

GUNNAR SAMUELSSON

# Crucifixion in Antiquity

*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen  
zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe*

310

---

**Mohr Siebeck**

Gunnar Samuelsson questions the textual basis for our knowledge about the death of Jesus. As a matter of fact, the New Testament texts offer only a brief description of the punishment that has influenced a whole world.

ISBN 978-3-16-150694-9

---

**Mohr Siebeck**

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen  
zum Neuen Testament · 2. Reihe

Herausgeber / Editor

Jörg Frey (Zürich)

Mitherausgeber / Associate Editors

Friedrich Avemarie (Marburg)

Markus Bockmuehl (Oxford)

James A. Kelhoffer (Uppsala)

Hans-Josef Klauck (Chicago, IL)

310





Gunnar Samuelsson

# Crucifixion in Antiquity

An Inquiry into the Background and Significance of the  
New Testament Terminology of Crucifixion

Mohr Siebeck

GUNNAR SAMUELSSON, born 1966; 1992 Pastor and Missionary Degree; 1997 B. A. and M. Th. at the University of Gothenburg; 2000 M. A.; 2010 ThD; Senior Lecturer in New Testament Studies at the Department of Literature, History of Ideas and Religion, University of Gothenburg.

ISBN 978-3-16-150694-9

ISSN 0340-9570 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe)

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

© 2011 by Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, Germany.

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was printed by Laupp & Göbel in Nehren on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Nädele in Nehren.

Printed in Germany.

*For my beloved wife Linda and our dear children  
Rebecca, Hannah, Daniel, Esther and Johannes*





## Preface

Being a parish minister, I took it as a blessing to hear the phone ring one day and convey the opportunity to spend some years on doctoral studies at what was then the *Department of Religious Studies* at the University of Gothenburg. During the preceding talks with my presumptive supervisor, Professor Samuel Byrskog, we soon ended up with the topic of crucifixion – with special attention to how Paul uses it as a rhetorical device in his letters. The first study that came into my hands was Martin Hengel’s epoch-making book *Crucifixion*. With fascination I was led by Hengel to some crucifixion accounts in Herodotus’ *History*, using the familiar verb ἀνασταυροῦν. Among the first texts studied, there emerged suspensions of corpses and body parts, all labeled “crucifixions” by Hengel.<sup>1</sup> The former verb was translated as “crucifixion” in Godley’s translation of the Loeb edition on my shelf as well.<sup>2</sup> This puzzlement regarding the meaning of ἀνασταυροῦν and its counterparts caught my curiosity and sparked a preparatory investigation of the philological aspects related to crucifixion in the Greco-Roman and Biblical texts. However, this effort – to establish a textual basis for the study of the historical and theological perspectives of the death of Jesus in the Pauline letters – appeared to be sufficient for a thesis by itself. And out went Paul. Thus, the present investigation is in part the result of a failure, but in my opinion a good failure. I obtained the chance to spend several intriguing years dealing with the part of the world, the part of history, and the parts of ancient languages that I love passionately. I am most grateful for this.

The present monograph is a slightly revised version of my Th.D. thesis defended publicly on 21 May 2010 at the *Department of Literature, History of Ideas and Religion*, University of Gothenburg. Within a few weeks from the date of my defense, news media globally from CNN to Pravda, and numerous blogs and discussion forums, had brought attention to it, sometimes with intriguing comments on the importance of biblical scholarship, sometimes with unfortunate misunderstandings.<sup>3</sup> The

---

<sup>1</sup> Hdt. 3.125.2; 6.30.1.

<sup>2</sup> Hdt. 3.125.2 (GODLEY, *LCL*).

<sup>3</sup> For a selection of media references, see <http://www.exegetics.org/Media.html>.

opportunity now to publish the results of my research is therefore all the more welcome.

Many people have assisted me during the years of study. My appreciation goes to my dear and competent supervisor Prof. Samuel Byrskog, who has guided my dissertation project in the best possible way. He never stops impressing and surprising me.

A special word of thanks goes to my dear colleague and friend Dr. Tobias Hägerland, who has helped my course to be steady, broadened my academic and religious life and brought joy to the years of biblical studies – and to numerous conferences.

I am thankful for help with proofreading to Jon van Leuven (English), Dr. Tryggve Göransson (Greek), Prof. Magnus Wistrand (Latin), and my dear colleague in language teaching, Ph.D. candidate Rosmarie Lillas-Schuil (Hebrew and Aramaic). Special thanks also to Dr. Georg Walser for proofreading and critical suggestions in the early stages of the process, and to my secondary supervisor Prof. Staffan Olofsson, Ph.D. candidate Lennart Thörn and Prof. Dick A. R. Haglund for their enthusiastic support and critical suggestions. The same gratitude goes to Dr. Jonas Holmstrand, who read the entire manuscript and delivered a good opposition at my last seminar, and to my opponent at the dissertation, Dr. Erkki Koskeniemi, for his very helpful comments and suggestions.

