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Abstract

In Judg 14–15, the source of Samson’s strength is not his uncut hair, but the רוח־יהוה. A Leitmotif of the biblical warrior tradition, the רוח־יהוה is a corporealized metaphor of fiery anger that envelops Samson and grants him great power. This motif was adapted from early biblical poetry, in which Yahweh’s wrath erupted as a fiery breath (רוח) against his cosmic foes. This study explores how the historical context of Judg 14–15 informs the use of this motif, comparing the רוח־יהוה with similar concepts of martial anger in Near Eastern and Greek warrior traditions. Like Mesopotamian melammu and Greek μηνις, the רוח־יהוה was part of a corporeal code that enabled ancient minds to think about the relations between mortals and divine beings in the context of battle.
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1 Introduction

The Samson Cycle contains two independent explanations for the source this judge’s strength. In Judges 16, his strength endures so long as his hair remains uncut—later reinterpreted in terms of the Nazirite tradition (Judg 13:5). In Judges 14-15, his strength is an ephemeral force that appears in tandem with the enigmatic רוח־יהוה (Judg 14:6, 19; 15:14).

1 On the hair motif in biblical heroic traditions, see Doak, Heroic Bodies in Ancient Israel, 89–94; Kamrada, Heroines, Heroes and Deity, 66–97; Smith, Poetic Heroes, 222–223.
Inspiring its more formulaic use in the stories of Othniel, Gideon, and Jephthah (Judg 3:10; 6:34; 11:29), the רוח יהוה is a key literary theme or Leitmotif in the Samson story.³ The motif first emerged in early warrior poetry as a corporealized metaphor of divine anger (Ex 15:3; 2 Sam 22:16//Ps 18:16[15]),⁴ only later emerging in warrior narratives involving humans as well.⁵ Like other attributes of Yahweh (e.g., כבוד, פניהם, זרוע, שמם), the corporealized metaphor of Yahweh’s רוח was not exclusive to a single literary tradition. Therefore, this article is not an attempt to present an overarching synthesis of all contextual meanings of the expression רוח יהוה, but rather, a close analysis of its use in the context of warrior literature.

In Judg 14–15, the רוח יהוה is a force that invigorates Samson and sends him into a fiery rage. This unrestrained and spontaneous strength emulates the fury of Yahweh himself. To understand the meaning of this motif within biblical warrior literature, this study has three aims: (i) to understand how the historical context of Judg 14–15 informs the use of this motif; (ii) to compare the רוח יהוה with the Mesopotamian concept of melammu and the Greek motif of “divine wrath” (μηνις) in their respective warrior traditions; and (iii), to identify the influence of this motif on biblical traditions beyond the Samson Cycle.

2 The Structure of the Samson Cycle and the Composition of Judg 14:1-15:19

The Samson Cycle consists of three independent textual units: Samson’s birth narrative (Judg 13:2-24), the רוח יהוה story (Judg 14:1-15:19), and the Delilah episode (Judg 16:1-30).⁶ The Samson Cycle is redactionally segmented by a Deuteronomistic introduction (Judg 13:1) and two separate conclusions (Judg 15:20, 16:31).⁷ Recounting essentially the same story of Samson’s liaisons and betrayals by an unnamed Philistine woman (Judg 14–15) and Delilah (Judg 16), two independent stories disagree on the source of Samson’s strength—the רוח יהוה or his unshorn hair.⁸ Neither story is aware of the other’s motif, with only the birth narrative in Judges 13 connecting the two. This first narrative block is the latest addition, reinterpreting Samson’s unshorn hair in terms of the biblical Nazirite tradition (Judg 13:5) and anticipating

---

³ Buber, “Leitwort Style in Pentateuchal Narrative,” 114.
⁴ Ballard, The Divine Warrior Motif; Cross, “Song of the Sea and Canaanite Myth”; idem, Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic, 91–144; Day, God’s Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea, 91–127; Miller, The Divine Warrior in Early Israel; Smith, The Early History of God, 43–47; idem, Poetic Heroes. Building on the observations of William F. Albright, Frank More Cross, and David Noel Freedman, the classical work on the archaic features in this poetry was Robertson, Linguistic Evidence in Dating Early Hebrew Poetry. See the critique of Robertson’s methodology in Young, Rezetko, and Ehrensvärd, Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts. The specific dates proposed for Ex 15 and 2 Sam 22//Ps 18 are discussed below.
⁵ The expression warrior tradition refers to texts and images that espouse certain attitudes, worldviews, and concepts tied to an historical warrior culture in the ancient Near East. See Levine, Numbers 21-36, 354; Mobley, The Empty Men, 19–47; Smith, Poetic Heroes, 2.
⁶ Brettler, The Book of Judges, 42.
⁷ Groß, Richter, 657.
⁸ Brettler, The Book of Judges, 42; Kamrada, Heroines, Heroes and Deity, 70.
the רוח יהוה motif of the subsequent chapters (Judg 13:25). The evidence strongly suggests that Judg 14–15 and Judg 16 were once independent narratives secondarily brought together with a new introduction (Judg 13).

The political and social landscape described in the narrative block of Judg 14-15 provides some hints to the date of its composition. The story locates the hero in the region of the Shephelah, more specifically, in the town of Timnah. The story depicts this region as a liminal locale where Israelites and Philistines intermingled. Mentioned only in passing in the narrative of Judah and Tamar (Gen 38), the authors of Joshua identified Timnah as a Judahite (Josh 15:10, 57) and Danite (Josh 19:43) possession—never mentioning the Philistines. The political landscape in Joshua is either a late seventh century BCE description of the region in Josiah’s reign, or more likely, an idealized vision of Israel after Judah lost control over the Shephelah in 701 BCE. The only biblical source to mention Philistine and Judahite interaction at Timnah is the Chronicler’s account of the Syro-Ephramite war (736–732 BCE):

2 Chr 28:16–20

16 At that time, King Ahaz sent (word) to the kings/governors of Assyria for help. The Edomites had again come and attacked Judah and taken prisoners. And the Philistines had raided towns in the Shephelah and in the Negev of Judah. They captured Beth-Shemesh, Aijalon, Gederoth, Soco and its villages, Timnah and its villages, and Gimzo and its villages—and they dwelt there. The Lord had humbled Judah because of Ahaz king of Israel, for he had promoted wickedness in Judah and had been most unfaithful to the Lord. Tiglath-Pileser king of Assyria came to him, but he was distressing to him and did not assist (lit. “strengthen”) him.

