

NOTE: This item is the archived peer-reviewed author-version of Paul Michael Kurtz, 'Defining Hellenistic Jews in Nineteenth-Century Germany: The Case of Jacob Bernays and Jacob Freudenthal,' Erudition and the Republic of Letters 5, no. 3 (2020): 308–42.

DEFINING HELLENISTIC JEWS IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY GERMANY: THE CASE OF JACOB BERNAYS AND JACOB FREUDENTHAL

Paul Michael Kurtz
Ghent University, Belgium
paulmichael.kurtz@ugent.be

*The terrible blows that lifted the Jewish state off its hinges
have also thrown the Jewish-Hellenistic literature out of the
heart of the Jewish people – even that of the Greek-speaking –
into exile under foreign peoples.¹*

–Jacob Freudenthal

Keywords

Historiography | Hellenism | Judaism | Eupolemus | Pseudo-Phocylides

Abstract

Hellenic language and culture occupy a deeply ambivalent place in the mapping of Jewish history. If the entanglement of the Jewish and the Greek became especially conflicted for modern Jews in philhellenic Europe, nowhere was it more vexed than in the German-speaking lands of the long nineteenth century. Amidst the modern redefinition of what it meant to be Jewish as well as doubts about the genuine Jewishness of Hellenistic Judaism, how did scholars identify Jewish authorship behind ambiguous, fragmented, and interpolated texts – all the more with much of the Hebraic allegedly deprived by the Hellenic? This article not only argues for the contingency of diagnostic features deployed to define the Jewish amidst the Greek but also maintains the embeddedness of those features in nineteenth-century Germany. It scrutinizes the criteria deployed to establish Jewish texts and authors of the Hellenistic period: the claims and qualities assumedly suggestive of Judaism. First, the inquiry investigates which characteristics German Jewish scholars expected to see in Greek-speaking Jewish writers of antiquity, interrogating their procedures and their verdicts. Second, it exam-

1. Jacob Freudenthal, “Zur Geschichte der Anschauungen über die jüdisch-hellenistische Religionsphilosophie,” *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* n.s. 18, no. 9 (1869): 399–421, at 401–02. Unless otherwise noted, all translations are my own.

ines how these expectations of antiquity corresponded to those scholars' own modern world. The analysis centers on Jacob Bernays (1824–1881) and Jacob Freudenthal (1839–1907), two savants who helped establish the modern study of Hellenistic Judaism. Each overturned centuries of learned consensus by establishing an ancient author – Pseudo-Phocylides and Eupolemus, respectively – as Jewish, rather than Christian or pagan. This article ultimately reveals the subtle entanglements as well as the mutually conditioning forces not only of antiquity and modernity but also of the personal and academic, manifest both in the philological analysis of ancient texts and in the larger historiography of antique Judaism in the Graecophone world.

Introduction

Hellenic language and culture occupy a deeply ambivalent place in the mapping of Jewish history. Hanukkah commemorates the rebellion of the Maccabees against the Seleucid Empire, while the very source for celebration of this Jewish revolt against the “zenith of Hellenism” is itself Hellenophone.² The rabbis then encouraged and discouraged the use of Homer’s tongue by turns, even as one passage that prohibits the study of Greek for children falls back on such a loan-word (*pulmus*).³ Such ambivalence persisted into late antiquity, when the Byzantine emperor Justinian felt compelled to intervene as to which – not whether – Greek translation may be used in the synagogue, which caused resistance by Hebraeophiles.⁴ At times, things Jewish and things Greek have morphed into antitheses. Witness the juxtaposition of Hebraism and Hellenism in “western” culture by a Matthew Arnold or the claim by Heinrich Heine that “All men are either Jews or Hellenes, a remarkable statement from a Jewish German who submitted himself to baptism for an “entry ticket to European culture.”⁵ Hellenic Judaica – or Jewish Hellenica – could therefore seem to be a contradiction in terms.

If this entanglement of the Jewish and the Greek became especially conflicted for modern Jews in philhellenic Europe, nowhere was it more vexed than in the German-

2. 2 Maccabees 4:13.

3. Mishnah, Sotah 9:14; cf. Babylonian Talmud, Sotah 49b. For the holy writ, this tension intensified for matters of translation: whereas one prescribed, “Also regarding the [Torah] scrolls, they [*sc.* the sages] permitted them to be written [apart from Hebrew] only in Greek,” another proscribed, “Seventy elders wrote the whole Torah in the Greek language for King Ptolemy. That day was as hard for Israel as the day on which they made the [golden] calf, for the Torah cannot be translated adequately” (Babylonian Talmud, Megillah 8b; Minor Tractate, Sefer Torah 1.6, cf. Sefer Soferim 1.7–8). A late addition to an earlier text further dramatized this sentiment: “On the eighth of Tevet, in the days of King Ptolemy, the Torah was written in Greek, and for three days, darkness came over the world” (Megillat Taanit, for Adar).

4. Justinian, Novel 146. On Greek translation among Jews, see Willem F. Smelik, *Rabbis, Language and Translation in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013); Nicholas de Lange, *Japheth in the Tents of Shem: Greek Bible Translations in Byzantine Judaism* (Text and Studies in Medieval and Early Modern Judaism 30; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015).

5. Heinrich Heine, *Heinrich Heine über Ludwig Börne* (Hamburg: Hoffmann & Campe, 1840), 27; idem, *Letzte Gedichte und Gedanken, aus dem Nachlasse des Dichters zum ersten Male veröffentlicht* (Hamburg: Hoffmann & Campe, 1869), 197. On the longer juxtaposition of the Hellenic and Hebraic, see Erich Gruen, “Hebraism and Hellenism,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Hellenic Studies*, ed. George Boys-Stones, Barbara Graziosi, Phiroze Vasunia (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 129–39; Asaph Ben-Tov, “Hellenism in the Context of Oriental Studies: The Case of Johann Gottfried Lakemacher (1695–1736),” *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 25, no. 3, Special Issue: “Constructing Hellenism: Studies on the History of Greek Learning in Early Modern Europe,” ed. Hans Lamers (2018): 297–314; Miriam Leonard, *Socrates and the Jews: Hellenism and Hebraism from Moses Mendelssohn to Sigmund Freud* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012); cf. also Daniel Boyarin, “Hellenism in Jewish Babylonia,” in *The Cambridge Companion to the Talmud and Rabbinic Literature*, ed. Charlotte Elisheva Fonrobert and Martin S. Jaffee (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 336–63.

speaking lands of the long nineteenth century. From the equation of things German with things Greek to the identification of *Bildung* – spiritual and aesthetic cultivation – with ancient Hellas, this was a time and place embodied by Wilhelm von Humboldt and his conviction that the Greek spirit had given the German people a mission to humanity.⁶ The tangle grew all the tauter, all the messier, with the dual association of Greekness with both the pagan and the Christian. This complexity went on full display in historiography of the ancient world. On the one hand, Jews were structured over against Greeks and written out of history. As opposed to earlier conceptions where “Hellenism” referred to the language and, later, thought of Jews under Greek influence, Johann Gustav Droysen used the word to designate the language and thought of all peoples under Greek influence after Alexander, which entailed both cultural and political dimensions.⁷ He constructed this Hellenism as a transitional period between classical Greece and Christianity – a crucial moment in the dialectic of world history when the Greek met the Oriental and thereby created the conditions of possibility for the Christian. Arnaldo Momigliano uncovered long ago how Droysen left Judaism out of this narrative, portraying Hellenistic culture as essentially devoid of Jewish elements.⁸ As another recent study has revealed, the ascent of Greek (and Roman) history in German classics correlated with a decline of interest in Jewish antiquity: propelled not merely by the forces of anti-Judaism but also by the national and political models sought in the ancient world – models deemed lacking in the Jewish past.⁹ On the other hand, the Greek was used to divide the Jewish against itself. Simon Goldhill has therefore shown how histories of the Jews written by Protestant scholars especially created a structural opposition between Palestinian and Alexandrian Judaism. This hierarchical dichotomy then cast Hellenistic Judaism as a betrayal or corruption of authentic religion because of its mixture of Jewishness and Greekness.¹⁰ However juxtaposed with Judaism, placed against or within it, the Greek posed a series of problems for defining the Jewish in antiquity.

6. Cf. especially Wilhelm Humboldt to Johann Gottfried Schweighäuser, 4 November 1807, in *Wilhelm von Humboldts Briefe an Johann Gottfried Schweighäuser*, ed. Albert Leitzmann (Jena: Frommann, 1934), 41–43, where he famously spoke of the Greek spirit inoculating Germans. See further Suzanne L. Marchand, *Down from Olympus: Archaeology and Philhellenism in Germany, 1750–1970* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996).

7. J.G. Droysen, *Geschichte Alexanders des Großen* (Hamburg: Perthes, 1833); idem, *Geschichte des Hellenismus*, vol. 1, *Geschichte der Nachfolger Alexanders* (Hamburg: Perthes, 1836), vol. 2, *Geschichte der Bildung des hellenistischen Staatensystems* (Hamburg: Perthes, 1843). The second edition of *Geschichte des Hellenismus* was restructured as vol. 1, *Geschichte Alexanders des Großen* (Gotha: Perthes, 1877), vol. 2, *Geschichte der Diadochen* (Gotha: Perthes, 1878), and vol. 3, *Geschichte der Epigonen* (Gotha: Perthes, 1877/78). This new edition helped stimulate a revival of Hellenistic studies at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century.

8. A.D. Momigliano, “J.G. Droysen Between Greeks and Jews”, repr. in idem, *Studies on Modern Scholarship*, ed. G.W. Bowersock and T.J. Cornell (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994 [1970]), 147–61; cf. also Hans Liebeschütz, *Das Judentum im deutschen Geschichtsbild von Hegel bis Max Weber* (Schriftenreihe wissenschaftlicher Abhandlungen des Leo Baeck Instituts 17; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1967), 86–90; Christhard Hoffmann, *Juden und das Judentum im Werk deutscher Althistoriker des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts* (Studies in Judaism in Modern Times 9; Leiden: Brill, 1988), 74–86. As Momigliano has argued, Droysen seemed to reconsider this position when writing his third book on Hellenism, of 1843, impacted by pioneering work – during the 1830s in Tübingen especially – on Alexandrian Judaism and Jewish–Greek exchange in the matrix of early Christianity. Nevertheless, in the four decades between editions, Droysen did not fundamentally alter his account of a Hellenism and Christianity largely bereft of Judaism.

9. Paul Michael Kurtz, “How Nineteenth-Century German Classicists Wrote the Jews out of Ancient History,” *History & Theory* 59, no. 2 (2019): 210–32.

10. Simon Goldhill, “What Has Alexandria to Do with Jerusalem? Writing the History of the Jews in the Nineteenth Century,” *The Historical Journal* 59, no. 1 (2016): 125–51; cf. Tessa Rajak, *The Jewish Dialogue with Greece and Rome: Studies in Cultural and Social Interaction* (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 48; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 535–57.

For Jewish scholars hoping to make Judaism a respectable field study (one worthy in its own right, apart from Christian genealogy), Hellenic language and culture seemed inescapable. These German, or at least Germanophone, Jews built their would-be tower of Jewish studies on the foundation of classical learning, with its scientific philology. Yet the status of Hellenistic culture proved problematic and that of Hellenistic Jews doubly so: both from the standpoint of German classicism, which placed restrictions on the chronology, geography, and demography worthy of study, and given its highly ambivalent standing in the Jewish tradition.¹¹ The forms of antique Judaism evoked by the Hellenosphere in general and by postclassical Egypt in particular long supplied an amphitheater for Jews to consider urgent questions of assimilation and reform, from the Haskalah to the Second Reich.¹² As Maren Niehoff writes, “The history of Jewish scholarship on Alexandrian Judaism has revealed a complex picture which tells of acculturation and attempts to define Jewish identity in nineteenth century Germany. At the hidden centre of these academic discussions stands the issue of Judaism’s

