

J. Staples

## THE MENNONITE COMMONWEALTH PARADIGM AND THE DNEPROPETROVSK SCHOOL UKRAINIAN MENNONITE HISTORIOGRAPHY

В статті проаналізовані напрацювання Дніпропетровської школи вивчення історії менонітів. Зроблений їх порівняльний аналіз з досвідом роботи в даній сфері представників англomовної історіографії.

The Mennonite Commonwealth idea has become paradigmatic in English-language literature about post-reform Ukrainian Mennonites. The paradigm originated in the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century with the work of E.K. Francis, an Austrian-trained sociologist and author of a famous study of Canadian Mennonites. The paradigm characterizes Mennonites in late Tsarist Russia as a community that self-consciously and successfully isolated itself from its neighbours. This accounted for its cultural vibrancy and wealth, but also contributed to its downfall when it became a victim of the homogenizing Soviet state<sup>1</sup>.

In this essay I will argue that the Commonwealth paradigm is fundamentally flawed, and that its continued influence on Mennonite scholarship in North America stands in the way of the emergence of Tsarist and Soviet Mennonite studies as a significant subfield of Ukrainian and Russian history. Scholars who accept the paradigm are ignoring significant new work by Ukrainian scholars that refutes many of its key elements. This does not mean that the new Ukrainian scholarship should be accepted without question, for it is subject to underlying influences that tend to overemphasize integration. The way forward begins with a reassessment of both approaches, not least in international conferences such as this one.

The main focus of E.K. Francis, the originator of the Mennonite Commonwealth paradigm, was the formation of ethnic groups. Francis explained his theory of ethnic group formation in a 1947 essay, "The Nature of the Ethnic Group", in the prestigious *American Journal of Sociology*<sup>2</sup>. He was attempting to distinguish the ethnic group from both small localised communities and larger nation-states. He argued that communities might sometimes become ethnic groups and ethnic groups might sometimes become nation-states but this transformation was never certain, and because

ethnic groups could survive both within nation-states and as trans-national phenomena they needed to be separately identified and understood.

Francis suggested that ethnic groups emerged out of "primary groups" (localised communities) that possessed a "we-feeling" based on "allegiance to some external object... a monarch, a religion, language and literature, other forms of higher culture, a political ideology,... a class, a 'race'"<sup>3</sup>. In order for such a primary group to become a "secondary group" (an ethnic group), it required a catalyst that permitted the extension of "the pattern of social interaction which is characteristic of the primary group ... to a larger, less well-defined, and culturally less homogeneous group"<sup>4</sup>. The resultant ethnic group, he argued, "not only permits a high degree of self-sufficiency and segregation but tends to enforce and preserve it"<sup>5</sup>.

The catalyst in this process of transformation, Francis wrote, was "a mental process based on abstraction and hypostatical transposition of characteristics from the primary group to the secondary group... The followers of a new religion, for instance, are moved by the overriding value they attach to their faith to withdraw their we-feeling from the non-believing members of their original community and to extend it to all fellow-believers"<sup>6</sup>.

Beginning from this theory, Francis sought a living laboratory to prove his case. He found one in the Manitoba Mennonites who had immigrated to Canada from the tsarist empire and the Soviet Union beginning in the 1870s. In the late 1940s Francis conducted extensive field work in Manitoba Mennonite communities, leading to the 1955 publication of his most important work, *In Search of Utopia: The Mennonites In Manitoba*<sup>7</sup>. This was a seminal study of Canadian Mennonites, and it remains influential today. The book contains, in abbreviated form, the 1951 Mennonite Commonwealth essay cited above. Together the essay and book constitute the genesis of the Mennonite Commonwealth paradigm.

Francis identified two central features of the creation of the tsarist Mennonite ethnic group: Subjectively the Mennonite immigrants were motivated not only by the "desire to escape the [Prussian] threat to their religious principles and economic welfare, ... the positive hope ... of ... realizing the utopian community suggested by the moral and social ideals of their religion, without outside interference and independently from the wicked "world" [and] a legal framework provided by the Russian government which not only permitted the almost complete segregation of homogeneous groups but tended to increase and protect their homogeneity, closure, and self-sufficiency"<sup>8</sup>.

