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The Demonization of Judaism

“Jew-hatred is the eldest social, cultural, religious and political prejudice of human kind; Jew-hatred occurs in segregating and stigmatizing stereotypes, long before discrimination and brute force make this resentment public, i.e. in passed down conceptions of the minority by the majority, passed on uncritically from generation to generation.”¹

Is there some continuity in antisemitism from Antiquity to the Shoah up to the present, or are these rather separated periods because of the large local and historical differences? In research on antisemitism, a line is drawn between the religiously motivated Jew-hatred and the national and racist antisemitism that developed in the nineteenth century. Is there a continuous “history of anti-Semitism” as described by Léon Poliakov in his four-volume book (1955–1977) of the same title?² Shulamit Volkov put it aptly when she talked about the development of antisemitism as “continuity and discontinuity,”³ similar to the way Raul Hilberg showed the connection between medieval Jew-hatred and National Socialist antisemitism in his standard work The Destruction of the European Jews (1961), but he also did not fail to point out the differences between the two. Certainly, religion-based anti-Judaism, racial antisemitism, and anti-Zionist antisemitism are forms of the same root—Jew-hatred, a phenomenon that can be encountered throughout the entire history of the Jews.

Of course, there are large and important differentiations between cultural and racist antisemitism, between primary and secondary antisemitism, just as there are surprising continuities with the phenomena of Jew-hatred. Certain antisemitic pictures from antiquity up to the present can be established that create new, often bizarre, bonds that survive preposterous to reason. One of the central antisemitic perceptions is the alleged relation between Judaism and the devil, which will be shown here.

The demonization of Judaism began already in ancient times, especially at the beginning of Christianity, and its ramifications became reflected not only in anti-Jewish legislation and pogroms but also in literature, arts, and movies. In antiquity, scribes such as Apion (20 B.C.E.–45 C.E.) and Manetho (250

1 W. Benz, Was ist Antisemitismus? (Munich: Beck, 2005), 7. Translation by the author of this article.
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B.C.E.) used antisemitic elements that show an alleged connection between Jews and dark forces. The texts of Apion and Manetho are lost and passed on in excerpts only by Flavius Josephus (37–100 C.E.), who points out aptly: “Would not anyone either laugh at such nonsense or alternatively detest the effrontery in writing such things?”

In the first century C.E., Josephus wrote a rebuttal to the antique antisemitism of authors like Apion and Manetho. In the third century B.C.E., Artapanus of Alexandria also knew about the antisemitic texts of Manetho, which should serve as a proof that Manetho himself wrote them and that they were not be attributed to a later Pseudo-Manetho. Artapanus of Alexandria, an early Jewish historian of the second century, wrote a history of the Jews entitled “Concerning the Jews” as an apologia against authors like Manetho. Unfortunately, only fragments of this text are preserved. Manetho, an Egyptian-Alexandrian high priest from Heliopolis, spoke out harshly against the Jews. He regarded them as “impure” Egyptians who pollute the country. It is of a certain importance that in his text, Manetho described Avaris as the living and dwelling place of the Jews, Avaris being the city of Seth, a rather evil god of the desert and ruler of war and chaos who killed Osiris according to Egyptian mythology.

Antisemitism of the antiquity influences even today’s Latin lessons via later Roman authors such as Tacitus (58–120 C.E.), who merged ideas with ancient antisemitic polemics in the fifth volume of his work “The Histories” in an “Exкурsus about the Jews.” The antisemite Tacitus deliberately ignored authors like Josephus in favor of these polemics. Tacitus, who contemptuously described Jewish monotheism and aniconism, makes use of elements that sound astoundingly modern.

