

The Spirit of God in the Old Testament¹

Introduction

An investigation into the idea of the Holy Spirit in the Old Testament begins with a methodological problem that must be dealt with before one can venture into its nebulous terrain. The first problem is that the very nature of the Old Testament seems to resist an ontological presentation of the Holy Spirit. At the beginning of the 20th century Davidson wrote that, "the sphere of the Old Testament is the practical religious sphere, out of which it never wanders into the sphere of ontology."² Brevard Childs recently wrote that ". . . Israel's understanding of God is grounded in divine disclosure, and there is never any attempt to locate it in his being or existence *per se*."³ Yet the history of exegesis reveals the tendency to move toward the ontological. Take for example Exodus 3.14 and the difficulty to translate "אֱהִיָּה אֲשֶׁר אֱהִיָּה." Jaroslav Pelikan tells us that it became a "proof text for Christian discussions of ontology." He writes:

To Clement of Alexandria it meant that "God is one, and beyond the one and above the monad itself"; to Origen, that "all things, whatever they are, participate in him who truly is"; to Hilary it was "an indication concerning God so exact that it expressed in the terms best adapted to human understanding an unattainable insight into the mystery of the divine nature"; to Gregory of Nazianzus it proved that "He who is" was the most appropriate designation for God; to Theodore of Mopsuestia it was the mark of distinction between the Creator and all his creatures; to Philoxenus of Mabbug it was the divine way of "expelling the tradition of polytheism"; to Augustine it proved that "essence" could be used of God with strict propriety, while "substance" could not. From these and other sources, such as *On Divine Names* of Dionysius the Areopagite, the ontological understanding of the passage passed into the authoritative summaries of Christian doctrine, namely, the *Orthodox Faith* of John of Damascus in the East and the *Summa Theologica* of Thomas Aquinas in the West.⁴

This flow is not stopped at Aquinas, as Childs shows, it moves through the reformers and post-reformation era.⁵ In terms of the doctrine of the Trinity, this tendency toward the ontological has preserved a notorious isogesis in the term אֱלֹהִים and its plural number. Contrary to such simplistic philological and grammatical notions as presented in Thiessen's *Introductory Lectures in Systematic Theology*, the plurality of אֱלֹהִים does not "intimate" the doctrine of the trinity.⁶ Even H. Bavinck was careful not to argue on this doubtful basis. Bavinck wrote, "The fact that the name Elohim is plural in form to be sure does not prove the trinity. . . ."⁷ The plurality is explained in two basic ways, either as

¹ This article is a reformatting of an article published in the *Koudan*, 1992, an annual journal of the Japan Assemblies of God. The Hebrew & Greek script were restored to the original writing which were not able to be printed in the 1992, publication. I have not presented the published pagination in the reprint edition.

² A. B. Davidson, *The Theology of the Old Testament*, 115.

³ B. S. Childs, *Old Testament Theology in a Canonical Context* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985) 44.

⁴ J. Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition [100-600]* (Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 1971), 54.

⁵ B. S. Childs, *The Book of Exodus: A Critical and Theological Commentary* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1974), 84-87.

the *pluralis excellentiae* or *pluralis maiestatis*.⁸ Recently Bruce Waltke and M. O'Connor have called it the *honorific* use of the plural and include the terms *קדושים, ארנים, בעלים*.⁹ The plural number used in reference to a singular deity is also noted in the Akkadian *ilanu* ("gods") and *ilania* ("my gods").¹⁰ Therefore the grounds for an explicit doctrine of the Trinity in the Old Testament is doubtful. Other "intimations" are so thin that they are drowned out by the reverberation of the Shema: *שמע ישראל יהוה אלהינו יהוה אחד* (Deut. 5.4).

A second important presuppositional problem that one must deal with is that the Old Testament has as its primary emphasis the self-disclosure of God.¹¹ Brevard Childs writes, "The truth is that the Old Testament is consistently theocentric. It assumes that God's primary action lies in revealing himself, and it never attempts to penetrate behind this initiative."¹² Childs gives five basic characteristic patterns to this self-disclosure:

- (a) The God of the Old Testament consistently takes the initiative in his pursuit of mankind. . . . (b) God is not limited to any one means of revelation, but his coming is one of surprise. . . . (c) God both reveals and conceals his identity to Israel. . . . (d) It is characteristic of the Old Testament revelation of God's presence to move quickly from the vision to that which is spoken. . . . (e) The God of the Old Testament is never viewed as a monolithic, unchanging entity.¹³

These five characteristic patterns play a crucial role in the analysis of the Holy Spirit in the Old Testament. *אלהים / יהוה רוח* follow the revealing and concealing pattern of God's identity to Israel. Samuel Terrien's *The Elusive Presence* makes this motif a primary one in the Scriptures; however he fails to capitalize on the presentation of the Spirit in this manner.¹⁴ It is the *רוח* that communicates God's word, enablement and authority. Yet the semantic range of the term *רוח* itself moves toward a concealment. Speaking in the form of prophetic utterances is central for the *רוח* texts, while the diversity, initiative and changeability is certainly present. The problem in dealing with this concept is

⁶ H. C. Thiessen, *Introductory Lectures in Systematic Theology* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956), 136ff. In the Japanese translation note pages 225-227.

⁷ H. Bavinck, *The Doctrine of God*, trans. William Hendriksen (Carlisle, Pennsylvania: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1977), 256.

⁸ Gesenius, Kautzsch and Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 15th ed., 1980), §124e, h.

⁹ B. K. Waltke, and M. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 122-124.

¹⁰ B. W. Anderson, "God, names of," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Volume 2 (Nashville/New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), 413; and also H. Ringgren, "אלהים," *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, Volume 1 (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1974), 270-274.

¹¹ Zimmerli's investigation into the statements of recognition in his work *I am Yahweh*, ed. W. Brueggemann (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1982), deal further with this topic. Recently Lyle Eslinger in "Freedom or Knowledge? Perspective and Purpose in the Exodus Narrative (Exodus 1-15)," *JSOT* 152 (1991), 43-60 has argued for the centrality of the divine self-disclosure in the Exodus narrative.

¹² Childs, op. cit., 44.

¹³ Ibid., 41.

¹⁴ Samuel Terrien, *The Elusive Presence* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1978).

that the self-disclosure of God should not be limited to the Old Testament canon, but instead challenges us to deal further with the New Testament understanding of the Holy Spirit and our own experience. Here we need to recognize the importance of a Pentecostal hermeneutic which such scholars as Gerald Sheppard, Mark McLean, David Nichols and many others have begun.¹⁵ How is one to integrate theological reflection with one's experience? It is part of the characteristic of the Old Testament רוח that moves toward this understanding.

In this article I will deal with the idea of the Holy Spirit in the Old Testament by investigating יהוה / אלהים רוח and other forms of רוח that point toward the Spirit of God. I will begin with a short discussion of the word's semantic range. Then I will turn to focus on some of the major occurrences by looking at the verbs that are used to govern this proper noun. Lastly, I will summarize my findings in light of the endowments that the רוח causes to be manifested.

