"Taken from Dust, Formed from Clay": Compound Allusions and Scriptural Exegesis in
1QHodayot^a 11:20–37; 20:27–39 and Ben Sira 33:7–15

Abstract

This paper argues that, in 1QH^a 11:20–27; 20:27–39 and Sir 33:7–15, the use of allusions to

humanity's creation from dust in Genesis 2–3 and to its formation from clay in Isa 29:16; 45:9;

Jer 18:4, 6 represents a conscious exegetical process in which the Genesis and prophetic

traditions were read and used in light of one another. Although originating within different social

environments—one sectarian and the other as part of a wisdom scribal context—both make use

of the same two scriptural allusions and evince a similar pattern of interpretive reflection. The

goal of the study is to demonstrate that the allusions function together, in a compounded manner,

to present (1) a composite portrait of God as creator and determiner of all human outcomes, and

(2) a corresponding composite portrait of humanity in its universal mortality and complete

subjection to the deterministic will of God.

Key Words: Hodayot, Ben Sira, scriptural allusions and exegesis, Genesis 2–3, Isa 29:16; 45:9;
Jer 18:4, 6

I. Introduction

In comparing the Qumran Thanksgiving Hymns with the book of Ben Sira, scholars have largely

focused upon similarities in their use of wisdom language (רז, בין, דעת, חכמה) and thus their

relation to the wider scope of sapiential traditions in Second Temple Judaism.[1] Much less work

---

[1] Probably the earliest study to note the sapiential language of the Hodayot is Hans Bardtke, "Considérations sur les Cantiques de Qumrân," *RB* 63 (1956) 220–33, who suggested that the Hodayot uses wisdom terminology for pedagogical purposes. Other early studies include: H. Germann, "Jesus ben Siras Dankgebet und die Hodajoth," *TZ* 19 (1963) 81–87; H.-W. Kuhn, *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil: Untersuchungen zu den Gemeindeliedern von Qumran mit einem Anhang über Eschatologie und Gegenwart in der Verkündigung Jesu* (SUNT 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), 139–75. See also the unpublished dissertation of S. Tanzer, "The Sages at Qumran: Wisdom in the Hodayot" (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1987). A. Lange's study of wisdom and predestination in the Qumran literature includes treatment of the Hodayot and Ben Sira, but it does not systematically compare them. See A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination: Weisheitliche Urordnung und*

has been done, however, that comparatively explores their respective strategies of scriptural

allusion and whether these strategies provide evidence of shared patterns of exegesis.[2] This

article is a study of two scriptural allusions that are brought together and used correspondingly

within the poems of 1QH[a] 11:20–37; 20:27–39 and Sir 33:7–15: God's creation of humanity

from the dust of the earth, based upon language found in Gen 2:7; 3:19 (יצר,לקח, שוב, עפר),[3] and

the portrayal of humanity as a vessel formed from clay by God as potter, based upon the

language of Isa 29:16; 45:9; Jer 18:4, 6 (חמר היצר).[4] The argument is that, in both of the Hodayot

---

Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran (STDJ 18; Leiden: Brill, 1995). More recently, see M. Goff, "Reading Wisdom at Qumran: 4QInstruction and the Hodayot," *DSD* 11.3 (2004) 263–88; M. Goff, "Recent Trends in the Study of Early Jewish Wisdom Literature: The Contribution of 4QInstruction and Other Qumran Texts," *CBR* 7.3 (2009) 376–416; Hugo Antonissen "Die weisheitliche Terminologie in den Hodayot: Ein kontextbezogener Überblick," *Leqach* 7 (2007) 1–15; É. Puech, "Le livre de Ben Sira et les manuscrits de la Mer Morte," in *Treasures of Wisdom: Studies in Ben Sira and the Book of Wisdom. Festschrift M.Gilbert* (ed. N. Calduch-Benages and J. Vermeylen; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999), 411–26 (although this study is more text-critically oriented); and É. Puech, "Ben Sira and Qumran," in *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: Studies on Tradition, Redaction, and Theology* (ed. A. Passaro and G. Bellia; DCLS 1; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008), 79–118.

[2] See C. Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran* (STDJ 52; Leiden: Brill, 2004), ch. 2, in part of which she compares the approaches of Ben Sira and the Hodayot to Torah as a symbol of cultural and religious knowledge (Ben Sira is treated on pp. 39–41). Two major contributions to the study of the use of scripture in the Hodayot are: J.A. Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions and Exegesis in the Hodayot* (STDJ 59; Leiden: Brill, 2006); and W.A. Tooman, "Between Imitation and Interpretation: Reuse of Scripture and Composition in *Hodayot* (1QH[a])11:6–19," *DSD* 18.1 (2011) 54–73. Neither of these studies intends to compare the scriptural allusions in the Hodayot with Ben Sira.

[3] Two studies are worth noting here. The first is J.-S. Rey, "Le motif de la poussière en Gn 2,7 et sa réception dans le judaïsme du second Temple," in *Lire et Interpréter: Les religions et leurs rapports aux textes fondateurs* (Geneva: Labor et Fides, 2013), 79–94. See esp. pp. 86–88, 90–93, where he treats Sir 33:10 and other Hodayot poems. Rey is not primarily concerned with identifying particular strategies of scriptural allusion or the potential exegetical processes involved. Further, his study is restricted to the dust motif in Second Temple Judaism more broadly and thus he does not consider, specifically, how this motif works in tandem with allusions to the clay/potter metaphor in the Hodayot and Sir 33:13. The second is K.M. Hogan, "The Mortal Body and the Earth in Ben Sira and the Book of Watchers," in *Christian Body, Christian Self: Concepts of Early Christian Personhood* (ed. C.K. Rothschild and T.W. Thompson; WUNT 284; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 21–40, which considers Ben Sira's use of dust and earth in the context of the book's anthropology. While Hogan does not put Ben Sira in conversation with the Hodayot, her insights will be drawn upon later in this article.

[4] The Hodayot's use of the terminology of "formed/taken from dust" (יצר/לקח מעפר) and "a thing formed from clay" (יצר חמר) in its supposedly low anthropology has often been discussed within the context of the *Niedrigkeitsdoxologien*, a form-critical designation first used by Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn to describe passages in which the speaker confesses or complains about the lowliness of his human condition. See Kuhn, *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil*, 27–29. On p. 27, however, he draws the distinction between *Niedrigkeitsdoxologie* and *Elendsbetrachtung*: "Als nächstes ist ein Gattungselement zu nennen, das in zwei verschiedenen Ausprägungen vorkommt, entweder als *Niedrigkeitsdoxologie* oder als *Elendsbetrachtung*." The difference between them is their connection to the righteousness of God. Regarding the *Niedrigkeitsdoxologien*, Kuhn says, "Der 'Niedrigkeit' des Menschen als Sünder und Geschöpf wird Gottes צדקה und seine Allmacht gegenübergestellt." The *Elendsbetrachtung*, however, "nur über die Sündenverfallenheit, die Nichtigkeit und den 'Kummer' des Menschen

poems and in Sir 33:7–15, use of allusions to humanity's creation from dust in Genesis and to its

formation from clay in Isaiah and Jeremiah represents a conscious exegetical process in which

the Genesis and prophetic traditions were read and used in light of one another. Although likely

originating within different social environments—one sectarian and the other as part of a wisdom

scribal context[5]—both make use of the same two scriptural allusions and evince a similar pattern

of interpretive reflection.[6] The goal of the study is to demonstrate that the allusions function

together, in a compounded manner, to present (1) a composite portrait of God as creator and

determiner of all human outcomes, and (2) a corresponding composite portrait of humanity in its

universally shared mortality and complete subjection to the deterministic will of God.

Comparison of the Hodayot and Ben Sira reveals a similar underlying exegetical process,

but at the same time a fundamental difference between them emerges concerning the particular

point of view from which each approaches scripture. Whereas the speaker in the Hodayot evokes

Genesis 2–3 and the prophetic material from the viewpoint of one "taken from dust" and

"formed from clay" through repetition of the first-person "I,"[7] Ben Sira approaches the same

---

reflektieren" (p. 28). See also H. Lichtenberger, *Studien zum Menschenbild in Texten der Qumrangemeinde* (SUNT 15; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980), 73–87; Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space*, 219–20, 225–26.

[5] I recognize the potentially problematic nature of my assertion that the Hodayot poems originated within a "sectarian" context. A.K. Harkins, "The Community Hymns Classification: A Proposal for Further Differentiation," *DSD* 15 (2008) 121–54, argues that, within some of the so-called Community Hymns, language is used that would seem characteristic of non-sectarian texts, and thus not all of these hymns should be understood as having their origins within the Qumran community. The major example she cites is the use of the phrase כול ברית אדם ("every human covenant") in 1QH[a] 4:27 (4:39 in DJD 40) (pp. 145–52). While Harkins' point is well taken here, her argument does not affect the traditional understanding of 1QH[a] 11:20–37 and 20:27–39, specifically, as compositions whose purview was restricted to the confines of the *Yaḥad*. On the wisdom scribal context of Ben Sira, see Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space*, 41.

[6] It is important to note that I am not necessarily arguing for a direct or dependent relationship between the Hodayot and Ben Sira, although at least one prominent Qumran scholar has suggested this (Puech, "Ben Sira and Qumran," 88) and although there is some manuscript evidence that seems to demonstrate that Ben Sira was read at Qumran (2Q18 and 11QPs[a]; see below). My intension, rather, is to demonstrate a similarity in their reading of scripture, while, at the same time, to highlight how their slight differences expose their different social concerns.

[7] This article is not concerned with the "real" identity of the "I" in the first-person singular material of the Hodayot, that is, whether the "I" represents a historical Teacher of Righteousness, the institutionalized office of the *Maskil* within the community, or some other figure. Further, although the argument of this article may have implications for the Community Hymns vs. Teacher Hymns classification debate, this also is not the primary

scriptural texts from the viewpoint of God as the creator and former of all humanity. That is, the allusions in the Hodayot function to provide a scriptural basis for sectarian self-definition; in Ben Sira, however, they operate primarily as scriptural support for theodicy. From this perspective, one of the main and overarching contributions of this study is that it attempts to clarify a common exegetical practice within Second Temple Judaism that was used in different texts for some very different purposes.