My thanks are due to the now expanded *Department of Literature, History of Ideas and Religion* at the University of Gothenburg; to the two Heads of Department that I have worked under during these years, Lars Branegård and Prof. Ingemar Nilsson; to the administrative staff, Marita Öhman and Pernilla Josefsson; to members of the Higher Seminar for Biblical Studies, especially Ph.D. candidates Hasse Leander, Fredrik Ivarsson, Rosmarie Lillas-Schuil, Dr. Erik Alvstad, Dr. Georg Walser, Dr. Martin Berntson, Dr. Tobias Hägerland, Prof. Staffan Olofsson, Prof. Bertil Nilsson and Prof. Magnus Wistrand for creative seminar opposition.

Special thanks go to the annual joint doctoral seminar with participants from *Norwegian School of Theology*, Oslo; *School of Mission and Theology*, Stavanger; *Centre for Theology and Religious Studies* at Lund University and *Department of Literature, History of Ideas and Religion* at the University of Gothenburg. Within this setting Prof. Hans Kvalbein, Prof. Karl Olav Sandnes, Prof. Reidar Hvalvik, Prof. Jostein Ådna, Dr. Gunnar Haaland, Dr. Årstein Justnes, Dr. Geir Otto Holmås, Dr. Nils Aksel Røsæg, Dr. Sverre Bøe and Ph.D. candidate Hanne Birgitte Sødal Tveito have read and offered opposition of great value on my seminar papers, as well as their enthusiastic support throughout this project.

A word of thanks goes also to the participants at the *SBL* and *EABS* conferences who have offered their suggestions and support, as well as to Prof. Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn, Prof. Richard B. Hays, Prof. Bengt Holmberg, Prof. Karl-Gustav Sandelin, Prof. Tryggve N. D. Mettinger and Dr. David W. Chapman for inspiring conversations.

I am deeply grateful to Prof. Jörg Frey and Prof. Markus Bockmuehl for recommending my book for publication in the prestigious WUNT-series, and for offering valuable suggestions. A special word of thanks also goes to Dr. Henning Ziebritzki and his editorial staff for their assistance during the preparation of the manuscript for publication.

Generous scholarships have been granted by *Adlerbertska Stipendiefonden*, *Stockholms Kristliga Ynglingaförening*, *Stiftelsen Wilhelm och Martina Lundgrens Vetenskapsfond*, *Letterstedtska föreningen*, *Kungl och Hvitfeldtska stiftelsen*, and *Helge Ax:son Johnsons stiftelse*. Their contributions have improved the quality of the dissertation not least through the possibility to buy literature and to participate in the mentioned conferences.

Finally I want to direct my thankfulness to my parents Sven and Solveig Samuelsson for their never-failing support for my 21 years of academic studies and not least for their continuous help with the sheer number of children in our household. The latter goes also to my father- and mother-in-law, Lennart and Margareta Einald, my sister Eva Olsson and my brother Lennart Samuelsson and their families, our dear nannies Jorunn Odenslätt, Margit Bryngelsson, Gunilla Hamnebo, Lena Sörenson and Ulrika Börjesson. Without their help our situation would be a disaster. And a disaster would also this weary body be without the firm hands and warm heart of *naprapath Anders Wanther*.

My gratitude goes foremost to my lovely wife, Linda, without whom this project would simply have been impossible – and to our loved children, Rebecca, Hannah, and the triplets Daniel, Esther and Johannes. You have made my life worth living, and to you, my beloved family, this study is dedicated.

Hönö, Good Friday 2011

Gunnar Samuelsson



# Contents

Preface.....	VII
Contents.....	XI
Abbreviations.....	XIX
1 Ancient Sources.....	XIX
2 Papyri and Non-Literary Sources .....	XXV
3 Early Jewish Literature.....	XXVI
4 Modern Works .....	XXVI
5 General.....	XXIX
6 Signs.....	XXX
Chapter One – Introduction.....	I
1 <i>The Purpose of the Study</i> .....	I
2 <i>The Scholarly Discussion</i> .....	2
2.1 Predecessors.....	2
2.2 Intermediate Studies .....	11
2.3 Main Contributors.....	14
2.4 Recent Studies .....	22
3 <i>Basic Problems and Method</i> .....	24
3.1 The Terminology .....	25
3.2 The Definition .....	26
3.3 The Basic Questions of the Investigation .....	29
3.4 Considerations of Theory .....	30
3.4.1 Philology.....	31
3.4.2 Semantics .....	32
4 <i>Content of the Book</i> .....	35