11. Various dimensions of Graecophone Jewish life and culture in antiquity were explored, among others, by Isaak Markus Jost, *Geschichte der Israeliten seit der Zeit der Maccabäer bis auf unsere Tage, nach den Quellen bearbeitet*, 9 vols. (Berlin: Schlesinger, 1820–28), with subsequent supplements; idem, *Allgemeine Geschichte des israelitischen Volkes, sowohl seines zweimaligen Staatslebens als auch der zerstreuten Gemeinden und Secten, bis in die neueste Zeit in gedrängter Uebersicht, zunächst für Staatsmänner, Rechtsgelehrte, Geistliche, und wissenschaftlich gebildete Leser, aus den Quellen bearbeitet*, 2 vols. (Berlin: Amelang, 1832); Immanuel Wolf, “Ueber den Begriff einer Wissenschaft des Judenthums,” in *Zeitschrift für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 1, no. 1 (1822): 1–24; Leopold Zunz, *Zur Geschichte und Literatur*, vol. 1 (Berlin: Veit & Co., 1845); Levi Herzfeld, *Geschichte des Volkes Jisrael von Vollendung des zweiten Tempels bis zur Einsetzung des Mackabäers Schimon zum hohen Priester und Fürsten*, 3 vols. (Nordhausen: Büchtig, 1847–57), later abridged; Zacharias Frankel, “Zur Frage über das Verhältnis des alexandrinischen und palästinischen Judenthums, namentlich in exegetischer Hinsicht,” *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 4 (1850): 102–09; idem, “Ueber palästinische und alexandrinische Schriftforschung,” in *Programm zur Eröffnung des jüdisch-theologischen Seminars zu Breslau “Fränckel’sche Stiftung,” den 16. Ab 5614/10. August 1854* (Breslau: Korn, [1854]); Heinrich Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden von den ältesten Zeiten bis auf die Gegenwart*, 1st ed., 11 vols. (Leipzig: Leiner: 1853–74), which underwent various editions and translations, including abridgment as *Völkstümliche Geschichte der Juden*, 3 vols. (Leipzig: Leiner, 1888); Abraham Geiger, “Vorlesungen über Judenthum. 7) Griechenthum; Sadducäer und Pharisäer,” *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben* 3 (1864/65): 1–15; idem, “Berührungen der Bibel und des Judenthums mit dem classischen Alterthume und dessen Ausläufern,” *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben* 4 (1866): 51–67; Joseph Derenbourg (Derenburg), *Essai sur l’histoire et la géographie de la Palestine, d’après les Thalmuds et les autres sources rabbiniques*, Part 1, *Histoire de la Palestine depuis Cyrus jusqu’à Adrien* (Paris: Imprimerie impériale, 1867); Albert Harkavy, *Alljüdische Denkmäler aus der Krim* (Mémoires de l’Académie Impériale des Sciences de St.-Petersbourg, 7th Series, 24/1; St. Petersburg: Imperial Academy of Sciences, 1876); Daniel Chwolson, *Corpus Inscriptionum Hebraicarum, enthaltend Grabschriften aus der Krim und andere Grab- und Inschriften in alter hebräischer Quadratschrift, sowie auch Schriftproben aus Handschriften vom. IX.–XV. Jahrhundert* (St Petersburg: Schmitzdorff, 1882); Moritz Friedländer, *Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Christenthums. Ein Excurs von der Septuaginta zum Evangelium* (Vienna: Hölder, 1894); idem, *Das Judenthum in der vorchristlichen griechischen Welt. Ein Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Christenthums* (Vienna: Breitenstein, 1897); idem, *Die religiösen Bewegungen innerhalb des Judentums im Zeitalter Jesu* (Berlin: Reimer, 1905). For discussion of such scholarship more broadly, see Yaacov Shavit, *Athens in Jerusalem: Classical Antiquity and Hellenism in the Making of the Modern Secular Jew*, trans. Chaya Naor and Niki Werner (London: Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 1997); Giuseppe Veltri, “Jewish-Greek studies in nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Germany: A brief overview,” in *The Jewish-Greek Tradition in Antiquity and the Byzantine Empire*, ed. James K. Aitken and James Carleton Paget (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 91–102.

12. The Haskalah, or Jewish Enlightenment, broadly and Moses Mendelssohn specifically have long been juxtaposed with Alexandrian Judaism wholly and Philo especially – to various effect. Already in 1770, the Christian Johann B. Kölbele wrote Mendelssohn and implicitly cast him, with reference to interpretation, as a “platonizing, philoizing, kabbalistic Jew” (Kölbele, “Zweites Schreiben an Herrn Moses Mendelssohn...,” in *Herrn Carl Bonnets, verschiedener Akademien Mitglieds, philosophische Untersuchung der Beweise für das Christenthum. Samt desselben Ideen von der künftigen Glückseligkeit des Menschen*, ed. and trans. Johann Caspar Lavater [Frankfurt: Bayrhaoffer, 1774], 131–32); looking the other direction, Max Margolis called Philo “the Mendelssohn of Alexandrian Jewry” (Margolis, “The Mendelssohnian Programme,” *Jewish Quarterly Review* 17 [1905]: 531–44, at 540). For later reflection on Philo as unifier of the Jewish and non-Jewish, cf. Israel Friedländer, “Moses Maimonides (Schluß),” *Jeschurun. Monatschrift für Lehre und Leben im Judentum* 3 (1916): 367–77, at 376–77.

relationship to both Christianity and modernization, which were in nineteenth century Europe intimately linked.”¹³ In her richly textured survey, Niehoff tells a tripartite story of engagement with this past: first, in the 1820s, an initial interest and positive evaluation by liberal figures committed to emancipation, which claimed a precedent for the assimilation and reformulation of Judaism; second, from the 1840s, a consolidated study in the *Wissenschaft des Judentums*, which imagined an essentialist opposition of the Jewish and the Greek; and third, as of the 1860s, an institutionalized concern, which described the synthesis of the Jewish and the Greek as a legitimate form of Judaism. Models for modernity, for life together and apart, were thus sought in antiquity – and yet not there alone. Alongside ancient Alexandria stood medieval Andalusia: an imagined Golden Age for Sephardim in Iberia, one marked by philosophical, aesthetic, and scientific engagement with the dominant non-Jewish (and non-Christian) civilization.¹⁴ In both cases, the past supplied a thesis or antithesis for Jewry in the present. Indeed, Judaism itself was construed specifically as a religion in this period: private, voluntary, and separate from other spheres of life – parameters of a modern category largely defined by German Protestants.¹⁵ Representations of the past performed heavy labor in this reconceiving of Jewishness.¹⁶

While interpreters in intellectual history, history of scholarship, and modern Jewish culture have concentrated on the reception, evaluation, and appropriation of Hellenistic Judaism, this focus has eclipsed the very process of reconstructing that phenomenon itself: the selection and deselection of those sources, figures, and material which supported conflicting portraits of the past. But before being dignified, disparaged, or disavowed, this Jewishness of history first required definition: to be delimited and described. Not only did Hellenistic Judaism become an object of sustained investigation in this period, but these efforts also expanded and framed the associated corpus. Apart from patent examples such as Philo, the Septuagint, or Josephus, a range of other sources came into play: often fragmentary, written or preserved in Greek, and comprising philosophical, historical, and poetic genres. The new identification of many writings and writers as Jewish was by no means obvious. While a number were marked by anonymity or pseudonymity like the Sibylline Oracles or Pseudo-

13. Maren Niehoff, “Alexandrian Judaism in 19th Century *Wissenschaft des Judentums*: Between Christianity and Modernization,” in *Jüdische Geschichte in hellenistisch-römischer Zeit. Wege der Forschung: Vom alten zum neuen Schürer*, ed. Aharon Oppenheimer (Schriften des Historischen Kollegs 44; Munich: Oldenbourg, 1999), 9–28, at 26.

14. Ismar Schorsch, “The Myth of Sephardic Supremacy,” *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book* 34, no. 1, Issue: “Patterns of Assimilation and Acculturation” (1989): 47–66; John M. Efron, *German Jewry and the Allure of the Sephardic* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2016); Carsten Schapkow, *Role Model and Countermodel: The Golden Age of Iberian Jewry and German Jewish Culture During the Era of Emancipation*, trans. Corey Twitchell (Lanham: Lexington Books, 2016). The venture continued into the twentieth century, when Israel Abrahams pronounced, “What Philo did in Alexandria, Samuel the Nagid did in Andalusia, Moses Mendelssohn did in Berlin, Moses Montefiore in Ramsgate, we can and must do it in New York and London...” (idem, *Permanent Values in Judaism: Four Lectures* [New York: Jewish Institute Press, 1923], 77).

15. On this protestantization of Judaism in the German-speaking lands, see Leora Batnitzky, *How Judaism Became a Religion: An Introduction to Modern Jewish Thought* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011). On a contrastive catholicization of Judaism in the Russian Empire, see Eliyahu Stern, “Catholic Judaism: The Political Theology of the Nineteenth-Century Russian Jewish Enlightenment,” *Harvard Theological Review* 109, no. 4 (2016): 483–511.

16. See Michael A. Meyer, “The Emergence of Jewish Historiography: Motives and Motifs,” *History & Theory* 27, no. 4, Beiheft 27: Essays in Jewish Historiography (1988): 160–75; David N. Myers, *Resisting History: Historicism and Its Discontents in German-Jewish Thought* (Jews, Christians, and Muslims from the Ancient to the Modern World; Princeton, 2003); Christhard Hoffmann, “Die *Verbürgerlichung* der jüdischen Vergangenheit: Formen, Inhalte, Kritik,” in *Judentum und Historismus. Zur Entstehung der jüdischen Geschichtswissenschaft in Europa*, ed. Ulrich Wyrwa (Frankfurt: Campus, 2003), 149–171; Nils Roemer, *Jewish Scholarship and Culture in Nineteenth-Century Germany: Between History and Faith* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2005); Andreas Gotzmann and Christian Wiese, ed., *Modern Judaism and Historical Consciousness: Identities, Encounters, Perspectives* (Leiden: Brill, 2007).

Orpheus, pagan authors – Theophrastus and Hecataeus, Mnaseas and Manetho – had long written on Jews, with varying degrees of appreciation, so an interest in things Jewish did not itself indicate authorship. The demarcation of Hellenistic Judaism came only on the other side of hard, slow labor. Neither ancient nor modern Judaism was stable or objective.¹⁷

Amidst this modern redefinition of what it meant to be Jewish as well as doubts about the genuine Jewishness of Hellenistic Judaism, how did scholars establish Jewish authorship behind ambiguous, fragmented, and interpolated texts from the ancient world – all the more when so much of the Hebraic had allegedly been deprived by the Hellenic? This article scrutinizes the identification of Greek texts as the products of Jewish authors in the Hellenistic period, placing such scholarship in its modern intellectual, confessional, and cultural contexts. The inquiry not only argues for the contingency of diagnostic features deployed to define the Jewish amidst the Greek but also maintains the embeddedness of those features in nineteenth-century Germany. To do so, the analysis centers on Jacob Bernays (1824–1881) and Jacob Freudenthal (1839–1907), two savants who helped found the modern study of Hellenistic Judaism. Each overturned centuries of learned consensus by identifying an ancient author as Jewish, rather than Christian or pagan.¹⁸ First, the exploration outlines the life and work of Bernays before proceeding to investigate his work on Pseudo-Phocylides, with sharp focus on what he deemed to be distinctively Jewish. Second, the investigation surveys the biography and bibliography of Freudenthal in brief and continues on to analyze his operations on Eupolemus, inquiring into his distinction not only of the Jewish but also this in contradistinction to the Samaritan. Finally, the examination inspects these criteria and judgments against the background of contemporaneous debates on what it meant to be Jewish. This article ultimately reveals the subtle entanglements as well as the mutually conditioning forces not only of antiquity and modernity but also of the personal and academic, manifest both in the philological analysis of ancient texts and in the larger historiography of antique Judaism in the Graecophone world.

Bernays on Pseudo-Phocylides

Jacob Bernays (1824–1881) was born into an established family of the Jewish community in Hamburg.¹⁹ The Bernayses serve well to map the contours of integration for the Jewish bour-

17. Equally unstable were the German, the Greek, and the Christian, as suggested in *The Essence of Christianity* pursued by Protestant Adolf Harnack and *The Essence of Judaism* sought by Jewish Leo Baeck: Adolf Harnack, *Das Wesen des Christentums. Sechzehn Vorlesungen vor Studierenden aller Facultäten im Wintersemester 1899/1900 an der Universität Berlin gehalten* (Leipzig: 1900); Leo Bäck (*sic*), *Das Wesen des Judentums* (Schriften der Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Wissenschaft des Judentums; Berlin: Nathansen & Lamm, 1905). Though sharing a title with Harnack, Ludwig Feuerbach had earlier critiqued the essence of religion as a strictly human phenomenon (Leipzig: Wigand, 1841).

18. In fact, problems remain for tracking Jewishness in these ancient sources: cf. James R. Davilla, *The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha: Jewish, Christian, or Other?* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 105; Leiden: Brill, 2005), esp. 10–73; Gregory E. Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephos, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography* (Supplements to Novum Testamentum 64; Leiden: Brill, 1992); Stewart Moore, *Jewish Ethnic Identity and Relations in Hellenistic Egypt: With Walls of Iron?* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 171; Leiden: Brill, 2015).

