

Introduction

Grammatical Type: n.f.

A.1 In Hosea 13.2 the occurrence is in the form m.s + suff. 3 m.p. (*tbwnm*), a form which in itself could be: a) an abbreviation for *tbwntm* (BDB: 108; *HAL*: 1548; GK: §91e; BL 599 §74h). A similar phenomenon can be seen also in Ps 49.15 (*ws̄wrm = ws̄wrtm*) and Gn 40.10 (*n̄sh = n̄sth*); b) a northern dialectal variant (Rudolph 1966:237, cited in *HAL*: 1549a). In favour of the latter hypothesis and against that of a textual error (v. infra) or of an abbreviation are set two further data (Sciumbata 1996-97:163): 1) the existence of the doublets *tmwr* (Sir)/*tmwrh* (BH); *tmwt* (Sam. Hebrew)/*tmwth* (BH) and of the Samaritan Hebrew form *twb* 'repentance' renders probable the existence of dialectal masculine variants for the *pattern taqtul*: the two examples from Samaritan Hebrew make one consider that northern variants are involved; 2) the same occurrence in Hosea, whose language is suspected of northern infiltration, would confirm this situation. It can also be said that, if the translations (v. infra) depend on a different *Vorlage* (*tabnît*), it is possible to postulate a simplification of a *lectio difficilior* which was not understood. To strengthen the hypothesis of the masculine form against that of textual corruption there is also a greater awareness of the special meaning of *tbwnh* obtained from the research in structural semantics developed by Sciumbata 1996-97 (v. infra Text doubtful B.1).

B.1 [nil]

Occurrences: 42× OT, 8× Sir, 1× Qum, 0× inscr.

A.1 Jr 51.15 is in reality a doublet of Jr 10.12: it should therefore not be counted as an independent occurrence. In this case there are 41 biblical attestations.

A.2 In Ob 7 the phrase *ʔyn tbwnh bw* is according to some to be omitted as a gloss, and according to others to be transferred to v. 8 (Bewer 1911:33; BHS). According to Bewer it can be kept in its place, as part of the old oracle which is quoted by the prophet (Bewer 1911:36-7).

A.3 In Pr 28.16 the LXX with *προσόδων* seem to have had in front of them a *Vorlage* *tbwʔwt*, "revenue", instead of *tbwnwt* (cf. BHS). One should note that in Sir 15.3A there is an identical error (v. infra, A.4).

A.4 In Sir 15.3 MS A presents the reading *tbwʔh*, cancelled and corrected with *tbwnh* (which is the reading of MS B).

A.5 In Sir 15.15 MS B presents in the body of the text the reading *ʔmwnh* in place of *tbwnh* of MS A (the reading accepted by the Greek text): *tbwnh* is, however, given in the adjacent margin.

B.1 The figure of 44 occurrences furnished by Fox (1993:151) is totally incomprehensible.

Text doubtful:

A.1 [nil]

B.1 The form *tbwnm* in Hosea 13.2 seems to have been variously interpreted by the translations. The LXX (κατ'εἰκόνα), followed by Pesh (*bdmwthwn*) and V (*secundum imaginem*), seem to have had a different Vorlage in front of them: *ketabnit* "according to the image (of the idols)". The same is true for the Targum of Jonathan (*kdmwthwn* "according to their own image") (cf. BHS, *HAL*: 1549, Harper 1905:395; Cathcart-Gordon 1989:58). The Babylonian Talmud, San. 63b, also interprets in the same way. Harper (1905:395) accepts the reading *tbwnh*, only with a sarcastic meaning. The MT, nevertheless, makes perfect sense, especially taking account of the fact that a northern dialectal variant of *tbwnh* is involved, in the sense of "ingenuity, genius in handicraft and art" (Sciumbata 1996-97:163 and v. supra). The verse would then say: "And now they continue to sin, with their silver they make themselves molten images according to their ingenuity". The reading of the ancient versions can be interpreted as a simplification of a *lectio difficilior*.

Qere/Ketiv: In Jb 26.12 the Kt *twbntw* has been corrected by the Qr *tbwntw*.

Orthographic variants: in Jb 32.11 the orthographic omission of the *w* for the plural ending is noteworthy: in the other instances it is always present.

B.1 Mandelkern erroneously gives the *w* for Job 32.11 in his concordance.

Distribution by functional languages (Sciumbata 1996-97:153-154):

a) Biblical Hebrew

ABH	1 (Dt 32.28)
EBH ₁	5 (Ex 31.3; 35.31; 36.1; 1Kg 5.9; 7.14)
EBH ₂	29 (Is 40.14, 28; 44.19; Jr 10.12 (=51.15); Ezk 28.4; Ob 7, 8; Ps 49.4; 78.72; 136.5; Pr 2.2, 3, 6, 11; 3.13,19; 5.1; 8.1; 10.23; 11.12; 14.29; 15.21;17.27; 18.2; 19.8; 20.5; 21.30; 24.3; 28.16)
EBH ₃	1 (Ho 13.2: * <i>tbwn</i>)
LBH ₂	1 (Ps 147.5)
LBH ₃	4 (Jb 12.12,13; 26.12; 32.11)
Total EBH:	36 (Jr 51.5 is a doublet)
Total LBH:	5

b) Ben Sira: Sir 4.24A; 14.20A; 14.21A; 15.3A,B; 15.15A,B; 44.3B,M; 45.5B; 50.27B

c) Qumran:

QH₂ 1 (11Q5 26.14) (DJD IV)

A.1 The Qumran text is a liturgical hymn of praise to the Creator, with quotations from Jr 10.12 and

Ps 136.5.

A.2 For the explanation of this distribution v. infra 5. Lexical/Semantic Field(s), A.2

B.1 [nil]

1. Root and Comparative Material

A.1 The noun is derived from the root *byn*, connected with the substantive *bayin* “intermediate space” which is used as a preposition (*TWAT* I,620).

The original meaning seems to be that of “separate, distinguish”, which is found in the semantic developments in various Semitic languages (*TWAT* I,621).

The root is attested in a large part of North-West Semitic and South Semitic (*THAT*:306; *HAL*:117b).

A.2 In ancient Hebrew, as well as *tbwnh*, there are attested the verb *byn* in the *binyanim qal, niph, hiph, polel, hitpolel*; the substantive *bynh*, “discernment, understanding”; and the adjectival participles *nbwn* and *mbyn*. The proper name Yabin is also connected to the root (*THAT*: 306). At Qumran *mbwnn*, “instructed” and the substantive *nbwnh* also appear (*TWAT* I,629). The particles *byn* “between” and *bnym* (in the expression *ʔš hbnym* “challenger?”) (*TWAT* I,621 and *HAL*: 118,134), as far as etymology is concerned, are connected but belong to a different semantic strand.

A.3 In Mishnaic Hebrew are attested: the verb *hbyn*, the participle *mbyn* and the substantives *bynh* and *tbwnh*.

A.4 In Ugaritic there is *bn* “to know, understand”.

A.5 Amorite: the form *ya-bi-ni-im* presupposes **byn* “distinguish” (see Cohen 1976:62).

A.6 In Aramaic (Cohen 1976:62) a) Biblical: *bynh* “understanding”; b) Palmyrene: a form *ybn(w)n* (aph impf. 3pplm) is attested from *byn* “make clear, precise”; c) in Palestinian Jewish Aramaic are attested *ʔbāntā* “understanding”, *bayyēn* “make understand”; in Mandaean: *ban* “separate, explain”; e) Syriac: the verbs *bayyen* “to show, point out, to give instruction, understanding, to discern” and *ʔtbayyan* “to notice, take notice of, regard, consider, understand, have discretion”; the substantives *buyyānā* “understanding, intelligence”; *mbyynn*, *mtbyynn*, *mtbyynnwt* (Payne Smith); f) Neo-Syriac (Urmia): **mabyin* “to appear”; *binā* “thought, understanding” (Cohen 1976:62).

