



Wilhelm Marr (1819–1904) and the Left in Germany: The Birth of Modern Antisemitism

Didier Musiedlak

WILHELM MARR'S PERSONALITY

The birth of modern antisemitism in Germany is often associated with journalist Wilhelm Marr, whose life stretched through both the upheavals of 1848 and the birth of the German Empire (Brustein 2003: 131, Puschner 1990: 247–249).¹ Marr does not occupy an important place *a priori* in the antisemitic movement, unlike pastor Adolf Stoecker, nationalist Heinrich von Treitscke, or Houston Stewart Chamberlain. However, because of his fame, the study of his life and impact in German society makes it possible to better understand the modes of dissemination of antisemitism, and to better measure its originality. Although he is credited with coining the concept of antisemitism, a point we will examine later on, Marr's career has interested only one biographer, Moshe Zimmermann,

¹ Marr, generally recognized as the inventor of the term antisemitism.

D. Musiedlak (✉)
Paris Nanterre University, Nanterre, France
e-mail: d.musiedlak@libertysurf.fr

© The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature
Switzerland AG 2021

A. Tarquini (ed.), *The European Left and the Jewish Question, 1848–1992*, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-56662-3_6

who published a work entitled *Wilhelm Marr The Patriarch of Antisemitism* (Zimmermann 1986). Born in Magdeburg in 1819 to an actor father, who then became director of a Hamburg theater, nothing in Marr's itinerary predicted his notoriety or originality. Politically speaking, he was on the left side of the spectrum, and he did his ideological apprenticeship in Switzerland, a refuge for Europeans who were being persecuted for their political commitment. Marr was introduced by Julius Fröbel, a member of the Radical Party and director of the newspaper *Der schweizerische Republikaner* (*The Swiss Republican*), and his circle, and to poet Georg Herwegh, who also belonged to this radical fraction. Under the influence of Wilhelm Weitling, the first German theorist of communism, who had moved to Zurich in the spring of 1843, Marr became a communist in connection with utopian socialism. After six weeks in Switzerland, Marr was expelled from Zurich because of his political activities. He then moved to Lausanne, where he established contacts with the *Young Germany* (*Jungedeutschland*).² This radical movement of the first half of the nineteenth century advocated for democracy, the constitutional state, and emancipation. In the spring of 1843, Marr joined the *Young German Confederation of Lake Geneva*, founded in Switzerland by socialists Hermann Döleke and Jules Standau. It is around this time that he became an atheist and an anarchist, and began his career as a journalist and editor. After being deported several times from Switzerland and Germany, he moved to Hamburg in 1845, where he was when the 1848 revolution broke out. His expulsion from Switzerland in 1845 was motivated more by his atheism than by his political activities.

During this period, his action was directed by a criticism of the established institutional forms (state, property, and religion). We can detect Proudhon's influence in his writings, especially *The Social Question*. The concept of "people" begins to emerge in his thinking but is not yet fixed (*Young Germany*, 1846). This idea is understood from a materialistic perspective, but is not yet connected with racial theories about the Jews. During the 1848 Revolution, Marr was elected to Hamburg's 1849 Constituent Assembly as a far-left representative of the Radical Democratic

²The term "Young Germany" describes a rather heterogeneous group of writers from around 1830 to 1850, the journalist Karl Gutzkow, Ludolf Wienberg, Theodor Mundt, Heinrich Laube, the poet Georg Herwegh, the satirist writer Karl Ludwig Börne, or Heinrich Heine. These authors were only in loose contact with each other, but were connected by the rejection of the restoration, the absolutist state, and their struggle for freedom of the press and free speech as well as for socialist ideas.

Party. In his perception, the Revolution was the only way to create a republican state. At first, he was in favor of the emancipation of the Jews, but quickly came to think that the liberalism of the Frankfurt Parliament only served their interests.

The failure of the Revolution was for him both a political and ideological rupture. After seeing his hopes thwarted as an elected member of the Assembly, Marr, from the autumns of 1849 onwards, advocated for a German state under Prussia, embracing Bismarck's point of view of a revolution made from above (*von oben*). He saw himself as the German Mazzini—whom he met in 1851 (Zimmermann 1986: 59–61). It is at around this time that his political thought started to be gradually dominated by the Jewish question and the matter of race, which then came to over-determine his political commitment. In 1852 he left Europe and travelled through Central America for seven years, probably engaging in the slave trade (Zimmermann 1979: 225, Rose 1990: 281–282).

