

ЕТНІЧНІ ТА РЕЛІГІЙНІ МЕНШИНИ СХІДНОГО ПОХОДЖЕННЯ В УКРАЇНІ

ISSN 1682-5268 (on-line); ISSN 1608-0599 (print)

Shidnij svit, 2021, No. 4, pp. 56–76

doi: <https://doi.org/10.15407/orientw2021.04.056>

UDC 94(477.63)(411.16)-054.62:276.2]“18/1920”

THE EKATERINOSLAV JEWISH AND MENNONITE COMMUNITIES: SOME DETAILS OF THE PARTNERSHIP AND MUTUAL ASSISTANCE AS A SURVIVAL STRATEGY IN THE MULTIETHNIC ENVIRONMENT (1800–1920)

Nataliya Venger

DSc (History), Professor

World History Department

Dnipro National University

apt. 502, 72, Gagarin Ave., Dnipro, 49010, Ukraine

nataliyavenger@yahoo.com

ORSID ID: 0000-0002-8898-5734

The author deals with the history of cultural and economic interaction between two diaspora groups in Ekaterinoslav city (Jews and Mennonites) in the period 1800–1920. The presence of these ethno-confessional groups in the social and financial life of the city was quite noticeable, and their collaboration is possible to observe throughout the Late Imperial period. Despite all the cultural and social differences, both the Jews and the Mennonites were actively engaged in entrepreneurship that encouraged the coincidence of their economic interests. Diasporas were also brought closer by the socio-legal situation in the state (both were representatives of non-Orthodox ethnic groups with partially limited civil rights). The first signs of the interdiasporic cultural interaction can be found in the 1860s, when some Jewish entrepreneurs, despite the existing system of ethnic education, sent their descendants to the Mennonite school. At a new modernization stage of the city's history (since the 1870s), the Jews and the Mennonites actively cooperated in the development of the flour-milling, woodworking, and investment industries. The political strategy of diasporas' survival in the second half of the 19th and at the beginning of the 20th centuries was similar. The Mennonites learned from the Jews how to be public figures, lobby for business interests (using the tribune of the City Council), and influence the public mood of the local people, using ethnic periodicals. Although anti-Semitism was condemned among the Mennonites, the German-speaking community kept a wait-and-see tactic, avoiding supporting another ethnic group in the context of global and local social cataclysms (1880–1920: revolutions, pogroms, banditry, and anarchy). The latter, however, did not exclude some cases of groups' mutual assistance during pogroms and a few support actions between families, which had been united by many years of cooperation and trust. After the defeat of the Ukrainian revolution and the collapse of the national statehood project, the diasporas, as united ethnic communities of the city, lost their political and economic subjectivity.

Keywords: Jews, Mennonites, Ekaterinoslav city, flour-milling industry, ethnic education, modernization, pogroms, Ukrainian Revolution

The research problem: the Ekaterinoslav Jews and Mennonites in the unity of opposites

Ekaterinoslav (Dnepropetrovsk, Dnipro) was formed as a multiethnic city – the Russian Empire future capital (“third Palmyra”), located on its new frontier territories [Яворницький 1996, 20–28]. Ethnic and confessional heterogeneity, which were provided by

© 2021 N. Venger; Published by the A. Yu. Krymskyi Institute of Oriental Studies, NAS of Ukraine on behalf of *The World of the Orient*. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

military campaigns of the end of the 18th century [Бойко 2007; Дружинина 1955, 1959, 1970; Венгер 2009, 76–92], as well as by active migration and colonization processes that followed them [Писаревский 1909; Bartlett 1979; Sunderland 1998], which were inherent in the region in general, determined the scenario of the city's development. Foreign colonists and random settlers, Ukrainian Cossacks (in fact, this region owners [Етнонаціональний світ... 2018]), visiting migrants and officials sent on business trips from the central regions of the empire, formed the city, creating a unique culture of Ekaterinoslav with its inherent multiculturalism. The practical experience was exchanged, the unspoken rules of the interethnic community were created, and the production practices (for example, economic activity and entrepreneurship) were formed and assimilated during the ecizing process between different population categories. Thanks to statistics appearance in the Russian Empire (in the middle of the 19th century), we have some information about confessional composition of Ekaterinoslav population in 1862 (about 80 years after its foundation). There were 9,588 Orthodox Christians living in the city (they included Ukrainians, Russian-speaking immigrants (called “Velikorossies” – the Great Russians), Armenians, Greeks, Georgians), the schismatic sect representatives (131 persons), 46 Roman Catholics (Germans and Poles), 18 Lutherans and Reformed church supporters (Poles and Germans), 69 German-speaking Mennonites and 3,365 Jews [Материалы для географии и статистики... 1862, 303]. Ekaterinoslav grew and changed in the “struggle and unity” of cultural and ethnic diversity and gradually turned into the largest industrial center in the South of the Russian Empire. The “new city phenomenon” created new rules of social community (residence), in which everyone had enough space (territorial and cultural), provided favorable conditions for cooperation between the representatives of different ethnic communities.

Two Diaspora groups¹ of the provincial center will be researched in our study: the Jews (representatives of one of the largest ethno-confessional groups in Ekaterinoslav) and the Mennonites (perhaps the quantitatively smallest diaspora of the town). The presence of these ethno-confessional groups in social and financial life of the city was very noticeable. At the same time, the diasporas interacted actively throughout the Ekaterinoslav history.

This fact might seem very unexpected and inexplicable at first glance². It may seem that it is hardly possible to imagine communities (of the Jews and the Mennonites) that are more distant from each other in terms of their special and actually contrasting ethno-cultural particularities (Western and European for the Mennonites, and Eastern for the Jews). Being the representatives of separate ethnic groups³, they were distinguished by all special characteristics (for example, according to Anthony Smith's considerations [Сміт 1994, 28–51]): ethnic self-identification, awareness of the corporate unity, the historical memory presence, religion, language, way of life, the conception of the ancestors' cultural homeland. However, it is impossible to deny the factors of some rapprochement, which was due to practical motives (at least in Ekaterinoslav), and which contributed to the formation of partnership and mostly good-neighborly relations between the representatives of the Jewish and Mennonite congregations both in the field of entrepreneurship and even in some areas of their everyday life.

The main common feature of these ethnic groups' social position in Russia was that they did not belong to the so-called “titular nation”, but they were national minorities. Both the Jews with their pale of settlement feature, and the Mennonites, who were more and more often called simply the Germans from the middle of the 19th century, were not included in the projects of a single Russian nation [Миллер 2006, 147–171], which were actively developed in the Russian Empire from the middle of the 19th century. This fact put them into a position of “increased vulnerability”, determined their self-presentation in the state and in a separate city, limited their ability to feel like the subjects of the Russian monarchy and to be engaged in activities that corresponded to their class affiliation

and financial capabilities⁴. For example, the “Jewish question” and the everyday anti-Semitism, which were inherent to the Russian Empire from the late 1860s, were supplemented by the so-called “anti-colonist propaganda” [Венгер 2009, 406–443], which affected not only the German colonists but the German-speaking Mennonites as well. Several decades later, during World War I, the large-scale anti-German and anti-Jewish campaigns were launched in Russia, and they were accompanied by the civil liberties and private property restrictions of the Russian Empire subjects belonging to these ethno-confessions [Линдеман 1917]. Thus, both the Jewish and the Mennonite populations found themselves in the position of persecuted communities during certain periods of their history in Russia. They were morally united by both – the past (a “historical myth” about the history of anti-Semitism and Anabaptism in Europe, which was peculiar for each of them), and by the certain factor, limiting their rights in conditions of political unpredictability, complex and unbalanced modernization in the empire. Their special religious and linguistic traditions, their everyday features, which they tried to follow tirelessly, aroused more and more attention and rejection from the authorities and the entire Russian society.

It is important that despite all cultural and social differences, both the Jews and the Mennonites were actively engaged in the economic processes (entrepreneurship), which often ensured the coincidence of the communities representatives’ financial interests in Ekaterinoslav. This fact became most noticeable after the 1860s.

And, finally, attention should be paid to high level of self-organization of the Jewish and Mennonite population, which seem to be peculiar to many ever “persecuted” groups, as they positioned and perceived themselves. The urban communities, both the Jewish and the Mennonite ones, were formed according to the model of a self-organized Diaspora, which also facilitated external contacts of the communities. It sometimes supported the intergroup, to be precise, the inter-diaspora interaction between them.

The Jewish and Mennonite diasporas formation, first contacts between them (1800–1860s)

As it was mentioned earlier, the Jews and the Mennonites appeared in Ekaterinoslav at the initial stage of the city’s history. The Jewish community formation is associated with the Novorossiysk province founding. On December 21, 1791, Catherine II issued a decree “On granting the citizenship to the Jews in Ekaterinoslav governorship and Taurida region”, according to which the Jews were allowed to open factories, to trade, to be engaged in rural farming, and to create educational institutions [Клиер 2000, 58]. At the same time, inviting the Jews to the Russian Empire lands, the authorities introduced territorial restrictions on their settlement from the very beginning⁵. Since Ekaterinoslav was part of the so-called “pale of settlement”, the Jewish population of the city grew rapidly. In 1796–1803 the Jewish community of the city counted about 380 people [Екатеринославская губерния... 1910, 503].

The Jews contributed to the city’s economic development, being engaged in trade, construction, small and medium-size production. 28 Jewish surnames were already added to the list of Ekaterinoslav province merchants in 1803. It is known that in the first half of the 19th century the Jewish merchants earned money on the intermediary flax trade (the Stieglitz, Katznelson brothers’ enterprises), were in demand as city tailors and shoemakers. It is also known that 440 representatives of the Jewish faith were engaged in various types of crafts in 1818 [Быстряков 2001, 23–25]. In 1832, the Ekaterinoslav Jew Zaslavskiy founded ironworks, which is considered to be an important event for the region – and establishment of the future large-scale industry of the city [Быстряков 2001, 23–25]. Later on, the Ekaterinoslav Jews invested their money in the factories’ development; they smelted cast iron, made bricks, lumber, built and operated the mills [Найман 2003, 225–226]. The first synagogues were founded in 1800 and 1833 [Из истории еврейской... 1887, 168]. According to information for 1862, there were already five synagogues and

prayer houses, various educational institutions (one Talmud Torah, some Cheders and Ueshivas [Найман 2003, 190]) in Ekaterinoslav, and at the end of the 1870s there were 6,659 Jews in the provincial center, which accounted for 27.3 % of the city's population [Еврейское население... 1884, 16–19]. By the middle of the 19th century the Jews had already formed one of the most powerful and consolidated Ekaterinoslav diasporas.

