

---

*H-France Review* Vol. 11 (January 2011), No. 24

Julie Kalman, *Rethinking Antisemitism in Nineteenth-Century France*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009. 246 pp. \$88 U.S. (cl). ISBN-10: 0521897327.

Review by Vicki Caron, Cornell University.

Julie Kalman's book *Rethinking Antisemitism in Nineteenth-Century France* examines French attitudes toward Jews during a period that has received relatively little attention—the years 1815 through 1848. In focusing on this time frame, Kalman has two goals. First, she wants to problematize the claim of historians such as Jean-Jacques Becker who have argued that the 19th century, at least prior to the Dreyfus Affair, was a relatively "tranquil century" in French Jewish history (p. 1). Second, she wants to show how the French used "thinking about Jews" to understand their rapidly changing world. As Kalman states, "This is a history of France; of how some French sought to come to terms with life in the early nineteenth century by using Jews to think, to dream, to make sense of change" (p. 21). Kalman concedes that she has not presented a comprehensive overview of French Jewish history or even of antisemitism during this period. Rather, she focuses on select episodes of the Christian-Jewish encounter. At times Kalman expresses discomfort with the term "antisemitism" and suggests that the term "ambiguity" might be preferable. But in truth, this book is essentially a cultural history of Catholic antisemitism, during the years between Napoleon's downfall and the Revolution of 1848.

The book includes six chapters, in addition to an introduction and conclusion, and each of these deals with some aspect of Catholic antisemitism. In the first chapter, "Competing Solutions to a Jewish Question", Kalman examines the ideas of several intellectuals, including Charles Joseph Bail, Silvestre de Sacy, Félicité Lammenais, and Louis de Bonald, regarding the Jewish Question during the Bourbon Restoration (1814–1830). As she shows, those thinkers who had hoped that the Restoration would restore not only the monarchy, but also the privileged position of the Catholic Church, were severely disappointed, and they not infrequently expressed this disappointment by lashing out at Jews. Initial hopes for a Catholic restoration had been high. Whereas the Napoleonic Concordat of 1801 had only recognized Catholicism as "the religion of the great majority of the French," the Charter of 1814 restored the Catholic Church to its position as the official state religion. Moreover, the government permitted the Jesuits to return in 1817, and under the reign of Charles X (1824–1830), Catholics were given a greater role over education. Nevertheless, both Protestants and Jews retained the equal rights they had won during the French Revolution. And in 1818, despite a fierce debate over the status of Jews, Napoleon's 1808 "Infamous Law," which had sharply restricted Jewish moneylending in Alsace, was allowed to lapse. Furthermore, the monarchy extended the 1825 Sacrilege Law, which labeled theft from churches and host desecration as crimes against "God and King," to Protestant and Jewish houses of worship as well, to the great chagrin of Catholic spokesmen. When the July Monarchy came to power, Jewish rights were further expanded. For the first time in 1831, rabbis were given the same right as Christian clerical personnel to receive state salaries, elevating Judaism as a religion to a status on par with Christianity. For Catholic intellectuals like Sacy, Bonald and Lammenais, this equality was a direct affront to their own faith. Indeed, the very idea of religious tolerance was anathema to them since it challenged the supremacy of the Church. In their eyes, neither Protestantism, which they deemed a heresy, nor

Judaism, which they believed had ceased to exist as a religion after the birth of Christianity, deserved the respect and stature owed the Catholic Church. Although Lammenais and Bonald still believed in the ultimate conversion of the Jews, they nevertheless insisted that as long as Jews persisted in their obstinate refusal to recognize the true faith, they deserved to remain in a subordinate position. Bonald even argued that granting the Jewish infidels a civil status on par with Christians would result in their domination.

Kalman's next two chapters, "The Unyielding Wall: Christianity and Judaism," and "The Eternal Jew", deal with the subject of conversion. Here she examines the impact of a handful of Jews who converted to Catholicism in the 1820s: Nicolas L'Evêque; David Drach; Ignace Morel (Lévy Morel); and Alphonse and Théodore Ratisbonne.<sup>[1]</sup> Although Thomas Kselman has recently documented 315 baptisms of Jews between 1833-1875, in truth conversion in France never became the widespread phenomenon that it was in Central Europe, largely because emancipation had been achieved and Jews were allowed to hold civil and military service posts.<sup>[2]</sup>

Despite the relatively small numbers of converts in France, the phenomenon of conversion is nevertheless important since many of these converts came from the very heart of the Jewish community. The Ratisbonne brothers were the grandsons of Cerf Berr, the most prominent Alsatian Jew at the time of the French Revolution, and their father was Auguste Ratisbonne, a prominent banker and president of the Jewish Consistory of the Bas-Rhin in Strasbourg. Similarly, David Drach was the son-in-law of the chief rabbi of France, Emmanuel Deutz, and Simon Deutz was the chief rabbi's son.