I. The Word רוח

William Holladay following Koehler and Baumgartner's *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros* defines רוח as "air in motion, blowing, wind, what is empty or transitory, spirit, mind."¹⁶ As can be noted the semantic field of רוח is wide. It is interesting to note that in most of the semitic languages the "spirit" aspect is not found with the "wind" aspect in a single root. Arabic comes closest with *rāḥā* designating "to blow," *rīḥ* meaning "wind", while *rūḥ* is defined as "spirit."¹⁷ Ugaritic had a term similar to רוח, but used it only to designate the "wind." Needless to say, the Hebrew concept of the Spirit of God is strongly influenced by this range of the word. This diversity of meaning cannot be divided chronologically, but is found in most time periods.

Ezekiel 37.1-14 is an exemplary text to investigate this diverse semantic range. In verse 1 the יהוה ברוח ("by the spirit of Yahweh") is used as the mode of transportation in a vision. The רוח has energizing and directing powers here and is mirrored in Ezekiel 2.1-2; 3.12, 14, 24; 8.3; 11.1, 5, 24; 37.1; and 43.5. In these verses we stumble onto an important phrase that often overlaps with the present

¹⁵ Note especially: Gerald Sheppard, "Pentecostalism and the Hermeneutics of Dispensationalism: Anatomy of an Uneasy Relationship," *Pneuma* 6, no. 2 (1984): 5-33; Mark McLean, "Toward a Pentecostal Hermeneutic," *Pneuma*, 6, no. 2 (1984): 35-56; and David Nichols, "The Search for a Pentecostal Structure in Systematic Theology," *Pneuma*, 6, no. 2 (1984): 57-76.

¹⁶ W. L. Holladay, *A Concise Hebrew And Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1982), 334.

¹⁷ Baumgärtel, "πνεῦμα, πνευματικός: Spirit in the OT," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, Volume VI, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964), 360.

meaning of רוח specifically יד־יהוה ("hand of Yahweh"). J. J. M. Roberts argues convincingly that, ". . . those who see the expression as referring to some kind of ecstatic experience of the prophet. . . are right in connecting the expression to concrete manifestations of a physical or psycho-physical nature."¹⁸ The occurrence of רוח in 1 Samuel 10.6, 10; 11.6; 19.20, 23 might be explained in connection with this phrase.

The use of רוח in verses 5, 6, 8, 9, 10 differ from that of verse 1. In these verses רוח is the life-giving breath or spirit coming from God. This רוח makes that which is inanimate, animate and is paralleled in Genesis 2.4-7 and Psalms 104.29-30 which are both creation pericopes. The third use of רוח in Ezekiel 37 is found in verse 9 where we should translate the plural רוחות with the preceding word מארבע and read "from the four winds." The last usage is found in verse 11 where the suffixed form רוחי indicates that the רוח is none other than Yahweh's spirit, the ultimate source of life. A similar idea is expressed in Ezekiel 36.27.

W. E. Lemke summarizes these occurrences in chapter 37 with a word of caution concerning the semantic range of רוח. He writes, "That these dimensions should never be separated too far, as religious people are sometimes tempted to do, is perhaps another lesson of which Ezekiel's vision would remind us."¹⁹

With this warning in the backs of our minds, reminding us of the revealing and yet concealing nature of God's self-disclosure we must narrow our own field of investigation into the word רוח. Lloyd Neve, in probably the single most important study on the Spirit of God in the Old Testament, has categorized the meaning of רוח into three basic groupings; wind, the רוח in human beings either as breath or spirit and the רוח of God.²⁰ He has isolated 102 occurrences of רוח used as indicating the Spirit of God.²¹ Within this list is a group of texts that are not usually classified among the "Spirit of God/the LORD" texts. The best example for this group is found in Exodus 15.1-18, especially verses 8 and 10 where the רוח of אפיך ברוח ("blast of your nostrils") and נשפת ברוחך ("blew with your

¹⁸ J. J. M. Roberts, "The Hand of Yahweh," *Vetus Testamentum* 21 (1971): 251.

¹⁹ W. E. Lemke, "Life in the Present and Hope for the Future," *Interpretation*, 38, no. 2 (1984): 179.

²⁰ Lloyd Neve, *The Spirit of God in the Old Testament* (Tokyo, Japan: Seibunsha, 1972): 3-4. Neve acknowledges that Johannes Scheepers, *Die Gees Van God en Die Gees Van Die Mens in Die Ou Testament* and Daniel Lys, *Ruach, Le Souffle Dans L'Ancien Testament* have followed a similar three division approach.

²¹ Gen 1.2; 41.38; Exod 15.8, 10; 28.3; 31.3; 35.31; Num 11.17, 25, 26, 29; 24.2; 27.18; Deut 34.9; Judg 3.10; 6:34; 11.29; 13.25; 14.6, 19; 15.14; 1 Sam 10.6, 10; 11.6; 16.13, 14; 19.20, 23; 2 Sam 22.16; 23.2; 1 Kgs 18.12; 22.24; 2 Kgs 2.16; Isa 4.4; 11.2, 15; 27.8; 30.1, 28; 31.3; 32.15; 34.16; 40.13; 42.1; 44.3; 48.16; 56.21; 61.1; 63.10, 11, 14; Ezek 1.12, 20, 21; 2.2; 3.12, 14, 24; 8.3; 10.17; 11.1, 5, 24; 36.27; 37.1, 14; 39.29; 43.5; Hos 9.7; 13.15; Joel 2.28[MT=3.1], 2.29[MT=3.2]; Mic 2.7; 3.8; Hag 2.5; Zech 4.6; 6.8; 7.2; Pss 18.15[MT=18.16]; 33.6; 51.11[MT=51.13]; 104.30; 139.7; 143.10; 147.18; Job 4.9; 26.13; 32.8; 33.4; 34.14; Dan 4.5, 6, 15; 5.11; 5.14; Neh 9.20, 30; 1 Chr 12.18[MT=12.19]; 2 Chr 15.1; 18.23; 20.14; 24.20.

wind") are best translated "breath." Neve therefore concludes that "in the use of *ruach* the hymn writer meant to indicate that it was Yahweh's power, and not just the wind, that moved the water."²² He queries if this and others like it are not the end result of ancient near eastern thought processes in which the "wind" that is subject to Marduk in a polytheistic society is transformed in a monotheistic setting. The end result is that "the glory is to be all Yahweh's. The victory is his alone. There is no divine assistant."²³ Neve tends to view this usage as a sign of an evolutionary development in the use of רוח. However, the evidence is slim for this view. But if we understand the very illusiveness of the semantic field of רוח we may appreciate Neve's effort in including these texts. If one begins to delete from consideration the occurrence of רוח in this category, one needs to delete: Gen 1.2; Exod 15.8, 10; 2 Sam 22.16; Isa 11.15; 30.28; Hos 13.15; Pss 18.15[16]; 33.6; 104.30; Job 4.9; 26.13; 32.8. Also one must consider if the רוח texts that are involved in the transportation of the Cherubim throne in Ezekiel's vision are not to be classified along with this category (Ezek 1.12, 20, 21; 10.17).²⁴ Yet by including them there is a built-in vagueness which Walther Eichrodt chose to express as, "a symbol of mysterious nearness and activity of the divine."²⁵

II. Predominate Verbs Used with רוח

רוח appears as the subject or object of many verbal phrases. One might investigate the phrase "Spirit of God/the LORD" by studying its semantic terrain. Some of the more dominate verbs and verbal phrases are: עלה על ("rushed upon"); היה על ("came upon"); נשא ("lifted"); מלא ("filled"); לבש ("clothed"); נתן ("gave"); יצק / שפך ("poured"); שלח ("sent").

