

Eastern Orthodoxy and national indifference in Habsburg Bukovina, 1774–1873

LUCIAN N. LEUSTEAN 

Aston University, Birmingham, UK

ABSTRACT. Bukovina, a predominantly Eastern Orthodox land, today divided between northern Romania and southwestern Ukraine, was the outmost frontier of the Habsburg Empire. Between its incorporation into the Empire in 1774 and Greater Romania in 1918, Bukovina produced an unusual Church. Rather than support a mono-ethnic Orthodox community, as evident across nation building processes in Southeastern Europe, in 1873, Romanians, Ruthenians and Serbians (in Dalmatia) established a multi-ethnic Church which rejected association with that of their Romanian brethren in Habsburg Transylvania. This article explores the lead up to the establishment of the church in 1873 and argues that, under the leadership of Bishop Eugen Hakmann, the Metropolitanate of Bukovina and Dalmatia was a novel ecclesiastical institution in which the clergy refused national identification while laypeople supported the growing rise of nationalist movements. This multi-ethnic Church became one of the most intriguing Orthodox structures which would impact upon the emergence of national churches in nineteenth-century Romania, Serbia and Ukraine.

KEYWORDS: nation building, religion, Romania, Southern Europe, Ukraine

Introduction

Eastern Orthodoxy, the third largest branch of Christianity, brings together a fellowship of churches intrinsically linked to nation building processes. In nineteenth century Southeastern Europe, under the political rule of the Ottoman, Russian and Habsburg Empires, political leaders and intellectuals looked back to medieval times and built on the symbolic resources provided by the Orthodox faith. Raising religious figures to the status of national symbols, assigning national characteristics to sacred spaces and engaging closely with hierarchy in order to construct homogenous nations characterised the interplay between religion and nationalism (Bilenky 2012; Breuilly 1993; Hobsbawm 1990; Hutchinson 2013; Kedourie 1960; Kitromilides 1989; Leustean 2014; Smith 1986). Modern nationalism was evident in the relationship between local religious and political leaders in opposition to the Ottoman Porte and the Greek-dominated Ecumenical Patriarchate. However, this

relationship was not paralleled in the Habsburg case. While the Patriarchate continued to maintain the *primus inter pares* role in the Eastern Orthodox world, there were unclear rules regarding the ways in which Orthodox communities should relate to the Habsburg authorities.

This article focuses on Bukovina, a predominantly Eastern Orthodox land, today divided between northern Romania and southwestern Ukraine. Between its incorporation into the Habsburg Empire in 1774 and Greater Romania in 1918, Bukovina produced an unusual Church. Rather than supporting a mono-ethnic or a mono-national Orthodox community, as evident across Southeastern Europe, in 1873, Romanians, Ruthenians and Serbians (in Dalmatia) established a multi-ethnic Church which rejected association with their predominantly Romanian brethren in Habsburg Transylvania. Nationalism affected not only the fate of Bukovina as a political and religious region but also the very structure of the Orthodox Church. Should the Church be multi-ethnic or national? Which centre of religious power should have authority over the Bukovinian Orthodoxy: the Serbian, Moldavian (Romanian) or Russian Church?

This article argues that the multi-ethnic Bukovinian Church was an ‘invented’ institution which developed from contrasting ways in which the clergy and the laypeople responded to nationalist movements. The concept of national indifference (Bjork 2008; Judson 2006; Wolff 2010; Zahra 2010) was fundamental to the construction of the Metropolitanate of Bukovina and Dalmatia, a Church which brought together Romanian, Ruthenian and Serbian communities into a supra-national ecclesiastical institution rejecting identification along national lines. This unique Church was the product of state authorities and, most importantly, of clergy clashing with the growing rise of political and cultural nationalist movements. As Bukovina became entangled between Romanian (after 1840s) and Ruthenian (after 1860s) nationalist mobilisations, the Church, under the leadership of Bishop Eugen Hakmann, aimed to overcome ethnic differences. The process of inventing Orthodoxy in Bukovina lies at the very heart of Eastern Orthodoxy with widespread ramifications impacting upon the emergence of national churches in nineteenth-century Romania, Serbia and Ukraine.

The Bukovinian church and ‘the enlightenment of the nation’, 1774–1849

On 21 July 1774, the Treaty of Küçük Kaynarca redesigned the balance of power in Southeastern Europe. The Russo-Turkish War (1768–1774) placed the Orthodox faithful in Crimea and southern Ukraine under the authority of the Russian Empire, while the Ottoman Empire ceded Bukovina to the Austrian Crown, a small territory near the province of Moldavia. At first sight, as a largely rural area with a mixture of ethnic communities, Bukovina seemed to have little geopolitical significance. However, the spread of political nationalism across Europe just a few years later would fundamentally transform this

province into one of the most contested in the Austro-Hungarian Empire, torn between allegiance to imperial authority and the emergence of nation-states in Southeastern Europe.

The arrival of Habsburg troops found no resistance from the local population and, on 5 May 1775, Bukovina came officially under full military control of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Negotiations between the Austrian and Ottoman authorities lasted two years, until 25 February 1777, when a treaty was signed confirming Bukovina's status. General Gabriel Anton Baron Splény von Mihálydy, who was appointed the first military governor, a position he held from 1774 to 1778, wrote upon arrival in 1775 a report to Vienna detailing the province under his administration. He commented that Bukovina was a largely rural society with 290 villages and 62 smaller abodes comprising around 14 350 families (71 750 people), and three main cities, Czernowitz, Suceava and Siret.¹ He found 179 boyars, 415 priests, 86 cantors, 466 monks, 88 nuns, 45 professionals, and 285 people in charge of the local administration (Nistor 1915: 70; *Rutenisarea*, 1904: 19). The predominant population, composed of Romanians and Ruthenians, was referred to as 'fearless at times of danger [...] unfor-giving to accusations [...] and inclined towards changing the government'. In a rather amused tone, von Mihálydy noted that 'The genius of this nation has at its fundament a natural humour, however, it is directed more towards slyness' (Neagu and Roşca 1998).

Over the following decades, Bukovina witnessed new settlements. A number of Romanian-speaking communities dissatisfied with the Habsburg rule crossed the border into Moldavia; others arrived from Transylvania. The Ruthenian-speaking population welcomed ethnic brethren from Galicia, while the government encouraged Poles and Jews to move to the province from other parts of the Empire. Changes in population structure became a contentious issue between the two dominant groups, Romanians and Ruthenians, each claiming to be the largest community. An imperial study conducted by Vienna in 1857 listed 184 741 (48.5 per cent) Romanians; 142 682 (37.5 per cent) Ruthenians; 25 592 (6.7 per cent) Germans; 11 856 (3.1 per cent) Jews; 5586 Hungarians; 4008 Poles; 2300 Lipovenians (Russians); 2240 Armenians and 1844 Slovaks (von Czörnig 1857: 74–80).

Bukovina largely fell under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the local Orthodox Church. Local monasteries and the Bishopric of Rădăuţi, the third honorific rank within the Metropolitanate of Moldavia, behind Iaşi and Roman, possessed around two thirds of Bukovina's land (Mitropolia Bucovinei 1939: 11). Bukovina's new political status found the Church responsible for parishes which were now in the Empire and some which remained across the border in Moldavia. To complicate matters further, Dositei Herescu, who was promoted to the ecclesiastical seat of the Bishopric of Rădăuţi in 1750, continued to be under the canonical jurisdiction of the Metropolitanate of Iaşi, however, on 12 October 1777, he took an oath acknowledging the authority of imperial rule and, effectively, rejecting that of the Moldavian prince (Morariu Andrievici 1893: 9). Dositei's oath did not

immediately affect relations with Iași. As there was limited contact between Iași and Rădăuți, on 24 April 1781, Austria convinced the Metropolitan of Moldavia to formally cease its jurisdiction over Bukovina. In the same year, the bishopric headquarters were moved from Rădăuți to Czernowitz, the seat of Bukovinian political, and, now, ecclesiastical power.

In 1783, Emperor Joseph II visited the province and placed it under the administration of the Serbian Metropolitanate of Karlovci, the highest Eastern Orthodox authority in the Empire. Furthermore, strengthening ecclesiastical control, on 29 April 1786, the Viennese Court regulated religious and educational affairs by setting up a Religious Fund which incorporated large sections of its property in Bukovina. A major shift occurred in the election of church hierarchs: under Moldavian rule the bishop was elected by boyars and members of the clergy, however, under the Austrian statute, the bishop was directly appointed by the emperor (Calinescu 1886; Brusanowski 2011: 208–81). Therefore, the bishop held not only a clerical position administering the faithful but, more importantly, a political role.