As to why these young Jewish males converted, Kalman posits several hypotheses. It is possible that they were influenced by the Catholic religious revival of the 1820s; as Thomas Kselman has shown, the Ratisbonne brothers were members of the abbé Louis-Eugène-Marie Bautain's study circle, an important center of the spiritual revival in Alsace.<sup>[3]</sup> It has also been argued that some might have been motivated by opportunism, but Kalman dismisses this interpretation, apparently on the grounds that conversion was unnecessary in France for career advancement. She also cites the interpretation put forth by Natalie Isser and Lita Linzer Schwartz in their article on the conversion of the Ratisbonne brothers. Here these authors argue that many young middle class Jews, who grew up in households devoid of religion, were afflicted with a "sense of malaise," and alienation, due to the intense religious fervor of this period.<sup>[4]</sup> Moreover, several of these converts, most notably the Ratisbonne brothers and Drach, perhaps impelled by a sense of insecurity regarding their newfound religious identities, turned their attention toward missionizing among the Jews. The Ratisbonne brothers founded the order of Notre Dame de Sion which was devoted to the conversion of the Jews, and Drach converted Jacob Liberman in 1826; his brother-in-law, Simon Deutz in 1828; and eventually his own children after he kidnapped them from their mother who had fled to England to avoid contact with him after his conversion.

Whereas Kselman has argued that the wall between these converts and their Jewish relatives was far more permeable than scholars have previously assumed, Kalman suggests that on the whole, once these Jews converted, all relations with the established Jewish community ceased. In part this was due to the traditional reluctance of the Jewish community to maintain relations with converts, an attitude that was reinforced by the efforts of these recent converts to convert Jewish friends and relatives. Moreover, several of them, most notably Drach, turned fiercely antisemitic. In his book, *De l'Harmonie entre l'église et la synagogue ou perpétuité et catholicité de la religion chrétienne*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1844), Drach denounced the "antisocial and monstrous morality" of the Talmud, and his work became an important source of information and inspiration for Catholic antisemites for decades to come <sup>[5]</sup> (p. 63). Ultimately, according to

Kalman, the attitude of these converts toward their former faith was summed up by Drach's comment that Jews and Christians were separated by an "unyielding wall, which could only be crossed through conversion." Otherwise, Kalman claims, at least for conservative Catholics, "there was no common ground on which Jews and Catholics could interact as equals" (p. 69).

In chapter three, "The Eternal Jew," Kalman continues her discussion of Jewish and Catholic attitudes toward conversion by examining the sensational case of Simon Deutz. When Drach had converted in 1823 the Catholic press hailed this event as an "important and glorious conquest" (p. 72). In 1828, Drach converted his brother-in-law, Simon Deutz, despite Deutz's earlier outrage over Drach's conversion, especially since Drach had placed his wife Sara and their children in an untenable situation. After his conversion, Deutz developed close relations with Legitimist circles. In 1832, the Duchess of Berry sought to ignite a coup to topple the new government of Louis Philippe and install her son, the Count de Chambord, Henry V, the last surviving heir of the Bourbon dynasty, on the throne. Her designs were thwarted, however, when Deutz disclosed the Duchess's whereabouts to government authorities. The Duchess was subsequently arrested and imprisoned, dashing Legitimist hopes for a swift return to power.

After Deutz's "betrayal," he was pilloried by both the right and the left. He was branded a "Judas," and his betrayal was blamed on his Judaism. As the Catholic paper *L'Ami de la religion* put it, Deutz's treason proved that despite his conversion, he remained a "Jew by nation" (p. 81). Victor Hugo, in a popular poem, claimed that Deutz had betrayed the Duchess for a "bagful of gold," and some commentators insisted that Deutz must have been a foreigner, since no Frenchman could have behaved so abominably. It was also argued that Deutz had feigned his conversion from the start in order to carry out his preconceived plan of betraying his compatriots. In recounting this episode, Kalman dismisses those historians, such as Zosa Szajkowski, who have suggested that Deutz was motivated by patriotism, although it is not clear why. Ultimately, she argues that Deutz's betrayal generated so much controversy because it erased the once clear boundaries that had separated Jews and Christians.