(5.1) This worship, however introduced, is upheld by its antiquity; all their other customs, which are at once perverse and disgusting, owe their strength to their very badness. The most degraded out of other races, scorning their national beliefs, brought to them their contributions and presents. This augmented the wealth of the Jews, as also did the fact, that among themselves they are inflexibly honest and ever ready to shew compassion, though they regard the rest of mankind with all the hatred of enemies. (5.2) They sit apart at meals, they sleep apart, and though, as a nation, they are singularly prone to lust, they abstain from intercourse with foreign women; among themselves nothing is unlawful. Circumcision was adopted by them as a mark of difference from other men. Those who come over to their religion adopt the practice, and have this lesson first instilled into them, to despise all gods, to disown their country, and set at nought parents, children, and brethren. Still they pro-

vide for the increase of their numbers. It is a crime among them to kill any newly-born infant.⁵

Tacitus connects the religion-based Jewish self-exclusion with hatred towards other peoples. He wants to limit Jewish influence on the Romans. According to him, Jews are rich and eager to reproduce heavily in order to rule the world at some point—these are all timeless ideas of antisemitism. Tacitus’ effective history in the history of antisemitism has been researched only partly so far. His book “Germania” serves as the background for the Deutsche Ahnenerbe-Studien-gesellschaft für Geistesurgeschichte [German Ancestral Heritage-Study Society for Primordial Intellectual History] and influenced National socialist ideologist like Alfred Rosenberg.⁶

However, it was not the antisemitism of the Egyptians and the Romans that constituted the central world of images of antisemitism but Christian Jew-hatred. The so-called “Jesus Movement” turned into Christianity by encountering Greek paganism, whereas Judeo Christians and Greek Christians singled out the central points of their common “Christian” teachings stemming from Philo of Alexandria’s intellectual world:

Philo didn’t see Jesus of Nazareth, his contemporary, as the son of God and as a teacher, he probably didn’t even know about him. His teachings were taken up by the Greek Christians who turned his concept into a new world religion. This fact is being downplayed or even denied by almost all Christian theologians of both confessions because of dogmatic reasons. This would lead to the conclusion that the profession of Christ in its display isn’t a divine revelation but rather the outcome of a cultural thinking process.⁷

In Christian theology, the Jewish philosopher Philo (20 B.C.E–50 C.E.), who did not have any influence on rabbinic Judaism, is seen as a link between Greek and Jewish culture with Jesus the Jew in the center of its faith. Nevertheless, a systematic demonization of Judaism took place already in the very first Gospels. A debate about the relevant paragraphs in the New Testament being antisemitic is, in fact, a pure theological discussion. Since these texts are the basis for the researchers’ own faith, it is important to free them from anti-Judaism. The

⁷ A. Grabner-Haider and J. Maier, Kulturgeschichte des frühen Christentums: von 100 bis 500 n.Chr. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008), 53. Translation by the author of this article.
New Testament has to be regarded as a collection of texts in its historical reality and most of the defamations should be seen as part of the disputes that came up when the Christians as a partial Jewish sect split from traditional Judaism. Similar disputes occurred also in modern sectarian movements within Judaism, such as Sabbatianism. Nevertheless, one must not ignore the bloody consequences of anti-Jewish sections in the New Testament, no matter if they had been part of a polemic debate or not—these text will never be a haven of charity. Despite engaged Christian theologians pointing out over and over again that the trial of Jesus was a Roman one and that crucifixion was a Roman form of capital punishment, the image of the Jewish deicides persists even today.

In a central study of Jesus’ trial, *The Trial and Death of Jesus: From a Jewish Perspective* by Haim Cohn (1911–2003), it is described how—as absurd as it may sound—after the foundation of the State of Israel in 1948, petitions, mostly from Protestant clerics, were sent to the newly established High Court to reinstate the trial of Jesus in order to “fix the tragic judicial error that our immediate predecessors, the Sanhedrin, made with Jesus.” The Israeli lawyer and law historian Cohn was consigned to this “case” and shows impressively in his book, how different and contradictory the passion reports are and which goals are hidden behind the thesis of the “Jewish deicides.” The four canonical Gospels (Matthew, Luke, John, and Mark) tell different and conflicting versions of the passion (the tale of woe). The High priest accuses Jesus (Mark) or does not (Luke); the story about Barabbas comes from Pontius Pilate (Matthew) or from the people (Mark), etc. The Evangelists wanted to show that the Jews are to blame for the killing of Christ and therefore, as a punishment, the Second Temple had been destroyed by the Romans in 70 C.E. Obviously, this is the background for carefully drawing a parting line between Christianity and Judaism, which unfortunately gradually turned into a deep rift. The alleged “collective guilt of the Jews” of the actual Roman execution of Jesus is pointed out many times in the New Testament—either as an accusation or a self-cursing.

