Armin Lange and Kerstin Mayerhofer

Introduction

To effectively counteract contemporary antisemitism, it is important to recognize the traditions that feed modern hatred of Jews. Manifestations of antisemitism in contemporary cultures and societies are manifold. They range from hate speech to actual physical violence and can be encountered in political or economic realms, in social discourses of nation and race, or on a meta-level both culturally and ideologically. Religious and theological antisemitism can be regarded as the source for most of the other forms of Jew-hatred, especially in its shaping of a canon of discriminatory images and perceptions of "the Jews" as essentially different from anyone not Jewish.

Many contributions to the conference "An End to Antisemitism!" confirmed that ancient and medieval religious traditions of Jew-hatred still have an impact today. Their canon of antisemitic traditions remains vivid, and it is necessary to first recognize the traditions in question to subsequently eradicate them from contemporary discourse.

Usage of Terms

The usage of the term *antisemitism* is as complex as the genesis of the term itself.[1] This is why some of the contributions in this volume dispute that the texts they study are "antisemitic" in nature. They rather wish to apply a more general term of "Jew-hatred" that subsumes all different forms of polemics against and persecutions of Jews. Focusing on theological concepts, especially in Christian religious history, some of the contributions also claim that specifically religious stereotypes confirm a notion of "anti-Judaism" that is not necessarily connected with other discriminatory allegations against Jews other than them accepting a system of beliefs and practices differing from and competing with Christianity. However, these traditions are also in fact clearly polemical and express negative images of and attitudes against Jews that reach far beyond the scope of religious alterity.

This seeming contradiction to the above claim of the ancient and medieval roots of modern antisemitism in some of the present volume's contributions can

1 See, e. g., G. I. Langmuir, *Toward a Definition of Antisemitism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990).

 https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110671773-002

be explained in two ways. (1) Not all of the ancient and medieval roots of modern antisemitism are perceived by all authors to be antisemitic in nature themselves but are regarded as expressions of the rejection of Judaism for other reasons than Jew-hatred.[2] (2) Despite the conference being based on the IHRA's Working Definition of Antisemitism,[3] several contributions employ different definitions of antisemitism. While some essays perceive all forms of Jew-hatred and anti-Jewish discrimination as antisemitic, others are more restrictive in their use of the term antisemitism as mentioned above. The editors of the present volume have chosen not to unify the usage of the various terms mentioned above. However, each author has been asked to present a definition according to which they understand and use a respective term.

Symbols, Images, and Traditions in the Formation of (Religious) Group Identities

Both individual and group identities are constructed and maintained by way of distinction and differentiation. A child develops its identity by differentiating itself from its mother in a process of several years. The construction of a personal identity includes thus not only the recognition "I am I" but also the recognition "You are not me." Social and religious group identities are constructed and maintained in a similar way, that is, in differentiation from other social or religious groups implying thus the recognition "We are we but not you." Group identities are thus constructed by way of distinguishing an in-group from an out-group, or—to say it in other words—a collective "I" from a collective "Other."[4]

---

2 Cf., e. g., the contribution by Reuven Firestone to this volume, "Is the Qur'an 'Antisemitic'?," 85 – 106.

3 For further detail refer to volume 1 of the present series, A. Lange, K. Mayerhofer, D. Porat, and L. H. Schiffman, eds., *Comprehending and Confronting Antisemitism: A Multi-Faceted Approach*, vol. 1 of *An End to Antisemitism!* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2019), 565 – 67.

4 This is based on Henri Tajfel's social identity theory whose central idea is that members of an in-group ("us") are conjoined together through the identification of negative aspects of an out-group ("them"). By doing so, the in-group members do not only differentiate themselves from their out-group opposites but also enhance their own self-image and identity. Cf. H. Tajfel and J. C. Turner, "The Social Identity Theory of Intergroup Behavior," in *Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, ed. S. Worchel and W. G. Austin (Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1986), 7 – 24, and H. Tajfel, *Differentiation between Social Groups: Studies in the Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations* (London: Academic Press, 1978). While social identity theory is classical in scholarly fields related to social studies such as psychology, its core concepts are also very helpful for an analysis of the formation of religious group identity in religious studies.

In the case of some religions, such a group identity is constructed by defining a unifying set of religious doctrines that distinguishes this religion from all other religions. In the case of other religions, the same goal is reached by a set of religious, moral, and ritual rules that achieve the same differentiation.

How religious identity is understood and constructed—both in terms of differentiating oneself from another ("I am not you") and understanding oneself as being part of a distinct group ("We are not them")—is thus a process inextricably linked to how religions are shaped. In establishing a new system of beliefs, values, and moral codes, religions need an opposite against which to define these beliefs, values, and moral codes and to prove their validity. On the other hand, they help to form communal spirits, feelings of solidarity, and shared identity. When members of the same group are brought together and held responsible for by the same religious beliefs, values, and moral codes, a common sense of togetherness and identity is shaped. This is true for all major religions.

The construction of religious group identities in monotheistic religions *qua definition* is especially competitive. The claim that there would be only one god negates all other religions to a much larger extent than in the case of polytheistic religions. A polytheistic religion can differentiate itself from another polytheistic religion without rejection of their opposite religious group identity. As an example, the claim of a collective "We" to believe in Isis does not need to deny the veracity of veneration of Mithras in its differentiation from a collective "Them." The construction of the religious group identity of the Isis mystery cult, therefore, did not depend solely on the differentiation from other mystery cults such as the Mithras cult. There is no need to fully negate another religious belief system in order to corroborate the very rationale of their own religious existence. Monotheism, however, beyond differentiation, implies rejection and condemnation of the religious "Other" against which its very own religious group identity is formed by default. If there can be only one god, then all other gods must be void.

This is even more so the case when a given monotheistic religion developed out of a preexisting one, that is, Christianity out of Judaism and Islam out of both Judaism and Christianity. Rejection, condemnation, and dismissal of a monotheistic ancestor religion is, if not a necessity, at least an obvious choice in the formation of the religious group identity of a newly born monotheistic religious group.

For the purpose of forming and maintaining their religious group identity in differentiation from Judaism, both Christianity and Islam constructed a set of religious symbols that guide their recognition of the Jewish out-group as to the Christian and Islamic in-group, respectively. Such symbols include the demoni-

zation of Judaism as purported, for example, in John 8:44 in Christianity[5] or the supposed violation of the covenant of Medina by the Jews of Medina in Islam.[6] The incorporation of antisemitic symbols into the religious canon of symbolism and imagery is thus inherent in and characteristic for both Christianity and Islam.[7]

Two examples from Christianity and Islam must suffice here to illustrate our point.