A.7 In Arabic (Cohen 1976:62): a) *bāna* “be separate from, be clear, evident”; b) Thamudic: there is a form *bnt* (3 f.s.) from **bn* “be clear, evident”.

A.8 In South Arabian: *byn* “depart, go away” (Cohen 1976:62).

A.9 In Ethiopic (Cohen 1976:62): a) Geez *bayyana* “distinguish, notice”; b) Amharic: *bäyyänä* “decide, decree”; c) Tigre: *ban* “alone, separately”, *bänbän* “different, separate”; d) Tigrin *baynu* (+ suff.) “alone”.

2. Formal Characteristics

A.1 The same verbal substantive with preformative *t* can be associated, according to the meaning, with various *binyanim* (JM: §88L o): *tbwnh* seems to derive from *byn* in *hiph.* on the pattern *taqtul* (cf Fox 1993:51, who discerns a reflexive meaning in the lexeme).

A.2 The *u* of *tbwnh* and analogous nouns seems to derive from a closed *o* (and hence from a primitive *a*) (JM §§88L s and 29bN).

A.3 The morphological forms attested are: f.s.; f.s. constr. + suff.; f.pl.; f.pl. constr. + suff.. There is a form *tbwnwtykm* in Jb 32.11 (with the Masoretic interpretation as a plural) and *tbwntyh* in Sir 14.21. In Ho 13.2 there is a m.s. + 3 m. pl. suff. (from a not otherwise attested **tbwn*).

B.1 According to JM (§88L s) the *pattern taqtol* (from *taqtul*) has no examples of masculine nouns. However if the form **tbwn* is really to be considered as a dialectal form of *tbwnh* (v. supra, Introduction, Grammatical Type, A.1), this statement should be corrected.

B.2 The plural *tbwnwt* is considered by some to be a plural of intensity, by others a singular with a final abstract termination in *-ot* (HAL: 1548; GK: §124.1e). According to Dahood (1965: 296ff; see also 1970:379) the form *tbwnwt* in Ps 49.4 and 78.72, on the model of some occurrences of *hkmwt*, is equivalent to a Phoenician f.s. termination: but the idea seems somewhat improbable (HAL: 1548). Above all the situation of some of the occurrences of *hkmwt* should be separated from those of the plural *tbwnwt*: for the latter all that can be said is that in some occurrences one should presuppose the crystallization of the plural as an autonomous lexeme to indicate “intelligent actions, maxims etc.” (Sciumbata 1996-97, v. infra, 6. Exegesis, A.1). The pl. does not elsewhere (see for example Is. 40.14) have any other semantic peculiarity except of an intensive type (see also Fox 1993:152).

3. Syntagmatics

A.1 Constructions with particles:

w't htbwnh (1Kg 7.14);

wl' tbwnh (Is 44.19);

ʔyn tbwnh (Ob 7; in Dt 32.28 with the insertion of *bhm* in the middle)

btbwnh (with and without suffix: Ex 31.3; 35.31; Jr 10.12 = 51.15; Ezk 28.14; pr 3.19; 18.2; 24.3; Ps 136.5; Jb 26.12; Sir 14.20; 44.3; with the noun in the pl. Ps 78.72; Sir 50.27; 11Q5 26.14; in Sir 14.21 *btbwnthy* occurs);

ltbwnh (with and without suffix: Is 40.28; Pr 2.2, 3; 5.1; Ps 147.5);

ʔd tbwnwtykm (Jb 32.11);

ktbwnm (Ho 13.2)

A.2 *tbwnh* occurs as subject, object, accusative of material (1 Kg 7.14; the accusative is required by the verb, JM §125d), second component of a construct chain, means, in a prepositional phrase of topic (Ex. 31.3), movement to a place, dative or indirect object, relation, time, and manner.

A.3 The lexeme *tbwnh* “intelligence” shows solidarity with the class of human beings, to whom it refers: in Ob 8 the reference to the mountain of Esau is metaphorical for the Edomites. The lexeme *tbwnh* “ingenuity” shows solidarity with the class of human beings and with God.

A.4 *tbwnh* “intelligence” is subject of *ʔyn* (Dt 32.28; Ob 7; Pr 21.30); *nʕr* (*piel*, Pr 2.11), *ntn* (*qwl*).

A.5 In 1 Kg 7.14 the article (a unique occurrence) should be noted: it specifies the kind of *tbwnh* which is involved (the artisan-technical kind).

A.6 The lexeme *tbwnh* “ingenuity” can be the object of the verb *ntn* (with subject Yhwh: Ex 36.1). In the post-exilic period the same construction passed to *bynh*, which in its turn also inherited this meaning from *tbwnh*. The lexeme *tbwnh* “intelligence” can be the object of *ntn* (with

subject *'lhy*m: 1 Kg 5.9); *h*sr (Pr 28.16 in the syntagma *h*sr *tbwnwt*); *š*mr (Pr 19.8, Sir 15.15); *h'*byd (Ob 8), *pyq hiph* (Pr 3.3)..

A.7 In relation to the substantive *tbwnh* “ingenuity” *ml'* also occurs (*piel* Ex 31.3 with subject Yhwh and *tbwnh* in a prepositional phrase of topic; *niph* 1 Kg 7.14 with *tbwnh* as accusative of material: JM §125d; BDB 108).

A.8 In Ex 31.3-4 and 35.31-32 the aim of *h*kmh, *tbwnh* and *d't* “skill, ingenuity and technical knowledge” is *lhšwb mħšbwt l'šwt* etc “to conceive thoughts to do etc.” and in Ex 36.1 the aim of *h*kmh and *tbwnh* “skill and ingenuity” is *ld't l'šwt* “to know how to do etc.”. In Dt 32.28-29 the function of *tbwnh* “intelligence” (together with *šwt* “sense, advice”) is synthesised by the phrase *hw hkmw yškylw z't ybynw l'hrytm* “if they were wise they would understand this, they would give attention to their end”.

A.9 The expression *btbwnh + n'th* etc. *šmym* (Jr 10.12; Ps 136.5; Pr 3.19; 11Q5 26.14) becomes a traditional *cliché*, which survives until Qumran (in spite of the disappearance of *tbwnh* as a functional lexeme, v. infra, 5. Lexical/Semantic Field(s), A.2).

A.10 In 1 Kg 5.9 the adverb *hrbh m'd* placed after *tbwnh* (*tbwnh hrbh m'd*) should be understood as depending on the verb *ntn* (GK: §131e; BDB: 915 *hiph* 1.e).

A.11 There are the following lexical syntagms:

*h*kmh *wtbwnh*: the syntagm, which can also be broken up by the introduction of particles or of other elements, appears in Ex 36.1; 1Kg 5.9 and 7.4; Ezk 28.14; Jr 10.12; Pr 2.2,6,11; 3.13,19; 5.1; 8.1; 21.30; 11Q5 26.14. The syntagm expresses a concept of complete ability (in the case of *tbwnh*, “ingenuity”) or knowledge of a theoretical-speculative kind (in the case of *tbwnh* “intelligence”), combining (merismus) a lexeme belonging to the class of concepts with one belonging to the class of faculties (according to the description of the meaning provided by Sciumbata 1996-97, v. infra 5. Lexical/Semantic Field(s), A.1). The same considerations apply to the parallelisms or the other contextual antonymies between the two lexemes. In Pr 10.23 and Sir 14.20-21A it seems that *h*kmh depends on *tbwnh*.

