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I

This essay attempts to bring together two areas in the history of scholarship that have been flourishing in recent years: on the one hand, the set of text-critical practices, hermeneutic methods and ideals of learning that we call philology; on the other, the attempt by Jewish scholars, from the early nineteenth century on, to make Judaism the object of historical-critical study, an academic discipline (and an emancipatory ideal) they called the Wissenschaft des Judentums. In both realms, scholars are looking backwards and forwards, combining research into the history of scholarship with reflection on cross-cultural, comparative possibilities in a new age of globalization. Philology has become a central prism through which humanists are reevaluating intellectual traditions that forged the modern humanities. Many recent studies are framed as (at once mournful and hopeful) reminders to our age of neuroscience, particle physics and algorithms: there was a time, not so long ago, when philology provided the most meaningful mode of knowing (das Erkennen des Erkannten, in August Boeckh’s winged words, ‘the knowledge of what has been known’). On this reading, philology represents a tradition of learning whose history might help us consider anew the purposes of the university and
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understand fundamental aspects of human life that resist quantification. Recent studies of the Wissenschaft des Judentums likewise combine the history of scholarship with genealogies of present practice and ruminations on ways that Jewish historiography might engage with our own troubled times.² Some of these studies are focused case-studies, the work of historians of Judaism reflecting on the origins and foundations of their discipline.³ Some historians craft grander narratives that trace the ways in which historical scholarship shaped modern Jewish life at large. The emergence of the modern German research university coincided historically with the quest for Jewish emancipation in deeply entangled ways that made the philosophical and historical mentality so central to the former vital to the latter. ‘The cumulative effect of Wissenschaft des Judentums’, Ismar Schorsch has written, ‘was to make historical thinking the dominant universe of discourse in Jewish life and historians its main intellectual figures’. In all the transformational debates of the modern era, ‘over emancipation, religious reform, antisemitism, Zionism, and the nature of Judaism’, historians became the main protagonists. ‘No intellectual history of the Jews in the modern period can be written without the Science of Judaism as its centrepiece.’⁴

The purpose of this essay is not to question the historical turn in nineteenth-century European Jewish scholarship. What I would like to explore in the pages that follow is what we might see if we consider this notion of Jewish modernity as a turn to philology. The following pages consider how traditions of classical philology – both as ideals of scholarship and as real work on ancient Greek texts – shaped the nineteenth-century study of Judaism. To do so, I look at how one pioneering scholar, Zacharias Frankel (1801–1875), studied Greek philology to write the Jews out of the supersessionist narratives of contemporary Christian ancient history and back into the linguistically and religiously complex world of Greco-Roman antiquity, as a people with a vital and creative culture of their own.⁵

II

Histories of the Wissenschaft des Judentums are told from many angles. Scholars, patrons, institutions, curricula, learned societies, journals and networks of correspondence are all receiving ongoing, illuminating

² See the beautiful Myers 2018. ³ Myers and Ruderman 1998. ⁴ Schorsch 1994. ⁵ Recent studies highlighting traditions of philology within the Wissenschaft des Judentums include Johnston 2017; Schorsch 2019.
The Jewish study of Christianity and of Islam in particular have been subjects of new and important work. But the nineteenth-century Jewish study of Ancient Greek, especially of Greek literature written in antiquity by Jews, is largely absent from these histories.

This is strange for many reasons. The relationship between the Wissenschaft des Judentums and German classical scholarship was deep and intimate from the very beginning. In the years immediately preceding the publication of his Etwas über die Rabbinische Litteratur (1818), which many consider the pioneering statement of the Wissenschaft des Judentums, Leopold Zunz (1794–1886) had studied at the University of Berlin with Friedrich August Wolf (1759–1824), the founding father of Altertumswissenschaft, as well as with Wolf’s student August Boeckh (1785–1867), arguably the most influential theorist of philology of the nineteenth century. Wolf himself had studied with Christian Gottlob Heyne (1729–1812) in Göttingen, where Baroque and Enlightenment models of erudition encouraged comparative approaches to textual traditions across the ancient world. Wolf went on to shape the self-conception of German classical philology as it emerged as a historical, secular discipline independent of theology. In the early work on Homer that made his name, Wolf had creatively compared the Alexandrian school of textual scholarship to the Jewish Masoretic tradition of the Hebrew bible. But as Anthony Grafton has shown, by the time the University of Berlin opened in 1810, Wolf had radically reconceived the study of antiquity. In both late eighteenth-century Göttingen and early nineteenth-century Berlin, the ideals of philological scholarship were forged in terms of the relation between Greek and Roman antiquity and the history of the Jews, Egyptians and other cultures of the ancient Mediterranean and Near East. But in the post-Napoleonic Germanies, comparison had made way for exclusion. Instead of comparing Alexandrian Homeric scholia with the Masoretic apparatus, Wolf now told his students that ‘The Hebrew Nation has not elevated itself to the degree of culture, such that one might
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8 Exceptions include Momigliano 1992; Niehoff 1999; Veltri 2014; Gafni 2019.
9 On Zunz as a student of Wolf and Boeckh, see Veltri 1999; Schorsch 2016; Bitzan 2017. On Zunz’s Etwas as the foundation programme for the Wissenschaft des Judentums, see Johnston 2017: 301 n. 20. On Boeckh, see Horstmann 1992 and now Grafton 2019. On German Philhellenism, see Marchand 1996.
10 On Heyne, see Grafton 2010; Harloe 2015; Harloe 2016.
11 Grafton, Most and Zetzel 1985: 23–4; Wolf 1985; see also Grafton 1981.
consider it a learned people.” As Wolf formulated it in his *Darstellung der Altertumswissenschaft* (1807), the new discipline was to be the exclusive study of Ancient Greece and Rome. German classical philology was born on the road from Göttingen to Berlin, and somewhere along the way the Jews were exiled from History.