At first glance, the history of the Mennonite Diaspora was not so impressive in the first half of the above-mentioned century. The first Mennonite families – immigrants from Prussia – settled in Ekaterinoslav in 1803. Their appearance was associated with the colonization program of the second half of the 18th – the first half of the 19th century [Писаревский 1909]. According to so-called “Privileges” signed by Prince G. Potemkin with the Prussian Mennonite communities’ representatives on the eve of 1789, the financially secure Mennonites, who did not count on the support of congregations and planned to be engaged in entrepreneurship, could choose the cities as their main place of residence [Rempel 1974, 281–288]. The grace period of tax exemption was provided for such immigrants, and the city budget allocated necessary funds for their arrangement. In general, considerable funds (more than 63,585 rubles) were spent until 1825 on Mennonites’ and colonists’ settlement in Ekaterinoslav (64 families) [Державний архів Дніпропетровської області – далі ДАДО, ф. 134, спр. 780, арк. 169]. According to the lists of 1816, 5 Mennonite families lived in Ekaterinoslav (J. Brandt, G. Thiessen, J. Toews, D. Schroeder, D. Welke) [ДАДО, ф. 134, спр. 491, арк. 24]. Later, P. Heese’s family arrived to the city from the colonies and gradually lured away from their numerous relatives to Ekaterinoslav. When asking to be accepted to the urban estate, the Mennonites reported that “[they] settled firmly in the city, acquired houses and businesses at their own expenses” [ДАДО, ф. 134, спр. 503, арк. 120]. For example, Brandt kept the inn [ДАДО, ф. 134, спр. 621, арк. 506]. Although Schroeder began his activity as a merchant and moneylender, he later built the city pier and was engaged in the timber rafting. The Fasts family possessed sawmills. Thiessen, Toews, and Heese were the owners of mechanical, and later – the steam mills (after 1861) [Венгер 2009, 218–221, 354–360]. The famous entrepreneurial dynasties were formed in Ekaterinoslav, and they received not only regional but all-Russian fame as well. The history of their mills’ development was confirmed by old French saying: “If you have money and want to have even more – build a mill”. Gradually the Mennonites formed a small, but separate and rather consolidated group. According to information for 1862, the Mennonite community of the city numbered 69 people (0.8 % of the total population) [Материалы для географии и статистики... 1862, 303].

Each of the two above-mentioned diasporas used their own strategy of settling down in the new city. Despite the differences, the strategy was intended to strengthen the financial base of individual families and ethnic diaspora in general. The Jews acted more presentable in this direction. For example, they settled compactly, on one Jewish street, built impressive religious buildings – synagogues, and founded numerous educational institutions⁶. Although, the Mennonites, like the Jews, were active promoters of the city’s economic development in the everyday life they still adhered to the self-isolation tactics. The latter corresponded to their idea of self-perception as the apostolic community of the “quiet”, the congregation of chosen by God [Snyder 1994, 3–19; Венгер 2009, 194–195]. Whereas the Mennonite entrepreneurs had achieved considerable business success by that period, they had had neither a prayer house, nor a school building. Thus, for a long time, religious meetings and education of children were held directly in the Mennonite families’ houses. According to P. Heese’s memoirs, children received secondary education in the numerous Mennonite schools, which functioned on the territory of the Chortitza colonies. It was decided to establish a separate school only in the 1850s. The history of this school provides us with the first evidence of contacts between the Jewish and Mennonite diasporas [Heese, 6].

In the early 1860s, the Mennonites made a decision to rent a few small rooms in a building on Catherine's Avenue – the main city avenue (named after Empress Catherine II). The first Mennonite teachers – J. Klassen, P. Wiens, P. Martens – were hired. Later, H. D. Epp got this position. He had been engaged in teaching for at least 25 years, and there is a lot of information saved about him as of the outstanding person, teacher, and preacher [Epp, Thiessen; Shepherds, servants, and prophets... 2003; Braun 1955–1959, 156].

The Mennonite School was a small, closed-type, and eventually prestigious educational institution, the number of students in which never exceeded 30 people. However, the school building, located in a prestigious area of the city, needed to be maintained. In this regard, the provident and prudent Mennonites started inviting children from the Lutheran and then from the Jewish families. Of course, the school accepted the offspring “from worthy families” only (education was to be paid for and amounted to a considerable sum – 24 rubles for one student per year [Heese, 6]). Thus, the community received an additional source of income, and the pupils themselves acquired profound knowledge, an individual approach peculiar to small educational institutions, as well as communication skills and important experience of socialization in a multicultural and multi-confessional environment. Although the Jewish educational institutions were created on Ekaterinoslav territory, the Jewish families' aspiration to send their offsprings to the Mennonite school could be associated with the desire to provide more comfortable learning conditions for the child and with the intention to place the heir among the local entrepreneurial elite (in a sense of the word, which corresponded to that time).

The intercultural barriers were in a manner overcome in such a school. It was an important opportunity to get acquainted with the representatives of other ethnic groups, which later led to closer cooperation between the Mennonite and the Jewish entrepreneurs. It should be noted that school taught Russian, the knowledge of which opened up career opportunities and the possibility to receive further education. The Russian language was taught by local teacher P. Osipenko [Heese, 6]. According to P. Heese's testimony, “Russian was one of the most important subjects”, and the Mennonites later used the practice of settling children in Russian-speaking families for 1–2 years with the purpose of ethnic integration [Heese, 5–6].

After graduating from the Mennonite school, which gave basic knowledge, the students continued their study in other educational institutions of the city (we are talking about secondary schools and not at all about higher educational institutions). P. Heese recollected, that “the doors of these schools were wide open for the Germans because they had a good reputation” [Heese, 6]. It should be assumed that children from Jewish families received the same promising prospect.

Thus, despite certain cultural isolation, which was never absolute in the urban life and entrepreneurial activity conditions, which the Mennonites and the Jews were engaged in, their first inter-diasporal contacts were precisely cultural. Herewith, it should be emphasized that the very same pragmatism and financial expediency became the reasons for those contacts. The latter, however, did not exclude the importance of preserving ethno-confessional identity, which remained relevant both for the Mennonites and the Jews – as the national minorities and “ever persecuted” groups. However, the school example also testifies the professional group identity emergence as the Mennonite school was attended by children from those Jewish families who dealt with entrepreneurship.

Modernization and prospects for new contacts and cooperation

Since 1880s Ekaterinoslav entered a new modernization stage of its development. In spite of obvious assumptions, these changes were not directly connected with the Great Reforms of 1860s and 1870s. Alexander Pol's activity directed towards the iron ore search and extraction in Kryvyi Rih region of Ekaterinoslav province [Кочергін 2002]

became in many respects an impetus for the economic “awakening” of the region. The railway named after Catherine the Great, which connected the Kryvyi Rih iron ore region with Yuzovka coal of the same province (Donbas) was laid through the city in 1884. Ekaterinoslav became the region’s metallurgical and machine-building center. Modernization granted new opportunities to the city and its population, and the enterprising Jews and Mennonites could not miss them. The cooperation prospects were first of all associated with entrepreneurship in the new economic conditions when the city was called no other than “New America” [Дніпропетровськ: віхи історії 2001, 84–89].

One should also pay attention to negative aspects, which the representatives of national minorities, including the diasporas, studied here, faced during the indicated period. In 1881 Tsar Alexander III ascended the throne of the Russian state. After an actual assassination of his father, the liberal emperor Alexander II [Захарова 1992, 58–79], the new tsar policy was distinguished by extreme conservatism, including the national politics area [Венгер 2013, 34–55]. His exclusive orientation towards the “Russianness” and fear of foreign influence strengthening, dictated by his closest surrounding (for example, by P. Pobedonostsev) led to unfavorable consequences for the “adherents of a different (not Orthodox) faith”, no matter what region of the empire they lived in [Венгер 2013, 34–55]. The Russian language was forcibly implanted in schools of certain ethnic groups, the German names of colonies in Ekaterinoslav and Tauride provinces were changed [Венгер 2013a], the “Pale of Settlement” rules were toughened [Кальян 2009, 121–122].

However, until 1883 (the date of the first anti-Jewish pogrom in the gubernia) it was still possible to maintain the multiethnic consensus in Ekaterinoslav, where the Jewish population was growing steadily (there were 39,979 Jews in Ekaterinoslav in 1887. They ranked second after the Russians and Ukrainians [Дніпропетровськ: віхи історії 2001, 91]). The Jews were perceived almost as the aboriginal population for a long time, and they retained not only economic but administrative influence in the region as well. Although they were not allowed to hold public ranks according to the legislation of the 1880s, the Jewish councilors (the deputies) were an invariable part of the city public administration since 1836⁷. The Mennonites became part of the city government much later, in the 1890s⁸.

The Jews showed themselves in actually all spheres of entrepreneurial activity of the city (metallurgy, mechanical engineering, finance, the services sector, food processing, woodworking)⁹, and the Mennonites in their turn were well-known millers and owners of woodworking enterprise. In the first decade of the 20th century, the Mennonite community consisted of entrepreneurs, homeowners, lawyers and doctors, an architect, and a banker (not more than 200 people). Unlike the Chortitza colonies, which was a kind of innovation center of the Mennonite entrepreneurship in the South of Ukraine, Ekaterinoslav community was an intellectual center of the Mennonites in the Empire [Фабрики, заводы и рудники... 1903, 152–170; Венгер 2009, 535–538; Епп 1989, 239–259].

