

Chapter Thirty-two

Religion in Eastern Europe and the Middle East from 1648 through the Reign of Catherine the Great

What in Polish and Lithuanian history is called “the Deluge” began in 1648, with the revolt of Ukraine from the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Ukraine has been important in the history of religion, and especially of Judaism. The Hasidic movement began in Ukraine in the eighteenth century. A century earlier, Ukraine had been the scene of an especially dark chapter in Jewish history. In what is conventionally called “the Khmelnytsky Uprising” (1648-1654) Orthodox Christians killed many thousands of Judaeans, and those who survived were forced temporarily to flee for safety to other lands. In order to see the Khmelnytsky Uprising and the rise of Hasidism in perspective, a summary glance at earlier Ukrainian history is necessary.

Early history of Ukraine: Judaism and Orthodox Christianity in Kievan Rus

We have seen in Chapter 24 that from the eighth century to the 960s the steppe country above the Black Sea, the Caucasus range and the Caspian had been ruled by the khan or khagan of the Khazars. Prior to the arrival of the Khazars the steppe had been controlled consecutively by coalitions of mounted warriors named Sarmatians, Goths, Huns and Avars. Under these transient overlords the valleys of the great rivers - Bug, Dniester, Dnieper, Don, Volga - were plowed and planted by a subject population known to the historian Jordanes (ca. 550) as *Antes* and *Sclaveni*. From the latter designation comes the name, “Slavs,” and it can be assumed that the steppe villagers spoke a variety of Slavic dialects. Because they were illiterate, they left behind no written records. In religion they were pagan and most of them continued to be so even under the Khazars, who converted to Judaism in the eighth century and whose rabbis learned to read and write Hebrew.

The first Slavic-speaking rulers of the steppe were the Grand Dukes of Kiev. Descended from Rurik, a Varangian (Norse) warlord, the Rurik dynasty at Kiev began late in the ninth century: ca. 880, Oleg of Novgorod conquered Kiev, taking it from the Khazarian khaganate. Kiev, on the right bank of the middle Dnieper, was already an important trading city, and Oleg moved his capital there from Novgorod. By the middle of the tenth century the Varangian rulers had become more or less Slavicized. Although Igor and Olga of Kiev still had Norse names, their son was named Sviatoslav. Sviatoslav I (ruled 963-972) was an intrepid warrior and greatly expanded the Kievan realm. The chief victim of his successes was the Khazarian khaganate, whose lands he overran. In 969 the forces of Sviatoslav sacked and burned Atil, the Khazars’ palace-city on the lower Volga.

For the next two hundred and sixty years Ukraine was ruled by Slavic-speaking monarchs of the Kievan Rus. For Ukraine these were years of religious transformation. When Sviatoslav conquered the land he and most of his army were still pagan (although Olga, Sviatoslav’s mother,

was a Christian and was remembered by later generations as St. Olga). Vladimir I (“the Great”), youngest son of Sviatoslav, was visited repeatedly by Jewish rabbis and Christian clerics, both groups doing their utmost to convert him to their religion. Vladimir finally crossed his Rubicon in 988, converting to Orthodox Christianity. Evidently the conversion resulted in an alliance with the Byzantine emperor. Following his conversion, Vladimir facilitated the establishment of Orthodox Christianity not only in Kiev but throughout his realm. Instrumental in the mass conversion was the availability of the Bible in the Old Church Slavonic translation that Cyril and Methodius had produced. Orthodox priests arrived from the Byzantine empire, bringing their sacred texts with them, and monks from Mt. Athos came to set up Orthodox monasteries. Several monastic communities were sited in caves, and one of the most famous of these cave monasteries was the Pechersk Lavra in Kiev, supposedly founded in 1015, just a generation after Vladimir’s conversion.

Vladimir’s pagan, Slavic-speaking subjects presumably were quite ready for Christianity, as they joined the South Slavic speakers of Serbia and Bulgaria in abandoning the gods and worshipping God. The ruling class in Ukraine, however, had been the Judaeans, and many of the Khazars’ subjects also were Judaeans: during the khaganate many Judaeans had transplanted themselves to Khazaria from the Byzantine empire and the Dar al-Islam, and we must assume that at least a small minority of the Khazars’ Slavic subjects had also converted to Judaism. For all the Judaeans of Ukraine the establishment of Christianity by Vladimir of Kiev must have been a bitter pill to swallow. Unfortunately, virtually nothing is known about this aspect of the Christianizing of Ukraine. We may suppose that some of the Judaeans were baptized into the Orthodox church and that their descendants became devout Christians. We may also suppose that other Judaeans left Ukraine for lands that were less enthusiastically Christian. Perhaps in the tenth and eleventh century a significant number of Ukrainian Judaeans moved northwest to Poland, where a tradition of religious pluralism obtained. This theory was proposed and argued by Yitzhak Schipper and other Polish historians who wrote before the Second World War, and has recently been revived by Jacob Litman.¹

Judaeans nevertheless continued to be an important element in Ukraine’s population under the Kievan Rus rulers.² The rulers were especially aware of the role that Jewish merchants and craftsmen played in the kingdom’s prosperity (one of the city gates at Kiev was known as “the Jewish Gate”). Some Christian subjects in the realm resented the Jewish prominence. Saint Feodosi, head of the Pechersk monastery in the 1060s, was said to have had frequent debates with Judaeans. Prince Sviatopolk II (1093-1113) was especially solicitous of the Judaeans, and immediately after his death Christians rioted against Judaeans at Kiev.³ The riots quickly subsided, however, and generally the Judaeans of Kievan Rus fared quite well.

At the end of the eleventh century the crusading frenzy led to attacks upon synagogues in Catholic Europe, and marked the beginning of a sustained movement of Judaeans from Germany and northern France to the more hospitable realms of Poland and Kievan Rus. In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the movement grew, in large part because of the Rindfleisch massacres along the Rhine, the expulsion of Judaeans from France and other Catholic kingdoms, and the anti-Jewish violence during the Black Death. As a result of the continuing migration the

Yiddish language became the language of the Judaeon communities in Ukraine and other lands of eastern Europe.

The Kievan Rus monarchy lasted from the ninth century to the thirteenth. It depended in large part on trade that moved along the Dnieper river, exchanging goods between the Byzantine empire and the lands along the Baltic sea. This trade declined in the twelfth century, after the Turkish conquest of Anatolia, and the state that had been centralized at Kiev began to fragment into smaller and regional states. All of these succumbed to the same Mongolian onslaught that devastated the Middle East and much of eastern Europe. The Mongolian riders defeated the princely and royal armies of Ukraine, sacked and burned the towns, and slaughtered many of the inhabitants. Kiev itself was sacked in 1240, the Rus kingdom came to an end, and for the next eighty years the people of Ukraine belonged to no state at all.

Ukraine under Lithuanian and Polish rule

In the early fourteenth century the predatory and pagan Lithuanians conquered most of Ukraine, while Polish kings were at the same time taking control of westernmost Ukraine. In 1386 the Polish and Lithuanian monarchies were united in the marriage of Jogaila, the Grand Duke of Lithuania, and the adolescent Queen Jadwiga of Poland (Jogaila's baptism into the Roman Catholic church was the condition for the marriage), and for almost three centuries the "Jagiellonian" monarchy and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth ruled over Ukraine.