Discrepancies can be found not only with regards to content. Since Jesus as the Messiah was never relevant in Judaism, the Gospel of John depicts the Jews in dualistic pictures in connection with the divine counterworld of Satan, because of their rejection of the wrong Messiah, Jesus states:

37 “I know that you are Abraham’s descendants. Yet you are looking for a way to kill me, because you have no room for my word.” 38 I am telling you what I have seen in the Father’s presence, and you are doing what you have heard from your father.” 39 “Abraham is our father,” they answered. “If you were Abraham’s children,” said Jesus, “then you would

---

do what Abraham did. As it is, you are looking for a way to kill me, a man who has told you the truth that I heard from God. Abraham did not do such things. You are doing the works of your own father.” “We are not illegitimate children,” they protested. “The only Father we have is God himself.” Jesus said to them, “If God were your Father, you would love me, for I have come here from God. I have not come on my own; God sent me. Why is my language not clear to you? Because you are unable to hear what I say. You belong to your father, the devil, and you want to carry out your father’s desires. He was a murderer from the beginning, not holding to the truth, for there is no truth in him. When he lies, he speaks his native language, for he is a liar and the father of lies. Yet because I tell the truth, you do not believe me! Can any of you prove me guilty of sin? If I am telling the truth, why don’t you believe me? Whoever belongs to God hears what God says. The reason you do not hear is that you do not belong to God.” (John 8:37–47)

In the book of Revelation, the “obdurate” Jews unwilling to accept Jesus as their messiah are called “Satan’s synagogue” (Rev 2:9; 3:9). They are seen as the leuds of the “anti-Christ” in the Epistles of John, bearing obvious Jewish traits later on in the Middle Ages. The demonization of Judaism, the way it was applied in the writings of the New Testament, was even expanded in the literature of the Fathers of the Church. Origen (185–254 C.E.) wrote a deeply anti-Jewish doctrine, which states that the Jews will of course end up in hell because of their denial of Christianity. John Chrysostom pointed out Judas’ greed and held eight speeches “Adversus Judeaeos” in 387.

But now you see your own brother being dragged off unjustly to the depth of destruction. And it is not the executioner who drags him off, but the devil [...]. If he will stand fast in his obstinate resolve, I shall choose to risk my life rather than let him enter the doors of the synagogue. (Adv. Jud. I:4, 6)

Alfons Fürst summed up the antisemitism of the Fathers of the Church:

They can be seen as the most outrageous denunciation of Judaism that can be found in the writings of a Christian theologian and form a proper compendium of polemic allegations and defamations. Jews are described as godless, brazen, heinous, contentious, rude and inhumane, unfortunate, cursed, mad, they are alleged braggarts, robbers and thieves, blasphemers, enemies of the truth, gluttons and drunkards, dogs, studs, bucks and pigs, they are in a league with the devil, sacrifice humans and crucified Christ, their synagogue is a brothel or a robber’s den and serves as a place where the law is breached and as a hideout for demons.