Business interests determined contact points of these two Ekaterinoslav diasporas’ interests. The Jewish mills, as well as the Mennonite ones, were mainly located on the Petersburg and Fabrichnaya streets (between the central avenue and the Dnipro river embankment). The Fabrichnaya Street itself was often called the Mennonite Street because these community entrepreneurs’ houses were located there. Thus, they were, first of all, neighbors. The Jewish flour-grinding business of Ekaterinoslav is associated with the surnames of Grinberg, Rubinstein, Lifshits, Averbukh, Kogan, Levenzon, Rosenberg, Shifrin, Sandomirsky, Gossen. The Mennonites also kept up becoming leaders and getting international awards for their production. By 1900, the Mennonite flour mills produced about 35 % of the city’s output [считано в: Памятная книга и адрес-календарь Екатеринославской... 1900]. The Mennonite steam and roller mills (the most innovative in their designs) turned into joint-stock companies, which competed for the best quality of flour they produced. When the corporatization wave reached the milling industry, most of

the Mennonite steam mills were converted into joint-stock companies. At the same time, they didn't limit themselves to their own real estate. For example, the enterprise "G. Heese & Co" (1909–1914) rented the mills of the Jews Sandomirsky and Gossen in an effort to obtain additional profit [Венгер 2009, 536].

We should mention the other case. Sophia Fast, the local miller's wife, invited the Jew Isaac Lyn to run the enterprise after the death of her husband. Among the Jewish entrepreneurs, Sophia got a reputation as a person, who "had a healthy understanding of people, was wise, crafty and sly and was in constant communication with them". P. Heese noticed, that many "years later the Jews still talked about her with very high respect" [Peter H. Heese's (1878–1947) manuscripts..., 18].

The Jewish–Mennonite cooperation was not limited to the milling business. It is also known that J. Thiessen and P. Heese with two Jewish entrepreneurs and one Russian miller paid for the construction of five commercial river steam vessels, the total carrying capacity of which was equal to 100,000 poods. They founded the steamship line, which operated modern for that time ships "Thiessen", "Pyotr" (Peter – in Russian), "Josephine", "Augustina", "Mukomol" (Miller – in Russian) [Heese, 4]. The launching of the first steamers was a great celebration. The owners and members of the Mennonite community had a river sail along the route Ekaterinoslav-Kamenskoye.

Although the Mennonites tried to trade, they didn't succeed in that field of activity. The flour trade was completely in the hands of the Jews in Ekaterinoslav. In addition, the Jews showed their active position in banking (for example, "I. Kofman Banking House" and many other private credit companies) and were successful financiers. Having resources, they were lending willingly to the Mennonites' business. The entrepreneurs testified that state banks (the City Bank, Ekaterinoslav State Bank) asked for a higher interest rate, which actually could destroy their business. The Jews lent money at only a 10 % rate. It was acceptable for the Mennonites and offered the possibility of making a profit [Heese, 8].

Another joint line of business, in which both Jews and the Mennonites presented themselves, was sawmill production [Фабрики, заводы и рудники... 1903, 152–170]. The sawmills were located on the banks of the Dnieper. The timber was floated by the entrepreneurs from the upper and middle areas of the river. Flour and sawmill production – two very different businesses, had a common point of contact. It was a compulsory social program for workers, that was required by so-called "factory legislation" [Устав о промышленности 1893]. The owners of these industries (Jews and Mennonites) established a foundation, which included 12 mills and 9 sawmills. The united financial resources of this fund (and two diasporas representatives') were intended to provide the workers with social security as it was recorded in the "Industrial Charter" [Русский мельник 1914].

In the first decade of the 20th century, the Mennonites began to participate actively in public city life. For them, as well as for the Jews, the motivation was associated with the new political, economic and social challenges to their ethnic congregation's growth and at a new stage of the Russian state development. So they decided to "get out of hiding" and build their own church and educational institution. The issue of land acquiring was resolved at a time when Johann Esau (the Mennonite, engineer, and entrepreneur) was the mayor of the city (1905) [Венгер 2009, 641–643]. The land in a very prestigious area of the city (on the Mennonite (Fabrichna) Street) cost 20,000 rubles. Half of that amount was reimbursed through the sale of previous school premises. The other part was collected by community members. They planned to build a rather impressive church building with a tower. Johann Thiessen promised to donate money for the construction of the tower. Even though the project had been prepared by the local Mennonite architect Dietrich Thiessen and his assistant – the builder Johann Hein, the plan was not implemented [Heese, 6]. The new Mennonite Church building, whose construction had been completed by 1912, was solid, but simple and restrained.

As both the Jews and the Mennonites got an active public position in the city and were interested in politics¹⁰, they had their own publishing offices. While the Jews supervised a number of diverse periodicals, the Mennonites realized the need to have their own printing platform since 1906 [Газети і журнали... 1993]. The newspaper was acquired exactly from the Jews, and then it was published by the Mennonites under the name “Yuzhnaya Zarya” (“The Dawn of the South”): a daily political, social and literary newspaper, the first issue of which was released on April 15th. The Jews were also involved in collaboration with the Publishing House Partnership subjected to “Yuzhnaya Zarya”. Although the company was headed by P. Heese, the Jew A. Efimovich, who held the same position in the previous periodical, remained the newspaper’s editor in 1906–1915 [Газети і журнали... 1993, 19; Періодичні видання... 1995, 65]. According to Mennonites’ recollections, the local authorities took a very high tax (about 3,000 rubles), when registering the sheet. However, the thrifty Mennonites, who felt it necessary to publish a liberal newspaper, were ready to pay such a significant amount of money [Heese, 5]. However, in 1914, when the First World War broke out, the publication of the newspaper, which was owned by Germans and Jews, was suspended, as subsequent events showed, forever.

Although the relations between two ethnic diasporas were of a partnership nature in general, one should recall a particular case, which was rather an exception to the rule. It was connected with the personal history of the Mennonite doctor Jacob Esau (brother of the city mayor Johann Esau) and his relationship with the Jewish representatives. Jacob lived on Jewish Street and practiced ophthalmology. Being a rather qualified doctor (a student of the famous doctor M. Semashko¹¹), he successfully competed with other practicing specialists. Most of his patients were exactly the Jews. As a person who lived on the Jewish Street, he regularly received the postcards with proposals of making donations for the activities of one of the charitable organizations [Матеріали з історії єврейської громади... 1992, 47] of this ethnic group in Ekaterinoslav. If one desired, he or she could fill in the card (informing the amount of the donations, expressing the wishes) and forward it to the sender’s address. But Dr. Esau did otherwise for an unknown reason. He sent a card with a pig face painted on it to the charity organization’s address. Esau had no chance of remaining incognito, as the senders kept the correspondence catalog. That action was perceived as an insult. A scandal broke out and led to reputation loss. The doctor had to change his place of residence and move to another, less prestigious area. Describing that case, P. Heese concludes that, having changed the place of work and residence, the oculist examined only poor factory workers who were unable to pay for the consultation. The doctor’s income was very poor, and it was a kind of punishment for his unworthy behavior as follows from the narrative [Peter H. Heese (1878–1947) manuscripts..., 35].

The survival strategy in the social turbulence conditions

Modernization in Russian Empire had an unbalanced and controversial character. It was despite the fact that economic processes in the state as a whole and in the region, in particular, showed consistently positive dynamics. It led to complex and difficult to resolve social contradictions in Russian society [Миронов 2000, 154–162; Шляхов 2016, 105–141, 301–341]. The empire outlived three revolutions during the period from 1905 to 1917, which are called “proletarian” in the traditional Soviet historiography. At the same time, the interethnic issues and nationalistic sentiments have always been important components of social contradictions and were present among the reasons for the Russian revolutions [Безаров 2018, 60–135; Ганелин 1991; Україна між самовизначенням та окупацією... 2015, 317–337].

The Russian nationalism and the Black Hundred radical by character parties, which appeared and became popular in the South of Ukraine [Венгер 2016, 142–165], acted in the direction of domestic nationalism escalation, which was of a social nature according to modern scholars [Грицак 2019, 64]. The anti-Jewish actions often started as workers’

strikes, which then turned into pogroms [Безаров 2009, 7–36; Сапрт 2006, 192–193]. The same happened in Ekaterinoslav in 1898 when the proletariat mass demonstration at Alexandrovsk metallurgical plant turned into obvious pogrom actions with complete destruction of 24 houses [Етнонаціональний світ... 2019, 197].

Similar events occurred more than once in the provincial center in 1901–1905. Some of them could be successfully repelled thanks to the local Jewish self-defense (1901) [Краткая еврейская энциклопедия 1994, 645–651]. However, it happened far not always. There are memories left about how the Mennonites supported the Jews during the pogrom of 1904. P. Heese reported that about 120 people had been hiding for several days in his house and on the territory of the scourer belonging to him. At the same time, according to his own testimony, 130 Jews were killed by the pogromists [Heese, 7]. Those who were hidden by the Mennonites needed to keep secrecy and not show their presence in the house. It should be admitted that the saviors risked no less than the Jews themselves in that situation. The researches show that there actually were no boundaries – motivational, ethnic, ethical – for the participants of the pogrom, who were in a state of general euphoria.

Heese reports that the city authorities knew about the upcoming events, but they couldn't undertake preventive measures. The pogromists' actions (nearly 1000 people participated) started as a peaceful demonstration with state flags and portraits of Nicholas II on Friday morning. The number of those who took part in the orderly organized patriotic procession increased as the movement was progressing, and it turned the demonstration into an uncontrollable aggressive crowd. The local Jew Aronovich's house became the first victim of the pogrom [Heese, 7]. The Jewish self-defense, which expected such a course of events, was supported by the local Social Democrats' group and some sympathizers. The Jewish population living in the area of the station and the railway bridge was affected most of all. The Jewish houses' arsons were recorded on the third day of the pogroms. The city's fire brigades, who were striking at that time, did not take part in the fire extinguishing process.

Although the Mennonites were not harmed during the pogroms, they were affected by their consequences. Those events caused significant damage to the city's economy. P. Heese says that after the pogroms the Jews refused to lend to local entrepreneurs "as if on command". Although the Jews did not openly express their grievances, a certain barrier still arose between them and the city elite, and it also affected the Mennonites (after all, not everyone rushed to defend the rightness!). The city's flour milling industry lost the possibility to receive loans that the Jews were previously providing for 3 to 4 months. As a result, the Mennonite millers lost 200,000 rubles [Heese, 8]. Some of them (W. Heese and J. H. Toews) sold their businesses soon [Heese, 8].