Chapter Two – Greek Literature .....	37
1 <i>The Archaic Era</i> .....	37
1.1 Homer .....	37
1.2 Aesop.....	40
1.3 Conclusion – The Archaic Era.....	41
2 <i>Historians of the Classical Era</i> .....	41
2.1 Herodotus.....	41
2.1.1 Herodotus’ Use of ἀνασταυροῦν .....	42
2.1.2 Herodotus’ Use of ἀνασκοποῦν.....	48
2.1.3 Herodotus’ Use of Nail Terminology .....	52
2.1.4 Conclusion – Herodotus and Crucifixion.....	55
2.2 Thucydides .....	59
2.3 Ctesias .....	61
2.4 Xenophon .....	63
2.5 Conclusion – Historians of the Classical Era .....	63
3 <i>Philosophical Literature of the Classical Era</i> .....	65
3.1 Plato.....	65
3.2 Aristotle .....	67
3.3 Conclusion – Philosophical Literature of the Classical Era.....	67
4 <i>Tragedy, Comedy and Orators of the Classical Era</i> .....	67
4.1 Aeschylus.....	67
4.2 Sophocles .....	69
4.3 Euripides .....	70
4.4 Demosthenes .....	72
4.5 Conclusion – Tragedy, Comedy and Orators of the Classical Era.....	73
5 <i>Greek Historians of the Hellenistic Era</i> .....	73
5.1 Polybius .....	73
5.1.1 Undefined Suspension Punishments in Polybius .....	73
5.1.2 Post-Mortem Suspension in Polybius.....	75
5.1.3 Ante-Mortem Suspension in Polybius.....	76
3.1.4 Conclusion – Polybius and Crucifixion .....	77
5.2 Diodorus Siculus.....	78
5.2.1 Undefined Suspensions in Diodorus Siculus.....	78
5.2.2 Post-Mortem Suspensions in Diodorus Siculus.....	80

5.2.3 Possible Impaling Accounts in Diodorus Siculus .....	81
5.2.4 Possible Ante-Mortem Suspensions in Diodorus Siculus .....	82
5.2.5 Suspension by Nailing in Diodorus Siculus .....	84
5.2.6 Conclusion – Diodorus Siculus and Crucifixion .....	86
5.3 Conclusion – Historians of the Hellenistic Era .....	88
<i>6 Papyrus and Fragmentary Texts of the Hellenistic Era .....</i>	<i>88</i>
6.1 Papyrus Hellenica .....	88
6.2 Alexis .....	89
6.3 Conclusion – Papyrus and Fragmentary Texts of the Hellenistic Era .....	89
<i>7 Historians of the Roman Era .....</i>	<i>90</i>
7.1 Strabo .....	90
7.1.1 Suspension Texts in Strabo .....	90
7.1.2 Conclusion – Strabo and Crucifixion .....	93
7.2 Dionysius of Halicarnassus .....	93
7.3 Flavius Josephus .....	95
7.3.1 Texts Without Indications of the Suspension Form .....	95
7.3.2 Texts With Indications of the Suspension Form .....	100
7.3.3 Conclusion – Josephus and Crucifixion .....	109
7.4 Plutarch .....	111
7.4.1 Undefined Suspensions in Plutarch .....	112
7.4.2 Suspension Accounts With Additional Information .....	114
7.4.3 Nailing Accounts in Plutarch .....	118
7.4.4 Plutarch’s Use of σταυρός .....	120
7.4.5 Conclusion – Plutarch and Crucifixion .....	123
7.5 Appian .....	125
7.5.1 Appian’s Use of σταυροῦν and σταυρός .....	125
7.5.2 Appian’s Use of κρεμαννύναι .....	126
7.5.3 Conclusions – Appian and Crucifixion .....	129
7.6 Conclusion – Historians of the Roman Era .....	130
<i>8 Philosophical and Poetical Authors of the Roman Era .....</i>	<i>131</i>
8.1 Philo Judaeus .....	131
8.1.1 Undefined Suspensions in Philo .....	131
8.1.2 Suspensions by Nailing in Philo .....	135
8.1.3 Ante-Mortem Suspensions in Philo .....	136
8.1.4 Conclusion – Philo and Crucifixion .....	137
8.2 Chariton .....	138
8.2.1 The Suspension of Theron .....	138