Although the excavators of Tel Batash (ancient Timnah) confirm the presence of coastal style pottery in the pre-701 BCE layers of the site, it is unclear if any Philistine group conquered the town in the eighth century BCE. In fact, the presence of lmlk seal-impressed pottery at the site in stratum III suggests that Timnah, Ekron, and Judah were part of a regional economy that transcended strict political boundaries.

---

9 The chapter concludes with the expression, “the רוח יהוה began to trouble him” (Judg 13:25), otherwise found only in court narratives describing anxiety from prescient dreams (Gen 41:8; Dan 2:1, 3). Brettler argued that Judg 13:25 was composed after Judg 13-16 were brought together, and perhaps after Judg 13-18 was combined (The Book of Judges, 43).

10 Na’aman, “The Kingdom of Judah under Josiah.”


12 Mazar and Panitz-Cohen, Timnah (Tel Batash) II, 279–280.

Extrabiblical evidence suggests that the political landscape in Judg 14–15 recalls the Shephelah shortly before or after Sennacherib’s invasion in 701 BCE.\(^{14}\) In his annals, Sennacherib boasts of conquering the Shephelah after the failed rebellion of Hezekiah, the governors of Ekron, and Egyptian allies:

> I surrounded, conquered, (and) plundered the cities Eltekeh (and) Timnā. I approached the city Ekron and I killed the governors (and) nobles who had committed crime(s) and hung their corpses on towers around the city.\(^{15}\)

The outcome for Judah was equally disastrous, perhaps even more so, as Sennacherib devastated the Shephelah and granted control of it to loyal Philistine kings:

> As for him (Hezekiah), I confined him inside the city Jerusalem, his royal town, like a bird in a cage. I set up blockades against him and made him dread exiting his town gate. I detached from his land the towns of his that I had plundered, and I gave (them) to Mitinti, the king of Ashdod, Padi, the king of Ekron, and Šillī-Bēl, the king of Gaza, and (thereby) made his land smaller.\(^{16}\)

Though the cities detached from Hezekiah’s kingdom are unnamed, Timnah may well have been among them. Before the Assyrian invasion, pottery forms of the eighth century BCE were roughly equal between Judahite and coastal types, whereas post-701 BCE layers attest to increased coastal and Assyrian representation in the site’s assemblage.\(^{17}\) The excavators considered Timnah part of the rapid economic recovery of Ekron after 701 BCE, in contrast to the Judahite Shephelah that experienced slower and more erratic rehabilitation after the Assyrian invasion.\(^{18}\) This may explain the notion of Philistine “hegemony” over Judahites in the Shephelah in the Samson narrative (Jud 15:11). The biblical, Assyrian, and archaeological evidence all suggest that the Shephelah and Timnah were liminal locales, where the boundaries between Philistine and Judahite identities were porous and constantly shifting—if such boundaries existed at all. The primary association of Timnah seems to have been the Shephelah and neighboring sites in the region. The town would be pulled into the political and economic orbit of its larger neighbors (Jerusalem and Ekron), but this did not necessarily make its inhabitants either Judahite or Philistine.

The Babylonians destroyed Timnah in 605 or 603 BCE, and the archaeological remains suggest a sparsely populated settlement in the subsequent Persian period.\(^{19}\) After this date, stories about Timnah relied only on a cultural memory of the site. Taken together, the evidence suggests that the Samson stories in Judg 14–15 reflect the cultural and social conditions of the Shephelah in the late eighth to seventh centuries BCE (leaning towards a

\(^{14}\) Leonard-Fleckman, “Blurred Lines,” 82.
\(^{15}\) Sennacherib 22 col. iii, ll. 6b–10a (RINAP 3/1, 175).
\(^{16}\) Sennacherib 22 col. iii, ll. 27b–34 (RINAP 3/1, 176).
\(^{17}\) In stratum III (mid-eighth century BCE), the assemblage of Tel Baṭash consisted of 29% Judahite forms, 25% coastal forms, and 1% Assyrian forms. In stratum II (seventh century BCE), the assemblage consisted of 26% Judahite forms, but coastal forms increase substantially to (54%) as do Assyrian forms (5%) (Mazar and Panitz-Cohen, *Timnah [Tel Batash] II*, 157–161).
date after the Assyrian invasion of 701 BCE). The Philistines loom large in Judg 14–15, where competing social identities provide a point of interpersonal conflict. Yet, it would be a mistake to confuse social identities with political boundaries, as the story makes clear that such labels as Philistine or “other” were not impenetrable barriers. Samson and his kin are not Philistines (Judg 14:3), but neither is he identified as an Israelite, a Judahite, nor a Danite. The only social identity attached to Samson comes from the mouths of Philistines, who call him “the son-in-law of the Timnite” (Judg 15:6).

The Shephelah in the late eighth through early seventh centuries BCE was also a plausible vector for intercultural exchange between Assyria and Israel/Judah, when biblical writers may well have encountered the martial rhetoric of the Neo-Assyrian king (either orally or written). Samson’s besting of the Philistines through the רוח־יהוה could have served as a meaningful counter-narrative to the subjugation of Judah, especially after the crushing defeat at the hands of the Neo-Assyrian king. In the absence of an effective defense from external threats, stories about local folk heroes who bested Judah’s political adversaries through their personal exploits may well have been committed to writing at this time.