By the time he returned to Germany, in 1859, he was convinced that races were not all equal. In his 1863 book, *Journey to Central America*, his racism came to light, even though at the time he had not yet made the connection between racism and his already well-entrenched anti-Judaism. On June 13, 1861, he published an antisemitic article, in which he indirectly attacked liberal Jewish politician Gabriel Riesser (1806–1863), at the time president in exercise of the Hamburg Council, and defender of the legal emancipation of the Jews (Zimmermann 1975: 59–84).

Marr rejected the idea of assimilation as a means for the Jews to become German, and believed Jews and Germans to be opposed by a complete antagonism. Placing himself within a tradition of anti-Jewish literature, such as Johannes Pfefferkorn's 1507 *Judenspiegel*, and Hartwig von Hundt-Radowsky's incendiary pamphlet of 1819 (Bergmann 2016), Marr saw the ultimate goal of Jewish emancipation to be integration and the consequent disappearance of the Jews into the state. Upon their total assimilation, Jews would finally vanish.

In terms of Marr's ideological radicalism, two moments are to be distinguished. The first takes the form of a pamphlet, *Der Sieg des Judentums über das Germanentum* (*The Victory of the Jews over the Germans*, 1879). The book became a bestseller in Germany with twelve reprints in its first year. In this book, Marr starts by attacking Jews for their religion. Then, he moves on to Jewish culture, highlighting the so-called mercantile spirit of the Jews that contributed greatly to the development of trade and industry in Germany (Mosse 1989, Pulzer 2003). However, since the

Jews have no homeland, the risk is for Germans to become enslaved, subject to the political and «legal feudalism» of Judaism. He describes Judaism as the Constitution leading to the formation of a “State within the State”. The biggest danger “a real *Kulturkampf*, against the German culture with an ambition of world conquest (*Weltherrschaft*). Marr uses many times the word “foreign domination.” (*Fremdeherrschaft*). In short, the Jewish question was a political and social problem and not a religious one.

In his second pamphlet, *The path of victories of Germanism over Judaism* (*Der Weg zum Siege des Germanenthums Über das Judenthum*, 1880), Marr introduces the idea that the Germans and the Jews are locked in a conflict, whose origins he attributes to the many advantages of the Jews. Taking up the idea that emancipation is the outcome of German liberalism, he argues that it has enabled the Jews to control the German financial and industrial systems. Since this clash is based on the different qualities of the two races, the total assimilation of the Jewish population cannot be resolved. This struggle between Jews and Germans will only end in the victory for one and death for the other. For Marr, the *Jewish Question* was socio-political and it had to be fought politically (Lange 2007: 120). The pessimistic tone of his *Victory of Jewry over Germanism* could not conceal a call to action, but in a new form of struggle (Marr 1879). Marr specifically rejected old anti-Jewish religion-based persecutory measures, like persecutions, expulsions, and pogroms, lobbying instead for a continuous political effort, institutionalized in parties, propaganda associations, and newspapers (Lindemann & Levy 2010: 128). He aimed to establish a new practice, based on clear rules. What remained implicit in *The Victory of Jewry*, became explicit in Marr’s next pamphlet, written in July 1879, *Elect No Jews!* It bore the subtitle, “*The way to victory of Germanism over Jewry*,” and it launched antisemitism into German political culture (Marr 1880). A Jewish victory, he concluded, would lead to the end of Germany, which is why Marr founded in 1879 *the League of Antisemites*, the first German organization specifically dedicated to fighting the alleged threat.