The catalytic moment in this self-isolating process, according to Francis, came in the 1870s, when the tsarist government, determined to incorporate national minorities more thoroughly into the Russian state, introduced russification policies that threatened the core Mennonite rights of exemption from military service and self-administration of their educational system. Mennonites responded by mobilising to protect their rights, and in the process they defined and institutionalised their ethnic identity into a Mennonite Commonwealth. Francis particularly emphasised what he saw as the success of tsarist Mennonites in isolating themselves from their surrounding community<sup>9</sup>.

Francis was not a historian? and for his knowledge of Ukrainian Mennonite history he relied upon two doctoral dissertations written in the early 1930s: David G. Rempel's "The Mennonite Colonies in Russia" and Adolf Ehrt's *Das Mennonitentum in Rußland*<sup>10</sup>. Their work provided Francis with a version of Mennonite history that was based on a narrow, German-language source base.

Francis's brief summary of Tsarist Mennonite history was transformed into an enduring paradigm in 1974 when David Rempel published his seminal essay, "The Mennonite Commonwealth in Russia"<sup>11</sup>. Ironically, Rempel's essay is only a summary of his 1933 dissertation, which in turn was Francis's key source for the Mennonite Commonwealth paradigm.

While Rempel adopts the Commonwealth label in his title, he does little to support the Commonwealth idea in his analysis. Far from identifying the reforms of the 1870s as the impetus for the emergence of a more clearly defined Mennonite identity, Rempel suggests that they drove the most radical Mennonites to emigrate to Canada and the United States, leaving a remnant who "recognized the justice of the reforms" and "were satisfied with the concessions they had obtained"<sup>12</sup>. It comes as a surprise when Rempel concludes by describing Russian Mennonites as a "state within a state", and arguing that they had "assumed most of the attributes of an ethnic subgroup"<sup>13</sup>. Rempel had accepted Francis' idea of the Commonwealth as an accurate representation of tsarist Mennonite society, despite making no significant attempt to reexamine it through additional research.

It is understandable that Rempel's essay, with its sweeping assessment of Mennonite history, helped set the research agenda for a new generation of historians; it is less understandable that the Commonwealth paradigm, which was an afterthought in Rempel's essay, should gain such a strong hold on western historians. It may not have done so without James Urry.

No one is more important in the development of the western historiography of Mennonites than Urry. Like Francis, he initially regarded Ukrainian Mennonites as an ideal case study, precisely because they seemed to be a closed culture<sup>14</sup>. While he subsequently recognized that this community was shaped in significant ways by its neighbours, in the end he acknowledges that his important study, *None But Saints*, is “a book about Mennonites, for Mennonites”<sup>15</sup>.

*None But Saints* remains the most important study of tsarist Mennonites yet published, and is unlikely to be supplanted from that position any time soon. In it, Urry shows himself to be extremely well-read in the published primary and secondary sources, and he describes with great clarity the dynamics of tsarist Mennonite society as it encountered modernity in the nineteenth century. His description of Mennonite religious disputes in particular is a model of articulate historical reconstruction.

For all of its merits, *None But Saints* also has significant failings. Most importantly, while Urry was fully conversant with the German- and English-language sources, he did not read Russian, and therefore had almost no knowledge of Russian-language sources. Indeed, he seems to have relied almost wholly on David Rempel’s interpretation of those sources. As a consequence, while Urry provides sharp, incisive criticism of the western historiography, he sometimes repeats the broad and unfounded generalisations of Soviet historians (presumably gained second-hand), without the least sense of their inadequacies<sup>16</sup>.

Urry characterizes Ukrainian Mennonite society as internally diverse, but in their relationship to their Ukrainian neighbours he portrays Mennonites as a monolithic, exploitive group. This is a product of the Mennonite Commonwealth paradigm. Urry writes: “A Mennonite commonwealth began to emerge which, as a religious and civil community, was representative of all Mennonites who now constituted a distinct cultural and social group in Russia”<sup>17</sup>. This illustrates the problem with the paradigm is illustrated, for Urry’s understanding of the Russian part of the story is closely bounded by David Rempel’s interpretation. Urry does not explore the implications of his own work and ask if the diverse society he describes had significant points of integration with Ukrainian society. This is a consequence of his lack of knowledge of Russian, for he is limited to sources that do indeed seem to reflect isolation. The Commonwealth paradigm – based mainly on a slim ten pages of theorising by Francis – both provided the interpretation and legitimised it.

Since 1989, Urry’s interpretation of tsarist Mennonites has dominated the field, and, despite the opening of the archives, Russian-language

sources remain virtually untapped in English language literature on Ukrainian and Russian Mennonites. There has been no serious analysis of the central concepts of the paradigm, and very little English-language scholarship at all on the history of Ukrainian Mennonites in the post-reform period.

