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

Abstract

One of the prominent trends among Jewish scholars during the era of the Jewish Enlightenment was the aspiration to find and determine differences in meaning and use of Hebrew synonyms. This trend developed in parallel to German scholars' occupation with discriminating German synonyms, which was at its peak in that time, and in all probability was the main source of inspiration for the Jewish trend. This inspiration is clearly reflected in R. Solomon Pappenheim's dictionary of Hebrew synonyms *Yeriʿot Shelomo* (first volume published in Dyhernfurth, 1784), which shows some quite certain affinities to 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 Jewish Enlightenment in general, and Pappenheim's linguistic methodology in particular are, therefore, expressions of the German cultural influence on contemporary Jewish scholars.

1. Jewish Occupation with Discriminating Hebrew Synonymy.
2. Discriminating synonyms in Jewish writings during the Middle Ages and the Haskalah

Although the beginnings of the Jewish interest in discriminating between biblical synonyms is found already in the Talmud, and continues 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. Among the works known to us, there was only one exception: *Hotam Tokhnit*, a dictionary of Hebrew synonyms by the 13th century provençal scholar Abraham ben Isaac Bedersi.[[2]](#footnote-2) But this work remained quite obscure and had no substantial influence on later authors.

In light of this situation, the publication of *Gan Naʿul* in 1765 (in Amsterdam) by Naftali Herz (Hartwig) Wessely (1725-1805), one of the anscestors of the Jewish Enlightenment, the *Haskalah*, was a turning point. This work, followed by a second volume published in 1766, is devoted to a thorough discussion on the exact meanings and differences between synonyms in the semantic field of wisdom.[[3]](#footnote-3) In accordance with his belief that there are no real synonyms in Hebrew and close-meaning words are always to be distinguished,[[4]](#footnote-4) Wesseley intended that *Gan Naʿul* would be the first item in a series of publications under the name *Lebanon*, planned to contain discussions on various semantic fields. This intention has never come to fruition.

Wessely, who was not familiar with Bedersi's work, which was published only some 100 years later, underscored the innovation in his approach and expressed his expectations that later authors would follow his footsteps and expand on his initial observations.[[5]](#footnote-5) His wish, at least with regard to the mere principle of discriminating synonyms, was fulfilled by an intensive activity in this field during the following decades. Many publications, including a number of 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 on biblical synonyms. A main figure in this field was the Jewish Italian scholar Samuel David Luzzatto (Shadal; 1800-1865).[[8]](#footnote-8) This trend significantly influenced also the 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 discrimination of synonyms was a main underlying principle.[[10]](#footnote-10)

The fact that this activity began and became a trend during the last third of the 18th century, and was usually connected, during its first stages, to the circles of the *Haskalah* in the German-speaking areas,[[11]](#footnote-11) is not coincidental. It seems to be beyond a reasonable doubt, that the *Synonymenlexikografie*, an important branch in the German linguistics that was at his 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, discriminating Hebrew synonyms, and their Parallels in German Scholarship.

It is well known that in many aspects, the common worldviews of the *Haskalah*, which motivated their social, scientific, and cultural activities, reflect the general European Enlightenment's worldviews. 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 towards the Hebrew language.

The contemporary questions of language, its forms and use, were the subject for numerous scholarly discussions during the Age of Enlightenment, especially in the German-speaking areas. The linguistic ideology prevailed in these areas demanded cultivating a unified German type, the High-German, which should be used only in its "good" or "correct" form.[[14]](#footnote-14) Similarly,[[15]](#footnote-15) Jewish scholars began calling for the use of Hebrew and mastering its vocabulary and grammar among the Jewish public during the 18th century,[[16]](#footnote-16) generating a powerful continuous linguistic and cultural activity aimed to the enhancement of Hebrew vocabulary, qualifying it for all practical and literary purposes of modern life.[[17]](#footnote-17)

As part of their efforts to elaborate the High-German and standardize it as an elite language, German scholars underscored the importance of language richness, while paying a great attention to correctness and accuracy in use of German.[[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 beginning of the German activity[[20]](#footnote-20) in this field is marked with two publications in the early 30's of the 18th century 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 anonymus 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) which discriminating synonyms was one of its main purposes.[[23]](#footnote-23) The next stage was the publication of comprehensive and systematic lexicons of synonyms, by Samuel Johann Ernst Stosch (1714-1796) in 3 volumes (1770-1773),[[24]](#footnote-24) and Johann August Eberhard (1739-1809) in 6 volumes(1795-1802)[[25]](#footnote-25).[[26]](#footnote-26)

