered the land and now push the original main inhabitants, the Romanians, ever further to the south. Wherever Romanians and Ruthenians share a border, the Slav prevails within ten or twenty years and the loser adopts the language of the winner. (On a group of people dancing) ... and what they perform is really a Romanian dance, the Harcanu. Their skin colour is bronze, and their thin, flexible shape betrays Roman blood. But listen to the shouting with which they dance on in ever wilder joy - it sounds Ruthenian. And when addressed in Romanian, they respond shaking their heads: "Ne ponemayu". ("I don't understand") They have forgotten the language of their fathers.*¹⁰⁸

Some Ukrainian nationalist diaspora publications argue opposite developments, stating that 'even the later state of Moldavia could not erase the autochthonous population' and 'in fact, Moldavia itself fell under the influence of Ukrainian culture and political civilisation', this - anachronistically - being 'evident from the fact that for centuries the Moldavian state, to which Bukovina belonged, used the then Ukrainian literary language of that time as the official and diplomatic language; this language was also used in the church of Moldavia', and 'even the titles of of Moldavian rulers were Ukrainian *voyevoda* and *hospodar*'.¹⁰⁹

As noted before, Splény had made a distinction between 'Rusnyaks' and 'Moldavians' (the later 'Ruthenians' and 'Romanians') in his early reports. Furthermore, he had explicitly mentioned that both groups were Orthodox. If his writings had been the only source material available to the competing nationalist groups, matters might have been slightly less complicated. The relatively large number of sources on the early years of Habsburg Bukovina, however, provided ammunition for those who wanted to deny Ruthenian indigenous presence as well as for those who wanted to prove it. Those referring to the travel diaries of Emperor Franz I could argue that according to his observations, the languages spoken in Czernowitz were German, Polish and Moldavian, while Ruthenian was not even mentioned.¹¹⁰ In defence of Ruthenian claims, a popular reference was geometrician Johann Budinsky, who had established in 1783 that 'because most of the inhabitants are emigrated Polish subjects, usually Rusnyaks, mostly Russian was spoken, and only about one quarter spoke Moldavian'.¹¹¹ Even if this proved a Ruthenian presence in Bukovina from the earliest years of Austrian rule, it also specifically branded the Ruthenians as immigrants, which was less

¹⁰⁷ 1777 – 1899, Deșteptarea, 22, 15.11.1899, p. 1.

¹⁰⁸ Franzos 1901, pp. 259-60.

¹⁰⁹ Preface by Matthew Stachiw in Nowosiwsky 1970. p. 15.

¹¹⁰ Wagner 1979, *Reisetagebücher des österreichischen Kaisers Franz I etc.*, p. 15.

¹¹¹ Polek, Dr. Johann, *Die Bukowina zu Anfang des Jahres 1783. Nach einer Denkschrift des Mappierungsdirectors Johann Budinsky*, Bukowinaer Rundschau, 09.05.1894, p. 1.

sought after in the pro-Ruthenian argumentation. Budai-Deleanu was even stauncher in his assertions on Ruthenian immigration by stating that ‘all Rusnyaks located in Bukovina and Moldavia are Galician or Russian subjects. Those in Bukovina are almost all Galicians and therefore have Galician customs, speak the same language, but with the distinction that they mix many Moldavian words in their language as a result of the contact with the Moldavians’.¹¹² Without any great effort, Romanian nationalists could adapt these observations to their own agenda and readily introduced the ‘dim-witted Ruthenian’ image in their 1890 calendar when they deemed the Ruthenians ‘stray Mazurians and Bojks, who had arrived naked and starved in Bukovina, wanting to realise their devious plans there, although they were very stupid’.¹¹³

Different Types of Ruthenian Nationalism

Ruthenian nationalists were struggling with more than the justification of their presence in Bukovina alone: mainly as a result of the Polish-Ruthenian tensions in Galicia, some openly called in question the mere existence of the Ruthenian people as such. In the words of Kann, ‘the Poles considered the Ruthenians a poorly developed branch of their national culture as frequently as the Russians considered them their kin’¹¹⁴. The fact that Ruthenian nationalists were supported by the enlightened governor of Galicia, Austria's future centralist reformer Count Franz Stadion, allowed their adversaries to label them ‘the invention of Count Stadion’. When the Constitutional Commission of the Austrian parliament debated in the possible separation of Galicia and Bukovina in January 1849, the Galician Poles invoked this argument to counteract a possible partition of the two:

*The Polish-Galician position was defended in particular by Mr Florian Ziemiakowsky. Central issue was the vehement opposition to any ideas or intentions of separation. No ifs or buts, he concluded that Galicia is a member of the ‘Polish Nation’ and that a ‘Ruthenian nationality’ had only been ‘invented’ by Governor Franz Stadion.*¹¹⁵

The underlying motive for Stadion’s supposed invention was said to be a claim to more political powers by the Poles in Galicia than the government in Vienna deemed agreeable, which urged Stadion to find a political counterweight in Galicia proper. This line of argumentation was eagerly adopted by Romanian nationalists in Bukovina and duly reproduced throughout the years. Hence it is found with Şafran, who concluded that Stadion

¹¹² Budai-Deleanu in Grigorovici 1998, p. 388 (Ab.22).

¹¹³ *Cătră sătenii români bucovineni*, in: *Calindarul poporului bucovinean*, Czernowitz 1890 pp. 79-99, as quoted in Daszkiewicz, Silvester, *Die Lage der gr.-or. Ruthenen in der Bukowinaer Erzdiöcese, zugleich Antwort auf die ‘Apologien’ des Bukowinaer gr.-or. Metropoliten Silvester Morariu-Andriewicz*, author’s edition, Czernowitz 1891, p. 19.

¹¹⁴ Kann, Robert A., *The Multinational Empire. Nationalism and National Reform in the Habsburg Monarchy 1848-1918, Vol. 1: Empire and Nationalities*, Columbia University Press, New York 1950, p. 322.

¹¹⁵ Maner, Hans-Christian, *Galizien: eine Grenzregion im Kalkül der Donaumonarchie im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert*, IGKS Verlag, Munich 2007, p. 99.

found the desired counterbalance in the local Ruthenians, ‘whom he invented politically, so to speak’.¹¹⁶

Once doubt was cast on the very existence of Ruthenians, Romanian nationalists could easily link this thesis to their dogma of ‘Ruthenisation of the Romanian Bukovinians’. So, when in 1891 growing Romanian nationalist tendencies within the Bukovinian Orthodox Consistory caused commotion among Ruthenian nationalists, the Uniate Church complained how Romanian nationalists ‘had wanted to prove to the government that in Bukovina there are no Ruthenians and that the people who currently use the Ruthenian tongue are nothing more than a truly Romanian tribe, Russified in the course of time’.¹¹⁷

However, Ruthenian nationalists had more issues to worry about than scepticism from outside: Also within their own circles, the very Ruthenian identity was still under debate. In 1888, *Bukovyna* despaired:

*It properly stands out as odd and it is ridiculous that we are quarreling about the question: Who are we? When one is German, he is German; when one is Polish, he is Polish; and when one is Czech or French he is Czech or French! Every educated German, Pole, Czech or Frenchman knows clearly and in detail what the German, Polish, Czech or French nation is; what and how their native language is; and that the native nation is only one, one native language, just like one has only one father and mother! And in this way, everybody knows about himself and about the others, since this is the natural and clever way. Nevertheless, with the Ruthenians things go differently. When one declares himself Ruthenian, he still does not know at all about the Ruthenian nation or language; the language of Shevchenko, Shashkevych, Fed’kovych.*¹¹⁸

Indeed, Ruthenian (later, more commonly: Ukrainian) nationalists were dealing with a problem, or, as Takach puts it, a ‘formidable obstacle’¹¹⁹ beyond external doubts regarding the provenance or the bare existence of the Ruthenians. Ruthenian patriots suffered from a profound identity crisis, dividing them in three orientations during the second half of the nineteenth century: the Old Ruthenians, the Ukrainophiles and the Russophiles. According to Magocsi, at the beginning of this period all Rus’ patriots were Old Ruthenians (*starorusyny*): ‘As for their similarities, all three orientations shared the belief that the origin of Austria’s East Slavs must be traced back to medieval Kievan Rus’. (...) All three also used the same term to describe themselves and their culture: they were the people of Rus’, who called

¹¹⁶ Şafran 1939, p. 91.

¹¹⁷ *Gegen die ‘Apologie’*, Bukowinaer Nachrichten, 05.05.1891, p. 1.

¹¹⁸ *Руский народ – руска мова*, Буковина, 01.12.1888, pp. 5-6; Taras Hryhorovych Shevchenko 1814 -1861 - Ukrainian poet and artist whose literary heritage is regarded to be the foundation of modern Ukrainian literature and, to a large extent, the modern Ukrainian language; Markiyan Shashkevych 1811 - 1843, Galician-born Ruthenian Greek-Catholic priest, poet, translator, and promotor of the Ruthenian popular vernacular as opposed to the bookish *iazychie*; Osyp Yuriy Fedkovych 1834 -1888 Bukovinian-born Ruthenian/Ukrainian writer, poet, folklorist and translator.

¹¹⁹ Takach, Arthur, *In Search of Ukrainian National Identity: 1840-1921*, in: *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 1996, 19, 3, 640-59, p. 650.

themselves *rusyny* (Rusyns or Ruthenians) and who spoke the *rus'kyi* (Rusyn or Ruthenian) language. Although all three orientations started from a similar terminological premise, their interpretations of the term differed. The Ukrainophiles argued that the terms *rusyny* and *rus'kyi* were antiquated forms of the preferable and more modern terms *ukraïntsi* (Ukrainians) and *ukraïns'kyi* (Ukrainian). The language and the group therefore should be called Ukrainian. The Russophiles argued that the terms *rusyny* and *rus'kyi* were local variants of the forms *ruskie* (Russians) and *ruskii* (Russian). Accordingly, the people in question were really Russian and the language they spoke was Russian, or more precisely, the 'Little Russian dialect' of Russian. The Russophiles (...) argued that members of all three East Slavic components (Great Russians, Belorussians and Little Russians) should identify themselves as Russian and use one literary language, Russian, for intellectual discourse. In contrast, the Ukrainophiles considered the idea of a single common-Russian nationality an ideological fantasy. They regarded the East Slavs of Austria-Hungary as belonging to a distinct Ukrainian nationality living on compact ethnographic territory that stretched from the Carpathian Mountains in the west to the Caucasus Mountains in the Southeast".¹²⁰

Contrary to Magocsi's division in three, Ruthenian nationalism in Bukovina came mainly in two versions: Russophilism and Ukrainophilism. Contemporary sources apply a wide variety to address these two: Russophilism is also called Moscophilism, and even, though incorrectly, Pan-Slavism. Ukrainophiles are at times referred to as *narodovtsi*, Young-Ruthenians, Young-Ukrainians, Ukrainomans or simply Ukrainians. For the sake of clarity, in this text the dominating terminology of the Habsburg era will be used: Young-Ruthenian (instead of Ukrainophile) and Old-Ruthenian (instead of Russophile). The generic term 'Ruthenian-speaking' will be used in reference to the Slavic-speaking Uniate and Orthodox population of Bukovina as a whole. Whenever appropriate, in quotations the original terminology will remain.

The fact that the Young-Ruthenians, having become the dominant one of the competing factions in the early twentieth century, wanted to be termed 'Ukrainians' instead of 'Ruthenians' caused bewilderment outside of their own circle. As Polish historian Stanislas Smolka commented in 1917:

*(...) the former name 'Ruthenian', which is known in Western Europe since well before the Crusades and dear to the Ruthenian heart until recent years, is something one should not rid oneself of so easily. (...) Yet it would be impossible to imagine the Swedes for instance declaring all of a sudden they will from now be known as Goths, in honour of a favorite part of their territory and ancient historical memories very dear to them.*¹²¹

In both Old-Ruthenian and Young-Ruthenian groups, heated debates were ongoing on what a future 'Ukrainian/Rus'kyi entity' should encompass: Old-Ruthenians desired a state from Galicia to the Ural, nationalists around Taras Shevchenko supported a Ukraine independent from Russia according to plans by Khmel'nitskyi and Mazepa, while Uniate Young-

¹²⁰ Magocsi, Paul R., *A History of Ukraine*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto/Buffalo 1996, pp. 437-438.

¹²¹ Smolka, Stanislas, *Les Ruthènes et les problèmes religieux du monde russe*, Ferdinand Wyss, Bern 1917, pp. 16-17.

Ruthenians mostly envisaged a Ukrainian state with Lemberg as its capital, including Bukovina; West-Galicia with its capital Cracow was then to remain Austro-Hungarian. This concept, formulated by historian Hrushchevskiyi, was of course rejected by Galician Poles, Carpathian Magyars and Bukovinian Romanians.¹²² Another issue entirely was the extent to which some of these concepts collided with Habsburg solidarity (*Kaisertreue*) and the inviolability of the Empire to the core (*Staatstreue*).

To complicate matters even further, Ruthenian patriots disagreed on the written language to be used. An old controversy opposing a book language with prestige to one based on the spoken vernacular continued. *Iazychie*, as the former was called, was based on Church Slavonic with some local vernacular elements and a large number of Russian borrowings. Vernacular was inspired by Dnieper Ukrainian writers such as Taras Shevchenko and was based on the language of the peasants.¹²³ Magocsi maintains that *iazychie* was promoted or even dictated by the conservative clerical leadership within the national movement, while the promoters of vernacular were Galicians called *narodovtsi* (populists) and that the use of or preference for either variant was not linked to different factions within the Ruthenian movement. Yet, *iazychie* was generally seen as being attached to the Old-Ruthenians and vernacular to the Young-Ruthenians. The choice of language of the different Ruthenian Bukovinian newspapers reflects this division. According to Romaniuk, ‘Old-Ruthenians created an artificial language (*iazychie*), which, in the words of Franko, ‘nobody in the world had ever heard’.¹²⁴ The fact that *iazychie* was an artificial creation indeed posed problems for those trying to introduce it to the audience at large. The Ruthenian newspaper *Bukovyna* – which appeared in vernacular itself – complained about the absence of Ruthenian writing in daily life, for ‘everything is written in German and when one stumbles upon Ruthenian, with minor exceptions it is written in this *iazychie* which is very hard to read’.¹²⁵ In the view of Kann, the language issue would be decisive for the future of Ruthenian nationalism. He concluded that ‘since the language of the church was that of the principal carriers of literacy, the outcome of this conflict was to decide whether Ruthenian cultural evolution was an achievement of the few or of the masses’.¹²⁶

The matter of internal division and especially the appeal of the Old-Ruthenian movement do not sit well with nationalist Ukrainian historians, who deem it a disruptive element in the preferred discourse of a united Ukrainian nation with a solid claim to historical rights. Some of them blame the phenomenon on the absence of Cossack traditions in - anachronistically - ‘western Ukraine’,¹²⁷ while others assume that ‘linguistic and cultural similarities between Russians and Ukrainians at a time before the crystallisation of a modern Ukrainian national consciousness’. In Galicia, ‘the marked sense of inferiority many leading Ukrainians felt in the face of Polish culture’ as well as social frustration attributed to diminishing power and prestige after political changes within the Monarchy during the 1860s are said to have led to

¹²² Roman, Viorel, *Bucovina și Basarabia: omagiu istoricului la 60 de ani*, Artemis, Bucharest 2002, p. 24.

¹²³ Magocsi 1996, p. 440.

¹²⁴ Romaniuk 1998, p.16.

¹²⁵ *I ce i me*, Буковина, 25.07.1907, p. 1.

¹²⁶ Kann 1950, p 323.

¹²⁷ Takach 1996, p. 651.

the desire of Galician Old-Ruthenians to identify with the status of the Russian nation and its cultural achievements.¹²⁸ Another way of explaining away the Old-Ruthenian movement is by coining it the embryonic phase of Ukrainian ‘national awakening’, thus suggesting sequential instead of synchronous phenomena.

Within the Bukovinian context, Young-Ruthenians had to deal with more than just the Old-Ruthenians in their defence of an authentically Ruthenian/Ukrainian identity. Some of their adversaries maintained that Ruthenians were in fact Slavicised Romanians, others accused them of having a hidden Polish agenda because of the Galician origins of their movement:

At some point in time, the world and its people started to take an interest in us, started to explain us and even started to quarrel about us and we were delighted, because only the living arouse interest – about the dead one remains silent. Therefore we live! Some say: you are Romanians. Just like us, you descend from Trajan, but you were displaced by our enemies, that is why you are Rus’ speaking Romanians! Others again: you are Great-Russians: we are one people, 80 million in total! Educated people have ascertained already that we are not Romanians and Rösler¹²⁹ says that even in Romania and Transylvania there were Ruthenians among the Romanians, who were Romanised later on. (...) If hence we are Little-Russians, from this results that we have to speak and write Little-Russian, for every self-respecting nation loves and applies its fatherland and mother tongue. (...) Among Rus’ dialects, the Middle-Rus’ is the most important, since the most well-lettered, most beautiful historical songs stem from it. The most eminent writers used this dialect and elevated it to the level of a literary language. Therefore the Middle-Rus’ dialect is our literary, ‘Little-Rus’ speech, we all understand it, the essence of our grammar is written in it and therefore we use and cherish it. This language is taught everywhere in primary and secondary schools and universities, consequently our speech is recognised by the k. and k. authorities. Our Bukovinian authors write in this language themselves and our paper Bukovyna does not steer away from it either. But we also have enemies, even from our native nest, who banish us to thunder and hell for this ‘error’ of ours, for the fact that we love our mother tongue above all. They say we are nihilists, socialists, anarchists, that we are selling out to the Poles, that we want to install some kind of ‘Ukraino-Polish’ state and God knows what! (...) You do not know Greater-Russian yourselves, but you force this language upon us. (...) In this kind of ‘language’ you try to write newspapers in Czernowitz, but Zorya Bukovyny only existed for three months and Rodymiy Lystok had only 5 subscribers in Bukovina.¹³⁰

The rather modest number of sold Old-Ruthenian newspapers in Bukovina as mentioned here is surely significant, if accurate, but the fact that *Bukovyna* felt urged to address its own audience in an editorial entitled ‘Who are we?’ (*Хто ми?*) also aptly illustrates that convincing results of the Young-Ruthenian campaign were a long time coming.

¹²⁸ Ripetsky, Stepan and Sereda, Ostap, entry: *Russophiles (rusofily, or moskvofily)*, in: Encyclopedia of Ukraine vol. 4, University of Toronto Press, Toronto 1993.

¹²⁹ Eduard Robert Rösler, (1836 - 1874) Austrian historian who gave his name to the ‘Rösler theory’ which claims that the Romanians originate south of the Danube and is - since this conflicts with the ‘continuity theory’ and its subsequent historical claims - highly controversial in Romanian nationalist circles.

¹³⁰ *Хто ми?* Буковина, 01.09.1886, pp. 1-2.

In their crusade against the Young-Ruthenians, the Old-Ruthenians consistently drew the religious card in their presentation of good versus evil, which in their discourse meant Orthodox-Russian-Bukovinian versus Uniate-Ukrainian-Galician¹³¹, hence in order to boost their own brand of Ruthenian nationalism, elements of a regional and religious nature were invoked, to say nothing of the justness of these clustered juxtapositions. Bukovinian Old-Ruthenian newspapers published poems like the anonymous *Song of the Bukovinian peasants* in which ‘evil Ukraine’ is portrayed as the arch enemy of ancient Rus’:

*Still holy Rus’ has not died/ It has lived for a long time/ And live till the age of ages/ Will the orthodox faith/ ‘Ukrainians’ are considered cursed/ Like smoke they will evaporate/ Our orthodox faith/ Will last forever/ Soul and body we devote/ To Rus’ in Bukovina/ And chase from Rus’ villages/ The devilish ‘Ukraine’.*¹³²

Another example in this category is titled *To the Faith and to Rus’* and although the poet deplored the fact that Ruthenians are not able to join forces, being a Young-Ruthenian is still considered a betrayal of Rus’:

Your children split up/ Became enemies/ Only to inflict pain on you/ By the hands of strangers/ Enemies gathered/ It is sad to see/ How they set out/ To make Bukovinians ‘smart’.
*They taught us to desert/ Holy Mother Rus’/ And accepted as their mother/ The shallow Ukraine.*¹³³

The intensity of Ruthenian infighting did not go unnoticed beyond their proper realm. According to *Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung*, it transcended even the bitterest quarrels between nations:

*The Ruthenians, who call themselves Ukrainians now, do not bear as much as hatred against their alleged hereditary enemies, the Poles, as they do against their brothers and sisters who claim to belong to the Russian tribe. What is argued in the Ukrainian press against the ‘Russians’ goes far beyond a newspaper polemic: this kind of utterly fanatical and bloodthirsty hostility may possibly reach a similar degree in Macedonia between Bulgarians and Turks, but certainly nowhere else among brethren of one tribe. Not a day goes by without the help of the courts and the political authorities being invoked by those very Ukrainians, and if the Austrian government followed every report, all ‘Russians’ in Austria would be in prison.*¹³⁴

The belligerent Ruthenian factions clearly did not attempt to settle their differences behind closed doors. Not only were press and regional authorities involved, but both Bukovinian Old-Ruthenians and Young-Ruthenians also readily dragged their quarrels all the way to Vienna. Young-Ruthenians urged the Minister of Education in the House of Representatives to intervene in what they saw as privileging of Old-Ruthenian priests over their Young-Ruthenian colleagues in the Bukovinian Orthodox Church:

¹³¹ For example: *До буковинського русско-православного народу!*, Народна Рада, 13.02.1907, p. 1.

¹³² *Bukovinets'*, *ПБсня буковинськихъ крестьянь*, Русская правда, 25.03.1911.

¹³³ *Tovstyuk, Vasiliy, За вЂру и Русь*, Народна рада, 16.12.1905.

¹³⁴ *Volk oder Partei?*, *Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung*, 14.04.1912, p. 1.

The consistory portrayed, promoted and honoured Russophile priests at every opportunity as true Ruthenians; Ruthenian priests, however were decried as Uniates and thus oppressed, persecuted and curtailed. The promotion of Russophilism among the Ruthenian clergy by the Orthodox Consistory was not inspired by love for Russianism, but by the same policy considerations of supporting Russophile elements on the surface as induced by the Polish leaders in Galicia. This way, two goals are reached: firstly, a weakening and paralyzation of Ruthenians by Ruthenians, which has become proverbial among the Poles (puścić Rusina Rusina = to put Ruthenians onto Ruthenians) and second, the creation of a good reason to denounce the Ruthenians as an unreliable element, a threat to the Empire (reichsgefährlich).¹³⁵

While the Young-Ruthenians took the stage in Vienna to denounce the Orthodox Consistory, Old-Ruthenians in turn used the same platform to accuse the regional government in Bukovina of being held in the Young-Ruthenians' leading strains when an Old-Ruthenian leader, Kassian Bohatyretz, got himself in trouble with activities deployed in Russia:

This way, a veritable witch hunt was staged recently by the imperial government administration against the leader of the Russian National Party in Bukovina, the Orthodox priest Dr. Kassian Bohatyretz, in order to destroy his material existence, and, since he became quite an inconvenience to the local Young-Ruthenian party because of its popularity and energy, to render his political life impossible as well - especially in view of the impending elections.¹³⁶

Busy battling each other at the highest level, Ruthenian nationalists just like their Romanian adversaries encountered 'disobedience' at the grassroots level. *Bukovyna* illustrated the situation in this scene from a railway journey of three men from Galicia to Czernowitz:

Two start a conversation, naturally in the good German language. At some point, the third one joins in, but this one speaks Polish, because he has evidently not been to Germany. In Czernowitz, getting off the train, they introduce themselves and to their astonishment they realise they are all – Ruthenians. The one speaking Polish is Galician, but he is the most embarrassed. You might expect them to continue their conversation in Ruthenian', but expressions like: "я бачув його іхаму"¹³⁷ do not seldom flow from their lips. And all of Bukovina is Ruthenian land....¹³⁸

Generally speaking, spreading national fervour among the respective target tribes proved to be challenging in Bukovina, as will be elaborated from paragraph 2.2.

¹³⁵ Haus der Abgeordneten, *Interpellation der Abg. Pihuliak, Spenul und Genossen an Seine Exzellenz den Herrn Minister für Kultus und Unterricht wegen Ruthenenverfolgungen seitens des griechisch-orientalischen Konsistoriums in Czernowitz*, 1909-1911/ 20. Session, Angang III, 688/I, Kaiserlich-königliche Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, Vienna 1911, pp. 4429-4430.

¹³⁶ *Interpellation des Abg. Dr. Dmitryj Marków und Genossen an seine Exzellenz den Herrn Kultusminister, betreffend gesetzwidrige Verfolgungen und Maßregelungen des griechisch-orthodoxen Pfarrers von Ober-Stanestie Dr. Kassian Bohatyretz*, Haus der Abgeordneten, 1909-1911/ 20. Session, Angang III, 1108/I, Kaiserlich-königliche Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, Vienna 1911, pp. 6081-6082.

¹³⁷ lit. "I saw him go", but according to German sentence construction.

¹³⁸ *I ce i me*, Буковина, 25.07.1907, p. 1.

Hutsuls

Even if general agreement was reached on the existence and the indigeneity of the 'Ruthenians of the planes', the question of the provenance of the enigmatic Hutsul mountain tribe remained. After the untimely death of the heir to the Imperial throne Arch Duke Rudolph at Mayerling in 1889, his widow thanked the 'Mountain Ruthenians' for the wreath they had sent. This makes it likely that the senders themselves had signed their wreath this way.¹³⁹ Trivial as it seems, this 'confession of identity' at least sheds some light on how the Hutsuls - their political representatives in any case - perceived themselves, for their origins puzzled contemporary ethnographers and their successors alike.

Those attempting to determine Hutsul origins often resorted to a (more or less) educated guess. It was argued they were of a Slavic descent and in all respects different from the Wallachian population with their name - which was said to be used only in Bukovina and Moldavia - derived from the old Dacian word 'Huzz', signifying 'robber', 'and therefore originally, like many other names of nations rather used as a *Nomen Appellativum* than as a *Nomen proprium*'.¹⁴⁰ To others, they made the impression of being a mixed race of Ruthenians, Romanians and Csángó¹⁴¹ or of being a destitute lot with an isolated lifestyle ('When a Hutsul wants to tell his neighbour something, he sometimes needs to wander through ancient forests for more than half a day'), peaceful, but 'with a raging hatred only towards Russians'.¹⁴² According to Franzos, Hutsuls despised the Ruthenians of the planes,¹⁴³ while Kassner - quoting from Kaindl's *Die Hutzulen* - underlined the good relations between Jews and Hutsuls:

*The Hutsuls know the system of 'hodowanci': Elderly Hutsuls with no offspring 'adopt' a wealthy man under the condition that he cares after him until death and arranges a decent funeral. In return, the adoptive son is heir to the deceased's possessions. Most of the time, Jews were chosen to be 'hodowanci', since the Hutsuls expect them to honour their promise.*¹⁴⁴

¹³⁹ "Der Obersthofmeister I. K. und K. Hoheit Kronprinzessin-Witwe Erzherzogin Stephanie Ihre k. und k. Hoheit die durchlauchtigste Kronprinzessin-Witwe, Erzherzogin Stephanie, haben mich zu beauftragen geruht, den "Ruthenen vom Gebirge", der Höchstsie getroffen, sowie für den weiland Seiner k. und k. Hoheit dem durchlauchtigsten Kronprinzen, Erzherzoge Rudolph gewidmeten Kranz den wärmsten Dank auszusprechen". *Expression of gratitude to 'Mountain Ukrainians' for their condolences on the death of Crown Prince Rudolph*, Cabinet of Crown Princess Dowager Stephanie, Vienna, 18. February 1889. DACHO, Viddil 1, Fond 3, Opis 1, spr. 5427.

¹⁴⁰ Kohl 1844, p. 427.

¹⁴¹ Weigand 1904, p. 11.

¹⁴² Zach, Franz, *Galizien und Bukowina. Wanderungen über die Schlachtfelder und Schilderung von Land und Leuten*, St. Josef-Bücherbruderschaft, Klagenfurt 1917, p. 197.

¹⁴³ Franzos 1901, p. 258.

¹⁴⁴ Kassner, Salomon, *Die Juden in der Bukowina*, Löwit, Vienna/Berlin 1917, p. 51.

In Bukovina, the Hutsuls enhanced local pride in its ethnographic specificity and exoticism.¹⁴⁵ Foreign correspondents contributed to this imaging, evoking how ‘downward from the mountains, robust warriors in picturesque colourful costumes descend to buy and barter - the Tyrolians of the East – the magnificent figures of the Hutsuls’.¹⁴⁶ In the early 1800s already, they were portrayed as ‘having almost no religion, but for the rest (...) a peaceful and polite people’, although ‘the efforts which had been applied to civilise them, had so far been fruitless’.¹⁴⁷ A century later, in his travel guide Mittelmann would add to this that ‘classically beautiful men and mostly ugly women are features of this tribe’.¹⁴⁸

Other attributes linked to the Hutsuls were more negative than the superficiality of their appearance. While Budai-Deleanu speaks of ‘a situation of anarchy’ in the Hutsul Mountains, physician Balthasar Hacquet had heard of street robbery and murder committed by Hutsuls when he visited the area in 1788, and he had added that many of them were infected with sexually-transmitted diseases by Russian troops during the 1768-1774 war.¹⁴⁹ In 1913, a grim court room report of a trial against a large group of Hutsuls, charged with murder, extortion and perjury evokes a hauntingly analogous picture:

The men dull and indifferent, as if the events in the courtroom did not concern them, the young girls, fifteen and sixteen, with all traces of devastation and vice in their very young faces, turning cigarettes with nimble fingers and deeply inhaling the smoke of the cheap reefers with evident passion. An image worthy of the pencil of a cartoonist or a portrayer of public morality. They were Hutsuls. National discretion prohibits us to say more, as in our land we are strangely too sensitive even where the most honest endeavour prevails in order to shed light into the darkest abyss, not to scold, but to improve. (...) These people, still living in some primitive state, do not hold human life in high esteem. (...) However, people who live amidst the Hutsuls maintain they possess a certain melancholy kindness. They kill out of ineradicable instincts which do not allow them to distinguish between good and evil. It is simply the custom on Hutsul territory that the girls at twelve years of age are taken by the man, by all men, and that - it must be said - the pox are the disease of each house. (...) The Hutsuls are sick. Sick in body and soul. All diseases, physical as well as moral, have raged among them for decades and bring them down lower and lower.¹⁵⁰

For the competing Ruthenian and Romanian nationalists of Bukovina, a community or tribe without a clearly declared ‘ethnicity’ offered attractive opportunities and thus easily became a bone of contention. The well-known elements of discourse between the two groups - mutual accusations of Romanisation respectively Ruthenisation, claims of one’s indigeneity as

¹⁴⁵ Turczynski 1993, p. 83.

¹⁴⁶ Julien, R., *Aus der Bukowina*, Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung (appeared earlier in *Vossische Zeitung* in Berlin), 22.09.1906, p. 3.

¹⁴⁷ Lindner, Fr. von, *Bemerkungen über die Bukowina*, Vaterländische Blätter, 35, 279-283, 6 September 1808, p. 280.