Wolf’s own Jewish students, and those who studied classics in his shadow, wrestled mightily with the contradictions between what they saw as philology’s liberating possibilities for the study of Jewish history and the nationalist ideology of German Philhellenism that shut them out of past and present. ‘Only the Greeks and the Romans belong to antiquity, for only they elevated themselves to a learned culture’, young Zunz recorded as Wolf’s definition of classical philology in his Berlin lecture notes for the years 1815–1817, noting nonetheless that ‘Boeckh instructs me, but Wolf attracts me.’ When those Jewish students attended Hegel’s Berlin lectures on the history of philosophy (Hegel’s student Eduard Gans was a member of Zunz’s short-lived society, the Verein für Cultur und Wissenschaft der Juden), they encountered similar claims of world-historical Progress through Hellenism’s antithesis to Hebraism, a philosophical version of Judaism as a spiritually superceded dead end. Throughout the nineteenth century, *Altertumswissenschaft* would shape the ideals of scholarship through which scholars of the Wissenschaft des Judentums conceived of making the full range of Jewish history into the object of modern, critical research. But it did so in complex, oedipal ways, as the first generation of university-educated Central European Jews used the philological and philosophical toolbox of the modern German university in defence of the history, culture and creative Geist of Judaism that the Berlin masters denied it.

For Zunz, the encounter with Greek culture triggered three pivotal surges of Jewish creativity – in ancient Alexandria, in medieval Islam and in Renaissance Europe. But Zunz himself did not work on Greek or Latin texts, and scholars tracing the indebtedness of the early Wissenschaft to the founding generation of Humboldt’s university have focused on methods, practices and ideals rather than actual Greek textual scholarship. What
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15 The long and fierce philosophical debates about European history in terms of Hellenism and Hebraism, from the German Enlightenment on, form a vital background to the story sketched here. See Leonard 2012.
16 See e.g. Zwiep 2010.
17 See Zunz 1845: 22 and discussion in Schorsch 2016, Chapter 5.
Zunz drew from German historicism, Ismar Schorsch distilled, was the quest for critical editions, the practice of philological exegesis, and finally, the need for contextual and comparative analysis.\textsuperscript{18} When the first generation of European Jews to attend gymnasium and acquire German doctorates sought to establish the study of Judaism as both an academic discipline and as a form of Jewish emancipation, they drew heavily on the philological study of Greek and Latin at the heart of those pedagogic traditions. Yet for all the simultaneity and deep entanglement of the nascent Wissenschaft des Judentums and the modern discipline of classical philology, we still know far too little about what its adherents actually did with the Greek and Latin that they learned.

We know most about the greatest of nineteenth-century German-Jewish classicists, Jacob Bernays (1824–1881). A set of very fine studies reconstructs Bernays’s magisterial work on Greco-Roman and Jewish antiquity (and the way he found his model and master in Joseph Scaliger), while illuminating the proud, private and painful ways he balanced loyalty to Judaism with the anti-Jewish prejudices of even his most devoted non-Jewish colleagues, such as Theodor Mommsen.\textsuperscript{19} Most other treatments of Jewish classicists in the Germanies of the nineteenth century, however, are cursory overviews.\textsuperscript{20} We have studies of the impact of the restoration of Greek independence on early Zionism.\textsuperscript{21} We have examples of how the editors of the first critical editions of Rabbinic literature took the latest critical editions of Latin and Greek classics as their model.\textsuperscript{22} We also have studies of the Jewish revaluation of ancient Greek literature, history, and philosophy by members of the Central-European and Russian Haskalah movement.\textsuperscript{23} But beyond a probing essay by Momigliano, we still lack a comprehensive study of the actual impact of the Jewish study of Greek on the study of Jewish history and literature, and especially the rediscovery of Greek itself as a Jewish language, in the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{24} The purpose of the remainder of this essay is to address this issue by looking at one of the first Jewish scholars of the nineteenth century to study directly the Greek literature written by Jews in antiquity.

\textsuperscript{18} Schorsch 1994.
\textsuperscript{19} Fraenkel 1932; Bach 1974; Momigliano 1975 [1994]; Urbach 1996; Bollack 1998; Grafton 1998; Simon-Nahum 2010; Porter 2015.
\textsuperscript{24} Momigliano 1992. For the French context, illuminating in all its differences, see now Simon-Nahum 2018.
III

Zacharias Frankel (1801–1875) was born in Prague’s Altstadt and studied there at the yeshiva (traditional Rabbinic school) of Rabbi Bezalel Ronsburg (1760–1820), the student and successor of Frankel’s maternal grandfather, Löb Fischels. Critically, Frankel learned German from childhood, and at the age of twenty-four, he moved to Pest, where he attended the Gymnasium and thereafter studied classical philology at the university under Johann Ludwig von Schedius, who himself had studied philology at Göttingen with Heyne. After obtaining his doctorate in 1830, Frankel served for several years as Rabbi in Teplitz in Bohemia (now Czech Teplice), where in 1835 he first met Zunz travelling between Berlin and Prague. In 1836 Frankel was appointed Chief Rabbi of Saxony, taking his seat in Dresden. There he served his community, helped to build the magnificent Semper Synagogue (1840–1938), established a Jewish elementary school, and fought vehemently for equal civil rights for Jews as Saxon law came to recognize the Jewish community as a corporate body (and against the humiliating ‘Jewish oath’). All the while, he tirelessly pursued his scholarship.

Prior to the establishment of modern Jewish seminaries in Breslau (1854), Berlin (the Hochschule in 1872, the Orthodox Seminary in 1873), Vienna (1862), and Budapest (1877), the main practitioners of the academic study of Judaism were Doktorrabbiner like Frankel, communal Rabbis with secular doctorates who could not obtain academic positions without conversion to Christianity. Frankel did not radically separate the rabbinical and academic spheres of life. The survival of Judaism in modern society demanded a loving knowledge of tradition and its history and the cultural self-confidence it nurtured. As we will see, his ideals of Wissenschaft shaped his understanding of Judaism as a tradition of study, and in turn his deep knowledge of that tradition shaped his own scholarly work. Frankel combined his Yeshiva education and his studies of classical philology by turning to the Septuagint and the Greek-speaking Jewish world in and for which that ancient Greek translation of the Hebrew bible had been produced.

In 1841, after a decade of work, Frankel published his first major work of scholarship, Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta. Presented in German fashion as the first part of the first volume of a set of ‘Historical-Critical Studies of the
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26 On Schedius, see Balogh 2007. In Pest, age limits on entry into a Gymnasium were less strictly enforced than in Vienna or Prague. See Richarz 1974; Wilke 2016: 73.
27 On Frankel’s communal and pastoral work, see Brämer 2000; Brämer 2007 and Ellenson 2007.
28 See Brämer 2000: 256.
Septuagint along with contributions on the Targums’, it outlined Frankel’s methodological aspirations for a work of grander scope to come. In fact, it constituted a ground-breaking work in its own right. Frankel’s scholarship presents an excellent vantage point from which to ask the question at the heart of this chapter: what did a first-generation Jewish academic with a Yeshiva education see when he brought his philological education in Greek and Latin at the feet of one of Heyne’s students to a masterpiece of ancient Jewish Greek? What happened to his understanding of Jewish history when an entire Jewish world – one that Rabbinic tradition had emphatically rejected – suddenly emerged from the shadows? And what shadows did Frankel’s commitments to tradition cast over his work?

