17. For the meaning of the term הָשִׁישׁ, the meaning attributed to it by Dunash ben Labrat, Menahem’s contemporaneous, and the disagreements about it in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, see Maman A., *Comparative Semitic Philology in the Middle Ages from Saadia Gaon to Ibn Baruq (10th-12th cent.).* Leiden, Brill 2004, pp.276-283.


19. Sometimes the man’s surname begins in the form of “ben” (i.e. son) and sometimes it begins with its Arabic counterpart, “ibn”, but in most cases a fixed form is used, either Hebrew or Arabic.

20. David Alfasi was also of this opinion.

21. Hayyuj, who lived following Menahem’s generation and worked in the same field as his, is regarded as the greatest Hebrew grammarian in the Middle Ages. He discovered the nature of trilliteracy of the Hebrew verb even for “weak” roots and composed two large books to prove his theory. Among other innovations, he also suggested a theoretical notion of sakín layyín, a soft unvocalized morphophonemic entity, in order to solve all kinds of morpho-phonological Hebrew problems. Hayyuj’s views are accepted up to date.

22. *Tosafot (Addenda)* refers to the comments made on Rashi’s commentary to the Babylonian Talmud, by his nephews, Rabbenu Y'�a'qov Tam and the Rashbam (twelfth century), followed by other French and Ashkenazi scholars up to the fourteenth century. In the famous Vilna edition of the Talmud, the Tosafot are printed in the external margins of the Talmudic text, opposite Rashi’s commentary, which is printed in the internal margins.


26. Geniza material refers to 250,000 fragments from ragged Hebrew books and documents which were piled for centuries in a special room in the Cairo Ezra synagogue and are now preserved in several libraries around the world.

27. *Masorah* is the philological apparatus and literature meant to keep the text of the Bible untouched. It is assumed that this kind of literature emerged soon after the canonization of each book of the Bible.

28. And see in Sáenz-Badillos’s article and the essays noted above.

---

**Review of B. Katz-Biletzky, Wörterbuch Deutsch-Hebräisch Philosopische, wissenschaftliche und technische Termini**

When I first started studying at university, an amusing adage in common usage was: “the most important Semitic language is German”. Scholars of Hebrew and Semitic languages, Biblical and Judaic studies, and indeed any of the scientific disciplines recognized that German had been the principal language of research from the nineteenth century onward. It is hardly surprising that when the Haifa Technion, the most prominent technological institute in Israel, was founded in 1914 on the initiative of the Ezra Organization from Germany, it was decided that teaching should be conducted in German. It was only a consequence of public opposition that prompted the institute to adopt Hebrew as its official language of tuition.

Katz-Biletzky’s dictionary is composed of an abundance of Hebrew equivalents for some 25,000 German terms, many of which have been in existence and dispersed throughout the extensive canon of Hebrew philosophical and scientific literature since the Middle Ages. The target audiences for this book are scientists and translators.

The dictionary itself has 720 pages. Following an introduction given in both Hebrew and German is a list of publications used in the compilation of the dictionary. This includes 113 Hebrew sources, books and articles, and 61 mainly German books and dictionaries. The final part of the dictionary includes a list of terms that the author himself has used his considerable scholarship to innovate.
The book’s lexical entries cover all science-related areas that a well-informed individual is likely to need: philosophy, psychology, anatomy, economics, zoology, biology, chemistry, geography, linguistics, and so on. Each term has Hebrew equivalents gathered either from one of the sources mentioned above or in some cases coined by the author.

The author retains a purist attitude towards translations and definitions throughout the work. He citation Hebrew terms before loan ones, avoids loan words as much as possible, and invents Hebrew terms and cites them as the first translated option.

The directory of abbreviations makes it possible for each Hebrew term listed to be placed in its relevant field e.g. 'etik [k] "ethics," mahsh [evim] "computer sciences," dat "religion," etc. Some entries are cited with a Hebrew source immediately after the first one or two terms, although not necessarily referring to them, e.g. German Cubus Hebrew me’ukav ‘cubic’ (mat[ematika]) [k/b/240] which refers to Jacob Klazkin’s Thesaurus of Philosophical Terms, volume 2 (New York, Feldheim 1968), p.240; Modulation = silum (mus[ika]) [lmw/249] referring to Aviva Shelah’s Dvir Musical Lexicon (Tel Aviv, Dvir 1990) (silum is in fact used within social sciences in modern Hebrew to mean a hierarchical building scale and it also appears in the translation of Skalierung in statistics). Nominalisierung ‘nominalization’ is first translated into Hebrew as shinuy based on Ora R. Schwarzwald and Michael Sokoloff’s A Hebrew Dictionary of Linguistics and Philology (Even Yehuda, Reches 1992), p.146, but this term is not used there at all, but rather nominalizatsiya or ha’atsama. These terms are conveyed secondarily in Katz-Biletzky’s dictionary, only after the citation. The same applies to Tautologie, translated as yittur lashon which is based on Klazkin and the same linguistic dictionary, even though both sources do not mention this definition. In the linguistic dictionary ‘pleonasms’ is translated as yittur milim (not yittur lashon), or as pleonasma and yittur, while ‘tautology’ is translated as plain tautologia. Had the author included references at the end of each lexical entry, this misleading information could easily have been avoided.

It is Klazkin’s thesaurus that is seemingly the authentic source for the last word in the Hebrew title of the book: Milon germani- ‘tvri lemunhey filosofya, mada va’asut, i.e., A German-Hebrew dictionary for philosophic, scientific and technological terms. The word ‘asut,’ ‘technology,’ does not exist in contemporary Israeli Hebrew nor in any Hebrew dictionary; the word teknologiya is the commonly used term. Even though it is the author’s personal innovation to make use of this specific term, he attributes it to Klazkin.

Although the dictionary is German-Hebrew, many English and French terms are also listed, but are only given some clarification when they happen to be the same in German. Each of these words is referred to the German term where it is translated. For instance, Langue -> Sprache; Sprache (Langue) is translated as leshon haklal (in linguistics), lashon, lang, leshon hahevra, etc. Binary -> binär; binär is translated as shinui, da- helki, binari, etc. It might have been more helpful to translate the English terms as well, as it is English that has become the international language of science since the middle of the twentieth century.

Most of the entries are explained in addition to their Hebrew equivalents, e.g. Bezugsgruppe -> kvutsat hityahusat ‘reference group’ (psychology, social sciences) is explained in Hebrew as “any group in which the individual sees in its ways of behavior, values and goals criteria for his personal evaluation, and according to which he positively or negatively directs his own behavior, values and goals”.

The author’s innovations are linguistically interesting. He uses only Hebrew elements and many words are derived from Semitic root and pattern construction, e.g. schmettern – himtiikh ‘sounded like metal’ (root m-t-kh, hif’il pattern, from matêkhet ‘metal’). Many words are linearly derived either by prefixing or suffixing, or by blends, e.g. global – kadtrasi (kadur ha’aretz ‘globe’ + -i ‘adjectival suffix’; globê in modern Hebrew). The formation of new roots using an initial shin is extensive, but the number of compounds is sparse.

What makes this dictionary so useful is its wide range of terms, some of which have yet to be officially translated into Hebrew. The explanations in the book are useful too. The book’s chief disadvantage derives from the fact that as it is a research dictionary, albeit extremely extensive, the first Hebrew term for each lexical item is determined by the author’s personal preference or invention and not by practice. This makes the dictionary less reliable for the average Hebrew speaking user.

Ora R. Schwarzwald
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