3 (Divine) Anger in Battle

Sennacherib claimed to have subjugated and conquered Judah through his terrifying melammu.21 The notion of a divine fury invigorating heroic figures is a common theme in ancient literature and iconography. In Mesopotamia, the Akkadian words melammu and puluḫtu referred to the overwhelming and overpowering strength or vitality of divine beings, objects, kings, and heroes.22 This was often envisioned as a resplendent light, an alienable component of divine and royal bodies that would inspire terrifying fear.23 Scholars have identified several biblical terms thought to capture some of the nuances of melammu (e.g., כבוד, הוד, and הדר),24 though the divine רוח has never directly entered the discussion.25 In Greek tradition, Achilles’ fury (μηνις) was an emotional metaphor ascribed to both gods and mortals.26 Jean-Pierre Vernant argued that the ancient Greeks believed that the human body was spatially delimited, but also permeable to divine forces that invigorate it. Frequently used

---

20 The inhabitants of Timnah likely possessed multiple social identities, as Samson’s wife is “among the daughters of the Philistines” (מבנות פלשתים [Judg 14:1]), though the Philistines call her father a “Timnite” (Judg 15:6.)
21 “As for him, Hezekiah, fear of my lordly brilliance (puḫi melammu bēlūṭiya) overwhelmed him” (Sennacherib 22 col. iii, 37b–38 [RINAP 3/1, 177]).
22 Cassin, La Splendeur Divine, 121.
25 In the most recent comparative study on the topic, Aster claimed that the melammu of heroes was either purposefully ignored by pre-exilic writers or never applied to any individual other than kings (The Unbeatable Light, 222).
26 Muellner, The Anger of Achilles, 395; Smith, Poetic Heroes, 22.
to refer to the wrath of the gods, Achilles’ μῆτις internally animates him, eventually exceeding his physical body and bursting into flames above his head.\(^{27}\)

The figure of Samson and his individualistic exploits have long captivated scholars because of similarities between this biblical judge and heroes from other warrior traditions.\(^{28}\) Based on one proposed etymology of Samson’s name, “little sun” (שמשון, Šemesh), some sought to identify him as a “solar hero” associated with the sun-god Šemeš and/or the site of Beth Shemesh.\(^{29}\) Hermann Gunkel identified Samson with the “Natural Man,” characterized by an ignorance of civilization, perpetual aggression, and uncontrollable lust.\(^{30}\) The most famous wild men of Near Eastern myth include Gilgamesh’s companion Enkidu and Lahmu (lit. “the hairy one”).\(^{31}\) Iconography offers another avenue of analysis, as the description of Samson overcoming a lion with his bare hands (Judg 14:5–6) may allude to an extremely common scene in post-Neolithic Old World iconography: the “Master of Animals” motif.\(^{32}\) A fixture of Mesopotamian iconography for millennia, the Master of Animals scene often depicted a bearded nude hero with six curls of hair grappling with two animals or Mischwesen.\(^{33}\) By the Neo-Assyrian period, the hero with six curls was referred to as lahmu “the hairy one,” appearing in Sargon II’s palace at Khorsabad,\(^{34}\) and in the reliefs of Assurbanipal’s Northwest Palace at Nineveh. Though absent from Judg 14–15, the association of Samson’s hair with his wild strength (Judg 16:1-30) may reflect a similar heroic archetype as depicted in Neo-Assyrian iconography.\(^{36}\)

Samson does dwell briefly in a rock crevice (Judg 15:8), fights his battles without weapons or tools (Judg 14:6; 16:3), is notably aggressive and lustful, overcomes nature’s most savage animal (Judg 14:6), and is lured into Philistine society by a woman—twice. His character reflects some attributes of the “wild man warrior,” but his connections to sedentary civilization, his family’s association with Timnah, and his ability to speak all distinguish him from such an archetype. The association between this heroic figure and his hair is perfectly

\(^{27}\) Vernant, “Mortals and Immortals,” 37.

\(^{28}\) Mobley, The Empty Men.


\(^{30}\) Gunkel, Reden und Aufsätze, 38-64; Mobley, “The Wild Man,” 218.

\(^{31}\) Mobley equated Samson with Tiāmat’s attendant Laḥmu, believing Samson represented Yahweh’s chaos monster unleashed on the Philistines (The Empty Men, 204). He also described these episodes as “fits of martial rage,” where the רוח־יהוה only departs from Samson when he has become cultivated and removed from nature (“The Wild Man,” 230).


\(^{33}\) Costello, “The Mesopotamian ‘Nude Hero’,” 25–35. The motif endured into the Persian period, as seen in the doorjamb reliefs at Darius’ palace in Persepolis (Root, The King and Kingship in Achaemenid Art, 303–308).


\(^{35}\) Ollivier, “The Hero Overpowering a Lion.”

\(^{36}\) Mobley, “The Wild Man,” 223–224. A fifth century BCE seal from Amman depicts a hairy hero battling two lions, whose owner also bore the Yahwistic name Ḥašabyah (Eggler and Uehlinger, “ハウスャ海 und der ‘Herr der Löwen’.”).
comprehensible in light of Near Eastern iconography that was known in the region of Israel/Judah by the Persian period at the latest. Yet, Samson’s strength in Judg 14-15 is not a product of his unshorn hair, but the רוח יהוה, an aspect of the deity that “rushes” upon Samson unexpectedly, disappearing just as quickly.37

Judg 14:5–6

Samson, his father, and his mother went down to Timnah, and they came up to the vineyards at Timnah. Then, a young roaring lion encountered him. And the רוח יהוה “rushed” upon him and he tore it (the lion) into pieces, like a young goat, (even though) there was nothing in his hand. He did not tell his father or mother what he had done.

Judg 14:19

And the רוח יהוה “rushed” upon him (Samson), and he went down to Ashkelon and killed thirty of their men and took their plundered (garments) and gave the garments to those who had solved the riddle. His anger burned and he went to his father’s house.

