Jews, Ukrainians, and Russians in Kiev: Intergroup Relations in Late Imperial Associational Life

Natan M. Meir

One of the best vantage points from which to consider the dynamics of interethnic and interconfessional relations, particularly those between Jews and non-Jews, in the late Russian empire is provided by the associational life within the empire's largest cities. The recent spate of social histories that focus on or include Russian Jews have only just begun to explicate their place in the landscape of fin-de-siècle civil society. One particularly rich lode of information on this subject is turn-of-the-century Kiev. The case of Kiev's Jews, their indeterminate place in the civic culture of the city, and their troubled relations with Russians and Ukrainians all shed light on the ambiguities of the sphere of *obshchestvennost'* (public or civic life) for Russian Jews. Is it possible to speak of a measure of Jewish integration in Kiev, as is the case with Jews in most cities in central and western Europe in this period? Or is that too hopeful a term?

Kiev, one of the largest cities in the strategically and economically important southwest region of the empire, was populated by Russians and Ukrainians alongside a growing number of Jews; nonetheless, as we shall see, it "could [not] be called a Ukrainian city; neither could it be considered fully Russian."[1] Indeed, an analysis from a purely ethnic or national perspective is anachronistic, in that the Russian empire's diversity encompassed "a wide range of collective identities"—not only national but also religious, social, and regional identities.[2]

Students of both Russian history and Jewish history are familiar with the ambiguous position of Jews within the Russian imperial framework before 1881–82, as with the repressive policies of the Russian state introduced after that momentous turning point.[3] The two pogroms that took place in Kiev in 1881 and 1905, along with local anti-Jewish restrictions, day-to-day hostility, and rising nationalist sentiment would seem to have made the prospect of integration of any kind impossible. The animosities and tensions that the following pages describe will not, then, come as a revelation. The small but significant islands of neighborly interaction, co-

The writing of this article was made possible in part by a grant from the British Academy. I am grateful to Eugene Avrutin, Jane McDermid, and David Rechter for their helpful comments, as well as to Diane P. Koenker and the two anonymous readers of *Slavic Review*. An earlier version was presented at the "Jews in Multi-Ethnic Networks" conference, Haifa University, 20 December 2004. All errors remain my own.

1. Michael Hamm, *Kiev: A Portrait, 1800–1917* (Princeton, 1993), 83.

2. Anders Henriksson, "Nationalism, Assimilation and Identity in Late Imperial Russia: The St. Petersburg Germans, 1906–1914," *Russian Review* 52, no. 3 (July 1993): 341.

3. See John Doyle Klier, *Imperial Russia's Jewish Question, 1855–1881* (Cambridge, Mass., 1995); Hans Rogger, *Jewish Policies and Right-Wing Politics in Imperial Russia* (Berkeley, 1986); Benjamin Nathans, *Beyond the Pale: The Jewish Encounter with Late Imperial Russia* (Berkeley, 2002).

operation, and even conviviality that we shall see may indeed be surprising, however. And yet the reality of meaningful interaction between Jews and non-Jews in Kiev cannot be discounted, nor can the extent to which some Jews felt at home in the society and culture of imperial Russia. Such interaction was not limited to commercial contacts, which had existed for centuries and, as Todd Endelman has written with regard to Jewish-Christian relations in England, "were generally of an instrumental and formal character" and at times could even hinder contact of a warmer nature when individuals evaluated each other purely on the basis of how they conducted business.[4] People coming together in the context of voluntary societies, charities, and educational institutions had something in common other than personal gain, and that sense of common purpose surely made it easier to overcome prejudices and forge working partnerships, acquaintanceships, and even friendships with members of other ethnic and religious groups.

Scholars have recently pointed out the importance of the voluntary sector within late imperial Russia's small but growing civil society. Kiev and other large cities were home to a rapidly growing number of associations, societies, clubs, and charities that provided a middle ground between the state and the individual, offered an outlet for political energies that until 1905 could not be expressed outside the limited municipal sphere, challenged the established social order based on *soslovie* (estate) and rank, promised the amelioration of many aspects of municipal life (especially in the realms of education and health) as well as individual self-improvement, and encouraged professionalization.[5] For Jews, whose opportunities to enter public life were becoming ever fewer as government restrictions blocked or severely narrowed the path to participation in municipal government, higher education, and the bar, the voluntary sector offered an alternative—and a chance to be active in a nonsectarian quarter of society that was truly "all-imperial."[6] But as Joseph Bradley

4. Todd M. Endelman, *The Jews of Georgian England, 1714–1830: Tradition and Change in a Liberal Society* (Philadelphia, 1979), 249.

5. On civil society in the Russian empire, see Joseph Bradley, "Subjects into Citizens: Societies, Civil Society, and Autocracy in Tsarist Russia," *American Historical Review* 107, no. 4 (October 2002): 1094–1123; Laura Engelstein, "The Dream of Civil Society in Tsarist Russia: Law, State, and Religion," in Nancy Bermeo and Philip Nord, eds., *Civil Society before Democracy: Lessons from Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Lanham, Md., 2000); the helpful collection of articles in Edith W. Clowes, Samuel D. Kassow, and James L. West, eds., *Between Tsar and People: Educated Society and the Quest for Public Identity in Late Imperial Russia* (Princeton, 1991); and also Louise McReynolds and Cathy Popkin, "The Objective Eye and the Common Good," in Catriona Kelly and David Shepherd, eds., *Constructing Russian Culture in the Age of Revolution: 1881–1940* (Oxford, 1998), 57–98. On voluntary and philanthropic associations, see especially Adele Lindenmeyr, *Poverty Is Not a Vice: Charity, Society, and the State in Imperial Russia* (Princeton, 1996), and Joseph Bradley, "Voluntary Associations, Civic Culture, and *Obshchestvennost'* in Moscow," in Clowes, Kassow, and West, eds., *Between Tsar and People,* 131–48.

6. Of course for some individuals this activity may have held the added potential of helping to combat anti-Semitism, as non-Jews witnessed the contributions of Jews to society and formed a more positive image of them. Paula Hyman speculates that this may have been the case with Jewish women's volunteer activity in Germany. Paula E. Hyman, "Two Models of Modernization: Jewish Women in the German and the Russian Empires," *Studies in Contemporary Jewry* 16 (2001): 43.

points out, even as associational life fostered a new spirit of obshchestvennost′ in the empire's cities, the associations "also promoted new identities and groupings based on craft, profession, culture, and choice"—and, we may add, nationality.[7] Nowhere could this contradiction be seen more clearly than in Kiev, a city of a quarter million in 1897 where three prominent ethnic groups—Russian, Ukrainian, and Jewish—lived side by side with smaller populations of Poles, Germans, Czechs, and others.[8] Even as individuals came together to improve city life for specific socioeconomic, religious, or occupational groups, the pull of national identification remained strong and grew only stronger as the empire, and especially its western borderlands, grew more polarized in the last decades of tsarist rule.[9] Kiev's voluntary sector provided common ground where Jews and non-Jews could come together, but ethnic tensions present everywhere in society could not be erased or forgotten even here. Without discounting the significance of the national question, however, the evidence also points to class as a secondary but still important factor in the formation of civil society in Kiev; as Hamm writes, "toward the end of the nineteenth century, . . . occupation, education, and income came increasingly to determine status and recreational choices."[10]

In the following pages, I will highlight the ambiguities inherent in the partial integration that some Jews, especially educated middle-class Jews, experienced in Kiev. This work, and the very use of the term *integration* in the context of Russian Jewry, are informed by recent trends in scholarship, especially Benjamin Nathans's magisterial *Beyond the Pale: The Jewish Encounter with Late Imperial Russia,* which "demonstrate that Jewish integration into Russian society began long before the Revolution of 1917" and emphasize Russian Jewry's "aspirations for civic emancipation and social integration."[11] These studies problematize the twin images of Russian Jewry as either a long-suffering, rightless, and passive minority within the

7. Bradley, "Voluntary Associations," 148. Charles Steinwedel writes that "in late imperial Russia, a type of enlightened civic inclusion and religion competed with ethnicity as bases for integration." Steinwedel, "To Make a Difference: The Category of Ethnicity in Late Imperial Russian Politics, 1861–1917," in David L. Hoffmann and Yanni Kotsonis, eds., *Russian Modernity: Politics, Knowledge, Practices* (New York, 2000), 81.

8. Another city with a similarly diverse population and a vibrant, often ethnic-group-specific associational life was Riga; see Anders Henriksson, "Riga: Growth, Conflict, and the Limitations of Good Government, 1850–1914," in Michael F. Hamm, ed., *The City in Late Imperial Russia* (Bloomington, 1986), 194–97, 200.

9. Daniel R. Brower, "Urban Revolution in the Late Russian Empire," in Hamm, ed., *City in Late Imperial Russia,* 329.

10. Hamm, *Kiev,* 169.

11. Nathans, *Beyond the Pale,* 2, 10. Other recent studies of Jewish acculturation, assimilation, and integration in the Russian context are Yuri Slezkine, *The Jewish Century* (Princeton, 2004); Harriet Murav, *Identity Theft: The Jew in Imperial Russia and the Case of Avraam Uri Kovner* (Stanford, 2003); Gabriella Safran, *Rewriting the Jew: Assimilation Narratives in the Russian Empire* (Stanford, 2000). Steven Zipperstein, *The Jews of Odessa: A Cultural History, 1794–1881* (Stanford, 1985), and Zipperstein, "Haskalah, Cultural Change, and Nineteenth-Century Russian Jewry: A Reassessment," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 35, no. 2 (1983): 191–207 remain standard works on the subject. As Michael Stanislawski points out, though Jews could not hope to call themselves Russians in the ethnic sense (*russkii*), a small but growing number did feel at home with the label *rossiiskii,* denoting affiliation with the Russian empire and especially with Russian language and culture. Michael Stanis-

Russian empire or as a group mobilized by its desperate situation to undertake political activity or to engage in personal action in the form of emigration. Both pictures insist on the continued isolation of Russian Jews from the imperial society that surrounded them, a conception that this article disputes and disproves. This may come as a particular surprise in the case of Kiev, a city infamous for two brutal pogroms (in addition to others, far more deadly, after 1917) and the Beilis blood libel affair, as well as onerous restrictions on Jewish settlement and vicious police roundups of illegal Jews. But it is precisely this image of Kiev that has continued to dominate the scholarship and thus obscure the reality of Jewish-Christian relations there, which did include some significant positive encounters.[12] Likewise, the excellent work that has been done on Russian state policy on the nationalities question often includes the empire's Jews, but usually focuses on official attitudes, at most detailing some Jewish responses to those attitudes or providing a sketch of internal Jewish socioeconomic, cultural, and political developments.[13] Many of these works are striking for their breadth of coverage, but often that very breadth hinders their authors from providing the kind of extended study of one locality or issue that is needed for a deeper understanding of the place of Jews within quotidian society.