1. עלה על

The phrase "עלה על" is used especially in Judges and 1 Samuel,²⁶ beginning with Samson and including Saul and David. The Deuteronomic Historian seems to have struck upon a patterned expression. Yet later in 1 Sam 19 he will drop this pattern in a context in which one would have expected this "rushed upon" phraseology. The Historian does not seem to limit the combination of "rushed upon" and רוח to designate a consistent manifestation. For example for Samson the רוח's rush

²² L. Neve, op. cit., 9.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel Chapters 25-48*, tr. J.D.Martin, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 566; and M. Greenberg, *Ezekiel, 1-20: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, The Anchor Bible (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, 1983), 45-46.

²⁵ W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, Volume 2, tr. J. Baker, (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1967), 46.

²⁶ Judg 14.6, 19; 15.14; 1 Sam 10.6, 10; 11.6; 16.13, (16.14; 18.10).

gave him superhuman strength to perform deeds of valor while for Saul in 1 Samuel 10.6, 10 it caused him to prophecy in some sort of ecstatic state. On the other hand, when David is "rushed upon", the Historian does not tell us if there is any outward manifestation. 1 Samuel 11.6 is especially interesting. Here, Saul's burning anger (וַיַּחַר אַפּוֹ נֹאֵד) causes him to cut up an oxen and send it throughout the Israelite territory. At first glance we might want to say that here Saul is responding like Samson to perform a deed of valor as in Judges 14.6, 19; 15.14. Moshe Weinfeld compares this passage with ancient near eastern treaty ratification sacrifices.²⁷ The statement of Saul in 1 Samuel 11.7, "Whoever does not come after Saul and Samuel, so shall it be done to his oxen!" is an oath-imprecation. It is quite interesting that in Judges 6.34 and 11.29, both Gideon and Jephthah encounter the "Spirit of the LORD" in order that they might gather together a fighting force. Yet Judges 6.34 uses the strange verb "to clothe" (לְבַשׁ), while in Jephthah's case "came upon" is the formula. Another pericope that may be used in comparison is the story of the Levite who cut up his "concubine"²⁸ into twelve pieces and sent her throughout all the territory of Israel in Judges 19. It is interesting to note the parallel elements in Judges 19-21 and 1 Samuel 9-11: "worthless fellows" (Judg 19.22; 1 Sam 10.27); Gibeah (Judg 19.12ff; 1 Sam 10.10, 26); cutting up and sending them/her "throughout all the territory of Israel" (Judg 19.29; 1 Sam 10.7). However, Tryggve Mettinger has argued that 1 Samuel 11.6 "contains an obviously very old tradition of a mighty deed of Saul's as a manifestation of the Spirit."²⁹ I would see both interpretations as not being mutually exclusive. In fact if the Deuteronomistic Historian is attempting to show a progression of thought through these narratives then the mighty deeds of Samson and the heinous acts of the Levite (to say nothing of the "worthless fellows" of Gibeah) work out the theme of the epilogue of Judges in 17.6; 18.1; 19.1; and 21.25. The וַיַּחַר pericope in 1 Samuel 10 then becomes a transition point so that when the וַיַּחַר comes upon Saul in power (1 Sam 11.6) closure is met between

²⁷ Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, (Reprint of Oxford University Press, 1972 by Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1992), 102-4.

²⁸ In Judges 19.1 the woman is referred to as אִשָּׁה פִּילֵגֶשׁ, both wife and concubine while in 19.4, 9 her father is referred to as "his father-in-law" (זֶרְעִי). This implies that our understanding of *pīleges* is faulty. John Gray [*Joshua, Judges, Ruth*, New Century Bible Commentary (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1986), 347] writes, "Ugartic usage indicates that *'issah* refers to various degrees of marriage, requiring further qualification when denoted a fully legal wife. The status of *pīl eges*, on the other hand, as 8.31 and ch. 9 indicate, denotes a regular status like that of a *tsadiqa* wife in early Arab usage, or a concubine contracted for a certain period (e.g. Hos 3.3) *Chotnen*, rendered here 'father-in-law', may, as in Arabic, denote either the father-in-law or brother-in-law (cf. 1.16; 4.11), or any male relative through marriage, particularly the one assuming responsibility for the rights and duties of the wife."

²⁹ Tryggve N. D. Mettinger, *King and Messiah: The Civil and Sacral Legitimation of the Israelite Kings* (Coniectanea Biblica, OTS 8; Lund: Gleerup, 1976), 69; Also: L. Neve, op. cit., 21-22; and P. Kyle McCarter, *I Samuel* The Anchor Bible, Vol 8 (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, 1980), 205-206.

the deeds of valor empowerment, the assembling enablement and a move toward solving the problem of lack of kingship.³⁰

When we focus our attention upon the ecstatic response of Saul in 1 Samuel 10.6, 10 which was to be one of the three signs of his calling, we are left asking why in 1 Samuel 19.20 and 23 we have a different verbal formulation ("came upon," וַתְּהִי עָלָיו). There is also the interesting parallel account of the רוּחַ inspired prophecy that is temporarily manifested by the seventy elders in Numbers 11. The ecstatic manifestations were seen as the sure sign of the division of the spirit that was upon Moses. The spirit's "resting" or "put upon" them causes them to "bear the burden" that Moses can not carry himself. Therefore we have a case of Spirit confirmation of leadership which really is not in the deeds of valor type of category seen in the Samson story. The problem is that the Numbers 11 pericope does not utilize the צִלַּח עָלָיו formula.

The interpretive crux for this formula may be found in 1 Samuel 16.14's "Now the spirit of the LORD departed from Saul and an evil spirit from the LORD tormented him."³¹ This passage depicts the succession of David in the transference of the charisma of Saul to David. A closer look at this passage is necessary. The text reads: "Then Samuel took the horn of oil, and anointed him in the presence of his brothers; and the spirit of the LORD came mightily upon David from that day forward." By emphasizing that the רוּחַ was upon David mightily "from that day forward" one cannot avoid the durative implications. Although it is commonly argued that the רוּחַ manifestations with Saul and Samson as representatives of a "Judges" type of charisma-leadership model are temporary, I wonder if this is not overstated. The very fact that 1 Samuel 16.14 had to state that "the Spirit of the LORD departed (סָרָה) from Saul" indicates that there was a durative aspect to Saul's רוּחַ enablement. Although the textual evidence is not as clear as in the case of Samson, yet the phrase, "he did not know that the LORD had left (סָר) him" (Judg 16.20) leans in this direction. That the same verb "סור" would be used in 1 Samuel 16.14 and Judges 16.20 seems to imply a similar situation. In Judges 16.19 the same verb is used again, yet this time we note that the object of the verb is "his strength" (כֹּחֹו), the major manifestation of the Spirit's endowment. Therefore there seems to have been a permanent aspect

³⁰ The problematic use of *nāgid* ("prince, king-designate") has been thoroughly investigated by Tryggve Mettinger in his monograph, *King and Messiah*. Note especially pages 80-98 and especially pages 151-184.