Neither Jogaila (Jogiello) nor his immediate successors made any effort to convert Ukrainians from Orthodox to Catholic Christianity: the Polish-Lithuanian kings were happy simply to collect taxes, rents and other revenues from this conquered territory. Even after the Reformation, Sigismund I and Sigismund II, the last rulers in the Jagiellonian monarchy, did not press their Catholicism upon their Orthodox Christian subjects.

As the Counter-Reformation gathered momentum, however, and as Jesuits began to affect policy in Poland, religious tensions increased. The transition from the Jagiellonian monarchy to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, finalized in the Union of Lublin of 1569, made room for new religious policies in subject lands. One important novelty was a movement to bring the Orthodox Christians "back" into communion with Catholics. In 1596, under Polish-Lithuanian auspices, a number of Orthodox and Catholic bishops were brought together at Brest, a city on the Bug river and now in Belarus. The goal of the synod was to create a "uniate" church, a church united to Rome although preserving many of the Orthodox traditions that eastern Christians held dear. Much of the initiative for the synod came from Ipati Potocki, the Catholic bishop at Brest. As presented by Potocki, the Uniate church would have its own patriarch, but the church and the patriarch would accept the ultimate authority of the pope. Uniates would be allowed to keep their traditional Eucharistic liturgy, in their traditional Church Slavonic language, and to retain several other traditions (including the right of priests to marry). For obvious reasons the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth promoted this Uniate church, and in scattered places Orthodox congregations were converted to Uniate congregations.

A more aggressive Catholic initiative was launched by Jesuits. Between 1570 and 1647 the Jesuits established at least twenty colleges in Ukraine. Most of these colleges enrolled only

a few dozen boys and adolescents, but each of the larger ones enrolled several hundred. The curriculum in these colleges, as in those of western Europe, was in Latin. Daniel Schlafly, in his study of the Jesuit colleges set up in Orthodox Christendom, finds that “the primary emphasis, especially at the lower levels, was the acquisition of what was called *eloquentia*, or facility in the reading, writing and speaking of Latin.”⁴ All the academies required the students to attend daily masses. The Jesuit colleges appealed especially to the nobility and wealthier classes of Ukraine, many of whose sons became Roman Catholic priests.

More broadly, after the Union of Lublin the somewhat backward Ukraine became very profitable for the wealthier classes of Poland. The towns and small cities of Ukraine attracted Polish immigrants, many of them Jewish, who made their livelihood as craftsmen, merchants, and moneylenders. At the beginning of the seventeenth century the Jewish presence in Ukraine was considerable. Numbers, as usual, are hard to come by. Hebrew chronicles written soon after the Khmelnytsky Uprising spoke of enormous Jewish casualties, and a century ago historians believed that in 1648 the Judaeen population of Ukraine totaled at least half a million. More recent historians have scaled the numbers down drastically,⁵ but a drastic reduction is difficult to square with the overall importance of Ukraine in the history of Judaism.

At the same time that Catholicism was beginning to erode the sway of the Orthodox church, and that Judaeans were becoming prosperous in Ukrainian cities and towns, the peasants of Ukraine were beset by new economic and social troubles. In medieval times and through most of the Jagiellonian monarchy the peasants owed to their noble landlords approximately fourteen days of labor over the course of an entire year, a fairly light obligation. In later times, and especially after the Union of Lublin, the landlords’ demands increased significantly. By the 1640s many peasants were required to supply two days of labor every week for their landlords’ estates. Many of the landlords were Ukrainian nobles, but just as many were wealthy Polish noblemen, who lived in one of the Polish cities and seldom if ever visited their properties in Ukraine. Often a landowner would divide his immense property into small parcels and lease each parcel to a Jewish *arendar*, or leaseholder (Judaeans were allowed to lease land, but not to own it). Orest Subtelny’s *History of Ukraine* provides a detail that “on the vast lands of the Ostrorog family, for example, there were about 4000 Jewish leaseholders, and in 1616, over half the crown lands in Ukraine were leased out to Jewish entrepreneurs.”⁶ During the term of his lease the *arendar* regularly extorted as much labor and profit as he could from the peasants who farmed the land. In most of Christendom the right to carry weapons was forbidden to Judaeans, but in Ukraine this was not the case: the Polish-Lithuanian *sejm* (parliament) recognized that the Jewish *arendars* were in some danger, and therefore permitted them to carry firearms.

The Khmelnytsky Uprising (1648-1654)

Revolution came to Ukraine from an outside source: the Cossacks. Since the fifteenth century Cossacks (from a Turkish word meaning “freebooter” or “adventurer”) had been important in wars fought in Ukraine. Occasionally these freebooters were employed by the Ottoman sultan, the khan of the Crimean Tatars, the Russian tsar, or some other ruler. Most often they fought for the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, although from time to time they revolted in order to secure concessions or privileges from the Commonwealth. Bohdan

Khmelnysky, a Ukrainian and a high ranking officer among the Zaporozhian Cossacks, owned an estate near Subotiv, on a tributary of the lower Dnieper. During Khmelnysky's absence from the estate a Polish nobleman seized it, killed Khmelnysky's son and abducted his wife. This personal loss inspired Khmelnysky to incite his fellow Cossacks to revolt once more against their Polish-Lithuanian employers. The Cossacks acclaimed Khmelnysky as their *hetman* ("general"), a title hitherto conferred by the Polish-Lithuanian ruler. When the revolt began in 1648 Khmelnysky's goal was evidently to secure redress against Polish-Lithuanian outrages and to gain material advantages.

Once Khmelnysky had won several victories over Commonwealth forces, however, masses of Ukrainian peasants joined the revolt. Initially Khmelnysky had no particular religious agenda. He was himself an alumnus of a Jesuit college, and when he launched his revolt he allied himself with the Crimean Tatars, who were Muslims. The Ukrainian peasants, however, were solidly Orthodox in their Christianity and deeply resented the recent expansion of Catholicism in their land. As Khmelnysky evolved into the "liberator" of Ukraine from the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, he also became the champion of the Orthodox church against the Jesuits, Catholicism, and the Uniate compromise. By the end of the uprising virtually all Jesuits had been driven out of Ukraine and Catholicism was scarcely in evidence.

Khmelnysky and his Zaporozhian Cossacks were supported by Alexei, the Russian tsar in Moscow, who saw the revolt as an opportunity to gain control of at least some of Ukraine. Although that prospect worried Khmelnysky, he had no real alternative: once he had been joined by the Ukrainian peasants, further approaches to the Crimean Tatars or to the Ottoman empire were unthinkable, and many of the peasants saw Tsar Alexei - who was an Orthodox Christian - as a desirable ally. Early in 1654 Khmelnysky and the Cossacks, together with representatives of the Ukrainian peasants, signed an agreement making the Hetman and Ukraine vassals of the tsar in Moscow. A series of treaties, culminating in the "Eternal Treaty" of 1686, divided Ukraine into a Russian (left bank of Dnieper) and a Commonwealth (right bank of Dnieper) suzerainty over Ukraine. In Polish history Khmelnysky's rebellion is regretted as the beginning of the decline of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, while in Ukrainian schools the rebellion is celebrated as the beginning of modern Ukrainian history.