Two pioneering works of social history published in the past half-decade have brought us closer to this understanding, each in its own context.[14] In *Beyond the Pale,* Nathans chooses three different arenas in which to limn the Russian-Jewish encounter: the geographic and symbolic territory of the imperial capital, far from the densely populated Pale of Settlement, and the social and ideational realms of the empire's student culture and legal profession. Chae-Ran Freeze, in her *Jewish Marriage and Divorce in Imperial Russia,* focuses on the ways in which changing gender, religious, and communal norms brought the Russian state ever closer to the

lawski, *Zionism and the Fin-de-Siècle: Cosmopolitanism and Nationalism from Nordau to Jabotinsky* (Berkeley, 2001), 123–25.

12. See, for example, Michael Hamm's *Kiev,* where an excellent description of Jewish life and community in Kiev is nonetheless overshadowed by the discussion of the 1881 pogrom, the Beilis affair, and, above all, the 1905 pogrom.

13. See Edward C. Thaden and Marianna Forster Thaden, *Russia's Western Borderlands, 1710–1870* (Princeton, 1984); Theodore R. Weeks, *Nation and State in Late Imperial Russia: Nationalism and Russification on the Western Frontier, 1863–1914* (DeKalb, 1996). On ethnicity and ethnic relations in the Russian empire generally, see Andreas Kappeler, *Rußland als Vielvölkerreich: Entstehung, Geschichte, Zerfall* (Munich, 1992); for a perceptive exploration of the development of ethnicity as a significant category for the organization of society, see Steinwedel, "To Make a Difference, " 67–86. For recent analyses of collective identity in the Russian empire focusing on Central Asia, see Robert P. Geraci, *Window on the East: National and Imperial Identities in Late Tsarist Russia* (Ithaca, 2001), and Daniel R. Brower and Edward J. Lazzerini, eds., *Russia's Orient: Imperial Borderlands and Peoples, 1700–1917* (Bloomington, 1997). For a highly suggestive examination of the relationship between the state and religious community and identity, see Robert Crews, "Empire and the Confessional State: Islam and Religious Politics in Nineteenth-Century Russia," *American Historical Review* 108, no. 1 (February 2003): 50–83.

14. For a review that details the accomplishments and shortcomings of both books, see Olga Litvak, "You Can Take the Historian Out of the Pale, But Can You Take the Pale Out of the Historian? New Trends in the Study of Russian Jewry," *AJS Review* 27, no. 2 (November 2003): 301–12.

everyday lives of Russian Jews.[15] I am also concerned with the everyday lives of "ordinary" Jews but focus instead on their encounters with their neighbors—Russians and Ukrainians—in the context of the voluntary associations of civil society. The few decades before 1905—not quite a "golden age" but still relatively peaceful—yield a number of fascinating examples of interethnic contact. Yet even after the 1905 pogrom, which shattered most Jews' hopes for peaceful coexistence with their Christian neighbors in Kiev, Jews and non-Jews continued to come together in professional and even social contexts. Moreover, these encounters did not necessitate Jews "becoming" Russian or even abandoning their Jewishness, though many individuals were acculturated to some degree. This point is crucial because the field continues to suffer from the impressionistic duality of isolated shtetl Jew versus assimilated, Russified, or even deracinated Jewish *intelligent*.[16] Kiev—a city seen by many Russian officials and subjects as quintessentially Russian and Orthodox yet home to thousands of Jews, a city legally "beyond the Pale" yet sitting right in the heart of a territory of historic Jewish settlement—is an ideal place to view the encounter between the average urban Jew and the Christian townsperson. In a city where ethnic segregation was the norm, the extent of interaction and cooperation—even when imperfect or restricted in some way—was truly remarkable and allows us to point to a very limited but no less real Jewish integration even in Kiev.

Kiev, City on an Ethnic Fault Line

Located in a region populated by Ukrainians and Jews that had shifted from Polish to Russian rule in the seventeenth century, Kiev was a city sitting on an ethnic fault line. Since the abolition of Ukrainian autonomy by Catherine the Great in the late eighteenth century, Russian influence had made itself increasingly felt in the Ukrainian lands, and especially in Kiev, the largest city in the region. Administrative russification left a rump Ukrainian "nation" consisting almost exclusively of peasants, while Ukrainian noblemen, merchants, and artisans were for the most part absorbed into their respective imperial estates, which were linguistically and culturally Russian.[17] But even these peasants did not call themselves "Ukrainian" but simply "peasants" or "Orthodox."[18] Starting in the 1860s and 1870s, rapid economic, social, and demographic changes within Russian Jewry, as well as the force of government policies, led to intensive Jew-

15. Chae-Ran Y. Freeze, *Jewish Marriage and Divorce in Imperial Russia* (Hanover, 2002).

16. The most recent example of this is Slezkine's *Jewish Century,* where the author contrasts the traditional Jews in the Pale of Settlement, who inhabited a completely different world from that of their Christian neighbors, to the generation of young Jews striving toward Russification in the 1870s and 1880s whose "joyous return to Russian togetherness meant a permanent escape from the Jewish home." Slezkine, *Jewish Century,* 137. See also Nathans, *Beyond the Pale,* 377.

17. Zenon E. Kohut, *Russian Centralism and Ukrainian Autonomy: Imperial Absorption of the Hetmanate, 1760s–1830s* (Cambridge, Mass, 1988).

18. Hamm, *Kiev,* 83; Weeks, *Nation and State in Late Imperial Russia,* 123–26; Bohdan Krawchenko, "The Social Structure of Ukraine at the Turn of the Twentieth Century," *East European Quarterly* 16, no. 2 (June 1982): 176.

ish urbanization in the western borderlands (the Pale of Settlement), even as peasants seeking work in the developing industrial economy swelled the urban population throughout the empire.[19] For their part, Russian merchants and industrialists also sought their fortunes in Kiev, the administrative and commercial center of the Russian southwest (right-bank Ukraine), whose population almost doubled in the decade between 1864 and 1874, when it reached 124,000, and doubled yet again between 1874 and 1897.[20] In 1874, only 28 percent of the city's population were native-born Kievans; of the migrants to Kiev, just under half of the new arrivals were from the southwest region, most of them Ukrainians and Jews, while the balance were Russians and Jews from other regions of the empire.[21] The 1897 census put the city's Great Russian population at 54 percent, while Ukrainians constituted 22 percent of the total and Jews, 12 percent.[22]

Continuous Jewish in-migration alongside intense pressures to adapt and acculturate of the kind usually found in large cities meant that the Jewish community of Kiev was diverse in its social, cultural, and religious makeup. Residence restrictions led to the formation of two heavily Jewish neighborhoods, though these areas were by no means exclusively or even majority Jewish. In the last decades of the tsarist regime, however, more and more Jews could be found living throughout the city alongside their Christian neighbors.[23] In the 1897 census, 6 percent of Kiev's Jews claimed Russian as their mother tongue, but far more must have been functionally bilingual, speaking it as their language of everyday use in a city where over half the population was Russian-speaking.[24]

Though there were a few prominent Ukrainian families among the city's economic elite, most of Kiev's captains of industry and commerce were Russians and, increasingly, Jews, who made up the lion's share of Kiev's first-guild merchants throughout the late imperial period (85 percent in the mid-1890s; non-Jews were more likely to be members of the less prosperous second-guild merchantry).[25] Ukrainians played a much

19. Arcadius Kahan, "The Impact of Industrialization in Tsarist Russia on the Socioeconomic Conditions of the Jewish Population," in Arcadius Kahan, *Essays in Jewish Social and Economic History,* ed. Roger Weiss (Chicago, 1986), 27–34.

20. Yakov Lestschinsky, "Di idishe bafelkerung in Kiev fun 1897 biz 1923," *Bleter far idishe demografie, statistik un ekonomik* 5 (1925): 50.

21. Institut istorii Akademiia nauk URSR, *Istoriia Kieva* (Kiev, 1963), 1:339.

22. Only those who gave their native language as Ukrainian were classified as ethnically "Ukrainian"; the percentage of Kievans who were ethnic Ukrainians would probably have been higher if Russian speakers had been included.

23. *Izvestiia Kievskoi gorodskoi dumy,* no. 5 (May 1909): 22–31; Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv (RGIA), f. 821 (Departament dukhovnykh del inostrannykh ispovedanii MVD), op. 8, d. 153, ll. 139–139ob. ("Evrei v g. Kieve"); Tsentral'nyi derzhavnyi istorychnyi arkhiv Ukraïny, Kyïv (TsDIAU), f. 442 (Kantseliaria Kievskago, Podol'skago i Volynskago general-gubernatora), op. 628, spr. 388, ark. 30 (O razreshenii evreiam sovershat' bogosluzhenie v dome Benediksa po Bibikovskomu bul'varu v g. Kieve).

24. B. Gol'dberg, "O rodnom iazyke u evreev Rossii," *Evreiskaia zhizn',* no. 4 (April 1905): 77; Lestschinsky, "Di idishe bafelkerung," 54.