*h*kmh *wtbwnh wd't*: in Ex 31.3; 35.31 and 1Kg 7.14 (with or without the addition of particles) the three-part expression should be translated as “skill, ingenuity and technical knowledge”, and describes the completeness of artistic-technical ability in all its varied aspects. In Pr 21.30 there appears *w'yn hkmh w'yn tbwnh w'yn d't* “There is no learning, nor intelligence, nor knowledge”;

d't wtbwnh is a relatively frequent syntagm (Is 40.14; Pr 2.6; 2.11; 3.19; 17.27). It appears in the negative in Is 44.19: *wl' d't wl' tbwnh*. In this case too there is a combination of a lexeme which refers to information possessed and one which indicates a faculty (merismus). In Qumran Hebrew the syntagm is replaced by *d't wbynh* (4Q158 1-2 8; 4Q405 17 3; 11Q17 5 1);

šh wtbwnh (Jb 12.13)

mšwh wtbwnh (Sir 15.15A): according to Sciumbata 1996-97, when understood in the light of Sir 45.5 the syntagm expresses the legalistic connotation assumed by *tbwnh*₃ in Ben Sira (v. infra 6. Exegesis, A.1), who while taking up the jargon lexeme of the didactic current of the wisdom movement, which designated its own *corpus* of teachings and values, reinterpreted it in a legalistic sense, in the wake of Dt 4.6, where, however, *bynh* appears. According to Sciumbata Ben Sira is aware of the post-exilic substitution of *bynh* for *tbwnh*, which is the reason why in respect to that text he makes, by hypercorrection, a deliberate lexical restoration: elsewhere too this author tends to re-establish the old variant of *bynh*.

twrt ḥyym wtbwnh (Sir 45.5) The same comments made for the previous syntagm apply.
 יָשׁ *tbwnh/tbwnwt* “an intelligent man” (Pr 10.23 in contrast/antonymy with *ksyl*; 15.21 in contrast/antonymy with *ḥsr-lb* ; 17.27, 20.5; in the plural in Pr 11.12). The adjectival syntagm (Schökel 792) could also occur in Ob 8 (BDB), if יָשׁ has been omitted here by scribal error;
drk tbwnwt (Is 40.14);
my tbwnh (Sir 15.3B);
tbwnwt kpyw (Ps 78.72)
rb tbwnh (Pr 14.29);
ḥsr-tbwnwt (Pr 28.16).

A.12 Other contextual relations:

a) with terms from the lexical field

in Dt 2.2-3 the antonymy is between *ḥkmh*, *tbwnh* and *bynh* (the verse provides a lexical repertoire of synonyms);

in Sir 15.3 AB there is a parallelism with *śkl*, “wisdom (= sagesness)”: the combination has not appeared in biblical Hebrew and should be considered as one of the elements of the late language present in Ben Sira (in spite of his attempt to maintain the classical style, especially as regards the lexicon of “knowledge”: Sciumbata 1996-97:168): *śkl* in fact takes the place of *ḥkmh* in this meaning in the late language (and in fact the more frequent parallelism in biblical Hebrew is between *ḥkmh* and *tbwnh*);

in Is 40.28 it is said that there is no *ḥqr* of the *tbwnh* “ingenuity” of God;

in Is 40.14 there is parallelism between *’oraḥ mišpat*, *da’at* and *derek tebunot*;

in Pr 11.12 and 15.21 the antonym of יָשׁ *tbwnh/tbwnwt* is *ḥsr-lb* “he who lacks intellect”. In Pr 17.27 the same syntagm is parallel to *ywd’ d’t*;

b) with other vocabulary:

śh (Pr 21.30; Jb 12.13), *śwt* (Dt 32.28);

rwh ḥym: in Ex 31.3 and 35.31 it is said that Bezalel is full of the spirit of God as regards skill (*ḥkmh*), ingenuity (*tbwnh*) and technical knowledge (*d’t*). The spirit of God is being considered as something which instills and empowers these human qualities;

mzymh (Pr 2.11);

lb in Pr 15.21 and *rḥb lb* in 1Kg 5.9 indicate the seat of the intellectual faculty (the same happens with other lexemes in the lexical field): sometimes *lb* is used metonymically to indicate the whole activity which takes place there;

in Jb 12.12 there is an equivalence between *tbwnh* and *’rk ymym*: a cultural fact is involved, not implied in the linguistic meaning of *tbwnh*.

B.1 According to Schökel 792 the syntagms *ktbwnh* and *btbwnh* should be translated adverbially (“diestramente, hábilmente, magistralmente”). In reality, according to the reconstruction of Sciumbata, complements of means and manner are involved, in which the artistic-technical lexical unit is implied (“with his ingenuity”, “according to their ingenuity”).

4. Versions

a. LXX:

ἀνδρεία/ἀνδρία “manliness, manly spirit”: Pr 21.30;
 ἔννοια “reflection, cogitation”: Pr 2.11;
 ἐπιστήμη “understanding, skill, knowledge”: Ex 36.1; Dt 32.28; Jb 12.12; 26.12; Sir 45.5;
 λόγος “speech, utterance, discussion, saying”: Pr 5.1;
 νουθέτησις “admonition, warning”: Pr 2.2;
 παιδεία “training and teaching, education, mental culture, learning”: Sir 4.24;
 σοφία “wisdom, cleverness, skill, intelligence, practical wisdom, learning”: 1Kg 5.9; Pr 18.2; Sir 15.3;
 50.27;
 σύνεσις “faculty of quick comprehension, sagacity”: Ex 31.3; 35.31; 1Kg 7.41; Jb 12.13; 32.11; Ps 49.4
 (=48.3); 78.72 (=77.72); 136.5 (=135.5); 147.5 (=146.5); Pr 2.2,3,6; 24.3; Ob 1,7,8; Is 40.14; Jr 51.15
 (=28.15); Sir 14.20; 44.3;
 φρόνησις “practical wisdom, prudence in government and affairs”: 1Kg5.9; Is 40.28; 44.19; Jr 10.12;
 Ezk 28.4; Pr 3.13,19; 8.1; 10.23; 14.29; 19.8;
 φρόνιμος “intelligent, sensible”: Pr 11.12; 15.21; 17.27; 20.5;
 No translation equivalent: Ho 13.2; Pr 28.16; Sir 14.21; 28.16.

- A.1 ἀνδρεία/ἀνδρία, which renders תְּבוּנָה in Pr 21.30, also translates כְּשָׁרוֹן in Qoh 2.21; 4.4 and 5.10.
- A.2 ἔννοια also translates דְּעָת, מְזִמָּה, בִּינָה and שְׂכָל. The use of the expression to render תְּבוּנָה in Pr 2.11 is due probably to the attempt to find a synonym for מְזִמָּה which occurs in the first hemistich of the verse.
- A.3 ἐπιστήμη also translates שְׂכָל, בִּינָה, דַּע, דְּעָה, דְּעָת, מְדַע, חֲכָמָה, הַשְׂכִּיל, שְׂכָל. Though ἐπιστήμη too may be used in an artistic-technical context as well as an epistemological one, its exploitation to translate תְּבוּנָה in the meaning “ingenuity” is partial. The substantive, which is used in Jb 12.12, is not repeated in Jb 12.13 (where σύνεσις is used).
- A.4 The rendering of תְּבוּנָה by λόγος in Pr 5.1 is interesting (the Pesh here depends on the Greek). In this verse תְּבוּנָה is the designation for the word of the teacher (“incline your ear to my intelligence”, Sciumbata 1996-97: 160). It would be a matter of the individual intuition of a translator, seeing that the fact is not repeated in the other occurrences of the same type. The same phenomenon is however, encountered with νουθέτησις in Pr 2.2 and with παιδεία in Sir 4.24.
- A.5 In Pr 2.2b νουθέτησις occurs twice, inasmuch as the hemistich is divided into two synonymous phrases. The Greek term does not translate any other Hebrew substantives.
- A.6 In Sir 4.24 παιδεία seems to be an attempt to provide a synonym for חֲכָמָה in the first hemistich of the verse.
- A.7 σοφία also translates שְׂכָל, בִּינָה, דְּעָת, חֲכָמָה, מוֹסֵר, מַחֲשַׁבַת.
- A.8 σύνεσις also translates בִּינָה, נְבוֹן, הַבִּינ, גְּבוּרָה, דְּעָת, מְדַע, מְנַדַּע, חֲכָמָה, טַעַם, הַשְׂכִּיל, שְׂכָל. The substantive is also used, though not uniformly, for the lexeme *tbwnh* in its artistic-technical sense.
- A.9 φρόνησις also translates הַשְׂכִּיל, בִּינָה, דְּעָת, מְדַע, מְנַדַּע, חֲכָמָה, לֵב, עֲרָמָה, רוּחַ, שְׂכָל. In Pr

