BİNGÖL ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI ANABİLİM DALI

THE IMAGE OF JEWS IN BRITISH NOVEL

The Case of *Oliver Twist* and *Our Mutual Friend*, Ulysses and *The Finkler Question*

Yakup BOR

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

Danışman
Doç. Dr. Ahmet KAYINTU

Bingöl – 2024

BİNGÖL ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
İNGİLİZ KÜLTÜRÜ VE EDEBİYATI ANABİLİM DALI
İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI BİLİM DALI

THE IMAGE OF JEWS IN BRITISH NOVEL

The Case of *Oliver Twist* and *Our Mutual Friend*, *Ulysses* and *The Finkler Question*

Yakup BOR

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

Danışman
Doç. Dr. Ahmet KAYINTU

Bingöl – 2024

İÇİNDEKİLER

CHAPTER III

CAUSES OF ANTI-SEMITISM

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH NOVELS

BİLİMSEL ETİK BİLDİRİMİ

Yüksek Lisans tezi olarak hazırladığım *The Image of Jews in British Novel- The Case of Oliver Twist* and *Our Mutual Friend, Ulysses* and *The Finkler Question* adlı çalışmanın öneri aşamasından sonuçlanmasına kadar geçen süreçte bilimsel etiğe ve akademik kurallara özenle uyduğumu, tez içindeki tüm bilgileri bilimsel ahlak ve gelenek çerçevesinde elde ettiğimi, tez yazım kurallarına uygun olarak hazırladığım bu çalışmamda doğrudan veya dolaylı olarak yaptığım her alıntıya kaynak gösterdiğimi ve yararlandığım eserlerin kaynakçada gösterilenlerden oluştuğunu beyan ederim.

11/12/2024

İmza

Yakup BOR

BİNGÖL ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜNE

Yakup BOR tarafından hazırlanan *The Image of Jews in English Novel: The Case of Oliver Twist and Our Mutual Friend, Ulysses, and The Finkler Question* başlıklı bu çalışma, 27.10.2024 tarihinde yapılan tez savunma sınavı sonucunda, oybirliği ile başarılı bulunarak jürimiz tarafından İngiliz Kültürü ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı'nda Yüksek Lisans tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

TEZ JÜRİSİ ÜYELERİ (Unvanı, Adı ve Soyadı)

Başkan	: Prof. Dr. Hikmet TAN	İmza: ……..
Danışman	: Doç. Dr. Ahmet KAYINTU	İmza: ……..
Üye	: Prof. Dr. Faruk KALAY	İmza: ……..

ONAY

Bu Tez, Bingöl Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Yönetim Kurulunun ...../..../ 202.. tarih ve ..... sayılı oturumunda belirlenen jüri tarafından kabul edilmiştir.

Doç. Dr. Nebi BUTASIM
Enstitü Müdürü

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ahmet KAYINTU, for his invaluable guidance, support, and encouragement throughout the course of my research. His expertise and constructive feedback have been instrumental in shaping this thesis and helping me grow both academically and personally.

I am also profoundly grateful to my beloved wife, Sümeyra Ceyhan BOR, for her unwavering love, patience, and endless support during this journey. Her understanding and encouragement have been my greatest source of strength.

Additionally, I extend my heartfelt thanks to all the esteemed staffs in the Department of English Language and Literature. Their dedication to teaching and their insightful perspectives have inspired me and contributed significantly to my academic development.

This thesis is the result of the support and guidance of many individuals, and I am deeply thankful to all who have been part of this journey.

Bingöl Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Yüksek Lisans Tez Özeti

Tezin Başlığı : *İngiliz Romanında Yahudi İmgesi- Oliver Twist ve Müşterek Dostumuz, Ulysses ve Finkler Sorunu*
Tezin Yazarı : Yakup Bor
Danışman : Doç. Dr. Ahmet KAYINTU
Anabilim Dalı: İngiliz Kültürü ve Edebiyatı
Bilim Dalı : İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı
Kabul Tarihi : 27.12.2024
Sayfa Sayısı : 170
Bu çalışma, antisemitizmin tarihsel ve kavramsal gelişimini inceleyerek İngiliz edebiyatında Yahudi karakterlerin temsillerini derinlemesine analiz etmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Antisemitizmin antik çağlardan modern döneme kadar nasıl şekillendiği, dini önyargılardan biyolojik ve ırksal teorilere nasıl evrildiği detaylı bir şekilde ele alınmıştır. Araştırma kapsamında Charles Dickens'in *Oliver Twist ve Our Mutual* Friend romanları, James Joyce'un *Ulysses* eseri ve Howard Jacobson'un *The Finkler Question* romanı analiz edilmiştir. Bu eserlerde Yahudi karakterlerin toplum tarafından nasıl algılandığı ve bu algının dönemsel ekonomik krizler, ulusal kimlik tartışmaları ve kültürel dönüşümlerle nasıl şekillendiği incelenmiştir. Ayrıca, antisemitizmin farklı dönemlerde aldığı biçimler, örneğin dini boyuttan 19. yüzyılda ortaya çıkan ırkçı ideolojilere geçişi, edebiyattaki yansımaları üzerinden değerlendirilmiştir. Çalışma, antisemitizmin edebiyat aracılığıyla nasıl devamlılık gösterdiğini ve bu durumun toplumun kültürel belleği üzerindeki etkilerini ortaya koymayı hedeflemektedir.
Anahtar Kelimeler: Antisemitizm, İngiliz edebiyatı, Yahudi temsili, tarihsel bağlam, roman analizi, Charles Dickens, James Joyce, Howard Jacobson, ırkçı ideolojiler, kültürel bellek

Bingol Üniversity Institute of Social Sciences Abstract of Master's Thesis

Title of the Thesis: *The Image of Jews in British Novel- The Case of Oliver Twist and Our Mutual Friend, Ulysses and The Finkler Question*	
Author	**:**Yakup BOR
Supervisor	**:**Doç. Dr. Ahmet KAYINTU
Department	**:**English Language and Literature
Sub-field	**:**English Culture and Literature
Date	**:**27.12.2024

This study aims to provide an in-depth analysis of the representation of Jewish characters in English literature by exploring the historical and conceptual development of antisemitism. The research delves into how antisemitism evolved from religious prejudice to biological and racial ideologies, tracing its transformation from ancient times to the modern era. The analysis focuses on Charles Dickens' *Oliver Twist* and *Our Mutual Friend*, James Joyce's *Ulysses*, and Howard Jacobson's *The Finkler Question*. These literary works are examined to uncover how Jewish characters were perceived by society and how these perceptions were shaped by factors such as economic crises, national identity debates, and cultural shifts of their respective periods. Furthermore, the study investigates how antisemitism transitioned from a religious discourse to racist ideologies in the 19th century and evaluates its reflections in literature. By examining these representations, the research sheds light on how antisemitism persists through literature and its implications for cultural memory and societal attitudes.

Keywords: Antisemitism, English literature, representation of Jews, historical context, novel analysis, Charles Dickens, James Joyce, Howard Jacobson, racism, cultural memory

INTRODUCTION

Defined as prejudice and discrimination against Jewish people, anti-semitism has been a persistent issue in Europe for a long time. This study analyses how anti-semitism shows up in English literature, focusing on the historical reasons for hostility against Jewish people and how writers have portrayed this hatred. By looking at how anti-semitism has changed from ancient times to today, the study helps us understand how this hatred has continued and evolved. Where the word "anti-semitism" comes from, how it has developed over time, the root causes of the term, and how it is depicted in English literature will be examined in this study.

Anti-semitism, which is prejudice against Jewish people, became a much bigger problem with the rise of Christianity. While it started with disagreements about religion, this hatred found new ways to exist as society became less focused on religion. People started using unscientific, racist theories to justify their prejudice. Over a very long time, this prejudice became deeply rooted in European society. It would get worse when times were economically difficult and better when things were more stable, but it never really went away. There has been a strong correlation with economic conditions throughout history. During times of economic hardship, Jewish communities were often scapegoated for broader societal issues. For example, in medieval Europe, Jews were frequently associated with moneylending and finance, as many other professions were restricted to them due to discriminatory laws (Johnson, 1987, p. 214). This association led to accusations of greed or exploitation, particularly during financial crises. Political leaders and propagandists also capitalized on these stereotypes to divert attention from systemic problems. A notable instance is Nazi Germany, where the Jewish population was blamed for economic instability following the Great Depression, exacerbating anti-semitic attitudes and policies. Conversely, in times of relative stability, these prejudices tended to diminish in visibility but never entirely disappeared, indicating the deep-rooted nature of anti-semitism in European culture (Kershaw, 1998, pp. 324-326).

The 19th century was a turning point in the development of modern anti-Semitism, as new ideas about biology and race provided a foundation for old prejudices to evolve into a more systematic ideology. During this time, pseudo-scientific theories classified people into racial hierarchies, often placing Jewish people

at the bottom. These ideas shifted anti-Jewish attitudes from focusing on religion to targeting Jewish identity as a permanent racial characteristic. This change made discrimination appear more rational and scientific in an era that valued progress and evidence (Johnson, 1987, pp. 230-231).

The term “anti-Semitism” was coined by Austrian Jewish scholar Moritz Steinschneider during this period, reflecting this new approach to hatred. Jewish communities were increasingly seen as outsiders who could not fit into the emerging nationalist identities of European countries. Nationalist movements and political changes reinforced this perception, leading to policies and public attitudes that excluded Jewish people. At the same time, the rise of mass media helped spread anti-Semitic propaganda, promoting discourses about Jewish control over finance or secret plots to dominate society. These discourses gained popularity during times of economic or political instability, providing a convenient scapegoat for broader societal problems (Kershaw, 1998, pp. 328-329). Thus, the 19th century cemented anti-Semitism as a more organized and enduring form of discrimination. However, even though the term is relatively recent, the hatred it represents has much older roots, going all the way back to anti-Jewish sentiments found in ancient Greece, Rome, and Hellenistic Egypt.

The term “anti-Semitic” was first used by Austrian Jewish scholar Moritz Steinschneider, but it became widely known through the work of German thinker Wilhelm Marr. Marr used the term to describe a new kind of racism, which defined Jewish people as a separate race. He preferred this term because it seemed more modern and scientific compared to older words tied to religious intolerance (Biale, 1986, p. 49). This concept was racial in nature, as it focused on the idea that “Semites” were biologically and linguistically distinct from the “Aryan” race of Europe. Many scientists in the 19th century supported this idea, claiming Jewish people were biologically different and linked to Middle Eastern origins, which they argued made them incompatible with European society (Mosse, 1985, pp. 76–78).

Earlier scientists also contributed to these ideas. Johann Friedrich Blumenbach, for example, categorized humans into races but did not specifically target Jewish people. However, later thinkers expanded their classifications to promote anti-Semitic views (Efron, 1994, pp. 21–23). Similarly, Arthur de Gobineau emphasized the

superiority of the Aryan race, which influenced later racial theories, including those about Jewish people (Mosse, 1985, p. 84). These pseudo-scientific ideas provided the foundation for Marr's concept of anti-Semitism, marking a shift from religious prejudice to one based on supposed scientific reasoning.

Investigating how anti-Semitism is shown in English literature, this research will be focusing on some famous books from the Victorian and Modern periods featuring the Jewish characters. The books to be analyzed in this regard are *Oliver Twist* and *Our Mutual Friends* by Charles Dickens, *Ulysses* by James Joyce, and *The Finkler Question* by Howard Jacobson. The goal is to understand how people viewed Jewish people in the past and continue to view them today through the lens of anti-Semitism. By analyzing these literary works, which often reflect the beliefs and values of the time period in which they were written, the study aims to uncover how these attitudes is demonstrated in British literature. The research also explores how anti-Semitism changed when influenced by new biological and racial theories in the 19th century, demonstrating that anti-Semitism is not just a historical issue but a recurring theme in literature.

Hostility towards Jews stems from their perception as the "other" (Bauman, 1991, p. 61). However, the marginalization of Jews is not entirely a one-sided phenomenon. Although Jews have tried to assimilate and partially integrate into the societies they lived in, they have always maintained their Jewish identity and viewed themselves as the "chosen people" (Johnson, 1987, p. 123). In this context, it is possible to say that marginalization is reciprocal. The history of Jewish and European societies is complex, mixing facts, rumors, and accusations. This history involves religious issues, identity perceptions, and struggles for economic and political power (Bauman, 1991, p. 61). To truly understand anti-Semitism, we need to look closely at its historical roots, how the term itself has changed, and how the concept has developed over time. This study uses English literature as a lens to examine how anti-Semitism is reflected in writing. By doing so, it aims to uncover how this hostility has continued and transformed, showing how it remains as a recurring theme in literature and how it affects society and culture.

The first chapter delves into the historical roots of anti-Semitism, tracing its origins from ancient times, through the growth of Christianity, and into the modern

world. It explores how anti-Jewish feelings first appeared in ancient Greece, Rome, and Hellenistic Egypt, and it examines how these feelings were given new meaning and reshaped as Christianity gained influence.

The second chapter takes a close look at "anti-semitism" in England, exploring its history from the early days to the present. This chapter will analyze how the term itself has changed over time and what it means that it became a commonly used word. This shift in language reflects a significant change in how prejudice against Jewish people was understood, moving from a focus on religious differences to a focus on ideas about race.

The third chapter focuses specifically on what causes anti-Semitism. It explores the historical reasons why Jewish people have been targeted and pushed to the margins of society, examining the factors that have contributed to this prejudice.

The last chapter examines the literary reflections of anti-Semitism in selected works by Charles Dickens' *Oliver Twist* and *Our Mutual Friends*, James Joyce's *Ulysses*, and Howard Jacobson's *The Finkler Question*. These works may have been written in different periods, but antisemitism, as a deeply rooted and historical phenomenon, recurs across societies irrespective of time and geography. Far from being confined to a specific historical framework or locale, antisemitism is a universal issue that manifests in various forms throughout human history.

The fact that Dickens wrote during Victorian Britain and Joyce in modernist Ireland provides a valuable comparative platform for understanding their approaches to antisemitism. Dickens' works feature more classical, stereotypical representations of Jewish characters, while Joyce's portrayals are shaped by modernism's nuanced and ironic perspectives. Both authors serve as significant resources for examining how antisemitism was reflected within the socio-cultural milieus of their respective eras. Comparing these works demonstrates that antisemitism is not merely a historical phenomenon but a persistent prejudice embedded in the social subconscious.

My attempt to analyze the shared elements of antisemitism across different periods and authors highlights the continuity of antisemitic prejudices and their reproduction in different cultural contexts. While Dickens' works reflect stereotypes as direct representations of social conflict and division, Joyce's works frame

antisemitic attitudes within a complex, critical lens that explores the individual. This comparison underscores how antisemitism persists as a recurring theme, shaped by historical and cultural nuances yet retaining its core prejudices across time.

CHAPTER I

ANTI-SEMITISM

1.1. Anti-Semitism

The relationship between Jewish communities and European societies has been intricate, shaped by a blend of historical facts, myths, and allegations. This dynamic encompasses religious tensions, challenges surrounding identity, and conflicts over economic and political dominance. Jews have always been seen as the “other” and have become an unwanted “internal enemy.” (Bauman, 1991, p. 61). According to Hitler (1976), Jews are a threat to the purity of the European race. Jews, who have faced various forms of torture, use lies and slander as their weapon. Therefore, Europe has always wanted to get rid of them throughout its history (p. 609).

Hitler’s statements about Jews reflect a race-based dimension of antisemitic ideology. According to him, Jews were identified as a group posing a threat to the purity of the European race. This perception of threat is intertwined with historical realities in which Jews faced persecution and discrimination. Furthermore, the claim that Jews resorted to methods such as "lies and slander" aimed to legitimize antisemitic rhetoric. Europe’s persistent efforts to exclude or eliminate Jews throughout history reveal the enduring nature and ideological strength of this hostility. Antisemitism is not merely a matter of individual prejudice but is deeply rooted as a social structure and ideology.

Throughout centuries of European history, stable and relatively unchanging anti-Jewish prejudices have developed through long phases. Initially appearing in the religious sphere, this hostility was later solidified and legitimized with biological foundations suitable for a secular age. Although these prejudices sometimes calmed down, especially during economic crises, they often increased. Nonetheless, opposition took on different forms, evolving into a contemporary political movement and ideology, reaching its highest point with the Holocaust in Central Europe during the late 19th century (Beller, 2007, p. 1).

As aforementioned, the term “anti-Semitic” was first used by an Austrian Jew Moritz Steinschneider in 1860 (Taguieff, 2017, p. 12). In 1879, German thinker Wilhelm Marr used the term “anti-Semitism.” Marr referred to conscious racism that

required Jews to be defined as a separate race. The term was preferred because it sounded soft and scientific, distinct from religious bigotry (Rattansi, 2007, p. 5). The concept is racial because it directly refers to Semites, separating them from other races. Modern Age scientists saw Jews as a group biologically and linguistically different from the European "Aryan" race, identifying them as a Middle Eastern people. This new term quickly spread in popular use, marking a shift from traditional religious anti-Jewish prejudice to a type based on scientific criteria (MacMaster, 2001, p. 95).

This progression clearly illustrates how antisemitism evolved and assumed a more dangerous form. The shift from religious bigotry to "scientific" racism provided a more systematic and seemingly legitimate foundation for hatred against Jews. Wilhelm Marr's choice of this term as a "softer" expression can be seen as an ideological strategy to make antisemitism more socially acceptable. Moreover, the emphasis on Jews' biological and linguistic differences transformed antisemitism from merely a religious hatred into a form of discrimination legitimized through race and science.

The term is a completely modern phenomenon with political, economic, and social components, but it also includes a theological and religious dimension, rationalized by traditional Jewish-Christian hostility. The creation of a new term, instead of using terms describing the old hostility towards Judaism, indicates that the Jewish issue had taken on a new dimension (Taguieff, 2017, pp. 9-12).

Taguieff points out that the hatred of Jews in ancient and pagan times had a different formulation, and thus defining the modern Jewish extermination as anti-Semitism misleads the historical development of the term. He emphasizes that the fear of Jews in ancient and pagan times was very different from the ideological and political developments of the 16th century (racism) and the 19th century (nationalism), arguing that the term "anti-Semitism" is used incorrectly (2017, pp. 35-36).

It is obvious that the definitions and uses of the term anti-Semitism have led to many variations. Therefore, this section will first discuss the contexts and meanings of anti-Semitism. Then, from a historical and chronological perspective, it will explore the origins of this term, the hatred towards Jews, and the conceptual development of anti-Semitism. To understand the reasons for anti-Semitism, the history of anti-Jewish sentiment from Ancient Greece to the 21st century will be discussed. The pinnacle of

racism during the Nazi era, the Holocaust, will be examined, focusing on the genocide of Jews. Finally, the Zionist movement will be addressed.

1.1.1. Etymology of Anti-Semitism

The term anti-Semitism is a combination of the Greek prefix "anti," meaning "against," and "semitism," which refers to support for Jews and semtitic races (Poliakov et al., 1978, p. 88). This concept was developed in European society, particularly towards the end of the 19th century, on anti-Jewish political platforms to unify all historical and contemporary anti-Jewish thoughts and practices under one term (Alan & Robert, 2005, p. 397). From this perspective, anti-Semitism is defined as follows: "A modern term that expresses hatred of Jews, beyond merely rejecting the Jewish religion" (Karesh & Hurvitz, 2006, p. 23).

Structuring the term antisemitism in this way allows us to understand how opposition to Jews evolved into a systematic and organized ideology within European societies. Notably, the formation of this concept not only highlights past hostility toward Jews but also demonstrates how such enmity was reshaped within the social and political context of the modern era. This definition of antisemitism points to a deeper system of hatred and exclusion rather than mere individual prejudices. While it provides a critical clue for understanding the historical context of antisemitism, it also serves as a warning about how such ideologies can dangerously persist in modern societies.

Another definition states that anti-Semitism is "a type of racism that considers Jews a dangerous and despicable group within society" (Oliver & Clive, 1998, p. 311). This concept, with its many aspects, fundamentally relies on theories that Jews aim to dominate non-Jews economically and politically. Furthermore, terms such as racism, anti-Semitism are used to describe the perceived inferior form of the other (Karesh & Hurvitz, 2006, p. 23). As Paul Johnson notes, even though modern Jews believe anyone who feels Jewish is Jewish, the definitions of Jews and related concepts are made by anti-Jewish groups, not by Jews themselves. This view applies not only today but also to Europe's past (2017, p. 611).[1]

[1] For this source, the page numbers provided are based on Turkish translations. However, the referenced content is also present in the original works or their English translations. Readers may verify the

It is emphasized that antisemitism not only attacks Jewish identity but also seeks to redefine it. Notably, the fact that definitions of Jews often come from their opponents rather than Jews themselves reveals how antisemitism establishes its power dynamics. This framing of Jewish identity as a constant threat provides an important clue about how prejudices have taken root throughout history. This perspective helps us understand that antisemitism is not merely a historical hatred but also functions as a mechanism of control.

On the other hand, some researchers argue that a categorical distinction should be made regarding the meaning spectrum of this concept. They emphasize that anti-Jewish sentiments developed within their unique conditions, as Jews have lived among different racial, cultural, and religious groups for thousands of years. According to this view, the perspectives of the Romans, Christians, and Adolf Hitler towards Jews should be distinguished. The Romans viewed Jews in terms of their political threat; Christians considered them God-killers; and Adolf Hitler opposed them based on their Jewish identity (Karesh & Hurvitz, 2006, pp. 23-24).

This approach is crucial for understanding that antisemitism is not a homogeneous phenomenon and has taken different forms in various historical contexts. The evolving nature of anti-Jewish sentiment reflects how it has been shaped by the socio-political and ideological dynamics of each era. For instance, the Romans' perception of Jews as a political threat can be linked to their concerns about maintaining the imperial order, whereas the Christian religiously motivated hatred toward Jews had a theological foundation. Hitler's biologically based racial antisemitism, on the other hand, exemplifies the ideological hate rhetoric of the modern era.

The key point to analyze under this heading is the root of the term "Semitism," which originates from "Semite," derived from the name "Shem." Shem was one of the three sons of Noah, along with Ham and Japheth, as described in the Torah and the Bible. According to the narrative, after the great flood, Noah's sons were believed to have become the progenitors of different nations and peoples. Shem, in particular, was associated with the ancestors of the Semitic peoples, including the Hebrews, Arabs,

accuracy of the relevant sections by consulting the original texts or their English translations listed below: Johnson, P. (1987). *A History of the Jews*. Harper & Row.

Assyrians, and other groups historically tied to the Middle East. Ham was considered the forefather of African and Canaanite peoples, while Japheth was associated with Indo-European populations (Smith, 2020, pp. 45–46).

The term "Semite" was first used in a linguistic context by Austrian scientist August Ludwig von Schlözer in 1781 (1735–1809). Schlözer applied it to languages such as Akkadian, Babylonian, Hebrew, Aramaic, Arabic, and Ge'ez, which share structural similarities and were thought to descend from Shem's lineage. This linguistic classification was inspired by the emphasis on Shem's descendants in the Torah, which positioned them as central to the biblical narrative of human history (Bigalke, 2017, p. 112).

However, in Western conceptual memory, "Semite" has often been narrowly associated with Jewish people, a perspective that becomes particularly evident in discussions of anti-Semitism (Karesh & Hurvitz, 2006, p. 25). While the term "Semitic" originally referred to a broader category of peoples and languages, anti-Semitism has come to specifically denote hostility toward Jews. This narrow usage is widely criticized, as it excludes other groups traditionally considered Semitic, such as Arabs, despite their shared historical and linguistic heritage (The World Holocaust Remembrance Center, 2017, para. 4).

This shift in meaning demonstrates how the term has evolved from its linguistic and historical origins to denote a racial and cultural prejudice in its modern usage. The reduction of the concept of "Semitic" solely to Jews represents a narrowing that contradicts both its etymological roots and historical context. This suggests that antisemitism has historically developed as a hate ideology focused exclusively on Jews, while other Semitic groups have been overlooked in this framework.

1.1.2. On The Concept of Anti-Semitism

The term anti-Semitism emerged in the late 19th century, around 1870s, influenced by pseudo-scientific racial theories. This concept was used to describe a new form of hatred and hostility towards Jewish people and their way of life. While the term itself is modern, the hostility it represents has ancient roots, tracing back to anti-Jewish sentiments observed in ancient Greece, Rome, and Hellenistic Egypt. During the early Christian period, this animosity was reinterpreted and reshaped,

particularly through the writings of Paul and the four Gospels that form the core of the New Testament (Katz, 2022, pp. 17-18).

Even prior to the rise of Christianity and the onset of harsh criticisms against Jews, they were often portrayed as peculiar figures in the texts of the Hellenistic world, Rome, and Egypt. This portrayal was influenced by their belief in an unseen single deity, their custom of observing a day of rest each week (the Sabbath), and their dietary restrictions, particularly their avoidance of pork. These practices led to the perception of Jews as outsiders who disrupted local customs, pagan family traditions, and religious practices. Consequently, they were seen as unfriendly, excessively superstitious, and arrogant, believing themselves to have a unique bond with their invisible God, whereas pagan deities were merely considered idols (Katz, 2022, pp. 25-26).

These depictions reveal that prejudices against Jews were not solely rooted in religious reasons but were also fueled by social and cultural differences. The monotheistic beliefs of Jews and their distinct way of life rendered them the "other," perceived as nonconforming to the norms of surrounding societies. Compared to the polytheistic worldview of pagan societies, the Jewish monotheistic faith was seen not just as a religious choice but also as a profound source of cultural and social divergence.

The term anti-Semitism literally means "opposition to the Semitic race." Etymologically, this group refers to people who speak Semitic languages, tracing their origins back to Noah. According to religious texts, humanity descended from Noah's sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth, who survived the flood. In this interpretation, Ham is the ancestor of Africa's dark-skinned peoples; Shem is the ancestor of the Hebrews; and Japheth is the ancestor of the Medes, Persians, Greeks, and later the Aryan peoples. This theory, as Lewis notes, lacks any historical, linguistic, archaeological, or ethnographic basis but persisted into modern times. However, the emergence of Semitic or Aryan languages had to wait for the birth of philology in the 18th century (Lewis, 2004, p. 311). The most commonly spoken Semitic languages include Hebrew, Arabic, and Aramaic. Additionally, Phoenician, Akkadian, and Syriac are part of the Semitic language family. The people who speak these languages are considered Semitic peoples (Chanes, 2004, p. 33).

In light of these studies, the term anti-Semitism is expected to mean opposition to all people classified as Semitic. However, it has never been used to include other Semitic races (such as Arabs). This opposition specifically targets Jews, making anti-Semitism the modern way of expressing hostility towards them (Chanes, 2004, p. 35). Even in the Arab world, anti-Jewish sentiment is referred to by this name.

The fact that anti-Jewish sentiment in the Arab world is also referred to as antisemitism demonstrates how this term has become a universal concept for hostility toward Jews. This reveals that antisemitism is not confined to the West but has also been adopted as a similar rhetoric of hatred in various cultures and regions. The use of the term in this manner has transformed antisemitism from a critique of an identity or ideology into a symbol of prejudice specifically against Jews. This necessitates a reevaluation of the historical, sociological, and ideological contexts of antisemitism.

German radical writer and politician Wilhelm Marr first used the term anti-Semitism with a political dimension in 1879, as it is described above. However, the main factor behind the widespread adoption of this term in the literature is not Marr's authority, which was not very significant in this context. Instead, it is because terms that can be considered predecessors to anti-Semitism were used by some thinkers before Marr such as German researcher Moritz Steinschneider, agreeing with French thinker Ernest Renan, used the term "semitism" to mask his hostility towards Jews, and this writing was published in a book edited by Karl von Rotteck (Levy, 2005, pp. 24-25). The term semitism was also used by A.L. Schlözer, one of the leading figures of the German Enlightenment, in his writings at the end of the 18th century (1735–1809). Thus, it was easy for the term semitism to evolve into anti-Semitism.

This historical context facilitated the transformation of the term "Semitism" into antisemitism. The evolution of the term into one that expresses hostility toward Jews occurred within an intellectual and ideological continuity. The works of figures like Schlözer and Steinschneider demonstrate that antisemitism is not merely a modern rhetoric of hate but has deep historical roots, even within Enlightenment thought. Marr's contribution was to politicize this process, spreading the modern usage of antisemitism as a political ideology. This helps us understand how the term has been redefined throughout history and how hatred toward Jews has been expressed through different means in various eras.

When Marr coined the term anti-Semitism instead of anti-Jewish (Jewish hostility), he aimed to achieve two things. Firstly, he wanted to differentiate the *Anti-Semitic League*, of which he was a member, from the Court Chaplain organization led by Adolf Stöcker (Aronsfeld, 1987, pp. 43-52). Secondly, fearing the reaction of Jews, Marr considered anti-Semitism to be more moderate compared to other terms symbolizing Jewish hostility (Pulzer, 2005, p. 10).

With Marr's usage, the concept of anti-semitism began to encompass modern phenomena, including natural sciences like biology, genetics, and anthropology. Thus, anti-semitism included elements of traditional Jewish hostility and modern components. However, this transition was not smooth, and deviations from the general consensus occurred. The primary distinction between early Jewish hostility (Judeophobia) and anti-Semitism is that the former is religiously based, while the latter involves racism, nationalism, and some anthropological basis (Pulzer, 2005, p. 11).

Marr's effort to present the term as a moderate discourse aimed to make antisemitism more socially acceptable. However, this also paved the way for the modernization of antisemitism, transforming it into a more systematic hate ideology. While traditional anti-Jewish sentiment stemmed from religious bigotry, antisemitism was grounded in scientific and ideological foundations, allowing anti-Jewish hostility to persist in a more sophisticated and sustainable manner. This demonstrates that antisemitism is not merely a rhetoric of hate but also an effective ideological tool employed in modern societies.

Unlike early Jewish hostility, anti-semitism posits that Jews will always remain Jews and cannot be transformed or assimilated. Moreover, in traditional literature, Jews are seen as collaborators with the devil, the killers of the Messiah. In contrast, in the modern world, Jews are declared to be the devil incarnate, embodying evil with the ultimate goal of world domination (Bauer, 1994, p. 41).

This distinction highlights how antisemitism evolved into a modern ideology of hatred. Traditional anti-Jewish sentiment, rooted in religious foundations, portrayed Jews as agents of moral deviance or sin. In contrast, antisemitism adopted a more radical stance, framing Jews as the very source of evil and a global threat. This approach transformed hostility toward Jews from merely individual or societal prejudice into an ideology that constructs their very existence as a fundamental threat.

This perspective strengthened the racial and political dimensions of antisemitism, making anti-Jewish sentiment more systematic and enduring. Defining Jews as "unalterable" or "unassimilable" transformed antisemitism from merely a hate rhetoric into a tool for legitimizing social exclusion and discrimination. This shift offers a critical insight into how modern antisemitism evolved beyond religious bigotry to become an ideology that reinforced mechanisms of political and social control.

There are differences between early Jewish hostility (Judeophobia or Anti-Judaism) and anti-Semitism. However, given the complex nature of anti-Semitism, this distinction is not always clear. For example, during the Nazi era, the most significant anti-Semitic period in modern times, Jewish religious elements were destroyed, similar to early Jewish hostility. The anti-Semitic movement was led by Christian clergy. Thus, the differences between periods and communities, along with attempts to categorize all forms of discrimination under the concept of anti-Semitism, increase conceptual confusion (Bauer, 1994, p. 11). As Pulzer noted, after a while, anti-Semitism became detached from the physical presence of Jews and turned into an issue of image. According to Pulzer, even if it were revealed that Jews were angels in human form, anti-Semitism would still persist (Pulzer, 2005, p. 12).

The example of the Nazi era demonstrates that antisemitism is a hate rhetoric that evolves and adapts across different periods. The leadership role of Christian clergy highlights how religious and racial prejudices intertwined, showing that antisemitism has not remained static but has been redefined to align with the social dynamics of each era. This underscores the importance of recognizing antisemitism not merely as a historical phenomenon but also as an ideological tool that continues to exert influence in the present day.

In light of this information, it is essential to note that many events and chronic problems in the world did not emerge suddenly. Instead, they are issues that have gone through various stages and taken on unique characteristics over time. In other words, they are unresolved problems from the past that have been inherited. Therefore, these realities must be analyzed and understood from a historical perspective. Contrary to popular belief, this situation cannot be simply explained within the framework of the Arab-Israeli conflict, seen as a common issue for both Jews and Arabs. It is, in fact, an

issue that can only be understood within the broader context of historical interactions and conflicts between civilizations and cultures globally.

When we first look at the history of Judaism, imagined as the sole subject of anti-Semitism, it becomes clear that it is deeply intertwined with violence. Observing the process from the early stages of Jewish history to the present, one will notice a mutually traumatic structure that affects not only Jews themselves but also all the communities they interact with. Interestingly, theological foundations have played a significant role in the formation of this structure (Batuk, 2008, p. 160). For instance, the imagination of a free and happy life being possible only in the promised land centered on Jerusalem was derived from the holy book (Old Testament-Tanakh). This has caused Jewish communities to maintain a distant stance towards the societies they lived in and to lead their lives with a sense of insecurity (Batuk, 2008, p. 166). On the other hand, the perspective that has fueled anti-Semitism throughout history has also been shaped by the image of Jews presented in the holy book, New Testament (Johnson, 2017, p. 11)[2]. In the New Testament, Jews are often portrayed in a negative light, especially in the context of the crucifixion of Jesus. The Gospels, which forms the core of the New Testament, depict Jewish authorities and crowds as primarily responsible for Jesus' arrest, trial, and eventual crucifixion. For instance, in the Gospel of Matthew, there is the infamous scene where a crowd of Jews is portrayed as shouting, "His blood be on us and on our children!" (Matthew 27:25), which has been interpreted historically as implicating the Jewish people in the death of Jesus and has contributed significantly to the spread of anti-Semitic views. The Gospel of John also contains passages that have been considered problematic in terms of their portrayal of Jews. In this text, the term "the Jews" is often used as a blanket term to refer to those opposing Jesus, and in several instances, it attributes negative characteristics to them, such as hostility towards Jesus' message (John 8:44). This characterization has fueled a stereotype of Jews as being adversaries of Christ and Christianity. Therefore, the encounter of these two psychological worlds has always posed a problem (Batuk, 2008, pp. 173-175).

[2] For this source, the page numbers provided are based on Turkish translations. However, the referenced content is also present in the original works or their English translations. Readers may verify the accuracy of the relevant sections by consulting the original texts or their English translations listed below: Johnson, P. (1987). *A History of the Jews*. Harper & Row.

The distanced stance rooted in Jewish theology, combined with Christian theology's portrayal of Jews as a negative figure, created a foundation for conflict on both individual and societal levels. This highlights the importance of examining theological and historical foundations together to fully understand the origins of antisemitism. Furthermore, it sheds light on how the interpretation of sacred texts played a pivotal role in transforming religious hatred into an ideological and social construct.

Starting to gain a sense of nationhood with Moses, Jews emerged on the historical stage and can perhaps be considered the most resilient society in history (Kaufmann & Eisenberg, 1987, p. 16). When Babylonian King Nebuchadnezzar II (634-562 BCE) destroyed Judah and took the Jews to Babylon, they encountered the reality of exile. This reality has become a significant and inseparable part of Jewish history, continuing until the establishment of the modern State of Israel. One of the most important aspects of both the emergence of Jews on the historical stage and the period beginning with the Babylonian Exile has been the phenomenon of anti-Semitism, commonly defined as anti-Jewish sentiment (Campbell, 2003, p. 98).[3]

The historical journey of the Jews, marked by exile, not only strengthened their identity and resilience but also subjected them to a continuous cycle of prejudice and exclusion. The Babylonian Exile was a turning point, intensifying their commitment to a national consciousness and compelling them to maintain their resilience in foreign societies. This process reveals that antisemitism is not merely a hatred targeting Jewish identity but also a phenomenon that has shaped the Jewish pursuit of social integration and cultural continuity.

Although this concept, with its long historical background, is central to Jewish history, it is also crucial for understanding many fundamental issues that the modern world has inherited from history. As one of the dominant topics on the global agenda, anti-Semitism deserves thorough examination in all its details. Therefore, it is most appropriate to study the etymological, historical, and chronological development of the concept to clearly understand its origins and the stages it has gone through.

[3] For this source, the page numbers provided are based on Turkish translations. However, the referenced content is also present in the original works or their English translations. Readers may verify the accuracy of the relevant sections by consulting the original texts or their English translations listed below: Campbell, J. (1964). *Occidental Mythology: The Masks of God*. Viking Press.

1.1.3. Historical Background of Anti-Semitism

1.1.3.1. Anti-Semitism in Ancient Times

Judaism completed the formation of its institutional structure through four significant stages: the period of Abraham, the period of Moses, the periods before and after the Babylonian Exile, and the period after the destruction of the Second Temple (Kaufmann & Eisenberg, 1987, p. 268). The first two periods can be described as the times when the foundations of monotheism were laid and strenghtened, while the last two periods saw the development of its religious and cultural dimensions (Johnson, 2017, p. 106). The development of the concept of anti-Semitism is closely related to all these periods. Therefore, the origins of anti-Semitism date back to times long before Christianity (Groepler, 1999, p. 7). In other words, the content of this concept began to take shape, especially with the emergence of Jews as a nation under the leadership of Moses. This early period involved intellectual, cultural, political, and economic conflicts between Jews and their pagan neighbours. The primary sources of information for this period are the Old Testament and the Quran (Davis & Chazan, 2005, pp. 397-400).

The process of nation-building that began during the time of Moses created a profound division between the Jews and the surrounding pagan societies. This division was not limited to religious differences but also brought about cultural and political conflicts. One of the primary reasons for this opposition was the monotheistic belief of Judaism, which fundamentally clashed with the value systems of polytheistic pagan societies.

The fact that antisemitism began to take shape as early as the formative periods of Judaism highlights how this hatred has been deeply rooted throughout history and has continuously manifested itself across various domains such as religion, culture, and economics. Sacred texts like the Old Testament and the Quran provide valuable insights into the interactions between Jews and pagans during this period, enabling a multifaceted examination of antisemitism’s historical context. This underscores that antisemitism is not merely a modern phenomenon but also a historically evolving ideological construct.

Although the phenomenon of anti-Semitism is often thought to have begun with the rise of Christianity and the religious discrimination against Jews, the real issue dates back to ancient times with the Babylonian attack, which initiated the Jewish diaspora that lasted for centuries. In the 3rd century BCE, Alexandria came under Roman influence and underwent Hellenization, even becoming a second Athens. Jews opposed the Hellenization process that the Egyptian population was undergoing. As a result, Jews, who opposed intermarriage outside their community and maintained a closed society centered around their religion, did not fit well with the Hellenic spirit that the Greeks were trying to cultivate. During this period, the populist historian Manetho depicted Jews as lepers who needed to be excluded from society (Maccoby, 2006, p. 10).

The diaspora process that began with the Babylonian invasion led to conflicts between Jews and surrounding societies as they strove to preserve their unique identity. Jewish resistance to Hellenization reflected their desire to safeguard their cultural and religious identity, yet this persistence also caused them to be perceived as "different" and "nonconforming."

Manetho's depiction of Jews as a group deserving exclusion from society illustrates how antisemitism has historically been employed as an ideological discourse, reinforcing societal exclusion. This highlights that the roots of antisemitism are not solely religious but also deeply intertwined with social, cultural, and political factors. The insular nature of Jewish communities positioned them not only as the "other" but also as a perceived threat to surrounding societies. This historical context provides a framework for understanding the multi-layered nature of antisemitism.

With Alexander the Great (356-323 BCE), the Greeks invaded the Middle East, and Jews, like other nations and religious groups, began living under Greek rule (Davis & Chazan, 2005, p. 398). This invasion marked the beginning of a difficult period for the Jews and was Europe's first true invasion of Asia (Johnson, 2017, p. 122)[4]. It also marked the start of the Hellenization project, which aimed to unite the world around common values. "The Greeks viewed civilized societies where their ideas prevailed as

[4] For this source, the page numbers provided are based on Turkish translations. However, the referenced content is also present in the original works or their English translations. Readers may verify the accuracy of the relevant sections by consulting the original texts or their English translations listed below: Johnson, P. (1987). *A History of the Jews*. Harper & Row.

multicultural societies: those who refused to join were considered enemies of humanity" (p. 168).

This period intensified the conflict between Jews and Greek culture and value systems. While the Hellenization project claimed to aim at creating universal values, its compulsory nature posed a threat to communities like the Jews, who sought to preserve their religious and cultural identity. The Jewish resistance to Hellenization further highlighted their differences, rooted in their insular societal structure and monotheistic beliefs.

The Greeks' characterization of those who refused to join the Hellenization project as "enemies of humanity" demonstrates how antisemitic attitudes gained ideological ground during this era. By resisting assimilation, Jews were perceived not only as a cultural "other" but also as a political and moral threat.

However, Jews had an intellectual heritage based on monotheism and possessed a deep awareness that resisted the dominance of foreign cultures perceived as threats to their heritage (Poliakov et al., 1978, p. 88). This resistance marked the beginning of the conflict. The Greeks perceived the Jews' stance as a form of arrogance and distancing (p. 90). Furthermore, the translation of the Old Testament into Greek attracted many Greek citizens to its monotheistic values (Wyne, 2017, pp. 275-276). Thus, for the Greeks striving to Hellenize the world, Judaism and its values posed a serious threat to their pagan culture.

After the reign of Alexander the Great, the Seleucids, rulers of Syria, Palestine, and surrounding areas after the Ptolemaic Greek dynasty in Egypt, implemented harsh policies against the Jews until they submitted to Roman rule. They viewed the Jewish religion and its central temple as the heart of rebellion against their authority and sought to suppress it forcefully (Davis & Chazan, 2005, p. 398). Considering these cases, it is possible to see the intensified anti-Jewish sentiment of the 1st century CE as the work of Greek writers representing the Greek side of the political and cultural struggle between these two competing traditions (Poliakov et al., 1978, p. 90).

The Seleucid regime's harsh stance against the Jewish religion marked an era where efforts were made to suppress Jewish identity and resistance. The Jewish temple was perceived not merely as a religious symbol but also as a representation of the political and cultural independence of the Jewish community. Consequently, the

Seleucids sought to suppress the temple and Jewish religious traditions as a means of eliminating potential resistance to their authority.

The Roman period must also be evaluated within this framework. The cultural and political struggle experienced between the Greeks and the Jews was mirrored in the relationship between the Romans and the Greeks. Although the Greeks submitted politically to Rome, the Romans had to submit culturally to the Greeks (Johnson, 2017, p. 150)[5]. Consequently, the Romans approached the situation as heirs to the Greeks and adopted their methods (Poliakov et al., 1978, p. 96). The Jews rebelled against the Romans twice and faced with a harsh reaction both times. In 70 CE, the temple was destroyed, and in 135 CE, Jewish religious practices were banned (Davis & Chazan, 2005, p. 398).