As Hetman of Ukraine, Khmelnysky was followed by other Zaporozhian Cossacks, each of them in turn elected to be - in effect - the Hetman and ruler of left-bank Ukraine. The Hetmanate continued until 1764, when Catherine II put left-bank Ukraine directly under her own rule. Right-bank Ukraine remained nominally under Polish control until 1793 (the Second Partition of Poland).

The pogrom against Judaeans in Ukraine, and their literary descriptions

The most conspicuous casualties of the Khmelnysky Uprising were the many Jewish communities which had hitherto been protected by the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. While Jesuits and their Catholic congregations were typically expelled from Ukraine or forced to convert to the Orthodox church, many Judaeans were killed and many others fled to lands where Polish-Lithuanian forces could protect them. Sources indicate that when the Khmelnysky

Uprising began more than two hundred Jewish communities were scattered across Ukraine. Most of these lay west of the Dnieper.⁷

Initially the Uprising was just another contest between the Cossacks and their Commonwealth employers, and the Jewish minorities would have had little cause for concern. When the peasants turned the Uprising into a Ukrainian revolt against the Commonwealth, and into a defense of the Orthodox church, the Judaeans were in obvious danger. The storm broke upon them especially in the years 1649-51. Many of Ukraine's Judaeans were massacred, and the survivors fled. How many Judaeans were slaughtered is much debated, but the number was high. On the lowest estimate it was something less than 20,000, but a number as high as 50,000 can also be supported by the evidence.⁸ The carnage and destruction of property gave rise to the word *pogrom*, which in Russian meant "devastation" (literally, "like thunder").

Terrible as the pogrom was, it became far worse in its literary descriptions. Soon after the massacres several Jewish writers composed and published Hebrew books telling what had happened. Such books were not a novelty: beginning with the First Crusade, texts in medieval Hebrew had chronicled Gentile atrocities against Judaeans. The early chronicles, or *Yizkor* ("remember," or memorial) books had been copied by hand, however, and therefore were slow to attract attention. In contrast, the chronicles of the Khmelnytsky massacres were written for publication in print, and once in print they almost immediately found readers in Jewish congregations across Europe and the Middle East. Most influential was Natan Hanover's *Sefer yeven metzulah* ("Book of Despair's Depth"). A refugee from northwestern Ukraine, Natan spent the rest of his life in central Europe or Italy. His book was printed at Venice in 1653. Two years later, and again in Venice, another description of Jewish suffering in the Uprising appeared. This was the *Tit ha-yeven* ("Place of Despair") of Shmuel Feibush, who was the son of Rabbi Nathan Feitel of Vienna. Such chronicles were meant to encourage Judaeans in remote places both to observe the Torah more strictly and to donate money for the survivors of the tragedy. Exaggeration of Gentile brutality and of Jewish suffering was therefore typical.⁹ The books written by Hanover and Feibush described how Khmelnytsky and his Ukrainians had desecrated and then destroyed synagogues and how they had cut up Torah scrolls and used them for sandals. Still more compelling were the grisly accounts of how the Gentiles had raped Jewish virgins to death, how they had drowned, flayed, or gutted thousands of Judaeans, and how they had buried thousands of others alive. In the chronicles 500,000 Judaeans are killed in the Khmelnytsky Uprising.

From a wide variety of sources - archival, literary, and archaeological - historians are now able to draw a more accurate picture of the pogrom.¹⁰ Shaul Stampfer has concluded that many, and possibly most, of the Judaeans in Ukraine were able to flee before the Ukrainian peasant forces arrived, and that the peasants' violence was often limited to vandalizing and burning the synagogues. The death toll was certainly considerable, but it is also clear that Judaism in Ukraine was only temporarily diminished. It revived quickly in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, and by the 1750s Jewish communities were many and flourishing. When Chaim Vital's *Etz hayyim* was finally published, in 1772, it was done at Zolkiev, a small city near Lviv, in northwestern Ukraine. And it was in Ukraine, at about the same time, that Hasidic Judaism began.

The Polish-Lithuanian Deluge, which began with the Khmelnytsky revolt, intensified with the Second Northern War (1654-1660) that the commonwealth fought against Sweden, and with the Russian-Polish war (1654-1667) for control of Ukraine. Through all of this perilous period John II Casimir was on the Polish-Lithuanian throne. As he fought against the Orthodox peasants of Ukraine, the Lutheran king of Sweden, and the Orthodox tsar of Russia, John Casimir became more and more devoted to the cause of Catholicism and the Counter-Reformation. In 1668 he abdicated his throne, went to France, and became a Jesuit. By that time the commonwealth had been reduced almost to half its earlier size, and in it neither Protestantism nor Socianian unitarianism was any longer of much consequence.

Jewish Messianism in the 1660s: Shabbetai Zvi

What Judaeans suffered in Ukraine, and the sensational books written about their sufferings, contributed to an extraordinary episode of Messianism. For many years Jewish expectations for the Messiah had been stirred by Kabbalah and especially by Isaac Luria's interpretation of the Kabbalistic texts. Some rabbis tried to lower such expectations, but in most synagogues Kabbalah and Messianism were more interesting than the Torah and the Talmud. As we shall see in the following chapter, in the middle decades of the seventeenth century Protestants in England and in western Europe were confident that the Millennium was about to begin, and they expected that it would be ushered in by the conversion of the Jews to Christianity. Amazing events were surely about to take place.

In the 1660s the Jewish enthusiasm for Kabbalah, compounded by the anguish over the Khmelnytsky massacres, led to the meteoric career of Shabbetai Zvi as the Jewish Messiah.¹¹ Shabbetai Zvi was born in Izmir, ancient Smyrna, in 1626, the son of a well-to-do Jewish agent for English interests at the city. Shabbetai was a studious boy, who steeped himself in the Kabbalah. Apparently he was mentally unbalanced, perhaps with a manic-depressive disorder, but he also had remarkable attributes. He came to believe that he was the Messiah, and in 1648, when he was twenty-two, he announced himself as such and began acting strangely. After the rabbis of Izmir excommunicated him because of his antics, he lived for some years in Thessaloniki, a largely Jewish city. There too the rabbis eventually banished him because of his messianic pretensions. From Thessaloniki he moved to Cairo, and then to Jerusalem.