The state and the region's social situation were developing in such a way that the danger of pogroms still persisted. The Orthodox clergy and the local government remained indifferent, however, they, in general, realized the enormity and irrationality of what was happening. It's not surprising that similar events repeated in July and October 1905. The victims were recorded despite the Jewish self-defense attempts to resist violence. The local police chief reported to Governor Johan Esau (the Mennonite community representative): "I inform Your Excellency that during the recent riots in Ekaterinoslav city 122 trade shops, 64 stores..., 40 apartments were destroyed and plundered, and 5 houses were burnt. The following number of Jews was killed by melee weapons: 34 men, 9 women, 1 girl; 20 men were killed by firearms" [ДАДО, ф. 11, спр. 465, арк. 107]. The note also reported about the victims among Russians, Turks, and the pogromists themselves. Esau did not leave mentioned events without attention. The issue of victims and the sufferers' material damage was discussed at the City Duma meeting [Журнал Екатеринославской городской думы 1906, 10–17, 78]. According to the Jewish hospital chief physician G. Puder, up to 2,000 people were being hidden and kept in the hospital

for in-patients. Although the hospital's food supply was carried out by the Jewish community, J. Esau proposed the Duma to allocate funds for food aid. The hospital was provided with 500 rubles according to the deputies' decision. The Winter Theater and the People's Auditorium buildings were allocated for temporary residence of people who were made homeless by the fire, and belated measures were taken to protect the victims. Only after the authorities' special request, the Bishop of Ekaterinoslav and Taganrog issued an appeal to the Christians of the city: "We have lived through hard days! Get away from illegal deeds... Live peacefully with everyone..." [Вестник Екатеринославского земства 1905].

Although the next decade (the period of industrial growth until 1914) was generally very successful and beneficial for the development of both the Jewish and the Mennonite communities of the city, these ethnic groups again fell into the list of the Russian society potential enemies with the outbreak of World War I [Лукьянов 2006, 36–46]. All the combating empires without exception renewed the debates about nationalism and national identity in the global conflict conditions. Mass anti-Semitism and anti-Germanism only increased both in the country in general and in the region in particular. At the same time, the position of both local Germans and the Jews gradually worsened as the state of the front deteriorated and the economic crisis intensified [Миллер 2006, 96–147]. The state adopted legislation that limited the foreign capital influence in Russia, including the German and the Jewish ones. The general feature of the so-called "Liquidation" program consisted in the fact that it arose as a project directed against the subjects of the states with which the empire fought, but soon turned into an internal social (limiting the civil rights) and economic war against the subjects of Russia, clearly unjust and ungrounded by nothing but the interests of certain social groups. The latter demanded the lands' and the economic positions' "redistribution", not realizing that simple mechanical "repartition" could bring economic success neither to individual representatives of this process nor to the state.

The political struggle around the Jewish and German communities undoubtedly took place in Ekaterinoslav. However, the situation was not so sad in general. P. Heese recollected, that "when the Russian government announced that the Mennonites were no longer worthy citizens of Russia, but were the enemies..., the searches started (in the city. – *N. V.*)" [Heese, 9]. However, the Mennonites, as well as the Jewish financiers, managed to maintain a favorable social climate around the communities thanks to their influence and charity programs.

When the sovereign Emperor Nicholas II visited Ekaterinoslav on January 31, 1915, he was accompanied by an escort, which included the representatives of both Jewish and German (the Mennonite, Roman Catholic, Lutheran) communities during the trip around the city. The Ekaterinoslav Jews were represented by the rabbi M. Brushtein, the honorary citizen M. Tavrovsky, the banker L. Deich, the entrepreneurs J. Shifrin and L. Rotenberg. The Mennonite delegation consisted of three people: the State Duma deputy (G. Bergman)¹² and religious leaders (J. Dick, J. Klassen). Wilhelm Toews, the son of a miller (had the nick "Toews-millionaire"), performed duties of the sovereign's personal driver throughout the day, which testified high level of personal trust in a man who, ironically, belonged to the unreliable category by his ethnic origin. Handing over the donation on behalf of the Jewish community (10,000 rubles), rabbi M. Brushtein pronounced the following patriotic words, important for the Jews: "The Ekaterinoslav Jewish community, as well as all Jewish people, bears all the hardships of the world war and is ready to sacrifice its life and all its property for the sake of Russia's power, greatness and honor" [Весь Екатеринослав... 1915, IX]. G. Bergman also presented 10,000 rubles collected by the Mennonites to Emperor Nicholas [Весь Екатеринослав... 1915, V]. The Red Cross hospital with 100 beds for the wounded soldiers [Toews 2018, 41], arranged by the Mennonites in Potemkin Palace, was one of the protocol points of the Emperor's visit to

Ekaterinoslav. The communities tried to demonstrate faithful feelings and to reduce the level of general suspicion by all their actions. Summarizing his memories of that event, P. Heese concludes: “Not everything went so bad for us – from time to time we perceived respect towards the German culture representatives” [Heese, *II*]. This judgment is undoubtedly true regarding the situation with Ekaterinoslav Jews as well. It is demonstrative that even during the period of so-called “liquidation legislation emergency”, the Ekaterinoslav Mennonites and Jews did not lose their most important posts in the municipal government. J. Heese, K. Unruh, P. Funk, V. Friezen performed the duties of attorneys at law in 1915. Peter Funk was an attorney at the Justices of the Peace Ekaterinoslav city congress. In 1914 J. Esau, J. Thiessen was mentioned among the responsible organizers of the Industry and Trade Congress, which was planned to be held in Odessa in autumn 1914 [Адрес-календарь Екатеринославской губернии... 1915, 192]. Although on the eve of the First World War, the Ekaterinoslav community numbered about 200 members, during the four war years it increased (including refugees and displaced persons) to 1,000 people.

The Jewish community interests in the City Duma were represented by merchants M. El, I. Shtromberg, I. Granovsky, lawyer Y. Berezovsky and the honorary citizen M. Tavrovsky. Being active, they, however, could not deny the pogroms, which the doomed Jews expected in the economic crisis conditions caused by the war. However, against all expectations, the Ekaterinoslav Germans and Mennonites were the first to face their danger. It is clear that the workers’ strikes, which were frequent and started with economic demands, often turned against the local Germans – the manufactures’ owners, in conditions of constant appeals for the struggle against the “hostile German dominant influence”. German pogroms swept Moscow at the end of spring 1915 [Кириянов 1999, 434]. The agents reported that similar events were prepared in Ekaterinoslav. The local police chief telegraphed the governor in June 1915: “After the destruction of German shops in Moscow, persistent rumors circulate recently among the province population, entrusted to me, and they concern the pogrom of German settlers, the anger against whom has ripened among the population not only due to the war but because the Germans-villagers live separately under better conditions and do not bear the burden that the indigenous Russian people are experiencing in the current war” [ДАДО, ф. 11, спр. 1294, арк. 19]. The governor demanded an immediate response from the security forces: “If the local administration stays condescending and does not undertake decisive measures from the very beginning, the population may gain confidence in the German pogroms and all sorts of illegal actions impunity. The riots can gain spontaneous character” [ДАДО, ф. 11, спр. 1294, арк. 10, 20]. It follows from the governor’s answer that the fears were caused not by the national enmity factor itself, but by the riots, which, as you know, could easily acquire spontaneous character, turning into Jewish pogroms as well. The Jews again started lending money readily to the Mennonite enterprises, having realized that such a danger existed. This decision was very timely because the city’s mills needed financial support most of all.

In July 1916 the Mennonite mills of Ekaterinoslav received military orders from the central government [Центральний державний історичний архів, ф. 2090, оп. 1, спр. 423, арк. 76], thanks to which the enterprises’ activity didn’t stop, and their owners fell under the patronage of the authorities. This way they were protected from the threat of getting under sequestration. Heese recollected that the enterprises had the “preferential tax”, and the owners were able to pay full wages to their workers. However, the government orders’ repayment was carried out with a delay and without taking into account all costs (they miss logistic ones). The authorities were paying for ready-made flour, excluding the costs of grain delivering at the production cycle beginning. The loans from the Jewish banks made it possible in that situation to carry out the entire production process and to pay wages to workers in the absence of state prepayment [Heese, *II*].

Common destiny

World War I ended with the collapse of several empires. The February Revolution of 1917 led to the monarchy's fall and to the unified Russian state's destruction. A long period of political instability, called in historiography the Ukrainian Revolution or the "national liberation competitions", started in Ukraine. The power changed 11 times in Ekaterinoslav over the next five years (until 1922). Political regimes, changing each other, were short-term and imperfect. The city population (including the Jewish and the Mennonite congregations' representatives) felt the demonstrations of those "imperfections" to the full extent: namely, the terror, requisitions, intimidations, repressions, devastations, violent breaking of the worldview. War weariness transformed into chaos, fear, and the post-war years' collapse for the Ekaterinoslav inhabitants. Both the Jews and the Mennonites assessed the prospects for a dialogue with various political forces from the point of view of their attitude to private property, the possibility of preserving religious identity, and their understanding of common sense. There was an attempt to interact, to participate in self-government structures (the Duma) at the initial stage (during the Ukrainian Republic, The Hetmanate (1918)). Later, they tried to demonstrate their loyalty to the left radical forces (the Bolsheviks), thereby trying to reduce the hostility degree of the latter. The tactics of self-elimination, disappearance from the political, administrative, and social spheres were chosen at the end of the considered period (since 1919) [Venger 2020, 40–50].

Most of the political forces, which came to power, used the anti-Semitism and anti-Germanism slogans, inherited from the previous regime. For example, the mistrust of the German population found its reflection in the Ukrainian nationalists' policy (Symon Petliura and his supporters). As well as the Jews, the Germans, who, in addition, supported the Hetmanate of P. Skoropadskyi and the Austro-German presence (April – November 1918) a year earlier, were considered by the Petliurists as a socially dangerous group. Having come to power in Ekaterinoslav, the nationalists (Petliurists) started building the Ukrainian statehood, clearly following the early nationalist scenario: they closed Russian-language and German-language newspapers, deprived of work employees who didn't speak Ukrainian [Республиканец 1918]. Their policy didn't match promising slogans of ethnic equality proclaimed by M. S. Hrushevsky (1866–1934), one of the Ukrainian People's Republic's (1917–1918) ideologists. For example, a former State Duma deputy from Ekaterinoslav province, G. Bergman, was arrested on charges "of cooperation with the Austro-German authorities". Ironically, he was freed by Nestor Makhno's detachments, which seized the provincial town for only one day in January 1919 (the first-timer) and managed to release all prisoners, including the worst criminals [Heese, 18]. It is not surprising that under such circumstances the German and Jewish communities representatives started fearing for their safety for the first time since 1917.

