

UDC 94(477):327(477:498)“185/191”
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.37.346046

Oleksandr DOBRZHANSKYI

PhD hab. (History), Professor, Head of the Department of Ukrainian History, Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University, 2 Kotsyubynskoho Street, Chernivtsi, Ukraine, postal code 58012 (o.dobrzhanskiy@chnu.edu.ua)

ORCID: 0000-0002-3817-188X

ResearcherID: R-7899-2016

Lyudmila STRILCHUK

PhD hab. (History), Professor, Head of the Department of World History and Philosophy, Lesya Ukrainka Volyn National University, 24-a Chopin Street, Lutsk, Ukraine, postal code 43025 (strilchuk.lyudmila@vnu.edu.ua)

ORCID: 0000-0002-0700-6080

ResearcherID: G-8696-2019

Олександр ДОБРЖАНСЬКИЙ

доктор історичних наук, професор, завідувач кафедри історії України, Чернівецький національний університет імені Юрія Федьковича, вул. Коцюбинського 2, м. Чернівці, Україна, індекс 58012 (o.dobrzhanskiy@chnu.edu.ua)

Людмила СТРИЛЬЧУК

докторка історичних наук, професорка, завідувачка кафедри всесвітньої історії та філософії, Волинський національний університет імені Лесі Українки, вул. Шопена, 24-а, м. Луцьк, Україна, індекс 43025 (strilchuk.lyudmila@vnu.edu.ua)

Bibliographic Description of the Article: Dobrzhanskyi, O., & Strilchuk, L. (2025). Ukrainian-Romanian relations in Bukovyna (the second half of the 19th – the beginning of the 20th century): stages, key problems, searches of a compromise. *Skhidnoievropeyskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 37, 38–49. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.37.346046

UKRAINIAN-ROMANIAN RELATIONS IN BUKOVYNA (THE SECOND HALF OF THE 19th – THE BEGINNING OF THE 20th CENTURY): STAGES, KEY PROBLEMS, SEARCHES OF A COMPROMISE

Abstract. *The purpose is to study the dynamics of the Ukrainian-Romanian relations in Bukovyna during the second half of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries, to identify the most important issues around which competitive struggle took place, and to summarize the state of relations between the two peoples on the eve of World War I. The research methodology is based on the principles of historicism, objectivity, and the use of historical and genetic, historical and problematic methods. The authors were guided by methodological approaches related to the study of interethnic relations in Central Europe in the second half of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries, and the processes of modern nations formation in this region. In particular, the Ukrainian-Romanian relations have been*

studied through the prism of theoretical constructs related to the history of multinational regions of Austria-Hungary, the peculiarities of the ethnopolitical situation in Bukovyna during the period under analysis. **Scientific Novelty.** For the first time in Ukrainian historiography, a number of relations aspects between the Ukrainians and the Romanians in Bukovyna during the period under analysis have been analyzed comprehensively. **Conclusions.** The Ukrainian-Romanian relations in Bukovyna went through several stages in the second half of the 19th and early 20th centuries. At the beginning, there was a significant advantage of the Romanians due to the presence of such an influential force as large landowners. The first period from the middle of the century to the end of the 80s was marked by the absence of Ukrainian deputies in the Bukovyna Sejm and the Austrian parliament, and isolated attempts by the Ukrainians to defend their interests. The second period covers the period from the 90s of the 19th century to the beginning of the 20th century. At that time, the Ukrainians were able to elect nationally conscious deputies to the Bukovyna Sejm. The main struggle was transferred to the walls of the highest representative body of the region. However, at this time a split occurred among the Ukrainian deputies, which significantly weakened the ability to defend national interests. The third period covers the time from 1902 – 1903 to the beginning of World War I. At this stage, the Ukrainian-Romanian relations mostly concerned the issues of reforming social relations in the region, changing the electoral law for the Sejm and rural communities, establishing parity in the Orthodox Church, etc. The activity and organization of the Ukrainians increased significantly, which contributed to the strengthening of their positions in the Ukrainian-Romanian rivalry. On the eve of World War I, parity was achieved in influence over most decisions concerning public issues. Although in some cases the disputes became quite acute, both peoples had a desire to resolve interethnic problems by using constitutional methods, discussions in the Bukovyna Sejm, in the columns of newspapers, or by appealing to various levels of government or judicial institutions. This distinguished Bukovyna from some other crown lands of Austria-Hungary, where interethnic relations went beyond legal actions. Not all problems in the Ukrainian-Romanian relations were resolved properly, but progress was obvious, valuable experience was accumulated in approaches to resolving interethnic problems within the framework of existing legislation, which has not lost its significance even today.

Key words: Bukovyna, Austrian Empire, Austria-Hungary, Ukrainian-Romanian relations, interethnic struggle, A. Onciul, M. Vasylo.