Judg 15:14

He (Samson) came to Lehi, and the Philistines were shouting to come meet him. And the רוח יהוה “rushed” upon him (Samson), and the ropes that were on his arms became like flax that has caught fire, and his bonds melted off his hands.

Iconography likely inspired some aspects of the Samson cycle (especially in Judg 16), but literary imagery of Yahweh as the divine warrior in battle was the primary inspiration for the רוח יהוה in the Samson Cycle.

Exploring body-related terminology in the context of warfare helps to clarify the meaning of the רוח יהוה in Judg 14–15. In his analysis of Greek literature, Vernant explained that the vocabulary of the body was a symbolic system, a kind of corporeal code that enabled ancient minds to think about the relations between mortals and the gods in terms of “double figures of the same and the other, of the near and the far, of contact and separation.”38 Applying this insight to biblical tradition, Friedhelm Hartenstein explained that the body was a socially- and historically-relative symbolic phenomenon.39 In Near Eastern, biblical, and Greek traditions, corporeality (Leiblichkeit) represents a field of energies and powers working within human beings, which were only deficient imitations of the divine splendor invigorating

37 Given that external stimuli elicit the onset of the רוח יהוה in two cases (Judg 14:6; 15:14), this may represent a stylized description of the physiological response to adrenaline.
39 Hartenstein, Das Angesichts JHWHs, 18.
gods. Samson was an emulation of God himself, though with greater limitations and ultimately mortality.

The size of the divine body in biblical tradition varies according to the literary and imagined social contexts. Aside from scale, what distinguished divine and mortal bodies was an intense brilliance that often obscured the divine form. In both ancient Near Eastern and biblical tradition, theophanic descriptions of divine beings frequently allude to a numinous light. Despite the common description of Mesopotamian kings and Greek heroes bearing divine or semi-divine brilliance, only one biblical text alludes to the transmission of Yahweh’s radiant aura to a human being. After his encounter with Yahweh on Mount Sinai (Ex 34:29–30), “the skin of his [Moses’] face radiated horns (of light)” yet, resplendent light is only one of numerous corporeal metaphors that relate divine and human bodies.

Two early poetic texts include the קן עור פניו of Yahweh as part of his battle theophany (Ex 15; 2 Sam 22//Ps 18). Proposed dates for 2 Sam 22//Ps 18 predominantly point to the early monarchic period, and for the Song of the Sea anywhere between the twelfth through the fifth centuries BCE. Dating these poems is notoriously difficult, though recent studies have attempted to buttress linguistic dating with historical and stylistic considerations that place them within the monarchic period. Whenever these poems were composed, they draw on stock motifs of divine fire in battle that had circulated the ancient Near East since the second

40 This may seem counterintuitive to the modern view that would understand the relationship in reverse: the gods were anthropomorphized reflections of the human form. However, as the conceptual framework informing the Priestly creation story demonstrates, their vision of divine and mortal forms presents humanity as a diminished likeness (צלם/דמות) of the gods (Gen 1:27–28).

41 Mark S. Smith enumerated three divine bodies: (i) a natural “human” body; (ii) a superhuman-sized liturgical body in the temple; and (iii), a “cosmic” or “mystical” body (“The Three Bodies of God”).

42 A constellation of Hebrew and Sumerian/Akkadian terms define these divine attributes, which emphasize difference aspects of their effects and purposes. The Akkadian term melammu (Sum. ME.LAM₂) described an outer covering of a person, god, or object demonstrating its power; pulūḥtu (N₂) described the terrifying effect of this outward covering; namurratu (N₁:GAL) referred to an “aura of fearfulness;” rašubbatu referred to the terror provoked by weapons; and, a group of terms (namrirru [N₁:GAL], šalummatu [SU.LIM], šaruṛu [SE.ER(ZI)/AŠ.MA], birbirrū [AŠ.ME]) refer to fiery radiance. The Hebrew terms נחד, הדר, עון, און, etc., and can all refer to the splendor, radiance, or beauty of Yahweh, humans, and objects.


44 Cross and Freedman dated the poems to the tenth century BCE (“A Royal Psalm of Thanksgiving,” 23–26; Cross, Canaanite Myth, 158–159).

45 Cross (Canaanite Myth, 237–250) and Robertson (Linguistic Evidence, 155) argued for a late-twelfth to early-eleventh century BCE date for the poem, whereas Martin Brenner identified it as a post-exilic text (Song of the Sea Ex 15:1–21,100–103).

millennium BCE.\textsuperscript{47} Such motifs were potentially available at any time in the monarchic and postmonarchic periods. In these poems, the divine רוח was an attribute of Yahweh’s body, a blast of wind or breath that emanates from within him to defeat his cosmic enemies. In early warrior poetry, Yahweh’s רוח resembled Marduk’s attendant “winds” in the \textit{Enûma Eliš}, though these winds were not components of the deity’s body as seen in biblical tradition.\textsuperscript{48} As a force emanating from the deity, the רוח was an expression of his martial rage that he could unleash. The concepts of \textit{melammu} and ים נ世代 offer helpful parallels in this regard, while recognizing that human and divine bodies represented culturally relative coded metaphors.