In parallel to the German linguistic situation and the discussions around it, the problems of the appropriate and desirable form and use of the Hebrew language played a central role in the Maskilic linguistic consciousness.[[27]](#footnote-27) Nevertheless, the discussions on the Hebrew synonyms focused on biblical synonyms and remained, on the explicit level, in the scope of biblical commentary, without any explicit statements regarding their application in practical use. Yet, it was already assumed that these discussions were aimed not only for biblical studies, but also to serve as a tool for expanding the use of Hebrew and elaborating its manners of expression.[[28]](#footnote-28) The parallelism to the German activity in this field and its aims corroborates this assumption. But even if rejected, there is no doubt that the development of Hebrew synonyms research in parallel to the German interest in this matter is not a coincidence. Even if one postulates that all Hebrew synonyms discussions were held for a pure commentary or linguistic aim, the inspiration that at least the first Hebrew works in this field drew from their German environment is not to be denied.

The influence of the German synonyms literature on Jewish scholars was not limited only to general inspiration; it is evident also in technical and methodological aspects. The second part of this essay deals with such kind of aspects in one of the earliest in this period, nonetheless one the most extensive and systematic Jewish works on synonyms – 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 the first volume of *Yeriʿot Shelomo* in Dyhernfurth, 1784. The third part was published in Dyhernfurth, 1811, preceding the second part, which was published only after Pappenheim passed away (Röderlheim, 1831).[[30]](#footnote-30) The fourth part remained unprinted.[[31]](#footnote-31)

This is an innovative work, both in respect of its nature as well as in its linguistic approach. It somewhat resembles Wesseley's *Gan Naʿul*, to which Pappenheim refers in his introduction (without explicitly mentioning the author's name nor 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 meaning of each word and define the differences between them.[[34]](#footnote-34) Pappenheim's explanations are based to a large extent on an original etymological-semantic approach (see below), according to 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 innovativeness and originality, a few structural features in *Yeriʿot Shelomo* were modeled by the above-mentioned Stosch's synonyms lexicon, and some aspects in its linguistic approach were probably inspired by some principles of the German linguistics of his time.[[36]](#footnote-36)

One aspect in which the affinity between *Yeriʿot Shelomo* and Stosch's work 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. For example, the first entries in *Versuch* are: "Gelingen. Glücken."; "Glücklich. Glückfelig."; "Nachnahmen. Nachthum. Nachmachen." And in *Yeriʿot Shelomo*: "ראשונה, תחלה"; "קץ, סוף, תכלית"; "זמן, עת, מועד". Another feature common to both works is the structure of interpretation: in part of the entries in *Versuch,* and most entries in *Yeriʿot Shelomo*, the interpretation begins with the basic meaning common in all synonyms under discussion,[[37]](#footnote-37) and then turns to deal with the unique meaning of each word and the difference between this specific word and its synonym(s).[[38]](#footnote-38)

Another common denominator between Stosch's *Versuch* and *Yeriʿot Shelomo* is the order of the lexical entries which, unlike the common practice which had already been well established in contemporary lexicons, is not alphabetical. In *Versuch*, the entries are probably arbitrarily ordered.[[39]](#footnote-39) *Yeriʿot Shelomo* is different in this respect, in which Pappenheim implemented an original division based on semantic classification: every volume deals with a certain semantic field,[[40]](#footnote-40) and divided into chapters (every chapter is called *Ḥoveret*, 'set of woven fabrics'),[[41]](#footnote-41) each one dedicated to a more specific semantic subdivision. Each chapter contains the entries (called *Yeriʿah*, 'woven fabric'[[42]](#footnote-42)), which are mostly[[43]](#footnote-43) not ordered according to any clear principle, here again with resemblance to *Versuch*. In both works, for the sake of user's convenience, an alphabetical register to all the headwords is included.[[44]](#footnote-44)

However, in comparison between these works, two main differences are to be indicated. While *Versuch* is aimed for the practical use of German, and all the words it discusses and the attached examples are from contemporary German, *Yeriʿot Shelomo* (as all works on Hebrew language at these times) deals only with the Hebrew of ancient sources, especially the Bible. Needless to say that this difference is entailed by the situation of Hebrew at this time, which was not a spoken language and its use was vey limited.