УКРАЇНСЬКО-РУМУНСЬКІ ВІДНОСИНИ НА БУКОВИНІ (ДРУГА ПОЛОВИНА ХІХ – ПОЧАТОК ХХ ст.): ЕТАПИ, КЛЮЧОВІ ПРОБЛЕМИ, ПОШУКИ КОМПРОМІСУ

Анотація. *Мета дослідження* – розкрити динаміку українсько-румунських взаємин на Буковині впродовж другої половини ХІХ – початку ХХ ст., визначити найважливіші питання, навколо яких відбувалася конкурентна боротьба та підсумувати стан відносин між обома народами напередодні Першої світової війни. **Методологія дослідження** ґрунтується на принципах історизму, об'єктивності, застосування історико-генетичного та історико-проблемного методів. Автори керувалися методологічними підходами, пов'язаними з вивченням міжнаціональних відносин у Центральній Європі другої половини ХІХ – початку ХХ ст., процесами формування модерних націй у цьому регіоні. Зокрема, українсько-румунські відносини досліджуються крізь призму теоретичних конструкцій пов'язаних з історією багатонаціональних регіонів Австро-Угорщини, особливостями етнополітичної ситуації на Буковині в зазначений період. **Наукова новизна.** Вперше в українській історіографії всебічно проаналізовано цілу низку аспектів взаємин між українцями та румунами на Буковині зазначеного періоду. **Висновки.** Українсько-румунські відносини на Буковині в другій половині ХІХ – на початку ХХ ст. пройшли декілька етапів. На початках спостерігалася значна перевага румунів завдяки наявності в них такої впливової сили як великі землевласники. Перший період з середини століття і до кінця 80-х рр. позначився відсутністю українських депутатів у Буковинському сеймі та австрійському парламенті, поодинокими спробами українців відстоювати свої інтереси. Другий період охоплює період з 90-х рр. ХІХ ст. до початку ХХ ст. У цей час українці змогли обрати національно свідомих депутатів Буковинського сейму. Основна боротьба була перенесена в стіни вищого представницького органу краю. Однак у цей час відбувся розкол серед українських депутатів, що значно ослабило можливості відстоювати національні інтереси.

Третій період охоплює час від 1902 – 1903 рр. до початку Першої світової війни. На цьому етапі українсько-румунські відносини найбільше торкалися питань реформування суспільних відносин в краї, зміни виборчого закону до сейму і сільських громад, встановлення паритету в православній церкві тощо. Активність та організованість українців значно зросла, що сприяло посиленню їхніх позицій в українсько-румунському суперництві. Напередодні Першої світової війни було досягнуто паритету за впливом на ухвалення більшості рішень, які стосувалися суспільних проблем. Хоча у ряді випадків суперечки набували досить гострого характеру, обом народам було притаманне бажання розв'язувати міжнаціональні проблеми шляхом використання конституційних методів, дискусій у Буковинському сеймі, на шпальтах газет, або за рахунок звернень до органів влади різного рівня чи судових установ. Цим Буковина відрізнялася від деяких інших коронних країв Австро-Угорщини, де міжнаціональні відносини виходили за рамки правових дій. Не всі проблеми в українсько-румунських відносинах були розв'язані належним чином, але прогрес був очевидним, було нагромаджено цінний досвід підходів до подолання міжнаціональних проблем у рамках чинного законодавства, що не втратило свого значення і для наших днів.

Ключові слова: Буковина, Австрійська імперія, Австро-Угорщина, українсько-румунські взаємини, міжнаціональна боротьба, А. Ончул, М. Василько.

Problem Statement. Since 1849, Bukovyna had become a separate administrative unit of the Austrian Empire with the status of a duchy. The region was multinational. But among other ethnic groups, the Ukrainians and the Romanians, who were considered autochthonous peoples, predominated. According to the 1880 census, more than 239 thousand (42.16%) Ukrainians and 190 thousand (33.43%) Romanians lived in the region (Special Orts-Repertorium der Bukowina, 1885, p. 26). The Ukrainians lived in the northern and northwestern parts of the region mainly, the Romanians in the southern and southeastern parts. There were many settlements with mixed populations along the ethnic divide line. For many centuries, both peoples lived side by side and developed many norms of tolerant coexistence. The Ukrainians and the Romanians were Orthodox, and religious identity was of decisive importance in the region until the middle of the 19th century. A feature of Bukovyna was that the Romanians had long been called Vlachs there, and the Orthodox Church was called Vlach (also Wallachian). Therefore, quite often Orthodox Ruthenians (the Ukrainians) were also called Vlachs, guided by religious identification. A common misconception was about Orthodox Wallachian people in Bukovyna who spoke two different languages.

However, although somewhat belatedly, after the revolution of 1848 – 1849, modernization processes began in Bukovyna, covering various spheres of life. National consolidation of ethnic groups became natural, and national movements developed rapidly. This development led to increased competition between both peoples for influence on social processes in the region. The Ukrainian-Romanian relations of this time are an eloquent example of interethnic relations under the conditions of modern nations formation and development and deserve in-depth study to understand the complex processes of nation-building and the development of national movements in individual regions of Austria (Austro-Hungary) and in Central and Eastern Europe in general.

Review of Recent Research and Publications. First of all, there should be singled out the studies by Harry B. Cohen (Cohen, 2007, pp. 241–278), Ammy-Diana Colin (Colin, 2020, pp. 17–44), Jan Surman (Surman, 2019, pp. 217–242), which are theoretical in nature and touch on general problems and patterns of interethnic relations in Austria (Austro-Hungary) in the second half of the 19th – the beginning of the 20th centuries.