IV

Years of studying Talmud had offered Frankel ample acquaintance with ambiguous views of the permissibility and prohibition, possibility and condemnation of Greek translations of sacred scripture. The Greek text itself, however, came to him not through Jewish but through Christian traditions of transmission and study. The editions of the text at his disposal and the bodies of early modern scholarship that accompanied them swelled with centuries of scholarly baggage packed by intellectual traditions very different from those in which Frankel had been raised. The authenticity of the biblical text as transmitted in the Septuagint vis-à-vis the Hebrew and the Samaritan Pentateuch had been the subject of detailed and intense debates from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries, painstakingly reconstructed by Scott Mandelbrote. Early-modern biblical scholarship provided Frankel with an invaluable arsenal of instruments for the critical study of the Septuagint, such as large collections of variants between extant manuscripts and between the Greek and both the Hebrew bible and the Latin Vulgate.

Early-modern scholarship also provided Frankel with one of the fundamental concepts with which to describe the world he had come to study: Hellenistic Judaism. It was in early seventeenth-century Leiden that Joseph Scaliger and his student Daniel Heinsius picked up on the opposition of Hellenistai and Hebraiaoi in Acts 6:1 to conceptualize the bilingual Aramaic-and-Greek-speaking Jewish world reflected in Josephus and the
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29 Frankel 1841, with a succinct plan for the work to come on 273–5.
30 The best study of these issues is now Smelik 2013.
31 See, among others, Mandelbrote 2012; Hardy 2015; Mandelbrote 2016a; Mandelbrote 2016b.
32 See Frankel 1841: 7, 242–73.

Two centuries of ensuing scholarly debates among Catholics and Protestants about the character of New Testament Greek helped Frankel understand the Greek literature written by Philo, Josephus and other Jews of the ancient Mediterranean, but as he saw it—in a tellingly philological move—they were of limited use to his work on the Septuagint, some three hundred years older than the New Testament. More helpful was the early modern scholarship on the *Letter of Aristeas* and its legend of the Septuagint’s origin. The Göttingen biblical scholar Johann Gottfried Eichhorn (who had studied with Heyne shortly before Wolf) had helpfully compiled a collection of the most important ancient witnesses, and Frankel traced the learned discussions back, through the writings of Antony van Dale, Humphrey Hody, Isaac Vossius, Richard Simon (‘mit seinem feinen kritischen Takte’) to Joseph Scaliger’s claim that the author of the *Letter of Aristeas* was Jewish, and back to the great 1522 commentary on Augustine’s *City of God* by the son of Valencian *conversos*, Juan Luis Vives, the first to doubt the *Letter’s* authenticity.

One Jewish scholar in sixteenth-century Europe had studied the ancient world and literature of Greek-speaking Jews seriously (albeit in Latin translation): Azaria de’ Rossi of Mantua (1513–1578). De’ Rossi’s *Me’or Enayim* (1573–1575), a collection of brilliant historical and antiquarian essays on Jewish history and chronology, engaged with a wide range of Greek and Latin texts, and included a Hebrew translation of the *Letter of Aristeas*, which he held to be authentic. From the late eighteenth century, De’ Rossi’s *magnum opus* had become a major inspiration and touchstone for members of the *Haskalah*. In 1841, the year that Frankel’s Septuagint study appeared, Zunz published the first instalment of the first biography of De’ Rossi, which would be reprinted in the 1863–1865 and 1899 editions of the *Me’or Enayim* (five editions appeared between the late eighteenth and late nineteenth centuries). Like several other Jewish contemporaries, Frankel presented De’ Rossi as the harbinger of the *Wissenschaft des Judentums*. At the same time, identifying in him a precedent for the practice of historical criticism of tradition within tradition itself also served to attenuate the rupture with tradition Frankel feared an unmoored *Wissenschaft* could become. De’ Rossi presented a model for Frankel’s work...
in a more direct way, too: the monumental *Me’or Enayim* opens with the origins of the Septuagint.

Frankel’s *Vorstudien* appeared between the first and second volume of Gustav Droysen’s *Geschichte des Hellenismus* (1836–1843), which, as Momigliano showed, used the term that the seventeenth-century scholars had designed for ancient Jewish Greek to describe the historical period and civilization that followed the death of Alexander the Great in 323 BCE. But Droysen mentioned Jews only in the second volume, and then only in passing. Frankel’s *Vorstudien* makes no mention of Droysen’s work, and still uses *Hellenismus* in the sense of ancient Jewish Greek. Droysen, in turn, never wrote the Jews into his history of Hellenism, even after he realized that one could not account for the rise of Christianity without them.41 Droysen’s work, contemporaneous to Frankel’s, is part of a wider history of which, in his contribution to this volume, Renaud Gagné notes that by the 1840s ‘Hellenism and Hellenisation are . . . conceived as recoverable pasts that point to the future, artifacts in a sequence of “not yets” leading up to now, and writing their detailed documentary history is a philological act of theological discovery.’ Frankel’s case offers a parallel example of Hellenism as a *Jewish* recoverable past in the nineteenth century, one that would have to first unpack the early modern tradition of biblical Greek scholarship in which the very notion of Hellenistic Judaism had been coined and, as we shall discuss below, dig through the strata of Christian providential history with which Frankel’s Protestant contemporaries had covered it. Frankel’s training in Latin and Greek opened up this vast body of early modern literature, written about Greek in Latin, to which very few Jews before him would have had access, but it required both a historical approach to Jewish antiquity and a reckoning with centuries of Christian readership.

V

Frankel’s classical education taught him Greek and Latin, it taught him principles of grammar, of source-criticism, of historical contextualization.