¹⁴⁸ Mittelmann 1907/8, p. 35.

¹⁴⁹ Nistor 1991, p. 67.

¹⁵⁰ *Krankes Volk*, Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung, 3034, 12.06.1913, p. 1.

opposed to the other's 'foreignness', quarrels about whose nation builds the majority in the crownland - were all projected on the Hutsuls.

Romanian nationalists claimed that the Hutsuls had spoken Romanian in the seventeenth and eighteenth century and that many mountains, creeks and villages in East Galicia bear Romanian names.¹⁵¹ In more recent times, authors defending the Romanian nationalist perspective have continued to invoke similar reasoning to downplay the number of Ukrainians/Ruthenians in Habsburg Bukovina. This way, it is asserted that 'at the beginning of the First World War, Bukovina had some 800,000 inhabitants of whom 300,000 were Ukrainians and Ruthenians and less than 300,000 Romanians' although 'according to British sources, the Ukrainian figure must have been inflated because Hutsuls were counted as Ukrainians although their language was different and they appeared to be of old Scythian origin'.¹⁵² Another admits that Hutsuls had features in common with Ruthenians such as ppeech and customs, but sustains they also shared many of these with Romanians and must therefore be descendants of Slavicised Romanian villages in eleventh to sixteenth century Galicia.¹⁵³ In a volume on the Hutsuls which appeared in 1998 - and tellingly adds on the cover page that it was published 'on the eightieth anniversary of the return of Bukovina to the bosom of Homeland'- the author, who is an archeologist and the director of the National Bukovina Museum in present day Suceava, argued that 'it has been clearly written and shown that the Hutsuls were not actual Ukrainians, although they speak a Slavic dialect', that 'tall, lively and hospitable, they closely resemble the Romanians, as they are Orthodox as well and have many similar customs, traditions and musical instruments' and finally, that 'the elders in Hutsul villages keep on emphasising how their nature is different from that of Ukrainian villages'.¹⁵⁴

In an academic context, the conclusion is based on at least dubious assertions here: the language argument is simply ignored, resemblances are not even considered to be the result of assimilation processes and opinions of (unspecified) village elders are presented and interpreted in the predictable nationalist way.

Most authors, not all of them necessarily trying to defend the Ruthenian/Ukrainian position, tended to lean towards a close kinship between Ruthenians and Hutsuls 'even though their origin is unclear',¹⁵⁵ while others, similar to Romanian nationalists, made a brave guess with regard to their origins. Bidermann opted that the Cumans¹⁵⁶ might have been Hutsul ancestors, but admitted that Hutsul dwellings, food and language hardly differed from those of the surrounding Ruthenians.¹⁵⁷ Editors of a prominent contemporary encyclopedia saw

¹⁵¹ (Zota) 1900, p. 5.

¹⁵² Dima 1983, p. 21.

¹⁵³ Iacobescu 1993, pp. 174-76.

¹⁵⁴ Andronic, Mugur, *Huțulii – o minoritate din Bucovina (Pagini din istoria și cultura Bucovinei)*, Societatea culturală 'Ștefan cel Mare', Suceava 1998, p. 23.

¹⁵⁵ Simiginowicz-Staufe, 1884, p. 66.

¹⁵⁶ A nomadic Turkic people who inhabited a shifting area north of the Black Sea known as Cumania along the Volga River.

¹⁵⁷ Bidermann 1875, p. 68.

distinctions between different tribes, but by naming them, they implicitly assumed that both the people from the mountains and the planes were basically from the same stock:

*The mountain dwellers, especially the tribes of the Bojks and Hutsuls distinguish themselves by their oval faces and slender body physique from the stocky inhabitants of the plains, the Podolaks, whose broad, square faces recall the Tatar invasion of the past. Despite the great richness of the soil, the latter seem much more unkept in matters of housing and clothing than the mountain dwellers.*¹⁵⁸

For the Bukovinian Ruthenian nationalist discourse it was vital to resolve the Hutsul question in favour of the Ruthenians. For one, apart from the mentioned assimilation accusations and rigged headcounts, there was the case of Yuriy Fed'kovich. Fed'kovich was the co-editor of the first Ruthenian-language publication in the region, *Bukovyna*, and the first to put Hutsul oral poetry down in writing – Ruthenian writing. He was widely seen as the ‘Bukovinian Shevchenko’.¹⁵⁹ This firmly linked Hutsuls and Ruthenians within the Ruthenian nationalist canon.

Even more important in this respect was the illustrious figure of the illiterate peasant leader Lukyan Kobyltsia, who played a key role in Bukovina during the tumultuous years 1848 and 1849. It was in these years that the conflict between Ruthenian and Romanian nationalists in Bukovina surfaced for the first time. The Romanian faction, led by Eudoxiu Hurmuzaki, opted for a separation of Bukovina from Galicia in order to form a Romanian Duchy under Habsburg sovereignty together with Transylvania, Banat, Moldavia and Muntenia in due course. Their Ruthenian adversaries wanted Bukovina to remain with Galicia in the hope that Eastern Galicia eventually be turned into a separate Ruthenian entity.¹⁶⁰

Prior to the revolutionary events, representatives of the peasantry had been admitted to the Austrian Parliament in 1848 in order to avoid social unrest.¹⁶¹ Of all 108 Galician deputies, eight were from Bukovina, the most controversial among them Lukyan Kobyltsia.¹⁶²

For the peasants of Galicia and Bukovina, the revolution brought the abolition of serfdom, albeit four months later for Bukovina's peasants than for those in other parts of Galicia, which were officially emancipated in August 1848. Hutsul peasant leader Kobyltsia and his followers were discontented because of the unresolved problem of peasant indemnification for their recently acquired land.¹⁶³ Instead of occupying his seat in the Austrian Parliament, which had moved to Kremsier after the October revolution in Vienna, Kobyltsia returned to his native village where he managed to convince his fellow Hutsuls that the Emperor had

¹⁵⁸ *Meyers Konversationslexikon*, Verlag des Bibliographischen Instituts, Leipzig und Wien, Vierte Auflage, 1885-1892, entry: *Ruthenen*.

¹⁵⁹ Turczynski 1979, p. 11.

¹⁶⁰ Heymann 2003, pp. 34-35.

¹⁶¹ Hausleitner 2001, p. 62.

¹⁶² For more on the role these eight played in the parliamentary discussions on a possible separation of Bukovina from Galicia and especially on the way in which they were nationally see paragraph 2.2 of this section:

Nationally Indifferent Parliamentary Deputies and Their Political Priorities.

¹⁶³ Magocsi 1996, 414-415.

appointed him to restore order in the mountains.¹⁶⁴ From November 1848 he organised a series of big public meetings (*великі народні зібрання*) against feudal oppression, referring to the Monarch as ‘his friend’.¹⁶⁵ All of this failed to amuse Austrian authorities, all the more since there were rumours that Kobylitsia also collaborated with the anti-Austrian Hungarian revolutionaries under General Bem and supported their attempt to occupy Bukovina.¹⁶⁶

Much of the turmoil attributed to Kobylitsia and his men remained limited to panic and hearsay. Hutsuls were said to address their leader as ‘King’ and large landowners took refuge at Czernowitz, where they urged the authorities to intervene. Meanwhile, Czernowitz residents feared a violent peasant raid on their city.¹⁶⁷ Some of Kobylitsia’s men informed the authorities of Kobylitsia’s instructions: Peasants were to approach their masters without taking off their hats and were to demand, for instance, the permission to chop the wood they needed. Furthermore, they were told to chase all ‘foreigners’ away from Bukovina and were promised that all soil and forests would be distributed among the peasants as soon as Kobylitsia had returned to Parliament at some point in the following five months.¹⁶⁸

District Captain Bach distributed a ‘circular’ among all dominions and church authorities in which he denounced Kobylitsia’s activities and the latter’s apparent success with the local population:

Kobylitsia posed as an emissary from the Emperor, he arrogated to himself to depose local judges and jurymen and to pick new ones, he terminated the obedience to the dominions and he preached that he was allowed to seize the groves of landlords, though without acting upon it. Such outrage will be rightly punished, Kobylitsia will be prosecuted and will not escape legal penalty. The High Parliament has declared void the seat which he abandoned without authorisation. It is regrettable that so many among the country people believed his silly delusions to be true, and for quite some time remained deaf to all instructions. Several of Kobylitsia’s companions who had connived at his fraudulent machinations and had carried the anxiety and excitement further had to be arrested and examined. Even military assistance had to be applied to suppress the arising rebellion. The country people may finally realise that an impostor entangled them in a dangerous web, confused their notions of property and right, and usurped an authority which was not rightfully his.¹⁶⁹

¹⁶⁴ Şafran 1939, p. 52.

¹⁶⁵ Zhukovs'kyi 1993, p. 25.

¹⁶⁶ Ceauşu 2004, p. 70.

¹⁶⁷ Wagner 1983, Revolutionsjahre etc., p. 89.

¹⁶⁸ “Alle Ausländer sollen sie aus der Bukowina herausjagen - der Grund der Herrschaft, soll sobald Kobylitsia zum Reichstage rückkehrt, was höchstens in 5 Monaten erfolgt, unter die Bauern, sowie auch die Wälder vertheilt werden. (...)” Strzelbicki, *Copy of a protocol*, Zelenen, Zl 996/196, 21 November 1849/ ANR, Fond ‘Guvernământul Bucovinei’, MI, mapa 86/4, vol. I.

¹⁶⁹ “Kobylitsia gab sich für einen Abgesandten des Kaisers aus, er maßte sich an Ortsrichter und Geschworene abzusetzen und neue zu wählen, er kündete den Dominien den Gehorsam auf, er predigte daß er erlaubt sei, die Waldungen der Grundherrschaften in Besitz zu nehmen, ohne Eingriffe dahin zu thun. Solcher Frevel findet gerechte Strafe, Kobylitsia wird Kriminalgerichtlich verfolgt, und wird der gesetzlichen Strafe nicht entgehen. Der hohe Reichstag hat seinen Sitz, den er eigenmächtig verließ, für erledigt erklärt. Zu bedauern ist, daß unter dem Landvolke so viele seinen albernen Vorspiegelungen Glauben schenkten, und längere Zeit taub gegen alle Belehrungen blieben. Es mußten mehrere Genossen des Kobylitsia die seinen betrügerischen Vorgängen Vorschub

In 1850, Kobylytsia was arrested and taken to Czernowitz, where he was sentenced to only one month of incarceration. His rebellion was of a social rather than a political nature and primarily directed against Bukovina's large landowners. The fact that the region had also fallen victim to a devastating epidemic and drought in 1848-49 had contributed to the generally miserable mood.¹⁷⁰ Evidently, Kobylytsia and his 'anti-feudal' struggle blended in well with Soviet versions of history, though Soviet authors seem to have overplayed their hand when they suggested that Kobylytsia's actions were directed against Austrian occupation.¹⁷¹ Indeed, Kobylytsia had claimed to have acted on behalf of the Emperor and if charged with treason, he would have faced substantially more than just one month in prison. Wagner notes that he would not have forfeited his mandate only because of 'no show' in the Diet if he had been found disloyal to the Monarchy.¹⁷²

For Romanian and Ruthenian nationalist historiography alike, 'Bukovina 1848' had a profound significance. In the matter of obtaining administrative autonomy from Galicia, the local nobility, the liberal bourgeoisie and the Orthodox Church readily agreed on the lobby initiative known as the 'Landespetition'. Although the document contained some specific (Romanian) nationalist demands, the political projects in cooperation with the other reforming forces clearly dominated.¹⁷³ On 15 December 1848, four of Bukovina's peasant Diet representatives, including Kobylytsia, had sent a memorandum on behalf of their electorates with the request to keep Bukovina within Galicia. The prominent Hurmuzaki brothers, who were among the architects of the autonomy proposal, greeted this clear contradiction with the Landespetition with outrage in *Bucovina*.¹⁷⁴ In his 'Promemoria', meant to clarify the 'Landespetition' to the Imperial Council, Eudoxiu Hurmuzaki noted that 'Bukovina had had already quite some trouble with the Ruthenian element during the pre-March system' and that 'to this the region owed a not insignificant part of its political and religious neglect, its national shortfall'.¹⁷⁵

Whereas Romanian nationalists had depicted Hutsuls hitherto as distinctly different from Ruthenians, the quarrel surrounding the 'Landespetition' as well as Kobylytsia's prominent role during the peasant unrest made a clear linkage between Hutsuls and Ruthenians politically attractive: by branding Kobylytsia a Ruthenian, his antagonism against Bukovinian autonomy could be explained as Ruthenian (and therefore anti-Romanian) agitation, while his absence from parliament, his revolutionary activities and his supposed collaboration with

leisteten und die Unruhe und Aufregung weiter trugen, festgenommen und der Untersuchung unterzogen werden. Selbst die Anwendung von Militärassistenten war nötig um die sich zeigende Auflehnung zu unterdrücken. Das Landvolk möge endlich einsehen, das ein Betrüger es in ein gefährliches Netz verwickelte, seine Begriffe von Eigenthum und Recht verwirrte, und sich eine ihm nicht zustehende Gewalt anmaßte". Bach, Eduard, *Zirkulare vom k.k. Kreisamte für die Bukowina an alle Dominien und der Geistlichkeit aller Ritus*, Kreisamt für die Bukowina, Czernowitz, 19 February 1849/ DJAN Suceava, Fond 'Mitropolia Bucovinei', secția 'Diverse', dosar 1006.

¹⁷⁰ Şafran 1939, p. 52.

¹⁷¹ Botushans'kyi 1980, p. 95.

¹⁷² Wagner 1983, *Revolutionsjahre etc.*, p. 90.

¹⁷³ Corbea-Hoisie 2004, p. 24.

¹⁷⁴ Ceauşu 2004, p. 70.

¹⁷⁵ Şafran 1939, p. 59.

Bem's Hungarian revolutionaries added a whiff of disloyalty towards Vienna and the Emperor which Romanian nationalists readily attributed to their Ruthenian adversaries in Bukovina. In *Bucovina*, the Hurmuzaki brothers would refer to Kobylitsia as a 'Ruthenian Hutsul'.¹⁷⁶

In turn, Ruthenian nationalists (and later Ukrainian historians) were more than willing to classify the Hutsuls as Ruthenians: Not only increased their number in Bukovina considerably this way, they were also presented with a regional national hero of their own. Romanian and Ruthenian nationalist movements had a profoundly different character. Much more than the Bukovinian Romanians, whose nationalism was a well-funded elitist project leaning heavily on historical claims and heroes from a distant past, the Ruthenians - who lacked an elite - needed to secure a solid popular base for their project.¹⁷⁷ No matter how important an intellectual like Fed'kovych was for the development of language and literature, a social rebel like Kobylitsia provided an excellent figurehead for the assertive, freedom-loving Ruthenians of Bukovina. Gradually, Ruthenian (later Ukrainian) sources portrayed Kobylitsia more and more as a political instead of a social rebel and in some cases, paradoxically, even attributed the eventual Bukovinian administrative autonomy of 1861 to the initial efforts of Kobylitsia and his men.¹⁷⁸

The events of 1848, combined with Fedkovych's incorporation of Hutsul oral poetry in the newly-born Bukovinian Ruthenian literary canon, enabled a subtle incorporation of the Hutsuls in the 'Ruthenian nation' as such. The Hutsuls themselves, or at least their leaders, do not seem to have objected, at least not when in 1889 in their condolences to the Crown Princess-Dowager they referred to themselves as 'Mountain Ruthenians'.

2.2 Popular culture, Apathy, Indifference and National Ambiguity among Romanian and Ruthenian speakers

Bukovinian Popular Culture along National Lines

In theory, popular culture with its arts and crafts, costumes and culinary traditions were of great instrumental value to activists with a desire to claim ethno-national uniqueness. In practice, it proved less malleable to nationalist agendas.

In 1906, the young Kingdom of Romania asserted its national pride and the abundance of its capital by organising an international exhibition in Bucharest to mark the 40th anniversary of the ascension of Carol I to the Romanian throne. The Habsburg Monarchy was well-

¹⁷⁶ Wagner 1983, *Revolutionsjahre etc.*, pp. 83-89.

¹⁷⁷ Hausleitner 2001, p. 68.

¹⁷⁸ See for instance: Kubijovyc, Volodymyr, *Ukraine - A Concise Encyclopaedia*, entry: "*Bukovina - Before the Middle of the Nineteenth Century*", University of Toronto Press, Toronto 1963.

represented at the event. In Bukovina, the crownland's own participation was passionately debated, mainly because Bukovinian Romanian nationalists insisted on having a separate pavilion in the capital of their 'brothers'. A compromise was reached when each nationality got its own section within the Bukovinian wing.¹⁷⁹ When the Romanian royal family paid a visit to this wing, they also devoted their attention to the Ruthenian section and were welcomed by Bukovinian Ruthenian chief Mykola Vasylo. However, the esteemed visitors appeared to be less than fully convinced of the unique character of the objects on display, since 'the Crown Prince said to Vasylo that the character of the exhibited Ruthenian objects is more Slavic, although a certain similarity with Romanian motives cannot be denied' while 'the queen noticed a similarity between the motives of the handicrafts with local ones'.¹⁸⁰

It is unlikely that a nationalist like Vasylo, whose own ambiguous ethno-national background will be discussed later,¹⁸¹ was pleased by the remarks in question. Though they may be easily dismissed as expressions of royal ignorance in this case, distinctions between Bukovinian handicrafts produced by Romanian and Ruthenian speakers were hard to make even by experts: Max Rosenberg quoted ethnographer Erich Kolbenheyer - the same Kolbenheyer who had been so prominently present at Baron Kapri's folk costume competition - when he discussed Bukovinian peasant art:

From the sociological and historical point of view, Kolbenheyer also considers the difference in the Bukovinian art from the artistic products of Galicia and the other regions surrounding Bukovina. The Dniester is the artistic border with Galicia. The ornaments are different. The colors are not the same. It is as if there is no relation at all, even though the adjacent areas are inhabited the same nation. Only the Hutsuls, who form their own social and ethnographic unit as mountain dwellers, share their art motifs with the Galician Hutsuls. It is however not language alone that influenced art. And that is why even in Bukovina it is difficult to make a clear distinction between Ruthenian and Romanian samples. Kolbenheyer specifies different features, but stresses that they do not apply always and everywhere. There is just something beyond the language of the different peoples, something superior reflected in art as well: social coherence. If nationalist politicians let themselves be guided by such considerations, perhaps they would run another path.¹⁸²

According to Kolbenheyer, or at least according to Rosenberg's interpretation of Kolbenheyer's observations, regional prevailed over national coherence in the case of Bukovinian embroidery. As early as in 1869, Bukovinian author Adolf Simiginowicz-Staufe (who himself was of mixed Slavic-German descent) he had come to similar conclusions regarding the Bukovinian songs and tales he had gathered and translated into German. He was firmly put right by Karl-Emil Franzos:

¹⁷⁹ For more on this event and the way it was approached in Bukovina, see Part III, paragraph 6: Displaying Bukovinian Identity: Parades, Exhibitions and Commemorations/ 6.4: Bukovina and the Bucharest 'Jubilee Exhibition' of 1906.

¹⁸⁰ *Die Bukarester Ausstellung*, Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung, 21.06.1906, p. 5.

¹⁸¹ See 'Prominent Bukovinians with Ambiguous National Backgrounds' in this paragraph.

¹⁸² Rosenberg, Max, *Heimatkunde - Bukowiner Bauernkunst II*, Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung, 05.04.1914, p. 7.

And yet this in itself so meritorious and in the circles of the homeland unfortunately so little appreciated work suffers from a serious defect. Staufe has coined the collected tales which he gathered from the Romanian and Ruthenian - or rather Little-Russian - people's vernacular and translated into German, Bukovinian folk tales. Regarding this issue, Staufe wrote me this: "The peculiar position of the two nationalities at the time when I collected the fairy tales, almost equivalent to a merger, was the reason for the fact that the Ruthenian folk tales of Bukovina were also heard in colloquial Romanian and that the Romanian ones could equally be found with the Ruthenian people. The almost accomplished merger of ethnic elements made it very difficult to distinguish them from each other; thus the unbiased collector had no choice but name the fairy tales Bukovinian folk tales, which I did". To this, however, we have to offer in reply that the nation's soul most tenaciously holds on to songs and tales, and that therefore, even in case of such a merger, separating the fairy tales and tracing them to their national origin would probably not have been an insurmountable obstacle. This distinction, however, is absolutely necessary - as our poet himself recently expressed - because fairy tales do not belong to the land in which they flourish, but to the ethnic soul from which they arose. We hope and wish that Staufe will soon succeed to order his estimable collection from this perspective and offer the homeland a valuable gift with its publication.¹⁸³

In the spirit of Herder and Grimm, Franzos refused to see folklore in any way other than national: with the nation as the foundation of civilisation, Bukovinian folk culture could only be a perverse Gordian knot of pure Ruthenian and Romanian elements which somehow needed to be separated. Franzos' stern reprimand provides an apt illustration of the pressure felt by those who suggested alternatives to nationalist doctrines. As suggested by Franzos here, Simiginowicz-Staufe soon wilted under it.

Presenting Bukovinian rural culture without making a distinction between Ruthenian and Romanian was nothing new: its long-standing tradition went back to the days of the earliest reports on Habsburg Bukovina and was still applied in promotional material such as Herman Mittelmann's Bukovina travel guide:

Modest as the Bukovinian farmer is, he is content with mamaliga (a kind of polenta) and Barszcz (a sour soup). Meat is eaten only on Sundays and public holidays, luxury items such as tea and coffee are alien to him, but he likes his brandy.¹⁸⁴

Obviously, Mittelmann saw no reason to differentiate between Romanian and Ruthenian culinary traditions. Even when he made the Ruthenian-Romanian distinction, he emphasised their common features:

Customs and traditions of both tribes are elemental; superstition is everywhere: the fear of devils, witches and evil spirits prevails the mindscape of the rural population.¹⁸⁵

The Orthodox church of Bukovina acknowledged the crownland's strong intermingling as well. Bishop Hacman, despised by Romanian nationalist for denying the Bukovinian Orthodox Church a specific Romanian identity, actually invoked the phenomenon when he

¹⁸³ Franzos, Karl-Emil, *Deutsche Poeten der Bukowina.I: Ludwig Adolf Staufe-Simiginowicz*, in: *Bucowinaer Volks-Kalender 1870*, Buchowiecki, Czernowitz 1869, p. 85.

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid*, p. 34.

¹⁸⁵ Mittelmann 1907/8, p. 29.

argued against a possible separation of the Bukovinian and the Dalmatian Orthodox Church. This separation was favoured by Romanian nationalists who envisaged a merger with the Transylvanian Orthodox, but opposed by their Ruthenian rivals who feared Romanian dominance:

All (...) Christian religious groups live so mingled together that they have their representatives not only in various communities, but also often in the various homes, and even in individual families. Through this close cohabitation, the frequent intermarriages and equally frequent conversions from one religion to another, over time a mutual toleration has formed among the common people, who do not want to hear or know about a confessional partition once internal displeasure erupts or advantages from outside allure. In such a situation, no religious instruction helps, no matter how carefully and thoroughly instructed in school or in church.¹⁸⁶

Hacman was not referring exclusively to the rural population, but he saw the same pattern among his own clergy, which was obviously homogenous from a religious point of view but until recently had shown the same national ambiguity:

These days, this task is not difficult at all, because nowadays, you can specify exactly to which nationality a priest is committed. This is not so easy for the past, at a time when national consciousness was not so highly developed and thus by the same token, many priests could be classed among both the Romanian and Ruthenian nationality.¹⁸⁷

Just like Franzos, Bukovinian Romanian nationalists started reasoning from the other end. They opposed Hacman's view of a pre-nationalist common identification and instead argued that previously separate Romanian and Ruthenian ethnic groups had begun to mingle to the detriment of national purity. In 1906, *Voința Poporului* opined that 'unions with non-Romanian women are already so numerous, so many children are already of dubious nationality that it might be necessary to impose some sort of ban'.¹⁸⁸

Perceived Apathy and Ignorance among rural Bukovinians

In contrast to the heated debates between nationalists and those like Bishop Hacman who proposed alternative collective identities (a religious one in Hacmans case), the rural population seemed indifferent to identification issues. According to the reports the Austrian governors sent to Vienna, the general population was indifferent to basically everything. The provisional governor addressed the population shortly after corvée had been abolished in a 'circular to all the communities of the crownland Bukovina':

During my official travels through Bukovina I have noticed that although this year's sowing germinates beautifully and lushly in the favourable spring weather, I also observed that extensive and fertile tracts of land are entirely uncultivated, that some fruit types still require

¹⁸⁶ Smal-Stocki, Stefan, *Nationale und Kirchliche Bestrebungen der Rumänen in der Bukowina 1848 – 1865* ('Von Bischof Hakmann in einem Sendschreiben dargestellt'), Ruska Rada, Czernowitz 1899, p. 128.

¹⁸⁷ Ibid, p. 18.

¹⁸⁸ *Romîni să fim – Reflexiuni și sfaturi la situația noastră/IV*, *Voința Poporului*, 4, 28.01.1906, p. 2.

*a lot of manpower and because of the outflow of human workforce they have not reached the voluptuousness which may be expected in this season. (...) This state of affairs causes the welfare of this so-blessed land irrecoverable and unpredictable damage which will only expand with the persistent laxity and the constant indolence of the peasantry (...).*¹⁸⁹

His successor Baron Franz von Schmück found the situation unchanged and his efforts to make a difference just as fruitless as earlier attempts. In his report to the Viennese authorities he characterised the general attitude as follows:

*In particular, the aversion to work has come prominently to the fore, the fields remain either uncultivated or, often the case with owners of large stretches of land - the fruits of the earth remain partially unharvested and are left to rot. The ever-increasing daily wages are seemingly unable to provoke the country people's industriousness, instructions by me, the clergy and the police are hardly listened to, much less taken to heart. Despite the abundance of time, the peasant - farmer - grows only as much as he needs for his household, since he does not care about the future. He does not have a palate for opulence, he'd rather starve than work more than the absolutely necessary; he usually spends the remaining time in the inn.*¹⁹⁰

In 1862, Governor Martina noted that apathy also dominated the general attitude towards politics:

*Due to its low level of spiritual development, the rural population is concerned about their proper affairs and within this realm only about ensuring their most urgent material needs. They are not able to grasp political events outside of their own sphere (...) and therefore retain in their political attitude their own peculiar reputation.*¹⁹¹

Similar impressions were echoed in the local press. Bukovinian Romanian *Patria* quoted an article from the 'competing' Bukovinian Ruthenian *Bukovynsky Vedomosty* in which Mykola Vasylok from Lukavetz reproached the Ruthenians from Wiznitz-Putilla for a lack of national awareness. It concluded that 'the bulk of ordinary people, our peasants, remain silent, because they are in the dark and have no concept of their national and economic status'.¹⁹² The eagerness of Romanian nationalists in Bukovina to disseminate Ruthenian nationalist difficulties in convincing their target group is may be explained by resemblant issues of their own: *Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung* observed that if there remained a Romanian nation to

¹⁸⁹ Henniger-Seeberg, Adalberth Baron von, *Circulare an sämtliche Gemeinden des Kronlandes Bukowina*, report no. 9954, Czernowitz, 30 June 1851/ DJAN Suceava, Fond 'Mitropolia Bucovinei', secția 'Diverse', dosar 1119.

¹⁹⁰ Schmück, Baron Franz von Governor's report to Vienna, Czernowitz, 31 December 1853/ ANR, Fond 'Guvernământul Bucovinei', MI 79/2.

¹⁹¹ 'Die Landbevölkerung ist durch den geringen Grad geistiger Entwicklung auf den eigenem unmittelbar beruhenden Verhältnisse beschränkt und selbst innerhalb desselben lediglich auf die Sicherstellung der nothwendigsten materiellen Bedürfnisse bedacht, vermag kein außerhalb ihrer Sphäre liegendes politisches Ereigniß zu erfassen und behält daher, nachdem zu ihrer Aufengung keine äußeren Einflüsse wie zur Zeit der Landtagswahlen wirkten, in ihrer politischen Haltung fortan die ihr eigenthümliche Rufe'. Martina, Wenzel Ritter von, *Abschrift des an Se Exzellenz den Herrn Polizeiministers erstatteten Stimmungsberichtes*, 115 Praes, Ministerium des Innern, Czernowitz, 14 January 1862/ ANR, Fond 'Guvernământul Bucovinei', MI, mapa 86/3.

¹⁹² *Bukovynsky Vedomosty* [Буковински Вѣдомости], no. 39, 5/17 October 1897 as quoted in *Spicuri din foile rutene*, *Patria*, 46, 15.10.1897.

speak of in Bukovina, this was thanks to the cities, because ‘the Romanian peasants had themselves denationalised in huge numbers by the tougher Slavs without offering resistance and this at a time in which the Romanians had the overwhelming preponderance in the land’.¹⁹³

Aloofness could not always be interpreted as apathy - it was also caused by ignorance. In a passage which fell victim to the censorship authority, Galician Ruthenian newspaper *Batkivshchyna* claimed that Ruthenians in Galicia made the least use of their rights and their power of all the peoples of Austria since they did not elect for themselves the sort of deputies who would do their will, but rather elected mainly Polish lords and government officials. And, it maintained, the situation was even worse in Bukovina.¹⁹⁴ In 1878, Julius Platter had quoted a conversation between a policeman and a peasant to illustrate the general cluelessness of the rural population:

*What is your native village called? The peasant named a nearby village. - What is the district called to which your village belongs? I don't know. - What is the country called in which you live? Well, I don't know that, either. - What is then the name of the entire state to which this country belongs? I have never heard anything about it. - Then who reigns over all of us? Is it a count, a prince or a king or an emperor? I have heard that further away somewhere there is a big, big city named Czernowitz and there a powerful king lives. - What is your religion? Oh, just the usual, common one, which is just for us peasants.*¹⁹⁵

Even in 1911, when the new system of national registers was passionately debated, rural ignorance was said to prevail:

*To them, the national divorce as well as the national principle as a combat moment have not at all become clear, and their economic credo is so ill-defined that their current representatives in the Imperial Council and the regional Diet actually only needed to hand out their business card and make some courtesy calls in order to secure their election.*¹⁹⁶

To nationalist activists in Bukovina, perceived peasant apathy and ignorance were sources of constant frustration. However, they had more to worry about than uncooperative peasants alone. They perceived a lack of national fervour even among those representing the backbone of nationalist movements in Bukovina, the clergy and the educated class. The editors of *Bukovyna* exclaimed in 1891:

The big mass of our people, our peasants and lower middle-class live under the influence of age-old spiritual slavery and obscurity, unaware of their human dignity, unaware of their proper issues, force and national obligations. But the mass of our educated class is not much

¹⁹³ *Der Landtag*, Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung, 28.12.1909, p. 1.

¹⁹⁴ *Batkivshchyna* [Батківщина] 1881, no. 16, as quoted in Himka, John-Paul, *Galician Villagers and the Ukrainian National Movement in the Nineteenth Century*, St. Martin's Press, New York 1988, p. 150.

¹⁹⁵ Platter 1878, p. 30.