In 1664 Shabbetai, still mostly an eccentric and a nuisance, married Sarah, a Jewish prostitute from central Europe. Soon after the marriage Shabbetai's fortunes began to change. The reason for the change was not so much Sarah as the endorsement that Shabbetai received from a young prodigy, Nathan of Gaza. At the time Nathan of Gaza was much better known than Shabbetai. Judaeans throughout the southern Levant regarded Nathan as a master of Kabbalah and indeed as a prophet: Nathan was believed, and believed himself, to be the recipient of divine visions. In 1665 Shabbetai Zvi entered into conversations with Nathan of Gaza, about Kabbalah and also about Shabbetai's belief that he was the Messiah. Nathan, assisted again by his divine visions, perceived that Shabbetai was indeed the Messiah, who would make Israel supreme over all the nations. Nathan proclaimed this good news, and added that Shabbetai's messianic destiny would very soon become manifest. Thanks to Nathan's

testimony, Shabbetai was soon celebrated as the Messiah by Judaeans, first in the Levant and then everywhere. It has been well said of Shabbetai Zvi that “his private myth had become the collective fantasy of the Jewish world.”¹²

In Italy and in Amsterdam and other Dutch cities the synagogues were especially caught up in the enthusiasm. Various witnesses claimed they had seen Shabbetai Zvi seated on the throne in Heaven, a crown upon his head.¹³ The year 1666 was a year that many Christians, especially in England, had identified as the year of Judgement Day, or the End of Time. Millennialism had emerged among English Protestants in the seventeenth century and increased after the execution of Charles I (in the early 1650s even Oliver Cromwell believed that The End was nigh).¹⁴ In 1665 English Millennialism crested during the Great Plague of London, in which perhaps 20% of Londoners died. With their great expectations for 1666, many English Christians were able to believe that Shabbetai Zvi was about to usher in the Millennium.

With great confidence Shabbetai declared much of the Torah no longer binding, since the Messianic Age had arrived, and he regularly and boldly pronounced the name, “Yahweh.” For his followers, now numbered in the hundreds of thousands, such radical behavior and teaching made his messianic claims even more convincing. Undoubtedly many Judaeans objected to Shabbetai and his program, and many more doubted his claims to be the Messiah. Few, however, protested. According to Harris Lenowitz, “many rabbinical figures did support Zvi’s claim; among those who did not, most hesitated to attack him openly.”¹⁵ Thousands of people, most of them Judaeans but some of them English Christians, poured into Palestine in order to be on hand when the world would be ruled from Jerusalem.

Shabbetai made a triumphant return to Izmir, but then his fortunes took a dramatic turn. Sultan Mehmed IV, worried about the uproar attending Shabbetai, summoned him to Istanbul and in September of 1666 gave him a stark choice: either convert to Islam (and receive a handsome stipend for life) or die. Shabbetai decided to live, and placed a turban upon his head. Most of his followers were shocked and dismayed, and denounced him as an imposter.

A minority of his followers, however, remained convinced that Shabbetai Zvi was the Messiah. Kabbalists discovered in their sacred texts that Shabbetai’s conversion to Islam was not only justified but required: the Messiah had first to plumb the depths before scaling the heights. Nathan of Gaza explained Shabbetai’s conversion “as a further step the messiah had to take to achieve the redemption of the broken bits of the universe.”¹⁶ Nathan also insisted that the day would soon come when the sultan would hand over his power and his throne to Shabbetai, after which the Muslims and Christians would surrender to him without a fight. All of Israel would be gathered together again, and the Gentiles would tremble in fear of their Jewish rulers.

The fantasies received another blow when Mehmed canceled Shabbetai’s stipend and exiled him to Dulcigno (in Turkish, Ülgün). This was a small town on the Adriatic sea in what is now Montenegro, and it was far from any Jewish population. Nevertheless, when Shabbetai died in 1676 his followers were still numerous. Although most Judaeans imposed a *damnatio memoriae* upon Shabbetai Zvi, Shabbetaian believers remained a significant sect through much

of the eighteenth century.

Shabbetaianism was the most spectacular instance of Jewish Messianism at least since the rebellion of Bar Kosiba in the second century, and perhaps since the formation of the *ekklesia* of Jesus the Christ in the first century. Subsequent episodes of Messianism have been less tumultuous. In the eighteenth century Jacob Frank presented himself as a reincarnation of Shabbetai Zvi. He attracted many followers in Ukraine and Poland, some of whom regarded him as the Messiah, but he was not of much consequence in the Middle East and in western Europe. In Hasidic Judaism expectation of the Messiah is much stronger than it is in other branches of Judaism. The most recent man regarded as the Jewish Messiah was Menachem Mendel Schneerson, the seventh Lubavitcher Rebbe.¹⁷ Schneerson headed the Lubavitcher Hasidic community in the Crown Heights neighborhood of Brooklyn from 1950 until he suffered a stroke in 1992 and died in 1994.

The “Great Turkish War” of 1683-1699

The Peace of Westphalia in 1648, establishing the principle of *cuius regio eius religio*, permitted the Habsburgs to make Catholicism the established religion throughout their hereditary lands (Austria, Bohemia, and western Hungary). The terms of the treaty obliged the emperor to allow Protestants to continue worshipping privately, and publicly at stated times and places, but he was hardly prevented from exerting pressure on them to rejoin the Catholic church. In response to such pressure, Protestants in western Hungary revolted from time to time, and they drew encouragement and support from the several Protestant communions of eastern Hungary, the prosperous plain over which the Ottomans were suzerains.

Leopold I, Holy Roman Emperor from 1658 to 1705, was especially keen to suppress Protestantism and in 1673 he forbade more than four hundred Protestant pastors to receive their livings from their congregations. In 1678 the Protestants of western Hungary rebelled, led by a young Lutheran nobleman named Imre Thököly (or Thököly Imre in Hungarian name-order). This revolt seemed unusually robust, as Protestant allies from Transylvania as well as eastern Hungary came to help their co-religionists. By 1683 Thököly was successful enough that the Ottoman vizier, Kara Mustafa, concluded that at long last the time had come for the Ottomans to extend their control across the Danube river. Mustafa convinced the sultan, Mehmed IV, to send him with a huge army to assist the Protestant rebels and defeat the Habsburgs. The army included some three hundred cannon, with which Mustafa intended to batter down the walls of Vienna. So began what from a Catholic vantage point was “the Great Turkish War.”

The Ottoman army, said to have numbered 100,000 men, easily marched through western Hungary and then proceeded to Vienna, laying siege to the city in July. As the Ottoman cannon were taking their toll on the city’s walls, and as Habsburg hopes were running low, relieving forces - well over 60,000 - arrived from Germany and Poland. Led by King Jan III Sobieski of Poland, and centered on his redoubtable hussar cavalry, the relieving armies attacked the Ottoman besiegers on September 12 of 1683. Within a few hours the Ottomans lost some 15,000 men and were put to flight, leaving behind all of their cannon. When news of the Battle of Vienna reached Istanbul, Sultan Mehmed recognized that the Ottomans were in danger of

losing much of their empire in central Europe and the Balkans. Vizier Mustafa was executed.