For the first several years after 1775, the Church trained its clergy in a small Theological Academy at Putna Monastery under the leadership of Archimandrite Vartolemeu Măzăreanu. After 1778, the Austrian government set up a new Clerical School at Saint Ilie Monastery in Suceava and appointed a Serbian Archdeacon, Daniil Vlahović, to oversee religious training. The new school and the Serbian monk faced distrust from the local population with parents refusing to send their children to study there. On 23 April 1789, Vlahović was appointed bishop and transferred the school to Czernowitz. The appointment of a Serbian hierarch in Bukovina was criticised by the Romanian population. Ion Budai-Deleanu, a leading intellectual, wrote that '[Daniil's] knowledge was not more than that of a village priest; the bishopric dignity made him only more arrogant rather than more educated' (Nistor 1916: 27–8). His leadership remained uneventful, until 1822, when the emperor appointed a native Romanian, Isaia Băloșescu, whose father was a priest at Putna Monastery. He led the bishopric until 1835 when he was replaced by Eugen Hakmann, one of the most controversial hierarchs in Bukovina.²

Eugen's leadership came at a time of tense relations between the Romanian and Ruthenian communities.³ An overview of his personal and professional career gives an insight into his shifting allegiances between these communities. Bishop Eugen was born under the lay name Iftimie in 1793 into a peasant family in Văslăuți village. He studied at the Clerical School in Czernowitz where his uncle, Ignatie Hakmann, was a professor. Ignatie was appointed hegumen of Dragomirna Monastery (1818–1840) and his nephew followed the same career path. In 1823, Iftimie became a monk and soon rose through the clerical ranks. In 1827, Bishop Isaia Băloșescu appointed him a provisional Professor of Hebrew and Biblical Archaeology and, in 1831, after passing further exams, he took on a full Professorship of Old Testament Studies in Czernowitz (Nistor 1916; Iacobescu 2003a: 302–3). In 1835, the Religious

Fund awarded him a grant to study at the Roman Catholic Faculty in Vienna where he stayed for a few months. His fluency in a number of languages was a major asset in enabling him to engage with the highest echelons of the Viennese Court. Eugen and Prince Ferdinand shared the same year of birth. Suffering from a speech impediment, Ferdinand benefited from the linguistic talents of the Bukovinian monk and close relations developed between them which would play a part in Eugen's career development.

The unexpected death of Francis I (2 March 1835) led to the coronation of Ferdinand as Emperor of Austria, a position he retained until 2 December 1848. As the Bukovina diocese was vacant after the death of Bishop Băloșescu on 14 September 1834, a few months after Ferdinand's enthronement, Eugen was appointed bishop on 8 May 1835. On 15 August, he went to Karlovci where the Serbian metropolitan confirmed his spiritual formation and, on 11 October, Eugen was officially installed in Czernowitz.

The appointment of Eugen, a simple professor without longstanding credentials in the corridors of power in Vienna remains puzzling. Romanian historians have claimed that Eugen was assigned to teach Romanian to the future emperor, Prince Ferdinand, following a tradition which required that sovereigns should be familiar with the languages spoken in the Empire (Iacobescu 2003a, 2003b; Nistor 1916). It is unclear if this was the case, or if, indeed, Eugen's ability to converse in a number of languages (Romanian, Ruthenian, Russian, German, Latin, Greek and Hebrew) helped him to make contacts within the Viennese Court. In the following decades, his familiarity with the Viennese Court and ease of conversing in Romanian and Ruthenian led to questions regarding his ethnic allegiance.

It was, therefore, no surprise that one of Eugen's first decisions as bishop in Bukovina related to the languages spoken among his faithful. On 25 May 1838, he issued a pastoral order which stipulated that the church calendar and all correspondence between local communities and Czernowitz should be written in the vernacular language of local communities, namely in Romanian or Ruthenian; the only exceptions were official state orders which were required to be written in German. The role of language was instrumental and his decision would have a long term impact in strengthening the rise of national consciousness among Romanians and Ruthenians. As evident in subsequent clerical disputes, defining the vernacular language was controversial. Over the following decades, Romanian and Ruthenian intellectuals looked back to the 1838 decision as recognition of their existence as separate nations in Bukovina. Individual parishes dealt with the faithful in the language spoken locally and there were many cases where an ethnic Romanian priest administered predominantly Ruthenian-speaking communities. The 1838 decision proved to be the beginning of a longer dispute on linking the language with the rising national political movements. At the end of the century, the Ukrainian politicians in the local Diet would regularly present the presence of Romanian clergy in Ruthenian-speaking communities as an attempt to Romanianise Bukovina.

Eugen noted that there was confusion among the clergy regarding what their native language was as most spoke both Romanian and Ruthenian,⁴ suggesting that in the 1830s national indifference was widespread. Previously, the clergy's communication with Czernowitz was unregulated. Letters from parish priests were written in either German or vernacular languages. Although Romanian is a Latin language and Ruthenian a Slavic language, Eugen enforced and sustained the use of the Cyrillic alphabet for both languages formalising the linguistic practice across the diocese.

Eugen's first years focused on church reforms. He condemned the clergy who smoked in public and performed pastoral duties under the influence of alcohol (AMRE, *Foaea*, 1868). He required that clergy give a sermon in the vernacular language after the liturgy each Sunday and on religious festivals, and that they take into account the financial circumstances of their parishioners by condemning, in 1848, those who, 'forgetting the words of the Holy Scriptures [...] oppressed their brethren, some of which are in most dire [financial positions]'. Not all priests delivered sermons but their mandatory introduction ensured both spiritual uniformity in the diocese and that messages from Czernowitz would easily reach local populations. Further reforms were issued in 1857, when Eugen prescribed that clergy were not allowed to leave their parishes for more than forty-eight hours without permission from their dean; those who wanted leave for more than eight days required special permission from the Orthodox Clerical Consistory in Czernowitz, the highest ecclesiastical administrative authority in Bukovina. Furthermore, in 1859, the clergy were forbidden to rent or buy land for the purpose of financial gain, and in the following years, a standard code of clerical attire was imposed in the diocese (AMRE, *Foaea*, 1868).

Rather than supporting one ethnic faction which could lead to political turmoil, on 23 December 1843, the Viennese Court approved a new Statute for the organisation of the Bukovinian Church. The Statute, written by one of Eugen's closest advisors, Constantin Popovici, restructured the diocese from six to twelve deaneries.⁵ The number of parishes increased from 186 in 1786 to 241 in 1843. Each deanery was under the supervision of a dean, a deputy dean and two assistant clergy. In order to strengthen their authority, the dean and his deputies were endorsed by the Clerical Consistory. All clergy were required to meet once a year in a pastoral conference discussing issues of concern for their communities. Additionally, an intermediary stage was introduced in clerical positions so that upon graduating from the Theological Institute in Czernowitz, those who intended to be ordained were first appointed 'supporting priests'. Some held this position for a few years under the guidance of an elderly priest until they were allowed to be in charge of a parish. Although at first this practice seemed to benefit the training of future priests, in time it led to abuses with some 'supporting priests' retaining their positions for nearly twenty years due to the lack of vacant places. After working in this position for many years, some clergy gave up their jobs while others, upon full nomination, became interested only in enriching themselves rather than in the

spiritual progress of their communities (Nistor 1916: 52–4). The introduction of clerical divisions was unprecedented and no other Orthodox church instituted this hierarchical structure among the clergy.

A major point of confessional dispute on ethnic lines was education. In 1766, Moldavian ruler Grigore III Ghica reformed local education by organising six upper schools in Bukovina, however, between 1768 and 1774 the schools did not run due to the Russo-Turkish war. Local monasteries and a small number of parishes organised some form of education, albeit unregulated. Thus, in 1775, education in Bukovina was incipient, poorly organised and lacked a curriculum. Only 86 teachers were employed by the local authorities in primary schools that year (Ungureanu 2015: 38–9).

The most controversial imperial patents came into effect in 1815 when all primary schools in Bukovina were placed under the Catholic Consistory of Lemberg. As a result, teachers were appointed from Galicia and many peasant families refused to send their children to study under Roman Catholic teachers (Nistor 1916: 39; Iacobescu 2003a: 204).⁶ The decision had a wide-reaching effect with local priests unable to teach children in their parishes, effectively excluding Orthodox children from primary education. As an example, in 1817, at the so called ‘German-Romanian school’ in Coțmani, Mardari Litvinul was removed from his position as a teacher due to the fact that he refused to convert to Catholicism; he was replaced by Andrei Orobko who came from Galicia. Although the school was ‘Romanian’ in title, no Romanian classes were available due to the fact that the teacher did not speak the language; instead Polish was introduced as a mandatory subject until 1843. The introduction of Polish also paralleled the government’s decision to appoint a Pole, Andreas Pankiewicz, as general inspector in charge of the primary education in Bukovina, from 1819 to 1844 (Ungureanu 2015: 58–9). After two decades of education available only through Catholic and German-Polish channels, disparity between rural and urban communities strengthened, as those who could afford to study usually entered the province’s bureaucratic apparatus. Discrepancies between the faithful and the Orthodox clergy were evident in linguistic terms, with the latter trained in German and Romanian at the newly established Theological Institute in Czernowitz in 1827.

In May 1837, Bishop Eugen sent a petition to Vienna stating that the 1815 government decision failed in Bukovina and that the majority of the population remained Orthodox and poorly educated at grassroots level. The petition was signed by local intellectuals, students in Vienna and the Hurmuzaki brothers, the leading elite of the Romanian nationalist movement in Bukovina. However, there was no official response. Only on 8 May 1844, the Viennese Court allowed primary schools to be divided between the Catholic and Orthodox Churches, with Romanian and Ruthenian spoken by the Orthodox communities. Each parish was entitled to have a school financially supported by the Religious Fund and the local village. Vienna’s decree seemed to recognise ethnic-religious divisions in Bukovina. It stated that ‘the control and guidance of Orthodox schools would be conducted by the Orthodox

Clerical Consistory'; the native language would be the teaching language; and German would be taught in high schools. The Clerical Consistory in Czernowitz retained the right to supervise education until 1869 when the government established a state body, the Provincial School Council, in charge of all religious confessions.

