

Life and death in the Old Testament

MICHAEL A. KNIBB

Beliefs about life and death, whether consciously articulated or not, form part of the make-up of all human beings, and the people of the Old Testament provide no exception in this respect. There are approximately eight hundred occurrences of the root *ḥāyāh* ('to live') in the Old Testament and one thousand occurrences of the root *mūt* ('to die'; for the statistics see Gerleman, 1971*a*, 1971*b*), and in addition there are numerous references to one or other aspect of the themes of life and death that do not make use of either of these roots; the sheer wealth of the material is an indication of the importance of these themes within the Old Testament. The occurrences of the roots *ḥāyāh* and *mūt* are discussed by Ringgren (1980 [1977]) and by Ringgren, Illmann and Fabry (1984), in both cases with some consideration of relevant material from the ancient Near East, while a comprehensive treatment of life and, particularly, of death and resurrection in the Old Testament was provided by Martin-Achard (1960 [1956]) in a work which contains very full references both to the relevant biblical material and to the older secondary literature.

1. Basic beliefs about life

Basic to the Old Testament is the belief that Yahweh has power over both life and death (cf. e.g. Deut. 32.39; 1 Sam. 2.6), and it is in accordance with this belief that life is frequently depicted in the Old Testament as the gift of God. This is of course the view of the creation narratives (Gen. 1.1–2.4*a*; 2.4*b*–3.24), as is expressed above all in Gen. 2.7: 'then the LORD God formed man of dust from the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living being'. But this idea is also reflected in a number of passages in which God is mentioned as the subject, and 'life' as the object, and God is said, for example, to 'make' (Job 10.12), or 'give' (Mal. 2.5), or 'command' (Ps. 133.3) life (cf. Gerleman: 1971*a*, 554–5). It is also reflected in the thought that God is the 'fountain of life' (Ps. 36.9 (Hebr. 10)) and is implied in the description of Yahweh as the 'living God' (cf. Johnson: 1964, 106–7).

The belief that Yahweh is the living God finds expression both in those passages in which he is described as such (e.g. Deut. 5.26 (23); 2 Kings 19.4; Josh. 3.10) and in passages which use the common oath formula 'by the life of Yahweh' (e.g. Judges 8.19, and for the translation cf. Greenberg: 1957). In a study entitled 'Der lebendige Gott' (1967, reprint 1972) Kraus has argued that the theological ideas associated with the oath formula are indicated in the relative clauses that are in some cases attached to them (e.g. 2 Sam. 4.9; in 1 Sam. 14.39 a participle is used), and that the emphasis in these passages is on Yahweh's active intervention on behalf of his people (e.g. Jer. 16.14-15; 23.7-8). Similar ideas occur in those passages which refer to Yahweh as the 'living God' in that the term is used in contexts which refer to Yahweh's presence among (e.g. Josh. 3.10) or intervention on behalf of (Hos. 1.10 (Hebr. 2.1)) his people, sometimes in polemical contexts in which Yahweh has been insulted (2 Kings 19.4, 16), or a contrast is drawn with powerless idols (Jer. 10.10). It is significant, however, that in Jer. 38.16 the oath formula is used in association with the thought of the creation of man: 'By the life of the LORD who made our souls' (cf. NEB, 'By the life of the LORD who gave us our lives'); this passage indicates that one of the ideas associated with the belief that Yahweh is the living God is that he is the giver of life (cf. Kraus: 1972, 5-30; but note his conclusion that the thought of Yahweh as the 'fountain of life' did not remain confined to the natural sphere, but was shaped by Israel's trust in his saving activity).

The belief that life is the gift of Yahweh is also reflected in the idea that he is the one who sustains and preserves life. Thus the Pi 'el of the verb *hāyāh* is used in Neh. 9.6 with reference to Yahweh's 'preserving' the whole of creation and in Ps. 33.19 with reference to his 'keeping alive' in a time of famine those who fear him (cf. the use of the Hiph 'il in Josh. 14.10). The Pi 'el of *hāyāh* is also employed in psalms of lament and thanksgiving to refer to Yahweh's 'preserving the life' of the psalmist, that is delivering him from danger or distress caused by enemies or curing him of sickness (cf. Johnson: 1964, 99-100). This usage is illustrated in Ps. 143.11:

'For thy name's sake, O LORD, preserve my life!
In thy righteousness bring me out of trouble!

or Ps. 30.3 (Hebr. 4):

'O LORD, thou hast brought up my soul from Sheol,
restored me to life from among those gone down to the Pit.'

Cf. also such passages as Ps. 41.2 (Hebr. 3); 71.20, and, with reference to the nation, 85.5-6 (Hebr. 6-7); 80.18 (Hebr. 19). The fact that in some of these

Life and death in the Old Testament

psalms (e.g. 30.3 (Hebr. 4)) the sickness or distress is seen to bring the psalmist into the power of death and the underworld will need to be considered below.

The passage quoted above about the creation of man (Gen. 2.7) deserves further attention because of the light it casts on Israelite beliefs about the nature of man, i.e. about the way in which he was thought to be a 'living being'. By way of background to an examination of this passage reference should first be made to the important study by Johnson (1964) on the Old Testament conception of man (cf. also Wolff: 1974 [1973]). Johnson's main concern was to urge 'that in Israelite thought man is conceived not so much in dual fashion as "body" and "soul", but synthetically as a unit of vital power or (in current terminology) a psycho-physical organism' (1964, 87). He took as the starting point of his argument the idea that Israelite thinking, like that of so-called 'primitive' peoples, was predominantly synthetic and was 'characterized in large measure by what has been called the grasping of a totality', according to which phenomena were 'perceived as being in some kind of relationship.' This approach conditioned Israel's conception of man inasmuch as 'in Israelite thought psychical functions have close physical associations' (1964, 1, 4). Johnson sought to demonstrate his view that man was seen as a psycho-physical organism by a careful examination of the wide range of meanings that attach themselves to the terms used for the constitution of man, namely *nepeš* ('conventionally 'soul'), *ruḥ* (often 'wind', but with reference to both God and man conventionally 'spirit'), and the various parts of the body, including, as the most important, *lēb* or *lēbāb* (conventionally 'heart'). He pointed to the fact that these terms are used, at one end of the spectrum, in a purely physical sense and, at the other, with reference to the whole range of man's emotional, volitional, and intellectual activity. With regard to the parts of the body he pointed out that 'besides being referred to in a simple straightforward way as mere instruments of the *ego* . . ., they are sometimes spoken of as themselves actively engaged in some form of personal behaviour, or as characterised by some personal quality' (1964, 37), and that they are in consequence in some cases subject to a moral judgement (cf. e.g. 1964, 45, 82-87).

The various terms used to refer to the constitution of man have also been examined in detail by Wolff, who, in the first part of his study, offers what he describes as an 'anthropological language primer' (1974: 5-80 [1973, 19-124]). His approach and conclusions in many ways overlap with those of Johnson. However, it is not intended to pursue here the question of the Old Testament conception of man except insofar as it relates to the way in which man was conceived to be a 'living being'.

