Study of Hebrew Synonyms and Semantics during the Jewish Enlightenment and Its Sources of Inspiration

Abstract

One of the most prominent trends among Jewish scholars during the Haskalah (Jewish Enlightenment) era was the aspiration to find and determine differences in the meanings and uses of Hebrew synonyms. This trend developed parallel to German scholars’ occupation with **discriminating synonymy—**differentiating German synonyms—which had reached its apogee at that time and was most likely the main source of inspiration for the Jewish trend. This inspiration is clearly reflected in R. Solomon Pappenheim’s lexicon of Hebrew synonyms, *Yeriʿot Shelomo* (first volume published in Dyhernfurth, 1784), which shows several rather strong affinities with the main German dictionary of synonyms of its time, Johann Ernst Stosch’s *Versuch in richtiger Bestimmung einiger gleichbedeutender Wörter der deutschen Sprache* (Frankfurt, 1770–1773). Pappenheim’s familiarity with German linguistics is probably reflected also in his original theory of Hebrew roots, which underlies the etymological-semantic discussions in *Yeriʿot Shelomo.* The Jewish occupation with synonyms during the Haskalah era in general, and Pappenheim’s linguistic methodology in particular, are therefore manifestations of German cultural influence on contemporaneous Jewish scholars.

1. The Jewish Occupation with Discriminating among Hebrew Synonyms
2. Discriminating Synonymy in Jewish Writings during the Middle Ages and the Haskalah Era

Although the Jewish interest in differentiating biblical synonyms began as far back as the Talmud and continued in sporadic comments in biblical commentaries and other medieval writings,[[1]](#footnote-1) no systematic works devoted to this aim were authored during the Middle Ages, with only one exception known to us: *Hotam Tokhnit*, a dictionary of Hebrew synonyms compiled by the thirteenth-century Provençal scholar Abraham ben Isaac Bedersi.[[2]](#footnote-2) This work, however, remained quite obscure and had no substantial influence on later authors.

In view of this situation, the publication of *Gan Naʿul* (Amsterdam, 1765) by Naftali Herz (Hartwig) Wessely (1725–1805), a forebear of the Haskalah (the Jewish Enlightenment), marked a turning point. This work, followed by a second volume published in 1766, is devoted to a thorough discussion on the exact meanings of, and differences among, synonyms in the semantic field of wisdom.[[3]](#footnote-3) In accordance with his belief that Hebrew has no real synonyms and that words of proximate meaning must always be differentiated,[[4]](#footnote-4) Wessely intended *Gan Naʿul* to be the first in a series of publications under the name *Lebanon* that would offer discussions on various semantic fields. This intention never came to fruition.

Wessely, unfamiliar with Bedersi’s work (which was published only some 100 years later), underscored the novelty of his own approach and expressed his expectation that later authors would follow his footsteps and expand on his initial observations.[[5]](#footnote-5) His wish, at least with regard to the very principle of **discriminating synonymy**, was fulfilled by intensive activity in this field in ensuing decades. Many publications, including several monographs,[[6]](#footnote-6) of which the most prominent is Solomon Pappenheim’s *Yeriʿot Shelomo* (see below), and numerous essays, especially in the well-known Maskilic journal *Hameʾassef*,[[7]](#footnote-7) were dedicated to specific discussions of biblical synonyms. A central personality in this field was the Italian-Jewish scholar Samuel David Luzzatto (Shadal, 1800–1865).[[8]](#footnote-8) This trend also had a significant influence on biblical exegesis during that period, as the Vilna Gaon (1720–1797) incorporated discussions of this type in his commentaries,[[9]](#footnote-9) and, especially, in the influential enterprise of Rabbi Meir Leibush Wisser (Malbim, 1809–1879), in which **discriminating synonymy** was a main underlying principle.[[10]](#footnote-10)

It is no coincidence that this activity began and became a trend during the last third of the eighteenth century and was usually connected, in its first stages, with Haskalah circles in German-speaking areas.[[11]](#footnote-11) It seems beyond reasonable doubt that *Synonymenlexikografie*, an important branch of German linguistics that reached its peak at that time, was an influential factor and a source of inspiration for the Jewish scholars.[[12]](#footnote-12)

1. The Attitude of the Haskalah towards Hebrew, Differentiating Hebrew Synonyms, and Parallels to **Discriminating Synonymy** in German Scholarship

It is well known that the common worldviews of the Haskalah, those that motivated its proponents’ social, scientific, and cultural activities, reflected those of the general European Enlightenment in many respects. Essentially, the Haskalah, as reflected in its English appellation *Jewish Enlightenment*, is an integral part of the European Enlightenment, with some unique features entailed by the Jewish context.[[13]](#footnote-13) One aspect in which this connection is evident is the Maskilic attitude toward the Hebrew language.