The ethnic stratification of the Church acquired a public dimension during the 1848 European revolutions. In March 1848, Doxache Hurmuzachi, one of the leading Romanian landowners, organised a national assembly attended by around two hundred clergymen. The assembly's decisions struck at the core of the Church's organisation. It demanded that the bishop be elected by the clergy and laymen rather than only appointed by the emperor, and, most importantly, that all Romanians in the Habsburg Empire should organise themselves into a unified Orthodox Metropolitanate. The assembly set up a Spiritual Committee which put pressure on Bishop Eugen to distance himself from a number of Ruthenians who had positions in the church administration (Nistor 1916: 59–66).

The political mobilisation of Romanians in Bukovina paralleled those of Ruthenians in neighbouring Galicia. After the 1772 incorporation of Galicia into the Habsburg Empire, the Greek Catholic Church acquired a prime role in asserting Ruthenian consciousness (Himka 1999: 6; Wilson 2002; Snyder 2003; Ploky 2015: 163).⁷ On 2 May 1848, around 300 Ruthenians gathered in the chancery of Saint George's Cathedral in Lemberg and established the Supreme Ruthenian Council (*Holova ru'ka rada*), an organisation which opposed the Poles' National Council (*Rada Narodova*). The Supreme Ruthenian Council closely followed the administrative structures of the Greek Catholic Church, under the leadership of Bishop Hryhorii Iakhymovych of Przemyśl. Fathers Mykhailo Kuzemsky and Mykhailo Malynovsky, both of whom were serving at the Greek Catholic cathedral in Lemberg, were appointed in charge of the Council's secretariat. From the start, the clergy took part in the Council's decision spreading revolutionary ideas among the masses to the extent that Polish intelligentsia compared the Galician movement to a theocracy (Himka 1999: 10; Vozniak 1924; Bohachevsky-Chomiak 1967; Kozik 1986). The Supreme Ruthenian Council advocated the partition of Galicia into two regions along ethnic and linguistic lines. The first region, around Kraków, would comprise the Polish speaking population, while the second, around Lemberg, the Ruthenian population. The Council sent delegates to the Prague Slav Congress and the Austrian Reichstag in June 1848, and organised a Ruthenian military guard in the autumn of 1848 in response to military developments in neighbouring Hungary. On 15 May 1848, the Council published its first Ruthenian language newspaper in Lemberg, *Zoria Halytska* (The Galician Dawn), a prime vehicle of Ruthenian nationalism that circulated throughout Galicia. Furthermore, a Department of Ruthenian Language and Literature was set up in the same year at the University of Lemberg (Magosci 2007: 182).

Events in Lemberg were paralleled in Romanian communities in Bukovina, where Doxache Hurmuzachi published the translation of a Greek booklet on

'The Duty of Bishops and Blessed Clergy' into Romanian. The book had previously been widely circulated around the Greek peninsula, with the aim of raising awareness of the role of the clergy in promoting national consciousness. Fearing a domino effect would take place in Galicia, on 18 May 1848, Eugen circulated a letter among his faithful in response to Hurmuzachi's assembly (SACO, Hakmann Dossier) in which he made four main points. He stated that Constantin Czechowski, the Polish secretary of the Orthodox Clerical Consistory in Czernowitz, who was not welcomed by the Romanian clergy, had been dismissed; the Clerical Consistory remained the highest authority in the local Church; the Consistory was composed of at least four full time clerical advisors, eight honorary advisors and professors from the Theological Institute; and he praised Professor Ioan Calenciuc, a widely respected Romanian in the local community. The contrast between the ethnicity of these two individuals (Polish and Romanian) was an attempt to alleviate further ethnic tensions in his diocese. The letter ended on a rather ambiguous tone by stating that '[...] today, which has the name of our loving emperor, is the happiest day of my life' (SACO, Hakmann Dossier and Eugen, 1848). However, the letter did little to alleviate ethnic disputes.

In June 1848, 230 representatives from all ethnic communities in Bukovina signed a document, comprised of twelve points, titled 'The Country's Petition' (Ceașu 2004: 56–7). The document stated that Bukovina should become an autonomous province separate from Galicia and that it should have its own Diet. In addition, the bishop should be appointed by a local congress composed of clergy and laymen, while the administration of the Religious Fund should come under a local Orthodox committee. Bishop Eugen joined leading landowners and intellectuals and presented the petition in person to Vienna (Ceașu 2004: 68).

Although 'The Country's Petition' found support across ethnic lines, Romanians and Ruthenians had their own views regarding the future administration of Bukovina. Romanians favoured independence, while a significant number of Ruthenians opposed the separation of the province from Galicia and sought closer relations with the Supreme Ruthenian Council. On 1 November 1848, a popular assembly opposing the Romanian cause was organised in Czernowitz under the leadership of deputies Ivan Dolynchuk, Vasyl Kirste, Lukian Kobyltsia and Vasyl Morgosh (Kozik 1986: 282–3). Competition between Romanian and Ruthenian political mobilisation continued throughout 1848. In September, Romanian was officially declared one of the teaching languages at the Theological Institute in Czernowitz, alongside Latin, Greek and German, and, on 4 October, a Romanian gazette, '*Bucovina. Gazeta Romaneasca pentru Politică, Religie și Literatură*' (Bukovina. Romanian Gazette for Politics, Religion and Literature), was issued with text in both Romanian and German (LCNU, *Bucovina*, 4 October 1848).

Romanian and Ruthenian communities elected their own deputies to the Austrian Parliament and set up separate cultural organisations. A Congress of Ruthenian Scholars in Galicia was paralleled by Romanians in 1846 who

established a Literary Society for the Bukovinian Church. The Society aimed to achieve the ‘enlightenment of the nation’, ‘the rising of the shrunken national language’ (*‘luminarea nației’* and *‘ridicarea mult decăzutei limbi naționale’*) and the publication of a Romanian-German-French Dictionary based on similar works circulating in Moldavia, Transylvania and Wallachia (Loghin 1926: 13–33; Iacobescu 2003a: 206).

Political activism gained momentum on 9 February 1849, when a delegation of the Bukovinian elite wrote a new document, ‘Postscript to the Country’s Petition’, addressed to the Austrian Parliament. The Postscript, conceived by Eudoxiu Hurmuzachi, repeated the points of the June 1848 document and was signed by the majority of local landowners and intellectuals (Ceașu 2004: 72). Bishop Eugen and two conservative deputies, Antonii Kral and Mykhailo Bodnar, presented the new demands to the Viennese Court. En route, they stopped in Lemberg where they were welcomed by the Diet, *Holova Ru’ka Rada*, which praised the historic ties between the Romanian and Ruthenians in Bukovina. An article published in the Ruthenian newspaper *Zoria Halytska* by Anton Petrushevych’ (*‘Polshcha, Rus’ i Romyny, napis istoricheskii’*) (Poland, Rus’, and the Romanians: A Historic Sketch) encouraged Romanians and Ruthenians to work together for the same political ideals. It argued that their common foe was Poland, which could easily extend its influence to Bukovina, and might even ‘intend to subordinate the Romanians’ (Kozik 1986: 282–3).

The 1848 Revolution led to the reorganisation of the imperial administration. A new imperial Constitution decreed, on 4 March 1849, that Bukovina should cease its administrative links with Galicia and become an autonomous duchy. The official act, dated 19 April 1849, was issued by the Ministry of Interior and sent to Eduard Bach, President of the provisory government of Bukovina, instructing him to organise a local committee in charge of drafting a local Constitution. Bishop Eugen and the provincial aristocracy, which included Ioan von Mustață, Iordachi von Vasilco, Mihai von Zotta, Alexandru von Goian, Iacob von Miculi, and Cristof von Petrovici, became members of the local committee (Ceașu 2004: 75). A few days later, on 17 March 1849, Eugen informed the faithful of new political circumstances by celebrating a ‘happy future [...] which only truth and justice will rule; [...] Children of Bukovina! Your fate is now in your own hands. Make yourselves examples of the common good, so that your own children will not cry. Be wise [...]!’ (SACO, Eugen, 1849).

Bukovina’s political autonomy faced proposals of reorganising the Empire to take into account its ethnic and religious diversity. On 6 July 1849, Eugen seemed to offer support for the Romanian nationalist movement by contacting the Patriarchate of Karlovci and stating that all Romanians in the Habsburg Empire should unite under a single metropolitanate. It proposed that the metropolitan should be elected by both the Romanian bishops and by the laity; the bishoprics should take into account the ethnic composition of the region; and, lastly, all metropolitans and an equal number of bishops and laity should elect

a patriarch whereas a Church synod should be in charge of the whole Orthodox faithful in the Empire (Sbiera 1896). The most important proposal was that bishoprics should be established across ethnic lines which would have enabled churches to emerge alongside national movements. This was a contested issue which would have departed from the norm of church structures. The Church in Bukovina had a territorial structure, namely the faithful was Orthodox regardless of ethnicity and the language spoken. The proposal would have meant that the Church would now have an ethnic organisation, clearly dividing Romanian- and Ruthenian-speaking communities which each could elect their own bishop. In many villages Romanian-speakers and Ruthenian-speakers were mixed together in the same parishes with the clergy performing ceremonies in both languages. As the Romanian national movement was better organised than that of Ruthenians in Bukovina, Eugen's letter was regarded by Romanian intellectuals as an example of the bishop's recognition of their predominance in the province.