The account of the creation of man in the 'Yahwistic' narrative of the creation and fall (Gen. 2.4b-3.24) epitomises the Old Testament view of the constitution of man: 'Yahweh God formed man out of dust from the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life (*nišmat hayyîm*); and the man became a living being (*nepeš hayyāh*)' (Gen. 2.7). It is widely recognised that there is no suggestion here of a dichotomy between body and soul; the 'breath of life' is not conceived of as having an existence somehow separate from the body, and it is man as an entity who becomes a 'living being'. Thus, for example, Westermann comments: 'a human being does not consist of a number of parts (like body and soul and so on), but rather is "something" that comes into being as a human person by a quickening into life . . . a person is created as a *nepeš hayyāh*; a "living soul" is not put into one's body' (1984: 206-7 [1974: 282-3]).

The idea that man's life depends on the breath breathed into him by God is expressed in the Old Testament in a variety of ways. Gen. 2.7 uses the expression 'the breath of life' (*nišmat hayyîm*), but in Job 33.4 (cf. 32.8) this is explicitly identified as 'the breath of the Almighty':

'The spirit of God has made me,
and the breath of the Almighty gives me life.'

Here 'spirit' (*rûāh*) and 'breath' (*nēšāmāh*) are used virtually synonymously, as they are also in Isa. 42.5; and in some later passages *rûāh* is used with the meaning 'breath' simply as a synonym of *nēšāmāh*: cf. Gen. 6.17; 7.15 (both 'breath of life'); Zech. 12.1. Gen. 7.22, in a redactional passage, employs the composite expression 'breath of the spirit of life'. Again, just as the life of man is dependent on the gift by Yahweh of the 'breath' or 'spirit', so the withdrawal of this by Yahweh means the death of man: cf. e.g. Ps. 104.29-30,

'When you take away their breath [*rûāh*], they die
and return to their dust.
When you send forth your breath [*rûāh*], they are created,
and you renew the face of the earth.'

Cf. Ps. 146.4; Job 34.14-15; Eccl. 12.7. Correspondingly, in Ezekiel's vision of the renewal of the nation (Ezek. 37), sinews, flesh and skin first come upon the bones, but life only returns to them after the 'breath' (*rûāh*) comes into them at Yahweh's command.

According to what has just been said, the principle of life within man lies in the 'breath', but sometimes in the Old Testament it is the *nepeš* (conventionally 'soul') that represents the vital element within him. (There is an overlap in the Old Testament between such concepts as *rûāh* and *nepeš*,

for which Wolff uses the idea of 'stereometric thinking'; cf. e.g. 1974: 7–8, 33 [1973: 22, 59], and his reference to Landsberger: 1965, 17.) As mentioned earlier, the term *nepeš* has a wide range of meanings: at the physical level it can signify 'throat', 'neck', 'breath', but it is also used with the meaning 'life', and then as something like 'soul' in contexts where it is seen as the seat of feelings and emotions, and hence it can mean 'desire'; it can also mean 'person' (as in Gen. 2.7), or even 'corpse', and it is sometimes used with pronominal suffixes as a substitute for the personal or reflexive pronoun (see e.g. Johnson: 1964, 3–22; Wolff: 1974, 10–25 [1973: 25–48]). Our concern here is only with the use of *nepeš* to refer to the life force, the vital principle within men and animals, and hence as meaning 'life' (cf. e.g. Prov. 7.23). This meaning is reflected most clearly in the idea that 'life' is, or is contained in, the blood; cf. Deut. 12.23, 'the blood is the life [*nepeš*]'; Gen. 9.4; Lev. 17.10–14. Because it is the life force within man, the loss of the *nepeš*, like the loss of the 'breath' (see above), means the death of the individual. Thus at death the *nepeš* is said to be 'breathed out' (Job 11.20; 31.39), or 'poured out' (Ps. 141.8; Lam. 2.12; cf. 2 Sam. 14.14), or to 'depart' (Gen. 35.18), while in the case of the recovery of the son of the woman of Zarephath the *nepeš* is said to 'return' (1 Kings 17.21–2). However, inasmuch as there is, from one point of view, no clear-cut distinction in the Old Testament between life and death, fainting can also be described in terms of the 'breathing out' (Jer. 15.9) and despair in terms of the 'pouring out' (Job 30.16) of the *nepeš*, i.e. in terms of the loss of vitality, while the recovery of strength or spirit can be described in terms of the restoration of the *nepeš* (e.g. Lam. 1.11; Ps. 23.3), i.e. in terms of the regaining of vitality. There is an overlap here with the many instances in the Old Testament in which the *nepeš* is the seat of the feelings or emotions and thus can be said, for example, to 'faint' from hunger (Ps. 107.5).

The nature and characteristics of life in the Old Testament (and in ancient Near Eastern writings) were considered by C. Barth in an influential monograph (1947: 21–36; cf. Martin-Achard: 1960, 3–15 [1956, 11–20]). Here it is important to observe that although 'life' in the Old Testament can be thought of in terms of mere physical existence – the verb *ḥāyāh* can, for example, be used of survival (Gen. 20.7; 43.8), or of existence at a place (Gen. 47.28) or over a period of time (Gen. 5 *passim*), just as the noun *ḥayyīm* can be used of the length of an individual's life (Gen. 23.1; 25.7), or of life in contrast to death (Jonah 4.3, 8) – the concept often carries with it the notions of prosperity, blessing, health, strength, etc., that is of life in its fullness (cf. Barth: 1947, 27–33; Johnson: 1964, 95–106). This follows, first of all, from the fact that *ḥayyīm* is sometimes used in combination with such notions as 'long life' (Deut. 30.20; Ps. 34.12 (Hebr.

13); Prov. 3.2), 'good' (i.e. 'prosperity' (*tôb*), Deut. 30.15), 'blessing' (*b'rākāh*, Deut. 30.16, 19; Ps. 133.3), and 'peace' (i.e. 'well-being, prosperity' (*šālôm*), Mal. 2.5; Prov. 3.16–18). It is also implied in the idea that an individual in trouble, whether caused by sickness (e.g. Ps. 88), or the attacks of enemies (e.g. Ps. 86, see vs. 13), or some unspecified cause (e.g. Ps. 40, see vs. 2 (Hebr. 3)), is already within the realm of death, i.e. in Sheol, and that deliverance from such a situation involves being 'brought up' from Sheol (e.g. Ps. 30.3 (Hebr. 4)). Furthermore, the Pi'el of *hāyāh* is sometimes used in psalms of lament and thanksgiving to refer to Yahweh's 'preserving the life' of the psalmist, i.e. rescuing him from the assaults of enemies or healing him of sickness, as we have seen (above, pp. 396–7). In a similar way the Qal of *hāyāh* can be used with the meaning 'be healed, recover' (e.g. Num. 21.8–9; Josh. 5.8), or 'revive' (Gen. 45.27 (from a state of despair); Judges 15.19 (from faintness); 1 Kings 17.22 (from apparent death)), just as the Hiph'il can have the meaning 'cure' (someone of sickness, Isa. 38.16) or 'restore to life' (someone apparently dead, 2 Kings 8.15). The clear implication of all this is that any impairment of, or threat to, life is a form of death, and that by contrast 'real' life is life that is not in any way impaired or threatened, but is life in its fulness.