It could, however, be argued that this episode demonstrated not only the persistence of these boundaries, but also the fact that they had hardened significantly over time. Kalman shows that conservative Catholics expressed deep skepticism regarding the efficacy of conversion, and their anti-Jewish animosity was becoming decidedly more racial. Moreover, it was not only Catholics who refused to consider Deutz one of their own after this "betrayal;" Jews, too, rejected him. When Deutz approached Adolphe Crémieux for legal assistance, the already prominent young lawyer from Nîmes adamantly refused, stating: "You counted on me as a fellow Jew, let your error cease. You now belong to no religion, you renounced the faith of your fathers, and you are no longer Catholic; no religion wants you" (p. 85). Even the Central Consistory censored Chief Rabbi Emmanuel Deutz for refusing to repudiate his son. Ultimately, Kalman concludes her discussion of this episode by stating that Catholic views of both Drach and Deutz illustrate how Catholic conservatives were adjusting their "centuries-old view of Jews to a changing world," and she claims that these accounts reveal the discomfort of Catholics in the face of Jewish emancipation, which had erased the traditional boundaries between Judaism and Christianity (p. 88). It is likely, however, that this antagonism arose less from "age-old" Christian anti-Judaism than from a new form of Catholic antisemitism that was developing in response to Jewish emancipation and the expansion of Jewish rights under the July Monarchy, particularly since Catholics viewed any advance in Jewish rights as an assault on their own status.

Chapter four, titled "Sensuality, Depravity and Ritual Murder: Jews in the Orient, and Jews at Home?" examines two themes: the way in which Jewish women were orientalized in French literature and art, and the Damascus blood libel of 1840. While it is true that these two themes are loosely interconnected via the thread of the orient, the juxtaposition of these subjects does

not work terribly well, and it would have been preferable to have divided these subjects into two chapters. In any event, Kalman begins the chapter with a discussion of the way in which Jewish women were depicted by writers and artists such as Victor Hugo, Eugène Delacroix, Charles Didier, and Jean-Auguste-Dominique Ingres. These artists, according to Kalman, became infatuated with the beauty of the oriental Jewess, who had become familiar to the French through contact with Jews in North Africa and the Near East. As the Swiss-born writer Charles Didier commented with respect to North African Jewish women, "Nowhere could be seen faces that are more perfect, more ideal" (p. 96). But as Kalman notes, the beauty of the Jewish woman was in some respects her Achilles' heel, since she came to be defined solely by her physicality and sensuality. Moreover the Jewess's beauty was pitted against the ugliness of the Jewish male, which, according to Didier, penetrated to his very soul: "It is a moral ugliness; it is the soul that is deformed and which is reproduced in each of the features." (p. 97)

After a detour in which she discusses the Damascus Affair, Kalman returns to the theme of the oriental Jewess later in the chapter, and here she examines the way in which this orientalized femininity was projected back onto descriptions of Jewish women at home. To prove her point she compares two portraits of women by the painter Ingres: one of the Baroness Betty de Rothschild and the other of Madame Marie-Clotilde-Inès Moitessier. Regarding Ingres's portrayal of the Baroness de Rothschild, Kalman argues that she seems mired in physicality as opposed to Madame de Moitessier. According to Kalman, the portrait of Betty Rothschild displays "echoes of the overwhelming sexuality of her fellow Jewesses in the Orient," although I must admit that to my own eye, her sexuality does not seem more pronounced than Madame Moitessier's. Nevertheless, Kalman is probably correct to point out that the image of the oriental Jewess did carry over to the way in which French Jewish women were conceptualized more generally. Indeed, French Jewish women themselves occasionally played on this theme, as was true of the famous tragedienne Rachel.

Interwoven into this discussion, Kalman treats a far more serious matter: the Damascus blood libel of 1840. She argues, unconvincingly in my view, that these two subjects are linked by the fact that the orientalized stereotypes about Jewish women help explain why so many in France were ready to believe Jews capable of ritual murder. In any event, the facts of this case are well known due to the rich and comprehensive study by Jonathan Frankel, *The Damascus Affair: "Ritual Murder," Politics, and the Jews in 1840*. In 1840 the Jews of Damascus were accused of having assassinated a Capuchin friar, Father Thomas, and his assistant for ritual purposes. As Kalman points out, this was the first accusation of its kind to surface in a Muslim land, and it embroiled the French government since Father Thomas, although born in Sardinia, was a French national, and the French consul in Damascus, the Count Benoit Ulysse-Laurent-François de Ratti-Menton, became the most outspoken proponent of the claim that the Jews were responsible for these murders.