MARR AND THE DEBATE ON THE CREATION OF THE CONCEPT OF ANTISEMITISM

Marr has often been credited with creating the concept of antisemitism. It is necessary to have a real perception of what is anti-Judaism is before the beginning of the 1880s. German historians distinguish two periods. The first phase, called “early antisemitism” (*Frühantisemitismus*) to distinguish it from traditional anti-Judaism, was characterized by a latency of

anti-Jewish sentiments that developed from the end of the eighteenth century until the first half of the nineteenth century. In Germany, it was between 1767 and 1822 that the *Völkisch* movement, a type of antisemitism linked to exclusionary ethnic nationalism is established with modern antisemitism (Best 2004: 84). The word provides a new definition to an old enemy. First, it designated a secularized form of the aversion toward the Jews and their “ideology”. The religious question became secondary, as the Jews became identified with the capitalist bourgeoisie (Nipperdey & Rürup 1972: 141–142). In the 1970s, historian Reinhard Rürup had highlighted the close relationship between political antisemitism and the emancipation of the Jews on the one hand, and changes of the civil society in nineteenth century Germany on the other (Rürup 1975).

After the Napoleonic occupation, the demand for national unity in Germany developed around a fundamentalist stance. The invasion, with its universal principles and values, had crushed ethnic and national identity. To preserve Germanity (*Deutschheit*), the watchword was to defend what embodied *Volkstum* at the highest level, namely *Kultur* and popular traditions. The awakening of German national consciousness with the wars of liberation had begun to instill a dangerous antisemitic sentiment, while at the same time legitimizing Prussian authority through the *Obrigkeit* (Nipperdey 1983: 131). It was in this context that the Jews were assimilated to the figure of the Enemy (Jeismann 1999: 173–190). The rise of modern bourgeois society was paving the way to the proclamation of equality and the establishment of an open society of a competitive nature. Between the end of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth century, writers and journalists started to portray Jewish national identity as concealing a “foreign body”, a *State in the State*. These commentators were romantic agitators who considered the French and “the Jewish people” (*das Judenvolk*), or “unrefined Jews” (*verfeinerte schlechte Juden*), were bad luck for Germany. The Jew was a foreign subject that called into question the Christian faith, and the nationalism of the people as an autonomous organic unit. Luther had been the first to denounce the supposed imposture of the Jews of claiming to be the chosen people, a theme reprised by Kant, Schopenhauer, and later by Nietzsche. These perspectives added up to yield a conspiracy climate grounded in the idea that Judaism was not a religion, but rather a people who aimed to control Europe by starting with colonizing the Germans.

This movement took a radical form in popular circles by drawing support in civil society. It is worth mentioning here the *burschenschaftliche Wartburgfest* of 1817, where books by French and Jewish authors, and the

revolt of craftsmen, often members of Christian guilds of merchants. The *Hep-Hep or Hepp-Hepp* riots of 1819 which started in Würzburg against the Jews, reached many cities of the German Confederation (Rohrbacher 1993: 94–156, Zimmermann 2017). The campaign was orchestrated by romantic agitators such as Ernst Moritz Arndt and Friedrich Ludwig Jahn. This protohistory of antisemitism in Germany (Sterling 1950) was exhumed in 1950 by Eleonore Sterling.

The idea of the German Movement for Unity was associated with doctrines that substituted the traditional religious hostility towards the Jews with biologically based antagonism. In a hierarchical ranking of human races, peoples were given collective and immutable qualities. Several intellectuals and journalists doubted the success of education as well as of legal and economic equality as means of emancipations, as a large section of the Jewish population was considered unfit for assimilation.

In his controversy over the endangerment of the well-being and character of the Germans by the Jews (*Über die Gefährdung des Wohlstandes und Charakters der Deutschen durch die Juden* 1816), liberal philosopher Jakob Friedrich Fries had called himself anti-Jewish. While first distinguishing Judaism from the Jews, he applied also his negative descriptions to individuals, arguing in favor of affixing a distinctive emblem on their clothes to make them stand out from the rest of the population.

Hartwig von Hundt-Radowsky was the first German to demand, in 1819, the extermination of the Jews (*Ausrottung*, removing roots) in his pamphlet, *A Mirror to the Jews* (Hundt-Radowsky 1819). Within the three weeks after its publication, the book was reprinted for a total of 10,000 copies. The Jews, Hartwig von Hundt-Radowsky wrote in 1819, had too many children, and were reluctant to work. Unlike the churches of ancient times, he did not want to convert the Jews, but rather to expel them. As early as 1819, Hundt-Radowsky was already designing a whole program for this purpose, based on stigma and ghettoization, enslavement, then deportation and finally annihilation (Fasel 2010). The second half of the nineteenth century amplified this first movement, and did not bring anything fundamentally new. Social Darwinism and racial biology, together with the progression of Jews in bourgeois society, were powerful vectors for this hostility. After the founding of the German Empire in 1871, antisemitism was linked to the rise of nationalism. In 1861, Johann Nordmann published *Die Juden und der Deutsche Staat (Jews and the German State)* in which he argued that Jews belonged not only to a separate religion or church, but also to a particular type of race. Furthermore, Nordmann suggested that a specific Jewish “type” with physical characteristics (nose,