In attempting to find a solution to the organisation of Eastern Orthodox communities, all of the Orthodox bishops in the Empire gathered for a series of meetings in Vienna between 15 October 1850 and 2 July 1851. On 26 April 1850, in Czernowitz, Eugen met all deans, the hegumens of monasteries and professors of theology who endorsed the idea of a single unified Orthodox Church. However, after ten months of discussions, the bishops in Vienna reached no agreement. Should the Church be ruled by a Synod composed of bishops and metropolitans? What role should the laity play in running the Church? How should the Church accommodate ethnic divisions? These questions would remain contentious throughout the following decades.

Before he travelled to Vienna, Romanian landlords and intellectuals regarded Eugen as a keen promotor of a unified Romanian Church. However, his public position subsequently changed. He entered into conflict with Andrei Șaguna, the bishop of the Orthodox Church in Transylvania, who criticised the involvement of clerical consistories from Sibiu and Czernowitz in issues relating to provincial administrative matters. Șaguna proposed that consistories should be elected by the oldest members of the Church rather than the clergy, a method that would have enabled a stronger participation of laymen, representative of the various ethnic communities, in decision making matters. By doing so, Șaguna favoured the ethnic model of church structure supporting the rise of Romanian national consciousness in Transylvania. Relations between the two bishops became acrimonious, to the extent that, on 5 November 1850, during a meeting, Eugen apparently took Șaguna's paper from the hand of the bishop of Karlstadt, who presided over the meeting, forbidding him to read the text aloud. While both bishops could not decide on the most appropriate structure of the Church, they did agree that a solution would have been for Romanians to have their own church in the Empire (NA, Dossier 1094; Bruszanowski 2006). On his return to Czernowitz, on 26 April 1851, Eugen held a local synod which took note of the discussions in Vienna and demanded wider church reform in Bukovina. For the first time, rather than supporting

a unified church for a particular ethnic community, Eugen publicly proposed the establishment of a local independent Bukovinian Church.

The making of the Metropolitanate of Bukovina and Dalmatia, 1850–73

On 31 December 1851, the emperor decreed the abolition of the 1849 Constitution (Smolka 1917; Turczynski 1976; Zayarnyuk 2013). Galicia was now ruled by a viceroy (*Statthalter*) who reported directly to the emperor, while Bukovina's autonomous provincial status was temporarily cancelled (Magosci 1996: 417–8) and the province re-joined Galicia. One of the first political consequences in Bukovina was the closure, after four years of regular publication, of the *Bucovina* gazette. The government adopted a stronger stance against nationalist movements and ethnic public gatherings were outlawed. Romanian intellectuals writing at this time claimed that between 1850 and 1860 was one of 'the darkest periods in the history of Bukovina' (Nistor 1916: 77). It was during this period that the idea of establishing a Bukovinian Church which embraced the concept of national indifference developed further.

In 1854, Bishop Şaguna in Transylvania advanced the arguments put forward in Vienna a few years earlier in an overview of the Canon Law of the Orthodox Church. His book focused in detail on the meaning of the word 'synod' as the highest authority in the Church. He proposed that the synod was 'the gathering of clergy and church teachers which meet to defend the faith, morality and Church rules. The Synods are either ecumenical or local. [...] Local synods could be: 1) national, of one nation; 2) provincial, of one province; 3) metropolitan, of one metropolitanate; or 4) eparchial, of one diocese' (Şaguna 1854). Eugen agreed with the proposed typology. However, he claimed that only the clergy had authority in the Church. In his own words, 'The layman, even if he were full of wisdom and humility, is still a layman, and not a shepherd [...] For this reason, the sheep should not be against their shepherds' (LCNU, Hakmann, 1899).

Reform in the Church increased in pace, when, on 27 September 1860, with the emperor's Decree no. 14721/469, a synod was established for all Orthodox bishops in the Empire under the leadership of Patriarch Rajačić in Karlovci to clarify the Eastern Orthodox jurisdictional structure (Morariu Andrievici 1893: 13). The Karlovci synod took place alongside administrative changes. In 1861, Bukovina was assigned the status of a separate province with its own governmental structures. A Bukovinian Diet with deputies elected according to their social status was set up with 31 seats, and representatives were also sent to the House of Deputies in Vienna (Magosci 2007: 173).⁸ Bishop Eugen was appointed the first marshal (*Landeshauptmann*) of the Diet, a position he retained for two years.⁹

Eugen's response to the Karlovci synod was to organise a local assembly in Czernowitz, on 17 February 1861, bringing together the Clerical Consistory, the rector of the seminary, and the hegumens of all monasteries who were

accompanied by a monk and two priests from their regions. The assembly issued a document titled *Dorințele dreptcredinciosului Cleru din Bucovina în privința Organizației canonice a diecezei, și a ierarhice sale referințe în Organismul bisericii ortodoxe din Austria* (The Wishes of the Faithful Clergy in Bukovina regarding the Canonical Organisation of the Diocese and of its Hierarchy within the Orthodox Church in Austria). The assembly sent its 'Wishes' to Eugen for approval, who, in turn, forwarded them to Vienna, on 10 June 1861. The document was divided into eight proposals: 1). An increase in the salary of all clergy and those with administrative duties in the diocese; 2). Equal rights for all religious confessions; 3). The Church should oversee marriage law and the running of the Religious Fund; 4). The Bukovinian Church should be separate from Karlovci; 5). Both Churches in Bukovina and Transylvania should be raised to the rank of metropolitanate; 6). Provincial canonical synods should be established in the Empire; 7). A general Orthodox synod should be set up for all dioceses in the Empire; and, 8). The hierarch in Bukovina should be appointed from a shortlist of three candidates.

The 1861 assembly had a long-lasting impact on the Bukovinian Church. First, by not including laymen in its organisation, it raised questions regarding the very nature of the Orthodox Church. Second, it declared support for an independent Church in Bukovina outside the jurisdiction of the Serbian Patriarchate. Third, it promoted the Bukovinian Church to the rank of metropolitanate, equal to the other recognised churches in the Empire. The Bukovinian stance led to an immediate reaction from Transylvania. Bishop Șaguna criticised the Czernowitz assembly in a publication titled *Anthorismos, sau Deslusire comparativă asupra broșurei 'Dorințele dreptcredinciosului Cleru din Bucovina în privința Organizației canonice a diecezei, și a ierarhice sale referințe în Organismul bisericii ortodoxe din Austria'* (Anthorismos. Or A Comparative Examination of the Booklet 'The Wishes of the Faithful Clergy in Bukovina regarding the Canonical Organisation of the Diocese and of its Hierarchy within the Orthodox Church in Austria') printed in Sibiu in 1861. Eugen continued his correspondence with Șaguna in which he reinforced the view that laymen should not be involved in ecclesiastical matters. He defended the idea of a separate Bukovinian Church, writing in 1865 that, 'We Bukovinians are not like all Romanians, because some of our brethren are Ruthenians. If we have to choose between Karlovci and Alba Iulia we could not decide amongst us.' Eugen's refusal to bring his Church closer to the Greek Catholic Church (Alba Iulia) and the Orthodox Church in Transylvania (Sibiu) underlined the uniqueness of the Bukovinian church. If in Transylvania both the Orthodox and the Greek Catholic Churches defended the political rights of the predominant Romanian population, Bukovina was different. A number of parishes moved from the Orthodox to the Greek Catholic Church (NA, 7/4.1 and Dossier 1425) and an independent Bukovinian Church would have ensured stronger social, legal and political representation of its multi-ethnic faithful. The defection of Orthodox parishes to the Greek Catholic Church (established in Bukovina in 1812) was mainly due to social rather than

ethnic or religious reasons. For example, in 1856, the Romanian-speaking parish of Boian joined the Greek Catholic Church in an attempt to influence the result of a public trial with the landowner (Reli 1928). The Boian example showed that while the number of Orthodox parishes switching their confession remained small, Romanian intellectuals were concerned that close links between the Ruthenian movement and the Greek Catholic Church in Galicia were felt in Bukovina and that the new confession represented a form of denationalising the Romanian faithful.

Eugen's stance did not represent all of his grassroots community, as became increasingly evident. The 1861 Czernowitz clerical assembly led to dissatisfaction among the Romanian elite in Bukovina and to public unrest (LCNU, *Stenographische*, 1863). A Romanian gathering protested against the bishop and smashed the windows of his residence. Two memoranda were sent to Vienna and to Eugen demanding a united Romanian Church for both Bukovina and Transylvania. Eugen responded in a pastoral letter by criticising attempts to obtain 'national-political advantages' and by claiming that the Church should not engage in political disputes. He enforced his arguments by claiming that 'the kingdom of Christ is not in this world' and that 'the priesthood does not have anything to do with politics or the spread of nationalism' (Nistor 1916: 81–9). Questions regarding religious matters lasted into 1863, when, on 27 March, the Bukovinian Diet discussed a motion put forward by Romanian deputies on the autonomy of the Church and asked the Viennese Court for a solution (NA, Dossier 1477).

During the Congress in Karlovci, which took place in August 1864, Eugen voted in favour of the establishment of a Romanian Metropolitanate in Transylvania but refused to unite his Church with the Romanian brethren. He publicly proposed the setting up of an autocephalous (independent) Metropolitanate in Bukovina and advanced the idea that each metropolitanate in the Empire should have its own administrative synod composed solely of clergy. His proposals failed to attract support in Karlovci, or in Bukovina (LCNU, *Aufruf; Einigkeitsruf*). Rather than offering full autonomy, the Viennese Court reorganised the Bukovinian Church in the Statute of 31 October 1865 to emphasise the prime role of the Clerical Consistory in church administration and the appointment of clergy for the newly built Cathedral in Czernowitz (LCNU, *Geschäftsordnung*, 1868).