19. For biography, see Arnaldo Momigliano, “Jacob Bernays,” repr. in idem, *Studies on Modern Scholarship*, ed. G.W. Bowersock and T.J. Cornell (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994 [1969]), 121–46; Hans I. Bach, *Jacob Bernays. Ein Beitrag zur Empanziationgeschichte der Juden und zur Geschichte des deutschen Geistes im 19. Jahrhundert* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1974); John Glucker and André Laks, ed., *Jacob Bernays. Un philologue juif* (Cahiers de philologie 16; Villeneuve d’Ascq: Presses universitaires du Septentrion, 1996); Albert I. Baumgarten, *Elias Bickerman as a Historian of the Jews: A Twentieth Century Tale* (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 131; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 173–79; Perrine Simon-Nahum, “Jacob Bernays, une autre voie de la modernité,” *Revue*

geoisie in German society. Father Isaak boasted a deep knowledge of traditional Jewish learning alongside modern philosophy, bridged orthodox and reformed Jews in the city as Chief Rabbi, integrated standard German education in the Jewish school system, maintained friendships with the likes of Heinrich Heine, and taught Samson Raphael Hirsch, a leader in modern orthodoxy. Brother Michael became a distinguished Germanist in Munich, while niece Martha (daughter of another brother) would later marry the Viennese Sigmund Freud. Jacob himself engaged with the Prussian diplomat Christian von Bunsen, frequented the house of the Prince and Princess of Wied, and befriended the eventual winner of the Nobel Prize in literature Paul Heyse.²⁰ To become the celebrated classicist he was, Bernays attended the University of Bonn, where he studied, from 1844–1848, with Friedrich Gottlieb Welcker and Friedrich Wilhelm Ritschl and then worked as an unsalaried lecturer (*Privatdozent*), having received a prize for his treatise on Lucretius.²¹ (He declined the offer to succeed his father as rabbi in Hamburg.²²) After a few precarious years, the philologist was enlisted, in 1853, to help design the training program for a new Jewish Theological Seminary in Breslau.²³ While teaching a regular load of courses in classics, he also functioned as an unsalaried lecturer at the University of Breslau. In 1865, he became a Corresponding Member of the Royal Academy of the Sciences in Berlin, together with Friedrich Max Müller. The following year, Bernays returned to Bonn as an *extraordinarius* (not full) professor and director of the library, once Ritschl had left for Leipzig after a dispute with Otto Jahn, and there he remained until he died. Bernays commanded respect from the other greats in classics of his day: the likes of Theodor Mommsen, Hermann Usener, and Franz Bücheler.

Precisely as a Jew, Bernays encountered obstacles throughout his whole career. In the five years between his habilitation and accession at the Seminary, advocates sought to secure him professorial positions in Bonn, Berlin, and Jena, but this or that opponent always thwarted the savant, whether in university or government.²⁴ Bunsen also tried to open doors in England, as those in Prussia were closing tighter for Jews in the wake of revolutions in 1848, and it was then that he (as well as others) implored Bernays to convert: to which he responded, in a now classic text of modern German Judaism, that Jesus himself, if born a Jew today, would

germanique internationale 14, Special Issue: “La philologie allemande, figures de pensée” (2011): 139–54.

20. Work on Bernays has stressed his amorous involvement with Heyse, noticed already by Freud. For the scattered discussion on his sexuality, see William Musgrave Calder, III, “Letters of Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff to Theodor and Heinrich Gomperz,” *Philologus* 122, no. 2 (1978): 289–301, at 294 n.42; Calder and Hermann Funke, “Vier Briefe Jacob Bernays’ an Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff,” *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* n.s. 122, no. 3/4 (1979): 260–67; Jacob Bernays, “Du, von dem ich lebe.” *Briefe an Paul Heyse*, ed. Calder and Timo Günther (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2010); cf. also Calder, “What Sort of Fellow was Diels?,” in *Hermann Diels (1848–1922) et la science de l’antiquité*, ed. Calder and Jaap Mansfeld (Entretiens sur l’antiquité classique 45; Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 1999), 1–28, at 27. Following Baumgarten’s use of personal memories from Carmen Sylva, see Sylva, *Mein Penatenwinkel*, vol. 1 (Frankfurt am Main: Minjon, 1908), 58 [ET: *From Memory’s Shrine: The Reminiscences of Carmen Sylva (H.M. Queen Elisabeth of Roumania)*, trans. Edith Hopkirk (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1911)]. For a speculative analysis of Freud and Bernays, who never met in person, see Martin Treml, “Zum Verhältnis von Jacob Bernays und Sigmund Freud,” *Luzifer-Amor* 10, no. 19, Issue: “Die jüdischen Wurzeln der Psychoanalyse” (1997): 7–32.

21. Bernays took kindly to Ritschl’s wife, Sophie, *née* Guttentag, who was one of three daughters baptized by their Jewish father (Bach, *Jacob Bernays*, 46–48).

22. *Ibid.*, 95–96.

23. On Jewish life in Breslau, see Till van Rahden, *Jews and Other Germans: Civil Society, Religious Diversity, and Urban Politics in Breslau, 1860–1925*, trans. Marcus Brainard (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2008). For the seminary in particular, see Marcus Brann, *Geschichte des jüdisch-theologischen Seminars (Fraenkel’sche Stiftung) in Breslau. Festschrift zum fünfzigjährigen Jubiläum der Anstalt* (Breslau: Schatzky, [1904]); Guido Kisch, ed., *Das Breslauer Seminar. Jüdisch-Theologisches Seminar (Fraenkel’scher-Stiftung) in Breslau, Gedächtnisschrift* (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1963).

24. For thwarted efforts, see Bach, *Jacob Bernays*, 96, 99–100, 108, 142, 159, 164, 169, 181, 186.

sooner submit himself to crucifixion by all the church authorities one by one than join one of the Christian confessions, which do not live up to his name.²⁵ Once at the Seminary, further attempts to find him a chair at the universities of Bonn, Breslau, and Heidelberg failed in similar fashion. Although a position in Bonn came through, Bernays was denied the chair (despite his salary of an *ordinarius*), no matter the continued efforts to promote him.

As for his Jewishness, Bernays lived and died observant – proudly and famously so. Recollections paint the portrait of “a frum Jew,” one “filled with ancient Jewish piety” who observed a “scrupulous practice of ceremonies” or, less favorably, “held obstinately to strict ritual Judaism throughout his life.”²⁶ Bernays read either the Tanakh or the Talmud for an hour every day, prayed daily with phylacteries, ate no food of his Christian friends, and neither traveled nor himself opened a letter on Shabbat. Though accepting an appointment as librarian at the university library in Bonn, he undertook no work on the Sabbath or the holidays, not so much as ringing a door-bell.²⁷ Such practice drew comments from colleagues like Ernest Renan and Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff (a former student), who attributed to him the binary of mind versus spirit in constructing a contrast between his outer ritual practice and his internal critical mind.²⁸ Bernays seemed to constitute, for many contemporaries, a kind of Nestorian embodiment of two distinct natures: the Jewish and the Greek. Articulating this view, a standard history of scholarship reports, “The Jew and the Greek were united in the person of Bernays, who was at once a strictly orthodox Jew, and a devoted adherent of Hellenic culture.”²⁹ Yet this “Hellenistic Jew,” as he once called himself, existed as if “from another world” or, better, “between two worlds.”³⁰ Bernays never fully integrated into life at

25. Bernays to Bunsen, November 1852, in Michael Fraenkel, ed., *Jacob Bernays. Ein Lebensbild in Briefen* (Breslau: M. & H. Marcus, 1932), 58. Early on, he called Christianity the “premature child” of Judaism and Jewish reform an “abortive brat” (Karlfried Gründer, “Aphorismen von Jacob Bernays,” in *Jacob Bernays*, ed. Glucker and Laks, 243–67, at 246). Brother Michael’s letters were also published: Hermann Uhde-Bernays, ed., *Briefe von und an Michael Bernays* (Berlin: B. Behr, 1907). Both had their letters excerpted in Franz Kobler, ed., *Juden und Judentum in deutschen Briefen aus drei Jahrhunderten*, repr. ed. (Königstein: Jüdischer Verlag Athenäum, 1984 [1935]).

26. Theodor Gomperz, “Jacob Bernays (1824–1881),” repr. in idem, *Essays und Erinnerungen* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1905), 106–25, at 109; Fraenkel, *Jacob Bernays*, 27; Benjamin Rippner, “Jacob Bernays,” *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 30, n.s. 13, no. 8 (1881): 337–47; no. 9 (1881): 385–94, at 341; Carl Schaarschmidt, “J. Bernays,” *Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft* 24 (1881)/ *Biographisches Jahrbuch für Alterthumskunde* 4 (1881): 65–83, at 81; cf. Moritz Güdemann, “Das Jüdisch-Theologische Seminar zu Breslau,” *Ost und West* 4 (1904), 741–748, at 747. Frankel reportedly told Hermann Cohen, upon completion of his habilitation in Marburg, “If Bernays had treated you better, perhaps you would have stayed with us after all” (Hermann Cohen, “Ein Gruss der Pietät an das Breslauer Seminar,” *Ost und West* 4, no. 11 [1904]: 747–56, at 749). Cohen mentioned Bernays’ “ritual orthodoxy, which he did not make a show of, true, but also did not understand to represent discretely and properly in social life” – an orthodoxy combined with “a Schellingian mysticism” (ibid., 751).

27. Bach, *Jacob Bernays*, 49; Hermann Usener, “Bernays: Jacob B.,” *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, vol. 46, *Nachträge bis 1899*, ed. Historical Commission of the Royal Bavarian Academy of the Sciences (Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1902), 393–404, at 403; Fraenkel, *Jacob Bernays*, 5; Berthold Auerbach to Jakob Auerbach, 28 May 1881, in Jakob Auerbach, ed., *Berthold Auerbach. Briefe an seinen Freund Jakob Auerbach. Ein biographisches Denkmal*, 2 vols. (Frankfurt: Büttner & Loening, 1884), 2:459. Usener also edited Bernays’ collected work after the latter’s death: cf. n. 36 below.

28. See Ephraim E. Urbach, “The Breslau Years of Jacob Bernays and his Impact upon Jewish Studies,” in *Jacob Bernays*, ed. Glucker and Laks, 17–28, at 26.

29. John Edwin Sandys, *A History of Classical Scholarship*, vol. 3, *The Eighteenth Century in Germany, and the Nineteenth Century in Europe and the United States of America* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1908), 179.

30. Jacob Bernays to Friedrich Wilhelm Ritschl, cited in Bach, *Jacob Bernays*, 145; cf. Jean Bollock, “Un homme d’un autre monde,” in *Jacob Bernays*, ed. Glucker and Laks, 135–225; repr. as *Jacob Bernays. Un homme entre deux mondes*, with a preface by Renate Schlesier (Villeneuve d’Ascq: Presses universitaires du Septentrion, 1998). Elsewhere, Bernays remarked his Christian colleagues considered him an Oriental but not an orientalist by guild: Jacob Bernays to Salomon Frensdorff, 27 December 1875, in Michael Fraenkel, “Aus Jacob Bernays’ und

the Jewish Seminary, where he resisted reform and retreated from communal life, or at the non-Jewish University, where he refused conversion and resigned himself to relegation.³¹ Despite a profound interest in politics, he refrained from public statements on Jewish affairs, whether social issues of emancipation or religious debates on reform.

This fate of Jacob contrasted that of his brother Michael, who achieved a noted career as professor of German in Munich – but only after conversion. (Their paternal uncle, Adolphus, *né* Aaron, had likewise converted to Protestantism and become the first professor of German at King’s College, London.) Jacob mourned his brother, sitting shiva and thereby treating him as legally dead according to Jewish tradition.³² Having broken off all contact, Jacob never recovered from Michael’s decision; out of respect for his friend, Mommsen avoided the brother as well.³³ While Jacob viewed the baptism as rebellion – all the more given its performance in their ancestral city of Mainz – other Jewish contemporaries considered it merely opportunistic, and still others claimed it came from conviction.³⁴ Nevertheless, this story of the Brothers Bernays corresponded to the broader history of German life for the Jewish bourgeoisie. (Another brother, Berman, remained observant and went into business.) Merely leaving the community, renouncing certain practice, or affirming some belief seldom sufficed: rather, baptism was a necessary ritual for acceptance into the Christian faith and thereby academia.³⁵ The closer a Jewish academic came to a chair, the greater the structural pressure.

Salomon Frensdorffs Schriftwechsel,” *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 80/n.s. 44, no. 2 (1936): 121–25, at 125.

31. Jacob Toury, “German Jewry in Mid-Nineteenth Century, As Background to Jacob Bernays’ Life,” in *Jacob Bernays*, ed. Glucker and Laks, 3–16, at 11; see further Urbach, “The Breslau Years of Jacob Bernays and his Impact upon Jewish Studies,” 25; Bach, *Jacob Bernays*.

32. Ernest Jones, *Sigmund Freud: Life and Work*, vol. 1, *The Young Freud: 1856–1900* (London: Hogarth Press, 1953), 112. However, Jones’ biography connected Jacob to Heidelberg, not Bonn, and described Michael’s position as “achieved at the cost of renouncing his faith” versus that of Jacob, who “refused his brother’s price [of apostasy] for a professorship” (*ibid.*). Nevertheless, Michael inherited much of Jacob’s library (Momigliano, “Jacob Bernays,” 129).

33. Usener, “Bernays: Jacob B,” 403; Theodor Mommsen to Otto Jahn, 15 August 1860, in Lothar Wickert, *Theodor Mommsen. Eine Biographie*, vol. 3, *Wanderjahre: Leipzig – Zürich – Breslau – Berlin* (Frankfurt: Klostermann, 1969), 322–42, at 331. According to Güdemann, Jacob never liked Michael, even before the baptism, calling him a “peddler,” although the two reportedly reconciled in the end (*idem*, “Das Jüdisch-Theologische Seminar zu Breslau,” 747). On the complicated relationship between Mommsen and Bernays, see *ibid.*, 321–42.