(1) From its early days onwards, Christianity has been drawing heavily on the notion of a Jewish "Other." The Jews serve as their religious opposite and proof of Christianity's truthful and righteous re-interpretation of the "Old Law." Judaism is considered to be the outdated "parent religion" from which Christianity wants to set itself apart. This idea is already embodied in the phrase "New Testament."

The term *New Testament* as a designation of the second part of the Christian Bible is inextricably linked not only with Christianity's rejection of Judaism but also with its claims to replace it. The phrase itself means "new covenant" and is Latin in origin [*novum testamentum*]. The Latin renders in turn the Greek ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη [*ʻē kainē diathēkē*] (Luke 22:20; 1 Cor 11:25; 2 Cor 3:6). The phrase is Jew-

5 See, e. g., the contribution by Adele Reinhartz to the present volume, "'Children of the Devil': John 8:44 and its Early Reception," 43 – 53, or the contribution by Maxine Grossman and Armin Lange to volume 1 of the conference proceedings, "Jews and Judaism between Bedevilment and Source of Salvation: Christianity as a Cause of and a Cure against Antisemitism," in *Comprehending and Confronting Antisemitism: A Multi-Faceted Approach*, vol. 1 of *An End to Antisemitism!*, ed. A. Lange, K. Mayerhofer, D. Porat, and L. H. Schiffman (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2019), 133 – 64. Also, just recently, M. Lindsay Kaplan has drawn attention to the understanding of literal figures employed to illustrate a theological claim in medieval Christian writings as a form of (proto-)racist thinking. Cf. M. L. Kaplan, *Figuring Racism in Medieval Christianity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2019).

6 Cf., e. g., Israel Shrenzel's contribution to the present volume, "Against the Mainstream: Muhammad Abduh's Reading of Q1:7 and its Implications for Current Muslim-Jewish Relations," 207 – 19, D. Pratt, "Muslim-Jewish Relations: Some Islamic Paradigms," *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations* 21, no. 1 (2010): 11 – 21. For a collection of common antisemitic perceptions and motifs in the Qur'an and related scriptures cf. A. G. Bostom, ed., *The Legacy of Islamic Antisemitism: From Sacred Texts to Solemn History* (New York: Prometheus Books, 2008).

7 Antisemitic traditions, symbolism, and imagery are not foreign to other major religions as well. Contemporary Hinduism and Buddhism show about the same prevalence of antisemitic notions and stereotypes as does contemporary Christianity. Cf. *ADL Global 100: An Index of Anti-Semitism,* https://global100.adl.org/, accessed March 21, 2020. Since the present volume's contributions focus on Christianity and Islam, only these two religions will be discussed in terms of the history of their antisemitic tradition and its transmission into contemporary Christian and Islamic religious denominations.

ish in origin and goes back to Jer 31:31 which promises Judaism a "New Covenant" [בְּרִית חֲדָשָׁה, *berit ḥadashah*] with its God after the double conquest of Jerusalem in the years 597 and 587 B.C.E. and the subsequent exile of many Jews to Mesopotamia. Jeremiah 31:31 promises thus a renewal of God's covenant with his people after a period of punishment. Christianity, however, appropriated this promise and understood it as a forecast of itself. Instead of a renewed relationship between God and his elected people, Christianity perceived itself as representing a new covenant between God and the world replacing and superseding Judaism as the "Old Covenant" God made with his formerly chosen people. This pattern of thought is called *supersessionism* or *replacement theology*. It is embodied already in the names of the two parts of the Christian Bible, that is, the Old Testament and New Testament. Today, many Christians are not aware of the supersessionist implications of this terminology anymore. However, when this terminology is used, awareness of its implied antisemitic notion is important. Designations for the Christian Old Testament that avoid supersessionist implications and are in use today are "First Testament" and/or "Hebrew Bible." Still, corresponding rhetoric for similarly appropriate terminology for the Christian New Testament such as "Second Testament" and/or "Christian Bible" is largely lacking.

Throughout the present volume, the term *New Testament* will be used, yet when this rhetoric is used, Christian supersessionist thought is nowhere endorsed here, rather its usage intends to depict a current Christian practice.

The establishment of a "new covenant" is both Christianity's aim and reason for rejecting Judaism. This religious doctrine has served—and continues to serve—as one of the major pillars of Christianity. Replacement theology was, and to a significant extant is even now at the heart of constructing and maintaining Christianity's religious identity. Christianity's self-conceptualization as fulfilment of Judaism in assuming the role of God's chosen people forms the basis for supersessionist thought even in contemporary Christianity. Notwithstanding different representations of Christian supersessionism, some more radical than others, all of them underline the general principle of Christian religious superiority with various images from the cultural, social, and economic realm which were formulated and continuously conflated already in pre-modern times. Right-wing ideologies such as the Christian Identity movement apply these ideas to argue for their calls for the eradication of Jews and Judaism. Ideologies like these have fueled and continue to fuel antisemitic and other racist hate crimes and acts of terrorism executed by White Supremacist or neo-Nazi groups.

(2) While the negative stereotypes regarding Jews in Islam differ from European Christian antisemitic perceptions, they too can be traced back to its earliest history. The Qur'an also shows the notion of a Jewish "counter figure" and em-

ploys the Jews figuratively to corroborate Islamist core beliefs and values. Quite often, these were discussed in the Hadith and Sira where they became increasingly discriminatory. An example for this phenomenon is the notion of *taḥrīf* that is present already in the Qur'an and is still employed today in Muslim polemics against both Jews and Christians. The idea of *taḥrīf* is even instrumental in forming an Islamic replacement theology that targets both Judaism and Christianity as the rejected and replaced religious out-group. *Taḥrīf* either claims that Jews and Christians would have forged their scriptures to suppress the true religious message of Allah to them (*taḥrīf al-nass*) and that they would interpret them wrongly to achieve the same goal (*taḥrīf al-ma'ani*). Therefore, Allah would have had to reveal his true message of Islam anew to Muhammad in the form of the Qur'an and Islam would have been necessary to replace both Judaism and Christianity as corruptions of the true message of God.

