

BUKOWINA BETWEEN 1880-1910: AN ETHNIC AND CONFESSONAL PERSPECTIVE

Arnold-Nicholas-Louis PESCARU

pescarunicolae1@gmail.com

“Ştefan cel Mare” University of Suceava, Romania

Abstract: Between 1880 and 1910, in multiethnic Bukovina each ethno-confessional community had a cultural life marked by a certain autonomy, possible thanks to the cultivation of the mother tongue and the existence of religious freedom. Romanians, Germans, Ukrainians, Jews, Poles, including smaller communities of Hungarians or Armenians, preserved their own traditions. But, after a hundred years of Austrian administration, based on a strong centralization of political and economic decisions especially until 1860, combined with a functional autonomy in 1880, segregation was largely replaced by political competition and socio-political and cultural communication. Modernization spoke its mind and produced changes and consequences. Each larger ethnic group in Bukovina fought during this period to acquire a form of power and influence. The struggle to assert one's own identity in the socio-political, economic and religious space, tempered by a certain tradition of tolerance and mutual respect. At the same time, Romanians, Ukrainians, Germans, Jews or Poles had to take into account the Bukovina ethno-confessional reality and, often, strove not to neglect the interests, sensitivities of others, always having in mind the construction of a particular, even privileged relationship with the central Viennese power. There was in this Bukovina a complex dynamic of the closure and opening of ethnicities and communities towards each other. Each community made an effort to preserve its national specificity, but sometimes it also became receptive to what was happening within the other communities. The Romanian community seemed more united than divided; the project was fighting for being the union with the Kingdom of Romania or, at least, the preservation of rights, of its own culture and of its mother tongue. Although there were, as always in history, people who pursued their personal projects and not the community project, the Romanians, through groups of aristocrats, intellectuals and clergy, and among the peasants, have primarily aimed at the national ideal. The Austrians created what in today's historiography is called a (pseudo)historical narrative, through much propaganda, education and administrative strategies, which, however, over time, took on content and legitimacy in the real historical dynamics, effectively becoming a historical narrative. The central representations of this story are related to the Bukovina's identity, marked by tolerance, acceptance and practice of multiethnicity and multiconfessionalism, patronized by a modern society, and based on an Enlightenment-type organization.

Keywords: historical Bukovina, ethnicity, confessions, 1900.

Introduction

The ethno-confessional structure of Bukovina between 1880 and 1910 was the result of a process accumulated since the first part of the 19th century, following colonization and the diversification of confessions and religious communities. The Orthodox remained the majority, because the absolute majority of Romanians was Orthodox; also, there was an increasing number of Ruthenians. However, the percentage of Orthodox people was continuously decreasing through the birth of other religious communities: Roman Catholics, Greek Catholics, Mosaics, Protestants. In these last decades of the Austrian administration, the process knew a certain stabilization, in the sense that the percentage of Orthodox was no longer decreasing, but remained constant.

In 1880, the Orthodox community formed around 70.7% of the total population of Bukovina. The Orthodox were followed by the Mosaic Jewish community, with a share of 11.8%, almost identical to that of the Roman Catholic community, of 11.1%. But the Catholic community also included Greek Catholics, with a share of 3.1%. The Protestant Lutheran community constituted 2.3% of the population of Bukovina in 1880 (Ungureanu, 2003: 175). If in a century, between 1774-1880, the ethno-confessional structure of the Bukovina province changed visibly, following the central policy of favoring immigration and colonization, after 1880, until 1918, the ethno-confessional composition had a much slower evolution, marked in particular by the increase in the number of mosaic Jews, which, however, did not change, however spectacularly, the majority pf the Orthodox community.

The central ethno-confessional issue: relations between Romanians and Ruthenians

At the end of the 19th century, the fundamental problem, however, of the ethno-confessional structure in Bukovina, lay beyond these figures and was quasi-camouflaged by the statistics established, whether manipulated or not, through the 1880 census. It was about the relations between the Romanians and the Ruthenians in Bukovina, who belonged to the Orthodox Church of Bukovina and who were counted together in the confessional community of the Orthodox. However, the relations between the Romanian Orthodox and the Ruthenian Orthodox followed an increasingly conflictual trajectory throughout the entire period of Austrian domination in Bukovina. It is interesting to mention here a study by Radu Grigorovici, *Critical Study of the Austrian Census of 1880 Regarding the Population of Bukovina. The Subsequent Manipulation of the Data*, where he reaches this conclusion:

“I must state that the efforts to manipulate the field data [by using the conversational language as a criterion for a person’s belonging to an ethnic community] obtained by the Austrian census of the population of Bukovina of December 31, 1880, through a deliberately unfavorable processing of the autochthonous Romanian element, by including Galician immigrants, not yet citizens in Bukovina, in the number of autochthonous Bukovinians, parallel to the exclusion from this number of citizens of Romania and, more seriously, of Transylvanians, citizens of the Kingdom of Hungary, part of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, have nevertheless changed relatively little the ratio between the number of Romanian speakers and that of Ruthenian speakers, within the autochthonous population of Bukovina.” (Grigorovici, 2006: 63).