Rome's adoption of Greek methods gave the pressures applied to Jews an ideological dimension. The harsh responses to Jewish rebellions reveal that Rome saw the Jewish community not merely as a political threat but also as a challenge to its own cultural hegemony.

It is significant to understand that the Jewish rebellions against Rome were essentially a conflict between Jewish and Greek cultures. In this context, it is important to mention the Council of Yavneh, held under the leadership of "Rabbi Johanan ben Zakai" in the 1st century CE, west of Jerusalem. This council marked the shift away from temple-centered and state-centered Judaism to a rabbinic Judaism focused on synagogues and led by rabbis, distancing itself from political and cultural claims. This change is seen as a reaction to the militant and passionate eagerness that was believed to have brought about destruction (Johnson, 2017, pp. 186-187). Thus, Jews ceased to be seen as an imperial threat. As they lived outside the region of Palestine, they were recognized by Roman authorities as a minority with certain rights (Davis & Chazan, 2005, p. 401).

The Council of Yavne facilitated the separation of religious and political strategies, steering the Jews away from being perceived as a group challenging

[5] For this source, the page numbers provided are based on Turkish translations. However, the referenced content is also present in the original works or their English translations. Readers may verify the accuracy of the relevant sections by consulting the original texts or their English translations listed below: Johnson, P. (1987). *A History of the Jews*. Harper & Row.

imperial policies. This transformation altered Rome's approach to the Jews, laying the groundwork for their recognition as a minority community.

The evolution of Judaism from a temple-centered faith system to a synagogue-centered structure reflects not only a religious shift but also a process of social and political adaptation. This adaptation enabled the Jewish community to sustain itself during the diaspora and contributed to a less conflictual period in their relationship with Rome. In this regard, the Council of Yavne represents a pivotal moment in Jewish history, offering a significant example of how Judaism developed resilience The two catastrophic events of 70 and 135 CE marked the end of ancient Jewish history. After these events, a significant turning point occurred: the definitive separation of Judaism and Christianity (Poliakov et al., 1978, p. 96).

1.1.3.2. Christendom and Anti-Semitism

The Christian view of Judaism has been shaped by different parameters across various periods. The Christian doctrine, which portrayed Jews as the killers of Jesus, did not deny its Jewish origins and emphasized that Mary and Jesus were Jewish. However, it also included that Jews betrayed Jesus by killing him and were consequently punished, unable to live as a unified community. These narratives persisted throughout the Middle Ages, dominated by religious elements. With the Enlightenment and the rise of secularization, the perception of the "other" shifted away from a purely religious context. During the formation of nation-states and the emergence of racial theories, anti-Semitism began to take on a new dimension (Chanes, 2004, p. 42).

This transformation is crucial for understanding the historical continuity and evolving nature of antisemitism. In the Middle Ages, religion-centered anti-Jewish sentiment led to Jews being scapegoated within Christian societies. The accusations leveled against Jews by Christianity played a critical role in legitimizing both religious and social exclusion. However, with the Enlightenment, this hatred shifted from religious bigotry to being grounded in scientific and ideological foundations.

Although the term anti-Semitism was first used in the 17th century, it may not seem logical to trace its origins to earlier times. However, the myths used in earlier periods serve as references to fill the content of the term anti-Semitism today, making

historical examination not just a necessity but an obligation. The conditions that developed from ancient times to the establishment of the State of Israel and the debates surrounding Zionism support this perspective (Chanes, 2004, p. 43).

The emergence of Christianity marked a turning point for anti-Semitic thought. The image of Jews as people hated by God, previously created by the pagan world, was revived but developed differently according to the new era's conditions. From early times, this thought evolved a longside Christianity through political, ethnic, and religious conflicts (Şenay, 2002, p. 119). Initially, Jews viewed Christians as a Jewish sect, but differentiation began with Paul, who distanced Christianity from the Law and circumcision. According to his central message, God chose a new community, Christians, as the new Israel to replace the sinful Jewish society (Poliakov et al., 1978, p. 99).

These developments illustrate how antisemitic thought became intertwined with Christianity and how prejudices against Jews gained religious legitimacy. Paul's critique of Judaism and his efforts to establish Christianity as a distinct identity played a pivotal role in embedding anti-Jewish sentiment within Christian doctrine. The characterization of Jews as a "sinful" society fostered the belief that they had been rejected by God, with Christians assuming the mantle of the chosen people.

This evolving perception of Jews as a rejected and sinful community not only shaped theological doctrines but also influenced how key events in Christian narratives, such as the crucifixion of Jesus, were interpreted and weaponized against them. While the Romans were the executors, all responsibility was placed on the Jews (Davis & Chazan, 2005, pp. 398-399). This context, which can be described as classical anti-Semitism, is the foundation of Christian discrimination against Jews. The emergence of a structure blended with old pagan images also led to a deeply rooted hatred that can be termed Judeophobia, resulting in strong animosity (Poliakov et al., 1978, p. 99). Thus, the conceptual core of anti-Semitism, extending to the present, is based on the crime of deicide, considered the greatest possible sin (Groepler, 1999, p. 10).

The fusion of pagan imagery with Christian doctrines transformed anti-Jewish sentiment from a mere religious prejudice into a broader ideology of hatred. The blame

placed on Jews for the crucifixion of Jesus stigmatized them as a "sinful" people, making them targets of collective anger and hatred within Christian societies.

In this context, the roots of antisemitism must be sought not only in theological debates within Christianity but also in the ideological and cultural narratives historically used against Jews. The hatred shaped around the accusation of deicide provides a crucial foundation for understanding the historical continuity of antisemitism and its echoes in the modern era.

The Jewish Christians, who faced similar fates as other Jewish groups during the famous wars when the temple was destroyed by the Romans, saw their churches demolished, leading to the triumph of Greek Christianity. Consequently, this situation also led Jews to develop a stance against Christians (Johnson, 2017, p. 184)[6].

Inspite of all the attempts to eradicate it, Christianity became the dominant religion in Rome about 300 years after its emergence, starting during the reign of Emperor Constantine (274-337). According to some researchers, this event marked the definitive separation of Christianity from its Jewish roots and the firm adoption of the belief that Jews were responsible for the death of God (Wyne, 2017, p. 278). However, Jews continued to exist as a legally recognized religious group, thanks in part to the tolerance doctrine of Saint Augustine (p. 280). This doctrine, seemingly positive for Jews, was actually contradictory. Christianity needed to validate its legitimacy by accepting the Old Testament as divine revelation (Matthew 13:35). This acknowledgment provided a space for adherents of the Old Testament. However, some scholars argue that Augustine depicted Jews as people who refused to accept the new grace shown to them by God. Augustine's other argument was that Jews served as an undeniable example of humanity's degraded sinfulness and divine punishment, necessary for humanity to witness. They were expelled from the Holy City and condemned to live in exile for rejecting the salvation offered to them. In this way, they formed an important part of God's plan (Davis & Chazan, 2005, p. 399). Perhaps the most concise and clear reflection of Augustine's view of Jews is his quoted in the

[6] For this source, the page numbers provided are based on Turkish translations. However, the referenced content is also present in the original works or their English translations. Readers may verify the accuracy of the relevant sections by consulting the original texts or their English translations listed below: Johnson, P. (1987). *A History of the Jews*. Harper & Row.

statement: “The true face of the Hebrews is Judas Iscariot, who sold the Lord for silver” (Wyne, 2017, p. 280).

This period redefined the relationship between Christianity and Judaism, laying the groundwork for the institutionalization of discrimination against Jews. The establishment of Christianity as the official religion of Rome deepened the theological and social divide between Christians and Jews. In particular, the reinforcement of the deicide accusation provided an ideological foundation for the religious and social exclusion of Jews.

Saint Augustine’s doctrine of tolerance did not eliminate this discrimination but rather granted Jews a form of legal recognition. Augustine viewed the presence of Jews as a reminder for Christians and as evidence of God’s wrath, fostering a concept of “controlled tolerance.” While this approach argued against the physical annihilation of Jews, it justified their low status and marginalization within society.

This era can be seen as the period when the religious and legal foundations of antisemitism were established. With Christianity’s dominance in Rome, hatred toward Jews transcended individual prejudices and became an institutionalized religious and political discourse. This marks a critical phase for understanding the multi-layered nature of antisemitism throughout history.

Christian doctrine’s contradictory approaches toward Jews are evident. While Christianity accepted the Old Testament, thereby not entirely rejecting the foundation of Judaism, it simultaneously portrayed Jews as symbols of sin and divine punishment, legitimizing their marginalization within society. Augustine’s doctrine of tolerance, although preventing the physical annihilation of Jews, relegated them to a degraded and excluded status.

This highlights that antisemitism is not merely a theological debate but also an ideology shaping mechanisms of political and social exclusion. The role Augustine attributed to Jews provides a critical framework for understanding how antisemitism, drawing strength from religious foundations, became systematized throughout history.

1.1.3.3. Anti-Semitism in the Middle Ages

In the first half of the Middle Ages, the number of Jews living in Christendom (the Christian world) was not very high. The majority of Jews continued to live in

Muslim territories (Davis & Chazan, 2005, p. 399). During this period, the Middle East, North Africa, Anatolia, and much of Spain were under Muslim rule. Jews lived comfortably within the legal framework established by Islam, which was based on the regulations applied to Jews by Prophet Muhammad in the city-state of Medina. This framework allowed for peace and harmony among different communities. Additionally, there were no conflicting and problematic theological differences between Muslims and Jews as there were with Christians, who had incorporated pagan Greek elements into their theology. As a result, the hostile and adversarial perspective towards Jews, often based on theological criticisms by Christians, was not adopted by Muslims. Therefore, anti-Semitic writings are rarely found in Muslim literature. Given these factors, Jews preferred to live in Muslim countries (Johnson, 2017, pp. 220-221).[7]

However, from the 11th century onward, Christians began to reconquer regions like Spain, which was a significant cultural center for Judaism, leading to migration and the inclusion of a substantial Jewish population within the borders of Christendom (Groepler, 1999, p. 49). The Crusades, aimed at reclaiming the Holy Land from Muslims, and the policies of the church to finance wars significantly influenced Christian anti-Semitic movements (Davis & Chazan, 2005, p. 399). The similarities between Jews and Muslims, such as rejecting the Trinity and basing their faith on Abraham, led Western Christians to categorize them similarly. This conflation of the two groups as enemy others was evident in socio-political practices and Christian art. In Christian art and iconography, Jews were often depicted wearing Muslim turbans when shown in opposition to Jesus. Moreover, paintings of the crucifixion sometimes included a Muslim Arab as a collaborator of the Jews who were believed to have crucified Jesus with blood on their hands (Şenay, 2002, pp. 125-126).

The emphasis on shared characteristics between Jews and Muslims led to their perception as similar enemies within the Christian world. This perception extended beyond religious differences, legitimizing practices that included social exclusion, economic discrimination, and cultural degradation. Depictions in art and iconography

[7] For this source, the page numbers provided are based on Turkish translations. However, the referenced content is also present in the original works or their English translations. Readers may verify the accuracy of the relevant sections by consulting the original texts or their English translations listed below: Johnson, P. (1987). *A History of the Jews*. Harper & Row.

reveal how antisemitism and Islamophobia overlapped, illustrating how hatred toward Jews often merged with hostility toward Muslims during certain periods. The instrumentalization of similarities between Jews and Muslims helped the Christian world consolidate its political and religious adversaries, thereby deepening societal prejudices. This process provides a significant framework for understanding how antisemitism evolved into a dynamic rhetoric of hatred, gaining strength by encompassing multiple groups.

Thus, by the time the First Crusade was declared in Clermont-Ferrand in 1095, a dangerous and uncontrolled buildup of anti-Semitism had occurred. Stories of Christians being persecuted in the Holy Land were spread, with Muslims identified as the external enemies and Jews as the internal enemies. This perception persisted, leading to massacres of Jewish communities in various parts of Europe before the Crusaders even reached the Muslims (Wyne, 2017, pp. 281).

On the foundation of this accumulated and entrenched hatred, anti-Jewish sentiment intensified with baseless accusations, leading to continued massacres. Jews were particularly accused of kidnapping youths and children. These accusations began to spread in England in 1144 and reached Spain by 1250 (Johnson, 2017, p. 282)[8]. The unsolved murders, such as the case of young William killed in Norwich in 1144 and the discovery of a dismembered body in Würzburg, were all blamed on Jews, seen as a product of this enmity. In William's case, the victims were even considered saints, and their graves became pilgrimage sites. This perception led to the belief that these murders were committed by Jews to revive ancient sacrificial rituals and were interpreted as activities of an international network spread worldwide (Poliakov et al., 1978, p. 107).

Accusations of child abduction and ritual murder intensified existing prejudices against Jews, fostering an atmosphere of fear and hatred within society. The canonization of William and the designation of his grave as a sacred site contributed to the legitimization of such accusations within a religious framework. The portrayal of these charges as the work of an international network emphasized that antisemitism

[8] For this source, the page numbers provided are based on Turkish translations. However, the referenced content is also present in the original works or their English translations. Readers may verify the accuracy of the relevant sections by consulting the original texts or their English translations listed below: Johnson, P. (1987). *A History of the Jews*. Harper & Row.

was not merely a local prejudice but part of a broader effort to construct Jews as a global threat. These allegations depicted Jews as enemies of societal order and fueled a rhetoric of hatred that justified violence against them.

Moreover, Jews were also blamed for the Black Death, which devastated Europe between 1347-1350, killing a third of the population. Their strict adherence to sanitation and relative immunity to the disease aroused suspicion, leading to accusations that they had deliberately poisoned wells to kill Christians, resulting in the massacre of tens of thousands of Jews (Wyne, 2017, p. 282). Another example is the spread of stories claiming that some Christian children were captured and mutilated by Jewish religious leaders in violent rituals, as Jews were believed to be devils in human form (Batuk, 2008, pp. 174-175).

During this period, the Church's stance was quite contradictory. While the Papacy rejected radical and baseless accusations against Jews, it also perpetuated many traditional themes that fueled hostility towards them (Davis & Chazan, 2005, p. 400). The Fourth Lateran Council of 1215 marked a significant phase in the humiliation of Jews as a community. The Church adopted similar practices for Jews as it did for Muslims in Christendom, forcing them to wear symbols of shame, such as the yellow Star of David, made from cloth (Şenay, 2002, p. 126).

These practices played a pivotal role in the institutionalization of antisemitism and the societal exclusion of Jews. While the papacy's rejection of radical accusations might seem like a gesture of tolerance, the use of degrading symbols and policies simultaneously legitimized discrimination and marginalization of Jews. The Fourth Lateran Council marked a turning point by framing Jews not only as a religious other but also as a visibly marked and stigmatized community.

The mandated use of identifying symbols made Jews easily recognizable within society, turning them into explicit targets of discrimination. This process heightened not only religious hostility but also social and economic exclusion. The Church's contradictory stance toward Jews demonstrates how antisemitism was perpetuated and institutionalized, not merely through individual hatred but through systemic policies. The Fourth Lateran Council represents a critical period in understanding the transformation of antisemitism from a religious framework into an ideological and societal system.

Christian hostility towards Jews stemmed not only from religious differences but also from their professions and generally high level of education (Groepler, 1999, p. 29). The Lateran Council also forced Jews to wear identifying markers to exclude them from society, and they were restricted to certain professions, such as peddling, pawnbroking, and moneylending. Interestingly, the verb "to judaize" was coined, meaning to be a heretic and to lend money at interest (Poliakov et al., 1978, p. 102). Portrayals of Jews as bloodsucking and deceitful moneylenders targeted them for mass looting and massacres. Ironically, Jews forced into these demeaning economic activities later became influential figures in Europe's economic life (Wyne, 2017, p. 283).

The forced confinement of Jews to specific economic roles not only heightened their social isolation but also intensified their marginalization within society. Assigning Jews roles such as moneylending at interest fueled economic antisemitic rhetoric and perpetuated their portrayal as scapegoats. At the same time, their compulsory specialization in these professions and subsequent economic success made them both envied and despised within European societies.

The prominence of Jews in economic life highlights that antisemitism was built not only on religious or cultural grounds but also on economic foundations. This underscores the multifaceted nature of hatred toward Jews and provides a significant example of how such animosity was reproduced in different historical contexts. It reveals the complexity of antisemitism and its capacity to adapt across various societal and economic frameworks.

Another significant reality of this period is that a large number of Jews, who were always forced to assimilate and integrate into the societies they lived in, converted to Christianity in the Iberian Peninsula in 1391 (Johnson, 2017, p. 215)[9]. However, this did not solve the discrimination they faced, as it was believed that baptism did not cleanse Jews of their inherent negative traits, and they were still viewed with suspicion. "Jews could escape the religion of Moses by converting, but they could not escape being Jews as a race" (Arendt, 1963, p. 163). Besides, the

[9] For this source, the page numbers provided are based on Turkish translations. However, the referenced content is also present in the original works or their English translations. Readers may verify the accuracy of the relevant sections by consulting the original texts or their English translations listed below: Johnson, P. (1987). *A History of the Jews*. Harper & Row.

strongest contributors to the growing anti-Jewish sentiment were often the fanatic new Christians, including some rabbis and writers who had hostile reckonings with their past (Groepler, 1999, p. 49).

This situation demonstrates that discrimination against Jewish identity was shaped not only by religious bigotry but also by racial and cultural prejudices. The rejection of Judaism through religious conversion did not diminish marginalization; instead, it rendered suspicion and hostility toward Jews more complex. The belief in the immutability of racial traits laid the groundwork for the race-based foundations of antisemitism in the modern era.

The role of fanatical new Christians in perpetuating anti-Jewish sentiment highlights the intricacies of identity and belonging. Their intensified hostility toward Jews, driven by a need to distance themselves from their own origins, reveals how antisemitism can be fueled by internal conflicts and societal dynamics. This process illustrates that anti-Jewish sentiment was not merely an external hatred but also shaped internally within the contexts of social assimilation and identity struggles. It provides a crucial perspective for understanding how antisemitism evolved and transformed throughout history.

1.1.3.4. Anti-Semitism from the Crusades to the Reformation

Although the Crusades were initiated against Muslims, Jews, and even Christian populations living along the Crusaders' routes also suffered during these expeditions. Thousands of Crusaders, setting out without proper preparation, expected help from the people they encountered along the way. However, when they did not receive the expected support, they resorted to looting and plundering the areas they passed through. The surrounding populations, terrified by the Crusaders' atrocities, often chose to keep their city gates closed to them and only engaged in trade with them from the city walls. In 1096, as unprepared Crusaders set out, some who had not yet departed targeted Jews to finance their pilgrimage (Chazan, 1987, p. 17).

The Jews in Europe, mostly engaged in trade and moneylending, had become a wealthy community. Many Christians who owed money to Jews hated them for their wealth (Runciman, 2008, p. 104). However, as previously mentioned, the basis of Christian hatred for Jews also had religious reasons. Christians believed that Jews had

reported Jesus to the Roman authorities. As complaints increased, Jesus was tried by the Sanhedrin, the Jewish High Religious Council at the time, and sentenced to death by crucifixion. Therefore, Jews were always regarded as traitors and God-killers in the eyes of Christians, and they were hated as the killers of Jesus or the descendants of those killers. The Crusades further strengthened the Christian people hatred for Jews. For many who took the Crusader oath, if the campaign was to rid Jesus of his enemies and bring peace to his soul, it should start with the Jews living among them, the descendants of those who killed Jesus (Maier, 1999, pp. 219-220). Indeed, Jewish chronicler Solomon Bar Simson recorded in his Hebrew chronicle, which describes the attacks on European Jews during the First Crusade, that Crusaders would say to each other when passing through cities where Jews lived:

> Look, we are undertaking a long journey to find the temples of the pagans (Muslims) and take revenge on the Muslims. But here, among us, are the descendants of those who killed Him (Jesus) and crucified Him without reason (the Jews). Let us take revenge on them first. Let us destroy them as a nation so that the name of Israel will no longer be remembered. Or let us allow them to become like us (convert)... (The Lengthy Hebrew First-Crusade Chronicle, 1987, pp. 243-244).

In the same chronicle, the Crusaders said to the Jews:

> You are the descendants of those who killed our God and crucified Him. Indeed, He (Jesus) said: 'The day will come when my children will avenge my blood.' We are His children. It is our duty to take revenge on you, who rebelled against Him and opposed Him (The Lengthy Hebrew First-Crusade Chronicle, 1987, p. 248).

These statements are recorded in the chronicle. Many Crusaders with the same mindset targeted the Jews in their regions before heading east.

This context illustrates how the Crusades expanded anti-Jewish hatred beyond a purely religious dimension to encompass economic and social aspects. The perception of Jews as the killers of Jesus rendered them vulnerable to all forms of persecution in the eyes of Christians. The attacks by Crusaders on local Jewish communities before embarking on their campaigns demonstrate the depth and pervasiveness of antisemitism as a widespread ideology of hatred.

These events serve as concrete examples of a period where anti-Jewish sentiment was legitimized through religious justifications but further intensified by societal prejudices and economic motives. They highlight how antisemitism operated as a

multifaceted phenomenon, intertwining theological, social, and material dimensions to sustain its impact.

The anti-Jewish attacks in Europe began in France and later spread to the Rhine region of Germany. These attacks, which escalated into massacres, saw thousands of Jews killed and their property looted on specific dates: May 3, 1096, in Speyer; May 18-20, 1096, in Worms; May 23 in Regensburg; May 27 in Mainz; and between June 1-30 in Cologne, Trier, Metz, Prague, Neuss, Wavelighoven, Moers, Xanten, Dortmund, Geldern, and Eller. Many Jews also had to accept baptism to survive (Riley-Smith, 2016, pp. 51-52).

Jews who sought survival through baptism during this period reveal that the violence they faced was not only physical but also religious and cultural. These individuals, forced to compromise their identity in an effort to maintain their societal presence, underscore how antisemitism waged both a physical and spiritual war against Jews.

During the First Crusade, it can be said that neither the Pope, the clergy, nor the Crusader leaders approved of the attacks on Jews. In fact, there is little information suggesting that the main Crusader armies, led by grand dukes and counts, were involved in anti-Jewish events. Most of these leaders reached Constantinople via Italy. Only Godfrey of Bouillon, who followed the France-Germany-Hungary-Constantinople land route, is known to have exhibited anti-Jewish behavior (Sharon, 1981, pp. 140-141).

According to a Hebrew chronicle, Godfrey of Bouillon sweared not to embark on his journey east without avenging the crucifixion of Jesus by exterminating the Jews. However, upon the appeal of the Jews, Emperor Henry IV of Germany sent letters to all provinces ordering the protection of Jews and preventing any physical harm. Due to these protection orders, Godfrey of Bouillon was unable to act on his intentions towards the Jews. Instead, he extorted a total of 1,000 silver coins from the Jews of Cologne (500 coins) and Mainz (500 coins) (The Lengthy Hebrew First-Crusade Chronicle, 1987, p. 247). This information indicates that Godfrey of Bouillon exploited the fears of the Jews to extract money for his journey (Sharon, 1981, p. 141).

Godfrey, while not directly harming Jews, exploited their fears and vulnerable position for financial gain. Although IV. Henry's protective decrees aimed to curb

violence against Jews, it is evident that such measures were largely ineffective, and antisemitic actions persisted in various forms. Godfrey's extortion of money from Jews highlights a pragmatic dimension of antisemitism: Jews were targeted not only for religious or cultural reasons but also for material profit.

This example underscores the multifaceted nature of antisemitism, demonstrating how economic motives intertwined with religious and cultural prejudices to sustain and reinforce anti-Jewish sentiment. It serves as a crucial illustration of how antisemitism adapted to exploit its victims across different domains.

During the People's Crusade led by Peter the Hermit, there is no information in either Crusader or Jewish sources about attacks on Jews. However, it is said that Peter's army, upon reaching Germany, posed two types of dangers to the Jews. According to Robert Chazan, who studied the experiences of European Jews during the First Crusade, the first danger was the emergence of spontaneous acts of violence against Jews, and the second was their financial exploitation (Chazan, 1987, p. 54). Besides Godfrey of Bouillon, Peter the Hermit is also known to have exploited the fears of Jews to collect financial aid from them (Oldenbourg, 1966, p. 81).

In Solomon Bar Simson's chronicle, it is clearly stated that Peter the Hermit's collection of money from the Jews of Trier encouraged the surrounding ill-intentioned populace, who then also extorted money from the Jews following Peter's example:

> On the 15th day of April, during the Jewish Passover, a high-ranking priest named Peter, a representative of Jesus from France, arrived to the Crusaders. Peter carried a letter from the Jews living in France, requesting aid from Jews wherever he set foot. When he and many men accompanying him on the pilgrimage to Jerusalem arrived in Trier, he spoke well on behalf of Israel because he was a priest, and his words were heeded by the Jews... We gave money to Priest Peter, and they went on their way. Then our ill-intentioned neighbors, the townspeople, came... We (the Jews) brought out our money and gave bribes to each of the people individually (The Lengthy Hebrew First-Crusade Chronicle, 1987, pp. 287-288).

In addition, it is said that Peter the Hermit forced the Jews of Regensburg to be baptized (Riley-Smith, 2016, p. 50). Although there was no physical attack on Jews during the People's Crusade, Peter the Hermit's actions exposed the fears and vulnerabilities of the Jewish community. These actions also allowed anti-Jewish sentiments to be expressed more openly.

The First Crusade was not solely composed of the Crusades led by Peter the Hermit and the Barons. Some Crusader groups, inspired by Peter the Hermit's sermons, set out to join him. The primary attacks on Jews during the First Crusade were carried out by these undisciplined, poor, and aimless Crusader groups. These attacks, which resulted in the massacre of large Jewish communities in Europe, particularly in Germany, are recorded in several Crusader and Jewish chronicles of the time (Chazan, 1987, p. 84).

Among the Crusader chronicles, Guibert of Nogent, Albertus Aquensis, Ekkehard of Aura, and William of Tyre briefly mentioned anti-Jewish attacks. According to a detail in Guibert of Nogent's chronicle, it is believed that the first anti-Jewish events occurred in the French city of Rouen. The chronicle notes that during an anti-Jewish uprising in Rouen, the son of the Count of Eu saved the life of a Jewish child. Aside from Guibert's account, there is little information in Crusader sources about the events in France (Riley-Smith, 2003, pp. 50-53).

However, another Hebrew chronicle from this period, though its author is unknown, confirms the anti-Jewish sentiment in France. This chronicle records that the terrified Jewish communities in France sent letters to all Jewish communities along the Rhine River, warning them to be cautious of the Crusaders and praying to God for their deliverance from their hands (The Short and Truncated Hebrew First-Crusade Chronicle, 1987, p. 225).

Despite the warnings from Jews in France, the Jews living around the Rhine River in Germany were caught unprepared for the Crusader attacks. It is believed that the first anti-Jewish attacks in this region were carried out by Crusaders led by a man named Volkmar, whose identity is otherwise unknown. Volkmar's army, consisting of about ten thousand Germans, departed from the Rhineland in April 1096. Upon reaching Prague on May 30, 1096, the German Crusaders began killing the Jews in the city on June 30. Despite opposition from the city's bishop, Cosmas, they massacred all Jews who refused to be baptized. After entering Hungarian territory, the Crusaders attacked the Jews living in the town of Neutra (Nitra). The Hungarians quickly intervened, and this Crusader army, which had caused widespread destruction across the country, was completely annihilated (Duncalf, 1969, p. 262).

The Crusaders led by Volkmar inflicted significant harm on Jewish communities, driven not only by religious justifications but also by regional and societal hatred. The massacre of Jews in Prague illustrates that antisemitism extended beyond religious animosity, manifesting as forced conversions or complete annihilation.

The resistance of the Hungarians against the Crusaders highlights that Jewish communities could not always rely on local authorities for protection but occasionally found unexpected support to survive. The defeat of the Crusaders demonstrates that anti-Jewish violence was not always unchecked and that local populations and authorities could resist such actions, showing the complexity of societal dynamics in these instances of persecution.

During the First Crusade, large-scale massacres of Jews were primarily carried out by Count Emich of Leisingen and his army. Both Jewish chronicles and Crusader chroniclers such as Albertus, Ekkehard, and William of Tyre mention the massacres committed by Emich and his followers. Ekkehard and William of Tyre provide brief accounts of these massacres. Ekkehard notes that Emich, who claimed his crusading call came from a divine revelation, led an army of about twelve thousand Crusaders. They mercilessly exterminated Jews or forced them to convert to Christianity throughout the cities along the Rhine, Main, and Danube rivers. After reaching the border of Pannonia, the Crusaders faced significant hardships during the six-week siege of Wieselburg. Ekkehard records that the Crusaders, who saw no difference between killing pagans and Hungarians, set the city on fire. However, he mentions that a divine intervention caused the victorious Crusader army to suddenly flee, abandoning everything (Ekkehard of Aura, 2006, pp. 53-54).

Emich's claim of a "divine revelation" framed the massacres within a context of religious legitimacy, illustrating how anti-Jewish violence was not merely an act of hatred but was perceived as a sacred duty. These attacks on Jewish communities reveal how antisemitism within Christianity facilitated the escalation of mass violence during the Crusades.

The siege of Wieselburg demonstrates the Crusaders' ruthlessness, not only toward Jews but also against other populations. Their ultimate failure reflects the complex interplay between religious and military motivations. The invocation of

divine intervention in Crusader narratives served as a means to rationalize defeat and became part of the mystical storytelling tradition within Christianity. This blending of faith and conquest highlights the multifaceted nature of Crusader ideology and its lasting impact on historical memory.

In William of Tyre's chronicle, it is noted that a group of Crusaders, on their way east, brutally massacred Jews in towns and villages they passed through unexpectedly. These massacres particularly occurred in the cities of Cologne and Mainz (William of Tyre, 2009, pp. 70-72).

The Crusader chronicler Albertus Aquensis provides the most detailed account of the massacres committed by Emich's army against the Jews. According to Albertus Aquensis, in the early summer of 1096, a Crusader army gathered from France, England, Flanders, and Lorraine set out, claiming that assaulting Jews was their primary aim. As a result, Jews who had scattered were mercilessly killed. According to Albertus, the first massacre against Jews occurred in Cologne, perpetrated by the city's Christians. The Christians suddenly attacked the Jewish community, killing many and severely wounding others. Then, they destroyed Jewish homes and synagogues, dividing the large sums of money they looted among themselves. The Crusaders also noticed two hundred Jews attempting to flee to Neuss under the cover of darkness, confiscated all their belongings, and killed every one of them, leaving none alive (Albertus Aquensis, 2006, p. 54).

The sudden attacks on the Jewish community in Cologne by local Christians demonstrate that antisemitism was not limited to Crusader armies but was also supported by local Christian communities. The destruction of Jewish homes and synagogues reflects a systematic effort to obliterate the physical and cultural symbols of Jewish identity. This violence underscores how deeply rooted antisemitic sentiments were within the broader Christian society, extending beyond the context of the Crusades and revealing a collective participation in the marginalization and erasure of Jewish presence.

Not all Christians approved of the Crusaders' attacks on Jews. It is known that especially those in leadership positions had good relations with the Jews, providing them with protection and economic support. In regions where Jews were attacked, bishops and administrative officials, although often in exchange for money, sheltered

Jews in their palaces to protect them from the Crusader threat. However, these measures were ineffective, and local authorities were unable to stop the attacks (Chazan, 1987, pp. 29-30).

The efforts of some Christian leaders to protect Jews indicate that their economic and social roles within society were acknowledged and valued at the time. However, the inadequacy of these protective measures reveals that attacks against Jews were fueled not only by individual hostility but also by widespread societal anger.

The fact that these protection efforts were often carried out in exchange for money highlights the economic dynamics of the period and how Jewish financial resources were leveraged as a means of defense. The inability of local authorities to prevent these attacks further demonstrates that antisemitism was not solely driven by external forces like the Crusaders but was also sustained by the silent or active complicity of local communities. This dual aspect underscores the systemic nature of antisemitism in medieval society.

Forcing Jews to choose between baptism or death was one of the most prominent practices of the Crusaders. Many Crusaders preferred to convert Jews to Christianity rather than killing them. A record in Solomon Bar Simson's chronicle clearly expresses this:

> They (the Crusaders) did not allow them (the Jews) to climb the wall, so they (the Jews) could not throw themselves off the wall. (The Crusaders) watched over them (the Jews) all night until morning so that they would not kill each other. They planned all this because they (the Crusaders) did not want to kill the Jews. Rather, they wanted to capture them, make them work, and forcibly convert them (to Christianity) (The Lengthy Hebrew First-Crusade Chronicle, 1987, p. 292).

One reason the Crusaders wanted to convert the Jews to Christianity was the belief among Christians at the time that the end of the world was near and that the Jews needed to be baptized and destroyed before Jesus could return for the second time. During the attacks, some Jews chose baptism to save their lives, while a large number preferred to die for their faith. Some Jews also chose to end their own lives rather than die at the hands of the uncircumcised. Jewish men would burn all their possessions, kill their children and wives, and then take their own lives (Riley-Smith, 2003, pp. 58-59).

The self-inflicted deaths of Jews during this period tragically reflect the extreme oppression and persecution they faced. Such actions highlight the profound depth of their religious devotion and the brutal nature of the coercive policies imposed by the Crusaders. The harrowing choice between life and faith underscores the lethal consequences of antisemitism as a persistent ideology of hatred throughout history. This serves as a critical example of how antisemitism has repeatedly forced Jewish communities into unimaginable dilemmas, exposing its enduring and destructive impact.

These mass suicides, considered martyrdom by the Jews, are recorded in both Albertus's chronicle and Jewish chronicles. Albertus describes the mass suicide during the Mainz massacre with horror:

> Seeing that the enemies of Christianity attacked them and their children without distinction of age, the Jews likewise turned upon each other—upon their brothers, children, wives, and sisters—and thus perished by each other's hands. It is horrifying to say that mothers cut the throats of their nursing infants with knives and stabbed the others. Thus, they chose to die by each other's hands rather than be killed by the weapons of the uncircumcised (Albertus Aquensis, 2006, p. 55).

Robert Chazan views these mass suicides, which had long been part of Jewish tradition, as a radical response to the massacres beginning in 1096. He sees this as a new form of action that many Jews resorted to in subsequent anti-Semitic incidents (Chazan, 1987, pp. 8-9). Mark Cohen also describes Jewish suicides, considered an honorable death, as a response by the Jews of Northern Europe (Ashkenazi) to the persecution they faced when given the choice between death or forced conversion (2013, p. 268).

Most Jewish sources, when recounting these attacks, place the blame not on the Crusaders but on the bishops, administrative officials, and Christian townspeople who promised protection in exchange for bribes. These protectors often failed to fulfill their promises, with some, like Bishop Ruthard of Mainz, abandoning the Jews to their fate and fleeing (The Lengthy Hebrew First-Crusade Chronicle, 1987, pp. 251-253). Some Christians joined the Crusaders in the massacres to seize Jewish property. However, many Christians who disapproved of the attacks believed that those Crusaders who participated in the massacres had no real connection to the cross and were only on the pilgrimage for wealth and plunder. According to this view, the fact that these

Crusaders perished in Hungary before reaching the East was seen as divine punishment for their crimes. Albertus suggests that God did not aid the Crusaders in Hungary because of their sins and their greed-driven murders of exiled Jews (2006, p. 55). This perspective is supported by another Crusader chronicler, William of Tyrensis. He believes that the defeat of these Crusaders in Hungary was due to God's wrath over their sins and their lack of faith, leading to their downfall and expulsion by the apostles (2009, pp. 70-72).

Authorities who took money from Jews under the promise of protection only to abandon them reveal the institutional dimension of antisemitism and the dual pressures faced by Jewish communities: physical attacks and systematic economic exploitation.

The Crusaders' greed-driven attacks on Jewish communities, carried out under the guise of a divine mission, illustrate how the antisemitism of the time was justified through religious reasoning while serving economic interests. However, the dissenting voices of Christians opposing these attacks reflect the conflicting moral perceptions of the period and the differing perspectives on the Crusades. This dichotomy highlights the complexities within medieval Christian society regarding antisemitism and the exploitation of Jewish communities.

The exact number of Jews killed in the massacres of 1096 is unknown. Modern studies on the subject provide varying figures, making it impossible to determine the precise number of Jews killed during the First Crusade. After these massacres, especially in the German regions, a series of edicts were issued to protect Jews. Despite these protection edicts, the events that began with the First Crusade led to significant changes in the lives of Jews in Europe. Most historians agree that the situation for Jews worsened after the Crusade (Cohen, 2013, p. 271). These massacres revealed that Jews were a vulnerable minority in Christian society, and their property could be easily seized. In the following period, Jews became more susceptible to attacks from Christians.

1.1.3.5. Anti-Semitism in the Reformation Period

By the time of the Reformation, it is well-known that the leaders and advocates of the reform focused entirely on undermining the authority of the Roman Catholic Church. At first glance, this might seem to have had some positive outcomes for the

Jews. However, this atmosphere quickly faded, and the anti-Semitic perspective continued to prevail. For example, Martin Luther (1483-1546), who is considered the most influential leader of the Reformation after John Wycliffe (1330-1384) and John Hus (1370-1415), initially defended Jews against Catholic persecution but later became a vehement anti-Semite (Davis & Chazan, 2005, pp. 397-403). His work, *Von den Juden und Ihren Lügen* (*On the Jews and Their Lies*), published in Wittenberg, portrayed Jews as criminals, parasites on society, collaborators with the devil, and enemies of Jesus. This work has been considered an inspiration for subsequent Jewish persecutions (Johnson, 2017, pp. 305-306)[10].

Furthermore, it is a known fact that Jews were segregated from society and confined to ghettos. This practice was used to consolidate the Church's power in response to the Reformation. In Catholic-dominated areas, a discourse emerged to prove the wrongness of Judaism and the correctness of Christianity (Poliakov et al., 1978, p. 108).

The Reformation movements provided only a brief period of tolerance for Jews and reveal how antisemitism persisted across religious ideologies. Luther's shift in attitude toward Jews highlights that antisemitism was not exclusive to the Catholic Church but was also deeply embedded within other Christian denominations.

In *Von den Juden und Ihren Lügen*, Luther directed his theological and social criticisms at Jews, transforming anti-Jewish sentiment from a purely religious discourse into a political and social narrative. The impact of this work extended far beyond Luther's era, playing a significant role in perpetuating hatred toward Jews in subsequent centuries. This illustrates how antisemitism adapted to different contexts, solidifying its influence as both a religious and socio-political ideology.

After the involvement of reformist Protestants alongside the Roman Catholic world, the idea that Jews were agents of the Turks, acting as the fifth column within Christendom, became widespread. As a result of all these developments, by the sixteenth century, it is reported that almost no Jews remained in Western Europe.

[10] For this source, the page numbers provided are based on Turkish translations. However, the referenced content is also present in the original works or their English translations. Readers may verify the accuracy of the relevant sections by consulting the original texts or their English translations listed below:
Johnson, P. (1987). *A History of the Jews*. Harper & Row.

Consequently, Jews sought refuge from the Crusaders and the Inquisition, which continued into modern times, by migrating to Eastern Europe. They faced some of the most horrific persecutions in places like Poland and Russia, where anti-Semitism was adopted as a state policy. However, pogroms such as the Chmielnicki massacres, which began in 1648 and led to the destruction of hundreds of Jewish communities in Eastern Europe, forced Jews to migrate once again. This time, many moved to countries like England and America, where modern Jewish communities began to form (Wyne, 2017, pp. 282-284).

The exclusion of Jews in Western Europe through religious and political antisemitism pushed them into even greater danger in Eastern Europe. The institutionalization of antisemitism as state policy in Poland and Russia severely threatened the physical and cultural existence of Jewish communities.

The Chmielnicki massacres represent one of the most tragic examples of anti-Jewish sentiment operating as an organized policy of violence rather than merely individual or localized hatred. The subsequent migration of Jews to countries like England and America marks a pivotal moment in the dynamics of the modern Jewish diaspora. These waves of migration underscore the international dimension of antisemitism and reveal how Jewish communities were forced to constantly seek new places for survival and continuity.

This situation exemplified the reaction against Jews in other Christian sects following the Catholic Church, shaping a theological form of anti-Semitism. Jews, who faced marginalization from a religious perspective, and the concept of anti-Semitism also became subjects of intellectual debate and philosophical interpretations that emerged during the Enlightenment.

1.1.3.6. Anti-Semitism in the Enlightenment Period

Until the Enlightenment, which emphasized the individual, and the liberal atmosphere created by the French Revolution began to prevail, Jews were the most marginalized group within European societies. Up until the 18th century, Jews faced numerous political, economic, and social restrictions. They were scapegoated for every misfortune experienced by Europe, a trend that persisted until the Holocaust (Maccoby, 2006, p. 48).

Before the Enlightenment, Jews in Europe generally had a closed, tribal-like societal structure dominated by religious authority. This religious authority did not only have religious duties but also held social and political power over the Jewish community. The authority's power did not come from a mandate willingly given by the community but rather from the longstanding pressure established since the Roman Empire, which the community members had to accept. The influence of this religious authority was so significant that it resolved internal disputes through rabbinical courts. Rabbis in these courts had the authority to impose punishments such as flogging, imprisonment, exile, and even the death penalty. The death penalty had various forms, including severe methods like flogging the convict to death. Outside their community, Jews also faced significant restrictions (Shahak, 2015, p. 42).

The immense power of religious authority within Jewish communities reveals that social and legal order was entirely structured around religious norms. The punishments enforced by rabbinical courts demonstrate the extent of this authority, which had the capacity to directly intervene in the lives of individuals.

At the same time, the restrictions imposed on Jews by the external world highlight that this insular structure was shaped not only by internal pressures but also by exclusionary external environments. The oppressive system inherited from the Roman Empire hindered Jewish societal integration, forcing them to live under a dual siege, one from within their communities and one from the surrounding society. This dual dynamic underscores the complexities of Jewish life in historical contexts shaped by both internal governance and external marginalization.

Jews were not free to work in any occupation they desired, and most notably, they were prohibited from owning land, which was essential for farming and which was a key profession of that era. Because owning property would place them on an equal footing with the rest of European society, Jews were also forbidden from purchasing homes for residence. Deprived of the opportunity to farm in rural areas, Jews were also banned from attending trade schools in more developed urban centers where they could learn crafts. The only exception was that Jews were allowed to attend medical schools. In trade, they were prohibited from engaging in the wool, wood, tobacco, leather, and wine trade (Elon, 2005, p. 23).