25. A. P. Subbotin, *V cherte evreiskoi osedlosti: Otryvki iz ekonomicheskogo izsledovaniia v zapadnoi i iugo-zapadnoi Rossii za leto 1887 g.,* vol. 2, *Belostok, Ostropol', Polonnoe, Berdichev, Zhitomir, Kiev, Odessa* (St. Petersburg, 1888), 159.

smaller role in the modernization and industrialization of the southwest regions than did Russians and Jews; they migrated to the cities in fewer numbers, were less educated, and when rising to positions of economic and social prominence were likely to become Russified fairly rapidly.[26] As Bohdan Krawchenko points out, it is only in the demographic sense that Ukrainians were a majority in the Ukrainian lands; the so-called minorities "dominated the social, economic, cultural, and political life" of the region.[27] Russian was thus the primary language of business and trade in Kiev, but it is likely that Ukrainian (or an admixture of Ukrainian and Russian called *surzhik*) was spoken in some quarters, especially in poorer neighborhoods.[28] Indeed, the 1874 census revealed that although ostensibly 80 percent of Kiev's populace fell into the linguistic category labeled "Russian," 40 percent of those people were counted as speaking "Little Russian," while 50 percent of them spoke what the census-takers called "generally Russian speech" (perhaps a reference to surzhik).[29] By 1897, however, the proportion of Ukrainians in the city had dropped to only slightly more than one-fifth. As Hans Rogger points out, however, for many peasants arriving in the big city, "their awareness of being Russian or Ukrainian was heightened in a multi-ethnic environment."[30]

The nature of relations between Jews and Christians in the Ukrainian lands varied depending on ethnic group and socioeconomic class. Most Russian bureaucrats and merchants moving to Kiev from the inner provinces of the empire had probably met few if any Jews before, and their knowledge of Jews and Judaism was likely limited to the stereotypes that surfaced in official imperial policy and in the relatively few works of Russian literature that discussed Jews; that is, as exploiters of the peasantry, enemies of Christianity, and individuals detrimental to the economic well-being of the state.[31] Poles and Ukrainians, on the other hand, had a long history of interaction with the Jews of the former Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, characterized by both economic interdependence and mu-

26. Orest Subtelny, *Ukraine: A History,* 2d ed. (Toronto, 1994), 272; Krawchenko, "Social Structure of Ukraine," 172; Paul Robert Magocsi, "The Ukrainian National Revival: A New Analytical Framework," *Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism* 16, nos. 1–2 (1989): 46; Patricia Herlihy, "Ukrainian Cities in the Nineteenth Century," in Ivan Rudnytsky, ed., *Rethinking Ukrainian History* (Edmonton, 1981), 135. In this sense Kiev was remarkably similar to Prague, with a significant Jewish population living alongside the hegemonic nationality that was nonetheless a minority in that region of the empire (the Germans), and a "minority" group (in terms of power, not numbers) corresponding to the peasant majority in that region (the Czechs). See Gary B. Cohen, *The Politics of Ethnic Survival: Germans in Prague, 1861–1914* (Princeton, 1981).

27. Krawchenko, "Social Structure of Ukraine," 171. Krawchenko also notes that "the larger the town . . . the fewer the Ukrainian inhabitants." Ibid., 174.

28. Hamm, *Kiev,* 94.

29. Ibid., 106.

30. Hans Rogger, "Conclusion and Overview," in John D. Klier and Shlomo Lambroza, eds., *Pogroms: Anti-Jewish Violence in Modern Russian History* (Cambridge, Eng., 1992), 337.

31. See John Doyle Klier, *Russia Gathers Her Jews: The Origins of the "Jewish Question" in Russia, 1772–1825* (DeKalb, 1986), 182–87; Rogger, *Jewish Policies;* Elena M. Katz, "Representations of 'the Jew' in the Writings of Nikolai Gogol, Fyodor Dostoevsky and Ivan Turgenev" (PhD diss., University of Southampton, 2003).

tual antagonism. Starting in the late sixteenth century, Polish (and Polonized Ukrainian) magnates had begun to invite Jews to settle on their estates and in private towns in the Ukrainian lands in order to provide essential economic services; the Christian burghers in this region, however, often resented Jewish competition.[32] Some citizens' groups attempted to attain the *de non tolerandis judaeis* right for their town, and at times—such as in Kiev in 1619—they succeeded. The relationship between Jews and peasants was also problematic, melding peaceable (or at least uneventful) day-to-day interaction with religious antagonism (including anti-Judaism on the part of Christians and a negative valuation of Christianity on the part of Jews) and peasant resentment of Jews for the supporting role they played in Polish economic hegemony in the region and especially the *arenda* leaseholding system.[33] The two groups often inhabited different sociogeographical terrains, Jews predominating in the market town (or shtetl) and Ukrainian peasants residing in agricultural village settlements. The modern period brought rapid change and upheaval for all these groups, however, and, though individual migrants to the city surely brought with them traditional images of how a typical Jew, Ukrainian, or Russian was supposed to behave, in the context of the late imperial city economic and social roles could not remain as rigid as in past times or in rural areas.[34]

Jews in Kiev found themselves caught between two (or even three) nationalities, a situation that was almost inevitable in such a contested city. As Jewish in-migration grew through the second half of the nineteenth century and Jews became much more visible in Kiev, some local Russians started to grumble about a Jewish "conquest" of the mother of Russian cities.[35] Kiev held great significance for Russians as the capital of medieval Rus′ and a bastion of Russian Orthodoxy, the "Jerusalem of Russia," and second in religious importance only to Moscow, and some government

32. While ethnic identity is a highly problematic term in this period, if identified by native language these burghers were likely to be Poles, Ukrainians, Germans, or Armenians.

33. Shmuel Ettinger, "Jewish Participation in the Settlement of Ukraine in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries," in Peter Potichnyj and Howard Aster, eds., *Ukrainian-Jewish Relations in Historical Perspective* (Edmonton, 1988), 28–29; Subtelny, *Ukraine: A History,* 124; Frank Sysyn, "The Jewish Factor in the Khmelnytsky Uprising," in Potichnyj and Aster, eds., *Ukrainian-Jewish Relations in Historical Perspective,* 48; Murray Jay Rosman, *The Lords' Jews: Magnate-Jewish Relations in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth during the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge, Mass, 1990). For an especially sensitive treatment of mutual perceptions, see Howard Aster and Peter J. Potichnyj, *Jewish Ukrainian Relations: Two Solitudes* (Oakville, Ont., 1983). A concrete illustration of Ukrainians' resentment of Jews is the original design for the statue of Bohdan Khmel′nyts′kyi in Kiev, showing the Cossack leader's steed crushing a Polish noble and a Jewish *arendator.* John D. Klier, "*Kievlianin* and the Jews: A Decade of Disillusionment, 1864–1873," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 5, no. 1 (1982): 86–87.

34. Brower, "Urban Revolution," 326–31.

35. *Kievlianin,* no. 106 (11 May 1880), and many other articles in *Kievlianin* in the late 1860s and 1870s; on the evolution of the newspaper's stance on the Jewish question, see Klier, *Imperial Russia's Jewish Question,* 182–203 ("Kiev Is Russian"), and Klier, "*Kievlianin* and the Jews." See also Andrei Nikolaevich Murav′ev, "Zapiska o sokhranenii samobytnosti Kieva (Nachalo 1870-kh gg.)," *Iehupets* 5 (1999): 259–67.

and church officials expressed anxiety that allowing Jews to live near Christian holy places would be a provocation to the sensibilities of the "Christian masses."[36] After the Polish uprising of 1863 and the emergence of a Ukrainian nationalist movement, many more Russians in Kiev and throughout the borderlands turned to strident nationalism in response to these new "threats."

Indeed, Kiev (or Kyiv, as it has always been known by Ukrainians) held a special place in the symbolic world of Ukrainians, which began to achieve expression with the emergence of the *hromada* (society) movement of Ukrainian national and cultural consciousness in the mid-nineteenth century.[37] The attitudes of Ukrainian *intelligenty* toward the Jews ranged from friendly to hostile and, understandably, the question of relations between the two groups often hinged on the perception of the Jewish role in the complex triangulation of national interests in the region. Were Jews shills for the imperial government and its program of Russification, or were they another oppressed nation that might be interested in allying with the Ukrainians to throw off the tsarist yoke? Many Ukrainian intellectuals and political leaders were resentful of what they saw as a Jewish alliance with the repressive Russian state.[38] (For obvious reasons, acculturating Jews in the late empire chose to learn Russian, not Ukrainian.) Nationalist Ukrainians hoped, of course, that the Jews would join forces with the Ukrainians against tsarism, as evidenced quite concretely by advertisements—in Ukrainian—placed in Jewish publications for Ukrainian-language newspapers and journals such as *Ukraina* and *Khata*.[39] The Revolutionary Ukrainian Party, founded in 1900, condemned the persecution and official repression of Russian Jewry in strong terms.[40] And in response, not only did Jewish socialist parties often ally themselves with Ukrainian and Russian groups, but individual Jews joined the Kiev hromada and later the Ukrainian socialist party Spilka (Ukrainian Social Democratic Union).[41] Liberal Jewish organizations in Kiev (the Non-Party Jewish Organization

36. TsDIAU, f. 442, op. 50, spr. 302, ark. 1–6 (Delo o zapreshchenii meshchanam evreiskago veroispovedaniia priobresti uchastok zemli okolo tserkvi Rozhdestvo Khristova na Podole); RGIA, f. 821, op. 9, d. 97, ll. 8–9 (Po voprosu o razreshenii evreiam zhit' vo vsekh chastiakh g. Kieva).

37. Magocsi, "Ukrainian National Revival"; Ivan Rudnytsky, "The Intellectual Origins of Modern Ukraine," in Ivan Rudnytsky, ed., *Essays in Modern Ukrainian History* (Edmonton, 1987), 123–41.

38. For a summary of statements by seminal Ukrainian thinkers on the Jewish question, see Ivan Rudnytsky, "Ukrainian-Jewish Relations in Nineteenth-Century Ukrainian Political Thought," in Potichnyj and Aster, eds., *Ukrainian-Jewish Relations in Historical Perspective,* 69–83. For discussions of these issues in the Ukrainian press, see "Evreis'ka sprava i ukraïns'ki techii," *Slovo,* no. 6 (1909), and S. O. Efremov, *Evreis'ka sprava na Ukraïni (Odbytok z "Rady")* (Kiev, 1909).

39. See, for example, most issues of *Khronika evreiskoi zhizni* in 1906.

40. Yury Boshyk, "Between Socialism and Nationalism: Jewish-Ukrainian Political Relations in Imperial Russia, 1900–1917," in Potichnyj and Aster, eds., *Ukrainian-Jewish Relations in Historical Perspective,* 177.

41. Hamm, *Kiev,* 251*n*63, and 109; this is also attested to in a history of the Zionist movement written by two secret police officials in TsDIAU, f. 274, op. 1, spr. 2444 (Spravka Departamenta politsii po istorii sionistskago dvizheniia). The Spilka was a Marxist party

[*Vnepartiinaia evreiskaia organizatsiia*] and the Kiev branch of the Union for the Attainment of Equal Rights for the Jewish People in Russia [*Soiuz dlia dostizheniia polnopraviia evreiskago naroda v Rossii*]) collaborated with the Kadet party and with Polish and Ukrainian organizations to mobilize the electorate in preparation for the first Duma elections in 1906. According to some reports, many peasants voted for M. Chervonenkis, one of the Jewish candidates for Duma deputy in Kiev province. For their part, after the elections, two of the non-Jewish deputies—one Ukrainian, the other Polish—pledged to fight for Jewish rights as well for those of their own nationality.[42]

Interactions between the ethnic groups took place in the realm of ideas—in books, newspapers, and political programs—but also in the sphere of everyday life: in voluntary societies, schools, libraries, mutual-aid societies, and social clubs. While most Jewish participation in associational life was in the context of specifically Jewish societies, many Jews were also active in—or at least took advantage of the benefits offered by—non-Jewish institutions.