II. Identifying Allusions and the Manuscript Situation of the Hodayot and Ben Sira

1. Identifying Allusions

The study of allusions and reuse of scripture in Second Temple literature is faced with a range of methodological challenges. In a recent article on scriptural reuse in 1QH[a] 11:6–19, William Tooman considers techniques used by the author to imitate the language of the scriptural source texts around which the poem is shaped (see note 2). He provides three guiding principles for identifying such scriptural reuse: *uniqueness or rarity*, *multiplicity*, and *thematic correspondence*.[8] All three of these principles are helpful for the current study.

Uniqueness or rarity refers to instances in which "the element in question may be unique to a particular source text (excepting its reuse) or rare outside of a particular source text."[9] In the case of 1QH[a] 11:22; 20:27, 30; Sir 33:10 (MS E; see table below), use of the lexical items עפר, and יצר, לקח to speak of the creation of humanity occurs in the Hebrew Bible only at Gen 2:7; 3:19, which strongly suggests that both the Hodayot and Ben Sira envision Genesis as

___

concern here. I have chosen to treat one hymn traditionally considered to be among the Teacher Hymns (1QH[a] 11:20–37) and one traditionally considered to be among the Community Hymns (1QH[a] 20:27–39) in order to circumvent objections based upon such concerns. On these issues, see M.C. Douglas, "The Teacher Hymn Hypothesis Revisited: New Data for an Old Crux," *DSD* 6 (1999): 239–66; Harkins, "The Community Hymns Classification," 121–54; A.K. Harkins, "Who is the Teacher of the Teacher Hymns? Re-examining the Teacher Hymns Hypothesis Fifty Years Later," in *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam* (ed. E.F. Mason, S.I. Thomas, A. Schofield, E. Ulrich; 2 vols.; JSJSup 153; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 449–67.

[8] Tooman, "Between Imitation and Interpretation," 58–59.

[9] Tooman, "Between Imitation and Interpretation," 58.

the source text for this language. *Multiplicity* involves the appearance in a new text of several elements that occur in close proximity in the source text. In the case of 1QH[a] 11:24–25; 20:35; Sir 33:13 (LXX//MS E), use of the lexemes יצר and חמר in close proximity occurs in the Hebrew Bible only at Isa 29:16; 45:9; 64:7; Jer 18:4, 6, which is, again, a clear indicator of the source texts for the usage of these elements in the Hodayot and Ben Sira.[10] Lastly, *thematic correspondence* results when an author draws upon texts that "share a similar subject, theme, or argument with the text that they are composing."[11] This principle will become readily apparent in the analysis below: both the Hodayot and Ben Sira draw upon scriptural texts that similarly accentuate the lowliness of humanity and the unparalleled sovereignty of God to accomplish their respective tasks of self-definition and theodicy.[12]

One of the major thrusts of Tooman's article, however, is that the author of 1QH[a] 11:6–19 could reuse scripture, mimicking its language and style, without implying that the reuse was exegetical. While the author clearly draws upon scriptural language, there is no explicit interpretation of the source texts given in the poem itself. Part of what leads him to this conclusion is that: "In no case is a referent of a source text reapplied to a new person, event, or

---

[10] The use of ὡς πηλὸς κεραμέως ἐν χειρὶ αὐτοῦ in Sir 33:13 LXX and, depending upon one's reconstruction, כחומר ביד ה[יוצר] in MS E, would represent a direct citation of Jer 18:4. This, of course, distinguishes Ben Sira from 1QH[a], which combines the distinctive elements of חמר and יצר into one phrase, which itself does not occur in the Hebrew Bible.

[11] Tooman, "Between Imitation and Interpretation," 59.

[12] It is helpful to note here as well two criteria that Julie Hughes puts forth for identifying allusions in the Hodayot specifically. The first is the need to identify an allusion marker based upon verbal similarities. This criterion is met in the use of a "more commonly occurring phrase which nonetheless has similarities of meaning or context" with either one identifiable scripture passage—here, the use of language specifically from Genesis 2–3 (לקח עפר; שוב עפר; יצר עפר)—or a group of passages that can be viewed as a single entity based upon some sort of shared relationship—here, the language of יצר החמר based upon Isa 29:16; 45:9; Jer 18:4, 6, which share a conceptual relationship through the use of the same extended potter/clay metaphor (Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions*, 53). The second criterion is evidence that the psalm, as the adoptive text, "directs the reader to a particular interpretation of the adopted text" (p. 53). As will be proposed below, this criterion is met in both of the allusions proposed here, since the Hodayot considered demonstrate an awareness of the context of their adopted passage(s), an awareness which subsequently contributes to the meaning of the Hodayot themselves. Further, while, as noted above, the exact phrase יצר החמר does not occur in the Hebrew Bible, its use in the Hodayot likely represents a word play on the relationship of the verb יצר and the occupation of a potter (יוצר, see below). Such poetic devices, Hughes says, also fulfill the second criterion of leading the reader to a particular interpretation of the adopted text.

circumstance. There is no conceptual harmonization of the sources (apart from merely conflating locutions and metaphors)."[13] In contrast to Tooman on this point, I argue below (1) that 1QH[a] 11:20–37 and 20:27–39 do, in fact, reapply their scriptural source texts to a new person, namely, the speaker of the poem; and (2) that these Hodayot and Sir 33:10, 13 both conceptually harmonize their scriptural sources within similar anthropological and theological frameworks. That is, the allusions in each poem work together toward similar anthropological and theological ends. The suggestion, then, that the allusions considered in this study are *compound* allusions— distinct allusions that function in tandem based upon shared properties of scriptural texts— provides a methodological mechanism for exploring a similar exegetical process at work in the two Hodayot passages and in Ben Sira.

2. Text and Manuscript Situation of the Hodayot and Ben Sira

The Hodayot are preserved in eight fragmentary copies—two from cave 1 (1QH[a], 1QH[b]) and six from cave 4 (4QH[a–e], 4QpapH[f] [4Q427–432]). Most of the content of the psalms considered in this study comes from the 1QH[a] scroll, although there are portions of text that have parallels in other manuscript copies as well.[14] Thus, while the 1QH[a] scroll as reconstructed in DJD 40 is the text primarily used here, notes are made to parallel material when necessary.[15] For space, only the most relevant lines of 1QH[a] 11:20–37 and 1QH[a] 20:27–39 are given below.[16]

1QH[a] 11:20–25

20 אודכה אדוני כי פדיתה נפשי משחת ומשאול אבדון
21 העליתני לרום עולם ואתהלכה במישור לאין חקר ואדעה כיא יש מקוה לאשר
22 יצרתה מעפר לסוד עולם ורוח נעוה טהרתה מפשע רב להתיצב במעמד עם
23 צבא קדושים ולבוא ביחד עם עדת בני שמים ותפל לאיש גורל עולם עם רוחות

---

[13] Tooman, "Between Imitation and Interpretation," 71. See pp. 71–72 for the fuller context of his statement.

[14] For thorough survey of the Hodayot manuscripts, see E. Schuller, "Recent Scholarship on the *Hodayot* 1993–2010," *CBR* 10.1 (2011): 119–62 (123–31).

[15] H. Stegemann, with E. Schuller, *1QHodayot[a] with Incorporation of 1QHodayot[b] and 4QHodayot[a–f]* (DJD 40; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009). Hereafter cited as DJD 40.

[16] English translations are adapted from Carol Newsom's translations in DJD 40.

24 דעת להלל שמכה ביחד רנה ולספר נפלאותיכה לנגד כול מעשיכה ואני יצר

25 החמר מה אני מגבל במים ולמי נחשבתי ומה כוח לי כיא התיצבתי בגבול רשעה

20 I thank you, O Lord, that you have redeemed my life from the pit and that from Sheol-Abbadon

21 you have lifted me up to an eternal height, so that I might walk about on limitless plain. And I know that there is hope for one whom

22 you have formed from dust for an eternal council. And a perverted spirit you have purified from great transgression in order to stand in position with

23 the host of the holy ones and to enter into community with the congregation of the children of heaven. And you cast for a person an eternal lot with the spirits

24 of knowledge to praise your name with a common joy and to recount your wonderful acts before all of your works. But I, a thing formed from

25 clay, what am I? A thing kneaded with water. As what am I regarded? And what strength do I possess? For I have taken my stand in the territory of wickedness.

1QHᵃ 20:27–35

27 [...]ואני[^17] מעפר לקח[תני ומחמר ק]ורֹצתֹי[^18]

28 למקור נדה וערות קלון מקוי עפר ומגבל] במים סוד רמ]ה ומדור

29 חושך ותשובת עפר ליצר חמר בקץ אֹפֹ[כה   יֹ]שֹוֹב עפרֹ

30 אל אשר לקח משם ומה ישיב עפר ואֹפֹרֹ] על משפטכה ומ[ה יבין

31 [במ]עֹשיו ומה יתיצב לפני מוכיח בו וֹ°°°]   [קֹודש

32 [ ]° עולם ומקוי[^19] כבוד ומקור דעת וגבורתֹ] פלֹ]א והמה לֹוֹא

33 [יוכ]לֹוֹ לספר כול כבודכה ולֹⁿתיצבֹ לֹפני אפכֹה[^20] ואין להשיב דֹבֹר

34 על בוכחתכה[^21] כיא צדקתה ואין לנגֹדכה ומֹה אפהו שב אל עפרו

35 ואני נאלמתי ומה אֹדבר על זות כדעתי ⁿⁿבֹרֹתֹⁱ מצורוק יצר חמר

27 [...] But as for me, from dust [you] took [me, and from clay] I was [sh]aped

28 as a source of pollution and dishonorable nakedness, a heap of dust and a thing kneaded [with water, a council of magg]ots, a dwelling

29 of darkness. And (there is) a return to dust for the thing formed from clay in the time of [your] anger[   ] dust returns

30 to that from which it was taken. What will dust and ash reply [concerning your judgement? And h]ow will it understand

31 its [w]orks? And how will it take its stand before the one who reproves it? And°°°[...] holiness

32 [ ]° eternal and a pool of glory and a fountain of knowledge and [wonder]ful strength. They are not

---

[^17]: Line 27 begins with ולוא לעבור על דברכה, which is a continuation of the thought from line 25. I have simply chosen to begin line 27 with the new thought that starts with ואני.

[^18]: The (reconstructed) phrase ומחמר ק]ורֹצתֹי is almost surely an allusion to Job 33:6, which reads: הן אני כפיך לאל מחמר קרצתי גם אני.