In the Song of the Sea, Yahweh has fully assumed the identity of a warrior (איש מלחמה [v. 3]), and although he is called a “man” (איש) here, his cosmic foe (תהם/ים) makes it somewhat ambiguous as to the imagined scale of the deity. The poem alludes to Yahweh’s “lofty majesty” (רב גאון), which may or may not point to his divine radiance, before quickly turning to his anger (חרן) that he sent forth to devour (אכל) the Egyptians.\textsuperscript{49} Anger represents a common characteristic of the divine warrior (e.g., Hab 3:8–12),\textsuperscript{50} though in the Song of the Sea Yahweh externalized this rage as his רוח, which he uses against his cosmic and human enemies.\textsuperscript{51}

\textbf{Ex 15:8}

\begin{align*}
\text{ברוח אפיך נערמו מים נצבו كما נד} & \quad \text{And at the } \text{רוח of your nose/nostrils,} \\
\text{נן למיא הנסים בליבים:} & \quad \text{the waters were gathered together,} \\
\text{המים נצבו كما נד} & \quad \text{the floods stood upright as a heap,} \\
\text{ונל סדנה בלבים:} & \quad \text{and the depths were congealed in the midst of} \\
\text{Yamm/the sea.} & \quad \text{Yam}/\text{the sea.}
\end{align*}

\textbf{Ex 15:10}

\begin{align*}
\text{ النفس ברוחך כסמו ים צללו כעופרת} & \quad \text{You blew your רוח,} \\
\text{כמים אדירימ:} & \quad \text{the sea covered them [the Egyptians],} \\
\text{הם שונתה במאים:} & \quad \text{they sank as lead in the mighty waters.}
\end{align*}


\textsuperscript{48} In this combat myth, Marduk rides his chariot to battle wearing his resplendent aura (\textit{melammu}) and accompanied by his attendant “winds” that he either received from his father Anu or fashions (\textit{banû}) himself (col. iv, ll. 45–59). The “Evil Wind” (\textit{imhulla}) inflates Tiāmat, allowing Marduk to pierce her with his arrow (col. iv, ll. 94–104) (Lambert, \textit{Babylonian Creation Myths}, 91). In the battle theophany of Psalm 104:1–9, Yahweh similarly rides into battle on his cosmic chariot, enrobed in his resplendent aura, and accompanied by his attendant “winds” (רוחות) and “fire” (אש/להט).

\textsuperscript{49} Moshe Weinfeld associated the “consuming rage” (חרך יאכלמו) that destroys the Egyptians with Mesopotamian \textit{melammu} but made no such connection with his רוח in the next verse (“Divine Intervention in War in Ancient Israel,” 135–137).

\textsuperscript{50} Alongside his resplendent aura (روحemploi) that makes no such connection with his רוח in the next verse (“Divine Intervention in War in Ancient Israel,” 135–137).

The imagery of Yahweh’s רוח blasts from his nose (אף) to “heap up” (נצב) and “congeal” (קפא) the sea, implies that this is a furious and scorching breath. This is more explicit in Deut 32:22, where Yahweh’s anger is “a fire kindled in my nose” (אש קדחה באפי). The fiery רוח of Yahweh is an instrument of battle in the Song of the Sea, but one that is an essential aspect of the deity himself. The same physiological metaphor appears in another poem describing Yahweh as the divine warrior:

2 Sam 22:16/ Ps 18:16(15)

ויראו אפקי ים יגלו מסדות תבל
At the reproach of Yahweh,

בגערת יהוה מנשמת רוח אפו׃
from the blasting of the רוח of his nose.

Alongside his resplendent light (גנה [v. 13]), the deity’s רוח (as an expression of his wrath) is a Leitmotiv of the battle theophany. Whereas Ex 15 and Hab 3 depict Yahweh as a warrior on campaign, 2 Sam 22/ Ps 18 imagined a resplendent Yahweh summoned from his earthly palace (היכל), who comes to the battle in his cosmic tent-shrine (סכה/סתר). Nevertheless, both scenes evoke Yahweh’s רוח as an expression of his divine rage in battle.

As an emotional force welling up in the deity, the expulsion of his divine fury in the form of his fiery רוח was not simply a metonym for Yahweh. Described in corporeal terms, Yahweh’s רוח was a fiery wind blasted from his nose (אף), the physiological center of anger. This reflects stock Near Eastern language for the “fury” (חרה) of gods that burns (חרה) against their enemies or their own people. If the “burning of the nose” (חרה אף) described the emotional state of the deity, the “blasting” (נפש/נשם) of the רוח from this body part was the physical response to or an outburst of such anger. In these descriptions of Yahweh’s martial rage, the רוח is a destructive terrifying force, perhaps even a weapon, which Yahweh uses against his cosmic and human foes.

---

52 A very different image of God’s רוח appears in the Priestly “combat myth” of Gen 1:3, where it “hovers over the water” (רוח אלהים מרחפת על-פני המים) but is not in any kind of violent confrontation with it. Mark S. Smith considered this the transmutation of the divine warrior to a power that transcended combat (The Priestly Vision of Genesis, 64–71).

53 Comparing 2 Sam 22/ Ps 18 and Ps 27, Hartenstein argued that this “audience chamber” imagery derived from a pre-exilic Jerusalem-based cultic tradition (Das Angesichts JHWHs, 168–170).

54 Simone, Your God is a Devouring Fire.

55 Through externalized physical metaphors, anger was described as a hot, fiery liquid substance (Wagner, “Emotionen in Text, Sprache und materialen Bildern,” 216).

56 In addition to these biblical texts, Smith identified the anger of Ba’al and Môt in the Ba’al Cycle (KTU 1.2 I 38; 1.6 V 20–21), the anger (ʾṇp) of Chemosh in the Mesha Inscription (KAI 181:5–6), and Yahweh’s anger (ʾṇ) against Yamm (Hab 3:8) and the people (Hab 3:12) (Poetic Heroes, 21).