Among all the politicians who established their power in the city, N. Makhno (who occupied Ekaterinoslav three times in 1919) turned out to be a common enemy of both the Germans (the Mennonites) and the Jews. Despite the fact that the chieftain denied the anti-Semitism accusations, it is widely known that his army was involved in organizing the pogroms. It also destroyed a lot of Mennonite villages in Ekaterinoslav gubernia [Венгер 2017, 240–255]. The first rumors about the chieftain started spreading in the city in January 1919, when Makhno's army approached the city (the first assault). Professor G. Igrenev recollected that "people said that Makhno demanded from the Petliurists to let him enter Ekaterinoslav for only three days... They said that Makhno was a noble man and an enemy only to the Jews and to the Germans..." [Игреньев 1930, 189].

The second presence of the Makhnovists in Ekaterinoslav (November 1919) lasted about 1.5 weeks and did not bring disasters to the Jewish community. Being afraid of the pogroms, the Jews (predictably!) acted ahead of the curve. They decided to "buy" the

chieftain's loyalty. The deputation of Jews with 3 million rubles, collected in synagogues, to his army's headquarters led to an expected result [Heese, 24]. Makhno accepted the offering and categorically forbade his soldiers to organize the pogroms. The houses and businesses of local Germans and other "bourgeois", which were located in the central part of the city, became a target for robbery in those circumstances. Some Jews tried to "take advantage of the moment" of temporary stability. One of them offered J. Thissen to buy out the steam mill from his ownership for 1,800,000 rubles. The amount could be paid not only in Russian but also in German, English or French currencies. The offer was rather profitable. Despite the financial instability, the buyer promised to open an account in the name of Thissen in one of the European banks. Unfortunately, the miller rejected such an advantageous, as the nearest future showed, offer [Heese, 27].

Both the Mennonites and the Jews associated the last hopes for stability and order with the liberation military campaign of the monarchist General Anton Denikin's "Volunteer Army". Although there were great expectations, its appearance in Ekaterinoslav at the end of June 1919 did not bring calmness to the city. The robberies began! According to the Jew Z. Arbatov (the editor of a local newspaper), "the entire richest part of the city, all the best shops (which mainly belonged to the Jews. – *N. V.*) were plundered, and Cossacks wandered along the streets, dragging sacks filled with goods on their shoulders..." [Арбатов 1923, 91]. P. Heese (as Mennonite community representative) wrote about the robberies of the Denikinites very condescendingly: "Well, the Cossacks are also Russians, and their weakness for foreign goods is well-known. They plundered all the Jewish warehouses immediately" [Heese, 23]. The White Guardsmen not only launched political repressions against the Bolsheviks' supporters but persecuted the Jews as well. A. Denikin's political program consisted in the restoration of the Russian Empire and the "Russian world", which, as you know, was sick with anti-Semitism. As a consistent supporter of private property, Denikin strove to resist robberies; however, being a fighter for the "Russian world" reinstatement, he did not oppose anti-Semitism sufficiently. Although the Ekaterinoslav Germans (and the Mennonites) had quite trusting relations with the general and his supporters, the Jewish population suffered significant material losses. The pogroms again became a real disaster for Ekaterinoslav. P. Heese mentioned those events on the pages of his diary, but, strangely, he did that superficially and impartially: "They [Denikin army] robbed the Jews for a long time, and perhaps there were victims, but only from their words. There were no official announcements. The Jewish self-defense didn't work, but they used the new tactics... They were building barricades around the courtyards. But the robbers didn't retreat. They fired into the air and took everything they wanted from the houses" [Heese, 21]. These lines are filled with aloofness and indifference to the fellow citizens' sufferings. What was the reason for Heese's indifference? After all, the Mennonites were repeatedly proving their loyalty to the Jews, with whom they built common business relationships, conducted financial transactions. We think that it is explained by the routine of violence, which turned into the townspeople's daily life factor in 1919 (after five years of war and anarchy). "The Jews are not the first ones, but they are not the last either. The Germans suffered no less", – perhaps, Heese reasoned that way, and his notes reflected a mood of apathy and despair towards violence as the inevitable phenomenon of the surrounding reality.

After General A. Denikin's army getaway and Baron Wrangel's unsuccessful attempt to retain the region, the Bolsheviks and the Red Army turned out to be the total rulers of the Ukrainian lands (since 1920). The independent national Ukrainian project, born in agony and contradictions, could not withstand competition with Russian Bolshevism, which was obsessed with an idea of permanent revolution. It predetermined the fate of Ukraine for the next several decades. Realizing the absence of prospects for that political situation, those residents of Ekaterinoslav, who could not tolerate Bolshevism and were wise enough to predict the future, tried to leave the city. They rushed southwards with the

purpose of emigration. P. Heese and his family found themselves in Taganrog. He met many members of the Ekaterinoslav Mennonite community there (G. Bergman's son, an engineer A. Esau) [Heese, 21]. All of them were waiting for the right moment to leave the country. The growth of emigration moods was undoubtedly influenced by a number of factors: limited resources for survival; fear for own life, incomprehension of the "game rules" (or their complete absence to be more exact), uncertainty about the future, distrust towards social institutions and, of course, fear of a new surge of interethnic conflicts – both the Jews and the Germans periodically became their victims in the conditions of political turbulence.

We do not have accurate information about the number of communities representatives, who went in search of a better life. Just fragments of memories are left, and many of them are of a tragic nature. The fate of German Bergman is very demonstrative. For a long time, he lacked determination and agility for leaving the city and his property in it. When the Red Army occupied the region and the railroad tracks were destroyed, H. Bergman had to flee in carts together with his companions. His friend Kaminsky (the Jew), two sons, and the son-in-law Peter Rediger accompanied him on the way. The fugitives overcame the distance from Ekaterinoslav to Nikopol without difficulties. However, they came across the Red Army's military unit in one of the nearest villages. Only Kaminsky somehow managed to escape from that scrape. He said that H. Bergman and his sons had been put to death after interrogations, tortures, and humiliations. The bodies of those unfortunate were thrown into a well [Heese, 28–29].

In this story, the Jew survived while his friends (the Mennonites) were murdered. The plot can be perceived as an indicative metaphor of these both ethnic groups near future when their fates parted. When the small Mennonite Ekaterinoslav Diaspora disappeared from the city and Soviet historiography as a result of persecution, emigration, and ideological sway, the numerous Jewish population lived in the Soviet Dnipropetrovsk¹³ till 1990s¹⁴. However, recollections about partnership (it is correct about the Mennonites at least) are a part of memory of their Ekaterinoslav history in Ukraine.

Conclusions

One can make an indisputable conclusion that the city, as a social space, is not only a territory of residence but also a zone of constant communication of its inhabitants. The interethnic dialogue was an important factor in Ekaterinoslav's development. The ethnically heterogeneous population of the provincial center demonstrated ideological tolerance initially (from the very beginning of the city's foundation), creating favorable conditions for different cultures' coexistence, for recognizing the right of the "others" to preserve "opacity" of their cultural space. Those principles were basic for building relations between two city dynasties that we are studying: the Mennonite and the Jewish one. Existing within the framework of their own unique cultural tradition and belonging to the non-Orthodox minorities with all the ensuing legal circumstances, maintaining the intercultural distances and barriers, they nevertheless needed communication. Importantly that mentioned external communication (for example, in the sphere of business) retained its significance during the crucial for the diasporas moments of identity confirmation and contributed to its preservation. In other words, in order to strengthen the diaspora, it was necessary to periodically destroy ethnic barriers and to create new intercultural relations that supported not only individual representatives of an ethnic group but also brought undoubted benefits to the diaspora on the whole.

Generally, there were mutual understanding and a tolerant attitude between the Ekaterinoslav Jews and the Mennonites (the ethnic minorities who were treated with suspiciousness in Russian society for various reasons (!)). For example, anti-Semitism was not welcomed among the Mennonites. It seems like the two dynasties' representatives were

well aware of ethnic peculiarities of each other and were able to use them for their own benefit. The Mennonites and the Jews were culturally distant, that is why the history of their relationship was non-systemic. At the same time, some of them could maintain long-term personal contacts, which were based on purely pragmatic tasks in the sphere of business, professional mentality affinity (professional identity), and long years of cooperation.

The two Ekaterinoslav diasporas' political strategy for survival was also very similar. The Mennonites learned from the Jews to be public people, lobby for entrepreneurial interests, and use their own periodicals for influencing public sentiments. Taking into consideration all political rights restrictions of the Jews (until 1917) and anti-Germanism, peculiar for the Russian Empire public life after the 1870s, those two diasporas were able to occupy a worthy position in the city (at a positive stage of the provincial center development). In conditions of social cataclysms of the global and local scale (revolutions, pogrom events) and uncontrolled anarchy that threatened the representatives of two ethnic groups (also for different reasons), they followed the observation and waiting tactics, avoiding public support of another ethnic group representatives. The latter, however, didn't exclude separate cases of mutual assistance. After the Ukrainian revolution defeat and the national statehood project collapse, the diasporas, as the united ethnic communities of the city, lost their political subjectivity and representation for some time (before the indigenization policy). The proletarian state formation at the early Soviet stage does not allow us to further single out any interethnic components in the public life of the city.

¹ Diaspora is an ethnic social category. We consider Urban Diaspora as a group of particular ethnos representatives living outside the country of their origin and presenting their self-organization and social activities within the urban space. Not all ethnic groups of Ekaterinoslav proved to be diasporas. Despite all the peculiarities of European Jewish communities' history, the lack of their unifying metropolis, it was the Jews of the city who showed all the signs of the Diaspora. Mennonites also showed themselves in the same way.