Certain aspects of the problem were researched by the Ukrainian historians Ihor Piddubny (Piddubny, 2010, pp. 9–40; Piddubny, 2023, p. 114–132; Piddubny, 2024, pp. 195–211), Ihor

Zhaloba (Zhaloba, & Piddubny, 2024, pp. 220–230), Oleksandr Dobrzhanskyi (Dobrzhanskyi 2024, pp. 404–419; Dobrzhanskyi, & Khrystan, 2022, pp. 196–205; Dobrzhanskyi, 2019, pp. 181–202). Among foreign researchers who did research on these issues, it is worth mentioning the Romanian historian Stepan Purici (Purici, 2006, pp. 115–1216; Purici, 2011, pp. 15–24) and the Moldovan researcher Constantin Ungureanu (Ungureanu, 2024).

However, this topic is not elucidated sufficiently and requires further comprehensive analysis and study.

The purpose of the article is to analyze the dynamics of the Ukrainian-Romanian relations in Bukovyna during the second half of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries, to identify the most important issues around which competitive struggle took place, and to summarize the state of relations between the two peoples on the eve of World War I.

Research Results. The Ukrainian and Romanian populations of the region had approximately the same social structure. Peasants dominated, making up over 90 % of the population. The intelligentsia was formed by priests, teachers, and partly civil servants. However, among the Romanians there was a small but influential social group of large landowners who tried to combine their class interests with those of the Romanian national movement. They had considerable influence on local self-government bodies, in particular the Bukovyna Sejm.

The first stage of the Ukrainian-Romanian relations in the Duchy of Bukovyna covers the period from the middle of the 19th century to the end of 1880. At that time, the Romanians had considerable advantages in solving social issues. They had already created their first cultural and educational society in 1862 and even tried to involve the Ukrainians into it. It was significant that until 1890 the Ukrainians did not have a single nationally conscious deputy in the Bukovyna Sejm or the Austrian Parliament. In Ukrainian electoral districts, ordinary peasants who were poorly oriented in the vicissitudes of political struggle, did not have proper education and were completely passive became deputies. Quite often, either German officials or Romanian landowners were elected in these districts.

This situation led to the fact that anti-Ukrainian decisions were periodically adopted in the Bukovyna Sejm, at the initiative of chauvinistically inclined Romanian deputies, representatives of boyar families. For example, in 1869, a vote was held on the initiative of the Romanian landowner Baron Oleksandr Vasylyko, who demanded that only Romanian and German be members of the Bukovyna Sejm. It should be mentioned that according to the law, the regional languages were German, Ukrainian, and Romanian in Bukovyna. Baron Oleksandr Vasylyko motivated his initiative by the fact that the Ukrainians supposedly use the Russian language, maintain close relations with the Russian consulate in Chernivtsi, and noted that many educated Ukrainians had enlisted in the service of Russia. Baron Vasylyko's initiative received the majority of voices (Stenographische Protokole, 1869, pp. 51–69, 131, 480). It is noteworthy that two Ukrainian peasant deputies, who were simply bribed, also voted for this initiative (Slovo, 1869, October 25). Bukovyna President F. Mirbach, on behalf of the regional administration, protested against this decision, and after some time it was cancelled.

It is worth noting that the Ukrainian-Romanian rivalry unfolded under conditions when none of the political forces had an absolute majority to resolve social issues. In addition to the Ukrainians and the Romanians, the Germans, the Jews, and the Poles had considerable influence on decision-making. Therefore, the ability to find allies, conclude agreements on joint actions, and make compromises was quite important. This fact made the situation in Bukovyna radically different from neighbouring Galicia, where the Ukrainian-Polish

confrontation took on acute forms and it was very difficult for both national groups to come to an agreement.

The lack of nationally conscious deputies in the representative bodies of power did not satisfy the leaders of the Ukrainian movement. In 1869, the first Ukrainian cultural and educational society “*Ruska Besida*” was founded, and the following year the Ukrainian political society “*Ruska Rada*” was founded as well. The latter was established precisely to strengthen the influence of the Ukrainians in the political arena and from the very beginning of its existence aimed at improving the situation in representative bodies of power (Statut, 1894, pp. 1–2). However, in the beginning all attempts failed. The reason for this was insufficient organization and a low level of national consciousness. At that time the Ukrainian movement was weakened by the lack of unity, the struggle between the Russophile and the Narodovska currents, which saw the future of the Ruthenians of the region differently, although they held approximately the same position regarding relations with the Romanians.

At the same time, the weak point of the Romanian movement consisted in the fact that it was completely ruled by large landowners who had little regard for the needs of ordinary Romanian peasants.

In the second half of the 1880s, the Narodovtsi became the dominant trend in the Ukrainian movement, taking control of the majority of the Ukrainian societies. In 1890, they first managed to elect their representatives to the Bukovyna Sejm. From this time on, a new stage in the Ukrainian-Romanian relations began. The main struggle was transferred to the Sejm.

In 1891, for the first time the political society “*Ruska Rada*” formulated a specific programme of demands in political, national, cultural, church, educational and economic issues. It is characteristic that I. Tyminsky, who made the main report at the meeting of the “*Ruska Rada*” society on the programme of actions, constantly referred to the inequality between the Ukrainians and the Romanians in certain issues. In particular, he pointed out: “In the Russian part of Bukovyna the Ruthenians do not have the appropriate number of full four-class public schools, but there are such schools in the Vlach (Romanian – *authors*) part of the region in every town and in every large area. ...considering that the Vlach minority has the Vlach gymnasium in Suceava, it is necessary for the Ruthenians to consider the establishment of the Ruska gymnasium in Chernivtsi... etc.” (Bykovyna, 1891, 28 liutoho, p. 5).