Most new scholarship on post-reform Mennonite history has been carried out by Ukrainian scholars associated with the Institute of Ukrainian-German Historical Research in Dnepropetrovsk. A careful assessment of this scholarship is long overdue, for it raises fundamental questions about the Commonwealth paradigm, and consequently about western interpretations of Ukrainian Mennonites.

The Dnepropetrovsk Institute was founded in the 1990's. A group of German historians, led by Alfred Eisfeld and Detlef Brandes, exerted a strong influence on the Institute's early work. They brought with them a research agenda that concentrated on the relationship of the Tsarist and Soviet governments to German-speaking minorities. This focus meant that German historiography made few distinctions between different German-speaking minorities. At first, historians at the Dnepropetrovsk Institute seemed to follow their German colleagues in studying "German" historical subjects as a monolithic category<sup>18</sup>.

But there were, from the outset, specifically Ukrainian concerns that occupied the attention of the Dnepropetrovsk School. The leader in defining a distinct Dnepropetrovsk agenda has been the Institute's director, Svetlana I. Bobyleva, who has overseen the Institute's activities from its outset and shaped its most important contributions to the study of German - and Mennonite - colonists. Bobyleva has played a crucial role in nurturing and promoting a new generation of Ukrainian scholars, pushing them to move beyond Soviet dogmas and create a distinctive Dnepropetrovsk School of Ukrainian historiography. Under her tutelage, scholars such as Oksana Beznosova, Aleksandr Beznosov, and Natalia Venger have begun to reinterpret the history of Ukrainian Mennonites<sup>19</sup>.

Bobyleva has long been a heartfelt champion of bringing "historical justice" to persecuted minorities. Good history, she has argued, is moral history that corrects the misinformation that typified Soviet accounts of minorities, and investigates the "white pages" of the Soviet past<sup>20</sup>. A second important theme in Bobyleva's work is the construction of a Ukrainian national history of tolerance and multi-ethnicity, consistent with the ideals of civic nationalism. As she wrote in her introduction to the 1998 edition of *Voprosy Germanskoi Istorii*: "The analysis of the problem of the role, place, and participation of the German population of Ukraine in the socio-

economic and public life, its contribution to the process of broader national development, must play a major role in the revival of national self-consciousness and promote the harmonization of relations between nationalities in modern Ukraine"<sup>21</sup>.

Mennonites began to emerge as a distinct topic in Dnepropetrovsk in 1996. At first this did not lead to distinguishing Mennonites sharply from "German colonists". Rather, Mennonites remained a subcategory of Germans. But this was not just imitation of the German historiography. Dnepropetrovsk scholars had accepted the Ukrainian state agenda of constructing a tolerant, multi-ethnic past. They were eager to demonstrate that "Germans" fit into that history, and guided by this agenda they were not likely to portray any ethnic sub-group of the Germans as distinct outsiders.

Clearly the Mennonite Commonwealth paradigm did not sit easily with the developing agenda of the Institute. Still, as the Dnepropetrovsk School struggled to fit Mennonites into their picture, some Dnepropetrovsk scholars closely echoed the Commonwealth paradigm, relying heavily on Urry's construction of it. This is most clear in Venger's 1998 monograph, *The Epoch of Transformation: the Mennonite Commonwealth in Ukraine, 1914-1931*<sup>22</sup>. Despite its title, Venger's book includes no serious consideration of the Commonwealth paradigm, settling for a brief summary of the historiography based on Urry's *None But Saints*<sup>23</sup>. Even here Venger sounds a cautionary note, writing that the "concept demands a fuller explication"<sup>24</sup>.

By the time *The Epoch of Transformation* was published, Venger had begun her own "fuller explication", turning her attention to Mennonite industrialists in the post-reform period. Now her doubts about the paradigm began to emerge more forcefully. In 1998 she wrote that, although there was a Mennonite "variant" of industrialization, Mennonite industrialists were "overcoming obstacles of a national character" - i.e., undergoing integration, and not, as the Commonwealth paradigm would suggest, isolation. By 2003, Venger was sharply critical of the western Mennonite historiography that had produced and perpetuated the paradigm, writing: "The work of Mennonite historians, because of the remoteness of the authors from the archives, frequently lacks the necessary concreteness, and their work acquires the character of *a priori* panegyrics"<sup>25</sup>. While Venger accepted that the success of Mennonite industrialists was in part based on a "confessional-clan character", she argued that there were equally important local and international factors that influenced their success. Moreover, she insisted, their success was leading toward assimilation, and not isolation.