The denial of land ownership excluded Jews entirely from rural economies, forcing them to live in urban areas with limited opportunities. Restrictions on trade further constrained their economic activities, confining them to specific sectors. While limited opportunities, such as access to medical education, allowed some Jews to specialize in certain fields, these opportunities did little to mask the systematic exclusion of Jewish communities from broader professional and commercial activities. Such restrictions hindered the integration of Jews into the economic fabric of society, relegating them to a socially and economically isolated position. This deliberate marginalization highlights the structural barriers that perpetuated their exclusion and reinforced societal prejudices.

Faced with various professional restrictions, Jews had no other option but to engage in brokerage, mediation, and essentially moneylending to make a living. Even in these circumstances, the economic status of the poorest Jew was considerably better than that of European farmers. Another restriction on Jews was that they were typically kept away from major European cities and allowed to live only in rural areas. Europeans did not consider Jews to be sufficiently equipped or cultured to live in large cities (Shahak, 2015, p. 108).

The feudal society that dominated Europe before modernity allowed Jews to maintain the aforementioned societal structure for many years. During this period, Jews managed to preserve their social cohesion under religious authority without undergoing significant changes. Consequently, until the 1800s, Jewish identity in Europe was primarily defined by religious reference. Their distinct religious identity further distanced them from their European Christian neighbors. Clinging to their religious teachings, which they had preserved for centuries, brought Jews closer to God but distanced them from the societies they lived in. This separation and insularity within their communities led to the emergence of the so-called Jewish Question in Europe (Shahak, 2015, p. 110).

Professional restrictions not only narrowed the living spaces of Jewish communities but also distanced them from societal integration as they sought to preserve their religious identity. This dynamic shaped the economic and social positions of Jewish communities while simultaneously fostering their perception as a problem in the eyes of Europeans.

The definition of Jewish identity through religious teachings strengthened internal solidarity within the community but also deprived them of opportunities to harmonize with European societies. This dual effect highlights the complex interplay between preserving cultural identity and navigating external pressures, which often led to further marginalization and isolation.

With Enlightenment thought ending the dominance of religion over European society and replacing it with individual-centered developments, the oppressive regime of Jewish religious authority was also affected. As secularism became the predominant ideology of this period, the closed societal structures of Jewish communities also came to an end (Shahak, p. 111).

This change marked a significant rupture in the traditional structures that had shaped Jewish communities for centuries. The weakening of religious authority's social and political power allowed Jewish individuals greater autonomy and pushed them toward greater integration into the societies around them. Secularism not only altered the internal dynamics of Jewish communities but also paved the way for Jews to adopt new identities and roles within European society.

The dissolution of closed societal structures made Jewish communities more flexible both socially and religiously, prompting individuals to redefine their roles within their communities. However, this process also brought about a reevaluation of Jewish identity and a search for a place within modern society. This reflects the complex impact of the Enlightenment on Jewish communities. While fostering emancipation and individualization, it also necessitated a challenging balance between traditional identity and the demands of the modern world. This duality underscores the transformative yet nuanced effects of the Enlightenment on Jewish life.

The Enlightenment era was a period focused on efforts to eliminate religiously-based conflicts. One of the leading thinkers of this period, John Locke (1632-1704), is known for discussing whether a person can exist based on reason alone, without belonging to any religious group. The rapid scientific and technical developments in Western societies introduced new paradigms of knowledge, creating significant doubts about traditional religious and theological perspectives. This led to the emergence of a secular space in life. Jews found themselves in a new and complex situation. On one hand, previous Church practices required the moral and intellectual scrutiny of the

mistreatment of Jews. On the other hand, Judaism was seen as the fundamental source of the oppressive nature of Christianity. This period saw a shift away from Christian sources and a return to Greco-Roman values, yet the negative perception of Jews persisted (Maccoby, 2006, p. 50).

Enlightenment leaders, particularly in France, such as Voltaire (1694-1778), held anti-Jewish views when considering their core emphases. Voltaire regarded Jews as inherently crude and ignorant, making their integration into modern society impossible. His anti-Semitism was rooted in his opposition to Christianity. He viewed Judaism as the foundation of the fanatical, conservative, and irrational Christian doctrine. Voltaire is significant as the first thinker to reference Christianity's Jewish origins and for possibly producing the first works of secular and racial anti-Semitism. The distinguishing feature of modern anti-Semites from medieval Christian anti-Semitism is their opposition to Christianity. Thus, the birth of modern anti-Semitism can be traced back to this period (Maccoby, 2006, p. 52).

This period marked a redefinition of the social position of Jews while also introducing new challenges. The rise of scientific and secular values provided a framework for questioning traditional religious identities, yet it also created new forms of marginalization for Jews within modern society. Judaism was perceived during this era both as a legacy of theological tradition and as an ideological obstacle to modernization.

Although the secular sphere emerging in the Enlightenment era seemed to offer Jews an escape from religious discrimination, the new societal norms shaped by Greco-Roman values failed to eliminate enduring prejudices against them. This highlights that negative perceptions of Jews were rooted not only in religious conflicts but also in cultural and historical biases. While the Enlightenment facilitated Jewish integration into the modern world, it simultaneously paved the way for new forms of discrimination, underscoring the dual and complex impact of this transformative period on Jewish communities.

It is also possible to interpret this period as a critique of Christianity in the name of natural religion. Up to a certain point, there were some empathetic approaches towards Jews, viewing them as victims of Christianity. However, over time, Judaism also became a target of this critical perspective. According to this view, Jews could

gain their rights to the extent that they shared the dominant understanding and adopted the majority's culture. Ultimately, as seen in the example of the French Enlightenment, critiques of Christianity often highlighted its Jewish roots, leading to harsh criticisms of Judaism as well (Poliakov et al., 1978, pp. 115-117).

Moreover, it is important to discuss the development of race consciousness, a product of the Enlightenment era and perhaps the most critical turning point in the history of anti-Semitism. During the Enlightenment, the emphasis on science increased, and scientific explanations replaced the theological doctrines that were prevalent before. This shift paved the way for racial studies. These studies classified the human race into categories, later known as the Aryan race, consisting of white-skinned and dark-skinned people. This classification had various implications. European societies were categorized as the white-skinned and superior Aryan race. Consequently, the Jews living among them were definitely not considered part of the Aryan race (Langmuir, 1990, p. 314).

The critical nature of the Enlightenment transformed religious prejudices against Jews into a more enduring and systematic form of discrimination grounded in scientific and racial theories. The critique of Christianity's Jewish origins reinforced the perception of Judaism as a problem within modern society. Thus, Judaism began to be perceived as a race.

This new form of antisemitism, shaped by racial consciousness, laid the foundation for a hate ideology that completely excluded Jews from European societies. It marked the beginning of a period where Jews were defined as socially, culturally, and biologically distinct and inferior. The scientific advancements of the Enlightenment elevated anti-Jewish prejudices to a new level, providing a critical context for understanding the persistent structure of antisemitism in the modern world.

1.1.3.6.1. Jewish Enlightenment- Haskalah

When discussing the Enlightenment movement, it is essential to mention the Haskalah movement, which is inextricably linked to it. This movement, which can be briefly defined as the Jewish Enlightenment, played a significant role in the spread of European culture among Jews. Developing in harmony with the spirit of the Enlightenment, the Haskalah was viewed by conservative Jews as a movement that

weakened the Messianic belief because it considered the return to the land of Israel as a political and secular issue (Elon, 2005, p. 45).

This movement criticized traditional Judaism and advocated for Jews to leave the ghettos and integrate into the societies they lived in. Although it had a critical stance towards the past, its primary goal was to ensure the survival of the Jewish community and promote their spiritual and cultural progress. As a result, the already existing negative perception of Jews in Western societies was reinforced by the Haskalah's transformation into a movement that fostered nationalist, Zionist, and reformist ideas (Kurt, 2010, pp. 33-34).

In response to the legal reforms in many European countries that ended ghetto life and facilitated their integration into society, Jews initiated an Enlightenment movement. This movement aimed to embrace the liberating influence of the Enlightenment and align with the mindset brought about by modernity. It included a series of transformations in their thought processes, belief systems, and even languages (Elon, 2005, p. 47).

Through their developed Enlightenment ideas, Jews aimed to shed their religious identities, which were not accommodated in the societal structure mandated by the modern state. They sought to remove Judaism from public life and confine it to a private dimension. Due to their natural attributes, Jews became an advantaged community in the industrial age. However, they realized that their achievements did not lead to full integration into the societies they lived in. Jews were identified by German Christians not as Germans, but as Jews. To prevent their religion from defining their identity and to be recognized by a national identity, they embraced the Enlightenment process (Kurt, 2010, p. 46).

The Jewish Enlightenment, similar to its European counterpart, emphasized rationality. This rational basis of the Jewish Enlightenment is reflected in the choice of the Hebrew term Haskalah. The term Haskalah is derived from the Hebrew word "sekhel," which means reason or intellect (Kurt, 2010, p. 46).

The Jewish philosopher Moses Mendelssohn was the one who gave philosophical and literary content to the Haskalah movement. Through his work in philosophy, Mendelssohn enhanced the reputation of German philosophy, earning him the nickname "the German Socrates" and spreading his fame throughout Europe (Elon,

2005, p. 51). In his 1783 work *Jerusalem or On Religious Power and Judaism*, Mendelssohn sought to present Judaism as a rational religion. He believed that a Jew could fulfill the requirements of their religion while also embracing Enlightenment ideals in all aspects of their life, living as a true German (2005, p. 63).

Despite facing intense criticism from rabbis for translating the Torah into German, which they saw as desecrating its sanctity, Mendelssohn paved the way for the Torah to be appreciated as a literary work. His translation had a similar impact on Jewish thought as Diderot's Encyclopedia had on French thought, promoting secular thinking among wide audiences. Mendelssohn did not advocate for Jews to fully convert to Christianity to integrate into their societies. Instead, he believed that modernizing Judaism by referencing reason was the key to helping Jews become Europeans (2005, p. 67).

It can be argued that the greatest impact of Haskalah thought on the Jewish community was the more secular interpretation of the "Messianic redemption idea" as a result of their work on Judaism (Kurt, 2010, p. 51). Among Jews who had secularized and benefited from the gains of Enlightenment thought, the belief in being a chosen people, the belief that "God intervenes in history in favor of Israel," and the expectation that "Israel will be gathered in the Holy Land by a future savior, the Messiah" gradually weakened (p. 51). The idea of a messianic savior was typically embraced during difficult times for Jews but lost its significance during more comfortable and less troubled periods, suggesting a pragmatic attitude toward their religious principles. Additionally, as the Jewish community increasingly adopted the idea that waiting for a messianic savior was not necessary for the return to Israel, it facilitated the rise of nationalist movements like Zionism, which aimed at the return to Israel (p. 52).

The realization of the Enlightenment's social ideals came to life through two revolutions at the end of the 18th century. In the American Revolution, the Jewish population that had migrated to the continent was minimal, and the acquisition of rights was viewed in the context of universal human rights. In contrast, the French Revolution involved a large Jewish population with a history of prior experiences, leading to a different process than in America. As a result, despite gaining some rights, as exemplified by Napoleon's (1769-1821) political struggle for freedom for all, the

residual perceptions from previous eras persisted in France and other European countries (Poliakov et al., 1978, pp. 113-114). In securing these rights, Jews were often questioned about their loyalty to the country they lived in and their ability to integrate into its cultural World. In the Western societal imagination, Jews were seen as highly suitable scapegoats, even for the smallest misfortunes (Parkes, 1964, p. 57).

The lack of positive reception and the anti-Semitic responses to their efforts to be socially, economically, politically, and religiously accepted by the societies they lived in led Jews to reconsider their ideas of integration to the point of assimilation. In the new century, Jews responded to the issues they faced in Europe with various approaches, ranging from nationalism to socialism. Despite having different solutions, these responses shared the common belief that no matter the degree of assimilation, European societies would never fully accept Jews. Consequently, Jews began to seek solutions not within Europe, but outside of it (Groepler, 1999, p. 70).

Despite all their efforts, the anti-Semitic attitudes faced by Jews caused views advocating integration and assimilation to lose their value. By the end of the 19th century, influenced by the era, nationalist sentiments began to emerge among Jews as well. In this context, the Haskalah movement, although unsuccessful in integrating the Jewish community through Enlightenment ideas, made a significant contribution by laying the ground for the spread of nationalist ideas among Jews.

1.1.3.7. Anti-Semitism in the Modern Era

The Peace of Westphalia (1648), signed after the Thirty Years' Wars (1618-1648), marked the beginning of the Modern Era and brought significant changes for Jews. Three specific provisions of the treaty had important implications for Jewish life: the recognition of imperial sovereignty, territorial adjustments, and the acknowledgment of religious tolerances. With the recognition of sovereignty, princes gained absolute power, which led to a need for regular armies, officials, and money. To meet these needs, princes turned to the Jews for assistance. Jews appointed to roles within the courts (Court Jews) served in regions where Jews were otherwise prohibited from living (Groepler, 1999, pp. 43-44). The prominence of Court Jews as financiers to emperors, kings, and princes contributed to the stereotype of Jews being associated with moneylending and being blamed for economic crises (Mora, 2011, p. 24).

Hannah Arendt highlights the parallel increase in anti-Semitic attitudes with the development of nation-states. The 17th and 18th centuries marked the transition from absolute monarchies to nation-states. During this period, Court Jews, who supported the principalities and managed their financial affairs, saw their positions rise. However, since the privileges of Court Jews did not extend to the broader Jewish population, these changes did not have a significant impact on the overall Jewish community (Arendt, 2018, p. 40).[11]

The 16th and 17th centuries witnessed a renewal of persecution and an increase in negative stereotypes against Jews. Martin Luther, initially positive towards Jews, got angry when they refused to convert to his faith, leaving a legacy of Jewish hatred in Lutheranism (Beller, 2007, p. 14). According to Luther, fighting against Jews was futile because he saw them as hopeless cases. He believed that the Inquisition courts should deal with sinful Christians, as there was always hope for them. Jews, however, were cursed by God for causing the crucifixion of God's son. In his work *On the Jews and Their Lies*, Luther advocated for Jews to be forced to work under harsh conditions, have their books confiscated, and even be expelled from the country. He suggested that synagogues and schools should be set on fire, houses demolished, books seized, public movement prohibited, valuable possessions (like gold and money) confiscated, and Jews made to do hard labor (using tools like axes and hoes). According to Luther, the best solution was to expel Jews from the country. Despite his fervent views, Luther's influence was limited, and Jews continued to live in many cities in Germany during the 16th and 17th centuries (Groepler, 1999, pp. 34-38).

Until the 18th century, Jews were prohibited from purchasing land and joining guilds. Beside this, they had to buy rights such as residency permits and licenses to practice their professions (Groepler, 1999, p. 34). By the late 19th century, most of continental Europe had accepted Jewish freedom. Public opinion in Western and Central Europe viewed the failure of countries like Tsarist Russia, which did not grant freedom to Jews, as evidence of their backwardness (Beller, 2007, p. 16).

[11] For this source, the page numbers provided are based on Turkish translations. However, the referenced content is also present in the original works or their English translations. Readers may verify the accuracy of the relevant sections by consulting the original texts or their English translations listed below: Arendt, H. (1951). *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. Harcourt Brace & Company.

Especially after the Enlightenment of the 18th century, anti-Semitism evolved to reflect new cultural, intellectual, and political realities (ushmm.org, 2021e). During the Renaissance and Reformation, Jews manifested themselves through the Haskalah movement. This movement aimed to abolish restrictive laws and integrate into European society. During the French Revolution (1789), some rights were granted to Jews under the principle of equality, provided that they integrated into the society, although not all of these rights were fully realized. With these newly granted rights, Jews engaged in economic and cultural activities (Mora, 2011, pp. 24-25).

Rights given to Jews:

"Article I: Men are born and remain free and equal in rights. Social distinctions may be based only on common utility.

Article II: The aim of all political association is the preservation of the natural and imprescriptible rights of man. These rights are liberty, property, security, and resistance to oppression.

Article IV: Liberty consists in the freedom to do everything which injures no one else; hence the exercise of the natural rights of each man has no limits except those which assure to the other members of the society the enjoyment of the same rights. These limits can only be determined by law.

Article X: No one shall be disquieted on account of his opinions, including his religious views, provided their manifestation does not disturb the public order established by law." (Mora, 2011, p. 26).

These articles, introduced by the French Revolution, provided Jews with a temporary solution. However, a review of parliamentary debates reveals that Jews were still not granted full freedom:

> We must refuse everything to the Jews as a nation and accord everything to Jews as individuals. We must withdraw recognition from their judges; they should only have our judges. We must refuse legal protection to the maintenance of the so-called laws of their organization; they must not be allowed to form a state within a state. Each individual among them must become a citizen. But some will tell me that they do not wish to be citizens. Well then! If they do not want to be citizens, let them say so, and we shall expel them. It is abominable that an individual should refuse to be a citizen in a free country Clermont-Tonnerre, 1789: Speech to the National Assembly (Groepler, 1999, p. 68).

In response to Clermont-Tonnerre's speech, conservatives argued that Jews could not be citizens because they were a separate nation. On the other hand, revolutionaries like Robespierre countered by saying, "The characteristics attributed to the Jews stem from the humiliation to which you subject them. Every citizen who meets the requirements for the right to vote has the right to hold public office." With this development, France became the first European country to grant equal rights to Jews (Groepler, 1999, pp. 68-69). Following this, European nations, starting with England and ending with the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia and the fall of the Ottoman Empire in the Balkans, established the principle of equality before the law in their constitutions. They removed all restrictions on residence and professional activities for Jews and other national and religious minorities (ushmm.org, 2021c).

The French Revolution changed the political conditions throughout Europe, leading to the emergence of nation-states that required much larger capital than the financial support provided by Court Jews to princes. Consequently, states needed Jewish capital, and Jews assumed an economic role as financial assistants to the government. However, with the rise of imperialism at the end of the 19th century, the relative value of Jews diminished. As Jews relinquished their economic roles to imperialist businessmen, their influence in Europe persisted, but the ties to the Jewish community began to sever. With the advent of imperialism, Jewish capital lost its significance. After World War I, in line with the European identity, hatred and violence towards Jews, perceived as non-European and non-national, increased (Arendt, 2018, pp. 41-42).[12]

The Church's prohibition on interest and borrowing was not well-received by Christian capitalists. While they did not want religious authorities making such decisions, they were also hesitant to openly rebel against their faith. However, the Church had no spiritual authority over Jews, and the prohibition on interest and borrowing did not apply to them, which posed a problem. The Church could not forbid Jews from engaging in money exchange and banking under the guise of doctrine and dogma (Arendt, 2018, p. 43).

[12] For this source, the page numbers provided are based on Turkish translations. However, the referenced content is also present in the original works or their English translations. Readers may verify the accuracy of the relevant sections by consulting the original texts or their English translations listed below: Arendt, H. (1951). *The Origins of Totalitarianism.* Harcourt Brace & Company.

Unlike other thinkers, Lazare argued that the reason Jews did not work the land and engage in agriculture was not because they could not own land, but because their patriotic beliefs did not allow them to cultivate foreign land. He stated, "Therefore, their lands were worked by their slaves." Nonetheless, as merchants, given the legal constraints imposed on them, they were destined to become moneylenders. To escape persecution and resentment, they had to make themselves useful, even indispensable, to their rulers, nobles, and the Church they served. Despite condemning it, the Church needed gold and sought it from Jews (Lazare, 1967, p. 46).

Throughout the 19th century, Jews in Western Europe who were emancipated and assimilated became closely associated with a dynamic liberal culture that valued education, intelligence, scientific thinking, and progress. By the late 19th century, the Church, facing challenges from secularism, scientific explanations of the universe, socialism, and militant anti-clericalism, depicted Jews as agents of a destructive rational tradition and as opponents of Christianity. Anti-Semitism, influenced by the Enlightenment and the French Revolution, left Jews with a fundamental way of thinking and a profound opposition to the spiritual values of the Christian worldview (MacMaster, 2001, p. 91).

Traditional anti-Jewish sentiment, dating back to the medieval pogroms, depicted Jews as a dangerous internal enemy that secretly threatened the vitality of Christian society by poisoning wells and deliberately spreading the plague. Throughout the 19th century, increasing anti-Semitic rhetoric was supported by metaphors suggesting that Jews lived as parasites on the host society. Jews were seen as a diseased race and a source of germs that could potentially infect European society, and they were also blamed for moral corruption. Therefore, it was believed that they should be excluded from social life (MacMaster, 2001, p. 92).

1.1.3.7.1. The Pinnacle of Anti-Semitism: The Nazi Era

> "On this earth, everything that is not of pure race is merely chaff driven before the wind" (Hitler, 1976, p. 256). Adolf Hitler.

Germany saw a significant amount of change as a result of both World War I and the Bolshevik Revolution. These events, which were considerably more devastating than the French Revolution, resulted in a large number of fatalities as well as widespread dread and instability. As a result of this instability, other radical

movements came into being, including communism, fascism, and national socialism. Following Germany's defeat in the war, the communist threat and the national anger stemming from the defeat created ideological chaos. Furthermore, the attempts of extreme leftists to seize power caused widespread panic. Among those extreme leftists aspiring to take control were Jews, which led the right-wing to associate the revolution with Jews. Consequently, anti-Semitic sentiments dominated the political atmosphere. In the midst of such chaos and fear of revolution, Hitler brought his party to the forefront. It was believed that the economic and political difficulties facing the country could be resolved by expelling the Jews (Friedlander, 2016, pp. 95-96).

In January of 1933, Adolf Hitler was given the position of Secretary of State for Germany. A one-party state was established almost immediately after the National Socialist German Workers' Party (NSDAP) took power. This was accomplished by swiftly demolishing all other political institutions and brutally repressing any dissent. Consequently, all economic, political, and social rights were suspended. The NSDAP, known as the Nazis, persecuted communists, social democrats, and particularly Jews, among many others (Geory, 2006, p. ix). Although anti-Semitic movements had been witnessed in previous years and some governments had always displayed anti-Jewish rhetoric, Hitler was the first state leader to implement these notions and explicitly state them as part of the party ideology (Lewis, 2004, p. 121). Among the significant figures of Nazism who became close friends of Hitler and held great importance within the party were Hermann Göring, Alfred Rosenberg, Rudolf Hess, and Heinrich Himmler (Geory, 2006, p. 2).

The NSDAP included references to Jews in four of the 25 points of its party program:

4. "Only those of German blood, regardless of creed, may be citizens. Therefore, no Jew can be a German citizen."

5. "Non-citizens may live in Germany only as guests and must be subject to laws for foreigners."

6. "The right to decide on the government and laws of the State is reserved solely for citizens. Therefore, we demand that all official positions, of any kind, whether in the Reich, in the States, or in the municipalities, be held only by citizens."

7. “The immigration of non-Germans into Germany will be prevented. We demand that all non-Germans who have immigrated to Germany since August 2, 1914, be forced to leave the Reich immediately” (Groepler, 1999, p. 141).

As clearly outlined in the NSDAP party program, the goal was to combine nationalist and socialist elements. At the same time, the greatest aim was to unite all Germans under a single state. One of the most important steps in this process was to strip Jews of their citizenship (Geory, 2006, p. 3). As the NSDAP continued to increase its votes, it enacted numerous laws and decrees that restricted the rights of the Jewish population. Chief among these were the Nuremberg Laws, enacted on September 14, 1935 (Groepler, 1999, p. 142).

The Nuremberg Laws consisted of two separate laws: the Reich Citizenship Law and the Law for the Protection of German Blood and German Honor (ushmm.org, 2021a). According to these laws, marriages between those of Aryan descent and those not of Aryan descent were prohibited. These laws aimed to exclude Jews from social and economic life. Many of the racist theories that formed the basis of Nazi ideology were solidified through these laws (Groepler, 1999, p. 143).

As aforementioned, under the Law for the Protection of German Blood and German Honor, marriages between Jews and non-Jewish Germans were prohibited. Additionally, sexual relations between these groups were considered racial defilement (Rassenschande) and were criminalized. The law also banned Jewish men from employing German women under the age of 45 as servants, to prevent any possibility of oppression and racial defilement. Many individuals accused of racial defilement were either imprisoned or sent to concentration camps (ushmm.org, 2021a). Jews were also forbidden from displaying or using the German flag (Geory, 2006, p. 74).

While traditional anti-Semitism was driven by theological debates, modern anti-Semitism was based on racial differences and the belief that the Jewish race was inferior (Mora, 2011, p. 26). According to the Reich Citizenship Law, which defined who was considered German and who was considered Jewish, only persons of German or related blood could be German citizens (Friedlander, 2016, p. 144). The Nazis ignored the religious, cultural, and traditional aspects of Jewish identity, focusing solely on race (ushmm.org, 2021a). Consequently, Jews were placed on the same legal footing as foreigners regarding citizenship rights. This rejection of the Jewish issue as

a religious matter is significant, though it was established that claims of racial differences lack scientific basis. Nevertheless, the Nazi regime promoted pseudo-scientific views to justify their policies (Hitler, 1976, p. 267).

To the Nazis, Jews were not seen as a religious or cultural community but as a racial and hereditary stain. In Nazi ideology, everything was categorized as either Aryan (good) or Semitic (bad). The Aryan race, to which Germans belonged, embodied all that was good and beautiful. In contrast, the Semitic race was seen as weak and focused solely on destruction (Hitler, 1976, p. 257). As an inferior race, Jews were believed to harm the superior race and attempt to dilute it through mixing (Lewis, 2004, p. 19). The Nazis' view of Jews as foreigners and fundamentally different from themselves (the Aryan European race) is a complex issue, especially considering that Jews had lived in Europe for centuries, adopting European languages, cultures, and traditions.

Hitler and the Nazis used the ideas of German Social Darwinists to justify their racial ideology. They adopted the Social Darwinist theory of evolution, which emphasized "the survival of the fittest". Consequently, during World War II, the Nazis targeted not only Jews but also individuals with physical and mental illnesses that were deemed incurable, believing that these people should be eliminated (ushhm.org, 2021d).

Nazi ideology exhibited such intense anti-Semitism that it overshadowed even the idea of uniting all Germans. Hitler was not alone in this endeavor; he included influential figures from various professions within the party (Friedlander, 2016, p. 73). Notably, about 45% of doctors in Germany were members of the NSDAP. These doctors conducted research on race and performed various experiments on people tortured in concentration camps, facilitated by their party membership. Besides, the Nazi regime sought to garner public support by publishing regional news articles that equated Communism with Judaism, thereby increasing anti-Semitic sentiments (Mora, 2011, p. 31).

An event that came to be known as "Kristallnacht" or "The Night of Broken Glass" took place on November 9, 1938. Hitler and Goebbels participated in the planning and execution of this atrocity. As a result of the Holocaust, hundreds of synagogues were demolished, hundreds of shops owned by Jews were robbed, one

hundred Jews were beaten and killed in the streets, and about thirty thousand Jews were imprisoned and transferred to concentration camps (Groepler, 1999, page 150). While the Holocaust was taking place in Germany, the only major pogrom that took place on German soil was Kristallnacht (Bauman, 2016, p. 141). The massacre that took place at this location was a watershed moment in the history of anti-Semitic violence. Despite the fact that the concept of committing genocide against Jews had not yet been settled upon, Kristallnacht played a significant role in determining the responses of both Germany and the world community (Friedlander, 2016, p. 302).

In 1941, the State Security Office issued a decree addressing the issue that, despite thousands of Jews being sent to camps, Aryans were still forming close relationships with Jews. The decree stipulated that Aryans involved in such relationships would be detained for educational purposes, and in serious cases, sent to concentration camps. Jews, on the other hand, were to be sent to concentration camps under any circumstance. Moreover, due to physical similarities between some Germans and Jews, German and Jewish schools were segregated to prevent any confusion between the two races (Groepler, 1999, p. 147).

At the Wannsee Conference on January 20, 1942, the decision was made regarding the "Final Solution," outlining the systematic expulsion, extermination, and disposal of Jewish bodies in Europe. Led by Reinhard Heydrich, the conference minutes carefully avoided harsh terms like extermination, killing, and deportation. Instead, they opted for softer and less conspicuous terms such as natural reduction of the population, special treatment, and emigration to describe the process (projetaladin.org, 2021a). The conference also addressed issues concerning Jews married to non-Jews, those involved in the arms trade, and foreign Jews. To resolve these issues, the conference decided to sweep Europe from west to east, prioritizing France in this operation. After declaring Germany cleansed of Jews in 1943, 52,000 Jews were deported from France, and 75,000 were killed (Groepler, 1999, pp. 156-159).

During World War II, as the Nazi regime expanded its territory into Eastern Europe, this expansion meant the inclusion of more Jews. With the annexation of Austria (Anschluss), the annexation of Czechoslovakia, and the invasion of Poland, the number of Jews in territories under German control rose to 10 million (Geory,

2006, p. 77). This increase rendered the strategy of Jewish emigration impossible. Consequently, the Final Solution was set to be implemented.

1.1.3.7.2. The Final Solution: The Holocaust

> On the contrary, the Jew is a parasite and will remain a parasite. He is a freeloader, like a harmful bacillus. As long as he finds suitable ground, he will spread further. In the places he settles, the peoples who contract this microbe will eventually end up in their graves. (testofcivilisation.eu, 2021). Adolf Hitler.

One of the most significant events in Jewish history also occurred during this period. At the onset of World War II and during the war, the German Nazi regime, with the support of France and Italy, carried out the Holocaust, a massive genocide against the Jews. This event, in both its development and its various outcomes, is considered one of the most horrific and crucial incidents in the 4000-year history of the Jews. As a result of these events, with the support of America, the modern State of Israel was established in 1948 in the land of Palestine to provide a homeland for the surviving Jews after the war (Adam, 2010, pp. 232-234).

Among the forms of hatred targeting Jews, physical violence, social exclusion, and assimilation manifested in varying degrees. Legal restrictions, pogroms, mass attacks, terrorist actions, and the Holocaust, the most extreme example of anti-Semitism, clearly demonstrate the extent of this hatred (Taguieff, 2017, p. 31). In earlier years, Jews who dug their own graves were buried in them; between 1939 and 1945, they were gathered into camps and subjected to various tortures solely because they were Jewish. There is no other genocide in history that was systematically planned and executed like the Holocaust. Therefore, the Holocaust can be seen as one of the darkest stains in human history (Lewis, 2004, p. 17).

During the Nazi regime, various laws were enacted that expelled Jews from their professions, distanced them from trade, subjected them to various tax applications, demanded atonement payments, and finally denied them access to basic needs like food. Initially, they were dispossessed, and then they were systematically gathered from their homes (Groepler, 1999, pp. 144-146). To eliminate Jews as a whole, the first death camps were built following the invasion of Poland. The Nazi regime gathered communists and prisoners opposing the Nazis into camps. After the mass shooting massacres in Poland, a more comprehensive cleansing was planned, leading

to the development of gas trucks (Erdoğan, 2018, p. 233). There were other groups of people who were killed in this massacre in addition to Jews. Among the non-Aryan victims were Russians, Slavs, and over 200,000 Germans who were physically and psychologically impaired. These individuals were slain in a methodical manner as part of the infamous Euthanasia Programme. The Nazis aimed to purify their race from diseases and protect the Aryan race from inferior races. Under eugenics policies, Germans with hereditary illnesses were sterilized (Lewis, 2004, p. 23).

Hitler worked to gain the support of the German people through various activities. Using Propaganda Minister Joseph Goebbels, he attempted to instill hatred of Jews in the German population. By portraying Jews as dangerous and a threat to the Aryan race, Hitler aimed to attract professionals such as doctors, engineers, and chemists through films and radio broadcasts. He sought to gather allies for his plan to exterminate the Jews (Mora, 2011, p. 31).

Groepler notes that the Nazi extermination process was carried out in two phases: the deportation phase (1933-1940) and the extermination phase (1941-1945). Initially, the identity of Jews was determined, followed by the confiscation of their property. Subsequently, all Jews were gathered into ghettos, and ultimately, various methods were used to exterminate them. The people gathered in these ghettos provided German doctors and scientists with unlimited opportunities for experimentation (1999, p. 142).

In 1939, gas chambers were established to administer "the final bullet to relieve the suffering of incurable patients." By 1941-1942, six gas-operated extermination centers were meticulously operating. Between 1939 and 1941, although the exact number is unknown, between 50,000 and 100,000 German mental patients were exposed to carbon monoxide gas, resulting in their deaths. These gas chambers were discreetly disguised as showers and baths in treatment centers (Groepler, 1999, p. 160). Following the Nazi invasion of Poland in 1939, a large portion of Polish Jews under German control was gathered in ghettos. Living under extremely harsh conditions, many Jews in the ghettos died from starvation, infectious diseases, or forced labor. As extermination camps became fully operational, the number of Jews in ghettos began to decline by 1942. Within a year, approximately 2 million Jews were murdered (projetaladin.org, 2021d). However, According to Roger Garaudy in his book *The*

Founding Myths of Modern Israel, the widely cited number of 6 million Jews killed during the whole Holocaust has been debated, and Garaudy claims that the actual number is closer to 600,000. He argues that this figure has been exaggerated for political purposes, raising questions about the use of historical events in shaping modern narratives (Garaudy, 1996, p. 134).

When the official decision to expel the Jews was made, they were swiftly relocated to ghettos, distancing them from the German populace. The first ghettos were established in April 1940 in one of the annexed areas. By the end of 1941, the ghettoization process was largely complete, with nearly all Jews living in these confined areas. Although the Jews in the ghettos had limited freedom of movement, they were still subjected to wearing the "yellow star" [13] during the day and a curfew in the evening. Especially during this period, poor Jews brought from Poland under German control were viewed as economic assets due to the impending forced labor policies. The segregation of Jews into ghettos and the imposition of various markers introduced a new dimension to societal division. Preventing physical contact between the German population and the Jews reinforced stereotypes and prejudices. Isolated from society, they faced discrimination, and controlling the Jewish population was thought to be easier in the ghettos. Furthermore, the ghettos facilitated the subsequent "extermination" process for the Germans (Groepler, 1999, pp. 152-153).

Until Hitler attacked the Soviet Union in 1941, the agreement made in 1939 between Germany and the Soviet Union remained in effect. During this period, anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union was tolerated, and cooperation with the Nazi regime occurred (Lewis, 2004, p. 28). However, following the attack, the German army invaded Soviet territories, and within five months, they killed about 500,000 of the 4 million Jews living in the occupied cities. Additionally, nearly 6 million Soviet soldiers were captured. The Germans separated Soviet soldiers from Jews, and it is estimated that an additional 900,000 Jews were killed (Groepler, 1999, pp. 153-154). In the

[13] "Police Decree on the Marking of Jews" - 1941
As of September 1, 1941, Jews over the age of six were required to wear a yellow star on their lapels everywhere. Hitler mandated the yellow star to distinguish Jews from Germans due to their biological resemblance. However, Hitler had always argued that Jews could never truly resemble Germans (testofcivilisation, 2021b).

occupied territories, the Germans established ghettos, primarily in cities and towns with large Jewish populations.

The largest camp where people were massacred during the Nazi era was Auschwitz, known as the death factory. Between 1940 and 1945, 4.5 million people were brutally killed in this camp (Groepler, 1999, p. 162). At the same time, some Jews were forced to work in the camp. The forced labor practice was particularly important for the Nazis as it supported the war economy. With the implementation of the Holocaust decision, the extermination process accelerated, and the status of Jewish workers became irrelevant. This was evident, especially in 1941, when Jews were worked to death. Auschwitz was used both as a labor camp and an extermination camp. Those who could not work upon arrival were sent to gas chambers, while those who could work were forced to labor under the harshest conditions until they died. Some chemical companies (e.g., I.G. Farben) are known to have rented workers from Auschwitz (projetaladin.org, 2021c). Besides the tortures, medical experiments were also conducted at Auschwitz. These so-called scientific experiments focused on sterilizing Jews. Many subjects died during these experiments, and survivors were eventually sent to the gas chambers and killed. Valuables such as gold and platinum teeth were extracted from the bodies and sent to Berlin after being melted down. It is also claimed that body fat was used in soap production (Erdoğan, 2018, p. 234).

Jews gathered in the camps were also seen as cheap labor. Groepler notes that 28 camps worked for the weapon industry. Some camps were directly used for agricultural activities. The IG-Farben Company employed workers by paying the camp administration 3-4 marks per person to work in its factories. Workers who could not work for more than 14 days due to illness or other reasons were sent to the gas chambers. It is also known that the company sought to purchase female prisoners from the camp specifically for drug testing (1999, p. 172). As seen, the industrial sector played a significant role in forcibly employing Jewish laborers and in gas poisoning.

After the entire extermination process, efforts to cover up their actions began. Since some of the bodies were burned, there was no evidence left. Bodies that were not burned were buried in graves and covered with flowers to hide them (Mora, 2011, p. 32). There are very few documents that prove the Holocaust. Undoubtedly, most documents were destroyed by the Nazi regime to prevent future evidence (Erdoğan,

2018, p. 234). By 1944, extermination centers along with concentration camps were being gradually dismantled. By 1944, Auschwitz was the only camp still in use. The Red Army exposed the scenes they encountered in the liberated concentration camps to the world press, revealing the Nazi regime's atrocities (Groepler, 1999, p. 160). Despite initial skepticism about the reports of mass killings that increased after 1939, British and American officials remained indifferent to the violence even after obtaining documents. As a result of these massacres, some Jews went to Palestine, while others dispersed to neighboring countries. However, even in these places, especially in Poland, anti-Semitism was still notably prevalent. As the Nazi genocide became known worldwide and the scale of the atrocities was realized, a revulsion against anti-Semitism began to emerge. The suffering of the Jews evoked sympathy, leading to the prosecution of German war criminals and efforts by the Allies to rescue Jews from the camps. Nevertheless, aside from a small minority, most people remained silent about the horrors inflicted on the Jews (Lewis, 2004, pp. 22-23). Just as the thousands of children and adults massacred in Palestine are being met with silence today.

After the Holocaust, the Zionist movement's call for the establishment of a Jewish state was met with skepticism, particularly by the British. British Foreign Secretary Bevin expressed his concerns by stating, "Despite all their sufferings, if the Jews want to take too much at the head of the queue, they could provoke another anti-Semitic reaction." However, Holocaust survivors argued that seeking refuge in a newly established Jewish state, after the massacre of 6 million Jews, was not "taking too much"(Lewis, 2004, p. 24). Roger Garaudy challenges this widely accepted narrative, suggesting that the actual number of Jewish victims was closer to 600,000 and arguing that the figure of 6 million has been used to justify political goals, including the establishment of Israel (Garaudy, 1996, p. 134).

Jewish antagonism, with historical roots spanning centuries, reached its extreme limits during the Nazi era. The Holocaust was neither a singular occurrence, nor did it take place all of a sudden; rather, it was the consequence of a chain of individual choices, circumstances, and happenings that took place over the course of many years. The Holocaust represents a process where successive horrific decisions were implemented by statesmen who pushed key political, moral, and psychological

boundaries to their limits. This process had its own bureaucracy and order. The statesmen involved, whether Hitler, Goebbels, Himmler, Göring, or others, collectively facilitated the establishment of a lethal mechanism. It is not surprising that Hitler and his associates found people willing to participate in these atrocities. Those who followed orders during the genocide had little choice, as their options were between obedience and death. In addition, the opportunity to acquire Jewish property cheaply, secure good jobs, or get quick promotions and personal gains were sufficient incentives for individuals to partake in this brutality (Beller, 2007, pp. 92-93)

Chapter Conclusion

In this chapter, the historical development of anti-Semitism has been explained, culminating in the Holocaust. It is important to note that the term Semite does not refer exclusively to Jews but also includes Arabs. Both Jews and Arabs (Arab Muslims) are considered part of the Semitic race. Thus, according to Europeans, both communities constitute the Semitic race, or Semites. Despite this, anti-Semitism has been directed primarily at Jews rather than Arabs. The reason for this lies in the historical context: from antiquity through the Middle Ages and into the modern period, Europe had a significantly larger Jewish population compared to Arabs (or Muslims after the rise of Islam). Although Muslims were also present in some European cities and faced xenophobic attitudes, they never experienced systematic attacks to the extent that Jews did. The noticeable presence and distinct differences of Jews among European societies made them the primary target of anti-Semitic attitudes.

In spite of making up 7-8% of the Roman population and easily adapting to local customs, Jews were distinguished by their monotheistic beliefs and religious practices (such as circumcising male children and abstaining from pork). These differences fostered a sense of mistrust among the Romans. In the Middle Ages, as Christianity became the dominant power, this mistrust towards Jews evolved into hostility and violence. Christians, eager for Jews to convert, labeled them as killers of God when their demands were not met. Jews were accused of ritual murders and were increasingly isolated from socio-economic life.

With their rights restricted and job opportunities taken away, Jews began to gain economic strength through land ownership. European feudal lords, especially in the Modern Era, sought financial assistance from the increasingly wealthy Jewish

community and assigned them various roles within the state. However, during times of economic crisis, Jews were scapegoated. The very people who provided much-needed financial aid became the primary enemies during these crises.

The perception of Jews as scapegoats during times of crisis stems from a complex interplay of historical, economic, and social dynamics. In periods of economic hardship, societies often seek to assign blame to easily identifiable groups. Jews, historically associated with financial roles such as moneylending, tax collection, and brokerage, became convenient targets for public frustration. This visibility in economic activities positioned them as a focal point of resentment, especially when manipulated by political or religious leaders to divert attention from systemic issues (Johnson, 1987, pp. 123–125).

However, it is worth asking whether this scapegoating was solely due to external factors or if certain strategies or ideological movements within the Jewish community also played a role. For example, the rise of Zionism in the late 19th century, while aimed at strengthening Jewish identity and establishing a national homeland, may have inadvertently fueled suspicion among non-Jewish communities. Zionism's emphasis on Jewish unity and state-building led to these perceptions about Jewish control over global economic and political systems, as seen in theories suggesting coordinated Jewish efforts to dominate world affairs (Mosse, 1985, pp. 178–180).

Anti-Semitism, being prevalent across Europe, reached incredible heights in Germany. With the changing world order, the rise of nationalism, and the emergence of nation-states, the advent of Fascism and National Socialism in Germany led to the culmination of centuries of Jewish persecution. During this period, the primary goal was to preserve the superiority and purity of the Aryan race, and the belief was that all other races, especially non-Aryans, should be eradicated. According to scientists' research, Aryans represented the superior race, while Semites were considered inferior and incapable of development or gaining superiority. Thus, Jews had to be expelled from Europe. Under the leadership of Adolf Hitler, Jews were first stripped of their citizenship rights, and with World War II, their right to life was seized. Millions of Jews were subjected to torture, exile, or death. This event, known as the Holocaust, has left a lasting impact to this day.