Another difference lays in these work's focus of interest. *Versuch*, as expected from a work of its kind, concentrates on comparing between the synonyms under discussion and giving examples of each synonym, side by side, in order to elucidate the distinction between them. By contrast, and in spite of its formal purpose as stated in its title, differentiation of synonyms in *Yeriʿot Shelomo* seems to get sometimes relatively marginal attention. Its entries begin with a definition of the meanings of the words in question and the differences between them, and then, in most cases, as already mentioned above, it switches to deep semantic-philosophic studies of each word's meaning and wide etymological discussions that contribute to the distinction between the synonyms, but always stretches far beyond that, showing connections between the words under discussion and many other words (see below). In this respect, *Yeriʿot Shelomo* clearly differs from *Versuch*, which is focused on the distinction between synonyms, and pays only a little attention to etymology.[[45]](#footnote-45) *Versuch*, therefore, was not a source for Pappenheim's semantic-etymological theory, but it is still probable to assume that Pappenheim's approach was inspired by German linguistic notions, as presented in what follows.

1. Pappenheim's etymological-semantic approach.

In his introduction to *Yeriʿot Shelomo*,[[46]](#footnote-46) Pappenheim criticizes the Hebrew grammarians' common approach, according to which the basic Hebrew morpheme is the triliteral root. He argues that this an unproven assumption, which is not based on any reliable tradition[[47]](#footnote-47) and causes difficulties in grammatical analysis and commentary of biblical words.[[48]](#footnote-48) By contrast, he claims, there are many biliteral and even monoliteral roots.[[49]](#footnote-49)

Nevertheless, Pappenheim did not introduce a clear alternative morphological theory, as his discussions focus on the etymological-semantic aspects of the Hebrew roots, expressing briefly some morphological reflections only in few incidental comments.[[50]](#footnote-50) Thus, the significance of his innovative שורש "root" notion lays mainly in the field of (logical, non-historical) etymology and semantics. This term 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) Pappenheim maintains that this derivation 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 which differs from the others' meanings.

Let us now look into one of Pappenheim's etymological discussions.[[56]](#footnote-56) In his description of nouns denoting the notion of swiftness, he claims that the word מַהֵר "fast" is derived from the root מר, which its basic meaning is תמורה "exchange", which means ביטול דבר והיכנס דבר שני במקומו "taking something off and putting another thing instead". The connection to מהר, as Pappenheim sees it, is that occurrence of swiftness always involves something that is cancelled or ceases to exist, and another thing that takes its place.[[57]](#footnote-57) Another meaning of this root is מַר "bitter", that is connected to the same concept, since 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 "drop" (Isaiah 40:15), which Pappenheim interprets as a drop that comes after a previous drop, since "the first drop is pushed, and the second comes instead". And this is the root of הַמְרָאָה "disobedience", because disobeyer "leaves a (obliged) matter and does the opposite". Another meaning of the sequence מ-ה-ר - מֹהַר "bride price" is also connected, as it relates to money paid in exchange for the loss of the bride's hymen. Another word derived from this root is נָמֵר "leopard", with נ' added before the root, which is also connected to the concept of exchange, since this animal seems as changing its shades of colors in the sunlight while moving. Similarly, תמר "date (fruit)", is also derived from מר, as it also changes its colors. Another word connected to here is מוֹרָה "razor" (Judges 13:5), that cuts off the hair, enabling new hair to grow, based thus on the idea of exchange. Pappenheim even connects this root the common verb אמר "say", explaining that the act of talking essentially changes the talker's status, from the status of silence to the status of talking.[[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.

Pappenheim, therefore, postulates a basic derivation mechanism which is responsible for creation of most of the Hebrew words. This is a modular mechanism, in which there is a minimal, biliteral or monoliteral base, which can serve as an independent word, or to which certain tiny components might be joined, forming another word.[[60]](#footnote-60) The minimal base always bares a basic meaning, to which all meanings of all its derivatives are connected.