The youthful Tsar Peter the Great (ruled 1682-1725) and his regent were among the prime beneficiaries of the Battle of Vienna, even though they were not involved in it. The Russian tsars were chronic rivals of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth for control of Ukraine, and the heroism of Jan Sobieski and his Polish hussars at Vienna had come at a price. To amass an army for use against the Ottomans, Sobieski had been forced to weaken his Ukrainian front against the Russians. In addition, although victorious at the Battle of Vienna, Sobieski lost several thousand men that day. As a result King Jan felt constrained to reach an understanding with the tsardom about Ukraine. In the "Eternal Treaty" of 1686 Sobieski conceded to the Russians control of Ukraine east of the Dnieper river. In return for Sobieski's concession Peter agreed to enter an alliance, "the Holy League," against the Ottoman sultan, but even this was to the Russians' advantage. Knowing that the sultan was already much weakened, Peter and his regent saw the alliance as an opportunity to extend Russian control to the Black Sea.

Another member of the Holy League, and so another participant in the Great Turkish War, was Venice. With their formidable naval power the Venetians hoped to take from the sultan various port cities along the Dalmatian coast of the Adriatic (they had long held the island of Corfu and the city of Split). It was during their part of the Great Turkish War that the Venetians tried to take the city of Athens, and in the process blew up the Parthenon on September 26 of 1687. Although they failed to take Athens, by the end of the war the Venetians had taken most of what they wanted on the Adriatic.

The Battle of Vienna was only the beginning of the conflict between the Ottoman empire and the Habsburgs of Austria. Sultan Mehmed ordered the creation of another army, with which he hoped to recover Hungary. The destiny of both Hungary and Transylvania was fixed at the second Battle of Mohács, on August 12 of 1687 (the city of Mohács is on the right bank of the Danube, in south-central Hungary). Here the Ottomans lost ten times as many men as did the Habsburgs, and in the battle's aftermath Emperor Leopold extended his sway over all of Hungary and much of Transylvania. The Great Turkish War continued through the Battle of Zenta, on September 11 of 1697. The Habsburg commander launched a surprise attack on the Ottoman army as it was midway through the long process of crossing the Tisza river. At Zenta the Ottoman casualties were even higher than at the Battle of Vienna, while the Habsburg losses were minimal. The defeat persuaded Sultan Mustafa II that the war was lost, and in 1699 the Great Turkish War ended with the Treaty of Karlowitz.

In the Treaty of Karlowitz the sultan renounced his claim to much of his European holdings. To Leopold, the Holy Roman Emperor, he ceded Hungary, Transylvania, and Croatia (including Slavonia, in eastern Croatia). The Ottomans also gave up the Dalmatian coast to Venice. The next year (1700), the Russo-Turkish war ended with a treaty signed at Istanbul. The sultan abandoned his claim to Azov, the most important city on the Sea of Azov, and so gave to Tsar Peter the access to the Black Sea that he had long wished for.

The Great Turkish War not only resulted in the retreat of the Ottomans in southeastern Europe, but also was followed by a quickening of the Counter-Reformation and the end of

Protestantism in Hungary and Transylvania. Imre Thököly, the Protestant nobleman whose revolt had started the war, had fought at the side of the Ottomans, and alongside of them was defeated. As victor in the war, Emperor Leopold saw it as his right to foster Catholicism everywhere in the lands he won. Leopold and his successor helped the Jesuit and Franciscan orders to establish themselves in eastern Hungary and Transylvania, and to take over Protestant churches and properties there. Lutheran and Calvinist nobles were allowed to remain what they were, but Socinians and Anabaptists (who had received the usual protections from the sultan) were forced either to convert to Catholicism or to go into exile.

Peter the Great and his religious policies

Throughout the Great Turkish War the Russian tsar was Peter the Great (from 1682-89 nominal ruler, although under the regency of his half-sister, Sofya), the third of the Romanov tsars. In addition to his victory over the Ottomans, Peter won his way to the Baltic, built St. Petersburg and made it his capital, turned Russia westward instead of eastward, and made it a great European power. Shortly before his death Peter established the Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg, the first such institution in Russia.

Peter's relations with the Russian Orthodox church were complex. He was personally quite religious, but saw the institutions of the church as a hindrance to Russia's modernization. Monasticism seemed to him a drain on talent, and during his reign over half of the Russian monasteries were closed. He also saw the patriarchate as hindering his ambitions for Russia, and when Patriarch Adrian died in 1700 Peter appointed no successor. Instead he set up, in 1721, the Most Holy Governing Synod. This college of leaders from the church and from secular life served as a replacement for the patriarchate, but it had little independence. The Russian Orthodox church thus became one of the many departments that Peter organized to administer his enormous state. The patriarchate was not restored until 1917, on the eve of the Russian Revolution.

The Muslim populations in the east and south of Peter's empire retained their precarious freedom. Most of the early tsars had dangled before the Muslims incentives to convert to Christianity: forgiveness of taxes, allotments of land, and immunities from military conscription. This evangelizing policy was changed by Sofya during her years as regent. Sofya disliked the mercenary aspects of conversion and ordered the Orthodox bishops to baptize only those Muslims who of their own free will came forward as proselytes. "Tsar Peter, on the other hand, appears to have been an enthusiast of the church's evangelical mission in the south and east." Although he did not coerce conversion, he expressed his desire that Tatars and other non-Christian people be brought to "the love and knowledge of God."¹⁸

The exclusion of Judaeans from Russia continued under Peter. No legislation on this topic is recorded for his reign. Some anecdotes indicate that he did not think the time had yet come when a Russian majority could accept a Jewish minority in its midst, and that he was doing Judaeans a favor by not admitting them to his land. But other anecdotal evidence states that he disliked Judaeans even more than Muslims or pagans, and was for that reason adamant that no Jewish immigrants be admitted to his empire.¹⁹

Baal Shem Tov and the beginnings of Hasidic Judaism

Hasidic Judaism began in the Polish half of Ukraine, in the person of Yisroel (that is, Yisrael) ben Eliezer (1698-1760). In his later years Yisroel was known as Baal Shem Tov, and consequently was given the acronym, “the Besht.” Yisroel’s career had some parallels to that of Jesus *Nazoraio*s. The Besht’s followers, the *hasidim* (“pious,” or “righteous”), saw themselves not as defecting from Judaism, but as correcting it. Many other Judaeans, especially in western Europe, regarded Hasidism as opposition to the Talmud and as essentially a new religion.

The time and place in which the Besht lived were unusually troubled. After the “Eternal Treaty” of 1686, assigning the right bank of the Dnieper to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the left bank to the tsar of Russia, right-bank Ukraine was devastated by a series of rebellions known as the *haidamaka* movements. Two serious outbreaks occurred in 1734 and 1750 (a still more destructive one occurred in 1768, after the Besht’s death). A *haidamaka* was a band of Cossacks and Ukrainian peasants, and the targets of the Haidamakas were Polish nobles and military units, Judaeans, and Catholics.

At Tluste (now Tovste) in Ukraine, a few miles east of the Dniester river, and at Mezibuz, another city in western Ukraine, Yisroel ben Eliezer gained a reputation as a healer and wonder-worker. In western Europe and in the American colonies belief in witches, wizards and miracles had greatly subsided by the eighteenth century, but in the Jewish communities of eastern Europe such beliefs remained strong. Not himself a rabbi, Yisroel had as a very young man been a rabbi’s helper, a pedagogue for small children. After his marriage he worked at various trades, then became a medicinal healer, and as such gained a reputation as a wonder-worker. Soon villagers sought him out to inscribe their amulets with effective prayers. His fame growing, Yisroel was widely hailed as a Baal Shem, or “Master of the Name” (the Hebrew noun *ba’al* means “master” or “lord”). The title came from the wonder-worker’s use of God’s name to work miracles of healing, a practice that proliferated with Kabbalah. At least a dozen men - most of them in Germany, Poland and Ukraine - are known to have been acclaimed as a Baal Shem. Many rabbis discouraged their congregations from seeking the help of a Baal Shem, and most Jewish physicians were indignant at the wonder-workers, but often a Baal Shem was preferred to the physician.