Public Education and Literacy

The Russian empire's small but growing civil society, most visible in large cities like Kiev, was one area where people of goodwill from different nationalities could come together to improve society. Within this arena, the public (that is, informal) education movement has been called "the central locus of philanthropic efforts."[43] In this regard, the Kiev Literacy Society (*Kievskoe obshchestvo gramotnosti*) is an interesting example of Jewish-Christian and Jewish-Ukrainian interaction.[44] The society, established in 1882 with an all-Christian board and a church-oriented program including the creation of parish-based village libraries, was by 1898—at the behest of two Jewish members—petitioning the authorities for permission to open a Jewish Saturday adult literacy school in addition to its existing Sunday literacy schools in Kiev. From the moment it opened its doors in 1897, the society's library and reading hall attracted a large proportion of Jews, and this number ballooned over the next decade, from one-fifth in 1897, to one-third in 1899, to 56 percent in 1904. In 1902, out of a total of 54,000 visits, almost 18,000 were made by Jews; and two years later over 1,500 Jews were library subscribers, making up 56 percent of the total; the overwhelming majority of library users were under the age of twenty.[45] The increase in Jewish numbers was due in part to the library's move to

that rejected nationalism as a meaningful political category of analysis. See Paul R. Magocsi, *A History of Ukraine* (Toronto, 1996), 279.

42. *Khronika evreiskoi zhizni,* no. 18 (10 May 1906): 26–29.

43. McReynolds and Popkin, "The Objective Eye and the Common Good," 66.

44. This discussion is based on annual reports of the society from 1896 through 1906: Kievskoe obshchestvo gramotnosti, *Otchet za . . . god* (Kiev, 1896–1906). See also *Hamm, Kiev,* 165–66.

45. The library was the most popular in the city. By contrast, the most heavily visited of the municipal libraries received about 30,000 visits per year. Kievskoe obshchestvo gramotnosti, *Otchet za 1902 god* (Kiev, 1903), 87.

the Literacy Society's new People's House in the heavily Jewish Lybed neighborhood, a change on which the 1902 annual report commented positively.[46] Construction of the new building was funded wholly by the Jewish sugar baron Lazar' Brodskii (by means of a gift of 14,000 rubles in memory of his daughter Vera), while his daughter Baroness Klara Ginzburg donated significant sums each year for book acquisition. By 1906, many of Kiev's most recognizable Jewish names were on the membership list.

The extent of Jewish involvement in the Literacy Society is even more interesting when we take into account that the organization's leadership was strongly Ukrainophile, not surprising given the fact that the literacy movement in Ukraine had close ties to the hromadas and nascent Ukrainian nationalism, especially through the Prosvita Ukrainian enlightenment movement.[47] The society's Publications Commission put out works in "Little Russian" as well as Russian, and the board encouraged the presentation of Ukrainian dramas alongside plays in Russian at the society's "people's theater."[48] The theater also offered pieces with Jewish themes, such as "Jews" by E. Chirikov and "Uriel Acosta," a play about the Sephardic philosopher, as well as plays by Max Nordau.[49] In 1906, the Publications Commission was reestablished in two separate Ukrainian and Jewish sections devoted to clarifying and disseminating "correct views on the questions of Ukrainian life and on the Jewish question," an initiative likely prompted in part by the previous year's pogrom.[50] The overall picture is one of an institution where Ukrainian interests were the first priority but—whether out of a true concern for other minority groups and the healthy development of their national consciousness, or baser financial interests—where other constituencies found an institutional infrastructure open to their interests as well (at a price, perhaps?). More prosaically but no less significantly, the society's institutions served as "neutral territory" where Kievans of all faiths and nationalities could and did mingle in the pursuit of knowledge and leisure.

Several other libraries and reading halls throughout Kiev also carried Russian-Jewish literature—such as the works of Grigorii Bogrov, Lev Levanda, and Simon Frug—in addition to more "mainstream" Russian fare. The fact that one could find the likes of Frug at a reading hall suggests that administrators or librarians were aware of the high proportion of Jews among their readers and did not mind catering to their perceived needs, or perhaps even that Russian-Jewish literature was considered important for any "good" library or reading hall.

46. Ibid., 88–89.

47. Hamm, *Kiev*, 165–66.

48. Kievskoe obshchestvo gramotnosti, *Otchet za 1899 god* (Kiev, 1900). The society had to receive official permission for each Ukrainian play that it put on. Among those authorized were "Natalka Poltavka" and "Zaporozhskyy klad." Kievskoe obshchestvo gramotnosti, *Otchet za 1903 god* (Kiev, 1904), 65–66.

49. *Kievskie otkliki*, no. 2 (2 January 1906): 1; Kievskoe obshchestvo gramotnosti, *Otchet za 1903 god* (Kiev, 1904), 65.

50. Kievskoe obshchestvo gramotnosti, *Otchet za 1906 god* (Kiev, 1907), 2.

Another Ukrainophile institution hospitable to Jewish interests was the Russian-language *Kievskaia starina,* a journal of Ukrainian historical and cultural studies established by members of the Ukrainian intelligentsia in 1882. From that year until 1907, when it ceased publication, the journal published dozens of articles devoted to Jewish history in Ukraine, such as "Jewish Cossacks in the Early Seventeenth Century" and "Notes on the History of the 1768 Uman′ Slaughter," the latter by I. V. Galant, a noted historian of Ukrainian Jewry and a resident of Kiev. Galant's article presented a newly discovered Hebrew document, translated into Russian, in order to shed light on the Haidamak rebellion of the eighteenth century.[51]

One of the few Christian families to support Jewish charitable causes in Kiev were the Ukrainian Tereshchenkos.[52] Perhaps this was a consequence of the close working relationship between the Tereshchenkos and the Brodskiis in the sugar cartel that the two families helped establish. Or there may have been an unspoken rule that each family donated to the other's favorite causes. A third possibility, though more remote because of the solidly establishment nature of these wealthy dynasties, is that out of principle they supported the "national" institutions of any oppressed minority within the empire, whether their own or that of another.

The Ambiguities of Civic Life

Other areas, such as formal education, could also accommodate shared spaces where ethnic and religious interaction was possible, though those spaces were frequently accompanied by significant tension and unease.[53] Along with outright anti-Semitism, government policies mandating or encouraging segregation—while simultaneously condemning the "isolation" engendered by the existence of separate Jewish charitable societies—contributed to the ambivalence.[54] For example, Jewish and non-Jewish children mixed in Kiev's public schools: Jews made up 11 percent of pupils in the municipal system in 1906, up from 5 percent in 1899 and, with over 15 percent of all applications submitted by Jews, even more

51. *Sistematicheskii ukazatel′ zhurnala "Kievskaia starina" (1882–1906 gg.)* (Poltava, 1911); "Evrei kozaki v nachale XVII veka," *Kievskaia starina* 5 (1890): 377–79; I. V. Galant, "K istorii uman′skoi rezni 1768 g.," *Kievskaia starina* 11 (1895): 209–29. See also I. Galant, *K istorii Uman′skoi Rezni 1768 goda* (Kiev, 1908).

52. See Vitalii Kovalyns′kyi, *Sem′ia Tereshchenko* (Kiev, 2003).

53. While educational institutions are not usually considered an element of civil society because they are controlled by the government, there was an element of voluntary activity involved in the late imperial period because so many private schools and institutes were founded in those years by individuals or groups of one kind or another. These institutions were often under the official supervision of a government ministry but direct control was at a minimum.

54. See an 1891 memorandum from the Economic Department of the Ministry of Interior in RGIA, f. 821, op. 8, d. 108, ll. 143–47 (Delo ob ustanovlenii novago poriadka deiatel′nosti evreiskikh blagotvoritel′nykh obshchestv i po voprosu o vozmozhnosti uprazdneniia evreiskikh pogrebal′nykh bratstv).

wanted to attend.[55] In some schools in neighborhoods with dense Jewish populations, the percentage of Jewish students in public schools was as high as 29 percent. Even the municipal School Commission counted two Jews among its twenty-two members.[56] Yet quotas led to a concentration of Jewish students in those schools offering unrestricted admission—Jewish schools, of course, but also commercial academies under the auspices of the Ministry of Trade, where Jewish pupils constituted half and even three-quarters of the student body.[57] In addition to the formal quotas established in official educational institutions with the introduction of the *numerus clausus* for Jewish males in universities and gymnasia in the mid-1880s, Jews began to be barred from other facilities on an ad hoc and individual basis.[58] Even private schools and academies, which did not fall under the numerus clausus law, began to institute Jewish quotas—especially schools for women, where Jews could often be found in large numbers. For example, the regulations of the Volodkevich Women's Commercial School, established in 1900, maintained that Jews were to constitute no more than 40 percent of the student body.[59] That very number reveals the overwhelming presence of Jews in Kiev's educational sector; clearly the school's founders feared that if no limit were set, Jewish applications and admissions would be at least if not more than half of the total. In 1906, one Jewish newspaper announced that the wife of a priest was opening a private girls' gymnasium that would educate pupils in the "true Russian spirit"; Jews would not be admitted.[60] Those Jews lucky enough to obtain admission to Kiev's St. Vladimir University were refused support from the local Student Aid Society (*Kievskoe obshchestvo posobiia studentam*) beginning in 1899.[61] And at least one gymnasium forbade its Christian students from being tutored by Jews, thus eliminating another important source of income for Jewish students.[62]

But exclusion was by no means a uniform trend, and in many cases a peculiar mixture of interaction and segregation seemed the norm. A relief committee set up after the Dnepr flood of 1895 was composed of wealthy Jews and Christians and provided for victims of both religions, albeit in separate facilities.[63] (As in many cases, the primary motivation for the separation of the groups was likely the need for a separate kitchen to provide kosher food for observant Jews.) The charter of the charitable society established by the Blagoveshchenskii parish in 1908 stated specific-

55. *Nedel'naia khronika Voskhoda,* no. 24 (13 June 1899): 731; *Izvestiia Kievskoi gorodskoi dumy,* no. 6 (June 1906).

56. Kievskaia gorodskaia uchilishchnaia komissiia, *Otchet Kievskoi gorodskoi uchilishchnoi komissii za 1909 g.* (Kiev, 1911).

57. *Evreiskii mir,* no. 33 (9 December 1910): 26.

58. Nathans provides a comprehensive analysis of the numerus clausus and its impact on the course of Jewish integration in *Beyond the Pale,* chap. 7.