19.8 it occurs twice, inasmuch as it also renders לָב.

A.10 φρόνιμος (absent in Hatch-Redpath 1897-1906 and noted in the edition of 1998) translates the syntagm *ʿš tbwnh/tbwnwt*.

A.11 As can be seen, תְּבוּנָה is rendered in the LXX by at least nine different substantives (for the cases of textual uncertainty v. infra), the larger part of which are used in their turn to translate other terms from the lexical field of knowledge or from the wisdom lexicon. However, the most frequent translation is by σύνεσις and φρόνησις, the only words that are used in the versions of Aquila, Theodotion and Symmachus (the last with two exceptions).

A.12 The parallel texts Jr 10.12 and 51.15 are translated differently (respectively with φρόνησις and σύνεσις).

The following passages present a textual problem:

A.13 In Ho 13.2 κατ'εἰκόνα εἰδώλων appears for the Hebrew *ktbwnm*. The rendering presupposes a Vorlage תְּבוּנִית, as a simplification of a *lectio difficilior* which was not understood (v. supra Introduction A.1 and Introduction, text doubtful B.1).

A.14 In Pr 28.16 the Greek diverges from the MT: the reading προσόδων presupposes תְּבוּאוֹת “revenue”.

A.15 In Sir 14.21, for the Hebrew וּבַתְּבוּנוֹתֶיהָ, there appears ἐν τοῖς ἀποκρύφοις “in her secrets”. Taking account of the rendering of the Peshitta for this passage (*šbilā'*, v. infra) Segal maintains (1958: 93) that the correct Hebrew reading should be בְּנִתִּיבוֹתֶיהָ “on her paths” (תְּבוּנוֹתֶיהָ would be a corruption due to the influence of the previous verse). The Greek should hence have ἀτραποῖς (the translation of נִתִּיבוֹת in Jb 24.13), which was in its turn the object of textual corruption.

A.16 In Sir 15.15 πίστις presupposes אַמוּנָה, a reading which does not fit the context (Segal 1958: 96).

b. Aquila

φρόνησις: Dt 32.28; Is 40.14; Ps 48.4; 78.72 (=77.72); Pr 2.11; 18.2.

A.1 The fact that in all the attestations of Aquila which we have תְּבוּנָה is translated by φρόνησις, unless it is to be attributed to chance, conforms to the desire of this translation to keep close to the original language.

c. Symmachus

κρίσις “separating, distinguishing decision, judgement”: Is 40.14;

σύνεσις: Ezk 28.4; Ps 48.4; Pr 28.16;

φρόνησις: Is 40.14; Ps 78.72 (=77.72); Pr 2.11;

No translation equivalent: Jb 32.11.

A.1 In Is 40.14 two renderings by Symmachus seem to be attested (κρίσις and φρόνησις).

A.2 In Jb 32.11 Symmachus has ἐφρονεῖτε.

d. Theodotion

φρόνησις: Is 40.14; Pr 2.11; 5.1.

σύνεσις: Ezk 28.4; Ps 48.4; 78.72 (=77.72); Pr 8.1; Jb 32.11.

e. *Peshitta*

buyyānā 'understanding, intelligence': Ex 31.3; 1Kg 7.14; Jb 12.12,13;

ḥekmtā (emp.) 'wisdom, knowledge; skill': Ps 136.5; Pr 18.2; Jb 26.12;

ḥakkim 'wise, intelligent': Pr 14.29; 17.27; 20.5;

mē'mrā 'speech, discourse': Pr 5.1;

re'yānā 'mind, intellect': Pr 28.16;

sakkultānā 'understanding, intelligent, prudent, capable': Ob 8; Pr 11.12; 15.21;

sakkultānutā 'understanding, intelligence': 1Kg 5.9 (=3Kg 4.29); Sir 15.3; 14.20;

sukkālā 'intelligence, understanding, intellect': Ex 35.31; 36.1; Dt 32.28; Is 40.14; 40.28; Jr 51.15; Ezk 28.4; Ob 7; Ps 49.4; 78.72; 147.5; Pr 2.2,3,6,11; 3.13,19; 8.1; 10.23; 21.30; 24.3; Sir 4.24;

tar'itā 'mind, intelligence': Jr 10.12;

No translation equivalent: Ho 13.2; Is 44.19; Pr 19.8; Sir 14.21; 45.5;

Unclear: Jb 32.11; Sir 44.3;

Large omission in text: Sir 15.15; 50.27.

A.1 In the Pesh *תְּבוּנָה* is most frequently rendered by *sukkālā*'. Also connected to this same lexeme are *sakkultānā*' and *sakkultānutā*'.

A.2 In Pr 2.3 *sukkālā*' occurs twice, as the translation both of *בִּינָה* and of *תְּבוּנָה*.

A.3 *ḥekmtā*' 'sapientia' is for Brockelmann (LS) an autonomous lexeme vis-à-vis the m. *ḥekmtā*' 'παίδεῖα eruditio'. Less correctly Payne Smith 141-142 considers *ḥekmtā*' the emphatic form of *ḥekmā*' ('wisdom, counsel'), with a difference of meaning vis-à-vis the absolute.

A.4 In Pr 5.1 the use of *mē'mrā*' probably depends on the *λόγος* of the LXX (v. supra LXX A.4).

A.5 Is 44.19 has *'etra'iu* 'have thought': the phrase has been changed in Syriac.

A.6 Pr 19.18 has *haymānutā*' 'truth, faithfulness'.

A.7 The adjective *ḥakkim* translates the syntagms *ʔš tbwnh* or *rb tbwnh*.

A.8 Ho 13.2 has *dmutā*' 'form, shape, figure': cf. Introduction A.1 and Introduction, text doubtful B.1.

A.9 In Sir 14.21 *šbīle*' occurs (pl. of *šbīlā*'), which for Segal (1958:93) represents the correct Hebrew reading (*בְּנִתֵּיבוֹתִיָּה*): v. supra LXX A.15.

A.10 In Sir 44.3 the phrase is completely rewritten, but *sakkultānuṯon* seems to correspond perfectly to *tbwnh*.

A.11 Sir 45.5 has *burktā*' 'blessing' (in the text in the pl. *burkātā*').