34. Cf. Bach, *Jacob Bernays*, 146–47, 119; Albrecht Hirschmüller, “Zur Familie Bernays,” in *idem*, ed., *Sigmund Freud – Minna Bernays. Briefwechsel, 1822–1938* (Quellen und Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der Psychoanalyse 3; Tübingen: edition diskord, 2005), 325–43, at 330. The Brothers Bernays and baptism entered the satire of Karl Kraus against Siegmund Münz, involving Carmen Sylva, originally published in *Die Fackel*: see the translation of the trilogy in Harold B. Segel, ed., *The Vienna Coffeehouse Wits, 1890–1938* (West Lafayette: Purdue University Press, 1993[1911]), 100–03.

35. See Norbert Kampe, “Jüdische Professoren im deutschen Kaiserreich. Zu einer vergessenen Enquete Bernhard Breslauer’s,” in *Antisemitismus und jüdische Geschichte. Studien zu Ehren von Herbert A. Strauss*, ed. Rainer Erb and Michael Schmidt (Berlin: WAV, 1987), 185–211; cf. Andreas D. Ebert, *Jüdische Hochschullehrer an preußischen Universitäten (1870–1924). Eine quantitative Untersuchung mit biographischen Skizzen* (Frankfurt am Main: Mabuse-Verlag, 2008); see further Monika Richarz, *Der Eintritt der Juden in die akademischen Berufe. Jüdische Studenten und Akademiker in Deutschland, 1678–1848*, with a preface by Adolf Leschnitzer (Schriftenreihe wissenschaftlicher Abhandlungen des Leo Baeck Instituts 28; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1974); Peter Pulzer, *Jews and the German State: The Political History of a Minority, 1848–1933* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2003); Deborah Hertz, *How Jews Became Germans: The History of Conversion and Assimilation in Berlin* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009); Todd M. Endelman, *Leaving the Jewish Fold: Conversion and Radical Assimilation in Modern Jewish History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015).

With regard to his scholarship, Bernays dissected the social, cultural, and religious entanglements of the past, producing a corpus of breadth and depth alike.³⁶ In the words of Arnaldo Momigliano, “What Bernays liked best was to discover in pagan literature new pieces of evidence either for Jewish history or for the slow conversion of pagan minds to Jewish and Christian beliefs.”³⁷ Much of his work derived its power precisely from a masterful integration of biblical and classical learning. (Although the Jewish classicist wielded the tools of philological science on any number of writings, he did oppose a thoroughgoing criticism of the biblical texts.³⁸) Indeed, Bernays once referred to “the great task assigned to humankind: to unite the Bible with Graeco-Roman *Bildung*” – a unification that drew him to the early modern savant Joseph Scaliger.³⁹ Interpreters of Bernays have suggested different directions for the relationality of these factors: whether he sought to “re-Judaize” antiquity, using Jerusalem to understand Athens, or to bring the beauty of Japheth into the tents of Shem, as his brother Michael wrote on his tombstone, ushering the Hellenic into the Hebraic.⁴⁰ More fundamentally, this negotiating of the Jewish and the Greek (and German) characterized not only the work but also the man. As Jacob Toury concludes, “During his whole life, and at least since his student years, Bernays had hoped to prove that a coexistence between Christians and Jews was indeed possible on German soil. He hoped to prove it in the spiritual realm of Classical culture, in the political realm of modern European secular statehood, and within the private bonds of friendship and understanding.”⁴¹

Through his work on Hellenistic Judaism, Bernays detected Jewish authorship behind a pseudonymous text written in Greek. Pseudo-Phocylides comprises 230 lines of didactic hexameter verse, dating somewhere between the first centuries BCE and CE.⁴² The original Phocylides was an Ionian bard from Miletus in the mid sixth century BCE, an aphorist famous in antiquity, only fragments of whose work have survived. Though far less popular in the ancient world, the lines of Pseudo-Phocylides rose to prominence in the late medieval period, especially the 16th century, when the work served as a schoolbook prized for its unification of lofty biblical morality with classical literary aesthetic. In 1606, however, Scaliger not only established the pseudonymity of this gnomic poem but also identified its author as a Christian

36. For his bibliography, see chronologically and fully, Jacob Bernays, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, ed. Hermann Usener, 2 vols. (Berlin: W. Hertz, 1885), 1:xi–xvii; thematically though partially, Schaarschmidt, “J. Bernays,” 78–80; cf. also Bach, *Jacob Bernays*, 229–32.

37. Momigliano, “Jacob Bernays,” 134.

38. Cf. Frankel, *Jacob Bernays*, 27–29; Bach, *Jacob Bernays*, 147–51; Rippner, “Jacob Bernays,” 343–44; see further Anthony Grafton, “Jacob Bernays, Joseph Scaliger, and Others,” in *The Jewish Past Revisited: Reflections on Modern Jewish Historians*, ed. David N. Myers and David B. Ruderman (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 16–38, at 34–36.

39. Jacob Bernays, *Ueber die Chronik des Sulpicius Severus. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der klassischen und biblischen Studien* (Berlin: Hertz, 1861), 70; Grafton, “Jacob Bernays, Joseph Scaliger, and Others,” 28. Bernays thus identified with Scaliger, whom he biographed; Momigliano, apparently saw something of himself in Bernays, on whom he, in turn, wrote a splendid essay (Baumgarten, *Elias Bickerman as a Historian of the Jews*, 175 n. 14); Grafton has since written on all three.

40. Cf. Renate Schlesier, preface to Bollock, *Jacob Bernays*, 10; Bach, *Jacob Bernays*, 214. On the motif of Shem and Japheth for imagining the Jewish and the Greek, see Yaacov Shavit, *Athens in Jerusalem: Classical Antiquity and Hellenism in the Making of the Modern Secular Jew*, trans. Chaya Naor and Niki Werner (London: Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 1997), 119–54.

41. See Toury, “German Jewry in Mid-Nineteenth Century, As Background to Jacob Bernays’ Life,” 15.

42. For a modern critical edition with sustained engagement with previous scholarship, especially Bernays, see Pieter Willem van der Horst, *The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides. With Introduction and Commentary* (Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 4; Leiden: Brill, 1978).

rather than a pagan.⁴³ As a result of this twofold conclusion, interest in the text dramatically declined over the next two centuries. But through a rigorous, erudite, and systematic investigation, Bernays offered a new analysis in 1856, published through an anniversary volume for the Jewish seminary in Breslau.⁴⁴ Although he seconded his hero Scaliger in judging it a pseudonymous work, the philologist diverged on one critical point: Bernays declared the poet Jewish. Structured in three parts, his argument first opposed pagan authorship, then contested Christian composition, and finally asserted Jewish origins. Modern scholarship on antiquity has largely upheld Bernays’s position ever since.⁴⁵

To identify Pseudo-Phocylides as a Jew, Bernays first adduced a monotheistic orientation. However, a handful of apparent inconsistencies hindered any simple identification of monotheism. Noting the discrepancy, he asserted, “The more evident that even such a fleeting acquaintance with the Phocylidean poem reveals its dependence on the Old Testament throughout, the greater the disconcertment that individual expressions must arouse, which go against precisely the highest point of biblical belief, against the teaching of the unity of God, by speaking of ‘gods’ in pagan plurality.”⁴⁶ Bernays proceeded to overcome these violations of biblical belief through emendation and reinterpretation. Observing two explicit references to multiple deities, he emended the word “gods” in each case and proceeded to rewrite the lines in question.⁴⁷ He detected other possible allusions to divinities in the plural: namely, the sons of Uranus or Titans and the blessed ones.⁴⁸ Yet Bernays interpreted the referents as astronomical objects, not only claiming the author had strictly eschewed any anthropomorphism but also comparing this poet’s portrait of celestial bodies as servants of the deity to a similar description by the psalmist in the Hebrew Bible.⁴⁹ Having dispensed with any suggestion of multiple divinities, he discerned a clever monotheism in the poem. The poet, he maintained, had “bent” the terms otherwise deployed by pagan writers as synonymous with divine beings “so finely and with such an obvious purpose that his monotheistic standpoint becomes thereby not questionable but all the more evident.”⁵⁰ In this way, Bernays described an “almost parodying art of our author in adjusting lemma from the pagan-classical literature to his own religious opinion.”⁵¹ Monotheism was thus a mark of the Jewish.

A knowledge of the Hebrew Bible also suggested Jewish authorship according to Bernays. In fact, he contended Pseudo-Phocylides had even used portions of the Tanakh as a base text. Most importantly, the critic demonstrated the textual substructure of the Decalogue and Leviticus 19, calling the latter the “principal source” of the poet.⁵² Bernays saw hidden in the text a whole range of biblical passages, including Psalms, Proverbs, and Jeremiah. Beyond

43. Joseph Justus Scaliger, “Animadversiones in Chronologica Eusebii,” in idem, *Thesaurus Temporum* (Leiden: Basson, 1606), 88–89 (separately paginated).

44. Jacob Bernays, “Ueber das Phokylideische Gedicht. Ein Beitrag zur hellenistischen Literatur,” in *Jahresbericht des jüdisch-theologischen Seminars “Fraenckelscher Stiftung” Breslau, am Gedächtnisstage des Stifters, dem 27. Januar 1856* (Breslau: Grass, Barth & Co., 1856), dedicated to Mommsen; repr. idem, in *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, ed. Usener, 1:192–261, with citation here following the reprint.

45. See, however, Jonathan Klawans, “The Pseudo-Jewishness of Pseudo-Phocylides,” *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 26, no. 3 (2017): 201–33.

46. Bernays, “Ueber das Phokylideische Gedicht. Ein Beitrag zur hellenistischen Literatur,” 199.

47. Ibid., 200–05 (θεοῖσι το γόοισι in v. 98; θεοί το νέοι in v. 104).

48. Ibid., 206–10 (οὐρανίδα in v. 71; μακάρεσσιν in vv. 75, 161).

49. He cites Psalms 104:4; 148:8.

50. Ibid., 205–06.

51. Ibid., 209.

52. Ibid., 227–334 (Decalogue in vv. 3–7; Leviticus 19 in vv. 8–41).

such “reminiscences,” he observed verbatim phrases from the Torah as well as Isaiah.⁵³ At the same time, the critic availed himself of biblical texts to interpret the lines of Pseudo-Phocylides, as he had done with other classical literature. Thus, he could declare, “Precisely Leviticus leads to the proper reading and understanding of this previously unclear verse ([v.] 20).”⁵⁴ Bernays went so far as to alter the text of Pseudo-Phocylides on the basis of biblical literature, emending one line to read “deposit” instead of “virginity” and correcting another particularly corrupt verse on the basis of Deuteronomy.⁵⁵ While Bernays detected specific knowledge of the Tanakh in Pseudo-Phocylides, which allegedly divulged its Jewish authorship, he maintained the text betrayed no familiarity with the New Testament or specifically Christian convictions – a conclusion made easier after the elimination of several passages as Byzantine interpolations.⁵⁶

Three other qualities disclosed the Jewishness of the ancient author for Bernays. First, he recognized a knowledge of Jewish tradition beyond the Hebrew Bible. Stressing the objection to infanticide in Pseudo-Phocylides, the classicist called the practice alien to Jews – a foreignness even noted by pagan observers in antiquity.⁵⁷ Next, Bernays discerned an underlying criticism of Greek culture. One general line of disapproval extended from the religious dimension. In his reading, “The author entered into more open or more tacit opposition to paganism wherever it diverged from the fundamental ideas of the Old Testament.”⁵⁸ More sweepingly, however, Bernays saw in Pseudo-Phocylides an assault on a central quality frequently praised in Greek literature: namely, adaptability according to circumstance – as symbolized by the polyp. The classicist saw a sharp distinction here between the Jewish and the Greek: the bard “was not himself a Greek but belonged to that people whose virtues and vices derive not from color-changing versatility but from the opposite characteristic, from tenacious inflexibility – that people whose prophets always had to bemoan its intractable nature, which, however, has also claimed credit for their fortitude over millennia, at least as a people.”⁵⁹ Finally, Bernays believed linguistic knowledge evinced the author’s Jewishness, as when he judged one expression in Greek as an undeniable imitation of the Hebrew.⁶⁰ In fact, Bernays even reconstructed a poetic line of Pseudo-Phocylides based on the Greek of the Septuagint with reference to the Hebrew.⁶¹

As he re-defined Pseudo-Phocylides as a Jew, Bernays offered an assessment of the Jewishness on display in the text and in the author himself. The Jewish Hellenist criticized the

53. Ibid., 231, 233, 245, 239 (phrases in vv. 24, 39, 220–21, 147–48, respectively), cf. 234 n. 1.

54. Ibid., 230; cf. also *ibid.*, 218 n. 1.

55. Ibid., 220–21, 238–39 (v. 13 and v. 142, respectively).

56. Cf., e.g., *ibid.*, 219, 221, 232 n.1.

57. Ibid., 242–43, cf. also 229, 231.

58. Ibid., 215.

59. Ibid., 212. One Christian reviewer criticized this rebuke, contending it only pertained to later periods of Greek history, once its national autonomy had waned; furthermore, the critic declared that this very critique exposed Bernays’s own Jewishness: Leopold Schmidt, review of *Ueber das Phokylideische Gedicht*, by Jacob Bernays, *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie 3 / Jahnsche Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik* 75 (1857): 510–19, at 512–14. Heinrich Ewald was, characteristically, even more severe: “This philologist traces it [*sc.*, the Phocylidean poem], as one would expect, back to a Judaeian origin.... We very much must rebuke that he as an educated Jew today, who wants to offer judgments on everything else including Christian things, judges not only very superficially but also very unjustly and in a disgustingly biased manner”: Heinrich Ewald, “Uebersicht der 1857–1858 erschienenen schriften zur Biblischen wissenschaft,” *Jahrbücher der Biblischen Wissenschaft*, vol. 9, 1857–1858 (Göttingen: Dieterich, 1858), 229.