---

10 A. Fürst, *Von Origenes und Hieronymus zu Augustinus: Studien zur antiken Theologiegeschichte* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011), 298. Translation by the author of this article.
When Christianity expanded its dominant position in the Middle Ages, its enemies such as sects and heretics were associated more and more with the concept of the enemy, the devil. Looking at the typical features the devil displays in Christian perception, one can easily notice the connection with Judaism through antisemitism. The devil as the endless roamer on earth looking for humans to seduce turns into the always roaming, restless Jew. The devil’s features such as the horns, bad smell, ecstasy, and “satanic” sexuality that he received from his archetypes like Hades, Pan, and his satyr Dionysus, form the antisemitic picture of the Jew. In the Middle Ages, distinct perceptions of the “satanic Jews” were already formed. Jews were blamed for various reasons for using Christian blood, either as a special ingredient for the unleavened bread (Mazzot) for Passah or for medical or theurgical reasons. These blood accusations, that Jews would kill Christian children in order to draw off their blood (first in Rothenburg, Germany) or that they would copy the crucifixion of Jesus by crucifying Christians (Norwich 1144), draw a line from the Middle Ages up to the present. It does not come as a surprise, then, that in one of the first depictions of a Jew, in the Forest Roll of Essex (1277), one can find the description: “Aaron fil (ius) diaboli,” Aaron, son of the devil.¹¹

The image of the Jew as the representative of the world of darkness and Satan is displayed in works of antisemitic writers throughout the ages up to Hit-

ler’s *Mein Kampf*, where Jews are described as the “archetype of the evil seeking force” and the “personification of the devil as the allegory of all evil.”

Unsurprisingly, the national-socialist weekly *Der Stürmer* [*The Stormtrooper*] too equates the Jew with the devil. In 1936, the Stürmer publishing house published one of the most disgusting antisemitic books, a children’s book by Elvira Bauer, a kindergarten teacher, called *Trau keinem Fuchs auf grüner Heid’ und keinem Jud’ bei seinem Eid! Ein Bilderbuch für Groß und Klein* [*Trust No Fox on a Green Heath and No Jew on his Oath! A Storybook for the Old and the Young*]. Its aim was to teach children in kindergarten and at school both the ABCs and Jew-hatred.

This unique book wasn’t written for little children only, but also for adults, because [...] as long as there are still people who do not recognize the hidden devil within their “decent” Jew [...], as long as people like these exist, this unique book by Elvira Bauer was written for big children too [...]. Young and old will thank her for having written a storybook that should be placed on every Christmas table in the new “Reich” of the new people.

The first chapter bears the title “The Jew’s father is the devil,” and so it continues:

At the creation of the world
The Lord God conceived the races:
Red Indians, Negroes, and Chinese,
And Jew, too, the rotten crew.
And we were also on the scene:
We Germans midst this motley medley-
He gave them all a piece of earth
To work with the sweat of their brow.
But the Jew went on strike at once!
For the devil rode him from the first.
Cheating, not working, was his aim;
For lying, he got first prize
In less than no time from the Father of Lies.
Then he wrote it in the Talmud.


**13** Ibid., 355.

**14** *Der Stürmer* 48 (1936). Translation by the author of this article.

**15** E. Bauer, *Trau keinem Fuchs auf grüner Heid und keinem Jud bei seinem Eid* (Nürnberg: Stürmer Verlag, 1936), 3. Translation by the author of this article.
One figure in the New Testament that demonstrates the demonization of Judaism very well and firmly established the Jewish connection to the evil side through folklore up to the National Socialist propaganda of the Third Reich and the current trash-culture is Judas Iscariot. In the Gospel of John, he already turns into the figure of the devil and into “Judas, the traitor,” while the Jewish people subsequently turn into the devil’s people par excellence:

70 Then Jesus replied, “Have I not chosen you, the Twelve? Yet one of you is a devil!” 71 He meant Judas, the son of Simon Iscariot, who, though one of the Twelve, was later to betray him. (John 6:70–71)
Hippolytus (d. 255 C.E.) claimed that Judas’ ancestry derives from the same tribe as the anti-Christ, while John Chrysostom pointed out Judas’ greed. Judas, the Jews, and Satan consequently form a counter image of the Holy Trinity.

It may seem as strange coincidence that of all Jesus’s twelve disciples, the one whom the Gospel story singles out as traitor bears the name of the Jewish people. The coincidence was not overlooked by Christian commentators, who saw it as a mysterious sign, by which the Judas-role of the Jews was divinely hinted at [...]. And it will become reasonably clear that Judas was chosen for a baleful but necessary mythological role precisely because of his name.