[^19]: The underlined portion is paralleled in 4Qᵃ 9 1–2.

[^20]: Underlined portion is paralleled in 4Qᵃ 9 1–2.

[^21]: The *DSSSE* reads תוכחתכה (p. 192).

33 [abl]e to recount all of your glory or to stand before your anger. And there is no response
34 concerning your reproof. For you are righteous and there is none before you. What, indeed, is he who returns to his dust?
35. But as for me, I have become silent. And what will I say concerning this? According to my knowledge I have spoken, a thing kneaded together, a thing formed from clay.

The situation is more complicated regarding the manuscript tradition of Ben Sira, which survives in Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Coptic, and Syriac versions.[22] Out of the nine extant Hebrew manuscripts (MSS A–F, Masada Scroll, 2Q18, 11QPs[a]), only MS E (MS Adler 3597) contains the text of Sir 33:7–15 (recto: Sir 32:16–33:14b; verso: Sir 33:14b–34:1).[23] The manuscript has synoptic parallels with MSS B and F at Sir 32:16–20, 21b, 24–33:2, with MS F at Sir 33:4–8, and with MS F in its lack of Sir 32:21a, 22–23; 33:3. Although MS E is noticeably more fragmentary than B and F, its contents differ only slightly from these two manuscripts, and it contains just one singular reading: at Sir 33:1 MSS B and F read the *plene* form בניסוי, while MS

---

[22] More work has been done on the Hebrew manuscripts in comparison to the Latin, Coptic, and Syriac ones. See, e.g., P.C. Beentjes, *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A Text Edition of All Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and a Synopsis of All Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts* (VTSup 68; Leiden: Brill, 1997); C. Martone, "Ben Sira Manuscripts from Qumran and Masada," in *The Book of Ben Sira in Modern Research: Proceedings of the First International Ben Sira Conference 28–31 July 1996 Soesterberg, Netherlands* (ed. P.C. Beentjes; BZAW 255; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997), 81–94; S. Schorch, "The Pre-eminence of the Hebrew Language and the Emerging Concept of the 'Ideal Text' in Late Second Temple Judaism," in *Studies in the Book of Ben Sira: Papers of the Third International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books, Shime'on Centre, Pápa, Hungary, 18–20 May, 2006* (ed. G.G. Xeravits and J. Zsengellér; JSJSup 127; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 43–54. On the Greek and Latin traditions, see M. Gilbert, "The Vetus Latina of Ecclesiasticus," in *Studies in the Book of Ben Sira*, 1–10; on the Coptic tradition, see F. Feder, "The Coptic Version(s) of the Book of Jesus Sirach," in *Studies in the Book of Ben Sira*, 11–20; on the Syriac tradition, see G. Rizzi, "Christian Interpretation in the Syriac Version of Sirach," in *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: Studies on Tradition, Redaction, and Theology*, 277–308.

[23] For a comprehensive description of MS E by its original editor, see J. Marcus, "A Fifth Ms of Ben Sira," *JQR* 21 (1931): 223–40. From Sir 33:7–15, only vv. 7–8 find a parallel in Hebrew, in MS F (see Beentjes, *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew*, 151). The readings of MS E and MS F for these two verses are virtually identical. MS F was found and published by Alexander Scheiber as "A Leaf of the Fourth [*sic*: read Sixth] Manuscript of the Ben Sira from Geniza," *Magyar Könyvszemle* 98 (1982): 179–85. An improved edition was published six years later by A.A. Di Lella, "The Newly Discovered Sixth Manuscript of Ben Sira from the Cairo Geniza," *Bib* 69 (1988): 226–38.

E reads the defective form בנסוי.[24] E does, however, agree more frequently and more closely with

F, which suggests a closer relationship between these two than with B and E.[25]

Unfortunately, the original editor of MS E did not date it. Beentjes notes the probability

that MSS A–F either originated in the Middles Ages or were at least copied during that period.[26]

In contrast, the fragments of Ben Sira discovered at Qumran and Masada date much earlier, from

the first half of the first century BCE (Masada Scroll), the second half of the first century BCE

(2Q18), and the first half of the first century CE (11QPs[a]). Despite the fragmentary nature and

late date of MS E, there is enough preserved for the manuscript to contribute to a comparison of

its use of scriptural allusions with those in the Hodayot. The manuscript gives a helpful

indication of the linguistic relationship between the Hebrew of Sir 33:7–15 and its Greek

counterpart, even if the Hebrew manuscript has a much later date. In any case, Ben Sira's Greek

version as reflected in Rahlfs modern edition of the Septuagint will be used in the comparison.

Below, the most relevant portions of the poem are given in the two textual traditions.

Sir 33:10–13 (MS E [MS Adler 3597])[27]

10 [.......]לי חמר < >	ומן עפר נוצר אדם:	
11 [...]ת יי׳ תבדילם	וישם אותם דרי הא[...]וישנ[....][28]	דרכיהם
12 [..........] מה[29]	[.]מהם הקדיש וא[.......]	
13 [..........]יוצר	לאחוז כרצון:	
[............]שהו	להתיצב מפני[.] חלק:	

---

[24] See P.C. Beentjes, "The Hebrew Text of Ben Sira 32[35].16–33[36].2," in his *"Happy the One Who Meditates on Wisdom" (Sir. 14.20): Collected Essays on the Book of Ben Sira* (CBET 43; Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 327.

[25] For a fuller analysis of parallel material, see Beentjes, "Hebrew Text," 317–31.

[26] Beentjes, *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew*, 5–6.

[27] The text given here is the one given in Beentjes, *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew*, 106. Beentjes' text appears to be based upon Marcus' original 1931 edition, but it is given without Marcus' proposed reconstructions. For those reconstructions, see Marcus, "A Fifth Ms of Ben Sira," 232–233. The English translation is mine.

[28] While very difficult to see due to the manuscript's poor condition, וישׁנ is a superlinear insertion and דרכיהם is a marginal insertion that runs vertically up the left side. Together these insertions—read as וישנה את דרכיהם—agree with the LXX reading. See Marcus, "A Fifth Ms of Ben Sira," 232.

[29] Marcus notes that מה may be a double of ומהם of the second hemistich. Suggesting that ם be read after מה, he reconstructs the first colon of v. 12 as [מהם ברך והרי]ם ("from among them he blesses and exalts"), which would parallel nicely with the LXX's reading of ἐξ αὐτῶν εὐλόγησεν καὶ ἀνύψωσεν (see below). See Marcus, "A Fifth Ms of Ben Sira," 232 n. 12.

10 [.......]*li* clay,[30] and from dust humanity/Adam was formed.

11 […]*t* Yhwh separated them, and he appoints them the generations of *h*ʾ[..] ^(and he alters) [..] ^(their ways)

12 [………….]*mh*, [.]from among them he sanctifies *w*ʾ[.……]

13 [………..] the one who forms (i.e., the potter), to hold according to (his) good favor.

[………]*shw*; to stand before him[.] (as) he apportions.

Sir 33(36):10–13 (LXX)[31]

10 καὶ ἄνθρωποι πάντες ἀπὸ ἐδάφους,
    καὶ ἐκ γῆς[32] ἐκτίσθη Αδαμ·

11 ἐν πλήθει ἐπιστήμης κύριος διεχώρισεν αὐτούς,
    καὶ ἠλλοίωσεν τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτῶν·

12 ἐξ αὐτῶν εὐλόγησεν καὶ ἀνύψωσεν,
    καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἡγίασεν καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἤγγισεν·
    ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν κατηράσατο καὶ ἐταπείνωσεν
    καὶ ἀνέστρεψεν αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ στάσεως αὐτῶν.

13 ὡς πηλὸς κεραμέως ἐν χειρὶ αὐτοῦ
    πᾶσαι αἱ ὁδοὶ αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν αὐτοῦ,
    οὕτως ἄνθρωποι ἐν χειρὶ τοῦ ποιήσαντος αὐτοὺς
    ἀποδοῦναι αὐτοῖς κατὰ τὴν κρίσιν αὐτοῦ.

10 And all humans are from dust,[33]
    and from the earth humanity/Adam was created.

11 In the abundance of knowledge the Lord separates them,
    and he alters their ways.

12 From among them he blesses and exalts,
    and from among them he sanctifies and draws (them) near to him.
    From among them he curses and brings low,
    and he overturns them from their position.

---

[30] If the beginning of v. 10 in MS E is reconstructed as כ[לי חמר ("a vessel of clay"), then this verse alone may constitute an allusion to both Gen 2:7 and Jer 18:4, the latter of which reads: ונשחת הכלי אשר הוא עשה בחמר ביד (היוצר ושב ויעשהו כלי אחר כאשר ישר בעיני היוצר לעשות). See Rey, "Le motif de la poussière," 87; Hogan, "Mortal Boday," 35. Marcus' reconstruction inserts a מן prefix: מכ[לי חמר (Marcus, "A Fifth Ms of Ben Sira," 232). Rey disagrees with Marcus based upon the presence in the manuscript of a noticeable space at the top of the letter *kaf*: "La tête du *kaf* de כלי est visible à la cassure du fragment. La préposition מן ne s'impose nullement devant כלי, ni pour le sens, ni pour l'espace" (p. 87 n. 22). MS E Sir 33:13's reading יוצר[….], if reconstructed as ה[יוצר ביד החומר], would also constitute a direct allusion to Jer 18:6 (כחמר ביד היוצר). See Marcus, "A Fifth Ms of Ben Sira," 233.

[31] In all extant Greek manuscripts of Ben Sira, the order of 33:13b–36:16a is reversed. See the comments in Gilbert, "The Vetus Latina of Ecclesiasticus," 4; Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 106 and 106 n. 44. The following English translation is mine.

[32] The Greek term γῆ translates both עפר and אדמה in LXX Gen 3:19 (ἐν ἱδρῶτι τοῦ προσώπου σου φάγῃ τὸν ἄρτον σου ἕως τοῦ ἀποστρέψαι σε εἰς τὴν γῆν, ἐξ ἧς ἐλήμφθης· ὅτι γῆ εἶ καὶ εἰς γῆν ἀπελεύσῃ). Thus, although one might expect the more specific χοῦς ("soil, dust"), the use of γῆ in the second colon of LXX Sir 33(36):10 is not unusual or even unexpected.