Another derivation mechanism introduced by Pappenheim, though only rarely mentioned in his semantic discussions, is compounding of two (or more) roots.[[61]](#footnote-61) For example, בֶּגֶד 'garment' is a compound of בא 'come' and גד, which its basic meaning is אֶגֶד 'bundle', the composition means 'to come into a bundle (of clothes)'. Another example: the verb חָשַׂךְ, according to Pappenheim, means 'refrain from a bad thing', and it is composed of two roots that give this meaning: חש 'hurry' and שך 'cover, shelter'.[[62]](#footnote-62)

It appears that Pappenheim's theory parallels 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 17th and 18th centuries.[[64]](#footnote-64) This theory points out the prominent characteristic of the German word formation, according to which compounding of two or more elements is the main manner of words' derivation.[[65]](#footnote-65) As one would immediately notice even in a simple browsing in every German dictionary, most of German derived words are composed of an existing lexeme, to which affix(es) or other word(s) are joined. For example, the noun *Arbeit* 'work, labor' and the verb *arbeiten* 'to work, labor' are the base for many derived words, with affixes: *aufarbeiten* 'to rehabilitate', *ausarbeiten* 'to work out, elaborte', *bearbeiten* 'to edit, handle, treat', *mitarbeiten* 'to collaborate', *verarbeiten* 'to use, to process', *Arbeiter* 'worker', *arbeitslos* 'unemployed', *Arbeitsam* 'industrious' etc. And with joining words: *Arbeitgeber* 'employer', *Arbeitskraft* 'capacity of work', *Arbeitsanzug* 'overall', *Arbeitseinstellung* 'cessation of work, strike', *Arbeitsfeld* 'field of work, sphere of action' etc.

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

This theory was developed by a few scholars in the middle of the 17th century.[[67]](#footnote-67) It had a great impact on later lexicographers until the late 18th century, and its imprints can be trailed in German lexical works even into the 19th century.[[68]](#footnote-68)

The similarity between Pappenheim's derivational mechanism and the *Stammwörter* principle is striking.[[69]](#footnote-69) In both theories, there is a basic element – the root (שורש, *Stamm*), which forms its own independent word, and which might form many other words by joining minimal elements (single letters in Pappenheim's theory, particles or affixes in the German theory) or by compounding it with other root. In both theories this is the main derivational mechanism in which most of the language's vocabulary was formed.

Indeed, there is also at least one clear difference regarding the implementation of the theories: the German scholars, although being aware to semantic connections between the root word and its derivatives,[[70]](#footnote-70) usually did not find it necessary to discuss it at length, while most of Pappenheim's efforts in *Yeriʿot Shelomo* are devoted to this aspect. The reason behind this difference is obvious: while these semantic connections are usually very clear in German, one thus would not need a great effort to figure them out, in Hebrew, 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 18th century German linguists, including Gottsched[[71]](#footnote-71) and Stosch,[[72]](#footnote-72) here again, it is logical to assume that this resemblance is not a coincidence. Pappenheim, in all probability, drew inspiration to his theory from German linguistic writings with which he was familiar.

1. Conclusion.

The era of the Jewish Enlightenment, beginning in late 18th in Europe, is known for its radical processes of change in Jewish society, culture and general worldviews, which were influenced and inspired by the surrounding Christian environment, especially the German society. An important expression of these processes is the development of sciences studies in the Jewish society, including the study of Hebrew language, which played also a central role in the Maskilic endeavors to create a new social agenda.

One branch of the Hebrew studies in this period, which so far has received only minor intention in modern research, is the study of Hebrew synonyms, aimed to find distinctions between different words which appear to have the same meaning. The intensive activity in this field held by contemporary Jewish scholars was, in all probability, inspired by the significant parallel activity of 18th century 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 quite clear affinities to the contemporary main German work on synonyms - Samuel Johann Ernst Stosch's *Versuch in richtiger Bestimmung einiger gleichbedeutender Wörter der deutschen Sprache*, hinting that Stosch's work served as a model for Pappenheim. It also seems plausible that the original etymological-semantic approach developed by Pappenheim and realized in all his semantic discussions in *Yeriʿot Shelomo* was inspired by the *Stammwörter* theory, which was a main etymological theory in 18th century German linguistics.

The study of Hebrew synonyms during the Jewish Enlightenment is, therefore, another expression of the German cultural influence on contemporary Jewish scholars. This comprehension adds another detail to the wide picture of this era, which modern research aspires to draw.