Church father Papias of Hierapolis (d. 140 C.E.) depicts Judas as a living dead, an undead. His attempt to take his own life failed because the rope around his neck had been removed before he drew his last breath. However, a devilish miracle happened to him. He started to decay alive until he finally died. Allegedly, the place of his suicide had been polluted in a way that the lingering, hellish smell made it impossible to live there. Judas is being demonized here in a disgusting manner, having the figure of an obese giant that secretes pus and worms and whose eyes are obscured by the amount of bulging fat around them. This depiction already contains antisemitic stereotypes such as ugliness, smell or “abnormal sexuality” that return in the Middle Ages and in Modernity. The Papias text, which has not been preserved, was originally passed on by Apollinaris of Laodicea:

His genitals appeared more loathsome and larger than anyone’s, and when he relieved himself there passed through it pus and worms from every part of his body, much to his shame.

Papias’ monstrous Judas later turns into Judas the “roaming Jew” and the prime father of the vampires. According to a Greek-Macedonian tale, Judas walks the earth as an always thirsty undead. The equation of Judas and Judaism is obvious in many European national customs and sayings, like the custom of burning the “Judas doll”:

17 H. Maccoby, Judas Iscariot and the Myth of Jewish Evil (London: Peter Halban, 1992), VII.
Judas is often incinerated as a “Jew,” rarely as Barabbas or Pilate, or as a “woman”. This anti-Semitic side of burning Judas, where at the same time a specific person has to endure the same procedure, almost led to a pogrom in the Jewish ghetto of Zante in 1760, when the Venetian authorities tried to hinder Christians from burning the Jewish merchant Jacob Tedishkos as Judas.\textsuperscript{20}

Some traditional sayings fatally equate Judas with the devil and the devil with Judaism, later adding the aspect of the red hair as a distinctive mark for vampires.

It doesn’t come as a surprise that Judas and the Jews are often interchangeable in the mal-edictory formulas [...] Red beard and blue eyes, Judas’ soul, Satan’s heart. [...] A saying in Symi, stemming from the Judas doll, calls a disheveled looking person “looking like a Jew on Easter Sunday.”\textsuperscript{21}

The idea of the satanic Judas being the first vampire became part and parcel of a popular belief, tending to be antisemitic. It is no wonder that the Irish writer Bram Stoker (1847–1912) in his classic vampire novel \textit{Dracula} (1877) draws the picture of the vampire with a multitude of antisemitic motives and images and refers to Judas as well:

The last I saw of Count Dracula was his kissing his hand to me; with a red light of triumph in his eyes, and with a smile that Judas in hell might be proud of.\textsuperscript{22}

Literary scholars such as Judith Halberstam have been pointing out this connection for quite a while already; regrettably, this hasn’t been taken into account so far and has been ignored in the commentaries of numerous reprints and translations:

Dracula, then, resembles the Jew of anti-Semitic discourse in several ways: appearance, his relation to money and gold, his parasitism, his degeneracy, his impermanency or lack of allegiance to a fatherland, and his femininity. Dracula’s physiognomy is a particularly clear cipher for the specificity of his ethnic monstrosity.\textsuperscript{23}

Historian Sara Libby Robinson of Brandeis University also recognizes quite a resemblance between Stoker’s portrait of Dracula with his crooked nose, bushy

\textsuperscript{20} Puchner, \textit{Lazarus und Judas}, 106. Translation by the author of this article.
\textsuperscript{21} Ibid., 108. Translation by the author of this article.
eyebrows, pointy ears and claw-like, ugly fingers and the antisemitic image of
the Jew: “Dracula’s physical attributes are stereotypically Jewish features.”

Stoker makes use of the various ritual murder accusations (e.g., the ritual
murder trial of Tisza Eszlar in 1882) as well as the eastern European migration
to England at the end of the nineteenth century. He lets Dracula and the other
vampires kidnap blond children in sacks in order to drink their blood.