59. *Voskhod,* no. 74 (24 September 1900): 11.

60. *Khronika evreiskoi zhizni,* no. 31 (10 August 1906): 30.

61. *Nedel'naia khronika Voskhoda,* no. 44 (24 October 1899): 1386.

62. *Kievskie vesti,* no. 55 (24 February 1910).

63. *Ha-melits,* no. 88 (23 April 1895): 2; *Ha-melits,* no. 98 (4 May 1895): 1–2.

ally that the society would assist all the needy of the parish, "not excluding non-believers"—even though membership in the society itself was restricted to Christians.[64] Another variation on Christian-Jewish interaction within the sphere of civil society was the semi-segregation of Jewish interests within a larger, nonsectarian organization, as was the case with two of Kiev's largest and most distinguished charitable societies, the Society of Day Shelters for Working-Class Children (*Obshchestvo dnevnykh priiutov dlia detei rabochego klassa*) and the aforementioned Kiev Literacy Society. At the behest of Jewish activists, the two institutions set about to establish facilities for Jews in the late 1890s; the former succeeded in founding a Jewish shelter, while the latter, despite several years of effort, was unable to obtain permission for its proposed Saturday literacy classes for Jewish adults.[65] Despite the integrated presence of Jews in schools and programs established by a number of philanthropic organizations in Kiev, including the Literacy Society—one of the society's Sunday schools had a Jewish enrollment of over 10 percent, while Jewish students made up approximately 6 percent of the students at its Kiev Women's Prison School[66]—both the Literacy Society and Society of Day Shelters were clearly determined to create institutions specifically for Jews. The pertinent documents show that this need was taken for granted by all those involved, perhaps because it was self-evident that most Jewish children would need a day shelter where Yiddish was spoken and kosher food was provided, while the majority of Jewish adults in need of literacy lessons would have a better chance of success if taught in their native tongue (Yiddish). And as far as funding was concerned, segregation seemed to persist even in the integrated schools, with all or most of the expenses for teaching Jewish students shouldered by Jews.[67] Although the question of whether Jews were expected to contribute to the general fund was left open, major Jewish donors often contributed funds for general support as well as for specifically Jewish causes. Despite the fact that some of the most generous donors to the Literacy Society were Jewish (in 1901, at least one-fifth of the largest contributions came from Jewish families),[68] few or no Jews sat on the society's board. Apparently, this was an organization willing to cater to Jewish interests but reluctant or uninterested in having Jews participate in the running of its (non-Jewish) activities, other than by giving money.

64. TsDIAU, f. 442, op. 661, spr. 273, ark. 29–30zv (Ob uregulirovanii blagotvoritel′nykh uchrezhdeniiakh v Kievskoi gubernii).

65. The Jewish initiators were members of the Literacy Society, but it is unclear whether the Jewish activists working together with the Society of Day Shelters were members of that society.

66. Kievskoe obshchestvo gramotnosti, *Otchet voskresnykh shkol za 1899–1900-i god* (Kiev, 1901). The Jewish presence was nonexistent or negligible in the society's four other Sunday literacy schools.

67. *Voskhod,* no. 15 (13 April 1897): 426; Obshchestvo dnevnykh priiutov dlia detei rabochego klassa, *Otchet za 1900 god* (Kiev, 1900); *Voskhod,* no. 51–52 (25 December 1897): 1435; Kievskoe obshchestvo gramotnosti, *Otchet za 1898 god* (Kiev, 1899).

68. Kievskoe obshchestvo gramotnosti, *Otchet za 1901 god* (Kiev 1902), 85.

The evening classes for adults sponsored by the local Committee for Public Sobriety (*Popechitel'stvo o narodnoi trezvosti*) provide another angle on Jewish participation in informal education. Ten of the sixteen classes had only one Jewish student or none at all, while an additional three—all in heavily Jewish neighborhoods—were between 80 and 90 percent Jewish. Only the three remaining classes had Jewish student bodies roughly proportional to the Jewish share in the overall population.[69] While these last three cannot be discounted, there is certainly a marked trend toward segregation, perhaps owing to residence patterns—or perhaps to the undesirability, for Christians, of attending a school perceived as "Jewish."

Separate Jewish welfare institutions, while meant to facilitate integration by firmly establishing Jews in the local institutional setting, often reinforced Jewish apartness. Jewish welfare institutions such as the Kiev Jewish Hospital welcomed the Jewish poor as well as non-Jews, but there is evidence that some Jews chose to frequent the city's non-Jewish hospitals and clinics as well, which by and large did not exclude Jews in the early years. Eventually at least one and possibly a number of institutions began to bar Jews, though, citing the existence of Jewish facilities.[70] On the other hand, one of the reasons cited for the founding of the new Jewish maternity clinic in 1901 was that some Kiev clinics did not admit Jews, while the Brodskii Vocational School (*Kievskoe evreiskoe uchilishche imeni S. I. Brodskago*) was established to educate Jewish boys, who were barred from Kiev's main trade school.[71] Thus, separate Jewish welfare institutions could be both the impetus for anti-Jewish restrictions and a consequence of such restrictions. Not surprisingly, Jews with a more nationalist bent often argued that shared institutions would never fully satisfy the needs of the Jewish public. Thus, despite the presence of Russian-language Jewish literature in Kiev's general libraries and reading halls, they called for an independent Jewish reading hall that would stock literature of all kinds in Hebrew and Yiddish in addition to Russian.[72]

Increasing Ethnic Cleavage

In the last decade before World War I, ethnic segregation in the realm of charitable work seemed increasingly to be the rule in Kiev. Considering the growth of nationalism and anti-Semitism in the Russian empire in these years, this is not a surprising development, especially given the strength of Russian nationalists in Kiev, not to mention the 1905 pogrom and the Beilis affair (1911–13). A fascinating case is the Kiev Branch of the Russian Society for the Protection of Women (*Rossiiskoe obshchestvo zashchity zhenshchin*), under whose auspices a special division for the care of

69. Kievskoe popechitel'stvo o narodnoi trezvosti, *Otchet o sostoianii vechernikh klassov dlia vzroslykh s 1 ianvaria 1904 po 1 ianvaria 1906 g.* (Kiev, 1906).

70. *Ha-melits,* no. 58 (2 August 1885): 937; *Die Judenpogrome in Russland* (Cologne, 1910), 2:348.

71. *Voskhod,* no. 9 (4 February 1901): 20; Obshchestvo Popecheniia o bednykh remeslennykh i rabochikh evreiakh g. Kieva, *Otchet za 1907 god* (Kiev, 1908), vi–viii.

72. *Voskhod,* no. 50 (12 December 1902): 37.

Jewish women and girls was established in 1914.[73] The scant documents relating to this organization seem to indicate that the Jewish chapter was initiated by outside activists in conjunction with the Kiev branch of the Society for the Spread of Enlightenment among the Jews of Russia (*Obshchestvo rasprostraneniia prosveshcheniia mezhdu evreiami*). The 1912 annual report revealed that only 5 of the 562 women housed at the organization's shelter were Jewish, while for most of the year there were no Jews at all among the students at its evening and Sunday classes—a circumstance that the report declared troubling. The report called the phenomenon "inexplicable" in view of the "attitude of the teachers (among whom there have always been Jews), which is wholly benevolent and impartial toward all nationalities." The report's authors speculated that Jewish women had only begun to sign up for the society's classes later in the year owing to the very recent closure by the authorities of educational organizations in Kiev.[74] One possibility that was not considered was that many working Jewish women, having taken Saturday as a day of rest, could not afford to lose precious working hours on Sunday, when classes were held from 11 a.m. to 2 p.m. Similarly, only 3 percent of women seeking legal assistance at the society were Jewish, as were less than 1 percent of those being housed in the society's shelter for migrants.[75]

The history of the society's Division for Care of Jewish Girls and Women (*Otdel popecheniia ob evreiskikh devushkakh i zhenshchinakh g. Kieva pri Kievskom otdelenii rossiiskago zashchity zhenshchin*), as related in its first annual report, reveals a few more interesting details about the assumptions shared by Jews and Christians with regard to their integration (or lack thereof) in charitable organizations. The history recounts that a Mrs. K. L. Geller initiated the founding of the branch, proposing it to the board members of the Kiev branch of the Society for the Spread of Enlightenment; only after she had gotten their enthusiastic promise to assist in the matter did Geller approach the board of the Kiev branch of the Society for the Protection of Women and begin to negotiate with them about establishing a Jewish branch. The history noted specifically Geller's justification of the new institution in pointing to "the great cultural significance" that such a branch would possess, perhaps suggesting that by caring for Jewish women and girls in need, the branch would help to raise the cultural level of the Jewish community and of society in general ("cultural" here being used in the sense of *Bildung,* denoting a certain level of civilization, education, and propriety).[76] In response to the initiators' pe-

73. For more on the *Rossiiskoe obshchestvo zashchity zhenshchin,* see Hamm, *Kiev,* 160.

74. Kievskoe otdelenie rossiiskago obshchestva zashchity zhenshchin, *Otchet za 1912 god* (Kiev, 1913), 37. It is unclear which organizations are being referred to, as the Kiev Literacy Society and Prosvita had been closed several years earlier, in 1908 and 1910, respectively. The Kiev branch of the Jewish Enlightenment Society had not been shut down.

75. Kievskoe otdelenie rossiiskago obshchestva zashchity zhenshchin, *Otchet za 1912 g.,* 7, 19.

76. Otdel popecheniia ob evreiskikh devushkakh i zhenshchinakh g. Kieva pri Kievskom otdelenii rossiiskago obshchestva zashchity zhenshchin, *Otchet za 1914 g. (god pervyi)* (Kiev, 1915).

tition, the national board of the Society for the Protection of Women wrote from St. Petersburg that it did not find necessary an autonomous Jewish division in Kiev, but that a shelter and other institutions "especially for Jewish women" could be set up under the auspices of the existing Kiev branch of the society. Why the Petersburg board decided that a Jewish division was unsuitable for the Kiev branch of the society when such a division already existed in the capital was unclear.[77] The board stipulated that funding for these institutions "could be provided by Jewish donors," on the condition that the board of the society's Kiev branch would have the final say on their internal structure and governance. Neither the initiators nor the board of the Kiev branch were happy with this suggestion and wavered over whether it was even worth going ahead under such circumstances. The resolution of the impasse came through the intervention of Princess Elena Al′tenburgskaia (probably at the prompting of Baroness Anna Ginzburg, who moved in the highest circles in Petersburg and had close ties with the Al′tenburgskii family), at whose recommendation an autonomous Jewish division was swiftly agreed to.