Some historians and authors argue that the rise of Zionism may have indirectly contributed to the persecution of Jews in Nazi Germany. For example, Lenni Brenner, in his book *Zionism in the Age of the Dictators*, claims that certain Zionist leaders collaborated with Nazi officials to promote Jewish immigration to Palestine. Brenner asserts that these collaborations aligned with Nazi propaganda goals to remove Jews from Europe, potentially exacerbating the pressures and policies against Jewish communities (Brenner, 1983, pp. 105-107). Similarly, Hannah Arendt, in her work *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, discusses how some Jewish leaders negotiated with the Nazi regime, agreeing to the emigration of select Jewish groups in exchange for accepting the broader fate of others. Arendt highlights that these negotiations reflected complex and morally ambiguous decisions under dire circumstances (Arendt, 1963, pp. 117-119). Such claims have sparked debates about the role of certain elements within the Zionist movement in the intensification of Nazi persecution.

During World War II, convincing persecuted Jews to emigrate became easier, and Zionists who supported the Aliyah Movement, which was spurred by the Dreyfus Affair in France, succeeded in establishing a Jewish state. The influence of Zionism on the expulsion of Jews from Europe cannot be overlooked. It emerged as a response to anti-Semitism. Zionism, believing that the salvation of the Jewish people lay in migrating to Palestine and owning their own land, received support from some Jews and was sharply rejected by others, especially those with religious sensitivities. Despite this, the success of the Zionist movement was supported not only by the Jews who endorsed it but also by Christians and Europeans who did not want Jews in Europe.

Herzl claims that Zionism is not limited to its aim of providing a homeland for Jews in response to anti-Semitism; it also encompasses broader political ambitions. While its origins were rooted in addressing the plight of persecuted Jews and promoting Jewish migration to Palestine, Zionism evolved into a political movement with significant geopolitical implications. Theodor Herzl, often regarded as the father of modern Zionism, envisioned not just a refuge but a sovereign Jewish state with political autonomy. This vision inherently carried political goals, including territorial expansion, state-building, and the establishment of a national identity (Herzl, 1896, pp. 45-47).

Moreover, Zionism's political aspects have been highlighted in its interactions with global powers. The Balfour Declaration of 1917, in which Britain expressed support for a Jewish homeland in Palestine, demonstrated the movement's engagement with international diplomacy and its influence on colonial geopolitics apart from strategically aligning itself with Western powers to secure political and material support for its objectives, further illustrating its political dimensions (Khalidi, 1997, p. 21).

It is also worth mentioning Hannah Arendt's (2009) book "Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil," which discusses the defense made by one of the Nazi regime's most ruthless leaders, Adolf Eichmann, when he was captured and brought to trial years later. Eichmann claimed that he was not an enemy of Jews, mentioning that he had Jewish relatives and sometimes helped Jews. He argued that, to solve the Jewish problem, he had sat at the same table with Zionists and supported the emigration of Jews to Palestine, asserting that it was in the best interest of both parties (Arendt, 2009).

The Nazis regarded both Jews and Arabs as belonging to the Semitic race. They believed that the Semitic race was inferior to the Aryan race and, therefore, needed to be separated and even exterminated to prevent the pollution of the Aryan race. This belief underpinned the Holocaust. However, it is known that the Holocaust was a genocide carried out exclusively against Jews, not Arabs. The hatred towards the Semitic race was directed solely at Jews, primarily because, for centuries, it was the Jews who lived in Europe, not the Arabs.

Jews, seen as foreigners within European society and believed to belong to a different race, were subjected to various forms of torture. Theodor Adorno (2016, p. 93) highlights in his writings that hostility is often directed not towards the unknown but towards those who are similar to oneself. Germans and Jews had lived together for centuries, with Jews adopting German culture and values, making it difficult to distinguish non-religious Jews from Germans. Therefore, it can be argued that the Holocaust was driven not by the differences between Jews and Germans but by their indistinguishable similarities.

CHAPTER II

ANTI-SEMITISM IN ENGLAND

2.1. Anti-Semitism in England

Anti-Semitism in England has been shaped by a range of social, economic, and religious factors throughout the country's history. Jewish presence in England dates back to the Middle Ages when William the Conqueror invited Jewish communities to settle. Upon their arrival, Jews faced significant restrictions and accusations, including the infamous blood libel in Norwich, which marked a turning point in their treatment (Jeudwine, 2001, p. 417). These hostilities culminated in Edward I's expulsion of Jews from England in 1290, an event supported by prevailing religious and economic sentiments of the time.

In the Renaissance and Reformation periods, limited resettlement efforts emerged, notably led by Menasseh Ben Israel, who petitioned Oliver Cromwell to allow Jews to return (Hillaby, 2003, p. 113). This period saw an increase in Jewish presence and contributions, but societal acceptance remained limited. During the 18th and 19th centuries, Jews began to gain more rights and opportunities, achieving gradual progress despite persistent prejudice (Katz, 1994, p. 190). However, critics of Jewish integration often cited fears of economic competition and cultural differences, fueling ongoing societal tensions.

The 20th century brought further complexity to the issue. According to Gartner (1981), anti-Semitism fluctuated during this time, influenced by global events such as the Holocaust and the influx of Jewish refugees. Some argued that these developments heightened tensions due to economic and cultural challenges posed by migration. Others emphasized that these events also fostered empathy and led to efforts to combat prejudice and discrimination.

Today, anti-Semitism in England manifests in various forms, including hate speech, vandalism, and political controversies. Supporters of critiques against Jewish communities often frame their arguments within broader societal debates about identity and privilege, though these perspectives are frequently challenged as perpetuating harmful stereotypes. On the other hand, advocacy groups and scholars highlight the long-standing discrimination faced by Jewish communities, arguing for

continued vigilance and education to address these issues effectively (Mendick, 2020, p. 32).

2.1.1. Middle Ages

The Jewish population in Anglo-Saxon England was quite low and as mentioned above they were initially introduced by William the Conqueror, who brought them as members of the French-speaking Norman ruling elite. They were moneylenders and their main responsibility was to provide loans to lords who were unable to pay their feudal taxes. These lords possessed certain spiritual or material qualities (Kemple, 1976, p. 90). It is worth noting that the taxes in England were particularly burdensome and were collected more rigorously compared to other European kingdoms (Shakak, 2002, p. 105). According to Paul Johnson, Jews migrated to this place during the invasion led by William the Conqueror, alongside other Flemish refugees. 50% of the Jewish population lived in London, while the remaining Jewish groups lived in York, Winchester, Lincoln, Canterbury, Northampton, and Oxford. Rather than having designated Jewish quarters, this area had two distinct Jewish streets: one serving to the affluent and another serving the less privileged. In Oxford, there were two distinct Jewish communities known as Great Jewry and Little Jewry. Due to the security concerns, Jewish individuals typically constructed robust stone dwellings. The Norwich community, comprised of Rhineland Jews, was not densely populated. V.D. Lipman has thoroughly examined the actions of 2,000 out of the over 5,000 Jews residing in England. In Norwich, Jewish residents were located in close proximity to the market square and the castle, with a notable presence of Christian individuals among them (2017, p. 262)[14].

In 1144, this small town subjected to a amazing accusation. On March 20, before to Easter and Passover, a Christian adolescent named William, who was the offspring of a farmer and served as an apprentice to a tanner, went missing. The individual was most recently observed entering a residence belonging to a person of Jewish descent. After a few days, his deceased body was discovered in Thorpe Wood, which is situated to the east of the town. He was dressed in his coat and shoes, with his head shaven,

[14] For this source, the page numbers provided are based on Turkish translations. However, the referenced content is also present in the original works or their English translations. Readers may verify the accuracy of the relevant sections by consulting the original texts or their English translations listed below: Johnson, P. (1987). *A History of the Jews*. Harper & Row.

and had numerous knife wounds. Thomas, Elvira (the boy's mother), and Goldwin (a local priest) alleged that the Jews were responsible for the murder, claiming that it was a deliberate attempt to replicate the agony endured by Jesus. Subsequently, Christian female servants employed in Jewish households stated that they witnessed, through a hole in the door, the apprehension of the boy following a synagogue ritual. They reported that he was bound with ropes, subjected to thorn pricks on his head, affixed to a cross-like structure by his left hand and foot, pierced in the side, and had scalding water poured over his entire physique. Nevertheless, the sheriff of the area, asserting that the Jews were under the king's safeguard, obstructed their legal proceedings and relocated them to the secure confines of Norwich Castle (Johnson, 2017, p. 313)[15].

This narrative was initially given a strict reaction by the authorities of the local church, as was the case with all other secular institutions (Leese, 1938, p.15)[16]. 1168 in Gloucester, 1181 in Bury St. Edmunds, and 1183 in Bristol are the years that this event took place. Upon a call for Crusades, an extensive amount of England participated in the Crusade declared in 1189 and 1190 and commanded by Richard the Lionheart. The people, who had already been strongly agitated due to the murder charges, reached its highest point of animosity during this time. In the year 1189, a group of wealthy Jews who had been invited to attend the coronation of Richard were assaulted by the audience. This was later followed by an assault on the Jews who lived in London. The following year, an organised massacres broke out and the wealthy Jewish community was massacred despite seeking safety in the castle. This was the most violent incident in York. An individual who works in journalism claims that Norwich was one of the victims. According to Leese (1938), "A great number of people who were in a hurry to get to Jerusalem initially made the decision to rebel against the Jews, thus, on February 6, all of the Jews who were discovered in their homes in Norwich were murdered" (p.16).

[15] For this source, the page numbers provided are based on Turkish translations. However, the referenced content is also present in the original works or their English translations. Readers may verify the accuracy of the relevant sections by consulting the original texts or their English translations listed below: Johnson, P. (1987). *A History of the Jews*. Harper & Row.

[16] For this source, the page numbers provided are based on Turkish translations. However, the referenced content is also present in the original works or their English translations. Readers may verify the accuracy of the relevant sections by consulting the original texts or their English translations listed below: Johnson, P. (1987). *A History of the Jews*. Harper & Row.

An anti-semitic sentiment was revived as a result of Innocent III's decision to integrate a new ritual into the wine and bread ceremonial. This was done as a show of his allegiance to Jesus. A consecrated wafer was stolen by Jews in the vicinity of Berlin in the year 1243, and they were suspected of using it for their own wicked ends. From a Christian perspective, this conduct was consistent with the belief that Jews, who were aware of the truth, fought against it. People were under the impression that the piece of bread was, in fact, the body of Jesus. Consequently, in the same way that they had previously believed that Jews had kidnapped and murdered Christian youngsters, they believed that the stolen bread had been tortured by Jews in order to resurrect the sorrows that Jesus had endured. Immediately after this imaginary stage was completed, the narrative proceeded. It was after the year 1243 that stories of stolen sacred bread began to circulate throughout Latin Europe, which led to a rapid increase in attrocity towards Jews (Johnson, 2017, pp. 265-266)[17].

The accusations should be viewed in the light of Jewish money lending. This situation influenced a huge proportion of the Jews. According to evidence from the 13th century in Perpignan, Southern France, 65% of borrowers were peasants, 30% and 41% were townspeople, 2% and 9% were knights and nobles, and 1% were from the church. The procedure in England was roughly the same. Important religious institutions and high-ranking nobles benefited from the Jews. In both countries, the rural areas with limited income borrowed the most. This class was the most prone to creating anti-semitic chaos. Someone with name and prestige, but without money and on the verge of losing their land, was the most suitable person to incite the mob. Throughout history, because of the interest rates, lending money to the rural population has been a source of unrest. A Jewish loan contract from 13th century England states that the annual return on a loan with interest could not be less than 12.5% (Johnson, 2017, p. 267).

Kings benefited significantly from the huge and powerful Jewish community. During the 12th century in England, the Angevin kings struck financial relationships with wealthy Jewish moneylenders that were extremely profitable. Aaron Lincoln

[17] For this source, the page numbers provided are based on Turkish translations. However, the referenced content is also present in the original works or their English translations. Readers may verify the accuracy of the relevant sections by consulting the original texts or their English translations listed below: Johnson, P. (1987). *A History of the Jews*. Harper & Row.

(1123-1180) was the Jewish individual who had the most wealth in England during this century. For instance, King Henry II owed the Jewish banker Aaron of Lincoln one hundred thousand pounds, which is equivalent to the amount of money that the Treasury received in annual tax collections (Jeudwine, 2001, p. 31). Jewish colonies were created in the counties of Lincoln, Northampton, Thetford, Bungay, Gloucestershire, Hampshire, and Wiltshire during the reign of Henry II (1154-1189). During the year 1159, King Henry II imposed taxes on Jews. These taxes included a total of 200 marks from London, 72 marks from Norwich, 60 marks from Lincoln, 50 marks from Cambridge and Hampshire, 45 marks from Thetford, 22 marks from Bungay and Northampton, 20 marks from Oxford, and 2 marks from Jews residing in Gloucestershire and Wiltshire (Hume, 1983, p. 417).

In all the cities where there was a Jewish community, Jews had a special financial system operating banks. Each bank was managed by two Jews and two Christians who kept records of all debt notes. At the center, alongside Jewish and Christian judges, there was a rabbi acting as an advisor. The king collected a percentage of all Jewish transactions and wanted to know who owed money to which Jew and how much. When the most successful Jewish financial expert of medieval England, Aaron of Lincoln, died in 1186, a special financial officer was appointed to handle his estates (Johnson, 2017, p. 268)[18].

The debts were passed on from generation to generation, with part of them being passed on to the king's son Elias. In the event that these unanticipated riches had been received on a more consistent basis, the English kings would have unquestionably protected the existence of the Jewish people. With that being said, Aaron's success came before the anti-Semitic crises that occurred in the 1190s and wreaked havoc on the community in York and other places. Afterwards, it became progressively more challenging for Jews living in England to make a living. The already challenging circumstances were made much more difficult by the anti-Jewish policies that were established at the Fourth Lateran Council in the year 1215. The Archbishop of Canterbury, Stephen Langton, who was also one of the architects of the Magna Carta,

[18] For this source, the page numbers provided are based on Turkish translations. However, the referenced content is also present in the original works or their English translations. Readers may verify the accuracy of the relevant sections by consulting the original texts or their English translations listed below: Johnson, P. (1987). *A History of the Jews*. Harper & Row.

which included a section that was anti-Jewish, attempted to organise a boycott against Jewish trade. Jews in England saw a decrease in their economic situation throughout the entire thirteenth century. Aaron of York, who had paid the king more than 30,000 marks, and away in a state of poverty in 1268. He revealed this information to the journalist Matthew Paris (Johnson, 2017, page 270)[19].

Under the reign of Edward I, the decline accelerated. Jewish money lending activities were largely taken over by the Knights Templar in Jerusalem and their societies in Europe, the first Christian bankers. Jews were limited to small-scale money lending, coin clipping, and pawn brokering. The systematic exploitation of Jews was no longer profitable for Edward, and at one point, he even considered killing them to seize their property. In 1275, he issued an anti-Jewish decree making usury illegal (Jeudwine, 2001, p. 417).

In 1278, all Jews in the country were arrested. Many were sent to the Tower of London. According to a journalist, 300 were killed. The amount of money seized by the king encouraged him to go further. The next step involved accusing Jews of coin counterfeiting. Ten people were hanged in Norwich for this crime. Finally, by the late 1280s, Edward needed a large amount of cash to bribe his cousin Salerno to Charles. He seized all the property of the Gascony Jews and expelled them entirely in 1289. The next year, he claimed that usury continued illegally and expelled all Jews from England, seizing all their possessions. The income of the richest Jew in Norwich was 300 pounds. The total from other cities was 9,100 pounds, with eighteen families contributing about 6,000 pounds. This was an incredible decline, but the Jewish community had also halved (there were only 2,500 Jews left in the country) (Jeudwine, 2001, p. 418). In short, the decline in the economic benefit of Jews led to their expulsion.

William Langland clearly expressed the societal view towards Jews in the Middle Ages in his poem *Piers Plowman* :

> *"... But the children of Judah are noisy clowns,*
> *They fool the people and laugh at them.*

[19] For this source, the page numbers provided are based on Turkish translations. However, the referenced content is also present in the original works or their English translations. Readers may verify the accuracy of the relevant sections by consulting the original texts or their English translations listed below: Johnson, P. (1987). *A History of the Jews*. Harper & Row.

Yet their minds are sharp, and they could work if they wanted.
I cannot prove it now, but they are the devil's own,
Foul-mouthed." (Langland, 54)

2.1.2. Crusades

Anti-Jewish events were also evident during the Second and Third Crusades. The most significant anti-Jewish events of the Third Crusade occurred in England. During the coronation of Richard the Lionheart on September 3, 1189, a delegation of wealthy Jews invited to the ceremony was attacked by the crowd. The public, already angry because of the privileges granted to Jews by the previous king, Henry II, was further incited by the new crusade and revolted against the Jews in London. Many Jews were killed, their homes set on fire, and their property plundered, while some were forced to convert to Christianity (Cohen, 2013, p. 142). After King Richard I left for the Third Crusade, attacks on Jews spread to the cities of Norwich, King's Lynn, Stamford, Lincoln, York, and Bury Saint Edmunds in England. On February 6, 1190, in Norwich; on March 7, 1190, in Stamford; and in 1190, in Bury Saint Edmunds, many Jews were killed (Johnson, 2017, p. 263)[20]. The largest massacre of Jews in England occurred on March 16-17, 1190, in York, where most of the wealthy Jews were killed. While the massacre continued in the city, about five hundred Jews who had taken refuge in Clifford's Tower, realizing they could not hold out any longer, chose to kill each other rather than fall into the hands of their attackers. As a result of the attacks, the Jewish presence in York was completely wiped out (Johnson, 2017, p. 265). Although it is believed that King Richard I benefited from Jewish property to finance his campaign to Jerusalem, it is known that he punished those involved in the attacks when he returned and allowed a Jew forced to convert under pressure to revert to his original faith (Runciman, 2008, p. 7). The Christian chronicler William of Newburgh stated that the reason for the 1190 York events was some Christians' desire to erase their debts to Jewish moneylenders and that poor Crusaders coveted Jewish property to finance their journey. After the massacre, the barons not only freed

[20] For this source, the page numbers provided are based on Turkish translations. However, the referenced content is also present in the original works or their English translations. Readers may verify the accuracy of the relevant sections by consulting the original texts or their English translations listed below: Johnson, P. (1987). *A History of the Jews*. Harper & Row.

themselves from their debts but also seized the property left by the Jews (Maier, 1999, pp. 221-222).

While King Richard I of England, who participated in the Third Crusade, had a certain attitude towards Jews, German King Frederick Barbarossa, who also joined the crusade, issued a decree to prevent the massacres of Jews that had occurred during the First and Second Crusades. The decree, issued on March 29, 1188, stated: "Whoever touches or injures a Jew shall have his hand cut off, and whoever kills a Jew shall also be killed." Furthermore, Conrad, the Archbishop of Mainz, warned the people by stating, "Whoever raises a hand against the Jews will be destroyed, and his crusade will not be accepted" (Cohen, 2013, pp. 143). However, the effectiveness of these decrees is uncertain. A Hebrew chronicle records that in 1188, hundreds or thousands of crusaders attacked Jews in the Mainz region of Germany. During the Fourth Crusade, it is also known that crusaders who captured Istanbul attacked and looted the neighborhoods where Muslim and Jewish merchants lived, burning and destroying these areas (Maier, 1999, p. 222).

2.1.3. Expulsion of the Jews (1290)

The rise of anti-Semitism in England after the Crusades can be explained by the convergence of social, economic, and religious factors. Throughout the 13th century, Jews were involved in significant financial activities in England. They engaged in money lending with interest (usury), which was an activity forbidden for Christians by their religion, making Jews indispensable in the economic system. However, this also led to widespread hostility towards them. The high interest rates inherent in money lending and the difficulty borrowers had in repaying their debts were fundamental reasons for the hatred against Jews (Richardson, 2001, p. 45).

King Edward I's policies towards the Jews were shaped by economic interests and religious fanaticism. In 1275, Edward enacted a law known as "Statutum de Judaismo". This law prohibited Jews from lending money with interest and forced them to engage in trade and crafts. However, Jews were not sufficiently experienced in these areas, and adapting to new economic activities was difficult for them (Hillaby, 2003, p. 107).

The restriction of Jewish economic activities severely limited their means of livelihood. Edward also increased financial pressures on the Jews by subjecting them to heavy taxes. These taxes became an important source of funding for the king's war expenses. In 1287, Edward seized Jewish debt bonds, which alleviated the debts of Christian borrowers and increased public support for the king (Stacey, 2002, p. 89).

Throughout the Middle Ages, religious prejudices against Jews were also a fundamental cause of anti-semitism. Jews were seen by Christians as the people who killed Jesus, and this was the main source of the hatred against them. Negative rhetoric against Jews was prevalent in Christian sermons and church teachings. These religious prejudices legitimized acts of violence and social exclusion against Jews (Lipman, 1990, p. 72). The Fourth Lateran Council of 1215 required Jews to wear specific clothing to distinguish them from Christians. Such regulations led to the stigmatization and further marginalization of Jews in society. Wearing different clothing socially isolated Jews and distanced them from the Christian community. During this period, accusations against Jews, especially blood libel and child murder allegations, spread widely and triggered collective violence against the Jewish community (Chazan, 2006, p. 143).

In 1290, King Edward I decided to expel all Jews from England. This decision was announced on July 18, 1290, as the Expulsion Edict. The edict gave Jews until November 1, 1290, to leave the country. During this time, Jewish properties, debt bonds, and other assets were transferred to Christians or the royal treasury. The expulsion led to approximately 2,000 Jews leaving England (Rubin, 2004, p. 217).

The expulsion of the Jews was a significant economic blow. The seizure of Jewish properties and assets allowed Christian debtors to be freed from their debts, which increased the king's popularity among the people. However, in the long term, the English economy suffered from the absence of Jews, as there were not enough financial experts to replace them (Hillaby, 2003, p. 109).

After the expulsion of the Jews, Jewish presence in England remained limited for centuries. Jews were able to return to England only in 1656 during the period of Oliver Cromwell. This return served the purpose of protecting England's economic and commercial interests. Cromwell wanted to benefit from the Jews' commercial skills and their extensive trade networks in Europe (Roth, 1994, p. 201).

Even after the Jews were allowed to return to England, anti-Semitism continued to exist in the country. Throughout the 18th and 19th centuries, Jews were confronted with a variety of social and economic obstacles. On the other hand, throughout this time period, the legal restrictions that had been placed on Jews were progressively loosened, and an increase in acceptance of Jews in English society occurred (Katz, 1994, p. 189).

In the year 1290, Jews were expelled from England, which is a notable expression of anti-Semitism occurring in England. There was a convergence of economic, social, and religious reasons that led to the expulsion of Jews from the country. The expulsion had a significant and long-lasting effect on the Jewish community in England. It was responsible for the evolution of the Jewish population in the country over the course of several centuries and played a role in the growth of anti-Semitism in the general population. Nevertheless, with the Jews' return in 1656, the Jewish community in England underwent a process of transition and eventually acquired social acceptance (Hillaby, 2003, p. 110).

2.2. Renaissance and Reformation Period

2.2.1. Jews in Europe During the Renaissance

The Renaissance period was a time of great changes in art, science, and culture in Europe. However, the innovations and changes of this period were limited for Jews. In Italy, one of the centers of the Renaissance, Jews enjoyed some limited freedoms. In various city-states of Italy, Jews engaged in trade and participated in some intellectual circles. Nevertheless, pressures against Jews continued in other parts of Europe (Roth, 1994, p. 201).

In the Iberian Peninsula, during the Spanish Inquisition in 1492, Jews were expelled and many were forced to migrate to other parts of Europe, particularly the Ottoman Empire. These Jews are known as "Sephardic Jews." Similar expulsions occurred in Portugal during the same period. These expulsions significantly changed the demographic structure of Jewish communities in Europe (Roth, 1994, p. 201).

In 1290, King Edward I exiled Jews from England, and they were not formally allowed to return until 1656. However, the return of Jews to England became possible during the mid-17th century under the rule of Oliver Cromwell. Cromwell served as

Lord Protector of England from 1649 to 1658, and during this period, he allowed Jews to return to England (Roth, 1994, p. 202).

The return of Jews to England was the result of the convergence of multiple circumstances. Initially, England's economic interests served as a catalyst for this resurgence. Europe valued Jews for their expansive commercial networks and exceptional financial power. Cromwell sought to capitalise on the commercial power of Jews and their extensive trade networks across Europe. The aim was to create commercial connections with regions that had significant Jewish populations, such as the Netherlands and the Ottoman Empire (Hillaby, 2003, p. 112).

In addition, the significance of religious and theological influences cannot be overstated in relation to this process. In the eyes of Cromwell and a number of other Puritan leaders, the return of Jewish people to their homeland was a religious obligation. There was a connection between the "Return to the Holy Land" that was mentioned in the Bible and the repatriation of Jews, and it was widely accepted as a religious obligation. According to Roth (1994), the theological belief was a crucial factor in the process of encouraging the return of Jews to England (p. 202).

A significant Jewish rabbi and religious leader who lived in Amsterdam, Menasseh Ben Israel was known for his work in the field. It was in the year 1655 when he made a formal request to Cromwell, imploring him to allow Jews to return to England. In the petition, it was emphasized that the return of Jews to their homeland will result in economic and commercial benefits for the nation (Hillaby, 2003, p.113). The petitions that were submitted by Menasseh Ben Israel were met with a favorable response from Cromwell, which ultimately led to the authorization of Jewish settlers to relocate to England in the year 1656. Not by an official mandate, but rather through Cromwell's personal backing and tolerance, Jews were allowed to return to their respective countries. It was around this time that Jews started to relocate to England, and London became the location of the establishment of a tiny Jewish community (Roth, 1994, p. 203).

The return of Jews to England initially remained limited to a small community. Jews who settled in London were particularly active in trade and finance. Although Jews faced some difficulties in participating in social life during this period, they were generally met with tolerance. The economic activities of Jews increased England's

trade volume and contributed to the country's economic development (Katz, 1994, p. 201).

During the return of Jews to England, Jewish groups from different cultural and ethnic backgrounds came together again in England. The Sephardic Jews, expelled from the Iberian Peninsula, were of Spanish and Portuguese origin and were generally engaged in trade and maritime activities. Due to their extensive trade networks and multilingual abilities, Sephardic Jews made significant contributions to England's commercial activities (Hillaby, 2003, p. 114).

On the other hand, Ashkenazi Jews from Central and Eastern Europe were fewer in number in England. Ashkenazi Jews, typically from Germany, Poland, and Lithuania, were more involved in crafts and small-scale trade. Despite having different cultural and religious traditions, Sephardic and Ashkenazi Jews lived together in England and influenced each other (Roth, 1994, p. 203).

The return of Jews to England also brought about processes of social integration. Initially, Jews remained a closed community, but over time, they interacted more with English society. By the late 17th century, Jews began to be admitted to educational institutions and trade guilds in England. During this period, the Jewish community started to establish a presence in other cities such as Bristol, Plymouth, and Manchester, in addition to London (Katz, 1994, p. 202).

The Renaissance and Reformation period was a critical time for the return and reacceptance of Jews in England. During the rule of Oliver Cromwell, Jews returned to England for economic and religious reasons. This return served to protect England's commercial and economic interests. Jews played significant roles in trade and finance in England and contributed to the country's economic development. Although the social integration of Jews took time, by the late 17th century, they began to be accepted in English society.

2.3. 18th and 19th Centuries

2.3.1. Jewish Enlightenment and Emancipation

The late 18th century and early 19th century witnessed the beginning of Jewish Emancipation across Europe. The Enlightenment, a philosophical movement

emphasizing reason and individual freedom, also influenced the social and legal status of Jews. During this period, various reform movements aimed at integrating Jews more fully into society and granting them equal rights began. Similar reform movements were also observed in England. The Jewish Naturalization Act of 1753, which granted Jews significant legal rights such as property ownership and citizenship in England, was an important legislative arrangement. However, due to intense reactions, this act was repealed shortly thereafter (Katz, 1994, p. 192).

Jewish emancipation was not limited to legal regulations; it also manifested itself through the progress of Jews in education and economic fields. In the late 18th and early 19th centuries, enlightenment movements began within the Jewish community, and many Jews were admitted to educational institutions and universities. During this period, Jews made significant contributions in fields such as science, literature, and art (Endelman, 2002, p. 56).

2.3.2. 19th Century Economic and Political Achievements

In the mid-19th century, Jews achieved significant economic and political successes in England. During this period, Jews' activities in trade, banking, and industry increased. The Rothschild family, in particular, became a major power in the finance and banking sector. They provided banking and financial services in many European countries and gained a great fortune (Ferguson, 1998, p. 142).

Lionel de Rothschild played a significant role in the struggle for political rights in England. In 1847, Lionel de Rothschild became the first Jew elected to the British Parliament. However, due to his Jewish faith, changes were required in the oath text, and he could not immediately take his place in Parliament. In 1858, with changes made to the oath text, Lionel de Rothschild officially took his seat in Parliament, marking a significant milestone in the expansion of political rights for Jews in England (Alderman, 1992, p. 223).

Throughout the 19th century, Jews accelerated processes of social integration in England. They achieved significant success in the economic realm and began to be represented in various sectors of society. During this period, there were also educational and cultural developments within the Jewish community. Jews assumed

important roles in universities and educational institutions in England (Endelman, 2002, p. 74).

2.4. The 20th Century and The Holocaust

The increase in anti-Semitism was notable across Europe at the beginning of the 20th century, with Britain also experiencing a rise. The influx of Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe to Britain in the late 19th and early 20th centuries significantly increased the Jewish population. This situation fueled prejudices and hostilities towards Jews among the local population (Cesarani, 1994, p. 125).

Anti-Semitism in Britain became more obvious after World War I. The economic hardships and unemployment in the post-war period led to increased accusations against Jews. Jews began to be seen as responsible for unemployment and low wages among the working class. Besides, their traditional involvement in trade and finance sectors symbolized capitalism and economic inequality (Gartner, 1981, p. 87). Their dominance in trade, finance, and banking was often cited as evidence of their control over the economic system. Many believed that Jewish financiers and businessmen exploited the working class for their own gain, exacerbating unemployment and driving down wages. This narrative portrayed Jews as the architects of economic disparity, profiting at the expense of ordinary citizens. Such claims were amplified during the economic hardships of the post-war period, with claims that Jewish elites manipulated financial systems to consolidate wealth and power, leaving the working class to bear the brunt of economic instability. This rhetoric not only deepened societal divisions but also painted Jews as symbols of unchecked capitalism, making them the main reason of broader systemic issues (Linehan, 2000, p. 112).

The Balfour Declaration of 1917, supporting the establishment of a Jewish state, further heightened anti-Semitic sentiments in Britain. The declaration endorsed the creation of a Jewish homeland in Palestine, triggering fears among some Britons that Jews were seizing political and economic power worldwide. The Balfour Declaration led to increased anti-Jewish propaganda in Britain and enhanced the strength of anti-semitic groups (Sachar, 1990, p. 312).

During this period, various anti-Semitic organizations and political movements emerged in Britain. The British Union of Fascists, founded by Sir Oswald Mosley in 1932, gained attention with its anti-Jewish rhetoric. This movement fueled hostility towards Jews through increased anti-Jewish actions and propaganda activities in the late 1930s. The rise of fascist movements led to an increase in physical attacks and acts of vandalism against Jews (Marrus, 1987, p. 58).

Among those who opposed Jews were not just fascists but nationalist and conservative groups, working-class members who felt their economic interests were threatened, religious leaders, and intellectuals who criticized Jewish social and cultural assimilation. For example, some religious circles opposed Jews on religious grounds, while some working-class groups viewed Jews as part of economic competition (Cohn-Sherbok, 2006, p. 78).

During World War II, the British Jewish community accepted many Jewish refugees fleeing Nazi Germany. Thousands of Jews escaping persecution by the Nazi regime sought refuge in Britain, attempting to start a new life there. The British government initiated the Kindertransport program in 1938 following the Munich Agreement, which allowed Jewish children to escape Nazi Germany. Under this program, approximately 10,000 Jewish children were brought to Britain and placed with British families, separated from their own families (Gilbert, 1989, p. 205).

During the war, anti-Semitism persisted in Britain. Prejudice and hostility towards Jewish refugees continued during the war years. Jews were seen as “foreign” and “dangerous” by some sectors and were accused of social dislocation. Anti-Semitic attacks and acts of vandalism against Jews increased in Britain during the war. Jewish cemeteries were desecrated, and Jewish businesses were targeted (Lipman, 1990, p. 87).

Following the end of the war and the revelation of the horrors of the Holocaust and the extent of the persecution against Jews, social perceptions towards Jews in Britain began to change. The brutality of the Holocaust created an awareness and sensitivity towards anti-Semitism in British society. However, this awareness does not imply the complete cessation of anti-Semitism. In 1947, a series of attacks took place on Jewish properties in the area known as Bevingrad on the east side of London. These attacks indicate the continued strength of anger and anti-Semitic attitudes towards

Jews. The Bevingrad incidents reflect the challenges faced by the Jewish community in the post-war period. Post-war, the Jewish community in England focused on reconstruction and integration processes. Jews made various efforts to recover from the devastating effects of the war and reintegrate into societal life. They achieved significant successes in education, culture, and economy. Jewish charitable organizations made important contributions to society in the post-war period and worked to improve the welfare of the Jewish community (Gartner, 1981, p. 102).

The argument that Jewish contributions to British society increased after the war yet were met with persistent anti-Semitic attitudes raises complex questions about societal dynamics and prejudices. While the Jewish community made significant strides in education, culture, and the economy, as well as through charitable contributions, this did not shield them from hostility. One explanation for this paradox lies in the historical scapegoating of minority groups, regardless of their positive contributions to society. Jews have often been viewed through stereotypical lenses, either as outsiders or as economically and culturally distinct. Their success in various fields has sometimes been interpreted not as a benefit to society but as a threat to the status quo. This perception, deeply rooted in centuries-old prejudices, suggests that societal acceptance does not automatically follow societal contribution (Marrus, 1987, pp. 85–87).

Moreover, post-war economic challenges in Britain, including housing shortages and unemployment, exacerbated tensions. Jews were sometimes blamed for these difficulties, as their visible presence and success became convenient targets for frustration and resentment. The persistence of anti-semitic rhetoric, often fueled by conspiracy theories about Jewish control or influence, further deepened these attitudes (Linehan, 2000, p. 112).

Thus, while the Jewish community's contributions were substantial, these efforts were overshadowed by entrenched prejudices and the social and economic insecurities of the time. The question of why such hostility persisted despite their contributions underscores the resilience of anti-semitic ideologies and the difficulty of overcoming deep-seated societal biases.

During the 1950s and 1960s, the Jewish community began to gain more acceptance in British society, and social integration accelerated. Because, during this

period, Jews took on significant roles in academic, commercial, and political fields. As Jewish individuals gained prominence in these fields, they were viewed as integral to the country's progress and development. However, anti-Semitism did not completely disappear. During the 1970s and 1980s, particularly influenced by conflicts in the Middle East, anti-Semitic attacks and prejudices against Jews increased in Britain. During this period, the Jewish community in Britain established various civil society organizations and initiatives to combat anti-Semitism. These organisations endeavoured to combat anti-Semitism, protect Jewish rights, and enhance society consciousness (Cesarani, 1994, p. 145).

The Jewish community in Britain faced significant obstacles and experienced substantial transformations during the 20th century. The heightened prevalence of anti-semitism and the exacerbated economic challenges during the interwar period posed significant obstacles for Jews in their efforts to assimilate into society. Anti-Semitic biases and discriminatory practices persisted both during and following World War II. Nevertheless, the atrocities of the Holocaust and the disclosure of the magnitude of persecution against Jews resulted in an enhanced recognition of anti-semitism within British society. During the decades after the war, the Jewish community concentrated on efforts to rebuild and integrate, making noteworthy contributions to society (Gartner, 1981, p. 103).

It might be expected that the horrors of the Holocaust and the revelation of the extent of persecution against Jews would lead to a more compassionate attitude towards the Jewish community in British society. Indeed, there was a noticeable increase in awareness of anti-Semitism in post-war Britain, and some groups adopted a more empathetic approach towards Jews. This is evident in the efforts of individuals and organizations that assisted Jewish refugees in rebuilding their lives. However, it is important to recognize that this compassionate attitude was limited and did not extend universally across society. Several factors contributed to the persistence of prejudice and discrimination against Jews, even in the aftermath of the Holocaust. For instance, post-war Britain faced significant economic challenges, including housing shortages, unemployment, and general financial instability. These difficulties exacerbated existing prejudices against minority groups, with Jews often scapegoated for systemic economic problems (Kushner, 1992, p. 89).

The establishment of the State of Israel and subsequent conflicts in the Middle East influenced perceptions of the Jewish community in Britain. Some groups associated British Jews with the actions of Israel, leading to increased criticism and hostility towards the Jewish population, which further fueled anti-Semitic attitudes (Cesarani, 1994, p. 149).

While the Holocaust elicited empathy and awareness among some, deep-seated historical stereotypes about Jews persisted. The belief that Jews held disproportionate economic and cultural power, continued to shape public perceptions and limited broader societal acceptance (Marrus, 1987, p. 102).

In other words, while the Holocaust did lead to some positive shifts in attitudes towards the Jewish community, these changes were constrained by economic, political, and historical factors. As a result, anti-Semitism persisted in various forms, revealing the resilience of deeply rooted societal biases.

2.5. Modern Era

2.5.1. Anti-Semitism in the 21st Century

Anti-Semitism has emerged in various ways in modern England. Since the beginning of the 21st century, anti-Semitic attacks and incidents have increased. In the 2000s, attacks on Jewish communities increased, due to the conflict between Israel and Palestine. Over time, anti-Semitism was not limited to physical assaults, and increasingly spread in the form of verbal attacks, acts of vandalism, and online hate speech (Community Security Trust, 2019, p. 13)

Since the early twentieth century, the number of cases of vandalism against Jewish cemeteries and synagogues in major city centers such as London and Manchester has increased. In 2009, Israel launched military operations in Gaza, which led to a significant increase in the number of anti-Semitic incidents in Britain. During this period, many Jewish students and business professionals were subjected to persistent and deliberate anti-Semitic harassment and threats (Community Security Trust, 2019, p. 15).

Modern reflections of anti-Semitism include negative expressions and threats against Jews, especially on social media platforms. The spread of anti-semitic

information in the community and the increase in threats against Jews, on social media sites such as Twitter, Facebook and Instagram, has raised great concerns. According to a 2018 study, the number of anti-Semitic incidents has increased by 16% compared to the previous year. There have been personal attacks, vandalism and hate speech on the Internet (Community Security Trust, 2019, p. 13).

The political situation in Britain has also prompted a debate on anti-Semitism. Between 2015 and 2020, the general public drew attention to allegations of anti-Semitism against members of the Labour Party. A series of anti-Semitic incidents occurred during the leadership of Labour Party leader Jeremy Corbyn. Corbyn was confronted with anti-Semitic speeches and links with anti-Semitic groups, both inside and outside the party (Mendick, 2020, p. 32).

In 2018, the Jewish community and other political parties were accused of taking inadequate measures to fight anti-Semitism. The Workers' Party suspected the Jewish community. Leaders of the Jewish community in the UK have voiced their hatred of Jeremy Corbyn's leadership and criticized the Labour Party for not paying enough attention to anti-Semitism. During this period, many members of the Jewish Workers' Party called for a more determined stance against anti-semitism (p. 33).

However, this debate also raises questions about how the term "anti-Semitism" is used and whether it sometimes serves to silence criticism of Israeli policies. Since 1948, Israel's actions in Palestine, including allegations of occupation and human rights violations, have drawn significant international criticism (Pappe, 2006, pp. 192–193). Yet, critics of Israeli policies are often labeled as anti-Semitic, blurring the line between legitimate political critique and genuine prejudice against Jews (Finkelstein, 2005, pp. 23–25). This dynamic has led to accusations that the term "anti-Semitism" is weaponized to delegitimize opposition to Israel's actions while ignoring the ongoing plight of Palestinians under occupation. Critics argue that this approach not only undermines the fight against genuine anti-Semitism but also stifles necessary political and ethical debates about Israel's policies (Butler, 2012, p. 106).

The controversy surrounding this issue underscores the importance of distinguishing between anti-Semitism as a form of hatred and prejudice against Jews and legitimate criticism of state policies. Failing to make this distinction risks

conflating two separate issues, which can harm both the fight against anti-Semitism and the pursuit of justice for Palestinians.

One thing that makes England different from continental Europe is that the Holocaust did not happen there. Even though there are many Holocaust deniers in Europe, it is important to remember that the British might be less involved with this issue since no genocide crimes were committed in England during World War II. However, it is worth noting that a Holocaust denier like David Irving came from England (Community Security Trust, 2019, p. 17).

David Irving, a British historian, has been widely criticized for his views on the Holocaust. He has argued that the number of Jewish victims during the Holocaust has been exaggerated and has questioned the use of gas chambers in Nazi extermination camps (Evans, 2001, pp. 53-54). In 1988, Irving testified in defense of Ernst Zündel, a German publisher on trial in Canada for distributing Holocaust denial material. During this trial, Irving endorsed the Leuchter Report, a document claiming that there were no gas chambers at Auschwitz. Irving stated, "The big point [of the Leuchter report]: there is no significant residue of cyanide in the brickwork. That's what converted me. When I read that in the report in the courtroom in Toronto, I became a hard-core disbeliever" (Irving, 1999).

Irving's claims have been discredited by historians and courts. In 2000, he filed a libel lawsuit against historian Deborah Lipstadt for calling him a Holocaust denier. The court ruled in Lipstadt's favor, concluding that Irving had deliberately misrepresented evidence to promote Holocaust denial and anti-semitic views. The judge described Irving as "an active Holocaust denier... anti-Semitic and racist" (Lipstadt, 2005, p. 87). Furthermore, in 2006, Irving was convicted in Austria for Holocaust denial, a crime under Austrian law, and sentenced to three years in prison. Although Irving claimed to have changed his views during the trial, acknowledging the existence of gas chambers at Auschwitz, he later reiterated his earlier denials (BBC News, 2006).

At the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century, Jewish migrations took place from Eastern Europe, mainly to America, but also to England, though to a lesser extent. As a result, the Jewish population, which was 65,000 in 1880, increased to 300,000 by 1914. During this period, British conservatives, who accused

Jews of bringing ideas like socialism and anarchism, saw reactions against Jews. This sentiment was also adopted by the left during the Boer War (1899-1902). For instance, conspiracy theories that the imperialist war in South Africa was started by rich Jews became popular among left-wing groups. In working-class areas like London's East End, anti-Semitic sentiments became widespread (Community Security Trust, 2019, p. 20).

At the same time, the Protocols of the Elders of Zion became very popular, and even the influential Times newspaper took them seriously until the paper's Istanbul correspondent revealed in 1921 that the claims were false. Additionally, among the British upper class and bureaucracy, there were those who advocated for closer ties with Arabs and more distant policies towards Jews due to their country's imperial interests in the Arab world. This stance was not only for strategic reasons but also influenced by centuries of anti-semitism. For example, Britain's last High Commissioner of Palestine, Sir Alan Cunningham, compared Zionism to Nazi ideology and described it as an idea stemming from the "abnormal psychology of Jews" (Mendick, 2020, p. 39).