41 Momigliano 1975 reprinted in Momigliano 2012: ‘In 1838 Droysen had satisfied himself that new research on Jewish texts was necessary – and possible. The reason for his unwillingness to pursue it, if it can be explained at all, must be sought elsewhere. Increasing involvement in the German national problem is certainly part of the story. But it is also true that Droysen had reached the point in his exploration of Hellenism at which he had to decide whether to include or exclude Judaism. The inclusion would have meant a radical revision of the original conception; it would have involved him in the difficult exegetic problems raised by the Tübingen theologians; and it would have touched intimate recesses of his personal life.’ The final three pages of this brilliant essay address the latter point in terms of the taboo on the Jewish past of the converts among Droysen’s friends and immediate family.
The *Vorstudien* were philological in all these senses: a substantial part of the book describes the linguistic particularities of Septuagint Greek by parts of speech, in comparison to the grammar of contemporary Palestinian Hebrew, and attempts to reconstruct the phonetics and accentuation of Hebrew as spoken in Alexandria at the time of the translation. Frankel included a separate chapter on the editorial history of the text (pp. 242–52), which traced the manuscript *Vorlagen* behind different printed editions of the text from the early sixteenth century onwards, arranging them genealogically (if not stemmatologically). And to that he added a chapter on the history of its scholarly reception (pp. 253–73), assessing the critical value of ancient witnesses. This was a radical move: the claim that Jewish history was not to be told by exclusive recourse to tradition, but rather that the development of tradition was to be told through history, by using any and all historical sources available. This had been one of Zunz’s fundamental arguments, and Frankel was among the first scholars to put it into sustained, fine-grained practice. In his *Vorstudien*, he told the history of a great masterpiece of ancient Jewish Greek with reference to Greek and Latin Fathers of the Church who had quoted from it, and who, in the case of Aristobulus of Paneas, even constituted the sole witnesses for the lost work of an Alexandrian Jewish scholar. In ways he likely never imagined as a young Talmud scholar, Frankel showed how Patristics could be vital to the telling of ancient Jewish history.

Frankel’s philological studies taught him something else, no less vital to his conception of the work ahead: the very notion of a ‘classical tradition’. As he put it in his programmatic preface to the *Vorstudien*: the ‘Grundstein’ of the historical and critical approach to Judaism necessary for participation in civil society would be an ‘Entwickelungsgeschichte [sic] der Halachah’ – a critically documented and historically informed account of the development of Jewish law over time.

To provide this has been for many years the idea which enlivened my studies. This approach would promote a classical study of the Talmud and guard against superficial opinions and many immature views.42

*Ein classisches Studium des Talmuds* – Frankel emphasizes the word – does not mean here a traditional approach to Rabbinic literature as he would have enjoyed in the Prague yeshiva, but rather an approach to rabbinic literature as a classical tradition as well as a deliberately designed curriculum for its study.43

42 Frankel 1841: x. Several scholars have drawn attention to the importance of this programmatic statement. See Treitel 1901: 254; Schorsch 1994: 262.

43 I am grateful to Constanze Güthenke for this suggestion.
Such an approach also accounts for the way Frankel went on to read the Greek Jewish tradition into Rabbinic literature itself, tracing the Talmud’s ambiguity vis-à-vis the Greek translation of the Torah, Rabbinic accounts of the Greek translation for Ptolemy (‘King Talmai’) and the origin of the Septuagint, and their variations between the Babylonian and Jerusalem Talmud, Minor Talmudic tractates and early Midrashim.\(^4\) A *Wissenschaft des Judentums* properly understood and properly practised, Frankel believed, would be the application not only of Heyne’s philological toolbox to Rabbinic literature, but the very conceptualization of Rabbinic literature – canonical texts embedded in dense webs of subsequent commentaries and supercommentaries – *as a classical tradition*, open-ended, unbroken and alive.

Several scholars have pointed to Frankel’s *Vorstudien* as a crossroads in two different histories of scholarship: that of the critical study of the Septuagint and the Jewish study of Jewish antiquity. Momigliano saw Frankel as ‘the first Jew to study the Septuagint in depth as a Jewish document’ and connected it to the Jewish rediscovery of De’ Rossi’s *Me’or Enayim* around 1800.\(^5\) Nicholas de Lange (who dedicated his *Japheth in the Tents of Shem* to Momigliano’s memory) noted how Frankel’s *Vorstudien* marks ‘a watershed in that it takes the Septuagint seriously as a source of ancient Jewish exegesis and religious ideas’.\(^6\) However, de Lange also observes how Frankel’s primary motivation for studying the Septuagint – to mine it in search of expressions of Rabbinic Judaism antedating the codification of the Oral Law, older, indeed, than the emergence of Rabbinic Judaism as such in the wake of the destruction of the Temple – meant that Frankel ‘evinces no interest whatever in the role it played within Greek-speaking Judaism, beyond a historical study of its use in the synagogue’.\(^7\) One might put this another way: Frankel’s desire to write an ‘Entwicklungsgeschichte der Halachah’ meant that he was interested in diachronic questions rather than synchronic ones, questions about the *longue durée* of Jewish law and literature.

De Lange’s work on Frankel is embedded in a longer argument that accounts for his disappointment in Frankel’s blindspots, and is instructive about another vital aspect of Frankel’s work. Over a long and distinguished career studying the Jewish Greek tradition, de Lange has demonstrated with abundant primary source material that Greek-speaking Judaism did not end with the emergence of Christianity and that Jews did not stop reading the bible in Greek when the Septuagint became the Old Testament

\(^4\) See e.g. Frankel 1841: 25–6.  
\(^6\) De Lange 2013: 150.  
\(^7\) Idem.
Scripture of the early Christian Church. Ostensibly historical claims to the contrary rest largely on theological assumptions which represent one of the longest shadows that Christian theology has cast over Hellenistic philology and over the history of Greek-speaking Jews of the ancient and medieval Mediterranean. The claim that the Septuagint ‘passed’ from ancient Greek-speaking Jews to the early Church has set a foundational framework for modern scholarship on Christian antiquity. It is rooted not in documentary evidence but replacement theologies generally and more particularly in a historiographical tradition going back to Eusebius’ *Praeparatio Evangelica*. According to this tradition, the very Hellenization of ancient Judaism, with the production of the Septuagint as its centrepiece, was a Providential intervention in history and a necessary condition for the spread of Christianity. And de Lange is right to call attention to the way supersessionist understandings of the relationship between Christianity and Judaism continue to inform, consciously or not, histories of Hellenistic Judaism.