60. Ibid., 242 n. 1; cf. also 228–29.

61. Ibid., 239.

Hellenistic Jew on two counts: a muting and a silencing of Judaism. Firstly, Bernays believed the author had downplayed essential elements of Judaism. Pseudo-Phocylides committed any number of sins in this regard: changing the biblical threat of punishment implied in “I am the Lord” to a more ambiguous statement of divine aversion to false witness; converting the rationale for treatment of foreigners in specifically Jewish history, i.e. deliverance from Egypt, to a general one rooted in common human experience; eschewing an appropriate citation of the Mosaic law so as not to alienate his audience; and narrowing the list of proscribed sexual partners from the fuller biblical inventory.⁶² Second, the classicist asserted his ancient author had fallen silent on certain pillars of Judaism. Pseudo-Phocylides neglected to mention Sabbath, sacrifice, or idolatry even though his own source text of the Bible (the Decalogue and Leviticus 19) explicitly emphasized these three.⁶³ This failure to denounce idolatry – what Bernays called “the core sin against the spirit of Judaism” – earned Pseudo-Phocylides reproof, for the bard – precisely as a Jew – had every right, even an obligation, to distinguish God from gods and to discriminate God from idols.⁶⁴ Although he saw a correspondence between the prescriptions of Pseudo-Phocylides and the Noachide laws, which pertained also to Gentiles (as opposed certain ritual laws applicable only to Jews), Bernays found this explanation even more incriminating: idolatry – on which Pseudo-Phocylides had fallen silent – was one of the most crucial laws among them.⁶⁵ In the end, Bernays claimed the Hellenistic Jew had elevated “laws of understanding” and suppressed “laws of obedience,” insofar as he included those laws of the Pentateuch that bore “a relationship to the morality of private or public life, as per its aspects that do not touch on Jewish nationality,” and excluded “everything that relates to the distinctive nature (*Sonderwesen*) of the Jewish nationality; moreover everything ritual that does not come to terms with understanding.”⁶⁶ With this kind of denationalized, deritualized Judaism, Pseudo-Phocylides – so Bernays – ultimately produced “a guide for ethical life, indeed created from biblical sources yet stripped from every positive biblical element.”⁶⁷ The truly Jewish had been diluted, or deluded, into a matter of general ethics or universal justice.

Bernays sought to explain this representation of Judaism in Pseudo-Phocylides. He ascribed such dampening and silencing, “the deliberation (*Bedacht*) with which our author skirts around everything nationally Jewish,” to attempts at acculturation.⁶⁸ In Egypt and Alexandria especially – “the metropole both of erudition at that time and of the Hellenistic Jews” – figures like Pseudo-Phocylides emptied Judaism of its distinctiveness, from Sabbath to sacrifice, because of either lazy or self-interested concessions.⁶⁹ Most of all on idolatry, Alexandrian Jews had felt compelled to acquiesce for two reasons: first, this practice had become inextricable from all aspects of life and, second, they did not want to jeopardize their favorable position, protected as they were by Alexander the Great and then the Ptolemies. Having reconstructed this ancient response, the critic found it “impossible to excuse fully, much less

62. *Ibid.*, 229, 233, 235, 242. The aversion to male–male intercourse shared by Leviticus 18 and Pseudo-Phocylides was muted.

63. *Ibid.*, 233–34.

64. *Ibid.*, 236, 225–26.

65. *Ibid.*, 252–53.

66. *Ibid.*, 227. Usener once wrote, “Belief and the law of Moses gives the Jewish people the security of nationality: he [*sc.* Bernays] clearly felt that no stone may be loosened or removed out of this construction unless one wanted to destroy the whole building and snatch away from Judaism the foundation of its being” (Usener, “Bernays: Jacob B.,” 403).

67. Bernays, “Ueber das Phokylideische Gedicht. Ein Beitrag zur hellenistischen Literatur,” 248.

68. *Ibid.*, 233

69. *Ibid.*, 251.

endorse” this “bootlicking timidity” of Pseudo-Phocylides, “from the moral as from the religious perspective.”⁷⁰ However, Bernays saw in the text not only information about antiquity but also, through its reception, larger lessons on Judaism:

....and therefore the history of this minor Jewish-Hellenistic product mirrors the fate to which the entire Judaeo-Hellenistic and any writing like it deservedly succumbs, namely, the fate of being unable to exert a lasting influence on the spiritual life of the nations, which revolves about in sharp oppositions and pushes aside contemptuously all attempts to flatten the concrete through compromise and abstraction.⁷¹

Bernays contended the author had been a victim of his own success. The ancient Jew had long been misidentified by and accepted into the Christian tradition – from the church fathers to schoolbooks of the 16th century – precisely because he had disavowed the quintessentially Jewish, which contrasted the necessary yet insufficient features of Jewishness that allowed Bernays to recover the true identity of Pseudo-Phocylides. So it was that the Jewish Hellenist condemned the Hellenistic Jew.

Freudenthal on Eupolemus

A figure far less known than Bernays, Jacob Freudenthal (1839–1907) was born in a village on the Weser in the Kingdom of Hanover.⁷² The son of a Jewish merchant, he was to work in the family shop at age 12 but showed little interest or desire. Rather, he gravitated towards learning, with special interest in Greek and Latin: attending the local school, taking private lessons, and considering a future as a schoolmaster. Yet the family was poor, the costs of gymnasium prohibitive, so Freudenthal sought an education at the Breslau seminary, from 1856 to 1862, with the intent of becoming a rabbi. Working at the same time to help pay for his education, he also passed the university entrance exam of Hanover, which allowed him to study in Breslau alongside his training at seminary. Now, Bernays inspired Freudenthal in classics, promoting his interest in these studies precisely as he was losing interest in rabbinic training. (Bernays liked Freudenthal but “terrorized” other students, who admired him nonetheless.⁷³) When serious illness took Freudenthal back home, he then studied at the University of Göttingen. Having published an award-winning essay on the Talmud in the *Monatsschrift für die Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, he received a Göttingen doctorate, in 1863, with a thesis on Aristotle.⁷⁴ As he prepared a further qualification for higher positions of the gymna-

70. Ibid., 251–52.

71. Ibid., 254.

72. For biography on Freudenthal, see Abraham Wolf, “In Memory of Freudenthal,” *Philosophy* 14, no. 55 (1939): 378–79; Richard Hönigswald, “Freudenthal, Jakob,” in *Biographisches Jahrbuch und Deutscher Nekrolog*, vol. 12, vom 1. Januar bis 31. Dezember 1907, ed. Anton Bettelheim (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1909), 217–20; idem, “Philosophie,” in *Festschrift zur Feier des hundertjährigen Bestehens der Universität Breslau*, vol. 2, *Geschichte der Fächer, Institute und Ämter der Universität Breslau, 1811–1911*, ed. Georg Kaufmann (Breslau: F. Hirt, 1911), 337–48, at 344–45; Matthias Wolfes, “Freudenthal, Ja[c]kob,” in *Lexikon deutsch-jüdischer Autoren*, vol. 7, *Feis-Frey*, ed. Renate Heuer (Archiv Bibliographia Judaica; Munich: Saur, 1999), 437–41; idem, “Freudenthal, Jakob auch: Jacob,” in *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon*, vol. 18 (2001): 470–75. The fullest accounts come in Carl Gebhardt, “Jacob Freudenthal,” *Chronicon Spinozanum* 2 (1922): 199–219; M. Baumgartner and P. Wendland, “Jacob Freudenthal,” *Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 35 (1907)/*Biographisches Jahrbuch für Altertumskunde (Altertumswissenschaft)* 30 (1907): 152–163; see also nn. 75 and 90 below.

73. Momigliano, “Jacob Bernays,” 130; cf. n. 26 supra. Freudenthal shared a room with Hermann Cohen at the seminary and apparently introduced him to Kant (Gebhardt, “Jacob Freudenthal,” 203).

74. The essay topic, set by the Breslau seminary, and title was “Ueber Princip und Gebiet der Präsumtionen nach talmudischer Lehre” (1860). This article notwithstanding, Freudenthal reportedly developed an aversion to the Talmud during his studies at the seminary, calling it “a pedantic, illogical, and utterly untenable teaching” (Gebhardt, “Jacob Freudenthal,” 203). The doctoral thesis was published as *Über den Begriff des Wortes ΦΑΝΤΑΣΙΑ*

sium, Freudenthal taught for a year at Samson School in Wolfenbüttel, before returning to the Seminary to teach remedial preparatory courses in classics for lower-level students and philosophy for advanced ones. In 1866, Freudenthal both succeeded his teacher Bernays, as the latter returned to Bonn, and completed his school qualification. Having received his habilitation from the University of Breslau nine years later, he became associate professor in 1879 and *ordinarius* (or full professor) in 1888, although the imperial government took two years to approve the appointment.⁷⁵ Not only did Freudenthal help found the department of philosophy, where he acted as director, but he also served as dean of the faculty of philosophy and member of the university senate.⁷⁶ The professor received support from the Prussian Academy of Science to work in England and the Netherlands. He even became a privy government councillor.

As a Jewish scholar, Freudenthal faced professional obstacles as well. Only when obstructed from a position at the gymnasium precisely because of his Jewishness did he return to teach at the Seminary.⁷⁷ The institution was pleased to have one of its own as a successor to Bernays and equally delighted to have one become professor at the University.⁷⁸ However, once associate professor, Freudenthal ceased teaching the lower-level courses in Greek and Latin at the Seminary, and then when *ordinarius*, he stopped altogether. Barriers continued to rise before him as he sought advancement in non-Jewish institutions. As *extraordinarius*, he featured first on the list of the faculty for a chair in Kiel, yet resistance came from other corners in the University: a Jewish academic had just been elector rector, and fears circulated of a potential scandal, were another Jew to be appointed as professor.⁷⁹ Philosophers Franz Brentano and Alexius Meinong then tried, unsuccessfully, to bring him to Austria, to the University of Graz.⁸⁰ While some accounts have already alluded to these foils by “confession” – a state of affairs (or being) that also hindered promotion at the University of Breslau – an overlooked report, quoted by his son Berthold, enumerates still other setbacks: consideration of Freudenthal in Jena, Giessen, Königsberg, Strasbourg, and Prague.⁸¹ Even once a full professor at

bei Aristoteles (Göttingen: Rente, 1863). For Hermann Lotze’s assessment of the dissertation, see Lotze, *Briefe und Dokumente*, ed. Reinhardt Pester, with a preface by Ernst Wolfgang Orth (Studien und Materialien zum Neukantianismus 20; Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2003), 389–90.

75. Cf. Gotthard Deutsch, “Freudenthal and the Breslau Seminary,” in idem, *Scrolls: Essays on Jewish History and Literature, and Kindred Subjects*, 2 vols. (Cincinnati: Ark Publishing Company, 1917), 2:279–86, at 283; Wolf, “In Memory of Freudenthal,” 378. Jacob Haberman suggests Freudenthal’s influence on Wolf: Haberman, “Abraham Wolf: A Forgotten Jewish Reform Thinker,” *Jewish Quarterly Review* 81, no. 3/4 (1991): 267–304.

76. Rector and Senate of the University of Breslau, *Chronik der Königlichen Universität zu Breslau*, vol. 10, *für das Jahr vom 1. April 1895 bis zum 31. März 1896* (Breslau: Grass, Barth & Co., 1896), 33; vol. 13, *für das Jahr vom 1. April 1898 bis 31. März 1899* (Breslau: Grass, Barth & Co., 1899), 4.

77. Wolfes, “Freudenthal, Ja[c]kob,” 438; idem, “Freudenthal, Jakob auch: Jacob,” 470.

78. Cf. Brann, *Geschichte des jüdisch-theologischen Seminars (Fraenkel’sche Stiftung) in Breslau*, 97, 99, 105–06, 112; Board of Trustees, *Das jüdisch-theologische Seminar Fränckelsche Stiftung zu Breslau. Am Tag seines fünfundzwanzigjährigen Bestehens, den 10. August 1879* (Breslau: Grass, Barth & Co., 1879), 30. According to Brann (*ad loc.*, 107), Freudenthal composed the work, which the *Curatorium* had commissioned.