effeminacy, shortness, etc.) existed. The second half of the nineteenth century was characterized by a period of consolidation of these concepts, that, supported by linguists and ethnologists, became widespread both in civil society and in the political discussion. *The Bluntschli Bratersche dictionary* (1857, 1865) and the *Rotteck Welckersche dictionary* (4th edition of 1865) contain eloquent articles on this point. In *the Bluntschli dictionary*, “Aryans” and “Semites” were described, with positive values assigned to Aryans, and negative ones to Semites (Nipperdey & Rürup 1972: 131). As early as 1910, the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, wrote that the Movement was born in Germany to then spread in the regions under the control of the Habsburgs and in France, before taking particularly violent forms in Russia and Romania (Wolf 1910).

The terms Jews and Judaism underwent a semantic shift during this time. Until the end of the eighteenth century, the term “Jew” was defined as belonging to a religious community. The concept of Jew then gradually secularized. Since the late eighteenth century, Jews began to be seen as part of a “nation”, the Jewish nation, and the secular conceptions of Jews and Judaism that emerged in the nineteenth century encompassed many of the negative ideas that had been growing. Since the early 1870s, the term “Semite” started to be used more and more as a fashionable word with pseudo-scientific connotations.

The 1880s saw the emergence of the concept of antisemitism, but it was not Marr’s pen that coined it. The first document referencing the word can be found in “*Allgemeine Zeitung des deutschen Judentums*” (*General Journal of German Judaism*, September 2, 1879) which lists the publication of an “antisemitic weekly” by Marr, *Der Sieg des Judentum*. This is surprising since Marr had referred to the newspaper as “social-political” or “anti-Jewish”, but not as “antisemitic”. The word “antisemitism” does not appear in it (Nipperdey & Rürup 1972: 138). From November 1879 to March 1880, Marr published “*Die deutsche Wacht. Monthly for national cultural interests (Organ of the anti-Jewish Union)*”. At the end of 1879, the word “antisemitic” is first mentioned, and from the beginning of 1880, it is more recurrent in the *Deutsche Wacht* (*The New German Guard*), but no justification is given to the use of the new term. It is only in the Spring of 1880 that Marr, who began to publish the anti-semitic notebooks, *Antisemitische Heften* (Chemnitz 1880), legitimized the word.

The term “antisemite” was therefore probably coined by an employee of the *Allgemeine Zeitung* and then circulated in Berlin circles hostile to the Jewish people. Presumably, the word was created in the early fall of

1879 in Berlin by journalists in Marr's *entourage* (Berding 1991: 77). The formation of the word was in line with the social climate of the time, and Marr's name was mentioned by his contemporaries in this regard. The word was never neither defined nor commented, being self-explanatory. What is certain is that the word "antisemitism" was not the product of science like the term "Semitism", but rather it was immediately transformed into a political slogan to serve the identity and ideology of a party. At the end of September 1879, announcements in Berlin called for the creation of an "antisemitic" league. In early October, the statute of the association "Antisemitic League" appeared. The group led only an obscure existence, but also attracted the attention of liberal newspapers, that talked about its establishment. The meaning of the association was defined clearly. The "Antisemitic League" thus made it possible to popularize the term antisemitism. There is every reason to believe that the concept of antisemitism refers to the birth of the Era of Masses, as K.D. Bracher recalled it, alongside the emergence of neologisms like socialism and nationalism (Bracher 1978: 19–20).