Contemporaneous questions of language, its forms, and its use were the subjects of numerous scholarly discussions during the Age of Enlightenment, especially in the German-speaking areas. The linguistic ideology that prevailed in these regions demanded the cultivation of a unified German type, High German, that should be used only in its “good” or “correct” form.[[14]](#footnote-14) Similarly,[[15]](#footnote-15) it was during the eighteenth century that Jewish scholars began to urge the Jewish public to use Hebrew and master its vocabulary and grammar,[[16]](#footnote-16) generating powerful and continuous linguistic and cultural activity that aimed to enhance Hebrew vocabulary so that it would be suitable for all practical and literary purposes of modern life.[[17]](#footnote-17)

As part of their efforts to elaborate High German and standardize it as an elite language, German scholars underscored the importance of language richness while paying much attention to correctness and accuracy in its use.[[18]](#footnote-18) One of the tools through which they hoped to promote these purposes was differentiation and definition of German synonyms.[[19]](#footnote-19)

The onset of German activity[[20]](#footnote-20) in this field is marked by two publications in the early 1730s by the well-known linguist and critic Johann Christoph Gottsched (1700–1766). It was followed by detailed discussions in Johann Jacob Breitinger’s (1701–1766) *Fortsetzung der Critischen Dichtkunst* (Zürich, 1740),[[21]](#footnote-21) an anonymous essay published in 1742,[[22]](#footnote-22) and a lexicographical work published by Gottsched under the title *Beobachtungen über* den *Gebrauch und Misgebrauch vieler deutsche Wörter und Redensarten* (Leipzig, 1758) with discriminating synonymy as one of its main purposes.[[23]](#footnote-23) Next came the publication of comprehensive and systematic lexicons of synonyms by Samuel Johann Ernst Stosch (1714–1796) in three volumes (1770–1773)[[24]](#footnote-24) and Johann August Eberhard (1739–1809) in six volumes (1795–1802).[[25]](#footnote-25),[[26]](#footnote-26)

Parallel to the German linguistic situation and the discussions that surrounded it, problems of the appropriate and desirable form and use of the Hebrew language were central in the Maskilic linguistic consciousness.[[27]](#footnote-27) Nevertheless, discussions of Hebrew synonyms focused on biblical synonyms and remained, at the explicit level, within the scope of biblical commentary and yielded no explicit statements about their application in practical use. Yet it was already assumed that these discussions were meant not only to enrich biblical studies but also provide a tool for expanding the use of Hebrew and elaborating its manners of expression.[[28]](#footnote-28) The parallel with the German activity in this field and its aims corroborates this assumption. Even if it is rejected, however, the development of Hebrew synonym research in parallel with the German interest in this matter is definitely not coincidental. Even if one postulates that all Hebrew synonym discussions were held for purely exegetic or linguistic aims, the inspiration that at least the first Hebrew works in this field drew from their German environment is undeniable.

The influence of the German synonym literature on Jewish scholars was not limited to general inspiration; it is also evident in technical and methodological aspects. The second part of this essay deals with such aspects in one of the earliest but also one of the most extensive and systematic Jewish works on synonyms in this period, Pappenheim’s *Yeriʿot Shelomo*.

1. Solomon Pappenheim’s *Yeriʿot Shelomo* and Its German Sources of Inspiration
2. *Yeriʿot Shelomo* and Stosch’s *Versuch*.