As the Statute did not offer a solution to the church structure, on 15 February 1866, Romanian deputies in the Bukovinian Diet urged the government to hold an assembly composed of an equal number of clergy and laymen. The initiative faced the repeated opposition of Eugen, who protested against the Diet's involvement in religious affairs. Imperial support came at the time of the Austrian-Prussian war, with Viennese newspapers commenting that some Romanian clergy in Bukovina retained close contact with Moldavia and Wallachia and may readily support a military invasion in the region (Nistor 1916: 90–3).

The 1867 Constitution which inaugurated the Austro-Hungarian Dual Monarchy led to major political and administrative changes. 'Austria' now

represented Cisleithania or the non-Hungarian half of the Monarchy while Hungary took over administrative and political affairs setting up a Parliament in Budapest. Austria-Hungary as a combined entity retained decision making rights on foreign affairs, military and financial matters, and links with provincial diets (Magosci 2007: 173). Under these circumstances, the Serbian Metropolitanate of Karlovci came under the jurisdiction of Budapest and lost authority over Bukovina, which instead strengthened its links with Vienna, under whose authority it now fell.

Faced with further religious fragmentation on ethnic lines, on 1 May 1868, Eugen sent a pastoral letter criticising the growing tendency of local clergy to become involved in nationalist movements. The letter condemned the revolutionary ideals of 1848 and presented as irrevocable the separation between priesthood and the idea of the nation. In his own words, Eugen stated that,

Old passions attracted some of our clergy, namely the passion of producing intrigues in the public national and church life, forgetting that a priest who is struggling to play a political or national role becomes unfaithful to his vocation [...] The Year of 1848 is unforgettable in the history of the Bukovinian clergy with colours of shame and dishonour [...] The seed which [the clergy] planted has now deep and new roots. Some clergy behave like saviours of nationality and like friends of the people hiding behind the mask of the holy religion and the Church [...] Who does not know these agitators [and] comedians among the clergy [...] In truth, we should be ashamed of our clergy; thus, the whole world is laughing at us [...] (AMRE, Eugen, 'Țirculariu', 1868).

His plea did little to alleviate tensions. As a result of the Law of 21 December 1867 on Citizens' Rights, in March 1868, the Romanian leadership of Bukovina appealed to Vienna arguing for church autonomy and for a diocesan conference to be held in Czernowitz composed half of clergy and half of laity under the presidency of an imperial commissary rather than under the local government or the Church. On 19 June 1868, the ministry responded that it was looking into the matter. On 21 July 1868, the ministry sent a letter to Eugen endorsing discussion on church autonomy after taking into account the views of the Clerical Consistory and, for the first time, officially, recognising the role of the laity.

However, Eugen refused to organise an assembly composed of clergy and laity and, instead, on 8 August 1868, asked a few laymen to express their personal opinions only in writing. As a result, in January 1869, the Clerical Consistory sent a draft statute comprised of 45 articles to Vienna. The statute proposed that discussions on church dogma, rituals and disciplinary issues should be under an eparchial congregation composed only of clergy; at the same time, when addressing church affairs which had an impact on the administration and structure of the local Church, a synod should bring together 30 clergy and 30 laymen. The statute also proposed that the bishop should be elected by the emperor from a shortlist of three candidates proposed by the Clerical Consistory and that the Religious Fund should be administered by the Church.¹⁰

The imperial decision promulgated on 2 February 1869 took into account these proposals and legislated on the structure of the Church in Bukovina. It stated that the Clerical Consistory should meet twice a week under the presidency of the bishop or a general vicar and that all discussions should be conducted in German, the official state language. In practice, official documentation was written in German for scrutiny by state officials while many decisions were issued in Romanian and Ruthenian. Decisions taken by the Consistory were then published in the newly established *Foaea Ordinac unilor Consistoriului Episcopal  n trebile bisericesc  ale Diecesei Bucovinei* (The Gazette of Ordinances of the Diocesan Consistory regarding Church Affairs in the Bukovinian Diocese). The title was published in Romanian (with Cyrillic letters until 1874) and contained texts in Romanian and Ruthenian, while state-related documents were printed in German. The Consistory had competence in the following areas: finance and the Religious Fund; faith matters; rituals; clerical discipline; church jurisdiction; the training of priests and religious education. The diocese was divided into four sections under the supervision of four inspectors who were in charge of religious education. Lastly, correspondence between parishes and the Consistory was conducted in German to reflect imperial authority. All of these decisions represented a victory for Eugen and an endorsement of his own vision of running of the Church which excluded the laity from ecclesiastical decision-making processes, instead placing authority solely on the Clerical Consistory.

In order to counteract Romanian mobilisation, Eugen showed support for the initiatives of Father Vasyl Prodan and Deacon Vasyl Dron to set up a Ruthenian cultural-educational society, *Ruska Besida in Bukovina* (The Ruthenian Discourse in Bukovina) which was structured on a similar format to *Ruska Besida* in Lemberg, founded in 1864; it would become the predominant Ruthenian cultural institution.¹¹ In 1870, the first newspaper in Ruthenian was published in Czernowitz, *Bukovynskaia zoria* (Bukovina's Dawn), written in a language which used a combination of Church Slavonic, Russian, Ruthenian and Polish.¹² In addition, Eugen supported the establishment of an 'Association of the Ruthenian Orthodox Priests' and an 'Orthodox Academy' which brought together theological students and promoted the idea of a united Ruthenian consciousness in opposition to Romanian and Russian influence (Zinkewych and Sorokowski 1988: 191–2).

As a sign of their opposition to Eugen's cross-cultural and ethnic strategies, the Romanian landlords and intellectuals appointed Samuil Andrievici Morariu, one of the advisors of the Clerical Consistory and a deputy in the Legislative Chamber in Vienna, to present a revised project of church autonomy. The Legislative Chamber agreed to discuss the project in principle and asked its Confessional Commission to investigate. Dissatisfaction with the lack of progress in Vienna led the Romanian community under the leadership of Baron George Hurmuzachi, on 11 June 1870, to organise a large popular assembly of around 2000 people in Czernowitz to demand church autonomy, administrative rights of the Religious Fund and the establishment of a

congress composed of clergy and laymen, similar to that in Transylvania. The Czernowitz assembly represented the climax of Romanian religious and political national mobilisation in Bukovina. It empowered twelve people (four clergy and eight laymen) to put forward their decisions to Vienna, travelling to the capital in September 1870 (Sbiera 1870).

Eugen condemned the assembly, suspended Samuil Morariu Andrievici and Ioan Țurcan from the Clerical Consistory, and rebuked the assembly's demands in a letter to Vienna on 10 September 1870. However, despite his opposition, on 30 September 1870, the Ministry of Religious Confessions decided to alleviate the escalation of tension over this matter by asking the Bukovinian governor, for the first time, to start consultations with both clergy and laity. The response from Vienna was unexpected. On 1 December 1870, the governor received further notification to ensure the organisation of a Constituent Congress composed of eighteen clergy and eighteen laymen, some directly appointed by the government, in order to discuss the basis of establishing a future Church Congress. Eugen was invited to participate in debates, however, he refused, showing that he was only willing to answer questions and provide recommendations in writing.

On 1 March 1871, the Constituent Congress met under the presidency of Felix Pino von Friedenthal, Bukovina's governor. It proposed that the Church Congress take place under the bishop's leadership and bring together forty-eight people, equally divided between clergy and laity, rather than with a larger proportion of laymen as was the case in the Orthodox Church in Transylvania (Nistor 1916: 105–111). The proposals were approved by the Viennese Court on 9 August 1871 and published in official state legislation, *Gesetz- und Verordnungs-Blatt für das Herzogthum Bukowina* (The Collection of Laws and Ordinances in the Duchy of Bukovina, 7 September). However, despite government endorsement, Eugen refused to participate. He did not attend the Constituent Congress and forbade the publication of proposals in the church journal, *Foaea Ordinacūnilor*. The first Church Congress did not take place until nearly one decade later, on 14 July 1882, under the leadership of Archbishop Silvestru Morariu Andrievici (1893: 9).

Close political ties between Czernowitz and Vienna rather than Budapest and Karlovci and the proposals of setting up a Church Congress to bring together clergy and laity were the key factors in the recognition of the unique church-state model in Bukovina. On 23 January 1873, the Viennese Court approved the establishment of the Metropolitanate of Bukovina and Dalmatia, a supra-ethnic Orthodox structure, divided between communities separated by a large geographical space, which comprised Romanians and Ruthenians in the Bukovinian Church and Serbians in the Zara and Cattaro dioceses of Dalmatia. German was declared the official language of the Metropolitanate while each diocese conducted services and communicated with its faithful in the local languages, namely Romanian, Ruthenian and Serbian. Most significantly, the new Metropolitanate proclaimed itself an autocephalous Church in the Empire with hierarchs meeting annually in Vienna rather than in

Czernowitz. To overcome linguistic barriers, discussions were held through translators, which showed that not all members of the church administration were fluent in German. The Metropolitanate of Bukovina and Dalmatia lasted until the incorporation of Bukovina into Greater Romania and of the local Church into the Romanian Orthodox Church in 1918.