THE COMPLEXITY OF GERMAN ANTISEMITISM

Far from being an isolated case, the example of Wilhelm Marr is thus representative of a whole generation, and of a well-established current of thought. Wilhelm Marr considered himself the descendant of the radical liberal generation of 1848, with their nationalist republican, anticlerical and romantic ideals. He also called for the destruction of the influence of the Catholic Church and the Jesuits, as well as the end of the "Semitic" domination of banks, credit institutions and press. His intense hostility to the Catholic Church was summed up in the popular pan-German slogan "Without Judah, without Rome, we will build the dome of Germany" (*Ohne Juda ohne Rom wird gebaut Germaniens Dom*).

Several factors contributed to the spreading of antisemitic thought on the political left, firstly, the secular anticlerical tradition from the Enlightenment. Attacks by French philosophers, like Voltaire, to the Old Testament and the Jewish origins of Christianity influenced Marx as well as German radicals such as Bruno Bauer, Wilhelm Marr and Eugen Dühring, who laid the foundations for modern racial antisemitism. It was Hegel who showed that the Jews resist assimilation and universalism. According to him, they remain strangers forever, *Fremder*, nomads condemned to wandering, who are left out of history. In 1844, Karl Marx found himself at the crossroads of this intellectual development, still under

the spell of the philosophical tradition of the young Hegel and of his main representatives, Bruno Bauer, Ludwig Feuerbach, and Moses Hess. *Zur Judenfrage* and *The Holy Family* are both transitional works on the road to mature Marxism. In neither of these studies there was any specific mention of capitalism, of the industrial proletariat, of socialism or of class struggle. It was not before the *German ideology* (1846) that Marx and Engels presented a fully developed materialist interpretation of history.

In pre-unification Germany, the 1830s and 1840s, there were radical Jews, like journalist Ludwig Boerne or Marx himself, who identified Jews with capitalism and assimilated “the Jewish spirit” to the “universal dominion” of money. Indeed, the Jewish radicals who insisted that the social Judaization of the Jew was intrinsic to the achievement of universal human emancipation were generally among the most extreme in their hostility to Judaism. Their antipathy went far beyond the rejection of religion and tribalism, or simple aversion to cultural particularism. The anti-Jewish contempt manifested by socialists of Jewish origin (Karl Marx, Ferdinand Lassalle, Rosa Luxemburg, Victor Adler, Otto Bauer, or the young Bernard Lazare) speaks of how they were determined to extinguish their own Jewishness, enveloping this wish for ethnic death in the name of a universal Brotherhood of Man. Among the various methods used, was a systematic process of denigration of Jewish religious practices and customs such as circumcision or the alleged inferiority of the Yiddish language.

Many similarities in terms of vocabulary existed between this socialist Left and the *völkisch* movement. For such leftist Judeophobes, the exclusion of the Jewish community was a necessary precondition for the “redemption” of humanity. Ironically, the more the Jewish radicals sought to not be identified as Jews, thus showing their ostentatious indifference towards their own people, the more it came to haunt them and fuel anti-semitic obsessions about a secret Jewish plot for world domination. Jewish socialists and communists were convinced that their future was within a culturally progressive development in the spirit of the French Revolution of 1789. Leaving the ghetto behind, the Jews were to be absorbed completely into their non-Jewish environment and disappear. Beyond the heritage of the Enlightenment, some Social Democrats did not hesitate to take up stereotypes used by antisemites. Certain prominent socialists such as August Bebel and Wilhelm Liebknecht had ambiguous ideas. Bebel sometimes echoed antisemitic discourses on “Jewish exploitation” or the quasi-Darwinian notion that racial traits can be transmitted over time. He presented the alleged inclination and readiness of the Jews to “trade” like a fact of nature. The physical appearance of the Jews, as well as their role

as intermediary and their presence in capitalist economic development, were considered by the leader of the SPD as major social causes of anti-semitism. There are also many traces of anti-Jewish prejudices in the letters that Marx and Engels exchanged, revealing a clear tendency to think along racial lines.