Frankel was all too aware of the theological underpinnings of Christian studies of Hellenism. How could any thoughtful Jewish reader of the term *Spätjudentum*, as a description of the Judaism of the Second Temple Period, not be? Two recent essays powerfully explore the neglected biblical scholarship of Heinrich Graetz, Frankel’s and Bernays’s immediate colleague at Breslau, and the leading Jewish historian of the nineteenth century. Graetz made a careful text-critical case that the *Song of Songs* was composed not in the tenth century BCE but in the third century BCE. The Hebrew hapax legomenon *apiryon* (palanquin, bridal canopy, at Song of Songs 3:9), he believed, was unmistakably of Greek origin. That small philological argument served a vast historical one: the Judaism of the Second Temple period had been poetically creative, adopting Greek loanwords while self-consciously resisting the lure of complete Hellenization. In so doing, Alexandra Zirkle writes, Graetz sought to ‘subvert the supersessionist schema’ of the dominant Protestant biblical scholarship and ancient historiography of his day. ‘Retrieving a vital, thoughtful, fruitful post-exilic Judaism was integral to Graetz’s project of carving out space for a robust, multifaced nineteenth-century Judaism.’

Frankel’s work, I believe, evinces a very similar move, a self-conscious attempt to use Greek philology to break both with the Eusebian tradition of Christian providential history and with Hegelian ideas according to

which the monolithic opposites of Judaism and Hellenism are dialectically overcome in Christianity. Frankel sought to reclaim the historical narrative, and to rewrite Jewish history. Philology would make Jews once again the authors of their own history.

Frankel’s working hypothesis was that earlier expressions of laws, ideas and interpretations that later Jews would record in the Mishnah, in halakhic Midrash and other works of early Rabbinic literature would already have circulated among Jews in the third-century BCE in Palestine, as well as in diasporic Alexandria, and that they might be recovered from the Septuagint if read by a Talmudically literate Greek philologist. At Leviticus 11: 46–7, the Septuagint had rendered Hebrew chaya [living animal] with the Greek zo’oganountoon [breeding creature].

Why hadn’t the seventy translators not simply rendered it with zo’on? As Frankel read it, the Greek translation reflected the Halakhic understanding of the prohibition of eating trefa (an animal torn to pieces in the field, c.f. Exod. 22: 30). ‘A characteristic sign for a healthy animal (and therefore one which may be enjoyed as food) according to the Halacha, is that it gives birth’, Frankel notes, with reference to the Talmud’s discussion in bT Hullin 58 and a responsum of R. Solomon b. Adret (Rashba, 1235–1310).

On this reading, the Septuagint served as a witness to the history of Jewish dietary laws centuries before the Rabbis would record them. Frankel’s Hellenistic Judaism represents not a Praeparatio Evangelica, but rather what we might call a Praeparatio Rabbinica.

This was not the only principle driving Frankel’s Septuaginta-Studien. As his programmatic preface indicates, he meant it to be a foundation for a new branch of the Wissenschaft itself. What Judaism needed was a history of halakhah, a historical-critical reconstruction of the way in which Jewish law developed into the corpus it is by the closing of the Babylonian Talmud and the dawn of the Islamic era. Frankel’s history of the law built on another master from Humboldt’s Berlin, Friedrich Carl von Savigny (1779–1861), the immensely influential founder of the German school of legal history known as the historische Rechtsschule, who taught at Humboldt’s university from its opening in 1810 until 1842. Savigny famously resisted the attempts to unify systematically the thicket of legal traditions across the Germanies, seeing each rather as the organically grown
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51 NRSV: ‘(46) This is the law pertaining to land animal and bird and every living creature that moves through the waters and every creature that swarms upon the earth, (47) to make a distinction between the unclean and the clean, and between the living creature that may be eaten and the living creature that may not be eaten.’

52 Frankel 1841: 189.
spirit of a people. Studying the history of law, rather than petrifying it by artificial codification, was the only way to understand and apply the law. One sees why Frankel would have been so attracted to Savigny’s model of legal scholarship: it privileged the historical scholar as the most authentic interpreter of the law, and granted authenticating force to history and custom. A people with a Law was a true historical Volk, even if it didn’t have a state of their own – a rejoinder to the authoritative Herderian view of the nation. It allowed Frankel to oppose both an orthodoxy unwilling to grant that law can change over time and the reformers overeager to discard ancient custom on a whim. Traditions could be sacred even if Rabbinic Law did not stipulate it explicitly, such as the use of Hebrew for liturgy. Like Wolf’s Altertumswissenschaft, the historische Rechtsschule served as vital inspiration for a Wissenschaft des Judentums. But here, too, the masters from Germany cast a shadow over their Jewish students: Savigny demanded Jewish conversion to Christianity as a condition for emancipation, rejecting emancipation of Jews qua Jews. Again, the teacher’s tools would have to serve to refute his teachings. The Greek philology that underpinned his Vorstudien looked to the Septuagint to lay the foundations for an Entwickelungsgeschichte der Halakha.

Regardless of the extent to which current scholars of the Septuagint and Rabbinics agree or disagree with him, it is Frankel’s original insight that the textual criticism of the Septuagint might contribute to a history of the Oral Law prior to its first redaction. By the time the Monatsschrift dedicated a volume to Frankel’s memory on the centenary of his death, one Breslau alumnus could respectfully note which aspects of the master’s Ur-Rabbinic discoveries in the Septuagint were ‘etwas zu phantasievoll’. But it is worth noting here that nowadays Septuagint scholars consider Frankel to have been the first to study Septuagint variants from the Hebrew as traditions or midrashim that would subsequently turn up in Rabbinic literature; the first, too, to study such topics as the translation principles of the translators, the extent and nature of their knowledge of Hebrew, their pronunciation of it, and in particular the possibility that the Septuagint reflects translation from post-Biblical Hebrew, the influence of

53 On the importance of Savigny’s historische Rechtsschule for Frankel’s history of Jewish law, see Schorsch 1994; Harris 1995; Brämer 2000. One might explore suggestive parallels between Frankel’s reading of Aggadah as Volkspoesie and the work of Savigny’s students, the brothers Grimm.
54 Henne and Kretschmann 2002.
55 On Frankel’s legacy and influence on twentieth-century scholars of ancient Jewish Hellenism, specifically, Jacob Nahum Epstein (1878–1952) and through him on his student Saul Lieberman (1898–1983), see Friedman 2009.
56 See Treitel 1901.
Aramaic thereon, as well as the attempt to reconstruct a ‘theology of the Septuagint’.  