A special place in the programme was given to granting equal rights to the Ukrainians and the Romanians in the Bukovyna Orthodox Metropolis. The fact is that at that time the metropolitan was Sylvester Morar-Andrievych (1880 – 1895), a Romanianized Ruthenian who believed that the only autochthonous people of Bukovyna were the Romanians, and the Ruthenians were the same Romanians, only Slavicized. That is why, as in ancient times, it was concluded that the entire Orthodox population of the region was Romanian. The period of his stay at the head of the metropolitanate became a vivid manifestation of injustice for the Ukrainians in the Orthodox Church of Bukovyna. The Romanian priests who did not know the Ukrainian language began to be appointed to the Ukrainian parishes. The Metropolitan forbade priests to use the Ukrainian Orthodox calendars, to subscribe to the Ukrainophile newspaper “*Bukovyna*”, and to participate in the activities of the Ukrainian cultural and educational societies (SACHR, f. 320, d. 2, c. 3032, pp. 15–19).

To resolve the church issue, the “*Ruska Rada*” suggested dividing the archdiocese into the Ukrainian and Romanian parts with separate bishops and consistories in the future. The participants of the meeting understood well that this requirement could not be fulfilled quickly, because this required a lot of preparatory work. Therefore, they emphasized that until such a division occurred,

they would demand that the positions of consistory councilors, positions in the Orthodox seminary and the cathedral church, as well as in the parish in Chernivtsi, be half replaced by representatives of the Ukrainians, that exclusively the Ukrainian priests be appointed to the Ukrainian villages, that all subjects for the training of the Ukrainian priests at the Theological Faculty of Chernivtsi University be taught in Ukrainian as well. The same applied to the sexton school. In addition, there were requirements regarding the use of the Ukrainian language in six Ukrainian deaneries, in the Orthodox consistory, seminary, and cathedral church, as well as the publication of the eparchial Bulletin in Ukrainian (Bykovyna, 1891, 28 liutoho, p. 5).

Thus, a well-founded programme of demands was adopted, the implementation of which would have made it possible to improve the situation of the Ukrainians significantly and equalize their rights with the Romanians in many areas. But the events after that took a completely different course, not as they could have been predicted based on the decisions of the “*Ruska Rada*”. In 1892, a split occurred among the Ukrainian deputies, as a result of which two approaches to relations with the Romanians were formed. The deputies E. Pihuliak and S. Smal-Stotskyi stood on the positions of confrontation and elimination of injustices against the Ukrainians, i.e. they adhered to the programme of the “*Ruska Rada*” of 1891. Other deputies V. Volian, I. Bezhan and, paradoxically, I. Tyminsky, abandoned previous decisions, entered into an alliance with the Romanian deputies representing large landowners, forming the so-called “party of conservative Ruthenians” in the Bukovyna Sejm. I. Tyminsky outlined the main ideas of this association in the brochure “The Russian Issue in Bukovyna by a Bukovynian Orthodox Ruthenian” (Tyminsky, 1892). He proclaimed the idea of Orthodox solidarity between the Ruthenians and the Romanians, and also put forward the old slogan “Bukovyna for Bukovynians” and the struggle of the autochthonous people of Bukovyna against all kinds of “invaders” – the Germans, the Jews, the Poles, the Armenians, and including the Galician Ruthenians.

Such ideas were completely satisfactory to the Romanian politicians and one of their leaders, Baron Nicolae Musteş, and therefore they formed a joint bloc with the conservative Ruthenians in the Bukovyna Sejm.

In turn, the Narodovtsi, continuing their confrontational actions against the Romanian boyars, entered into the alliance with the German and Jewish deputies.

The fierce struggle between the Ukrainian deputies of the Bukovyna Sejm affected the situation negatively, as very often I. Tyminsky and his team voted “against” only because S. Smal-Stotsky and E. Pihuliak voted “for”. The opposite also happened. The Romanian conservative (boyar) party benefited the most from the disputes among the Ukrainian deputies, because for the sake of fighting the populists, the Ukrainian conservative club made unprecedented concessions to it in political matters, which are difficult to assess as anything other than betrayal. For example, in 1894, at the beginning of the sessions of the Bukovyna Sejm, the traditional procedure of approving the mandates of newly elected deputies was carried out, and among others, the Romanian large landowner Leon Vasyenko’s mandate. He was elected from the purely Ukrainian Vyzhnytsky district, contrary to objective circumstances. Deputy Ye. Pihuliak declared 10 points that proved that the elections were held illegally, using various forms of pressure on the Ukrainian peasants and bribery, and demanded that the elections of L. Vasyenko be cancelled. He was supported by the German, Polish, and Jewish deputies. But during the vote, the Ruthenian conservative club supported the Romanians and with their votes ensured the approval of the representative of the Romanian boyars as the deputy from this Ukrainian constituency (Bukowiner Rundschau, 1894, pp. 1–3).