79. Franz Brentano to Alexius Meinong, 12 December 1883, in *Philosophenbriefe. Aus der wissenschaftlichen Korrespondenz von Alexius Meinong*, ed. Rudolf Kindinger (Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, 1965), 20–21. The professor in question, Albert Ladenburg, later was baptized.

80. David F. Lindenfeld, *The Transformation of Positivism: Alexius Meinong and European Thought, 1880–1920* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980), 68. Freudenthal also found an improbable ally in those otherwise averse to Judaism, including the wildly antisemitic Paul de Lagarde: cf. Berthold Freudenthal, “Unsere Eltern,” Leo Baeck Institute Archives, ME 150, MM 24, 1917, 30–31. Courtesy of the Leo Baeck Institute, New York.

81. Berthold Freudenthal, “Unsere Eltern,” 13–14; cf. Gebhardt, “Jacob Freudenthal,” 209; Baumgartner and Wendland, “Jacob Freudenthal,” 153;

Breslau, in the 1890s, the philosopher found himself foiled. Freudenthal complained he had been overlooked for the examination committee, with younger colleagues being asked to serve instead, which meant students deemed his lectures superfluous, thereby making him a “second-class professor.”⁸² He petitioned Wilhelm Dilthey, as well as Friedrich Althoff, for help with the situation. Here, however, he himself rejected Judaism as a significant factor in the affair, noting Catholics examined Protestant students and Protestants Catholic ones.

With respect to his observance, Freudenthal changed his practice as he progressed through life. Both Freudenthal and his wife, Therese, were once strictly orthodox, but she too (the daughter of Berlin rabbi Michael Sachs) reportedly “participated in her husband’s cold attitude toward all things Jewish” in the end.⁸³ According to recollections from one student of the Seminary, Freudenthal regularly attended synagogue Friday evenings and Saturday mornings, laid phylacteries each day, gave the priestly blessing on holidays while chanting, made Kiddush and prayed when hosting students in his home, and recited the Kaddish upon the death of his mother.⁸⁴ However, as he left the Seminary, he abandoned such traditions. Although this Jewish philosopher had lectured on Jewish philosophers at the Seminary, his university courses had “no connection to Judaism,” and he apparently “did not like to see the manners of the *Beth Hamidrash* lectures transferred to his lecture-room.”⁸⁵ Others recalled food “not in accordance with the Jewish dietary laws” at the annual dinner hosted for university students in his seminar, while a Breslau rabbi discouraged one American visitor from meeting the professor, proclaiming him “not in sympathy with Jewish institutions.”⁸⁶ One eulogy saw something commendable in this move: “With iron will, Freudenthal cut a path for himself that led out of the tradition of Judaism fenced in by the law to the breadth of European scholarship. For what he accomplished, he has himself to thank.”⁸⁷ The same eulogizer contended, “In every Jew, so far as the tradition of Judaism is living in him, there is a penetration of Eastern and Western thinking,” before proceeding to claim that Freudenthal had derived his penetrating insight into Baruch Spinoza precisely from an ability to reproduce – or at least empathize with – this synthesis, as embodied in his object of study.⁸⁸

Conversion affected the Freudenthal family, too – but found a different response than it did with Bernays. Writing on an encounter with Margarete Freudenthal, wife of Berthold and daughter-in-law of Jacob, the philosopher Hugo Bergman(n) recalled her saying that not only had Jacob relinquished much practice once away from the Seminary but almost all of his children had even been baptized; furthermore, she mentioned a letter from her father-in-law that declared the baptism of their other son Martin “understandable.”⁸⁹ A memoir by Mar-

82. Jacob Freudenthal to Wilhelm Dilthey, 12 March 1895, in Wilhelm Dilthey, *Briefwechsel*, vol. 2, 1882–1895, ed. Gudrun Kühne-Bertram and Hans-Ulrich Lessing (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015), 487–90.

83. Deutsch, “Freudenthal and the Breslau Seminary,” 286, citing “very good authority.” They married in 1869.

84. *Ibid.*, 285.

85. *Ibid.*, 284.

86. *Ibid.*, Deutsch remains agnostic on these reports, however.

87. Gebhardt, “Jacob Freudenthal,” 200. Gebhardt’s wife, Lilly (*née* Hellmann), was Jewish.

88. *Ibid.*; cf. also Carsten Schapkow, “L’oeuvre et la vie de Spinoza comme paradigme scientifique et fondement d’une identité juive sécularisée chez Heinrich Graetz et Jacob Freudenthal,” trans. Laure Bemardi, *Revue germanique internationale* 17 (2002). Similarly, one tribute celebrated Freudenthal for showing “how Jewish genius enriched the store of human knowledge”: N.N., “Freudenthal,” *Year Book of the Central Conference of American Rabbis*, vol. 17, *Containing the Proceedings of the Convention held at Frankfort, Michigan, U.S.A., July 2 to 8, 1907*, ed. Tobias Schanfarber, Samuel Hirschberg, and Joseph Stolz (New York: Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1908), 72–73, at 72.

89. Schmuël Hugo Bergman, *Tagebücher und Briefe*, vol. 1, 1901–1948, ed. Miriam Sambursky (Eine Veröffentlichung des Leo Baeck Instituts; Königstein: Jüdischer Verlag, Athenäum, 1985), 359, written 2 May

garete herself contains extracts from her husband's memories and diaries as well as letters between Berthold and his parents: the son quickly feeling torn over Judaism in his student days; the father keeping holidays and affirming, "Tomorrow is the first day of Passover – (I am going to temple, you have your own prayerbook and will find your way to God even without temple."⁹⁰ Yet the most remarkable letter, perhaps the one cited by Bergman, was dispatched to close relatives after Martin's baptism. Written by Therese, the missive reflects on her and Jacob's complicated place in the matrix of German Jewish life: how they lived and felt like Jews but were not considered as such by their coreligionists, how they experienced only love and kindness from Christian colleagues, who treated them as their own, how they themselves struggled with being caught between worlds, and how they empathized – if did not fully agree – with their son who wanted to secure an easier life for himself and his children rather than secure any professional gain.⁹¹ "We, who came in so much contact and intimate relationship with free-thinking and noble Christians," she penned, "we know how small the difference is between a free-thinking Christian and a free-thinking Jew." Before his death, Jacob not only declared Martin had never caused him any grief but did so in front of all his friends. She continued, "I believe that our Lord God does not care whether one calls himself a Jew or Christian if he is a good person. . . ." This distillation of the Jewish into ethics – current among reformers (or constructors) of modern Judaism – aligned with Jacob himself. As his posthumous editor recalled, "Through this commitment to the transcendent concept of God, Freudenthal remained a Jew, despite all breaking off from dogmatic Judaism, where Spinoza overcame Judaism through the Renaissance immanent conception of God (despite complete ignorance of the prophetic ethic)."⁹²

As regards his scholarship, Freudenthal mastered Greek as well as Spinoza, although most discussions now treat his work on philology and philosophy in splendid isolation.⁹³ This philologist and -osopher showed an early yet uncommon interest in ancient Graecophone Judaism, lamenting, in 1869, that "the theology of the Jewish Hellenists" still remained "a stepchild of modern Jewish scholarship."⁹⁴ Even a score of years later, once he himself had helped to raise the status of Hellenistic Judaism within the family of Jewish studies, Freudenthal continued to argue forcefully for its import. In his commemoration of a former teacher, who had also written on the subject, this lover of language and wisdom described the significance of the period not only for Judaism but also for the modern world: "The most interest-

1934. Jacob and Therese had two sons and three daughters.

90. Jacob Freudenthal to Berthold Freudenthal, 20 April 1894, in Margarete Sallis-Freudenthal, "Meine beiden 40 Jahre," Leo Baeck Institute Archives, ME 550, MM 66, 1975, 70, see further 55–72, 80–90; cf. idem, *Ich habe mein Land gefunden. Autobiographischer Rückblick* (Frankfurt: Knecht, 1977). Courtesy of the Leo Baeck Institute, New York. On Berthold's recollections, see n. 80 above.

91. Sallis-Freudenthal, "Meine beiden 40 Jahre," 88–90. Dated 30 April 1908, this particular letter came from Theresa, not long after Jacob had died.

92. Gebhardt, "Jacob Freudenthal," 205. Amid the antisemitism of the 1880s, Moritz Lazarus sought to enlist Freudenthal, among others, for a communal work on Jewish ethics: see Ingrid Belke, ed., *Moritz Lazarus und Heymann Steinthal. Die Begründer der Völkerpsychologie in ihren Briefen* (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1971), lxxiii–lxxiv, 164–65 n. 2.

93. For his bibliography, see Brann, *Geschichte des jüdisch-theologischen Seminars (Fraenkel'sche Stiftung) in Breslau*, 129–30; Baumgartner and Wendland, "Jacob Freudenthal"; and, with annotations, Wolfes, "Freudenthal, Ja[c]kob." On his teaching at both the seminary and the university, see Brann, *Geschichte des jüdisch-theologischen Seminars (Fraenkel'sche Stiftung) in Breslau*, xxvi–xxviii; the regular "Jahresbericht des jüdisch-theologischen Seminars 'Fränkel'scher Stiftung'," in the *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums*; and *Chronik der Königlichen Universität zu Breslau*, with further announcements in the *Mitteilungen der landwirtschaftlichen Institute der Königlichen Universität Breslau*.

94. Freudenthal, "Zur Geschichte der Anschauungen über die jüdisch-hellenistische Religionsphilosophie," 400.

ing, if also perhaps the darkest, period of world history is the time of that wonderful merging of the Occidental and Oriental spirit, from which our modern culture has evolved.”⁹⁵ Indeed, Freudenthal published substantial work on the subject, leading Solomon Schechter to hail him “the only Jewish student who has ever written anything on the Hellenistic literature which deserves the name of research.”⁹⁶ He continued to write on philosophy ancient and modern for his entire life: from Kant to Aristotle, from Xenophon to Elia del Medigo.

Through his labors in Hellenistic Judaism, Freudenthal discerned a Jewish author amidst a group of fragments written in Greek and attributed to one Eupolemus. He undertook the inquiry in his now foundational *Hellenistic Studies*, in a part entitled “Alexander Polyhistor and the Remains of the Judaeian and Samaritan Historical Works He Preserved.”⁹⁷ Now, Eupolemus was a Graecophone historian from the mid 2nd century BCE, and his preserved work, entitled *On the Kings of Judaea*, depicted the greatness of Moses, narrated the period from Moses to David and Solomon, including military campaigns, international relations, and construction of the temple, reproduced royal correspondence, described Jeremiah and the capture of Jerusalem by the Babylonians, and calculated the years from Adam to the Seleucid king Demetrius. Yet these fragments showed a complicated history. They, alongside a number of other Jewish sources, were collected by Alexander Polyhistor in his work *On the Jews*, from the 1st century BCE, which the Christian apologist Eusebius of Caesarea then incorporated into his own *Praeparatio evangelica* (Book 9), in the 4th century CE. Clement of Alexandria also preserved some fragments attributed to Eupolemus in *Stromata*, at the turn of the 3rd century. When writing on the author, Freudenthal also entered the fray of a seemingly hopeless debate that had already raged for well over eighteen centuries: whether Eupolemus was a pagan, a Jew, a Samaritan, a Jew in pagan’s clothing, a pagan collector of Jewish legends, or a pagan writer with Samaritan interpolations. Noting the impasse, he wrote, “If someone wanted to prove the fallibility and uncertainty of historical criticism through contradictions in which it only too often proceeds, the fragments of Eupolemus preserved by Alexander could deliver the most striking evidence; for hardly any greater contradictions are thinkable than those of the last eighteen hundred years concerning the author of these fragments.”⁹⁸ As Freudenthal observed, no other solution seemed possible: based on the arguments back and forth, Eupolemus could not have been a pagan, a Christian, a Samaritan, or a Jew. Yet he did propose a new one: through an intricate reconstruction, the critic contended Alexander Polyhistor had, in fact, combined two sets of fragments, one from a Samaritan, the other from a Jew.⁹⁹ Asking who was the “true” Eupolemus, he concluded it had been the Jew

95. Jacob Freudenthal, “Ueber die wissenschaftliche Thätigkeit Dr. M. Joels,” *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums. Ein unparteiisches Organ für alles jüdische Interesse* 54, no. 46 (1890): 589–92, at 589. He continued, in a passage well worth citing at length: “It is the time in which Greeks, Romans, Egyptians, Babylonians and Indians came into contact with one another [and] communicated their views, religions and philosophemes to each other; the time in which also Judaism stepped out of its rigid isolation, became enthusiastic for the grandeur of Greek art and literature and filled itself with Greek views; the time in which Christianity confronted Judaism and paganism all at once as a most tremendous spiritual power. The writings of Joel on Philo, a lecture on the attacks of paganism against Jews and Christians, and the looks into the history of religion lead us into this time of the connection of nations and the separation of faiths, of war and reconciliation, of religious, political, and social fermentation” (ibid.).

96. Solomon Schechter, “Moritz Steinschneider,” *Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society* 17 (1909): 226–31, at 226.