¹⁹⁶ *Der große Wahltag*, Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung, 02.04.1911, p. 1.

*better than our popular masses; even now in free Austria, the majority of our educated class lives from day to day, without a clear program, without spirit, awareness of a higher goal in human life or awareness of prevailing obligations regarding its nation of origin!*¹⁹⁷

Lukewarm reactions to nationalist agitation were not merely a matter of perception. Throughout the decades of history of the nationalist press in Bukovina, editors appeared strapped for cash and struggled with debtors. In 1887, *Deșteptarea* called upon its readers to pay their bills:

*Romanians! If you see that our people move towards enlightenment and prosperity, for which 'Deșteptarea' has sacrificed not just a little, then do not allow it to disappear, for the foreigners would laugh bitterly at our depravity and stupidity.*¹⁹⁸

Viitoriul, a journal specifically aimed at an audience of Romanian Orthodox clerics in Bukovina spoke of 'a disease from which suffer almost all Romanian journals in the land', referring to the weak intellectual and material support from the circle of readers for whom the paper was meant. This 'disease' caused Romanian journals in general to be short-lived. Not only were subscriptions left unpaid, but copywriters equally lacked. And even if the editors received enough copy, they were no means available to cover overhead expenses. *Viitoriul* did not even have four hundred subscriptions. Overall, a large part of the clerics seemed not to care, even when they received personal reminders. The editors conceded grudgingly that 'apparently they shared the principle of our Romanians to have journals, but not to pay for them.'¹⁹⁹

Signs of lacking national awareness were at times explained more favourably, for instance when Bukovinian politician Aurel Onciul was said to skillfully tap into the peasants' economic worries:

*The peasant is passive in national issues. The hard battle for existence which he must fight makes him focus compellingly on economic issues, something Mr Onciul with his sound instinct of a tireless agitator immediately found out.*²⁰⁰

Others imputed Bukovinian peasantry with the wisdom to see through nationalist agitation:

*Fractions of the people, intellectuals and shopkeepers believed to be able to use nationality and language in order to prevent the masses to turn to the 'foreign element'. The linguistic battle cry was the watchword of those who believed to be able to protect themselves against the efficiency and fairness of the competition. The first to see through this campaign was the peasant with his healthy instincts.*²⁰¹

¹⁹⁷ *Наша непорядність*, Буковина, 05.09.1891, pp. 1-2.

¹⁹⁸ *Fraților Români!*, *Deșteptarea*, 23, 01.09.1897, p. 175.

¹⁹⁹ *Nepăsânță neexplicabilă și nescuzabilă*, *Viitoriul*, 8/9, 23.04.1908, p. 57.

²⁰⁰ *Die Wahlen auf dem Lande*, *Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung*, 08.05.1907, p. 1.

²⁰¹ *Aschermittwoch*, *Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung*, 05.03.1908, p. 1.

Although all available sources point at peasant apathy, largely absent political awareness and a high level of ignorance, it should be noted that these observations are largely elite reflections: They were uttered by governors longing for more local economic activity, journalists trying to explain unexpected election results and nationalists unable to understand why their campaigns largely fell on deaf ears. Useful as these opinions may be, they will have to be handled with care.

Nationally Indifferent Parliamentary Deputies and Their Political Priorities

Indifference regarding nationalist agendas was not confined to members of the population who chose to stay away from politics. The first 'peasant deputies' from Bukovina are a case in point. When under popular pressure the 1848 Constitution was revoked, new elections for the Imperial Parliament were necessary. Although still part of Galicia, Bukovina got its own electoral regulation and was divided into electoral districts. Czernowitz elected its own deputy, the others came from the remaining seven rural districts.²⁰²

The urban Czernowitz deputy was Gymnasium principal Anton Kral, who would later move to Brünn/Brno. Of the seven peasant deputies, Lukyan Kobyltsia (Wiznitz district) was the most prominent. The remaining six were Ivan Dolenchuk from Hatna (Suczawa), Vasile Cârste from Bojan (Sadagora), Vasyl Murgoch from Kotzman (Kotzman district), Miron Ciupercovici from Louisenenthal (Kimpolung), Mihai Bodnar from Woitinell (Radautz) and Gheorghe Timiș from Kupka (rural Czernowitz)²⁰³. Apart from the educated liberal German Kral, only Ciupercovici and Bodnar were literate and, perhaps therefore, the only two with a clear - Romanian - nationalist focus. The other five were ambiguous or indifferent on a national level and concentrated their political activities on matters aimed at the improvement of the situation of the peasantry. Nevertheless, a recent study tried to make the national shoe fit maintaining that Dolenchuk and Kobyltsia were definitely Ruthenian, while Cârste from Boian and Murgoci from Kotzman were Ruthenised Romanians. According to their colleague Ciupercovici, Cârste was 'Ruthenian, though he also knew Moldavian' (*'un rus, dar știe și moldovenește'*) and Murgoch was 'Ruthenian and did not know a word of Moldavian' (*'rus și nici nu știe nici o vorbă moldovenească'*).²⁰⁴

When the project of the 'Landspetition' was launched, it became painfully clear that the peasants in Bukovina mainly perceived it as an elite project, conceived by the local boyar nobility and the liberal bourgeoisie. During the debates in the Constitutional Committee, committee member Rieger noted that the desire of the separation of Bukovina only stemmed from aristocrats and bureaucrats, not from the people and that he had heard from eyewitnesses that particularly Romanian nobles oppressed their peasants the most, even more than the Jews. For that reason, Rieger maintained, a number of peasant deputies from Bukovina protested

²⁰² Ceaușu 2004, p. 58.

²⁰³ The autobiographical details of the eight deputies can be found in Ceaușu 2004, p. 414-116.

²⁰⁴ Ibid, p. 65.

against the separation.²⁰⁵ The explanation these protesting deputies gave their electorate certainly pointed at a deep distrust of the boyars' intentions and of those of their two fellow representatives:

The two Parliament deputies Miron Ciupercovici from Kimpolung and Mihai Bodnar from Radautz do not support our just cause. They united with the landowners and the clergy, and wish that we, the country people, remain in the old landlord patronage, which we have suffered for so many years and from which we have only liberated ourselves halfway. We, the undersigned, have been called by deputy Lukyan Kobylitsia to the two deputies mentioned above in order to sign a petition to the Parliament; as it was read to us, we realised that the two deputies mentioned above are completely opposed to our view, our general welfare - we saw that they are paid by the large landowners, and that it is us whom they want to sell to the gentlemen in the strict sense of the mandate.²⁰⁶

The initiators of the autonomy initiative were outraged by this majority position taken by the Council deputies. In later analysis, not only the deputies' lack of knowledge, but also their illiteracy and their lacking command of the German language was blamed for the position they took in the case of Bukovinian autonomy and claimed they were turned into 'instruments in foreign hands', fostering 'certain pro-Ukrainian sentiments and affinities'.²⁰⁷ Whereas Kobylitsia and Dolenchuk might somewhat plausibly be labeled Ruthenians, matters were more complicated in the case of Cârste and Murgoch. The latter two had been adopted as Romanians by Romanian historiography and thus had displayed curious behaviour when they had turned against the 'Landespetition', which in turn had been a pre-eminent Romanian initiative according to Romanian nationalist historians. In the words of a historian from present-day Bojan, they had 'opposed openly the wishes of the whole province as formulated in the 'Landespetition', while 'among them was, unfortunately, also Vasile Cârste from Bojan', whose 'lack of intellectual and political preparation, of knowledge of the German language and of the political situation led to his transformation into a puppet of the forces interested in maintaining the old system within the framework of the Habsburg monarchy'.²⁰⁸ However, if this line of argumentation is followed, the number of 'Habsburg puppets' does not seem to be limited to the inexperienced parliamentarians alone: in November 1848, deputy Bodnar deemed it necessary convince his peasant constituency of the advantages of

²⁰⁵ Wagner 1983, *Revolutionsjahre etc.*, p. 102.

²⁰⁶ "(...) Die beiden Reichstagsdeputirten Miron Czuperkowicz aus Kimpolung und Mihai Bodnar aus Radautz sind nicht für unsere gerechte Sache. – Sie vereinigten sich mit den Gutsherrn und mit der Geistlichkeit und wollen daß wir, das Landvolk, wieder in die alte Grundherrn- Kundschaft, welche wir durch so lange Jahre erlitten, verharren aus der wir uns bis jetzt nur halb herausgefunden haben. Wir, Unterzeichneten, sind durch den Deputirten Lukian Kobilitza zu den obigen zwei Deputirten gerufen worden um dort eine Petition an den Reichstag zu unterschreiben; als wir dieselbe uns vorlesen ließen, da sahen wir daß die obbenannten zwei Deputirten ganz gegen unsere Ansicht, gegen unser Gesamtwohl sind; - wir sahen, daß sie in Solde der Grundherrn stehen, und daß sie uns, in eigentlichen Sinne das Mandat, den Herrschaften verkaufen wollen (...)". Morgotsch, Krste, Kobelitz, Dollenczuk (deputies), *Die unterzeichneten Reichstagsdeputirten an das Landvolk in der Bukowina!*, Vienna, 30 August 1848/ DJAN Suceava, *Colectia de documente*, pachet XII, no. 48 (Photocopy from the original located in Vienna).

²⁰⁷ Ceauşu 2004, p. 65.

²⁰⁸ Dârda, Florin, *Boianul din Bucovina*, website of the village of Boian, Romania, 2008, http://www.mareleboian.com/istorie_austr_1848.html, accessed 15 June 2010.

Bukovinian autonomy by means of manifesto²⁰⁹ while his Romanian nationalist colleague Ciupercovici was repudiated by his Romanian-speaking electorate when he pronounced himself in favour of Bukovinian autonomy.²¹⁰

In conclusion, the episode of the ‘Landespetition’, the lobby for Bukovinian autonomy and the role of the eight Bukovinian deputies in the debate seems unfit for a plausible nationalist framing. At the Ukrainian side, the leader of the peasant opposition against Bukovinian autonomy, ‘the Emperor’s friend’ Lukyan Kobylitsia is portrayed as an anti-Habsburg initiator of that very autonomy. Romanian nationalist historians faced an even more daunting balancing act: By declaring the ‘Landespetition’ a purely Romanian initiative and by branding deputies Cârste and Murgoch Romanians, they now had to explain why those Romanians opposed a Romanian initiative and why an electorate they presented as Romanian reproached Bukovinian Romanian deputy Ciupercovici for supporting that same initiative.

Ceașu touched upon the problem when he referred to the ‘barely developed national consciousness’ of the deputies²¹¹ and to the ‘Landespetition’ as the product of merging interests of the emerging bourgeoisie and the local nobility:²¹² social emancipation is likely to have played a larger role in the development of both the ambitions of the local elite and the recently liberated peasantry. In the case of the illiterate early peasant deputies, nationality issues do not seem to have loomed large. Even more, there does not even seem to be a national affiliation.

Prominent Bukovinians with Ambiguous National Backgrounds

Generally, national apathy, indifference and ambiguity were attributed to the lower classes with their lack of education and literacy. As far as apathy and indifference are concerned, this may have been largely true. However, national ambiguity was firmly rooted in all strata of Bukovinian society and admitted, though hesitantly, by nationalists as well. An author only known as ‘an Orthodox Romanian priest’ commented in his brochure regarding the nationalist polemics within the Bukovinian Orthodox Church:

*It should be noted, however, that the name alone is not essential for the membership of a particular nationality, especially in Austria and certainly in Bukovina. There are indeed persons within each nation who play a leading role among their fellow tribesmen, and yet have foreign names.*²¹³

²⁰⁹ Ceașu 2004, pp. 68.

²¹⁰ Wagner 1983, *Revolutionsjahre etc.*, p. 88.

²¹¹ Ceașu 2004, pp. 64-65.

²¹² Ceașu, Mihai-Ștefan, *Obținerea autonomiei Bucovinei în dezbaterile elitei multi-etnice provinciale. 1848-1861*, in: *Analele Bucovinei*, 2006, XIII/1, 39-54. Tellingly, Wagner accredited a decisive role to the German Kral in the lobby for the ‘Landespetition’ (Wagner 1983, *Revolutionsjahre etc.*, p. 83).

²¹³ N.N., *Die gr.-or. Kirchenfrage in der Bukowina und die Jungruthenen (Kritische Beleuchtung der Brochure: ‘Beitrag zur kirchlichen Frage in der Bukowina. Zwei zeitgemäße Artikel vom Reichsratabgeordneten Hierotheus Pihuliak und einem gr.-or. ruthenischen Priester’)*, Bukowinaer Vereinsdruckerei, Czernowitz 1906, p. 20.

That said, things were definitely more complicated than clearly defined nationalities with ill-fitting family names. This may be illustrated by presenting a number of prominent Austrian Bukovinians with their own perception of identification as well as the identity attributed to them by others. Not surprisingly, the first two names, Morariu-Andrievici and Călinescu, are those of prominent figures in the hierarchy of the Bukovinian Orthodox Church. Being the single common institution of exclusively Romanian and Ruthenian speakers, the Orthodox Church provided fertile soil for national ambiguity. Outside the realm of the Church, prominent politicians Mykola Vasylyko and Constantin Tomasciuc are discussed here.

Metropolitan Silvestru Morariu-Andrievici

Silvestru Morariu-Andrievici became Metropolitan of Orthodox Bukovina in 1880 and kept this position until his death in 1895. Unlike his predecessor Eugen Hacman, Morariu represented the Romanian national wing, which presupposed identification with the nation as the only way for the Church to reach the highest goal on earth.²¹⁴ Morariu opposed Ruthenian influences within the Bukovinian Metropoly and maintained that Galician and Bukovinian Ruthenians were ethnic separate groups.²¹⁵ Although the clerical infighting clearly intensified under Morariu, he was also the initiator of the bilingual (Romanian-Ruthenian) theological magazine *Candela* in 1882, which aimed at keeping the Bukovinian clergy unified.²¹⁶ His staunch position on the alleged Romanian character of the Bukovinian Orthodox Church also created tensions between the Metropolitan and the Habsburg authorities. In 1890, the expiration of the lease on a Radautz domain owned by the Orthodox Church Fund led to Morariu's initiative to organise a church congress in order to discuss the administration of the Church and the Church Fund. Since both the Fund administration and clerical appointments fell within the sphere of competence of the state, the central government was ill-disposed towards the event. Governor Pace, known to have supported a stronger Ruthenian political clout in regional politics,²¹⁷ was in the end ordered to convene the congress in 1891. Bad blood between Morariu and Pace caused it to be dissolved almost immediately, never to be convened again.²¹⁸

The regional press was critical of Morariu's disregard for Ruthenian interests. *Gazeta Polska*, *Bukovyna* and especially *Bukowinaer Rundschau* with its feuilleton named 'Laical Voices from the Province' (*Laienstimmen aus der Provinz*) slashed the Metropolitan's pro-Romanian attitude. Morariu responded to the accusations by means of two self-justification brochures, one from 1883 and the other from 1889, entitled 'Apologies of the Orthodox Church of Bukovina' (*Apologien der orthodoxen griechisch-orientalischen Kirche der Bukowina*). These only added fuel to the flame, since the Metropolitan openly argued that there were no real

²¹⁴ Hitchins 1973, p. 620.

²¹⁵ Nistor 1991, p. 272.

²¹⁶ Turczynski 1993, p. 173.

²¹⁷ Corbea-Hoisie 2005, p. 93.

²¹⁸ Nistor, pp. 275-278.

Ruthenians in Bukovina, but only Ruthenised Romanians. This was understood as a move to enlarge Romanian influence in Vienna and was criticised in the local press:

As it is well-known that the Ruthenians in Bukovina are the clear majority of the indigenous population and have expressed their existence most energetically, the gentlemen from the Orthodox consistory calculated that the central government would assign to the Romanians - who in recent times have sought to manifest their loyalty in every possible way - a similar dominant position against the Ruthenians in Bukovina as they have allocated to the Poles in Galicia.²¹⁹

The same way he regarded Orthodoxy a Bukovinian (and therefore, in his view, a Romanian) characteristic, Morariu attributed Catholic influences firmly to Galicia. In 1885, he filed an official complaint at the Prime-Minister's office in Vienna because of the acclaimed Polish character of Catholicism in Bukovina and the behaviour of its priests, who were said to behave like Polish representatives.²²⁰ Paradoxically, his adversaries held Morariu responsible for involuntarily strengthening the Uniate Church, since his Romanian nationalism would cause Ruthenian Orthodox parishioners to convert.²²¹ In his second Apology, the metropolitan presented himself as a champion of tolerance and lamented the increase of fanaticism in Bukovina. Most of all, he decried Polish/Galician influences:

We no longer believe to be in Austria and in our homeland, but in Poland and as an Orthodox priest I cannot show my face in the so-called Russian street without being reminded of the streets of Cracow from the past and without being pelted with mud and dung by the dumb mob, this dirty ejection of Galicia.²²²

Morariu's Romanian nationalist fervour and his anti-Galician position become more intriguing in view of his assumed ethnic background. Silvester Daszkiewicz, who dismissed Morariu's assertions on behalf of the 'secular Orthodox members of the Ruthenian Club in Czernowitz', casually noted how 'the author of the Apology forgot that his ancestors were millers and simple farmers of Ruthenian nationality'.²²³ In its eulogy for the Metropolitan, *Bukovyna* portrayed the deceased as a 'descendant of former lower middle-class inhabitants of Drohobych (Galicia - HFD) called Zilyns'kiy, educated by Romanian relations and associations at a time in which the Ruthenian cause was not yet clear', and who 'like many of his age-mates had not been able to grasp its importance'.²²⁴ Changing from a Ruthenian to a Romanian speaker may well have been a practical career move for Morariu, or more likely for his ancestors, in a time in which Romanian was the *lingua franca* of the Bukovinian Orthodox clergy and Ruthenian nationalism had not yet developed into an attractive alternative. It is gripping nevertheless that one of the more prominent Bukovinian Romanian nationalists was said to be of Galician Ruthenian descent.

²¹⁹ *Gegen die 'Apologie'*, Bukowinaer Nachrichten, 05.05.1898, p. 1.

²²⁰ *Ecclesia militans*, Bukowinaer Rundschau, 13.08.1885, p. 1.

²²¹ *Kirchliches*, Bukowinaer Rundschau, 15.04.1888, p. 2.

²²² Silvestru Morariu, Metropolitan, *Apologie der orthodoxen griechisch-orientalischen Kirche der Bukowina*, Erzbischöfliche Buchdruckerei, Czernowitz 1889, p. 58.

²²³ Daszkiewicz 1891, p. 28.

²²⁴ *Високопреосвященний Митрополит Сильвестер Морар-Андрієвич... помер дня 3. (15) квітня...*, Буковина, 05.04.1895, pp. 1-2.

When in 1902, Bishop of Radautz Vladimir Repta was appointed Archbishop of Czernowitz , the position of consistory archimandrite remained vacant. On behalf of the Romanian Bukovinian Orthodox population, a request was sent to the Emperor to take into consideration Romanian nationalist concerns when naming a successor. The obvious worries regarded a possible Ruthenian candidate, but on top of this, the petitioners addressed the problem of personal connections within the church hierarchy, thus preventing the best candidate to obtain the position he deserved.

Therefore, we resort to the Highest church-protecting care and grace of Your Majesty to ensure that neither of these two movements be successful to the detriment of the Church of our land and that by Your Majesty's gracious appointment to the dignity of an episcopal vicar and consistory archimandrite, possibly also to Bishop of Radautz, a man will be chosen who is - we certainly want to not say a Romanian - but we only say a man, who is worthy and capable in every respect, who on the one hand guarantees the safeguarding of equality between Ruthenians and Romanians in the sense and degree in which national equality also applies to state affairs, and to no lesser degree guarantees respect for the historic general character of the Church and who on the other hand has excellent and proven abilities in all duties of the consistorial services and diocese administration, knowledge of both languages of the diocese and especially not only imperfect knowledge of Romanian, as well as a deserving, hard-working previous life devoted both dutifully and professionally to higher ecclesiastical and theological activity and who enjoys universal respect and recognition in the diocese.

Finally, the petitioners suggested the appointment of Miron Călinescu and assured the Emperor that Călinescu would prove to be a loyal servant not only to his church but to Throne and Empire as well.²²⁵ However, it was exactly the matter of loyalty which made Călinescu highly unpopular among Ruthenian parishioners, who 'hated him most fiercely because he had traded his Ruthenian nationality against a better one and from his high position he had forgotten about his former tribesmen'.²²⁶ After Călinescu's passing in 1912, *Nova Bukovyna* presented Călinescu's life story in a rancorous eulogy as that of a traitor:

²²⁵ "Dem gegenüber nehmen wir unsere Zuflucht zur Allerhöchsten kirchenschutzherrlichen Fürsorge und Gnade Euerer Majestät, auf daß keine dieser zwei Bewegungen zum Schädigen unserer Landeskirche Erfolg habe und auf daß durch Euerer Majestät Allergnädigsten Ernennungsakt zur Würde eines Consistorial-Archimandriten und erzbischöflichen Vicars, eventuell auch Bischofs von Radautz, wir wollen durchaus nicht sagen, ein Rumäne, sondern, wir sagen nur, ein Mann gelange, welcher der Stelle in jeder Beziehung würdig und gewachsen ist, welcher einerseits wie Garantien für die Wahrung der Gleichberechtigung der Ruthenen mit den Rumänen in dem Sinne und Maße, in welchem nationale Gleichberechtigung auch auf staatlichem Gebiete gilt, so nicht minder Garantien für die Respectierung des historischen Gesamtcharakters der Landeskirche bietet und welcher andererseits hervorragende und bewährte Tüchtigkeit in allen Obliegenheiten des Consistorialdienstes und der Diöcesanleitung, Kenntnis beider Diöcesensprachen und zwar die Kenntnis der rumänischen Sprache nicht bloß in unvollkommenem Maße, dabei ein verdienstvolles, in berufseifriger und arbeitsamer höherer kirchlicher und theologischer Thätigkeit zugebrachtes Vorleben und allgemeinen Achtung und Anerkennung in der Diöcese besitzt". *Die allerunterthänigsten und allergetreuesten gr.or. Rumänen der Bukovina, Euere kais. und königl. Apostolische Majestät! Allerdurchlauchtigster, Allergnädigster Kaiser und Herr!*, Czernowitz, 2 May 1902/ DJAN Suceava, Fond 'Mitropolia Bucovinei', secția 'Diverse', dosar 2133.

²²⁶ *Schweigen ist Gold*, Bukowinaer Rundschau, 2608, 18.12.1897.

*Our nation, like others which are still in the course of development, had many turncoats. Not only did they refuse to provide protection to their poor nation, but they also fought their own people as mercenaries of a foreign nation and helped to oppress their proper nation. When the Uniate Pumnul from Transylvania organised the Bukovinian Romanians fifty years ago, they started to fish out our ignorant youngsters, who almost all believed to be Romanians to such extent that they now head the Romanians and are recruiting by their side. (...) To this group also belonged the late M. Kalynovskiy. He was the son of a Ruthenian potter-craftsman from Holy Trinity Street. Entering the seminary, he joined the Romanian's association and converted to their ideas. As a grammar school teacher he already belonged to the active Romanians and recruited mercenaries even among his pupils, especially when acting as secretary of the Association for Culture and Literature (Societatea pentru cultură și literatură). In 1877 he changed his name to Miron Călinescu and afterwards became a theology professor, a consistorial councilor and finally consistorial archimandrite. In these influential positions, as well as in the position of crownland deputy, he developed an assiduous activity, but always clearly more for the Romanians than for the school of the Ruthenians. Thus having the proper relations in public life, he left no room for Ruthenian influences and gave everything a Romanian character. (...) The truth is that also today many Ruthenians defect to the Romanian camp and deal us decisive blows, nevertheless with a changed diocese system, exactly as it should be, our deprivations will finally be compensated (...).*²²⁷

In the eulogy written by ‘an Orthodox Ruthenian’, *Bukowinaer Post* echoed that Romanian nationalists had lured ‘nationally underdeveloped’ Ruthenians into their camp and even maintained that because of this, ‘almost all’ prominent Bukovinian Romanians were from Ruthenian descent, having changed their names into Romanian ones when the Romanian nationalist current gathered steam and Ruthenian names were considered an embarrassment.²²⁸

Earlier, in 1903, Young-Ruthenian parliamentary deputies had lamented the deprived position of Ruthenians in the Orthodox consistory of Bukovina and had highlighted how those who were said to be Romanised Ruthenians now had become the driving force behind the Romanisation of the Bukovinian Orthodox Church themselves.

*A remediation for the situation in the diocese, which has become unbearable, is unfathomable due to the present Orthodox consistory, with at the centre men like Călinescu (formerly Kalynovskiy) and Bejan (formerly Bezhan) who are hostile towards the Ruthenians. For it is precisely through the activity of these two consistorial councilors and through that of the previous Metropolitan Morariu (formerly Andriewicz) that the once numerous Ruthenian clergy was pushed into the Romanian camp and the continuation of the theological faculty by the Ruthenian youth was understandably completely suppressed (...).*²²⁹

Even in matters not directly related to Călinescu’s public activities, Ruthenian nationalists readily used the case of his ‘national conversion’. When *Bukovyna* accused Romanian clerics

²²⁷ *Мирон Калинеску, з роду Михайло Калиновский...*, Нова Буковина, 23.01.1912, p. 5.

²²⁸ *Myron Calinescu*, *Bukowinaer Post*, 23.01.1912, p. 1.

²²⁹ *Interpellation der Abgeordneten Pihuliak, Nikolaj v. Wassilko und Genossen an Seine Excellenz den Herrn Minister für Cultus und Unterricht wegen der notorischen Verkürzung und Schädigung der ruthenischen Gläubigen durch das griechisch-orientalische Consistorium in Czernowitz*, Sitzung, 14 March 1903/ ANR, Fond ‘Guvernământul Bucovinei’, MCÎ CXXXI/4.

of deliberately registering Romanian versions of Ruthenian names in birth certificates, they illustrated their claim with several examples, including the one of ‘the honourable potter Kalynovskiy who stemmed from the glorious Cossacks and was mutilated into Călinescu’.²³⁰ Instead of resenting Călinescu for his conscious identification with Romanian nationalism as usual, this time the Young-Ruthenians of *Bukovyna* considered it more convenient to depict him as a passive victim of Romanisation schemes.

Mykola Vasylo

Baron Mykola (‘Koko’) Vasylo²³¹ was born in 1868 as the son of landowner Nicholas von Wassilko and his wife Aglaia, the former Baroness Petrino-Armis. A graduate of the Viennese Theresianum, he settled on the family estate in Lukawetz. From the age of thirty he represented the district Wiznitz-Putilla in the regional diet. Later, when the Young-Ruthenians managed to obtain five out of the fourteen Bukovinian seats in the first democratic parliamentary election in 1907, he entered the Austrian Parliament. Vasylo was one of the most prominent Bukovinian Ruthenian politician of his time, as well as one of the architects of the ‘Freethinking Alliance’ (*Freisinniger Verband*), the short-lived ‘reservoir of progressive politicians of the new generation from all national camps’²³² together with Romanian Aurel Onciul, German Arthur Skedl and Jewish Benno Straucher. In 1911, he was one of the architects of the Bukovinian Compromise, which envisaged popular representation along national lines. Vasylo energetically advocated the opening of a Ruthenian university in Lemberg and was one of the driving forces behind the founding of a Ruthenian Gymnasium in Wiznitz in 1908. Although he was popular with the peasantry and fostered a down-to-earth image, his former ally Onciul noted in his memoirs that ‘Vasylo never refrained from the feudal tendencies of his younger years; being used to bossing his Ruthenian fellow men around, he tried to do the same to the Romanians who would not tolerate this’.²³³

Once the war broke out, Vasylo moved to Vienna, where in 1915 he was among the founders of the Central Ukrainian Council and promoted the concept of an autonomous Ukrainian entity comprising Podilia, eastern Galicia and Bukovina in case the Central Powers would win the war. In 1918 Vasylo served in the Ukrainian National Council in Lemberg. Just like in Bukovina, Vasylo proved to be a controversial political figure in Galicia, where, judging from a private letter from Lemberg in December 1917, he was definitely not universally trusted by his fellow Ukrainian nationalists:

Following the events in Ukraine there is a total lack of organisation and orientation among the local population. Moreover, the Ukrainian Republican Party speaks out very clearly

²³⁰ *Волоска віра*, Буковина, 05.03.1909, p. 1.

²³¹ Biographic details from: Ceașu 2004, pp. 461-462, *Reichsrathscandidat Nicolai Ritter von Wassilko*, Czernowitzer Presse, 15.12.1899, p. 1, *Turning the pages back*, in: *The Ukrainian Weekly*, 12, 21.03.1999, p. 6.

²³² Leslie, John, *Der Ausgleich in der Bukowina von 1910: Zur österreichischen Nationalitätenpolitik vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg*, in: *Geschichte zwischen Freiheit und Ordnung - Gerald Stourzh zum 60. Geburtstag*, Brix, Emil et al. (ed.), Styria, Graz/Wien/Köln 1991, 113-143, p. 117.

²³³ Onciul 1999, p. 43, ad. 3.

*against the president of the club of Bukovinian Ukrainian deputies, Baron Vasylko, who is accused of never having been a true and genuine Ukrainian politician and of always having cared more about foreign interests, supporting these as well. An anonymous author published a series of very harsh newspaper articles against him in which he is subjected to severe criticism.*²³⁴

In the war's immediate aftermath, Vasylko served as the diplomatic representative of the Western Ukrainian National Republic government in Austria between in 1918 and 1919. He was the Ukrainian National Republic's ambassador to Switzerland and subsequently to Germany, where he died in 1924.

Whereas the letter from Lemberg implies that Vasylko was regarded by some as being more Austrian than Ukrainian/Ruthenian, in Bukovina his political enemies instrumentalised another aspect of his background to call his sincerity into question. The Romanian nationalists from *Deșteptarea* brought out their version of Vasylko's record in 1905:

*In order for our readers to know who Koko Vasylko is, we will tell them in two to three words. His father, the boyar Nicholas Knight of Wassilko of the Komarestie estate was a particularly respected Romanian. To what purpose however, if his son Koko was to squander all parental wealth after the death of the old man? Honourable Koko even managed to waste the Lukawetz estate, brought as a dowry by his wife, so that the other day it was auctioned off to a Galician bank. What was poor Koko to do now? He resorted to begging on the threshold of the Romanians so they would help him get a mandate. However, our people knew his kind only too well and would not entrust it to him. This bitterly upset the gentleman and within a split second, he transformed from Romanian into a staunch Ruthenian. He goes to the regional administration and lashes out mightily at us Romanians. The administration receives him and lo, today he is a Ruthenian deputy to both the regional Diet and the Imperial Council in Vienna.*²³⁵

The Wassilko family was one of the oldest in Bukovina and played a prominent role in Moldavia well before the Austrian annexation. According to the list of electors for both the Imperial Council and the regional Diet in the large landowner category as compiled by Governor Alesani in 1875, the Wassilko's²³⁶ were classified as 'Romanian'.²³⁷ The fact that

²³⁴ (...) Infolge der Ereignisse in der Ukraine herrscht unter den hies. eine völlige Desorganisation und Desorientierung. Ausserdem tritt die ukr. Republikanische Partei sehr scharf gegen den Präses des Bukowinaer-ukr. Abgeordnetenklubs Baron Wassilko auf, dem zum Vorwurf gemacht wird, dass er niemals ein wahrer und echter ukr. Politiker war und dass er sich immer eher um fremde Interessen kümmerte und auch solche unterstützte. Gegen ihn veröffentlichte ein anonymer Autor eine Reihe sehr scharfe Zeitungsartikel, in welchen er einer strengen Kritik unterzogen wird. (...)” *Letter from Marijka Donzow from Lemberg*, 28.12.1917, in: *Beilage 35 zur Monatsbericht pro Jänner 1918/ Innerpolitische Wahrnehmungen einschl. der hochverraeterischen Umtriebe unserer Staatsbuenger im Auslande – Ukrainische Bewegung in der Monarchie*, Vienna, Kriegsarchiv/Armeeoberkommando/Gemeinsames Zentralnachweisbüro (AOK/GZNB), Karton 3757, Fasc 4986.