It is against the background of such an understanding of life that the frequent references to life in Deuteronomy and in Proverbs should be seen. In Deuteronomy the attainment of life is dependent on obedience to the commandments (cf. also Lev. 18.5; Neh. 9.29), and life itself is usually associated with possession of the land and with such concepts as well-being and long life: cf. e.g. 5.33, 'You shall walk in all the way which the LORD your God has commanded you, that you may live, and that it may go well with you, and that you may live long in the land which you shall possess'; cf. also, for example, 4.1; 8.1; and especially 30.15–20.

The approach in the book of Proverbs is not dissimilar. Here the attainment of life is frequently depicted as the consequence of obedience to the teachings of the wisdom teacher (e.g. 3.1–2; 4.10), or is linked with the acquisition of wisdom (e.g. 3.13–18; 8.35), the receiving of instruction (4.13), or the like. Occasionally other concepts, such as well-being or riches, are associated with life (e.g. 3.2, 16–18; 4.22), and this indicates that life is understood to mean a full, happy and prosperous life (cf. 15.27).

So far as the prophets are concerned, it is noticeable that it is only in Ezekiel that references to life occur at all frequently (cf. Zimmerli: 1963 [1957], 178). In Ezekiel the unconditional promise of the renewal of the life of the nation and of the return to the land (37.1–14; cf. 47.9) has to be held in balance with the two disputations (18; 33.10–20) in which the promise of life is dependent on the observance of the 'statutes of life' (33.15; cf. 18.9,

17; 20.11, 13, 21; and see Zimmerli; 1963)). These two disputations take up the complaints of the exiles that they are being treated unjustly (18.2, 25, 29; 33.10, 17, 20), and despite the appearance created by the mode of argument, which makes use of individual case histories, the concern is primarily with the fate of the exilic generation as a group, rather than with that of individuals. The prophet argues that each generation is responsible for its own fate. There is an inescapable link between sin and death on the one hand, and righteousness and life on the other. The righteous man who turns from his righteousness must inevitably die; the sinner who turns from his sin will live. The exiles are urged to repent in order to obtain life (cf. 18.23, 30–2; 33.11).

Zimmerli (1963; cf. 1979 [1969a]) has made a particular study of the background of the literary form of the disputations. He argued with reference to 18.5–9 that the combination of the recapitulation of a series of legal pronouncements, the declaratory formula 'he is righteous', and the promise of life 'he shall live', reflected the procedure of a ceremony of admission to the temple in which the worshipper had read to him the rules of the temple, to which he affirmed his adherence – or himself recited a list of rules as a form of confession of innocence – and was then declared 'righteous' and was admitted to the temple (Zimmerli: 1963, 182–4; 1979, 375–6 [1969a, 397–9]); cf. Gunkel-Begrich: 1933, 408–9; von Rad: 1966, 244–5, 254; 1958 [1950], 226–7, 235–6). Zimmerli further maintained that 'the third element of Ezek. 18.5–9, the promise of life, also points to an event in the sanctuary. 'Life' is especially the gift given in the sphere of the sanctuary as the place of God's presence' (1979, 376 [1969a, 399]). A similar point had earlier been made by von Rad. In comment on Deut. 30.15, 19 he pointed out that the promise of life was intimately linked to the proclamation of the commandments, such as occurred on certain great cultic occasions (e.g. the feast of booths, cf. 31.10–13). He argued that it was within the cultus that the individual received the assurance that he would have life, and that this assurance was given not just on great cultic occasions when the commandments were recited, but also in more 'private' circumstances, when the individual in distress came to the temple (von Rad: 1966, 253–4 [1958, 234–6]). Zimmerli found indirect support for his view *inter alia* in the words of Amos 5.4–5, 'Seek me and live; but do not seek Bethel . . .', behind which has been seen to lie the viewpoint of the priests of Bethel, 'Seek Bethel and live'. The priests of Bethel sought to encourage pilgrimage to the sanctuary at Bethel by the promise of life, but Amos (cf. 5.4–5, 6, 14), like Ezekiel after him, was concerned to stress the conditional character of this promise of life. Recognition of the cultic background of Ezek. 18.5–9, and in particular the promise of life (vs. 9), is important for

understanding what is meant by 'life' in Ezek. 18 (and in 33.10–20). Whereas 37.1–14 specifically mentions return from exile (see vs. 14), the promise of life is left undefined in 18 and 33.10–20. Zimmerli drew attention to the way in which the salvation promised in the cult 'was not primarily the promise of a specific, and materially defined, gift, but more broadly a promise "God will be with you"', as indeed life is defined in Amos 5.14. He argued that in a similar way the promise of life in Ezek. 18 was left open and deliberately not restricted to a return from exile. 'That God promises his "Yes", and therewith his assurance of "life", to the man who confesses obedience to him and his commandments is here also the important factor' (1979, 381–2; [1969a, 406–9]).

2. Death in the Old Testament

Relatively more attention appears to have been paid in recent studies to the theme of death in the Old Testament than to the theme of life. Mention has already been made of the article by Ringgren, Illmann and Fabry (1984) and of the volume by Martin-Achard (1960 [1956]). Other general studies include those by Kaiser (Kaiser and Lohse, 1977; Eng. Tr., 1981), Ringgren (1963, 218–26, 293–5; Eng. Tr., 1966, pp. 239–47, 322–3), Maag (1964, reprint 1980), Fohrer (1968), Wolff (1973, 150–76 (Eng. Tr., 1974, 99–118), and Plöger (1978). Studies that are concerned more with the theological understanding of death in the Old Testament include von Rad (I, ²1958, 274–6, 385–9 (Eng. Tr., 1962, 275–7, 387–91); II, ²1961, pp. 361–2 (Eng. Tr., 1965, 349–50)), Zimmerli (1971), Brueggemann (1976), and Bailey (1979, especially, 23–74). Funeral rites are discussed by de Vaux (I, 1958, 93–100; Eng. Tr., 1961, 56–61). Other works will be mentioned in the course of what follows.

Despite such passages as Rom. 5.12; 6.23; Wisd. Sol. 2.23–4; 2 Esdras 3.7, there is no suggestion in the narratives of the creation and fall, nor indeed in the Old Testament as a whole, that man was created immortal and lost his immortality as a result of disobedience. In Gen. 2.17 death is certainly prescribed as the penalty for eating the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, but there is no hint that man had originally possessed immortality, and in any case the actual punishment was different (cf. Gen. 3.17–19). In Gen. 3.19 death is mentioned as marking the end of man's toil on the earth, not as a punishment, while the implication of 3.22, 24, which refer to the tree of life which might have given man immortality, is that man did not at that time possess it (cf. e.g. Martin-Achard: 1960, 19–20 [1956, 23–4]); Wächter; 1967, 198–203; and on Gen. 3.19 see Westermann: 1974, 362–3 (Eng. Tr. 1984, 266–7), with references to other views). There is thus no

Life and death in the Old Testament

idea in the narrative of the creation and fall that man had once been immortal. In contrast Gen. 3.19c, 'you are dust, and to dust you shall return', reflects the view that death is the inevitable fate of all men, a view that, under a variety of images, occurs throughout the Old Testament: cf. e.g. 1 Kings 2.2; 2 Sam. 14.14; Job 14.1–2.