In the early 1880s, nothing disturbed public opinion more than the “Jewish question” nourished by a popular ethnography, according to which there was a recognizable Jewish type:

We immediately distinguish the Jew by his face, his entire bearing, the way he holds his head, his gesticulation, and even the most assimilated Jew, if the expression may be permitted, can still be recognized by some feature of his race. [...] But if we are required to define this type and provide any general formula for it, we find ourselves at a loss, for our terminology and our powers of definition lag behind, unable to keep pace with our emotion and our intuition. (Robertson 1999: 165)³

The Social Democrats, as an extra-parliamentary opposition, remained silent in the debate, leaving the field open to left-wing liberals. No leading social democrat raised his voice in defense of the Jews during this period. It was only later that some awareness took shape. Following antisemitic riots in the form of pogroms on 29 December 1880 in Berlin, the Social Democrats organized a mass rally to clarify the workers’ position on the Jewish question. Also, in the following months social democratic workers demonstrated in front of antisemitic assemblies.

In reality, there was ambivalence in German antisemitism shared by the Left and the Right.

THE AMBIVALENCE OF ANTISEMITISM BETWEEN LEFT AND RIGHT

Everything seems to indicate that antisemitic sentiments were present both in the Left and in the Right, until they began to develop further within the conservative right in the 1880s–1890s. The phenomenon consolidated in Germany after 1880 in the racist writings of Wilhelm Marr, Otto Glagau and Eugen Dühring. All of them were radical writers and journalists with an almost socialist past, and emphasized in their writings that *Judenfrage* was a social issue. In his magazine, *Der Kulturkämpfer* (1880–1888), journalist

³ See the anthropologist’s works of Richard Andrée. He argued for the continuity of Jewish physical traits over time (Andrée 1881: 37, Hart 1995: 162).

Otto Glagau assimilated Jews to liberalism and capitalism. In the climate of social aggression engendered by the stock market crash of 1873, he called into question the economic liberalism of the 1870s, with overtones of left-wing antisemitism, becoming one of the earliest to publicly blame Jews for the crisis. Glagau claimed that 90 percent of the companies gone bankrupt were controlled by Jews. *Die Gartenlaube* (350,000/400,000 readers) published a series of articles by Glagau. In these articles, he reiterated his claim about the role of Jewish speculators in the crash, stating that an invasion of *Ostjuden* from the area of Posen seeking to become rich on the German Stock Exchange had played a role in the crash. Socialist Wilhelm Hasselmann, a member of the Reichstag and editor in chief of the *Neuer Sozial-Demokrat*, identified in his definition of the *homo capitalisticus* with the iniquities of Jewish merchants and bankers (Wistrich 1990: 35). He consciously appealed to embittered artisans and businessmen who had been hit hard by the crash, saying that the “Semites” were seeking to impose their tribal racial dominance on German Christians through banks, the stock market, liberal parties, and the state. During an exchange with Bernstein, he did not hesitate to attack him over his Jewish origins. This left-wing antisemitism would be skillfully used by the conservatives in their own arguments during the economic crisis.

The stock market crash of 1873, combined with the transformation of capitalism during the Second Industrial Revolution, fueled a brutal reaction against liberal political culture. German antisemites saw themselves as the organizers of a defensive movement opposed to “Jewish domination”. Between 1870 and 1914, the German population changed its social base. Many non-Jews threatened by socioeconomic decline were convinced that Jews were a particular menacing «race» that wanted to conquer them (Berghahn 2005: 98–99). By identifying Jewish merchants and bankers with the *homo capitalisticus*, Glagau and other radical antisemites of the 1870s perpetuated a communist tradition that had begun with Marx (without the intellectual sophistication of the Hegelian dialectic) during the transition to mass society, thus opening up a large space for antisemites.

The antisemitic anti-Christian *Völkisch* tradition in nineteenth century Germany and Austria, led by Otto Böckel found expression in the plebeian populist turmoil that claimed to be above parties and religious denominations. Böckel’s *Antisemitische Volkspartei*, which won several parliamentary seats in the 1890s, embodied a populist revolt against the parliamentary system of the Second Reich, standing against metropolitan culture, big business, the world of industry, the Jews, and the Prussian aristocracy. At the same time, Böckel’s anti-modernism represented the conservative aspects of

modern German antisemitism, and his *völkisch* romantic aspirations for a pre-industrial culture. However, as Otto Glagau and Dühring, Böckel strongly rejected the Judeo-Christian vision, and defended *Mittelstand*'s interests against the Junkers, the capitalists, and the Jews. Even the title of one of his best-known pamphlets, *Die Juden—Die Könige unsere Zeit* (1887), which notably attacked the Rothschilds, consciously recalled the antisemitic work of French socialist Alphonse Toussenel, a disciple of Fourier (Toussenel 1845, Sternhell 1984: 177, Crapez 1997: 235).