²³⁵ *Să fie oare Bucovina țeară rusască??* *Deșteptarea*, 5, 01.03.1900, pp. 33-35.

²³⁶ Since Mykola Vasyenko (Nicholas von Wassilko) was the only family member to claim a Ruthenian identity, on these pages his name is spelled according to the transcription of Ruthenian/Ukrainian orthography. To other family members will be referred as 'Wassilko', according to the German spelling common at the time. To avoid further confusion, the Romanian alternative 'Vasilco' will not be used.

young Mykola ‘chanced his luck’ at the Ruthenian side of the local political spectrum was obviously perceived rather divergently by either group. According to the Young-Ruthenians of *Selyanin*, Vasylo was ‘one of the inhabitants of their native land who staunchly and heartily stood by the Ruthenian people and had dared to avow himself Ruthenian, while all other Wassilko’s had sided with the Romanians’ and his while father ‘like the entire unconscious Bukovinian gentry, had regarded himself as Romanian’.²³⁸ On the other hand, the conservative nationalist faction of Romanian large landowners in Bukovina used every opportunity to use Vasylo’s ‘national betrayal’ against him. When they felt that in Vienna he had spoken on behalf of the Bukovinian Romanians, they fumed that ‘it was about time the Romanians showed this man point-blank with the desired lucidity that when Romanian politicians had already earlier refused him party membership, today, now that he had ‘shed’ his Romanian nationality and had become ‘Ruthenian’, they decidedly abhorred cooperation of any kind with him and that he had forfeited the right to count on whatever kind of consideration from the side of the Romanians’.²³⁹

Vasylo’s turncoat reputation proved to be persistent, even among those who appreciated his political capacities. After the 1905 parliamentary elections, the editors of *Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung* worried about the Young-Ruthenians, who had lost the elections but might become more popular in the future thanks to their socialist and anti-Semitic positions. The newspaper wondered why a relatively moderate politician like Vasylo had joined these ranks and opined he could change his mind once more, since ‘he had never been a Young-Ruthenian, but had simply converted to the Ruthenians’. So, ‘if he managed to draw the only permissible conclusions from the circumstances, his valuable work for the Ruthenian people in Bukovina would remain’.²⁴⁰

In spite of his unambiguous political activity within the framework of Ruthenian/Ukrainian nationalism, Vasylo’s loyalty would never be completely uncontested. His specific Bukovinian background and life career made him a renegade to Romanian nationalists, an Austrian centralist to non-Bukovinian Ruthenian/Ukrainian nationalists and ‘flexible’, to say the least, to some of his more appreciative fellow Bukovinians. In present day scholarly work, Vasylo remains ‘the Romanian who turned Ruthenian’.²⁴¹

Constantin Tomasciuc

When Constantin Tomasciuc died in 1889, *Bukowinaer Rundschau* commented that to Czernowitz, he had been ‘the Prometheus who set off the fire of spiritual freedom, the man

²³⁷ Bidermann 1875, pp. 64-65.

²³⁸ *Посоль на соймъ краевый бояринъ Николай Василько*, Селянинъ, 01.09.1898, pp. 2-3.

²³⁹ *Wird der Frieden in der nächsten Landtagssession gestört und von wem?* Bukowinaer Journal, 1010, 15.06.1902, p. 1.

²⁴⁰ *Die Neue Aera - Die Ruthenen*, Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung, 15.10.1905, p. 1.

²⁴¹ See for instance Ceaușu 2004, p. 461 (*român ucrainizat*) and Corbea-Hoisie 2004, p. 56 (*grand propriétaire terrien roumain, autodéclaré ruthène*).

who had made the sun of Enlightenment rise in the east and had opened the halls to scholarship, so that intellectual life and aspiration would find their way into them'.²⁴²

Born 1840 in Czernowitz, Tomasciuc remained widely revered in Bukovina after his death as one of the most prominent advocates for and, consecutively, the first rector of the Franz Joseph University. He had been educated at the Lemberg University and was appointed regional court judge after having served the Habsburg government administration in Lemberg and Hermannstadt. He was a member of the Czernowitz municipal council and the regional diet of Bukovina, which in turn delegated him to the Austrian Parliament. The latter proved a useful platform for his lobby campaign for a German-language Bukovinian university, which was realised in 1875 at the occasion of Austrian Bukovina's centennial.²⁴³ Speaking on the subject before the House of Representatives of the Austrian Imperial Council on 13 March 1875, Tomasciuc had proven himself a true Austrian centralist:

*We are not only Polish, Germans, Romanians, but we are most of all people rooted in the same soil from which we draw our collective strength. I mean our Austria. And the university is a genuinely Austrian idea.*²⁴⁴

Ironically, it was exactly the new university with its professors from all over the Monarchy that would eventually bring a fresh influx of nationalist fervour to Bukovina. Tomasciuc himself would maintain that 'in his opinion, the widely-held view in the land that party differences in the diet were predominantly of a national nature, was erroneous'.²⁴⁵ In his capacity as university dean, Tomasciuc seems to have lacked the aptitude for the balancing act necessary to appease Viennese sensitivities in matters of nationalist political activity. When Romanian nationalist students sent Tomasciuc a telegram to congratulate him on a parliamentary speech against Polish nationalist agitation in Bukovina, the Minister of Culture and Education was not amused: Tomasciuc was ordered to let his students know that students in general should refrain from political activities and was subtly informed that a next time, Vienna expected him to act without having been told specifically to do so.²⁴⁶

From the reports received from its representative in Czernowitz, the central government was unlikely to hold a favourable opinion of rector Tomasciuc, anyway: no matter how vital Tomasciuc's role had been in the prelude to the establishment of the Franz Joseph University, as its dean his star had faded fast. Shortly before Tomasciuc's death, his position at the faculty was characterised by Governor Bourguignon:

Professor Tomasciuc occupies a peculiar position in this faculty. At the time of the university's establishment, he succeeded in radiating a certain aura around him which gradually he has

²⁴² † Dr. Constantin Tomaszczuk, Bukowinaer Rundschau, 22.12.1889, pp. 1-2.

²⁴³ Ceaușu 2004, pp. 459-460. For more on the Czernowitz University, see Part III, paragraph 2.2/ Franz Joseph University.

²⁴⁴ Lechner, Elmar, *Die ehemalige k.k.Franz-Josefs-Universitat zu Czernowitz - eine Chronologie und eine Bibliographie*, Historico-Paedagogica Europaea 17, Klagenfurt 2001, p. 1.

²⁴⁵ *Die Wahlerversammlung*, Bukowinaer Nachrichten, 18.09.1888, p. 1.

²⁴⁶ *Orders from the Ministry of Culture and Education to Czernowitz with regard to political activities by Romanian students*, reports No. CUM 567 and CUM 865, 16 April and 7 June 1886/ DACHO, Viddil 1, Fond 3, Opis 1, spr. 4916.

*lost completely, since the younger generation of professors will not forgive him for never having become a professor prior to his appointment at the Czernowitz University and for rarely holding lectures for many years now because of his parliamentary activities. On the other hand, he participates as much as possible in state exams and doctoral viva (...), acts as counsel in criminal cases against wealthy clients, and on top of this he likes to pretend a certain dominance over his colleagues.*²⁴⁷

Once Tomasciuc had passed away however, his name soon became a synonym for cultural progress in Bukovina. In October 1897, the city of Czernowitz dedicated a monument to his memory. *Czernowitzer Presse* recalled how Tomasciuc, ‘the son of another tribe, had fought for the Germans in Austria because he had realised that only a strong central authority could save the fatherland, and that the young emerging nations still needed the old culture for a long time in order to mature’.²⁴⁸ Indeed, like Karl-Emil Franzos, Tomasciuc had been a product of Josephinist enlightenment, a school of thought which rapidly lost ground after the 1880s.²⁴⁹ He had firmly believed in the German cultural hegemony in Bukovina, since in his view, cultural development in a pluri-ethnic community could only prosper if one of those ethnicities took the lead. To Tomasciuc, in Austria this task fell to the Germans.²⁵⁰ He considered himself a German liberal and as such he had distinguished himself in the different political bodies. As a German liberal and a staunch opponent of Slavic dominance within the Austrian parliament,²⁵¹ Tomasciuc’s roots as a son of a Ruthenian-speaking priest and a Romanian-speaking mother perhaps offer a surprising background for such views. That said, Tomasciuc regarded himself as an ethnic Romanian and remained a devout Orthodox throughout his life.²⁵² *Bukowinaer Nachrichten* offered an explanation for Tomasciuc’s ability to harmonise all these identification markers:

Although he had an intense national consciousness just like any of his co-nationals, although he cherished the magic of that sweet sound of the mother tongue and was a proud and devoted Romanian just the same, he understood that apart from nationalism there are higher interests and obligations, the fulfillment of which equally benefits one’s own nationality. He was therefore not merely a Romanian, but also a liberal who constantly paid homage to progress,

²⁴⁷ “Eine eigenthümliche Stellung nimmt in dieser Fakultät Professor Tomaszczuk ein, welcher bei Eröffnung der Universität einen gewissen Nimbus um sich zu verbreiten wußte, den er aber nach und nach vollständig eingebüßt hat, weil die jüngere Generation unter den Professoren es ihm nicht verzeihen will, daß er vor seiner Berufung an die Czernowitzer Universität niemals Professor geworden ist, weil er ferner seit vielen Jahren in Folge seiner Wirksamkeit im Reichsrathe nur selten Vorlesungen hält, dagegen sich bei den Staatsprüfungen und Rigorosen (...) soviel als möglich betheiligte und als Vertheidiger in Strafsachen wohlhabender Clienten fungirt, überdies gegenüber den Collegen sich ein gewisses Übergewicht anmaßen möchte”. *Bericht des Landespräsidenten an den Minister für Cultus und Unterricht*, 482 Pr., Czernowitz, 27 March 1889/ ANR, Fond "Guvernământul Bucovinei", MCĪ, XCIII/9.

²⁴⁸ *Das Tomaszczuk-Denkmal*, Czernowitzer Presse, 15.10.1897, p. 1.

²⁴⁹ Turczynski 1993, p. 176.

²⁵⁰ Osatschuk, Sergij, *Nationalisierungsprozesse und religiöser Wandel in der Bukowina von der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts bis zum Anfang des 20. Jahrhunderts*, in: Karpf, Peter et al. (ed.), *Volksgruppen und Religion - Identität und Bekenntnis* (Kärnten Dokumentation, 24), Klagenfurt 2008, 144-159, pp. 147-148.

²⁵¹ Ceauşu 2004, p. 190.

²⁵² Osatschuk 2008, p. 147.

*and he was therefore not merely a Bukovinian, but also an Austrian connected to the united fatherland with every fiber of his heart.*²⁵³

Bukowinaer Rundschau had advanced a similar opinion in its previously quoted eulogy when stating that Tomasciuc ‘had known that he served his nation best when he served the Empire, devoting all his strength to its unity and welfare’ and that he ‘had felt that his nationality could only stay healthy if the entire state remained unimpaired and unbroken’.²⁵⁴

Even the analysis of only four Bukovinian biographies provides useful insights into questions of identification as well as the mobility and flexibility of identification markers. In the cases of Morariu-Andrievici and Călinescu, the decisive element which determined their national identity was their religious affiliation and subsequently their clerical careers. In a time when Ruthenian nationalists still struggled with Romanian dominance within the Bukovinian Orthodox Church, an excellent command of the Romanian language was a matter of course and declaring oneself Romanian must have been helpful, if not a prerequisite, to reach the highest ranks of the hierarchy.

In the case of Morariu, a close reading of the sources referring to his background makes it unlikely that he personally took a conscious decision to ‘swap nationalities’. If his family was indeed originally from Galicia, this might explain why to Călinescu - stemming from an Orthodox minority - Galicia was a byword for Catholics and Uniates, while Bukovina represented the ‘true faith’ - Orthodoxy - with the Romanian language as its local vehicle. For Călinescu’s ancestors, who were said to have made the conversion from Galician Ruthenian to Bukovinian Romanian, the move to Southern Bukovina might have implied an automatic assimilation into the Romanian language and, once nationalism gained ground, into the Romanian national identity.

Although Călinescu’s integration into the Romanian cultural realm displays obvious similarities to Morariu’s, the salient contrast is here that Călinescu represented a first-generation ‘national convert’, whose conscious decision was widely known and, when convenient, used against him. Although the example given above shows that he was occasionally depicted as a victim of Romanisation (a hypothesis much more plausible in the case of Morariu, if any), the overall picture in non-Romanian circles was that of a national traitor, who, just like Morariu, tended to play the Romanian card even more fanatically than other Romanian clerics and was therefore largely held responsible for the national polarisation of the Bukovinian Orthodox Church.

A mirror image of Călinescu’s ‘nationality swap’ is that of Mykola Vasylo, who managed to turn ‘becoming Ruthenian’ into a flourishing career. Whereas Călinescu benefited from Romanian clerical dominance by conformation, Vasylo saw the advantages of siding with a newly emerging national group which had large political potential but lacked political clout and local prominent to defend its interests. Just like Călinescu, however, Vasylo would be struggling with accusations of disloyalty and opportunism throughout his life.

²⁵³ *Den Namen Tomaszczuks*, Bukowinaer Nachrichten, 02.06.1892, p.1.

²⁵⁴ † *Dr. Constantin Tomaszczuk*, Bukowinaer Rundschau, 22.12.1889, pp. 1-2.

Looking for a classic example of *homo bucovinensis*, a better representative of the species than Constantin Tomasciuc is hardly imaginable. While he defined himself as a German liberal and was clearly an Austrian Centralist, he was an Orthodox Christian at the same time and, being from mixed Ruthenian-Romanian descent, he chose the Romanian nationality.

It would be self-evident to conclude here that Bukovinian identities were a patchwork of many components, each of which depending on religious, political and national affiliation of the individual. Although Habsburg Bukovina represents an interesting case from this perspective, the phenomenon has been addressed in numerous studies. More interesting perhaps is that ‘the common people’ are generally described as passive in matters of nationality determination. In the Bukovinian context they were mostly said to have been either Romanised or Ruthenised once a shift in national identity was detected or suspected. Since their individual biographies can no longer be traced, debates on such processes all too often fizzle out under the influence of nationalist bickering. Biographies of more prominent Bukovinians are easier to reconstruct and, as has been illustrated by the case studies presented above, may provide new insights on how Bukovinian individuals dealt with national identification. Next to more or less organic processes such as bilingual marriages, ‘nationality’ seems to have been determined and subsequently altered according to rather lucid terms of ‘career planning’ as well.

2.3 The Bukovinian Orthodox Church

The Orthodox Church (known in the Habsburg era as the Greek-Oriental or Greek Non-Uniate Church) unmistakably dominated the religious landscape of Austrian Bukovina. Until the fourteenth century, the Orthodox population had been subordinate to the Galician Metropolitan. Independent of the local language(s), services were held in Church Slavonic. From the fifteenth century onward, the Church represented an autonomous entity in the Moldavian principality. From the early sixteenth century, the first Moldavian-language prayer books appeared.²⁵⁵

When the Habsburgs annexed the land in 1774, the Church was said to have 67,000 members, while 8,000 people were of other denominations. Franzos counted 39 monasteries and therefore an average of one monastery on every 1,500 believers, ‘a proportion unequalled anywhere in the world at any given time’.²⁵⁶ Moldavian nobles had established the monasteries and had donated considerable wealth to them. By 1775, the monasteries owned about 63% of the available arable land and forests and controlled 109 villages, which in turn comprised half of the population. The wealthiest of these monasteries was Putna, the final

²⁵⁵ Osatschuk 2008, pp. 144-145.

²⁵⁶ Franzos 1901, p. 238. The number of monasteries as mentioned by Franzos seems exaggerated. Other sources mention ten monasteries and thirteen hermitages.

resting place of Stephen the Great.²⁵⁷ The administration of the estates was in the hands of the monastery abbots (*stareți*), who mostly leased the properties, serfs included, to Armenians, Greeks or Jews. Mismanagement and conflict were rife.²⁵⁸

The Orthodox Church in Bukovina had less influence over education than its pendant in Transylvania. Although the Orthodox Church had the right to supervise Romanian-language education after the Galician era, the provincial government took over the direction of primary education in 1869. While the German language dominated at all levels of education, the Orthodox Theological Seminary could be considered a centre of Romanian-language education in Bukovina.²⁵⁹ By 1900, the Orthodox Church had 407,311 followers, other religions a total of 84,481.²⁶⁰

The role played by the Orthodox Church has been controversial right from the first reports. As discussed in the literature survey, men like Balsch and Budai-Deleanu had characterised the clerics as incompetent, uneducated and corrupt. According to Splény, they were not very tolerant either:

*And though the priests have almost no concept of the difference between religions, they are still so fanatical that they consider all other Christians, especially Catholics, hardly any better than Jews and heathens.*²⁶¹

Furthermore, their private lives were ‘not worthy of praise either, however, through the hypocrisy of way too strict fasting they managed to keep the naïveté of the populace tightly enchained’.²⁶² Franzos dealt with the Moldavian clergy in equally depreciating terms and highlighted that two thirds of the land belonged to the monasteries, that the clergy, ‘this army of slackers’ (*dieses Heer von Nichtsthuern*) was maintained by the monastery estates and that it was only natural that Josephinism had properly cleaned up this ‘Augean stable’.²⁶³

Bukowinaer Post gave the Church more credits, because ‘religious peace is a solid foundation on which one can easily and securely build social peace’ and accordingly, ‘the Orthodox Church had always promoted these inclinations and therefore was also sympathetic to believers of other religions, who were sincerely interested in its events and shared its joys and sorrows, just as men, as children of the same land’.²⁶⁴ For obvious reasons, recent Romanian historiography, traditionally claiming the Orthodox Church of Bukovina as a Romanian national one, adorned it with positive features:

²⁵⁷ More on Putna and Stephen the Great in Part III, paragraph 6.3: The 400th Anniversary of the Death of Stephen the Great in 1904.

²⁵⁸ Hausleitner, Mariana, *Der griechisch-orientalische Religionsfonds und die rumänischen Vereine in der Bukowina*, conference paper, *Kirche und Nation in Ostmitteleuropa im 19. Jahrhundert (1848-1914)*, Lüneburg 26-28 October 2006, p. 1.

²⁵⁹ Hitchins 1994, p. 236.

²⁶⁰ Franzos 1901, p. 240.

²⁶¹ Splény in Grigorovici 1998, (Ab. 78).

²⁶² *Ibid.*, (Ab. 147)

²⁶³ Franzos 1901, p. 239.

²⁶⁴ *Ein Festtag der gr.-or. Kirche*, *Bukowinaer Post*, 29.01.1899, p. 1.

*It has always been an institution devoted to the state, for in their view even the ruler owes his elevated position to the grace of God. It had no inquisitions, no autos-da-fé and no religious wars. In those troubled times, the Church and its monasteries had been the only stable and peaceful institutions one could count on in these areas, both in the village and at Court.*²⁶⁵

Church Fund and Bukovinian Orthodox Church Autonomy

Upon acquiring the territory, Austrian authorities, especially worried by the miserable situation in which the peasantry found itself, decided that extensive reforms of church and education facilities were in order.²⁶⁶ The military administration ordered boyar Basilius Balsch to produce an inventory of all church property. Based on its result, General Enzenberg advised Vienna to bring all church possessions under state control and have all revenues transferred to a fund established to cover church expenses.

The number of monasteries was to be reduced to three, Putna, Suczewitza and Dragomirna. Each of them was to house no more than twenty-five monks.²⁶⁷ Enzenberg justified this reduction with the argument that the monasteries had not assumed socially beneficial services such as education and health care. The well-being of the community was specifically mentioned in the new regulation:

*It is understood that the notified assurances to the clergy and the people relieve the concerns of the community and so, according to guidelines of the Council of War from 12 February 1785, the diocese regulation drafted by administrator Enzenberg and Bishop Dosoftei, approved by the Emperor and verified by the High Court on 29 April 1786 was published in the land. (...) Revenues from these goods will flow into a Church Fund and after deduction of support for priests and schools, these will be employed in the community, exclusively for the true good of clergy, religion and mankind.*²⁶⁸

Apart from these honourable intentions, Vienna also fostered considerations of a more practical nature. Two thirds of the land's income defied state control. Until 1781, the Bishop of Radautz had been subordinate to the Archbishop of Moldavia, who then transferred his possessions in Bukovina to Radautz. In 1782, Bishop Dosoftei was ordered to move his see to Czernowitz and a year later his bishopric was incorporated by the Serbian Archbishop in Karlowitz/Sremski Karlovci, who also ruled over the Transylvanian Orthodox. Emperor

²⁶⁵ Grigorovici 1996, p. 266.

²⁶⁶ Kapri 1974, pp. 42-43.

²⁶⁷ Nistor 1991, pp. 36-37.

²⁶⁸ "Se înțelege, că astfelu de asigurări notificate clerului și poporului, alinară îngrijirile de obște, și așa, conformu directivelor date de consiliulu belicu de curte din 12. Fauru 1785, făcându-se de administrătoriu Enzenberg cu episcopulu Dositeiu proieptulu de regulământu pentru diecesă, s'a aprobatu de împăratulu și cu rescriptulu consiliulu supreme de curte din 29. Aprilie 1786 s'a publicatu în țară. (...) Proventele acestoru bunuri încurgu la o casă religiunariă anume și, duple subtragerea susținerii pentru preuțime și scoale, se vor întrebuință în de obște numai câtu spre binele adevăratu alu clerului, alu religiunii și alu omenimii." Morariu Andrievici, Șamuil, *Despre istoria fondulu religiunariu gr. or. în Bucovina - Prelegere ținută într'a 3/15. Ianuariu 1871 în localitățile Societății literarîe române din Cernăuți*, in: *Calendaru pe anul ordinaru 1874*, Eckhardt, Czernowitz 1874, p. 81.

Joseph II announced on 19 June 1783 that ‘with regard to spiritual discipline it was highly necessary that the reduction and contraction of the monk’s monasteries advance without delay, that their estates and funds all be included in the new structure, that everything belonging to foreign clergy folk without residency in the land be taken from them and that from the fund which is thus to emerge, the entire Orthodox clergy be sustained and at least one school be established in Suczawa or Czernowitz, while the remaining means be spent on other useful things’.²⁶⁹ Gypsies were freed from servitude and large numbers of immigrants arrived, who received parcels of land and initial educational support from the Church Fund estate.²⁷⁰ In 1786, a seminary was opened in Suczawa, but moved to Czernowitz in 1789.²⁷¹ Some of the 466 monks were not inclined to work as village clerics, as the new regulation ordained, and decided to move to monasteries in Ottoman Moldavia. Others stayed, because the authorities forbade them to take along their worldly possessions once they left.²⁷²

In spite of the new hierarchy, Serbian influence remained limited. After the Archbishop had attempted twice to bestow an assistant on Dosoftei - the first candidate was appointed Bishop of Transylvania before he could travel, the second is said to have run off with a mistress and never to have reached Bukovina either - Dosoftei refused to accept a third candidate. He addressed the Austrian authorities explaining these difficulties and henceforth remained free from direct interference from Karlowitz.²⁷³

Initially, the church revenue reform put the local administration firmly in charge of Church Fund management.²⁷⁴ However, in 1791 it was decided by imperial decree that the Bishop be in charge, while according to a 1820 imperial decision, the revenues could only be used to serve the orthodox religion and community.²⁷⁵ Reason for this shift was the fact that Bukovina was now part of the Galician administration, and Church Fund resources had also been made available to Catholic educational facilities, much to the dismay of the Orthodox population.²⁷⁶ Around 1820, the Uniate Church gained a foothold in Bukovina as well, sometimes with the support of Bukovinian boyars.²⁷⁷ At the same time, the Josephinist spirit of modernisation and the Austrian ambition to modernise clerical education led to generous stipends for aspiring

²⁶⁹ “(...) in Ansehung des geistlichen Faches ist höchst notwendig, daß die Verminderung und Zusammenziehung der Kalugier-Klöster ohne Weiters vor sich gehe, daß ihre Gründe und Fonds alle in die Administration genommen, was fremden, nicht im Lande wohnenden Geistlichen hievon gehöret, denselben ganz benommen und aus dem hieraus entstehenden ganzen Fundo der gesammte griechische Klerus unterhalten und wenigstens eine Schule, es sei zu Suczawa oder zu Czernowitz, errichtet werde, das von diesfällige Einkünften sodann noch übrig Bleibende zu anderer nutzbarer Verwendung vorbehalten bleibe”. Bidermann 1875, p. 23.

²⁷⁰ Hausleitner, 2006, (*Der griechisch-orientalische Religionsfonds* etc.), p. 2.

²⁷¹ Wagner 1996, p. 15.

²⁷² Kapri 1974, p. 63.

²⁷³ Nistor 1991, p. 35.

²⁷⁴ “Principele  aerii, carele are asupra sea  ngrijirea pentru buna stare de obste, este protectorulu fondulu religianariu; administrarea, conservarea  i  ntrebuin area acestuia pentru preu ime  i scoale. Precum este elu numai  i singuru dedicatu, depinde numai c tu dela or nduirea sea”. Morariu Andrievici 1874, p. 81.

²⁷⁵ Nistor 1991, p. 68.

²⁷⁶ Turczynski 1993, pp. 75-76, Hausleitner 2001, p. 36.

²⁷⁷ Iacobescu 1993, p. 299.

theologians such as Eugen Hacman, who studied in Vienna²⁷⁸ and went down in history as the Bukovinian bishop who achieved autonomy for the Orthodox Church of Bukovina. In 1844, Hacman had succeeded in divesting Lemberg of the inspection of Orthodox schools and thus secured direct access to at least part of the Church Fund's assets.²⁷⁹

The same Hacman led the deputation asking Emperor Franz Joseph in Olmütz/Olomouc for the creation of a separate Bukovinian crownland in 1848. In the 'Landespetition', equality for all denominations, independence from the Orthodox Archbishop of Karlowitz, self-management of the Church Fund and the creation of Romanian schools were requested.

As argued previously, Bukovinian peasant deputies distrusted the project because they feared that the abolition of serfdom in an autonomous Bukovina would not be enforced. The majority of landowners were Romanians and forced labor had been reduced only through the support of the district captains. When in 1849 Bukovina became a separate crownland by imperial decree, the distributed land originated in Church Fund property.²⁸⁰ In Olmütz, Bishop Hacman had offered Church Fund assets as a bargaining chip for autonomy. The first result of this deal was the establishment of an orthodox grammar school in Suczawa, which was also frequented by Catholics and Jews.²⁸¹

As it took until 1861 for Bukovina to be ultimately separated from Galicia, the Orthodox Church had needed all its energy to fend off Catholic claims on Church Fund means and therefore had not yet occupied itself with internal tensions between Romanian and Ruthenian national factions.²⁸² Simultaneously, Hacman had to oppose Transylvanian Bishop Andrei Şaguna, who was lobbying Vienna for the creation of a united Romanian Orthodox Church in Austria.²⁸³ Hacman argued that the Bukovinian Orthodox could not join since half of them were Ruthenians and not Romanians. When Şaguna succeeded in breaking away from the Serbian Orthodox Metropoly and an autocephalous Transylvanian Metropoly was established in 1864, Bukovinian Orthodox remained out. Only once the Empire was split into two political entities as a result of the 1867 Compromise between Austria and Hungary and Transylvania and Bukovina ended up on different sides of the demarcation line, the Romanian nationalist lobby for a united Romanian Orthodox Church within the borders of the Empire came to an end once and for all. In 1873, the Metropoly of Bukovina and Dalmatia was established and the Bishop of Bukovina was consequently promoted to the rank of Metropolitan. Since the new Metropolitan presided over the Orthodox communities in Vienna and Prague as well, his authority now comprised Cisleithanian Orthodoxy in its entirety.²⁸⁴

²⁷⁸ Turczynski 1993, p. 98.

²⁷⁹ Hausleitner 2006 (Der Griechisch-orientalische Religionsfonds etc.), p. 3.

²⁸⁰ Ibid.

²⁸¹ Turczynski 1993, p. 134.

²⁸² Hausleitner, 2006, (Der griechisch-orientalische Religionsfonds etc.), p. 3.

²⁸³ Hausleitner 2006 (*Eine wechselvolle Geschichte* etc.), p. 36.

²⁸⁴ Bihl, Wolfdieter, *Die Ruthenen, in: Die Habsburgermonarchie 1848-1918, Band III, 1. Teil: Die Völker des Reiches*, Wandruszka, Adam and Urbanitsch, Peter (ed), Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna 1973, 555-584, p. 568.

Meanwhile, the responsibility for Church Fund affairs had been transferred from the Ministry of Culture to the Ministry of Agriculture. The practical background for this decision was the fact that the Fund with its vast domains, arable plots and forests constituted an agricultural rather than a religious issue.²⁸⁵

Both the Galician administration and the Transylvanian Bishop had obviously wanted to benefit from the wealthy Bukovinian Church Fund. It continued to play a pivotal role in Habsburg Bukovina once these outside threats had disappeared and nationalists began to dominate the Bukovinian Orthodox Church. Since Romanian nationalists in the clerical hierarchy generally refused to assist Ruthenian initiatives (such as *Narodnyi Dim*, *Selyans'ka Kasa* and *Rus'ka Shkola*) financially, Ruthenian nationalists depended to a much larger degree on their peasant constituency for financial support than their Romanian adversaries. That said, Ruthenian organisations sometimes received financial aid for their activities from Vienna directly. In other cases, the Church Fund received orders from the government to render support to Ruthenian initiatives.²⁸⁶ The 80,500 hectares of farmland and forest distributed from Church Fund property between 1853 and 1907 - for which the receiving parties had to compensate the Fund - went to Ruthenian sepaekers and even to non-Orthodox Bukovinians.²⁸⁷ Meanwhile, Ruthenian nationalist protests in the Orthodox Church became louder. Metropolitan Morariu-Andrievici and his Romanian nationalist course intensified the Romanian-Ruthenian polarisation: When Morariu tried to abolish Ruthenian as the second official consistory language, Ruthenian nationalists demanded equal rights for Ruthenians in the Bukovinian Metropoly. This in turn led to accusations from Romanian activists who claimed that the Ruthenian faction wanted to get their hands on Church Fund property.²⁸⁸ This nationalist tug of war was put on hold by the outbreak of World War I and put to rest for good after the collapse of the Habsburg Empire. The Church Fund itself kept functioning until 21 April 1921, when it was restructured and incorporated in Romanian state structures.²⁸⁹

With a treasure trove like the Church Fund at stake, the relation between religion and nationalism was a hot topic in the Habsburg Bukovinian press. *Bukowinaer Rundschau* denied the Romanian character of the Fund and claimed it was 'international' (where 'a-national' would have been more suitable):

With the international money of the Romanian Church Fund - which has only a religious purpose, belongs to Romanians and Ruthenians alike and must serve both equally - the Romanisation of the land is carried out unflinchingly. With an odd logic, the purely religious

²⁸⁵ Nistor 1991, p. 194.