Attitudes towards death in the Old Testament are, however, much more varied than mere acknowledgement of death as the common lot of mankind, as Wächter (1967) has shown (cf. also Bailey: 1979, 47–61, 71–4). Wächter distinguished between instinctive attitudes towards death and the theological evaluation of death in the Old Testament. Under the former he regarded aversion to, or fear of, death as the most common reaction, expressed at its simplest in the flight of an individual in the face of the threat of death (e.g. 1 Sam. 19.11–12) or the panic of a group in the face of an enemy attack (e.g. 2 Kings 7.6–7; Josh. 2.9), and at a deeper level in terror at the prospect of meeting God (e.g. Num. 16.34; Judg. 13.22). But he also noted other attitudes, including both acceptance of death (e.g. Job 5.26; 2 Sam. 19.34–7 (Hebr. 35–8)), particularly when it occurs in 'good old age' (e.g. Gen. 25.8), but also sometimes a common human longing for death (e.g. Exod. 14.11–12; 1 Kings 19.4), and in Ecclesiastes a weariness with life (2.15–18; 6.2–6). The Old Testament also speaks of death as the inevitable fate of all men (see above), and Wächter drew attention to the variety of contexts in which this notion occurs and the variety of purposes to which it is put (e.g. as the basis of an appeal to God's forbearance (Job 14.1–3), or as the means of emphasising the eternal love and righteousness of God (Ps. 103.13ff.)). So far as the theological evaluation of death is concerned, Wächter noted that death is predominantly seen as divine punishment, whether of communities (e.g. Deut. 28; Lev. 26) or of individuals (e.g. Amos 7.9, 11). But whereas sudden or premature death is clearly seen as a divine punishment in the Old Testament, mortality as such is not so regarded (Ps. 90 forms a partial exception (cf. Kellermann: 1976, 264–6); for Gen. 2–3, see above). Throughout Wächter drew on ancient Near Eastern as well as Old Testament sources. He surveyed – and carefully evaluated – an enormously wide range of material, and it is in this that the usefulness of his study lies.

At death the individual was placed in the grave, but he was at the same time thought to go down to the realm of the dead, i.e. to Sheol, as that realm is most commonly named in the Old Testament (cf. e.g. Gen. 37.35). Maag (1980, 184ff.) draws a sharp distinction between the grave and Sheol, but it seems clear that the two concepts frequently overlap, as is shown particularly by Ezek. 32.17–32. Pedersen's comments in relation to this passage are still apposite: 'Sheol is the entirety into which all graves are

merged . . . The "Ur"-grave we might call Sheol; it belongs deep down under the earth, but it manifests itself in every single grave . . . Where there is grave, there is Sheol, and where there is Sheol, there is grave' (Pedersen, I-II, 1959, 462, quoted by Tromp: 1969, 133, cf. 139; and also Barth: 1947, 83-5).

The studies of the two scholars just mentioned, Tromp and Barth, have considerably increased our understanding of the Old Testament conception of the realm of the dead. Tromp (1969) devoted the first part of his monograph to the listing and discussion of the many names and epithets used for the nether world in the Old Testament. For the sake of convenience he divided the names into three groups: those in which the local aspect is the predominant common element, such as Sheol, *'ereš* ('nether world', e.g. Exod. 15.12), or *bôr* ('pit', e.g. Isa. 38.18); those which reflect something of the character of the realm of the dead, such as Abaddon ('place of destruction') or *'āpār* ('dust', e.g. Job 17.16); and those which refer to death as a personal reality, such as *môṭ* ('Sir Death', e.g. Isa. 28.15) or *melek ballāhōt* ('king of terrors', Job 18.14). In the second part of his study Tromp attempted to draw out the implications of the material he had assembled in Part I in relation to other biblical descriptions of the realm of the dead. Here he treats such topics as the nether world as a city, or a prison, death as a personal force and the demons associated with him, and the inhabitants and conditions of the nether world. The distinctive feature of Tromp's study is the extent to which he makes use of the evidence of the Ugaritic texts in his elucidation of the Old Testament material. Whether or not one agrees with all the details of his interpretation of the Old Testament texts, there is no question that his monograph marked an important advance in the study of the subject. Not the least point of interest is his demonstration of how widespread was the concern with death and the realm of the dead in the Old Testament.

An equally important advance was marked by Barth's somewhat older study (1947), which has remained very influential. Barth (76-91), who made extensive use of parallels drawn from Mesopotamian and Egyptian sources, treated a good deal of the same Old Testament material as Tromp in the context of a study whose particular purpose will be discussed later. Here attention should be drawn to Barth's views on the location of Sheol, which is conventionally regarded as being under the earth. Barth, who was strongly influenced by the ideas of Pedersen (cf. I-II, 1959, 460-70), argued that the various locations and names of Sheol expressed something of the character of Sheol and were not to be understood as providing precise geographical information. Thus the common idea that Sheol lies in the depths of the earth reflects the separation of Sheol from the world of life.

Life and death in the Old Testament

The conception of Sheol as being in the depths is derived from the grave, which itself is to be regarded as a manifestation of Sheol. But Sheol also manifests itself in other phenomena, particularly the ocean (cf. e.g. Ps. 69.2, 14–15 (Hebr. 3, 15–16); 71: 20), which was perceived as the embodiment of death and destruction, and the desert. Barth concludes: 'The realm of death is present wherever death exercises its rule. The location of the realm of death cannot be defined more precisely or more comprehensively' (*ibid.*, 88; see particularly 80–9).

There is undoubtedly an element of truth in Barth's view of the descriptive character of what is said of the realm of the dead and its location in the Old Testament, but to some extent his argument represents an overstatement. Tromp (1969, 129–40), while paying tribute to the importance of Barth's study, nonetheless offered a number of qualifications to his views. So far as the location of Sheol is concerned it must suffice here to quote the following comment: 'It seems imperative to distinguish between death's province comprising both local realities as ocean and desert, and other realities as prison, illness, and wild beasts – and the abode of the dead proper, which is seated deep in the earth. Sheol then is the complete reign of Death, the abode of the dead from which nobody returns; it is partially identical with the grave and with the primeval ocean also' (*ibid.*, 133).

The Old Testament conception of the realm of the dead as a place of darkness, in which the dead lead a shadowy existence, cut off from men and God, unable to praise God and indeed unable to do anything, is well-known and has often been discussed by scholars (see e.g. Martin-Achard: 1960, 36–46 [1956, 36–43]); Wächter, 1967, 181–93). The Old Testament gives vivid descriptions of this realm in such passages as Isa. 14.9–20a; Ezek. 32.17–32; Ps. 88; Job 3.13–19; 10.21–2; 14.12; Eccl. 9.5, 10. It is not intended to discuss the nature of this realm here, except to note that the dead were believed to continue in existence in Sheol, albeit in a very weak and reduced state. 'Death is to be explained in terms of life. It is a weak and indeed, insofar as it marks the final disintegration of one's *nepeš*, the weakest form of life' (Johnson: 1964, 88, and see 88–95). The idea that the dead survive in a much reduced form of life is presupposed by the practice of offering food and drink to the dead (cf. Deut. 26.14; Sir. 30.18), which may well have been intended to strengthen the dead (cf. Wächter: 1967, 186–93). But it is also reflected in 1 Sam. 28, the account of the conjuring up of the ghost of Samuel by the woman of En-dor (cf. vs. 13, 'I see a ghost [*ʿlōhīm*] coming up from the nether world'), in which Samuel complains at being disturbed (vs. 15); and above all in the taunt-song against the king of Babylon (Isa. 14.3–23), in which the 'shades' (*rēpāʾīm*, here a term referring

to former rulers) are roused from their thrones to greet the arrival of the dead tyrant in Sheol:

‘Sheol beneath is stirred up
to meet you when you come,
it rouses the shades to greet you,
all who were leaders of the earth;
it raises from their thrones
all who were kings of the nations.
All of them will speak
and say to you:
“You too have become as weak as we!
You have become like us!”’