Oksana Beznosova provides an important second example of how integration, rather than isolation, has emerged as a dominant theme of the Dnepropetrovsk School. Beznosova has focused on how pietism emerged in both the Mennonite and German communities and then spread into Ukrainian peasant communities<sup>26</sup>. In a series of essays she has documented points of contact between Mennonites and Ukrainians, thus emphasizing integration instead of isolation. Most intriguingly, in a recent essay she argues that the Ukrainian Mennonite scholar P.M. Friesen intentionally left unmentioned the extent of Mennonite-Ukrainian religious contact in order to protect the Mennonite Brethren from unwanted scrutiny from the Orthodox Church<sup>27</sup>. Beznosova shows that Friesen's account fails to mention important evidence of a shared Mennonite-Ukrainian religious life. This raises significant questions about a western Mennonite historiography that is based almost exclusively on Mennonite sources, of which Friesen is a mainstay.

It must be said that the Dnepropetrovsk School's conscious effort to construct a civic version of Ukrainian national identity presents the danger of historicism. This approach is sometimes more concerned with constructing Ukraine's future than reconstructing its past, and the results, while intriguing, must be assessed with care. There is evidence to suggest that Mennonites did constitute a special case in Ukraine, distinct from other German-speakers. One of the reasons that Mennonite historians have identified them as a people apart is that the tsarist state understood them in this way. Although the Mennonite Commonwealth paradigm overstates Mennonite isolation, there is reason to suspect that the Dnepropetrovsk school understates it.

But whatever the pitfalls of the Dnepropetrovsk School's approach, the failure of western historians to take it seriously is a significant obstacle for the further advancement of Ukrainian Mennonite scholarship. This is evident in two recently-published western studies, James Urry's *Mennonites, Politics, and Peoplehood*<sup>28</sup> and Abraham Friesen's *In Defense of Privilege*<sup>29</sup>. These are the first monographic studies addressing the Commonwealth period since the collapse of the Soviet Union. Each relies heavily on the Mennonite Commonwealth paradigm, perpetuating traditional scholarship on Ukrainian Mennonites.

Urry's book is a broad survey of Mennonite engagement in politics. He argues that Mennonites, far from isolating themselves from politics, were throughout their history forced to engage with governments in order to secure and preserve their privileges. The Charters that Mennonites negotiated are central to Urry's argument. He contends that they provided the

nexus of Mennonite political engagement, ensuring the continuation of the Mennonites' distinct status. But, he argues, because the Charters were essentially medieval in their understanding of subject-ruler relations, they diverted Mennonites from engaging in the new political processes that evolved in the nineteenth century. Consequently, when the Russian empire devolved into political chaos in the first decades of the twentieth century, Mennonites were unprepared to deal with the new political realities and defend their interests.

Urry's claim that Mennonites were always politically engaged seems a welcome challenge to the Commonwealth paradigm. Unfortunately, the main thrust of his argument contradicts this; the process he describes, of a Mennonite defense of an antiquated Charter, emphasizes rather than discredits the Commonwealth paradigm, while his sources, drawn from the same old, in-group Mennonite records, bind him in the constraints of that paradigm<sup>30</sup>. Urry is not disputing the existence of the Commonwealth, only the Utopian character ascribed to it by Mennonites. As with *None But Saints*, he constructs a vision of a community that retained its monolithic character in its relationship both to its non-Mennonite neighbours and to the state.

The work of the Dnepropetrovsk School refutes Urry's argument by showing that diverse elements of Mennonite society engaged separately with diverse elements of Ukrainian society, leading toward a multidimensional process of integration. This suggests that, contrary to Urry's central assertion, the Charter was not an insurmountable roadblock to Mennonite integration. Unfortunately, Urry completely fails to engage with the new Ukrainian scholarship,

Friesen's *In Defence of Privilege* displays the same basic flaws as Urry's new book. Friesen's core argument is that Mennonites, by gaining and defending their distinctive privileges, brought Soviet repression upon themselves. The Commonwealth paradigm is essential to his argument, and he subscribes to it unconditionally<sup>31</sup>. Concentrating on a small group of Mennonite intellectuals, Friesen, an intellectual historian, finds intriguing currents in the writings of his subjects. As he shows, Mennonite intellectuals were consciously constructing a version of Mennonite history that they thought would help them survive the political chaos that was engulfing them. However, Friesen does not even acknowledge the diverse interest groups in Mennonite society, and he dismisses the work of social historians who have documented diversity<sup>32</sup>.