²⁸⁶ "We Bukovinian Ruthenians will remember forever with gratitude how our Emperor condescended some years ago to assign a considerable sum from lottery proceedings to our sacred 'National House', for we could not have imagined the glorification of this spiritual centre of ours without it. By courtesy of our Father-Emperor we have since 6 years a Gymnasium, where hundreds of our children learn about the Ruthenian people. Also ordered by our grandest Guardian-Emperor we receive already five years assistance from the orthodox Church Fund for the seminary of the 'National House'. *День уродин цїсарских*, Руска Рада, 02.04.1902, pp. 233-234.

²⁸⁷ Hausleitner 2006 (*Der griechisch-orientalische Religionsfonds* etc.), pp. 3-4.

²⁸⁸ Hausleitner 2001, pp. 54-55.

²⁸⁹ Irimescu, Gavril, *Prefața la inventarul fondului 'Administrația Fondului Bisericesc ort.rom. din Bucovina'*, DJAN Suceava, Suceava (year unknown).

*character of this fund is imputed with national importance and the Orthodox Church Fund is turned into the Romanian nationalist agitation fund.*²⁹⁰

Czernowitzer Tagblatt seemed more open to the nationalist logic which deemed the source of prosperity ‘Moldavian’ and therefore Romanian property, but was not so sure if the situation should remain unchanged:

*... the Romanians can point at the fact that the Orthodox Church Fund, whose rich resources endow the Orthodox Church, stems from Moldavian monasteries and that therefore it is Romanian property which constitutes the material basis of the Orthodox Church. It is a common human weakness to be reluctant to pass inherited property to others.*²⁹¹

Ruthenian nationalists asserted that if the Bukovinian Orthodox Church stuck to its pro-Romanian policies, all of Bukovina would soon convert to the Uniate Church and even maintained that, should this occur, the Consistory apparently did not care as long as Church Fund assets remained in place.²⁹²

As modernisation advanced in Europe and industrialisation changed landscapes in the Dual Monarchy, Bukovina and the firm grip of its Church Fund started to look increasingly like relics from an underdeveloped past. In 1895, *Bukowinaer Rundschau* blamed the economic misfortune of the land entirely on the Fund and appealed to the Minister of Agriculture to end its crushing power position, since it was the only way to bridge the development gap between the eastern and western part of Austria.²⁹³ In an editorial favourably comparing Galicia’s economic development to Bukovina’s, *Bukowinaer Nachrichten* held the vast and bureaucratically managed Church Fund responsible for the absence of investment initiatives and the necessary dynamism in Bukovina.²⁹⁴ Karl Emil Franzos was equally critical of the Fund and noted that its condition and administration were poor: the number of cattle had decreased significantly, poultry breeding had never been seriously attempted, wooden ploughs were still widely used and forests sold for deforestation turned into nothing but treeless meadows. Franzos also accused Church Fund authorities of misleading official inspections, claiming that ‘when high officials made their inspection tours, their routes were designed by people who eclipsed their role model, the late Potemkin’. After the first edition of his book had been published, Franzos was told by a former Governor of Bukovina, Myrbach-Rheinfeld: “The Augean stables of the monasteries, as you call them, have changed only by name and now have ‘Church Fund’ written on them”.²⁹⁵ The Fund that had once had seemed the pearl in the Bukovinian crown now had become a burden.

The plans of Transylvanian Orthodox Bishop Andrei Șaguna to unite all Romanian Orthodox believers of the Habsburg Empire under one roof had caused excitement among Romanian

²⁹⁰ *Der Fortschritt des Romanismus*, Bukowinaer Rundschau, 15.02.1887, p. 1.

²⁹¹ *Ruthenen und Rumänen*, Czernowitzer Tagblatt, 04.03.1903, p. 1.

²⁹² *Політика, а унія на Буковині*, Буковина, 01.08.1888, pp. 1-2.

²⁹³ *Der gr.-or. Religionsfonds*, Bukowinaer Rundschau, 15.03.1895, pp. 1-2.

²⁹⁴ *Galizien und Bukowina*, Bukowinaer Nachrichten, 25.10.1891, p. 1.

²⁹⁵ Franzos 1901, p. 240.

nationalists in Bukovina, but it had encountered less than lukewarm reactions from both the Bukovinian clerical and political authorities. After Şaguna's lobbyists had repeatedly petitioned in Vienna and after they had even addressed the Minister for Culture and Religion in October 1849, Bishop Hacman was more or less urged to present his views on the issue. He admitted that those who wanted to rid themselves 'of the despotic pressure exercised upon them and their brethren in Austria in intellectual, moral and material respect by the Serbian hierarchy' had won the sympathy of Bukovinian Romanians. On the other hand, Hacman feared that the Ruthenian Orthodox in Bukovina would be just as unhappy under a Romanian Metropoly as the Romanian nationalists had been so far under a Serbian one. Either way, Hacman saw himself confronted with the likely possibility of half of his diocese being discontented. His experience had taught him that dissatisfaction among the Bukovinian Orthodox had often led to massive conversions and he expected that if the situation were aggravated by additional nationalist elements, he might lose more than half of his believers.²⁹⁶

Governor Martina shared the Bishop's concerns and wondered whether the Bukovinian supporters of Şaguna's plans were sufficiently aware of the consequences these plans might have. In case a new Metropoly had a distinctive national flavor, which Martina clearly expected, a Ruthenian counter movement with similar claims was expected to emerge. Since Ruthenians were now considered to be the majority in the diocese, such developments would confront Romanian nationalists in Bukovina with unforeseen blowbacks. Prophetically, the governor advised those in favour of Şaguna's ambitions to handle the Ruthenian issue with care.²⁹⁷

The hierarchic affiliation of the Bukovinian Orthodox church had been a cumbersome topic from the first days of the Austrian annexation. First of all, the ties it had with the Iași Metropoly in Ottoman Moldavia had to be severed, upon which the Bukovinian diocese was subordinated to the Karlowitz Metropoly by an Imperial Resolution from 30 September 1783. The Dalmatian bishopric, established in 1808, was equally subordinated to Karlowitz from 1829. In the view of the Austrian authorities, these different branches were not meant to function as a fully integrated organisational unit, but merely allowed Karlowitz to exercise influence *in pure dogmaticis et mere spiritualibus*. Accordingly, the Bukovinian and Dalmatian bishops were not invited to Karlowitz synods and when they showed up nonetheless, they were denied the right to vote. Since this organisational structure was clearly a mere façade, in 1861 the Bukovinian clergy requested a formal separation and a promotion of the Bukovinian bishopric to the status of Metropoly. When the matter was brought to the attention of the 1864 Karlowitz synod, it was simply ignored and left undebated. The Emperor then decided to invoke his right as Patron of the Church to found new Metropolies, and, in view of the 1867 Compromise between Austria and Hungary, he planned an Orthodox

²⁹⁶ Smal-Stocki 1899, p. 128.

²⁹⁷ "Vom Standpunkte der hierländigen Verhältnisse beurtheilt, scheint die Theilnahme der Bukowinaer an der erwähnten Deputation mit Rücksicht an der Klugheit nicht im Einklang zu stehen, und es liegt außer allem Zweifel, daß die Romanen der Bukowina alle Ursachen haben, den. gr.n.un. Ruthenen gegenüber vor allem Rücksichten der Klugheit wirken zu lassen (...)". Landespräsident Martina, *Abschrift an das Ministerium des Innern des an Se Excellenz den Herrn Polizeiminister erstatteten Volksstimmungsberichtes des Bukowinaer Landes*, Vienna, 13 April 1862/ ANR, Fond 'Guvernământul Bucovinei', mapa 86/3.

Metropoly for the whole of Austria with its see in Czernowitz. In spite of protests by Dalmatian parliamentarians, who objected to the 'Romanian-Ruthenian' character of the new Metropoly and who maintained that such a decision could not be taken without prior approval by the Orthodox Church authorities, the Metropoly of Bukovina and Dalmatia was established in 1873.²⁹⁸ In the process, the Governor's Office in Czernowitz had played a mediating role between Vienna and the church authorities in Bukovina. For instance, Governor Myrbach-Rheinfeld had requested the Emperor in 1870 to receive an Orthodox delegation from Bukovina advocating Church autonomy.²⁹⁹ Bishop Hacman had also done his share to create goodwill at the Imperial Court. The decision by Hacman and his consistory to donate one million guilders to the Austrian efforts in the Austro-Sardinian War in 1859 had been gratefully accepted by the Emperor.³⁰⁰

Most post-Habsburg assessments of the establishment of the Church Fund, including those by Romanian analysts, are generally positive. True to form, Iacobescu argues that closing a large number of monasteries had been 'anti-Romanian', since these monasteries could no longer offer shelter to 'Romanian resistance from the other side of the mountains'. Furthermore he objects against the 'denationalisation and exploitation' which he claims took place after the Fund was placed under the care of Lemberg, but he acknowledges the decent Josephinist intentions at the root of the reforms.³⁰¹ Not surprisingly, Habsburg-nostalgic Kapri deemed the church reform one of the most important, if not the most important condition *tout court* for cultural and material development of the region.³⁰² In 1941, Nicolae Tcaciuc-Albu appreciated the Fund as 'the strongest fortress of Romanianness throughout Austrian domination' and went on to claim, rather contrary to the Habsburg era sources quoted above, that 'the good management of forests and estates of the fund exerted a beneficent influence on the material life of the residents and served as a role model for other countries'.³⁰³ More recently, Ceaușu commented that 'many of the modernising changes realised in Bukovina under the impact of Josephinism would only be introduced in the Romanian principalities much later, in the second half of the nineteenth century, in another time and another historical context'.³⁰⁴ Both the analyses by Tcaciuc-Albu and Ceaușu bear the strong imprint of retrospective comparison of asynchronous developments in what would later become Greater-

²⁹⁸ Haus der Abgeordneten, *Interpellation von Abg. Ljubiša und Genossen/ Errichtung einer serbisch-rumänischen Metropole*, 1871-1873/7. Session, 11 March 1873, kaiserlich-königliche Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, Vienna 1873, pp. 1387-1388/ Haus der Abgeordneten, *Minister Ritter von Stremayr zur Interpellation von Abg. Ljubiša und Genossen/ Errichtung einer serbisch-rumänischen Metropole*, 1871-1873/7. Session, 23 April 1873, kaiserlich-königliche Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, Vienna 1873, pp. 1864-1865.

²⁹⁹ Minister für Cultus und Unterricht, *Letter to Governor regarding Bukovinian Church autonomy*, no. 382, 19 January 1870/ DACHO, Viddil 1, Fond 3, Opis 1, spr. 3431.

³⁰⁰ Șafran 1939, p. 155.

³⁰¹ Iacobescu 1993, pp. 196 and 299.

³⁰² Kapri 1974, pp. 64-72.

³⁰³ Tcaciuc-Albu, N., *Bucovina de Nord 28 iunie 1940 - 28 iunie 1941*, author's edition, Sibiu 1941, p. 27.

³⁰⁴ Ceaușu, Mihai Ștefan, *Bucovina habsburgică de la anexare la Congresul de la Viena: iosefinism și postiosefinism, 1774-1815*, Fundația Academică 'A.D. Xenopol', Iași 1998, p. 232.

Romania. In other words, both authors compared the Austrian Bukovinian Church Fund to similar institutions in the Romanian state.

R.W. Seton-Watson regarded the new Metropoly an accomplishment of the ambitious Bishop Hacman, but in the tradition of racial science of this time, he concluded that ‘the result was to accentuate the dangerous isolation in which this diminutive fragment of the [Romanian] race found itself amid the rising Slavic flood’.³⁰⁵ Contrary to what Seton-Watson suggested here, the writings by both Hacman and Martina show that they had been well aware of the ‘risks’ of a Bukovinian Metropoly indeed.

Clearly, autonomy in church affairs was limited by the power of the Emperor. From the start, Bukovinian Orthodox Church leaders had attempted to obtain the right to elect their own officials and to administer the Church Fund, but these requests had been refused by Vienna as they were seen contrary to the rights of the Throne. Further efforts to achieve these goals, including an interpellation by Romanian Bukovinian nationalists as late as 1918, fell on deaf ears in Vienna. The Bukovinian Metropoly could therefore only hope for more support from its new ruler, the King of Romania.³⁰⁶

2.4 Romanian and Ruthenian Nationalists and the Bukovinian Orthodox Church

Once the Bukovinian Orthodox Church had obtained its autonomous status, it inevitably became the arena for competing Romanian and Ruthenian nationalists. The figure of Bishop Hacman remained highly controversial. When he died in Vienna in 1873 just before he was to be promoted to the rank of Metropolitan, the Vienna-based Romanian nationalist paper *Albina* commented in an obituary: “A foreign name he bore, foreigners he served, in a foreign land he died” (*Nume străin a purtat, străinilor le-a servit, în străinătate a murit*).³⁰⁷ In Ruthenian nationalist circles, Hacman with his Slavic background (and who, anachronistically, was called a ‘Ukrainian bishop’ in later Ukrainian historiography)³⁰⁸ was revered as ‘an unforgettable labourer in the vineyard of the Lord’, with ‘his name written in gold in the history of the Bukovinian Orthodox Church’.³⁰⁹ Hacman was well aware of the growing

³⁰⁵ Seton-Watson, Robert William, *History of the Roumanians - from Roman Times to Completion of Unity*, University Press, Cambridge 1934, p. 558.

³⁰⁶ Metropoly of Bukovina, *Memorandum to King Ferdinand*, Cernăuți 1920/ DJAN Suceava, Fond ‘Mitropolia Bucovinei’, secția ‘Diverse’, dosar 2296.

³⁰⁷ Nistor 1991, pp. 196-197.

³⁰⁸ See for instance Zhukovs'kyi 1993, p. 29.

³⁰⁹ Его имя золотими буквами ясныть въ исторіи православной церкви Буковины. Громадныя заслуги его для ея блага долають незабвеннымъ этого труженника въ виноградникъ Господнемъ и память его живеть въ сердцахъ всѣхъ вѣрныхъ Буковинцевъ. Сынъ бѣднаго крестьянна родился онъ въ деревнѣ Васловцахъ, въ Буковинѣ, 1793 года, изъ русскихъ родителей. Vorobkevych, Yevgeniy, *Kratkiy istorichesko-statisticheskiy poglyad na hr. pravosl. Archieparchiyu Bukovinsko-Dalmatinskuyu*, Stavropigia, Lemberg 1893, p. 14.

danger which nationalism posed for his church. He presented his views in a missive in 1865:

*The national frictions and conflicts which have affected the Orthodox Church in Austria for fourteen years already, and which threaten to tear the cord of their external unity, have not remained without a profound impression on the two different national elements of the Bukovinian diocese. The national ego here is just as vivid now as elsewhere, naturally for Ruthenians and Romanians alike.*³¹⁰

The newly created Bukovinian Metropoly was soon confronted with Romanian-Ruthenian nationalist bickering. Far from leaving church matters in church, dissatisfied parties tried to involve the Austrian authorities, both local and central. In 1881, the Ruthenian political association 'Russkaya Rada' complained to the Governor about the 'denationalisation' of Ruthenians within the Orthodox Church, which they claimed was condoned by the Metropolitan administration, and asked for equal treatment.³¹¹

The first Governor of Bukovina to actually get entrapped in nationalist controversies in the Bukovinian Orthodox Church was Anton Pace Count von Friedensberg. Although the local German-language press regarded him as 'an objective and fair man, capable of doing justice to the legitimate needs of the different stakeholders within the framework of the land's interests',³¹² it took only a few months for the new governor to get into conflict with Romanian nationalist factions. The Church Congress of 1891, organised upon request of Metropolitan Morariu-Andrievici and meant to revise certain issues established at the 1871 Congress, was officially opened on 1 October 1891. The governor was present at the opening ceremony, not only in his capacity as Governor of Bukovina but also as an Imperial observer. It remains opaque how the situation escalated exactly, but Morariu's opening remarks were made in Romanian and translated for Pace. A translation mistake subsequently urged Pace to emphasise in his own address the importance of equal rights for Romanians and Ruthenians in the Church, whereupon Pace was attacked by Romanian nationalist deputy Zotta for not having replied in Romanian. On top of this, the governor and the metropolitan disagreed on the synodal structure in relation to the Romanian Orthodox Church outside of Bukovina. The debate deteriorated to such extent that the congress was postponed *sine die* and never convened again. Whereas *Bukowinaer Rundschau* failed to see why the session had not been held in German, since this language would have been understood by all and would have had a more neutral character which would have pleased the Ruthenian-language participants, Romanian nationalists saw the events as a declaration of war. They accused the governor of having planned a deliberate confrontation in order to sabotage Morariu's congress.³¹³ Once Bukovina had joined Greater-Romania, the Bukovinian metropoly once again tried to initiate a Congress and, easily adjusting its tone of voice to the new situation, blamed the Habsburg

³¹⁰ Smal-Stocki 1899, p. 128.

³¹¹ Russkaya Rada, *Letter to the Governor's Office*, 16 May 1881/ DACHO, Viddil 1, Fond 3, Opis 1, spr. 4533.

³¹² *Unser neuer Landespräsident*, *Bukowinaer Rundschau*, 11.01.1891, p. 1.

³¹³ *Chauvinismus?* *Bukowinaer Rundschau*, 04.10.1891, pp. 1-2/ Nistor 1991, pp. 276-277.

authorities, 'having little sympathy and consideration for the the Romanian (!) Orthodox Church in Bukovina' for dissolving the earlier Congress 'out of petty and external reasons' (*din cauze meschine și externe*).³¹⁴

By February 1892, relations between Governor Pace and the Romanian nationalists were so toxic that regional diet President Wassilko, all members of the Romanian aristocracy as well as the Metropolitan refused to attend Pace's annual ball. Sixteen non-Romanian diet members saw an opportunity to rid themselves of the dominant Romanian aristocrats and resigned, thus forcing new elections. However, these did not result in a new and stable majority and when two Ruthenian Diet members decided to join the Romanian aristocrats, the latter had obtained a majority once more. Habsburg authorities decided that peace had to be restored and to this end, Governor Pace was relieved from his duties.³¹⁵

A second governor to run afoul of the leaders of the Bukovinian Orthodox Church was Friedrich Baron Bourguignon-Baumberg. Bourguignon was appointed governor in a time when Romanian nationalists were at odds with the Church, since they deemed Metropolitan Czuperkowicz too lenient to Ruthenian demands. Demonstrations against Czuperkowicz even led to court cases with subsequent convictions. High Church functionaries who sympathised with the nationalists grumbled. At the same time, Austrian authorities both in Vienna and in Bukovina struggled with a new development: Romanian nationalists in Bukovina had started to use the blue-yellow-red tricolour, claiming that this colour combination represented all ethnic Romanians. The Habsburg authorities, however, linked the flag exclusively to the Romanian state and regarded its presence on Austrian soil as a provocation and a symbol of disloyalty. Its use was banned in Bukovina and a lengthy discussion developed whether the tricolour reflected adherence to the Romanian people or to the Romanian state.³¹⁶ Governor Bourguignon played an active role in this debate. As a result, Romanian nationalists perceived both Metropolitan Czuperkowicz and Governor Bourguignon as hostile to their cause.

The existing tensions reached a climax at the occasion of the sixty-ninth birthday of the Emperor, when a Bukovinian Orthodox Church delegation headed by the metropolitan called on Governor Bourguignon to convey their congratulations. Bourguignon accepted the good wishes but also addressed the sensitive issue of the tricolour, mentioning that Romanian priests as well as their families wore the tricolour and therewith the colours of a foreign nation. He added that, according to an old proverb, this was not true love (*"Und das ist, wie ein alter Spruch sagt, die wahre Liebe nicht"*). Metropolitan Czuperkowicz did not reply to these remarks, which in the eyes of Romanian nationalists left them 'stigmatised'. In periodicals such as *Patria* they seized the opportunity to denounce the governor.³¹⁷ A pamphlet against Bourguignon was later deemed offending enough to have its author, Transylvanian Valeriu Braniște, expelled from Bukovina:

³¹⁴ Metropoly of Bukovina, *Memorandum to King Ferdinand*, Cernăuți 1920/ DJAN Suceava, Fond 'Mitropolia Bucovinei' secția 'Diverse', dosar 2296.

³¹⁵ Corbea-Hoisie 2005, pp. 89-90.

³¹⁶ See for instance the informative, though one-sided Bălan, Teodor, *Lupta pentru tricolor. Un capitol din istoria politică a Bucovinei, 1898-1904*, Editura Academiei Române, Bucharest 2008.

³¹⁷ Bălan 2008, pp. 121-122.

*A mathematical zero embodied in a human form; (...) amorphous as a paragraph of Austrian law. (...) Granting Bourguignon the title of honorary citizen equals permitting the most disgusting form of servility.*³¹⁸

Clerics from Kimpolung and Gurahumora sent protest telegrams to the Emperor and the editors of *Deșteptarea* exhausted themselves to such extent that they found their periodical censored because of ‘insults, taunts false statements or misrepresentations of facts against the government and against the person of the governor’.³¹⁹ Manifestations were organised by clerics who claimed to use the opportunity only to reconfirm their loyalty to the Throne, but who found their initiatives under scrutiny by the same governor they rallied against. Consequently, Romanian nationalists took their discontent to the Austrian Parliament and bitterly complained about the accusations they had faced. They emphasised the Church’s traditional loyalty, they mentioned in this context the substantial donation from the Church to Austria’s latest war efforts and lamented the difficulties experienced by the initiators of the ‘loyalty meetings’.³²⁰ The matter was put to rest after Bourguignon had written to the Bukovinian Orthodox Consistory, insisting that in his address he had specifically stressed the ‘always loyal and patriotic conduct’ (*die stets loyale und patriotische Haltung*) of the Consistory and that his remarks about the use of the tricolour were not to be interpreted as an accusation of disloyalty, but only as ‘a solemn warning’ (*eine eindringliche Warnung*). Bourguignon furthermore announced that he had discontinued the investigations regarding the protest meetings as well as investigations into the use of the tricolour in families of Romanian nationalist clerics³²¹. Although it seems unlikely that Governor Bourguignon kowtowed to his nationalist adversaries of his own volition, the sting was taken out of the tense relationship between Romanian nationalists and the local Austrian government. On the other hand, the tricolour question had now gained momentum and would demand more attention than it had hitherto.

Bourguignon operated more carefully from then on. He did not hesitate to underline the ‘loyalty and patriotism of all peoples in Bukovina’³²² and was - obviously not in Romanian nationalist circles - generally appreciated for the way he supported Ruthenian emancipation within the Orthodox Church. *Czernowitzer Presse* attributed the appointment of two Ruthenian consistorial councils and two Ruthenian theology professors to Bourguignon’s

³¹⁸ “(...) O nulă matematică întrupată în chip de om; (...) amorf ca un paragraf de lege austriac: (...) A-l numi cive de onorar pe Bourguignon, e a sancționa cea mai grețoasă formă a servilismului”, *Patria*, 362/19.12.1899.

³¹⁹ Regional Criminal Court, *Motivation for censoring Deșteptarea*, No. 17, 1899, 20 September 1899/ DACHO, Viddil 1, Fond 3, Opis 1, spr. 7676.

³²⁰ Haus der Abgeordneten, *Interpellation des Abg. Popovici und Genossen an Ihre Excellenzen den Herrn Minister des Innern und den Herrn Leiter des Ministeriums für Cultus und Unterricht, betreffend das Vorgehen des Herrn Landespräsidenten Baron Bourguignon gegen den Bukowinaer rumänischen Clerus*, 1899-1900/ 16th Session, 16 November 1899, kaiserlich-königliche Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, Vienna 1899, pp. 922-923.

³²¹ Governor Bourguignon, *Bericht an das hochwürdigste gr. or. erzbischöfliche Consistorium*, Z. 2152, 1900/ ANR, Fond ‘Guvernământul Bucovinei’, MI, dosar 84/1.

³²² “(...) daß nämlich meiner Überzeugung nach, sämtliche Volksstämme in der Bukowina mit Bezug auf ihre Kaiserstreue und Vaterlandsliebe nichts zu wünschen übrig lassen (...)”. *Stenographische Protokolle des Landtages*, Bukowinaer Post, 1332, 31.07.1902.

efforts³²³ and *Bukowinaer Rundschau* opined that in this way, Bourguignon had broken ground for reconciliation between Romanians and Ruthenians.³²⁴ Upon Bourguignon's transfer from Czernowitz in 1903, *Czernowitzer Tagblatt* characterised the Bourguignon era as 'one of the happiest in the history of Bukovina'³²⁵. After his passing in 1907, *Tagblatt* honoured the former governor as 'one of Bukovina's best governors', but also mentioned his lack of diplomacy.³²⁶

In Orthodox Church matters, the scorn of Romanian nationalists was not limited to representatives of the Austrian state alone. Leaders of the Bukovinian Orthodox Church who preferred to steer clear of nationalist quarrels and who strove to maintain cordial relations with Vienna rather than to support nationalist claims on Church and crownland soon became targets for those who considered them traitors. Since a considerable number of Orthodox priests sympathised with the nationalists, ironically, those same church leaders often had to play the role of mediators between the Romanian nationalists and Viennese authorities in order to keep the peace. In his years in office, Bishop Hacman had his windows smashed by Romanian nationalists for opposing their wish for unification of the Bukovinian and Transylvanian Orthodox Churches.³²⁷ On the other hand, when clerics complained to Hacman that they had been accused of disloyalty by Austrian officials as was the case in 1866, the Bishop had to verify these rumours. To the governor, the Bishop insisted that such accusations were unacceptable, but when the Governor's Office replied that the cases mentioned by the Bishop were completely unknown, Hacman could only return to those who had complained to him in the first place to demand further loyalty and gratitude to the Austrian state, while noting that 'only the pulse of Austria had resuscitated Bukovina' and that 'this land and [that] especially its Orthodox clergy owed all it was as well as its material and spiritual welfare only to Austria, Austria's Most Serene Imperial house and to its high government'.³²⁸

An incident with more serious implications occurred in 1899 at the Czernowitz railway station, where Metropolitan Czuperkowicz prepared for a visit to Vienna. The trip had been suggested by Governor Bourguignon, who had assessed the tense situation in Bukovina - following the appointment of two Ruthenians in the Orthodox Consistory and two more at the theological faculty - as serious enough to advise the Metropolitan not to attend church services and diet sessions and moreover, to leave Czernowitz for a while. When on 17 April 1899 Czuperkowicz was about to board his train, he ran into a Romanian nationalist group of students who started to yell 'Pereat!' at him. In the following consternation, the Metropolitan's

³²³ *Durch Kampf zum Siege*, Czernowitzer Presse, 01.02.1900, p. 1.

³²⁴ *Die Ruthenen im gr-or. Consistorium*, Bukowinaer Rundschau, 29.01.1899, p.1.

³²⁵ *Die Aera Bourguignon*, Czernowitzer Tagblatt, 05.04.1903, p. 1.

³²⁶ *Baron Friedrich Bourguignon †*, Czernowitzer Tagblatt, 27.09.1907, p. 1.

³²⁷ Smal-Stocki 1906, p. 89.

³²⁸ "(...) daß nur der Pulsschlag Österreichs die Bukowina belebt hat und dieses Land, so wie insbesondere der gr. or. Klerus desselben, das was sie sind und zwar ihre bessere materielle und geistliche Existenz und Wohlfahrt nur Österreich, Österreichs allerdurchlauchtigsten Kaiserhause und Österreichs hoher Regierung zu verdanken haben (...)". Hacman, Bisop Eugenie, *Circulär an den ehrwürdigen Klerus der Bukowiner Diözese*, 2 November 1866/ DJAN Suceava, Fond 'Mitropolia Bucovinei', secția 'Diverse', dosar 1582.

daughter Aglaia Cosovici hit one of the students with an umbrella, upon which the student ‘defended himself’ with a walking stick, causing Mrs Cosovici to suffer minor injuries. The student was arrested and locked up for several hours.³²⁹

In Vienna, the news from Czernowitz caused anxiety, first and foremost because of the way Governor Bourguignon had handled the delicate situation. The Minister of Internal Affairs reproached the governor for having advised the Metropolitan to make himself scarce instead of having protected him sufficiently. The fact that Bourguignon had known about Czuperkowicz’ departure by train and yet had not taken adequate measures to guarantee his safety at the railway station was taken badly. Moreover, the student in question should have been held in custody and appropriate measures should have been taken against the others, since their ‘Pereat’ cries constituted an offense under Austrian law.³³⁰ In order to prevent further incidents, Bourguignon instructed his Bukovinian district captains to forbid new rallies and to appeal to the public to abstain from disruptive actions.³³¹ Under clear pressure from Vienna, the students involved in the incident were fined while one of them was ordered to leave Bukovina since he was a Hungarian citizen. On top of this, the dean of the Czernowitz University expelled them for a limited period of time.³³² Metropolitan Czuperkowicz eventually returned to Czernowitz in July 1899, but relations between Romanian nationalist clerics and their leader remained strained: in his address at the occasion of the inauguration of the new Emperor’s Jubilee Church in Lukawetz in October of that same year, Czuperkowicz praised his Ruthenian priests, called himself a good Romanian as well as a good Austrian and openly condemned the disloyalty and animosity he had experienced from the side of Romanian nationalist clergyfolk. As was to be expected, the speech immediately found its way into the local press.³³³

In Bukovina, especially the German-language press was disquieted by the fact that Romanian and Ruthenian nationalists had chosen the Bukovinian Orthodox Church as their battlefield. When Metropolitan Morariu-Andrievici created unrest with his first ‘Apology’ in 1891, *Bukowinaer Nachrichten* noted that ‘priesthood can barely be combined with national leadership’ and that ‘the task of the pastor is complicated significantly when he involves himself in worldly matters’. *Nachrichten* stressed that the Orthodox Church did not represent a particular nation, but a religion only.³³⁴ *Bukowinaer Post* held similar views in 1897:

³²⁹ Bălan 2008, pp. 56-57.

³³⁰ *Minister Thun to Governor Bourguignon*, 3059 MI, 24 April 1899/ DACHO, Viddil 1, Fond 3, Opis 1, spr. 7664.

³³¹ Bukowiner k.k. Landespräsidium, *Der k.k. Landespräsident an alle Herrn k.k. Bezirkshauptmänner*, No. 1666 Präs, 30 April 1899/ DACHO, Viddil 1, Fond 3, Opis 1, spr. 7664.

³³² Bălan 2008, pp. 68-83.