(vss. 9–10, cf. vss. 16–17)

(For the *rpā'im* and their relationship to Ugaritic *rp'um*, see Healey: 1978, and *b*; Spronk: 1986, 161–96.)

The conception of death as a very weak form of life forms the counterpart to the belief that any impairment of, or threat to, life represents a form of death (cf. Johnson: 1964, 95). It is against the background of this conception of life and death, and against the background of the perception that the realm of death cannot simply be defined in terms of Sheol as a place deep in the earth, that those passages in the individual laments and thanksgivings which speak of the individual in distress as being already in the realm of death have to be interpreted. Barth's discussion of the Old Testament understanding of life (1947, 20–51) and death (*ibid.*, 52–91) was intended to provide the necessary basis for the interpretation of just these psalm passages (91–122). Barth, who built on the work of Pedersen (1–11 1959, 153ff., 460–70) and Baumgartner (1959 [1933], 125), noted that in an earlier period passages which referred to the individual who was sick or otherwise in distress as being in Sheol were understood as metaphor, or exaggeration, or poetic fantasy. The character of the language used in the individual laments might at first appear to support this view. The laments, which in any case tend to avoid the ominous overtones of the name 'Sheol', and to use synonyms instead, speak of the individual being 'like' those who go down to the pit, etc., or 'near' to death, the gates of death, etc. (cf. e.g. Ps. 28.1; 31.12 (Hebr. 13); 88.3–5 (Hebr. 4–6); 107.18); the individual in distress never directly identifies himself with the dead. It is only in the thanksgivings that the individual is said in retrospect to have been completely within the power of death and so can be said, for example, to have been 'brought up' (Ps. 30.3 (Hebr. 4)) or 'delivered' (Ps. 86.13) from Sheol. (The difference in approach is illustrated by the difference in language in verses 22 and 28–30 of Job 33). It would, however, be a mistake to interpret the language of the laments as metaphorical, and the language

of the thanksgivings as exaggeration, for this would fail to do justice to Old Testament ways of thinking. We have already seen that from one point of view there is no clear cut distinction in the Old Testament between life and death, and that the realm of death cannot simply be defined in local terms. Further, similarity implies real identity. Thus Barth argues that the experience of death of the individual in distress is real, but only partial. The difference between the individual in distress in the realm of death and the dead man is that for the former there is still the possibility of a change in his situation, of a deliverance by God; the latter is completely cut off from God and without any hope of deliverance (cf. Ps. 88.10–12 (Hebr. 11–13)).

Wächter (1967, 48–50) has criticised Barth's approach as being too 'philosophical' and has argued that the references to the underworld were intended metaphorically. But on the whole Barth's views have been accepted and have been widely influential (cf. e.g. Maag: 1980, 187–9; or the psalm commentaries of Kraus and Anderson). Reference should, however, be made here to the careful qualifications of Tromp (1969, 129–40, particularly 135–9). Two points may be mentioned here. Barth spoke of the individual being in 'the domain of the dead' (*Totenreich*), but Tromp, while accepting the main thrust of Barth's arguments, prefers rightly to speak of 'the domain of death'. Further, Tromp takes up the question of the character of the spatial language used of residence in, and deliverance from, the realm of death, and the extent to which this retained its force. He concludes: 'The use of nether-world terminology, though implying a real experience of death and consequently being more than mere poetic ornamentation, must, as far as the peculiar use in the individual laments and thanksgivings is concerned, be considered as secondary and technical.' The extent to which such language is 'secondary and technical' (*ibid.*, 139) or 'figurative' (*ibid.*, 138) requires further consideration.

3. Life after death

One of the characteristics of Sheol is that it is 'the land of no return' (cf. e.g. 2 Sam. 12.23; Job 7.9–10; 10.21–2; 16.22; Barth, 1947, pp. 77–8; Tromp, 1969, pp. 189–90), and this raises the question of how far there is present in the Old Testament a belief in resurrection or in life after death. Dan. 12.2–3 clearly expresses the belief in the resurrection of some, or all, Jews (cf. Plöger: 1965, 171), and there would probably be fairly general agreement that Ezek. 37.1–14 refers to the restoration of the nation in exile (cf. Zimmerli: 1983, 264–5 [1969b, 900]). Beyond this there is a very considerable difference of opinion about the interpretation of the relevant Old Testament evidence. Thus, for example, in recent studies Isa. 26.19 has

been understood to refer metaphorically to the restoration of Israel (Wildberger: 1978, 995; cf. Fohrer: 1968, 260; Clements: 1980, 216), to refer explicitly to the resurrection of the dead, but to be a later interpolation (Kaiser: 1973, 169, 173–7; Eng. Tr., 1974, 210, 215–20), and to refer to the physical resurrection of the faithful as the climax of the 'heart' of the Isaiah Apocalypse (Hasel: 1980, 275). Again, several passages in the psalms have been thought to refer in some way to life after death. Thus Ps. 49.15 (Hebr. 16) and 73.24, to mention two of the most important, have frequently been interpreted as referring to a future life, as expressing, for example, a belief, however, tentative, in life after death (cf. e.g. von Rad: 1, 21958, 403–5 (Eng. Tr. 1962, 405–7); Kraus: 1961, 367–8, 509–10; Anderson: 1972, 1, 379–80, II, 535–36), as referring to the translation of the soul (Maag: 1980, 190–93), or as expressing the conviction that the communion of the faithful with Yahweh would not be broken by death (Kellermann: 1976, especially 275–7; cf. Martin-Archard: 1981a, 309–10). In contrast, Barth (1947, 152–66, particularly 158–63) argued that Ps. 49.15 (Hebr. 16) refers to deliverance from distress in this life, not to a future life, and that Ps. 73.23ff. refers to life this side of death; and Wächter (1967, 195–8) believes that only Ps. 73 may express the hope of communion with God continuing after death. To take one final example, Isa. 53.10b–12 has been traditionally understood to refer to the resurrection of the servant, or at least – even though it is impossible to define it precisely – to 'an act done upon him after his death and on the far side of the grave' (Westermann: 1969, 267 [1966, 215]); but Whybray (1975, 171–83; 1978, 79–106) has argued that there is no idea of resurrection, or indeed of the death of the servant, in Isa. 53.