[33] ἔδαφος ("ground, surface of the earth") translates עפר at LXX Ps 118:25; Isa 25:12; 26:5; 29:4. However, it can also translate מוסד ("foundation;" LXX Jer 38:35), קרקע ("floor;" LXX Num 5:17; 1 Kgs 6:15, 16, 30), and ארץ ("ground;" LXX Ezek 41:16 [2], 20).

13 As clay in the potter's hand—
   all of its ways are according to his (the potter's) good pleasure—
   so are humans in the hand of the one who made them,
   to render to them according to his judgement.

Table of Texts and Allusions

Sources	MT	LXX	1QHᵃ 11:20–37	1QHᵃ 20:27–39	Sir 33:10, 13 MS E	Sir 33(36):10, 13 LXX
Gen 2:7a	וַיִּיצֶר יהוה אלהים את האדם עפר מן האדמה	καὶ ἔπλασεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον χοῦν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς	ואדעה כיא יש מקוה לאשר יצרתה מעפר לסוד עולם (lines 21–22)		ומן עפר נוצר אדם (v. 10)	καὶ ἄνθρωποι πάντες ἀπὸ ἐδάφους, καὶ ἐκ γῆς ἐκτίσθη Αδαμ (v. 10)
Gen 3:19	בזעת אפיך תאכל לחם עד שובך אל האדמה כי ממנה לקחת כי עפר אתה ואל עפר תשוב			ואני מעפר לקח[תני (line 27) ותשובת עפר (line 29) י]שׁוב עפר אל אשר לקח משם (lines 29–30) שב אל עפרו (line 34)		καὶ ἄνθρωποι πάντες ἀπὸ ἐδάφους, καὶ ἐκ γῆς ἐκτίσθη Αδαμ (v. 10)
Isa 29:16	הפככם אם כחמר היצר יחשב כי יאמר מעשה לעשהו לא עשני ויצר אמר ליוצרו לא הבין.	οὐχ ὡς ὁ πηλὸς τοῦ κεραμέως λογισθή-σεσθε;[…] ἢ τὸ ποίημα τῷ ποιήσαντι Οὐ συνετῶς με ἐποίησας;	ואני יצר החמר מה אני (lines 24–25)	ליצר חמר (line 29) כדעתי דברתי מצורוק יצר חמר (line 35)		ὡς πηλὸς κεραμέως ἐν χειρὶ αὐτοῦ... οὕτως ἄνθρωποι ἐν χειρὶ τοῦ ποιήσαντος αὐτοὺς (v. 13)

12

Sources	MT	LXX	1QHᵃ 11:20–37	1QHᵃ 20:27–39	Sir 33:10, 13 MS E	Sir 33(36):10, 13 LXX
Isa 45:9	היאמר חמר ליצרו מה תעשה ופעלך אין ידים לו	μὴ ἐρεῖ ὁ πηλὸς τῷ κεραμεῖ Τί ποιεῖς, ὅτι οὐκ ἐργάζῃ οὐδὲ ἔχεις χεῖρας;	ואני יצר החמר מה אני (lines 24–25)	ליצר חמר (line 29) כדעתי דברתי מצורוק יצר חמר (line 35)		ὡς πηλὸς κεραμέως ἐν χειρὶ αὐτοῦ (v. 13)
Isa 64:7(8)	ועתה יהוה אבינו אתה אנחנו החמר ואתה יצרנו ומעשה ידך כלנו	ἡμεῖς δὲ πηλὸς ἔργον τῶν χειρῶν σου πάντες·	ואני יצר החמר מה אני (lines 24–25)	ליצר חמר (line 29) כדעתי דברתי מצורוק יצר חמר (line 35)		ὡς πηλὸς κεραμέως ἐν χειρὶ αὐτοῦ (v. 13)
Jer 18:4, 6	ונשחת הכלי אשר הוא עשה בחמר ביד היוצר ושב ויעשהו כלי אחר כאשר ישר בעיני היוצר לעשות (v. 4) הכיוצר הזה לא אוכל לעשות לכם בית ישראל נאם יהוה הנה כחמר ביד היוצר כן אתם בידי בית ישראל (v. 6)	Εἰ καθὼς ὁ κεραμεὺς οὗτος οὐ δυνήσομαι τοῦ ποιῆσαι ὑμᾶς, οἶκος Ισραηλ; ἰδοὺ ὡς ὁ πηλὸς τοῦ κεραμέως ὑμεῖς ἐστε ἐν ταῖς χερσίν μου. (v. 6)	ואני יצר החמר מה אני (lines 24–25)	ליצר חמר (line 29) כדעתי דברתי מצורוק יצר חמר (line 35)	כ]לי חמר (v. 10) [כחומר ביד ה]יוצר (v. 13)	ὡς πηλὸς κεραμέως ἐν χειρὶ αὐτοῦ… οὕτως ἄνθρωποι ἐν χειρὶ τοῦ ποιήσαντος αὐτοὺς (v. 13)

III. Taken from Dust, Formed from Clay in 1QHa 11:20–37 and 20:27–39

Language depicting humanity as dust and clay occurs throughout the Hodayot.[34] However, their convergence as formal allusions to God's creation of humanity from dust in Genesis 2–3 and the potter/clay metaphor in Isa 29:16; 45:9; 64:7(8); Jer 18:4, 6 occurs mostly clearly in 1QH^a 11:20–37 and 20:27–39.[35] Four questions guide the analyses (not necessarily addressed in this order): (1) How, if at all, do the allusions function in relation to one another within the adoptive text? (2) What specific properties of the adopted texts are evoked, and in what ways are they similar? (3) What role does the use of poetic devices play in relation to the allusions, especially word play and rhetorical questions? And (4) is there an identifiable exegetical process involved in the use of these allusions, i.e., is there an intentional interpretive reflection occurring in the bringing together of these allusions in a single psalm?

1. 1QHodayot^a 11:20–37

---

[34] The phrase יצר החמר ("a thing formed of clay") is used eleven times in the Hodayot, nine of which occur in hymns considered to be among the Community Hymns (1QH^a 3:29; 9:23; 12:30; 19:6; 20:29; 20:35; 21:38; 22:12; 23:13; 23:28; 25:3; the occurrences in 9:23 and 12:30 are usually considered to be among the Teacher Hymns). To my mind, eleven occurrences does not necessitate the view that neither the author intended nor would the reader have recognized an allusion to the somewhat small cluster of scriptural texts that make extensive use of the potter/clay metaphor (i.e., Job, Isaiah, and Jeremiah). Likewise, the phrase יצר עפר ("a thing formed from dust," 9x: 1QH^a 7:34; 8:18; 11:22; 19:6; 20:29; 21:17; 21:25; 21:34; 23:13) and other phrases that parallel language from Genesis 2–3 (לקח עפר "taken from dust," 3x: 1QH^a 20:27, 30; 23:24; שוב עפר "return to dust," 6x: 1QH^a 18:14; 20:29; 20:34; 22:8, 30; 23:29) are not so common that intentional allusion to these texts should be considered out of the question. Further, the fact that these phrases appear in relatively close proximity to one another, sometimes in the same psalm (as will be seen below), suggests to me the use of conscious allusion.

[35] As noted above, although not the primary focus of this study, it would be a point of further research to consider what implications a comparison of the use of these allusions in the two psalms might have for the Community Hymns/Teacher Hymns classification debate. While 20:27–39 (as part of the larger psalm beginning at 20:7; see DJD 40, 252) has traditionally been grouped along with the Community Hymns, scholars have been divided over the classification of 11:20–37. On the opinions of various scholars, see the chart given in Douglas, "The Teacher Hymn Hypothesis Revisited," 245. I acknowledge here that each psalm is accompanied by a range of critical issues, all of which cannot be addressed in the analysis. The focus must remain on the function of the scriptural allusions.

1QH[a] 11:20–37 seems to form a clearly delineated psalm, being marked with *vacats* and the

introductory formula אודכה אדוני at both 11:20 and 11:38.[36] The psalm is interesting for a number

of reasons, such as its description of the speaker's elevation to communion with the angels

(11:22–24) and its depiction of eschatological destruction (11:27–37), and there are also a

number of other scriptural allusions in this psalm that cannot be not considered here.[37] Lines 20–

25 are the most relevant for the current study. In lines 21–22, the speaker asserts ואדעה כיא יש מקוה

לאשר יצרתה מעפר לסוד עולם ("I know that there is hope for the one whom you have formed from

dust for an eternal council"), with the phrase יצרתה מעפר constituting the allusion to Gen 2:7.[38]

Lines 24–25 contain the allusion to Isa 29:16; 45:9; 64:7(8); Jer 18:4, 6: ואני יצר החמר מה אני מגבל

במים ("But as for me, a thing formed from clay, what am I? A thing kneaded with water").[39] In

this psalm, the speaker takes the reader through several movements based upon the polarities of

his lowly yet simultaneously elevated status.[40] The language of שחת (line 20), רוח נעוה (line 22),[41]

התיצבתי בגבול רשעה ועם חלכאים (in contrast to the רוחות דעת, lines 23–24),[42] איש (line 22), פשע רב

---

[36] For a thorough analysis of the poetic and literary structure of this psalm, see Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions*, 207–19. On the division of the psalms in col. 11, see DJD, 146.

[37] See Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions*, 220–26.

[38] Scholars have noted that creation plays a fundamental role in the entire Hodayot collection. N.A. Meyer, "Adam's Dust and Adam's Glory: Rethinking Anthropogony and Theology in the Hodayot and the Letters of Paul" (Ph.D. diss., McMaster University, 2013), 31 says, "Creation is a major theme of the Hodayot, especially of psalms that have been described as *Gemeindelieder* or 'Community Psalms'… If one spoke of the Community Psalms specifically, it could be claimed that creation is *the* major theme of such Hodayot." C. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 42; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 107 likewise says: "Much of the Hodayot is a sustained and extended mediation on the anthropology of Genesis 2:7 where Adam is formed from the dust of the ground."

[39] See S. Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran* (Acta Theological Danica 2; Aarhus: Unversitetforlaget I Aarhus, 1960), 25, who sees החמר יצר as alluding to Isa 29:16; 45:9 and "first and foremost," Genesis 2–3. Here he differs from Hughes, who suggests that both the dust and clay imagery are alluding to Gen 3:19.

[40] Newsom's analysis of this psalm employs employs Norbert Lohfink's analogy of modern filmmaking, which, she suggests, provides precisely the controlling metaphor one needs to appreciate the psalm's aesthetic quality (*The Self as Symbolic Space*, 257–58).