Parsing this episode carefully, we can learn a good deal about the assumptions of the individuals involved, likely shared by many members of society. First, Jewish women were apparently unwilling to take advantage of the services offered by a non-Jewish organization, even when it declared itself "impartial" to the ethnic origins of its clients and was clearly, at least in theory, dedicated to serving all segments of society. The low numbers of Jewish clients described by the 1912 report may well have been a product not only of worsening conditions for Jews within the Russian empire but specifically of the Beilis affair; with tensions mounting between Jews and Christians, it is not surprising that Jews tended to steer clear even of those Christians who professed a desire to help them.[78] Second, the group of Jewish women who initiated the Jewish division originally intended it to operate autonomously: within the general framework of the Society for the Protection of Women, but not as a constituent part of the Kiev branch. The activists of the Kiev branch shared this vision. Perhaps here they had in mind that only an organization with a specifically Jewish character would attract the very women it aimed to serve—the question of the language of instruction may have been an issue here, as well—but whatever the reason, all the individuals involved in founding the Jewish division apparently assumed the necessity of separate services for Jews. Moreover, even when the division was established as an integral part of the society, the society's governors were clearly not interested in providing the necessary funding for it. Thus, even when Jewish women's need for services similar to those being provided to Christian women was clearly demonstrated, the assumption was that the Jewish community

77. *Evreiskaia entsiklopediia* (1906–13), s.v. "Sankt-Peterburg."

78. Aster and Potichnyj write that "although the jury of Ukrainian peasants found Beilis innocent the trial itself legitimized and perpetuated the perception of the Jew as a threatening figure in the minds of the people." Aster and Potichnyj, *Jewish Ukrainian Relations,* 56.

needed to step forward to make them available; Christians could not be expected to support a Jewish institution.

Professional and Social Associations

Jews and Christians could also meet in the framework of trade-based organizations, often mutual-aid societies.[79] Government registries reveal that there were at least a few such societies with mixed memberships (though some of them may have come into existence to circumvent the law banning mutual-aid societies with majority-Jewish memberships).[80] Significantly, these were organizations of proprietors who evidently hoped to strengthen their position vis-à-vis their employees by allying with one another. Charters of professional societies registered with the provincial authorities include a Society of Proprietors of Ladies' Apparel Workshops (*Professional'noe Obshchestvo vladel'tsev masterskikh damskikh nariadov g. Kieva*), founded in 1906 by Shmuilo Iomtefovich Gutmanovich, Avrum Ruvinov Veiner, Gersh Itskovich Katsenelenbogen, Khaim Mikhelevich Polevik (all Jewish names), Tikhon Mikhailovich Bondarenko, and Semen Lavrenteevich Martinenko (Ukrainian or possibly Russian names). The primary goal of the society was "raising the material well-being and ameliorating the living and working conditions of Society Members," while objectives included "elucidating and coordinating the economic interests of members" as well as seeking out peaceful means of settling labor disputes between the proprietors and the artisans in their workshops (either by mediation or third-party arbitration). The society would also provide support to members whose workshops had been shut down by strikes, as well as access to production materials at reduced costs. A Society of Hairdresser-Proprietors (*Obshchestvo parikmakherov-vladel'tsev g. Kieva*), established in 1906 or 1907 by four Jews and a peasant living in the same neighborhood, aimed to unite all businessmen in their metier to defend their professional interests as well as to provide assistance to members.[81] Evidently, ties of class and economic interest were strong enough to cross the divide of religion and ethnicity, especially in an era of frequent strikes and worker protests. Notably, these associations were founded in the year or two after 1905—perhaps evidence that not all opportunities for interethnic contact were wiped out by the pogrom.

Whether workers of different nationalities—such as the dressmakers and hairdressers who might have labored in the shops owned by the members of these two organizations—came together in similarly formal societies is unclear. Certainly some and perhaps most artels (traditional workmen's cooperative associations), such as the First Kiev Laborers' Ar-

79. Hamm, *Kiev,* 138.

80. For example, the governor-general closed a shoemakers' society because it was majority Jewish. See *Evreiskii narod,* no. 6 (22 November 1906): 23.

81. TsDIAU, f. 442, op. 636, spr. 647, ch. 1, ark. 252–60, 554–66 (Ob obshchestvakh i soiuzakh, utverzhdennykh na osnovanii zakona 4-go marta 1906 g.).

tel of Floor-Polishers (*Pervaia Kievskaia trudovaia artel' poloterov*), required members to be Christians.[82]

Even if they did not work together, Jewish and Christian workers may have socialized together in the context of Kiev's many social clubs. In 1909, a workers' club was established to enable laborers of all nationalities and religions to come together for educational activities and classes in Russian and other subjects, and by early 1910 membership had reached 350. Judging by the names—Berman, Metushchenko, Smirnov, Gal'perin, Svirskii—the governing board included both Jews and Christians.[83] An announcement for an upcoming masquerade ball for members of the Kiev Podol' Society Club (*Kievskii Podol'skii obshchestvennyi klub*) could be found in the "Workers' Chronicle" column of the Yiddish newspaper *Kiever vort,* suggesting that, like the workers' club, the membership was largely proletarian. Archival documents reveal that the club's founders were non-Jews, whereas the membership was mostly Jewish. That a Yiddish paper advertised the club's events further complicates the picture, suggesting that even unacculturated Jews whose primary language was Yiddish might mingle socially with non-Jews of the same socioeconomic status.[84]

In addition to the workers' club, the more bourgeois Kiev Social Gathering (*Kievskoe obshchestvennoe sobranie*), dedicated "to the development of community spirit [*obshchestvennost'*]," was open to members of all religions.[85] The club provided meeting space for community organizations such as the Society for Literature and the Press (*Obshchestvo deiatelei literatury i pechati*), the Religio-Philosophical Society (*Religiozno-filosofskoe obshchestvo*), the Jewish Literary Society (*Evreiskoe literaturnoe obshchestvo*), the Society of Lovers of the Hebrew Language (*Obshchestvo liubitelei drevnoevreiskago iazyka*), and the Society for the Protection of Women. The Kiev Community Library (*Kievskaia obshchestvennaia biblioteka*), purchased by the club after its closure by the authorities in 1910, included books in Russian as well as Ukrainian, Yiddish, and Hebrew, while periodicals subscribed to included the Ukrainian *Rada,* the Yiddish *Der fraynd,* and the Russian-Jewish *Razsvet* and *Evreiskii mir* in addition to a variety of mainstream Russian dailies and weeklies.[86] An unscientific survey of the names of members listed in the 1915 annual report suggests that, although a majority were Jews, a significant number of non-Jews were members as well.[87] Thus, even if this ostensibly nondenominational organization was known to most middle-class Kievans as a "Jewish" institution, it nonetheless

82. Hamm, *Kiev,* 212; TsDIAU, f. 442, op. 636, spr. 647, ch. 8, ark. 689, 893.

83. *Kiever vort,* no. 2 (3 January 1910) and no. 9 (11 January 1910).

84. TsDIAU, f. 442, op. 636, spr. 647, ch. 3, ark. 704–12; DAKO (Derzhavnyi arkhiv Kyïvs'koï oblasti), f. 10 (Kievskoe gubernskoe po delam ob obshchestvakh prisutstvie), op. 1, spr. 129, ark. 19zv, 32 (O registratsii Kievskago Podol'skago obshchestvennago kluba); *Kiever vort,* no. 6 (5 January 1910).

85. A similar club existed in Odessa in the 1860s. See Zipperstein, *Jews of Odessa,* 110.

86. Kievskoe obshchestvennoe sobranie, *Otchet za 1910–1911 g.* (Kiev, 1911).

87. Kievskoe obshchestvennoe sobranie, *Otchet za 1915 g.* (Kiev, 1916).

counted non-Jews among its members as well and interacted regularly with the non-Jewish public sphere of the city.

In his memoirs of fin-de-siècle Kiev, E. E. Friedmann remembered that Jews attended Russian clubs and that "equality reigned at the green table" on which card games were played; since everyone played cards in Kiev, these games served as an equalizing force that brought together people from all walks of life.[88] An organization calling itself the "Kiev Russian Society Club" (*Kievskii russkii obshchestvennyi klub*), which existed in 1912 but may have been founded earlier, was open, at least in theory, to members of all faiths and nationalities.[89] Such a club would surely have consciously juxtaposed itself to nationalist organizations such as the Club of Russian Nationalists (*Klub russkikh natsionalistov*) which explicitly excluded Jews; indeed, with the rise in anti-Semitism, recalled Friedmann, the Jews eventually founded their own club, which they called, perhaps not without some irony, the "Concordia Club" (*Obshchestvennoe sobranie "Konkordiia"*). As this case and that of the Society for the Protection of Women demonstrates, in the last years of tsarist rule Jews responded to rising hostility by turning inwards and, in many cases, creating Jewish institutions that were replicas of those in which they no longer felt comfortable or were unwelcome.

Whether hated or grudgingly tolerated, however, Jews were too important an element in the city to be ignored. That Jews were an integral part of the fabric of municipal life as early as 1865 is demonstrated by the casual inclusion of a "benefit performance in aid of poor Jewish students" in a local newspaper's survey of leisure opportunities available to the public.[90] The trading house of the Brothers Lepeiko (a Ukrainian name) advertised its ready-mades in the Yiddish newspaper *Kiever vort;* the advertisement itself was in Yiddish, though the paper did also carry Russian-language notices.[91] The semi-weekly *Kievskoe slovo* often carried articles of Jewish interest, including a feuilleton piece by Sholom Aleichem entitled "Confusion" featuring a character by the name of Tevel′, better known to his Yiddish and English-language readers as Tevye.[92] Footnotes explained the meaning of unfamiliar Yiddish words such as *shadkhen* (matchmaker). Yiddish words that had entered Russian were used widely in Kiev; the city's *balaguly* were Jewish carters known in Yiddish as *balagoles,* while a Russian slang word for pickpocket, *marvikher,* was clearly derived from a related Yiddish word meaning profit or gain.[93] On the other end of the socioeconomic spectrum, Kiev's Jewish millionaires

88. E. E. Friedmann, *Sefer ha-zikhronot* (Tel Aviv, 1926), 2:363–64.

89. TsDIAU, f. 442, op. 636, spr. 647, ch. 8, ark. 224–29, 374–84, 906. The constitution of the Kievskii russkii obshchestvennyi klub does not explain the use of the descriptor "Russian" (in the ethnic, not the all-imperial sense) in the name.

90. *Kievskii telegraf,* no. 12 (29 January 1865): 2.