The diversity of views in the three cases just mentioned illustrate the difficulties that beset any attempt to trace the development in the Old Testament of a belief in resurrection or life after death, difficulties that are compounded by the uncertainties concerning the date of many of the relevant passages (e.g. Isa. 26.19). It is unlikely that the belief in resurrection only emerged at the time when Dan. 12.2–3 was composed, i.e. at the time of the persecution by Antiochus Epiphanes, and indeed Eccl. 3.19–21; 9.2–6 show that the question of the fate of man after death was in the air in the Hellenistic period; but we cannot be at all sure how far back the idea of resurrection is to be carried. Isa. 26.19 *may* provide evidence of a belief in resurrection, but if so, it is hard to say whether this would be evidence of what was believed at a time not much earlier than that of Dan. 12.2–3, or of what was believed at a much earlier time, i.e. in the exilic or early post-exilic period. Psalm passages such as 49.15 (Hebr. 16) and 79.24 *may* hint at, if not actually express, a belief in some form of life after death, but this is by no means clear, and in view of what has been said earlier in this article, it

Life and death in the Old Testament

seems more likely that Barth's approach is correct, and that the passages refer to deliverance from distress and from the power of death in this life. In any case, there is again the problem of the date of the material.

It is not possible to pursue this question here. For a detailed discussion of all the relevant Old Testament material, reference may be had to the studies of Martin-Achard (1960: 49–181 [1956, 45–144], supplemented by his two articles of 1981) and of Spronk (1986). Here it is only possible to refer briefly to attempts to use new materials and new methods in tackling this subject.

In his three-volume commentary on the Psalms Dahood (1965, 1968, 1970) has argued that the belief in resurrection and immortality is widely reflected in the psalter – he speaks of it occurring in some forty texts – and hence that the belief existed in Israel at a much earlier stage than is commonly assumed: 'the opinion of Sigmund Mowinckel that "neither Israel nor early Judaism knew of a faith in any resurrection nor is such a faith represented in the psalms" will not survive serious scrutiny' (1965, xxxvi; see further particularly 1970, xli–lii). Dahood based his argument on his interpretation of the Ugaritic texts, notably KTU 1. 17. vi, 25–38, and maintained, for example, that *ḥayyīm* can have the meaning 'life eternal' and *ʾahʿrīt* the meaning 'the future' or 'future life'. Thus, to mention only two instances, he translates Ps. 16.11a, 'You will make me know the path of life eternal', and Ps. 109.13, 'May his future life be cut off, from the age to come his name erased.' (For a similar treatment of material in Proverbs, see Dahood, 1963 (e.g. 28–9, 48–9).)

Dahood's views have not on the whole been accepted, but here it must suffice to mention only two of the criticisms that have been made (cf. Martin-Achard: 1981a, 307–8). Vawter (1972) rightly pointed out that Dahood had too one-sidedly read the material in the light of what was philologically possible and had taken insufficient account of what was theologically probable (161–2), i.e. he had not taken account of the whole context of the book of Psalms, and of the Old Testament in general, in which death is usually presented as the inevitable end of all men. Further, Loretz (1979, 462–8) has shown that Dahood's reliance on the evidence of KTU 1. 17. vi, 25–38 was based on a misinterpretation of the passage. He concluded that the Ugaritic texts confirmed anew that ancient Canaan and pre-exilic Israel were convinced of man's mortality and his unenviable fate after death, and that it was only after the breakup of the old Semitic culture in the exilic and post-exilic period that the way was open for new speculation about the life and the fate of man after death.

Dahood was not of course the only person who has attempted to make use of the Ugaritic texts in relation to the emergence in Israel of a belief in

resurrection, or life after death. As representative of the work of other scholars in this area reference may be made here to the recent study by Spronk (1986). Spronk places his treatment of the Old Testament material in the context of a discussion of ancient Near Eastern conceptions of a beatific afterlife, and makes particular use of the evidence of the Ugaritic texts. He argues that the Israelites were clearly familiar with, even if Yahwism did not adopt, 'the Canaanite belief in Baal rising from the netherworld every year and taking the deified spirits of the royal dead with him' (p. 324), and that although Israelite belief in a life after death was clearly distinguished from Canaanite belief – particularly because it was not tied to the cycle of nature, but depended totally on Yahweh himself – the way in which the belief was formulated was influenced by the Ancient Canaanite conception of a beatific afterlife. He maintains that Canaanite traditions survived for a long time in the folk religion of Israel (not in the official Yahwistic religion) and were thus able to be influential as late as the second century BC, and he believes that some elements in Jewish and Christian conceptions of life after death can be traced back to this influence. It remains to be seen how far all the details of Spronk's study will be accepted, but this work represents an important contribution to the subject, not least because of its comprehensive treatment of all the relevant Ugaritic and Old Testament evidence.

Sawyer (1973) has used linguistic techniques in his treatment of the theme of resurrection. He noted the value both of studying a word, not only in its immediate linguistic environment, but also in 'its situational or non-verbal context, that is to say, the "universe of discourse" in which it was used', and of studying a word's 'associative field'. He discussed the associative field of the Hebrew term *t'hiyyat hammē'im*, 'resurrection of the dead', and observed that most of the examples come from Hebrew of the Middle Period, the period that covers the later parts of the Hebrew Bible, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and mishnaic and mediaeval Hebrew. It was just in the early part of this period that belief in resurrection began to be a live issue, and Sawyer notes that whereas Ben Sira rejects this belief, there is no indication that all the late psalms were orthodox in this sense. It was also in the early part of this Middle Period that the Prophets and the Writings received their final form. Against the background of these considerations he suggests that a belief in the resurrection is reflected in the final form, but not necessarily the original context, of some twenty passages, mostly passages in which the belief has traditionally been sought, and he endeavours to illustrate this by a discussion of Ps. 1.5; Job 19.25–7, and Isa. 53.11.

The linguistic techniques to which Sawyer has drawn attention clearly

Life and death in the Old Testament

have their value for the study of the 'resurrection' passages, but there remains a considerable degree of uncertainty about the interpretation of these passages – even in the context of the final form of the text. Thus it is, for example, by no means clear that Job 19.25–7 was already understood in the context of the final form of the book as referring to the resurrection of Job from the dead (Sawyer: 1973, 232–33). What applies in the context of the final form of the text applies even more in the original context, and the difficulties in tracing the emergence of the belief in resurrection and life after death remain.

4. Distinctive formulas relating to death

The themes of life and death in the Old Testament raise many other issues which it is not possible to consider here. But by way of conclusion reference may be made to two studies which are concerned – in quite different ways – with the language used of death.

Illmann (1979) examined the Old Testament formulas used about death, and his approach in this monograph underlies his treatment of the root *mūt* in the *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament* (Ringgren, Illmann and Fabry, 1984, cols. 768–86). (Treatment of formulas relating to death is not in itself new, and mention may be made here of Alfrink's discussion of the expressions 'he slept with his fathers' and 'he was gathered to his people' (1943, 1948; cf. Driver, 1962, 137–43); what is distinctive of Illmann's study is his comprehensive treatment of one particular root and his concern about methodology). Illmann noted that his purpose in his 1979 volume was twofold: 'to describe the characteristics of the Hebrew formula from the horizon of the stem *mūt*', and 'to find out whether the formulaic use of this stem is an essential feature to be borne in mind in interpreting its meaning' (1979, 178). He defines a 'formula' as 'a repeated word group or repeated word combination', but also as one which has 'a distinct function within the larger context' (*ibid.*, 18), and he attempts, both in his introduction and throughout the book, to distinguish a 'formula' from an 'idiom' (where the criterion of function is lacking, and the word group is the natural Hebrew way of expression), a 'repetition' (where the word group is repeated within a limited context and generally by the same author), and a 'coined phrase' (where the word group is borrowed by another author). The formulas are grouped under such rubrics as 'Recognizing Death', 'Death and Burial', etc., and the study is restricted almost entirely to the occurrences of the root *mūt*. Illmann notes that he is primarily concerned with the mode of expression, with *how* the Old Testament speaks about death, and although the approach has its limitations, the arrangement and discussion of the

material in terms of the formulas used often cast an interesting light on the interpretation of particular passages.