[41] Interestingly, Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 73 cautiously notes that the phrase רוח נעוה in line 22 "could, but need not, be based on Is 29:24," which may be an indication that the author has in mind the broader context of the potter/clay metaphor of Isa 29:16.

[42] See Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions*, 215.

בגורל (lines 25–26), and ותגור נפש אביון עם מהומות רבה (line 26), functions to establish the lowly, even inherently sinful, situation of the speaker. This language is balanced by a rhetoric of elevation and loftiness, in which God clearly functions as the determinative agent in the speaker's process of purification and ascent: פדיתה נפשי (line 20), העליתני לרום עולם (line 21), יש מקוה (line 21),[43] טהרתה מפשע רב (line 22),[44] and להתיצב במעמד עם צבא קדושים (lines 22–23).[45] Both יצרתה מעפר and יצר החמר function together within this polarity of experience to articulate through scriptural allusion the ignoble origins of the speaker as one originally formed by God out of dust and now existing as a thing fashioned out of clay. As a pair, they work along with the rest of the language of lowliness in the psalm to produce a three-tiered portrait of humanity's finitude, sin, and impurity.[46] On the one hand, both allusions stress the speaker's anthropological fragility and God's sovereign creative agency over him; on the other hand, they highlight the speaker's existence as utter nothingness and entirely contingent upon the deterministic will of God.[47] Part of this divine will, however, seems to have been God's electing the speaker to a special elevated

---

[43] See Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 109–10, who sees this entire psalm as expressive of a cultic context, and points also, contra Holm-Nielsen, to the use of the term מקוה in line 21 as indicative of a "ritual bath" rather than "hope."

[44] Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 68 suggests that, while the use of טהרתה מפשע רב is Levitical language, its use here does not necessarily imply the ritual cleansing process.

[45] For an interpretation of this process of ascent as the angelmorphic experience of the speaker, see the comments in Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 104–112. See also E. Chazon, "Lowly to Lofty: The *Hodayot*'s Use of Liturgical Traditions to Shape Sectarian Identity and Religious Experience," *RevQ* 101 (2013): 3–19 (11–15), who, although treating specifically 1QHa 19:6–20:6, argues that the Hodayot's concept of worship with the angels draws upon the liturgical tradition of the *'Amidah Qedusha*, which she believes was in development before or during the time of the Qumran community rather than created in the post-70 rabbinic era.

[46] See Meyer, "Adam's Dust and Adam's Glory, 40. It is possible that the allusion to Gen 2:7 through יצרתה מעפר may have the entire context of Genesis 2–3 in sight, including the sin of Adam and Eve. This may explain why the apparently non-negative phrase יצרתה מעפר is used in a context clearly associated with negative anthropology. However, see below.

[47] This language is part of what Newsom calls "the language of self-confrontation," as the speaker is faced with the crisis of his own plight. See Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space*, 256–257. Elsewhere, she refers to this language as the "cultivation of the masochistic sublime," in which, similar to Peter Berger's notion of "masochistic theodicy," the speaker reduces his "self" to nothingness in relation to "the absolute being of God" (p. 220).

status, a status that allows him communion with angelic beings,[48] and seemingly gives him a

privileged position to speak of the coming eschatological destruction (lines 35–37).[49]

Meyer notes that the broader context in which language such as יצרתה מעפר and יצר החמר

(and other expressions found within the *Niedrigkeitsdoxologien*) occurs usually deals with

matters of divine determinism.[50] More interesting, however, is what he notes about the

immediate contexts that often accompany such language: "The *immediate* context to which the

disjunctive *waw* [in ואני] responds is the experience of election, exemplified either by revealed

knowledge (cf. V 30-31; IX 23; XVIII 5-9) and/or participation in the community of the elect,

both human and angelic (1QS XI 9;1QHᵃ XI 23-25; XX 27; XXVI 35-36)."[51] Meyer's point

about the speaker's experience of election is particularly important for an understanding of the

use of the phrase יצר החמר in 1QHᵃ 11:24–25 as an allusion to Isa 29:16; 45:9; 64:7(8); Jer 18:4,

6 (see below). Thus, further unpacking of the word play involving יצר חמר and its prophetic

contexts is needed.

The exact phrase יצר החמר does not occur in the Hebrew Bible, although the two words do

appear in Isa 29:16, which contains the phrase from which the Hodayot's word play derives: Isa

29:16 uses חמר היצר ("clay of the potter"), whereas 1QHᵃ 11:24–25 uses יצר החמר ("a thing

---

[48] On angelic worship at Qumran, see Chazon, "Lowly to Lofty," 11–15; Chazon, "Liturgical Function of the Cave 1 Hodayot Collection," in *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited: Proceedings of the Sixth IOQS, Ljubljana 2007* (ed. D.K. Falk, S. Metso, and E. Tigchelaar; STDJ 91; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 137–48 (esp. 137–39, which deals with 1QHᵃ 11:20–37). Fletcher-Louis's, *All the Glory of Adam* is almost entirely devoted to the subject of humanity's engagement with, and even metamorphosis into, the angelic divine in Second Temple Judaism and the DSS. See pp. 104–112, 199–216 for his treatment of the Hodayot (pp. 199–216 are his treatment of the so-called "Self-Glorification Hymn"). See also J. Angel, *Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 86; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 132–45; P. Alexander, *The Mystical Texts: Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice and Related Manuscripts* (London: T&T Clark, 2006), 85–90, 101–110.
[49] See Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space*, 257, where she notes the challenge of how to relate these lines referring to eschatological destruction to the rest of the psalm, especially the first part regarding the speaker's plight.
[50] Meyer, "Adam's Dust and Adam's Glory," 41.
[51] Meyer, "Adam's Dust and Adam's Glory," 41.

formed from the clay").[52] The participial form of the verb יצר occurs in connection with חמר in Isa 45:9 (used 2x substantivally ["one who forms"] with God as the implied subject)[53] and Isa 64:7(8) (also used substantivally with God as subject).[54] The noun יוצר ("potter") and חמר are used throughout Jer 18:1–11, which is an extended discourse between God and Israel framed by the potter/clay metaphor (יוצר: vv. 2, 3, 4[2], 6[2], 11; חמר: vv. 4, 6). The key point to highlight here is that, whereas in the Hodayot the root יצר appears most often as a nominal form (43 of 50 occurrences) with the speaker as the implied subject, meaning either "inclination" or "a thing formed," in the Hebrew Bible the root appears more frequently as a verbal form (38 of 59 occurrences, mostly in Isaiah and Jeremiah),[55] often with reference to the creative activity of God as the one who forms (24x).[56] The use, then, of יצר חמר in 1QH[a] 11:24–25 to refer to the speaker as a "thing formed of clay," in contrast to the use of יצר to refer to God as the "former of clay" in the prophets, represents a conscious word play by which the speaker acknowledges simultaneously his anthropological frailty as חמר as well his subjectedness to the deterministic role of God in creatively shaping him.

The word play draws upon the contexts of the prophetic passages in two ways. First, even if it is reflective of a consistent formal marker of the *Niedrigkeitsdoxologien* form-critical units,[57] the use of rhetorical questions at 1QH[a] 11:24–25 — ואני יצר החמר מה אני מגבל במים ולמי נחשבתי ומה

---

[52] Isa 29:16: הפככם אם כחמר היצר יחשב כי יאמר מעשה לעשהו לא עשני ויצר אמר ליוצרו לא הבין. The MT points היצר as הַיֹּצֵר.

[53] Isa 45:9: הוי רב את יצרו חרש את חרשי אדמה היאמר חמר ליצרו מה תעשה ופעלך אין ידים לו

[54] Isa 64:7: ועתה יהוה אבינו אתה אנחנו החמר ואתה יצרנו ומעשה ידך כלנו

[55] According to my count, of the 59 occurrences of the יצר root in the Hebrew Bible, 38 are verbal forms (including participles), 15 are the nominal form יוצר, and 6 are the nominal form יצר. The vast majority of both verbal and nominal forms have God as the implied subject. I am including in this count instances when this root has the meaning "inclination," despite the possibility it should be considered a homonym, and thus a completely different root.

[56] The 24 occurrences are: Isa 22:11; 27:11; 43:1; 44:2; 44:24; 45:7; 45:9; 45:11; 45:18; 49:5; 64:8; Jer 10:16; 18:11; 33:2; 51:19; Amos 4:13; 7:1; Hab 2:18; Zech 12:1; Ps 33:15; 94:9; 94:20.

[57] Meyer, "Adam's Dust and Adam's Glory," 40.

כוח לי ("But I, a thing formed from clay, what am I? A thing kneaded with water. As what am I regarded? What strength do I possess?")—seems to resonate quite closely with the contexts of Isa 29:16; 45:9; Jer 18:4, 6. Each of these prophetic texts recount God's posing rhetorical questions to the people of Israel: "Shall the potter be regarded as clay? Shall the thing made say of its maker: 'He did not make me'; or the thing formed say of the one who formed it, 'He has no understanding'?" (Isa 29:16); "Does the clay say to the one who fashions it, 'What are you making'? or 'Your work has no handles'?" (Isa 45:9); "Can I not do with you, O house of Israel, just as the potter has done?" (Jer 18:6). These questions and those in 1QH^a 11:24–25 have precisely the same rhetorical thrust, since they are both concerned with exposing the ontology of humanity as created thing: the speaker in the Hodayot psalm and the people of Israel in the prophetic texts are presented within the ontological category of "clay" (חמר), with God as the one who forms and fashions the clay (יצר). Both sets of texts express the idea that certain activities commensurate with these categories of being are to be naturally expected. The problem laid bare by the prophets, particularly Isaiah, was that Israel was not acting commensurate with her ontology. Hence, at the start of Isa 29:16, God says through the prophet, "You reverse things!" (הפככם), referring to the clay's attempt to act with the authority of the potter. The speaker of 1QH^a 11:24–25, on the other hand, willingly and explicitly acknowledges his existence as חמר; he recognizes and accepts his location within the ontological category of "clay" (as well as "dust"), but he is, in fact, able to transcend his situation toward angelic communion (1QH^a 11:23–24) by the deterministic agency of God.[58]

---

[58] See J. Maston, *Divine and Human Agency in Second Temple Judaism and Paul* (WUNT 2.297; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 117–18.