³³³ N.N., *Die gr.-or. Kirchenfrage in der Bukowina und die Jungruthenen (Kritische Beleuchtung der Brochure: “Beitrag zur kirchlichen Frage in der Bukowina. Zwei zeitgemäße Artikel vom Reichsratabgeordneten Hierotheus Pihuliak und einem gr.-or. ruthenischen Priester”)*, Bukowinaer Vereinsdruckerei, Czernowitz 1906, p. 93.

³³⁴ *In stiller Zeit*, Bukowinaer Nachrichten, 07.05.1891, p. 1.

*The national idea has its full rights in this land. But the Church must behold its primary function in maintaining the noble good of religion entrusted upon it pure and clear, in safeguarding the faith for the believers, in teaching it to them and in encouraging them, irrespective whether they speak Romanian or Ruthenian as their mother tongue and whether they express their devotion in one language or the other.*³³⁵

Here as well as in the majority of contemporary periodicals without a clear nationalist agenda of their own, references to ‘the national idea’ and ‘national rights’ as such were carefully chosen. Nationalist influences or activities were regularly criticised, but nationalism as such was mostly approached as a natural phenomenon. In 1899, *Bukowinaer Rundschau* dryly commented that ‘race and language have shown to be stronger than faith, proof once again that these days nationality is superior to religion’.³³⁶ However, it was not the German-language press alone that worried about the bad blood between Ruthenian and Romanian nationalists. Ruthenian *Priyatel’* commented in 1903 that the only remaining source of discontent between the two was the church question and especially the advocates from both parties. Romanian aristocrats and clerics were blamed for depicting Ruthenians as ‘the evil spirits of Bukovina’ and ‘the reason for the hardships suffered by the Romanians’. They were accused of acting only to divert the attention from their own dubious activities. Then again, Ruthenian nationalists were not considered much better with their agitation against Romanian clerics, presenting them as ‘some kind of one-eyed Ruthenoids’ (*якісь однооки Русиноїди*) with whom it was dangerous even to talk.³³⁷

As early as 1870, Orthodox priest Hrihoriy Vorobkevych had noted in his diary that relations between in Romanians and Ruthenians in Bukovina were ‘unbearable’, especially in the towns and that although the population wanted to live in harmony, the intellectuals would not let them be and encouraged them to fight.³³⁸ By 1908, the editor of *Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung* opined that in the Orthodox Consistory with its staff being both Romanian and Ruthenian ‘as far as is known in public’, a collegial and fraternal spirit prevailed. He added that ‘in the broad masses of both races absolutely no need for religious disputes existed’. The expectation was that, with regard to what was considered ‘the only legitimate complaint’, a lack of new clerical blood at the Ruthenian side, the issue would be resolved in a few years time by the growing number of Ruthenian-speaking students at the theology faculty.³³⁹

In the public eye, the Church itself mostly remained the dignified outsider in the heat of the nationalist shouting match and protested only in specific cases. A 1898 campaign speech by Young-Ruthenian deputy Hierotheus Pihuliak was one of these occasions. The consistory turned to the district attorney with a request to start criminal proceedings against Pihuliak after he had pointed at Romanising priests within the Bukovinian Orthodox Church. Yet, the district attorney’s office argued that by accusing certain members of the Church, Pihuliak had in fact not offended the Church as a whole and dismissed the case. An explanatory letter by

³³⁵ *50 Jahre Priester*, Bukowinaer Post, 07.11.1897, p. 1.

³³⁶ *Die Ruthenen im gr-or. Consistorium*, Bukowinaer Rundschau, 2938, 29.01.1899, p. 1.

³³⁷ *Русини і Румуни на Вуковині*, Приятель, 08.02.1903, p. 3.

³³⁸ As quoted in Osatschuk 2008, p. 149.

³³⁹ *Ein müssiger Wettkampf*, Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung, 14.05.1908, p. 1.

Pihuliak to the metropolitan stating that his comments had not been intended as a personal attack on the latter had no effect: the Consistory now turned to the Senior Public Prosecutor's office in Lemberg.³⁴⁰ However, since the competent committee of Bukovina's regional Diet refused to lift Pihuliak's parliamentary immunity, further action was blocked and the situation was defused.³⁴¹

In 1911, the clerical journal *Viitoriul* published a protest when Romanian nationalist politician Aurel Onciul had proclaimed that 'in the absence of a national tradition, the Orthodox Church in Bukovina had delivered much less than might have been expected for the national culture', and that 'by tradition the Orthodox Church was a heavy vehicle alien to national aspirations.' Moreover, Onciul had stated that in the case of the Romanians, the Church had always been a culturally indifferent, in many respects inhibitory factor', while 'the country priest loved peace and a good income while the language in which he delivered the sermon did not really matter to him'.³⁴² By that time the discussions about a church split fully absorbed *Viitoriul* and its editors sighed:

*Only from 1890 onward we started to understand that being Orthodox yet did not imply being national. That is why so far Ruthenians were allowed to be in the Metropolitan See as well, seemingly without causing us any damage.*³⁴³

While the Church tried to explain to the readers of *Viitoriul* that they had been Orthodox before the nationality question appeared, Ruthenian-language *Nova Bukovyna* deemed it necessary to emphasise that one did not need to be Romanian in order to be Orthodox. It was argued that there is no such thing as a national religion and that there are obviously Protestant, Catholic and Calvinist Germans as well as Orthodox and Uniate Romanians and Ruthenians. Those Vlachs, *Nova Bukovyna* continued, now called themselves 'Romanians' and, although they had used the Cyrillic alphabet until recently, they now claimed that in spite of their different language, Ruthenians were actually Romanians.³⁴⁴

Metropolitan Morariu-Andrievici had achieved numerous results in the field of education and printing: he was responsible for the first Romanian-language school books, he established a printing office on the Metropolitan See and founded the religious periodical *Candela*,³⁴⁵ which would appear until well into the 1940s. However, he was also responsible for

³⁴⁰ Staatsanwalt, k.k., *Note an das löbliche bukowinaer k.k. Landespräsidium (regarding complaints by the Orthodox Consistory because of a speech by Pihuliak)*, Czernowitz, 15 July 1898 and Pihuliak, Hierotheus, *response and apology to the Archbishop*, Czernowitz, 25 February 1899/ DACHO, Viddil 1, Fond 3, Opis 1, spr. 7286.

³⁴¹ Hausleitner 2001, p. 65.

³⁴² *Să ne strângem rândurile*, *Viitoriul*, 3, 01.02.1911, p. 14, in reaction to comments made by Aurel Onciul in 'Die Wahrheit' from 05.02.1911.

³⁴³ *Încă ceva despre chestia bisericască*, *Viitoriul*, 8-9-10, 27.05.1913, p. 63.

³⁴⁴ *Чи є волоска віра?* *Нова Буковина*, 16.06.1912, pp. 1-2.

³⁴⁵ In spite of Morariu's efforts to abolish Ruthenian as the second official language of the Church, *Candela* was bilingual. Turczynski regarded its establishment as an important attempt to create a continuous connection between the Romanian and Ruthenian clergy. Turczynski 1993, p. 173.

introducing nationalist disputes in the realm of the Bukovinian Orthodox Church. Shortly after Morariu's installation as metropolitan, the 1880 general census had caused panic among Romanian nationalists in the crownland, since, contrary to their expectations, 42% of the population had indicated Ruthenian as their language of conversation.³⁴⁶ From the Ruthenian side, it was the Young-Ruthenians who tried to enlarge their political influence by instrumentalising the Orthodox Church. Their intentions were often distrusted, and not by their Romanian adversaries alone. *Bukowinaer Post* accused them of claiming positions in the Church only for their personal vanity and glory, disguised as nationalism.³⁴⁷ In a rather peculiar and possibly fictional 'conversation with a lady who had only been in Bukovina for a short time' and who remained anonymous, *Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung* ventured that 'the Young-Ruthenian efforts within the Orthodox Church of Bukovina were actually efforts against it' while 'the Orthodox Church in Bukovina was by its very nature Old-Moldavian or Byzantine' and 'its intrusion or even its conquest by Young-Ruthenians would have its destruction as a direct and inevitable effect' and as such 'the last remnants of old Bukovinian culture would be destroyed'.³⁴⁸

Meanwhile, Romanian nationalists sought the support of Old-Ruthenians in order to oppose Young-Ruthenian ambitions. By and large, group identification was not made any easier. First, nationalism was introduced in the formerly a-national Church, and in order to counter one Ruthenian faction, Romanian nationalists now looked for support from the other. An illustration of the complicated situation was provided by Governor Goëss, who qualified a candidate for the position of priest in Czernowitz as a 'national agitator and instigator of the Romanian/Old-Ruthenian orientation'.³⁴⁹ Moreover, for Romanian nationalists, their alliance with the Old-Ruthenians - whose influence was waning anyway - proved to be a burden rather than a blessing: as a result of this alliance, Ruthenian Orthodox believers converted to the Uniate Church.³⁵⁰ The Romanian trade cooperative - founded in 1905 - went out of business in 1909 partly because a loan to the Old-Ruthenians had not been paid back.³⁵¹ On top of this, Austrian authorities were less than happy with the lenient stance the Bukovinian Orthodox generally took regarding the activities of Old-Ruthenian priests. Governor Regner-Bleyleben wrote to Vienna in 1910:

I cannot help but take this opportunity to point out that the Orthodox Archbishop's Consistory in Czernowitz is in most cases not inclined to oppose Old-Ruthenian priests with the necessary focus and energy, even when they doubtlessly harbour Russophile inclinations, this apparently

³⁴⁶ Hausleitner 2006, *Der Griechisch-orientalische Religionsfonds* etc, pp. 5-6.

³⁴⁷ *Aus dem jungruthenischen Lager – II*, *Bukowinaer Post*, 08.03.1896, pp. 1-2.

³⁴⁸ *Gespräch mit einem Fremden*, *Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung*, 11.04.1909, pp. 1-2.

³⁴⁹ "Der an erster Stelle vorgeschlagene Pfarrer und Bezirkspriester Ioan Homiuca, in Kotzman wird von dem dortigen Bezirkshauptmann mit dem Berichte vom 15. December 1895 Z. 319 AV als ein nationaler Hetzer und Wühler u. zw. im Sinne der altruthenisch-rumänischen Richtung geschildert". Landespräsident Goëss, *Report to Minister for Culture and Education on the appointment of a priest in Czernowitz*, Z. 4455 Präs, February 1896/ DACHO, Viddil 1, Fond 3, Opis 1, spr. 6695.

³⁵⁰ Turczynski 1993, p. 174.

³⁵¹ Hausleitner 2006, *Der Griechisch-orientalische Religionsfonds* etc, p. 8.

*in order not to rob itself of the valuable assistance of Old-Ruthenians against the aspirations of Young-Ruthenians.*³⁵²

The idea of a church split was officially ventilated for the first time on 2 February 1891, when the Young-Ruthenian political association 'Ruska Rada' presented a twelve-point programme in which it also demanded an equal division of appointments between Ruthenians and Romanians in both the Consistory and the seminary and furthermore Ruthenian priests for Ruthenian villages.³⁵³ Against the backdrop of the growing number of Ruthenians counted in government censuses, Young-Ruthenian ambitions were often mistrusted and seen as detrimental to a harmonious Bukovinian society. Once the question of a church split gained momentum, *Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung* wondered how Young-Ruthenians could claim their numbers were shrinking because of Romanisation when all data implied the opposite. Between the lines, the *Allgemeine* showed to have adopted a national view on Church matters, too, when it argued that Ruthenians were not entitled to half of the Church because they had hardly enriched it with any 'national assets' (*Nationalvermögen*). Surely, the wealth of the Church was based on ancient Moldavian monastery property - and thus, *CzAZ* echoed Romanian nationalist reasoning, it fell under Romanian input. The general worry was that the debate would open 'Pandora's box' and destroy what was viewed as a 'bulwark of the indigenous population'.³⁵⁴ Rather than an ardent desire of the 'nationally conscious' part of the Ruthenian population, the project seemed a personal venture of Young-Ruthenian Pihuliak, who only aimed at winning his affiliates as many influential positions in the Church hierarchy as possible.³⁵⁵

On numerous occasions, Pihuliak's popular backing and the way he mobilised his supporters were called into question. When Pihuliak picketed the courtyard of the Metropolitan residence in 1903 in protest of Metropolitan Repta's refusal to discuss Ruthenian Church matters with Ruthenian nationalist politicians, Repta mentioned in his report to the Governor that the peasants joining Pihuliak 'had been gathered in the well known way and [were] brought to him [Repta]'.³⁵⁶ A similar, but obviously less than impartial accusation was made by the anonymous 'Romanian Orthodox priest' in his pamphlet about the Church question and the role of the Young-Ruthenians:

The Reverend Archbishop had visited all the congregations of the Kotzman Protopresbyterate and had had the opportunity to get acquainted first-hand with the mood of the Ruthenian

³⁵² "Ich kann auch nicht umhin, bei dieser Gelegenheit darauf hinzuweisen, dass das gr. or. erzbischöfliche Konsistorium in Czernowitz in den meisten Fällen nicht mit der erforderlichen Schärfe und Energie gegen altruthenische Priester, selbst wenn diese zweifellos russophilen Tendenzen huldigen, aufzutreten geneigt ist und zwar offenbar aus dem Grunde, um sich nicht der wertvollen Mithilfe der Altruthenen gegenüber den Aspirationen der Jungruthenen zu berauben". Regner-Bleyleben, Baron Oktavian, *Abschrift (vertraulich)*, Zl. 3829, 2 January 1910/ ANR, Fond 'Guvernământul Bucovinei', MCÎ I/7, pp. 103-108, p. 107.

³⁵³ Osatschuk 2008, p. 154.

³⁵⁴ *Ostern*, *Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung*, 15.04.1906, pp. 1-2.

³⁵⁵ *Die gr.-or. Kirchenfrage*, *Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung*, 30.11.1906, p. 1.

³⁵⁶ 'mit den bekannten Mitteln zusammengebrachten und zu mir geführten Bauernschaft'. Repta, Vladimir Metropolitan von, *Abschrift eines Schreibens an den Landespräsidenten*, 144/Präs, 12 November 1904, ANR, Fond 'Guvernământul Bucovinei', MCÎ CXXXI/4.

people. The people by and large had not only received him with the respect due to a Leader of the Church because of his high position, but also with joy and true love. In several communities, conscious and non-conscious Young-Ruthenian factionists had presented the Most Reverend gentleman with petitions related to the creation of a Ruthenian diocese. But when people in the respective community were asked at the end of the visit if they had any requests to put forward, they submitted requests of a local nature, which, as they thought, had already been included in the presented documents. It turned out that the poor people had been misled by their leaders at the collection of signatures for the petitions to be handed to the Archbishop.³⁵⁷

In *Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung*, Tichon Hacman, priest in Okna, related how Pihuliak actively sent questionnaires to all Ruthenian teachers in order to gather incriminating evidence against Romanian priests.³⁵⁸ Indeed, Pihuliak and those who shared his views were well aware of how controversial their Church-dividing plans were in the broader circles of Bukovinian society. Though *Rus'ka Rada* dismissed negative comments in *Gazeta Bucovinei*, *Voința Poporului*, *Bukowiner Lloyd* and *Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung* simply as statements coming from 'Romanisators',³⁵⁹ Governor Regner-Bleyleben reported to the Ministry for Religion and Education in Vienna that he was less than convinced of broad popular support for a church split. Those untouched by Young-Ruthenian campaigning, the governor maintained, would 'resolutely abhor' the idea. Then again, Regner Bleyleben also admitted that complete neglect of nationality considerations in matters of high-level Church appointments could no longer be upheld, 'no matter how valid and ideal'.³⁶⁰ A year before, the governor had termed a division of the Bukovinian Archdiocese as 'completely unfeasible under the given circumstances', because 'it would be clear to all those unbiased by national fanaticism that the existence of two consistories of the same denomination and with the same diocesan parish in which diocesan membership is only determined by the respective national disposition is not only an anomaly but also only likely fit to keep the national differences of Orthodox fellow believers alive for all time and thus to miss the desired goal of national peace entirely'.³⁶¹

³⁵⁷ NN, *Die gr.-or. Kirchenfrage in der Bukowina und die Jungruthenen*, 1906, p. 15.

³⁵⁸ *Zur Frage der Teilung der gr.-or Erzdiöcese*, *Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung*, 12.05.1906, p. 3.

³⁵⁹ *Цертифікати румунізаторів*, *Руска Рада*, 05.05.1906, pp. 2-3.

³⁶⁰ "Meiner Ueberzeugung nach würden nicht nur die Rumänen und Altruthenen, sondern wohl die ganze das Gros der hierländigen gr.or. Gläubigen ausmachende bäuerliche Landbevölkerung, soferne dieselbe von den Suggestionen der jungruthenischen Parteiführer noch unberührt geblieben ist, in entschiedenster Weise perhoreszieren. Andererseits aber kann man sich der Einsicht nicht verschliessen, das an dem gewiss idealen, rechtlich noch immer geltenden, in der Praxis aber bereits längst aufgegebenen Grundsätze des völligen Abstrahierens von der Rücksichtnahme auf die Nationalität (wohl zu unterscheiden von der sprachlichen Qualifikation) der einzelnen geistlichen Funktionäre bei Beurteilung der ihnen jeweils zugeordneten Dienstesposten - speziell wenn es sich um die Besetzung der höheren leitenden hierarchischen Stellen handelt, nicht mehr festgehalten werden kann". Regner-Bleyleben, Count Oktavian, *Bericht and das k.k. Ministerium für Kultus und Unterricht*, Zl. 2419 Präs., 26 June 1907, p. 15/ ANR, Fond 'Guvenământul Bucovinei', MCI, CXXIII/10.

³⁶¹ "Der Landespräsident bezeichnet sohin unter den gegebenen Verhältnissen die Frage der Zweiteilung der BUKOWINA'er Erzdiöcese als völlig unrealisierbar, denn es müsse jedem vom nationalen Fanatismus Unbefangenen einleuchten, daß der Bestand zweier Konsistorien desselben Bekenntnisses und mit demselben

By the end of 1906, the 'Association of the Orthodox Clergy in Bukovina' held a meeting in the metropolitan's residence and openly discussed the clerical 'divorce' of Romanians and Ruthenians. In *Apărarea Națională*, Romanian nationalists insisted that they only recognised the 'Orthodox Russians' or Old-Ruthenians as the legitimate Ruthenian representatives and had 'always adopted an unmatched courteous and fair attitude with regard to these brothers', even if only because of the 'numerical importance' of the Ruthenian population.³⁶²

Meanwhile, an interesting shift had taken place in the debate on a 'religious divorce': It had been the Young-Ruthenians who had first brought the idea to the table, only to be met with staunch resistance from the side of Romanian nationalists as well as from Metropolitan Repta, who had stated that he had at one time taken over the Church in one piece and that he had every intention to hand it over to his successor in the same state. However, over the years the image had gradually shifted: while the Young-Ruthenians had continued to work hard on their leverage and on securing their vested rights in the Church, their Romanian adversaries saw themselves confronted with the fact that parity and, in the foreseeable future, Ruthenian preponderance was to become a reality in the Consistory. As a result, Romanian nationalists warmed to the idea of a split, keenly keeping in mind that if such were to occur, Church Fund property would remain within their respective sphere of interest. Simultaneously, the initial passion at the Young-Ruthenian side had started to wane for exactly the same reasons. The death of Vicar General Călinescu, the second in the consistorial hierarchy, brought matters to a head; the Romanian side correctly predicted that it would not be able to prevent a Ruthenian candidate to be appointed as Călinescu's replacement and therefore demanded the problem to be addressed only once the Church division had been finalised. Its Young-Ruthenian antagonist on the other hand wanted to have its candidate installed while the Church was still united - and wealthy.³⁶³ The Bukovinian German-language press had tended to sympathise with the Young-Ruthenians as long as they had aimed for equality and a sufficient number of Ruthenian priests to serve the communities they claimed as Ruthenian. Once the Young-Ruthenians attempted to gain supremacy and started to threaten the unity of the Church, this position shifted³⁶⁴ and allowed a Romanian nationalist like Dori Popovici to make the most of growing public compassion - and to weep some crocodile tears in the process - when he declared that 'with a broken heart and indescribable sorrow, the Romanians finally had to say to themselves that it would be better now if they paid for the gentleness and hospitality with

Diözesansprengel, innerhalb dessen die Diözesangehörigkeit lediglich durch die jeweilige nationale Gesinnung bestimmt ist, nicht nur eine Anomalie sondern auch nur geeignet wäre, die nationalen Differenzen er griechisch-orientalischen Glaubensgenossen der beiden Volksstämme für alle Zeiten rege zu erhalten und somit das angestrebte Ziel, der nationalen Frieden, gänzlich zu verfehlen". Marchet, Gustav (Minister für Kultus und Unterricht), *Alleruntertänigster Vortrag des treuehorsaamsten Ministers für Kultus und Unterricht Dr. Gustav Marchet betreffend das von den Reichsrats- und Landtagsabgeordneten Nikolaj Ritter von Wassilko und Hierotheus Pihuliak und Genossen in der Audienz vom 29. März 1906 überreichte Gesuch um Teilung der BUKOWINA'er griechisch-orientalischen Erzdiözese in eine rumänische und ruthenische Diözese sowie betreffend den alleruntertänigsten Bericht des griechisch-orientalischen Erzbischofs und Metropoliten der BUKOWINA und von DALMATIEN Dr. Vladimir von Repta über seine Eindrücke über die Frage dieser Teilung*, KUM 1687 ex 1907, Vienna, 28 May 1908, p. 3/ ANR, Fond 'Guvernământul Bucovinei', MCÎ CXXIII, 10.

³⁶² Antonovici, Eusebie, *Editorial*, *Apărarea Națională*, 1, 03.01.1907, p. 1.

³⁶³ *Die gr.-or. Kirchenfrage*, Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung, 28.03.1912, p. 1.

³⁶⁴ *Die gr.-or. Kirchenfrage*, Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung, 05.10.1913, p. 1.

which they had treated the Ruthenians with their agreement to a separate Ruthenian episcopate, about which they felt so passionately'.³⁶⁵

Back in 1899, Governor Bourguignon and Metropolitan Czuperkowicz had already experienced to which extent the appointments of 'declared' Ruthenians could lead to the mobilisation of at least part of the active Romanian nationalists in Bukovina. Although even Romanian sources themselves had later disparaged the individuals involved in the anti-Czuperkowicz incident at Czernowitz railway station as 'some hotheads from among the Romanian students as they occur just anywhere',³⁶⁶ the concerns and the indignation surrounding the appointment of a new vicar-general in 1912 and 1913 clearly had stronger social reverberations. The vicar-general was traditionally the one to succeed the metropolitan eventually,³⁶⁷ so when it went public that a Ruthenian candidate would in all likelihood succeed the late Vicar General Călinescu, 'commotion, in some cases even exasperation' was reportedly the dominant reaction of 'the Romanians', according to Governor Meran. In May 1912, well-organised demonstrations against the impending doom of the Church took place in Suczawa, Radautz, Kimpolung, Gurahumora, Dornawatra and Storozynetz, while the governor estimated that around 10,000 people participated in a similar demonstration in Czernowitz. In his speech at the Czernowitz rally, Eudoxiu Hormuzachi focused on the intrinsic Moldavian (and thus Romanian) character of the Church and underlined now that the Austrian government had always respected these specifics.³⁶⁸ The demonstrations were all markedly patriotic, including distinct expressions of loyalty to Emperor and Empire and in Czernowitz. The governor was explicitly requested to convey the participants' loyalty to the authorities in Vienna.³⁶⁹ The organisers of the demonstrations, Eudoxiu Hormuzachi and Dori Popovici, had obviously followed a careful strategy: since appointments regarding the Bukovinian Orthodox Church hierarchy were ultimately decided upon by the Emperor, demonstrations against any upcoming decision could easily be understood as disloyalty to the Throne.

The Habsburg authorities, however, were disinclined to yield to the demonstrators' pleas. Alienating Bukovinian Ruthenians might make the latter susceptible to Russophile agitation and thus Vienna was adamant that a Ruthenian be appointed.³⁷⁰ Just like the Bukovinian Romanian protesters, the government proceeded with care and relied for its opinion-forming not only on its own local representatives, but also took into account the views of Philipp

³⁶⁵ Popovici, Dori, *Der Sturm der ruthenischen Eindringlinge auf unsere rumänische Kirche aus der Bukovina*, Landtäglicher rumänischer Nationalklub, Czernowitz, 25 March 1912/ ANR, Fond 'Guvernământul Bucovinei', MCĪ CXXI/3.

³⁶⁶ 'einige Heißsporne aus dem Kreise der rumänischen Studentenschaft wie sie eben überall vorkommen', NN, *Die gr. -or. Kirchenfrage in der Bukowina und die Jungruthenen*, 1906, p. 90.

³⁶⁷ Turczynski 1993, p. 197.

³⁶⁸ *Die gr.or. Kirchenfrage*, Bukowinaer Gebirgs-Journal, 28.03.1912, pp. 1-2.

³⁶⁹ Governor Meran, *Rumänische Protestmeeting in der gr. or. Kirchenfrage*, Zl. 2289/Präs. 25 March 1912/ ANR, Fond 'Guvernământul Bucovinei', MCĪ CXXI/3.

³⁷⁰ Hausleitner 2001, p. 65.

Menczel, editor at *Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung*. Menczel advised a cautious and benevolent approach of the Romanian religious issues, but in addition warned against a ‘deepening of the principle of national registers, which contained in itself all the dangers of degeneration of the sense of affiliation with the State’.³⁷¹ Putting forward a moderate Ruthenian candidate might therefore have served to restore calm while keeping the Bukovinian Orthodox Consistory intact. The Austrian Minister of Religion and Education put Metropolitan Repta under the necessary pressure to suggest a candidate, but Repta proved reluctant. After a meeting with Repta, Governor Meran had to report back to that the metropolitan ‘to his sincere regret and with the best will in the world had not been in a position to comply to the appeal addressed to him by the Minister, because the Romanian diocesans laid claim to the position of vicar-general with all tenacity, citing their historic rights, and that he would have acted not only against his conviction but would also have created a very difficult position for himself had he recommended a Ruthenian for this post’.³⁷² Meanwhile, the metropolitan had not shied away from sharing his views with the general public. After a delegation of participants had thanked him for his support at the end of the Czernowitz rally, Repta had appeared on the grand balcony of the metropolitan residence and had blessed the audience.³⁷³ Even though he was unable to change Viennese intentions, at least he had openly distanced himself from the eventual appointment of Artemon Manastyrski as vicar-general in 1913 and had thus escaped the scorn of Romanian nationalists which had been harassing his predecessor Czuperkowicz back in 1899. In an article mutilated by censor’s blanks (erasing even the title), *Viitoriul* bemoaned Manastyrski’s appointment and bitterly remarked that the metropolitan, ‘famous for his loyalty to the government and in every way all too correct in the political fora, would need to see that as a reward they had trodden over his will with a smile of disdain, the way you stumble over a stump while you go’.³⁷⁴

The initial caution regarding their loyalty to the Austrian state which Romanian nationalists in Bukovina had showed waned considerably after they had lost the battle over the contested appointment. Although the article in *Viitoriul* mentioned above was severely curtailed, at least it had been published. Other periodicals such as Romanian nationalist *Viața Nouă* and Old-

³⁷¹ “Die kirchlichen Fragen der Rumänen müssten mit Vorsicht und Wohlwollen behandelt werden. Für sie wie für die Ruthenen gilt aber die gleiche Maxime: Keine Vertiefung des Prinzipes der nationalen Kurie, welche in sich alle Gefahren des Herabsinkens des staatlichen Zugehörigkeitsgefühles unter die Schwelle des Bewusstseins birgt”. Präsidium des k.k. Ministeriums für Kultus und Unterricht, Ante repos. *Einsichtsakt des Ministerrats-Präsidiums betr. ein Promemoria des Redakteurs der ‘Czernowitzer Allgemeinen Zeitung’ Dr. Menczel in Angelegenheit der ruthen. und der rumänischen Frage in der Bukowina*, no. 937, 24 March 1912/ ANR, Fond ‘Guvernământul Bucovinei’, MCÎ I/7, p. 145.

³⁷² “Hierauf erklärte mir den Erzbischof, daß er zu seinem aufrichtigen Bedauern beim besten Willen nicht in der Lage sei, dem an ihn seitens Eurer Exzellenz gerichteten Apell nachzukommen, weil die rumänischen Diözesanen den Konsistorial-Archimandritenposten unter Berufung auf ihre historischen Rechte mit aller Zähigkeit für sich in Anspruch nähmen, und er nicht nur gegen seinen Ueberzeugung handeln sondern auch für sich eine äusserst schwierige Lage schaffen würde, wenn er für diese Stelle einen Ruthenen in Vorschlag brachte”. Governor Meran, *Schreiben an den Herrn Kultusminister*, 25 March 1912/ ANR, Fond ‘Guvernământul Bucovinei’, MCÎ CXXI/3.

³⁷³ *Die Kirchenfrage - das rumänische Meeting*, Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung, 27.03.1912, p. 2.

³⁷⁴ *Confiscat! [censored]*, *Viitoriul*, 18, 11.09.1913, p. 1.

Ruthenian *Russkaya Pravda* were confiscated altogether because of the way they had reported on the matter. In one of the seized issues, *Viața Nouă* had stated to ‘have lost faith in the leadership of this empire which has trampled all over our most sacred rights’.³⁷⁵ Then again, when *Bukowinaer Post* suggested that Romanian nationalists had taken their complaints to Bucharest, *Viitoriul* felt obliged to strike back, labeling the accusations ‘a stupidity originating from some pathological Ruthenian brains’ (*o stupiditate izvorită din niște creieri ruteni patalogici*). Its editors countered that so far there had been no accounts of Romanian spies, whereas stories about Russian spies assisted by Galician Ruthenians were abound.³⁷⁶ This way, the appointment of the new vicar-general degenerated into a public defamation contest between Ruthenian and Romanian nationalists, with the other’s alleged disloyalty to the Throne at stake. The argumentation by the Ruthenian side was further substantiated when in Romania, Nicolae Iorga and his ‘Liga Culturală’ saw the Manastyrski affair as an impetus to organise popular rallies in support of ‘the oppressed Bukovinian Romanians’ and quoted *Viitoriul* and *Viața Nouă* as their sources of information. The fact that these meetings ended with the yell ‘Down with the perfidious Austria!’ (*Jos perfida Austrie!*), did little to improve the loyal image of Romanian nationalists in Bukovina, either.³⁷⁷ Prominent Bukovinian Romanian politicians publicly distanced themselves from the ‘Liga Culturală’.³⁷⁸

In Bukovina, reactions to the Imperial decision from either side were predictable. Mykola Vasylo sent a telegram to the Emperor on behalf of the Bukovinian Orthodox Ruthenians, expressing their gratitude for Manastyrski’s appointment.³⁷⁹ Meanwhile, the outraged Romanian nationalists kept a close eye on the way ‘their’ politicians responded to the developments and did not hesitate to publicly reveal the names of those ‘reckless and irresponsible’ Romanians who were suspected of congratulating Manastyrski on his appointment. Maybe not entirely unrelated, parliamentary deputy Teofil Simionovici initiated a parliamentary interpellation³⁸⁰ about Manastyrski’s selection only a few weeks after *Viața Nouă* had suggested that Simionovici’s congratulatory telegram to the vicar-general had been rather long.³⁸¹

In the following months, the acrimonious debates quieted down. In the spring of 1914, *Czernowitzer Tagblatt* bitterly referred to the affair in its Easter editorial, putting itself in the

³⁷⁵ In *Einsichtsbogen - Beschlagnahme von Bukowinaer Zeitungen*, Z. 1825/ 4 Präs, October 1913, the following newspapers are mentioned: *Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung*, 3 October 1913, *Viața Nouă*, no. 92, 4 October 1913; no. 94, 18 October 1913 (“... deși am pierdut încrederea în stăpânirea acestui imperiu care a călcat în picioare drepturile noastre cele mai sfinte...”) *Русская правда*, 10 October 1913/ ANR, Fond ‘Guvernământul Bucovinei’, MCÎ CXXXIII/8.