The *taḥrīf* polemic draws on Christian polemics that suggest that Jews would have forged their scriptures to suppress the truth about the messianic nature of Jesus of Nazareth[8] and turns them into a supersessionist rationale for the very existence of Islam. Its basis can be traced back to the Qur'an itself (e. g., Sura 3:78), however an increasing radicalization can be found in the Hadith and Sira. Examples for the latter include Sahih al-Bukhari's *Kitāb al-sahadat* [*The Book of Testimonies*, no. 29] from roughly 900 C.E. *Taḥrīf* polemics and *taḥrīf* replacement theology did not stop with the Sira but characterize the construction of Islamic group identity from the Middle Ages until today. An example from the high Middle Ages is Ibn Hazm (994 – 1064). In his book *Kitāb al-Faṣl fī l-milal wa-l-ahwā' wa-l-niḥal* [*Treatise on Religions, Sects, and Creeds*], the chapter polemicizing against Jews and Christen is entitled:

> Treatise on the obvious contradictions and evident lies in the Book which the Jews call the Torah and in the Rest of their books, and in the Four Gospels, all of which establish that these have been distorted, and are different from what God, Mighty and Exalted, revealed.[9]

8 Cf. W. Adler, "The Jews as Falsifiers: Charges of Tendentious Emendation in Anti-Jewish Christian Polemic," in *Translation of Scripture: Proceedings of a Conference at the Annenberg Research Institute, May 15 – 16, 1989*, ed. D. M. Goldenberg (Philadelphia: Annenberg Research Institute, 1990), 1 – 27.

9 Translation according to M. Whittingham, "Ezra as the Corrupter of the Torah? Re-Assessing Ibn Ḥazm's Role in the Long History of an Idea," *Intellectual History of the Islamicate World* 1 (2013): 256. For *taḥrīf*, see also C. Adang, *Muslim Writers on Judaism and the Hebrew Bible: From Ibn Rabban to Ibn Hazm* (Leiden: Brill, 1996); A.-S. Boisliveau, "Qurʾānic Discourse on the Bible: Ambivalence and *taḥrīf* in the Light of Self-Reference," *MIDÉO* 33 (2018): 3 – 38; H. Lazarus-Yafeh, *Intertwined Worlds: Medieval Islam and Bible Criticism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), 19 – 49; H. Lazarus-Yafeh, "Taḥrīf," in *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed., ed. P.

Concerning *taḥrīf* it is especially important to notice that it is directed against both Jews and Christians. This duo-direction documents how a positive self-image and self-esteem is created in an in-group through distinction from an opposite out-group, here in a most negative way. On the other hand, it also serves as example of how Jew-hatred often intersects with discrimination of other religious, cultural, social and ethnic groups.

While the basis for current Muslim antisemitism cannot be traced back to the Qur'an as Islam's foundational scripture to the same extent as Christian Jew-hatred can be traced back already to the New Testament as Christianity's foundational scripture, antisemitic hate crimes based on a discriminatory understanding of Muslim holy scripture can be encountered already in the pre-modern times. However, Muslim antisemitism changed significantly in the nineteenth century after common Christian antisemitic perceptions had found their way into Muslim theology. Both genuinely Muslim traditions of Jew-hatred as well as imported Christian and/or Western antisemitic traditions form the basis of contemporary discrimination against Jews in Islam. Many antisemitic ideas are employed today to advance an anti-Zionist agenda against the State of Israel by Muslim individuals and states.

Even though some of the classical Christian antisemitic notions and images are alien to Islamic culture and heritage, both religions have always conceptualized Jews as their religious "Other" in the process of formation of their own identity. These images prevail in both contemporary Christianity and today's Islam in their various denominations. Because the main question of our conference was how to combat antisemitism, the essays described below include some that focus not so much on ancient and medieval sources themselves but ask how the persistence of their antisemitic motifs and notions might be countered today. All of them, however, are dedicated to the questions of how traditions, symbols, and imagery that are employed to construct and maintain Christian and Islamic religious group identities in a way that is hostile to Judaism can be counteracted.

The present volume engages thus with one of the basic mechanisms underlying religiously motivated Jew-hatred. Only a thorough understanding of such mechanisms allows the development of successful strategies to combat antisemitism effectively. The traditions, symbols, and imagery that are used in the construction and maintenance of Christian and Islamic group identities and which

---

Bearman et al. (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 10:111–12; T. Pulcini, *Exegesis as Polemical Discourse: Ibn Ḥazm on Jewish and Christian Scriptures* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998). For research on modern *taḥrīf*, cf. G. Nickel, "Higher Criticism," in *Encyclopedia of the Bible and its Reception*, vol. 11, *Halah – Hizquni*, ed. D. C. Allison Jr. et al. (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015), and G. Nickel, *The Gentle Answer to the Muslim Accusation of Biblical Falsification* (Salmon Arm: Bruton Gate, 2015).

are discussed by the contributions of this volume are part of a system of religious symbols. This symbolic system lies at the core of both Christian and Islamic identity. It is dynamic and flexible, adjusting itself to social, historic, and religious developments through history and transforms in accordance with other cultural, political, and socio-economic changes in the world.[10] It is preserved in the world's cultural memories from which individual antisemitic symbols are drawn by antisemites to understand the Jewish "Other" in their respective light. The religious symbols provided by the world's cultural memories form preconceptions that allow for an interpretation of both the Jewish out-group per se as well as the antisemitic in-group as distinct from the Jewish-out group. In other words, the antisemitic in-group perceives the Jewish out-group by way of the antisemitic symbolic systems mentioned above. The religious symbol systems underlying both Christianity and Islam thus play a key role in the antisemitic construction of religious group identities.

In the present introduction, this mechanism was briefly discussed by way of the example of supersessionist thought in Christianity and Islam. It is addressed in more detail in the present series' first volume *Comprehending and Confronting Antisemitism: A Multi-Faceted Approach*[11] and forms the rationale from which the recommendations of the first volume against antisemitism in religious groups were developed. It has, of course, implications for the recommendations of how to combat antisemitism in other areas as well. These will be discussed further and corroborated by the contributions in the subsequent volumes of the present series.

Confronting Ancient and Medieval Religious Traditions of Antisemitism

In ancient and medieval Christianity, the relation between Christianity as a newly established religion and its Jewish antecedent is one important pillar in the formation of Christian identity. Drawing on their belief system on Jewish thought, early Christians had to find a way of differentiating their new faith from it. As is often the case in processes of identity formation, Christianity em-

10 More about the continuities and discontinuities of antisemitic tendencies throughout the ages resulting from cultural, political, and socio-economic changes will be discussed in the subsequent three volumes of the present series, both in their introductions as well as in the contributions to the volumes.