Ratti-Menton's motives were two-fold: first he wished to represent the wishes of the Christian community of Damascus, and second he was seeking to further French interests in the region by propping up the regime of the Egyptian viceroy, Muhammed Ali (Pasha Mehmet Ali), the governor of Damascus, as opposed to the British and Austrians, who were hoping to diminish Mehmet Ali's power and restore Ottoman rule in the region. As a result, over 100 Jews in Damascus were thrown into prison, and many were tortured. Ultimately, sixteen of these men were accused of the murder, and four died in prison. The others were released only after a delegation, led by Sir Moses Montefiore of Great Britain and Adolphe Crémieux, who was then vice president of the Central Consistory, traveled to the Middle East to secure the prisoners' release. Although they succeeded in liberating the surviving prisoners, they were unable to persuade Mehmet Ali to issue a firman stating categorically that the ritual murder charge was

"libelous and without foundation," although they did secure such a statement from the Turkish sultan in late 1840.[6]

As Jonathan Frankel illustrated, the most astonishing aspect of this affair was the degree to which public opinion throughout Europe, and especially in France, supported this ritual murder charge. Kalman delves into this issue more deeply by analysing four newspapers: the center left paper, *Le Constitutionnel*; the royalist paper, *Le Quotidienne*; and two conservative Catholic papers, *L'Univers* and *L'Ami de la religion*. (It is not clear why Kalman does not include the royalist *Gazette de Languedoc*, since as Frankel showed, it was probably the foremost anti-Jewish voice in the right-wing press, and Kalman consulted it for material in subsequent chapters). As Kalman shows, all of these papers expressed the belief that that the Jews of Damascus had possibly committed ritual murder, but the Catholic papers led the way. *L'Ami de la religion* published extracts from the Talmud to show that Jews detested Christianity and that they had been commanded by the Talmud to commit ritual murder. And *L'Univers* used this affair to criticize Jewish emancipation in France itself. As it declared, "Even though one people may follow another in its exterior habits, as long as it professes a secret religion and the mystery of its beliefs cannot be penetrated, it will be a foreign people and it will be natural to be suspicious of its tendencies" (p. 113).

Moreover, all these papers vigorously supported the anti-Jewish campaign of Ratti-Menton, and they roundly criticized Crémieux's participation in the international Jewish delegation that secured the Jewish prisoners' release. Such behavior, *L'Univers* insisted, reflected the fact that French Jews placed their loyalties to international Jewry above their loyalties to France, and it proved that "Judaism is less a religion than a nationality" (p. 126). Regardless of whether they were "Talmudists" or "rationalists on the Paris stock exchange," *L'Univers* insisted that the Jews forever remained "foreigners, enemies of the Christians" (p. 127). To be sure, the Jews did have some defenders, most notably the liberal newspaper, the *Journal des débats*. Nevertheless, pro-Jewish voices in the press were few and far between. For French Jewry, the lowest point in this affair had to have been when Prime Minister Adolphe Thiers, lashed out at the Jews on the floor of the Chamber of Deputies: "You protest in the name of the Jews; well, I protest in the name of the French....They [the Jews] are more powerful in the world than they pretend to be...." In response to this tirade, Crémieux lamented, "France is against us." [7]

In chapter five, "Rothschildian Greed: This New Variety of Despotism," Kalman explores the ways in which Jews, and especially James Rothschild, became the preeminent symbol of unfettered capitalism and limitless greed, and in turn came to symbolize the ethos of the July Monarchy. As Kalman shows, these themes were immensely popular, especially during the tremendous economic boom of the 1840s. Georges-Marie Mathieu-Dairnvaell's, *Histoire de Rothschild [sic] Ier, roi des juifs, par Satan* (Paris, 1846) was one of the era's bestsellers; it sold over 60,000 copies, and it went through twenty editions. In this book Mathieu-Dairnvaell decried the new "financial feudalism," over which Rothschild, whom he described as someone "born in stock exchange scandals and dominating everything through usury, speculation and the vilest of dealings," ruled as king (p. 138). Similarly, Alphonse Toussenel's two volume work, *Les Juifs rois de l'époque. Histoire de la féodalité financière* (Paris, 1845), excoriated Rothschild as the real power behind the July Monarchy and argued that the Jewish bourgeoisie, the new "financial feudality", had supplanted the old aristocracy that had been swept away by the French Revolution. Hence, society today was by no means a meritocracy, as liberals claimed; rather, it was just as plutocratic as the ancien régime, even though the new caste distinctions were not so readily apparent. This book too was immensely popular; it was republished in 1847, and again in 1886 and 1888, after it had been cited extensively by Edouard Drumont in his antisemitic classic, *La France juive*. [8]