³⁷⁶ *Ținuta deamă și corectă a preoțimii noastre în afacerea bisericească*, *Viitoriul*, 19-20, 09.10.1913, p. 127.

³⁷⁷ *Die wahre Ursache*, *Bukowinaer Post*, 01.03.1914, pp. 1-2.

³⁷⁸ *Stimmen unserer Rumänen*, *Bukowinaer Post*, 05.04.1914, pp. 1-2.

³⁷⁹ *Die Dankesdepesche des ukrain. Verbandes an den Kaiser*, *Bukowinaer Post*, 21.10.1913, p. 1.

³⁸⁰ *Interpellation des Abgeordneten Simionovici und Genossen an Ihre Excellenzen den Herrn Ministerpräsidenten und den Herrn Minister für Kultus und Unterricht in der Angelegenheit der Regelung der griechisch-orientalischen Kirchenfrage in der Bukowina*, 28 October 1913, 166. Sitzung der XXI. Session/ ANR, Fond ‘Guvernământul Bucovinei’, MCÎ CXXI/3.

³⁸¹ *D. deputat Simionovici l-a felicitat pe A. Manastyrski?* *Viața Nouă*, 92, 21.09.1913, p. 17.

position of the Bukovinian peasantry: in spite of all the commotion over vested national rights, Romanian and Ruthenian peasants were still equally destitute.³⁸²

The entire matter of national conflict in the Bukovinian Orthodox Church ground to a final halt when the Habsburg heir to the throne and his wife were killed in Sarajevo in June 1914. The ensuing World War and Bukovina's subsequent incorporation in the centralist Kingdom of Romania brought about fundamental changes and canceled all Ruthenian/Ukrainian nationalist ambitions about their position in the Orthodox Church. *Păstorul*, a periodical dealing with Orthodox Church issues, depicted the situation unambiguously:

*The gangrene, from which our church organism suffers for a long time already, is the Ukrainian question. This disease, which until now has consumed most of our energy, should be healed as quickly and radically as possible. The Ukrainians who were favoured by petty Austrian politics for years tended not only to establish a separate Ukrainian church on the territory of our land, but also to put their hands on our Metropoly. Today however, now that our land is part of Greater-Romania, the essential national Romanian state, there is no longer room for such Ukrainian aspirations.*³⁸³

Village Priests and Nationalism

In 1905, the editors of the clerical periodical *Viitoriul* expressed their annoyance with the parliamentary activities of the Bukovinian Young-Ruthenian parliamentarians in Vienna:

*For a number of years, Ruthenians members of the Viennese Parliament have tried to create the impression that Ruthenians are still oppressed within the Orthodox Church of Bukovina and that they are exposed to the danger of being Romanised by the Church hierarchy. In a series of interpellations they have brought up all sorts of insignificant church matters in order to reach their goal, knowing that semper aliquid haeret (something always sticks). If a priest has quarreled with a parishioner, within days it is brought to the attention of Parliament in the form of an interpellation. If a Ruthenian student was not admitted to the seminary in time because the government has not issued an approval yet, out goes an interpellation. If in some parish a supporter of the present Ruthenian deputies has not managed to get the job, there should be at least an interpellation. And so on.*³⁸⁴

From the point of view of the Bukovinian Orthodox Church, which was closely involved in *Viitoriul*, the expressed irritation is easily imaginable since it was exactly this institution which was mostly targeted by Young-Ruthenian politicians. And, indeed, the activity of the latter was impressive. Under the leadership of Hierotheus Pihuliak, the first decade of the twentieth century witnessed a steady accumulation of Ruthenian protests in Vienna against what they regarded as an infringement of Ruthenian rights in the Church. The following

³⁸² "Ihr habt hüben Hallelujah, drüben Trauerchorale angestimmt, als ein Ruthene eine hohe kirchliche Würde erlangte. Monate sind seither ins Land gegangen und wir überwachten seither die Aufteilung der Güter der Nation, und siehe: Rumänen und Ruthenen nagen im gleichem Maße am Hungertuch, nicht um ein I-Tüpfelchen mehr oder weniger kam den 'rivalisierenden Stämmen' zu". *Gr.-or. Ostern - Eine nicht gehaltene Rede*, Czernowitzer Tagblatt, 19.04.1914, p. 1.

³⁸³ *Noi și ucrainenii*, *Păstorul* - Organul pentru interesele bisericești, 03.02.1919, p. 3.

³⁸⁴ *Afacerile bisericeii în parlamentul din Viena*, *Viitoriul*, 13, 01.07.1905.

overview may serve as an illustration of the complaints received by the Austrian House of Representatives.

On 3 December 1903, an interpellation was submitted regarding scholarships to redeem the shortage of Ruthenian Orthodox priests. On 18 December 1905, another was launched to criticise high appointments in the Orthodox hierarchy. On 15 February 1906, Pihuliak and his fellow parliamentarians complained about a Romanian priest in Kuczurmare who was said to have forced school children to bring false accusations against a Ruthenian teacher, followed on 23 January 1907 by a protest against discrimination when out of nine newly appointed priests in Czernowitz, ‘only’ four of them were Ruthenians, then by an accusation of ‘persecution’ of Ruthenians by the Orthodox Consistory on 8 November of that year and on 21 December by a denunciation of ‘Romanisation activities’ allegedly deployed by the Consistory. On 23 June 1908 the Pihuliak group launched another claim of ‘persecution and discrimination’ of Ruthenian priests by the Consistory, a similar complaint followed on 23 April 1909. Yet another complaint about ‘persecution’ on 22 December 1909 actually dealt with the number of Ruthenians admitted to the seminary which the Pihuliak group deemed inadequate and on 6 May 1910, the charge of ‘persecution and discrimination’ was uttered once more.³⁸⁵

³⁸⁵ (3 December 1903) *Interpellation der Abgeordneten Pihuliak, Nikolaj Wassilko und Genossen an Seine Excellenz den Herrn Minister für Cultus und Unterricht, Dr. Ritter v. Hartl, wegen der Creirung von Stipendien zum Zwecke der Beseitigung des Mangels an griechisch-orientalischen Priestern ruthenischer Nationalität*; (369. Sitzung, 18 December 1905) *Interpellation des Abgeordneten Pihuliak und Genossen an Seine Exzellenz den Herrn Leiter des k.k. Ministeriums für Kultus und Unterricht in Angelegenheit der jüngsten Ernennungen höherer kirchlicher Funktionäre in der orthodox-katholischen (sic) Kirche Diözese der Bukowina*; (381. Sitzung 15 February 1906) *Interpellation des Abgeordneten Pihuliak und Genossen an Seine Exzellenz den Herrn Leiter des k.k. Ministeriums für Kultus und Unterricht wegen demoralisierender Wirksamkeit nichtruthenischer griechisch-orthodoxer Priester auf die ruthenische Schuljugend*; (32. Sitzung der XVIII. Session, 8 November 1907) *Interpellation des Abgeordneten Pihuliak und Genossen an Seine Exzellenz den Herrn Leiter des k.k. Ministeriums für Kultus und Unterricht wegen Verfolgung der orthodox-katholischen Ruthenen seitens des orthodox-katholischen (sic) Konsistoriums in der Bukowina*; (55. Sitzung der XVIII. Session, 21 December 1907) *Interpellation des Abgeordneten Pihuliak und Genossen an Seine Exzellenz den Herrn Minister für Kultus und Unterricht wegen romanisatorischer Umtriebe des griechisch-orientalischen Konsistoriums in der Bukowinaer griechisch-orientalischen Diözese*; (481. Sitzung, 23 January 1907) *Interpellation des Abgeordneten Pihuliak und Genossen an Seine Exzellenz den Herrn Leiter des k.k. Ministeriums für Kultus und Unterricht wegen Zurücksetzung der Ruthenen bei der Aufnahme in das Klerikerseminar in Czernowitz*; (35. Sitzung der XIX. Session, 23 June 1908) *Interpellation des Abgeordneten Pihuliak und Genossen an Seine Exzellenz den Herrn Minister für Kultus und Unterricht wegen Verfolgungen und Zurücklegungen der griechisch-orientalischen Priester ruthenischer Nationalität seitens des Konsistoriums in der Bukowina*; (43. Sitzung der XX. Session, 23 April 1909) *Interpellation der Abgeordneten Pihuliak und Genossen an Seine Exzellenz den Herrn Minister für Kultus und Unterricht wegen Bedrückung und Verfolgung der Ruthenen in der griechisch-orientalischen Diözese in der Bukowina*; (20. Sitzung der XX. Session, 22 December 1909) *Interpellation der Abgeordneten Pihuliak, Spenuk und Genossen an Seine Exzellenz den Herrn Leiter des k.k. Ministeriums für Kultus und Unterricht wegen Ruthenenverfolgungen seitens des griechisch-orientalischen Konsistoriums in Czernowitz*; (44. Sitzung der XX. Session, 6 May 1910) *Interpellation der Abgeordneten Pihuliak und Genossen an Seine Exzellenz den Herrn Minister für Kultus und Unterricht, betreffend die Verfolgung und Zurücksetzung der griechisch-orientalischen Geistlichkeit durch das romanisatorische Konsistorium in der Bukowina*/ ANR, Fond ‘Guvernământul Bucovinei’, MCÎ CXXXIII/1.

Whereas the intensity of (Romanian) nationalism within the higher echelons of the Bukovinian Orthodox Church was to a high extent dependent on the individuals in charge, the lower level of town and village priests is usually labeled as the key force behind nationalism in Bukovina. Again, it was mainly Romanian nationalism which was strongest identified with Orthodox Church. *Bukowinaer Rundschau* observed in 1887 that Romanians ‘had one of the most influential and effective cornerstones in the Orthodox Church of Bukovina, whose clergy considered it to be their job not only to preach the teachings of the Gospel but also to raise enthusiasm for the Romanian nationality in the heart of its communities’. The position of the clergy was seen as ‘peculiar’ (*eigenthümlich*) and compared to that of the Catholic clergy in Ireland.³⁸⁶ In order to maintain the peace, the Governor’s Office kept close contact with headquarters in Vienna to make sure that controversial parish appointments were avoided. In the case of the St. Paraschiva Church in Czernowitz, the Orthodox Consistory submitted three candidates. On one of them, priest Ivan Homiuca, Governor Goëss commented as follows:

Here in Bukovina, where all nationalities and religions are represented, where national and religious frictions are generally known to be nurtured mainly by Orthodox priests and are easily fueled and then travel just like waves through the land, here a person must be chosen who is capable first and foremost of being moderate in the national field and sufficiently unbiased with regard to religion. This, however, cannot be expected of priest Homiuca. His appointment as pastor in Czernowitz would no doubt bring him in his proper element and would provide him with an appropriate forum from which he would sow the seeds of national discord and incitement with his fists.

According to the governor, the only reason Homiuca’s Romanian propaganda in his district had not been successful so far was the fact that he had picked the wrong audience: his Ruthenian-speaking parish had already developed a divergent national awareness.³⁸⁷ By 1907, Governor Regner-Bleyleben noted that ‘just like elsewhere, the waves of the national movements held all strata of the population in this land in their grip in those days and a pronounced national disposition was observed anywhere, especially with people who - as is common here with the local priests - had reached a relatively high social status while coming from modest backgrounds’. However, just like Metropolitan Repta, Regner-Bleyleben denied that relations between clergy and parish were strained ‘in every village’, but instead emphasised that incidents were exceptions and as such they were ‘opposed accordingly by the same Consistory held responsible for them and - as far as it fell within their competence- by

³⁸⁶ *Der Romanismus in der Bukowina – II*, Bukowinaer Rundschau, 06.11.1887, p. 1.

³⁸⁷ “Hier, wo sämtliche Nationalitäten und Confessionen vertreten sind, wo nationale und confessionelle Reibungen, die bekanntlich in der Bucowina zumeist von gr.or. Priester genährt werden, leicht angefacht werden können, die sich eben wie Wellen im Lande fortpflanzen, hier muß eine Persönlichkeit gewählt werden, die in allererster Linie auf nationalem Gebiete sich Mäßigung aufzulegen und in confessioneller Hinsicht hinreichende Objectivität zu bewahren im Stande ist. Dies kann aber vom Pfarrer Homiuca nicht erwartet werden. Seine Ernennung zum Pfarrer in Czernowitz würde denselben außer Zweifel in sein richtiges Element bringen, würde ihm einen geeigneten Bock zuführen, auf dem er den Samen nationaler Zwietracht und Verhetzungen mit den Fäusten säen würde”. Governor Goëss, *Report to Minister for Culture and Education on priest appointment in Czernowitz*, Z. 4455 PräS, February 1896/ DACHo, Viddil 1, Fond 3, Opis 1, spr. 6695.

the state authorities as well'.³⁸⁸ Especially when elections were taking place, interference with local politics was a common activity among nationalist clerics, although they were certainly not the only ones said to have disrupted the electoral process. On election day 28 April 1911, clerics, professors, court officers and teachers in Radautz, Sereth and Suczawa apparently disrupted the peace, with 'Father Berlinski attacking voters at the polling stations and Father Tarnavski, Court Intern Nastasi and the Orthodox theologian Hotinczan paying for votes with money'.³⁸⁹

Nationalism and its possible by-products like irrendentism and disloyalty to Empire and Emperor caused the Austrian authorities to watch nationalist manifestations vigilantly. As illustrated by the developments surrounding the appointment of Vicar General Manastyrski, accusations of disloyalty to the State and its institutions provided a powerful instrument for the incrimination of political foes. Applied in the political arena, they had the power to kill two birds with one stone: the plaintiff was able to distinguish himself as the oppressed party and to charge the inculpated with subversive activities at the same time.

Authors of an anonymous letter to Governor Alesani protested in 1886 against the appointment of Zaharia Voronca as pastor of the Czernowitz Orthodox Cathedral. Back in 1877, Voronca had been one of the suspects in the 'Arboroasa case'. 'Arboroasa', the Romanian association of theology students in Bukovina, had not joined in the 1875 centennial celebrations of the Austrian annexation of Bukovina, but instead its members had expressed their support for initiatives in Romania to publicly mourn the same event. Adding insult to injury, they had accepted a subsidy from the Ministry of Education in Bucharest. The Austrian authorities thereupon disbanded 'Arboroasa' and five of its members, including Voronca, received (mild) sentences.³⁹⁰

In the anonymous letter, the governor was reminded of the weeks Voronca had spent in prison as a result of his involvement in the Arboroasa case, of the fact that he had been expelled from the theological faculty and of his animosity towards Catholicism, the official religion of the Empire. Furthermore, Voronca was said to be the third of the five former students linked to

³⁸⁸ "Die Wogen der nationalen Bewegung haben heutzutage wie anderwärts so auch hiezulande alle Schichten der Bevölkerung ergriffen und kann man überall gerade bei Personen, die - wie dies bei den hierländigen Priestern häufig der Fall ist - aus beschränkten Verhältnissen zu einer relativ höheren sozialen Stellung gelangt sind, eine prononziert nationale Gesinnung und dementsprechende Strebungen wahrnehmen. (...) Dass solche Zustände - wie dies im Memorandum behauptet wird - 'in jedem Dorfe' herrschen - kann nicht als zutreffend bezeichnet werden. Vielmehr kann ich in Uebereinstimmung mit den bezüglichen Ausführungen des Erzbischofs von Repta in dem von ihm an seine kaiserlich und königliche Majestät erstatteten Alleruntertänigsten Vortrage vom 15. November 1906 Zl. 192/Pr. behaupten, dass das Einvernehmen zwischen der hierländigen Bevölkerung und ihren Priestern im Allgemeinen ein gutes ist und Vorkommnisse wie die geschilderten zu den Ausnahmen gehören, denen gerade von dem hiefür verantwortlich gemachten Konsistorium und - soweit dies in deren Kompetenz fällt - auch von den Staatsbehörden entsprechend entgegengetreten wird". Governor Regner-Bleyleben, *Bericht and das k.k. Ministerium für Kultus und Unterricht*, Zl. 2419 Präs, 26 June 1907, p. 7/ ANR, Fond 'Guvernământul Bucovinei', MCÎ, CXXIII/10.

³⁸⁹ Präsidium des k.k. Ministeriums für Kultus und Unterricht, *Erlass*, Z. 5583 MI, 19 June 1911/ ANR, Fond 'Guvernământul Bucovinei', MCÎ I/7.

³⁹⁰ For more on the Arboroasa case, see paragraph 3 of Part III: The Empire, the Nation and the Region: Competing Identifications in Bukovina/ 3.3: Cracks in the Layer of Loyalty.

the Arboroasa case to be appointed in Czernowitz. Yet, the letter continued with the complaint that many other candidates had successfully passed the test for the position now to be taken by Voronca, also the latter had allegedly been promoted without any relevant experience, while others applied ten to fifteen years in vain for a pastoral position in the smallest village as a result of the abundance of candidates.³⁹¹ The fact that the letter focused mainly on the frustration of unappointed priests suggests that it was these same priests who were behind it. The rather tumultuous past of Voronca had offered itself as a useful instrument in the battle for clerical positions. Incidentally, the Governor's Office was probably not too concerned about possible problems caused by Arboroasa veterans: in 1889, Governor Pino reported to Vienna that 'since the difficulties experienced by some theology students - who by then had been working as priests for years already - because of their participation years ago in the already dissolved 'Arboroasa' association, nothing had been detected among the seminarians to make a disparaging assessment appropriate'.³⁹²

In 1888, the Kotzman district captain was ordered by the Governor to verify a complaint by the Metropoly regarding teachers Atanasi, Popovych, Prodan and Pihuliak and financial clerk Tyminski. The Consistory had accused the men of 'political, national and confessional activities' (*politische, nationale und confessionelle Umtriebe*) in their speeches at the occasion of the inauguration of Ruthenian reading halls in the villages of in Witelowka, Laschkowka und Stawczan. However, after having concluded his 'unobtrusive, but most insistent inquiries' (*im unauffälligem Wege eindringlichst gepflogen Erhebungen*), the district captain had assessed the accusations unsubstantiated.

Just like when the Church requested information on unwelcome statements concerning church affairs, as shown by the case in the Kotzman district, government authorities asked for information from the Consistory when nationalist activity from the pulpit was suspected. In Bojan, debates were passionate during the municipal elections of 1895, and when a complaint about Bojan's assistant priest reached the Governor's Office, the Church was expected to conduct an investigation. The priest had been charged with having advised the parish to vote for 'someone decent from our village', which plaintiffs had interpreted as an endorsement for the Romanian candidate. The Consistory found the assistant priest not guilty, but reprimanded him for not choosing his words more carefully in a tense election period. The background of all commotion was said to be political with both major candidates trying to discredit the other. Remarkably, it proved to be a severe challenge for the Austrian authorities to convince the

³⁹¹ "Es giebt viel fähigere, verdienstvollere, makellose und loyale Cooperatore, die in einem entlegenen Dorfe den größten Entbehrungen ausgesetzt, zwölf bis fünfzehn Jahren sich vergeblich um die kleinste Dorfsparre bei gegenwärtig vorhandener Überfüllung bewerben". Anonymous, *Letter to the Governor complaining about the upcoming appointment of Zaharia Voronca*, Czernowitz, December 1886/ DACHO, Viddil 1, Fond 3, Opus 6, spr. 119.

³⁹² "Seit dem Anstande, welchen einzelnen bereits seit Jahren als Priester fungierende Studenten der Theologie wegen Theilnahme an dem bereits aufgelösten Vereine 'Arborosa' im Jahre hatten, ist bei den Seminaristen nichts wahrgenommen worden, was eine abfällige Beurtheilung hervorzurufen geeignet gewesen wäre". *Bericht des Landespräsidenten an den Minister für Cultus und Unterricht*, 482 Pr., Czernowitz, 27 March 1889/ ANR, Fond 'Guvernământul Bucovinei', MCÎ, XCIII/9.

Consistory that an investigation was in order: initially, church authorities had simply replied that there was no case and had left it at that.³⁹³

In 1906, two Romanian priests took the initiative to present their personal experiences in *Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung* in an attempt to counter Pihuliak's allegation about tensions between Romanian-speaking priests and their Ruthenian-speaking flock. For a period of eight years, Tichon Hacman had been an assistant priest and teacher in the purely Ruthenian-speaking community of Werenczanka, and upon leaving his assignment, he had received a letter to thank him for his good works on behalf of the entire community.³⁹⁴ A similar letter was provided by Constantin Gramatowicz, who had served in the Ruthenian-speaking parish of Wasloutz for fifteen years until 1906.³⁹⁵ In Breaza, the matter of who was to succeed the deceased father Prelicz in 1908 was said to be an easy one, since the entire parish seemed to prefer Prelicz' assistant Father Agapi. A delegation of prominent Breazans asking for Agapi's appointment was even received in audience by both the governor and the metropolitan. According to *Bukowinaer Gebirgs-Journal*, a significant detail was that the delegation had consisted mainly of Ruthenians. Then, however, a new candidate had entered the stage and 'since the road of competence and fair competition was too unreliable', the generally loved and respected candidate was suddenly depicted as a Romanian chauvinist.³⁹⁶

In the House of Representatives, Young-Ruthenians headed by Pihuliak seemed to focus more on the quantity of their anti-Romanisation interpellations than on their convincibility. Whereas in Bojan the words from the pulpit had had at least some potential to be interpreted politically, the two samples from sermons held in 1913 by assistant priest Regusz in Hliboka only seemed silly and off the mark:

Orthodox Christians! I want to explain to you today what the Greek Uniates are, as you may believe that it is all one and the same, you speak Ruthenian too, and believe therefore that the Uniates are your brothers and that is why you have to be ashamed. For, although we also studied this subject, we do not understand the essence of the matter, so you can not understand it either! Amen! (...) Orthodox Christians! You go around in inns and due to alcoholism become as stupid as oxen, for the drunken man cannot assess his actions. For example, a married woman came to me and said her husband had gone with another woman under the influence of alcohol, because drunkards go completely crazy. Once our people, Romanians that is, emigrated to America and gave the local savages spirits to drink, and the consequence was that these savages died. Amen!

Young-Ruthenian deputies had intended to use these examples to highlight that Ruthenian Orthodox parishioners no longer went to church since the services were held in Romanian - which they were said not to understand - and that furthermore the asinine content of those

³⁹³ Orthodox Consistory, *Report to Governor's Office*, No. 3526, 11/23 September 1895/ DACHO, Viddil 1, Fond 3, Opis 1, spr. 6191

³⁹⁴ *Zur Frage der Teilung der gr.-or Erzdiöcese*, *Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung*, 12.05.1906, p. 3.

³⁹⁵ *Zur Frage der Teilung der gr.-or. Diöcese*, *Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung*, 15.05.1906, p. 3.

³⁹⁶ *Um eine Pfarre*, *Bukowinaer Gebirgs-Journal*, Kimpolung, 15.02.1908, pp. 1-2.

services caused the churchgoers to stay away.³⁹⁷ However, the fact that the substance of the cleric's words bothered them would imply that they had less trouble with the Romanian language than the petitioners had aimed to convey. Other cases brought to the fore were short of a relation to the claimed Romanisation altogether, as is illustrated by the account of an unpleasant encounter in 1908 between Euphrosyne Kuruca from Gogolina and Father Cojocariu:

When he entered the room, he began to ask me questions and at the end he asked me this question about indecent things, which I am ashamed to repeat, and then he asked why I am without children. He added that I do not have the right husband. "If you had sexual intercourse with a man as clever as I", the priest said, "you would have children to inherit your property one day". I answered that it is a sin to say such things, let alone do them as I am lawfully married. But the priest replied: "I tell you before the holy images and the Lord is my witness that this is not a sin. By the way, I will answer for this." Then he approached me and wanted to rape me ...

According to the text of the interpellation, someone had walked in on the scene before anything else could occur, but the story spread fast and Cojocariu invoked the regional court in an attempt to force Kuruca to deny the events. When she refused, the priest was forced to withdraw his complaint. Interestingly, Pihuliak and his comrades introduced their interpellation in this matter as dealing with 'the annoying attitude of a Romanising Orthodox priest in Bukovina'.³⁹⁸

Similar activities were said to be deployed in 1910 by Father Adrian Bodnărescul, who allegedly assaulted a married woman in Hatna and in the end was scared away by a village girl who walked into the scene. Next, Bodnărescul was accused of attacking the wife of a fellow priest, but since she had proved to be stronger than him he had ran off. When Young Ruthenians filed an interpellation regarding these events, it was 'because of Romanising practices in Ruthenian parishes on behalf of the Romanising potentates in the Czernowitz Orthodox Consistory'.³⁹⁹

In May 1903, the number of Young-Ruthenian interventions had been numerous enough for Governor Hohenlohe to provide Vienna with a more generic report about the situation of

³⁹⁷ Ukrainische Abgeordneten, (Interpellationen betr. ukrainischer Sprache in den Pfarngemeinden) 169. Sitzung der XXI. Session, 5 November 1913: *Interpellation der Abgeordneten Spenul und Genossen an Seine Exzellenz den Herrn Minister für Kultus und Unterricht, betreffend das Vorgehen des Kooperators Regusz in Hliboka (Bukowina) seinen Pfarrkindern ruthenischer Nation gegenüber/* ANR, Fond 'Guvernământul Bucovinei', MCÎ CXXXIII/1.

³⁹⁸ Ukrainische Abgeordneten, (Interpellationen betr. ukrainischer Sprache in den Pfarngemeinden) 98. Sitzung der XVIII. Session, 1 July 1908: *Interpellation der Abgeordneten Pihuliak, Spenul und Genossen an Seine Exzellenz den Herrn Minister für Kultus und Unterricht über die ärgerniserregende Haltung eines romanisatorischen griechisch-orientalischen Priesters in der Bukowina/* ANR, Fond 'Guvernământul Bucovinei', MCÎ CXXXIII/1.

³⁹⁹ Ukrainische Abgeordneten, (Interpellationen betr. ukrainischer Sprache in den Pfarngemeinden) 72. Sitzung der XX. Session, 2 December 1910: *Interpellation der Abgeordneten Pihuliak und Genossen an Seine Exzellenz den Herrn Minister für Kultus und Unterricht wegen der romanisatorischen Praktiken in den ruthenischen Pfarren seitens der romanisatorischen Machthaber im griechisch-orientalischen Konsistorium zu Czernowitz/* ANR, Fond 'Guvernământul Bucovinei', MCÎ CXXXIII/1.

Ruthenian Orthodox believers in Bukovina.⁴⁰⁰ He stressed that there was no crisis-like aggravation of the situation of the Orthodox Ruthenians in Bukovina resulting from a hostile attitude of the Orthodox priesthood of Romanian nationality, but that instead, the relationship between Romanian pastors and their Ruthenian flock could generally be described as peaceful. According to Hohenlohe, Romanian priests in Ruthenian-speaking communities generally met the linguistic requirements. He admitted that there were exceptions, but that the regional government did not hesitate to intervene in these cases. Yet, the governor acknowledged tensions between the Consistory - largely under the influence of nationalist Romanians – and its Ruthenian-speaking parishioners. These differences were accentuated by the increasing number of Ruthenian reading halls and banking cooperatives. These institutions, Hohenlohe maintained, pursued not only cultural and economic but also social and national aspirations and in this way competed directly with the Orthodox Church as such and were met with hostility by the clergy. Consequently, this attitude ‘caused Ruthenian party leaders to lodge exaggerated complaints in the press, in meetings and in parliamentary representative bodies about Romanising actions by those priests and about their hostility towards the cultural aspirations of their Ruthenian flock, thereby exacerbating national differences between Romanian priests and their Ruthenian parish and jeopardising national peace’. Well aware of the shortage of Ruthenian priests, Hohenlohe still advised against the appointment of Romanian priests in Ruthenian-speaking communities.⁴⁰¹

Likewise, Hohenlohe’s successor Regner-Bleyleben took the opportunity to present a more general view on the situation when he was requested from Vienna to provide background information on a complaint from Pihuliak and his fellow Young-Ruthenians concerning a pastor from Russ-Moldawitz by the name of Bocancea. Bocancea was accused of keeping his registers in Romanian and of demanding money from his parishioners for services he was supposed to render free of charge. The Governor concluded that the complaint had not been submitted by a group of people, but only by one individual and had asserted that it was completely unfounded. The matter of the Romanian-language register was more complicated, since this ‘accusation’ was adequate. However, the community of Russ-Moldawitz was a Ruthenian language island amidst Romanian-speaking villages, and to charge Bocancea with Romanisation affinities because he had continued a tradition which he himself was not able to

⁴⁰⁰ Ukrainische Abgeordneten, (Interpellationen betr. ukrainischer Sprache in den Pfarngemeinden) Sitzung, 14 March 1903: *Interpellation der Abgeordneten Pihuliak, Nikolaj v. Wassilko und Genossen an Seine Excellenz den Herrn Minister für Cultus und Unterricht wegen der notorischen Verkürzung und Schädigung der ruthenischen Gläubigen durch das griechisch-orientalische Consistorium in Czernowitz*/ ANR, Fond ‘Guvernământul Bucovinei’, MCĪ CXXXI/4.