In his studies, Constantin Ungureanu believes, on the contrary, that the census data from 1880 and 1910 were ultimately affected by the abusive registration of a significant number of Romanians as Ruthenians, because they also spoke the Ruthenian language. The necessity of these studies in themselves, and then the entire Romanian-Ukrainian historiographical controversy, show to this day that the history of Romanian and Ukrainian Orthodoxy is very complex. And the issue of relations between Romanian Orthodoxy in Bukovina and Ruthenian (Ukrainian) Orthodoxy in historical Bukovina is an extremely sensitive space, with conflict zones unresolved to this day. There were also interdenominational conflicts in Bukovina.

From the time of Miron Ciupercovici, Ukrainian clergy began to claim positions in the leadership of the Metropolitanate and the Consistory, and in the decade preceding World War I they campaigned for the establishment of a Ukrainian diocese. Another Bukovina peculiarity is worth noting, namely the ethnic mix within the Christian confessional communities. The Orthodox confession also included Armenians, Lipovean Russians, and Gypsies. Also, the Catholic community consisted of several ethnic groups: Germans, Poles, Slovaks, Catholic Armenians, and Hungarians.

The Protestant community mainly consisted of Germans and a small part of Hungarians. If Bukovina was predominantly Orthodox due to its Romanian and Ruthenian population, its capital, the city of Cernăuți / Chernivtsi, was not predominantly Orthodox in 1910. In fact, no denomination held a majority in the city. At that time, 87,128 people lived in Chernivtsi, the largest of which was the community formed by the Mosaic Jews (32.8%), followed by the Roman Catholic community (26.9%), the Orthodox community (23.7%), the Greek Catholic community (11%) and the Lutheran community (4.9%).

The ethno-confessional dynamics of Bukovina between 1775-1880, in the context of demographic evolution

The historical content of this ethno-confessional process in Bukovina was strictly linked to the evolution of demography in Bukovina. In 1775, when the Austrian administration in Bukovina began, most of the inhabitants were Christians. The population was made up of an absolute majority of Romanian Orthodox. Almost all other inhabitants of an ethnicity other than that of the majority autochthonous Romanians (Ruthenians, Armenians, Gypsies) were also of the Orthodox faith. Exceptions made the few Germans, then settled in the colonies of Sadagura and Prelipcea, and a small number of Polish families, who belonged to the Catholic or Protestant denominations. The first census conducted by the Austrian administration, immediately after the military occupation of northwestern Moldova, highlighted the fact that the Jews of the Mosaic religion constituted the most significant confessional minority, different from the majority Orthodox denomination.

Jews were settled in Chernivtsi, Suceava, Vijnița, and in several villages in northern Bukovina, forming around 3-3.5% of the region's population in 1775. The massive colonization that followed, carefully planned and controlled by the Viennese Crown, strongly transformed this ethno-confessional structure over the course of a century, without, however, changing its Orthodox matrix.

In 1816, the population of Bukovina reached 200,000 inhabitants, 90% of whom were still Orthodox, and 5.12% Catholic. In 1850, when around 400,000 inhabitants already lived in Bukovina, the Orthodox community shrank, but not spectacularly, reaching a percentage of 81.1% of the total population. The confessional evolution was different

from the ethnic dynamics in Austrian Bukovina. From an ethnic perspective, the native Romanians were progressively losing their population share through the massive immigration of Galician Ruthenians. But from a confessional perspective, the same Ruthenian migration process largely covered the modification of the ethno-confessional structure through the establishment of Catholic or Mosaic allogenes, because the Ruthenians were mostly Orthodox. Only a minority of Ruthenians were Catholic. In 1850, the inhabitants of Bukovina of Roman Catholic and Greek Catholic religion together reached around 12% of the total Bukovinian population. At the same time, around 14,618 Mosaic Jews lived in Bukovina.

The Austrians found in Bukovina a primarily Romanian Orthodox society, with an ancient organizational system, with rules of life, with a Byzantine culture and tradition, on which the entire civilization of the native Romanians was based. The culture and art of the monasteries are worth mentioning as testimony to the strength and influence of Orthodoxy in this part of Moldova.

At Dragomirna Monastery, for example, in 1774 there was an Orthodox monastic community with over 300 monks led by Saint Paisius Velicicovici, who took refuge in Moldova after the annexation in 1775 and eventually founded a large monastic community at Neamț Monastery, a model for the entire Orthodox world, where he completed the translation of the Philokalia into Slavonic. And at Putna, in 1758 Saints Iacob Putneanul and Vartolomeu Măzăreanu founded the Theological Academy which operated during the Austrian military administrations until 1786 as a nucleus of Orthodox education and culture. In 1774, Northwest Moldova, annexed by the Austrians was by tradition and through centuries of continuity a center of Byzantine Orthodox Christianity.

Significant moments in the history of the Orthodox Church in Bukovina

The Austrians have striven permanently to deny in the political-administrative discourse this native culture and especially the level of culture of the native Romanians. They have promoted the representation of the primitive Romanians, civilized and saved from the wilderness of a medieval world by the enlightened policy of the Austrian state. It is certain that the Christian civilizational model and the Byzantine identity memory collided with the Western civilizational model of enlightenment inspiration brought by the Austrian state. The two cultures mutually excluded each other in many fundamental rules of life.