8.2.2	The Suspension of Chaereas and His Cellmates .....	139
8.2.3	A Recapitulation of the Suspensions.....	140
8.2.4	Chariton's Use of <i>στανυρός</i> .....	141
8.2.5	Conclusion – Chariton and Crucifixion .....	142
8.3	Conclusion – Philosophical and Poetical Literature of the Roman Era .....	142
9	<i>Conclusion – The Greek Literature</i> .....	143
9.1	The Terminology .....	143
9.1.1	The Verbs.....	143
9.1.2	The Nouns .....	146
9.1.3	The Terminological Problem .....	147
9.2	The Punishment .....	147
Chapter Three – Latin Literature.....		151
1	<i>Historians</i> .....	151
1.1	Gaius Iulius Caesar .....	151
1.2	Gaius Sallustius Crispus .....	152
1.3	Titus Livius.....	154
1.3.1	The Case Against Horatius.....	154
1.3.2	Livy's Use of <i>crux</i> .....	156
1.3.3	Conclusion – Livy.....	159
1.4	Valerius Maximus.....	159
1.4.1	Conclusion – Valerius Maximus.....	161
1.5	Cornelius Tacitus .....	161
1.5.1	Tacitus' Use of Assumed Crucifixion Terminology.....	162
1.5.2	Conclusion – Tacitus .....	167
1.6	Gaius Suetonius Tranquillus.....	167
1.6.1	Suetonius Use of <i>crux</i> and Accompanying Verbs.....	167
1.6.2	The Ancient Custom .....	169
1.6.3	Conclusion – Suetonius.....	170
1.7	Clodius Licinius .....	170
2	<i>Playwrights</i> .....	171
2.1	Titus Maccius Plautus .....	171
2.1.1	Conclusion – Plautus.....	175
2.2	Publius Terentius Afer.....	175



3	<i>Rhetorical and Philosophical Texts</i> .....	176
3.1	Marcus Tullius Cicero .....	176
3.1.1	Cicero's Oration Against Gaius Verres .....	176
3.1.2	Cicero's Defense of Rabirius .....	182
3.1.3	Conclusion – Cicero .....	183
3.2	Lucius Annaeus Seneca (the Elder) .....	184
3.3	Lucius Annaeus Seneca (the Younger).....	186
3.3.1	Conclusion – Seneca the Younger .....	191
3.4	Gaius Plinius Secundus.....	192
3.5	Marcus Fabius Quintilianus .....	194
3.6	Quintus Curtius Rufus .....	194
4	<i>Poetry</i> .....	195
4.1	Gaius Valerius Catullus .....	196
4.2	Quintus Horatius Flaccus .....	196
4.3	Publius Ovidius Naso.....	197
4.4	Marcus Valerius Martialis.....	198
4.5	Decimus Iunius Iuvenalis .....	198
5	<i>Inscription</i> .....	199
6	<i>Conclusion – The Latin Literature</i> .....	201
6.1	The Terminology .....	202
6.2	The Punishment .....	205
Chapter Four – The Old Testament and Early Jewish Literature .....		
1	<i>The Old Testament</i> .....	211
1.1	Genesis .....	211
1.2	Numeri.....	213
1.3	Deuteronomy .....	216
1.4	Joshua.....	217
1.5	The Books of Samuel .....	219
1.6	Ezra .....	223
1.7	Esther .....	224
1.8	Lamentation.....	227
2	<i>The Deuterocanonical Texts</i> .....	228

3	<i>The Dead Sea Scrolls</i> .....	228
4	<i>The Apocryphal Old Testament</i> .....	231
5	<i>Conclusion – Old Testament and Early Jewish Literature</i> .....	233
5.1	The Terminology .....	233
5.2	The Punishment .....	235
	<b>Chapter Five – The New Testament</b> .....	237
1	<i>The Gospels</i> .....	238
1.1	Jesus Foretells His Passion.....	238
1.2	To Carry One’s Own Cross .....	240
1.3	A People’s Call for Execution.....	242
1.4	The Road to Golgotha.....	243
1.5	The Execution .....	246
1.6	The Criminals.....	248
1.7	The Mocking of Jesus .....	249
1.8	The Death of Jesus .....	250
2	<i>Acts</i> .....	251
3	<i>The Epistles Attributed to Paul</i> .....	252
4	<i>The Epistles Not Attributed To Paul</i> .....	255
5	<i>Revelation</i> .....	257
6	<i>Conclusion – The New Testament</i> .....	257
	<b>Chapter Six – Discussion with Reference Literature and Scholars</b> .....	261
1	<i>Discussion One – The Definition of Crucifixion</i> .....	261
1.1	An Execution.....	262
1.2	In the Strict Sense, an Execution.....	263
1.3	Not Necessarily an Execution .....	264
1.4	Uncertainty, but Nevertheless a Crucifixion .....	265
1.5	A Better Way: A Suspension Among Others.....	267