In the winter of 1873, the eighty-year-old Bishop Eugen travelled to Vienna to be appointed metropolitan; he died there on 31 March before being officially confirmed in his new position. The news led to great distress in Bukovina. The Clerical Consistory feared that his death would affect not only recognition of the newly established metropolitanate but would have an impact on its ecclesiastical integrity amidst ethnic tensions. Before announcing his death, *Foaea Ordinacūnilor* published a letter reproducing laws of the Viennese Court of 7 August 1817 and 22 February 1849 that foreign clergy were not allowed to attend or celebrate the liturgy without the approval of the local hierarch. All clergy were required to follow state and church legislation and, if they failed to do so, they would be severely reprimanded by the local authorities (AMRE, *Foaea*, 1873). On the following page, *Foaea Ordinacūnilor* included Note no. 2447 of 29 May 1873 signed by two Advisors of the Clerical Consistory, a Romanian and a Ruthenian, stating that all clergy were required to mention the name of Eugen in their prayers, who had now departed (AMRE, 'Circulariu', no 2447, 1873). At the same time, under Note no. 2664 of 31 May 1873, Teophil Bendella was temporarily assigned administrator of the Bukovinian Church and the clergy were required to include his name in their liturgical prayers (AMRE, 'Circulariu', no 2664, 1873).

Conclusion

The Bukovinian Church remains one of the most controversial church organisations which emerged as a result of state and religious authorities engaging with national movements in the nineteenth century. The rising and conflicting forces of the Romanian nationalist movement in the 1840s and, two decades later, of Ruthenian national consciousness, affected the structure of the Orthodox Church from the first days of Bishop Eugen's leadership, when he attempted to complement Romanian-Ruthenian relations by instructing the clergy to communicate and pray in the vernacular. Rather than foster the notion of an ideal mythical past, as evident in neighbouring Moldavia and Wallachia, the Bukovinian Church supported the vision of a Church in which the clergy held sole authority. He rejected the presence of laity in the Church leadership due to the idea that national indifference was key to establishing a strong Church and that the laity's presence in church structures would increase conflict between Romanian and Ruthenian communities. He emphasised that the Church should follow the same format as that of the first days of the Christian faith when apostles and early synods defined the dogma without taking into account the ethnic structure of their communities.

Eugen's continued condemnation of the clergy regarding national activism, his refusal to hold a Church Congress along ethnic lines, and his imposition of a Clerical Consistory composed only of clergy did little to alleviate the rise of national movements. His reinforcement of national indifference did not fully reflect the grassroots reality in Bukovina. Most likely, as in Transylvania, an Orthodox Consistory which included laymen would have followed a similar national mobilisation to a Consistory composed solely of the clergy.

Bishop Eugen Hakmann's leadership has been widely regarded as highly controversial by national historiographies ever since. At the time of his death in 1873, a publication in Prague wrote that his contemporaries saw him as 'a traitor sold to the Germans' for failing to support either Romanians or Ruthenians in the Bukovinian Church (Picot 1873: 298). He was criticised for first supporting the Romanian community, as seen in the period between 1848 and 1850, but later, in the 1850s and 1860s, he seemed to favour the rising Ruthenian consciousness and oppose the Romanian political movement, as evident in his lack of support for a Church Congress in the late 1860s and early 1870s (Dan 1912; Iorga 1934; Reli 1925). Oscillating between the political interests of Romanian and Ruthenian communities, he regularly expressed support for both ethnicities. He justified the uniqueness of the Bukovinian Church in contrast with the Romanian-dominated Church in Transylvania by arguing that ethnic communities should work, in his own words, 'in harmony', while at the same time, 'a priest who is struggling to play a political or national role becomes unfaithful to his vocation'. It was this view of a conflict between faith and political nationalism which underpinned the difficulties of constructing a Church alongside national indifference.

Eugen's opposition to unification with Transylvania was harshly criticised by historian Ion Nistor in a widely circulated book published in Bucharest in 1916, two years before the incorporation of Bukovina into Greater Romania. Nistor wrote that Eugen's uncle, Archimandrite Ignatie Hakmann, claimed that his family descended from a *hatman*, a high-ranking official in Moldavia. When he spoke to Austrians he claimed that his name came from Hackemann. When he spoke to Ruthenians he claimed that his name came from a Russian family from Podolia. Eugen's ease of communicating in the three main languages of Bukovina led to confusion among his fellow countrymen: in the first years of his leadership he spoke Romanian, later German, and, after 1865, mostly Ruthenian (Nistor 1916: 74–5). Nistor's depiction of Bishop Eugen as an unfortunate figure who attracted the misfortunes of the Romanian community in Bukovina has remained the dominant perception of him:

'[...] born in a Ruthenian environment, educated in German schools, blinded by Jesuit doctrines and called to profess in a Romanian diocese, he represents the true type of old Bukovinian employee, who lost any spiritual link with his fellow countrymen, and lived only through the grace of the almighty government [...] It is very hard to identify to which nation Evghenie [Eugen] belonged. Some stated that he was Romanian, as in fact

most who have this name in Bukovina regard themselves Romanians, some of whom are even good Romanians. On the other hand, Ruthenians consider him to be of their own nation, because in his private life he spoke in Ruthenian and he supported the Ruthenian cause in the Romanian diocese. In fact, there are some Ruthenian families in Bukovina with the name of Hakmann. However, it seems that Bishop Evghenie, taking into account his [public] feelings and attitude, was neither Romanian nor Ruthenian, but a mere Austrian bureaucrat, authoritarian and despotic, who ruled on the idea that the Diocese of Bukovina was designed for himself and not him for the diocese' (Nistor 1916: 74–5).

In summarising his life, Nistor (1916: 124) wrote that, allegedly, Eugen's secretary, Anton Schönbach, added an epitaph to his gravestone with the following words: 'Therein lies stubbornness and untamed ambition' (*Aci odihnește îndărătnicia și ambițiunea neînduplecată*).

Bishop Eugen's legacy was contested by Ukrainian scholars. In a book published in 1970, I. M. Nowosiwsky (1970: 84) viewed Eugen as a 'Romanized Ukrainian' who 'made a certain rapprochement with the Ukrainians not so much because of private convictions but because the latter were opponents of his own adversaries'. Eugen was praised for ensuring that Ruthenian became the second language in the diocese in 1838 and officially approved by imperial authorities in 1869.

The long-lasting controversy around Eugen's life has recently reappeared after the fall of communism in Romania and Ukraine. Writing in 1999, historian Oleksandr Masan from the University of Chernivtsi (in Ukrainian Bukovina) regarded Eugen as 'the first Ukrainian to head the Bukovinian bishopric [who] was not a conscious Ukrainian, but he remembered his origins [...] the interests of the Church and his diocese were more important for him, than the national aspirations of the nationalities of the region' (Masan 1999: 71–2; Chuchko 2011; Botushans'kyi 2012). In 1993, historian Mihai Iacobescu (1993: 370 and 459–62) from the University of Suceava (in Romanian Bukovina) after conducting archival research in Chernivtsi, emphasised that 'First and foremost, Eugen Hakmann was Romanian. He was a man of his region from his fore-fore-fathers'. In Iacobescu's view, Eugen 'was an intimate advisor of Franz Joseph (1848–1916) [who] asked and obtained everything he wanted from the Viennese Court. If we select only what we want from the life and activity of Hakmann we could present him and crown him like a hero' (Iacobescu 2003b: 301, 305).

The organisation of the Bukovinian Church has not only had an impact upon Orthodox Churches in Romania and Ukraine but has affected religious and political debates throughout Southeastern Europe. In 1918, the regions of Moldavia, Wallachia, Transylvania, Banat and Bukovina united into Greater Romania supporting a single unified Romanian Orthodox Church. The Serbian dioceses of the Bukovinian Metropolitanate and Dalmatia were included in the Serbian Orthodox Church. After the Second World War, the Church in Bukovina would become part of the Russian Orthodox Church, and, at the end of the Cold War, of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church – Moscow Patriarchate.

Furthermore, ethnic divisions between Romanians and Ukrainians have haunted the fate of Eugen's mortal remains and memory in the public domain. In the 1970s, one century after his death, the Soviet authorities removed his tomb from the Czernowitz Cathedral placing it in an unnamed communal grave. After 1990, Romanians canonised Bishop Andrei Șaguna of Transylvania for supporting the national political movement; in response, Ukrainians appropriated Bishop Eugen to the core of their Church in Bukovina by erecting a large bronze statue of him outside the main Cathedral in Chernivsti. Controversy in establishing Orthodox Churches along ethnic and national lines has remained fundamental to the structure of the Eastern Orthodox world.

Acknowledgements

I am very grateful to the journal editors and five anonymous reviewers for their extensive and thought-provoking comments on earlier drafts of this article. My thanks go to the academics, archivists and librarians in the institutions I visited in Chernivtsi, Ukraine and Suceava, Romania, listed in the References, for their guidance in identifying key unpublished material. Research in these cities was supported by the Aston Centre for Europe at Aston University, Birmingham, United Kingdom.

Notes

1. The official name of Bukovina's capital, Czernowitz, has been used throughout the text, rather than Romanian (Cernăuți) or Ruthenian/Ukrainian (Chernivtsi, as known today). Romanian, Ruthenian and Serbian characters have been used according to official use.

2. Between 1821 and 1848 Bukovina was ruled by five marshals: Alois von Stutterheim (1817–23), Josef von Melczek (1823–33), Franz Kratter (1833–38), Kasimir von Milbacher (1838–40) and Gheorghe Isăcescu (1840–49).

3. The bishop's official name, Eugen Hakmann, has been used throughout the text rather than Romanian (Eugenie/Evgenie Hacman) or Ruthenian/Ukrainian (Yevhen Hakman).