A.12 Jb 32.11 has *ṭalleqton* 'you have finished' corresponding to *tbwnh*.

f. *Targum*

TgNeo

סוכלתנוּת; סוכלתנוּ; 'intelligence, intellect': Ex 32.3; 35.31; 36.1; Dt 32.28

TgO

סוכלתנוּת; סוכלתנוּ; Ex 32.3; 35.31; 36.1; Dt 32.28

TgPsJ

סוכלתנו; סוכלתנו Ex 32.3; 35.31; Dt 32.28

TgPro

סוכלתנו; סוכלתנו Kg 5.9; 7.14; Is 40.14; 40.28; 44.19; Jr 10.12; 51.15; Ezk 28.14; Ob 7,8

TgHag

“understanding” בינא; בינתא Jb 12.12,13; Ps 49.4; Pr 2.6; 3.13,19; 5.1

“understanding” ביונא; ביונתא Pr 2.2,3; 2.11; 8.1; 14.29; 18.2; 19.8; 21.30; 24.3; 28.16; Jb 32.11

סוכלתנו; סוכלתנו Jb 26.12; Ps 78.72; 136.5; 147.5;

דמתביין Pr 10.23; 11.12; 15.21; 17.27; 20.5

TgJb (from Qumran Cave 11)

מנדעה “knowledge” Jb 26.12

No translation equivalent: Ho 13.2; Pr 28.16

A.1 The syntagm $\gamma\delta$ *tbwnh* is translated by דמתביין (hitp. ptc. of בין “to reflect upon, to understand”).

A.2 For כדמותהון “according to their image” in Ho 13.2 cf. Introduction A.1 and Introduction, Text doubtful B.1.

A.3 In Pr 28.16 the edition of Lagarde has *hwn*’ “sense”, while the MS Villa-Amil n.5 of Alfonso de Zamora (Diez Merino 1984) has *twbn*’ (Healey 1991:56)

A.4 The targumic renderings are particularly significant:

a) *bynh/bywnh* (it could be a loan from the Hebrew to translate *tbwnh* and *bynh* as designations of wisdom instruction) re-echoes the post-exilic substitution of Hebrew *bynh* for *tbwnh*.

b) the other lexeme which replaces *tbwnh* in LBH is *škl*, cognate of the Arm סוכלתנו (and the Aramaic could be a contributing factor for that replacement, in addition to other influences internal to the linguistic structure).

c) The exceptional rendering by מנדעה “knowledge” in 11QTgJob at Jb 26.12 should be noted.

g. *Vulgate*

disciplina “teaching, instruction, training”: Sir 45.5;

intellectus “the faculty of comprehension, understanding, intellect”: Ex 36.1; Ps 78.72 (=77.72)

intelligentia “the faculty of comprehension, understanding”: Ex 31.3; 35.1; 1Kg 7.14; Jb 12.13;

prudens “knowing, skilled, experienced”: Pr 11.12; 15.21; 17.27;

prudentia “acquaintance with a thing, knowledge, skill”: Dt 32.28; 1Kg 5.9 (=3Kg 4.29); Is 40.14; Jr

10.12; Ezk 28.4; Ob 7,8; Ps 49.4 (=48.4); 147.5; Pr 2.2,3,6,11; 3.13,19; 5.1; 8.1; 10.23; 14.29; 18.2; 19.8;

21.30; 24.3; 28.16;; Jb 12.12; 26.12; 32.11; Sir 44.3;

sapiens “wise, knowing”: Pr 20.5;

sapientia “wisdom, good sense, discernment, intelligence”: Is 40.28; Ps 136.5; Sir 15.3;

No translation equivalent: Is 44.19; Ho 13.2; Sir 14.21 (=14.23);

Unclear: Sir 4.24 (=4.29);

Different text: Sir 14.20 (=14.22); 15.15 (=15.16);

Omission in text: Sir 50.27.

A.1 The most frequent Latin equivalent is *prudentia*.

A.2 The syntagm $\gamma\text{š } tbwnh$ is translated by the adjective *prudens* (for the most part *vir prudens*) or *sapiens* (*homo sapiens* in Pr 20.5).

A.3 The different treatment reserved for תְּבוּנָה in Job 12.12-13 in the LXX also appears in the Vulgate, where it is translated respectively by *prudentia* and *intelligentia*.

A.4 In Is 44.19 the phrase $wl' d't wl' tbwnh$ becomes *neque cognoscunt neque sentiunt*, with the correspondence between the substantive *d't* and the verb *cognoscunt* on the one hand and of *tbwnh* with the verb *sentiunt* "to perceive (physically and mentally)" on the other.

A.5 In Sir 4.24 (=4.29) three Latin words correspond to תְּבוּנָה (*et sensus et scientia et doctrina*).

A.6 The translation of *tbwnh* by *disciplina* in Sir 45.5 catches the designative level of the lexeme, which refers to the words taught by the wisdom teacher.

A.7 For Ho 13.2 (*quasi similitudinem idolorum*) cf. supra Introduction A.1 and Introduction, Text doubtful B.1.

A.8 The translation *et in absconsis illius* in Sir 14.21 clearly depends on the Greek text: v. supra LXX A.14.

5. Lexical/Semantic Field(s)

A.1 In the work on structural semantics (carried out following the methodology elaborated by the Romanian linguist Eugenio Coseriu) which Sciumbata (1996-97) has devoted to the lexical field of the substantives for "knowledge" and to the reciprocal relations and linguistic boundaries between the lexemes in the paradigmatic structure, the semantic specificity of *tbwnh* and the history of its diachronic vitality have been precisely identified.

tbwnh "intelligence" is located at the positive pole of the lexical field and hence enters into polar opposition with *ptywt* "silliness, lack of knowledge", *tph* "senselessness, irrationality" and *ksylwt* "obtuseness". This last is its exact polar opposite in that it expresses the lack of the mental faculty which is open to knowledge, understood on the theoretical-speculative level, that is to say as information which is possessed or learned. There is not a direct antonymy with *pty* "silliness, lack of education", insofar as this lexeme belongs to the jargon of the didactic-sapiential strand. As for *hwlw* "insipience, ignorance", *ś/sklwt* "stupidity", *skl* "stupidity", *ksl* "obtuseness", lexemes are involved which Sciumbata maintains are coinages of Qoheleth, who makes a refinement of the language in this domain, to exhibit without ambiguity the central issue implicit in his book (the epistemological polemic against the traditional strand of the sapiential movement: cf Sciumbata 1996), by avoiding the lexicon connected with the sapiential current against which he polemizes: these lexemes are not opposed paradigmatically to *tbwnh*, because this latter has no living use in post-exilic times.

The positive pole of the lexical field is structured (even if not in all the functional languages) on three dimensions, lexical sub-groups characterised by a common semic feature. The

dimensions (theoretical-speculative, pragmatic-behavioural and methodological) represent three ways in which the feature “knowledge” is understood in ancient Hebrew. The theoretical-speculative dimension, a semic feature shared by *tbwnh* “intelligence”, understands knowledge as a theoretical matter, which can be expressed in the form of information or faculties (thus giving rise to two further lexical sub-divisions: v. infra). Hence *tbwnh* is opposed to the group of lexemes characterised by the feature “pragmatic-behavioural dimension”, in which the same “knowledge” is understood as the possession of a quality which guides one to act (involved are *hkmh* “wisdom”, *škl* “judgement, sense, good sense”, *hškl* “judgement, sense, good sense”, *rmh* “shrewdness”, *škl* “wisdom”), and to the group characterised by the feature “methodological dimension”, in which knowledge is taken as an aim to reach (for the substantives this dimension is poorly developed and concerns only *heqer* “investigation”, a poetic word).