As an argument, we can only evoke a possible comparative meditation. In the years 1779-1794, at the Neamț Monastery, Paisie Velicicovici, together with an impressive community of monks (between 700 and 1,000 people), most of whom came from the monasteries closed by the Austrians in the new Bukovina, translated the Philokalia into Slavonic and cultivated a hesychast mystical culture of prayer and Christian love as the culmination of all post-Byzantine Orthodoxy.

During the same period, as the Enlightenment philosophy was asserted in the Franco-Germanic world and the French Revolution took place, the profound secularization and secularization of the Western world began. The directions in which the two societies, the Romanian Orthodox and the Austrian, were heading were not at all complementary or similar. The Austrian administration positioned itself against the autochthonous nature of the Romanians through a policy directed first against the Orthodox Church of Bukovina, marking the history of all the monasteries and churches of this land in a disastrous way.

During the occupation of almost 144 years (1774 – 1918), Imperial Vienna constantly wanted, through all its policies, to create a Catholicized and secularized Bukovina.

In this persistent strategy, the Austrian and Galician administrations relied on immigration, accelerated colonization, Slavization and Catholicization, as means of denationalizing and assimilating the Romanians. The situation of the Romanian Orthodox was also affected by significant waves of immigration, as Petre S. Aurelian shows in a monograph dedicated to Bukovina, published in 1876. The entry of the Austrians in 1774, quickly followed by colonization and the closure of Orthodox monasteries, generated suffering and insecurity among the Romanian Orthodox, who chose to emigrate in the first years after the annexation:

“The Romanian population [of Bukovina], frightened at the sight of these people, gathered from all corners of Austria, began to flee. Entire villages were deserted; the inhabitants crossed into Moldavia, Bessarabia and Russia as far as near Odessa, just to escape the oppression and religious persecution.” (Petre S. Aurelian, 1916: XIV).

Romanians emigrated from Bukovina in several waves, due to the anti-Romanian and anti-Orthodox policies of the Austrian administrations. The largest wave of emigration, as we have shown, occurred in the years 1814-1816, when education in the Romanian language, Romanian schools and the authority of the Orthodox Church were affected by Austrian laws. A few years after the occupation of northwestern Moldavia, Emperor Joseph II (1780-1790) made a decision with structural consequences in the organization of the Orthodox Church of the Romanians in Bukovina. The Austrian administration identified the strength of the native Romanians in the Orthodox faith, in the existence of monasteries and churches, maintained by priests, monks and nuns. As we have seen, the Austrian census counted up to 75,000 inhabitants during the years of the Habsburg annexation, of which up to 60,000 were Romanians.

Moreover, the large numbers of monasteries, churches, and, of course, monks, nuns, and priests show the importance of Orthodoxy. The Orthodox clergy represented the core of the Bukovina people, around which the peasants and village shepherds gravitated, together with the boyars, merchants, and intellectuals. After the imperial administration estimated that forced Catholicization was not possible, the decision was made to secularize the assets of the monasteries and to brutally intervene in their organization, with the obvious conviction that the native Romanians would thus be assimilated over time.

We recall here only a few significant moments in the history of the Orthodox Church in Bukovina. The Austrian state cut the canonical link between the Episcopate of Rădăuți and the Metropolitanate of Moldavia in Iași. This was the beginning of dramatic events and a continuous struggle with the Austrian state, for the preservation of the religious and canonical autonomy of the Orthodox Church in Bukovina. The episcopal residence was moved to Cernăuți / Chernivtsi. In effect, the Diocese of Rădăuți was abolished and a new Diocese of Bukovina was established on February 12, 1782, which would be placed in hierarchical dependence on the Serbian Metropolitanate of Karlowitz.

Immediately after these events, the secularization of monastic assets followed. By the Imperial Ordinance of June 19, 1783, Joseph II confiscated all the lands and funds administered by the Bishopric of Rădăuți. Practically, after all the properties of the Orthodox monasteries were confiscated, most monasteries were forcibly dissolved. The monks were expelled; the churches and monasteries were closed. Where the monks and the

nuns resisted, the monasteries and churches were burned or destroyed. This tragedy was at the origin of the organization of Bukovina as an Austrian province.