⁴⁰¹ “Dies gibt den ruthenischen Parteiführern Anlass in der Presse, in Versammlungen und parlamentarischen Vertretungskörpern über ein romanisatorisches Vorgehen der in der Rede stehenden Priester, über deren feindselige den Kulturellen Bestrebungen ihrer ruthenischen Parochianen hinderliche Haltung in übertriebener Weise Klage zu führen, hiedurch die nationalen Gegensätze zwischen rumänischen Priestern und ihren ruthenischen Pfarrlingen zu verschärfen und damit die Erhaltung des nationalen Friedens zu gefährden”. Governor Hohenlohe, *Bericht an das Ministerium für Kultus und Unterricht*, Zl. 3344/ Präs., *Reply to “Interpellation der Abgeordneten Pihuliak, Nikolaj v. Wassilko und Genossen wegen der notorischen Verkürzung und Schädigung der ruthenischen Gläubigen durch das griechisch-orientalische Consistorium in Czernowitz”* dd. 14 May 1903 (*Reichsrat Vienna*), 23 June 1903/ ANR, Fond ‘Guvernământul Bucovinei’, MCĪ CXXXI/4.

change without instructions from above, struck the governor as ‘fairly reckless’ (*einigermassen gewagt*). Still, Regner-Bleyleben acknowledged the problem and reported to have taken the necessary measures to solve it. With regard to the overall situation as depicted by Pihuliak *cum suis*, the governor was clear:

*Moving on to the further inquiry regarding alleged Romanising activity by the non-Ruthenian Orthodox priests in Bukovina as linked to this subject by the Hon. Petitioner, I am able to reply only that I am fully aware of my responsibility to counter any possible interference in both national and other rights of the population within my sphere of influence. However, the Hon. Petitioner has not proven a violation of the interests of the Orthodox Ruthenians in Bukovina through alleged Romanising efforts by the non-Ruthenian clergy in this land in the field of ecclesiastical matters – as demonstrated by this recent case – to such extent that I see myself forced to take measures in this regard that go beyond the ones which have already been observed by the safeguarding of all related issues of equal treatment anyway.*⁴⁰²

Finally, a closer look on the nationalist instrumentalisation of minor local conflicts is provided by a set of two conflicting interpellations regarding an incident which took place in the village of Dzemini near Kimpolung on Saturday 4 October 1913. Triggered by a Young-Ruthenian interpellation on the issue, Bukovinian Romanian nationalists decided to submit an interpellation reflecting their own version of what had happened.

According to the Young-Ruthenian account, the head of the village school, Antoniuk, appeared at the doorstep of the village church, accompanied by his pupils in order to attend the mass honouring the name day of the Emperor. Arriving at 08.30, they found the Church closed. When Antoniuk sent one of the children to priest Popescul to ask why, he was told that High Mass has already been celebrated, upon which Antoniuk asked the priest why Mass had started at 08.00 instead of the habitual 08.30, whereupon the ‘Romanisator’ started yelling at him and asserted his right to celebrate Mass whenever he so desired. When Antoniuk asked Popescul how people were supposed to know when that was, he was thrown out.⁴⁰³

⁴⁰² “Auf die von den Herren Interpellanten an diesen Gegenstand geknüpfte weitere Anfrage bezüglich der angeblichen romanisatorischen Thätigkeit der nicht ruthenischen gr. or. Priester in der Bukowina im Allgemeinen übergehend, vermag ich nur zu erwidern, dass ich mir meiner Verpflichtung, allfälligen Eingriffen in die sei es nationalen, sei es andersweitigen Rechte der Bevölkerung innerhalb des mir zustehenden Wirkungskreises entgegenzutreten selbstverständlich vollauf bewusst bin, dass aber die Herren Interpellanten den Beweis einer Schädigung der Interessen der gr.or. Ruthenen in der Bukowina auf kirchlichem Gebiete durch angebliche romanisatorische Betreibungen des nicht ruthenischen Theiles der gr.or. Priesterschaft dieses Landes - wie dies der gegenwärtige Fall neuerdings dargethan hat - nicht in dem Masse erbracht haben, dass ich mich in die Lage versetzt sehen würde, in dieser Hinsicht weitergehende Massnahmen treffen zu sollen, als die mit Wahrnehmung der Interessen alle hiebei in Frage kommenden gleichberechtigten Faktoren ohnehin bereits geschehen ist”. Governor Regner-Bleyleben, *Bericht an den Minister für Kultus und Unterricht*, Zl. 2577 Präs; ex 1906, Zl. 2577 Präs; ex 1906, Vienna, 11.06.1907/ ANR, Fond ‘Guvernământul Bucovinei’, MCÎ CXXXIII/1.

⁴⁰³ Haus der Abgeordneten, *Interpellation des Abg. Spenul und Genossen an Seine Exzellenz den Herrn Minister für Kultus und Unterricht, betreffend das Vorgehen des griechisch-orientalischen Pfarrers Popescul in Džeminy*

As expected, the Romanian report of the events depicted Antoniuk as an ‘agitator and rabble-rouser’ (*Wühler und Hetzer*), whose main pastime was causing conflicts between people. Although he had been beaten up regularly in Dzemini and the surrounding villages, he had managed to hang on to his position. It was only logical that priests were his main targets. On 4 October, Father Popescul celebrated Mass which ended at 09.30. Subsequently, Antoniuk had appeared and had demanded that Mass be celebrated once again for him and his pupils. In the presence of many parishioners, Antoniuk had started to scream at Father Popescul. When Popescul, supported by the church community, had requested him to leave Antoniuk had had no choice but to comply. Of course, Antoniuk had filed a complaint, after which Spenul and his comrades had submitted their interpellation.⁴⁰⁴

When compared, only a few components of the two versions of the rather futile village incident remain: Antoniuk and his pupils arrived on Saturday morning and realised they had missed mass, teacher Antoniuk claimed Father Popescul had started mass too early and Father Popescul insisted that Antoniuk had been late. All the sabre-rattling language of ‘Romanisators’ and ‘agitators and rabble-rousers’ aside, this nationally framed account seems to entail only a conflict about punctuality.

The most tangible element in the struggle between Ruthenian and Romanian nationalists in the Orthodox Church was language. As discussed before, Moldavian/Romanian was the dominant language in the Archbishopric and later in the Metropoly. At the establishment of the Franz Joseph University in 1875, the only non-German instruction was provided in the theological faculty where the language of education was Romanian. During the years Metropolitan Morariu-Andrievici was in office, at the faculty neither the admission of Ruthenian-speaking students nor the use of the Ruthenian language was encouraged.⁴⁰⁵ In 1904, Governor Hohenlohe provided the Bukovinian Regional Diet with interesting percentages. While admitting that a number of Ruthenian-language parishes were still served by Romanian-speaking priests, he affirmed that ‘seventy-five percent of them were more than completely proficient in the Ruthenian language, more than twenty-one percent were so to a lesser extent, but still well enough to comply with their professional responsibilities in church

seinen Pfarrangehörigen ruthenischer Nation gegenüber, 1911-1914, XXIst Session, 170th Meeting, 4155/I, kaiserlich-königliche Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, Vienna 1914, pp. 17231-17232.

⁴⁰⁴ *Fünf Interpellationen des Abg. Sérbu – III*, Bukowinaer Gebirgs-Journal, 24.01.1914, p. 1. and Haus der Abgeordneten, *Interpellation des Abg. Serbu und Genossen an Seine Exzellenz den Herrn Minister für Kultur und Unterricht, betreffend die agitatorische Tätigkeit des Lehrers D. Antoniuk in der Gemeinde Gemene*, 1911-1914/ 21st Session, 187th Meeting 4568/I, Anhang III, kaiserlich-königliche Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, Vienna 1914, pp. 18581-18582.

⁴⁰⁵ “Was die Studierenden an der theologischen Fakultät anbelangt, welche im Seminartrakte der erzbischöflichen Residenz unterbracht sind, so gehören dieselben mit nur sehr geringer Ausnahme der rumänischen Nationalität an und befinden sich nur einige Ruthenen unter ihnen, weil der gegenwärtige Erzbischof und sein Consistorium vorwiegend das rumänische Element protegirt. Ihre Umgangssprache ist zumeist die rumänische, weil es der Erzbischof nicht gerne sieht, wenn sie eine andere Sprache sprechen”. *Bericht des Landespräsidenten an den Minister für Cultus und Unterricht*, 482 Pr., Czernowitz, 27 March 1889/ ANR, Fond ‘Guvernământul Bucovinei’, MCÍ, XCIII/9.

and in school... therefore more than ninety-seven percent of the priests of Romanian nationality working in Ruthenian communities met the language requirements'. Hohenlohe added that he acknowledged the existing shortage of Ruthenian native speakers in the clergy and assured that measures were being taken to guarantee a larger number of Ruthenian-speaking seminarists.⁴⁰⁶ In 1907, his successor Regner-Bleyleben wrote to the Ministry for Religion and Education that in all mixed-language communities in the crownland the priests were Romanian-speaking, but that with few exceptions all parishioners were bilingual. Both mass and sermon were held in Romanian, while 'the parishioners mostly agreed with this practice and did not want changes in this respect' and 'objections were raised almost exclusively by nationally conscious elements from outside'.⁴⁰⁷ The 'Orthodox Romanian priest' who responded to Young-Ruthenian assertions concerning the Orthodox Church implied that adjustment came from the local clergy rather than from his flock:

It is completely incorrect that priests belonging to the Romanian nationality and deployed in Ruthenian communities were tendentious Romanisators of the Ruthenian people. Although of Romanian descent, as a result of their long stay among Ruthenians they are so mild in national respect that they can only nominally and never nationally be reckoned among the Romanians. Quite a few might just as well be seen as Ruthenians because of their disposition and attitude, especially since their command of Ruthenian is at least as good that of Romanian language, indeed sometimes even better.

According to the author, there were also Ruthenian priests stationed in Romanian-language communities. Apparently, their poor command of Romanian was sometimes the butt of local jokes, but the author refrained from providing concrete examples.⁴⁰⁸

In January 1907, the Bukovinian Regional Diet and Metropolitan Repta received a complaint from Michailo Mandryk and others, insisting that the parish in Molodia had been taken over by a fanatic Romanian, Ioan Ianovici, who was said not to master Ruthenian and to perform all his duties in Romanian. Mandryk requested that the priest alternate languages on a weekly basis. Yet, according to the metropolitan, Ianovici already preached and prayed in Ruthenian and national tensions would have only aggravated if the existing situation had changed even more in favour of the Ruthenian language. The Archpriest of Czahor informed the Metropoly that the complaints against Ianovici had in no way been a collective Ruthenian initiative, but an individual action by 'chauvinist' schoolteacher Jakubowski.⁴⁰⁹

⁴⁰⁶ *Aus dem Bukowiner Landtage*, Czernowitzer Zeitung, 4, 06.01.1904, p. 1.

⁴⁰⁷ "Die Pfarrlinge sind aber mit dieser Geflogenheit (...) meistens einverstanden und wird von denselben eine Aenderung in dieser Hinsicht nicht gewünscht. Ein Widerspruch dagegen wird fast nur von Seiten ausstehender national bewusster Elemente erhoben". Landespräsident, *Bericht and das k.k. Ministerium für Kultus und Unterricht*, Zl. 2419 Präs, 26 June 1907, p. 9/ ANR, Fond 'Guvenământul Bucovinei', MCÎ, CXXIII/10.

⁴⁰⁸ N.N., *Die gr.-or. Kirchenfrage in der Bukowina und die Jungruthenen (Kritische Beleuchtung der Brochure: "Beitrag zur kirchlichen Frage in der Bukowina. Zwei zeitgemäße Artikel vom Reichsratabgeordneten Hierotheus Pihuliak und einem gr.-or. ruthenischen Priester")*, Bukowinaer Vereinsdruckerei, Czernowitz 1906, pp. 25-26.

⁴⁰⁹ Acting Governor, *Bericht der Bukowiner k.k. Landesregierung an das Ministerium für Kultus und Unterricht betreffend die Beschwerde des Michailo Mandryk und Genossen wegen Nichtgebrauches der ruthenischen*

In another case, *Narodniy Holos* published an open letter dated 5 November 1911 said to have originated from hundred inhabitants of the village of Korczestie. The village had been without a priest for quite some time and substitute priest Breaban was said to speak only Romanian. According to the plaintiffs, a letter sent to this priest returned unread with the instruction either to write in German or to provide a German translation. Furthermore, Breaban had allegedly divided his parishioners in two leagues, the ‘Orthodox’ or ‘Vlachs’ and the ‘nationally conscious’ Ruthenians’ he was said to call ‘Uniates’. Since only the first group was provided with both Ruthenian and Romanian schools, Breaban was accused of creating a rift in Korczestie. The authors of the letter asked for a Ruthenian priest and mentioned presumed activities of a Romanian priest by the name of Bejan, who would go to Ruthenian villages to celebrate mass there and to ‘forge, together with the Romanian priests, Ruthenian Vlachs out of Ruthenians’ (*із Русинів Руских Волохів*).⁴¹⁰ The terminology and identification markers applied in the letter (Vlach, Romanian, Uniate, Rus’, Ruthenian and so on) must have been quite a challenge for the readers of *Narodniy Holos*. Predictably, the complaint was also brought to the attention of Vienna by the well-known instrument of the interpellation.⁴¹¹

In his explanatory notes, Governor Meran presented the problem as one of staffing rather than of nationalist indoctrination: the priest of Korczestie had indeed been ill, his replacement was old and frail himself, so the actual work had been left to an assistant priest who did not speak Ruthenian. However, in the meantime the Consistory had provided another substitute, one who had mastered Ruthenian, and according to the captain of the Storozynetz district, all parishioners were now satisfied.⁴¹²

The Young-Ruthenians of *Bukovyna* might have grumbled that it was outrageous that Ruthenians had to listen to Romanian sermons while there was no village where Romanians had to listen to Ruthenian,⁴¹³ but they were contradicted by one of their own: Daszkiewicz provided his audience with several illustrative examples of the opposite, showing how Romanian-language priests sometimes struggled with Ruthenian, mixing genders, mixing in Romanian words and making a hash of idiomatic expressions.⁴¹⁴ All in all, priests seem to

Sprache bei gottesdienstlichen Funktionen in der gr. or. Pfarre in Molodia, Z. 30989, 14 September 1908/ ANR, Fond ‘Guvernământul Bucovinei’, MCĪ CXXXIII/1.

⁴¹⁰ *Отверте письмо...*, Народный голос, 10.11.1911, pp. 1-3.

⁴¹¹ Haus der Abgeordneten, *Interpellation des Abg. Spenul und Genossen an Seine Exzellenz den Herrn Minister für Kultus und Unterricht Dr. Max Ritter Hussarek v. Heinlein*, 1911-1914/ 21st Session, Anhang III, 956/I, kaiserlich-königliche Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, Vienna, 14 November 1911, pp. 5270-5271.

⁴¹² “Laut Berichtes der k.k. Bezirkshauptmannschaft in Storozynetz vom 7. März 1912, Zl. 84/A.V. erscheinen die gr. or. Glaubensgenossen von Korczestie - und zwar auch die ruthenischen - mit der Zuweisung des Hilfspriesters Tudan zufriedengestellt und hat sich gegen denselben bisher keine Mißstimmung bemerkbar gemacht”. Governor Meran, *Bericht an Seine Exzellenz den Herrn k.k. Minister für Kultus und Unterricht in Wien*, Zl. 2428 Präs, 20 June 1912/ ANR, Fond ‘Guvernământul Bucovinei’, MCĪ CXXXIII/1.

⁴¹³ *Волоска віра*, Буковина, 05.03.1909, p. 1.

⁴¹⁴ The examples and the mistakes they contained can only be partly translated into English since many of them are gender-related (which was no problem for the original translation into German). When this is the case, it is indicated between brackets. Daszkiewicz used a Polish transliteration for Ruthenian. This is maintained here. “Wyzlizła Isus na horu i stala rykaty” (Jesus [fem] crouched on the mountain and started to bawl); “Isus szczezła i zdymydła” (Jesus [fem] carried himself off and went up in smoke); “Cy choczyty wy ces pani, kotre berete sobi za zinku?” (Do You want this [masc] lady, which [neut] You take for yourself as woman?); “Prynesy

have made an effort and even in the case of Father Bocancea from Russ-Moldavitza - one of the clerics discussed previously and accused by Pihuliak of being a Romanisator - Governor Regner-Bleyleben assured the Viennese authorities that the inculcated celebrated mass and read his sermons exclusively in Ruthenian.⁴¹⁵

According to the comments of Metropolitan Repta in relation to a Young-Ruthenian interpellation, nationalist forces had quickly gained ground in the various Bukovinian parishes. Whereas Repta had dismissed a Young-Ruthenian demonstration at his doorstep in 1903 as orchestrated by Hierotheus Pihuliak, by 1912 he assessed the situation as significantly more serious and widespread:

National disputes and conflicts about religious issues increase on a daily basis and already degenerated in acts of violence like in the mixed parishes of Korczestie, Czahor, Kamenka, Moldovan-Banilla and many others. The population demands only priests belonging to their own nationality, as Your Excellency may have learned from the appendices to the Consistorial report in reply to the interpellation regarding the situation in the Korczestie parish submitted by Imperial Council Deputy Spenul. They motivate their demands with the claim that a priest of foreign nationality can never be as replete with benevolence towards his parishioners as a priest of the same nationality. And this approach is not limited to immediate pastors, but is also extended to district priests, vicars-general and to the archbishop. Once they belong to a different nationality, these clerical figures are regarded as opposed to national aspirations from the outset and it is even believed that they are happy if progress in the field of culture and prosperity of those entrusted but not related to them is thwarted.⁴¹⁶

As opposed to his position in 1903, the metropolitan now seemed to regard Young-Ruthenian protests as the legitimate *vox populi* of the Bukovinian Ruthenian Orthodox. Both the Bukovinian Orthodox leadership and the Austrian authorities deemed a language harmonisation policy a prerequisite for national peace. Then again, language matters and the

caruța, budu pojichatu na îngropaciune” (Carry caruța [Rom. carriage], I shall go to îngropaciune [Rom. funeral]); “Stereze nasza konsystor prawoslawie tak szczyro, jak polowyk kuriata” (Our ([fem] Consistory protects Orthodoxy as faithfully as the vulture the cookies!), Daszkiewicz 1891, p. 64.

⁴¹⁵ “Die hl. Messe wird vom Pfarfer Bocancea ausschliesslich in der ruthenischen bzw. kirchenslavischen Sprache gelesen, die Predigt ausschliesslich ruthenisch gesprochen”. Governor Regner-Bleyleben, *Bericht an den Minister für Kultus und Unterricht*, Zl. 2577 Präs; ex 1906, Zl. 2577 Präs; ex 1906, Vienna, 11.06.1907, p. 3/ ANR, Fond ‘Guvernământul Bucovinei’, MCÎ CXXXIII/1.

⁴¹⁶ “(...) die nationalen Streitigkeiten und Kämpfe auf dem kirchlichen Gebiete nehmen täglich zu und arten bereits in Tätlichkeiten aus, wie z.B. in den gemischten Pfarrgemeinden Korczestie, Czahor, Kamenka, Moldauisch-Banilla und in vielen anderen Orten. Die Bevölkerung verlangt, wie Eure Exzellenz auch aus den Beilagen des Konsistorialberichtes zwecks Beantwortung der vom Reichsratsabgeordneten Spenul eingebrachten Interpellation betreffend die kirchlichen Zustände in der Pfarre Korczestie entnehmen können, nur solche Priester, welche derselben Nationalität angehören. - Sie motiviert ihre Forderung mit der Behauptung, dass ein Priester fremder Nationalität nie von dem Wohlwollen gegen seine Pfarrlinge erfüllt sein könne, wie ein Priester derselben Nationalität. - Und diese Anschauung wird nicht nur auf den unmittelbaren Seelsorger beschränkt, sondern auch auf den Bezirkserpriester, auf die Konsistorialräte und auf den Erzbischof ausgedehnt. - In diesen geistlichen Personen sieht man, wenn sie einer anderen Nationalität angehören, von vornherein Gegner der nationalen Bestrebungen; ja man glaubt, dass sie sich sogar freuen, wenn dem Fortschritte auf dem Gebiete der Kultur und des Wohlstandes der ihnen nicht stammverwandten Pflegebefohlenen irgendwelche Hindernisse in den Weg gelegt werden”. Repta, Vladimir Mitropolit von, Schreiben an Seine Exzellenz den Kultusminister, 3/16 March 1912/ ANR, Fond ‘Guvernământul Bucovinei’, MCÎ CXXI/3.

contentment of the Orthodox parishioners did not always have priority on the agenda of the Austrian administration: when the Governor's Office had lost patience with the Russophile activities of assistant priest Kassian Bohatyretz, Metropolitan Repta was kindly requested to isolate the culprit by displacing him from Zastavna to a 'Romanian district'.⁴¹⁷

In 1888, the Bukovinian village of Rarancze rose to prominence when a substantial number of Orthodox believers went over to the Uniate Church. Similar phenomena took place in the surrounding villages, including Ispas and Toporoutz. According to *Bukowinaer Rundschau*, Orthodox Ruthenian peasants had attempted to establish a reading hall, but had been obstructed in their efforts by the local priest. As a result, they were said to have lost faith in their Romanian priests and had demanded clerics 'belonging to their nationality, who would proclaim the Word of God to them in their own language'. The Consistory 'in all its headliness' refused to concede, even raised the sulpice fees and in this way 'did everything within its powers to ensure a success for the [Uniate] Bishop of Stanislau'.⁴¹⁸ *Bukovyna* made a clear distinction between the behaviour of the virtuous reading hall members and that of the local Orthodox clerics. From Toporoutz, it was reported that drunken priests had left church with items clearly stolen from it while in Ispan, Father Fratzián was said to have greeted his flock in church 'with his fists'. Attempts by the Archbishop to settle matters in person in Ispas and Toporoutz had apparently failed and the converts refused to return to the Orthodox Church 'for the Consistory had offended the holiest of moral feelings of the Ruthenian peasant' (*світла консисторія кпнтя з образених найсвятійших моральних чувств руского хлібороба*). Rumours had it that the Consistory planned to invoke the assistance of Old-Ruthenian prominent Hrihoriy Kupchanko to restore confidence, but the editors of *Bukovyna* assured that 'like the two-faced Pharisee', he would not receive a particularly warm welcome.⁴¹⁹ Meanwhile, the Orthodox Church in the villages concerned was accused of doing anything in its power to win back the apostates or at least make life as difficult for them as possible. In the cases presented to the governor, there was mention of intimidation and abuse, of forcibly collected contribution from members of the Uniate Church for the local Orthodox Church and of reluctance from Orthodox clerics to emit administrative declarations.⁴²⁰ Especially the latter was a major source of discontent, since most converts were still dependent on the Orthodox Church for duplicates of their birth certificates and other documents required for certain legal procedures. In the matter of intimidation and abuse, the only witness willing to testify against the alleged culprits was related to the claimed victim and his testimony was therefore dismissed. The allegation of extorted contributions from Uniate believers by Orthodox Church representatives could not be confirmed either. However,

⁴¹⁷ "Ich beehre mich daher Euer Exzellenz zu ersuchen, behufs der unbedingt erforderlichen Eindämmung der russophilen Propaganda im Zastavna'er Bezirke die Versetzung des genannten Hilfspriester in einen anderen Dienstort in einem rumänischen Bezirke verfügen und hierüber binnen 14 Tagen eine Mitteilung anher machen zu wollen". Governor Regner-Bleyleben, *An Seine des hochwürdigsten Herrn gr.or. Erzbischof und Metropoliten Dr. Vladimir von Repta*, Zl. 6772 Präs, 15 December 1909/ DJAN Suceava, Fond 'Mitropolia Bucovinei', secția 14/1, dosar 56.

⁴¹⁸ *Kirchliches*, *Bukowinaer Rundschau*, 15.04.1888, pp. 1-2.

⁴¹⁹ *Політика, а унія на Буковині*, Буковина, 01.08.1888, pp. 1-2.

⁴²⁰ Balasiewicz, Josef, *Appeal to Governor by a Greek-Catholic priest concerning the crisis in Rarancze*, Bojan, 24 March 1889/ DACHO, Viddil 1, Fond 3, Opis 1, spr. 5311.

the district captain charged with the investigation into the reported grievances endorsed the complaints against priest Tarnawski from Rarancze, who was said to demand a conversion back to Orthodoxy before he would supply copies of register entries to Uniate converts.⁴²¹ Although its extent remains unclear, it is thus safe to say that there was pressure from the Orthodox Church to win back its strayed flock.

Years later, in 1912, *Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung* opined that the Rarancze conversions had been a conscious first step by Ruthenian nationalists to enhance their influence; their clearly subordinate position in the Bukovinian Orthodox Church had seemingly rendered futile further attempts to solidify their grip within Orthodox hierarchy and therefore they had concluded they stood a better chance in the Uniate Church. The Orthodox Consistory, still under the Romanian nationalist control of Metropolitan Morariu-Andrievici, had thought it best to counter the conversions with all means.⁴²² Ironically, a massive outflow of Ruthenian speakers out of the Bukovinian Orthodox Church would have served later Romanian nationalists rather well once they saw themselves confronted with their skilful Ruthenian adversaries in the power struggle over supremacy in the Orthodox Church.

The same argument was used by the Young-Ruthenians themselves, who ridiculed 'Romanisation policies', since these would only chase Orthodox (Ruthenian) believers away from the Church because they 'wanted to hear a comprehensible Slavic word'.⁴²³ *Bukowinaer Post* laid the blame firmly on the Young-Ruthenians, who 'only brought discord into the peaceful sphere of the Church and even propagated apostasy if the Church refused to be their political accomplice'.⁴²⁴ When on one occasion Metropolitan Repta spoke with dissatisfied parishioners who threatened to convert to the Uniate Church if their priest was not transferred immediately, he reportedly replied:

I regret that you are so weak in the belief of your fathers that you want to convert to another faith because of a triviality. Still, if you are this determined, you can go right ahead, since the

⁴²¹ "Anbelangend die gegen den gr.ort. Pfarrer Theodor Tarnawski erhoben Anschuldigung, wienach derselbe die gr.kath. Pfarlinge gelegentlich ihrer Petita um Ausfolgung der Familienauskünfte zum Rückübertritte zum gr.ort. Glauben auffordert, diese sogar zur Bedingung für die Ausfolgung der gedachten Familienauskünfte macht, erlaube ich mir ergebendst zu berichten, daß die Eingangsbezogen Beschwerde bezüglich dieses Beschwerdepunktes begründet ist, indem alle diesfalls einvernommenen Zeugen gegen den obgenannten Pfarrer betreffend deponirten, der Beschuldigte selbst diese Depositionen durch Seine Rechtfertigung keineswegs zu entkräften vermochte". *District captain's report to the Governor's Office regarding the alleged oppression of Greek-Catholics in Rarancze*, 2 May 1889/ DACHO, Viddil 1, Fond 3, Opis 1, spr. 5311.

⁴²² *Die gr.-or. Kirchenfrage*, Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung, 28.03.1912, p. 1.

⁴²³ "Der priesterliche Agent der romanisatorischen Propaganda hat es endlich dahin gebracht, daß, wer vom Volke ein verständliches slawisches Wort hören will, der begibt sich nach Kimpolung in die griechisch-katholische Kirche!" Haus der Abgeordneten, *Interpellation des Abgeordneten Pihuliak und Genossen an Seine Exzellenz den Herrn Leiter des k.k. Ministeriums für Kultus und Unterricht wegen romanisatorischer Umtriebe des griechisch-orientalischen Konsistoriums in der Bukowina*, 13 December 1907, 47. Sitzung der XVIII Session/ ANR, Fond 'Guvernământul Bucovinei', MCÍ CXXXIII/1.

⁴²⁴ *Zum Bischofseinzuge*, Bukowinaer Post, 03.05.1896, p.1.

*state laws allow anybody to choose the church of his liking and to leave his church if they do not like it. I on the other hand am prohibited by law to do what you ask.*⁴²⁵

It is doubtful, as the scene depicted above indicates, that conversions were a matter of national or linguistic ambitions. More often, they seem to have had a more practical background. It is equally disputable that the leadership of the Bukovinian Orthodox Church was as indifferent as the words attributed to Metropolitan Repta suggest. An earlier conversion affair sheds some light on these circumstances, since the case of the Rarancze conversions was not the first incident of its kind.

Thirty years before, in 1858, similar steps had been taken by villagers from nearby Bojan. From Czernowitz, the marshal had reported that Bojan's Orthodox parishioners were outraged to such extent by the burden of the suplice fees imposed on them by Orthodox priest Simon Andruchkowicz that they demanded his transfer or else they would convert to the Uniate Church. However, Andruchkowicz remained, whereupon Uniate priest Chlebowicki from Sadagora traveled to Bojan to register the dissatisfied in the Uniate Church without having informed their Orthodox priest as he was obliged to do. The Orthodox Consistory in turn lodged a complaint with the local authorities, which eventually resulted in Andruchkowicz to be lifted from his duties after having been ordered to compensate the parishioners he had wrongfully overburdened. In the following official census, all formerly converted once again registered as Orthodox. As a countermove, the Lemberg Uniate Bishopric sent a delegate to duly consign the Uniate converts, to urge them to remain faithful to the Uniate Church and to ensure them they were protected by the local Austrian authorities if necessary. Soon thereafter, Orthodox Archimandrite Bendella preached in Bojan, assuring his audience that one could not be forced to stay loyal to the Uniates and that the oath they had taken was void. This overt bickering between the competing Churches led to general unrest and resulted in a mission to Vienna consisting of Bishop Hacman and a number of Bukovinian Orthodox noblemen in order to complain about the goings-on.⁴²⁶ Yet, Emperor Franz Joseph proved to be less than declined to curb Uniate activities: so far, Bukovinian Orthodox nobility had staunchly opposed any attempt by Vienna to enhance the dire position of Bukovinian peasants, which, logically, would reduce the power of large landowners. If peasants had discovered the powerful tool of religious conversion in order to improve their situation, the Emperor was not going to take this away from them.⁴²⁷

In spite of the considerable ground nationalists had gained over the years, close to the final stages of the nationalist struggles within the Bukovinian Orthodox Church, the Austrian

⁴²⁵ "Es tut mir leid, daß ihr so schwach in euerem väterlichen Glauben seid, daß ihr wegen einer Kleinigkeit zu einem anderen Glauben übertreten wollt. Seid ihr dazu aber entschlossen, so könnt ihr es freilich tun, denn die Staatsgesetze gestatten einem jeden, sich jene Kirche zu wählen, die ihm gefällt, und seine Kirche zu verlassen, wenn sie ihm nicht gefällt. Mir aber verbieten die Gesetze das zu tun, was ihr verlangt". N.N., *Die gr.-or. Kirchenfrage in der Bukowina und die Jungruthenen (Kritische Beleuchtung der Brochure: "Beitrag zur kirchlichen Frage in der Bukowina. Zwei zeitgemäße Artikel vom Reichsratabgeordneten Hierotheus Pihuliak und einem gr.-or. ruthenischen Priester")*, Bukowinaer Vereinsdruckerei, Czernowitz 1906, pp. 49-50.

⁴²⁶ Ministerium des Innern/ 4. Gendarmerie-Regiment, *Notiz 1379 Pr. II*, Vienna 1858/ ANR, Fond

'Guvernământul Bucovinei', MI, mapa 79/1.

⁴²⁷Turczynski 1993, p. 93.

authorities observed no shift in the rationale behind conversions compared to that of decades earlier. In 1913, Governor Meran noted that ‘conversions from one church to another usually occur for personal or physical reasons whereby a certain conservative sense and indolence play a more prominent role than only modestly existent religious consciousness’.⁴²⁸

⁴²⁸ “Uebertritte von einer Kirche zur anderen erfolgen zumeist aus persönlichen oder materiellen Gründen, wobei ein gewisser konservativer Sinn, eine gewisse Indolenz weit mehr als das im geringen Masse vorhandene konfessionelle Bewußtsein auch die erwähnten Motive nur verhältnismäßig selten zur Geltung kommen läßt”. Governor Meran, *file ‘unerledigte Präs. Akten’* no. Zl. 2361 Präs, 17 August 1913, p. 15/ ANR, Fond ‘Guvernământul Bucovinei’, MCÎ CXXIII/11.