11 Cf. Lange and Grossman, "Jews and Judaism between Bedevilment and Source of Salvation."

ployed the concept of alterity—being different from their former religious "parent" and therein finding their own religious group identity and self-expression. The idea of Christianity being the fulfilment of God's promises and salvation as well as the belief in a spiritual, that is, allegorical way of interpreting the "Old Law" led to a subsequent conceptualization of the Jews as the ultimate opposite to the early Christians. A canon of images and theological notions helped to shape the idea of a Jewish "Other" that would in turn confirm and validate the new theological concepts of Christianity. In this ongoing process, that was reaffirmed especially during the Middle Ages, a variety of antisemitic imagery and traditions were established and substantiated that are effective even today. They led not only to an increasing rejection of Judaism but also to antisemitic discrimination and persecution of Jews on the basis of religion. The following contributions to the present volume focus on the theological concepts that are part of the core of this process.

Karin Finsterbusch identifies *Antisemitic Positions in Christian Holy Scriptures: The Idea of Israel's Election and its Challenge for New Testament Authors and for their Readership* and engages with Christian supersessionism as a response to the Jewish idea of Israel's Election. She argues that the examples of Rom 11:11–36; Eph 1:3–14; 2:14–16; and Acts 13:14–51 show how Christianity, in its development as new monotheistic religion, established itself as replacement of Israel and thus made it "nearly impossible to value Israel as God's chosen people" (28). Early Christianity did only understand itself as the new Israel but also regarded Judaism unworthy of God's protection and preservation—"the New Covenant was believed to have superseded the old Mosaic Covenant" (37). Finsterbusch argues that both Martin Luther and the figures of *ecclesia* and *synagoga* in Christian art are examples of how antisemitic supersessionism dominated Christian thought until the end of the Shoah.

Adele Reinhartz's contribution "*Children of the Devil": John 8:44 and its Early Reception* shows that supersessionism was not the only way in which early Christianity established its group identity through the rejection of Judaism. Reinhartz regards John 8:44 as a part of rhetorical program that is based on the concept of "a covenantal relationship with God through faith in Jesus" (51). The competing claim that Jews have been and are God's covenantal partners is discounted by the statement of John 8:44 that the Jews have the devil as their father. The Gospel of John promotes thus "a parting of the ways" between those who follow Jesus "and the Jews who do not" (52). Throughout its history of reception, John 8:44 was read both with and without associating Judaism with the devil. When the Gospel of John became part of the Christian canon, "John 8:44, like the rest of the Gospel, came to be seen as a divinely inspired and eternally valid, and therefore, exceedingly dangerous text" (52).

Agnethe Siquans' essay analyzes *Anti-Jewish Polemic and Jewish Bible Interpretation: Two Examples from Origen and Ephrem the Syrian* and shows that biblical exegesis too was employed to maintain a Christian identity through the rejection of Judaism. The close link between Jewish and Christian hermeneutics and interpretative traditions demonstrates that both Origen and Ephrem conceptualized Jews as an alien and sometimes hostile religious "Other" to keep Christians away from Judaism. Many of the topoi formulated in patristic polemics against the Jews "soon became conventional and played a prominent role in later antisemitism." According to Siquans, therefore, "the first step towards avoiding the perpetuation of these concepts is critically revealing their way of construing identity and its ongoing impact on contemporary thought about Jewishness" (66).

The blood libel, that is, accusing Jews of murdering Christian children in order to use their blood for religious and medical purposes, is a narrative widely employed not only in medieval antisemitic polemic but continues its tradition even today. As other antisemitic polemics, the blood libel served the elevation of Christians above their Jewish "Other" and subsequent demonization of that Jewish "Other." The blood libel was instrumental in maintaining a Christian identity in delineation from their supposedly murderous Jewish opposites. David Berger reflects on *Scholarship and the Blood Libel: Past and Present* and uses the blood libel as an example to show how evidence and reasoned argument will not be able to reach the purveyors of antisemitic propaganda and persecution, that is, the core of antisemites. However, it can be applied to enlighten a substantial part of the world's population susceptible to antisemitic polemics and, consequently, to "overcome the resurgence of chimerical and near-chimerical fantasies about Jews and the Jewish state" (83).

The question whether early and medieval Islamic polemics against Jews should be regarded as antisemitism or not is widely disputed among modern scholars of Islam. As explained above, the answer to this question depends heavily on how antisemitism is defined. Polemics against Jews as well as hatred and discrimination of Jews can be found already in the Qur'an and widely throughout its medieval reception. Their abundance is undisputed. But even during those periods when Muslim Jew-hatred and antisemitic discrimination were more extensive, they mostly did not compare with what Jews had to experience and suffer in Medieval Europe. The example of scapegoating the Jews for the plague pandemic, which is pervasive in Christian Europe but absent from Muslim anti-Jewish polemic, needs to suffice to underline this point. Such differences between Christian and Muslim Jew-hatred and the fact that discrimination against Jews was less drastic in the Muslim world does not mean that contemporary an-

tisemitism in the Muslim world is free of roots that date back to the beginnings of Islam and the Qur'an itself.

Reuven Firestone discusses the question *Is the Qur'an "Antisemitic"?* He emphasizes that the "Qur'an does not racialize Jews, nor does it dehumanize them. It certainly does not call for their destruction" (104). Firestone understands Qur'anic polemics against Jews instead as part of the wider phenomenon of "scripturally sanctioned animosity toward the religious Other" (86) which occurs in all religions. The Qur'anic attitude towards Jews is ambivalent, ranging from admiration and esteem to criticism and antipathy. Especially the latter needs to be understood in the context of religious struggle between the established Jewish religion and its authorities and the new revelation expressed by Muhammad. Firestone suggests that the Qur'an would respond with its polemics against Jews to Jewish criticism of Muhammad and his followers.

Notwithstanding the reasons or the cause of the negative Qur'anic attitude towards Jews, it is inseparably linked to the formation of Islam and thus with the creation of a Muslim identity in distinction from Judaism. That Judaism was not the only foil against which Muslim identity was built does not negate this observation.