I. Tyminsky and V. Volian took a similar anti-Ukrainian position during the discussion of the initiative made by the German, Jewish, and Ukrainian deputies to introduce the fifth general curia in the elections to the Bukovyna Sejm, similar to the one introduced in the parliamentary elections, as well as a direct and secret voting. This initiative would have made it possible to increase the number of deputies from the Ukrainian peasants. But the Sejm rejected this initiative by 16 votes to 7. I. Tyminsky and V. Volian, together with the Romanians, voted against it (Stenographische Protokolle, 1897, pp. 37–38; Bukovyna, 1897, 25 liutoho).

Thus, in the 1890s, the Ukrainian-Romanian relations were contradictory. The Conservative Ruthenians led by I. Tyminsky went for a full alliance with the Romanian political forces, while the Narodovtsi continued to take a confrontational position. However, this situation was unnatural and could not last for a long time. In the second half of the 1990s, the party of conservative Ruthenians lost its positions. They were never able to reach the broad masses of the population with their ideas. Having no followers, at the end of the 19th century the conservative Ruthenians left the arena of political struggle.

The dominant force in the Ukrainian movement remained the Narodovtsi, who strengthened their influence on the masses significantly. This dominance gave them the opportunity to take a consistent confrontational position regarding the policies of the Romanian boyar landowners.

At the beginning of the 20th century, a number of important changes also occurred in the Romanian politics. A new force emerged on the political scene, calling itself the Democratic Romanians. It was led by Avrel Onciul, a native of Bukovyna who had spent a long time in Vienna and Brno, but decided to return to his native land to begin a political career there. His appearance significantly changed the alignment of political forces in the Ukrainian-Romanian relations and initiated a new, third stage, which actually lasted from 1902 – 1903 until the beginning of World War I. A characteristic feature of this period was that the struggle unfolded around the development and implementation of reforms that were aimed at modernizing socio-economic and socio-political relations in the region, and ultimately equalized the political influence of the Ukrainian and Romanian movements significantly.

In 1902, A. Onciul founded the Peasant Democratic Party and sharply criticized the policies of the large Romanian landowners as not meeting the interests of the broad masses of the people. In a number of newspaper articles, he justified the need to carry out a wide range of socio-economic and political reforms in Bukovyna, which would significantly improve the situation of ordinary peasants, both Romanian and Ukrainian.

The logic of political struggle pushed the supporters of A. Onciul to search for allies. It is clear that quite quickly there was a rapprochement with those forces that were against the policy of the Romanian boyars, i.e. with the Ukrainians and the Jews, partly the Germans. As a result, in 1903 an interethnic deputy association called the “Free-thinking Association” was established. Its leaders were a Romanian Avrel Onciul, a Ukrainian Mykola Vasylo, and the Jewish representative Benno Straucher. The main goal of the association was to fight for reforms, including changes to the electoral law for the Bukovyna Sejm, reform of local community self-government bodies and elections to them, the establishment of a peasant bank that would provide relatively cheap loans to small producers, the elimination of outdated tax and customs institutions, an increase in teachers’ salaries, and the development of education in national languages.

In 1904, supporters of the “Free-thinking Association” won the elections to the Bukovyna Sejm and received a solid majority in it. This victory gave them the opportunity to make

decisions on the implementation of the planned reforms without obstacles. But their final implementation required the Emperor's sanction, and this was a long process.

Meanwhile, despite the apparent unity, the members of the "Free-thinking Association" had many of their own ambitions, which they could not hide for long. In 1905, due to internal disputes, this Association disintegrated. Disputes broke out between its leaders in the press, in which they accused each other of illegal actions. The most striking example of this was the trial between A. Onciul and M. Vasylo. The former made unfounded accusations of corruption by his recent colleague in the "Free-thinking Association". M. Vasylo sued A. Onciul on charges of falsifying facts and insulting honour and dignity. As a result, A. Onciul lost the trial and was sentenced to a month in prison or a fine of three thousand kronas (Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung, 1908; Bukovyna, 1909, 21 kvitnia).

However, despite the sharp disputes between former members of the "Free-thinking Association", the most important thing in the Ukrainian-Romanian relations was the struggle for the implementation of draft laws proposed in 1903 – 1905. Each side sought to ensure that these laws were the most favourable to it.

For the Ukrainian movement, the development and approval of regional reforms was of a particular importance. First of all, the reform bills, no matter how they were finalized or reworked, were aimed at democratizing socio-political and economic relations in the region, which provided the Ukrainians with expanded opportunities in the struggle for national rights as the largest ethnic group in the region.

In 1908–1909, a new, revised statute for rural communities and an electoral law for public self-government bodies were approved. Direct, secret elections to public councils were introduced, in which all adult men over the age of 24 who had lived in the community for at least 2 years had the right to participate in the elections. Although the Ukrainians sought universal suffrage, at the request of the Romanian conservative party, the division of voters into three curiae was maintained, depending on the amount of tax paid (Gemeindeordnung, 1908, pp. 141–150). However, this electoral law was much more beneficial for the Ukrainians than the previous one. This was clearly confirmed by the elections to public councils held in 1910, in which the Ukrainians won a majority in public self-government bodies in almost all Ukrainian communities.

The most heated discussions between the Ukrainian, Romanian, German, and Jewish deputies were caused by the draft of a new electoral law for the Bukovyna Sejm, originally proposed by A. Onciul. After several years of disputes and revisions, it was adopted in October 1909 by the Bukovyna Sejm with the support of both Romanian and Ukrainian deputies and put into effect on May 10, 1910. The new law introduced the national division of voters, but also preserved the social curiae.