57 Grant, Divine Anger in the Hebrew Bible, 89–100. Alternatively, Yahweh’s רוח may take the place of attendant deities in battle, such as “Plague” (דבר) and “Pestilence” (רשף) in Habakkuk 3:5 (Lipiński, Resheph; Münich, The God Resheph). See Hillers, “Amos 7, 4 and Ancient Parallels,” 221–225; Miller, “Fire Mythology.”
The Mesopotamian notion of melammu as a component of the divine and royal body covers a much broader semantic field than the biblical motif of the רוח יהוה, though there are some notable similarities between the two concepts. Like Yahweh’s רוח in Exodus 15, two Sumerian hymns recount how the melammu of Enlil and Inanna/Ištar boils the cosmic underground waters: “your melammu boils fish in the deep!” (me-lam-zu engur-ra ku₄ mu₉-mi-ib-šeg₂-šeg₂). A Neo-Babylonian hymn to Nergal refers to the deity as “fire clothed in melammu” (girru lābiš melamme), and a Šurpu incantation describes the effect of the dimītu and aḫḫazu demons emerging from the Apsû: “to the four winds, the[ir] melammus spread out like fire” (ana šāri erbetti melammē saḥpū kīma išāti). Elena Cassin cites numerous Neo-Assyrian texts that equate “flaming weapons” (šuripat šurippak) with the king’s terrifying melammu. The connections between anger, fire/heat, and battle are on display throughout the Poem of Erra and Išum, especially when Marduk makes “furious Girru (lit. ‘fire’)” (ezzu girru) restore his diminished melammu. Mesopotamian literature qualifies a particular type of melammu related to the martial rage of divine beings and humans through the use of the adjective ezzu, “furious.” Biblical and Mesopotamian tradition share similar conceptions of the divine and human warrior in battle, though they stem from culturally distinct corporeal metaphors. The heat and fire of Yahweh’s רוח in battle is a physiological metaphor for anger, whereas the same theme in Mesopotamian literature seems to be a “by-product” of melammu’s radiance. Anger, and its metaphorical representation through fire, appear in literature about battle because that is the cognitive and experiential reality of warfare common to many cultures. How these themes are explained through corporeal metaphors, however, are culturally relative.

Samson’s martial rage emulates that of the divine warrior, though in diminished form. His triumphs and defeats repeatedly evoke the visual motif of heat, fire, and fury. In the episode of the thirty Ashkelonites (Judg 14:19), the הרוח הקצוע causes Samson to “burn with anger” (ירוח גשונ). In his encounter with the Philistines at Ramat-Lehi (Judg 15:14), the רוח הקצוע causes Samson’s fetters “become like flax that has caught fire” (רוח הקצוע הבתים אש פרה) (רותריי כפתים אש ברע ב האלהים). As a cruel outcome of his constant attacks, the Philistines ultimately kill Samson’s wife and her father by burning them (Judg 15:6). The verbal root רוח הקצוע is granted agency in Judg 14–15, where it always serves as the subject of the verb צלח. Typically translated as a stative, “to succeed/prosper,” Hebrew צלח may represent the merger of two

58 CT 42, 26, l. 32 (Cohen, Canonical Lamentations of Mesopotamia, 2:340, 582).
59 K 9880 (von Weiher, Der babylonische Gott Nergal, 57–58).
61 Cassin, La splendeur divine, 75–76.
62 Tablet III, ll. 50–51 (Cagni, The Poem of Erra; Aster, The Unbeatable Light, 55).
63 Cassin, La splendeur divine, 8, 10, 19, 21, 73.
64 Aster, The Unbeatable Light, 43.
65 Robert Alter considered fire “a metonymic image for Samson himself” (The Art of Biblical Narrative, 95).
66 A reflex of the “burning” of Samson’s restraints appears in the next narrative in the cycle when Samson breaks his restraints: “like a thread of flax that breaks when it “touches” fire” (カメラה גשונ נקק תעלית חמשת בהרוהא אש [Judg 16:9]). The peculiar use of the verbal root רוח most likely refers back to the רוח that burned/melted Samson’s restraints in Judg 15:14.
Semitic roots: $\sqrt{\text{ṣlh}}$ I “to split, to force entry, to penetrate, to succeed;” and $\sqrt{\text{ṣlh}}$ II “to burn.”

The prepositional complement of the verb is על, implying that the imagery is not that of theروح יהוה entering into Samson, but it resting upon him. If the conception of Yahweh’sروح in Judg 14-15 derives from divine warrior literature, then could correspond to a sense of a fire that “burns” on human warriors. Potential cognates are known from Akkadian selû “to burn (fumigants),” sarâhu “to heat/to scorch/to flare up/display a sudden luminosity,” and Syriac srh “to burn.” These verbs are not completely satisfying linguistic cognates of Hebrew צלח, even though their semantic ranges suggest some kind of relationship. Amos 5:6 provides biblical support for the association of צלח and burning: “lest He [Yahweh] ignite/burn the house of Joseph like a fire” (בית יוסף פן-יצלח כאש).

The conceptual framework connecting corporealized divine anger, heat/fire, and theروح-יהוה may provide a critical connection between Yahweh’sروح as a component of the divine body and theروح-יהוה as invigorating force in Judges. Emerging from the corporeal center of anger (אף), Yahweh’s “breath” (روح) is what enables his internalized emotions to affect the outside world. In no way is “breath” a corporeal metaphor unique to the emotion of anger, but rather, it covers a range of internal and external descriptions of emotion or characteristics (e.g., jealousy, wisdom). As the human body is but a diminished emulation of the divine one, Samson too possesses some of this divine martial rage, which would occasionally emerge and burn upon his body, enabling him to perform superhuman feats.