91. *Kiever vort,* no. 1 (1 January 1910).

92. *Kievskoe slovo,* no. 3595 (13 January 1898).

93. *Balaguly* was used in the 1874 Kiev census. Iugo-Zapadnoe otdelenie Imperatorskago russkago geograficheskago obshchestva, *Kiev i ego predmestiia* (Kiev, 1875). A reference to *marvikher* can be found in *Kievskoe slovo,* no. 3585 (3 January 1898).

were recruited for the boards of all the city's major institutions; Lazar' Brodskii sat together with Dmitrii Pikhno, the conservative and nationalist owner of the Judeophobic newspaper *Kievlianin,* on the boards of the Kiev Literacy Society and the Bacteriological Institute.[94] As Thomas Owen points out, sugar magnates of all ethnic backgrounds worked together to promote their product: individuals of Russian, Ukrainian, Polish, and Jewish extractions were members of both the Society of Russian Sugar Producers (*Obshchestvo rossiiskikh sakharozavodchikov*) and the Kiev Exchange Committee (*Kievskii birzhevoi komitet*).[95] These men, and their wives, may even have mingled socially. And in the eyes of ordinary Kievans, Jewish plutocrats were just as much a part of the city's firmament of wealthy constellations as their Christian counterparts: according to the Hebrew newspaper *Ha-melits,* large numbers of both Jews and non-Jews flocked to the city's Choral Synagogue in 1898 on the occasion of the wedding of scions of the Brodskii and Ginzburg clans, two of the richest families in the empire—presumably to try to catch a glimpse of the "royal" couple, their entourage, or any of the illustrious invitees.[96] Although of a particularly Jewish nature, the event clearly had overtones of civic pride as well.

Antagonism and Animosity

Kiev also had its share of groups that explicitly excluded Jews from membership or advocated anti-Jewish policies. Anti-Jewish groups such as the Union of Russian People (*Soiuz russkago naroda*) were quite active in Kiev, seeing themselves as defenders of Russianness in a part of the empire "threatened" by the existence of significant minorities such as Jews and Ukrainians, especially with the rise of openly nationalist movements among these groups after 1905.[97] Also very influential was the growing belief among many non-Jews that Jews represented a serious threat to the very existence of the empire.[98] Indeed, one of the most prominent groupings within the Russian nationalist movement as a whole in the post-1905 empire was the Kiev Club of Russian Nationalists.[99] The Kiev Russian Gathering (*Kievskoe russkoe sobranie*) (originally a branch of a national movement but later independent) was founded to promote "Orthodoxy and autocracy, the rights of the state, and the distinctive features

94. *Ha-melits,* no. 108 (17 May 1896): 3–4; Kievskoe obshchestvo gramotnosti, *Otchet za 1906 god* (Kiev, 1907).

95. Thomas C. Owen, "Impediments to a Bourgeois Consciousness in Russia, 1880–1905: The Estate Structure, Ethnic Diversity, and Economic Regionalism," in Clowes, Kassow, and West, eds., *Between Tsar and People,* 84–85.

96. *Ha-melits,* no. 223 (23 October 1898): 2.

97. For an analysis of Russian government policy in the Ukrainian provinces and nationalist responses, see Weeks, *Nation and State in Late Imperial Russia.* For the Russian right, see Hans Rogger, "The Formation of the Russian Right: 1900–06," in Rogger, *Jewish Policies,* 188–211.

98. Rogger, "Conclusion and Overview," in Klier and Lambroza, eds., *Pogroms,* 342.

99. Robert Edelman, "The Russian Nationalist Party and the Political Crisis of 1909," *Russian Review* 34, no. 1 (January 1975): 33–34.

of the Russian people."[100] Non-Christians could not be members. Lectures held in the years leading up to World War I included a talk on the evils of Ukrainian separatism, but much more energy was devoted to what club members viewed as the Jewish threat to Russia. In the eyes of the organization's leaders, the most important of whom was Father G. Ia. Prozorov, organized Jewry was planning to destroy the Russian state and enslave the Russian people. The "all-powerful Jewish kahal" was also blamed for the Beilis affair, which was an opportunity to do away once and for all with the "indignation that Russian Kievans must suffer who do not submit to Hebrew suggestions and temptations."[101] The Kiev Russian Sports Society (*Kievskoe russkoe sportivnoe obshchestvo*) restricted its membership to individuals of Russian descent and Christian faith: even Jews who had converted to Christianity were banned.[102]

That the leader of the Kiev Russian Gathering was a priest was no coincidence, since some segments of the Russian Orthodox Church—usually among the lower levels of the ecclesiastical hierarchy—took an active role in promoting Judeophobic sentiment. After the 1905 pogrom, the authorities investigated claims that proclamations calling for the beating of Jews and Poles had been printed at Kiev's Caves Monastery.[103] In 1912, the anniversary of the slaying of Andrei Iushchinskii, the boy who had supposedly been the victim of a Jewish ritual murder at the hands of Mendel Beilis, was commemorated at the Cathedral of St. Sofia.[104] And the upper ranks of the clergy in Kiev province were reported to be in attendance at a provincial conference of the Union of Russian People, along with the governor and the regional military commander.[105] Notably, however, no Orthodox priests could be found who were willing to testify to the truth of the blood accusation in the Beilis case.[106]

Although a detailed discussion of the pogroms of 1881 and 1905 lies outside the scope of this paper, it is worth noting that even after the 1881 pogrom, which dealt a considerable blow to the Jewish community, the threat of pogrom seems to have played strikingly little role in the lives of Kiev Jewry in the quarter-century that followed (that is, until 1905). In this period, at least, interethnic violence was seen as a rare phenomenon; Kiev Jews lived in far greater fear of the *oblava,* the police roundup of Jews living in Kiev illegally, who were subject to arrest and immediate expulsion from the city.[107] The considerable opportunities for Jewish-Christian in-

100. Kievskoe russkoe sobranie, *Otchet o sostoianii s dekabria 1911 goda po 1 ianvaria 1914 goda* (Kiev, 1914). For more on the national Russian Assembly, see Rogger, *Jewish Policies,* 191–93.

101. Kievskoe russkoe sobranie, *Otchet o sostoianii s dekabria 1911 goda po 1 ianvaria 1914 goda.*

102. TsDIAU, f. 442, op. 636, spr. 647, ch. 8, ark. 224–29, 374–84, 906.

103. *Khronika evreiskoi zhizni,* no. 32 (17 August 1906): 24; Hamm, *Kiev,* 204–5.

104. *Novyi voskhod,* no. 11 (15 March 1912): 11–12.

105. *Novyi voskhod,* no. 14 (5 April 1912): 21.

106. Albert S. Lindemann, *The Jew Accused: Three Anti-Semitic Affairs (Dreyfus, Beilis, Frank), 1894–1915* (Cambridge, Eng., 1991), 187.

107. See, for example, *Nedel'naia khronika Voskhoda,* no. 23 (5 June 1894) and no. 60 (21 October 1901).

teraction in the civil sphere that existed before 1905 shrank significantly after that year and the pogrom it brought for Kiev's Jews. One clear illustration of this trend is the drop in Jewish attendance at the library of the Kiev Literacy Society in the year after the 1905 pogrom: Jews as a proportion of all subscribers fell from 55 to 32 percent.[108] This suggests that the outbreak of anti-Jewish violence, while generally outside the norm, severely damaged Jewish willingness to mingle with their Christian neighbors, even in such a benign environment as a lending library. But there is little evidence that the pogrom was a backlash against increasing Jewish participation in civic life and civil society; rather, as Rogger suggests, it was the image of the Jew as revolutionary and seditionist that drove the xenophobic nationalists who whipped up the riotous mob and—when it was not vodka and the prospect of plunder that was motivating them—the members of the mob themselves.[109]

Some non-Jewish Kievans made deliberate attempts to show their Jewish fellow subjects that not everyone supported the violence: many donated to the fund established after the pogrom to aid needy victims.[110] Moreover, in the wake of the pogrom, workers at some factories held meetings, vowing to expel from their collectives anyone who had participated in the pogrom; some pledged to defend Jews against future attacks.[111] And in May 1906, about 150 workers at one of Kiev's shipbuilding yards passed a resolution decrying the possibility of another pogrom, appealing for an end to attacks on defenseless citizens, and calling on all workers "to defend citizens from attacks on their freedom, life, and property."[112]

In the years that followed, Kiev's civil society continued to show a certain resistance to anti-Jewish policies and attitudes. At various times after 1905, Kiev merchants petitioned the government to call off planned expulsions of Jews from Kiev, since such evictions would cause economic harm to the city, and even to include Kiev within the Pale of Settlement, presumably to eliminate the burdensome restrictions on Jewish economic activity.[113] The administrations of institutions of higher education were apparently also interested in alleviating the burdensome conditions under which their students lived: in 1906 the rector of St. Vladimir's University and the director of the Women's Higher Courses requested liberalized residence permits for their students.[114] For their part, middle-class Russian and Jewish professionals established a Society for the Promotion of the Dissemination of Accurate Information on Jews and Judaism (*Obshchestvo sodeistvuiushchego rasprostraneniiu vernykh svedenii o evreiakh i evreistve*)

108. Kievskoe obschchestvo gramotnosti, *Otchet za 1905 god* (Kiev, 1906).

109. Rogger, "Conclusion and Overview," in Klier and Lambroza, eds., *Pogroms,* 342.

110. Hamm, *Kiev,* 194–96.

111. *Kievskoe slovo* (9 November 1905), quoted in Viktor Gusev, "Bund i ievreis'ki pohromy v 1905 roku," in *Ievreis'ka istoriia ta kul'tura v Ukraïni: Materialy konferentsiï, 2–5 veresnia 1996* (Kiev, 1997), 36.

112. *Khronika evreiskoi zhizni,* no. 20 (25 May 1906).

113. *Evreiskii mir,* no. 12 (25 March 1910): 24; *Khronika evreiskoi zhizni,* no. 7 (21 February 1906): 25.

114. *Evreiskii narod,* no. 8 (8 December 1906).

on the model of the first such society in Moscow. The Kiev society took the opportunity to address Jewish stereotypes prevalent in Ukraine with the publication of its first brochure, "Did Jews Lease Christian Churches in Ukraine?"[115]

Despite these efforts, the trend among Jews after 1905 was to turn inward. Discouraged by growing persecution and political reaction, many sought succor in the Jewish nationalist movement. Those who did not give up hope in a multiethnic and harmonious Russian empire faced an uphill battle in a society growing more fragmented by the day.