This law did not completely eliminate the imbalance of national representation in the Sejm. The Romanians received 24 seats, and the Ukrainians – only 17, because in the curia of large landowners and the clergy, the Romanians retained a significant advantage. However, it was still more favourable for the Ukrainian community. For comparison, in the previous Sejm, the Ukrainians had a maximum of five seats out of 31 (16%), and this time – 17 seats out of 63 (27%).

In the pre-war decade, a sharp struggle between the Ukrainians and the Romanians continued in the Orthodox Church. Several times, the Ukrainians petitioned higher authorities to resolve this issue, and in 1906, the Ukrainian delegation led by Mykola Vasylo had a royal reception by the Emperor, who promised to give orders to the government to study the validity of the Ukrainians' demands.

Gradually, the Ukrainians increased their influence in the Orthodox Church. After a trip to the capital and a powerful propaganda campaign, the Ukrainians were able to win several more important positions for themselves. The consistory included the third Ukrainian councilor, Father M. Halip. In 1907/1908, the number of Ukrainian and Romanian seminarians in the Theological Seminary became equal (Nova Bukovyna, 1913, 5 zhovtnia). Articles in phonetic spelling began to be published in the Ukrainian section of the church-literary magazine "Candela". The number of Ukrainian catechists in educational institutions increased, among them F. Hryhoriy, I. Horodysky, P. Kateryniuk, N. Kopachuk, D. Tashchuk and the others. The mentioned changes testified to the growing influence of the Ukrainians in the Orthodox Church, but still they were of a secondary nature. Therefore, the demands of the Narodovtsi continued to grow. They sought cardinal changes to solve the problem once and for all.

The decision of the Bukovyna Sejm at its session in late 1912 – early 1913 to create a separate Ukrainian-Romanian commission to resolve the church issue was of fundamental importance. It was to consist of six Ukrainians and six Romanians, who were to resolve all disputed issues at joint meetings (Nova Bukovyna, 1913, 20 kvitnia).

Such a commission did indeed begin to work, but due to sharp disputes and the position of certain Romanian politicians who were unwilling to make any concessions, it ceased its work after some time without making any decisions.

But it was at this time that the Ukrainians achieved the appointment of their protege Artemon Monastyrsky as vicar general, who in the future could claim the position of metropolitan. This was great success, which opened up prospects for the division of Bukovyna archdiocese into Ukrainian and Romanian. The completion of this process was prevented by the beginning of World War I.

Another issue that became quite acute in the Ukrainian-Romanian relations at that time concerned the problems of demographic accounting. Ever since the annexation of Bukovyna to Austria, the Romanian boyars claimed that the vast majority of the population of the region were the Romanians, and the Ukrainians constituted a small minority and were from Galicia mainly. Therefore, the results of the 1880 census, which for the first time counted ethnic groups by spoken language, came as a real shock to the Romanian leaders. This census convincingly proved that the Ukrainians were the largest ethnic group, and the Romanians occupied the second place. In order to somehow explain this ratio, a theory was put forward about the Ruthenization (Ukrainization) or Slavicization of the Romanian population in Bukovyna. Allegedly, unconscious Romanian peasants were influenced by the Ukrainians and mistakenly recorded the Ukrainian language as spoken during the census. Several pseudoscientific opuses were published on this subject (Hormuzaki, 1900; Voronca, 1903). In one of them, written by Konstantin Hormuzaki, it was noted: "The Ruthenians see in the Romanians an element less capable of resistance, which is extremely easy to assimilate; on the other hand, the Bukovynian Romanians often cannot understand that any weakening of the fighting spirit only exalts the enemy, gives rise not to reconciliation, but only to their complete suppression" (Hormuzaki, 1900, p. 33).

Interestingly, some Romanian politicians were well aware of the unscientific nature of the claims about "Ukrainization". In particular, in 1902 the very A. Onciul in the newspaper "Privitorul" ("Observer") noted that the Wallachian element showed extraordinary vitality at different times in Romania, Transylvania, and Hungary, preserving its nationality. He further wrote: "Under such circumstances, it is impossible from the very beginning that the

Bukovynian Vlachs (the Romanians – *authors*) were so weak and lost their nationality within a few decades” (Onciul, 1902).

This problem began to flare up especially actively before the 1910 census. In the press, at meetings and assemblies, various agents from among the Romanians called on the population to show, by their definition, “consciousness” and write down the spoken Romanian language. By the way, the number of ethnic groups was important in the formation of national curiae for elections to the Bukovyna Sejm. In some cases, intimidation and bribery of ordinary people were used. This issue was especially acute in communities with a mixed population.

As a result of the 1910 census, 305,101 Ukrainians were recorded in Bukovyna, which constituted 38.38% of the total population. There were 273,254 Romanians (34.38%) (Mitteilungen des statistischen Landesamtes, 1913, pp. 56–95). For comparison, in 1900, 297,793 (41.16%) Ukrainians and 229,018 (31.65%) Romanians lived in the region (Gemeindelexikon, 1907, pp. 1–116). That is, if in 1900 there were 9.51 % more Ukrainians, then in 1910 there were only 4 %. It is clear that such radical changes in the population ratio could not have occurred in ten years. It was about election fraud. The Ukrainian politicians, taking into account the massive falsification of data, demanded that the results of the 1910 census be cancelled. However, the regional authorities did not agree to this.