An example for increased discrimination against Jews is analyzed by Amir Mazor in his study of *The Position of the Jews in Egypt and Syria in the Late Middle Ages*. Mazor argues that the increased discrimination of Jews in the Mamluk period in Syria and Egypt (1250 – 1517) articulated itself in a particularly strict enforcement and radical interpretation of the discriminatory laws of the Pact of Umar. Mazor finds several reasons for the changed circumstances for Jews in the Mamluk period: (1) discrimination against Jews would have been part of an increased discrimination against all non-Muslims; (2) the Mamluk offensive policy against the Crusades; and (3) the economic crises that were caused by the Mongol invasion alongside severe epidemics and drought. The Mamluk rulers began as non-Muslim military slaves and where thus particularly zealous in proving their loyalty to Islam. Mazor shows how, in being based on earlier traditions and polemics, political, military, economic, and socio-religious factors could trigger systematic discrimination and hatred targeted against Jews and other non-Muslim minorities. Similar to Christianity, at least the increased discrimination and hatred of Jews and other non-Muslim groups in the Mamluk period is thus intricately connected to the creation and maintenance of a (Mamluk) Muslim identity. Herein, it mirrors similar processes of identity formation in Christianity that established the Jews as the ultimate theological, and subsequently also social and cultural, "Other."

Confronting Antisemitism in the Study of Holy Scriptures and Related Writings in the Modern Period

Supersessionist ideas were not only employed in ancient and medieval times. The modern study of the Bible and the Qur'an has often been shaped by them. Again, the main goal of post-medieval supersessionism is to develop an antisemitic religious group identity and, in the case of the study of holy scriptures and related writings, support this notion with what is claimed to be a careful and correct reading and understanding of the main religious sources. Therefore, this part of the present volume brings together a wide variety of topics connected with study of holy scriptures and other religious writings. They do not only uncover antisemitic notions and traditions within the study of the Bible, the Qur'an, and other religious writings, but most of all they try to show how the study of these holy scriptures and other religiously important texts can help to overcome antisemitic hatred.

In his contribution about *The Impact of Johann Wolfgang von Goethe's Discovery of the "Original" Version of the Ten Commandments upon Biblical Scholarship: The Myth of Jewish Particularism and German Universalism*, Bernard M. Levinson uses an early publication by Johann Wolfgang von Goethe called *Zwo wichtige bisher unerörterte biblische Fragen*[*Two Important but as yet Unaddressed Biblical Questions*] from 1773 and its reception history in (Protestant) biblical studies as an example of how the emerging field of biblical studies could create "a myth of Judaism as the particularistic 'Other' in opposition to an allegedly normative, universal German identity" (122). Goethe abused the Decalogue's history of literary growth to construct a German cultural identity in contradistinction from the supposedly ritualistic and particularistic Jewish "Other." He portrays "Christianity as a 'universal' religion that supersedes and is completely independent of the 'particularistic' religion of Judaism. This portrayal entails his cultural construction of the Jew as 'Other.' It equally advances an unreflected cultural construction of the German self as a universal that contradictorily can only be universal to the extent that it constructs and excludes that which is other" (132–3). Goethe's essay did not only influence the way the literary history of the Decalogue was perceived but also how Judaism as a particularistic and ritualistic religion was superseded by universalistic and ethical Christianity. In this way, Goethe's early publication influenced a specific perception of Judaism in German-speaking Christianity in a negative way and became an integral part

of Christian antisemitism. The works of Julius Wellhausen are widely acknowledged as a case in point.

From its beginnings onwards, biblical scholarship corroborated the notion of a Christian group identity in the German-speaking world through the rejection of the Jewish "Other" as particularistic and ritualistic. Konrad Schmid's essay on *The Interpretation of Second Temple Judaism as "Spätjudentum" in Christian Biblical Scholarship* provides another spotlight on this phenomenon. Schmid surveys the history of the term "Spätjudentum" ["late Judaism"] as a designation of the period in Jewish history that begins with the rebuilding of the Jerusalem temple in 520 B.C.E. and that ends with its destruction in 70 C.E. Nowadays this period is designated as Second Temple Judaism. Schmid shows that the notion of "Spätjudentum" was prominent between 1870 and 1970 and is German in origin. It was coined by Karl Heinrich Ludwig Poelitz (1772–1838) and further developed by Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768–1834), Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wette (1780–1849), Julius Wellhausen (1844–1918), and Wilhelm Bousset (1865–1920). The term "Spätjudentum" describes Second Temple Judaism as a legalistic distortion of the supposedly true prophetic Israelite religion preceding it. Jesus Christ and Christianity would draw on the true prophetic Israelite religion thus being the true heir of Israel. Schmid clearly shows how among Christian scholars the conceptualization of Judaism depended on Protestant readings of the New Testament. To understand Judaism as a dead religion, that displaced the prophetic Israelite religion and that was superseded by Christianity, is key to maintaining a Christian group identity by defining Christianity as the true successor of Israel and condemning Judaism as a religious corpse without a right to exist dubbed thus as "late Judaism" already in an early phase of its existence.

Anders Gerdmar presents his readers with *The National Socialist Bible. "Die Botschaft Gottes": Theological Legitimation of Antisemitism.* He focuses on a German Bible translation produced during the Nazi period by the *Institut zur Erforschung und Beseitigung des jüdischen Einflusses auf das deutsche kirchliche Leben* [*Institute for the Study and Eradication of Jewish Influence on German Church Life*]. This institute was a key research institution of the *German Christian* ["Deutsche Christen"] movement and was deeply antisemitic in its work. It aimed at eradicating anything Jewish from *German Christian* thought and thus not only legitimized the Shoah but participated actively in the cultural genocide of Judaism. The German Bible translation called *Die Botschaft Gottes* [*The Message of God*] was one of the institute's major projects. It attempted to merge National Socialism with the New Testament by creating a *German* gospel for the German person. To achieve this goal, antisemitic principles were embodied in the translation technique of *Die Botschaft Gottes*. Including the Old Testament, the translators removed everything they regarded as Jewish from the text of the Bible. As a guiding principle, all Jewish elements were

regarded as secondary additions by Jewish Christians that would blur the supposed true message of the gospel. This antisemitic approach to the translation of the Bible was justified by the *German Christian* myth that as a Galilean, Jesus would not have been a Jew but an Aryan. In this line of thought, anything connected to Jewish blood needed therefore to be removed from the Bible to distill an antisemitic German gospel out of it.

With its antisemitic approach to the translation of the Bible, *Die Botschaft Gottes* marks a summit in the line of thought already addressed in the contributions by Levinson and Schmid. The hiatus between Christianity and Judaism develops into a new extreme. Christianity is no longer envisioned as replacing Judaism only, rather Jewish thought is regarded as a defilement of an Aryan Christian religion that needs to be removed from its tradition altogether. *German Christian* group identity is constructed racially by removing anything Jewish from the Bible as the heart of a German Aryan cultural memory. This approach became deeply influential in contemporary White Supremacist thought as presented in the contribution by Yaakov Ariel in the present volume (see below).