As has been said, within the group of lexemes which belong to the theoretical-speculative dimension there is a further sub-division between those characterised by the feature “information” (*hkmh* “wisdom (= learning)”, *d’t* “knowledge”, *d’h* “knowledge”, *md* “knowledge”, *lqh* “instruction”) and those characterised by the feature “faculties”: among these latter *tbwnh* “intelligence” is located. Among the faculties some are understood (“marked”) by the functions they display and others by the effect which their possession produces: *tbwnh*, which is a cognitive faculty of the functional kind, is therefore opposed from this point of view to *t’m* “reason” and *twšyh* “acumen, lucidity of thought, farsightedness”. The remaining semes peculiar to the substantive are of being an intellectual faculty which is “general” and “of understanding”.

To summarise, *tbwnh* “intelligence” indicates the intellectual faculty of man which allows him to understand. Its most immediate antonym, in EBH, is *bynh* “discernment” (intellectual faculty of perception and distinction), which, even when it neutralises some of its features by indicating “intelligence” generally retains traces of this identity. If some trials of interchange between *tbwnh* and *bynh* are made in different contexts in EBH, the difference of the semantic intentionality conveyed will quickly be noticed. Only in one case (Pr 2.3, a text which is a true and typical inventory of the sapiential lexicon) do *tbwnh* and *bynh* occur in the same context, effectively as synonyms.

For other lexemes *tbwnh* which belong to specialised languages (sub-systems) v. 6. Exegesis.

A.2 In the research developed by Sciumbata 1996-97 the diachronic vitality of *tbwnh* is also delineated, on the basis of the following considerations (Sciumbata has applied the dating criteria for linguistic phenomena defined by Hurvitz in various works: cf. Hurvitz 1982 and 1995):

- a) *tbwnh* has a major distribution in EBH (36 occurrences). Here it appears already in ABH and in the poetic as well as the narrative layers of the language. In LBH there are five attestations, poetic or poetic-sapiential. For the rest, the relatively good frequency in Ben Sira (8×) is counter-balanced by the almost total absence from Qumran Hebrew (1×).
- b) In many post-exilic texts the meanings and the constructions of *tbwnh* are inherited by *bynh* and *škl*, which occur in the contexts in which EBH would have used *tbwnh*.
- c) A general late morphological substitution is attested between the patterns *taqtul* on one side and *qi:l/qu:l* on the other (feminine forms: cf. Bendavid 1967-71:II 445§28). The replacement of *tbwnh* by *bynh* ends by becoming automatic even for quotations (CD 5.17, 4Q504 8 recto 5), and is

particularly clear in technical-craft and creation contexts (2Ch 2.12; Jb 38.4; 39.26; 4Q503 51-55 1 3). Among other things, *bynh* which previously had a poetic character clearly became a more common term in the post-exilic texts.

d) Close examination of the attestations of *tbwnh* in LBH gives the following results: I) in Job the meanings and the contexts of the four occurrences show that the choice of *tbwnh* is due either to the imitation of the terminology of the wisdom groups to which the three friends belong or to a stereotypical *cliché* in the context of references to creation. A comparison with the diffusion of *bynh* in the book (9 occurrences) and a careful scrutiny of its meanings and constructions (not attested in EBH, but shared with other post-exilic texts) reveals that the author of the poem has accepted the morphological and semantic substitution between the two terms; II) Ps 147.5 is a reminiscence of Is 40.28. The general context is related to creation which explains the choice of a lexeme which was by now obsolete; III) in Sirach the frequency of the attestations is explicable by his adherence to the literary genre of Proverbs to which he aspires and by the patina of archaism which the term secures for him. Ben Sira takes great care to avoid the automatic replacement of *tbwnh* by *bynh* which is encountered in other post-exilic texts, so much so that he seems to commit an error of hypercorrection in 15.15A, where he defines with *tbwnh* the legal *corpus* of Israel which in Dt 4.6 (a text which is equally late) is defined by *bynh*; IV) the unique Qumran attestation is in reality a quotation of Jr 10.12 and Ps 136.5.

e) The comparison with Qohelet is illuminating: in contrast to Ben Sira he is in polemic against the didactic and traditionalist groups and in contrast to the author of the poem of Job he does not imitate them even for the sake of a literary stratagem: in his lexicon there is no longer any place for *tbwnh*.

f) The comparison with the frequency which the other lexemes of the lexical field have in the Qumran texts compared to the biblical text (in particular *bynh* and *škl* should be observed) excludes the suspicion that the lack of attestations may be due to a lack of thematic opportunity.

g) Only *ħkmh* has less occurrences in the Qumran texts, and in fact it is a matter of another lexeme which loses active life after the exile.

In summary, from the distribution of the occurrences and from the analysis of their character it is concluded that *tbwnh* (in all its meanings) belongs to the lexical structure of EBH, where it appears in the narrative register as well as in the poetic one (beginning already in ABH). The two post-exilic authors who use it (the author of the poem of Job and Ben Sira) make a scholarly salvage operation, from among the most frequently occurring lexicon in the wisdom literature, lexicon that is connected to the issues developed by the intellectual tradition, like the problem of knowledge, the ways of obtaining it and its relations with faith in the God of Israel. As for Ps 147.5 and 11Q5 26.14 they are rather some stereotypical *clichés* on God the creator, which drag *tbwnh* behind them, as mnemonic remembrance. The heirs of *tbwnh* in LBH are *bynh* and *škl* (and then the translation with *ביונא*, *בינא*, and *סוכלתנו* which is offered by the Targumim is not by chance).

In the Mishna there is only a single attestation of *tbwnh*: Abot 2.7, where it is probable that the lexeme has been called up by the didactic-sapiential aura of the saying: *mrhb yšybh mrhb ħkmh mrhb šh mrhb tbwnh* “the more schooling the more wisdom, the more counsel the more understanding” (Danby).

B.1 The Targumim treat *tbwnh* and *bynh* as synonyms. They translate them normally with *swkltnw* and derived forms, while in the wisdom texts (with an implicit recognition of the peculiarity of the meanings which come into play) they have recourse to a loan or calque from Hebrew: *bywn*'.

B.2 Regarding 1Kg 5.9 the statement of Gray (³1977:146) turns out to be totally unfounded, when he says that *tbwnh* and *rhb-lb* (which is a hapax) appear only in late sources, a fact which together with other factors makes him think of a late dating for the passage in question.

6. Exegesis

A.1 The meanings reconstructed for *tbwnh* in ancient Hebrew, in the light of the structuration and functioning of the whole lexical field of the substantives for "knowledge", are the following (Sciumbata 1996-97:153-170; 319-322; 394-395):

tbwn "ingenuity": Ho 13.2. It is possible that we are dealing with a dialectal variant of *tbwnh*.

I) *tbwnh*, "intelligence" (intellectual faculty whose function is to allow one to understand).

Occurrences: Dt 32.28; 1Kg 5.9; Is 44.19; Ob 7,8; Pr 2.6; 10.23; 11.12; 14.29; 15.21; 17.27; 18.2; 20.5; 21.30; Jb 12.13; Sir 4.24A; 44.3BM. The clear-cut distinction of meaning from *bynh* should be noted, to understand the reasons for lexical choices made by the authors in the various contexts. Thus, in Dt 32.28 (*ky-gwy 'bd 'swt hmh w'yn bhm tbwnh* "since they are a nation which has lost its sense, and there is not in them any intelligence") it is not a matter of "discernment" (NJPS, which also translates in this way elsewhere), namely of a faculty of perception or distinction, but of the faculty of understanding (what is to be done: cf. also Zorell 887, whose definitions "animadversio, attentio... habitus seu virtus animadvertendi animadvertenda" seem to be misguided by the etymological lens with which the meaning is interpreted).