1. Shadal; Shalom Spiegel, "Midrash ha-Nirdafim be-Sifrutenu", Lešonenu ? (1935), pp. 20-22. Kahan's discussion on Joseph ibn Kaspi's methodology in this matter provides a good example for medieval occupation with discriminating synonyms (Moshe Kahan, "An Examination of Synonyms in Kaspi's Dictionary – *Šaršoṯ Kesef*", *Hebrew Linguistics* 69 (2015): 87-105 [Hebrew]). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Judith Olszowy-Schlanger, "The Science of Language among Medieval Jews", , p. 408. There were a few other medieval Jewish works on synonyms, but their main purpose was to introduce a collection of synonyms in order to serve as a stylistic tool for Hebrew writers, mostly without discriminating between their meanings. See F. Mühlau, "Geschichte der hebräischen Synonymik: ein literaturhistorischer Versuch", *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 17 (1863): 320-321; Gabriel Pollak, "Hakdamah", printed in *Sefer* *Hotam Tokhnit* (Amsterdam: Israel Levissohn), 1865, pp. 2-3; Spiegel, "Midrash", p. 12. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. See details in Mühlau, "Synonymik", p. 321-323; Binyamin Shmueli, "Šitato ha-Lešonit šel Naptali Herz Vizel", *Lešonenu* ? (1946), pp. 13-18; Yosef Yizḥaki, "Deʿotehem šel Sofre ha-Haskalah ʿal ha-Lashon ha-ʿIvrit ve-Darkhehem be-Harḥavatah ve-ḥiddušah", *Lešonenu* 38 (1971), p. 51; Andrea Schatz, *Sprache in der Zerstreuung: Die Säkularisierung des Hebräischen im 18. Jahrhundert*, Göttingen 2009, pp. 234-235. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Shadal noted that another 18th century scholar - Ruben Griesshaber (שם לועזי) – preceded Wesseley in expressing this stance (See ʿAnaf ʿEtz ʾAbot, p. 41a). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. *Gan Naʿul*, pp. 4b…. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Mühlau, "Synonymik", pp. 323-324; Spiegel, "Midrash", p. 26. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Yizḥaki, "ha-Haskalah", pp. 51-52; Isaac Barzilay, "From Purism to Expanionism: A Chapter in the Early History of Modern Hebrew", *The Journal of the Ancient Near East Society* 11 (1979), p. 14; Moshe Pelli, *The Circle of Ha'measef Writers at the Dawn of Haskalah* [in Hebrew]. Bnei-Brak: Hakibbutz Hameuchad, p. 193. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Spiegel, "Midrash"', pp. 28-34; Yizḥaki, "ha-Haskalah", p. 52. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Spiegel, "Midrash", p. 25. Encyclopedia Judaica, Gra [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Rivka Shemesh, 2012. Eshloki [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Wessely, Pappenheim and the publishers of *Hameʾassef*  all lived in German territories. See below for more details on Pappenheim. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. As explained, assuming a German influence here seems to be much reasonable. However, discriminating synonyms was also a prominent trend in other central and western Europe territories (see Franz Josef Hausmann, "The Dictionary of Synonyms: Discriminating Synonymy", in *Wöterbücher, Dictionaries, Dictonnaires: ein internationales Handbuch zur Lexikographie*, ed. Franz Josef Hausmann et al., vol. II [Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1991], 1068) which also could have had some impact on the Jewish activity. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. פיינר; for an example of adoption of contemporary European modes and patterns in the field of Hebrew literature in this period, see Moshe Pelli, "בחיפוש אחר הז'אנר: הז'אנרים הסיפרותיים בראשיתה של ההשכלה העברית בגרמניה", *AJS Review* 22, no. 2 (1997): 18-25. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Yaakov Shavit, "A Duty too Heavy to Bear: Hebrew in the Berlin Haskalah, 1783-1819: Between Classic, Modern and Romantic", , pp. 116-118; Schatz, *Sprache*, 214. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Shmuel Werses, "Interlingual Tensions in the Maskilic Periodical *Hameʾasef* and Its Time in Germany" (Hebrew), *Dappim: Research in Literature* 11 (1997-1998): 57-61. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Werses, "Interlingual Tensions," 58-59. (ברזילי, יצחקי, רבין) [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Peter von Polenz, *Deutsche Sprachgeschichte vom Spätmittelalter bis zum Gegenwart* (Berlin and New York 1994), 2: 198-199. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Peter Kühn and Ulrich Püschel, "Die deutsche Lexikographie vom 17. Jahrhundert bis zu den Brüdern Grimm ausschliesslich", in: Franz Joseph Hausmann et al. (eds), *Wörterbücher: ein internationales Handbuch zur Lexikographie*, Berlin and New York 1990, vol. 2, p. 2058; Ulrich Püschel, "Die deutsche Synonymendiskussion im 18. Jahrnhundert", in: Werner Hüllen (ed.), *The World in a list of Words*, Tübingen 1994, pp. 256-257; Marion Hahn, *Die Synonymen-Lexikografie vom 16. Bis zum 20. Jahrhundert* (Heidelberg, 2002), pp. 82-85; Polenz, *Deutsche Sprachgeschichte*, p. 206. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. For a short survey of discriminating synonyms in the classical era and early-modern Europe see Hausmann, "Discriminating Synonymy," 1067-1068. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. Püschel, "Synonymendiskussion," 258. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. See idem. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. Idem; idem, "Von mehrdeutigen und gleichgültigen Wörtern: Gottscheds Beitrag zur einsprachigen Lexikographie", *Germanistische Linguistik* 5 (1978), pp. 287-292, 308-313; Hahn, *Synonymen-Lexikografie,* pp. 86-101. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. *Versuch in richtiger Bestimmung einiger gleichbedeutender Wörter der deutschen Sprache* (Frankfurt). [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. *Kritische Anmerkungen über die gleichbedeutenden Wörter der Deutschen Sprache* (Frankfurt). [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. Hausmann, "Discriminating Synonymy," 1068; Kühn and Püschel, "deutsche Lexikographie", pp. 2058-2059; For a detailed description of Stosch's and Eberhard's works see Hahn, *Synonymen-Lexikografie*, p. 101 ff. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. Yizḥaki, "ha-Haskalah", p. 51; Barzilay, "Expanionism", pp. 6,14; Schatz, *Sprache*, p. 235. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. For some biographical information and references see Isidore Sinder and Meyer Kayserling, "Pappenheim, Solomon", in Jewish Encyclopedia, vol. 9, p. 512; Salomon Pappenheim, *Sefer Ḥešek Shelomo*, ed. Moshe Zuriʾel, Sha'alvim 2018, pp. 3-7. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. The whole work was republished in one volume by Moshe Zuriʾel (Jerusalem 2018). On the reason that the second volume was published after the third see ibid., p. 7. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. A few pages of this part were published in Pappenheim, *Ḥešek*, pp. 573-580. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. P. 13. All references here are to the 2018 edition. Pappenheim also acknowledged that this book has strengthened his motivation to deal with the matter of synonyms. See also Spiegel, "Midrash", p. 27; H. Eshkoli, *Synonymy in Biblical Hebrew According to the Method of Malbim*, unpublished dissertation thesis, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat Gan 2009 (in Hebrew), p. 52. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. While Wessely presented an extremely detailed discussion in 2 volumes dedicated to one semantic field, paying attention to every relevant biblical occurrence, Pappenheim's discussions are still comprehensive, yet focusing mainly on etymological foundations of the words under discussion, enabling him to deal with various groups of synonyms. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. Many discussions of this kind are also found in his dictionary *Ḥešek Šlomo*. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
35. For example, his first discussion (*Yeriʿot* , p. 45 ff.) is about two words indicating beginning: ראשונה, תחילה. For the word ראשונה he explains its connection to ראש 'head', רָש'poor', ירש'inherit', רִשְיוֹן 'permission', רשם'inscribe', אֲרֶשֶת 'speak' (?), תִּירוֹשׁ 'fresh wine', and רֶשֶׁת 'net'. See discussion below. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
36. An influence of Christian scholars of his time is evident also in his philosophical approach in *Yeriʿot Shelomo*. See Harry Austryn Wolfson, "Solomon Pappenheim on Time and Space and His Relation to Locke and Kant", in Jewish Studies in Memory of Israel Abrahams (New York: Press of The Jewish Institute of Religion): 426-440. [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
37. Pappenheim addressed this principle in his introduction, *Yeriʿot*, pp. 38-39. [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
38. On this feature in *Versuch*, see Hahn, *Synonymen-Lexikografie,* pp.109-111. In Stosch's terminology, the common meaning is called *Hauptbegriff*, and the specific meaning of each word is *Nebenbegriff*. [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
39. Hahn, *Synonymen-Lexikografie*, p. 108. [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
40. For example, the first volume discusses nouns indicating time, place or motion. [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