97. Jacob Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien*, Parts 1–2, *Alexander Polyhistor und die von ihm erhaltenen Reste jüdischer und samaritanischer Geschichtswerke* (Breslau: H. Skutsch, 1875), Part 3, *Der Platoniker Albinos und der falsche Alkinoos* (Berlin: S. Calvary & Co., 1879).

98. Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien*, Parts 1–2, 82–83.

99. The analysis of Pseudo-Eupolemus appears in ibid., 82–103, 207–08; on Eupolemus, in ibid., 105–30,

(Judaean), whom he further identified with a figure from the book of Maccabees, the ambassador of Judas Maccabeus to Rome.¹⁰⁰ The philosopher undertook a perspicacious reading of these ancient texts and proceeded to unfold his argumentation in a highly logical, deductive process of reasoning, which contrasted, to some extent, the performance of a thoroughly technical, philological demonstration in Bernays' analysis of Pseudo-Phocylides.

In view of this complex textual history, Freudenthal first isolated a Samaritan author behind a couple of fragments otherwise assigned to Eupolemus – a figure he then designated Pseudo-Eupolemus. The critic utilized a series of diagnostic features to establish this Samaritaness. First, he gained analytical purchase through the mention of Mount Gerizim. This sanctuary, more than anything else, ostensibly divided Judaeans and Samaritans, so he contended no Judaean would have called Gerizim “the mountain of the most high,” as attested in the text. Furthermore, he saw a certain syncretism in these fragments, which suggested a Samaritan bent insofar as this people had proved susceptible to such amalgamation: whether their affinity for things Babylonian or their propensity to identify with Phoenicians. Finally, Freudenthal drew parallels between Pseudo-Eupolemus and other supposed Hellenistic Samaritans, perceiving a number of subtle, crafty changes in these excerpts to the original biblical texts that served to advance this people's ideological claims, including the exaltation of Shechem, not Jerusalem, and a mixture of Greek mythology and Jewish history. In fact, he argued the “real” Eupolemus had written his own text against the Samaritans.¹⁰¹ Freudenthal ultimately painted an unappreciative portrait of Samaritan Hellenism:

Despite the small size and severely broken state, they [*sc.* the fragments of Pseudo-Eupolemus] confirm what we knew about the ideas of the peculiar people up to now from Jewish sources alone. They are monuments of a sad distortion of the Hebrew tradition. Where the Samaritan uses the Bible, he misunderstands or misinterprets it; where he cites legends of foreign peoples, he sets them against the Hebrew reports not in original consistency but blends the hostile elements in such a way that both appear corrupted or ruined.¹⁰²

Not only did sleights and distortions distinguish Pseudo-Eupolemus as an author, but they also characterized Samaritaness itself, which allowed them to serve as a diagnostic feature over against the Judaean: “But this [syncretism], like everything similar we found earlier with the Samaritan, corresponds entirely to the character of the people to which he belongs.”¹⁰³ In the end, Freudenthal did allow for different factions among the Samaritans, with some holding truer to monotheism, for example, but “they must have been more susceptible to pagan teachings than the Judaeans nonetheless.”¹⁰⁴ Ironically, this Jewish classicist cast an aspersion on the Samaritans that Scaliger and others had long hurled at Jews in general and the Hellenistic one in particular – for which Freudenthal himself denounced such interpreters: namely, mendacity and trickery.¹⁰⁵

208–09, 209–12, 212–15. For a modern edition, which engages Freudenthal's work, see Carl R. Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, vol. 1, *Historians* (SBL Texts and Translations 20, Pseudepigrapha Series 10; Chico: Scholars Press, 1983).

100. See 1 Maccabees 8:17–18; 2 Maccabees 4:11. As for terminology, Freudenthal juxtaposed ‘Samaritans’ and ‘Judaeans’ but did so inconsistently, as he also employed ‘Jews’ to signify the latter over against the former (cf., e.g., *ibid.*, 86, 87).

101. *Ibid.*, 101.

102. Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien*, Parts 1–2, 92.

103. *Ibid.*, 96.

104. *Ibid.*, 102.

105. Cf. *ibid.*, 194. Notably, Bernays stopped short of criticizing Scaliger in this regard: Grafton, “Jacob Bernays, Joseph Scaliger, and Others,” 32–34.

To define Eupolemus as a Jew, Freudenthal advanced a series of arguments, having separated the fragments and identified Pseudo-Eupolemus as a Samaritan. He began with the form of the text, in its linguistic execution. A simple knowledge of Hebrew – evinced by use of the biblical text in *Lashon Hakodesh* – indicated Jewishness for Freudenthal, especially when it impacted composition in the Greek.¹⁰⁶ Conversely, ineptness in Greek revealed the author as a Jew. He described the ancient writer as “one hardly in control of the Greek language, extremely poor in vocabulary and expressions, and probably aware of his poverty.”¹⁰⁷ According to Freudenthal, this alleged incompetence in Greek and competence in Hebrew proved distinctive of Hellenistic Judaism – all the more when the languages were blended. Eupolemus thus wrote in “the Greek of the Jewish Hellenists, starkly ridden with Hebraisms,” and, betraying a knowledge of the septuagintal translation, composed lines “in good biblical language,” which therefore disqualified him as a pagan author.¹⁰⁸ Based on this linguistic evaluation, Freudenthal proceeded to locate the provenance of his Jewish Hellenist. Having excluded Egypt and Syria on internal grounds, he argued, “Finally, also the style of the writing indicates that its author did not live under a purely Greek population but in a land whose mother tongue was a non-Greek idiom. From the second half of the second century, there was no other profane writing composed outside Palestine whose Greekness (*Gräcität*) showed so many weaknesses as that of Eupolemus.”¹⁰⁹ For the classicist and onetime Talmudist, a handle on Hebrew and a shaky grasp of Greek thus suggested Jewish authorship.

Even more than form, Freudenthal believed distinctive content indicated Jewishness in Eupolemus. First and foremost, this specific subject matter comprised a knowledge of the Tanakh. What made the author Jewish (and non-Samaritan) was his glorification of the temple in Jerusalem, his celebration of David and Solomon, his designation of Eli as high priest, description of Samuel, Elijah, and Jeremiah as prophets, and his depiction of Samaria as a dependency of Judah.¹¹⁰ Freudenthal also found familiarity with Chronicles and Kings (plus a preference for the former) as well as specific details in line with other biblical texts, such as the length of Moses’ prophesy and the lifespan of Joshua.¹¹¹ In fact, he discerned not only acquaintance with the Bible but also direct dependence on it, in Greek and Hebrew alike.¹¹² The very selection of biblical material suggested Jewishness for Freudenthal: “Much is retold from the Bible that a pagan author would have written and a pagan reader would have believed,” like an angel telling David where the altar of the temple should go.¹¹³ Second, this criterion of content encompassed Jewish tradition beyond the Bible. On one level, he saw some agree-

106. Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien*, Parts 1–2, 120, 122, 126, 127. He further argued that Eupolemus showed a blend of the Hebrew and Hellenic on various points, including chronological systems and etymology (cf. *ibid.*, 120).

107. *Ibid.*, 112, cf. 107, 109–10, 111. Freudenthal even contended, “All spiritual life proceeds from the language of a people. It is not simply the tool of thought but also its source” (*ibid.*, 195).

108. *Ibid.*, 83. This statement on the Jewish Hellenists appears in the section on Pseudo-Eupolemus, which broaches another issue: the relationship of Samaritans to Jewishness.

109. *Ibid.*, 126. He continued, “That, on the other hand, also the hellenistically educated in Palestine never learned the Greek language to the complete mastery of expression is confirmed by Josephus (end of the *Antiquities*), albeit with great exaggeration, by his own bumpy style, where Greek friends have not polished him, and by also the Palestinian authors writing two centuries after Eupolemus, whose clumsy way of writing – incorrect beyond all measure – we encounter in the New Testament” (*ibid.*).

110. *Ibid.*, 86–87.

111. *Ibid.*, 106, 108, 113.

112. *Ibid.*, 108–09, 119–20. He maintained the Samaritans had used the Septuagint as well: *ibid.*, 98–99.

113. *Ibid.*, 83.

ment with “Talmudic-Haggadic views,” especially for interpretative modalities.¹¹⁴ The Jewish classicist saw “Haggadic interpretation” in the harmonization efforts across biblical texts, as when Eupolemus depicted David as well as Solomon sourcing wood for the temple from Lebanon, described the wood for its walls as both cypress and cedar, and calculated the height of the pillars.¹¹⁵ On another, Freudenthal detected still older Jewish legends, as with the claim of Jews serving as teachers to the Greeks and the story of Jeremiah preventing extraction of the ark and tablets to Babylon.¹¹⁶ However, these arguments for Jewish knowledge required Freudenthal to explain both absence and error in this distinctive content, which he accomplished by attributing most of them not to the Jewish author but to the Greek transmitter. Eupolemus therefore must have originally included now lost material on the heroic period of the judges, which Alexander Polyhistor then suppressed, while one particularly heinous mistake – the naming of David’s high priest as Eli – must have come from Alexander instead of Eupolemus.¹¹⁷ Certain kinds of knowledge and interpretation were, for Freudenthal, diagnostically Jewish.

As he identified Eupolemus as a Jew, Freudenthal provided an appraisal of the Jewishness represented by the writing and the writer. He defended the author of ignorance and error when blame could shift onto the transmitter. Freudenthal observed a number of embellishments, even complete inventions, in Eupolemus: from freely rendering form and content alike from the biblical narrative to attributing much of Greek culture to Moses.¹¹⁸ Yet the critic softened these charges, claiming, in this case, that loose reproduction of earlier material had characterized historiography in the period and that the Greeks themselves had traced their origins to the East. He also argued contradictions in Eupolemus had, in fact, proceeded from the attempt to resolve contradictions in the biblical text or from still more ancient traditions, rather than unconsciousness or carelessness.¹¹⁹ Furthermore, the classicist contended such violations of historicist principles had often resulted from an ambition to make Jewish history impressive: “Indeed, Eupolemus invents, much unlike the honest Demetrius, the most unbelievable things to glorify the Jewish people, their progenitors, kings, and prophets.”¹²⁰ Despite such shortcomings, however, Freudenthal appreciated the bold exegesis of his ancient author, an exegesis marked by a willingness to compare biblical passages, to reinterpret the text, and to include foreign material, which contrasted the allegorical approach of later Hellenistic exegesis – what Freudenthal called a “sickness.”¹²¹ Nevertheless, he advanced a more basic claim on Jewishness: “A Jew can also be ignorant of Jewish things; many Jewish Hellenists in particular were extremely ignorant, and with better reason than [Humphrey] Hody cites against Eupolemus it could be demonstrated that Philo and Flavius Josephus were pa-

114. Ibid., 118.

115. Cf. *ibid.*, 108, 114. According to Freudenthal, Samaritans and Judaeans could both demonstrate knowledge of the Talmud, while the Talmudic and the Hellenistic literature also shared non-biblical traditions (cf., *ibid.*, 97–98, 115–16).

116. *Ibid.*, 116–17, 84.

117. *Ibid.*, 120–23.

118. Cf. *ibid.*, 107, 117.

119. *Ibid.*, 114, 116.

120. *Ibid.*, 84. For both points, i.e. the recounting of events pagans would not believe and the glorification of Jewish history, Freudenthal included examples from Pseudo-Eupolemus as well, to establish the non-pagan authorship of the text.

121. *Ibid.*, 123.

gans.”¹²² Specific knowledge allowed Freudenthal to determine the Jewishness of his Hellenistic writer but did not seem constitutive of Judaism itself.

Freudenthal endeavored to explain the kind of Jewishness represented by Eupolemus, as both text and author – an account that supported his greater analysis of Greek-speaking Judaism. He understood the Hellenistic Jews as caught between two worlds: geographically, religiously, culturally. On the one side, they faced opposition from fellow Jews:

The Jewish-Hellenistic literature was never considered a legitimate child of Judaism by the Palestinians. Developed from the merging of Greek spirit and Jewish faith, recorded in a foreign language – the language of the pagans, the idol-worshippers, the much-hated enemy of the nation – this body of literature became itself hated and rejected by an age for which explanation, interpretation, and application of the biblical word, not original research, was the highest task of being, which scorned the study of literature from foreign lands, indeed every work that followed a movement different from the dominant one.¹²³

Revealing his appreciation of Hellenistic Judaism, Freudenthal insisted Palestinian Judaism was neither an impenetrable sphere, uninfluenced by Jews of other stripes, nor the lone determiner of Jewishness.¹²⁴ Through Eupolemus, he contravened the common notion that “every Palestinian Hellenist must have been a traitor to his fatherland and every Palestinian patriot an enemy of Greek *Bildung*.”¹²⁵ On the other side, they faced opposition from the Greeks:

Now, if the Palestinian homeland had become foreign to the Hellenists, the foreign could not become a homeland for them. They lived among a hostile population. They stood over against a public that – poisoned by rhetorical prattle and an addiction to mockery and beguiled by superstition or unbelief – was unreligious in its highest echelons, credulous and uncultivated in the lower classes; that was in large part filled with prejudice against unfamiliar religion, with envy and hatred for its confessors, and [that] never regarded them, despite all official recognition, as fully entitled fellow citizens but rather as foreign interlopers. The Jewish Hellenists had to struggle against the mockery of the one and the attacks of the other; against the quiet yet all the more stubborn prejudice of the masses. And how difficult this struggle was made for them!¹²⁶

Freudenthal imagined an unwanted group of Jews: outnumbered, maligned, and under-equipped. In this context, writers like Eupolemus had to record the life of the Hebrew nation, expand on the biblical material, compare Jewish history with the pagan kind, and do so in appealing literary form.¹²⁷ They were compelled to write apologetics instead of proper history. Reading the reconstructed texts against this reconstructed background, Freudenthal offered a sympathetic portrait – if not explicit defense – of Hellenistic Judaism in general and Eupolemus in particular.¹²⁸

Contingency and resonance

122. Ibid., 85. While contemporary scholarship frequently treats Freudenthal as bedrock for the study of Hellenistic Judaism, he directed his arguments against earlier – especially French – authors, including Ernest Havet and Patrice Cruice as well as Jan Gerard Hulleman, Carel Gabriel Cobet, Lodewijk Caspar Valckenaer, Carolus Kuhlmeij, and Joseph Rauch (cf., e.g., *ibid.*, 174–81, 189).