*In Defence of Privilege* is an example of the worst influence of the Commonwealth paradigm. It is based on the assumption that tsarist Men-



nonites lived an isolated existence, independent of their Ukrainian context. It attempts to understand Mennonites without reference to Russian- or Ukrainian-language sources, and without serious reference to secondary literature on Russian history. This is precisely the type of "a priori panegyric" that Dr. Ostasheva correctly berates<sup>33</sup>.

Urry's and Friesen's books are not just a representative sample; apart from a handful of narrowly focused essays they are virtually the only recent English-language scholarship on post-reform Ukrainian Mennonite history. Unfortunately, their primary contribution to Mennonite scholarship is to pointedly remind us of that scholarship's short-comings. Blind to the Russian- and Ukrainian-language literature, they at once depend upon and reinforce the Mennonite Commonwealth paradigm.

The post-reform period of Ukrainian Mennonite history was pivotal to the subsequent experiences of Mennonites. It produced the Mennonite Brethren emigration to Canada and the United States; it created a well-educated, prosperous group of industrialists and farmers whose wealth helped build a physical culture mat is still evident in Ukraine and America; it gave birth to a body of literature that continues to influence our understanding of Mennonite cultural and intellectual currents; and it produced, in the hands of some historians, an explanation for late-tsarist and Soviet repression of Mennonites that places the blame on the Mennonite victims.

Such an important historical epoch deserves careful scrutiny, and yet, in western historiography, it is probably the least carefully studied period of the entire Ukrainian Mennonite story. Instead of close, professional historical reconstruction, it has been left to theory-driven pronouncements.

The Dnepropetrovsk School has begun to offer an alternative history, but it has not yet produced a definitive interpretation. The desire of Dnepropetrovsk scholars to construct a Ukrainian state history that they hope will lend itself to a more tolerant future is admirable, but it may also be an obstruction. Historicism, after all, seldom produces satisfactory explanations of historical developments. Their work would benefit from more careful attention to the things that make the Mennonite story unique.

The most hopeful path to a fuller understanding of post-reform Mennonite history is through the interaction of western, Ukrainian and Russian scholars. While there may have been no Mennonite Commonwealth, the singularity of the Mennonite experience in Ukraine must still be recognized and accounted for by Ukrainian scholars. At the same time, the multiple levels of integration that the Dnepropetrovsk School has identified must surely undermine simplistic interpretations that Mennonites were exploiters who brought repression upon themselves. The Dnepropetrovsk school

is actively pursuing new understandings. Its scholars are assessing the western literature and exploring new theoretical approaches to accompany their archival research. Unfortunately, there is little sign that western scholars are prepared to meet them halfway.

If there is a Mennonite commonwealth, it is a commonwealth of western Mennonite historians who have isolated themselves from the surrounding scholarly world. That isolation must first end if the Mennonite commonwealth paradigm is to give way to a more nuanced understanding of the Mennonite experience in Ukraine.

### Notes

<sup>1</sup> Francis, E.K. The Mennonite Commonwealth in Russia, 1789-1914: A Sociological Interpretation / E.K.Francis // *Mennonite Quarterly Review*. - 1951. - N 25:3. - P. 173-182, 200. - Further: MQR.

<sup>2</sup> Francis, E.K. The Nature of the Ethnic Group / E.K.Francis // *The American Journal of Sociology*. - 1947. - March (N 52:5). - P. 393-400.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* - P. 398.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* - P. 399.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> Francis, E.K. In Search of Utopia: The Mennonites in Manitoba / E.K.Francis. - Glencoe [Illinois], 1955.

<sup>8</sup> Francis, E.K. The Mennonite Commonwealth in Russia. - P. 174-175.

<sup>9</sup> Francis, E.K. In Search of Utopia. - P. 24-25.

<sup>10</sup> Rempel, D.G. The Mennonite colonies in Russia: a study of they settlement and economic development from 1789 to 1914: Ph.D. Diss. / David G.Rempel. - Stanford University, 1933; Ehrt, A. Das Mennonitentum in Rußland: von einer Einwanderung bis zur Gegenwart / Adolf Ehrt. - Berlin, 1932.