Solomon Pappenheim (1740–1814)[[29]](#footnote-29) published Volume 1 of *Yeriʿot Shelomo* in Dyhernfurth, 1784. Volume 3 was published in Dyhernfurth in 1811, preceding Part 2, which appeared posthumously (Röderlheim, 1831).[[30]](#footnote-30) The fourth part remained unprinted.[[31]](#footnote-31)

*Yeriʿot Shelomo* is an innovative work in both its nature and its linguistic approach. It somewhat resembles Wessely’s *Gan Naʿul*, to which Pappenheim refers in his introduction (without explicitly mentioning either the author’s name or the title of his book),[[32]](#footnote-32) but its uniqueness is evident.[[33]](#footnote-33) The aim of this monograph, as stated in its subtitle, is to explain the exact meaning of Hebrew synonyms in order to illuminate the specific denotation of each word and define the differences between dyads of words.[[34]](#footnote-34) Pappenheim’s explanations are based largely on an original etymological-semantic approach (see below), in accordance with which he expands his discussions far beyond the synonyms in question, showing that many other words are connected to them.[[35]](#footnote-35)

Nevertheless, without detracting from its novelty and originality, several structural features in *Yeriʿot Shelomo* were modeled after Stosch’s aforementioned lexicon of synonyms andsome aspects of its linguistic approach were probably inspired by principles of contemporaneous German linguistics.[[36]](#footnote-36)

One aspect in which the affinity between *Yeriʿot Shelomo* and Stosch’s opus is reflected is the structure of the entries. In both works, a list of the synonyms in question serves as a title for each entry. The first entries in *Versuch,* for example, are *Gelingen, Glücken*; *Glücklich, Glückfelig*; *Nachnahmen, Nachthum,* *Nachmachen.* In *Yeriʿot Shelomo,* the first entries are ראשונה, תחלה; קץ, סוף, תכלית; זמן, עת, מועד. Another feature common to both works is the structure of interpretation: In some entries in *Versuch* and most entries in *Yeriʿot Shelomo*, the interpretation begins with the basic meaning shared by all synonyms under discussion[[37]](#footnote-37) and then turns to deal with the unique meaning of each word and the difference between it and its synonym(s).[[38]](#footnote-38)

Another commonality in Stosch’s *Versuch* and *Yeriʿot Shelomo* is the order of the lexical entries, which, unlike the common practice already well-established in contemporaneous lexicons, is not alphabetical. In *Versuch*, the entries are probably arbitrarily ordered.[[39]](#footnote-39) *Yeriʿot Shelomo* is different in this respect: Pappenheim divides his work in an original way, based on semantic classification: Every volume deals with a certain semantic field[[40]](#footnote-40) and is divided into chapters (each chapter is called a *Ḥoveret*, “a set of woven fabrics”),[[41]](#footnote-41) each dedicated to a more specific semantic subdivision. Each chapter contains the entries (each called a *Yeriʿah*, “a woven fabric”[[42]](#footnote-42)), most of which[[43]](#footnote-43) not ordered according to any clear principle—again in resemblance to *Versuch*. In both works, an alphabetical register to all the headwords is included for users’ convenience.[[44]](#footnote-44)

When these works are compared, however, two main differences should be indicated. While *Versuch* is aimed for the practical use of German and all the words it discusses and the attached examples come from contemporary German, *Yeriʿot Shelomo* (like all works relating to the Hebrew language at that time) deals only with the Hebrew of the ancient sources, especially the Bible. Needless to say, this difference is entailed by the situation of Hebrew at this time—a non-spoken language in very limited use.

Another difference is the focus of interest in these works. *Versuch*, as one would expect from a work of its kind, concentrates on comparing the synonyms under discussion and giving examples of each, side by side, in order to elucidate distinctions between them. In contrast, notwithstanding its formal purpose as stated in its title, *Yeriʿot Shelomo* sometimes seems to invest relatively marginal effort in telling synonyms apart. Its entries begin by defining the meanings of the words in question and the differences between them, and then, in most cases, as aforesaid, segues to deep semantic-philosophic studies of the meaning of each word and broad etymological discussions that help to differentiate the synonyms but always stretch far beyond, showing connections between the words under discussion and many other words (see below). In this respect, *Yeriʿot Shelomo* clearly differs from *Versuch*, which focuses on distinctions between synonyms and pays only a little attention to etymology.[[45]](#footnote-45) Accordingly, Stosch’s *Versuch* was not the source of Pappenheim’ssemantic-etymological theory. Still, it stands to reason that his approach was inspired by German linguistic notions, as presented below.