II) *tbwnh*₂ "ingenuity, genius" (mental, creative faculty in handicraft and art: we are dealing with a usage of the specialized language of the technical artisan sector). Occurrences: Ex 31.3; 35.31; 36.1; 1Kg 7.14; Is 40.28; Jr 10.12; Ezk 28.4; Ps 136.5; 147.5; Pr 3.19; Jb 26.12Q; 11Q5 26.14. The artisan-technical linguistic context which is typical of this lexeme is clear in the narrative occurrences in Ex and Kg. The poetic language of Prophets, Psalms and Proverbs uses it in creation contexts, making a parallel between the artistic genius or cleverness of man and that of God (and already the Babylonian Talmud, *Berakot* 55a, made a connection between the three gifts made by God to Bezalel and the same three qualities which according to Pr 3.19-20 God displayed at the moment of creation: see also Rashi on Pr 3.19). The creation context becomes topical for *tbwnh*, to such an extent that it is the principal cause of its recovery in late Hebrew, down to the Qumran texts. In Ho 13.2 the lexeme appears in the masculine *tbwn*.

This technical meaning, even if not recognised as specifically sector-related, is noted by all the lexica (and by the modern translations), though not always in its precise nuance: see Schökel 792, who speaks of "destreza, habilidad, maestría, pericia"; *TWAT* I, 628 "Geschicklichkeit im Beruf" (linking to it Ho 13.2 as well); *HAL* 1548 "Geschick"; Whybray 1974 seems undecided: on p.138 he speaks of "manual skill", while on p.139 of "creative skill such as that of an artificer". An exception is represented by B. Jacob 1992:842: "Bezalel possessed the gift of originality, a divine inspiration here defined as the ability to visualise and execute".

The professional technicalisation of *tbwnh* (like other terms too of the lexicon of

“knowledge”) occurs also in other contexts: song in Chronicles, medicine in Ben Sira.

III) *tbwnh*₃ “intelligence” (lexeme of the didactic-wisdom jargon, designating the corpus of instructions and values taught by that tradition). Occurrences: Pr 2.2; 5.1; Sir 14.20,21A; 15.3AB; 15.15A; 45.5. The reference is to the teachings and the words of the teacher, mostly of an ethical-behavioural kind. In the jargon of the traditionalist sapiential strand many other lexemes of the lexical field of “knowledge” undergo this treatment (the same applies to *tbwnh*₄ and *tbwnh*₅), obliterating the semantic peculiarity of each one: the superimposed technical sense is prevalent. The translation by *bywn'* in the Targumim on the wisdom texts, a term which can be considered as a loan from the Hebrew (v. supra 4. Versions *f.* Targum, a.4) and which is equally used in the same contexts for *bynh*, seems to render this technical development which is basically untranslatable.

IV) *tbwnh*₄ “intelligence” (lexeme of the didactic-wisdom jargon, designating a virtue obtained by training with the teachers of the current, understood to take the place of the natural faculty of man). Occurrences Pr 2.3,11; 3.13; 19.8; 24.3; Jb 12.12. There is here a lack of distinction from *bynh* with the same meaning.

V) *tbwnh*₅ “Intelligence” (name given *tout court* to the metaphysicalization of the teaching of the didactic-traditional sapiential current. An identical phenomenon happens with *hkmh* and *bynh*). Occurrences: Pr 8.1. According to Dahood 1970 the personification of *tbwnh* appears also in Ps 136.5: in reality we have repeated the *cliché* on the creation of the heavens thanks to divine ingenuity/genius.

VI) *tbwnh*₆ “intelligent manifestations, actions, words etc”. The semantic transition of the plural to indicate the effects or the manifestations of the concept expressed by the singular noun occurs also with *hkmh* and *bynh* (for this phenomenon cf. JM §136g; Fox 1993:152). Occurrences: Ps 49.4; 78.72; Jb 32.11; Sir 50.27B.

A.2 In Fox 1993:151-152 some attempts at a definition of the meaning of *tbwnh* are made, also in opposition to *bynh*: “One may have *tebunah* and do things in *tebunah*, but *tebunah* is not an action done to something” (151); *tebunah* designates the pragmatic, applied aspect of thought operating in the field of action; it aims at efficacy and accomplishment. *Binah* is the conceptual, interpretive activity of thought, operating in the field of meaning; it aims at perception and comprehension” (152). A little later he maintains that it is a matter rather of common sense than of the exercise of the intellect. Despite the vagueness and confusion of these statements, Fox’s is one of the few serious attempts to provide descriptions of the meaning of the lexicon of “knowledge” on the linguistic level, without confusing it with a summary of the connections, equivalences and contextual senses. Its explicit attempt to escape from the fetters of contextual descriptions of meaning fails nevertheless for the lack of a rigorous method of linguistic research.

A.3 McKane 1970 shows a fine semantic sensibility in regard to the lexicon of knowledge. In his reconstruction of the wisdom movement he speaks of the lexicon of ancient wisdom which is resemanticised in the book in a religious sense. Independently of the validity of this reconstruction, the semantic definitions often hit the nail on the head. On p. 281 he describes *hkmh* and *tbwnh* in ch. 2 of the book as “mental virtues of sagacity and penetration, inculcated by an educational process which addressed itself to the right shaping and maturing of intellectual attitudes”.

B.1 The distinctions made by Rashi between *hkmh*, *tbwnh* and *d't* in the manual contexts of Exodus are of a rationalistic (and in part theological) kind. In the comment on Ex 31.3 regarding

tbwnh he says: *mbyn dbr mlbw mtwk dbrym šlmd* (it would be a matter namely of the capacity to draw conclusions on the basis of learned knowledge). Cassuto is located on the same line when he specifies that it is a matter of “the capacity to deduce one thing from another and to find a way of solving any problem that may arise in the course of the work” (1967:402). It is curious that Rashi does not mention in this context the technical use which is made of the three terms, since in the comment in Pr 3.19 he recognises the agreement between the three faculties which God uses there and those of Bezalel in Exodus and of Hiram in 1Kg 7.14.

B.2 BDB treats many of the words of the lexical field according to an identical scheme. For *tbwnh* (and *bynh*) it distinguishes three applications (BDB 108): 1) the act; 2) the faculty; 3) the object of knowledge. A fourth meaning is given, with the personification of the term (cf. also Gordis 1978: comment on Jb.32.11). This division does not grasp, except partially, the real lexematic articulation of *tbwnh*.

B.3 HAL: 1548 limits itself to the provision of “glosses” or “labels” in the German language (“Einsicht, Klugheit, Geschick”), which turn out to be rather vague and do not allow the identification of the specific semantic content of the lexeme with respect to other “synonyms”.

B.4 Zorell 887 (*animadversio, attentio, habitus seu virtus animadvertendi animadvertenda, prudentia, intelligentia*) seems to have been carried off course in his definitions by the attempt to describe the meaning according to the etymological perspective.

B.5 It is a practice of many commentators and lexicographers to speak of a connection with wisdom thought (see as a representative *TWAT* §6). In reality *tbwnh* (like the other terms of its lexical field) belongs to the everyday language (Whybray 1974; Fox 1993; Sciumbata 1996-97 and 1999) and only for thematic reasons does it recur in the so-called wisdom texts. If in certain circles the practice was established of defining with the lexemes of the lexical field of “knowledge” a given *corpus* of teaching, the contents of this *corpus* cannot be identified *tout court* with its linguistic meaning.

7. Conclusions

In the semantic reconstruction provided by Sciumbata 1996-97, it is concluded that *tbwnh*, in all its meanings (see 6. Exegesis, A.1), belongs to the vocabulary of pre-exilic Hebrew, where it appears in the narrative register as well as in poetry. The post-exilic occurrences are due to the recovery (polemical in Job, from imitation in Ben Sira) of the didactic-wisdom terminology, or to stereotypical *clichés* related to creation. The reasons for the decline of *tbwnh* in late Hebrew are to be seen in the morphological replacement of the *pattern taqtul* on the one hand by *qi:l/qu:l* on the other. Its uses and its semantic content are taken up in LBH by *bynh* and *škl*.