VI

Over the next decade Frankel pursued his Septuagint studies along these lines. Reading Targum Onkelos (an Aramaic paraphrase of the Hebrew Pentateuch) against the Septuagint, he attempted to show that the author(s) of the former had read the latter: the Septuagint serving both as Vorlage alongside the Hebrew and as legitimizing example of Targum in the generic sense. This was his argument in Dresden in 1844, where he was serving as Rabbi when Heinrich Fleischer, Germany’s leading Orientalist as professor of Oriental languages at Leipzig from 1835 to 1888, convened the opening conference of the Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft there. The Gesellschaft, of which Frankel became a member, was the rare learned organization to treat and accept Jewish academics as equals and incorporate Jewish studies as a legitimate branch of academic research, in large measure thanks to Fleischer’s magnanimous support for promising and accomplished Jewish scholars, and his strict aversion to all expressions of anti-Jewish prejudice. Three of the fifteen speakers Fleischer invited to address the conference were Jews without academic appointment: Abraham Geiger and Frankel opened the conference while Fleischer’s student Moritz Steinschneider closed it.

One major argument that threads its way through Frankel’s work is the relationship between Palestine and Alexandria in the Hellenistic era. Simon Goldhill has shown how the supposed opposition between Alexandrian and Palestinian Judaism runs throughout the entire genre of ‘Histories of the Jews’ as practised by German, English and French historians from Henry Hart Milman through Heinrich Ewald and Dean Stanley to Ernest Renan and Emil Schürer. The explicit separation of Jerusalem and Alexandria, in this literature, draws the fault-line between Jew and Greek, the Judaic and the Hellenic, between the ‘pure’ Judaism of Jerusalem and the corrupt, assimilated Judaism of Alexandria.  

Maren R. Niehoff has traced this story from the point of view of Jewish scholarship, showing how historians of the Wissenschaft des Judentums constructed ancient Alexandria as a model for contemporary Jewish acculturation along a spectrum that ranged from the high praise of Isaac Markus Jost (1793–1860), who took it as an example of Enlightened culture, to the utter rejection of Immanuel Wolf (Wohwill, 1799–1847), who took Judaism and Hellenism to be irreconcilable opposites.  

Frankel navigated his own way between these two early members of Zunz’s circle. His next book, *Ueber den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik* (Leipzig: Barth, 1851), was born from a contribution to Fleischer’s journal. Here he studied a rich range of sources – Jewish Hellenistic literary sources such as the work of Philo, Ezekiel the Tragedian, and the Apocrypha, Rabbinic sources such as the Jerusalem Talmud as well as Jewish Greek inscriptions discovered in the eighteenth century by Scippione Maffei – to argue that in vital ways, early Ptolemaic Egypt and Palestine had shared a common culture. Even if Philo had not known Hebrew, he could have learned Palestinian Midrashic traditions in Greek. Historically speaking, any radical dichotomy between these two geographically close centres of ancient Mediterranean Jewish life is to be rejected: ‘Palästina und Alexandrien müssen in der Wissenschaft mit einander Hand in Hand gehen.’ Yet where the Septuagint translators had been bilingual, eventually ignorance of Hebrew and reliance on Greek traditions of philosophical allegory disconnected Alexandrian Judaism from a direct link to the source of the Torah and its application to daily life. To Frankel, for these reasons, the Judaism of Palestine would always remain more authentic. If this reading confirms a Jewish counterpart to Goldhill’s story, it intersects with it in more chilling ways, too. One of the protagonists of Goldhill’s account, Heinrich Ewald, wrote a bitterly anti-Semitic review of Frankel’s *Ueber den Einfluss*, claiming that the ‘Talmudic-Rabbinic Jew . . . tries to speak [about the Septuagint and other non-Rabbinic literature] according to the veneer of contemporary Wissenschaft, but falls into the most un-wissenschaftlich judgments.’

And so, Frankel’s work presents us with a set of questions about the intersection, at the mid-nineteenth century, of classical philology,
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61 Niehoff 1999.  
62 Frankel 1850.  
63 Ewald 1852: 16: ‘Der Verfasser ist nämlich soweit Talmudisch-Rabbinischer Jude dass er ganz nach des Talmudes Sinne über die Septuaginta den Samarischen [sic] Pentateuch und was sonst nicht-Rabbinisch ist urtheilt; er verachtet also auch alles was nicht Masorethisch ist, sucht aber darüber nach dem scheine heutger Wissenschaft zu reden, und verfällt in die unwissenschaftlichsten Urtheile.’ See also Brämer 2000: 271, and Schorsch 2010.
Christian theology and Rabbinics, questions, too, about the implications, consequences and dangers of learning Greek for Jewish history. But he also presents us with a puzzle: in spite of his pioneering work, there seems to have been significantly less sustained further interest in Greek-speaking ancient Judaism on the part of Jewish scholars in the nineteenth century, both in Germany and in France, compared with scholarship on the Jews of the Medieval Islamicate worlds. In the second half of the nineteenth century, recent histories of the *Wissenschaft des Judentums* tell us, the main intellectual attraction to European Jewish scholars was the study of Arabic, and of Jewish life and thought in the Islamicate world.

We now know a great deal about the depth of attraction and identification that nineteenth-century European Jews felt towards an idealized Sephardic-Islamic world. This found expression on a Romantic-popular level: Frankel’s own magnificent Dresden Synagogue, destroyed in the *Reichskristallnacht*, was one of the prime architectural expressions of this Judaeo-Moorish aesthetic. But it also played out on the level of historical, philological scholarship and the study of Jewish philosophy and science. Fleischer’s German Oriental Society gave Jewish studies a home, but one that focused largely on the Jewish history of and in the Islamicate world. In forcing the Leipzig chair of Oriental philology from the theological to the philosophical faculty in 1840, Fleischer had liberated a philological discipline with its status as *ancilla* to Protestant theology. Manuscript discoveries in the course of the second half of the nineteenth century, culminating in the discoveries of the Cairo Geniza, made the world of Medieval Islam a thrilling realm of Jewish history. Of course, Arabic and Greek are not mutually exclusive alternatives. On the contrary, much of the nineteenth-century research by Jewish Orientalists focused on the transmission of Greek natural science and philosophy from Arabic into Hebrew. But Andalusia and Alexandria presented nineteenth-century European Jews with two distinct models of emancipation and acculturation. Did Andalusia represent a more attractive model of reconciling a life of secular learning with a commitment to the Torah than Alexandria? Was Islamic monotheism a more acceptable other than Greek paganism? Was it because the Arabophone Jews of Medieval Islam remained intimately familiar with Hebrew and the Hebrew bible, in a way the Alexandrians had failed to do? Was it because the study of the Islamicate world was free of the anti-Jewish assumptions ubiquitous in the German scholarship on
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Hellenistic Judaism? Or was it that the combination of the continuing rabbinical distaste for all things Greek together with the Hellenists’ desire for a pure Hellenism – untainted by Oriental or Jewish influence – proved too rebarbative? The answers to these questions are complex and will differ from one scholar to the next.