Attempts to use biblical studies in the construction of Christian identity by way of supersessionist thought did not end with the Nazi period nor with the demise of the term "Spätjudentum." Russel Fuller offers two examples on *Christian Antisemitism in Biblical Studies* through which he demonstrates how ancient Christian supersessionist thought influenced and still influences the study of the Hebrew Bible. For this purpose, Fuller examines first a supersessionist typological reading of Hosea 11:11 in Matt 2:15 and traces its impact on Christian literature through modern scholarly commentaries. Fuller argues that the Hosea commentaries of Wilhelm Rudolph and Andrew A. Macintosh both "reproduce and authorize older theological antisemitic ideas" (197). The second example for supersessionist thought in contemporary biblical studies is a booklet on the text of Jeremiah 31 in its Hebrew and Greek versions by Adrian Schenker. Schenker claims that the earlier version of Jeremiah 31 as preserved by the Greek text would regard God's covenant with Judaism as terminated while the younger Hebrew version would have reworked the text of Jeremiah 31 to argue the opposite. When Schenker communicates the earlier Jeremiah text with Christian supersessionist ideas about the old covenant having been terminated by God in favor of a New Covenant yet to come, Fuller points to the danger that Schenker "is indeed maintaining the heart of the older supersessionist theology and with it comes all of the dangers, which this pernicious theology has spread down through the centuries" (203).

The contributions by Levinson, Schmid, Gerdmar, and Fuller all point to the dangers of replacement theology. Regardless of its timeframe, Christian replacement theology has always served the purpose of creating a positive religious

group identity by way of a supersessionist salvation history. Christianity as a religion would distinguish itself from Judaism being the new object of God's salvation while Judaism would have lost any claim to it and would thus be condemned. This approach to religious identity building can only work by contrasting the supposed Christian bliss against the envisioned evil of a Jewish "Other." Supersessionist thought therefore has the need to construct a Jewish "Other" that is delivered to condemnation to enable Christian entitlement to salvation. In this way, religious antisemitism has become an integral part of Christian religious identity.

The above-mentioned observations give rise to the question of whether similar processes of religious identity construction can be observed also in Islam. Israel Shrenzel's contribution *Against the Mainstream: Muhammad Abduh's Reading of Q1:7 and its Implications for Current Muslim-Jewish Relations* helps to answer this question. Shrenzel surveys the hostile and tolerant verses of the Qur'an towards Jews showing that its polemical passages mainly date to the period after Muhammad's fleeing from Mecca to Medina in 622 C.E. Upon encountering a group of Arabicized Jewish tribes in Medina and its surrounding areas, Muhammad gradually lost all hope in gaining Jewish support for his religious ideas. This experience changed his views and doctrinal thinking about Judaism. After his survey, Shrenzel discusses in detail the interpretation of verse 7 of the Quran's first Sura *al-Fatiha*. The three groups mentioned in that verse would traditionally be interpreted in Islam in a way that is hostile towards Jews and Christians: "the 'blessed ones' are the Muslims; those who suffered God's wrath are the Jews; and those who are astray are the Christians" (212 – 3). This threefold interpretation differentiates Muslims "sharply from the past and future of Jewish and Christian history and destiny" (213). Therein, it imposes an antisemitic reading on Sura 1:7 that is popular as of today, especially among fundamentalist radical circles. A case in point is the mastermind of many Muslim extremist organizations, Sayyid Qutb (1906 – 1966). Against this antisemitic reading of Sura 1:7, Shrenzel points to the work of the Egyptian scholar Muhammad Abduh (1849 – 1905). Abduh does not want to understand the three groups of Sura 1:7 as unified collective entities but rather as groups and individuals from pre-Islamic nations. The "blessed ones" would not be Muslims but the "prophets, righteous men, and the martyrs from previous nations, that preceded Islam" (214). Those who suffered God's wrath and those who went astray Abduh identifies as individuals from the "previous nations" and not as the Jewish and Christian "Other" as such.

Thus, Shrenzel's essay unveils a supersessionist pattern of thought that in interpreting Sura 1:7 creates an Islamic religious group identity by rejecting the Jewish and Christian "Other." Simultaneously, Shrenzel points to a very dif-

ferent reading of the same verse that allows for a peaceful coexistence of the three monotheistic religions. The study of holy scripture can thus be both an instrument of antisemitic hatred and the cure for this hatred.

The question of how the study of ancient texts can help to combat antisemitism is an important question that is addressed in another essay. The Dead Sea Scrolls can serve as a role model of how the study of a shared group of literature is ideally suited to enable mutual understanding between adherents of different monotheistic religions. In her contribution *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Antisemitism: Past Results and Future Possibilities*, Eileen Schuller discusses the impact that the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls had on relations between Christians and Jews in general and on the issue of antisemitism specifically. Schuller demonstrates how the Dead Sea Scrolls played a "unique role" in the reconfiguration of earlier scholarship on Second Temple Judaism. Different from antisemitic ideas of earlier (Christian) scholars outlined in part above, this period in the history of Judaism is now understood as "vital, rich, diverse, and complex" and "Jesus and the early Christian community are … situated firmly within the Judaism of the time and cannot be understood apart from that environment" (225). The Dead Sea Scrolls are thus documenting a crossroads between rabbinic Judaism and early Christianity. In this context, they could be of vital importance in facilitating interreligious dialogue beyond the ivory tower of scholarship. Starting out as a field in which Jewish and Christian scholars were deeply separated, the close collaboration between Jewish and Christian experts in the last decades has turned the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls in to a lived experience of Jewish-Christian relations and thus contributed to reducing antisemitism. To build on this positive example of Jewish-Christian relations, Schuller suggests "the promotion and formation of study groups that actually read and discuss the Scrolls. Such groups could be formed jointly by a church and synagogue from their members, or, more challenging, could seek to attract a more diverse clientele if advertised via social media, adult education networks or broadly based community channels" (232).