Wilhelm Marr thus appears as one of the vectors of the spread of anti-semitism in Germany during the rise of political antisemitism and of anti-semitic movements. It would be a mistake to impute to him the development of such movements. Marr popularized the term antisemitism but did not invent it (Waldenegg 2003). The birth of modern antisemitism is more an expression of the cultural climate of the time, resulting in a shift in public opinion in the German Empire. The word was first used by the scholar of Jewish history, Moritz Steinschneider against the thinking of Ernest Renan (Marcus 2015: 58), but the racialist definition appears too restrictive by excluding forms of a more general phenomenon such as ethnic and religious prejudice or xenophobia (Zikelnat 2008). This means that antisemitism was not only an instrument of political conflict, but also the symptom of a particular zeitgeist (Pulzer 2004). For this reason, anti-semitism cannot be limited to Marr's racist definition, but encompasses a set of negative attitudes, ideologies, and practices directed at Jews as Jews, individually or collectively (Marcus 2013).

REFERENCES

- Andrée, Richard. 1881. *Zur Volkskunde der Juden*. Bielefeld and Leipzig: Velhagen & Klasing.
- Antisemitism: A History*. 2010. eds. Albert S. Lindemann, Richard S. Levy. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Berding, Helmut. 1991. *Histoire de l'Antisémitisme en Allemagne*. Paris: Edition de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.
- Berghahn, Volker Rolf. 2005. *Imperial Germany, 1871–1918: Economy, Society, Culture, and Politics*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Bergmann, Werner. 2016. Wilhelm Marr's. A Mirror to the Jews (translated by Richard S. Levy). In *Key Documents of German-Jewish History*, September 22.
- Best, Renate. 2004. Nationalismus und antisemitismus in Deutschland. Annäherung von zwei Disziplinen in der historiographie. In *Antisemitismus, Paganismus, Völkische Religion*, eds. Hubert Cancik, Puschner Uwe, 83–96. München: Ravensberg zu Bielefeld.

- Bracher, Karl Dietrich. 1978. *Schlüssel Wörter in der Geschichte*. Düsseldorf: Droste Verlag.
- Brustein, William. 2003. *Roots of Hate: Antisemitism in Europe before the Holocaust*. I. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crapez, Marc. 1997. *La gauche réactionnaire. Mythes de la glèbe et de la race dans le sillage des Lumières*. Paris: Berg International.
- Fasel, Peter. 2010. *Revolte und Judenmord: Hartwig von Hundt-Radowsky (1780–1835). Biografie eines Demagogen*. Berlin: Metropol Verlag.
- Hart, Mitchell B. 1995. Picturing Jews: Iconography and Racial Science. In *Values, Interests and Identity. Jews and Politics in a Changing World*, ed. Peter Y. Medding, 159–175. Studies in Contemporary Jewry XI. New York Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hundt-Radowsky (Hartwig von). 1819. *Judenspiegel. Ein Schand – und Sittengemälde alter und neuer Zeit*. Schwarzburg-Sondershausen: Bernhard Friedrich Voigt.
- Jeismann, Michael. 1999. Der letzte Feind. Die Nation, die Juden und der negative Universalismus. In *Die Konstruktion der Nation gegen die Juden*, eds. Bärsch Peter, Ekkehard Claus, Berghoff Peter, 173–190. München: Wilhelm Fink.
- Lange, Matthew. 2007. *Antisemitic Elements in the Critique of Capitalism in German Culture. 1850–1933*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Marcus, Kenneth L. 2013. The Definition of Antisemitism. In *Global Antisemitism: a crisis of Modernity. Conceptual approaches*, 99–119. New York: Institute for the Study of Global Antisemitism and Policy.
- Marcus, Kenneth L. 2015. *The Definition of Antisemitism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Marr, Wilhelm. 1879. *Der Sieg des Judenthums über das Germanenthum – Vom nicht confessionellen Standpunkt aus betrachtet*. Bern: Rudolph Costenoble.
- Marr, Wilhelm. 1880. *Wählet keinen Juden! Der Weg zum Siege des Germanenthums über das Judenthum. Ein Mahnwort an die Wähler nichtjüdischen Stammes aller Confessionen*. Berlin: Hentze.
- Mosse, Werner E. 1989. *The German-Jewish Economic Elite 1820–1935*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nipperdey, Thomas, and Reinhard Rürup. 1972. Antisemitismus. In *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe: Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland*, eds. Otto Brunner, Werner Conze, Reinhart Koselleck, 129–153. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta.
- Nipperdey, Thomas. 1983. *Deutsche Geschichte 1800–1866: Bürgerwelt und starker Staat. I*. München: C. H. Beck.
- Pulzer, Peter G. 2003. *Jews and the German State. The Political History of a Minority, 1848–1933*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Pulzer, Peter G. 2004. *Die Entstehung des politischen Antisemitismus in Deutschland und Österreich 1867 bis 1914. Mit einem Forschungsbericht des Autors*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