Conclusion: Jewish Integration in a European Context

Against a backdrop of centuries of interethnic tension, government-sponsored segregation, rising nationalism, and sporadic violence, Kiev's ethnic and religious groups got along better than might have been expected in the period before 1905 and even, to some extent, in the years after. Russian Jews could not hope for full acceptance into the fabric of urban society, but the extent of their integration ranged widely from outright segregation or rejection to grudging toleration to acceptance—the latter especially to be found in the world of voluntary associations. In many ways the same was true for other European societies, notwithstanding the broader rights that Jews formally enjoyed there; in the German, Austrian, and Hungarian cultural contexts, for example, modernity and emancipation ushered in Jewish acculturation but not necessarily full integration or assimilation—if these were indeed possible (or even desirable).[116] The examples of interethnic contact and collaboration in Kiev were probably fairly unusual, but they are nonetheless strikingly similar—both in quality and in their relative rarity—to what we might observe in the cities of central Europe.

In central as in eastern Europe, integration in all its varieties was often accompanied by a measure of adaptation to the culture and norms of the hegemonic society, but as Jonathan Frankel writes, "The loss of linguistic and cultural distinctiveness [does not] necessarily bring . . . with it a loss of ethnic identity."[117] To be sure, many and even most Jews had no desire entirely to lose their Jewish identity even if they could, and even the term *identity* itself is made more complex by the reality of "situational ethnicity," the individual's ability to consciously emphasize or deemphasize

115. *Evreiskii mir,* no. 3 (21 January 1910): 30; *Kiever vort,* no. 6 (5 January 1910).

116. See, for example, Werner E. Mosse, "The Revolution of 1848: Jewish Emancipation in Germany and Its Limits," in Werner E. Mosse, Arnold Paucker, and Reinhard Rürup, eds., *Revolution and Evolution: 1848 in German-Jewish History* (Tübingen, 1981), 389–401. Eli Lederhendler also rejects "a theory of Eastern European exceptionalism" in his "Modernity without Emancipation or Assimilation? The Case of Russian Jewry," in Jonathan Frankel and Steven J. Zipperstein, eds., *Assimilation and Community: The Jews in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Cambridge, Eng., 1992), 324–43.

117. Jonathan Frankel, "Assimilation and the Jews in Nineteenth-Century Europe: Towards a New Historiography?" in Frankel and Zipperstein, eds., *Assimilation and Community,* 22.

his or her identification depending on the context.[118] Identity is almost never a zero-sum game. As Harriet Murav has shown in her study of Avraam Uri Kovner, when Jews took on aspects of Russian identity they often made themselves more, not less, suspect in the eyes of ethnic Russians, because they were seen as attempting to disguise their true nature.[119] This may help to explain why Jewish acculturation from Berlin to Odessa usually took place within a specifically Jewish sphere; Jews identified themselves as German, Hungarian, or even "Russian" (*rossiiskii*) even as they maintained a particularly "Jewish" social and professional profile and even as their primary associational circles continued to consist almost exclusively of other Jews.[120] Another pan-European phenomenon was the separate Jewish welfare institutions that were meant to anchor Jews in their milieux but instead all too frequently underlined Jewish difference.[121] Growing secularization among European Jews (including those in the Russian empire) meant that more and more of them were finding the voluntary association, and not the traditional Jewish *hevrah* (brotherhood), an ideal instrument for expressing their most cherished values and ideals, as well as an alternative to the conflict-ridden official Jewish community [*obshchina, Gemeinde*].[122]

Moreover, the Russian empire was not unique in the choices that it forced Jews to make. Across multiethnic central and eastern Europe, as hegemonic imperial cultures slowly gave way to regional and usually na-

118. Chew Sock Foon, "On the Incompatibility of Ethnic and National Loyalties: Reframing the Issue," *Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism* 13, no. 1 (1986): 1–11, cited in Magocsi, "Ukrainian National Revival," 51.

119. Murav, *Identity Theft,* 190. Murav and Safran both explore the ways in which Jewish acculturation destabilized and subverted "the idea of the innateness of identity, whether religious, national, or personal." Safran, *Rewriting the Jew,* 193.

120. David Sorkin calls this "parallel sociability." David Sorkin, "Religious Reforms and Secular Trends in German-Jewish Life: An Agenda for Research," *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book* 40 (1995): 182. See also David Jan Sorkin, *The Transformation of German Jewry, 1780–1840* (New York, 1987), 113–14; Jacob Katz, *Out of the Ghetto: The Social Background of Jewish Emancipation, 1770–1870* (New York, 1978), 177; Rainer Liedtke, *Jewish Welfare in Hamburg and Manchester, c. 1850–1914* (Oxford, 1998), 10–12; Stefanie Schüler-Springorum, "Assimilation and Community Reconsidered: The Jewish Community in Königsburg, 1871–1914," *Jewish Social Studies,* n.s. 5, no. 3 (1999): 107, 110; Zipperstein, *Jews of Odessa,* 110; Marsha L. Rozenblit, *The Jews of Vienna, 1867–1914: Assimilation and Identity* (Albany, 1983).

121. See, for example, Liedtke, *Jewish Welfare,* 10–12.

122. On associational life among German Jews, see David Sorkin, "The Impact of Emancipation on German Jewry: A Reconsideration," in Frankel and Zipperstein, eds., *Assimilation and Community,* 177–98. Women played a particularly important role in the new Jewish associations, especially those in the realm of welfare. "Although German-Jewish women were prominent in the work of the non-sectarian German women's movement and in the advancement of social work, the majority of organized Jewish women remained within Jewish local or national organizations." Marion Kaplan, "Gender and Jewish History in Imperial Germany," in Frankel and Zipperstein, eds., *Assimilation and Community,* 218. See also Marion A. Kaplan, *The Making of the Jewish Middle Class: Women, Family, and Identity in Imperial Germany* (New York, 1991), 192, and Natan M. Meir, "Mnogostoronnost' evreiskoi blagotvoritel'nosti sredi evreev Kieva, 1859–1914 gg.," *Ab Imperio* 4 (2003): 185–216.

tionalist cultures, Jews had to choose to which society or culture it was most prudent to acculturate. In Kiev this choice was relatively easy (at least before 1917); elsewhere it was not. At times this decision became of major significance, not only for the Jews themselves, but also for representatives of neighboring ethnic groups battling for supremacy. In Prague, for example, embattled Germans formed liberal associations that welcomed Jews of a German cultural and linguistic orientation into their ranks even during a period (the last two decades of the nineteenth century) widely considered to be one of growing anti-Semitism.[123]

But the choice on the part of Jews to join non-Jewish organizations cannot always be ascribed to a conscious attempt to integrate into the larger surrounding society.[124] The many opportunities available outside the Jewish community for making social change, defending one's rights, or participating in leisure activities proved a powerfully attractive force for some Jews. As in Kiev, it was Jews of the middle class and haute bourgeoisie who were the most likely to participate in general civic culture, but working-class Jews crossed ethnic and religious lines as well.

Nevertheless, when evaluating the implications of mixed-membership associations in the Russian imperial context, it is impossible to divorce them from the generally hostile environment in which Russian Jews found themselves in the last years of tsarist rule—the terrible post-1905 decade, when Kiev's Jews were said to live "with a sword hanging over their heads."[125] In these years, events and policies on the national stage created an atmosphere of intolerance and fostered clannishness and self-segregation. For all the similarities we have seen among European Jews across the continent, the situation for Russian Jews was decidedly different because they were without civil rights and confronted a constant threat of violence. They were challenged not only by the ingrained hostility and prejudice of imperial society but also by the antagonism of the Russian state, a state that, at least in its dying years, was determined to saddle its Jews with ever more legal disabilities and to stir up national and even world opinion against them. Thus, imperial Russia's growing civil society could serve both as a neutral territory where Jews, Ukrainians, and Russians could come together as well as a space where old habits of ethnic particularism—as well as new forms of xenophobia—could thrive even in an atmosphere of ostensible egalitarianism. In this environment, voluntary societies could bring people together but could also be used to keep them apart, as is clear in the case of the Jewish school or branch—with specifically Jewish funding—within the larger voluntary association.[126]

123. Cohen, *Politics of Ethnic Survival,* 175–76.

124. See, for example, Todd M. Endelman, *The Jews of Britain, 1656 to 2000* (Berkeley, 2002), 99–101.

125. *Novyi voskhod,* no. 37 (13 September 1912). On the Jewish policy in the last years of the empire, see Rogger's "The Jewish Policy of Late Tsarism: A Reappraisal," in his *Jewish Policies,* 25–39.

126. In the realm of politics, too, many Jews found it more and more difficult to remain active in all-imperial liberal parties and groupings, or at least to do so without also contributing their energies to specifically Jewish liberal groups as well (such as the Union for the Attainment of Equal Rights for the Jewish People in Russia. See Christoph Gassen-

Clubs that espoused ethnic chauvinism as their primary raison d'être are an even more extreme example of this trend.

The possibility must be entertained, then, that some Jewish members of mixed-membership associations saw them as prophylactics against the threat of pogrom, while others viewed their continued engagement with non-Jewish Kievans as a philosophical statement in the face of anti-Jewish violence and continuing state persecution. Both possibilities have far-reaching implications for scholars: the former is a strong statement about the reach and efficacy of the voluntary association and its impact on society, while the latter is a conviction that historians must take as seriously as those expressed in political brochures and at party conferences.

As Joseph Bradley has shown, civil society and voluntary associations provide a key with which to unlock many of the riddles of imperial Russian society, and one that helps the scholar "to understand the civil society that [Russia] did achieve" rather than "explain[ing] the liberal-democratic civil society that Russia clearly did not become."[127] In other words, we must strive to see what was, rather than what was not. Voluntary associations can indeed be used as a microscope of sorts through which to examine the most mundane interactions between Russian Jews and their Christian neighbors. In the context of the late empire, however, even the least of these interactions was far from ordinary, and that they occurred at all is significant in and of itself. The examples we have seen point up how steady a hand and how light a touch one needs when applying the tools of historical analysis to the case of Jews within Russian civil society. Doing it with creativity and sensitivity enables one fully to explore the complexities and paradoxes of the lived experience of Russian Jews. Such a nuanced history will, to paraphrase Bradley, guide us away from the pitfall of trying to figure out what Russian Jewry was not, what it did not achieve, and toward a more complete understanding of what, and who, Russian Jews were.

---

schmidt, *Jewish Liberal Politics in Tsarist Russia, 1900–1914: The Modernization of Russian Jewry* (New York, 1995), esp. 19–44.

127. Bradley, "Subjects into Citizens," 1105.