³¹ L. Neve, op. cit. p. 137, lists the following as references to רוּחַ being used as an "evil spirit": Judg 9.23; 1 Sam 16.14, 15, 16; 18.10; 19.9; 1 Kgs 22.21, 22, 23; 2 Kgs 19.7; Isa 37.7; Zech 13.2; 2 Chr 18.20, 21, 22.

of the "spirit of the LORD" in reference to all three: David, Saul, and Samson. However with both Saul³² and Samson there was a termination while with David none is recorded.³³

Therefore the formula using על צלח seems to be used by the Deuteronomic Historian to accentuate the transition from the days of the Judges into the monarchic period. The departure of the Spirit/LORD places more weight upon the choice of David. While the lack of external manifestations of David's endowment with the Spirit is unexpected, we might explain it as a further differentiation being made between David and Saul/Samson.

2. היה על

The formula "the Spirit came upon him (or a person's name)" is found in seven passages in the Old Testament.³⁴ Unlike the על צלח formulation, this construction does not cluster in one segment of the Biblical material. Therefore its usage is even more varied by the Biblical authors.

The first occurrence of the היה על formula is found in the Balaam narratives (Num 24.2). Although each of the four oracles of Balaam have been introduced by "then he uttered his oracle, saying" (וישא משלו ויאמר), the Numbers 24 pericope adds a further introduction in the narrative caption to the oracle. Our formulation is preceded by Balaam's setting "his face toward the wilderness" where he sees the Israelite encampment. Neve suggests taking this phrase to indicate, "a position preparatory to the ecstatic condition."³⁵ This characterization is substantiated by Numbers 24.3-4 and 15-16. Robert Wilson suggests from these verses that: "This description suggests that Balaam received his messages while in a state of trance, although outside of his 'falling down' his trance behavior is not specified. It is not clear whether his trance was due to possession or soul loss, but in either case he received his messages by 'seeing' the gods."³⁶ The visionary aspect of Balaam's prophecy in Numbers is supported by the Deir 'Alla inscriptions. In Combination I, line 1-2 we read the reconstructed text by Jo Ann Hackett as "The account of [Balaam, son of Beo]r, who was a seer of the gods. The gods came to him in the night, and he saw a vision like an oracle of El."³⁷

³² Note also 1 Sam 28.15-16, where this fact is explicitly stated by Saul himself and Samuel who comes back from the dead!

³³ We may consider the Elijah/Elisha transfer of charisma in 2 Kings 2.9 and the Moses/Joshua transfer in Deuteronomy 34.9 as possible parallels, but this is without linguistic support.

³⁴ The texts are: Num 24.2; Judg 3.10; 11.29; 1 Sam 19.20, 23; 2 Chr 15.1; 20.14 (MT v15).

³⁵ L. Neve, op. cit., 15; J. Lindbloom, *Prophecy in Ancient Israel*, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962) gives an excellent discussion of supernatural experiences in the primitive prophets on pages 47-104.

³⁶ Robert R. Wilson, *Prophecy and Society in Ancient Israel*, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980), 148.

³⁷ Jo Ann Hackett, *The Balaam Text from Deir 'Alla*, Harvard Semitic monographs, no. 31 (Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1984), 25, 27, 29, 30-34.

Yet all this does not quite clarify the usage of the "Spirit of God came upon him" formulation and how רוח is to be understood here. It is important to notice that in the Balaam narrative as a whole Yahweh is seen as the source of Balaam's messages.³⁸ This implies that along with the ecstatic behavior the רוח is associated closely with Yahweh. The רוח is used to clarify the ecstatic behavior and the category that it is placed into is a Yahweh originated message.

In 1 Samuel 19.20, 23, we encounter a similar emphasis upon the ecstatic with the על היה as its source of origin. Interestingly, the end result of the Spirit of God coming upon the messengers of Saul and Saul himself, is to protect David. The same aspect is seen in the continued interferences of Yahweh and the "Spirit of God" upon Balaam. Ralph Klein has suggested that, "since the ecstasy of the messengers of Saul and presumably, of the prophets is considered from a negative perspective in this pericope, the spirit may have been the evil spirit from God previously referred to (cf. 16.14)."³⁹ This approach is unnecessary if we see Numbers 24.2 as a parallel account of prophetic ecstasy being used by God to protect. The fact that both pericopes utilize אהלים rather than יהוה may further this relationship. However, one must be cautious in arguing along these lines. Although Cassuto has differentiated the usage of יהוה and אהלים, his conclusions have not been universally accepted.⁴⁰ The Chronicler does not seem to differentiate between the רוח אהלים (2 Chr 15.1) and the רוח יהוה (2 Chr 20.15).

The 1 Samuel 19.20, 23 texts are note worthy in the use of the HtD-stem of נָבֵא after the formulaic introduction of the Spirit of God, which Robert R. Wilson suggests means to "act like a prophet."⁴¹ However Saul's stripping himself and lying naked while prophesying does not seem to be normative in spite of the proverbial, "Is Saul also among the prophets?" (1 Sam 19.24b, notes that this clause is introduced by על-כן). J. Lindblom classifies Saul's actions as part of the "orgiastic type." Lindblom furthers writes, "This ecstasy was of the collective kind and contagious. It was through contact with the ecstatic band that Saul himself fell into ecstasy."⁴² Robert R. Wilson follows this same line of reasoning and adds two observations. First, that in this text there is a negative portrayal of the prophetic movement and that prophetic behavior is a "form of uncontrolled trance."⁴³ Second, following the

³⁸ Note especially: Num 23.5, 12, 16, 17, 26 all cited by L. Neve, op. cit.

³⁹ Ralph W. Klein, *1 Samuel*, Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 10 (Waco, Texas: Word Books, Publisher, 1983), 198.

⁴⁰ U. Cassuto, *The Documentary Hypothesis*, (Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1983), 15-41. Note Claus Westermann's summary in his *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*, (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1984), 578-580; also Duane Garrett's, *Rethinking Genesis*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1991), 18-22.

⁴¹ R. R. Wilson, op. cit., 136-138.

⁴² Lindblom, op. cit., 48.

⁴³ R. R. Wilson, op. cit., 182.

reading of this section of the Samuel narrative as pro-Davidic, he argues that the people were to answer their own question by "No, Saul is not prophet; he is insane."⁴⁴ I would argue that instead of presupposing that the behavior of Saul and his messengers were in anyway normative to prophetism, it would be better to see here the work of the Spirit in protective action.