- Puschner, Uwe. 1990. Marr, Wilhelm. In *Neue Deutsche Biographie* (NDB). Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 16: 247–249.
- Robertson, Ritchie. 1999. *The Jewish Question' in German Literature, 1749–1939: Emancipation and Its Discontents*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rohrbacher, Stefan. 1993. *Gewalt im Biedermeier. Antijüdische Ausschreitungen in Vormärz und Revolution (1815–1848/49)*. Frankfurt am Main New York: Campus.
- Rose, Paul Lawrence. 1990. *German Question/Jewish Question: Revolutionary Antisemitism in Germany from Kant to Wagner*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Rürup Reinhard. 1975. *Emanzipation und Antisemitismus. Studien zur 'Judenfrage' der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.
- Schneider, Manfred. 1980. *Die kranke schöne Seele der Revolution. Heine, Börne, das Junge Deutschland, Marx und Engels*. Bodenheim: Athenaeum.
- Sterling, Eleonore. 1950. Anti-Jewish Riots in Germany in 1819. A Displacement of Social Protest. in *Historia Judaica*, XII: 105–142.
- Sternhell, Zeev. 1984. *La Droite révolutionnaire. Les origines françaises du fascisme*. Paris: Le Seuil, 2e éd.
- Toussenel, Alfonse. 1845. *Les Juifs. Rois de l'Époque. Histoire de la féodalité financière*. Paris: A la Librairie de l'École Sociétaire.
- Waldenegg Berger, Christoph G. 2003. *Antisemitismus. Eine gefährliche Vokabel? Diagnose eines Wortes*. Wien: Böhlau.
- Wistrich, Robert. 1990. *Between redemption and perdition: modern antisemitism and Jewish identity*. Boston: Routledge.
- Wolf, Lucien. 1910. Antisemitism. In *The Encyclopaedia Britannica. A Dictionary of Arts, Sciences, Literature, and General Information*. 11th ed. 2: 134–146. New York: The Encyclopaedia Britannica Company.
- Zimmermann, Moshe. 1975. Gabriel Riesser und Wilhelm Marr im Meinungsstreit. *Zeitschrift des Vereins für Hamburgische Geschichte*, 61: 59–84.
- Zimmermann, Moshe. 1979. *Hamburgischer Patriotismus und deutscher Nationalismus. Die Emanzipation der Juden in Hamburg 1830–1865*. Hamburg: Hans Christians.
- Zimmermann, Moshe. 1986. *Wilhelm Marr The Patriarch of Antisemitism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Zimmermann, Moshe. 2017. Die Hep-Hep-Unruhen in Hamburg. in Ludolf Holsts Schrift, Über das Verhältnis der Juden zu den Christen in den Handelsstädten. In *Juedische-Geschichte-Online.net*. März 9.
- Zikelnat, Reiner. 2008. Historisches zum Antisemitismus in Deutschland. Zur Entstehung und Entwicklungdes “modern” Antisemitimus im Kaiserreich. In *Neues vom Antisemitismus: Zustände in Deutschland (Rosa-Luxemburg-Stiftung Texte 46)*, eds., Helas Horst, Rubisch Dagmar, Zikelnat Reiner, 13–44. Berlin: Karl Dietz Verlag.