² For example, the interaction of the German-speaking Mennonites with the Lutherans and Catholics living in the city is understandable and predictable, as well as the Jews' interaction with the Karaite population, which is close to them by religious and cultural traditions. There were about 100 Karaites in Ekaterinoslav [Памятная книга Екатеринославской губернии на 1864 г..., 99].

³ Soviet and post-Soviet historians name these types of ethnic communities as ethno-confessional (ethnoreligious) [Брук, Чебоксаров, Чеснов 1969; Петренко 2008].

⁴ The Russian Empire was an estate-type state. The system of estates lined up the boundaries and caused the social lift absence. This was the most important obstacle to the state's socio-economic development and Russian modernization.

⁵ The wave of Jewish resettlement to the Ukrainian territory was caused by Poland's partitions, as a result of which about 20,000 Jews entered the territories of Ukraine and Bessarabia. In total there were 1.6 million Jews in the Russian Empire (1825) [Миронов 2017, 339].

⁶ Privileges allowed the Jews to have their own ethnic educational institutions on the "Pale of Settlement" territory. The Talmud Torah (a charitable school for orphans and children from the poorest families) has operated in Ekaterinoslav since the late 1850s. The first-class Jewish school (for 40 students) was opened. There were 15 cheders, one yeshiva for training rabbis, and about 30 different schools at the end of the 19th century [Найман 2003, 277].

⁷ Isai Umansky (1836), Itsko Salpeiter (1839), Alexander Munshtein (1842), Abram Berdshadsky (1847), Itsko Bogoslovsky (1851), Joseph Saksagansky (1854), Isaac Stanislavsky (1860) and Joseph Dinansky (1874). City Duma deputies: G. L. Lutskey (1828–1830), M. V. Maidansky (1887–1890, 1893–1905), P. A. Labinsky (1888), A. O. Rokhlin (1909–1917), V. V. Ash (1913–1917), P. I. Gelman (1917–1918). The councilors appointed from the Jewish community of the city were J. Granovsky (1893–1894), M. Karpas (1897–1917), I. Granovsky (1909–1917) [Владимиров 1887, 240–246].

⁸ The lists of the deputies are presented in the periodicals called “Commemorative book of Ekaterinoslav province”. See: “Памятная книжка Екатеринославской губернии”, published in Russian. The volumes for 1889, 1894, 1899, 1900, 1903, 1910–1917 are available. The Mennonites – members of the Ekaterinoslav City Duma in different years were: Johann Fast (1893–1901), Heinrich Heese (1905–1909, 1913–1917), Johann Heese (1905–1909), Peter Heinrich Heese (1905–1909, 1913–1917), Johann Thissen (1897–1901, 1905–1917), Heinrich Toews (1901–1905), Johann Esau (1901–1905, 1909–1917) [Венгер 2009, 359].

⁹ Jewish entrepreneurs owned metallurgical and machine-building plants (Gelerschtain family, Leschaver brothers, V. Kropman, the heirs of the Zaslavskys family), metalwork factories (Shabad and Kogan; P. Nemirovsky, Zolberg); locksmiths and mechanical workshops (Gopper, I. Katshev). There were also Jewish printing houses (Shvartsman, Bershadsky, Bukhman, A. Khaytov), sawmills (E. Levenzon, Orshansky; M. Kogan, Gussman, Z. Shulman) and many other enterprises of various specializations [Фабрики, заводы и рудники... 1903, 152–170].

¹⁰ In 1905 the Mennonites attempted to create the first Mennonite political party “The Union of Freedom, Justice, and Peace” (P. Friesen was the project’s initiator), the political program of which was close to the liberal-Cadet platform, supplemented with the Christian messianic ideas [Martin 1996, 11–20].

¹¹ Dr. N. Semashko (Russian, 1874–1949), was a Soviet revolutionary, statesman, and academic who became People’s Commissar of Public Health and was one of the organizers of the health system in the Soviet Union.

¹² Bergman German Abramovich (1850–1919), businessman, landlord, zemstvo activist, deputy of the 3rd and 4th State Duma (presented Ekaterinoslav province).

¹³ It was a new name of the Dnipro city in 1926–2016.

¹⁴ In 1926 the Jewish population in the city numbered 62 000 [Матеріали з історії єврейської громади... 1992, 23].

ЛІТЕРАТУРА

- Адрес-календарь Екатеринославской губернии на 1915.** Екатеринослав, 1915.
- Арбатова З. Ю. Екатеринослав в 1917–1922 гг. // **Архив русской революции.** Т. 12. Берлин, 1923.
- Безаров А. Социально-психологические особенности еврейских погромов в Российской империи в конце XIX века // **Исторична панорама: Збірник наукових статей ЧНУ. Спеціальність Історія.** Чернівці, 2009.
- Безаров О. Т. **Єврейський чинник у революційному русі в Російській імперії (1861–1917 роки).** Чернівці, 2018.
- Бойко Я. В. Заселение Южной Украины. Формирование этнического состава населения края // **Этностатистический очерк.** Вып. 1. Черкассы, 2007.
- Брук С. И., Чебоксаров Н. Н., Чеснов Я. В. Проблемы этнического развития стран зарубежной Азии // **Вопросы истории,** 1969, № 1.
- Быстряков А. Г. **Евреи Екатеринослава – Днепропетровска.** Днепропетровск, 2001.
- Венгер Н. В. **Меннонитское предпринимательство в условиях модернизации Юга России: между конгрегацией, кланом и российским обществом (1789–1920).** Днепропетровск, 2009.
- Венгер Н. В. Немецкая колонизация и российский национализм: динамика формирования идеологических концептов и государственной политики // **Два с половиной века с Россией: материалы 4-й международной научно-практической конференции.** Москва, 2013.
- Венгер Н. В. Немецкий вопрос в системе идеологии и деятельности правомонархических партий в Российской империи (1905–1917) // **Образование, жизнь и судьба немецких поселений в России.** Москва, 2016.
- Венгер Н. В. Нестор Махно та “німецьке питання” на українських землях // **Перша світова війна і революції: вектори соціально-культурної трансформації: колективна монографія.** Київ, 2017.
- Вестник Екатеринославского земства,** № 42, 3 ноября 1905 г.
- Весь Екатеринослав 1915 г.** Екатеринослав, 1915.
- Владимиров В. В. **Первое столетие Екатеринослава.** Екатеринослав, 1887.
- Газети і журнали Катеринославщини (1838–1916).** Дніпропетровськ, 1993.

Ганелин Р. Ш. **Российское самодержавие в 1905 году. Реформы и революция.** Санкт-Петербург, 1991.

Грицак Я. **Нарис з історії України.** Київ, 2019.

Державний архів Дніпропетровської області (ДАДО, м. Дніпро, Україна), ф. 11, оп. 1, спр. 465, 1294; ф. 134, ор. 1, спр. 491, 503, 621, 780.

Дніпропетровськ: віхи історії. Дніпропетровськ, 2001.

Дружинина Е. И. **Кючук-Кайнарджийский мир 1774 года.** Москва, 1955.

Дружинина Е. И. **Северное Причерноморье в 1775–1800 г.** Москва, 1959.

Дружинина Е. И. **Южная Украина 1800–1825 гг.** Москва, 1970.

Еврейское население и землевладение в юго-западных губерниях европейской России, входящих в черту оседлости. Санкт-Петербург, 1884.

Екатеринославская губерния // **Еврейская энциклопедия: в 16 т.** Т. 7. Санкт-Петербург, 1910.

Етнонаціональний світ Придніпров'я: в 2 ч. Ч. 1. Харків, 2018.

Етнонаціональний світ Придніпров'я: в 2 ч. Ч. 2. Дніпро, 2019.

Журнал Екатеринославской городской думы. Екатеринослав, 1906.

Захарова Л. Г. Александр II // **Вопросы истории, 1992, № 6–7.**

Игреньев Г. **Екатеринославские воспоминания // Революция на Украине.** Москва – Ленинград, 1930.

Из истории еврейской хоральной синагоги // **Екатеринославский юбилейный листок, 1887, № 18.**

Кальян С. **Єврейська спільнота у політичному процесі на теренах підросійської України.** Полтава, 2009.

Кириянов Ю. И. **Рабочие России и война // Первая мировая война. Пролог XX века.** Москва, 1999.

Клиер Дж. Д. **Россия собирает своих евреев: происхождение еврейского вопроса в России: 1772–1825.** Москва – Иерусалим, 2000.

Краткая Еврейская энциклопедия: в 11 т. Т. 7, кол. 645–651. Иерусалим, 1994.

Кочергин І. **Олександр Поль: мрії, справи, спадщина.** Дніпропетровськ, 2002.

Линдеман К. Э. **Прекращение землевладения и землепользования поселян-собственников: Указы 2 февраля и 13 декабря 1915 г. и 10, 15 июня и 19 августа 1916 г. и их влияние на экономическое состояние Южной России.** Москва, 1917.

Лукьянов М. Н. “Россия – для русских” или “Россия – для русских подданных”? Консерваторы и национальный вопрос накануне Первой мировой войны // **Отечественная история, 2006, № 2.**

Материалы для географии и статистики России, собранные офицерами Генерального штаба. Екатеринославская губерния / сост. В. Павлович. Санкт-Петербург, 1862.

Матеріали з історії єврейської громади Дніпропетровщини. Дніпропетровськ, 1992.

Миллер А. **Империя Романовых и национализм.** Москва, 2006.

Миронов Б. Н. **Социальная история России периода империи: в 2 т.** Т. 2. Санкт-Петербург, 2000.

Миронов Б. Н. **Управление этническим многообразием Российской империи.** Санкт-Петербург, 2017.

Найман О. Я. **Історія євреїв України.** Київ, 2003.

Памятная книга Екатеринославской губернии 1864 г. Екатеринослав, 1864.

Памятная книга и адрес-календарь Екатеринославской губернии на 1900 г. Екатеринослав, 1900.

Періодичні видання Катеринослава та Катеринославської губернії (1838–1917). Львів – Київ, 1995.

Петренко С. П. **Этноконфессиональная общность как форма взаимосвязи религии и этноса // Вестник Таганрогского института имени А. П. Чехова, 2008, № 2.**

Писаревский Г. Г. **Из истории иностранной колонизации в России в XVIII веке.** Москва, 1909.