The struggle over the census became a vivid example of the Ukrainian-Romanian competition for influence over broad segments of the population and demonstrated that many issues in interethnic relations on the eve of World War I remained unresolved.

Conclusions. The Ukrainian-Romanian relations in Bukovyna went through several stages in the second half of the 19th and early 20th centuries. At the beginning, there was a significant advantage of the Romanians due to the presence of such an influential force as large landowners. The first period from the middle of the century to the end of the 80s was marked by the absence of Ukrainian deputies in the Bukovyna Sejm and the Austrian parliament, and isolated attempts by the Ukrainians to defend their interests. The second period covers the period from the 90s of the 19th century to the beginning of the 20th century. At that time, the Ukrainians were able to elect nationally conscious deputies to the Bukovyna Sejm. The main struggle was transferred to the walls of the highest representative body of the region. However, at this time a split occurred among the Ukrainian deputies, which significantly weakened the ability to defend national interests. The third period covers the time from 1902–1903 to the beginning of World War I. At this stage, the Ukrainian-Romanian relations mostly concerned the issues of reforming social relations in the region, changing the electoral law for the Sejm and rural communities, establishing parity in the Orthodox Church, etc. The activity and organization of the Ukrainians increased significantly, which contributed to the strengthening of their positions in the Ukrainian-Romanian rivalry. On the eve of World War I, parity was achieved in influence over most decisions concerning public issues.

Although in some cases the disputes became quite acute, both peoples had a desire to resolve interethnic problems by using constitutional methods, discussions in the Bukovyna Sejm, in the columns of newspapers, or by appealing to various levels of government or judicial institutions. This distinguished Bukovyna from some other crown lands of Austria-Hungary, where interethnic relations went beyond legal actions.

Not all problems in the Ukrainian-Romanian relations were resolved properly, but progress was obvious, valuable experience was accumulated in approaches to resolving interethnic problems within the framework of existing legislation, which has not lost its significance even today.

Acknowledgement. We express sincere gratitude to all editorial board members for the consultations provided during the preparation of the article for printing.

Funding. The authors did not receive any financial assistance for the research and publication of this scientific work.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bukovyna.** (1891, 28 liutoho). *Bukovyna* [Bukovyna. Newspaper]. [in Ukrainian]
- Bukovyna.** (1897, 25 liutoho). *Bukovyna* [Bukovyna. Newspaper]. [in Ukrainian]
- Bukovyna.** (1909, 21 kvitnia). *Bukovyna* [Bukovyna. Newspaper]. [in Ukrainian]
- Bukowiner Rundschau.** (1894, 31. Jänner). *Bukowiner Rundschau* [Bukovyna Review. Newspaper]. [in German].
- Cohen, G. B.** (2007). Nationalist Politics and the Dynamics of State and Civil Society in the Habsburg Monarchy, 1867–1914. *Central European History*, 40(2), 241–278. DOI: 10.1017/S0008938907000532 [in English].
- Colin, A.-D.** (2020). Czernowitz/Cernăuți/Chernovtsy/Chernivtsi/Czerniowce: A Testing Ground for Peaceful Coexistence in a Plural Society. *Journal of Austrian Studies*, 53(3), 17–44. DOI: 10.1353/oas.2020.0040 [in English].
- Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung.** (1908, 2. Oktober). *Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung* [Czernowitz General Newspaper. Newspaper]. [in German].
- Derzhavnyi arkhiv Chernivetskoï oblasti* [State Archives of Chernivtsi Region – **SACHR**].
- Dobrzhanskyi, O.** (2024) Lider rumunskykh demokrativ Aurel Onciul i yoho vzaïemny z predstavnykamy ukrainskoho natsionalnoho rukhu na Bukovyni na pochatku XX st. [The leader of the Romanian Democrats, Aurel Onciul, and his relations with representatives of the Ukrainian national movement in Bukovyna at the beginning of the 20th century]. *Ukraincy i ich sasiedzi na przestrzeni wieków: polityka, gospodarka, religia, kultura i życie codzienne* [Ukrainians and their Neighbours throughout the Centuries: politics, economy, religion, culture and everyday life], (vols. 4, pp. 404–419). Słupsk-Warszawa. [in Ukrainian].
- Dobrzhanskyi, O.** (2019). Nikolaj von Wassilko. Bukovynian Statesman and Diplomat. *Codrul Cosminului*, 25(1), 181–202. DOI: 10.4316/CC.2019.01.010 [in English].
- Dobrzhanskyi, O., & Khrystan, N.** (2022). A. Zhukovskyi yak istoryk ta populiaryzator znan pro Ukrainu [A. Zhukovsky as a Historian and Populariser of Knowledge about Ukraine]. *Ukrains'kyj istorychnyj zhurnal – Ukrainian Historical Journal*, 6, 196–205. DOI: 10.15407/uhj2022.06.196 [in Ukrainian].
- Gemeindelexikon der Bukowina.** (1907). [Community Encyclopaedia of Bukovyna]. Wien [in German].
- Gemeindeordnung.** (1908). *Landes Gesetz und Regierungsblatt für das Herzogtum Bukowina* [State Law and Government Gazette for the Duke of Bukovyna], (35), 141–150. [in German].
- Hormuzaki, C.** (1900). *Die Slawisierung der Bukowina im 19. Jahrhundert als Ausgangspunkt großpolnischer Zukunftspolitik* [The Slawisation of Bukovyna in the 19th Century as the Starting Point for Greater Poland's Future Policy]. Wien: Gerold. [in German].
- Mitteilungen des statistischen Landesamtes.** (1913). *Mitteilungen des statistischen Landesamtes des Herzogthums Bukowina* (Heft XVII. Teil 2). [Communications from the Statistical Office of the Duke of Bukovyna]. Czernowitz. [in German].
- Nova Bukovyna.** (1913. 20 kvitnia). *Nova Bukovyna* [New Bukovyna. Newspaper]. [in Ukrainian].
- Nova Bukovyna.** (1913. 5 zhovtnia). *Nova Bukovyna* [New Bukovyna. Newspaper]. [in Ukrainian].
- Onciul, A.** (1902. Nr. 4. 15. Mai). Chestiunea romănescă în Bucovina [The Romanian Issue in Bukovyna]. *Privitorul* [The Viewer]. Brno. [in Romanian].
- Piddubny, I.** (2010). Rumuny Bukovyny v zhytti kraiu: 1848 – 1918 rr. [Romanians of Bukovyna in the Life of the Region: 1848 – 1918]. *Istorychna panorama – Historical panorama*, (10), 9–40. [in Ukrainian].
- Piddubny, I.** (2023) Relationships of the Romanian Population of Bukovyna with Representatives of the Authorities during World War I. *Naukovi pratsi Kamianets-Podilskoho natsionalnoho*