The targeting of James Rothschild as "King of the Epoch" is a theme that has been explored many times before.<sup>[9]</sup> What is new in Kalman's treatment of the subject, however, is that she suggests that the utopian socialists who used the terms "Jew" and "capitalist" interchangeably—especially Charles Fourier, Pierre Leroux, and Toussenel—had all been influenced by the "legacy of Catholicism" (p. 150). According to Kalman, these utopian socialists should not be seen primarily as adherents of a new secular left-wing antisemitism, as they have been in the past. Rather, she argues that their worldview too had been shaped above all by their "strong adherence to the Catholic faith" (p. 150). Indeed, Toussenel worked on the staff of the ultra conservative paper *La Paix*, and he was acquainted with Louis Veuillot, who became the preeminent voice of ultramontane Catholicism. Moreover, according to Kalman, Toussenel anticipated that the overthrow of the reign of "financial feudalism" would be marked by a return to the Catholic faith. As Kalman concludes, despite the fact that most utopian socialists were strongly anticlerical, they nevertheless believed that the socialism of the future needed to remain rooted in Christian morality. Ultimately, according to Kalman, there was a huge overlap between the social Christian theology of Lammenais, which influenced not only liberal Catholics, but even conservatives like Veuillot, and the socialist theories of Fourier, Toussenel, and Leroux. Hence, the utopian socialist left and the conservative Catholic right converged in their desire to eradicate competition, egotism, and greed from the heart of modern society, and both camps concurred that the cause of these evils was the Jew.

Chapter six, "Evolutions in the Jewish Question," together with the conclusion, examine the way thinking about the Jewish Question evolved from the early to the mid-nineteenth century. Here Kalman's argument is somewhat confusing. On the one hand, she suggests that the debate over the role of Jews in French society changed little over the course of these decades. Whereas opinion regarding whether Jews were capable of becoming French citizens had been primarily negative at the time of the French Revolution, it remained negative in the 1820s when there were two major essay contests—one in Rouen in 1823 and the other in Strasbourg in 1824—on topics relating to Jews. In response to the questions posed in the Strasbourg essay contest regarding the most "the most appropriate means to enable the Israelite population of Alsace to enjoy the benefits of civilization," and "the causes that estrange...this population from society," the majority of submissions continued to depict Jews as retrograde and incapable of "regeneration." The essays by Charles Joseph Bail and Count Arthur-Auguste Beugnot, for example, blamed the Talmud for Jewish recalcitrance, and they depicted Alsatian Jews as mired in superstition and inclined to criminality, especially due to their usurious practices. The essay by Amedée Tourette did suggest that reform was possible, but only on condition that Jews abandon Judaism in order to achieve social "fusion."

Kalman then moves to examine public opinion toward Jews during the July Monarchy, and here she focuses on two writers: Maximilien Charles Alphonse Cerfberr de Medelsheim, a journalist and son of a convert, and Théophile Hallez, a lawyer, as well as some prefects' reports. Hallez criticized the ongoing segregation of Jews, and he blamed the Jews themselves for this state of affairs. He furthermore claimed that the Jews of 1844 were no different than their forebears in 1789. Cerfberr de Medelsheim similarly depicted the character of Jews as unchanging, but he partly blamed Christian persecution. Still, he saw only two possibilities for the future: Jews could either renounce their Judaism in order to remain French citizens or they could cling to their Judaism and relinquish their French citizenship.