Confronting Antisemitic Traditions in Contemporary Christianity and Islam

Confronting antisemitic traditions in contemporary Christianity and Islam is especially difficult. Not only do today's antisemites still employ classical religious-theological ideas that date back to the formation of religious scripture itself, they also borrow from a variety of sources, established or not, and conflate them with

contemporary political and socio-economic aspects of society in order to underpin their own antisemitic claims. These too can have manifold intentions, ranging from political and economic propositions to cultural and social goals they want to achieve. Drawing both on theological motifs and psychological aspects of the formation of identity based on in-groups and out-groups, these concepts are often not only hard to grasp but also very difficult to identify as purely antisemitic in content and form. Especially problematic is the conflation with contemporary socio-political events such as the Israel-Palestinian conflict, social injustice, and deteriorating conditions of living, elections of right-wing governments, and the perpetuation of patriarchal hegemonic social structures especially in newscasts and advertising. It takes a close look to recognize the different strands of traditions, symbolism, imagery, and intentions in antisemitic utterances and incidents within a contemporary religious society. The essays in the last section of the present volume all make a significant effort to uncover what both Christian and Muslim antisemites try to veil.

Antisemitism in contemporary Christianity can manifest itself in a variety of ways. This is mainly due to the multitude of Christian denominations. Clearly, most of these denominations oppose antisemitism. After the Shoah, leaders of many Christian churches try to recognize the antisemitic religious traditions of their theological ancestry and to eradicate them. Other Christian groups, however, still draw upon the concept of the Jewish "Other" to reinforce their own theological and ideological concepts of self-determination. Herein, they use a diverse canon of traditions, imagery, and motifs the use of which can differ from denomination to denomination. Theological traditions, socio-cultural notions of the Jews as hereditarily different and as a separate race as well as anti-Zionist ideas are employed equally.

Wolfgang Treitler's contribution deals with *Antisemitism, Christianity, and the Churches in Europe*. He traces a line of Christian antisemitic traditions from the church fathers of late antiquity into the Middle Ages. Their effort of stripping Christ of his Jewishness to shape and establish their own Christian identity as well as the concept of self-description of European Christianity based on Jew-hatred forms the basis for later discrimination and agitation against Jews. Treitler uncovers this in the collaboration of both the Protestant and Catholic churches with the Nazis. Finally, he recognizes *Nostra Aetate* 4 and the continued bid of contemporary church leaders such as Popes John Paul II and Francis as an important effort in acknowledging and confronting Christianity with its antisemitic roots and manifestations. Based on the idea of Protestant theologian Friedrich-Wilhelm Marquardt to establish a new system of belief and dogmas faced with what happened at Auschwitz and during the Shoah, Treitler concludes his essay with a suggestion. All Christians have to ad-

dress scripture from a different angle, perceiving it first and foremost as a collection of Jewish texts. In so doing, Christianity might become more courageous "to turn their backs to claims that have turned out to produce hatred against Jews or indifference to their fate" (248).

Petra Heldt focuses on anti-Zionist antisemitism in the Protestant churches and calls for a *Quest for Reform*. She sees the responsibility for the spread of antisemitic imagery and ideas in Protestant Christianity especially in connection with contemporary anti-Zionist notions and sentiments directed against Israeli politics. Particularly important in this regard are the "Protestant church leadership in-groups" (251) especially in Israel. They would increasingly mislead the church and the public with their veiled antisemitic intentions. Heldt goes on to unveil their antisemitic discourse that "thrives on purposefully selected memory on the one hand, and on narratives that contest, marginalize, and suppress alternative views by ignoring, labeling, and smearing opposing voices on the other" (253). She shows that these groups use different forms of social power abuse, cognitive mind control, and discursive interaction to manipulate both the public discourse and their audience. This is especially dangerous when not countered because of the hierarchical structure of the Protestant churches. Therefore, Heldt calls for combined actions taken by both Christians and Jews in reviewing established Protestant theological concepts. She asks that fora be created to promote those theologians who oppose antisemitism and enable detailed research of and education on the phenomenon to prevents its spreading further.

The perception of Jews and Israel in American Christianity is Yaakov Ariel's research topic, presented in his essay *American Christianity, Jews and Israel: Antisemitism and Faith?* While following the Civil Rights Movement in the 1950s and 1960s, American culture had turned more pluralistic and inclusive and antisemitism had moved to the margins. Today antisemitism seems to be stronger than ever in the US and Canada, especially in the Christian religious realm. This is mostly due to the particular diversity of American Christianity and its multiple denominations. Most of these have diverse attitudes towards antisemitism, ranging from opposition to an openly positive affirmation of discrimination against Jews. In his contribution, Ariel traces these different strands in liberal and mainline Christianity, in evangelical Christianity, and in radical white supremacist Christian movements. He concludes that especially in a pluralistic nation like the US, it is important to enable interaction between different religious, cultural, and social groups in the form of dissemination of information, institutional education, and direct contact. This will help to reduce and ultimately remove barriers and delineations between these groups, and it "brings with it greater respect" (274) for each of their respective members.

It has already been established above that Islam differs from Christianity in its use of discriminatory images and ideas of Jews. The previous sections have shown, however, that the concepts of Muslim Jew-hatred and their manifestations are quite similar. Like Christians, contemporary Muslim theologians, in their antisemitic sentiments, use images and motifs from Muslim scripture (Qur'an and the Hadith) and conflate it with other forms of political, socio-economic and cultural discriminatory ideas. A supposed eternal Jewish enmity is established based on the Qur'an and forms the basis for antisemitic claims such as Jewish world conspiracy, Jewish financial dominance, and the "Holocaust against the Palestinians."

In his contribution, Raimund Fastenbauer identifies *Common Codes and Differences* between images of the Jews in the Qur'an and their reflections in European antisemitism and political anti-Zionism. Modern Islamic anti-Zionist discourse uses antisemitic motifs as forms of "cultural code."[12] Despite changes and adaptions in profaned social systems, religious motifs continue to function persistently, especially in societies that are dominated by Christian or Muslim religions alike. In a comparative approach, Fastenbauer chooses five motifs from Christian and Muslim hermeneutical discourses to compare them with manifestations in the print or internet media. Ideas of Jews as murderers of Christ and Christian children, as pigs, apes or other animals, as a secret conspiracy group and as economic exploiters can be found in classical religious scripture such as the Qur'an and the Hadith collection. Their elaboration in pre-modern times forms the basis for contemporary antisemitic and especially anti-Zionist sentiments about Jews as murderers of their Palestinian neighbors, leading members of world supremacy and controllers of the Wall Street and other global capital markets. Fastenbauer proves that these coded motifs of religious origin are often "underestimated in the research on antisemitism" (295) and calls for taking a closer look at them in our daily confrontation with information from the media.