41. In the first volume there are three chapter, each of them dedicated to one general subject: the first is about nouns of time, the second is about nouns of place, the third is about nouns of motion. [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
42. The terms *Ḥovetet* and *Yeriʿah* (on which the title of the work is based) are taken from the description of making the curtains of the Tabernacle (Ex. 26). [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
43. In some cases there is a natural order, as with the words of time, which their entries are ordered chronologically. [↑](#footnote-ref-43)
44. As there are more than one headword to each entry in a dictionary of synonyms, alphabetical arrangement of entries is indeed a problem, since regular alphabetical order is able to represent only one headword. For this reason, a register is essential. Another solution adopted by other dictionaries of synonyms (as, for example, the above-mentioned Eberhard's work) is to place all headwords in alphabetical order, with every headword under which its entry is not presented, rather under its synonym, the information given in its place is a reference to its entry. On another arrangement of contemporary dictionaries of synonyms see Hausmann, "Discriminating Synonymy," 1068. [↑](#footnote-ref-44)
45. On Stosch's etymological approach see Hahn, *Synonymen-Lexikografie,* pp. 113-114. [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
46. Pp. 14-15. He repeats this criticism and adds some aspects in his introduction to *Ḥešek Šlomo*, pp. 11-12. [↑](#footnote-ref-46)
47. לא קבלה הוא בידם מסיני "It is not a tradition they received from Sinai". [↑](#footnote-ref-47)
48. His main case in this respect is that this approach is forced to postulate the existence of many synonymous roots, as one basic meaning may appear in two or more similar triliteral forms. He maintains that since there is no logical ground for the "creator of the language" to set two roots for one meaning, this situation thus is unreasonable (His principled opposition to the concept of cognitive synonymity, i.e., synonyms with exactly the same meaning, is explained at length in *Yeriʿot*, pp. 8-11). But, according to Pappenheim, this difficulty is resolved when one assumes that synonymous separate triliteral roots are actually different appearances of the same biliteral root. For example, אול and יאל, are two triliteral roots meaning 'folly', but according to his analysis, this is one root – אל; another example: ישם and שמם, meaning 'devastation', actually stem from one root - .שמ In contrast to the common derivation apparatus drawn by Pappenheim (see below), it seems that in these examples, Pappenheim does not postulate any distinction in the meaning of the roots' variations. [↑](#footnote-ref-48)
49. Pappenheim's approach may remind the approach held by a few medieval scholars, as Menaḥem ben Saruk and Dunash ben Labrat, according to which the number of the Hebrew radicals is variable, between one to five, including many biliteral roots (see G. Goldenberg, "֫Al ha-Šokhen he-Ḥalak veha-Šoreš ha-֫Ivri", *Lešonenu* 44 (1980), pp. 285-288; I. Eldar, *Hebrew Language Study in Medieval Spain*, Jerusalem 2014, pp. 15-14). However, as a matter of fact, these are completely different approaches: while the medieval approach is based on morphological principle, the core of Pappenheim's approach is etymological. This distinction will be elucidated in another publication. [↑](#footnote-ref-49)
50. In the introduction of *Yeriʿot Shelomo* it even seems that he accepts some of the triliteral approach's principles regarding the analysis of weak roots (*Yeriʿot*, p. 31). However, in the introduction to *Ḥešek Šlomo* (p. 11) it seems that he changed his mind, with a harsh criticism expressed against the triliteral approach, in which he attacked the traditional classification of the Hebrew roots into root classes. [↑](#footnote-ref-50)
51. It seems that Pappenheim's use in this term evolved from the sense of "noun", while his use is in a wider and more abstract sense, comprising not only concrete nouns included in the Hebrew vocabulary, but also theoretical sequences of letters which do not represent a real noun, denoting only an abstract meaning which is fulfilled in various concrete forms. for example: יסף, *Yeriʿot*, p. 63; עות, *Yeriʿot*, p. 81. Both examples, named שֵם, are not concrete words, but rather theoretical morphemes from which concrete words are derived. [↑](#footnote-ref-51)
52. This term may also denote biliteral fundament, as in the case of חל (see *Yeriʿot*, pp. 51-57). The exact use of this term requires further research, which is not necessary for the purpose of this paper. The significant point is that Pappenheim never uses in his etymological discussions the term שורש with regard to the triliteral morpheme, his terminology therefore clearly differs from the common Hebrew linguistic terminology. To the best of my knowledge, the only exception is in his introduction to *Yeriʿot Shelomo* (p. 31), where he uses the term שורש in its common sense in order to clarify the difference between his approach and the common approach. [↑](#footnote-ref-52)