In Judges 3.10 and 11.29 on the other hand the *רוח יהוה על* formula combined with the *רוח יהוה* produces a positive action. These two verses best portray the usage of *רוח יהוה* in the book of Judges. Robert Boling writes, "In the Book of Judges the expression stands for an impersonal power or force which can be absorbed or can so envelop a man that he becomes capable of extraordinary deeds. This spirit is distinguishable from other spirits in that it is a Yahwistic one and thus lends itself to correlation with the administrative freedom of Israel's Sovereign."⁴⁵

The specific end result of the actions of the *רוח יהוה* was the calling and equipping of the judge. As Boling again writes, "the prime symbol of Yahweh's participation in the raising up of the judge is 'the Yahweh spirit.'"⁴⁶ This is clearly seen in Judges 3.10 where the coming of the *רוח יהוה* is followed immediately by the verb "to judge."⁴⁷ It is important to note that the text does not end with a nebulous conception of judging alone. Othniel is said to go "out to war"; enemy "given" to him; "his hand prevailed"; and ultimately the "land" has forty years of "rest." Jephthah's case is similar in that there is a clustering of activities in response to the *רוח יהוה*. For Jephthah the verb "to pass through" (*עבר*) is used three times. Then Jephthah makes his fateful vow (*נדר*) which becomes the center of the narrative rather than the battle with the Ammonites, which is swiftly concluded in verses 32-33. The language of the battle and victory is stereotypical to the judges narratives.

What can be gleaned from these two pericopes in terms of the phrase *רוח יהוה* [עליפתח] וותהי? First, is that the endowment causes a flurry of activity. The end result is not just to suit or profit the recipient, but rather the tribe/s of Israel. The activities are significant to *Heilsgeschichte*. Second, for Jephthah, the adding of a vow led to personal misfortune, while for Othniel the record is silent concerning any negative results.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 183.

⁴⁵ Robert G. Boling, *Judges*, The Anchor Bible, Volume 6a (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, 1975), 81.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 25.

⁴⁷ The exact nature of the *שפט* is still debated. Henri Cazelles in "Shiloh, Laws and the Return of the Ancient Kings, *Proclamation and Presence*, ed. J. I. Durham and J. R. Porter, (Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1983), 241; wrote, "*שפט* then does not designate a unique act of deliverance or of condemnation, but a series of acts of government." Boling follows this understanding (Boling, op. cit., 5-6). While Malamat write, "Like its West Semitic cognates from the early second millennium B.C. on, the root *שפט* in the Book of Judges signifies more than merely 'judging'; it covers the broad concept of rulership, including the aspects of judge and champion." A. Malamat, "Charismatic Leadership in the Book of Judges," *Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God*, ed. F. M. Cross, P. D. Miller and W. E. Lemke, (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, 1976), 164.

The late texts of 2 Chronicles 15.1 and 20.14(15) utilizes a similar formulation. Yet both texts seem to indicate a more cult centered prophetic response to the king/peoples' questioning. 1 Chronicles 12.18(19) and 2 Chronicles 24.20 utilizes instead the verb "to clothe" (לְבַשׁ) without any noticeable difference in meaning. Neve follows the argument that "the Levites considered themselves the heirs of the prophets in that they were the ones who were inspired by the spirit."⁴⁸ The exhortation to "believe his prophets" in 2 Chronicles 20.20 shows further the concept. The "prophets" that Jehoshaphat is referring to are the Levitical prophet (cult-prophets).⁴⁹

The formulaic use of *רוח יהוה על* gives a diverse picture of the *רוח יהוה / אהלים* ranging from protection of God's chosen ones (Num 24.2; 1 Sam 19.20, 23) to normative endowment bestowed upon a judges. Even the late Chronicler adds to the diversity in terms of cult-prophecy.

3. נשא

The verb "to carry," "to lift up," is also found with the *רוח יהוה* designation. Here however, there is a narrower usage that can be assigned to the Spirit. In both 1 Kings 18.12 and 2 Kings 2.16 Elijah is supposed to have been or could have been lifted up by the Spirit and carried away. It is interesting to note that in both cases the phrases are found in dialogues and there is no indication as to the truth of the statements. In both cases however, there is a touch of irony in the recording of these statements, because they contain a certain amount of truth at the same time.

The usage of the verb *נשא* with *רוח יהוה* in the book of Ezekiel is highly specialized. It indicates the visionary mode of transportation in 3.12, 14; 8.3; 11.1, 24a; 43.5. H. Van Dyke Parunak has noticed that *נשא* is used with *רוח* only in the three major vision of Ezekiel which are termed "visions of God" (*מראות אלהים*). Therefore this usage becomes more specifically related to the book of Ezekiel and even forms the major structural outline book for Parunak.⁵⁰ Clustered together in response to the *רוח יהוה* are the verbs: "לקח" (3.14) and "בוא" (8.3; 11.1, 24a; 43.5). Although without *נשא* the transportation idea is also found with *רוח* in 37.1 (*ויצאני*) and 11.24. Zimmerli wonders if 2.2 and 3.24 should not also be included in this transportation usage of *רוח*.⁵¹ In these two texts Ezekiel, who has collapsed is lifted up back on his feet.

⁴⁸ Neve, op. cit., 116.

⁴⁹ Thus Raymond Dillard accentuates in his comments on this verse in *2 Chronicles*, Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 15 (Waco, Texas: Word Books, Publishers, 1987), 158.

⁵⁰ H. Van Dyke Parunak, "The Literary Architecture of Ezekiel's 'mar'ot 'elohim'," *JBL* 99, no. 1 (1980), 61-62.

⁵¹ W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2*, trans. J.D. Martin, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983), 568.

In this usage of the **רוח יהוה** we are confronted with the inner dynamic involved in Ezekiel's revelatory moments. Yet, Parunak's observations cautions us from generalizing from this usage. The lifting up seems to be as out of the ordinary as the appearances, disappearance and reappearance of the "Glory" (**כבוד**). However, it would not be wrong to see once again the work of the **רוח יהוה** in the schema of *Heilsgeschichte*.

4. מלא

The fourth verb is usually translated "to be full," "to fill." It is found five times with **רוח**. In Exodus 28.3; 31.3; 35.31 the D-stem of **מלא** is used with a factitive meaning,⁵² while in Deuteronomy 34.9 and Micah 3.8 it is in the G-stem.

Most interpretations of the Exodus 28.3 passage is based on Exodus 31.3 and 35.31. John I. Durham writes:

Bezalel, appropriately enough from the tribe of Judah, is described as specially endowed for his assignment by an infilling of the divine spirit, which adds to his native ability three qualities that suit him ideally for the task at hand: wisdom (**חכמה**), the gift to understand what is needed to fulfill Yahweh's instructions; discernment (**תבונה**) the talent for solving the inevitable problems involved in the creation of so complex a series of objects and materials; and skill (**דעת**), the experienced hand needed to guide and accomplish the labor itself. Bezalel, so gifted, is the ideal combination of theoretical knowledge, problem-solving practicality, and planning capability who can bring artistic ideals to life with his own hands.⁵³

When the **רוח יהוה** of Exodus 31.3 and 35.31 are interpreted as the basis of the following endowments which are all introduced in the preposition **בְּ** then the **רוח חכמה** "a spirit of wisdom" or "a spirit of skill"⁵⁴ can be understood as also skill that derives from God. This God-given talent or better talents increases the horizons of what one may consider God's charisma. One might argue, however that this "charisma" may be understood as human ability. Neve has countered this argument with two answers. He writes:

First, the *ruach* in man is used to mean 'disposition,' 'will,' even 'moral character,' but is nowhere in the Old Testament used to refer to ability or talent. Secondly, the human seat of this divinely given ability is consistently referred to as the heart throughout these chapters, (cf. 28.3; 31.6; 35.35; 36.1, 2). God's spirit could be said to be in man's heart but not the human spirit. *Ruach*, then, even in 28.3, must be taken to mean the spirit of God, the divine source of that ability which is now to be placed in the service of the Lord for the construction of the tabernacle and the making of the priestly garments.⁵⁵

Deuteronomy 34.9 reads "Joshua son of Nun was full of the spirit of wisdom (**מלא רוח חכמה**), because (**כי**) Moses had laid his hands on him. Then the children of Israel obeyed (**וישמעו אליו**) him

⁵² Waltke & O'Connor, op. cit., 400-404.