The violence of the Habsburg Empire's policy, directed against Romanian Orthodoxy, is rare in the entire history of Europe. Aurel Morariu summarizes in his 1940 study *Bukovina* the process of liquidating the autonomy of the Romanian Orthodox Church of Bukovina and confiscating all its assets by the Austrian state:

“Immediately after the annexation of Bukovina, the Austrian rule also began reforms in the Romanian Orthodox Church [of Bukovina]. After the Metropolitanate of Iași had renounced its metropolitan rights towards the Diocese of Bukovina, an imperial autograph of August 8, 1781 decreed that the church reforms in Bukovina be completed. [...] ...in the same year (December 12, 1781) Bishop Dosoftei Herescu, urged by the governor of Bukovina Enzenberg, moved his residence from Rădăuți to Cernăuți, an old Moldavian market, which Joseph II had chosen as the city of residence of the Austrian rule in this part of Moldavia.” (Morariu, 2012: 175)

In 1782, Bishop Dosoftei Herescu, separated from the Metropolitanate of Moldavia, addressed the emperor with a request to be granted the title of Metropolitan of Bukovina, in order to respect the canons of the Orthodox Church. But the request was rejected and the emperor decided that the bishopric of Bukovina would depend in dogmatic and purely spiritual matters – *in dogmaticis et mere spiritualibus* – on the Serbian metropolitanate of Karlovitz, on which the Orthodox Bishopric of Transylvania also depended at that time. The political decision of the imperial administration aimed at the rapid assimilation of the Orthodox Church in Bukovina. This rather unnatural dependence would create many conflicts between Bishop Dosoftei and Metropolitan Moise Putnic of Karlovitz.

The new hierarchical ties into which the Orthodox Church in Bukovina was forcedly placed would later fuel a process of sharp loss of administrative and financial decision-making power, to the benefit of the extremely numerous Ruthenian and Ukrainian colonists. Aurel Morariu evokes the process of secularization of monastic assets, carried out against the will of the abbots, the clergy, and the monks, and despite their revolt. This is how the Religious Fund of the Greek-Oriental Church of Bukovina was created, given that more than half of the area of Bukovina, including numerous estates, forests, and mountains, belonged to monasteries and hermitages, through successive donations over hundreds of years received from the lords, boyars, and peasants of Moldavia:

“On August 3, 1782, another imperial decree abolished several hermitages and smaller monasteries and secularized their assets. These assets formed the first basis of the later “Gr[eco]-Or[iental] Religious Fund”, for a so-called Spiritual Regulation (Geistlicher Regulierungsplan) of Emperor Joseph II of April 29, 1786 secularized all the assets [of the churches and monasteries] in Bukovina and incorporated them into the “Gr[eco]-Oriental Religious Fund”, specifying that: under the name of religious fund is included “the entire wealth intended for the preservation or conservation of religion. The income of this wealth shall enter a religious house (Religionskasse) intended for this purpose and after deducting the expenses of supporting church buildings and schools, these incomes shall be used only for the true good of the clergy, religion and humanity.” (Morariu, 2012: 176)

The imperial administration rejected, even through the emperor's voice, the idea that the properties of the monasteries had in fact been confiscated by the Austrian state,

and motivated its decision by an official statement of good intentions. The episcopal and monastic assets should have been placed under an efficient state administration in this way, so that from their income the Orthodox churches, schools, and monasteries that remained in operation could be maintained, but also new churches and new schools for the Orthodox Romanians could be built. Visiting Suceava in 1783, Emperor Joseph II made efforts to have this imperial policy perceived as sincere.

Thus, the reacquiring of the relic of the Great Martyr John the New from Suceava, with his holy relics, is linked to this visit. The relics had been taken in 1686 by Saint Metropolitan Dosoftei first to Strey and then to Zolkiev, in Galicia, during his exile imposed by the armies of Jan Sobieski. Although the monks united at Zolkiev opposed the repatriation of the holy relics and claimed them for their church, Emperor Joseph II, after noticing the empty place in the Saint George church in Suceava where the relics of Saint John the New had once been placed, ordered them to be returned to Suceava.

In order for the order to be fulfilled, however, it was necessary for Bishop Dosoftei Hereescu to prove the origin of the saint and his martyrdom for the Orthodox faith in a biographical writing dedicated to Saint John the New, where he also showed the fact that he was venerated as the protector of Bukovina. The closure of the vast majority of monasteries and the secularization of monastic assets produced great distrust of Austrian rule and a state of discouragement, and in some places even panic. The consequences were very sad for the entire Orthodox community of Bukovina. A good part of the priests and monks left Bukovina and retreated to Moldova. Together with them, an impressive number of peasants fled and left behind their homes and lands. A document from the time shows that between November 1785 and April 1786 only, almost 7,000 people emigrated from Bukovina to Moldova (“*6937 souls of men, women, and children*”). Aurel Morariu explains statistically and comparatively the reality before and after secularization:

“From now on, the fate of the Romanian Church in Bukovina is linked to this institution [the Religious Fund of the Greek-Oriental Church of Bukovina]. The spiritual regulation of April 1786 maintained the division of the diocese into six protopresbyterates, namely: Cernăuți, Ceremuș, Nistru, Berhomet, Vicov, Suceava; and into two so-called vicariates, namely, of the Câmpulung-Moldovenesc and the Câmpulung-Rusesc. The number of parishes was reduced from 239 to 186, and so was the number of hermitages and monasteries. At the time of the abduction, Bukovina had 9 large monasteries and 11 hermitages [according to Ion Nistor, 23 monasteries and hermitages]. The large monasteries were: Putna, with the tomb of its founder, Stephen the Great [Ștefan cel Mare], built between 1466-1470; St. Ilie, built by Stephen the Great in 1488; Moldovița, built by Alexandru cel Bun in 1401 and rebuilt in 1531 by Petru Rareș; Humorul, founded by the logophate Toader Bobiog and his wife Anastasia in 1530; Sucevița, built by the Movilești brothers between 1578-1584; Dragomirna, founded in 1602 by the Metropolitan of Moldavia Anastasie Crimca and the Lord of Moldavia Miron Movilă Bărnovschi (1626-1629); Solca, built by Lord Ștefan Tomșa in 1630; and Ilișești, founded in 1714 by the goldsmith Ionașcu Isăcescul and his wife Alexandra. In Pătrăuții Sucevei there was a nunnery built by Ștefan cel Mare in 1487. And among the hermitages we mention St. Onufrie, then Bărbești, Luca, Babin, Coribnița, Vîjnița, Crisceacul, Bereznîța, Broșcăuții, Zamostea, Horecea, founded in 1766 by the hegumen Artemon, the Metropolitan of Moldavia Gavriil and the great logophate Cilibiu, and finally Jadova, founded in 740 by the martyr George Vlad. [...] After the secularization in 1786, only three monasteries remained in operation, namely: the one in Putna, the one in Sucevița and the one in Dragomirna, to

which later, namely from September 17, 1905, the one in Suceava was added, where from 1402 and then from 1783 the relics of St. John, the patron saint of Bucovina, are housed.” (Morariu, 2012: 172-174).

All the Romanians from Bucovina who left thoroughly documented writings on the administration of the Religious Fund and on the spending of the huge income obtained from its exploitation, from Metropolitan Silvestru Morariu-Andrievici, Professor Isidor Onciu, to the others mentioned, led by Ion Nistor, demonstrate that the funds of the fund were systematically spent for purposes completely foreign to those mentioned in the initial regulations for its operation, announced by the Habsburg rule:

“...Aron Pumnul shows unequivocally in one of his works that: “The administration of this [religious] fund had fallen into the hands of people foreign to the nation and law of its founders.” The same is expressed in their works on this Church Fund by Metropolitan Morariu-Andrievici, then ... Isidor Onciu and Professor Ion. I. Nistor, all concluding that the means of the fund were spent for a long time for purposes completely foreign to its purpose; this abuse had caused great discontent among the Romanians, discontent that had persisted for a long time without being taken into account. [...] The fact is that in the course of about 60 years, that is, from 1786 to 1848, only four churches were built in all of Bucovina; and from the large income of the Fund, only a few thousand Austrian florins had been spent during this time on the establishment and maintenance of the Theological Institute in Cernăuți.” (Morariu, 2012: 175-176).

It is worth noting, however, that despite the extraordinary pressures systematically exerted by the imperial administration through diverse and tireless strategies to assimilate Orthodoxy into the Catholic Church, despite the betrayal of some Orthodox clergy led by Bishop Eugenie Hacman, despite the confiscation of property, the closure of almost all monasteries for 140 years, and the use of the Church Fund for the benefit of other churches, the Romanian Orthodox Church resisted heroically through patriotic hierarchs such as Bishop Isaia Baloșescu, Metropolitan Silvestru Morariu Andrievici, Metropolitan Vladimir de Repta, through its priests and serving monks. United around their Church in faith and hope in God, the Romanians preserved their national being.

It is certain that the bishops and metropolitans of Bucovina, together with the entire Romanian Orthodox clergy, managed to preserve the national character and the canonical historical content of the Orthodox Church of Bucovina, and, finally, the Orthodox faith was legally recognized by the Habsburg administration. Thus, through the *Church Administration Regulation of 1786*, the Romanian language was declared the language of worship for the liturgical service in the Orthodox Church, and the Diocese of Cernăuți was established. As the first bishop of Bucovina Dositei Herescu (1782-1789) fought to preserve the *status quo* of the land.

After Dositei Herescu, Emperor Joseph II appointed the Serbian Daniil Vlahovici as bishop of Bucovina, in order to create the opportunity for the Catholicization of the Orthodox in Bucovina. The new bishop rejected Catholicization, but he initiated a process of Slavization of the Orthodox Church in Bucovina. This situation changed from the moment Isaia Baloșescu was appointed bishop of Bucovina (1823-1834).

A graduate of the Theological Academy of Putna, Bishop Isaia organized the Orthodox theological education of Bucovina, placing the Romanian Orthodoxy of the

region under the sign of durability in a context and in a period of great ascension of both Catholicism and secularism. Through unprecedented approaches to the Court of Vienna begun in 1824, Isaia Baloșescu managed to establish both the Higher Theological Institute (1827), from which the University of Cernăuți would be born, and the Clerical Seminary (1828). Bishop Isaia then obtained the imperial decree of December 22, 1828, by which Orthodox priests received an annual income of 300 florins paid by the Religious Fund of Bukovina. Through countless memoirs addressed to the Imperial Court, a tireless struggle of Bishop Isaia was to obtain the right to education in the mother tongue for the children of the native Romanians as a form of resistance in the face of Germanization, Catholicization, and Polonization – all of which were assiduous policies of the Galician administration. Bishop Isaia's achievements consolidated Romanian Orthodoxy and thus created the basis for the struggle that the metropolitans of Bukovina would wage, especially on the front of the rivalry between the Romanians and the Orthodox Ruthenians.