In 1947, as a result of clashes with armed groups like Irgun, who wanted Britain to leave the mandate in Palestine, some British soldiers were killed. This led to attacks on Jewish-owned shops and the desecration of cemeteries in British cities like London, Manchester, and Liverpool (Mendick, 2020, p. 40).

As it can be seen through all the information given, the roots of anti-Semitism in Britain go back a long way. From the 1960s onwards, due to left-wing movements' sympathies with the Palestinian national struggle, there was a growing number of people accusing Israel of having a Nazi-like regime and implementing policies similar to apartheid in South Africa. In this context, caricaturists occasionally depicted former Israeli Prime Ministers Menachem Begin and Ariel Sharon in Nazi uniforms in the British media. As a result, within the Labour Party, there was a significant anti-Semitism problem, especially after Jeremy Corbyn became the leader in 2015. Even Corbyn himself acknowledged this issue, though he also stated that it was exaggerated (Mendick, 2020, p. 40).

CHAPTER III

CAUSES OF ANTI-SEMITISM

Anti-Semitism, persisting for centuries, has undergone various formulations throughout this process. As Lazare (1967, p. 12) stated, "The nations among whom the Israelites lived, their attitudes, traditions, religions, and even the philosophy of the nations within which Israel developed, determine the specific character of anti-Semitism, which varies according to time and place." When examining the causes that shape the character of anti-Semitism generally distribute as follows:

3.1. Economic and Political Causes

According to Arendt, the main cause of anti-Semitism in the modern era is political rather than economic. This is because feudal states failed to solve the land issue and provide the minimum level of equality necessary for the liberation of peasants during the transition to nation-states. During the period when feudal aristocracy was the dominant power, the formation of the middle class was also hindered. Although Jews appeared to be part of the middle class, they were not successful in fulfilling its requirements. During this period, wealthy Jews were treated differently by governments compared to other Jews. Aware of this, the wealthy Jewish elite tried to maintain a distance between themselves and their communities while establishing a relationship based on mutual benefit with the governments: the governments would receive financial support from wealthy Jews and, in return, grant them significant positions in the court, while the wealthy Jews would exert control over other Jews in their communities and strive to keep them out of public life (Arendt, 2018, pp. 63-70).[21] Thus, anti-Semitism is built upon "political ignorances rooted in the economic life of the state" (Arendt, 2018, p. 107). In Arendt's view, anti-Semitism is not a concept developed through religious reasons or the xenophobia resulting from nationalist movements. It is a hatred that arose alongside and in parallel with the nation-state process.

[21] For this source, the page numbers provided are based on Turkish translations. However, the referenced content is also present in the original works or their English translations. Readers may verify the accuracy of the relevant sections by consulting the original texts or their English translations listed below: Arendt, H. (1951). *The Origins of Totalitarianism.* Harcourt Brace & Company.

Taguieff explains the political source of anti-Semitism based on the following quote. In the 19th century, the political discourse that anti-Semitism would encounter progressed precisely through the accusation that Jews were establishing a "state within a state" (Taguieff, 2017, p. 19).

> The Jew, until our time, had included himself everywhere by asserting common law; but, in fact, the Jew was not part of the common law, he maintained his own special status; he wanted to be assured in all respects, especially regarding his own exceptions, his own laws. He wanted to have the advantages of nations without being a nation himself, without sharing the obligations of nations. No people ever tolerated this. [...] The greatest misunderstanding in the claims of the Israelites lies here (Taguieff, 2017, p. 19).

Based on Arendt and Taguieff's emphasis on the political aspect of anti-Semitism, it is possible to discuss the Jews' quest for equality within the state and the accumulation of centuries-long experiences. Excluded from social life in every way, Jews tried to find a place within the society they lived in. Besides being excluded from the workforce, being deprived of both political and legal rights pushed them into a search for alternative means. Their involvement in money lending and banking, and their significant economic contributions to states, always kept them within the political realm. As clearly seen in the quote from Taguieff above, it was thought that Jews demanded privileges and special freedom without providing any benefit to the country they resided in. Additionally, Mora mentions that the publication of the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* in 1993, although proven to be false, exposed documents containing secret political goals of Jews to dominate the world, thus providing a pretext for their eradication (2011, p. 37).

"Political anti-Semitism arose because Jews formed a separate social structure, whereas the reason for the birth of social discrimination was that Jews were increasingly becoming equal to other social groups" (Arendt, 2018, p. 107).[22] As equality increases among societies, it becomes more challenging to explain the differences between them. Therefore, as Jews became more equal, their distinctive traits became more noticeable. This, in turn, resulted in social antipathy. However, initially, this antipathy did not cause political harm because equality was not an

[22] For this source, the page numbers provided are based on Turkish translations. However, the referenced content is also present in the original works or their English translations. Readers may verify the accuracy of the relevant sections by consulting the original texts or their English translations listed below: Arendt, H. (1951). *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. Harcourt Brace & Company.

economic and political reality. In other words, Arendt explains the view that anti-Semitism is a political problem by stating that social anti-semitism has never been effective on political anti-Semitism (Arendt, 2018, pp. 109-110).

The economic causes of anti-Semitism are generally explained by the perception that Jews involved in money lending and banking were gaining easy profits and were seen as shameless, thieving, deceitful capitalist parasites aiming to dominate all economic relations in the world. For this reason, Mora (2011, p. 36) states that the main cause of anti-Jewish sentiment is economic, although it is often hidden behind other reasons.

For anti-Semites, Jews were seen as the main force behind greedy capitalism, controlling the world economy through a network of international financiers. They believed Jews' great wealth came from monopolizing the press, controlling public opinion, displacing the old land aristocracy, and becoming the new wealthy elite who owned large estates and influenced high society.

In his election manifesto, Adolf Stoecker stated, "I see the concentration of active capital in the hands of a small number of people, most of whom are Jews, as a threatening danger and one of the causes of a social democratic revolution... I do not want a culture without Germanness and Christianity, so I fight against Jewish domination." These words seem to have paved the way for later anti-Semitic events (Groepler, 1999, pp. 94-98).

3.2. Theological Causes

From the Middle Ages (4th century) to the Enlightenment Period (17th-18th centuries), the focus of anti-Semitism can be said to have been theological (Taguieff, 2017, pp. 32-33). Ideas that Jews were immoral and gluttonous, "killers of the Lord" and "companions of the devil," began to be propagated by Christian preachers. A more intense Christian opposition to Judaism can be traced back to the 8th century. During these times, accusations that Jews sought ways to torture and kill Christians gained greater significance. Concepts like the notorious "Blood Libel" (the belief that Jews used Christian blood, especially from children, for matzo or unleavened bread during Passover) also became more widespread (Rattansi, 2007, p. 15).

Christians believed that Jews were commanded to destroy, misuse, and desecrate everything considered sacred. Far from disappearing by the late 19th century, these traditional forms of anti-Jewish beliefs were integrated into new anti-Jewish movements. The Church also worked to integrate anti-Semitism in society through education and newspapers (MacMaster, 2001, pp. 90-92).

Theological anti-Semitism was born and peaked in the Middle Ages. Over the centuries, especially by the Church, society was incited with blood libels, accusations of ritual murders, cannibalism, and the stigma of being the killers of Jesus, leading to the exclusion of Jews from social life. The refusal of Jews to convert to Christianity and their continued adherence to their own beliefs and religious traditions were met with fear and hatred within society. Although the term "Jew" clearly has a religious dimension, the historical Nazi definition extended beyond this. People of Jewish birth or descent who had renounced their religion and converted to Christianity were still defined as Jews. Nevertheless, the religious aspect of anti-Semitism cannot be denied. Jews were stigmatized as those who never accepted Jesus Christ as the Messiah and even killed him. The Nazi regime is one of the clearest examples of racial persecution, initially built around a racial category defined by religious differences (Caioni et al., 2012, p. 161).

3.3. Nationalism

Although nationalist movements emerging after the Enlightenment Period provided living space for Jews, they also imposed the necessity of assimilation. It is known that those who did not show loyalty to the nation they lived in and did not assimilate faced social exclusion or were forced to emigrate (Taguieff, 2017, p. 33).

In response to xenophobic nationalism, Jews were seen as profoundly foreign and considered a dangerous and destructive "alien" element within the land and fabric of society. Jews were thought to form a "state within a state" because they were seen as a "nomadic race" without roots or a sense of belonging, remaining loyal to their ancestral customs and religion. In an age where patriotism and sacrificing for the homeland had a profound religious connotation, Jews were perceived as a fundamental threat. They were viewed as having the most significant loyalty to their own race and nation (MacMaster, 2001, p. 93). At the root of the idea was the fact of Jews seeing themselves as the chosen race. Due to their being a violator, their separateness from

the rest, and their Zionism, Jews were accused of "nationalism" and viewed as a spy and the enemy within the society. (Taguieff, 2017, p. 34).

During times of crisis or war, it was thought that the patriotism of Jewish soldiers could not be trusted (MacMaster, 2001, p. 93). The 1870s and 1890s were the years when the first organized nationalist movements emerged. In the German world, anti-Semites claimed that Jews were the cause of all the problems in the country. Therefore, the need to combat the Jew, both the internal and external enemy, was emphasized (Taguieff, 2017, p. 36).

Lazare saw Jews as "nationalist egoists" and considered them a threat. He also argued that the reason for the emergence of anti-Semitism in the modern era was that Jews did not assimilate and harmonize with European societies. Therefore, he regarded the laws that excluded and restricted Jews as natural (1967, p. 112).

3.4. Racism

In the 19th century, scientific methods began to be used to legitimize the hatred directed at Jews (Taguieff, 2017, p. 32). During this period, some changes in anti-Semitic movements in Germany were observed compared to earlier times. Groepler notes that this shift moved from rural areas (conservative groups) to urban areas (groups less close to religion). While Jews were seen as a religious, cultural, and economic disaster in rural areas, racist anti-Semitism began to manifest in cities. This was because Jews made up a large part of the urban bourgeoisie. Gobineau's work *An Essay on the Inequality of the Human Races* provided a basis for these ideas. In this context, it is evident that religious anti-Semitism and racist anti-Semitism diverged. The only common point between these two types might be the belief that Jews were economically disastrous (Groepler, 1999, pp. 106-108).

Writers of the period, such as Wilhelm Marr and Eugen Dühring, separated anti-Semitism from the theological realm and referred to science and "race theory". Dühring (1881), in his book *The Jewish Problem as a Racial, Social, and Cultural Question*, stated, "My book was the first to present a racial perspective on the Jewish problem, opposing the then-dominant religious viewpoint," emphasizing the racial aspect of anti-Semitism. Similarly, racist ideologue Marr sought to separate anti-Jewish sentiment from theological foundations (Taguieff, 2017, p. 37). Thus, racist

anti-Semitism focused on physical and mental differences, shedding the taboo Christian teachings and adopting an ideological stance (MacMaster, 2001, p. 95).

By distinguishing between Aryan and Semitic races, it was claimed that Jews, not being part of the Aryan race, could not share the same moral, social, and intellectual concepts as Aryans. Lazare argued that Jews needed to be eliminated; otherwise, they would destroy the nations they were part of. According to anti-Semites, Jews were individuals from a foreign race, unable to assimilate into the Aryan race, and were hostile to Christian civilization and religion (1967, pp. 93-95).

That is to say, according to racist anti-Semitism, Jews belong to the inferior Semitic race. Therefore, they should be kept away from Aryan people to avoid tainting their blood and honor, and even be eliminated. Racist anti-Semitism, which was the starting point of the Nazi regime and used to legitimize their mass killings, has lost its validity today with the discrediting of race theories.

3.5. Slanders Against Jews

After the gradual decline of the Crusader spirit, anti-Jewish slanders that emerged from the mid-12th century began to replace the Crusades (Groepler, 1999, p. 16). The most common of these slanders was the "Blood Libel," the accusation of ritual murder. When a Christian went missing, it was claimed that the Jews living in the area had kidnapped the person, crucified them, and used their blood for rituals. The blood libel first appeared in Germany and England during the Second Crusade (Groepler, 1999, p. 14). Another accusation was that Jews stole the sacred bread used in Christian religious ceremonies from the church and desecrated it. From the 14th century onwards, Jews were also accused of poisoning wells to spread deadly diseases among Christian communities, especially the plague. During the great plague outbreak of 1348, known as the "Black Death," this accusation became even more widespread. Following these accusations, anti-Jewish attacks resulted in the torture and killing of thousands of Jews and the destruction of many Jewish communities (Cohen, 2013, pp. 265-266).

When looking at the general impact of the Crusades on Jews, these campaigns first revealed how weak and helpless the Jews were compared to the Christian society in Europe. This situation further exposed the hostility of Christians who harbored

religious hatred towards Jews. Attacks and pressures on Jews living under Christian dominance, especially in Europe, increased. Socially, Jews were already considered second-class citizens, and the Crusades exacerbated their exclusion from guilds and trade in Europe. Their sources of livelihood became increasingly restricted, leading many Jews, especially those in European cities, to turn to money lending. In this way, Jews found a place in the economic life, becoming indispensable to kingdoms towards the end of the Middle Ages due to the taxes they paid. However, they also became capital exploited by some kings. When their economic productivity decreased, they were often expelled from their places of residence (Brenner, 2011, pp. 91-93).[23]

3.6. Prejudices

"An atom can be more easily split than a prejudice."

Albert Einstein

Rumors and gossip that Jews were "greedy," "subversive," "moneylenders," and "God-killers" have persisted for centuries. Additionally, beliefs that they committed ritual murders and drank the blood of small children evolved over time and continued into the modern era (Taguieff, 2017, p. 31). The prejudice stemming from these rumors led to the necessity of isolating Jews from the social sphere. "Prejudice wants to lose sight of those it targets. It has found various ways to hide them and achieve this. Christians forced Jews to live in ghettos" (Bernasconi, 2007, p. 140).

In his work *The Authoritarian Personality* (2016), Theodor W. Adorno examines "the nature of the potential fascist individual" with a focus on anti-Semitism. He argues that the reason for prejudices against Jews lies within the anti-Semitic person themselves. The work emphasizes that anti-Semitism reflects ideological debates and that a person's inclination towards any ideology can be explained by psychological reasons (Adorno, 2016, p. 13).

To give an example from Adorno's research for this work, the words of a 40-year-old female subject about Jews were as follows: "I don't like Jews... They are taking over our country. They are aggressive. They are ambitious in everything... I am

[23] For this source, the page numbers provided are based on Turkish translations. However, the referenced content is also present in the original works or their English translations. Readers may verify the accuracy of the relevant sections by consulting the original texts or their English translations listed below: Brenner, M. (2010). *A Short History of the Jews*. Princeton University Press.

in favor of legal discrimination against Jews among Americans, not in a Hitler style, but everyone knows that Jews are behind the Communists..." (Adorno, 2016, p. 42). As seen, the subject exhibits anti-Semitic thoughts that could be legally endorsed, even if she does not sympathize with violence. Defining all Jews as aggressive, possibly due to witnessing the aggressiveness of a single Jew, reflects her prejudice against the entire religious group.

Another subject in the same study stated, "I do not feel particularly sorry for what the Germans did to the Jews. The Jews could have done the same kind of things to me" (Adorno, 2016, p. 43). With these words, the subject expresses support for the genocide against Jews, based on the prejudiced assumption that they could also be subjected to such violence by Jews.

Adorno states that highly prejudiced individuals perceive an out-group (enemy) as a threat as long as it maintains its differences, no matter how weak it is, and he defines this as "psychological totalitarianism" (Adorno, 2016, p. 68).

It is evident that the causes of anti-Semitism are political-economic, religious, nationalist, racist, and prejudice-based. When we consider all these factors together, it becomes clear that anti-Semitic thought is rooted in deeply ingrained prejudices and accusations that have persisted for centuries. These are significant reasons and have existed not just because of the Jews but due to the prevailing social conditions of the time. Supporters of anti-Semitism, as discussed under the heading "Racism", try to justify their views with baseless accusations against Jews, unaware of the true reasons for their feelings. Accusations related to race, religion, politics, and economics are made. However, none of these complaints about anti-Semitism are well-founded. As Lazare pointed out, some, like ethnic complaints, stem from a misunderstanding of race; others, like religious and political accusations, arise from a narrow and incomplete interpretation of historical evolution. Lastly, the economic rationale lies in the necessity to conceal the ongoing conflict within the capitalist class. Although these accusations are not true, saying that the Jew is a pure Semite is as inaccurate as saying that European peoples are pure Aryans (1967, p. 145).

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH NOVELS

4.1. Representation of Jewish Characters in Dicken's *Oliver Twist* and *Our Mutual Friend*

Charles Dickens, a famous English writer from the 1800s, was really good at showing what life was like back then. Victorian era was a time of big changes in England because of the growth of factories and cities. These changes unfortunately led to a big gap between the rich and poor, and to prejudice against certain religious groups, especially Jewish people. To really understand how Dickens portrayed Jewish characters in his books, it is important to remember the difficult and biased world they lived in.

The Victorian Age, spanning from 1837 to 1901, represents a pivotal period in literary history, connecting the Romantic era with the rise of modernism and realism. Victorian novels frequently depicted the struggles of life during that time, highlighting how individuals could triumph over hardshipness and enhance their lives through hard work and determination. These stories often showcased how personal change could be facilitated and often emphasized the importance of personal growth and societal improvement through their moral messages.

Queen Victoria's reign, from 1837 to 1901, brought significant social and economic shifts to England. The Industrial Revolution sparked rapid city growth, leading to a massive influx of people from rural areas to urban centers. This migration significantly changed the structure of cities and brought various social issues. These changes deeply impacted the Jewish community, who often faced discrimination. It is important to consider this social and cultural context when analyzing how Dickens portrayed Jewish characters in his writing (Ragussis, 2010, p. 78).

Despite living in England for centuries, Jewish people continued to face considerable discrimination during the Victorian era. Like elsewhere in Europe, they were often subjected to prejudices and negative stereotypes (Lipman, 1990, p. 52). Until the mid-1800s, Jews in England had limited rights and were excluded from many professions. However, things slowly began to improve throughout the Victorian

period, and Jewish people gradually became more integrated into society (Endelman, 2002, p. 103).

Charles Dickens wrote about Jewish characters in a few of his novels, but only two were really important to the story. The most well-known is Fagin from *Oliver Twist*, a wicked guy who uses kids for his own gain. Many years later, Dickens wrote *Our Mutual Friend*, which has a good Jewish character named Mr. Riah. Mr. Riah is not as famous as the villainous Fagin, but he is a good person who looks out for children (Heller, 1990, p. 41).

Oliver Twist, published in 1838, shows the dark side of London's poor neighborhoods and how poverty often leads to crime. The story is about a young orphan named Oliver who grows up in cruel orphanages called "child farms". These places are known for treating children terribly, giving them barely enough food and no freedom. When Oliver simply asks for more to eat, he is sent away to work as an apprentice. But the work is so horrible that he runs away and ends up with a criminal named Fagin. Fagin runs a gang of young pickpockets and teaches Oliver how to steal. However, when Oliver sees one of the boys stealing, he gets scared and tries to escape. He is quickly caught and brought back to Fagin. In the end, Fagin is hanged for his crimes, and Oliver discovers he has a wealthy half-brother who leaves him a large inheritance (Dickens, 1838).

Fagin is one of the most memorable, though infamous, Jewish characters in English literature, rivaled only by Shakespeare's Shylock. He is a "fence", someone who buys and sells stolen goods. Fagin exploits a group of children and young adults, teaching them to steal and engage in prostitution while pretending to be their protector. These children, all homeless orphans like Oliver Twist, live with Fagin. Their home is like a school for criminals. Fagin's wickedness is connected to his lack of morals in financial matters, fitting the traditional negative stereotype of Jewish people familiar to the time (Heller, 1990, p. 42).

Fagin carries multiple characteristics linked with Jewish people. He is devious, thieving, disloyal, greedy, a coward. He is not only a thief himself but also indirectly responsible for murders. He arranges to have members of his gang captured and killed when they become inconvenient or dangerous to him. Fagin also encourages Bill Sikes

to kill Nancy after failing to convince Nancy to poison Sikes, leading to the story's climactic murder (p. 44).

Charles Dickens often portrayed Jewish characters in a negative way. He described them in ways that made them seem like frightening monsters rather than regular people, even comparing them to animals. This type of portrayal contributed to harmful stereotypes about Jewish people. Later in his life, Dickens insisted that he never meant to be prejudiced against Jewish people in his writing, especially his portrayal of the character Fagin. However, in 1854, the *Jewish Chronicle*, a newspaper representing the Jewish community, raised an important question. They asked why Dickens, known for his sympathy for the oppressed and mistreated, seemed to exclude Jewish people from that same compassion. This question was posed to Dickens in an invitation to a special event for a Jewish school. Dickens responded by saying he couldn't understand why Jewish people would see him as unfriendly or hostile towards them. He defended himself by pointing to his book, *A Child's History of England*, where he wrote about the unfair treatment and persecution of Jewish people throughout history. He believed this book showed his support for Jewish people. Dickens stated that he felt he had spoken up for their rights and freedoms and that his book clearly expressed how much he disapproved of the way they had been treated in the past (Johnson, 1952, p. 1010).

Nine years after the *Jewish Chronicle* questioned Dickens' portrayal of Jewish characters, a new debate arose. In 1863, Dickens began corresponding with Mrs. Eliza Davis through letters, who, along with her husband, purchased Dickens' former house. This exchange of letters provides valuable insights into how Dickens viewed his infamous character, Fagin, and his Jewish identity. Mrs. Davis, being Jewish herself, decided to address the issue directly with Dickens. In her letter, she bravely expressed the hurt and offense that many Jewish readers felt because of the fact how he portrayed Fagin in his novel. She acknowledged Dickens' reputation as a champion of the downtrodden but pointed out the contradiction in his work (Heller, 1990, p. 45). She wrote:

> It has been said that Charles Dickens, the compassionate writer whose works argue so eloquently and nobly for the oppressed of this country... has encouraged a vile prejudice against the despised Hebrew... I fear Fagin allows for only one interpretation; but (while) Charles Dickens lives, the author can justify himself or atone for a great wrong (Heller, 1990, pp. 44-45).

Her words were direct and powerful. She challenged Dickens to recognize the harm his portrayal of Fagin had caused and suggested that he could still use his platform to make amends for the hurtful stereotype he had created.

Part of Dickens' response is that:

> If there be any general feeling on the part of the intelligent Jewish people, that I have done them what you describe as "a great wrong," they are a far less sensible, a far less just, and a far less good-tempered people than I have always supposed them to be. Fagin, in Oliver Twist, is a Jew, because it unfortunately was true of the time to which that story refers, that that class of criminal almost invariably was a Jew. But surely no sensible man or woman of your persuasion can fail to observe - firstly, that all the rest of the wicked dramatis personae are Christians; and secondly, that he is called a "Jew," not because of his religion, but because of his race. If I were to write a story, in which I described a Frenchman or a Spaniard as "the Roman Catholic," I should do a very indecent and unjustifiable thing; but I make mention of Fagin as the Jew, because he is one of the Jewish people, and because it conveys that kind of idea of him which I should give my readers of a Chinaman, by calling him a Chinese (Dickens, 1937-1938, p. 357).

Mrs. Davis did not accept his explanation. She said:

> It is a fact that the Jewish race and religion are inseparable, if a Jew embrace any other faith, he is no longer known as one of the race either to his own people or to the Gentiles to whom he has joined himself... If, as you remark all must observe that the other Criminals were Christians they are at least contrasted with characters of good Christians, this poor wretched Fagin stands alone The Jew (Heller, 1960, pp. 45-46).

Mrs. Davis later suggested in his letter that a famous author like Dickens should take a closer look at Jewish people in Britain and show what they are really like. Some critics believe this suggestion inspired Dickens to create the kind and respectable Jewish character, Mr. Riah, in his later book *Our Mutual Friend*: "I hazard the opinion, that it would well repay an author of reputation to examine more closely into the manners and characters of the British Jews and to represent them as they really are." (p. 45).

While Dickens was writing *Our Mutual Friend* in 1864, he did not want to be seen as anti-Semitic or prejudiced against Jewish people. This is also true of his correspondence with Mrs. Davis in 1863. He tried to explain that Fagin's Jewishness was not essential to his role in *Oliver Twist*. He claimed it was simply a reflection of the time period in which the story was set, saying, "because it unfortunately was true of the time to which that story refers, that that class of criminal almost invariably was

a Jew." (Roth, 1938, p. 304). This may have been an attempt to convince himself of something he wanted to believe. It is also possible that Dickens' personal opinions about Jewish people had changed somewhat between the time he created the character of Fagin and the time he was defending his creation many years later.

The idea that Fagin's Jewish identity is merely incidental to his character, a mere historical coincidence, is almost too absurd to consider. This argument is only given any weight because it was put forward by Dickens himself and has been entertained by numerous critics since then. However, Charles Dickens decides to continuously reflect Fagin as a Jew. It is impossible to ignore how often Fagin is called "the Jew" throughout the novel. If Dickens, or any other author, were to repeatedly refer to a villain as "the Frenchman" or "the Chinaman," any reader would be justified in assuming the author was making a deliberate point about the nature of French or Chinese people in general (Roth, 1938, p. 309).

Dickens' argument that all the other evil characters in *Oliver Twist* are Christian doesn't hold up very well. First, there is another, less important Jewish character named Barney who is also portrayed negatively. More importantly, Dickens seems to have borrowed heavily from common prejudices and stereotypes about Jewish people to make Fagin seem even more evil and scary. Dickens gives Fagin many physical characteristics that were often used to depict Jewish people in a negative way, especially in literature of that time. For example, Fagin has red hair, which is mentioned over and over again. The illustrations of Fagin also show him with a hooked nose, a big hat, and a long robe, all common stereotypes. Dickens often describes Fagin hiding and sneaking around in the dark alleys of London, making him seem like a creepy and disgusting character. On top of that, Fagin makes a living by selling used clothes and trinkets, which was one of the few jobs that Jewish people were allowed to have at the time the story takes place. However, it is worth mentioning that Dickens does not use every single stereotype about Jewish people when describing Fagin. For instance, he does not give Fagin any of the exaggerated speech patterns or mannerisms that were often used to make fun of Jewish people in those days. Fagin speaks perfect English, just like Oliver, which is actually quite unrealistic for how people from their backgrounds would have spoken (Lane, 1958, pp. 94-100).

One of the main reasons why Fagin fits so properly into the stereotype of a villainous Jewish person is his connection to the devil, much like Shakespeare's character Shylock. This link, along with Fagin's disturbing role in kidnapping children and leading them into a life of crime, reinforces harmful and long-standing prejudices against Jewish people. The association of Jewish people with the devil and the idea that they corrupt innocent children have been used to justify discrimination and violence against them for centuries, from the Middle Ages to the modern times (Stone, 1979, p. 34).

When Dickens describes Fagin in *Oliver Twist*, he makes him look a lot like the devil, especially with the red beard, which was a common way to show the devil in old plays. Plus, when Oliver first meets Fagin, he stands near a fire with a poker in his hand, just like you would imagine the devil. This all makes it seem like Dickens is connecting the idea of the devil with Fagin, who is Jewish:

> In a frying-pan, which was on the fire ... some sausages were cooking; and standing over them, with a toasting fork in his hand, was a very old shrivelled Jew, whose villainous-looking and repulsive face was obscured by a quantity of matted red hair. He was dressed in a greasy flannel gown with his throat bare ... Seated round the table were four or five boys, none older than the Dodger ... These all crowded about their associate as he whispered a few words to the Jew; and then turned round and grinned at Oliver. So did the Jew himself, toasting-fork in hand (Dickens, 1966, p. 105)

Having red hair was seen as an unpleasant and undesirable trait often linked to Jewish people. This stereotype likely came about because marrying within the same community (endogamy) was more common in the past, and also because Judas, who betrayed Jesus, was often shown with red hair in art. By giving Fagin red hair, Dickens was showing these negative stereotypes and making him seem even more like a villain to his readers.

Dickens keeps describing Fagin with things that remind us of the devil. His toasting-fork looks like a devil's pitchfork, and he is always hanging out by a fire in his hiding place. He is often shown cooking over the fire, thinking deeply next to it, or making it burn stronger. It all adds to the idea that he is meant to be a devil-like figure.

Dickens keeps linking Fagin to fire, which makes us think of hell. He also calls Fagin "the merry old gentleman," a phrase that people used to describe the devil back then. Moreover, some characters who know Fagin well actually call him the devil. For

example, when Fagin walks in on the criminal Bill Sikes, Sikes yells at his barking dog, saying, “Lie down, you stupid brute! Don't you know the devil when he's got a great coat on?” (p. 187). Sikes makes a similar association later in the novel:

> “I don't feel like myself when you lay that withered old claw on my shoulder, so take it away”, said Sikes casting off the Jew’s hand. “It makes you nervous, Bill — reminds you of being nabbed, does it?” said Fagin ...
>
> Reminds me of being nabbed by the devil,” returned Sikes. “There never was another man with such a face as yours, unless it was your father, and I suppose he is singeing his grizzled red beard by this time, unless you came straight from the old 'un without any father at all betwixt you (p. 398).

Even characters with good hearts, like the prostitute Nancy, have a strong aversion to Fagin, “shrank back, as Fagin offered to lay his hand on hers.” (p. 401). This is similar to the instinctive antipathy that virtuous characters in medieval folklore felt toward the devil. Later, Nancy looks back on her past with Fagin and remembers how he “led her, step by step, deeper and deeper down into an abyss of crime and misery, whence was no escape.” (p. 397). She sees him as a truly evil influence in her life, even calling him a “devil” and saying he has been “worse than devil as he has been to me.” (p. 412).

Fagin’s role as a tempter, much like the devil, is really important in the story. He is secretly working with Oliver’s half-brother, Monks, to make Oliver lose his inheritance by leading him down a bad path. It is like Fagin is making a bet with Oliver’s very soul. Fagin’s big plan is to make Oliver want to be a criminal. He starts by keeping Oliver isolated and sad. Then, he shows him the gang and tries to make that seem way better than being alone. For a while, it seems to be working:

> The wily old Jew had the boy in his toils. Having prepared his mind, by solitude and gloom, to prefer any society to the companionship of his own sad thoughts in such a dreary place, he was now slowly instilling into his soul the poison which he hoped would blacken it, and change its hue for ever. (p. 185).

Later, when Fagin is setting up a robbery and wants Oliver to be a big part of it, he says, “Once let him feel that he is one of us; once fill his mind with the idea that he has been a thief; and he's ours! Ours for his life.” But Sikes doesn’t like this plan, saying:

> “Ours! ... Yours, you mean.”
>
> “Perhaps I do, my dear,” said the Jew with a shrill chuckle. “Mine,
>
> if you like, Bill.” (p.192).

When Fagin tries to poison Oliver's mind and turn him into a criminal, it reminds us of a horrible stereotype that Jewish people poison people and water sources. This awful idea has been around for a long time and has caused a lot of harm. Even in the story, Fagin tries to get Nancy to poison Sikes before convincing Sikes to kill her. He even tells her, "I have the means at hand, quiet and close." (p. 401).

Fagin is a figure of ancient and widespread evil. He conveys a sense of overwhelming horror that is intensified because he is often seen through the eyes of defenseless childhood innocence, which he is constantly plotting against. Sometimes, he even lacks the "humanoid" characteristics of most well- known devilish descriptions, as it is seen in the quotation below:

> The mud lay thick upon the stones, and a black mist hung over the streets; the rain fell sluggishly down, and everything felt cold and clammy to the touch. It seemed just the night when it befitted such a being as the Jew to be abroad. As he glided stealthily along, creeping beneath the shelter of the walls and doorways, the hideous old man seemed like some loathsome reptile, engendered in the slime and darkness through which he moved: crawling forth by night, in search of some rich offal for a meal (p.186).

And towards the end of the novel:

> Fagin sat watching in his old lair, with face so distorted and pale, and eyes so red and bloodshot, that he looked less like a man, than like some hideous phantom, moist from the grave, and worried by an evil spirit ... His right hand was raised to his lips, and as, absorbed in thought, he bit his long black nails, he disclosed among his toothless gums a few such fangs as should have been a dog's or rat's (p. 469).

The night before Fagin is going to be executed, Dickens describes him in a way that reminds us of those devilish descriptions from before. We are told that "His red hair hung down upon his bloodless face."(p. 470). He is also described as having a "countenance [was] more like that of a snared beast than the face of a man."(p. 472).

The comparison of Jewish people to animals, particularly dogs and reptiles, has a long history in anti-Semitic literature, including Shakespeare's works. This dehumanizing tactic aims to make Jewish people seem disgusting, dangerous, and fundamentally different from others. The image of a Jew as a reptile, specifically, evokes fear and disgust. It suggests that they are sneaky, predatory creatures who operate in the darkness, seeking to consume the flesh and blood of innocent victims. This imagery often connects to accusations of blood libel, which claimed that Jews

used the blood of Christian children in their rituals. This famous myth further fueled prejudice and violence against Jewish communities (Trachtenberg, 1983).

Fagin is portrayed as both “demoniacal” (p. 189) and somehow less than human, fitting into those old stereotypes from centuries ago. But even though he is shown as this scary figure, he is more of a potential danger to Oliver than a real one, especially compared to how he is hurt others. We get a glimpse of Fagin’s capacity for violence when Oliver sees him a second time.

Fagin thinks Oliver is asleep, so he takes out a box of jewels and admires them. He is happy about how quickly some former gang members were executed: “What a fine thing capital punishment is! Dead men never repent; dead men never bring awkward stories to light. Ah, it's a fine thing for the trade! Five of 'em strung up in a row.” (p. 107). But Oliver is not fully asleep – he's in “a drowsy state, between sleeping and waking.” (p. 106). When Fagin realizes Oliver is watching, “He closed the lid of the box with a loud crash; and, laying his hand on a bread knife which was on the table, started furiously up. He trembled very much though; for, even in his terror Oliver could see that the knife quivered in the air.” (p. 108). That shaking knife makes us think of the horrible blood libel accusations made against Jewish people, and it sticks in Oliver’s mind as a threat, even though Fagin never actually uses it.

Later in the novel, Oliver has another scary vision of Fagin when he is in that same kind of half-asleep, half-awake state. Oliver has been rescued from “the Jew's” clutches a second time and is staying at the Maylies’ peaceful house in the country. Fagin and Monks, though, have followed him there. It is like they come straight out of Oliver’s dream because they suddenly appear right outside his window. But by the time Oliver is awake enough to call for help, they have vanished. The people taking care of Oliver look for footprints or any sign of Fagin and Monks, but they can not find anything (pp. 309-312).

Another negative stereotype Dickens uses is the idea that Jewish people are obsessed with money and valuable things. This stereotype goes way back, showing up in works by writers like Marlowe and Shakespeare. Dickens makes Fagin fit this stereotype perfectly. He is greedy and would rather have riches than anything else, even if it means hurting others to get them. There is a part where Dickens describes Fagin looking at a box of stolen jewels with a lot of pleasure:

> Aha! said the Jew, shrugging up his shoulders, and distorting every feature with a hideous grin. Clever dogs! Clever dogs! Staunch to the last! Never told the old parson where they were. Never poached upon old Fagin! And why should they? It wouldn't have loosened the knot, or kept the drop up… At least half a dozen more were severally drawn forth from the same box, and surveyed with equal pleasure; besides rings, brooches, bracelets, and other articles of jewelry, of such magnificent materials, and costly workmanship, that Oliver had no idea, even of their names (p. 95).

This shows how much he cares about material things, even more than people or doing what is right.

Dickens also portrays Jewish people as being selfish, stingy, and unwilling to share. He has Fagin say, "Did you see any of these pretty things, my dear? They—they're mine, Oliver; my little property. All I have to live upon, in my old age. The folks call me a miser, my dear. Only a miser; that's all" (p. 97). This makes Fagin seem like he only cares about holding onto his possessions.

The novel continuously highlights Fagin's pure evil. His evil is so immense and widespread that even during his dramatic trial scene, no specific charges are mentioned. This implies that any particular accusation would diminish the magnitude of his wickedness. In the eyes of the spectators in the novel he deserves a harsh verdict:

> Looking round, he saw that the jurymen had turned together, to consider of their verdict. As his eyes wandered to the gallery, he could see the people rising above each other to see his face: some hastily applying their glasses to their eyes, and others whispering their neighbours with looks expressive of abhorrence. A few there were, who seemed unmindful of him, and looked only to the jury, in impatient wonder how they could delay. But in no one face ... could he read the faintest sympathy with himself, or any feeling but one of all-absorbing interest that he should be condemned (p. 466).

And the moment jury starts to speak there happens a silence:

> Perfect stillness ensued — not a rustle — not a breath — Guilty. The building rang with a tremendous shout, and another, and another, and then it echoed loud groans, then gathered strength as they swelled out, like angry thunder. It was a peal of joy from the populace outside, greeting the news that he would die on Monday (pp. 467-468).

Fagin is entirely rejected by society. He is not even part of a Jewish community. He cooks sausages and eats ham, foods considered nonkosher (forbidden by religion).

The night before his execution, we witnesses a different kind of Jew for the first time: "Venerable men of his own persuasion had come to pray beside him, but he had driven them away with curses. They renewed their charitable efforts, and he beat them

off ” (p. 469). The fact that Fagin is a bad Jew, a voluntary outsider to the Jewish community, does not change the fact that his wickedness throughout the novel is presented as inseparable from his identity as “the Jew”. His wickedness throughout the novel is still tied to his Jewish identity.

Dickens emphasizes Fagin’s Jewishness and uses several common terrifying stereotypes associated with Jews: “the devil, monster, poisoner, kidnapper, child murderer” who practices cannibalistic rituals. This is not to say Dickens was promoting anti-Semitism. Rather, he was using existing anti-Semitism in his readers to create his first major depiction of evil contrasted with innocent childhood. While Dickens has many evil characters, only Fagin is Jewish. It is important to acknowledge that in portraying Fagin, Dickens relied on existing prejudices of Jewish villainy of the time (Stone, 1979, p. 40).

Lauriat Lane, Jr. observed that in the 1867 revision of *Oliver Twist*, Dickens replaced “the Jew” with “Fagin” in the chapter depicting Fagin awaiting execution. Lane argues this emphasizes Fagin’s individuality rather than portraying him as a stereotypical villain. He further suggests that Dickens creates sympathy for Fagin, changing his character from how he is presented in the rest of the novel (Lane, 1951).

While Dickens made these changes, and it might be correct that these changes were motivated by guilt and a desire to compensate for what he did, the revisions do not necessarily evoke sympathy for Fagin. On the contrary, humanizing Fagin could be seen as a way to satisfy the reader’s desire for him to receive his deserved punishment, to experience genuine fear and be hanged. The key point is that Dickens could not remove Fagin’s Jewishness, even if he wanted to. Without it, Fagin could not be as scary demonic character Dickens created in *Oliver Twist* (Lane, 1951).

One way to explain how Dickens could write the villainous Fagin and then the fatherly Mr. Riah is to look at the idea that Dickens had two sides to his imagination, as Edmund Wilson suggested. Wilson points out that throughout all of Dickens’ writing, there are both good and bad versions of all sorts of characters: a bad factory owner and a good one, a bad dwarf and a good one, a rebellious illegitimate daughter and a submissive one, and so on. So, it makes sense that Dickens felt like he had to create a good Jewish character, Mr. Riah, to balance out the bad Jewish character, Fagin (Wilson, 1965, p. 53).

While Dickens argued that he reflected the social and cultural realities of his time, the stereotypical portrayal of Fagin reveals an approach that goes beyond this defense, aligning with antisemitic tropes.

Fagin's depiction, particularly through his physical description and moral depravity, exemplifies the use of antisemitic stereotypes in literature. Greenblatt (1988, p. 45) notes that Fagin is described as a "long-nosed, dirty, and deceitful Jew," which served the popular prejudices of the era. By linking Fagin's moral corruption with his physical appearance and Jewish identity, Dickens perpetuated an image that reinforced unconscious biases among his readers.

In her article, Maria Cristina Paganoni (2010) examines Fagin in *Oliver Twist* not merely as a reflection of anti-Semitic stereotypes but as an example of how these stereotypes operate within the narrative fabric of the novel. Dickens, in depicting Fagin, does not only focus on his physical traits but also explicitly highlights the character's moral corruption, societal exclusion, and the discrimination rooted in religious context. This portrayal shapes Fagin as an anti-Semitic figure, leading readers to see him not merely as an individual villain but as a symbol embodying historical prejudices against Jewish identity.

However, an intriguing tension arises here: while Dickens reproduces the social prejudices of his time through the character of Fagin, does he simultaneously provide a space to grapple with these prejudices? Fagin's portrayal not only illustrates the impacts of anti-Semitism in 19th-century England but also prompts modern readers to reflect on biases and social exclusion. In this context, it could be argued that Fagin transcends being merely an "anti-Semitic symbol" and critiques society's tendency to create scapegoats. Whether consciously or unconsciously, Dickens invites readers to question the idea that Fagin is merely an individual and instead see him as a product of collective unconsciousness.

Dickens' character portrayals not only positioned Fagin as a villainous figure but also equated Jewish identity with moral corruption, embedding a negative image of Jews in the minds of readers. This association between Fagin's unethical behavior and his Jewish identity reinforced stereotypes, contributing to the perpetuation of antisemitic attitudes within literary and societal contexts.

Fagin's physical features are meticulously portrayed as a reflection of traditional prejudices associated with Judaism. Dickens describes Fagin as a "very old, shriveled Jew," emphasizing stereotypical elements such as a "large hook-shaped nose" (Paganoni, 2010, p. 310). Such depictions parallel the physical traits frequently employed in the anti-Semitic caricatures of the era, prompting readers to evaluate the character through the lens of Jewish identity. Furthermore, Noah's mockery of Fagin's nose serves to reinforce these stereotypes explicitly. Even as Noah struggles to imitate Fagin, he exaggerates the prominence of Fagin's nose, remarking that "his own nose was not large enough to mimic the gesture" (Paganoni, 2010, p. 311).

These portrayals make it evident that Fagin represents more than just an individual character; he embodies societal prejudices. By focusing on such physical details, Dickens not only reduces Fagin to his Jewish identity but also shapes the readers' perception of him. A significant question arises here: did Dickens employ these descriptions as a deliberate critique, or was he unconsciously perpetuating the prevalent stereotypes of his time? The emphasis on Fagin's physical traits underscores that he is not merely an isolated figure but also a symbol of society's anti-Semitic attitudes and their manifestations.