⁵³ John I. Durham, *Exodus*, Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 3 (Waco, Texas: Word Books, Publisher, 1987), 410.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 381; Durham translates this phrase as "with creative artistry."

⁵⁵ L. Nevel, op. cit., 86.

and did that which the LORD had commanded Moses." The fact that this is a charisma from God is not difficult to see. Here the problem is the nature of the "spirit of Wisdom." Moshe Weinfeld has argued for the understanding that a "judicial wisdom" is intended here and that it points to the "required intellectual qualities of the leader."⁵⁶ As noted in the discussion dealing with 1 Samuel 16.13 this text deals with a succession of leadership and the charisma is especially of a durative nature rather than temporal. It is significant that the endowment with the "spirit of wisdom" is followed by the people's obedience toward both Joshua and the commands of the LORD through Moses. While in Joshua 1.7-8, Joshua is warned to act according to the law. Here is the basis of the "wisdom" in Deuteronomy.⁵⁷

The last מלא text is that of Micah 3.8. Many scholars would delete either the whole phrase "את־רוח יהוה" or just את. Even, Neve would have us delete it, although he takes time to deal with the text as if it were original. However, Delbert Hillers has quite convincingly extinguished the flames of doubt by finding no real reason for its deletion.⁵⁸ It is interesting to note that there is a structural similarity between the Exodus 31.3 and 35.31 pericopes in that a list of attributes follow after the יהוה / אלהים רוח citation. This list is differentiated from the רוח designation by a preposition. In the case of Micah 3.8 it is the addition of the preposition את, which here should be taken as "with the help of."⁵⁹

For Micah the רוח יהוה indicates the nature of the strength that he has over against the false prophets who prostitute their prophetic office. As most commentaries indicate the strong self-affirmation of the Spirit's endowment is viewed as unique to Micah. Hiller however cites 2 Samuel 23.2 and Isaiah 30.1 as other examples of the same time period,⁶⁰ while Neve points toward the Micaiah ben Imlah of 1 Kings 22.⁶¹

When all five מלא texts are considered they add many items to the list of "things" that humans are endowed with by the רוח. This list seems to be open ended and situational.

5. לבש

⁵⁶ M. Weinfeld, op. cit., 181n.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 244ff.; Note that the "wisdom" that Joseph is said to have come from the רוח אלהים is not the same (Gen 41.38). There, one must remember who is talking and that the reason for the statement is a dream interpretation. Daniel 4.5, 6, 15; 5.11, 14 is a parallel to the Joseph narrative. On this subject note especially Robert Karl Gnuse's, *The Dream Theophany of Samuel*, (Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 1984), 88-101.

⁵⁸ Delbert R. Hillers, *Micah*, Hermeneia Series (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 45.

⁵⁹ Waltke & O'Connor, op. cit., 195. Also Leslie Allen, *The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah and Micah*, The New International Commentary on the Old Testament Series (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1976), 314.

⁶⁰ D. Hillers, op. cit., 260.

⁶¹ L. Neve, op. cit., 39-41.

In Judges 6.34, 1 Chronicles 12.19, and 2 Chronicles 24.20 we meet the verb לָבַשׁ ("to clothe") used with the Spirit of God. Scholars have given many possible suggestions as to the exact nature of what is taking place. The difficulties involve the definition of not only לָבַשׁ but also אֵת and their syntactic relationship.

Neve for example argues that לָבַשׁ here "indicate(s) not only the violence of the spirit possession, for the spirit seized Gideon to drive him on to his feats of military prowess, but also the fact that the individual was used as an instrument or tool by the spirit of Yahweh."⁶² Yet this "violence" and "possession" imagery might be an unevoked mixing of metaphors. A. Bowling describes לָבַשׁ's semantic field as "1) being clothed, 2) being clothed as a sign of rank, status, or character, and 3) poetic figures likening abstract qualities to clothing."⁶³ In this range we do not readily recognize the imagery of "violence" nor "possession." Rather "to clothe" is used metaphorically without filling out the picture. Stanley Horton offers the suggestive, "Gideon was filled with the Spirit," as part of his definition.⁶⁴ Yet this does not really align with the rest of his argumentation in which he would have us believe that "the Spirit puts on Gideon."⁶⁵

The second problem is the identification of אֵת. The difficulties of this particle is notorious.⁶⁶ The very fact that it can not be differentiated morphologically from the preposition אֵת gives evidence to its problematic nature. In the context of our present discussion, it seems that some have taken the *nota accusativi* as an emphatic particle justifying a forceful interpretation.⁶⁷ Others tend to translate the particle as a preposition "with." The solution to this problem must be found in the phrase itself. The phrase "the Spirit of Yahweh clothed Gideon. . . ." (Judg 6.34); "the Spirit clothed Amasai. . . ." (1 Chr 12.19a [18a]); "the Spirit of God clothed Zechariah. . . ." (2 Chr 24.20a), utilizes the syntactic structure that is common to verbs of clothing and stripping. Waltke and O'Connor indicate that "verbs of clothing (or stripping) can govern a personal *direct object* or *complement object*."⁶⁸ It seems that the

⁶² Ibid., 20. G. F. Moore, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1895), 87 writes, "with expressions which give more prominence to the suddenness or violence of the seizure."

⁶³ Bowling, A., "לָבַשׁ," *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, ed. Harris, Archer and Waltke, (Chicago: Moody Press, 1980), 469.

⁶⁴ S. Horton, "The Holy Spirit in the Book of Judges," *Paraclete* 3, no. 2 (1969), 12.

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ Waltke & O'Connor, *Ibid.*, 177ff.

⁶⁷ Ibid., 176.

⁶⁸ Note also Muraoka's discussion in his *Emphatic Words and Structures in Biblical Hebrew*, (Jerusalem & Leiden: The Magnes Press, The Hebrew University & E. J. Brill, 1985), 146-156. He concludes on page 158, "there is no basis for the assertion that the particle 'et can be used for the purpose of emphasis neither as the genuine object marker nor where it is rather awkwardly employed because of the *Konstruktionsmischung*, that it is never used with a genuine subject noun, and that even where it appears to be so used in the (originally) hybrid passive construction it never plays the role of emphasizing the following noun."

syntax of clothing may utilize **את** as the direct object marker with the person being clothed following. The nature of the "clothing" then follows, being preceded by a preposition **מן** or **ל** or marked by a second **את** (complement object). In the case of our clause the complement object is missing. I would see the lack of the complement object as a case of ellipsis.