Республиканец, 15 января 1918 г.

Русский мельник, 1914, № 1.

Сартр Ж.-П. **Размышления о еврейском вопросе // Портрет антисемита.** Санкт-Петербург, 2006.

Сміт Е. **Національна ідентичність.** Київ, 1994.

Україна між самовизначенням та окупацією: 1917–1922 роки / В. Дорнік та ін. Київ, 2015.

Устав о промышленности. Санкт-Петербург, 1893.

Фабрики, заводы и рудники Екатеринославской губернии. Екатеринослав, 1903.

Центральний державний історичний архів України у м. Київ, ф. 2090, оп. 1, спр. 423.

Шляхов О. Україна в умовах модернізації та загострення соціального конфлікту (кінець XIX – початок XX ст.). Дніпропетровськ, 2016.

Яворницький Д. И. История города Екатеринослава. Днепропетровск, 1996.

Bartlett R. P. Human Capital: The settlement of Foreignness in Russia, 1762–1804. Cambridge, 1979.

Braun P. Education among the Mennonites in Russia // **Mennonite encyclopedia: in 4 vols.** Vol. 2. Hillsboro, Kansas, 1955–1959.

Epp G. K. Urban Mennonites in Russia // **The Mennonites in Russia.** Winnipeg, 1989.

Epp H. H., Thiessen Richard D. Epp, Heinrich D. (1861–1941) // **Global Anabaptist Mennonite Encyclopedia Online.** URL: [https://gameo.org/index.php?title=Epp,_Heinrich_D._\(1861-1941\)&oldid=112192](https://gameo.org/index.php?title=Epp,_Heinrich_D._(1861-1941)&oldid=112192) (дата звернення: 01.03.2021).

Heese P. Yekaterinoslaw // **Mennonite Heritage Centre Archives (Winnipeg, Canada),** Vol. 5015, Item 15.

Martin T. The Mennonites and the Russian State Duma // **The Donald W. Treadgold Papers in Russian, East European and Central Asian Studies.** Washington. Paper No. 4. January 1996.

Peter H. Heese's (1878–1947) manuscripts and papers // **Mennonite Heritage Centre Archives (Winnipeg, Canada),** File 4, Vol. 2250, Item 8.

Rempel D. G. The Mennonite Commonwealth in Russia: A sketch of its Founding and Endurance, 1789–1919 // **Mennonite Quarterly Review,** 1974, No. 4.

Shepherds, servants and prophets: Leadership among the Russian Mennonites (1880–1960) / ed. H. Loewen. Kitchener, Ontario, 2003.

Snyder A. Anabaptist spirituality and economics // **Mennonite faith and economics.** Lanham, New York, London, 1994.

Sunderland W. An Empire of Peasants: Empire-Building, Interethnic Interaction and Ethnic Stereotyping in the Rural World of the Russian Empire, 1800–1850 // **Imperial Russia: New histories of the Empire.** Bloomington, 1998.

Toews P. **The Russian Mennonite Story: The Heritage Cruise Lectures.** Winnipeg, 2018.

Venger N. V. The German / Mennonite Urban Communities in the Province of Ekaterinoslav during the Ukrainian Revolution: Between Devotion and Exodus // **Ежегодник международной ассоциации исследователей истории и культуры российских немцев.** № 8. Москва, 2020.

REFERENCES

Adres-kalendar' Ekaterinoslavskoy gubernii na 1915 (1915), Izdatel'stvo gubernskoy tipografii, Ekaterinoslav. (In Russian).

Arbatov Z. Yu. (1923), "Ekaterinoslav v 1917–1922 gg.", in *Arkhiv russkoy revolyutsii*, Slovo, Berlin, Vol. 12, pp. 83–148. (In Russian).

Bezarov A. (2009), "Sotsial'no-psikhologicheskiye osobennosti evreyskikh pogromov v Rossiyskoy imperii v kontse XIX veka", in *Istorichna panorama: Zbirnik naukovikh statey ChNU. Spetsial'nist' Istoriya*, Chernivets'kyu natsional'nyy universytet, Chernivtsi, pp. 7–36. (In Russian).

Byezarov O. T. (2018), *Yevreys'kyu chynnyk u revolyutsionomu rusi v Rosiys'kiy imperiyi (1861–1917 roky)*, Tekhnodruk, Chernivtsi. (In Ukrainian).

Boyko Ya. V. (2007), "Zaseleniye Yuzhnoy Ukrainy. Formirovaniye etnicheskogo sostava naseleniya kraya", in *Etnostatisticheskyy ocherk*, Issue 1, Vertikal', Cherkassy, pp. 3–47.

Bruk S. I., Cheboksarov N. N. and Chesnov Ya. V. (1969), "Problemy etnicheskogo razvitiya stran zarubezhnoy Azii", in *Voprosy istorii*, No. 1, pp. 89–93. (In Russian).

Bystryakov A. G. (2001), *Evrei Ekaterinoslava – Dnepropetrovska*, Art-Press, Dnepropetrovsk. (In Russian).

Venger N. V. (2009), *Mennonitskoye predprinimatel'stvo v usloviyakh modernizatsii Yuga Rossii: mezhdru kongregatsiyey, klanom i rossiyskim obshchestvom (1789–1920)*, Izdatel'stvo Dnepropetrovskogo natsional'nogo universiteta, Dnepropetrovsk. (In Russian).

- Venger N. V. (2013), “Nemetskaya kolonizatsiya i rossiyskiy natsionalizm: dinamika formirovaniya ideologicheskikh kontseptov i gosudarstvennoy politiki”, in *Dva s polovinoi veka s Rossiyei: materialy 4-y mezhdunarodnoy nauchno-prakticheskoy konferentsii*, MSNK, Moscow, pp. 34–55. (In Russian).
- Venger N. V. (2016), “Nemetskiy vopros v sisteme ideologii i deyatelnosti pravomonarkhicheskikh partiy v Rossiyskoy imperii (1905–1917)”, in *Obrazovaniye, zhizn' i sud'ba nemetskikh poseleniy v Rossii*, RusDoych, Moscow, pp. 142–165. (In Russian).
- Venher N. V. (2017), “Nestor Makhno ta ‘nimets’ke pytannya’ na ukrayins’kykh zemlyakh”, in *Persha svitova viyna i revolyutsiyi: vektory sotsial’no-kul’turnoyi transformatsiyi*, Kondor, Kyiv, pp. 240–255. (In Ukrainian).
- Vestnik Ekaterinoslavskogo zemstva* (1905), No. 42, November 3. (In Russian).
- Ves’ Ekaterinoslav 1915 g.* (1915), Izdaniye L. I. Satanovskogo, Ekaterinoslav. (In Russian).
- Vladimirov V. V. (1887), *Pervoe stoletie Ekaterinoslava*, Tip. Ya. M. Chauskogo, Ekaterinoslav. (In Russian).
- Hazety i zhurnaly Katerynoslavshchyny (1838–1916)* (1993), Porohy, Dnipropetrovsk. (In Ukrainian).
- Ganelin R. Sh. (1991), *Rossiyskoye samoderzhaviye v 1905 godu. Reformy i revolyutsiya*, Nauka, Saint Petersburg. (In Russian).
- Hrytsak Ya. (2019), *Narys z istoriyi Ukrayiny*, Yakaboo Publishing, Kyiv. (In Ukrainian).
- Derzhavnyy arkhiv Dnipropetrovs’koyi oblasti* (DADO) [State Archive of Dnipropetrovsk Region], Fond 11, Inventory 1, Files 465, 1294; Fond 134, Inventory 1, Files 491, 503, 621, 780.
- Dnipropetrovs’k: vikhy istoriyi* (2001), Hrani, Dnipropetrovsk. (In Ukrainian).
- Druzhinina E. I. (1955), *Kyuchuk-Kaynardzhiyskiy mir 1774 goda*, Izdatel’stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, Moscow. (In Russian).
- Druzhinina E. I. (1959), *Severnoye Prichernomor’ye v 1775–1800 g.*, Izdatel’stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, Moscow. (In Russian).
- Druzhinina E. I. (1988), *Yuzhnaya Ukraina 1800–1825 gg.*, Nauka, Moscow. (In Russian).
- Evreyskoye naseleniye i zemlevladieniye v yugo-zapadnykh guberniyakh evropeyskoy Rossii, vkhodyashchikh v chertu osedlosti* (1884), Izdatel’skiye arkhivy, Saint Petersburg. (In Russian).
- “Ekaterinoslavskaya guberniya” (1910), in *Evreyskaya entsiklopediya: in 16 vol.*, Tip. Akts. Obshch. Brokgauz-Efron, Saint Petersburg, Vol. 7, column 503. (In Russian).
- Etnonatsional’nyy svit Prydniprov’ya: in 2 vol.* (2018), Vol. 1, Fop Panov A. M., Kharkiv. (In Ukrainian).
- Etnonatsional’nyy svit Prydniprov’ya: in 2 vol.* (2019), Vol. 2, Lira, Dnipro. (In Ukrainian).
- Zhurnal Ekaterinoslavskoy horodskoy dumy* (1906), Ekaterinoslavskaya horodskaya tipohrafiya, Ekaterinoslav. (In Russian).
- Zakharova L. H. (1992), “Aleksandr II”, in *Voprosy istorii*, No. 6–7, pp. 58–79. (In Russian).
- Igrenev G. (1930), “Ekaterinoslavskiye vospominaniya”, in *Revolutsiya na Ukraine*, Gosudarstvennoye izdatel’stvo, Moscow and Leningrad, pp. 186–196. (In Russian).
- “Iz istorii evreyskoy khoral’noy sinagogi” (1887), in *Ekaterinoslavskiy yubileynyy listok*, No. 18, pp. 168–169. (In Russian).
- Kal’yan S. (2009), *Yevreys’ka spil’nota u politychnomu protsesi na terenakh pidrosiys’koyi Ukrayiny*, Dovkillya, Poltava. (In Ukrainian).
- Kir’yanov Yu. I. (1999), “Rabochiye Rossii i voyna”, in *Pervaya mirovaya voyna. Prolog XX veka*, Nauka, Moscow, pp. 432–446. (In Russian).
- Kliyer Dzh. D. (2000), *Rossiya sobirayet svoikh evreyev: proiskhozhdeniye evreyskogo voprosa v Rossii: 1772–1825*, Mosty kul’tury, Moscow and Jerusalem. (In Russian).
- Kratkaya Evreyskaya entsiklopediya: in 11 vol.* (1994), Vol. 7, Obshchestvo po issledovaniyu evreyskikh obshchin, Jerusalem, columns 645–651. (In Russian).
- Kocherhin I. (2002), *Oleksandr Pol’: mriyi, spravy, spadshchyna*, Natsional’na hirnycha akademiya, Dnipropetrovsk. (In Ukrainian).
- Lindeman K. E. (1917), *Prekrashcheniye zemlevladieniya i zemlepol’zovaniya poselyan-sobstvennikov: Ukazy 2 fevralya i 13 dekabrya 1915 g. i 10, 15 iyunya i 19 avgusta 1916 g. i ikh vliyaniye na ekonomicheskoye sostoyaniye Yuzhnoy Rossii*, Tipografiya K. Men’shova, Moscow. (In Russian).
- Luk’yanov M. N. (2006), “‘Rossiya – dlya russkikh’ ili ‘Rossiya – dlya russkikh poddannykh’? Konservatory i natsional’nyy vopros nakanune pervoy mirovoy voyny”, in *Otechestvennaya istoriya*, No. 2, pp. 36–46. (In Russian).