The political conflict between the Romanians and the Ruthenians in Bukovina

The Bukovinian historian Ion Nistor, although in a speech marked by emotion and revolt, evokes the core of the political conflict between the Romanians and the Ruthenians in Bukovina, extremely accentuated after 1861, systematically fueled by the central power and transferred to the sensitive territory of religion and the Orthodox Church. After referring to a Ruthenian historiography that he claims falsifies the data regarding the origin of the Romanians and Ruthenians in Bukovina, Ion Nistor contends:

“Based on my extensive research regarding our relationship with the Ruthenians, I believe that I have managed to establish beyond a doubt that Bukovina was from the very beginning a Romanian country and that the Bukovinian Ruthenians are not autochthonous in this country, but simple Galician nomads sheltered in Bukovina as Greek Catholics only at the end of the 18th century.” (Nistor, 1916:16).

Why this harsh war between the Romanians and the Ruthenians in Bukovina, increasingly evident after 1880? In 1880, the Romanians were all Orthodox, while the Ruthenians were divided between the Orthodox Church and the Greek Catholic Church. However, the majority of the Ruthenians recognized themselves as Orthodox, and around 16,900 people among the Ruthenians belonged to the Greek Catholic Church. A radical nationalist movement of young Ruthenians was born in the Ruthenian community, which also fought to take over the leadership of the Orthodox Church in Bukovina.

Through the biography of Vladimir de Repta, we reach the heart of the political conflict between Romanians and Ruthenians around 1900. The greatest tensions occurred immediately after his installation as metropolitan:

“In November 1898 Vladimir de Repta obtained the bishopric of Rădăuți, and in 1902 the emperor appointed him archbishop of Cernăuți and metropolitan of Bukovina and Dalmatia. Repta was at the head of the Orthodox Church in Bukovina during a tense period, when Ukrainian believers demanded equal representation with Romanians in church life and advocated the division of the Metropolis of Bukovina into two dioceses on ethnic criteria. In 1913, the Ukrainian Artemon Manastyrski was appointed to the vacant post of vicar general of the Metropolis, and it was agreed that the Orthodox Church in Bukovina would be divided into a Romanian and a Ukrainian diocese. However, an

understanding could not be reached regarding the place of residence of the Ukrainian bishopric, nor the manner of separation of the two bishoprics. Metropolitan Vladimir of Repta managed to promote a balanced and wise policy, managing to preserve the integrity of the Orthodox Church in Bukovina. The outbreak of the World War prevented the division of the Orthodox Church in Bukovina into two.” (Ungureanu, 2003:184).

Metropolitan Vladimir de Repta, a high hierarch of the Orthodox Church, was subjected to an extraordinary challenge, not only as a Romanian, when the Ruthenians wanted and *de iure* almost achieved, by political decision, the breakup of the Orthodox Church in Bukovina. Vladimir of Repta had to face the threat of the uncanonicity of such a decision, which denied the dogma and canonical Orthodox tradition.

At the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century, an original source evocative of the specific atmosphere in Romanian Orthodox communities is the memoirs published in Cernăuți by Ovid Țopă (1891-1974), a Bukovina intellectual, son of a priest. The simple return to the house of the parish priest of Zeleneu, Meliton Antonovici, around 1891-1898, is extremely significant today, because it gives substance to the mentality of the Orthodox Romanians of Bucovina in one from the educated class:

“On another wall [of the living room] you could see an imposing portrait of Franz Josef, another of Metropolitan Silvestru Morariu, equally imposing, a smaller Stephen the Great and between them two landscapes: one showing the viewer a hunt in the Alps, and the second a German village in Tyrol, dominated by a Catholic church. [...] In one corner was the most expensive furniture in the house, a grand piano on which were the notes for several chorales and waltzes, the most beloved being that of the Romanian Ivanovici, old romances and some classical music. From the living room you could see ... into the bedroom [...]. On the walls were hanging only holy icons.” (Țopă, 2022: 48.)

The evocation reveals to the current reader the cosmopolitan culture in which the Bukovina intelligentsia lived, including the Romanian Orthodox clergy. We can read in the presence of the paintings an identity symbolism, linked to the memory of the Bukovina Romanians in 1890. The proximate homeland was perceived as Austria, and the profound homeland was that of Stephen the Great. Ovid Țopă speaks in his memoirs about the Bukovina realities of that period. He refers to the change in the urban demographic configuration, about the process of alienation from the mother tongue to which Romanians were subjected through the Austrian education system based on the German language, about the Slavicization of Romanian names, about the process of denationalization that targeted the Romanian community.