While absent from histories of nineteenth-century Greek scholarship and ancient history, Frankel is a major figure in modern Jewish history, in which his ‘positive-historical’ approach to Jewish history and Jewish emancipation represents the moderate via media between Abraham Geiger’s far-reaching Reform movement and Samson Raphael Hirsch’s neo-orthodoxy among a triumvirate of approaches to reconciling the religious commandments of Judaism with a wider German society.67 Frankel was a new kind of Rabbi, devoted to the establishment of a thriving Judaism at the heart of modern Europe, engaged in civil society and committed to keeping Judaism alive within it. His primary way of accomplishing this was through scholarship, as a scholar and a teacher. Heading towards the future with his face towards the past, Frankel developed a programme for the historical study of Judaism in which faith in Divine Providence was not abandoned but ceased to be an acceptable wissenschaftlich category of explanation. He broke with Geiger over what he saw as the latter’s rupture with tradition (the final straw for Frankel was the Reformer’s abandonment of Hebrew as liturgical language, though Geiger’s claiming of both Christianity and Islam as expressions of the Jewish Geist would have gone too far for Frankel, too). And he broke with orthodoxy in ascribing to history a sacredness distinct from revelation. As the founding editor of the Zeitschrift für die religiösen Interessen des Judenthums (Leipzig, 1844–1846), founding director of the Jewish Theological Seminary in Breslau in 1854, editor of the Seminary’s journal, the Monatsschrift für die Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums, Frankel’s vision of Jewish history shaped Jewish scholarship, and German Jewish life more generally, during critical decades of the modern era.

Frankel opened the Breslau seminary with a lecture ‘On Palestinian and Alexandrian exegesis’.68 The study of Alexandrian Judaism was absolutely critical, both as a chapter of ancient Jewish history and literature and of the civilizational encounter with Greece, but it also stood as a warning against

67 The modern movement of Conservative Judaism takes Frankel as its founding father. On Frankel’s notion of ‘Positive-Historical Judaism’ see Schorsch 1994; Brämer 2000; Wiese 2005. On the impact of Frankel’s thought beyond Germany see e.g. Yedidiya 2016.
Because it is the Book of Life and for the life of all times, in it each age will find itself anew, so that it not sink beneath the tempestuous and engulfing flow of Time.  

Greek philology was also necessary for intellectual self-defence, and ancient Jewish literature in Greek provided models here as well. Frankel inaugurated the Monatsschrift with his German translation of selections of Josephus’s Contra Apionem, a vindication in Greek of Judaism and of the antiquity and authenticity of the Hebrew bible. ‘One regrets to have to add’, Frankel introduced his translation, ‘that many of those accusations [against the antiquity of the Jewish people] assert themselves from time to time in our own time. Let them find their refutation here’. As a bookend and mirror image of his translation of Contra Apionem, Frankel closed the issue with his own blistering rebuttal of Ewald’s anti-Semitic review of his book. He knew too well that Apions abounded in nineteenth-century Germany.

It was self-evident then, that Greek philology became an intrinsic part of the curriculum at the Breslau Seminary of which Frankel became the founding director. He appointed Jacob Bernays to teach classics, Heinrich Graetz to teach history, and Manuel Joel to teach philosophy, while he would teach Rabbinics. Ephraim Urbach, one of the last students of the Breslau Seminary, noted that Bernays’s teaching only really comprised the equivalent of high school Greek and Latin (though one shudders at the thought of the level of Greek and Latin Prussian gymnasia required) and there seems to have been little room in the Breslau curriculum for study of ancient Jewish Greek. Nonetheless, the school of Frankel, Graetz, Joel and Bernays did in fact produce a rich library of serious scholarship on Alexandrian Judaism, especially on Philo, from Bernhard Ritter’s 1879 study of Philo und die Halacha, written on Frankel’s direction, to Philons griechische und jüdische Bildung (1932) by Isaak Heinemann, a student of Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (himself a student of Bernays), who would hold Bernays’s chair at the Breslau Seminary.

69 ‘[D]a sie als das Buch des Lebens und fuer das Leben aller Zeiten galt; in ihr, sollte jedes Zeitalter sich wiederfinden, dass es nicht in dem brausenden und verschlingenden Zeitstrom untergehe.’ Frankel 1854: 11.

70 Frankel 1852a: 9.  
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72 Bernays arrived in 1854, the same year Theodor Mommsen was appointed to the University of Breslau and spent there what Momigliano considered the thirteen most creative years of his life.

In closing, it is worth noting that while we have an ongoing scholarly literature illuminating histories of nineteenth-century Jewish Orientalism, we still await the historian of Jewish Hellenism, from the nineteenth century to the destruction of the German-Jewish civilization that brought forth the *Wissenschaft des Judentums* in the first place. This time frame largely overlaps with the publication of the *Monatsschrift* (1851–1939), and Frankel, Graetz and Bernays – the Breslau triumvirate – would be central protagonists of that history. An early chapter in such a study would look backwards, to the reappraisal of Greco-Roman literature in the Eastern-European Hebrew Republic of Letters constituted by the readership of such Maskilic journals as *Ha-Me’assef* (1783–1811), *Bikkurei ha-Ittim* (1821–1832) and *Kerem Chemed* (1833–1856). Prominent among these maskilim was Isaac Ber Levinsohn, who wrote the first Hebrew biography of Josephus (in 1828), and the Moravian Joseph Flesch (1781–1839), whose Hebrew translation of Philo’s *Vita Mosis* appeared in 1838.74 A subsequent chapter would look at the self-identification with Azaria de’ Rossi by adherents of the *Wissenschaft* and the *Haskalah*, tracing the five Hebrew editions of the *Me’or Enayim* published between 1794 and 1899, with particular attention to David Cassel’s edition.