123. Freudenthal, “Zur Geschichte der Anschauungen über die jüdisch-hellenistische Religionsphilosophie,” 401; cf. Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien*, Parts 1–2, 196.

124. Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien*, Parts 1–2, 118, 98.

125. Ibid., 130, cf. 128.

126. Ibid., 197.

127. Ibid., 105.

128. Cf. *ibid.*, 189–92, 198.

The Jacobs Bernays and Freudenthal overturned centuries of consensus when they discovered Jewish authors behind Greek texts from the Hellenistic period. Their task proved all the more formidable (and hence informative) given the intricate transmission history of these ancient texts: while Bernays detected later interpolations by Christians, Freudenthal discerned remarks from a Christian transmitter as well as a seam of two originally independent sources, one by a Samaritan. In doing so, they deployed a series of mostly implicit criteria to define Pseudo-Phocylides and Eupolemus as Jews. Knowledge of the Tanakh, familiarity with non-biblical Jewish tradition (as content, practice, and exegetical modality), acquaintance with Hebrew, and inadequate command of Greek constituted, for them, diagnostic features. Further indicators included a pride in Jewish nationality regardless of education and a criticism of Greek culture. Yet these markers of the distinctively Jewish not only carried heavy assumptions about the relative importance and prioritization of such qualities among the ancients but also resonated with shifts in the redefinition of Jewishness during the nineteenth century, especially on matters of distinctive knowledge, language, and practice.¹²⁹ After all, reform initiatives wrangled over permissibility on days of observance: whether playing music in the synagogue on the Sabbath, attending school on holidays, or opening hours of shops.¹³⁰ So, too, the regime of philhellenic *Bildung* entailed matters of knowing and speaking. Questions of Greek and Hebrew in antiquity often mapped onto discussions of modern German and Yiddish in modernity, with some Jews attempting to remove Yiddish culture in favor of a high German one, while many Christians added further incentive through unfavorable representations of Yiddish life and language.¹³¹ In this way, Judaism of antiquity as that of modernity were not only moving targets but also deeply entangled. Bernays and Freudenthal themselves inhabited a place that seemed to resonate with their own objects of study: being caught be-

129. As for idolatry, Bernays refused to allow any portrait or photograph be made of him (cf. Urbach, “The Breslau Years of Jacob Bernays and His Impact on Jewish Studies,” 17), which some scholars have interpreted through the prohibition on idolatry. However, Bernays thought himself ugly (Calder and Günther, “*Du, von dem ich Lebe,*” 235), and his own parents permitted such images (Bach, *Jacob Bernays*, Figure 1; cf. Ernst Simon, “Zur Vergegnung zwischen Deutschtum und Judentum,” *Neue Deutsche Hefte* [145] 22, no. 1 [1975]: 124–35). On the increased circulation – and controversy – of images of rabbis from the 18th century onward, see Richard I. Cohen, *Jewish Icons: Art and Society in Modern Europe* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 114–53; cf., on questions of idolatry, Jay R. Berkovitz, *The Shaping of Jewish Identity in Nineteenth-century France* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1989), 64, 187, 237.

130. See Michael A. Meyer, *Response to Modernity: A History of the Reform Movement in Judaism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), esp. 56–57, 160–63, 184; Andreas Gotzmann, *Jüdisches Recht im kulturellen Prozeß. Die Wahrnehmung der Halacha im Deutschland des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Schriftenreihe wissenschaftlicher Abhandlungen des Leo Baeck Instituts 55; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), esp. 139–46, 354–406; Simone Lässig, *Jüdische Wege ins Bürgertum. Kulturelles Kapital und sozialer Aufstieg im 19. Jahrhundert* (Bürgertum Neue Folge. Studien zur Zivilgesellschaft 1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), esp. 246–89.

131. For the force of German language in Jewish life, see Nancy Sinkoff, *Out of the Shtetl: Making Jews Modern in the Polish Borderlands* (Brown Judaic Studies 336; Hanover: Brown University Press, 2004), 168–202; Steven M. Lowenstein, “The Beginnings of Integration, 1780–1870,” in *Jewish Daily Life in Germany, 1618–1945*, ed. Marion A. Kaplan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 127; cf. also Paula E. Hyman, “The Social Contexts of Assimilation: Village Jews and City Jews in Alsace,” in *Assimilation and community: The Jews in nineteenth-century Europe*, ed. Jonathan Frankel and Steven J. Zipperstein (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 110–29. On Yiddish as other, see Jeffrey A. Grossman, *The Discourse on Yiddish in Germany: From the Enlightenment to the Second Empire* (Studies in German Literature, Linguistics, and Culture; Rochester: Camden House, 2000); on the life of Yiddish more broadly, see Jonathan Skolnik, *Jewish Pasts, German Fictions: History, Memory, and Minority Culture in Germany, 1824–1955* (Stanford Studies in Jewish History and Culture; Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2014); Kerstin von der Krone, “The Representation and Creation of Spaces through Print Media: Some Insights from the History of the Jewish Press,” in *Space and Spaciality in Modern German-Jewish History*, ed. Simone Lässig and Miriam Rürup (New German Historical Perspectives 8; New York: Berghahn Books, 2017), 125–39.

tween worlds Jewish and German, based in a reforming Breslau, obstructed by systemic discrimination, and affected by conversion in their families.

With a specific understanding of Jewishness, these two Jewish classicists evaluated the Hellenistic Judaism they had reconstructed, be it silence on sacrifice, Sabbath, and idolatry or even ignorance. Based on these judgements, interpreters have offered conflicting assessments of Bernays and Freudenthal, specifically their views on Greek-speaking Jews of antiquity. On the one hand, Niehoff casts Bernays and Freudenthal as parade examples of the same accepting integration of the Jewish and the Greek. She describes Bernays as “unaffected by both Christian and Orthodox agendas to the extent that he does not even justify the authentic Jewishness of Alexandrian Judaism” but rather argues “for the great fluidity of the boundaries between Judaism and Hellenism.”¹³² Freudenthal, for her, likewise “shows how the authors’ assimilation of foreign traditions was fully compatible with their Jewish identity and did not at all diminish their Jewish national pride.”¹³³ On the other hand, Anthony Grafton and Irene Zwiép discern a substantial contrast between them. In their telling, Bernays condemned Pseudo-Phocylides for concealing the very essence of that tradition which he hoped to preserve in seeking to reconcile the Jewish with the pagan, while Freudenthal attributed the foibles of Hellenistic Jews – their idiolect and historiographical faults – to their own difficult position, forced as they were to defend their culture against widespread hostility.¹³⁴ As this article has emphasized, however, the analysis of uses, verdicts, and controversies often gives the impression that Hellenistic Judaism was stable or objective – some ancient artifact lying passively for “reception” – when that essence and those foibles first required recovery from the past, one deeply shaped by scholars’ own environment and experience. Even further, Bernays and Freudenthal ultimately saw different undertakings in their sources: the universalization of ethics at the expense of Jewish national heritage in Pseudo-Phocylides and the universalization of Jewish significance at the cost of historical authenticity in Eupolemus. Although both ancient authors had hoped to universalize the Jewish – its practice, its teaching, its history – the classicists rendered discordant assessments of such ventures. For Freudenthal, Eupolemus was a bad historian. For Bernays, Pseudo-Phocylides was a bad Jew.

These two Jewish Hellenists identified Graecophone Jews of antiquity as Germanophone Judaism, especially, underwent reformulation as a religion in the nineteenth century. However, the criteria deployed and the verdicts delivered were not inevitable but historically contingent, embedded in concrete time and place. Not only did the diagnostic features they selected and the judgments they rendered illuminate the ancient world of Hellenistic Judaism, but they also elucidate the modern one of Bernays and Freudenthal themselves, including their own expectations and understandings of the (authentically) Jewish. Precisely because these scholars avoided normative statements, apologetic writings, and programmatic movements, their work proves all the more incisive. Indeed, the textures of their ancient texts contained the conditions of interpretative possibility to define the distinctively Jewish in other ways – ones not chosen by Bernays and Freudenthal but perhaps more defining (or seemingly

132. Niehoff, “Alexandrian Judaism in 19th Century *Wissenschaft des Judentums*,” 23. She continues, “For Bernays, being Jewish – both in Antiquity and modernity – does not necessarily imply segregation or opposition to the Gentile environment” (ibid., 24). Bernays would have likely disagreed with her description of him as “rather alienated from tradition,” which rightly characterizes Freudenthal, however.

133. Ibid., 24, concerning Eupolemus and Artapanus.

134. Grafton, “Jacob Bernays, Joseph Scaliger, and Others,” 32–33; Irene E. Zwiép, “‘Judenthum,’ ‘Griechentum’ and ‘Christentum’ as Parameters in Early Nineteenth-Century Jewish Political Thinking,” in Empsychoi Logoi – *Religious Innovations in Antiquity: Studies in Honour of Pieter Willem van der Horst*, ed. Alberdina Houtman, Albert de Jong, and Magda Misset-van de Weg (Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 73; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 3–17, at 15–16.

obvious) today. Eupolemus wrote of the temple and Jerusalem, a Jewish mother of a Phoenician architect, and Solomon's inheritance at age twelve, yet Freudenthal did not employ connection to ancestral land, matrilineal descent, or ritual events, like a bar mitzvah, as criteria to find his author a Jew. Likewise, Bernays established Pseudo-Phocylides as a Jew on the basis of tanakhic knowledge, Jewish tradition, and linguistic (in)competence. Reading his author against the biblical source text, he rebuked the Hellenistic Jew for omitting Sabbath and sacrifice and for remaining silent on idolatry. But he did not censure the absence of any statement on *kashrut*, although the base texts prohibited consumption of blood and regulated passover meals, which Bernays himself recognized.¹³⁵ Nor did Bernays condemn the absence of circumcision, even as Pseudo-Phocylides otherwise addressed purification of the body and one of his source texts employed a lexeme associated with foreskin or uncircumcision in agricultural law.¹³⁶ The markers of Jewishness that Bernays and Freudenthal did not select from the potentialities of their ancient texts – diet, heritage, circumcision – proved just as revealing, if not more, than what they did leverage to identify (and reprimand) their Greek-speaking Jewish writers.

The representations of Hellenistic Judaism by Jacob Bernays and Jacob Freudenthal therefore demonstrate the difficulty of defining Jewishness in the ancient world, especially in the matrix of great exchange among various languages, geographies, and cultures. They also offer a reminder on the historical contingency of selecting the criteria to do so – in the expectations held of the “authentically” Jewish and in the judgments rendered for Jews of the past. Even for Jewish classicists devoted to the subject, the relationship of the Hebraic and Hellenic, the Jew and the Gentile proved to be a troublesome affair. A century and a half after Freudenthal's statement on the fate of Jewish-Hellenistic literature, one may well ask whether Graecophone Judaism has yet to return to the core of the Jewish people, at least in historiography – and which other hyphenated-Jewish literatures may still remain in exile under foreign peoples.

Acknowledgements

For stimulating discussion that promoted this research, I am indebted to James Aitken, Anna Angelini, Marieke Dhont, Theodor Dunkelgrün, Simon Goldhill, and Rebecca Van Hove. My gratitude extends to the anonymous reviewers of this essay, who provided valuable suggestions. Earlier versions of this essay were presented at the multiply sponsored conference “Interpreting Rituals: Historiographical Perspectives and Pluralistic Contexts,” organized by Judith Frishman at the University of Leiden, and in the Seminar for Old Testament & Semitic Languages, convened by Sonja Ammann at the University of Basel. The project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No. 749628, undertaken at the University of Cambridge in 2017–2019, with further backing from the Research Foundation–Flanders (FWO). For supporting my work in an optimal setting, I am grateful to Nathan MacDonald, the Faculty of Divinity, and Queens' College.

135. Cf. Bernays, “Ueber das Phokylideische Gedicht,” 239–40, cf. 224.

136. Ibid., 228; cf. Leviticus 19:23.