universytetu imeni Ivana Ohienka: istorychni nauky – Scientific works of Ivan Ohienko Kamianets-Podilskyi National University: historical sciences, (41), 114–132. DOI: 10.32626/2309-2254.2023-41.114-132 [in English].

Piddubny, I. (2024). Politychna kar'iera Yanku kavalera de Flondor [The Political Career of Yankou de Flondor]. *Shchorichnyk Chernivetskoho oblasnoho kraieznavchoho muzeiu – Yearbook of Chernivtsi Regional Museum of Local History*, (9), 195–211. [in Ukrainian].

Purici, S. (2006). From Subjects to Citizens: Romanians in Bukovina (1775 – 1914). *Citizenship in Historical Perspective*, (pp. 115–121). Edizioni Plus, Pisa. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/313842638_From_Subjects_to_Citizens_Romanians_in_Bukovina_1775-1914 [in English]

Purici, S. (2011) Bucovina 1774–1918: abandonarea paradisului sau evadarea din infern? [Bukovina 1774–1918: abandoning paradise or escaping hell?] *Petru Bejinariu, Istorie și identitate* [Petru Bejinariu, History and Identity], (pp. 15–24). Suceava. [in Romanian].

Slovo. (1869. 25 zhovtnia). *Slovo* [Word. Newspaper]. [in Ukrainian].

Special Orts-Repertorium der Bukowina. (1885). *Special Orts-Repertorium der Bukowina* [Special Local Repertory of Bukovina]. Wien. [in German].

Statut. (1894). *Statut bukovynskoho politychnoho tovarystva “Ruska Rada”* [Statute of the Bukovynian Political Society “Ruska Rada”]. Chernivtsi. [in Ukrainian].

Stenographische Protokole. (1869). *Stenographische Protokole des Bukowiner Landtages für die dritte Session der zweiten Wahlperiode* [Stenographic Protocols of the Bukovina Provincial Diet of the Third Session of the Second Legislative Period]. Czernowitz. [in German].

Stenographische Protokole. (1897). *Stenographische Protokolle des Bukowiner Landtages der sechsten Session der achten Wahlperiode* [Stenographic Protocols of the Bukovina Provincial Diet of the Sixth Session of the Eighth Legislative Period]. Czernowitz. [in German].

Surman, J. (2019). Imperial Space and Its Identities. In *Universities in Imperial Austria 1848–1918: A Social History of a Multilingual Space*, (pp. 217–242). Purdue University Press. DOI: 10.2307/j.ctv2x00vh0.14 [in English].

Tyminsky, I. (1892). *Ruske pytannia na Bukovyni. Obhovoryv bukovynskiy pravoslavnyi rusyn* [The Rusyn Issue in Bukovina. Discussed by the Bukovynian Orthodox Rusyn]. Chernivtsi. [in Ukrainian].

Ungureanu, C. (2020) *Populația Bucovinei și Basarabiei sub stăpâniri străine (1774/1812 – 1918)* [The Population of Bukovina and Bessarabia under Foreign Rule (1774/1812 – 1918)]. Suceava: Editura Karl A. Romstorfer. [in Romanian].

Voronca, Z. (1903). *Rutenizarea Bucovinei* [The Ruthenization of Bukovina]. Cernăuți: Tip. bucovineană. [in Romanian].

Zhaloba, I., & Piddubny, I. (2024). U poshuku “zolotoi seredyiny”: politychna diialnist Aurela Onchula [In Search of the ‘Golden Mean’: the Political Activities of Aurel Onciul]. *Istoryko-politychni problemy suchasnoho svitu – Modern Historical and Political Issues*, (49), 220–230. DOI: 10.31861/MHPI2024.49.220-230 [in Ukrainian].

*The article was received March 25, 2025.
Article recommended for publishing 28/11/2025.*