1. Pappenheim’s Etymological Semantic Approach

In his introduction to *Yeriʿot Shelomo*,[[46]](#footnote-46) Pappenheim criticizes the Hebrew grammarians’ common approach, in which the triliteral root is seen as the basic Hebrew morpheme. This, he claims, is an unproven assumption, not based on any reliable tradition,[[47]](#footnote-47) that causes difficulties in the grammatical analysis and interpretation of biblical words.[[48]](#footnote-48) Indeed, he continues, Hebrew offers many biliteral and even monoliteral roots.[[49]](#footnote-49)

Nevertheless, Pappenheim did not introduce a clear alternative morphological theory, his discussions focusing instead on the etymological-semantic aspects of Hebrew roots and offering brief morphological reflections in a few incidental comments only.[[50]](#footnote-50) Thus, the significance of his innovative שורש (“root”) notion belongs mainly to the fields of etymology and semantics, which he treated from a purely logical and non-etymological point of view and not from the historical perspective from which these disciplines would be regarded today. The term “root” denotes a theoretical biliteral (or, in some cases, monoliteral) fundament, from which many triliteral morphemes (which he usually introduces using the term שֵם [[51]](#footnote-51))[[52]](#footnote-52) are derived. The principle behind this derivation is that one of seven letters (א, ה, ו, י, מ, נ, ת) [[53]](#footnote-53) is added before, between, or after[[54]](#footnote-54) the two components of the biliteral root, forming a triliteral morpheme.[[55]](#footnote-55) This derivation, Pappenheim maintains, has semantic implications: The meaning of the “root” is always semantically connected to the meanings of its derivatives; yet each derivative has its own meaning that differs from those of the others.

Let us now listen in on one of Pappenheim’s etymological discussions.[[56]](#footnote-56) In his description of nouns that denote swiftness, he claims that מַהֵר, fast, is derived from the root מר, which has the underlying meaning of תמורה, exchange, which, in turn, means ביטול דבר והיכנס דבר שני במקומו “taking something off and putting on something else.” The connection with מהר, as Pappenheim sees it, is that the occurrence of swiftness always involves something that is cancelled or ceases to exist and something else that replaces it.[[57]](#footnote-57) Another meaning of this root, מַר, bitter, is connected to the same concept because bitterness “changes and cancels the regular sense of taste’s status” and puts it in “a new, different status.” This is also the root for מר, a drop (Isaiah 40:15), which Pappenheim interprets as a drop that comes after a previous drop because “the first drop is pushed, and the second comes instead.” This, too, is the root of הַמְרָאָה, disobedience, because a disobeyer “drops something [to which he is obliged] and does the opposite.” Another meaning of the sequence מ-ה-ר — מֹהַר, a bride-price—is also connected because it relates to money paid in exchange for the loss of the bride’s hymen. Yet another word derived from this root is נָמֵר , leopard, with נ’ added before the root. This also ties into the concept of exchange because the leopard seems to change the shades of its colors in the sunlight as it moves. Similarly, תמר, the date fruit, is derived from מר because the date also changes its colors. An additional product of this nexus is מוֹרָה, a razor (Judges 13:5); by cutting off the hair and enabling new hair to grow, it is based on the idea of exchange. Pappenheim even links this root to the common verb אמר, to say, explaining that the act of talking essentially changes the talker’s status from silent to articulate.[[58]](#footnote-58)

In this way, most of the Hebrew words are derived from non-triliteral roots. It is clearly reflected in Pappenheim’s dictionary, which, as stated in its title *Ḥešek Šlomo—Šorašim*, is aimed to collecting and interpreting the Hebrew roots,[[59]](#footnote-59) in which the vast majority of headwords are biliteral roots.

Therefore, Pappenheim postulates a basic mechanism of derivation that is responsible for the creation of most Hebrew words. In this modular mechanism, a minimal, bilateral, or monoliteral base may serve as a word in itself or accept the affixing of various tiny components to form another word.[[60]](#footnote-60) The minimal base always retains an underlying meaning, to which all meanings of all its derivatives are connected.

Another derivation mechanism that Pappenheim introduced, though only rarely mentioned in his semantic discussions, is the compounding of two (or more) roots.[[61]](#footnote-61) For example, בֶּגֶד, garment, is a compound of בא, come, and גד, which has the underlying meaning of אֶגֶד, a bundle. The coupling of the two means ‘to come into a bundle [of clothes].` In another example, the verb חָשַׂךְ, according to Pappenheim, means “refrain from something bad” and is composed of two roots that yield this meaning: חש, hurry, and שׂך, cover or shelter.[[62]](#footnote-62)