Yisroel ben Eliezer far outdistanced the rest of the wonder-workers, and eventually became *the* Baal Shem (the adjective *tov* - “good” - was added to his epithet to distinguish him from ordinary wonder-workers, who were suspected of occasionally stooping to deception). The Besht was regarded by most Ukrainian Judaeans as an incomparably righteous man, a *tzadik*. He was not supposed to be the Messiah (the Besht himself spoke often of the Messiah, and wondered when he would appear). Nevertheless, the Besht was supposed to be the intermediary through whom divine power was transmitted to many of those with whom he came in contact.

Because of his great fame as a wonder-worker, the Besht was also supposed to have a unique understanding of God and his will. The Besht did not pretend to be a learned man. Unlike the rabbis, he was not well versed in the Talmud. Not surprisingly, he discounted study

of the Talmud and insisted that the path to God was through prayer rather than through study of the sacred texts. Instead of immersing himself in Talmudic complexities, the Besht preached that the essentials were thankfulness to God, joy in God's creation, and spirituality. Because of its emphasis on spirituality, Hasidism can be seen as an extension or outgrowth of Kabbalah.²⁰ One of the appeals of Kabbalah had always been the possibility of drawing closer to God through ecstasy. Ecstatic practices had usually been reserved for an inner circle of Kabbalist scholars, but Baal Shem Tov broadcast the practices to all of his followers. In several other respects the Besht's teachings were a departure from Kabbalah, and especially from Lurianic Kabbalah, which had encouraged asceticism and had taken a quite pessimistic view of the world.

Rabbi Dov Ber: the formulation and dissemination of Hasidic Judaism

The Besht died in 1760 and was buried at Mezibuz. After his death his example and his ideas coalesced into a religious movement. The elaboration of Hasidism was the achievement of Rabbi Dov Ber. One of the Besht's followers, Dov Ber was convinced that his master had indeed been a wonder-worker with unparalleled insights into God. Until his own death in 1772 Dov Ber worked tirelessly to spread the Besht's teachings. At Mezhirichi, another town in western Ukraine, Rabbi Dov Ber set up a rabbinical school in order to teach the Hasidic way that he had learned from Baal Shem Tov.

The average man, Dov Ber explained, can be in touch with God, for God is everywhere: in us, and in all things. It is wrong to emphasize (as Lurianic Kabbalah had) asceticism, mourning, waiting for the Messiah to appear, and denigration of the present. The world is good, not evil, and a person's life should be joyful. No great learning is required to draw close to God. The Hasidim can do that most directly through prayer, especially if they pray in a group, and make their prayers while chanting, dancing, or employing other emotional stimuli. Dov Ber also insisted, however, that a prayer can more quickly ascend to God if it is made by a man who is especially righteous: a *tzadik*. The Besht, said Dov Ber, was such a person. Emulating the Besht, Rabbi Dov Ber and his students strove to be Tzadikim.

After indoctrinating his students, Rabbi Dov Ber sent them out as both rabbis and apostles, to spread the Hasidic way through the synagogues of Ukraine. In his appointed city each of Dov Ber's disciples established his own Hasidic dynasty or "tradition," and maintained control of it throughout his lifetime. At the disciple's death he was succeeded by his oldest son. The grand rabbi in each tradition is conventionally known as "the Rebbe." Often younger sons of a Rebbe would each establish his own tradition. Thus Menachem Nachum Twerski, who was a disciple first of the Besht and then of Dov Ber, established the Hasidic dynasty at Chernobyl, and at his death was succeeded by his son, Mordechai Twerski. When Mordechai died in 1837 he was in turn succeeded by his oldest son, Aaron, as the Rebbe of the Chernobyl tradition. Aaron, however, was not Mordechai's only son, and at least four of Aaron's younger brothers moved to other and smaller cities and towns in order to establish dynasties of their own. Although many Hasidic dynasties came to an end in the Holocaust, several dozen still survive, each of which can trace its roots back to the disciples of Dov Ber and of the Besht.

Thus Hasidism expanded through all of right-bank Ukraine and Poland. At the

beginning of the nineteenth century several hundred thousand Judaeans were already Hasidic, and by the end of the nineteenth century the number had swelled to several million. Almost all lived in what by then had become Russia's Pale of Settlement and in other eastern European countries. During World War II their descendants were killed en masse by the Nazis. Hasidism today is centered in New York and in Israel.

Jacob Frank and Frankism

More temporary and far less important than Hasidism was Frankism. This movement began at about the same time and place as Hasidism, but was scarcely related to it (Frankism's disaffection from the Torah and Talmud went far beyond anything advocated by the Besht). In the 1720s the rabbis of Lviv (Lviv in Ukrainian, Lvov in Polish, Lemberg in German) had banished the Shabbethaians from their synagogues, but the sect stayed alive clandestinely. One of its members was Jacob Frank, and in the 1750s he began to gather a following in the western Ukraine. Claiming to have inherited Shabbetai Zvi's messianic mantle, or even to be a reincarnation of Shabbetai Zvi, Frank declared that he was receiving new revelations from God. The revelations instructed Frank's believers that they should abandon the Talmud and its requirements, and look only to the Kabbalah for guidance. Mainstream Judaeans called Frank and his followers "Zoharists," and most synagogues excommunicated them.

When Frank was rejected by the rabbis, another revelation ordered him and his followers to be baptized into the Catholic church (Frank was baptized in 1759). Throughout his life Frank continued to be regarded by his followers as the precursor to, and the herald of, the Messianic Age. Frank died in 1791, but Frankism continued into the nineteenth century.

Catherine the Great and the Jewish "Pale of Settlement"

Catherine II, a patron of the Enlightenment, ruled Russia from 1762 until 1796. Raised as a Lutheran, she married the heir-apparent to the Russian throne and accordingly converted to the Russian Orthodox church. After her young husband's untimely abdication and death, to which Catherine greatly contributed, she became the tsarina. Although her own religious views are unclear, as tsarina she was ostensibly the protector of the Russian church. She was not intolerant, however, in her Orthodoxy. After defeating the Ottomans in the Russian-Turkish war of 1768-1774, during which her fleets destroyed most of the Ottoman navy and gave Catherine control of the Crimea and all the northern shores of the Black Sea, she settled thousands of Mennonite Protestants in her newly acquired territory. The Mennonites had been harassed in Prussia, gratefully accepted Catherine's invitation, and prospered in Ukraine until the 1940s.²¹ Catherine was also reasonably tolerant of Catholicism. In 1773, when Pope Clement XIV dissolved the Jesuit order, Catherine made it clear that the Jesuits would be protected in Russia. Her noncompliance with Clement's order was intended to make it clear that - unlike the Catholic monarchs of western Europe - she did not obey the pope.