Meir Litvak focuses on representations of Jews in modern Islam, too. He, however, draws attention to *Modern Antisemitism in Iran*, recognizing *Old Themes and New Trends*. The unique feature of Iranian Shi'i antisemitism according to Litvak is its conflation of motifs from pre-Islamic Zoroastrianism and classical Qur'anic teachings. The notion of the Jews' rejection of the Prophet Muhammad and Zoroastrian concepts of ritual purity form its basis. Its manifestations, however, varied throughout history. While in the 1970s Jews in Iran were largely tolerated, contemporary Iranian discourse transmits a different image of Jews

12 Sh. Volkov, *Antisemitismus als kultureller Code* (Munich: Beck, 1990).

and Judaism. Especially modern media, TV programs and semi-official websites frequently express discriminatory sentiments against Jews. They all thrive on the age-old concept of the Jews as "historical yet active enemies, who are motivated by hatred against Islam and the Muslims" (304 – 5) based on their inherited negative traits that are documented already in the Qur'an. Litvak goes on to focus on the supposed Jewish role and responsibility for a series of historical events following Muhammad's death. Herein, he proves a continuous politicization of former religious motifs and recognizes that deliberate disinformation especially on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict "helps popular readiness to believe hostile charges against Jews" (316).

Nesya Rubinstein-Shemer recognizes the same thing in her examination of *Sheikh Yūsuf al-Qaraḍāwī's Theo-Political Response to Trump's Jerusalem Declaration*. She shows how al-Qaraḍāwī's outcry in social media that followed Trump's transfer of the American embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem documents his "deep motivation to fight Israel's existence" (319). His utterances show a high degree of hostility against Jews dangerously mixed with a deliberate inability to distinguish between the Jews of the Qur'an and contemporary Jews. He draws on classical Muslim motifs of Jewish (and Christian) eternal infidelity and enmity that call for a war against them. In this way, he employs the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in a theological approach to file his own antisemitic claims and to justify his call for *jihad* against the State of Israel. While the target of al-Qaraḍāwī's antisemitism is mainly the State of Israel and not individual Jews, Rubinstein-Shemer shows that, again, religious-theological imagery and motifs, established in the Middle Ages, are used to corroborate contemporary antisemitic theological ideas, sometimes even completely out of context.

Armin Lange is Professor of Second Temple Judaism and director of the University of Vienna's Department of Jewish Studies as well as a corresponding member of the Austrian Academy of Sciences. His research specializes in ancient Judaism, the Dead Sea Scrolls, the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible, ancient antisemitism, and the cultural and religious histories of antisemitism. He has published widely on all of these research areas.

Kerstin Mayerhofer is a PhD candidate at the University of Vienna's Department of Jewish Studies and is co-advised at Queen Mary University of London. Her research focuses on perceptions of Jews in pre-modern Christian narrative with regards to representations of the Jewish body and gender. She has been working for the project "An End to Antisemitism!" since 2017 and has been serving as the managing editor of its multivolume conference proceedings.

Bibliography

Adang, Camilla. *Muslim Writers on Judaism and the Hebrew Bible: From Ibn Rabban to Ibn Hazm*. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

Adler, William. "The Jews as Falsifiers: Charges of Tendentious Emendation in Anti-Jewish Christian Polemic." In *Translation of Scripture: Proceedings of a Conference at the Annenberg Research Institute, May 15–16, 1989*, edited by David M. Goldenberg, 1–27. Philadelphia: Annenberg Research Institute, 1990.

Anti-Defamation League. *ADL Global 100: An Index of Anti-Semitism*. Accessed March 21, 2020. https://global100.adl.org/.

Boisliveau, Anne-Sylvie. "Qurʾānic Discourse on the Bible: Ambivalence and *taḥrīf* in the Light of Self-Reference." *MIDÉO* 33 (2018): 3–38.

Bostom, Andrew G., ed. *The Legacy of Islamic Antisemitism: From Sacred Texts to Solemn History*. New York: Prometheus Books, 2008.

Kaplan, M. Lindsay. *Figuring Racism in Medieval Christianity*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2019.

Lange, Armin, and Maxine Grossman. "Jews and Judaism between Bedevilment and Source of Salvation: Christianity as a Cause of and a Cure against Antisemitism." In *Comprehending and Confronting Antisemitism: A Multi-Faceted Approach*, vol. 1 of *An End to Antisemitism!*, edited by Armin Lange, Kerstin Mayerhofer, Dina Porat, and Lawrence H. Schiffman, 133–64. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2019.

Lange, Armin, Kerstin Mayerhofer, Dina Porat, and Lawrence H. Schiffman, eds. *Comprehending and Confronting Antisemitism: A Multi-Faceted Approach*, vol. 1 of *An End to Antisemitism!* Berlin: De Gruyter, 2019.

Langmuir, Gavin I. *Toward a Definition of Antisemitism*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.

Lazarus-Yafeh, Hava. *Intertwined Worlds: Medieval Islam and Bible Criticism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.

Lazarus-Yafeh, Hava. "Taḥrīf." In *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, edited by P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C. E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, and W. P. Heinrichs, 2nd ed., 10:111–12. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Nickel, Gordon. *The Gentle Answer to the Muslim Accusation of Biblical Falsification*. Salmon Arm: Bruton Gate, 2015.

Nickel, Gordon. "Higher Criticism." In *Encyclopedia of the Bible and its Reception*, vol. 11, *Halah – Hizquni* edited by Dale C. Allison, Jr., Christine Helmer, Volker Leppin, Choon-Leong Seow, Hermann Spieckermann, Barry Dov Walfish, and Eric J. Ziolkowski. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015.

Pratt, Douglas. "Muslim-Jewish Relations: Some Islamic Paradigms." *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations* 21, no. 1 (2010): 11–21.

Pulcini, Theodore. *Exegesis as Polemical Discourse: Ibn Ḥazm on Jewish and Christian Scriptures*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.

Tajfel, Henri. *Differentiation between Social Groups: Studies in the Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. London: Academic Press, 1978.

Tajfel, Henri, and John C. Turner. "The Social Identity Theory of Intergroup Behavior." In *Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, edited by Steven Worchel and William G. Austin, 7–24. Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1986.

Volkov, Shulamit. *Antisemitismus als kultureller Code.* Munich: Beck, 1990.
Whittingham, Martin. "Ezra as the Corrupter of the Torah? Re-Assessing Ibn Ḥazm's Role in the Long History of an Idea." *Intellectual History of the Islamicate World* 1 (2013): 253–71.