Pappenheim’s theory appears to parallel the basic concept behind the theory of *Stammwörter,* “root words,”[[63]](#footnote-63) which introduced one of the main principles in German lexicography during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.[[64]](#footnote-64) This theory illuminates the principal and most prominent characteristic of German word formation, the compounding of two or more elements to derive words.[[65]](#footnote-65) As one can notice immediately even by simply browsing in any German dictionary, most derived words in German are composed of an existing lexeme, to which affix(es) or other word(s) are joined. For example, the noun *Arbeit,* work or labor, and the verb *arbeiten,* to work or labor, underlie many words that are derived by the application of affixes: *aufarbeiten,* to rehabilitate; *ausarbeiten,* to work out or elaborate; *bearbeiten,* to edit, handle, or treat; *mitarbeiten,* to collaborate; *verarbeiten,* to use or to process; *Arbeiter,* worker; *arbeitslos,* unemployed; *Arbeitsam;* industrious, etc. By joining words, one obtains *Arbeitgeber,* employer; *Arbeitskraft,* the capacity of work; *Arbeitsanzug,* overall; *Arbeitseinstellung,* the cessation of work or a strike; *Arbeitsfeld,* a field of work or a sphere of action, etc.

According to the *Stammwörter* theory, the underlying word, like *Arbeit* in our example, was considered the root or base—the *Stamm*—of the derivation process. Espousers of this theory considered it an underlying characteristic of the German language, reflecting its purity and uniqueness and worthy of being a fundamental principle in every lexicographical work on German.[[66]](#footnote-66)

This theory, developed by several scholars in the middle of the seventeenth century,[[67]](#footnote-67) had a powerful impact on later lexicographers until the late eighteenth century; its imprints can be detected in German lexical works even into the nineteenth century.[[68]](#footnote-68)

The similarity between Pappenheim’s derivational mechanism and the *Stammwörter* principle is striking.[[69]](#footnote-69) In both theories, an underlying element—the root (שורש, *Stamm*) constitutes a word in its own right and may form many other words by allowing minimal elements (single letters in Pappenheim’s theory, particles or affixes in the German theory) to join or by compounding it with another root. In both theories, this is the main derivational mechanism in which most of the vocabulary of the language was formed.

Yet there is at least one clear difference regarding the implementation of the theories: The German scholars, although aware of semantic connections between the root word and its derivatives,[[70]](#footnote-70) rarely found it necessary to discuss the matter at length, whereas most of Pappenheim’s efforts in *Yeriʿot Shelomo* are devoted to this aspect. The reason for this difference is obvious. These semantic connections are usually very clear in German; accordingly, one would not need a great effort to figure them out. In Hebrew, however, according to Pappenheim’s theory, a very sophisticated and creative approach is required in order to show these connections.

As the *Stammwörter* principle is reflected in the writings of prominent eighteenth-century German linguists including Gottsched[[71]](#footnote-71) and Stosch,[[72]](#footnote-72) again it is logical to assume that this resemblance is not a coincidence. Pappenheim, in all probability, drew inspiration for his theory from German linguistic writings with which he was familiar.

1. Conclusion

The Jewish Enlightenment era, beginning in the late eighteenth century in Europe, is known for the radical processes of change that it animated in Jewish society, culture, and general worldviews, under the influence and the inspiration of the surrounding Christian environment, especially German society. An important expression of these processes is the development of science studies in Jewish society, including the study of Hebrew language, which was also central in the Maskilic endeavors to create a new social agenda.

One branch of Hebrew studies in this period, thus far given only minor attention in modern research, is the study of Hebrew synonyms in search of distinctions among different words that appear to have the same meaning. The intensive activity in this field among eighteenth-century Jewish scholars was, in all probability, inspired by significant parallel activity among German scholars on German synonyms.

One of the first Jewish works on synonyms, nonetheless the most comprehensive product of this Jewish trend, is Solomon Pappenheim’s *Yeriʿot Shelomo*. This work shows rather clear affinities with the most important contemporaneous German compendium—Samuel Johann Ernst Stosch’s *Versuch in richtiger Bestimmung einiger gleichbedeutender Wörter der deutschen Sprache—*hinting that Stosch’s work served Pappenheim as a model. It also seems plausible that the original etymological-semantic approach that Pappenheim developed and realized in all his semantic discussions in *Yeriʿot Shelomo* was inspired by the *Stammwörter* theory, a main etymological theory in eighteenth-century German linguistics.

Therefore, the study of Hebrew synonyms during the Jewish Enlightenment is another manifestation of German cultural influence on contemporaneous Jewish scholars. By understanding this, we add another detail to the wide picture of this era that modern research aspires to draw.
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