A.2 *tbwnh* “intelligence” and *bynh* “discernment, intelligence” are not interchangeable synonyms. Apart from a different viewpoint on the semantic information which they transmit they are distinguished by their different distribution: *bynh* is in standard Hebrew a poetic term, and only in the post-exilic period does it descend into the language of prose.

8. Bibliography

- Bendavid, A. 1967-71. (H) *Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew*, vols I-II, Tel Aviv, Dvir.
 Bewer, J.A. 1911. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Obadiah and Joel* in J.M.P. Smith, W.H.

- Ward and J.A. Bewer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Micah, Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Obadiah and Joel* (ICC), Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark.
- Briggs, C.A. and E.G. 1906-07. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms* (ICC), 2 vols, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark.
- Cassuto, U. 1967. *A Commentary on the Book of Exodus*, Jerusalem, The Magnes Press (tr. from Heb. 1951).
- Cathcart, K.J. and Gordon, R.P. 1989. *The Targum of the Minor Prophets. Translated with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus and Notes*, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark.
- Cohen, D. 1976. *Dictionnaire des racines sémitiques ou attestées dans les langues sémitiques*, Paris-Mouton-La Haye.
- Dahood, M. 1965. *Psalms 1-50* (Anchor Bible), Garden City-New York, Doubleday.
--1970. *Psalms 101-150* (Anchor Bible), Garden City-New York, Doubleday.
- Diez Merino, L. 1984. *Targum de Proverbios. Edición Príncipe del Ms. Villa-Amil n° 5 de Alfonso de Zamora*, Madrid, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Instituto "Francisco Suárez".
- Fox, M.V. 1993. "Words for Wisdom: תְּבוּנָה and עֲרָמָה; בִּינָה and עֵצָה; מִזְמָה and תּוֹשִׁיָּה", *ZAH* 6: 149-69.
- Gordis, R. 1978. *The Book of Job. Commentary, New Translation and Special Studies*, New York, The Jewish Theological Seminary of America.
- Harper, W.R. 1905. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Amos and Hosea* (ICC), Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark.
- Hatch, E., and Redpath, H.A. 1897-1906. *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament*, 2 vols, Oxford.
--1998. *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament*, 2 vols, Grand Rapids, Michigan, Baker Books.
- Healey, J.F. 1991. *The Targum of Proverbs*, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark.
- Hurvitz, A. 1982. *A Linguistic Study of the Relationship between the Priestly Source and the Book of Ezekiel. A New Approach to an Old Problem*, Paris, Gabalda.
--1995. "Continuity and Innovation in Biblical Hebrew. The Case of 'Semantic Change' in Post-Exilic Writings", in T. Muraoka (ed.), *Studies in Ancient Hebrew Semantics*, Leuven, Peeters, 1-10.
- Jacob, B., 1992. *The Second Book of the Bible: Exodus*, Hoboken, Ktav Publishing House.
Jewish Publication Society (ed.) 1985. *Tanakh. A New Translation of the Holy Scriptures according to the Traditional Hebrew Text*, Philadelphia-Jerusalem, The Jewish Publication Society (=NJPS).
- McKane, W. 1970. *Proverbs. A New Approach* (OTL), London, SCM Press.
- Rudolph, W. 1966. *Hosea* (KAT XIII/1), Gutersloh, Mohn.
- Sciumbata, M.P. 1996. "Peculiarità e motivazioni della struttura lessicale dei verbi della 'conoscenza' in Qohelet. Abbozzo di una storia dell'epistemologia ebraico-biblica", *Henoch* 18: 235-49.
--1996-97. *Il campo lessicale dei sostantivi della 'conoscenza' in ebraico antico*, Università degli Studi di Firenze, doctoral thesis.
--1999. "Dalla linguistica alla storia della cultura. La natura, l'organizzazione e lo sviluppo diacronico del campo lessicale dei sostantivi della 'conoscenza' in ebraico antico e il loro

significato per la comprensione degli scenari intellettuali dell'antico Israele", *Materia giudaica* 6: 2-8.

Sanders, J.A. (ed.) 1965. *The Psalm Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 (11QPs^a)*, DJD IV.

Segal, M.S. 1958. *spr bn syr' hšlm. kwll kl hšrydym h'bryym šntglw mtwk hgnyzh whžrt hqṭ'ym hšsrym, 'm mbw', prwš wmpthwt*, Jerusalem, Mosad Bialik.

Stec, D.M. 1994. *The Text of the Targum of Job. An Introduction and Critical Edition*, Leiden-New York-Köln, E.J. Brill.

Whybray, R.N. 1974. *The Intellectual Tradition in the Old Testament*, Berlin, Walter de Gruyter.

[The section on the Peshitta benefited from the collaboration of Giovanni Lenzi, a Syriac specialist and a monk of the Piccola Famiglia dell'Annunziata.]

M. Patrizia Sciumbata (Firenze)

[translated by G. I. Davies]

Appendix: Functional Languages of Ancient Hebrew (1998)

(as revised by M.P. Sciumbata in 2001)

ABH Archaic Biblical Hebrew	Gn 49:3-27; Exod 15:1-19; Nm 22:2-24:25; Dt 32; 33; Jd 5; 1 Sam 2:1-10; Ps 68
EBH ₁ Historical-Narrative Language	Torah (except ABH and EBH ₄); Former Prophets; Ruth; Inscriptions (first half of the first millennium)
EBH ₂ Poetical Language	2Kgs 19:21-35; 2Sam 22:1-23:7; Classical Prophecy; Lam; Prv; Ps (except post-exilic ones); [Jer, Ezek and Lam are chronologically exilic, whereas Hag, Zech, Mal, Joel, Isa 40-66 and probably Prv 1-9, 30-31 are chronologically post-exilic; however these sections are considered typologically pre-exilic]
EBH ₃ Language of Hosea	Hosea
EBH ₄ Juridical-Cultic Language	Exod 20:1-17; 20:22-23:33; 34:10-26; Lv; Dt 5:6-21; 12-26; 27:14-26 (Ezek, whose language is at the same time poetic and of juridical-cultic type, can be considered in this section)
LBH ₁ Historical-Narrative Language	Jonah; Job 1-2; 42:7-17; Qoh; Est; Dn; Ezra; Neh; 1-2 Chr; inscriptions of the second half of

	the first millennium
LBH ₂ Poetical Language	Cant; Ps 103; 117; 119; 124; 125; 133; 144; 145; Doxologies 41:14; 72:19-20; 106:47-48; disputed: 104, 106, 107, 109, 111, 112, 113, 116, 126, 135, 137, 143, 146, 147, 148
LBH ₃ Language of Job	Poetry of Job
BSh Late Hebrew of Ben Sira	Ben Sira
QH ₁ Language of the exegetical and para-biblical literature at Qumran	<i>Pešarim</i> , Paraphrases, Apocrypha
QH ₂ Qumranic Poetical Language	Apocryphal Psalms; <i>Hodayot</i> ; 1QS X:1-XI:22; 1QM X:8-XII:18; XIII:2b-18; XIV:4b-18; XV:7b-XVI:1; XVI:15-XVII:9; XVIII:6b-XIX:8; Hymns and Sapiential Works; Blessings; Curses; Liturgical Works
QH ₃ Qumranic Juridical-Cultic Language	Rules; Liturgical-Ritual Works; Halakhic Texts; War Scroll; Temple Scroll; Damascus Document; Rules of the Community etc.