Bukovinian Communities

Roman Catholic and Greek Catholic communities. Before the annexation, there were in Moldova, since the 14th century, several extremely small groups of Catholics. In 1597, the first mentioning of the existence of a Catholic bishopric in Bacău, which was subordinate to Poland, appeared. The Roman Catholic community was therefore born, after the annexation, first through the entry of Austrian and German soldiers, officials and civil servants, then through the immigration of German and Hungarian craftsmen and peasants. After 1880 and until around 1900, there was a significant wave of immigration with Polish Catholics who

organized themselves into several colonies. A minority of Armenians were Catholics. The number of the Roman Catholic community grew in the 19th century. By the 1910s, the Roman Catholic community already numbered over 100,000 of the inhabitants of Bukovina, which had a population of approximately 800,000 people. About half of the Bukovinian Roman Catholics were of German or Austrian origin, and the rest were Polish or Hungarian. The Roman Catholic community was helped by the Austrian authorities to build churches and organize itself. In the period 1880-1910, amid the entry of Galician Poles into Bukovina, a rivalry arose between the Germans and the Roman Catholic Polish, regarding the presence of Polish priests perceived as a tendency towards Polonization. The Greek Catholics in Bukovina came from the Ruthenians, in particular. Although they were not in large numbers (around 7% of the total number of Ruthenians), they made an important contribution to the cultural and political life of Bukovina.

Protestant communities. Protestants were Lutherans and a few Calvinists. They came either from rural German colonies or from Hungarian colonies. The majority of Protestants were Lutherans who lived in mixed rural communities, together with Orthodox Romanians, with whom they lived in good understanding. In 1910, there were 19,475 German Lutherans and 1,042 Lutherans of other ethnicities.

The Mosaic community. Between 1880-1910, the Mosaic community in Bukovina grew strongly and its economic and social role strengthened, especially in the provincial capital, Cernăuți, which also became a center of Mosaic culture. Proof of this reality and of the atmosphere of tolerance and religious freedom in which the Mosaic community in Bukovina lived at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century is the organization in Cernăuți of the first international conference for the Yiddish language and culture between August 30 and September 3, 1908. The Jewish community in Cernăuți was the third largest in the Empire after those in Vienna and Lemberg. A statistic from 1910 is significant in demonstrating the presence and influence of the Mosaic Jews in Bukovina society. Of the 445 civil servants employed at that time in Bukovina, 141 were Jews, 76 were Romanians, and the rest were of other ethnicities. And of the 161 lawyers recognized by the Austrian state in the Duchy of Bukovina, 136 were Jews, 11 were Romanians and the rest were of other ethnicities. Of the 151 doctors in Bukovina, 109 were Jewish. The Jews from the elite of intellectuals, politicians and businessmen represented, in Bukovina, an extremely active engine in promoting German culture and language, in the process of modernization, standardization and Germanization of the province. The ultra-Orthodox Jews and those who were followers of Hasidic mysticism lived more isolated in their communities, but in good understanding with the other ethnic groups.

Conclusions

Since the time of Joseph II, Austria used a sustained modernization program in the policy of annexing Bukovina. In this way, the goal of the progressive assimilation of non-German ethnic groups and integration through denationalization was pursued through an Enlightenment policy of civilization in the sense of the cultural model promoted by the Western modernist elite since the Renaissance. After 1775, the Romanian Orthodox, the Ruthenians and Lipovians, Armenians, together with the ultra-Orthodox Jews and the Jews of Hasidic mysticism, were permanently subjected during the entire Austrian rule to a cultural shock to which each religious community reacted in different ways. The reactions were influenced by the political-economic context, by the attitude of

the elite of each community, but also by the personal choices of the majority of the members of the confessional communities.

In general, with few exceptions, the intellectual, financial and political elites welcomed the integration quite openly in order to exploit it for the benefit of their own national goals. The history of the population of Bukovina has generated much interest starting from a social evidence that may seem exceptional: against the background of the intense process of colonization of Bukovina organized by the Austrian administration after 1786, in the dynamics of intense migration in several periods and despite the abrupt change in the number of foreigners, compared to natives, in most localities in Bukovina, social life in Bukovina was rather quiet. The rapid or sudden changes in the ethnic configuration of a locality, the loss by the Romanians of the state of ethnic majority did not lead to confrontations, insoluble conflicts, or violence. There were no pogroms, interethnic massacres, or serious interfaith conflicts in Austrian Bukovina. Between 1880 and 1910, in multiethnic Bukovina each ethno-confessional community had a cultural life marked by a certain autonomy possible thanks to the cultivation of the mother tongue and the existence of religious freedom. Romanians, Germans, Ukrainians, Jews, Poles, including smaller communities of Hungarians or Armenians, preserved their own traditions and inherited rules of life.

But, after a hundred years of Austrian administration, based on a strong centralization of political and economic decisions especially until 1860 combined with a functional autonomy in 1880 segregation was largely replaced by political competition and socio-political and cultural communication. Modernization spoke its mind and produced changes and consequences. Each larger ethnic group in Bukovina fought during this period to acquire a form of power and influence. The struggle to affirm one's own identity in the socio-political, economic and religious space, tempered by a certain tradition of tolerance and mutual respect, under the watchful eye of Vienna, energized the public life of Bukovina and gave it that memorable cultural content, which has made Bukovina a place where even today some travelers through history want to return.