The second way the חמר יצר word play draws upon the context of its adopted texts is through evocation of the theme of election.[59] The use of the potter/clay metaphor in Isaiah and Jeremiah is bound up with God's election of the people of Israel. Its use in Isa 29:16 comes within the context of God's warning of judgement yet promise of hope for the people (vv. 13–24). Here God criticizes Israel for her heartless worship and for considering herself so wise and discerning (vv. 13–14) as to believe she can outsmart her maker (v. 15). In 29:16, God then reminds his elect people of their status as his clay, formed and shaped according to his divine understanding.[60] In Isa 45:9, the metaphor comes in the context of God's anointing of Cyrus the Persian as his means of reestablishing his elect people in the land (45:1–19). This text presents a strong picture of deterministic monotheism, in which YHWH self-identifies as the one who has called Cyrus by name for the sake of his chosen people Israel (45:3–4) and who alone fashioned the heavens and earth (45:5–8). As creator and orchestrator of history, YHWH's plan for Israel's deliverance through the Persian king is inscrutable (45:9–17); though Israel is God's elect, it is, as clay, in no position to question God's activity. Finally, the metaphor in Jer 18:1–11 presents God, as the potter deals with his clay, as having the right to choose to do what he wishes with his people, the house of Israel, and thus as having the right to judge their wickedness.

---

[59] See Meyer's comments above. See also M.T. Brand, *Evil Within and Without: The Source of Sin and Its Nature as Portrayed in Second Temple Literature* (JAJSup 9; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 66–67. She says, "It is because of the speaker's confidence in his status as one of the divine chosen that he can thank God in XI.19–22 for the knowledge that there is hope for 'him whom you created from dust'…God's aid to the righteous demonstrates that they have been *chosen* for righteousness from the start, despite their 'muddy' beginnings." However, Brand does not place the notion of election in this psalm within a scriptural context. Commenting on the term רוח נעוה in 1QH[a] 11:22, Maston (*Divine and Human Agency*, 106) says, "This 'depraved spirit' is something from which God redeems the elect," thus implicitly highlighting the theme of election in this psalm.

[60] The potter/clay metaphor seems to draw closely upon to the notion of God's "understanding" (הבין) in his role as potter. This may also be an interesting connection with the Hodayot's use of the language of knowledge/understanding, especially regarding the phrase ידעתי מבינתך ("I know from the understanding that comes from you") in passages such as 1QH[a] 6:23; 7:25; 9:23. See also Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space*, 221.

In 1QH[a] 11:23–25, allusion to the potter/clay metaphor through יצר חמר likewise draws upon the experience of God's election. Here, as Meyer notes, the speaker's experience of election is exemplified in his participation in the worship of the angelic community.[61] The strong disjunctive *waw* at line 24 (ואני) constitutes the speaker's humble acknowledgment that his election to this heavenly community is considered commensurate with his existence as חמר only because of the divine will. In this way, the use of יצר חמר is a means of self-definition for the speaker that, through scriptural allusion, aligns him with the elect people of Israel—an Israel that has turned from its evil and is thus no longer, as Jer 18:4 puts it, "spoiled clay."

2. 1QHodayot[a] 20:27–39

1QH[a] 20:27–39 appears to be a portion of a larger psalm that, according to the editors of DJD 40, possibly begins at line 7 with the rubrical introduction [למשכי]ל and might end at line 42, although this is uncertain.[62] This section of text is more difficult and certainly reflects the overall complexity of determining scriptural allusions in the Hodayot. Here allusions to the book of Job are likely made as well,[63] which themselves seem to draw upon the language of Genesis.[64] There are six occurrences of עפר, but only at 20:27 (ואני מעפר לקחתני), 29–30 (ותשובת עפר ליצר חמר בקץ) and 34 (ומה אפהו שב אל עפרו) do they seem to allude specifically (אף[כה י] שוב עפר אל אשר לקח משם) to Gen 3:19. The phrase יצר חמר—which, contra Hughes, is taken here as an allusion to the potter/clay metaphor in Isaiah and Jeremiah—occurs twice, at lines 29 and 35.[65] Similar to what

---

[61] Meyer, "Adam's Dust and Adam's Glory," 41.

[62] See the discussion in DJD 40, 252–54; note the mention on p. 252 that the rubrical introduction to this psalm is supported in the parallel text 4QH[a] frg. 8 ii 10–21.

[63] E.g., the possible use of עפר ואֹפֹר in 1QH[a] 20:30 (cf. Job 30:19; 42:6) and, although largely reconstructed, the potential use of ומחמר ק[וֹרצתי in 1QH[a] 20:27 (cf. Job 33:6).

[64] E.g., Job 10:9 and 34:15 use the language of humanity's return to dust (ואדם על עפר and ואל עפר תשיבני ישוב, respectively).

[65] Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions*, 47, where she takes it as an allusion to Gen 3:19, functioning along with the language of humanity's being taken from and returned to dust.

we see in the psalm from column 11, the allusions function together to generate a composite portrait of human createdness and subjectedness to the divine will, while God is presented as humanity's sovereign maker. However, in 1QH[a] 20:27–39, the allusions seem to take on two slightly different emphases than in 1QH[a] 11:20–37. The first is the more direct association of humanity's dust-anthropology with sin in 20:27–39; the second is this psalm's stronger focus on the divine prerogative to judge.

The explicit linkage in 1QH[a] 20:27–39 of the speaker's being taken from and returning to dust with his shameful existence as למקור נדה וערות קלון in line 28 ("a source of pollution and dishonorable nakedness"), suggests that the speaker could have in mind the broader context of Gen 3:19 regarding the sin and resulting nakedness of Adam and Eve (Gen 3:7).[66] If so, the allusion to Gen 3:19 in this psalm contributes more directly to the meaning of the adoptive text than does the allusion to Gen 2:7 in 1QH[a] 11:22. While both allusions in both psalms function to establish a portrait of the lowly origins of the speaker, the Gen 3:19 allusion in 1QH[a] 20:27–39 appears to connect these lowly origins more directly with the speaker's sinful status via the sin and judgement of Adam. The allusion to Gen 2:7 in 1QH[a] 11:22 may have the broader context of Adam's sin in view (Genesis 2–3), but, regardless, 11:22 depends more upon its own unique articulation of the speaker's sinful state (e.g., רוח נעוה, פשע רב) than its allusion to Gen 2:7.

The evocation of Gen 3:19 works particularly well with the potter/clay metaphor in 1QH[a] 20:27–30 to supply this psalm with a stronger focus on God's right to judge in light of humanity's sinful mortality. To an extent, allusion to the Genesis text alone provides the

---

[66] One issue here is the kind of impurity that the psalm has in mind, i.e., whether ritual or moral impurity (or both?) is in view, and how this view is shaped from reflection upon the sin of humanity in the Garden (see Meyer, "Adam's Dust and Adam's Glory," 57–69). The use of נדה וערות is probably reflective of the language of impurity and nakedness used in Leviticus 18 and 20. Nevertheless, the use of ערות ("nakedness") in 1QH[a] 20:28 works particularly well with the poem's allusions to Genesis 2–3, since there knowledge of one's nakedness is the result of sinful disobedience (note the use of עירם ["naked"], the adjectival form of ערות, in Gen 3:7).

emphasis, but the use of יצר חמר twice amplifies it in view of the context of the adopted prophetic texts.[67] 1QH[a] 20:34's assertion ואין לנגדכה ("there is no one before you")[68] resonates strongly with Isaiah 45's repeated use of אני יהוה ואין עוד ("I am the LORD and there is no other;" Isa 45:5, 6, 14), which declares the oneness of God and his deterministic role in salvation history. Further, the potter/clay metaphor in Isa 29:16 and Jer 18:4, 6 has the clearest expressions of the divine prerogative to judge. In the Isaiah text, God, as the omniscient potter, promises to wipe out the wisdom of Israel's wise ones (29:14–15; cf. 1QH[a] 20:36–37); in Jeremiah, God retains the potter's right to destroy spoiled clay.[69]

3. Summary

What can be said at this point regarding the presence of an exegetical process in the use of these allusions? 1QH[a] 11:20–37 and 20:27–39 demonstrate that the allusions to humanity's origins in dust and its existence as clay work well as a scriptural compound in the articulation of several of the Hodayot's key anthropological and theological ideas by specifying similar properties of the adopted texts. Both Genesis 2–3 and the prophetic texts speak to the notions of human fragility and sin, divine determinism and judgement, and the experience of election, all of which have been picked up to varying degrees in these two psalms in the self-definition of the speaker.

IV. Taken from Dust, Formed from Clay in Ben Sira 33:7–15

Like the Hodayot treated above, Sir 33:7–15 has been approached by scholars from a number of angles, but the concepts of creation, divine determinism, and theodicy are the most often

---

[67] 1QH[a] 20:33–42 may have Job's encounter with God (Job 38–42) as its conceptual background; however, Job nowhere uses the term יצר in connection with חמר.

[68] Newsom translates this phrase "there is none corresponding to you" (DJD 40, 260).

[69] Although outside of the lines considered here, it is important to note that the scriptural allusions 1QHa 20:27–39 also have the concept of election in view: lines 14–16 portray the speaker's election to special knowledge through God's giving of his holy spirit. See Meyer, "Adam's Dust and Adam's Glory," 41.

discussed.[70] The poem functions within the broader context of Sir 32:14–33:18, which, as

Beentjes notes, is a passage book-ended by the common wisdom term MS B מוסר//LXX παιδεία

("instruction" or "discipline").[71] This larger section sets in contrast the blessed life of the one

who fears the Lord and seeks after the Law with the hypocrite who hates the Law and eventually

goes the way of disaster. The role of Sir 33:7–15, then, is to connect this opposition of the pious

and the wicked to the divine ordering of the entire cosmos. In regard to the poem's reuse of

scripture, the question is not *if* the poem is alluding to Gen 2:7 and Isa 29:16; 45:9; Jer 18:4, 6—

this appears to be acknowledged by scholars frequently enough.[72] The question, rather, is *how* do

the allusions function together as a compounded whole?