53. These are the consonants from which all Hebrew affixes are built. Pappenheim uses the mnemonic האמנתי"ו, a common mnemonic in Jewish Hebrew grammatical literature. [↑](#footnote-ref-53)
54. He differentiates between the letters in this respect: א, ה, ו, י may appear in all three potential locations, while מ, נ, ת may be added only before or after the radical components (*Yeriʿot*, p. 34). [↑](#footnote-ref-54)
55. Pappenheim presented this principle at length in his introduction (*Yeriʿot*, pp. 19-29). [↑](#footnote-ref-55)
56. *Yeriʿot*, pp. 111-113. [↑](#footnote-ref-56)
57. Pappenheim's intention may be understood that in a swift occurrence, there is always a sequence of short events, in which one event is rapidly cancelled and another event immediately comes instead. [↑](#footnote-ref-57)
58. *Yeriʿot*, p. 502. [↑](#footnote-ref-58)
59. And also includes many etymological-semantic discussions of *Yeriʿot Shelomo*'s style. [↑](#footnote-ref-59)
60. The term "word" I used above is not completely accurate, since the minimal base and its triliteral derivatives are not always actual words, but rather theoretical morphemes, from which actual words are built. As in the example presented above, מר meaning "exchange" is not a word, but rather a morpheme from which the word תמורה is derived. The same is מוֹרָה, which is derived from מרה(מר+ה) – a theoretical morpheme that does not exist in the actual language in this sense. However, it appears that Pappenheim has not attached an impotence to this distinction, usually paying attention only to the actual words, in many cases even without mentioning the "mediating" morpheme from which the actual word is derived (as in the aforementioned example: Pappenheim does not mention the morpheme מרה, but only the actual word derived from it – מוֹרָה). This is the reason for my wording above. [↑](#footnote-ref-60)
61. *Yeriʿot*, pp. 18,34. [↑](#footnote-ref-61)
62. The meanings of these two roots are given above according to *Ḥešek Šlomo*, pp. 233,357. Pappenheim did not explain the semantic connection between these roots and חָשַׂךְ. I can assume that he would explain that refraining from a bad thing requires that one hurries up to distance himself from the bad situation and take a shelter in order to defend himself from it. [↑](#footnote-ref-62)
63. This notion has been indicated also with the term *Wurzel* and Latin term *radix* in German linguistic literature. See Ernst Leser, "Fachwörter zur Deutschen Grammatik von Schottel bis Gottsched," *Zeitschrift für Deutsche Wortforschung* 15 (1914): 70-71; Helmut Henne, *Deutsche* *Wörterbücher des 17. Und 18. Jahrhunderts: Einführung und Bibliographie* (Hildesheim and New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 1975), 19. [↑](#footnote-ref-63)
64. Oskar Reichmann, "Geschichte lexikographischer Programme in Deutschland", in *Wöterbücher, Dictionaries, Dictonnaires: ein internationales Handbuch zur Lexikographie*, ed. Franz Josef Hausmann et al., vol. I (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1989), 231. [↑](#footnote-ref-64)
65. A humorous description of this characteristic was the main theme in the second chapter of Mark Twains' essay *The Awful German Language* (Hartford, Connecticut: 1880). [↑](#footnote-ref-65)
66. Henne, *Wörterbücher*, 19-20,27; Reichmann, "lexikographischer Programme," 232; Peter Kühn and Ulrich Püschel, "Die deutsche Lexikographie vom 17. Jahrhundert bis zu den Brüdern Grimm ausschlisslich", *Dictionaries,* II, 2052; Polenz, *Deutsche Sprachgeschichte*, 194-195. [↑](#footnote-ref-66)
67. Henne, *Wörterbücher*, 14-16; Reichmann, "lexikographischer Programme," 231. [↑](#footnote-ref-67)
68. Reichmann, ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-68)
69. Interestingly enough, Schatz (*Sprache*, 208) claims that Justus Georg Schottelius (1612-1676), one of the fathers of the *Stammwörter* theory, based his perception on the affinity that he saw between the Hebrew roots and the nature of the German root words. It is doubted, however, if this perception had any impact on Pappenheim. [↑](#footnote-ref-69)
70. See, for example, Schottelius' discussion in his sixth introductory essay to his magnum opus *Ausfürliche Arbeit von der teutschen HaubtSprache* (Braunschweig: Christoff Friedrich Zilligern, 1663), 113 ff. [↑](#footnote-ref-70)
71. Püschel, "Gottscheds Beitrag," 304. [↑](#footnote-ref-71)
72. Hahn, *Synonymen-Lexikografie,* 114. [↑](#footnote-ref-72)