68 AHw selû II:1090a; CAD §:124b.
69 CAD §:98b–100a (mngs. A & C); Sokoloff, A Syriac Lexicon, 1301.
70 Émile Puech rejected Blau’s proposal for a second root meaning “to burn” underlying Hebrew צלח, though he accepted that there was an “established relationship” between Hebrew צלח, Akkadian sarâhu, and Syriac srh. However, he could not find acceptable linguistic evidence for the consonantal shift between /l/ and /r/ in Semitic languages (“Sur la racine šlh en Hébreu et en Araméen,” 18).
71 In a riddle posed to the Son of Man (Ezek 15:1-6), Yahweh asks what use the wood of thevine (עץ הענבים) serves “for work” (למלאכה), rhetorically asking if charcoal: “can burn’ for work?” (היצלח למלאכה).
72 Compare theروح-יהוה melting (מסס) Samson’s fetters with the melting of mountains inYahweh’s presence (Ps 97:5; Micah 1:3–4).
73 In her comparative study of spirits in Near Eastern, biblical, and Greek tradition, Anna Angelini observed: “la relation de l’individu avec l’environnement est caractérisée, à l’époque prémoderne, par un soi poreux, ‘porous self,’ en contraste avec le soi enveloppé, ‘buffered,’ ou isolé, ‘bounded,’ de l’époque moderne. Dans cette perspective, lesémotions intenses [my emphasis], ainsi que les conditions qui produisent un changement d’état ou d’esprit dans l’individu ne sont pas considérées comme un produit de son intimité, mais comme ayant leur origine hors de la personne et pouvant la saisir de l’extérieur. Par conséquent, les limites de la physicalité de l’individu sont perçues comme perméables non seulement aux esprits et aux démons, mais aussi, de manière plus...
The expression רוח־יהוה implies that the origin of Samson’s martial rage is the deity, or perhaps that his martial rage is Yahweh-like. The verb צלח denotes moments when this internalized fury manifests externally, a fire that burns around Samson. Developing out of an older tradition that depicted Yahweh as a divine warrior who used his fiery רוח to defeat his enemies, the authors of one Samson narrative created a new meaning for the רוח־יהוה in relation to human beings. It was still a destructive outburst of martial rage, but it was also an invigorating force that “burned” (צלח) on Israelite heroes/leaders. This fiery anger enabled them to emulate Yahweh’s divine fury in combat, if only briefly.

4 The Influence of the רוח־יהוה Motif beyond the Samson Cycle

4.1 Othniel, Gideon, and Jephthah

Outside of the Samson Cycle, the phrase רוח־יהוה appears in three other narratives about Othniel’s, Gideon’s, and Jephthah’s preparations for battle (Judg 3:10; 6:34; 11:29). The רוח־יהוה rests upon these judges as they muster troops but elicits no physiological response as with Samson. In two cases, the רוח־יהוה is simply described as “being upon” (עליו) the judges Othniel and Jephthah in the prelude to war (Judg 3:7-11; 11:29, 32–33). In Judges 16:34, Gideon is clothed (Railsa) in the רוח־יהוה as he musters the men of Abi‘ezer, Zebulon, Asher, and Naphtali. A later reflex of this type-scene occurs in 1 Chr 12:19, where an enigmatic רוח “clothes” (לבשה) one of David’s military commanders, Amasai, in the conflict against Saul.

What connects the three descriptions of the רוח־יהוה in the Book of Judges is an externalized image of Yahweh’s divine vitality enwrapping human leaders. Yet, previous interpretations understood the רוח־יהוה “clothing” Gideon as an example of biblical spirit possession, where the רוח־יהוה inhabited its host and prompted them to behave according to its whims. This uncertainty stems from the convergence of two independent corporeal metaphors about divine רוח: a tradition of spirit-inducing prophecy (e.g., Num 11:25, 27; 1 Sam 10:5–12; 1 Kgs 22:19–23) and a warrior tradition of Yahweh’s רוח as an outburst of martial rage. Understanding the רוח־יהוה as a vital force invigorating a warrior, a divine energy temporarily available to select humans, and its description as “clothing” certain heroes.

74 Soggin asserted that the רוח־יהוה was the usual pretext or “efficient cause” to call a charismatic leader (Judges, 46). Although this “pretext” can be found in the Gideon and Samson narratives, Jephthah had already been chosen as leader before the רוח־יהוה covers him.

75 The Othniel account appears to be a late Deuteronomistic addition to the Book of Judges (Carr, The Formation of the Hebrew Bible, 171; Groß, Richter, 218-19; Soggin, Judges, 47).

76 On the secondary nature of Judg 6:36-40, see Groß, Richter, 378. Soggin identified Judg 7:1-8 as a pre-Dtr interpolation (Judges, 139).

77 Wilson, Prophecy and Society, 33, 145. Alternatively, Nahum Waldman argued that the imagery of “clothing” could carry a special sense of “overwhelming,” based on well-attested usage in Sumerian and Akkadian literature (“The Imagery of Clothing, Covering, and Overpowering,” 161).

78 On spirit possession, see Carlson, The Spirit and the Self.
shares many conceptual parallels with the Mesopotamian concepts of *melammu* and *puluḫtu*. Just as the רוח־יהו clothes (לבוש) Gideon, so too did *melammu* and *puluḫtu* clothe Mesopotamian humans, gods, and other beings. This is not to be understood as a literal garment, but external representations of the physical vitality of those who possess the terrifying radiance of *melammu*. A similar cultural notion appears in Greek tradition, as Vernant explained how the accoutrements of the warrior (i.e., armor, garb, clothing) were extensions of the body: Achilles’ μῆνις burns in his eyes and was reflected in his dazzling bronze armor. In the *Enûma Eliš*, Ea removes the vestments and *melammu* of Apsû and clothes himself in them to kill the god ([ipṭur riksīšu ištaḫat agāšu melammēšu itbala šu ūtaddiq]. Likewise, Assyrian and Babylonian kings like Adad-nārārī II (r. 911–891 BCE) and Nebuchadnezzar II (r. 604–562 BCE) were also described as “wearing” a divine/royal vitality in battle. The authors/redactors of the Book of Judges used the רוח־יהוה to evoke the image of the judge as a warrior in battle, wearing or bearing externalized forms of their martial fury. The purpose was to connect Samson’s personal exploits to the community-oriented goals of these other judges. This created a line of continuity between the charismatic leaders within the Book of Judges, and ultimately influenced the narratives of Israel’s early warrior-kings.