4. In his own words, '...seeing that the clergy rejected their mother's language [văzând că clerul delatura limba maicei sale]' in *Foaea Ordinacțiunilor Consistoriului Episcopal în trebile bisericesci ale Dieceșei Bucovineî*, 29 June/11 July 1868 [Cyrillic]. *Foaea Ordinacțiunilor* has been printed in only a few copies. A full collection has been consulted at the Archives of the Museum of Regional Ethnography, Chernivtsi. A partial list is available at State Archives of Chernivtsi Oblast.

5. Twelve deaconates in Câmpulung, Homor, Suceava, Rădăuți, Vicov, Siret, Storojineț, Putila, Cernăuți, Coțmani, Ceremuș and Nistru.

6. In 1821 the Catholic Church had 15 parishes; in 1822 a new Greek-Catholic church in Czernowitz; in 1821 a synagogue in Czernowitz; in 1847 the first Protestant parish in Czernowitz.

7. The Church benefited from highly trained clergy in Vienna and Lemberg during the reigns of Maria Theresa (1740–80) and Joseph II (co-ruler since 1765; 1780–90). In 1808, the Metropolitanate of Halych was restored and the Archbishop of Lemberg oversaw the whole Greek Catholic Church in Galicia.

8. By contrast, the Galician Diet had 150 seats.

9. Bishop Eugen remained a deputy in the Bukovinian Diet until 1872.

10. The 1869 statutes were published in *Foaea Ordinacțiunilor Consistoriului Episcopal în trebile bisericesci ale Dieceșei Bucovineî*. *Edat și tremis la 5/17 aprilie 1869*, no. 6/1869. The next statues

in 1884 ('Das Synodal-Statut der Griechisch-Orientalischen Metropole der Bukowina und Dalmatien (24 August 1884)') were published in Milash 1885.

11. *Ruska Besida in Bukovina* continued uninterrupted until 1940. In the first decade, from 1869 to 1878, it was chaired by Father Vasyl Prodan and many intellectuals regarded it as a Russophile organisation.

12. A number of newspapers published in Galicia and Bukovina used the same language at the time. In Galicia: *Slovo* (Word) (1861–87), *Naukovyi sbornik* (Scientific Collection) (1865–73, 1885–90, 1896–97), *Vremennik Stavropigiiskogo instituta s mesiatsoslovom* (Chronicles of Stavropiegic Institute with Menology) (1864–1915) and *Věstnik Narodnoho doma* (Newsletter of the People's Houses) (1882–1914). In Bukovina: *Pravoslavnaya Bukovina* (Orthodox Bukovina) (1893–1904) and *Bukovinski vědomosti* (Bukovina Newsletter) (1895–1909).

References

Archival material

- Archives of the Museum of Regional Ethnography (AMRE), Chernivtsi, Ukraine*
Eugen, 'Circulariu cǎtrǎ cinstitul cler al Eparhiei Noastre' (Letter to the Esteemed Clergy of our Diocese), 1/13 May 1868 in *Foaea Ordinǎciunilor Consistoriului Episcopal în trebile bisericesci ale Diecesei Bucovinei* (The Gazette of Ordinances of the Diocesan Consistory regarding Church Affairs in the Bukovinian Diocese), 29 June/11 July 1868 [Cyrillic characters]
"Circulariu, no 2447 semnat de Blajeviciu și Illasievici, din Consiliul Consistoriului Episcopesc al Bucovinei" (Letter no 2447 signed by Blajeviciu și Illasievici in the Consilium of the Episcopal Consistory of Bukovina), 29 May/10 June 1873 in *Foaea Ordinǎciunilor Consistoriului Episcopal în trebile bisericesci ale Diecesei Bucovinei, Edat și tremis la 4/16 Iuniu 1873* (The Gazette of Ordinances of the Diocesan Consistory regarding Church Affairs in the Bukovinian Diocese. Promulgated and Sent on 4/16 June 1873) [Latin characters]
'Circulariu no 2664' (Letter no 2664), 31 May/12 June 1873 in *Foaea Ordinǎciunilor Consistoriului Episcopal în trebile bisericesci ale Diecesei Bucovinei, Edat și tremis la 4/16 Iuniu 1873* (The Gazette of Ordinances of the Diocesan Consistory regarding Church Affairs in the Bukovinian Diocese. Promulgated and Sent on 4/16 June 1873) [Latin characters]
Foaea Ordinǎciunilor Consistoriului Episcopal în trebile bisericesci ale Diecesei Bucovinei, 1868–1872 (The Gazette of Ordinances of the Diocesan Consistory regarding Church Affairs in the Bukovinian Diocese) [Cyrillic and Latin characters]
- State Archives of Chernivtsi Oblast (SACO), Chernivtsi, Ukraine*
Eugen, Pastoral Letter, 18/30 May 1848
Eugen, Pastoral Letter, 17/29 March 1849
Eugen Hakmann Dossier
- Department of Rare and Valuable Books, Library of Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University (LCNU), Chernivtsi, Ukraine*
Bucovina. Gazeta Romaneasca pentru Politică, Religie și Literatură (Bukovina. Romanian Gazette for Politics, Religion and Literature), no 1, Cernăuți, 1848–52
Candela. Foie bisericească-literară (The Candle. Religious-Literary Gazette)
Eugen Hakmann, *Nationale und kirchliche Bestrebungen der Rumänen in der Bukowina, 1848–1865, von Bischof Hakmann in einem Sendschreiben dargestellt*. Herausgegeben von Dr. S. Smal-Stocki. Czernowitz, 1899
Stenographische Protokolle des Bukowiner Landtages, 1863
Aufruf an die hohe Staatsverwaltung in der hierarhischen und Organisationsfrage der gr. or. Kirche in der Bukowina [undated]

Einigkeitseruf an die gr. or. Provinzialkirche der Bukowina in der hierarchischen und Organisationsfrage [undated]

Geschäftsordnung für das Consistorium des gr. Or. Bisthumes der Bukowina, Wien, 1868

4. *Fond Bukovina Metropolitanate; National Archives (NA), Suceava, Romania*

Dossier 7/4 (Reports on Conversion from the Orthodox Church to the Greek Catholic Church, 1794-1824)

Dossier 1094 (Paper on Church-State Relations Presented at the Bishops' Meeting in Vienna, 1851)

Dossier 1425 (Reports on Greek Catholic Clergy Celebrating Rituals with Greek Catholic and Orthodox Families, 1859)

Dossier 1477 (Bishop Hakmann's Report on the Bukovinian Church, 1863)

Published

Bilenky, S. 2012. *Romantic Nationalism in Eastern Europe: Russian, Polish, and Ukrainian Political Imaginations*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Bjork, J. 2008. *Neither German nor Pole: Catholicism and National Indifference in a Central European Borderland*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Bohachevsky-Chomiak, M. 1967. *The Spring of a Nation: The Ukrainians in Eastern Galicia in 1848*. Philadelphia: Shevchenko Scientific Society.

Botushans'kyi, V. 2012. *Narysy z istorii Pravoslavnoi Tserkvy Bukovyny: kinet s' XVIII-pochatok XX st. (Essays on the History of Orthodox Churches in Bukovina: The End of the 18th to the Beginning of the 20th Century)*. Chernivtsi: Tekhnodruk.

Breuilly, J. 1993. *Nationalism and the State*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Brusanowski, P. 2006. "Polemica dintre episcopii Hakmann și Șaguna cu privire la organizarea canonică a Bisericii Ortodoxe din Imperiul Austriac" (The Polemics between Bishops Hakmann and Șaguna regarding the Canonical Organisation of the Orthodox Church in the Austrian Empire), *Revista Teologică (Theological Journal)* 88, 4: 91–129.

Brusanowski, P. 2011. *Rumänisch-orthodoxe Kirchenordnungen 1786-2008: Siebenbürgen, Bukowina, Rumänien*, herausgegeben von Karl W. Schwarz und Ulrich A. Wien, Köln: Böhlau Verlag.

Calinescu, M. M. 1886. *Normalien der Bucowinaer gr. or. Diöcese von 1777-1886. Zusammengestellt und redigirt Beschlusses des Bucovinaer gr. or. Erzbischöflichen Consistoriums vom 13/25 März 1886 ad Nr. 726, Band IO*. Czernowitz: Erzbisch. Buchdruckerei.

Ceașu, M.-Ș. 2004. *Parliamentarism, partide și elită politică în Bucovina habsburgică (1848–1918). Contribuții la istoria parlamentarismului în spațiul central-est european (Parliamentarism, Parties and Political Elite in Habsburg Bukovina (1848–1918). Contributions to the History of Parliamentarism in Central and Eastern Europe)*. Iași: Junimea.

Chuchko, M. 2011. *Pravoslavni kul'tovi sporudy Bukovyny: derev'ia ni tserkvy ta dznyvyt s i seredyny XIV – pochatku XX st. (The Orthodox Ecclesiastical Architecture of Bukovina: Wooden Churches and Bell Towers from the Mid-14th Century to the Beginning of the 20th Century)*. Chernivtsi: Bukrek.

von Czörnig, K. 1857. *Ethnographie der Oesterreichischen Monarchie: mit einer ethnographischen Karte, in vier Blättern*. Wien: K.-K. Hof- u. Staatsdr.

Dan, D. 1912. *Cronica Episcopiei de Rădăuți: cu un apendice de documente slavone originale și traduse și mai multe ilustrațiuni (The Chronicle of Rădăuți Bishopric: With An Appendix of Slavonic Translated Documents and Many Illustrations)*. Vienna: Editura Fondului Religionar Gr.Or. al Bucovinei în Cernăuți.