The repetition of such stereotypes is not merely a literary choice but a cultural indicator. Dickens's use of these stereotypes to engage contemporary readers may have contributed to solidifying Fagin as an enduring anti-Semitic figure. However, for modern readers, these depictions provide an opportunity to interrogate the social and cultural context of the 19th century and adopt a critical stance against such biases. The exaggerated details of Fagin's appearance can thus be viewed not only as an individual characterization but also as a literary reflection of deep-seated prejudices and discrimination ingrained in the collective consciousness.

Fagin's portrayal as a criminal gang leader, thief, and potential child abuser reflects not only his individual villainy but also the deeply rooted prejudices against Jewish men of the era. Notably, discriminatory perceptions such as "sexual deviance" often attributed to Jewish men in Victorian society are prominently embedded in Fagin's characterization (Paganoni, 2010, p. 310). Dickens's depiction of Fagin in this manner leads readers to view him not only as morally corrupt but also as a figure who threatens societal norms.

Maria Cristina Paganoni suggests that Fagin embodies both masculine and feminine traits, thereby transgressing the rigid gender boundaries of the Victorian period. This dual representation positions Fagin as an unsettling, unconventional presence that lies outside the established social order. His depiction as a "demonic creature" is further reinforced through the metaphor of a serpent. For instance, Fagin is described as a "creature thriving in slime and darkness," emphasizing his presentation as a supernatural and menacing entity rather than a purely human character (Paganoni, 2010, p. 311).

This portrayal underscores Fagin's role not merely as an individual antagonist but as a symbol of the societal fears and prejudices of the time. The Victorian era's anxieties surrounding gender roles and moral boundaries are vividly embodied in Fagin's character. By crafting Fagin as a figure outside both gender and moral norms, Dickens transforms him into more than an anti-Semitic stereotype; he becomes a reflection of everything Victorian society deemed other. From a modern perspective, this representation invites scrutiny of the socio-cultural context of the period and offers a critical lens to examine how characters like Fagin perpetuate biases in literature.

Fagin's Jewish identity further accentuates his positioning outside the boundaries of Christian society, solidifying his role as the other. Maria Cristina Paganoni interprets Fagin's depiction as a "silent object" during his trial as a clear indication of his subjection to anti-Semitic prejudices: "He is judged, interpreted, but cannot articulate his own perspective" (Paganoni, 2010, p. 311). This portrayal symbolizes Fagin's complete exclusion, not only physically and morally but also as a voiceless figure stripped of his agency.

Fagin's silence deepens his exclusion within both social and religious contexts. Being treated as an object in court underscores his dehumanization and his reduction to a tool that serves the prejudices of Christian society. This silencing suggests that Fagin's identity has been shaped entirely by society's collective biases, leaving him deprived even of the right to narrate his own story, transforming him into a caricature defined by external perceptions.

From a broader perspective, Fagin's silence can be read as a powerful metaphor for the broader silencing of the Jewish community in 19th-century England, where Jews were often perceived as the other and denied a voice in societal discourse.

Dickens's portrayal forces readers to view Fagin's story solely from an external perspective, denying them the opportunity to develop empathy for his inner world. This reinforces the idea that Fagin transcends his role as an individual character, becoming a symbol of the prevailing attitudes toward Jews of the period.

For modern readers, this depiction not only invites reflection on Dickens's narrative techniques but also prompts critical analysis of how such portrayals impact marginalized groups. Fagin's silence poignantly reflects both individual and collective marginalization and othering, serving as a stark reminder of the consequences of denying a voice to those positioned outside the dominant social order.

The article emphasizes that Fagin is positioned not only as an other within Victorian Christian society but also as a scapegoat. According to Paganoni, Fagin's question at the end of the story, "What right have they to butcher me?" highlights him as both a victim and a figure of defiance (Paganoni, 2010, p. 311). This statement is significant as it allows Fagin to articulate his societal exclusion and the injustice underlying it in his own words. It also critiques society's tendency to select a scapegoat and sacrifice them to maintain its moral order.

Fagin's final words reveal that he can be interpreted not just as a villain but as a symbol exposing the moral contradictions of Victorian society. By condemning Fagin, Dickens reaffirms Christian values while simultaneously making Fagin's marginalization and tragedy visible. This reflects society's attempt to resolve its guilt and flaws by projecting them onto another. Beyond his individual sins, Fagin becomes a figure bearing the collective fears and prejudices of a community.

Fagin's physical traits position him outside the norms of Victorian society. Susan Meyer notes that Dickens describes Fagin as "miserly," "obsequious," "cowardly," and "odd-looking," reinforcing anti-Semitic stereotypes (Meyer, 2005, pp. 239–240). These descriptions solidify Fagin as an other excluded by society.

Juliet John highlights the influence of Cruikshank's illustrations in shaping Fagin's image. In these illustrations, Fagin appears as a "rat-like" figure, dehumanized and grotesque (John, 2005, p. 212). This visual portrayal complements the literary depiction, making Fagin not just a narrative "other" but also a visual one.

In their analyses, Juliet John and Susan Meyer (2005) view the character of Fagin in *Oliver Twist* as a reflection of anti-Semitic prejudices prevalent in 19th-century England. However, this portrayal is not merely a reproduction of societal biases but can also be interpreted as an attempt at social critique. Fagin's depiction illustrates both the process of constructing an other and the use of this figure to interrogate the moral and social structures of Victorian society.

Fagin's physical traits position him as entirely outside the norms of Victorian society. Susan Meyer highlights Dickens's description of Fagin as "miserly," "obsequious," "cowardly," and "odd-looking," which reinforces anti-Semitic stereotypes (Meyer, 2005, pp. 239–240). These descriptions fix Fagin not only as an individual character but also as a societal other. His physical appearance creates a menacing figure that exists beyond the boundaries of Victorian social norms.

Juliet John emphasizes that this othering extends beyond the text, supported visually through Cruikshank's illustrations. Fagin is portrayed as "rat-like" and "dehumanized," presenting a grotesque and repellent figure (John, 2005, p. 212). These visual depictions further alienate Fagin, ensuring that readers perceive him as a foreign and threatening presence. This dual portrayal in literature and illustration constructs Fagin not just as an individual but as a collective representation of the Jewish community.

Susan Meyer interprets Dickens's emphasis on Fagin's Jewish identity as part of his critique of Victorian Christianity. According to Meyer, Dickens condemns the harsh and merciless treatment of the poor by English society as "unchristian" and uses Fagin as a counterpoint to this moral decay (Meyer, 2005, pp. 241–242). However, the focus on Fagin's Jewish identity complicates this critique. Fagin becomes a symbol of both non-Christianity and moral corruption (Meyer, 2005, p. 243).

Juliet John argues that Fagin's representation has become more contentious in the post-Holocaust era. His manipulative, demonic, and morally depraved traits perpetuate historical prejudices and caricatured perceptions of Jews (John, 2005, p. 214).

Fagin's leadership of child criminals serves as a reflection not only of his personal villainy but also of the moral degradation of Victorian society. Susan Meyer interprets Fagin's corruption of children as a mirror of England's own corrupt values

(Meyer, 2005, p. 245). Dickens, while emphasizing Fagin's villainy, invites readers to question society's moral boundaries.

Juliet John explores how Fagin evolves into a cultural "myth" and how this myth shapes Dickens's social critique (John, 2005, p. 216). This mythological dimension elevates Fagin from an individual character to a symbol embodying Victorian society's fears and prejudices.

Susan Meyer notes that Fagin is not depicted as wholly evil; in some respects, he is portrayed as a sympathetic character. His provision of shelter, food, and a sense of community to Oliver reveals his humanity (Meyer, 2005, p. 244). However, Dickens's simultaneous reproduction of anti-Semitic stereotypes and critique of societal values creates a complex and contradictory narrative.

This dual portrayal suggests that Fagin is not merely a figure of evil but also a tool for exposing society's flawed moral values. Fagin represents not only a reflection of anti-Semitic prejudices but also a symbol for understanding the human cost of social exclusion.

Some critics argue that Dickens did not intentionally express antisemitism in this portrayal but was influenced by the widespread prejudices of his time. Stone suggests that Dickens adhered to the cultural codes of his era, "associating moral decay with Jewish identity" in his creation of Fagin (1979, p. 102). However, this does not absolve Dickens of including antisemitic imagery in his work, even if unintentionally.

The presence of antisemitic elements in Dickens' work, irrespective of his individual intentions, highlights how prevailing perceptions of Jews during that era infiltrated artistic production and became normalized through literature. This observation, emphasized by critics, provides a crucial context for understanding how antisemitism was propagated not only through overt hostility but also through unconscious depictions. It underscores the subtle yet pervasive ways in which literature contributed to embedding and perpetuating societal prejudices.

Later in his career, Dickens responded to criticisms of Fagin's depiction by expressing sensitivity toward the Jewish community. For instance, the Jewish character Riah in *Our Mutual Friend* offers a positive representation. However, this does not erase the biased approach seen in Fagin's portrayal. Morris argues that these

corrective efforts were “far from sufficient to mitigate the antisemitism reinforced by the societal perception of Fagin” (1991, p. 67).

This demonstrates that Dickens was aware of the shifts in his representations of Jewish characters, though these changes could not entirely erase the antisemitic impact of his earlier depictions. Fagin’s negative portrayal catered to the societal prejudices of the time, deepening these perceptions on a literary level. While characters like Riah reflect Dickens’ attempt to adopt a more balanced approach, the enduring influence of Fagin’s negative Jewish imagery remains a significant part of literary history.

In this context, Dickens’ later works can be seen as efforts to reassess the biases present in his earlier writings. However, as Morris notes, such attempts were insufficient to undo the societal impact of the antisemitic stereotypes established in the past. This highlights the lasting effect of these depictions, even when corrective measures are taken.

Although Dickens asserted that he was not antisemitic in creating Fagin, the character’s stereotypical depiction reflects the prejudices of his era, carrying antisemitic undertones. This underscores the need to critique antisemitism in his works, irrespective of the author’s intentions.

Many critics believe that Dickens created Riah to apologize for the harmful stereotypes he used when creating Fagin. During the Victorian period, attitudes towards Jewish people were changing, and Dickens might have been trying to show this shift in his writing.

Critics have praised Dickens for making Riah so different from Fagin, with some even calling Riah the “anti-Shylock” because he is the opposite of Shakespeare’s stereotypical Jewish villain. This shows how Dickens was trying to move away from negative stereotypes and create more realistic and nuanced characters (Grass, 1971, p. 171).

Dickens presents an important shift in portrayal of Jewish characters with Riah in *Our Mutual Friend*. While Riah’s job as a money-lender might seem like a stereotypical Jewish profession, Dickens avoids other common negative clichés. He is not portrayed as a devilish character with exaggerated features. Instead, he is kind, gentle, and helps other characters like Jenny and Lizzie.

Another explanation, which complies with the first one, is that as Victorian society became more open-minded, Dickens was more likely to listen to what Mrs. Davis had to say. Between 1830 and 1860, the lives of English Jews got a lot better. As one source puts it, “Legal barriers were swept away, commercial restrictions removed, and social antagonisms lessened” (Wilson, 1965, p. 54). In 1830, England had around twenty to thirty thousand Jewish people, and most of them were peddlers, used clothing dealers, or moneylenders. Back then, “A Jew could not open a shop ... [in] London, be called to the Bar, receive a university degree, or sit in Parliament.” But things changed a lot in the next thirty years. By 1858, Baron Lionel Rothschild became a member of Parliament, and England was even on its way to having a Jewish Prime Minister, even though he had converted to Christianity (p. 54).

It is quite possible that Dickens’ own opinions were changing along with the more accepting attitudes of the time. When he was a young man working on *Bentley’s Miscellany*, he published some writings that were definitely anti-Semitic. And in his letters from the 1830s and 1840s, he uses the word “Jew” as an insult to describe dishonest business dealings, even when the people involved were not Jewish (Stone, 1960, p. 24)

Up until the 1850s, Dickens’ periodicals, *Household Words* and *All the Year Round*, still had some anti-Semitic hints in them, but the tone was much less harsh than what he had written earlier in *Bentley’s Miscellany*. In his 1851 book, *Child’s History of England*, he did speak out against the mistreatment of Jewish people, something he later reminded Mrs. Davis about. Even so, looking back from today’s perspective, Dickens’ personal feelings about Jewish people still were not great. In 1860, when he was selling his London house, Tavistock House, to the Davises, he wrote, “If the Jew Money-Lender buys (I say 'if,' because of course I shall never believe him until he has paid the money).” And when the sale was finished, he wrote: “Tavistock House is cleared to-day, and possession delivered up to the new tenant. I must say that in all things the purchaser has behaved thoroughly well, and that I cannot call to mind any occasion when I have had money-dealings with anyone that have been so satisfactory, considerate and trusting.” It's interesting to note that the “Jew Money-Lender” he was talking about was married to the same Mrs. Davis whose letters to Dickens are believed to have inspired him to create the character of Mr. Riah (Lane, 1958, p. 98)

Mr. Riah is developed in many ways as a direct opposite to Fagin. Riah embodies honesty, faithfulness, moral uprightness, modesty, and a selfless, kindhearted concern for the less fortunate and defenseless. An Old Testament patriarch in the novel, in his meeting with his employer, he initially describes him as:

> An old Jewish man in an ancient coat, long of skirt, and wide of pocket. A venerable man, bald and shining at the top of his head, and with long grey hair flowing down at its sides and mingling with his beard. A man who with a graceful Eastern action of homage bent his head, and stretched out his hands with the palms downward, as if to deprecate the wrath of a superior (Dickens, 1971, p. 328).

Regarding his clothes, we discover, "In the entry hung his rusty large-brimmed low-crowned hat, as long out of date as his coat; in the corner near it stood his staff—no walking-stick but a veritable staff " (p. 328). As he was going up the stairs, "As he toiled on before, with his palm upon the stair-rail, and his long black skirt, a very gaberdine, overhanging each successive step, he might have been the leader in some pilgrimage of devotional ascent to a prophet's tomb" (p. 332).

The biggest contrast between Fagin and Riah is how they treat children and young people. Fagin is a dark figure who takes advantage of children, even though he pretends to be a nice leader. Riah, on the other hand, is a more serious but kind protector. He takes care of two hardworking, good young women; Jenny Wren, who has a hunchback and a cruel, alcoholic father, and Lizzie Hexam, an orphan whose father was a "riverman" who pulled bodies out of the Thames. Riah gives them a safe place to live, teaches them right from wrong, and makes sure they get "book-learning" (Dickens 1971).

Jenny calls Mr. Riah as her "fairy godmother" or simply "godmother," depicting her not only at his role as a benefactor and also a protector. We encounter him "stealing through the streets in his ancient dress, like the ghost of a departed Time," (p. 465) and the "long black skirt" is repeatedly emphasized: his "long-skirted coat" (p. 462); "his grave and measured pace, staff in hand, skirt at heel" (p. 480); and when Jenny discovers her father has died, she seeks solace from her fairy godmother by "hiding her face in the Jewish skirts." (p. 801).

One very important thing about Mr. Riah is that he clearly has no sexual desires at all. This is a key part of why he can be a protector for both Jenny and Lizzie. It is especially important in his relationship with Lizzie because, according to the social

rules of Victorian times, her “virtue” and “innocence” are in danger in a way that is different from what Oliver faces. Lizzie strictly falls in love with Eugene Wrayburn, a lawyer from a wealthy background who is drawn to her and respects her, but he does not seriously consider marrying her. Recognizing the potential harm, Riah helps Lizzie fulfill her desire to leave this dangerous situation by finding her a job with a Jewish couple who operate a paper mill quite a distance from London. Lizzie will later remark about her employers, saying, “The gentleman certainly is a Jew ... and the lady, his wife, is a Jewess, and I was first brought to their notice by a Jew. But I think there cannot be kinder people in the World” (p. 579). Riah’s generous and unselfish care for Lizzie’s well-being stands in stark opposition to Fagin, who takes advantage of Nancy for his own selfish benefit. However, it is crucial to note that Fagin’s almost legendary status, similar to Riah’s, also makes something as normal as sexual desire unimportant. In his capacity as a typical Victorian protector of a young woman’s chastity, Riah actually resembles a previous Dickens character, the benevolent Mr. Pickwick, although Riah doesn’t have the happy and energetic nature that Mr. Pickwick has (Heller, 1990, p. 52).

Dickens tries to create a good Jewish character named Riah, but even he ends up in a bad situation. Riah works for a really mean loan shark named Fascination Fledgeby. Fledgeby is greedy and cruel but hides behind his business, Pubsey and Co., using Riah as a cover. Riah is compelled to relay the harsh terms dictated by Fledgeby to Pubsey’s clients.

Riah has to be the one to tell people the awful loan terms Fledgeby sets, making everyone think he is the bad guy even though he is just an employee. Fledgeby thinks this is hilarious and constantly insults Riah with anti-Semitic slurs, both to others and directly to his face. He even boasts about how much of a “Jew” Riah is, playing on harmful stereotypes “He is a thorough Jew to look at, but he is a more thorough Jew to deal with” (pp. 634-635). Fledgeby humiliates Riah through a client, and he constantly maintains this mock for his own private entertainment: “Now, old 'un!' cried Fascination, in his light raillery, what dodgery are you up to next, sitting there with your eyes shut? You ain't asleep. Catch a weasel at it, and catch a Jew!” (p. 481). Faced with his unreasonable anti-Semitic humiliations, Riah respond with a timid question: “Do you not, sir - without intending it ... sometimes mingle the character I fairly earn

in your employment, with the character which it is your policy that I should bear?" (p. 482). Riah is powerless against Fledgeby's constant abuse and can only meekly ask if Fledgeby realizes that he is mixing up Riah's true character with the fake one he has to portray for the business. This shows how even when Dickens tries to create a positive Jewish character, he still falls back on harmful stereotypes and puts them in situations where they are mistreated and powerless. This shows how even when Dickens tries to create a positive Jewish character, he still falls back on harmful stereotypes and puts them in situations where they are mistreated and powerless.

Even though Dickens tries to portray Riah as a good person, it is hard to believe someone so kind and honest would end up in such a terrible situation. Dickens seems to realize this and tries to explain it by saying Riah is extremely poor and feels indebted to Fledgeby's father, who forgave his debts: "I had sickness and misfortunes, and was so poor,' said the old man, 'as hopelessly to owe the father, principal and interest. The son inheriting, was so merciful as to forgive me both, and place me here" (p. 329). Dickens even points out that Riah is a "grateful servant" and emphasizes that gratitude is a strong trait in his race (p. 335). However, it seems like Dickens is more interested in what Riah's situation represents symbolically than in making it realistic. He seems to be using Riah to make a point about Jewish people and gratitude, even if it means putting a good character in an unbelievable position.

The portrayal of Riah and his relationship with Fledgeby is shaped by a broader socio-historical context, a characteristic often found in Dickens's later novels. Dickens makes this perspective clear in the novel where Riah goes to Fledgeby's doorstep "door with the top of his staff, and, having listened, sat down on the threshold. It was characteristic of his habitual submission, that he sat down on the raw dark staircase, as many of his ancestors had probably sat down in dungeons, taking what befell him as it might befall" (p. 480). Even the simple act of Riah sitting on Fledgeby's doorstep is given a deeper meaning because Dickens compares it to his ancestors submitting to imprisonment. It shows how Dickens uses small details to say something bigger about the relationship between Riah and Fledgeby, and about how Jewish people have been treated throughout history.

Fledgeby, who seems to really enjoy being cruel, takes things too far when he makes Riah look like a bad guy in front of Jenny Wren, comparing him to the heartless

Shylock. At first, Fledgeby enjoys seeing Jenny turn against Riah, calling him a "wicked Wolf!" (p. 638). But this backfires on Fledgeby. Seeing Jenny so disappointed in him makes Riah feel awful about himself, and he decides to quit his job working for Fledgeby. However, this reaction from Riah seems a bit late and not entirely believable. It mainly serves a symbolic purpose, highlighting the shared responsibility of Jewish people, a theme that emerges rather late in the story:

> I reflected ... that I was doing dishonour to my ancient faith and race. I reflected ... that in bending my neck to the yoke I was willing to wear, I bent the unwilling necks of the whole Jewish people. For it is not, in Christian countries, with the Jews as with other peoples. Men say, "This is a bad Greek, but there are good Greeks. This is a bad Turk, but there are good Turks." Not so with the Jews ... they take the worst of us as samples of the best ... and they say "All Jews are alike." If, doing what I was content to do here, because I was grateful for the past... I had been a Christian, I could have done it, compromising no one but my individual self. But doing it as a Jew, I could not choose but compromise the Jews of all conditions and all countries. It is a little hard upon us, but it is the truth. I would that all our people remembered it! (p.795)

Riah regrets enabling Fledgeby's anti-Semitic behavior and feels saddened by the lack of positive Jewish representation. He observes that Jewish characters are often treated as unchanging stereotypes, unlike characters of other backgrounds. Dickens uses this to highlight how, even in a time of progress and literary experimentation, Jewish people are still mostly portrayed as "bad Jews" with no counter-examples of "good Jews" in literature.

Throughout the novel, Riah consistently appears more as a symbolic figure than a real person. It is almost unnecessary to point out the common belief that, Riah completely short of the lively energy that Fagin possesses. One critic, commenting on the unconvincing portrayal of the "good Jew" that Riah embodies, accurately notes, "Riah and his type will not bleed if you prick them."(Rosenberg, 1960, p. 69).

In *Our Mutual Friend,* Dickens wants to show us that the so-called "Good Society" is really not that different from the criminals they claim to be above. They support and enable each other, making them almost impossible to tell apart. For instance, when we look at Fascination Fledgeby. He is a shady character involved in shady financial dealings; "a kind of outlaw in the bill-broking line ... His circle of familiar acquaintances, from Mr. Lammle round, all had a touch of the outlaw, as to their rovings in the merry greenwood of Jobbery Forest, lying on the outskirts of the

Share-Market and the Stock Exchange" (p. 324). He has ties to both the good and the bad parts of society. He is a distant relative of Twemlow, who is a good person but not very strong, and he is even related to the important Lord Snigsworth. But at the same time, Fledgeby is friends and partners in crime with the Lammles. The Lammles are accepted by society until they lose all their money and have to run away.

Fledgeby pretends to be Riah's kind and generous friend ("Generous Christian master"[p. 328]) while secretly taking advantage of him, just like the stereotypical cruel moneylender, Shylock.

Dickens subtly connects Fledgeby to Fagin, the villainous Jewish character from *Oliver Twist*, further emphasizing the anti-Semitic undertones in Fledgeby's treatment of Riah. Alfred Lammle, who understands Fledgeby's character, remarks, "When money is in question with that young fellow, he is a match for the Devil" (p. 319), linking Fledgeby to a deceitful, evil figure. This connection is strengthened when Fledgeby forces Riah to embody the stereotype of a Jewish moneylender Twemlow and Jenny Wren. Dickens describes Fledgeby as "merry" during this interaction, a word previously used to characterize both Fagin and the devil, further solidifying the association. Fledgeby's deep-seated hatred for Riah appears to stem from his own insecurities and cruel nature, mirroring the irrational hatred often exhibited by anti-Semites.

Fledgeby exploits Riah's Jewish identity for his own gain, stating, "he has got a bad name as an old Jew, and he is paid for the use of it, and I'll have my money's worth of him" (Dickens, 1971, p. 338). This shows how societal prejudice against Jews allowed Fledgeby to blame his unethical actions on Riah. This contrast between Riah's inherent goodness and Fledgeby's manipulation further emphasizes Dickens' attempt to move away from harmful stereotypes and portray a Jewish character defined by his virtue which is namely Riah.

Riah remains calm and does not seek revenge against his exploitative boss, Fledgeby, for much of the novel. However, as the story progresses, he becomes increasingly saddened by his situation and realizes how Fledgeby has taken advantage of him. He understands that by accepting his role and allowing his Jewish identity to be used negatively, he is harming the representation of all Jewish people. He confesses to Jenny, "I reflected--clearly reflected for the first time, that in bending my neck to

the yoke I was willing to wear, I bent the unwilling necks of the whole Jewish people" (Dickens, 1971, p. 335). Eventually, Riah ends his work contract with Fledgeby, revealing Fledgeby's true nature as the villain to the world. Through Riah's story, Dickens effectively criticizes the socially constructed negative image of Jewish people and raises awareness about the irrationality of this prejudice.

Eugene Wrayburn is a lazy and unmotivated guy who is attracted to Lizzie, even though she is from a lower social class. He wants to take advantage of her, which is clearly wrong. Bradley Headstone, who is also obsessed with Lizzie, tries to kill Eugene by drowning him. Lizzie saves Eugene, but he is badly hurt and thinks he is going to die. This near-death experience makes him realize how much Lizzie loves him and how terribly he is treated her. He marries her as a way to make amends for his evil behavior, even though he believes he does not have long to live. Dickens describes him after the attack as "the utter helplessness of the wreck of him" (p. 824). Eugene faces serious consequences for his actions towards a virtuous woman. She eventually begins to heal and become a better person. By the end of the novel, he is on the path to physical and moral recovery, ready for a new life with Lizzie filled with love, hard work, and goodness. He transforms from being almost a villain to one of the heroes, alongside Harmon/Rokesmith (Dickens, 1971).

Besides being lazy and arrogant in his pursuit of Lizzie, he does something else really offensive that never seems to be addressed; even with Lizzie right there, he still says prejudiced things to Riah, and what is worse Lizzie has just been through something really upsetting.

Bradley Headstone, in a scary way, proposed marriage to her, and when she said no, her own brother, who is Headstone's student, cruelly turned against her. Riah finds Lizzie upset and tries to comfort her. He is about to take her back to his place so she can calm down, and that is when Eugene shows up. Lizzie asks Eugene to leave them alone, but he does not listen at all. Instead, he says, "But, Lizzie, I came expressly to join you. I came to walk home with you ... And I have been lingering about,' added Eugene, 'like a bailiff; or,' with a look at Riah, 'an old clothesman" (p. 463).

By comparing Riah to "an old clothesman," Eugene is using a common anti-Semitic stereotype. It is a really cruel thing to say, especially given that Riah is trying to help Lizzie. This incident shows a very prejudiced side of Eugene.

Even though Lizzie calls Riah her "savior or rescuer" and "a reliable fellow man," Eugene continues to act badly:

> If Mr. Aaron, said Eugene, who soon found this fatiguing, will be good enough to relinquish his charge to me, he will be quite free for any engagement he may have at the Synagogue. Mr. Aaron, will you have the kindness?
> But the old man stood stock still.
> Good evening, Mr. Aaron, said Eugene, politely; "we need not detain you." Then turning to Lizzie, "Is our friend Mr. Aaron a little deaf? (p. 464).

Even though Eugene might seem nicer than Fledgeby, who cruelly calls Riah "Judah" to erase his individual identity (p. 786), Eugene also talks about Riah in a way that is really prejudiced. He uses a language to dehumanize Riah in a way that is clearly anti-semitic. When Eugene assumes Riah would rather go to "any engagement he may have at the Synagogue" than help Lizzie, he is basically saying that Riah's Jewish identity stops him from caring about people from other religions. This shows how Eugene also sees Riah as a stereotype, not as a real person, which is a big part of anti-Semitism.

It gets even worse when Eugene keeps calling Riah "Mr. Aaron," making him seem even more like a Jewish stereotype instead of a real person. Even though Lizzie wants Riah to stay with her, she does not feel like she can tell Eugene to leave. So, the three of them end up walking to Lizzie's house together, and nobody mentions going to Riah's house anymore (p. 465). This whole scene shows how Eugene's casual prejudice against Jewish people makes everyone uncomfortable, which the book never really criticizes him for acting this way.

Eugene acts regretfully towards Riah. Even though he is supposed to be changing into a better person by the end of the story, he never seems to understand or feel bad about how poorly he treated Riah. Someone trying to become a better person would realize and take on their mistakes, but that does not happen with Eugene.

And it is not just Eugene. After Riah helps Lizzie get away from London, she never sees him again in the story. He is not even invited to her wedding, which would normally be a time for people to come together and forgive past wrongs, both in literature and real life. It is like the whole thing is just brushed aside and forgotten. The story only focuses on Eugene seeking forgiveness from Lizzie, his mistreatment

of Riah, who Lizzie herself called her "protector" and "trustworthy friend," is completely ignored.

Throughout the novel we as readers expecting Eugene feels sorry for his anti-Semitism even though it is not directly stated. But there is no clear indication of this. When Fledgeby, the real villain behind Pubsey and Co., is exposed, he gets a very direct punishment. Alfred Lammle shoves salt and snuff in his mouth and then gives him "as furious and sound a thrashing as even Mr. Fledgeby merited" (p. 792). Even Jenny Wren gets her revenge on Fledgeby for lying about Riah. She puts pepper, vinegar, and brown paper on his wounds to make him hurt even more.

Thus, both of the characters who mistreat Riah get what is coming to them in very obvious ways. But with Eugene, it is different. While he does change his ways, it is not connected to how badly he treated Riah. It is like the Dickens forgets about that part entirely.

When we look at how Dickens portrays his two most important Jewish characters, Fagin in *Oliver Twist* and Riah in *Our Mutual Friend*, we can see how much his views on morality and society changed over the 25 years between the two books. Examining Dickens' Jewish characters through a socio-cultural lens helps us understand the complex social and economic forces at play during the Victorian era. While Fagin embodies the pervasive anti-Semitism of his time, Riah suggests a growth in Dickens' own social awareness, reflecting a more empathetic view of Jewish people (Ledger, 2007, p. 195). This shift in his writing highlights how Dickens' portrayal of Jewish characters reflects the changing social and cultural landscape of Victorian England, particularly regarding its Jewish community.

Charles Dickens' views on Jewish people were influenced by the social and cultural norms of Victorian England. Early in his career, he sometimes depicted Jewish characters using harmful stereotypes that were prevalent at the time. However, as he grew and became more socially aware, his portrayals shifted to present more positive and complex Jewish characters. This evolution in his writing reflects both the prejudices of Victorian society and Dickens' own personal development. By studying his works, we can gain a deeper understanding of how Jewish people were represented in literature and the social dynamics.

4.2. Jews in Joyce's *Ulysses*

James Joyce stands out as a pivotal figure in 20th-century literature, celebrated for his innovative writing style and significant contributions to modernist literature. His works, often set in Dublin, delve into the complexities of Irish society, culture, and religion. Joyce's exploration of Jewishness or being a jew, particularly through the character of Leopold Bloom in his renowned novel *Ulysses* is worth to be analyzed in this regard. How Joyce approaches the portrayal of Jewish characters and how he addresses the theme of anti-Semitism within the social and cultural context of his time will be discussed.

Ellmann (1982) notes that Joyce's interest in Jewish culture began during his time in Trieste. As a cosmopolitan city where various ethnic and religious groups coexisted, Trieste provided a fertile environment for intellectual and cultural exchange. It was here that Joyce encountered Jewish intellectuals, which undoubtedly enriched his worldview. Among these interactions, his friendship with Italo Svevo (Ettore Schmitz) played a particularly influential role, as Svevo's Jewish heritage and intellectual background offered Joyce a personal gateway into Jewish traditions and experiences (Ellmann, 1982, p. 245).

This environment not only exposed Joyce to Jewish cultural and philosophical thought but also allowed him to grapple with broader questions of identity, otherness, and belonging. It is worth noting that Joyce's fascination with Jewish identity extended beyond mere curiosity; it was deeply intertwined with his own exploration of marginalization and cultural hybridity. Living as an expatriate in a city like Trieste, Joyce may have found parallels between the Jewish experience of diaspora and his own Irish identity, marked by colonialism and displacement. This resonance could explain his empathetic portrayal of Leopold Bloom in *Ulysses*, a character who embodies both the ordinary and the outsider, navigating a complex web of cultural affiliations.

In many ways, Joyce's engagement with Jewish culture was not only an intellectual pursuit but also a means of enriching his literary imagination. The intersection of Jewish themes with his own Irish Catholic background allowed him to create a nuanced dialogue on religion, identity, and exile themes that resonate universally. Trieste thus becomes more than just a backdrop for Joyce's personal

growth; it is a microcosm of the multicultural influences that shaped his literary genius. This dynamic interplay of cultures, ideas, and identities underscores the richness of Joyce's works, making them timeless explorations of human complexity.

When James Joyce was writing, the Jewish population in Ireland was relatively small. Jewish people began immigrating to Ireland in the late 1800s, settling primarily in cities like Dublin and Cork. This community, largely made up of immigrants from Eastern Europe, remained a small minority within Irish society (Kaufman, 2007, p. 45). Prejudices and anti-Semitic attitudes were not uncommon in Ireland during this period, which is a factor that is important to consider when analyzing how Joyce portrays Jewish characters in his works.

Throughout his life, James Joyce made numerous friendships with Jewish individuals and developed a close affinity for Jewish culture. These relationships fostered a deeper sensitivity and interest in the themes of Jewishness and anti-Semitism within his work. During his time in Trieste, in particular, Joyce spent a significant amount of time with Jewish friends, integrating himself in their culture. These experiences contributed to the delicate and authentic portrayal of Jewish characters in his writing (Stanislaus Joyce, 1950, p. 95).

Joyce's interest in Jews extended beyond personal relationships; he also engaged deeply with Jewish history and religious texts. Ellmann (1982) points out that Joyce studied the Old Testament and other Jewish religious writings, integrating these insights into his literary works (p. 276). This profound knowledge laid the groundwork for the sensitivity and authenticity with which Joyce approached Jewish characters and themes.

This intellectual engagement reveals Joyce's methodical approach to understanding the cultural and spiritual dimensions of Judaism. His exploration of Jewish texts was not superficial; it reflected a genuine effort to grasp the philosophical and ethical nuances of a tradition that had endured centuries of diaspora and adversity. For instance, the intricate references to Jewish customs and biblical motifs in *Ulysses* demonstrate Joyce's ability to weave religious symbolism seamlessly into his narrative structure, enriching his exploration of identity, faith, and morality.

Moreover, Joyce's interest in Jewish themes likely stemmed from a deeper empathy for marginalized groups. As an Irishman living under British colonial rule,

Joyce may have found a kinship in the Jewish experience of alienation and resilience. This connection is evident in his portrayal of Leopold Bloom, a character whose Jewish identity serves as both a point of distinction and a source of prejudice. By embedding Bloom's Jewishness within the broader tapestry of Dublin life, Joyce not only humanizes the character but also challenges prevailing stereotypes, inviting readers to reconsider their own biases.

Joyce's engagement with Jewish texts also reflects his broader fascination with the intersection of religion, culture, and human behavior. His ability to draw on the richness of Jewish traditions, while simultaneously critiquing institutionalized religion, highlights his unique perspective as a writer. Through this lens, Joyce's works transcend their immediate cultural context, offering timeless meditations on the complexities of belief, belonging, and the human condition.

Joyce's personal observations were deeply intertwined with his exploration of Jewish themes in his writing. He was acutely aware of the prevailing attitudes towards Jews in Dublin and other European cities, and he reflected these observations into his narratives. Therefore, the theme of Jewishness in Joyce's work surpasses mere fictional invention, rather it serves as a reflection of the author's own experiences and insights (Nadel, 1996, p. 112).

James Joyce's *Ulysses* is widely regarded as a cornerstone of modernist literature, offering a vivid and realistic portrayal of everyday life and social dynamics in Dublin. One of the novel's central figures, Leopold Bloom, a Jewish man navigating the city streets, becomes a lens through which Joyce explores the complexities of Jewish identity and the social prejudices of the time (Ellmann, 1982, p. 125). As Bloom goes about his day, he is subjected to ostracism and mockery due to his heritage, with Joyce unflinchingly depicting the anti-Semitic attitudes he faces. A striking example occurs in the "Cyclops" chapter, where Bloom endures hateful insults and prejudice while at a bar, highlighting the pervasive discrimination of the era (Joyce, 1986, pp. 288-295).

Bloom's character embodies both Jewish identity and the experience of alienation within Irish society. Ellmann (1982) highlights that Bloom is often perceived as an outsider in Dublin and subjected to antisemitic prejudices (p. 322).

This portrayal is crucial in Joyce's critique of societal biases, as it exposes the pervasive discrimination and narrow-mindedness within his contemporary society.

Bloom's Jewish identity is explored in nuanced ways throughout the novel. In the "Cyclops" episode, his confrontation with the nationalist character Citizen brings issues of Jewish identity and antisemitism into sharp focus. Bloom's response, "Your God was a Jew. Jesus was a Jew like me," not only asserts his identity but also directly challenges antisemitic rhetoric (Joyce, 1922/1986, p. 345). This moment is both personal and symbolic, as it underscores Bloom's refusal to conform to the stereotypes imposed upon him.

Ellmann interprets this scene as a reflection of Joyce's critique of narrow nationalism and religious intolerance (1982, p. 346). The Citizen, with his fervent Irish nationalism, represents an exclusionary ideology that opposes the pluralistic vision Joyce advocates. Through Bloom's calm yet firm defense, Joyce dismantles the binary oppositions of us versus them, illustrating the absurdity of prejudice based on religion or ethnicity.

Furthermore, Bloom's outsider status in Dublin mirrors Joyce's broader exploration of displacement and identity. As an Irish Catholic expatriate, Joyce was intimately familiar with the tension between belonging and exclusion. By portraying Bloom, a Jew in a predominantly Catholic society, as both ordinary and extraordinary, Joyce forces readers to confront their own assumptions about identity and otherness.

The "Cyclops" episode, with its interplay of humor, tension, and profound insight, becomes a microcosm of Joyce's critique of societal hypocrisy. Bloom's humanity, juxtaposed with the Citizen's dogmatic rigidity, ultimately elevates the novel's exploration of tolerance and coexistence, making *Ulysses* a timeless commentary on the struggles of the marginalized in any society.

Joyce skillfully portrays anti-Semitic characters and Jewish stereotypes in his work. These characters contain the pervasive prejudices that existed within Irish society during that period. The people Bloom encounters ridicule his Jewish identity and treat him with hostility. By giving voice to these characters, Joyce critiques anti-Semitism and prompts readers to confront the irrationality of such prejudices (Schwarz, 1995, p. 142).

The theme of exile, a recurring motif in Joyce's works, closely parallels the Jewish experience of displacement. Bloom's wandering through the streets of Dublin serves as a metaphor for the Jewish diaspora and its enduring legacy of exile. Ellmann states that Joyce saw himself as an exile, which allowed him to identify deeply with the Jewish experience of alienation and uprootedness (1982, p. 275). This sense of connection is pivotal to Joyce's empathetic and nuanced portrayal of Jewish characters.

Joyce's own life, marked by self-imposed exile from Ireland, provides a personal lens through which he explored themes of belonging and dislocation. Like the Jewish diaspora, Joyce grappled with the tension between a longing for home and the freedom found in distance. In this way, Bloom's experiences in *Ulysses* not only reflect Jewish historical struggles but also serve as an extension of Joyce's own identity as an outsider.

Bloom's role as a Jewish character navigating a predominantly Catholic society encapsulates this duality of belonging and exclusion. His wanderings, both physical and metaphorical, resonate with the universal human desire to find a place in the world while confronting the barriers imposed by societal prejudice. Joyce's ability to weave this theme into Bloom's narrative highlights his remarkable skill in using individual experiences to comment on broader cultural and historical realities.

Furthermore, Joyce's identification with the exile experience enriched his literary perspective, allowing him to craft characters who transcend simplistic categorizations. His portrayal of Bloom reflects not only a deep understanding of Jewish identity but also an acknowledgment of the shared struggles of all marginalized groups. This intersection of personal and collective exile underscores the universal relevance of *Ulysses*, making it a profound exploration of displacement, identity, and the human condition.

The novel is enriched with Jewish symbolism and themes, offering a layered narrative that intertwines cultural and religious references. While Bloom's journey parallels Homer's *Odyssey*, it also alludes to the Israelites' forty years of wandering in the desert. This dual symbolism situates Bloom's experiences within a universal framework while simultaneously drawing upon Jewish cultural and religious traditions

(Ellmann, 1982, p. 298). Such intertextuality underscores Joyce's ability to merge classical and biblical motifs, creating a narrative that resonates on multiple levels.

Bloom's wanderings, much like the Israelites' journey, signify not only physical displacement but also a quest for identity and belonging. The alignment of these two archetypal journeys highlights the timeless and cross-cultural nature of exile and perseverance. This subtle yet profound connection between Homeric and Jewish narratives enriches the novel's thematic depth, offering a nuanced exploration of displacement, faith, and resilience.

Additionally, Molly Bloom's character introduces elements of Jewish femininity and matrilineal heritage, adding another dimension to the novel's engagement with Jewish identity. Ellmann (1982) observes that Molly's characterization challenges traditional gender and cultural norms, reflecting Joyce's progressive views on identity and intersectionality (p. 310). Molly's sexuality, independence, and complexity defy the stereotypical representations of women, particularly within patriarchal frameworks, making her a pivotal figure in the narrative.

Through Molly, Joyce subtly incorporates matrilineal aspects of Jewish tradition, where lineage is traced through the mother, into a broader commentary on identity and legacy. Her role as both Bloom's wife and a symbol of cultural continuity creates a dynamic interplay between personal relationships and collective heritage. Molly's presence in the novel, therefore, is not merely complementary to Bloom's journey but a parallel exploration of identity, tradition, and the boundaries of societal expectations.

In combining these elements, Joyce crafts a narrative that transcends its immediate cultural and historical context, offering insights into the intersections of identity, gender, and tradition. The use of Jewish symbolism and themes not only deepens the novel's universal appeal but also reaffirms Joyce's commitment to exploring the complexities of human experience in all its diversity.

In *Ulysses*, Joyce confronts antisemitism, using the novel as a platform to critique the prejudices and discrimination pervasive in his time. The antisemitic attitudes Bloom encounters highlight Joyce's effort to expose the irrationality and cruelty of such biases (Ellmann, 1982, p. 335). By presenting Bloom's experiences

with sensitivity and depth, Joyce challenges the stereotypes and dehumanizing portrayals of Jews that were common in early 20th-century literature.

Bloom's character stands in stark contrast to the caricatured and often negative representations of Jewish individuals in contemporary narratives. Joyce humanizes the Jewish experience, portraying Bloom as a complex, empathetic, and relatable figure. Through his trials and interactions, Bloom embodies universal struggles, alienation, belonging, and identity, while remaining grounded in his particular cultural and religious context. This duality enables Joyce to create a character who transcends societal labels, inviting readers to view him not as an "other" but as a reflection of shared humanity.

Additionally, Joyce's critique of antisemitism extends beyond individual characters to address the broader societal structures that perpetuate discrimination. By weaving these themes into the fabric of *Ulysses*, Joyce not only critiques the prejudices of his era but also offers a progressive and inclusive vision for literature. His portrayal of Bloom serves as a counter-narrative to the prevailing antisemitic tropes, making *Ulysses* a groundbreaking work in its empathetic and respectful depiction of Jewish identity.