Dracula also reflects the antisemitic incidents surrounding the hunt for Lon-
don’s “Jack the Ripper” (1888). Sander Gilman already recognized the contempo-
rary British “Press images” of the murderer as antisemitic:

What is striking is that the image of “Jack” is also set. He is the caricature of the Eastern
Jew. Indeed, the official description of “Jack” was of a man “age 37, rather dark beard and
moustache, dark jacket and trousers, black felt hat, spoke with a foreign accent.”

The “Judaizing” of the murderer did not only anger the British Jews but also the
“Ripper” himself. He wrote a letter to Scotland Yard, stating that he was not a
“Yid.”

Stoker’s Count Dracula, originating from Eastern Europe, matches the
antisemitic conception of the Christian blood drinking Jew and at the same
time, the notion of the bloodsucking, Jewish capitalist threatening the entire
world. Dracula hoards in his castle “a great heap of gold in one corner—gold
of all kinds, Roman, and British, and Austrian, and Hungarian, and Greek and
Turkish money.” During the last dispute with the vampire, Dracula’s coat
turns out to be a veritable treasure chest:

As it was the point just cut the cloth of his coat, making a wide gap whence a bundle of
bank-notes and a stream of gold fell out. The expression of the Count’s face was so hell-

ish.

Significantly, this devilish creature can be defeated by vampire slayers, who
slowly turn into a bunch of modern crusaders in this novel, by using Christian
symbols like crucifixes, holy water, and hosts as their weapons. The way the
“old knights of the Cross” devastated Jewish communities in the Occident and

24 S. L. Robinson, Blood Will Tell: Vampires as Political Metaphors before World War I (Boston:
25 Cf. Stoker, Dracula, 47, 235.
28 Stoker, Dracula, 56.
29 Ibid., 340.
Orient in the Middle Ages, they also wanted to “redeem more souls”: “Like them we shall travel towards the sunrise; and like them, if we fall, we fall in good cause.”

It is not surprising that the “cosmopolitan” Dracula who speaks many languages, employs a German Jew called Immanuel Hildesheim, as his servant, “a Hebrew of rather the Adelphi Theater type, with a nose like a sheep, and a Fez.”

The reference to the theater is not merely a coincidence. In 1895, London’s West End Adelphi Theatre staged the drama “One of the best” by Seymour Hicks (1871–1949), based on the antisemitic trial against Alfred Dreyfus (1859–1935) in Paris. The basis of this trial against the officer Dreyfus was the allegation that, as a Jew, he cannot be a real French patriot and therefore must be a spy. In this way, Hildesheim, the Jew, lets himself get bribed by the vampire slayers in order to support them, according to the antisemitic idea that the homeless Jew cannot be faithful to any home country.

Knowing all languages and fitting in anywhere might be merely impressive accomplishments, but it also signals the potential danger vampires pose. With no ties to any particular country, their movements are harder to control and their loyalties harder to predict—something else linking vampires to the debates regarding Jewish immigrants and their suspect loyalties.

The potent images of antisemitism are adopted at times by writers and filmmakers, either naively or deliberately. Patrick Lussier, together with Joel Soisson, wrote the script for his self-staged horror movie “Wes Craven presents Dracula 2000” (USA 2000). The contemporary movie shows Dracula’s “historical” background. He responds with an allergic reaction to Christian symbols like crosses, hosts, and holy water as well as to silver, since he is no one else but Judas. A lengthy cutback shows Judas’ failed suicide attempt, when thirty pieces of silver fall out of his garment. Judas turns into the “roaming Judas” and the first vampire, who not only lives forever but also possesses a seducing “supernatural” sexuality.

Lussier comments about the movie that Bram Stoker led him towards the idea of the Judas figure. He does not seem to realize that he turns Judas, the Jew, into the prime-vampire and thus implements an antisemitic motive used by the Church Fathers up to the Nazis. Naivety and a careless dealing with clas-

30 Ibid., 356.
32 Robinson, Blood Will Tell, 149.
sic antisemitic motives can be seen even today, thus one should treat these images with the utmost care, sensitivity, and awareness.
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