Materialy dlya geografii i statistiki Rossii, sobrannyye ofitserami General'nogo shtaba. Ekaterinoslavskaya guberniya (1862), Compl. by V. Pavlovich, Tipografiya Departamenta General'nogo shtaba, Saint Petersburg. (In Russian).

Materialy z istoriyi yevreys'koyi hromady Dnipropetrovshchyny (1992), Dnipro, Dnipropetrovsk. (In Ukrainian).

Miller A. (2006), *Imperiya Romanovykh i natsionalizm*, Novoye literaturnoye obozreniye, Moscow. (In Russian).

Mironov B. N. (2006), *Sotsial'naya istoriya Rossii perioda imperii: in 2 vol.*, Vol. 2, Dmitriy Bulavin, Saint Petersburg. (In Russian).

Mironov B. N. (2017), *Upravleniye etnicheskim mnogoobraziyem Rossiyskoy imperii*, Dmitriy Bulavin, Saint Petersburg. (In Russian).

Nayman O. Ya. (2003), *Istoriya yevreyiv Ukrayiny*, Akademiya istoriyi ta kul'tury yevreyiv Ukrayiny, Kyiv. (In Ukrainian).

Pamyatnaya kniga Ekaterinoslavskoy gubernii 1864 g. (1864), Izdatel'stvo Ekaterinoslavskogo gubernskogo zemskogo komiteta, Ekaterinoslav. (In Russian).

Pamyatnaya kniga i adres-kalendar' Ekaterinoslavskoy gubernii na 1900 g. (1900), Izdatel'stvo gubernskogo statisticheskogo komiteta, Ekaterinoslav. (In Russian).

Periodychni vydannya Katerynoslava ta Katerynoslavs'koyi huberniyi (1838–1917) (1995), Naukova biblioteka imeni V. Stefanyka, Lviv and Kyiv. (In Ukrainian).

Petrenko S. P. (2008), “Etnokonfessional'naya obshchnost' kak forma vzaimosvyazi religii i etnosa”, in *Vestnik Taganrogskogo instituta imeni A. P. Chekhova*, No. 2, pp. 52–57. (In Russian).

Pisarevskiy G. G. (1909), *Iz istorii inostrannoy kolonizatsii v Rossii v XVIII veke*, Pechatnya Snegirevoy, Moscow. (In Russian).

Respublikanets (1918), January 15. (In Russian).

Russkiy mel'nik (1914), No. 1. (In Russian).

Sartr Zh-P. (2006), “Razmyshleniya o evreyskom voprose”, in *Portret antisemita*, Azbukaklassika, Saint Petersburg, pp. 125–250 (In Russian).

Smit E. (1994), *Natsional'na identychnist'*, Osnovy, Kyiv. (In Ukrainian).

Ukrayina mizh samovyznachennyam ta okupatsiyeyu: 1917–1922 roky (2015), Nika-Tsentr, Kyiv. (In Ukrainian).

Ustav o promyshlennosti (1893), Knizhnyy magazin N. K. Martynova, Saint Petersburg. (In Russian).

Fabriki, zavody i rudniki Ekaterinoslavskoy gubernii (1903), Tipografiya Bratstva Svyatogo Vladimira, Ekaterinoslav. (In Russian).

Central State Historical Archives of Ukraine in Kyiv, Fond 2090, Inventory 1, File 423. (In Ukrainian).

Shlyakhov O. (2016), *Ukrayina v umovakh modernizatsiyi ta zahostrennyia sotsial'noho konfliktu (kinets' XIX – pochatok XX st.)*, Hrani, Dnipropetrovsk. (In Ukrainian).

Yavornitskiy D. I. (1996), *Istoriya goroda Ekaterinoslava*, Sich, Dnepropetrovsk. (In Russian).

Bartlett R. P. (1979), *Human Capital: The settlement of Foreignness in Russia, 1762–1804*, University Press, Cambridge.

Braun P. (1955–1959), “Education among the Mennonites in Russia”, in *Mennonite encyclopedia: in 4 vols*, Vol. 2, Mennonite Publishing House, Hillsboro, Kansas, p. 156.

Epp G. K. (1989), “Urban Mennonites in Russia”, in *The Mennonites in Russia*, CMBC Publication, Winnipeg, pp. 239–259.

Epp H. H. and Thiessen Richard D., “Epp, Heinrich D. (1861–1941)”, in *Global Anabaptist Mennonite Encyclopedia Online*, available at: [https://gameo.org/index.php?title=Epp,_Heinrich_D._\(1861-1941\)&oldid=112192](https://gameo.org/index.php?title=Epp,_Heinrich_D._(1861-1941)&oldid=112192) (accessed March 1, 2021).

Heese P., “Yekaterinoslaw”, in *Mennonite Heritage Centre Archives (Winnipeg, Canada)*, Vol. 5015, Item 15.

Martin T. (1996), “The Mennonites and the Russian State Duma”, in *The Donald W. Treadgold Papers in Russian, East European and Central Asian Studies*, paper No. 4, University of Washington, Washington, pp. 11–20.

“Peter H. Heese's (1878–1947) manuscripts and papers”, in *Mennonite Heritage Centre Archives (Winnipeg, Canada)*, File 4, Vol. 2250, Item 8.

Rempel D. G. (1974), "The Mennonite Commonwealth in Russia: A sketch of its Founding and Endurance, 1789–1919", in *Mennonite Quarterly Review*, No. 4, pp. 281–288.

Shepherds, servants and prophets: Leadership among the Russian Mennonites (1880–1960) (2003), H. Loewen (ed.), Pandora Press, Kitchener, Ontario.

Snyder A. (1994), "Anabaptist spirituality and economics", in *Mennonite faith and economics*, University Press of America, Lanham, New York and London, pp. 3–19.

Sunderland W. (1998), "An Empire of Peasants: Empire-Building, Interethnic Interaction and Ethnic Stereotyping in the Rural World of the Russian Empire, 1800–1850", in *Imperial Russia: New histories of the Empire*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, pp. 174–198.

Toews P. (2018), *The Russian Mennonite Story: The Heritage Cruise Lectures* (2018), A. Friesen (ed.), Centre for Transnational Mennonite Studies, Winnipeg.

Venger N. V. (2020), "The German / Mennonite Urban Communities in the Province of Ekaterinoslav during the Ukrainian Revolution: Between Devotion and Exodus", in *Ezhegodnik mezhdunarodnoy assotsiatsii issledovateley istorii i kul'tury rossiyskikh nemtsev*, No. 8, Moscow, pp. 35–54.

Н. В. Венгер

**Єврейська та менонітська громади Катеринослава:
партнерство та взаємодопомога як стратегія виживання
в поліетнічному оточенні (1800–1920)**

У статті досліджується історія культурної та економічної взаємодії двох діаспорних груп м. Катеринослава (євреїв та менонітів) у період 1800–1917 рр. Наявність цих етно-конфесійних груп у суспільному та фінансовому житті міста було досить помітною, а їхня взаємодія простежується протягом усього дорадянського періоду. При всіх культурних та соціальних відмінностях, як євреї, так і меноніти активно займалися підприємництвом, що забезпечувало збіг їхніх економічних інтересів. Діаспори також об'єднувало соціально-правове становище в державі (обидві були представниками неправославних етносів із частково обмеженими правами). Перші ознаки міждіаспорної культурної взаємодії простежуються з 1860-х рр., коли окремі єврейські підприємці, незважаючи на наявну систему етнічної освіти, віддавали своїх нащадків до менонітської школи. На новому модернізаційному етапі історії міста (з 1870-х рр.) євреї та меноніти активно співпрацювали в розвитку борошномельної, деревообробної промисловості та у сфері інвестицій. Схожою була й політична стратегія виживання діаспор у другій половині XIX – на початку XX ст. Меноніти вчилися в євреїв бути публічними людьми, лобювати підприємницькі інтереси (застосовуючи трибуну міської думи) і впливати на суспільні настрої городян, використовуючи етнічні періодичні видання. При тому, що антисемітизм серед менонітів засуджувався, в умовах соціальних катаклізмів глобального і локального масштабів (1880–1920 рр.: революції, погроми, бандитизм та анархія), вони дотримувалися тактики вичікування, уникаючи публічної підтримки представників іншої етнічної групи. Останнє, однак, не виключало окремих випадків групової взаємодопомоги під час погромів та взаємної підтримки між окремими родинами, що були об'єднані довгими роками співробітництва та довіри. Після поразки Української революції і колапсу проекту національної державності діаспори як об'єднані етнічні спільноти міста втратили свою політичну та економічну суб'єктність.

Ключові слова: євреї, меноніти, Катеринославі, борошномельна промисловість, етнічна освіта, модернізація, погроми, Українська революція

Стаття надійшла до редакції 31.07.2021