Kalman then asks whether it was indeed true that the image of the Jew had not changed at all. Here she shifts gears and suggests that this image had in fact changed significantly. Whereas Jews in the early nineteenth century had been depicted as downtrodden and lowly, by the 1830s and 40s they were increasingly portrayed as aggressive and domineering. Cerfberr de Medelsheim described them as "hungry wolves," and "birds of prey," and he predicted that they

would ultimately take over. Despite the fact that they numbered fewer than 100,000, he declared, "There is no post that they do not desire, no position that they do not exploit..." (p. 183). Similarly as early as 1835, the *Gazette du Languedoc*, in a discussion of the Rothschilds, announced: "THE JEWS HAVE THE UPPER HAND EVERYWHERE" (p. 183). Lammenais went so far as to demonize Jews. Not only did he condemn them as "a people devoured by a thirst for gold," but he railed against them as a "race of murderers...[who] love the dark, they delight in it..." (p. 189). Still, after illustrating this striking change in anti-Jewish rhetoric by the mid-nineteenth century, Kalman in her conclusion reverts back to emphasizing the continuities in anti-Jewish rhetoric during these decades. In the end, the reader is left befuddled as to whether or not the author believes that a significant shift has occurred.

To conclude, Kalman's book has many strengths. Kalman convincingly demonstrates that the first half of the nineteenth century was far from a tranquil era in French Jewish history. Above all she has shown the enduring strength of Catholic antisemitism. Indeed, she has significantly reshaped our understanding of nineteenth-century French antisemitism. Most scholars have hitherto argued that antisemitism in France prior to the Dreyfus Affair was a largely left-wing phenomenon, but Kalman convincingly demonstrates that right-wing antisemitism was more influential. Indeed, she has shown that even the negative attitudes toward Jews and Judaism held by utopian socialists were shaped in part by Catholicism

Whether this Catholic antisemitism was as "age old" and unchanging as Kalman suggests, however, is another question. Rather the evidence she adduces strongly implies that even Catholic antisemitism was changing. In the eyes of Catholic conservatives, Jews were not merely a "relevant other," who helped them make sense of a rapidly changing world, as Kalman claims. Rather, Jews were very specifically targeted because they came to represent capitalism and modernity, notwithstanding the rhetoric about their persistent backwardness and lack of "regeneration." Moreover, from the vantage point of conservative Catholics, their very acceptance into society served as a constant reminder of the devastating and irremediable blow suffered by the Catholic Church as a result of the French Revolution. To be sure, Catholic conservatives had hoped to rollback the gains of the Revolution under the Bourbon Restoration. But these efforts failed so that by the time of the July Monarchy, it was clear that society was rapidly becoming dechristianized and that the Church would never regain its pre-revolutionary stature.

In addition, although Kalman has done a wonderful job of showing how this Christian antisemitism evolved over the course of the first half of the nineteenth century, it would have been helpful had she provided some background on the social status of French Jewry, and especially the progress of Jewish integration during this era. Indeed, it was this integration that Catholic conservatives found so objectionable. Moreover, although Kalman has revealed the depth and persistence of negative opinion toward the Jews, rarely does she touch on growing positive public opinion linked to the Jews' rapid assimilation. Even the prefectural reports from the 1840's were in reality more mixed than Kalman suggests. Although the prefects of Alsace and Lorraine sharply criticized the backwardness of the impoverished Jewish population of the countryside, they went out of their way to praise the "immense" progress made by "the richest and most enlightened Israelites." As the prefect of the Bas-Rhin explained in 1843, by "improving their appearance, by accustoming themselves to habits that correspond to their new position, [they] have brought about a noticeable rapprochement between that class and the part of the Christian population whose social position is materially analogous." The prefect of the Moselle similarly noted the social advancement of urban middle class Jews. As he stated, "the rich or even only well-to-do families," were abandoning traditional Jewish quarters in order to live among Christians. He went on to add that "this class lodges, dresses, and supports itself,

except in solemn circumstances where it is necessary to perform external religious acts, exactly like the Catholic population."

As a result of this success, Jews were beginning to win acceptance among many liberals. By 1866, the economic historian Xavier Mossmann commented: "The Revolution was not mistaken....Assimilation has taken place slowly, but surely." Although all classes among Jews had made progress, Mossmann emphasized that "the elite led the way. You can recognize them everywhere, those men who were ahead of their times and who preceded their coreligionists in the letters, in the arts, in education, in the sciences, in industry, in finance, in the magistracy, in the army, at the bar."<sup>[10]</sup> Indeed, the intense animosity toward Jews that emerged during the July Monarchy only becomes comprehensible when this rapid assimilation is taken into account. It was this assimilation, and not the continued segregation of village Jewry, that most irritated conservative Catholics and provoked charges of Jewish domineering.