Each ethnic community imagined a future for itself and a future for Bukovina. At the same time, Romanians, Ukrainians, Germans, Jews or Poles had to take into account the Bukovina ethno-confessional reality and, often, strove not to neglect the interests and sensitivities of others, always considering the construction of a particular, even privileged relationship with the Viennese central power. There was in this Bukovina a complex dynamic of the closure and opening of ethnicities and communities towards each other. Each community made an effort to preserve its national specificity, but sometimes it also became receptive to what was happening within the other communities. The Romanian community seemed more united than divided, the project for which it fought being the union with the Kingdom of Romania or, at least, the preservation of rights, of its own culture, and of its mother tongue. Although there were, as always in history, people who pursued their personal projects and not the community project, the Romanians, through groups of aristocrats, intellectuals, and clergy, and among the peasants, primarily aimed at the national ideal. The Austrians created what in today's historiography is called a (pseudo)historical narrative, through much propaganda, education and administrative strategies, which, however, over time, took on content and legitimization in the real historical dynamics, effectively becoming a historical narrative. The central representations of this story were linked to the identity of the Bukovinian, marked by tolerance,

acceptance and practice of multiethnicity and multiconfessionalism, patronized by a modern society, based on an Enlightenment-type organization. In the 1907 introduction to the 1900 census, the Austrian administration expressed the following point of view:

“Bukovina is the region that most faithfully reflects the polyglot and multi-confessional character of Austria, which is why it is so often called an Austria in miniature.” (GEMEINDELEXIKON, 1907: VIII).

The Romanians in the Duchy of Bukovina fought a hard fight under the Habsburg Empire, which would give birth to a specific strength and mentality in Bukovina, easily identifiable to this day in the Bukovinians' sense of dignity and attachment to tradition, in their real patriotism. The origin of this way of being of the Bukovinian, the origin of his proverbial pride and the need to affirm his Romanian identity lies in the unequal confrontation, with many sacrifices, with the imperial administration. *Homo bucovinensis* existed. However, it is not at all a correspondent of Bucovinism; it is not an expression of this failed political movement during World War I. *Homo bucovinensis*, after all the synthetic analysis that we have gone through, inevitably leaving aside several areas of interpretation of the history of Bucovina, does not emerge as a concrete identity reality, at the level of the person and the communities. *Homo bucovinensis* is, in the perspective of the historical narratives that we can evoke and reconstruct today, a dream of Bukovinians of all ethnicities, an identity projection first invented propagandistically-manipulatively by the Austrian occupiers, assiduously promoted through laws, education, organization, but then mentally assumed by a large majority of Bukovinians, especially after 1880. In this sense, *homo bucovinensis* becomes a common aspiration that unites the Bukovinian world in 1900 from a manipulative political strategy. Therefore, *homo bucovinensis* still works today in the memory of the inhabitants of the territory of the former historical Bukovina as a very generous cultural model.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

GEMEINDELEXIKON, (1907), „Gemeindelexikon Der Im Reichsrat Vertretenen Königreiche Und Länder”, Bearbeitet Auf Grund Der Ergebnisse Der Volkszählung Vom 31, Dezember 1900. Herausgegeben Von Der K.K. Statistischen Zentralkommission, XIII, Bukowina, 1907, Wien, Drukh Und Verlag Der K.K. Hof- Und Staatsdruckerei, p. VIII.

GRIGOROVICI, Radu, (ed.), (1998), *Bucovina în primele descrierii geografice, istorice, economice și demografice*. Ediție bilingvă, cu introducere, postfață, note și comentarii de acad. Radu Grigorovici, București, Editura Academiei Române.

MORARIU, Aurel, (2012), *Bucovina. 1774-1914*, Ediție și notații biobibliografice de Nicolae Cârlan, Suceava, Editura Lidana.

NISTOR, Ion, (1915), *Românii și rutenii în Bucovina: studiu istoric și statistic*, București, Viena, Lipsca, Editura Academiei Române, Librăriile Socec & Comp. și C. Sfetea: Gerold & Comp.: G. Harrassovitz.

NISTOR, Ion, (1916), *Istoria bisericii din Bucovina și a rostului ei național-cultural în viața românilor bucovineni*, București, Institutul de Arte Grafice “Carol Göbl”.

NISTOR, Ion, (1991), *Istoria Bucovinei*, București, Humanitas.

PETRE S. Aurelian, (1916), *Bucovina. Descriere economică*, București.

PURICI, Ștefan, (1998), *Mișcarea națională românească în Bucovina între anii 1775-1861*, Academia Română, Filiala Iași, Centrul de Studii “Bucovina”; Suceava, Editura “Hurmuzachi”.

ȚOPA, Ovid, (2002), *Sfârșit și început de lume într-un ducat habsburgic. Bucovina. Amintiri, locuri, oameni, întâmplări. Memorialistică*, Cernăuți, Editura Druk Art.

UNGUREANU, Constantin, (2003), *Bucovina în perioada stăpânirii austriece (1774–1918): aspecte etnodemografice și confesionale*, Chișinău, Editura Civitas.

UNGUREANU, Constantin, (2020), *Populația Bucovinei și Basarabiei sub stăpâniri străine (1774/1812 – 1918)*, Suceava, Editura Karl A. Romstorfer.