One of the formulas studied by Illmann is *môt yûmat* ('he shall be put to death'), and the sentences that conclude with this formula (e.g. Exod. 21.12, 'Whoever strikes a man so that he dies shall be put to death') were investigated by Schulz (1969) in an important form-critical study (cf. Wagner: 1972, 16–31). A series of these *môt yûmat* sentences, in which the first part consists of a participial phrase, occurs in Exod. 21.12, 15, 16, 17, and a further series, in which the participle is replaced by a relative clause, occurs in Lev. 20. Schulz began his inquiry by referring to the uncertainty that exists as to whether the *môt yûmat* sentences of the type represented by Exod. 21.12 are to be categorised as apodictic law, as Alt argued (1966, 109–14 [1953, 307–13]; cf. Boecker: 1980, 191–7 [1976, 166–72]), or as a form of casuistic law (cf. e.g. Gese: 1960, 147–50). Schulz maintained that the *môt yûmat* sentences represented a transformation of the prohibitive law of the clan (thus, e.g., Exod. 21.12 was based on the prohibition of Exod. 20.13, 'You shall not kill') and constituted a distinct legal form. He placed this transformation at the time of the occupation of the land and argued on the basis of a study of Gen. 26.1–11 that the *Sitz-im-Leben* of this legal form belonged in the tribal community, in the proclamation of law by the tribal leader. After the settlement the responsibility of pronouncing the death sentence was taken over by the local community, which for this purpose – so it is argued on the basis of 1 Kings 21, Jer. 26.7ff., and Jer. 7 – was constituted as a cultic community in order that the community might thereby avoid any risk of blood guilt. An analysis of Lev. 18–20, in which it is striking that there are close links between the *môt yûmat* sentences of chapter 20 and the prohibitions of chapter 18, indicates that the influence of cultic institutions in such proceedings continued in the post-exilic period. It is argued that underlying Lev. 18–20 the various stages of a cultic procedure can be traced, by which the cultic community pronounced the sentence of death. Schulz also suggests that the influence of this legal tradition can be discerned in material in Ezekiel which he regards as secondary.

Schulz has not been the only one to study the *môt yûmat* sentences (see the discussion, with bibliography, by Boecker), but to pursue this further would take us beyond the limits of this article. Schulz's monograph offers much of interest, but the soundness of his overall thesis stands or falls on the soundness of his interpretation of a large number of individual passages in the Old Testament, and there must inevitably be a question about his treatment of some of the material, not least the use that he makes of Gen. 26.1–11; 1 Kings 21; Jer. 7 and 26. However, it must suffice to refer to the detailed and careful review by Zimmerli (1970). What may be said here is

Life and death in the Old Testament

that the form-critical study by Schulz and the treatment of formulas by Illmann both point to areas where there is yet room for further work in relation to the themes of life and death in the Old Testament.

Bibliography

- Alfrink, B., 1943. 'L'expression šākāb 'īm ḥbôtāw', *OTS* 2: 106–18.
1948. 'L'expression ne^usap bel-'ammāw', *OTS* 5: 118–31.
- Alt, A., 1966 [1953]. 'Die Ursprünge des Israelitischen Rechts', Leipzig, 1934 (= *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, Band 1, Munich, 1953, 278–332; Eng. Tr., *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1966, 79–132).
- Anderson, A. A., 1972. *The Book of Psalms*, NCB, 2 vols., Grand Rapids and London: Eerdmans.
- Bailey, L. R., sr., 1979. *Biblical Perspectives on Death*, Overtures to Biblical Theology, Philadelphia: Westminster.
- Barth, C., 1947. *Die Errettung vom Tode in den individuellen Klage- und Dankliedern des Alten Testaments*, Zollikon.
- Baumgartner, W., 1959 [1933]. 'Der Auferstehungsglaube im Alten Orient', *ZMR* 48 (1933), 193–214 = *Zum Alten Testament und seiner Umwelt*, Leiden: Brill, 124–46.
- Boecker, H. J., 1980 [1976]. *Recht und Gesetz im Alten Testament und im Alten Orient*, Neukirchener Studienbücher 10, Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1976; Eng. Tr. *Law and the Administration of Justice in the Old Testament and Ancient East*, London, SPCK, 1980.
- Brueggemann, W., 1976. 'Death, Theology of', *IDBS*: 219–22.
- Clements, R. E., 1980. *Isaiah 1–39*, NCB, Grand Rapids and London: Eerdmans.
- Dahood, M., 1963. *Proverbs and Northwest Semitic Philology*, Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici 113, Rome: Biblical Institute.
- 1965, 1968, 1970. *Psalms: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*, 3 vols., Anchor Bible, 16, (1965), 17 (1968), 17A (1970), Garden City: Doubleday.
- Driver, G. R., 1962. 'Plurima mortis imago', in M. Ben-Horin, B. D. Weinryb, and S. Zeitlin, eds., *Studies and Essays in Honor of Abraham A. Neuman*, Leiden: Brill, 1962, 128–43.
- Fohrer, G., 1968. 'Das Geschick des Menschen nach dem Tode im Alten Testament', *KuD* 14: 249–62.
- Gerleman, G., 1971a. 'hjh leben', *THAT* 1: 549–57.
1971b. 'mūt sterben', *THAT* 1: 893–7.
- Gese, H., 1960. 'Beobachtungen zum Stil alttestamentlicher Rechtssätze', *ThLZ* 85: 147–50.
- Greenberg, M., 1957. 'The Hebrew Oath Particle ḤAY/ḤĒ', *JBL* 76: 34–9.
- Gunkel, H., and Begrich, J., 1933. *Einleitung in die Psalmen*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht.
- Hasel, G. F., 1980. 'Resurrection in the Theology of Old Testament Apocalyptic', *ZAW* 92: 267–84.
- Healey, J. F., 1978a, 'Ritual Text KTU 1.161 – Translation and Notes', *UF* 10: 83–8.
1978b. 'MLKM/RPUM and the KISPUM', *UF* 10: 89–91 (= 1978b).
- Illmann, K.-J., 1979. *Old Testament Formulas about Death*, Meddelanden från Stiftelsens för Åbo Akademi Forskningsinstitut 48, Åbo.