In doing so, Joyce elevates his novel beyond a mere reflection of its time, positioning it as a timeless exploration of prejudice and humanity. By challenging the entrenched stereotypes of his contemporaries, Joyce not only enriches the literary canon but also advocates for a more compassionate and nuanced understanding of cultural and religious diversity.

Leopold Bloom is not like the other Jewish characters. People usually see him as a kind of "everyman" figure. Now, this does not mean he is on a inner journey or search for meaning. Instead, he is like an average person you might encounter at the street, but Bloom is a more devoloped character, he has a fully realized version. He is both ordinary and extraordinary all at once. He tries to be a good husband, even though he can't help but be tempted by other women. He manages to make ends meet financially, but he often has to get creative to do so. He enjoys music and appreciates art. He knows a lot of people but is not particularly close to anyone. He can be a bit stingy and set in his ways, preferring to avoid conflict unless a situation calls for him to be brave. He is a mourning father who unexpectedly finds a kind of spiritual son

along the way. And even though he is always on the move, he always seems to find his way back home (p. 96).

While Leopold Bloom has Jewish ancestry, he does not fully embrace a Jewish identity. His mother was Jewish, but his father converted from Judaism to Christianity. Bloom is often treated as an outsider in Irish society and regularly encounters anti-Semitism. This complex background makes his search for belonging and his attempts to find his place within society even more challenging (Goldman, 1992, p. 56).

Bloom does not fit exactly into typical ideas of Jewish identity. He was not raised in a particularly Jewish way, and his family history is mixed, his father even converted into Christianity. However, in the context of Ireland and Dublin, where Jewish people are a tiny minority, Bloom is definitely perceived as Jewish. His name, his appearance, even the way others see him - it all marks him as different. He might even agree that he has a "Jewish soul" inside, even if he would not express it that way himself (pp. 96-97).

Through Leopold Bloom, Joyce explores the theme of Jewishness while simultaneously emphasizing Bloom's humanity and the universality of his experiences. Bloom's everyday struggles, joys, and sorrows make him a relatable and universal character. While Joyce acknowledges Bloom's Jewish identity as a significant aspect of his character, he also highlights Bloom's inherent humanity and individuality (Ellmann, 1982, p. 133).

Unlike the radical religious Jews or Christians, Bloom is open-minded and humanist, preferring dialogue over conflict to resolve disagreements. Especially, Joyce's portrayal of Bloom avoids traditional Jewish stereotypes, suggesting a successful effort in redefining Jewish representation in literature. He maintains friendships with many Jewish individuals, however; he does not fit the stereotype of a strictly religious Jew who has hatred towards Christians. Instead, he has a modernist perspective, reflecting 20th-century ideals. He represents an open-minded Jewish individual dealing with uncertainties about his own religious and racial identity, which is a theme commonly found in modernist literature.

Another character fitting this description is Leon Blum, who is a Jewish individual and keeps away from conventional stereotypes. Unlike the stereotypical Jewish merchant or money-lender, Leon Blum occupies a significant and distinct

position in society as a Jewish socialist politician. He defends unity and integration, advocating for "union for all" instead of promoting religious segregation or hatred. As it is stated in the novel:

> I stand for the reform of municipal morals and the plain Ten Commandments. New worlds for old. Union of all, Jew, Muslims, and gentile. Three acres and a cow for all children of nature... All parks open to the public day and night. Electric dish scrubbers. Tuberculosis, lunacy, war and mendicancy must now cease. General amnesty, weekly carnival with masked license, bonuses for all, Esperanto the universal language with universal brotherhood... Free money, free rent, free love, and a free lay church in a free lay state (Joyce, 1922, p. 399).

Bloom is trying to figure out who he is, and during one hallucination, he remembers hiding pig's feet from his father. Eating pork is against Jewish tradition, so this memory is important. He finds comfort in thinking about his father and his childhood. Another time, he can only remember parts of a Passover[24] song from his childhood. It is like his identity is in pieces, just like the song. But this does not mean he is not Jewish anymore. It actually shows how important his culture and background are to him. When he gets home, he sees the Haggadah[25] "in which a pair of hornrimmed convex spectacles inserted marked the passage of thanksgiving in the ritual prayers for Passover" (Joyce, 1922, p. 594) that his father used to read to him. Next to it is a note his father wrote before he died, a note Bloom knows by heart. He feels sad that he is lost touch with his heritage and tries to find meaning in his memories. Even though everything around him is changing, Bloom finds something real and meaningful in his Jewish identity and he keeps sticking to it.

It is understandable that there was not pure joy and celebration right after World War I ended in November 1918. While people in London, for example, were overjoyed when the ceasefire was declared, that initial relief was quickly followed by the harsh realities of a world shattered by war. Not only were there widespread hardships and local crises to deal with, but a deadly influenza pandemic swept across the globe, claiming even more lives than the war itself. Despite all this, many people held onto the hope that this war had been so horrific, so devastating, that it would be the "war to end all wars." They wanted to believe that the Treaty of Versailles, designed to

[24] Passover is a Jewish holiday that celebrates the ancient Hebrews' escape from Egypt. It starts with a special meal.
[25] The Haggadah is like a book used during Passover. It tells the story of the Exodus, when the Jewish people left Egypt. It is read out loud during the first two nights of Passover at a special meal called a Seder.

establish lasting peace, would actually work. Even as the years went by and new challenges arose, some idealistic individuals held onto this hope well into the 1930s. They placed their faith in the League of Nations, believing it could prevent future wars. This faith, unfortunately, was never quite matched by the later United Nations, which often seemed to be hindered by political maneuvering among the most powerful countries (Girling, 1990, p. 98).

Blackmur contends that Leopold Bloom's significance extends beyond his representation of Jewish identity. Bloom emerges as a symbolic figure, embodying the universal struggle of the outsider striving for acceptance and understanding in a fractured and often unwelcoming society (1949, p. 213). This perspective shifts the focus from Bloom's cultural and religious background to his broader role as a reflection of human alienation and resilience.

Blackmur emphasizes the intricate layers of Bloom's characterization, noting that Joyce masterfully balances cultural specificity with universal themes (1949, p. 217). This balance allows Bloom to serve as both a distinctly Jewish figure and a universally relatable character. His experiences resonate with anyone who has felt marginalized or out of place, making him a powerful symbol of the human condition.

By crafting Bloom in this way, Joyce challenges readers to move beyond simplistic categorizations and confront the shared struggles that transcend cultural and religious boundaries. The novel's exploration of Bloom's journey invites readers to reflect on themes of identity, belonging, and the need for empathy in a fragmented world. This nuanced portrayal not only deepens the emotional impact of *Ulysses* but also reinforces its relevance as a timeless examination of the outsider's plight.

Through Bloom, Joyce addresses the intersection of the personal and the universal, illustrating how individual identity is shaped by both cultural heritage and broader human experiences. This duality makes Bloom a profoundly empathetic figure and highlights Joyce's literary genius in creating a character who speaks to the universal longing for understanding and acceptance.

Blackmur examines Joyce's employment of irony and symbolism as tools to subvert conventional portrayals of Jewish characters. For example, Bloom's internal monologues frequently oscillate between moments of self-doubt and displays of quiet

resilience. This juxtaposition captures the layered complexities of Jewish identity within a predominantly Christian cultural framework (1949, p. 221).

Blackmur suggests that this narrative approach not only dismantles reductive stereotypes but also fosters a deeper connection between the reader and Bloom. By presenting Bloom's thoughts and emotions with such nuance, Joyce humanizes him, challenging the audience to move beyond superficial judgments and recognize the universal aspects of his experiences. This technique highlights the richness of Joyce's characterization, allowing Bloom to serve as both a distinctly Jewish figure and a symbol of broader struggles with identity, belonging, and prejudice.

Through this lens, Joyce's use of irony and symbolism becomes more than a stylistic choice; it is a deliberate strategy to provoke reflection on societal attitudes and to cultivate empathy. This layered portrayal of Bloom underscores Joyce's progressive vision, positioning *Ulysses* as a text that not only critiques but also redefines the representation of marginalized identities in literature.

Blackmur also commends Joyce's groundbreaking use of language and narrative structure in portraying Jewish themes. He highlights how Joyce's stream-of-consciousness technique provides an intimate view of Bloom's inner world, revealing the intricate layers of his identity and his nuanced reactions to societal pressures (Blackmur, 1949, p. 233).

This stylistic innovation allows readers to experience Bloom's thoughts and emotions in real time, making his struggles and resilience profoundly relatable. By immersing the audience in Bloom's internal monologues, Joyce captures the fluid and multifaceted nature of identity, especially within a context of marginalization. Blackmur argues that this approach not only deepens the authenticity of Bloom's characterization but also amplifies the novel's exploration of human dignity and perseverance.

Through this technique, Joyce transforms *Ulysses* into more than a narrative; it becomes a psychological and cultural study, offering a window into the complexities of an individual navigating a world rife with prejudice and misunderstanding. This integration of form and theme underscores Joyce's mastery, as the very structure of the novel mirrors the resilience and adaptability that Bloom embodies.

Both Ellmann (1982) and Blackmur (1949) underscore the intricate connection between Bloom's Jewish identity and his broader role as a universal figure. While Bloom's experiences are firmly grounded in the historical and cultural setting of early 20th-century Dublin, the themes they evoke alienation, displacement, and the search for meaning are timeless and universal.

Blackmur argues that Joyce's portrayal of Bloom surpasses cultural and religious boundaries, presenting a vision of humanity that is inclusive and profoundly empathetic (1949, p. 240). By rooting Bloom's identity in a specific context yet allowing his struggles to resonate universally, Joyce bridges the gap between the particular and the universal. Bloom becomes a symbol of the shared human condition, embodying resilience and dignity in the face of marginalization.

This duality highlights Joyce's genius in creating a character who is both a reflection of his immediate environment and a vessel for exploring larger existential questions. Through Bloom, Joyce critiques societal prejudices while affirming the interconnectedness of human experiences, inviting readers to find common ground beyond divisions of culture or identity.

The years after World War I brought a search of hope for independence in both Israel and Ireland. For Israel, the journey was just beginning. The 1917 Balfour Declaration, where Britain pledged support for a Jewish homeland in Palestine, was a crucial first step. After the war, the League of Nations gave Britain the mandate to make it happen. While full independence was still decades away (achieved in 1948), this mandate offered a glimmer of hope for the future – a hint of the "golden city" as described in James Joyce's *Ulysses*. Ireland's path to freedom reached a turning point in 1922. Centuries of British rule ended with the establishment of the Irish Free State, officially recognized by a treaty with Great Britain on January 8th, 1922 It was a hard-won victory, marking a new era for the Irish people (Girling, 1990, pp. 99-100).

Even before the Irish Free State was established, the country had endured years of brutal conflict between the Irish Republican Army and the Black and Tans, ruthless British forces sent to quell the rebellion. Then, just as Ireland was taking its first steps as a free nation, civil war erupted. From 1922 to 1926, Irishmen fought against Irishmen – those who supported the treaty with Britain against those who refused to accept anything less than a fully independent republic. As Sean O'Casey's character

Jack Boyle bitterly observes in the play *Juno and the Paycock*, "Ireland sober is Ireland free." But true peace, like sobriety, seemed elusive. The shadow of violence continued to haunt Ireland long after the civil war ended. In the late 20th century, the conflict shifted to Northern Ireland, where Catholics and Protestants clashed in a bitter and bloody struggle known as "The Troubles." The dream of a truly united and peaceful Ireland, a "golden city" free from fear, remained tragically out of reach (Girling, 1990, p. 101). And the question came out: when would the violence finally end, not just in Ireland, but in other troubled parts of the world, like Israel, as it is reflected in the novel as well:

> - But it's no use, says [Bloom]. Force, hatred, history, all that. That's not life for men and women, insult and hatred. And everybody knows that it's the very opposite of that that is really life. - What? says Alf (Joyce, 1986, p. 273).

The quote also highlights Leopold Bloom's philosophical outlook on life, contrasting the destructive forces of violence, hatred, and historical grievances with a vision of life rooted in connection and positivity. Bloom's assertion that life's true essence is the very opposite of conflict underscores his belief in compassion and mutual respect as fundamental human values.

The dialogue's simplicity belies its depth, as Bloom rejects the cyclical nature of animosity that often defines human history. His stance stands in stark contrast to Alf's incredulous response, reflecting the pervasive skepticism or indifference Bloom encounters in Dublin society. This exchange also reinforces Bloom's role as a moral and empathetic figure in the novel, often at odds with the prevailing attitudes around him.

By questioning what truly constitutes life, Joyce invites readers to reflect on the forces that shape human existence whether it be historical burdens or the potential for understanding and unity. Bloom's perspective, though dismissed by others, serves as a quiet yet powerful critique of the divisiveness that often dominates both personal relationships and broader societal dynamics.

James Joyce described his novel as a multifaceted epic, encompassing the intertwined destinies of two peoples, the Irish and the Jewish, represented through the characters of Leopold Bloom and Stephen Dedalus. But it was also, as he explained, a microcosm of human existence, a "cycle of the human body," playing out over the

course of a single day in Dublin. And within this ordinary day, Joyce uses skilfully symbolism, allusion, and literary experimentation, creating a work that is like an "encyclopedia" of modern life (Ellmann, 1972, p. 186).

The novel is incredibly complex, full of symbolism, historical detail, and references to Homer's *Odyssey*. It is easy to get lost in the intricate layers and interpretations. Some parts are quite clear, while others are quite enigmatic. It seems like Joyce is playing a game with the reader, and it offers a unique journey for every reader, regardless of their background or analytical approach. It has three main stories conveyed together, parts that mirror the *Odyssey*, set in Dublin, events of one day from start to finish and how Leopold Bloom and Stephen Dedalus meet and interact. Each story runs throughout the book and can be followed separately.

In Homer's epic poem, *The Odyssey*, Ulysses (also known as Odysseus) endures a long and arduous journey home after the Trojan War. He faces countless trials and temptations, including a terrifying encounter with the Cyclops and a transformative stay on Circe's island, where his men are turned into pigs. After years of wandering, Ulysses finally returns to Ithaca, only to find his faithful wife, Penelope, besieged by suitors vying for her hand. With the help of his son, Telemachus, Ulysses reclaims his rightful place and reunites with his family (Homer, 1996).

James Joyce draws inspiration from this classic tale in his novel *Ulysses*, reimagining the characters and themes within a 20th-century Dublin setting. Molly Bloom, Leopold Bloom's wife, becomes a modern-day Penelope, navigating the complexities of desire and fidelity in a stream of consciousness monologue that concludes the novel. Just as Penelope remained loyal to Ulysses despite his prolonged absence, Molly reveals a complex inner life marked by both temptation and enduring love for her "Poldy." (Joyce, 1986).

James Joyce chose a specific date, June 16, 1904, as the background for his novel *Ulysses*. This ordinary day, now celebrated as "Bloomsday," contains meticulous details, from Stephen Dedalus' breakfast of fried bacon to Leopold Bloom's late-night cocoa. Joyce weaves real-world events into his fictional structure, referencing incidents like a boat sinking in New York harbor and a horse race in England. Despite the significance of these events, they do not directly touch upon Ireland or Israel, two nations deeply intertwined with Joyce's personal life and the thematic fabric of the

novel. Interestingly, June 16, 1904, holds personal significance for Joyce as the day he first met his future wife, Nora Barnacle. Yet, more significantly, the day passed without major historical significance for Ireland or the Zionist movement, allowing the events of *Ulysses* to unfold against a backdrop of everyday life (Ellmann, 1972, p. 188).

In *Ulysses*, the most direct comparison between Ireland and Israel appears within a speech overheard in a busy newspaper office. The speech centers on the revival of the Irish language, a topic deeply intertwined with Irish nationalism in the early 1900s. At the time, Ireland yearned for independence, but the path forward remained unclear. The fierce rebellion of the Fenians had faded, and the violence of Sinn Fein was yet to fully sparked. The Abbey Theatre, soon to become a symbol of Irish cultural identity, was still finding its footing. In this climate of uncertainty, passionate speeches filled the air, often fueled by nothing more substantial than pub talk and fleeting convictions. *Ulysses* captures this sense of searching for a national identity and a path to freedom, reflecting the historical context of the time (Girling, 1990, p. 102).

At the turn of the 20th century, the Zionist movement faced a similar linguistic debate: should Hebrew, the ancient language of prayer, be revived as the language of a modern Jewish state? Some, particularly within the socialist Bund movement, favored Yiddish, the everyday language of many Eastern European Jews. Ultimately, Hebrew prevailed, becoming the language of Zionist movement and the State of Israel. Ireland's experience with reviving Irish as a national language proved more complicated. Despite government efforts and cultural initiatives, Irish remains a second language for most. This reality might have surprised those passionately advocating for the Irish language in 1904, as depicted in *Ulysses*. Back then, amidst the intensive nationalism, it was difficult to predict how deeply rooted linguistic habits would resist change. As Joyce notes in the novel, "Sufficient for the day is the newspaper thereof,"(p. 114) highlighting the limitations of foresight when it comes to predicting the course of cultural shifts (Girling, 1990, p. 102).

In the novel, the Egyptian high priest look down on a young Moses. He acts more like a arrogant ruler than a priest. He insults the Jewish people, saying they are dumb and an inferior race:

> Why will you jews not accept our culture, our religion and our language? You are a tribe of nomad herdsmen: we are a mighty people. You have no cities nor no wealth: our cities are hives of humanity and our galleys, trireme and quadrireme, laden with all manner merchandise furrow the waters of the known globe. You have but emerged from primitive conditions: we have a literature, a priesthood, an agelong history and a polity ... Israel is weak and few are her children: Egypt is an host and terrible are her arms ... — But, ladies and gentlemen, had the youthful Moses listened to and accepted that view of life, had he bowed his head and bowed his will and bowed his spirit before that arrogant admonition he would never have brought the chosen people out of their house of bondage, nor followed the pillar of the cloud by day. He would never have spoken with the Eternal amid lightnings on Sinai's mountaintop or ever have come down with the light of inspiration shining in his countenance and bearing in his arms the tables of the law, graven in the language of the outlaw (Joyce, 1986, p. 117).

Joyce emphasizes the disconnect between Irish identity and the Irish language within the novel. The first character who speaks Irish fluently is actually a rude Englishman who kicks Stephen out of his home. Even Bloom, who is Jewish, can barely recall the Hebrew prayers from his childhood, misremembering the Passover story and suggesting that Moses led the Israelites "into the house of bondage" instead of out of it. This mistake indicates the challenges and uncertainties facing both the Irish and Jewish people in their pursuit of self-determination (p. 41).

Throughout *Ulysses*, we see instances where anti-Semitic comments are directed towards Bloom, often even when he is not around. Stephen, in a way, becomes a silent observer of these prejudiced discourse, which reflects the prevalent social attitudes of early 1900s Dublin. One example occurs early in the novel. Haines, a British man who shares living quarters with Stephen and their friend Buck Mulligan, casually makes a pejorative comment. He blames "German jews" for trying to gain control over England (p. 18). This reflects a common conspiracy theory of that era, which blamed a handful of Jewish financiers for the failures of British imperialism. This prejudiced viewpoint is further put forward by Mr. Deasy, the headmaster of the Protestant school where Stephen teaches short term. Deasy, representing the views of the Protestant elite in Ireland, mistakes his deep-seated prejudices for historical insight. It is not hard to imagine him making similar offensive remarks about the Catholic Irish if given the chance. He states, "England is in the hands of the jews. In all the highest places: her finance, her press ... Old England is dying ... They sinned against the light ... And that is why they are wanderers on the earth to this day" (p. 28). Stephen does not verbally

respond to Deasy's bigotry. Instead, his reaction stays as an internal monologue, a technique that shows Joyce's groundbreaking writing style. These thoughts, although unspoken, are just as significant to the scene as any dialogue or action. Rather than directly confronting Deasy, Stephen's mind drifts to his own memories of Jewish merchants he encountered in Paris. He does not challenge Deasy's prejudice directly but instead reflects on the fleeting nature of worldly achievements, using the image of Jewish merchants to symbolize the temporary nature of material success (Girling, 1990, p. 104).

> On the steps of the Paris Stock Exchange the goldskinned men quoting prices on their gemmed fingers. Gabble of geese. They swarmed loud, uncouth, about the temple, their heads thickplotting under maladroit silk hats. Not theirs: these clothes, this speech, these gestures. Their full slow eyes belied the words, the gestures eager and unoffending, but knew the rancours massed about them and knew their zeal was vain. Vain patience to heap and hoard. Time surely would scatter all. A hoard heaped by the roadside: plundered and passing on. Their eyes knew the years of wandering and, patient, knew the dishonours of their flesh (Joyce, 1986, p. 28).

In the quotation above, Stephen takes the stereotype about Jewish people, usually used in a negative way, and sees something else in it. Instead of accepting the prejudice, he seems to understand the pain and vulnerability hidden behind the stereotype. He recognizes that stereotyped groups are often unfairly treated and uses this understanding to connect with their suffering.

His next statement, though, shows how disillusioned he is with the state of the world. He says, "History, Stephen said, is a nightmare from which I am trying to awake" (p. 28). This is not just about anti-Semitism anymore. It is a powerful statement about the suffering and darkness that marked the 20th century, a time filled with violence and hardship. Stephen's words express a deep desire to escape the horrors of the past and find a better, more hopeful future. Stephen's thoughts about history as a nightmare could be about Ireland's own difficult past. Ireland had seen a lot of pain and hardship and feel like they could be a reflection of that shared experience. It is like he is speaking for everyone who looks back on history with sadness and does not have much hope for the future.

But even though Stephen's words suggest a deep awareness of Ireland's troubles, he does not seem to want to dwell on it. Later in the day, when Bloom talks on and on

about improving life for the Irish people, a drunk and weary Stephen interrupts him. He says, "We can't change the country. Let us change the subjecté" (p. 527). It seems like Stephen, despite his understanding of Ireland's past, feels powerless to change things. He would rather avoid the topic altogether.

The moment when Bloom sees the Zionist picture in the novel it makes him think about his own Jewish identity. Bloom is getting ready for breakfast and goes to the store to buy kidneys. While he is at the butcher shop, he sees a picture of a Jewish settlement called Kinnereth, it is printed on the butcher paper. The name "Moses Montefiore" is on the picture, and Bloom remembers hearing it before. But then, a young woman with "vigorous hips" walks up to the counter, and Bloom forgets all about the picture. He is distracted by her, and even thinks about following her when she leaves (p. 48).

Bloom notices that the butcher, Dlugacz, is also Jewish, even though he sells pork. They share a look, it is like they both recognize something in each other. But then Bloom looks away, thinking "No: better not: another time" (p. 49). He is not ready to think about what it means to be Jewish at this moment.

Once the woman leaves, Bloom looks back at the picture of Kinnereth. The address on the picture says "Bleibtreustrasse," which means "Remain True Street" (p. 49). This makes Bloom wonder if he can be true to a Jewish community and tradition that he does not really know. He decides to focus on being true to himself, even if he is not sure what being Jewish means. He likes the idea of moving to Palestine and growing oranges. It wonders us if Bloom can really connect with a tradition and community that feel so foreign to him.

> Orange groves and immense melonfields north of Jaffa. You pay eighty marks and they plant a dunam of land for you with olives, oranges, almonds or citrons ... Your name entered for life as owner in the book of the union ... Nothing doing. Still an idea behind it. He looked at the cattle, blurred in silver heat. Silver-powdered olive trees. Quiet long days: pruning, ripening (p. 49).

Bloom's happy thought about the orange groves does not last long. It is like a cloud suddenly blocking the sun, and now all he sees is a gloomy and empty landscape. The landscape disappears replacing with a desolate scene:

> No, not like that. A barren land, bare waste. Volcanic lake, the dead sea: no fish, weedless, sunk deep in the earth ... A dead sea in a dead land, grey and old. Old now. It bore the oldest,

> the first race. A bent hag crossed from Cassidy's clutching a naggin bottle by the neck. The oldest people. Wandered far away over all the earth, captivity to captivity, multiplying, dying, being born everywhere. It lay there now. It could bear no more. Dead: an old woman's: the grey sunken cunt of the world. Desolation. Grey horror seared his flesh (p. 50).

"A barren land, bare waste and desolation" is like a flashforward of Holocaust which will take place a few decades later. Joyce they couldn't have known about the horrors that would happen in Europe and the Holocaust, with its concentration camps and mass killings, would become the true "barren land, bare waste."

Even though Joyce could not have predicted the Holocaust, he seems to sense the deep suffering in the Jewish people's past and future. He captures this sadness and pain in Bloom's experiences. He also could not have known about the thriving orange groves and opportunities that would exist in the future state of Israel.

Bloom has a resilient nature inside. Despite facing a barrage of challenges like infidelity, societal boredom, and the sting of anti-Semitism, he endures. He is primarily a survivor. He has a strength within him. Even if it is not constant, Bloom can fight back against persecution when the moment arises. The quote, "Old lardyface standing up to the business end of a gun" (p. 273), reveals that he has a hidden courage.

The most obvious example of his resillient nature is seen when Ulysses and his men were trapped by the giant with one eye, only to run away after Ulysses blinded him, a different kind of "monster" emerges in Dublin. This "monster" is not a real monster but jus an angry Irishman named "the Citizen." He spends his time in a pub, complaining about Ireland's problems and drinking lots of beer. He has a grumpy dog named Garryowen. We see Bloom enter the pub. He is there to find someone who can help a widow get money after her husband died. Bloom tries to fit in with the rough crowd at the pub by talking with them about things they find interesting, like hangings, sports, trials, punishments in the navy, and the problems Ireland has. However, Bloom causes trouble when he suggests that other people besides the Irish have been treated badly (p. 240).

> - Persecution, says [Bloom], all the history of the world is full of it.
> Perpetuating national hatred among nations ...
> - What is your nation if I may ask? says the citizen.
> — Ireland, says Bloom. I was born here. Ireland.

> The citizen said nothing only cleared the spit out of his gullet and, gob, he spat a Red bank oyster out of him right in the corner ...
>
> — And I belong to a race too, says Bloom, that is hated and persecuted.
>
> Also now. This very moment. This very instant.
>
> Gob, he near burnt his fingers with the butt of his old cigar.
>
> — Robbed, says he. Plundered. Insulted. Persecuted. Taking what belongs to us by right. At this very moment, says he, putting up his fist, sold by auction off in Morocco like slaves or cattle.
>
> — Are you talking about the new Jerusalem? says the citizen.
>
> — I'm talking about injustice, says Bloom ...
>
> - But it's no use, says he. Force, hatred, history, all that. That's not life for men and women, insult and hatred. And everybody knows that it's the very opposite of that that is really life.
>
> - What? says Alf.
>
> — Love, says Bloom. I mean the opposite of hatred. I must go now ...
>
> — That chap? says the citizen. Beggar my neighbour is his motto. Love, moya! He's a nice pattern of a Romeo and Juliet (pp. 271-273).

The word "love" can mean a lot or a little, depending on who is using it. Bloom, being an ordinary guy, does not see love as some grand, poetic idea. His experiences with love are simple and everyday things: kindness, thinking of others, being with his wife, remembering his family, and even helping someone in need. The author compares this simple, everyday kind of love to what Hannah Arendt called "the banality of evil." Arendt observed that even the most horrific acts of evil can be carried out by ordinary people simply going about their business, like officials following orders or people ignoring what is happening around them. Bloom's perspective, however, suggests that "love," in its most basic form, can be a powerful force against this "banality of evil." He seems to believe that even small acts of kindness, compassion, and connection, as ordinary as they may seem, can make a difference. It is not about grand gestures, but about holding onto these simple acts of love as a way to survive and persevere in a world where terrible things happen (Girling, 1990, p. 110).

The next time Bloom visits Kiernan's pub, things take a turn for the worse. He gets into trouble, but not because of his thoughts on love. This time, it is a case of mistaken identity and ridiculous rumors. People wrongly believe Bloom won a bet and then broke the unspoken pub code by not buying a round of drinks. He ends up being blamed for something he does not even understand.

> Mean bloody scut. Stand us a drink itself. Devil a sweet fear! There's a jew for you! All for number one. Cute as a shithouse rat. Hundred to five ...
> - Don't tell anyone, says the citizen, letting a bawl out of him. It's a secret.
> And the bloody dog woke up and let a growl.

The situation in the pub escalates, and some of the patrons intervene. They hold back the Citizen while others help Bloom escape outside to a waiting car, which serves as a kind of getaway "ship" in this scenario. As Bloom makes his exit, he can not resist shouting back defiantly at the Citizen, who is in the middle of a rant about Jewish people.

> - Mendelssohn was a jew and Karl Marx and Mercadente and Spinoza.
> And the Saviour was a jew and his father was a jew. Your God.
> — He had no father, says Martin ...
> - Well, his uncle was a jew, says he. Your God was a jew. Christ was a jew like me.
> Gob, the citizen made a plunge back into the shop.
> - By Jesus, says he, I'll brain that bloody jewman for using the holy name. By Jesus, I'll crucify him so I will. Give us that biscuitbox here (pp. 279-80).

Mirroring the Cyclops episode in the Odyssey, the Citizen attempts to assault Bloom as he makes his escape, throwing a biscuit box that fails to hit its target. Bloom hastily leaves the place in a car, but the comparison to Ulysses sailing away is enhanced to a humorous level. The narration portrays Bloom's exit as a grand ascent, similar to the prophet Elijah's ascension to heaven in a fiery chariot.

While Bloom's dramatic "escape" from the pub holds significance, it does not signify the end of his journey. This event elevates him, transforming him from a specific individual into a more universal figure. He becomes less defined by his Jewishness and more aligned with the mythical Ulysses, an adventurer embodying resilience.

Joyce implies that Bloom's Jewish experience is combined with history, particularly the turbulent history of the 20th century. He refers to a future awakening, a progression towards a more peaceful and tolerant world, symbolized by both Ireland and Israel finding peace. Joyce imagines a time when conflicts and struggles diminish, and the world embraces the ordinary, even "banal" virtues that Bloom represents – kindness, compassion, and everyday love. This utopian vision ends in a global celebration of "Bloomsday," a day dedicated to recognizing and celebrating the values exhibited by Bloom throughout the novel.

4.3. Jewish Characters in Howard Jacobson's *The Finkler Question*

Howard Jacobson is a prominent contemporary English author and he is known for his insightful explorations of Jewish identity, culture, and history. In 2010, Howard Jacobson's humorous novel *The Finkler Question* brought attention to the experiences of Anglo-Jewish communities. The book, which won the 2010 Man Booker Prize, drew the attention of both critics and readers. While exploring various themes, Jacobson effectively examined modern Anglo-Jewish identity as a common theme. He presented this theme from multiple perspectives, illustrating its evolution over time through flashbacks and the development of characters spanning three generations (Jacobson, 2010).

His novels, often infused with humor, delve into Jewish experiences, the complexities of identity formation, and the pervasive nature of social prejudices. Jacobson's works deals with the evolving meaning of Jewish identity in the modern world, prompting reflection on what it means to be Jewish in a constantly shifting modern world. His writing suggests that Jewish identity is not a fixed concept but rather an ongoing process of exploration and redefinition (2010, p. 35).

The novel is about Jewish identity and anti-Semitism. It tells the story of three friends Julian Treslove, Sam Finkler, and Libor Sevcik and how each of them relates to being Jewish. Even though Julian Treslove is not Jewish, he is deeply drawn to Jewish culture and identity. Jacobson uses Treslove's longing to be Jewish, and his sometimes comical experiences trying to understand it, to explore what Jewish identity really means. Treslove's constant daydreams about being Jewish, and the changes he thinks it would bring, highlight his own search for identity and meaning (Jacobson, 2010).

Sam Finkler is a Jewish philosopher and writer who has a complicated relationship with his own Jewish identity. He seems to both embrace and reject it, and this internal struggle impacts him deeply, both intellectually and emotionally. Finkler's experiences with anti-Semitism and societal prejudices further complicate his feelings about being Jewish. There are times when he even questions his own identity, making his connection to his Jewishness even more intricate and multifaceted (Jacobson, 2010).

As an older Jewish man, Libor embodies the profound connection to Jewish identity and culture, but also the weight of its tragic past. His experiences reflect the deep impact of historical events on individual lives. The losses and pain Libor has endured throughout his life have undeniably shaped his relationship with his Jewish identity, making it a defining element of who he is (Jacobson, 2010).

Jacobson explores the complexities of Jewish identity through a diverse cast of characters dealing with similar issues from different ways. The main character, Julian Treslove, is not Jewish himself and ever since he was a kid, he has been totally curious about what makes Jewish people different from Gentiles[26]. As Julian faces a mid-life crisis, he feels obliged to finally understand what makes Jews unique, ultimately deciding to join the Jewish community himself. However, his Jewish perception is blurred by stereotypes, limited knowledge, and an idealized view of Jews, attributing their successes solely to their ethnicity (Jacobson, 2010).

Sam Finkler is a complete opposite of Treslove. While Treslove desperately wants to be Jewish, Finkler wants to escape his Jewish identity and his past support of Zionism. We do not hear Finkler's voice directly very often. Instead, his friend Treslove often speaks for him, creating a blend of Finkler's actual thoughts and Treslove's guesses about what Finkler is thinking. This fundamental difference between them increases the story's tension. Treslove romanticizes Jewishness, while Finkler is bothered by the stereotypes associated with it. He feels oppressed by a sense of responsibility for the actions of other Jewish people, even when he disagrees with them (Jacobson, 2010).

Libor Sevcik, a Jewish widower like Finkler, is from an older generation. He represents what Treslove desires: experiencing real loss and having a strong sense of belonging. Sevcik is a Czech immigrant who left his country to escape communism, not anti-Semitism. He is portrayed as a man who has seen the world, a famous Hollywood journalist who was close to many famous actresses. He is comfortable outside of exclusively Jewish circles but has still had the chance to observe them closely. While he does not initially care much about his Jewish background, he eventually comes to appreciate his heritage and becomes interested in Zionism. As a

[26] It simply means non-Jewish. It is a term used by Jewish people to refer to anyone who is not Jewish, regardless of their specific religion or background.

friend and former teacher to both Finkler and Treslove, he often helps to bridge the gap between their very different perspectives (Jacobson, 2010).

Although Finkler and Treslove's children, who represent the youngest generation, are not a big part of the story, their point of view still matters. Treslove's sons mainly serve to highlight their father's disconnect from reality. He longs for deep, lasting love but neglects his own children and does not understand them. They disapprove of his attempts to become Jewish, not out of prejudice, but because they recognize his point of view regarding this issue. As for Finkler's children, who appear even less frequently, openly express anti-Zionist views, taking their father's attitude to a further level. Their opinions stem not only from negative personal experiences with other Jewish people but also, more importantly, from their father's philosophy. They represent a generation of Jews who resent their heritage but feel trapped by it (Jacobson, 2010).

The women in *The Finkler Question* are central to the story, even more than the younger generation. They each have a unique relationship with Jewish identity. Hephzibah, for instance, is a lifelong member of the Jewish community. As Libor's niece and Treslove's love interest, she represents a natural comfort and joy within Jewish life, unlike Finkler, who has a more complicated relationship with his heritage. Then there is Finkler's late wife, Taylor. Even though she was not Jewish originally, she completely embraced her husband's traditions and culture. It is almost ironic because she achieved what Treslove desperately wants to truly feel Jewish. And finally, we have Libor's deceased wife, Malkie. Although she is only present through Libor's memories, she represents an idealized version of womanhood and Jewishness in his mind. However, her wealthy family embodies negative Jewish stereotypes like arrogance and elitism, highlighting class divisions within the community. While women are essential to the story and equally engaged in political issues, their perspectives are not fully explored (Jacobson, 2010).

The novel portrays non-Jewish characters in a variety of ways. Some, like Treslove's sons and past lovers, are relatively indifferent towards Jewish people. They do not actively think about Jewishness much, but they might still hold some stereotypes. Other non-Jewish characters have a very idealized view of the Jewish community, romanticizing their history, culture, and even their genetics. Then there is

a darker side represented by a group of people with a strong prejudice against Jews. This group is not shown as individuals, but rather as an anonymous, hateful mass, like when they vandalize the Jewish museum. The novel describes them as a "creeping thread," (p. 281) suggesting that their hatred is a growing and insidious threat (Jacobson, 2010).

Treslove has a very idealized view of Jewish people. He envies his friend's intelligence and confidence, and because he can not find any flaws in himself, he decides that Finkler's success must be due to his Jewish heritage. Treslove has this idea that Jewish people are just programmed for success, like it is in their genes or something. He feels like he is at a disadvantage because he is not Jewish, as if he could never measure up. For example, when Finkler makes a Jewish joke out of Treslove's simple question about a girl named Juno: "D'Jew know Jewno?" (Jacobson, 2010, p. 19) Treslove feels inadequate and defeated. He feels he can never makes a joke like this in his life which makes him frustrated and feel insulted. He accuses his Jewish friends of seeing Jewish influence everywhere in history, something he himself can not do. He does not understand Jewish traditions but wants to find solace and meaning in them. He seeks personal fulfillment by trying to join the Jewish community, but he slowly lost his interest in this issue. To show that Jewish people are not the problem, Jacobson points to Taylor's success in the same area. Unlike Treslove, Taylor easily embraces Jewishness because she does not join the community seeking personal fulfillment. She finds meaning in the rituals and connects with Jewish history, seeing it as a way of life and a philosophy rather than a competition or a way to define herself (Jacobson, 2010).

The novel presents two main types of Jewish characters. One group, which includes Sam's friends, consists of Jews who are either ashamed or modest about their heritage. The other group, represented by characters like Hephzibah and Libor, embraces their Jewish identity, supports Zionism, and actively participates in Jewish communal life. Orthodox Jews are notably absent, perhaps because their experiences differ from those of secular Jews who grapple with their distinct identity while not strictly adhering to religious practices (Jacobson, 2010).

Even among the Jews who are not proud of their heritage, there are different types. Some people join groups like Finkler's "ASHamed Jews" because it is trendy

and influential, not because they genuinely dislike being Jewish. They criticize loudly Israel and its cruel actions in Gaza, but it is more for show than a reflection of their true beliefs. Then there are people like Finkler who are genuinely uncomfortable with being associated with Israel's actions, a country they do not even consider their own. They are deeply critical of how they see their community using the Holocaust for personal gain. They have turned away from religion and tradition but have not found anything to replace them. Their criticism of Israel comes from a thoughtful, philosophical place. Then there are characters like Finkler's son, Immanuel, who represent a shocking and disturbing extreme. He is deeply anti-Semitic, harboring a violent hatred towards Zionists and Israel, even though he does not care about politics in general.

> So, what's it going to be?' He asked. 'Medicine? Law? Accountancy?' 'Do you know what that's called?' Finkler asked him. 'Stereotyping. You've just stereotyped me.' 'You said you knew which side of bread was buttered. Isn't that stereotyping yourself?' 'I am allowed to stereotype myself.' Finkler told him. 'Ah,' Treslove said. As always he wondered if he would ever get to the bottom of what Finklers were permitted to say about themselves that non-Finklers were not (Jacobson, 2010, p. 26).

Heidi Burges explains that "stereotyping" means making generalization about an entire group of people based on a fixed, often inaccurate, image (Burges, n.d.). The Merriam Webster dictionary (n.d.) defines "stereotype" in a similar way, as "something conforming to a fixed or general pattern; especially: a standardized mental picture that is held in common by members of a group and that represents an oversimplified opinion, prejudiced attitude, or uncritical judgment." (Webster, n.d.).

In *The Finkler Question*, Treslove often falls into stereotypical thinking, seeing the world in black and white terms. He struggles to see beyond these simplistic judgments. Finkler, on the other hand, uses common stereotypes about Jewish people to his advantage, often turning them around on others. Sam also seems to enjoy making people feel guilty for stereotyping him, using it as a way to control conversations (Jacobson, 2010).

The novel shows a wide range of biases about Jewish people, from overly positive ones that make them seem perfect to very negative ones. However, the book puts forward that all stereotypes, even those that seem nice, are bad. When people make generalizations about Jewish people, even if they are trying to be complimentary,

it makes Jewish people feel even more different and excluded. This feeling of being "other" can lead to hidden anti-semitism in society, even if people do not realize it.

One of the "positive" stereotypes about Jewish people in the novel is the idea that they are all incredibly smart and logical. Treslove often feels like he can't measure up to Finkler intellectually, not because Finkler is actually smarter, but because Treslove believes that Jews are naturally gifted in that area. When Treslove assumes Finkler will study a subject typically associated with Jewish people, it shows just how ingrained this stereotype is in his mind.

Treslove carries this idea that Jews are special or "chosen" even further. He believes they have a certain "mark of God's covenant" that makes them naturally confident and makes others regard themselves as second race (Jacobson, 2010, p. 79). He is totally captivated by Finkler's charm and confidence. He sees how easily Finkler carries himself and just assumes it is because he is Jewish, like it is some secret advantage. Even the way Jewish people use language becomes evidence of their "chosen nation" status for Treslove. He observes, "Finklers were like that with language, Treslove understood. When they were not playing with it they were ascribing holy properties to it. Or the opposite." (p. 24). He is convinced that because Hebrew texts are so ancient and complex, all Jews have this inherent ability to find deeper meaning in words. Instead of trying to keep up with Finkler's cleverness, he just uses his identity as an excuse, assuming he could never measure up with as he is not of Jewish race.

Jacobson also tackles the stereotype of Jewish sexuality. Treslove is sometimes uncomfortable with how openly Finkler and Libor talk about sex, assuming that all Jewish people are raised to discuss such things publicly. He even compares his own love life to theirs, feeling like a "Benedictine monk" (p. 47). This is irrational, considering Treslove has had many lovers while Finkler, for example, was not always faithful to his wife. However, Treslove is so influenced by this stereotype that he feels insecure whenever the topic of sex comes up. He tries to overcompensate for this perceived lack of masculinity, even going so far as to sleep with Finkler's wife without any remorse. Furthermore, Treslove buys into the idea that there is something unique and alluring about Jewish women. He is almost angry when he discovers that Tyler, a woman he finds attractive, is not actually Jewish. This highlights how deeply

entrenched these stereotypes are in his mind, influencing his perceptions and actions even when they contradict reality.

The most negative stereotype about Jewish people presented in the novel is the association of Jewishness with thievery. Finkler points this out when he says, "At school they called it Jewing (you probably called it Jewing yourself) – taking what's not yours. It's what you see when you see a Jew – a thief or a skinflint" (p. 80). When Treslove is robbed, it is not just the act itself that upsets him, rather the sentence told by the thief: "You Jew." Whether or not the woman actually said this is unclear, but Treslove's belief that she mistook him for Jewish makes him feel targeted. He sees it as a justification for the robbery, as if his perceived Jewishness made him a deserving target for theft and revenge. This highlights how deeply rooted anti-Semitic stereotypes are in society, shaping people's perceptions and actions in insidious ways. Even though Treslove himself is not Jewish, his fear of being perceived as such reveals the power these harmful stereotypes hold.