The *Schwerpunkt* of such a study would be a set of case-studies of ancient Greek Jewish texts – sacred and secular – and their nineteenth-century Jewish readers.75 Together, it would provide a reassessment of a major tradition within the *Wissenschaft des Judentums* largely neglected by its later historians. Urbach’s and Momigliano’s discussions of the importance of Frankel’s Seminary to this tradition of Judeo-Hellenistic studies suggests that Breslau would be central to this story. It would include assessments of the aforementioned Ritter and Heinemann, as well as Bernays’s student Jacob Freudenthal, who, as Tony Grafton showed, went onward where his teacher stopped, attacking the assumptions of a natural Jewish inclination to deceive which had marked Christian studies of Hellenistic Jewish literature from Scaliger to Boeckh.76 Other major figures would be the aforementioned David
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74 On Maskilic reappraisal of the historical Josephus (against the author of the *Sefer Yossipon*), see Cohen 2019; on Flesch, see Miller 2010.

75 Gafni 2019 provides a counterexample for nineteenth-century scholarship in Hebrew rather than in German.

Cassel, who translated the *Apocrypha* into German, and Leopold Cohn (1856–1915), the Breslav classicist who co-edited the seven-volume edition of Philo in Greek and translated the Philonic corpus into German together with Heinemann and Maximilian Adler (1884–1944). The latter was still lecturing on Aristotle, Socrates and the Stoics to fellow inmates at Theresienstadt before his deportation to Auschwitz in October 1944. The Dutch Sephardic classicist, orientalist and biblicist Juda Lion Palache (1886–1944) apparently brought the only copy of his lost study of the Septuagint with him to Theresienstadt, where his student, the Dutch (and later Israeli) Septuagint scholar Isaac Leo Seeligmann (1907–1982), met Palache again before the latter’s deportation with his wife to Auschwitz, apparently on the same convoy as Adler.

Other scholars within the scope of this study would be Moritz Friedländer (1842–1919), who wrote on a wide range of Hellenistic topics, Benno Badt (1844–1909), who worked on the Sybilline oracles, as well as Leopold Treitel (1845–1931) who wrote his doctoral dissertation on the language of Philo under Graetz (*De Philonis Judaei sermone*, 1872), penned an assessment of Frankel’s study of the Septuagint, and whose study ‘Die alexandrinische Lehre von den Mittelwesen oder göttlichen Kräften, insbesondere bei Philo, geprüft auf die Frage, ob und welchen Einfluss sie auf das Mutterland Palästina gehabt hat’ (1912) in the Festschrift for Hermann Cohen (himself a former student at the Breslav Seminary), tells of Frankel’s *Nachleben* nearly four decades after his death. Yet another distinct chapter in this story would be the ongoing study of Greek loanwords, especially for realia, in Rabbinic literature. This, too, was a topic in which Frankel had done pioneering work, and it saw such monuments of scholarship as Alexander Kohut’s multi-volume *Aruch Completum* (1878–1892), a vast dictionary of loanwords in Talmudic literature based on the eleventh-century lexicon of Nathan b. Yechiel, and culminated in Samuel Krauss’s unsurpassed *Griechische und Lateinische Lehnwörter im Talmud, Midrasch, und Targum* (Berlin: Calvary, 1898–1899).

The well-known part of this story is how learning Greek, the elder language of the classical tradition, presented a rite of passage in the process of *Bildung*, a pedagogical initiation along the road by which European Jews learned to speak the language of European learned culture, and gained direct access to its classical literature. The birth of the *Wissenschaft des Judentums* from the spirit of Berlin philology is also
receiving renewed attention at a time when scholars are looking afresh at the leading theorists and practitioners of philology.\footnote{Schorsch 2016; Bitzan 2017; Johnston 2017.}

But a major chapter in the history of modern Jewish scholarship – Jewish Hellenism – remains to be written. As this essay has tried to show, Frankel’s case is seminal to this story. Through his scholarly and popular publications, his pedagogy, and his activism, he provided an immensely powerful example of the way Greek philology allowed nineteenth-century Jewish scholars to rediscover a fascinating chapter in their own history that Jews had long neglected. Classical studies enabled them to see the ways in which in the ancient Mediterranean, Greek had been a living and literary Jewish language, allowing for a discovery of the manifold ways that Palestinian Rabbinic literature was redolent with Hellenisms. In Frankel’s case, conceptions and practices of philological and legal historical scholarship, as they were taught in Berlin from 1810 on, gave him the tools to reconceive of the entirety of Rabbinic literature as its own ‘classical tradition’ and as a legal corpus to be studied along the lines of the \textit{historische Rechtsschule}. Frankel directed the first seminary and one of the most important journals that sought to practise the historical study of Judaism as an academic discipline, and thereby contribute vitally to the entry of Jews into civil society. Greek philology turned him into a critical intermediary between Jewish and secular scholarship and between nineteenth-century histories of classical and Jewish antiquity. It armed him to fight anti-Judaism in the shape of philological shadows cast by Wolf and Savigny and theological shadows cast by ubiquitous Christian histories of Hellenism as a providential preparation. Both sets of shadows compounded the slander that Jews – without a state, a common language, and a culture – had no real history after Christ and weren’t even a proper people. But philology also allowed Frankel to return to the works of the Rabbis and read them in a new light, resisting the way Rabbinic Judaism constructed Greek culture as its ultimate, paradoxical other (a paradox inherent in Jewish tradition predating Christianity: the account of Jewish triumph over the Greeks – Maccabees – is written in Greek). Frankel sought to un-write both the Christian providential histories of ancient Judaism and the Rabbinic accounts in which Alexandria is justly ignored, philosophy was prohibited as ‘Greek wisdom’ and in \textit{apikoros} the name of a philosopher and his school became a loanword meaning heretic. Instead, Frankel found in Alexandria – the very place where his Christian teachers saw the well-spring of philology itself – a mirror in which he showed his
Dresden parishioners, his Breslau students, and his Jewish and Christian readers a meaningful model of intellectual, political and spiritual acculturation and emancipation by means of historical, textual scholarship. But it was also one that carried with it a warning against ignorance of tradition and rupture of the lifeline to Palestine and its Torah. In Frankel’s hands, the study of ancient Greek made the *Wissenschaft des Judentums* a Philology of Judaism.