Finally, although Kalman is constantly seeking to draw analogies between mid-19th-century antisemitism and its late 18th-century precedent, she would have broadened the purview of her book considerably had she looked ahead to the late 19th century as well. How did the trends of the 1815-1848 period influence the rise of modern antisemitism later in the century? Moreover, to what degree did Catholic antisemitism continue to play a central role, especially since Catholics have frequently been written out of this story. The fact is, however, as Kalman has shown, that Catholics already by the mid-nineteenth century were forging links between antisemitism, on the one hand, and nationalism and racism, on the other. In addition, it would have been helpful for Kalman to have commented on the explosion of antisemitism in Alsace during the Revolution of 1848. Was this antisemitism, focused primarily in rural areas of Alsace, a sign of the persistence of traditional anti-Judaism animosity, or did it augur something new?

Despite the fact that Kalman has not tied together all these loose ends, this book nevertheless fills an important gap in the historiography of 19th-century antisemitism. It is elegantly written, and it has been handsomely produced by Cambridge University Press. Kalman has adduced a substantial amount of new material, and she has raised a number of critical questions that will undoubtedly stimulate further research. *Rethinking Antisemitism in Nineteenth-Century France* therefore stands as a valuable contribution to our understanding of antisemitism, and especially Catholic antisemitism, during the post-emancipation era.

## NOTES

[1] Another prominent Jew who converted during this period was Jacob Libermann, the son of a rabbi, who achieved considerable renown as a priest--abbé François Marie Paul Libermann. Libermann, who founded a religious order devoted to missionizing among blacks primarily in Africa, is mentioned in passing, but it is not clear why he is not treated more extensively.

[2] On Jewish conversion in Germany, see Deborah Hertz, *How Jews became Germans: The History of Conversion and Assimilation in Berlin* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2007). See also Todd Endelman, ed., *Jewish Apostasy in the Modern World* (New York and London: Holmes & Meier, 1987).

[3] See Thomas Kselman, "The Bautain Circle and Catholic-Jewish Relations in Modern France," *The Catholic Historical Review* 92, no. 3 (July, 2006), pp. 177-196.



[4] Natalie Isser and Lita Linzer Schwartz, "Sudden Conversion: The Case of Alphonse Ratisbonne," *Jewish Social Studies* 45 (1983), pp. 17-30.

[5] Théodore Ratisbonne similarly expressed antisemitic views. See especially R. P. Théodore Ratisbonne, *La Question Juive* (Paris, 1868).

[6] Cited in Hillel J. Kieval, Review of Jonathan Frankel, *The Damascus Affair: "Ritual Murder," Politics, and the Jews in 1840* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997), *AJS Review* 25, no. 1 (2000-2001), pp. 137-142, especially p. 138.

[7] Cited in Anka Muhlstein, *Baron James: The Rise of the French Rothschilds* (New York: The Vendome Press, 1984), pp. 123-124.

[8] Edouard Drumont, *La France juive: Essai d'histoire contemporaine*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1886).

[9] See especially Michael Graetz, *The Jews in Nineteenth-Century France: From the French Revolution to the Alliance Israélite Universelle*, trans. Jane Marie Todd (Stanford, Cal.: Stanford University Press, 1996), especially chapter three, pp. 79-110.

[10] All citations in this paragraph are from Vicki Caron, *Between France and Germany: The Jews of Alsace-Lorraine, 1871-1918* (Stanford, Cal.: Stanford University Press, 1988), pp. 22-23

Vicki Caron  
Cornell University  
[vc21@cornell.edu](mailto:vc21@cornell.edu)

Copyright © 2011 by the Society for French Historical Studies, all rights reserved. The Society for French Historical Studies permits the electronic distribution of individual reviews for nonprofit educational purposes, provided that full and accurate credit is given to the author, the date of publication, and the location of the review on the H-France website. The Society for French Historical Studies reserves the right to withdraw the license for edistribution/republication of individual reviews at any time and for any specific case. Neither bulk redistribution/ republication in electronic form of more than five percent of the contents of H-France Review nor re-publication of any amount in print form will be permitted without permission. For any other proposed uses, contact the Editor-in-Chief of H-France. The views posted on H-France Review are not necessarily the views of the Society for French Historical Studies.

ISSN 1553-9172