Himka, J.-P. 1988. *Galician Villagers and the Ukrainian National Movement in the Nineteenth Century*. Basingstoke: Macmillan Press.

Himka, J.-P. 1999. *Religion and Nationality in Western Ukraine. The Greek Catholic Church and the Ruthenian National Movement in Galicia, 1867-1900*, Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

- Hobsbawm, E. J. 1990. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hutchinson, J. 2013. 'Cultural nationalism' in J. Breuilly (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Nationalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 75–96.
- Iacobescu, M. 1993. *Din istoria Bucovinei. Vol. I (1774-1862). De la administrația militară la autonomia provincială (From the History of Bukovina. Vol. I (1774-1862). From Military Administration to Provincial Autonomy)*, Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.
- Iacobescu, M. 2003a. 'Bucovina' in Academia Română, *Istoria Românilor, Vol. VII, Constituirea României Moderne (1821-1878) (The History of Romanians. Vol. VII, The Establishment of Modern Romania (1821-1878))*, Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică.
- Iacobescu, M. 2003b. *30 de zile în 'Siberia' căutând arhivele Bucovinei (30 Days in 'Siberia' Searching the Archives of Bukovina)*. Iași: Junimea.
- Iorga, N. 1934. 'Câteva acte și documente privitoare la Biserica Bucovinei' (Some Acts and Documents regarding the Church of Bukovina), *Biserica Ortodoxă Română (The Romanian Orthodox Church)* 52, 11-12: 726–737.
- Judson, P. M. 2006. *Guardians of the Nation. Activists on the Language Frontiers of Imperial Austria*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Kedourie, E. 1960. *Nationalism*. London: Hutchinson.
- Kitromilides, P. M. 1989. 'Imagined communities and the origins of the national question in the Balkans', *European History Quarterly* 19, 2: 149–192.
- Kozik, J. 1986. *The Ukrainian National Movement in Galicia: 1815-1849*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies.
- Leustean, L. N. (ed.) 2014. *Orthodox Christianity and Nationalism in Nineteenth-Century South-eastern Europe*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Loghin, C. 1926. *Istoria literaturii române în Bucovina (1774-1918) (The History of Romanian Literature in Bukovina (1774-1918))*. Cernăuți: Tipogr. Mitrop. Silvestru.
- Magosci, P. R. 1996. *A History of Ukraine*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Magosci, P. R. 2007. *Ukraine. An Illustrated History*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Masan, O. 1999. *Vladyka Yevhen (Hakman) – vyznachnyiĭ dii a ch Pravoslavnoi Tserkvy na Bukovyni v XIX stolitti: narys z h ytti a i dii a l'nosti (His Eminence Yevhen (Hakman) – Prominent Figure of the Orthodox Church of Bukovina in the 19th Century: Essays on Life and Legacy)*. Chernivtsi: Misto.
- Milash, N. 1885. 'Das Synodalstatut der gr. – or. Metropole der Bukowina und Dalmatien (Text und Erläuterungen)', *Archiv für Katholisches Kirchenrecht* 53: 251–256.
- Mitropolia Bucovinei. Administrația Fondului Bisericesc. 1939. *Averile Bisericești din Bucovina (The Wealth of the Church in Bukovina)*. Cernăuți: Editura Mitropoliei Bucovinei.
- Morariu Andrievici, S. 1893. *Istoricul Bisericeii Ort. Or. Din Bucovina (1775-1893). Scriere festivă la serbarea jubileului de 50 de ani de preoție a Înalt Prea Sfințitului Arhiepiscop al Cernăuților și Mitropolit al Bucovinei și Dalmației. Edată de "Academia ortodoxă" pentru literatură, muzică și retorică bisericească în seminariul clerical din Cernăuț (The History of the Orthodox Church in Bukovina (1775-1893). Festive Writing at the Jubilee Celebration of 50 years in the Clergy of His Highness Archbishop of Cernăuți and Metropolitan of Bukovina and Dalmatia. Edited by "The Orthodox Academy" for Literature, Music and Religious Rhetoric at the Clerical Seminary in Cernăuți)*. Cernăuți: Tipogr. și litografia concesiunată Arch. Silvestriu Morariu Andrievici.
- Neagu, S. and Roșca, N. 1998. 'Bucovenienii văzuți altfel' (Bukovinians Seen Differently), *Ziarul de Iași (Iași Newspaper)*, 18 July.
- Nistor, I. 1915. 'Românii și Rutenii în Bucovina' in *Studiu Istoric și Statistic (Romanians and Ruthenians in Bukovina. Historical and Statistical Study)*. Bucharest: Librăriile Socec & Comp. și C. Sfetea.
- Nistor, I. 1916. *Istoria bisericii din Bucovina și a rostului ei național-cultural în viața românilor bucovineni (The History of the Church in Bukovina and its Cultural-National Purpose in the Life of Bukovinian Romanians)*. Bucharest: Institutul de Arte Grafice Carol Göbl.

- Nowosiwsky, I. M. 1970. *Bukovian Ukrainians. A Historical Background and Their Self-Determination in 1918*, translated from Ukrainian by Walter Dushnyck. New York: The Shevchenko Scientific Society.
- Picot, A. É. 1873. *Les Serbes de Hongrie, leur histoire, leurs privilèges, leur église, leur état politique et social*. Prague: Gréger & Dattel Libraires Éditeurs.
- Plokhly, S. 2015. *The Gates of Europe. A History of Ukraine*. New York: Basic Books.
- Reli, S. 1925. 'Din suferințele Bisericii noastre ortodoxe sub stăpânirea austriacă' (From the Sufferings of Our Orthodox Church under Austrian Rule), *Candela. Foaie bisericească-literară* (The Candle. Religious-Literary Gazette), (35) 3-7, pp. 212-36
- Reli, S. 1928. *Propaganda catolică austriacă împotriva Bisericii ort. române din Bucovina. Trecerea la unie a sătenilor români din Boian (Dupa acte și documente oficiale)* (*The Austrian Catholic Propaganda against the Romanian Orthodox Church in Bukovina. The Conversion to Uniatism of Romanian Peasants in Boian (From Acts and Official Documents)*). Cernăuți: Institutul de arte grafice și Editura 'Glasul Bucovinei'.
- Rutenisarea Bucovinei și Căuzele Desnaționalizării Poporului Român după Date Autentice (*Fragment din lucrarea nepublicată 'Românii din Bucovina' De Un Bucovinean*) (*The Ruthenisation of Bukovina and the Causes of the Denationalisation of the Romanian Nation according to Authentic Documents (Fragment from the Unpublished Work 'Romanians in Bukovina' by a Bukovinian)*) 1904. Bucharest: 'Minerva' Institut de Arte Grafice și Editură.
- Șaguna, A. 1854. *Elementele dreptului canonic al Bisericii Dreptmăritoare Răsăritene spre întrebuițarea Preoțimei, a clerului tânăr, și a Creștinilor* (*Elements of Canon Law of the Eastern Orthodox Church for the Use of Priesthood, Young Clergy and Christians*). Sibiu: Tipografia diecezana.
- Sbiera, I. G. 1870. *Prima adunare poporală în cauza autonomiei bisericii dreptcredincioase din Bucovina, ținută în Cernaueți într'a 11.23 iunie 1870* (*The First Popular Assembly for the Autonomy of the All-Faithful Church in Bukovina*). Cernăuți: Rudolf Echartd.
- Sbiera, I. G. 1896. "Mișcarea bisericească a Românilor din Bucovina" (*The Religious Movement of Romanians in Bukovina*), *Candela. Foaie bisericească-literară* (*The Candle. Religious-Literary Gazette*) 15: 97–113.
- Smith, A. D. 1986. *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Smolka, S. 1917. *Les Ruthènes et les problèmes religieux du monde russe*. Berne: Ferdinand Wyss.
- Snyder, T. 2003. *The Reconstruction of Nations. Poland, Ukraine, Lithuania, Belarus, 1569–1999*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Turczynski, E. 1976. *Konfession und Nation. Zur Frühgeschichte der Serbischen und Rumänischen Nationsbildung*. Pädagogischer Verlag Schwann: Düsseldorf.
- Ungureanu, C. 2015. *Sistemul de învățământ din Bucovina în perioada stăpânirii austriece (1774-1918)* (*The Educational System in Bukovina under the Austrian Rule (1774-1918)*). Chișinău: Academia de Științe a Moldovei, Institutul de Istorie.
- Vozniak, M. 1924. *Іак пробудылося ўкраінаўскае народнае жыццё ў Галічыні за Аўстры*. *Biblioteka "Novoho chasu"* (*How the Ukrainian People's Life Was Built in Galicia under the Austrian Rule. Library of the "New Era"*). Lviv: Dilo.
- Wilson, A. 2002. *The Ukrainians: Unexpected Nation*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Wolff, L. 2010. *The Idea of Galicia: History and Fantasy in Habsburg Political Culture*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Zahra, T. 2010. 'Imagined noncommunities: national indifference as a category of analysis', *Slavic Review* 69, 1: 93–119.
- Zayarnyuk, A. 2013. *Framing the Ukrainian Peasantry in Habsburg Galicia, 1846–1914*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, The University of Alberta Press.
- Zinkewych, O. and Sorokowski, A. (eds.) 1988. *A Thousand Years of Christianity in Ukraine: An Encyclopedic Chronology*. New York: Smolokyp Publishers.