---

[70] E.g., see G. Maier, *Mensch und freier Wille: Nach den jüdischen Religionsparteien zwischen Ben Sira und Paulus* (WUNT 12; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1971), 98–112, *et passim*; J.K. Aitken, "Divine Will and Providence," in *Ben Sira's God* (ed. R. Egger-Wenzel; BZAW 321; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2002), 282–301; G.S. Goering, *Wisdom's Root Revealed: Ben Sira and the Election of Israel* (JSJSup 139; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 50–60, *et passim*; Maston, *Divine and Human Agency*, 64–65; B.G. Wright, "Sirach and 1 Enoch: Some Further Considerations," *Henoch* 24 (2002): 179–87, in which, in part, compares the theme of creation in both Ben Sira and *1 Enoch*; Hogan, "Mortal Body," 21–40, which also compares Ben Sira with *1 Enoch*; M. O'Connor, "The Language of Creation in Ben Sira: חלק = κτίζω," in *Studies in the Greek Bible: Essays in Honor of Francis T. Gignac, S.J.* (ed. J. Corley and V. Skemp; CBQMS 44; Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2008), 217–28; H. Spieckermann, "Is God's Creation Good? From Hesiodus to Ben Sira," in *Beyond Eden: The Biblical Story of Paradise (Genesis 2–3) and Its Reception History* (ed. K. Schmid and C. Riedweg; FAT 2.34; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 79–94; Beentjes, "Theodicy in Wisdom of Ben Sira," in his *Collected Essays*, 265–79 (esp. 70–74); Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 106–13. G.L. Prato, *Il problema della teodicea in Ben Sira: Composizione dei contrari e richiamo* (AnBib 65; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1975), 13–61 is probably still the most comprehensive study of theodicy in Sir 33:7–15. Prato understands the problem of theodicy for Ben Sira to have arisen out of an enduring experience of the disharmonies at work in the created universe and among human beings, which seems to call into quiestion divine justice. Sir 33:7–15 answers this question through the principle of complementarity. In a study of the reception history of Gen 3:19, H. Sysling does not mention Sir 33:10 in his list and treatment of the "oldest exegesis of Gen 3:19," although he does mention other texts from Ben Sira (17:1; 40:1). See H. Sysling, *Teḥiyyat Ha-Metim: The Resurrection of the Dead in the Palestinian Targums of the Pentateuch and Parallel Traditions in Classical Rabbinic Literature* (TSAJ 57; J.C.B Mohr [Paul Siebeck]: Tübingen, 1996), 67–90.

[71] Beentjes, "Theodicy in Wisdom of Ben Sira," 271. Cf. 1QHª 5:17 (reconstructed); 10:16; 14:7 (reconstructed).

[72] J.T. Sanders, *Ben Sira and Demotic Wisdom* (SBLMS 28; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983), 68–69; A.A. Di Lella and P.W. Skehan, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes* (ABC; New York: Doubleday, 1987), 400–401; Goering, *Wisdom's Root*, 52; Beentjes, "Theodicy in the Wisdom of Ben Sira," 272; Hogan, "Mortal Boday," 34; Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 107. See note 30 on the possibility that the reading of Sir 33:10 MS E itself contains allusions to both Gen 2:7 and Jer 18:4. Rey, referring to a comment by Prato, notes that the pair עפר/חמר occurs throughout the book of Job (4:19; 10:9; 30:19) as a designation for humanity ("Le motif de la poussière," 87). This is certainly true. However, these Job passages lack references to "vessel" language, whether כלי or יצר. Thus, while I acknowledge that Job may be standing in the conceptual background of Sir 33:10,

The poem begins in vv. 7–9 with a comparison between ordinary days and days "separated" or "appointed" (MSS E//F נשפטו; LXX διεχωρίσθησαν) by God to mark "seasons and festivals" (MS E [..]מועד//MS F […]מוע; LXX καιροὺς καὶ ἑορτάς).[73] The question posed in v. 7 reveals a certain tension in the author's mind regarding God's arrangement: why is one day more exalted and hallowed than another when all days are illuminated by the same sun?[74] The note in v. 8, that such things are "by the Lord's wisdom" (MSS E//F בחכמת יי; LXX ἐν γνώσει κυρίου), is an implicit answer to the question and anticipates the theodicy to come regarding the same tension involving God's dealing with humans. Verse 10's assertion, via its allusion to Gen 2:7, that all humanity shares its origins in the dust, parallels the question posed in v. 7 concerning all days being illuminated by the same sun.[75] This allusion to Gen 2:7 in v.10 regarding the common earthyness of humans, then, exposes the need for Ben Sira to justify in vv. 11–13 why God, in the end, distinguishes among them. Just as God, in his wisdom, judges between different days and times despite their common nature, so, "in the abundance of knowledge" (ἐν πλήθει ἐπιστήμης; LXX v. 11), God distinguishes between different types of people, blessing and cursing according to his will (v. 12).[76] Allusion to the potter/clay metaphor in v. 13, which is

---

13, the more direct allusions appear to be to Gen 2:7 (Rey agrees) and the potter/clay metaphor of Isaiah and Jeremiah.

[73] Hogan, "Mortal Body," 24 says that Sir 33:8 may have Gen 1:14 in view, the separation of day and night. While the Greek text may have this in mind via its use of the word διεχωρίσθησαν ("separated"), MS E uses נשפטו ("judged, appointed), not בדל, which is used in Gen 1:4 and 1:14. Interestingly, בדל is used in Sir 33:11 to speak of God's "separating" of the "ways" of humans. Prato, *Il problema della teodicea*, 26–28 also sees Genesis 1 standing in the background of Sir 33:7–9.

[74] See Goering, *Wisdom's Root*, 50–51 for his treatment of Ben Sira's comparison of "profane time" vs. "sacred time."

[75] There are some differences here in the Greek and Hebrew versions of Sir 33:10 that should be noted. The Greek includes πάντες after ἄνθρωποι; whether or not כל was present in MS E is undeterminable. Hogan notes, with reference to Sir 17:1–4, that humanity's relationship to the earth is central to Ben Sira's anthropology, and that this anthropology extends beyond Adam specifically to all humankind, which is evidenced by his used of plural pronouns ("Mortal Body," 34). The Hebrew uses language more specific to Gen 2:7, particularly its use of עפר נוצר. Greek Ben Sira only uses ἐκ γῆς ἐκτίσθη, whereas LXX Gen 2:7 uses the Greek terms that normally translate יצר (ἔπλασεν) and עפר (χοῦν) in addition to the phrase ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς.

[76] Hogan, "Mortal Body," 34–35 suggests that this poem is in fact mainly about different types of people.

anticipated in MS E's use of כ[לי חמר in v. 10, functions as the main thrust of Ben Sira's theodicy: the reason God can distinguish between types of people, despite the fact they all originate in dust, is that they are "clay in the hand of the potter," and as potter, God can mold his clay into whatever he wishes. Thus, Hogan rightly notes that, "In this poem, being made from clay or dust does not primarily connote mortality…but rather a common human nature that entails subjection to the will of God, their Maker."[77] While the notion of human mortality is surely present in Sir 33:10, 13, the emphasis in this poem does seem to fall upon the deterministic will of God in light of the commonality of human origins, which represents for Ben Sira a difference from the Hodayot's preoccupation with not only human mortality but also human depravity.[78] Certainly God's sovereign agency is a major theme in the Hodayot, but, as argued above, it is depicted from the perspective of the speaker's own mortality, sin, and impurity.[79] It seems, then, that the allusions in Sir 33:10, 13 work together to create a scripturally based theodicy for Ben Sira, and, what is more, that they are in fact dependent upon one another for doing so: whereas Gen 2:7 exposes the apparent contradiction in God's dealings with humans, allusion to the potter/clay metaphor of Isaiah and Jeremiah resolves it by framing God's actions within a theology of divine sovereignty.

However, Miryam Brand notes that Sir 33:7–15 has led to debate over whether Ben Sira in fact evinces a predestinarian world-view and, if so, how its "doctrine of opposites" (33:14–15)

---

[77] Hogan, "Mortal Body," 35.

[78] When Ben Sira wishes to use humanity's origins in the earth as indicative of its mortality, he sees to allude rather to Gen 3:19, noting *both* humanity's origins and its return to the earth, e.g., in Sir 17:1–4; 40:1, where the "children of Adam" are said to "come from their mother's womb until the day they return to the mother of all the living," i.e., Mother Earth.

[79] However, note the presence of "evil" and "sinner" in Sir 33:14–15 (paired with "good" and "godly"), which suggests that Sir 33:7–15 is not entirely unconcerned with the role of human sin in relation to the deterministic will of God.

is to be understood within it.[80] Some scholars have suggested that the poem does present a

deterministic dualistic anthropology and cosmology, with Sir 33:14–15 as the main evidence.[81]

However, Greg Goering and Jonathan Klawans have argued that Sir 33:7–15 is concerned with

neither predestination nor dualism but rather with the election of Israel.[82] While Brand agrees

that Ben Sira, indeed, has election in view (as well as dualistic predestination), she questions

whether he has in mind the election of *Israel*, since the name of Israel is not mentioned.

"Instead," she says, "this passage seems to address the election of the individual *within* Israel."[83]

Brand is right to retain the element of divine determinism in her interpretation of Sir 33:7–15

(which undoubtedly reflects another commonality between this poem and the Hodayot).[84] But

her understanding of election in this passage suggests that she undervalues the context of the

adopted texts of Ben Sira's allusion to the potter/clay metaphor. Brand herself sees Sir 33:13 as

drawing upon imagery from Jer 18:4, 6, but she does not appear to acknowledge that the potter's

interaction with the clay in these verses has in view God's actions toward the whole "house of

---

[80] Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 108–109.

[81] E.g., Maier, *Mensch und freier Wille*, 158–59; J.J. Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 80–83; Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 108–13, although she also sees election as an important element in Sir 33:7–13. Sir 33:14–15 reads: "Good is the opposite of evil, and life the opposite of death; so the sinner is the opposite of the godly. Look at all the works of the Most High; they come in pairs, one the opposite of the other." One of the major problems for the study of predestinarian thought in Ben Sira has been how to relate Sir 15:11–20—which is an extended poem on humanity's ability to choose according to its free will—with Sir 33:7–15. See J. Klawans, "Josephus on Fate, Free Will, and Ancient Jewish Types of Compatibilism," *Numen* 56 (2009): 44–90 (57–59). Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 83 and Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 110 are more inclined to say that there is an apparent and unresolved tension in Ben Sira between human free will and divine predestination. Also of note here is the common assertion that Ben Sira's alleged use of dualism is on par with the Stoics (see, e.g., Beentjes, "Theodicy in Wisdom of Ben Sira," 272–73; Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 85). However, this idea has been argued against in, e.g., Sanders, *Ben Sira*, 55 n.127; S.L. Matilla, "Ben Sira and the Stoics: A Reexamination of the Evidence," *JBL* 119 (2000): 473–501; and Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 111–12.