The novel highlights how stereotypes about Jewish identity do not just affect how non-Jewish characters see them. Even Jewish characters like Sam, his children, and Hephzibah internalize and deals with these stereotypes, shaping how they see themselves and their place in the world. Finkler, in particular, often describes himself using these stereotypes, suggesting that he partially believes them and lets them shape his self-image. However, he is fiercely protective of how others perceive him and Jewish people in general. He challenges any hint of stereotyping from others, sometimes even using their attempts at political correctness against them to point out the absurdity of their assumptions. This complex relationship with his Jewish identity highlights the struggle of living with deeply rooted societal stereotypes. Finkler's efforts to distance himself from his Jewish background are ultimately futile. He can not escape the fact that others see him as Jewish, regardless of his own feelings on the matter.

Hephzibah presents a different perspective on Jewish identity. While she does not consider herself particularly religious ("not a synagogue person" (p. 369)), she still maintains her faith through prayers and certain rituals. Interestingly, she does not see herself as fitting into Jewish stereotypes; instead, she applies those stereotypes to Jewish men. Having been married to two Jewish men previously, she actively avoids

them, believing they are all arrogant, loud, and condescending. This demonstrates how stereotypes can be internalized and applied even within a group. Hephzibah's experiences, while not necessarily representative of all Jewish men, have shaped her perception of them in a way that reinforces certain stereotypes, even as she rejects those same stereotypes for herself.

> If this was what all the Jews look like, Treslove thought, then Finkler was a better name for them than Jew. So that was what he called them privately- Finklers. It took away the stigma, he thought. The minute you talked about the Finkler Question, say, or the Finklerish Conspiracy, you sucked out the toxins (Jacobson, 2010, p. 20)

Treslove makes an intelligent observation about the power of names. He points out that the word "Jew" itself carries negative meaning. It evokes an image of someone small, dark, and secretive, perpetuating harmful stereotypes. In contrast, the name "Finkler" presents a different picture. Finkler is a physically striking man, whose height and confident air often leave a strong impression on those around him. His way with words can be both captivating and somewhat overwhelming. This contrast highlights how names can influence our perceptions of individuals. The word "Jew," is fulled with historical prejudice, creates a preconceived notion, while "Finkler," being less burdened, allows for a more open and individualized impression.

While Treslove attempts to move away from negative stereotypes of Jewish people, he ends up creating new, seemingly positive ones. Instead of irrationally hating Jews, he irrationally admires them. This admiration, however, stems from a place of insecurity and intimidation. He constantly brings up the topic of Jewishness, revealing a deep fascination and a desire to be associated with it. Finkler recognizes this when he tells Treslove, "You don't know what you are so you want to be a Jew. Next time you'll be wearing fringes and telling me you've volunteered to fly Israeli Jets against Hamas. This, Julian, I repeat, is not healthy" (p. 82). Finkler understands that Treslove's fascination is unhealthy because it is rooted in an idealized and unrealistic view of Jewish identity. Treslove's desire to be seen as Jewish, even to the point of claiming he was mistaken for one, demonstrates a lack of understanding of the complexities and nuances of Jewish identity. He romanticizes it without acknowledging the historical and contemporary struggles that come with being Jewish.

Finkler's use of his first name reveals a significant shift in his relationship with his Jewish identity. Initially, he rejects the nickname "Sam," associating it with a

private detective and preferring the more formal and biblical "Samuel". However, as he embraces his career as a philosopher, a path he sees as a way to combat prejudice, he adopts the name "Sam". This change suggests a move away from a rigid adherence to his Jewish background. He is no longer defined by the biblical "Samuel" but chooses the more common "Sam," signifying a more integrated and less self-conscious identity. The idea of choosing a name to reflect a shift in identity is central to the novel. Libor Ševčík, for example, adopts a less Jewish-sounding name once he enters the world of Hollywood, signifying a conscious shift away from his background. Similarly, Hephzibah chooses to go by "Juno". While seemingly insignificant, this name holds a deeper meaning for Julian, who thinks he will one day meet his soulmate, a woman named Juno. These instances underscore how names can be powerful symbols of personal transformation, especially when it comes to navigating one's cultural or religious identity (Jacobson, 2010).

The novel highlights how even the pronunciation of names associated with Zionism can carry different meanings and spark conflict. Libor, a Zionist, pronounces "Israel" as "Isrrrae," omitting the final "l" sound in accordance with Hebraic tradition that avoids speaking the name of God. This pronunciation, however, causes friction with some, as indicated in the line: "There were some troubles with fellow-Finklers he gathered, especially for the sort who, like Libor, called Israel Isrrrae" (p. 68). This contrast with Finkler, who utters "Israel" and other Zionism-related terms with disdain, almost like curses. This difference in pronunciation reflects their opposing stances on Zionism, turning these words into triggers for arguments between them. The simple act of saying these loaded words becomes a battleground for their differing ideologies, demonstrating how language itself can be imbued with political and emotional weight, especially within the context of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict (Votýpková, 2013, p. 21).

While Yiddish is not frequently used in the novel, it holds different meanings for the characters, reflecting evolving attitudes towards Jewish identity. For Finkler, Yiddish evokes shame. He associates it with his father's calculated attempts to appear more Jewish in front of customers, highlighting a disconnect between genuine cultural expression and performative identity. In contrast, Malkie and Hephzibah view Yiddish more nostalgically. It represents the language of their parents and past generations,

holding positive memories. This contrast highlights a generational shift in how Yiddish is perceived. While it might have once been a defining element of British Jewish identity, Jacobson suggests that its significance has diminished over time. It is no longer a unifying force but a language tied to individual memories and experiences (Jacobson, 2010).

Judaism is a significant presence in the novel, shaping the characters' identities and choices. While they each grapple with their own relationship to Jewish rituals and traditions, it is clear that religion holds a complex and personal meaning for each of them.

The novel also presents an aspect of religious identity through Tyler, who converts to Judaism before marrying Sam. She explains her motivation: "We were out to conquer the each other's universe. He wanted the goyim to love him, I wanted the Jews to love me. And I liked the idea of having Jewish children" (p. 92). Despite Finkler's own rejection of Judaism, Tyler embraces it with his whole heart, involving herself in Jewish rituals and traditions. She finds peace in practices like ritual baths and Sabbath candle lighting, even surpassing other Jewish women in her dedication. However, her efforts are met with indifference from Finkler, who still sees her as a non-Jew. This creates a division between them, highlighted by Tyler's statement: "I'm the Jew of the two of us even I was born a Catholic. I'm the Jewish princess you read about in the fairy stories, only I'm not Jewish" (p. 94). Their relationship becomes a constant struggle for belonging. Tyler sought a Jewish life, while Finkler sought distance from it. They married based on these desires. Tyler drawn to Finkler's Jewishness, and he to her status as a shiksa[27]. This fundamental incompatibility, with each trying to embody what the other rejects, leads to infidelity and ultimately, the breakdown of their marriage.

Sam's relationship with religion is complex and constantly evolving throughout the novel. While he initially ignores the importance of faith, his actions reveal a deeper struggle. Despite rejecting traditional religious practices, he is drawn to the synagogue to memorize the Kaddish, the Jewish prayer for the deceased, after Libor's death. This suggests that even without active belief, Jewish rituals offer him solace and connection

[27] "Shiksa" is a word used to describe a non-Jewish woman. It is mainly used within Jewish communities, and it can sometimes be meant as an insult.

in times of grief. His journey with faith is marked by a transition from devout belief in his youth to a rejection of Judaism, fueled by a sense of shame. This shame becomes a defining aspect of his identity, shaping his worldview and interactions. However, witnessing his children's casual anti-Semitism, mocking those who embrace their Jewish faith, forces him to confront the consequences of his own dismissiveness. This realization leads him back towards religious practice, suggesting a newfound appreciation for his heritage and a desire to reconnect with his roots (Jacobson, 2010).

Libor and Hephzibah represent a more casual approach to Judaism. While they appreciate traditions like the Passover Seder [28], they prioritize personal connection over strict religious observance. Libor, for instance, invites Julian to Seder but adapts the rituals to make them more enjoyable for everyone. This demonstrates that his focus is on shared experience and togetherness rather than rigid adherence to every rule. Similarly, Hephzibah chooses to pray at home, away from communal scrutiny. This suggests a more personal and less formal approach to faith. Their attitude mirrors how many contemporary Czechs relate to Christianity, acknowledging important holidays and maintaining a belief in God without actively participating in organized religion. For Libor and Hephzibah, Judaism functions more as a "family religion," emphasizing familial bonds and cultural heritage over strict religious devotion (Jacobson, 2010).

Treslove's exploration of Judaism remains superficial. He approaches it intellectually, trying to grasp its essence through philosophy and observation, but fails to connect with its deeper meaning. Although he takes part in Libor's Passover Seder, he remains isolated and alienated, unable to appreciate the significance of the rituals or the value of familial bonds they reinforce. His self-centered nature prevents him from truly engaging with the spirit of the tradition. While he learns about Jewish history and stories, they remain mere facts rather than transformative experiences. Ultimately, Judaism functions as a passing interest for Treslove, an experiment rather than a genuine pursuit of faith or a meaningful philosophy. He moves on from both his fascination with Jewishness and his relationship with Hephzibah, reverting to his previous life (Votýpková, 2013, p. 23).

[28] Passover Seder is a special meal that happens at the beginning of Passover, a Jewish holiday. During the meal, people tell the story of how the Jewish people escaped from slavery in Egypt, and they eat foods that symbolize parts of the story.

> Just because you're a Jew doesn't mean you're a monster.
> I don't think I'm a monster. I don't even think you're a monster. I'm ashamed of Jewish, no, Israeli actions-
> 'There you are then.
> It is not peculiar to Jews to dislike what some Jews do.
> No, but it's peculiar to Jews to be ashamed of it. It's our shtick. Nobody does it better. (Jacobson, 2010, p. 55).

Jacobson highlights shame and mourning as central aspects of Jewish identity, particularly through Finkler's character. Despite his attempts to distance himself from his heritage, these qualities remain deeply involved within him. He embodies a uniquely "Jewish shame" (p. 166), which he describes as an internalized feeling of betrayal stemming from the actions of other Jews. This shows a complex relationship with his identity, where disappointment and disillusionment are intertwined with a sense of belonging. This exploration of shame reveals how deeply connected Finkler is to his Jewishness, even as he tries to deny it. It suggests that his attempts to distance himself are, in part, a response to this profound sense of responsibility and disappointment he feels towards his own cultural group (Votýpková, 2013, p. 25) .

Jacobson takes a look into the origin of Finkler's shame, linking it to his childhood experiences with his father. Finkler was deeply embarrassed by his father's behavior, particularly his habit of asking to be punched in the stomach. Young Finkler perceived this as foolish and attention-seeking, and the memory continues to haunt him into adulthood. This experience shaped Finkler's perception of Jewishness, leading him to reject those aspects he found so distasteful in his father. He strives to be the antithesis of his father's image, distancing himself from anything that could be perceived as stereotypically Jewish. However, Jacobson suggests that true Jewishness runs deeper than outward behavior. It is about a way of thinking and feeling that surpasses superficial expressions. Despite Finkler's efforts, he cannot escape this inherent aspect of himself. His shame, ironically, becomes the most defining characteristic of his Jewish identity (Votýpková, 2013, p. 26).

The ASHamed Jews group plays a significant role in the second part of the book, serving as a platform for expressing disapproval of Israel's actions. However, the group's motivations are not always pure. Finkler, a leading figure, uses his rhetorical skills to steer the group's direction, seeking both genuine expression and personal validation. He thrives on the attention and respect he garners as their leader. However,

Tyler's death prompts a shift in his behavior. He becomes more reserved, acknowledging her disapproval of his public displays of shame. This highlights the complexity of their relationship, where Tyler, despite embracing Jewish traditions, struggles to grasp the depths of Finkler's internal conflict. Tyler, not having been raised Jewish, can not fully comprehend the nuances of Jewish identity as Jacobson portrays it. She aptly points out, "you've got to be a Jew to get why you're ashamed of being a Jew" (p. 147). This statement underscores the inherent difficulty of outsiders understanding the unique blend of pride, guilt, and self-awareness that shapes Jewish identity for those raised within its traditions. From Tyler's perspective, Jewish shame appears like excessive self-absorption, a need to broadcast their internal struggles for external validation. This difference in perspective highlights the cultural and experiential gap between those raised within and outside of the Jewish community, even within a marriage (Votýpková, 2013, p. 26) .

The novel explores two forms of anti-Semitism. The first is a kind of "Jewish anti-Semitism" that Libor criticizes in Finkler and his group. This form is primarily intellectual, claiming hostility towards Israel and Zionism. While not totaly violent, it reflects a discomfort with the concept of a Jewish state. It is important to note that most of these individuals is identified as anti-Zionist rather than anti-Semitic, drawing a distinction between criticizing Israeli policies and harboring prejudice against Jews as a whole. The second form is more obvious and violent, exemplified by Finkler's son's unprovoked attack on an Orthodox Jewish boy based solely on his appearance. While the son does not perceive his actions as anti-Semitic, Finkler recognizes the horrifying truth. This event forces him to confront the potential consequences of his own anti-Zionist rhetoric, realizing that his ideas may have contributed to his son's hateful behavior.

Finkler grapples with the root of his own animosity towards Israel. Tyler suggests that his hostility stems from a love and fear of losing something precious. He hesitates to fully accept the idea that his anti-Zionism masks a form of patriotism, yet he does not entirely dismiss it either.

Another type of anti-Semitism in the book is like a hidden sickness, quietly spreading and showing itself in scary ways. Nazi symbols and messages shown on

walls, making Jewish people afraid. This hatred seems to explode out of nowhere, leaving people feeling very unsafe.

Julian is right in the middle of this growing problem. He steps in when Jewish kids are bullied and then gets into a fight with people protesting against Jewish people. Treslove also feels this hate when he thinks someone attacked him just because he is Jewish. When Treslove looks online, he finds tons of stories about anti-Semitism in Britain. One story is about a young girl chased by a group yelling "Death to Jews," and another is about a man who was robbed and called a bad name. "In Birmingham, a twelve-year-old schoolgirl fled a mob of children no older than she was chanting "Death to Jews". And in London, just around the corner from the BBC, a forty-nine-year-old Gentile with orderly features was robbed of his valuables and called a Ju." (p. 98). These events, though they seem random, show that deep down, some people are very prejudiced. The book suggests that this kind of anti-Semitism comes from a dislike of anyone who is different. It is like being scared of anything that is not familiar, and it can easily turn into hatred.

Howard Jacobson's book, *The Finkler Question*, is all about what it means to be Jewish in today's world. The story takes place in London and shows us lots of different Jewish characters, giving us a glimpse into how Jewish communities have changed over time. One of the big questions is about how connected people feel to their Jewish identity. One main character is Jewish but does not like being Jewish, while his friend who is not Jewish wants to be Jewish more than anything. This friend spends years trying to figure out how to fit in but realizes it is not that simple. You can not just choose to be Jewish; it is something deeper than that. Even his friend's wife, who wasn't born Jewish but becomes a big part of the community, shows that being Jewish is more complicated than it seems. The book makes us think about what makes someone truly Jewish and how much someones' background shapes who he or she is.

It explores the complex relationship modern Jewish people have with their faith and traditions. The novel also acknowledges the enduring power of religion, particularly in times of loss, as evidenced by a character who finds solace in returning to synagogue after experiencing the death of a friend. Importantly, Jacobson avoids presenting a monolithic view of Jewish identity. He explores the various, and sometimes conflicting, perceptions of Jewishness, both from within and outside the

community. While some characters may hold idealized views of Jewish people and their supposed inherent talents, Jacobson ultimately portrays his Jewish characters as complex individuals with flaws and contradictions, just like everyone else in order to break down the stereotypes against them.

CONCLUSION

The analysis of antisemitism throughout history reveals a complex and evolving form of prejudice, shaped by a mixture of cultural, religious, political, and social influences. This thesis explored how antisemitism emerged from early religious tensions, later evolving into more systematic racial discrimination, particularly during the Enlightenment and the rise of pseudo-scientific racial theories in the 19th century.

Anti-Semitism in English literature reflects the broader societal attitudes towards Jewish people. The portrayal of Jewish characters in selected works from the Victorian to Modern periods, such as *Oliver Twist*, *Our Mutual Friend*, *Ulysses*, and *The Finkler Question*, illustrates how these changing ideologies have influenced literature, often perpetuating harmful stereotypes. The thesis demonstrated that the portrayal of Jews as "the other" has remained a recurring motif, influenced by various socio-economic factors and shifts in scientific, nationalistic, and cultural paradigms.

The study also highlighted the fluid nature of anti-Semitism, noting how it transitioned from religious intolerance to racial discrimination and how its expressions changed during times of economic or political instability. Literature serves as a valuable lens through which to understand how these prejudices have persisted and transformed over time.

Literary works serve as mirrors of the prevailing thoughts and beliefs throughout the period in which they were composed. They provide us with valuable perspectives on the evolution of anti-Semitism against Jewish individuals. During the Victorian era, Charles Dickens' writings such as *Oliver Twist* and *Our Mutual Friend* exemplify the intricate nature of societal attitudes towards Jewish individuals at that time. Although Dickens employed pejorative stereotypes when portraying Jewish characters, such as Fagin, he also wanted the readers to make a critical analysis of the origins of these prejudices and question why these biases occurs at the time. It is like holding up a mirror to the changing social and cultural views of the Victorian era. Fagin embodies many negative stereotypes about Jewish people that were common during that time. He is depicted as a bad guy, almost like a devil, which shows us just how deeply rooted prejudice against Jewish people was in Victorian society. However, it is important to note that Dickens' portrayal of Fagin received numerous criticism. This criticism

seems to have pushed Dickens to rethink how he represented Jewish characters in his later works.

Dickens faced quite a bit of criticism for his portrayal of Fagin, especially from Jewish readers who felt the character played into harmful stereotypes. This seems to have really made him think about his own views. In *Our Mutual Friend*, we see a clear shift in how Dickens approaches Jewish characters. Mr. Riah is the complete opposite of Fagin. He is kind, honest, and a genuinely good person. It is almost as if Dickens was trying to make compensation for the negative stereotype of Fagin with this new character. This change in Dickens' writing might also reflect a broader shift in how society was starting to view Jewish people at the time, moving away from the deeply rooted prejudices of the past.

Even though Mr. Riah is a good character, things are not totally comfortable for him. Dickens makes him kind and moral, but he is still stuck working for this awful guy named Fledgeby. And the worst part is, Fledgeby actually uses the fact that Riah is Jewish to his own advantage, taking advantage of him and the stereotypes people believe. So even though Dickens is trying to do better with representing Jewish characters, this situation with Riah shows us that prejudice was still a huge problem. Even when they were portrayed positively, Jewish people were often trapped in systems that were unfair and biased against them.

It can be easily seen that how Dickens' own understanding grew when we compare Fagin and Mr. Riah. It is like he went on a journey, and his writing reflects that. Fagin, unfortunately, came from a time when terrible stereotypes about Jewish people were everywhere. But with Mr. Riah, Dickens showed that he was listening to the criticism and trying to do better. Riah is a much more moderate and positive character. This change in Dickens' writing probably was not a coincidence. During Victorian times, things were slowly starting to improve for Jewish people in England. They were gaining more acceptance and rights. So, in a way, Dickens' characters reflect that broader shift in society. He was a writer who paid attention to what was happening around him, and his work shows us how attitudes were changing, even if it was a slow process.

James Joyce's *Ulysses*, which is set during the modernist era, depicts a more comprehensive depiction of Jewish identity through the character of Leopold Bloom

from the modernist period. Joyce demonstrates that Bloom is a diverse person who does not fit into those basic negative jewish stereotypes, thereby challenging the negative stereotypes that are associated with those of Jewish descent. Bloom deals with many of the same prejudices that many people face back then. He is treated like an outsider because he is Jewish, and you can tell he is searching for a place where he truly belongs. But what makes Bloom such a great character is that he is not just defined by his Jewishness. He is a husband trying to make his marriage work, a father grieving the loss of a child, and someone who is always looking for meaning in the world around him. He has got layers, just like a real person.

Ulysses is not just a story; it is like a snapshot of what life was like in the early 1900s, especially in Ireland and Europe. Joyce throws us right into a world that is full of change and tension, and Bloom's character is right at the heart of it. What makes Bloom's story so powerful is that Joyce really understood what it meant to be Jewish, not just as a religion, but as a whole identity that is shaped by history and culture. We see the malignity of anti-Semitism through Bloom's eyes, but we also see his incredible capacity for empathy and understanding. He is a character who can hold both the pain of prejudice and the hope for a better future. Joyce demonstrates how literature may assist individuals in comprehending such discriminations prevalent at the time.

In more recent times, Howard Jacobson's novel *The Finkler Question* tells the story of Jewish characters trying to navigate life in the modern world. They face challenges both from people outside their community and, surprisingly, from within it as well. Jacobson's book is a powerful reminder that even though it might look different than it used to, prejudice against Jewish people is still something that is confronted within the society we live now. Jacobson tackles the whole idea of what it means to be Jewish in today's World through these three friends, Julian, Sam, and Libor, we see how being Jewish affects their lives in different ways. Jacobson gets into the feeling of not really belonging, of carrying the weight of history and culture, and how stereotypes still exists, even in modern times. It is a really thoughtful look at identity and how our experiences shape who we are.

Julian is kind of obsessed with Jewishness, even though he is not Jewish himself. He is drawn to it, but in a way that feels superficial, like he is romanticizing it without

really getting it. And that is where things get interesting. He goes from being totally admired to feeling disillusioned, and it shows how hard it is to truly understand and become part of a culture that is not yours. Jacobson is using Julian to say something about those who try to adopt an identity without putting in the real work. You can not just choose the parts you like; you have to engage with the whole history, the good and the bad. It is a critique of cultural appropriation, basically.

Sam is a really interesting character because he is struggling with what it means to be Jewish on a personal level. He has got this internal war going on, where he is both drawn to and pushing away from his Jewish identity. And then there is the whole ASHamed Jews thing, which adds another layer of complexity. What Jacobson's getting at with Sam is that being Jewish is about more than just religion; it is about politics, history, and where you stand on issues like Israel and anti-semitism. Sam is critical of Israel, and that puts him at odds with some in the Jewish community. He embodies the challenges of navigating Jewish identity in a world where those issues are front and center.

Libor is like the voice of experience in the story. He has seen a lot, especially when it comes to loss and the impact of history. He is a reminder that the past does not just disappear; it shapes who we are, even generations later. What is interesting about Libor is that he comes to adopt his Jewish heritage later in life. It is like he is finally making peace with his past and finding comfort in his cultural identity. But it is not always easy for him. He still faces challenges fitting into the world. Jacobson is showing us that even as we find strength in our heritage, there is always some fluctuations between holding onto your identity and finding acceptance in a larger society.

Jacobson does not hesitate when it comes to showing the ugly reality of anti-Semitism. He reflects it into the story in ways that feel very real, from the casual street harassment that Treslove experiences to the more blatant act of vandalism at the Jewish museum. The point he is making is that anti-Semitism is not always this big, obvious thing. It often hides in plain sight, in the things people say and do, and it affects both individuals and the whole Jewish community. It is a reminder that prejudice is still very much alive, even in a supposedly tolerant society. *The Finkler Question* is a book that really makes the reader think about what it means to be Jewish in general.

Jacobson mixes humor with some really deep reflections on culture, prejudice, and the whole idea of belonging. We see the world through the eyes of three very different Jewish men, each trying to figure out their own place in it all.

Thus, the discrimination against Jews has been a persistent issue throughout history and the findings of this research reveal that its nature has evolved over time, reflecting changing societal dynamics. In ancient times, negative attitudes toward Jewish people were primarily rooted in religious differences. Over time, however, these attitudes shifted to focus more on racial identity, influenced by the rise of pseudo-scientific theories and nationalist sentiments. These changing justifications demonstrate how prejudice against Jewish communities adapted to the prevailing social and political contexts.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adam, B. (2010). Judaism. In Ş. Gündüz (Ed.), *Living world religions.* (3rd ed., pp. 205-275).

Adorno, T. W. (2016). *The Authoritarian Personality.*. Sel Yayıncılık.

Albertus Aquensis. (2006). *Liber Christianae expeditions pro ereptione et restitutione Sanctae Hierosolymitanae Ecclesiae* (A. C. Krey, Trans.). Martino Publishing.

Alderman, G. (1992). *Modern British Jewry*. Oxford University Press.

Arendt, H. (2009). *Kötülüğün sıradanlığı: Eichmann Kudüs'te* (Ö. Çelik, Çev.). Metis Yayınları.

Arendt, H. (2018). *Totalitarizmin kaynakları 1: Antisemitizm* (B. S. Şener, Çev.). İletişim Yayınları.

Arendt, H. (1963). *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil*. Viking Press.

Aronsfeld, C. C. (1987). A German antisemite in England: Adolf Stöcker's London visit in 1883. *Jewish Social Studies, 49*(1).

Batuk, C. (2008). Tanrı'nın asi çocukları: 'Zalimlik ve mazlumluk arasında şiddet sarmalındaki Yahudiler'. *Milel ve Nihal, 5*(1), 157-187.

Bauman, Z. (1991). *Modernity and Ambivalence*. Polity Press.

Bauer, Y. (1994). In search of a definition of antisemitism. In M. Brown (Ed.), *Approaches to antisemitism-Context and curriculum*. The American Jewish Committee & The International Center for University Teaching of Jewish Culture.

BBC News. (2006, February 20). Holocaust denier Irving is jailed. *BBC News*. Retrieved from https://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/4733820.stm

Beller, S. (2007). *Antisemitism: A very short introduction*. Oxford University Press.

Biale, D. (1986). *Power and Powerlessness in Jewish History*. Schocken Books.

Bigalke, R. J. (2011). Anti-Semitism. In *The Encyclopedia of Christian Civilization*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd. Retrieved from http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/9780470670606.wbecc0054/abstract

Bigalke, R. J. (2017). *Anti-Semitism: A Biblical Perspective*. Biblical Worldview Press.

Blackmur, R. P. (1949). *Eleven Essays on the European Novel*. Harcourt, Brace and Company.

Brenner, M. (2011). *Kısa Yahudi tarihi* (S. Altınçekiç, Çev.). Alfa Yayınları.

Brenner, L. (1983). *Zionism in the Age of the Dictators*. Lawrence Hill Books.

Burges, H. (n.d.). Stereotyping. Beyond Intractability. Retrieved from http://www.beyondintractability.org/bi-essay/stereotypes

Butler, J. (2012). *Parting Ways: Jewishness and the Critique of Zionism*. Columbia University Press.

Caioni, M., della Porta, D., & Wagemann, C. (2012). *Mobilizing on extreme right: Germany, Italy and the United States*. Oxford University Press.

Campbell, J. (2003). *Batı mitolojisi Tanrı'nın maskeleri* (K. Emiroğlu, Trans.). İmge Yayınları.

Cesarani, D. (1994). *The Jewish Chronicle and Anglo-Jewry, 1841-1991*. Cambridge University Press.

Chanes, J. A. (2004). *Antisemitism*. Contemporary World Issues ABC-CLIO Inc.

Chazan, R. (1987). The lengthy Hebrew First-Crusade chronicle. In *European Jewry and the First Crusade*. University of California Press.

Chazan, R. (2006). *The Jews of medieval Western Christendom*. Cambridge University Press.

Cohen, M. R. (2013). *Haç ve hilal altında ortaçağda Yahudiler* (A. Fethi, Trans.). Köprü Kitapları.

Cohn-Sherbok, D. (2006). *The Paradox of Anti-Semitism*. Continuum.

Community Security Trust. (2019). *Antisemitic incidents report 2019*.

Davis, A., & Chazan, R. (2005). Anti-Semitism. In L. Jones (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Religion* (Vol. 1, pp. 397-403). Thomson Gale.

Dickens, C. (1838). *Oliver Twist*. Bentley's Miscellany.

Dickens, C. (1971). *Our mutual friend*. Penguin Classics.

Duncalf, F. (1969). The councils of Piacenza and Clermont. In K. M. Setton (Ed.), *A history of the Crusades* (Vol. I, pp. 220-252). The University of Wisconsin Press.

Duncalf, F. (1969). The first crusade: Clermont to Constantinople. In K. M. Setton (Ed.), *A history of the Crusades* (Vol. I, pp. 253-279). The University of Wisconsin Press.

Efron, J. M. (1994). *Defenders of the Race: Jewish Doctors and Race Science in Fin-de-Siècle Europe*. Yale University Press.

Ekkehard of Aura. (2006). Hierosolymita (A. C. Krey, Trans.). In *The first crusade: The accounts of eyewitnesses and participants*. Martino Publishing.

Ellmann, R. (1972). *Ulysses on the Liffey*. Oxford University Press.

Ellmann, R. (1982). *James Joyce*. Oxford University Press.

Elon, A. (2005). *Çöküşe tırmanış: Alman Yahudilerinin öyküsü 1743-1933* (D. Altaras, Trans.). Gözlem Gazetecilik Basın ve Yayın A.Ş.

Endelman, T. M. (2002). *The Jews of Britain, 1656 to 2000*. University of California Press.

Erdoğan, Ö. (2018). *Yahudilik tarihi*. Kalipso Yayınları.

Evans, R. J. (2001). *Lying About Hitler: History, Holocaust, and the David Irving Trial*. Basic Books.

Ferguson, N. (1998). *The world's banker: The history of the House of Rothschild*. Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

Finkelstein, N. G. (2005). *Beyond Chutzpah: On the Misuse of Anti-Semitism and the Abuse of History*. University of California Press.

Friedländer, S. (2016). *Nazi Almanyası ve Yahudiler: Zulüm yılları (1933-1939)* (A. Selman, Çev.). İletişim Yayınları.

Garaudy, R. (1996). *The founding myths of modern Israel*. Institute for Historical Review.

Gartner, L. P. (1981). *The Jewish immigrant in England, 1870-1914*. Simon & Schuster.

Geory, D. (2006). *Hitler and Nazism*. Routledge.

Gibson, W. (1968). *The art of Dickens*. Oxford University Press.

Gilbert, M. (1989). *The Holocaust: A history of the Jews of Europe during the Second World War*. Henry Holt and Company.

Girling, H. (1990). The Jew in James Joyce's *Ulysses*. In D. Cohen & D. Heller (Eds.), *Jewish presences in English literature* (pp. 96-112). McGill-Queen's University Press.

Goldman, A. (1992). *The Joyce paradox: Form and freedom in his fiction*. Routledge.

Greenblatt, S. (1988). *Shakespearean negotiations: The circulation of social energy in Renaissance England*. Berkeley: University of California Press. p. 45.

Grass, S. (2014). *Charles Dickens's Our Mutual Friend: A publishing history*. Ashgate Publishing.

Groepler, E. (1999). *Anti-Semitizm: Antik Çağdan günümüze Yahudi düşmanlığı tarihi* (S. Kaya, Trans.). Belge Yayınları.

Gross, J. (1992). *Shylock: A legend and its legacy*. Simon and Schuster.

Grossman, L. (1973). *Charles Dickens and the Jews*. Simon and Schuster.

Heller, D. (1990). The outcast as villain and victim: Jews in Dickens's *Oliver Twist* and *Our Mutual Friend*. In D. Cohen & D. Heller (Eds.), *Jewish presences in English literature* (pp. 40-60). McGill-Queen's University Press.

Hertz, D. (2013). *George Eliot and Judaism: An intellectual and moral kinship*. Routledge.

Herzl, T. (1896). *The Jewish State: An Attempt at a Modern Solution of the Jewish Question*. Maccabean Publishing Co.

Hillaby, J. (2003). *Jewish London: A history and guide*. I.B. Tauris.

Hitler, A. (1976). *Kavgam* (A. Nejat, Trans.). Toker Yayınları.

Holocaust Memorial Day Trust. (2020). *Holocaust Memorial Day*.

Hume, D. (1983). *The history of England*. Retrieved March 5, 2006, from www.heretical.com/British/jews1290.html

Irving, D. (1999). *The Leuchter Report: The End of a Myth*. Focal Point Publications.

Jacobson, H. (2010). *The Finkler question*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Jeudwine, J. W. (2001). *The foundations of society and the land: A review of the social systems of the Middle Ages*.

John, J. (2005). Fagin, the Holocaust and Mass Culture: Or, *Oliver Twist* on Screen. *Dickens Quarterly, 22*(4), 204-223. https://www.jstor.org/stable/45292040

Johnson, E. (1952). *Charles Dickens: His tragedy and triumph* (Vol. 2). Little, Brown and Co.

Johnson, P. (1987). *A history of the Jews*. Harper & Row.

Johnson, P. (2017). *Yahudi tarihi* (F. Orman, Çev.). Pozitif Yayınları.

Joyce, J. (1986). *Ulysses* (H. W. Gabler, W. Steppe, & C. Melchior, Eds.). Penguin Books.

Joyce, S. (1950). *My brother's keeper: James Joyce's early years*. Viking Press.

Karesh, S. E., & Hurvitz, M. M. (2006). Antisemitism. In G. Melton (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Judaism* (p. 23). Facts On File.

Katz, D. S. (1994). *The Jews in the History of England, 1485–1850*. Oxford University Press.

Katz, S. T. (Ed.). (2022). *The Cambridge companion to antisemitism*. Cambridge University Press.

Kaufman, M. (2007). *The origins of Victorian anti-Semitism*. Cambridge University Press.

Kaufmann, F., & Eisenberg, J. (1987). Yahudi kaynaklarına göre Yahudilik. *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi, 29*(1), 267-283.

Kemple, J. M. (1876). *The Saxons in England: A history of the English commonwealth till the period of the Norman conquest*.

Kershaw, I. (1998). Hitler, 1889–1936: Hubris. W.W. Norton & Company.

Khalidi, R. (1997). *Palestinian Identity: The Construction of Modern National Consciousness*. Columbia University Press.

Kurt, A. O. (2010). Yahudi aydınlanma hareketi: Haskala. *Milel ve Nihal, 7*(1), 33-35.

Kushner, T. (1992). *The Persistence of Prejudice: Antisemitism in British Society During the Second World War*. Manchester University Press.

Lane, L. (1951, July 20). 'Oliver Twist': A revision. *The Times Literary Supplement*, 450.

Lane, L., Jr. (1958). Dickens' archetypal Jew. *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America (PMLA), 73*, 94-100.

Langmuir, G. I. (1990). *Toward a definition of antisemitism*. University of California Press.

Lazare, B. (1967). *Antisemitism: Its history and causes*. Britons Publishing Company.

Leaman, O., & Nyman, C. (1998). Anti-Semitism. In E. Craig (Ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Vol. 1, p. 311). Routledge.

Ledger, S. (2007). *Dickens and the popular radical imagination*. Cambridge University Press.

Leese, A. (1938). *My Irrelevant Defence: Jewish Ritual Murder*. Guildford: Privately Published, 1938.

Levy, R. S. (2005). *Antisemitism: A historical encyclopedia of prejudice and persecution*. ABC-Clio Press.

Lewis, B. (2004). *Semitizm ve anti-semitizm: Çatışma ve önyargıya dair* (H. Güldü, Trans.). Everest Yayınları.

Linehan, T. (2000). *British Fascism, 1918–39: Parties, Ideology, and Culture*. Manchester University Press.

Lipman, V. D. (1990). *A history of the Jews in Britain since 1858*. Leicester University Press.

Lipstadt, D. E. (2005). *History on Trial: My Day in Court with David Irving*. Harper Perennial.

Maccoby, H. (2006). *Antisemitism and modernity: Innovation and continuity*. Routledge.

MacMaster, N. (2001). *Racism in Europe 1870–2000*. Palgrave.

Maier, C. T. (1999). Crusade propaganda and attacks against Jews in the late twelfth and thirteenth centuries. In *Uluslararası Haçlı Seferleri Sempozyumu* (pp. 213-226). Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.

Marrus, M. R. (1987). *The Holocaust in history*. University Press of New England.

Marrus, M. R. (1987). *The Unwanted: European Refugees in the Twentieth Century*. Oxford University Press.

McHugh, R. (1981). *An annotated critical bibliography of James Joyce*. Harvester Press.

Mendick, R. (2020). Jeremy Corbyn and the Labour antisemitism crisis. *The Telegraph*.

Merriam-Webster. (n.d.). Stereotype. In *Merriam-Webster.com dictionary*. Retrieved from http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/stereotype

Meyer, S. (2005). Antisemitism and Social Critique in Dickens's *Oliver Twist*. *Victorian Literature and Culture, 33*(1), 239-252. https://www.jstor.org/stable/25058705

Mora, N. (2011). *Alman kültüründe düşman imgesi*. Nobel Yayıncılık.

Morris, P. (1991). *Dickens and the imaginary Jew*. Victorian Literature and Culture, 19(1), 59-74. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1060150300002581

Mosse, G. L. (1985). *Toward the Final Solution: A History of European Racism*. Harper & Row.

Nadel, I. B. (1996). *Joyce and the Jews: Culture and texts*. University Press of Florida.

Oldenbourg, Z. (1966). *The Crusades* (A. Carter, Trans.).

Özdemir, M. (2012). Hıristiyan İspanya'da Yahudi aleyhtarlığı (VI-XIV. yüzyıllar). In A. Ünal et al. (Eds.), *Bütün yönleriyle Yahudilik (Uluslararası Sempozyum)* (pp. 239-256). Türkiye Dinler Tarihi Derneği.

Paganoni, M. C. (2010). From book to film: The semiotics of Jewishness in *Oliver Twist*. *Dickens Quarterly, 27*(4), 307–320. https://www.jstor.org/stable/45292291

Pappe, I. (2006). *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine*. Oneworld Publications.

Parkes, J. (1964). *Antisemitism*. Quadrangle Books.

Poliakov, L., & et al. (1978). Anti-Semitism. In *Encyclopedia Judaica* (Vol. 3, pp. 88-160). Keterpress Enterprises.

Pulzer, P. (2005). Third thoughts on German and Austrian antisemitism. *Journal of Modern Jewish Studies, 4*(2), 10.

Ragussis, M. (2010). *Figures of conversion: "The Jewish question" and English national identity*. Duke University Press.

Rattansi, A. (2007). *A very short introduction*. Oxford University Press.

Richardson, H. (2001). *The governance of medieval England*. Clarendon Press.

Riley-Smith, J. (2003). *The first crusade and the idea of crusading* (pp. 50-53).

Rosenberg, J. (1973). *From Shylock to Svengali*.

Roth, C. (1938). *Anglo-Jewish letters* (pp. 304-309).

Roth, C. (1994). *A history of the Jews in England*. Clarendon Press.

Rubin, M. (2004). *Charity and community in medieval Cambridge*. Cambridge University Press.

Runciman, S. (2008). *Haçlı seferleri tarihi* (Vol. I-III, F. Işıltan, Trans.). TTK Yayınları.

Sachar, H. M. (1990). *A history of the Jews in the modern world*. Knopf.

Schwarz, D. R. (1995). *Reading Joyce's Ulysses*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Schwarzbach, F. S. (2011). *Dickens and the city*. The Athlone Press.

Shahak, I. (2002). *Yahudi tarihi Yahudi dini.*

Shahak, I. (2015). *Yahudi tarihi Yahudi dini* (A. E. Dağ, Trans.). Düşün Yayıncılık.

Smith, J. M. (2020). *The Sons of Noah: Shem, Ham, and Japheth in History and Myth*. Oxford University Press.

Stacey, R. C. (2002). *The English Jews under Angevin kings*. Oxford University Press.

Stone, H. (1959). Dickens and the Jews. *Victorian Studies, 2*.

Stone, H. (1960). From Fagin to Riah: Jews in the Victorian novel. *Midstream, 6*, 29-30.

Stone, H. (1969). *The night side of Dickens: Cannibalism, passion, necessity*. The Ohio State University Press.

Stone, H. (1979). *Dickens and the Jews*. Yale University Press.

Stone, H. (1979). Oliver Twist and fairy tales. *Dickens Studies Newsletter, 10*(2-3), 34.

Şenay, B. (2002). Yahudi-Hıristiyan ilişkileri tarihi ve anti-semitizm-oryantalizm ilişkisi. *Uludağ Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi, 11*(2), 117-146.

Taguieff, P. A. (2017). *Antisemitizm* (I. Ergüden, Trans.). Dost Kitabevi.

Testofcivilisation. (2021a). *Uitroeiing*. Retrieved April 24, 2021, from http://testofcivilisation.eu/tr/uitroeiing

Testofcivilisation. (2021b). *Jodenster*. Retrieved April 24, 2021, from http://testofcivilisation.eu/tr/jodenster#:~:text=Sar%C4%B1%20Y%C4%B1ld%C4%B1z,yerde%20y%C4%B1ld%C4%B1z%20takmakla%20y%C3%BCk%C3%BCml%C3%BC%20k%C4%B1l%C4%B1nd%C4%B1.&text=Hedef%20hem%20Yahudilerin%20tan%C4%B1nmas%C4%B1n%C4%B1%20sa%C4%9Flamak%2C%20hem%20de%20onlar%C4%B1%20izole%20edip%20a%C5%9Fa%C4%9F%C4%B1lamakt%C4%B1.

Testofcivilisation. (2021c). *Kristallnacht*. Retrieved April 24, 2021, from http://testofcivilisation.eu/tr/kristallnacht

The World Holocaust Remembrance Center. (2017). Antisemitism. Retrieved from https://www.yadvashem.org/odot_pdf/Microsoft%20Word%20-%205742.pdf

Trachtenberg, J. (1983). *The devil and the Jews*. The Jewish Publication Society of America.

UK Government. (2016). *UK adopts IHRA definition of antisemitism*.

United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. (2021a). *Nuremberg laws*. Retrieved April 3, 2021, from https://encyclopedia.ushmm.org/content/tr/article/nuremberg-laws

United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. (2021b). *Antisemitism in history: The early modern era (1300-1800)*. Retrieved April 4, 2021, from https://encyclopedia.ushmm.org/content/en/article/antisemitism-in-history-the-early-modern-era-1300-1800?series=30

United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. (2021c). *Antisemitism in history: The era of nationalism (1800-1918)*. Retrieved April 4, 2021, from https://encyclopedia.ushmm.org/content/en/article/antisemitism-in-history-the-era-of-nationalism-1800-1918?series=30

United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. (2021d). *Victims of the Nazi era: Nazi racial ideology*. Retrieved April 4, 2021, from https://encyclopedia.ushmm.org/content/en/article/victims-of-the-nazi-era-nazi-racial-ideology?series=30

Wilson, E. (1965). *The wound and the bow*. Oxford University Press.

Wyne, H. (2004). Kilise tarihinde antisemitizm (S. Turan, Trans.). *Dinbilimleri Akademik Araştırma Dergisi, IV*(1), 275-290. Retrieved from http://www.dinbilimleri.com/DergiTamDetay.aspx?ID=470&Detay=Ozet