The ellipsis is used here because of the inability or undesirability to describe the Spirit's full manifestation within the *clothing metaphor*. The use of Akkadian verb *labašū* may be helpful in explaining this ellipsis. Note the following phrases: "be clothed in awesomeness;" "clothed in loveliness;"⁶⁹ "DN covered you (Marduk) with radiance;" "She (Tiamat) covered terrible dragons with awe-inspiring splendor."⁷⁰ As one can gather from even a cursory study of these clauses, the metaphorical usage points to a "glory" and "awesomeness" that the Biblical authors would not attribute to the recipient. Yet the use of the formula with "to clothe" indicates an almost visible transformation in the individual that confirms his empowerment. In the two passages from the chronicler the formula functions as an authentication of the prophetic utterances, while in Judges 6.34, Gideon performs a non-supernatural act that has redemptive significance. Once again the **לבש** formula authenticates his actions as enabled by Yahweh.

6. נתן

As a verb that occurs more than 2,000 times in the Old Testament it is difficult to manage its full usage. Milton Fisher offers three broad areas of meanings, "1) give, 2) put or set, and 3) make or constitute."⁷¹ The semantic field is increased by **נתן**'s synonyms **שום** and **שים**. These verbs are found with **רוח** in Isaiah 42.1; 63.11; Numbers 11.17, 25, 29; Ezekiel 36.27; 37.14.

The text of Numbers 11 is one in which **רוח** is once again associated with prophesying (11.25, 26, 27, 29). Obviously the Spirit enables the seventy to participate temporarily in divine utterances. However this phenomena is short lived according to 11.25 "ולא יספּו" ("but they did not do so again"). In spite of the fact that the prophesying ceased, the **רוח** is not indicating as departing. In fact the verb **נח** meaning "to settle," "to stay settled," "to rest," found in verses 25 and 26 imply otherwise. Therefore although the **רוח** in this passage caused the temporary condition of "acting like a prophet," the end result is different.

⁶⁹ The Assyrian Dictionary, ed. A. Leo Oppenheim, Volume 9 (Chicago: Oriental Institute, 1973), 18.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 22.

⁷¹ M. Fisher, "נתן," *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, ed. Archer Harris, & Waltke, (Chicago: Moody Press, 1980), 608.

It is the verb **אָצַל** meaning "to take away" that is significant to the understanding of the **רוּחַ** in these verses. This verb is used four times in the G-stem and once in the N-stem. Its meaning may well be understood in this passage as "withhold" rather than a total withdrawal. The context of the passage implies that the **אָצַל** was for a specific purpose, i.e., "וּנְשְׂאוּ אִתְּךָ בְּמִשְׂאֵה הָעָם וְלֹא־תִשָּׂא אֹתָהּ לְבַדְּךָ" ("they shall bear the burden of the people along with you so that you will not bear it alone"). In this case the verbs **נָתַן** and **שׂוּם** function in their role as verbs of appointment. It is strange that the syntax does not follow the normative pattern of governing the person appointed in the accusative along with the "rank."⁷² The statement of Moses in verse 29 however indicates that the appointment has an open ended structure that has an egalitarian ring to it.

Isaiah 42.1 more clearly points to an appointment. The text which reads, ". . . I have put my spirit upon him; he will bring forth justice to the nations." This appointing of the one who traditionally has been called the "suffering servant" has as its purpose the establishment of **מִשְׁפָּט**, a term that reappears in verse 4 parallel to **לְתוֹרָתוֹ** ("to his teaching"). In Ezekiel 36.27 **מִשְׁפָּט** appears again in connection with the verb **נָתַן** and **רוּחַ**. Here, however it is to observe God's **מִשְׁפָּט**. There is in these two passages an inner enablement. In Isaiah 42.1-4 it is to promote the **מִשְׁפָּט**, while in Ezekiel is to do God's **מִשְׁפָּט**.

Isaiah 63.11 uses **שׂוּם** like Numbers 11.17 which falls into this category. The rhetorical question in the third line reads, "Where is the one who put his holy spirit within them?" As in the case of Isaiah 42.1; Numbers 11.17, 25, 29; Ezekiel 36.27 and 37.14 the spirit is the accusative with either an adjective and a personal pronoun or a personal pronoun alone to modify it. This means that the nature of the endowments involve not only an outward charisma, but that the **רוּחַ** is what is endowed. It is interesting to note that the preposition **בְּקִרְבֵּן** ("midst of") together with a personal pronoun is found in the Numbers pericope, in Ezekiel 36.27 and here in Isaiah 63.11, but not in Isaiah 42.1. Commentaries quite often express a certain frustration about not being able to identify the referent of Isaiah 63.11c.⁷³ Is it not possible that this category of **רוּחַ** texts supply a particle solution to this problem?

The **נָתַן** category moves away from a single result, due to the fact that it is the **רוּחַ** that is being "given." The combined effect of these texts along with other categories begin to sound like the Apostle Paul's "Now there are varieties of gifts, but the same Spirit; and there are varieties of services, but the

⁷² Walkte & O'Connor, *Ibid.*, 175. They cite 1 Sam 8.1; Isa 3.7; Deut 1.15. I would add Jer 1.5c.

⁷³ Note for example George A. F. Knight's *Isaiah 56-66: The New Israel*, in the International Theological Commentary series, page 77.

same Lord: and there are varieties of activities, but it is the same God who activates all of them in everyone."⁷⁴

7. שפך / יצק

This verbal category involves three synonyms beside the two used to designate this field. Hermann Austel summarizes this grouping:

1) *rīq* in the Hiphil means "pour out," but the Qal means "be empty," so the pouring out generally involves the emptying of a container; 2) *nāsak* means to "pour a libation"; 3) *nātak* means "pour forth" in an intransitive sense (note that the Accadian cognate means "to dip") in the Qal, while the infrequent Hiphil means "pour out," "melt"; 4) *yāšaq* is, with *shāqak*, a general word for pouring, but it is interesting to note that of the fifty-three occurrences, fifteen involve the oil of consecration or anointing on a head and another fifteen have to do with some form of metal casting. *Shāpak* is not found in either of these latter usages. That there is some overlap, however, is seen from the comparison of Lev 8:15 with Exo 29:12. In the former *yāšaq* is used of pouring blood on the base of the altar. In the latter, *shāqak* is employed. On the other hand, *yāšaq* is not used of the shedding of blood, as is *shāqak*."⁷⁵

This field occurs with **רוח** in four verses: Isaiah 44.3; Ezekiel 39.29; Joel 3.1, 2 [2.28, 29]. All four have a futuristic perspective from the context of the passages.