[82] See Goering, *Wisdom's Root*, 50–55, 59–60; Klawans, "Josephus," 60–61, although he does not deny there is a "deterministic element to the idea of divine election" (p. 60). See also Di Lella and Skehan, *Ben Sira*, 400; and Hogan, "Mortal Body," 34–35, who agrees with Goering's analysis. U. Wicke-Reuter, *Göttliche Providenz und menschliche Verantwortung bei Ben Sira und in der Frühen Stoa* (BZAW 298; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2000), 224 argues that, in Ben Sira's thought, God's providence and human responsibility are not mutually exclusive: "Gott hat es in seinem 'Plan' für die Schöpfung von vornherein so vorgesehen, daß der Mensch in der Lage ist, sich für das Gute und gegen das Böse zu entscheiden […]."

[83] Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 108–109

[84] Wicke-Reuter, *Göttliche Providenz*, 225; A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 38–39.

Israel" (בית ישראל; v. 6) as his elect people, not individuals *within* Israel.[85] The use, then, in Sir

33:7–15 of allusions to Gen 2:7 and the potter/clay metaphor of Isaiah/Jeremiah function

collaboratively to develop three concepts: (1) the common anthropological origins of humanity

in the dust of the ground, and, perhaps secondarily, its shared experience of mortality; (2) God's

prerogative, as creator and potter, to determine and distinguish among human outcomes by

means of his wisdom and knowledge; and (3) the experience of election from the perspective of

God's election of Israel.

V. Conclusion: A Common Exegetical Process

This study has demonstrated how two sets of writings, coming from two distinct social contexts,

could employ scriptural allusions in a way that evinces a common underlying exegetical process,

even though the particular religious and anthropological ideas toward which the scriptural

interpretation is geared in each case differ.[86] The allusions in Sir 33:10, 13 to Gen 2:7 and

especially Jer 18:4, 6 are perhaps clearer and more straightforward than in the Hodayot, since

they resemble the wording of the scriptural texts more closely (e.g., MS E Sir 33:10 ומן עפר נוצר

אדם // MT Gen 2:7 וייצר יהוה אלהים את האדם עפר מן האדמה; LXX 33:13 ὡς πηλὸς κεραμέως ἐν χειρὶ

αὐτοῦ // LXX Jer 18:6 ὡς ὁ πηλὸς τοῦ κεραμέως ὑμεῖς ἐστε ἐν ταῖς χερσίν μου; see table above).

This point suggests that Ben Sira has consciously interpreted Gen 2:7 and the potter/clay

metaphor as mutually reinforcing scriptural texts that possess similar conceptual properties

---

[85] See Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 107. This point would also seem to strengthen Goering's argument regarding the poem's focus on the election of Israel, since he does not include reference to the potter/clay allusion in Sir 33:13. Further, what makes Brand's refusal to see the election of Israel in Sir 33:7–13 stranger is that she draws upon Isa 45:7 as the source of Ben Sira's dualism in 33:14–15, in which God says "I form light and create darkness, I make weal and create woe; I the LORD do all these things." Just two verses later is the potter/clay metaphor, which, I have argued, has Israel's election in view as well.

[86] S. Ruzer, "Exegetical Patterns Common to the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament, and Their Implications," in *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity* (ed. R.A. Clements and D.R. Schwartz; STDJ 84; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 231–251, has made a similar argument in his comparison of exegetical practices in the double love command in Matt 22:34–40 (par. Mark 12:28–31; Luke 10:25–28) and 1QS 1:1–12; and the exegesis of Amos 9:11–12 in Acts 15:13–21 and 4Q*Florilegium* 1:10–13.

concerning the frailty of the human condition and the creative omnipotence of God. The outcome

of this interpretive process is that Ben Sira is able to justify scripturally God's actions in human

history despite their apparent contradictions. The Hodayot poems, on the other hand, make

greater use of word play and depend more upon the context of the adopted texts in their use of

the allusions, but the exegetical process is largely the same: the word play יצר החמר based upon

the prophets and the language of יצר/לקח מעפר derived from, but not identical to, Genesis are

brought together, because they are seen to possess similar conceptual properties that, as a pair,

work to accomplish the speaker's task of self-definition.

Although appearing differently in both sets of texts, the convergence of the scriptural

allusions functions around a common conceptual core. In addition to the notions of human

fragility and divine determinism, the experience of election is central to the interpretation and

reuse of the scriptural texts. In the Hodayot, election is the experience of the speaker, who, self-

defined as one "taken from dust" (rather than "from the earth" as it reads in Gen 2–3) and

"formed from clay," is elected either to participate among the angelic worship community (1QH[a]

11:22–24) or to possess a divinely given spirit that engenders special knowledge within him

(1QH[a] 20:14–16). The elected "I" of these poems, as Newsom has argued, thus functions to

construct a docile self, a sectarian subjectivity for the ordinary community member, as clay

shaped by the divine potter and as dust given life by the sovereign creator.[87] In Ben Sira, the

notion of election is cast from God's vantage point, and particularly draws upon the idea of

divine knowledge (ἐν πλήθει ἐπιστήμης) as the basis of his ordering of times and people. In

---

[87] Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space*, 196–204. There is, of course, debate over whether poems such as 1QH[a] 11:20–37 is a composition pertaining only to the leader of the community and thus does not have a bearing on the formation of the self of community members at large. Newsom asserts that such an approach is unhelpful (p. 197).

contrast to the restrictive "I" of the Hodayot, Ben Sira's vision of God's justice involves "all humanity" (ἄνθρωποι πάντες…Αδαμ) in its earthy beginnings and its status a moldable clay.[88]

The sinful origins of humanity are not stressed in the Ben Sira passage as they are in the Hodayot.[89] While the earth is central to Ben Sira's anthropology overall,[90] Sir 33:7–15 does not associate it specifically with human sinfulness or impurity. This appears to be the fundamental difference between Ben Sira and the Hodayot in their interpretation of the scriptural texts, and may speak to a broader theological difference between them:[91] in Ben Sira, sin is the result of people acting according to their character (cf. Sir 15:11–20); in the Hodayot poems, sin appears to be an innate human inclination that, without divine aid, is entirely unavoidable.[92] Despite this different approach to sin, both texts similarly draw upon the allusions to dust and clay to present the mortal weakness of humanity before God.

---

[88] This point heads in a similar direction to Shane Berg's argument, that Ben Sira's retelling of the Genesis creation account in Sir 16–17 represents a non-exclusivist view of religious epistemology, which stands in tension with the exclusivist model found in 4QInstruction ("Ben Sira, the Genesis Creation Accounts, and the Knowledge of God's Will," *JBL* 132.1 [2013]: 139–57). However, I do not agree with Berg's assertion that Ben Sira is necessarily refuting the epistemological claims of 4QInstruction or any other sectarian text from Qumran (he mentions 1QS and the Hodayot on p. 156). The reason is that it would become even more difficult to explain how Ben Sira could exist side-by-side with these texts within the Qumran library. In my view, then, the tension is probably more perceived than actual, being due to their differing social contexts and purposes rather than their competing ideologies.

[89] This could be due to the nature of the theodicy of Sir 33:7–15. That is, whereas the theodicy on free will in Sir 15:11–20 deals with an existential problem, defending God from any responsibility for the existence of human sin, Sir 33:7–15 seeks to deal with a theological problem, defending God's right as creator to exercise his will upon whomever he wishes. Note the introduction to the theodicy in Sir 15:11–12: "Do not say 'It was the Lord's doing that I fell away'; for he does not do what he hates. Do not say, 'It was he who led me astray'; for he has no need of the sinful." See Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 83. This suggestion, that Sir 15:11–20 and 33:7–15 represent different sides of the same relationship between God and humanity, comes close to the argument of Aitken, "Divine Will and Providence," 297–98; cf. Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 111 n.61.

[90] Hogan, "Mortal Body," 34.

[91] The nature and source of sin and the concept of moral agency in the Hodayot and Bens Sira are topics too large to deal with here as well. On these, see, e.g., Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 59–73, 93–127; C.A. Newsom, "Flesh, Spirit, and the Indigenous Psychology of the *Hodayot*," in *Prayer and Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honor of Eileen Schuller on the Occasion of Her 65th Birthday* (ed. J. Penner, K. Penner, and C. Wassen; STDJ 98; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 339–54

[92] Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 72, 126. Important here is the manner in which both the Hodayot and Ben Sira locate the concept of human sinfulness within their approach to human free will vs. divine determinism. I wonder if the two texts actually share a common approach to this issue, since both seem to show evidence of two co-operating systems that are held in tension (e.g., Sir 15:11–20/33:7–15; 1QHa 7:23–27, in which the speaker says "And I love you [God] freely," but then "And I know that in your hand is the inclination of every spirit [and all] its [activi]ty you determined before you created it").

In conclusion, if, as the discovery of 2Q18 and 11QPs[a] might suggest, Ben Sira was actually read at an early stage of the Qumran community's history, that is, around the time of the Hodayot's production in the mid-second century BCE, the vaguer but more pervasive use of the compound allusions in the Hodayot could mean that the author(s) drew upon an already established exegetical tradition of bringing these scriptural texts together.[93] This, however, is difficult to prove, and, with only two manuscripts extant, it is still quite uncertain to what extent Ben Sira was known and read at Qumran. Nevertheless, if the Hodayot and Ben Sira are approached synchronically, as was done in this article, the conclusions drawn here suggest that, despite coming from two different social locations, the two sets of texts are doing something very similar (though not identical) in their reuse of scripture. While more research is needed in this area of Qumran scholarship and Second Temple Judaism more broadly, this article has suggested a way in which comparisons of Ben Sira and the Hodayot can move beyond the use of wisdom language to their patterns of scriptural reuse. At the very least, the study has highlighted the importance of considering not only the actual presence of scriptural allusions but also how allusions function in relation to one another in the construction of particular ancient Jewish world-views.

---

[93] The conflation of the imagery of dust and clay in Job (although in a different way) might constitute another pre-existing tradition alongside of Ben Sira, from which the Hodayot could be drawing.