- Johnson, A. R., 1964. *The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel*, 2nd ed. Cardiff: Univ. of Wales.
- Kaiser, O., 1974 [1973]. *Der Prophet Jesaja. Kapitel 13–39*, ATD 18, Göttingen. Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht, 1973; Eng. Tr., *Isaiah 13–39: A Commentary*, OTL, London: SCM.
- Kaiser, O. and Lohse, E., 1981 [1977]. *Tod und Leben*, Biblische Konfrontationen, Stuttgart, 1977; Eng. Tr., *Death and Life*, Biblical Encounters Series, Nashville: Abingdon, 1981.
- Kellermann, U., 1976. 'Überwindung des Todesgeschicks in der alttestamentlichen Frömmigkeit vor und neben dem Auferstehungsglauben', *ZThK* 73: 259–82.
- Kraus, H.-J., 1961. *Psalmen*. 1. Teilband, BKAT, XV/1, Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag. 1972 [1967]. 'Der lebendige Gott: Ein Kapitel biblischer Theologie', *EvTh* 27 (1967), 169–200 = *Biblisch-theologische Aufsätze*, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1972, 1–36.
- Landsberger, B., 1965. *Die Eigenbegrifflichkeit der Babylonischen Welt*, von Soden, W., *Leistung und Grenze sumerischer und babylonischer Wissenschaft*, Darmstadt.
- Loretz, O., *Die Psalmen. Teil II*, AOAT, 207/2, Kevelaer and Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Maag, V., 1980 [1964]. 'Tod und Jenseits nach dem Alten Testament', *SThU* 34, 17–37; = *Kultur, Kulturkontakt und Religion: Gesammelte Studien zur allgemeinen und alttestamentlichen Religionsgeschichte*. Zum 70. Geburtstag herausgegeben von H. H. Schmid und O. H. Steck, Göttingen, 1980, 181–202.
- Martin-Achard, R., 1960 [1956]. *De la mort à la résurrection d'après l'Ancien Testament*, Bibliothèque théologique, Neuchâtel and Paris, 1956; Eng. Tr., *From Death to Life: A Study of the Development of the Doctrine of the Resurrection in the Old Testament*, (Edinburgh and London, 1960).
- 1981a. 'Trois remarques sur la résurrection des morts dans l'Ancien Testament', in A. Caquot and M. Delcor, eds., *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de M. Henri Cazelles*, AOAT, 212 (Kevelaer and Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1981), pp. 301–7.
- 1981b. 'Résurrection dans l'Ancien Testament et le Judaïsme', *DBS* X/55: 437–87.
- Pedersen, J., 1959. *Israel: Its Life and Culture*, 2 vols. (I–II, III–IV) 2nd edition, London and Copenhagen).
- Plöger, O., 1965. *Das Buch Daniel*, KAT, XVIII, Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn.
1978. 'Tod und Jenseits im Alten Testament', in H.-J. Klimkeit, ed., *Tod und Jenseits im Glauben der Völker*, Sammlung Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 1978, 77–85.
- von Rad, G. 1966 [1958]. '"Gerechtigkeit" und "Leben" in der Kultsprache der Psalmen', *Festschrift für Alfred Bertholet*, Tübingen: Mohr, 1950, 418–37 = *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*, ThB8, Munich, 1958, 225–47; Eng. Tr. *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*, Edinburgh and London, 1966), 243–66.
- 1962 [1958] 1965 [1962]. *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, Munich, Band I, 2. Auflage, 1958, Band II, 2. Auflage, 1961; Eng. Tr., *Old Testament Theology*, Edinburgh and London, vol. I, 1962, vol. II, 1965.
- Ringgren, H., 1966 [1963]. *Israelitische Religion*, Die Religionen der Menschheit 26, Stuttgart, 1963; Eng. Tr., *Israelite Religion*, London: SPCK.
- 1980 [1977]. '*hājāh, haj, hajjīm, miḥjāh*', *ThWAT* 2 1977, 874–98; Eng. Tr., '*chāyāh; chai; chāyīm; chāyāh; miḥyāh*', *TDOT* 4, 1980, 324–44.
- Ringgren, H. Illmann, K.-J. and Fabry, H.-J., 1984. '*mūt, māw oet, t'mūtāh, m'mōtīm*', *ThWAT* 4, 763–87.

Life and death in the Old Testament

- Sawyer, J. F. A., 1973. 'Hebrew Words for the Resurrection of the Dead', *VT* 23: 218–34.
- Schulz, H., 1969. *Das Todesrecht im Alten Testament: Studien zur Rechtsform der Mot-Jumat-Sätze*, BZAW 114 Berlin.
- Spronk, K., 1986. *Beatific Afterlife in Ancient Israel and in the Ancient Near East*, AOAT 219 Kevelaer and Neukirchen-Vluyn.
- Tromp, N. J., 1969. *Primitive Conceptions of Death and the Nether World in the Old Testament*, *Biblica et Orientalia*, 21, Rome: Biblical Institute.
- De Vaux, R., 1961 [1958, 1960]. *Les Institutions de l'Ancien Testament*, 2 vols., Paris, 1958, 1960; Eng. Tr., *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*, London: Darton, Longman & Todd.
- Vawter, B., 1972. 'Intimations of Immortality and the Old Testament', *JBL* 91: 158–71.
- Wächter, L., 1967. *Der Tod im Alten Testament*, Arbeiten zur Theologie II/8, Stuttgart.
- Wagner, V., 1972. *Rechtssätze in gebundener Sprache und Rechtssatzreihen im israelitischen Recht: Ein Beitrag zur Gattungsforschung*, BZAW 127, Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Westerman, C., 1969 [1966]. *Das Buch Jesaja. Kapitel 40–66*, ATD 19, Göttingen, 1966; Eng. Tr., 1969, *Isaiah 40–66: A commentary*, OTL, London: SCM.
- Westermann, C., 1984 [1974]. *Genesis. 1. Teilband: Genesis 1–11*, BKAT I/1, Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1974; Eng. Tr. 1984, *Genesis 1–11: A Commentary*, London: SPCK.
- Whybray, R. N., 1975. *Isaiah 40–66*, NCB London: Marshall-Pickering.
- Whybray, R. N., 1978. *Thanksgiving for a Liberated Prophet: An Interpretation of Isaiah Chapter 53*, JSOT Supp 4, Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Wildberger, H., 1978. *Jesaja. 2. Teilband: Jesaja 13–27*, BKAT x/2, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Wolff, H. W., 1974 [1973]. *Anthropologie des Alten Testaments*, Munich: Beck; Eng. Tr. 1974, *Anthropology of the Old Testament*, London: SCM.
- Zimmerli, W., 1963 [1957]. '"Leben" und "Tod" im Buche des Propheten Ezechiel', *ThZ* 13, 494–508 = *Gottes Offenbarung: Gesammelte Aufsätze zum Alten Testament*, ThB 19, Munich, 1963, 178–91.
- Zimmerli, W., 1970. Review of H. Schulz, *Das Todesrecht im Alten Testament*, *ThLZ* 95, 891–7.
- Zimmerli, W., 1971. *Die Weltlichkeit des Alten Testaments*, Göttingen.
- Zimmerli, W., 1979 [1969a]. *Ezechiel. 1. Teilband: Ezechiel 1–24*, BKAT XIII/1, 1969, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag; Eng. Tr. 1979, *Ezekiel 1: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, Chapters 1–24*, Hermeneia, Philadelphia: Fortress.
- 1983 [1969b]. *Ezechiel. 2. Teilband: Ezechiel 25–48*, BKAT, XIII/2, 1969, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag; Eng. Tr. 1983, *Ezekiel 2: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, Chapters 25–48*, Hermeneia, Philadelphia: Fortress.