Catherine's most important action relevant to religion was her creation of a "Pale of Settlement" for her newly-acquired Jewish subjects. Traditionally the tsars had forbidden Judaeans to live in Russia. Even Peter the Great was adamant about this ban. Catherine was

forced to modify this traditional exclusion when she appropriated vast territories in which a large Jewish minority was well established. These were territories taken from the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The tsarina agreed first with Frederick II of Prussia, and then with his successor (Frederick William II), to “partition” the empire of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The first partition, with Prussia and Russia each taking over Polish-Lithuanian territory and subjects, occurred in 1772 and gave Catherine half of what is now Belarus. The second partition, in 1793, was far more drastic and left Poland-Lithuania a mere shadow of what it had once been. In this partition, Catherine took over the rest of Belarus, parts of eastern Poland and all of right-bank Ukraine. Following a revolt of Polish-Lithuanians and Belarusians, a third partition was implemented in 1795. Here Russia got much of what was left, Prussia and Austria taking the rest. Neither Poland nor Lithuania survived as a sovereign state (they were not resurrected until 1918). In the three partitions Catherine acquired 178,000 square miles of what had once been ruled by the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, and added more than ten million subjects. Of these, perhaps some two million were Judaeans, most of whom belonged to one or another Hasidic tradition.

The acquired territories became the “Pale of Settlement,” the only part of the Russian empire in which Catherine and her successors allowed Judaeans to live.²² An exception was made for certain professions and for all Judaeans who served in the tsar’s armies (conscription of young Jewish men began in 1827): upon discharge, these veterans were allowed to live outside the Pale. Stretching from the Black Sea almost to the Baltic, the Pale of Settlement covered approximately 200,000 square miles.

For Jewish residents within the Pale life was much restricted and often dangerous. Although pogroms were infrequent, the threat of a pogrom was constant. This was true especially at Odessa. During the Russo-Turkish war of 1787-1792 the small coastal town of Khadjibey (Hacıbey in Turkish) was taken from the Ottomans by Catherine’s troops. In 1795 she renamed the town Odessa and began building and transforming it into a large harbor city, to serve as Russia’s principal port on the Black Sea. Because of its role in international trade, Odessa attracted many Jewish merchants. A minor pogrom occurred at Odessa in 1821 and another in 1859. The last Odessa pogrom took place in March of 1905, during the revolutionary upheavals that culminated in the battleship *Potemkin* incident and that presaged the fall of the tsars. The 1905 pogrom, which was said to have resulted in the death of eight hundred Judaeans, was the work of Odessian supporters of the tsar and opponents of a revolution, but the pogrom also had religious ramifications (it occurred in Holy Week).

The worst of the pogroms, extending over much of the Pale of Settlement, exploded in 1881. The assassination of Tsar Alexander II was blamed by many, including Alexander III, on “the Jews.” The pogroms of 1881-83 were mostly grass-roots, but the tsar’s army and police did little to stop them. In May of 1882 Alexander III issued new laws tightening the restrictions under which Judaeans lived. The “May Laws” made it illegal for Judaeans to live either in the countryside of the Pale or in any of its cities that had fewer than 10,000 inhabitants. In large cities, such as Kiev, Odessa, and even Moscow, which was outside the Pale, a Jewish population was allowed, because the large cities required Jewish artisans, merchants and bankers. Hundreds of thousands of Judaeans were relocated from the countryside and from smaller cities

in the Pale to small towns that were entirely Jewish. The typical *shtetl* (the Yiddish word for “small town” was *shtetl*, cognate with the German *Städtlein*) had a population of a few thousand. Most of its inhabitants became progressively poorer as the decades passed, and the only education available was provided in the *shul* operated by the local rabbi. A fairly large *shtetl* might feature a yeshiva, to which young men from neighboring *shtetls* would repair in order to undertake advanced study of the Talmud and of Hasidic writings. The Pale of Settlement, and its many restrictions, continued until 1917. Significant Jewish emigration from Russia began in the 1880s, with many of the emigrants coming to the United States of America (half of the Russian immigrants to the U.S.A. proceeded no further west than New York City).

Reaction in Islam: the beginnings of Salāfism (Wahhābism)

The defeat suffered by the Ottomans at the hands of Austria, Venice and Russia was followed by cultural and religious changes in the Ottoman empire. One change, set in motion by the sultans themselves, was to modernize Ottoman political and military institutions, borrowing from the Christian states of Europe.²³ A very different initiative, launched by an Arabic religious reformer, was an attempt to rid the Islamic world of foreign influence. The reform aimed to return the Muslim world to its Arabic roots, and to return Islam to what it was immediately after Muhammad’s death.

Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Wahhab (ca. 1703-ca. 1790) was a native of the Najd, the vast plateau of central Arabia.²⁴ He was born in al-Unaynah, a village some twenty miles north of Riyadh. The Najd, very different from the Hijaz, was subject to few outside influences, and had rarely been dominated by imperial powers. Ibn Abd al-Wahhab came from a long line of jurists (his grandfather was a *qadi*) prominent in the Najd, and in that tradition he went off to study *fiqh*, first at Mecca and Medina and then at Basra. It was at Basra that Ibn Abd al-Wahhab had what has been described as a conversion experience.²⁵ In the aftermath he became convinced that Islam in the more civilized world had become decadent. By the 1730s, persuaded that a more primitive society and a strict application of Sharia were what God required, Ibn Abd al-Wahhab returned to the Najd and began his career as religious reformer.

In his harangues and in his *Kitab al-tawhid* (“Book of Monotheism”) and other writings Ibn Abd al-Wahhab stressed that God alone has supernatural powers, and that any practice that suggests otherwise is *shirk* (the term connotes superstition, pantheism, and polytheism). The reformer was opposed to Shiah Islam and especially to the Sufis and their mysticism. He also denounced the prayers that Sunnis frequently made at the graves of holy men. Throughout his life he preached a return to *salāf*, a collective noun referring to the “time of origins” or to the first generation of Islam. His followers called themselves *salafī* and strove to resemble as closely as possible the first believers. The religious movement that Ibn Abd al-Wahhab began is therefore called Salāfism, although its opponents commonly call it Wahhābism.