Isaiah 44.3, for example is found in an "oracle of salvation" with a promise for revivification. The paralleling of water being poured on dry ground to "my spirit" being poured upon the "descendants"⁷⁶ makes room for the final declaration in verse 5. Here a total restoration to patriarchal promises and blessings is pictured, yet not just a return, since the **אני ליהוה** ("I am the Lord's") and the latter writing of **ליהוה** on their hand is beyond the patriarchal.

This same promise aspect is found in Ezekiel 39.29. The whole pericope beginning in verse 25 points to a state beyond deliverance. Here, Ezekiel seems to be already moving toward the message of chapters 40-48. The "glory" that departed in chapters 8-11 is now foreshadowed as going to return. The promise to "never again hide" his face overturns the act described in 39.23. Now the hope is turned toward the return of God's glorious presence.⁷⁷ The crux of this passage, however, hinges on the relative particle **אשר** in verse 29. Although many take this particle as meaning "for" (NIV, NASV,

⁷⁴ This quotation from 1 Corinthians 12.4-6 is from the *New Revised Standard Version Bible*, (Iowa Falls, Iowa: World Bible Publishers, Inc., 1989).

⁷⁵ H. Austel, "שפך," *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, ed. Harris, Archer & Waltke, (Chicago: Moody Press, 1980), 948.

⁷⁶ Note that the term "your descendants" is **זרעך**, literally "your seed." The text plays on the metaphor of fecundity after a drought in both the natural and supernatural realms.

⁷⁷ Note Tryggve Mettinger's *The Dethronement of Sabaoth: Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*, (Coniectanea Biblica, OTS 18; Lund: Gleerup, 1982), pages 97-115 concerning this interpretation.

KJV), it probably is better to read it as a temporal particle "when."⁷⁸ There can be no denying that this passage shares a lot in terms of its hope with Joel 3.1, 2.⁷⁹

The contextual interpretation of Joel 3.1ff. hinges on the introduction with an unusual conjunctive formula in v1a.⁸⁰ There is a definite shift in time from the deliverance oracle of 2.19b-27 and that of 3.1-5. The tense continues to be future following verses 25-27, yet these verses have been substantially influenced by the insertion of verses 21-24 which claim that the promises of verses 19b-20 and 25-27 have been more than fulfilled. Now the prophecy makes a quantum leap in its projection into the future.⁸¹

The pouring forth of the Spirit in verse 1b differs from Isaiah 44.3 and Ezekiel 39.29 since its limitations are contextually not limited to Israel in its restoration or return from a Babylonian captivity. The crucial phrase כָּל-בָּשָׂר ("all flesh") should in no way be limited. Walter Kaiser writes, "This expression . . . appears 32 times in the Old Testament outside of Joel. In 23 of these occurrences the expression refers to Gentiles alone Certainly the preponderance of usage favors the meaning of 'all mankind' without distinction of race, sex or age."⁸² This definition of כָּל-בָּשָׂר is established by the fact that even the "male and female slave" will enjoy this outpouring. The clustering of different endowments (prophecy, dreams, visions) seems to indicate that the external manifestations are not as significant as the actual outpouring of the Spirit of God.

III. Conclusion

J. Rodman Williams in his second volume to his *Renewal Theology*, summarizes quite aptly one of our findings in this study. He writes:

It is evident that the Spirit of God is largely depicted as the Spirit of enablement. The Spirit's activity was that of endowing an artisan, a judge, a king, a prophet, or a priest to perform certain functions or tasks. Whatever the individual's natural abilities and capacities, the endowment of the Spirit is shown to be something additional, hence supernatural. And it is by virtue of this special endowment that the person involved was enabled to fulfill a certain task or vocation.⁸³

⁷⁸ The LXX indicates a temporal sequence also in its ἀνθ' οὗ. Note also Gesenius, Kautzsch and Cowley, *Ibid.*, 502.

⁷⁹ Note that the numbering of the verses are different from the English versions. In English and in most Japanese translations it is 2.28, 29. But note that the Shinkyodo Translation follows the MT's versification.

⁸⁰ Note its occurrences in Isa 1.26; Jer 16.16; 21.7. Jouion & Muraoka, *Ibid.*, p. 625.

⁸¹ I have written more on this in an unpublished Exegesis paper on Joel 2.18-27, presented in a course at Princeton Theological Seminary, 1981.

⁸² W. Kaiser, "The Promise of God and Outpouring of the Holy Spirit," *The living and Active Word of God*, ed. Morris Inch and Ronald Youngblood, (Winona Lake, Indiana: Esenbrauns, 1983), 119. Note however, it is incorrect to argue that since the "preponderance" of occurrences are in favor of such an meaning, therefore this specific text mean such. Note Douglas Stuart's article "Exegesis," in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, Volume 2, page 686a.

⁸³ J. R. Williams, *Renewal Theology: Salvation, the Holy Spirit, and Christian Living*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Academie Books, Zondervan Publishing House, 1990), 160.

Williams' conclusion may be considered truly the tip of the iceberg. Yet in the midst of the various manifestations of the Spirit that were studied, there was constant evidence to the fact that the external forms may not have been the most important factor in the Spirit encounters. The range from fecundity to protection by causing ecstatic prophetic experiences, widens what may normally be considered the results of the Spirit empowerments. The texts seem to tell us that the "giftings" as seen in the Old Testament are beyond numbering and classification. It is an open-ended system.

The momentary giftings are not, however, the important aspect of this investigation. It is instead the constant reminders in the different pericopes that the work of the Spirit was intended to be lasting. Contrary to taking David as the exception that proves the rule that the endowment with the Spirit in the Old Testament was temporal, we noticed that in many cases it was intended to be for an undesignated duration. In this context, however the Spirit may still be removed, depart, be grieved, etc.

This is where Williams' work falters. He argues in his second summary remark concerning the Spirit in the Old Testament that "this activity of the Spirit is shown generally to be temporary and occasional."⁸⁴ In all honesty, when we consider this argumentation it can be recognized as not being really new. There is a valid desire in Systematics to make a radical break between the Spirit's work in the Old Testament and that in the New Testament. This would parallel the radical in-breaking of the supra-temporal into the temporal world in the incarnation. The problem is that the exegetical data of the Old Testament just will not produce that result. David is not the only exception. The problem is that the external endowments quite often prevent us from seeing those pericopes that lean toward continuity. The conclusion that can be seen is that the Spirit in the Old Testament is the Enabler, however there are endowments that are only temporary, momentary and those that have longevity.

Lastly, as Williams once again rightly puts it, "the whole thrust of the Spirit of God presupposes the fact and existence of Israel as God's people. Thus the Spirit came to give direction, strength, and empowerment for their life and mission."⁸⁵ We might use the rubric of *Heilsgeschichte* just as well to express this aspect of the Spirit's work. In fact this final aspect is the key to understanding the first two points. The enablements, both in temporary and lasting forms are intended to continue God's working of salvation in the lives of the covenantal peoples. However, the borders of this covenant are not tall enough to inhibit the vision of the pouring out of God's Spirit in a much wider area.

The Old Testament picture of the working of God's Spirit should enhance the understanding that we glean from the New Testament. For ultimately the New Testament stands on the shoulders of God's dealing with people kind in the Old Testament.

⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁸⁵ Ibid., 161.