### 4.2 Saul and David

The use of the verb צלח to describe the רוח־יהוה in the Samson narrative also appears in the accounts of the establishment of the monarchy under Saul and David. In 1 Samuel 10:1, Samuel anoints Saul as king before informing him that the רוח־יהוה would soon צלח upon him (v.6). During the clandestine coronation of David, Samuel anoints the young warrior and the רוח־יהוה is said to צלח upon him (1 Sam 16:13), again signaling the divine election of a charismatic leader. There is no sharp distinction between king and warrior in biblical and Near Eastern tradition. Royal ideology is remarkably consistent in the tripartite depiction of the enthroned king, the king as judge, and the king as warrior. Like Gideon (Judg 6:11) and Jephthah (Judg 11:1), both Saul (1 Sam 9:1) and David (1 Sam 16:18) are called “mighty warriors” (גבור חיל). Like the divine warrior in the Song of the Sea (Ex 15:3), David is twice called a “man of war” (איש מלחמה) (1 Sam 16:18; 2 Sam 17:8). The authors of Judges and 1

---

79 Though largely rejected today, the frequent usage of the Akkadian cognate labāšu with *melammu* and *puluḫtu* led A. Leo Oppenheim to argue that these terms referred to a hood/mask and a resplendent garment worn by Mesopotamian kings (“Akkadian pul(u)ḫ(t)u and melammu,” 31-34).

80 In *Ludlul Bēl Nēmeqi*, the protagonist is beset by the god Marduk, who is described as “wrapped in *melammu*, clothed in *puluḫtu*” (mellamē ḫālip lābiš pulḫāti) (VAT 9954, iii. obv. line 12 [W. G. Lambert, *Babylonian Wisdom Literature*, 48]).

81 Winter, “Radiance as an Aesthetic Value in the Art of Mesopotamia,” 128.

82 Marduk’s epithet, lābiš pulḫātālmelamma occurs in the combat myth, *Enûma Eliš*, where he is described as: “clothed in the *melammu* of ten gods, he was crowned sublimely” (lābiš melammī ešret ilānmeš ṣaqiš etpur) (*Enûma Eliš* I 103 [Lambert, *Creation Myths*, 56-57]).

83 Vernant, “Mortals and Immortals,” 37.

84 *Enûma Eliš*, Tablet I, ll. 67-68.

85 Adad-nārārī II A.0.99.1, obv. l. 8 (Grayson, RIME 2, 146); Hymn to Nebuchadnezzar, rev. line 10 (Strong, “A Hymn to Nebuchadnezzar,” 154–162).
Samuel may have independently drawn on several themes from Israel’s warrior tradition, but the particular usage of the רוח־יהוה implies a more direct connection between these texts.

At key narrative junctures related to royal ascension (1 Sam 10:6, 10; 11:6; 16:3), the רוח־יהוה is said to “burn/rush upon” (צלח על) Saul and David. Mareike Verena Blischke argued that the stereotyped use of the verb צלח with the רוח־יהוה/ אלהים pointed to the direct textual dependence of the Judges material on the Samuel traditions.86

Judg 14:19  
1 Sam 11:6

In both cases, what follows is a display of wild martial rage: Samson kills thirty men of Ashkelon and Saul cuts apart oxen with their own yoke and then musters (פקד) his people for battle.87 In contrast to Blischke, however, I would argue the opposite direction of influence. The Samson tradition appears to only know the older conception of Yahweh’s רוח as found in the warrior poetry of Ex 15 and Ps 18//2 Sam 22: a fiery/vitality emanating from the divine body in battle. The Samuel material draws on this theme through the reuse of the verb צלח and the anger of Saul, but it also incorporates a number of other themes that only later became associated with God’s רוח—namely, the battle muster and the prophecy-inducing רוח in other Saul stories (1 Sam 10:5–12; 19:24).88 As repositories for multiple traditions that converge on the motif of Yahweh’s רוח, the Samuel narratives present Israel’s first kings as the successors to the charismatic warrior-judges and the spiritual legitimacy of Moses’ prophetic authority. The awareness of these themes seems much later than the localized folk tradition of Samson contained within Judg 14–15.

5 Conclusion

As a Leitmotif in warrior literature, the רוח־יהוה derives from a physiological metaphor of Yahweh’s externalized anger in battle. As imperfect reflections of the divine form, human beings possess some of this fury, which could erupt from within the permeable limits of the human body. The various verbs used to describe the effects or appearance of the רוח־יהוה in the Book of Judges (הצלח על, לבש, היה על), are literary metaphors that explained physiological responses of warriors in battle. Whereas Yahweh’s divine radiance and fury was inexhaustible, Samson’s strength was ephemeral and limited like any other human being (Judg 15:17–18). The רוח־יהוה was a fruitful concept that marked the biblical warrior tradition, one that developed within biblical literature but compares with similar corporeal metaphors in other cultures. Through their own corporeal symbolic systems, both Mesopotamian and Greek traditions offer numerous parallels to the motif of the רוח־יהוה in the Book of Judges. Like Achilles’ μηνις or the Neo-Assyrian king’s melammu, the physiological state of a warrior was a furious heat, emulating the emotions of the gods. The

86 Blischke, Der Geist Gottes im Alten Testament, 89.
87 The “fear of Yahweh” (פחד־יהוה) that falls upon the people of Israel after hearing of Saul’s superhuman rage recalls the “fear” (puluḫtu) that the melammu of Neo-Assyrian kings can inspire.
88 Blischke isolated 1 Sam 11:6 from other references to the divine רוח in 1 Samuel that allude to the prophecy-inducing רוח (Der Geist Gottes im Alten Testament, 89).
bodies of gods and humans reflect inner states; the “breath” (רוח) as what passes in and out of bodies—is a particularly rich metaphor to explain the permeability of inner and outer states of emotion. By connecting the רוח־יהוה in Judges with older divine warrior poetry, fury, heat, and fire become the central themes of Judg 14–15 and may offer yet another etiological explanation for Samson’s peculiar name.
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