Ibn Abd al-Wahhab’s significance is due in large part to his conversion of Muhammad ibn Sa‘ūd, the amir of the oasis town of Dar‘iyya, a hundred miles west of Riyadh. Until his conversion, Ibn Saud had been a minor - although fairly independent - ruler of a sparsely settled province of the Ottoman empire. After his conversion, Ibn Saud not only declared his

independence from the sultan but also began to attack and subdue neighboring amirates. The Salafis despised the Ottoman empire, seeing it as the instrument of a debased form of Islam.²⁶ By his death in 1765, Ibn Saud ruled a large desert territory. The conquests were made in the cause of *jihād*, for Ibn Abd al-Wahhab had persuaded Ibn Saud that Muslims who disagreed with *salāf* were not Muslims at all, but heretics. Given the Salafis' veneration of tradition it is an irony that Ibn Saud's military success was made possible by the introduction of firearms, in place of the traditional sword and spear, an innovation that was apparently made on the instruction of Ibn Abd al-Wahhab. With his modern weaponry Ibn Saud was able to conquer much of the Arabian peninsula and to harry the lands just beyond its perimeter.²⁷

The Saudi dynasty and Saudi Arabia itself trace their roots to this religious, military and political upheaval in the middle of the eighteenth century. Between 1805 and 1811 Saudi forces, led by Saud ibn Abdul Aziz, temporarily controlled Medina and Mecca, and so oversaw the annual Hajj. In response to this expansion of Saudi power, Muhammad Ali Pasha, the ruler of Egypt and a nominal subject of the Ottomans, went to war with the Saudis, defeated them, and in 1818 destroyed their capital at Dar'iyya. So ended the first Saudi state. A second Saudi state was established in 1824, with its capital at Riyadh, and lasted until 1891, but neither it nor its Salafi brand of Islam were of more than regional importance. In 1902 the youthful Abdul Aziz bin Abdur Rahman al Saud (who preferred to be called "Ibn Saud") led a daring expedition that recaptured Riyadh, and established the third Saudi state. With the development of the oil industry in the Arabian peninsula, and with the end of the Ottoman empire, the Saudi dynasty and Wahhabi Islam began to assume global importance.

1. See Litman 1984.

2. On Judaeans in Kievan Rus see Dubnow 1918, pp. 9-11.

3. It was under Sviatopolk II that a monk, Nestor, composed what is conventionally called the Primary Chronicle, the most important source on the early Kievan Rus dynasty.

4. Schlafly 1997, p. 422. At pp. 428-29 Schlafly observes that in the Jesuit colleges of Belarus "the curriculum reflected the *Ratio*'s emphasis on Latin, with fourteen and one-half hours per week, or one-half of all class time, devoted to it in the first year."

5. In his recent history of Ukraine, Orest Subtelny estimated that in the early seventeenth century the Jewish minority in Ukraine numbered about 120,000, or about six per cent of the total population of Ukraine. See Subtelny 2000, pp. 81 and 107-08. An extreme revision, by Shaul Stampfer, puts the number at only 40,000. See Stampfer 2003B.

6. Subtelny 2000, p. 124.

7. For locations see Stampfer 2003A.

8. Stampfer 2003B argues for the lower estimate, noting (p. 210), that the Jewish chronicles “report far more casualties in Pinsk and Dubno than do the archival sources. Many Jews clearly escaped.” Subtelny 2000, pp. 127-28, states that “between 1648 and 1656, tens of thousands of Jews - given the lack of reliable data, it is impossible to establish more accurate figures - were killed by the rebels, and to this day the Khmelnytsky uprising is considered by Jews to be one of the most traumatic events in their history.”

9. See Stampfer 2003B, p. 210: “The authors of the Jewish chronicles were motivated by a desire to arouse emotions and to lead readers to consider the punishments God metes out to individuals. Their descriptions had value only if they could lead readers to repent or to maintain the sacred memory of the victims. The more moving the description, the more likely it was to achieve its goal. Chronicles also aimed at encouraging readers generously to support survivors: here, the more dramatic the story, the better. Historical accuracy plays no role in either case. Precision might, in fact, be counter-productive. The more victims reported, the greater the horror and consequent repentance and generosity.”

10. The second fascicle of Vol. 17 of *Jewish History* (2003) is devoted entirely to the consequences for Jewish communities of the Khmelnytsky Uprising.

11. For details on Shabbetai Zvi see Lenowitz 1998, pp. 149-166, a chapter titled, “The Messiah of Izmir: Shabtai Zvi.”

12. Halperin 1997, p. 297.

13. Most of the Hebrew writings that glorified Shabbetai, hailing him as the Son of God, were destroyed either after his conversion to Islam or after his death. But a few have survived. Two Hebrew books (one of them a daily prayer book) published in Amsterdam in 1666 proclaim Shabbetai Zvi as the Messiah, Son of David, and destined to rule the entire world. For the frontispieces of these books see the website <http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/loc/False.html>

14. See Bryan Ball, *A Great Expectation: Eschatological Thought in English Protestantism to 1660* (Leiden: Brill, 1975).

15. Lenowitz 1998, p. 160.

16. Lenowitz 1998, p. 150.

17. On Schneerson and other messiahs in Hasidic Judaism see Lenowitz 1998, pp. 188-224 (“The Tzaddik of Hasidism”).

18. Cracraft 1971, p. 65.

19. Dubnow 1918, pp. 119 ff. (“The Jews under Peter I and his Successors”).

20. See Idel 1988, p. xvii: “we may consider the emergence of Hasidism not so much as a

reaction to Sabbatianism or Frankism but as a restructuring of Jewish mysticism already initiated by the Safedian Kabbalists.”

21. After 1917 the Russian Mennonites suffered under the Soviets and in 1941 welcomed the German armies as liberators. As the Soviets drove the Germans out of Ukraine in 1943 and 1944, most of the Russian Mennonites fled westward to Germany.

22. On the establishment of the Pale see Richard Pipes, “Catherine II and the Jews: the Origins of the Pale of Settlement,” *East European Jewish Affairs* 5 (1975), pp. 3-20.

23. On this see Ekmeleddin Ihsanoglu, *Science, Technology, and Learning in the Ottoman Empire: Western Influence, Local Institutions, and the Transfer of Learning* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate/Variorum 2004). Although some borrowings were made in the 18th century, substantial change did not occur until the 19th. The “reorganization” or *tanzimat* of the Ottoman empire began with Sultan Abdülmecid’s proclamation in 1839 that new programs would be launched, leading to new institutions. The reforms led to the building of railroads, the establishment of non-religious schools and universities, civil equality for non-Muslims, and other “modernizations.” The Tanzimat continued through the 1860s.

24. For a recent book on Muhammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb and Wahhabi Islam see Natana J. DeLong-Bas, *Wahhabi Islam: From Revival and Reform to Global Jihad* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004). This book paints a positive picture of Ibn Abd al-Wahhab, and early Salafism, and presents the modern Muslim jihadists as aberrations from the original intent. The latter seems a fair assessment, but does not give enough attention to the radicalism inherent in the original doctrine.

25. Michael Cook, “On the Origins of Wahhābism,” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 2 (third series, 1992), pp. 191-202.

26. See Ochsenswald and Fisher 2004, p. 264: “From the Saudi-Wahhabi point of view, the Ottomans were among the chief enemies of true Islam.” In the 18th century, according to Lewis 1997, p. 333, “Only one Arabian movement challenged the legitimacy of the Ottoman state, and that was Wahhābism.”

27. See Lewis 1997, p. 333: “From about the middle of the eighteenth century these new warriors of the faith, led by the military skill of Ibn Sa‘ūd and inspired by the religious teachings of Ibn Abd al-Wahhāb, conquered much of Arabia and in time even threatened the borderlands of Syria and Iraq.”