<sup>11</sup> Rempel, D.G. The Mennonite Commonwealth in Russia: A Sketch of ist Founding and Endurance, 1789-1919 / David G.Rempel // MQR. - 1973. - N 47:4. - P. 259-308; 1974. - N 48:1. - P. 5-54.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.* - P. 41.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.* - P. 50.

<sup>14</sup> Urry, J. None But Saints: The Transformation of Mennonite Life in Russia, 1789-1889 / James Urry. - Winnipeg, 1989. - P. 16. For Urry's critical assessment of this approach to anthropology, see his introduction to: *Urry, J. Before Social Anthropology: Essays on the history of British anthropology* / James Urry. - Chur [Switzerland], 1993.

<sup>15</sup> Urry, J. None But Saints. - P. 18.

<sup>16</sup> See, e.g., Urry's use of E.I.Druzhinina's doctrinaire Soviet Marxist accounts of the settlement and development of New Russia. Urry, who admits to having no knowledge of Russian, inexplicably cites Druzhinina and other Soviet- and tsarist-era Russian-language sources in many places in his study.

<sup>17</sup> Urry, J. None But Saints. – P. 252.

<sup>18</sup> See, for example, Brandes' discussion of "The Landlessness Question in the German Colonies, where the Molochna Mennonite crisis in his main example, but the general discussion is extended broadly to other German settlers: *Brandes, D. Von den Zaren adoptiert: Die deutschen Kolonisten und die Balkansiedler in Neurussland und Bessarabien, 1751-1914* / D.Brandes. – Munich, 1993. – S. 335-347.

<sup>19</sup> Note that Natalia Venger's pre-2001 publications appeared under the name Ostasheva.

<sup>20</sup> For a particularly clear example, see: *Ostasheva [Venger], N.V. Na perelome epoch: Mennonitskoe soobshchestvo ukrainy v 1914-1931 gg.* / N.V.Ostasheva. – Moscow, 1998. – S. 8. The moral "mission" defined by Bobyleva has influenced the work of Russian scholars of Mennonites as well – see, e.g.: *Cherkaz'ianova, I.V. Shkol'noe obrazovanie rossiiskikh nemtsev (problem razvitiia i sokhraneniia nemetskoj shkoly v Sibiri v XVIII-XX vv.)* / I.V.Cherkaz'ianova. – St. Petersburg, 2004. – S. 10.

<sup>21</sup> *Bobyleva, S.I. Preface* / S.I.Bobyleva // *Voprosy germanskoi istorii: Sb. nauch. tr.* – Dnepropetrovsk, 1998. – S. 3.

<sup>22</sup> *Ostasheva [Venger], N.V. Na perelome epoch.*

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.* – S. 43-44.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.* – S. 43.

<sup>25</sup> *Venger, N.V. Promyshlennye mennonitskie dinastii g.Aleksandrovka* / N.V.Venger // *Voprosy germanskoi istorii: Sb. nauch. tr.* – Dnepropetrovsk, 2003. – S. 22-23.

<sup>26</sup> See, e.g.: *Beznosova, O.V. Rol' nemetskiikh kolonistov i mennonitov v rasprostraneniui protestantizma sredi pravoslavnogo naseleniia Ukrainy vo vtoroi polovine XIX veka* / O.V.Beznosova // *Voprosy germanskoi istorii: Sb. nauch. tr.* – Dnepropetrovsk, 1996. – S. 76-86.

<sup>27</sup> *Beznosova, O.V. O chem. umolchal P.M.Frizen? Mennonity i Pravoslavnaiia tserkov' v Tsarskoi Rossii, 1860-1917* / O.V.Beznosova // *Voprosy germanskoi istorii: Sb. nauch. tr.* – Dnepropetrovsk, 2005.

<sup>28</sup> *Urry, J. Mennonites, Politics, and Peoplehood: Europe-Russia-Canada, 1525-1980* / James Urry. – Winnipeg, 2006.

<sup>29</sup> *Friesen, A. In Defense of Privilege: Russian Mennonites and the State before and during World War I* / Abraham Friesen. – Winnipeg, 2006.

<sup>30</sup> *Urry, J. Mennonites, Politics, and Peoplehood.* – P. 5.

<sup>31</sup> *Friesen, A. In Defense of Privilege.* – P. 260.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.* – P. 347.

<sup>33</sup> *Venger, N.V. Promyshlennye mennonitskie dinastii g.Aleksandrovka.* – S. 22-23.

Надійшла до редколегії 20.09.2007