1.6 Conclusion – The Definition of Crucifixion .....	270
2 <i>Discussion Two – The Terminology of Crucifixion</i> .....	271
2.1 The Greek Terminology .....	271
2.1.1 ἀνασταυροῦν and ἀνασκολοπίζειν .....	271
2.1.2 σταυροῦν .....	274
2.1.3 σταυρός .....	276
2.1.4 κρεμαννύναι .....	279
2.2 The Latin Terminology .....	280
2.3 The Hebrew-Aramaic Terminology .....	281
2.4 Conclusion – The Terminology of Crucifixion .....	282
2.4.1 Verbs of the σταυρ-Stem .....	283
2.4.2 ἀνασκολοπίζειν .....	283
2.4.3 σταυρός .....	284
2.4.4 κρεμαννύναι .....	285
2.4.5 <i>crux</i> .....	286
2.4.6 <i>patibulum</i> .....	286
2.4.7 The Hebrew-Aramaic Terminology .....	287
2.4.8 The Terminology of Crucifixion .....	287
3 <i>Discussion Three – The Description of Crucifixion</i> .....	287
3.1 The Scholarly Contributions .....	287
3.2 Evaluation of the Scholarly Contributions .....	293
3.3 A Description of Crucifixion .....	296
4 <i>Test Case I – The Archaeological Challenge</i> .....	297
5 <i>Test Case II – Challenging the Basic Theory</i> .....	298
Chapter Seven – Conclusion .....	303
1. <i>Answers to the Basic Questions of the Investigation</i> .....	303
2. <i>Conclusion</i> .....	306
Epilogue .....	309

Bibliography .....	311
1 Primary Sources (Texts and Translations) .....	311
2 Reference Works .....	320
3 Secondary Literature.....	323
4 Internet.....	331
Index of Ancient Sources .....	333
1 Greek Literature.....	333
2 Latin Literature .....	340
3 Papyri and Non-Literary Sources .....	345
4 Old Testament.....	345
5 Old Testament Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha and Septuagint .....	347
6 Targums .....	347
7 Early Jewish Literature.....	348
8 New Testament .....	348
9 Patristic Sources .....	350
Index of Modern Authors .....	351
Index of Subject.....	355
1 English Terms.....	355
2 Greek Terms .....	356
3 Hebrew/Aramaic Terms.....	357
4 Latin Terms .....	357

## Abbreviations

The abbreviations used in the present investigation are listed in Patrick, *The SBL Handbook of Style*, 68-152. For ancient authors the abbreviations are listed in *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, xxix-liv. For abbreviations of Latin authors the list in *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* is also consulted. For sources and periodicals not included in the books mentioned above, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 1.xvi-xl, and Liddell and Scott's *Greek-English Lexicon*, xvi-xlv, are used. I have decided to use the Latin names of the ancient authors and their work to harmonize them with the titles on the TLG-E and PHI-5 discs.

### 1. Ancient Sources

<i>Act. Mar. Ap.</i>	<i>Acta et Martyrium Apollonii</i>
Add. Esther	Addition to Esther
Ael.	Claudius Aelianus
<i>Nat. An.</i>	<i>De natura animalium</i>
Aesch.	Aeschylus
<i>Eum.</i>	<i>Eumenides</i>
<i>PV</i>	<i>Prometheus Vincetus</i>
Ap. Rhod.	Apollonius Rhodius
<i>Argon.</i>	<i>Argonautica</i>
App.	Appian
<i>B civ.</i>	<i>Bella civilia</i>
<i>Celt.</i>	<i>κελτική</i>
<i>Iber.</i>	<i>ιβηρική</i>
<i>Mith.</i>	<i>μιθριδάτειος</i>
<i>Pun.</i>	<i>λιβυκή</i>
<i>Sici.</i>	<i>σικελική</i>
Ar.	Aristophanes
<i>Ecc.</i>	<i>Ecclesiazusae</i>
<i>Eq.</i>	<i>Equites</i>
<i>Plut.</i>	<i>Plutus</i>
<i>Tesm.</i>	<i>Thesmophoriazusae</i>

Artem.	Artemidorus Daldianus
<i>Oneir.</i>	<i>Oneirocriticon</i>
Arist.	Aristotle
<i>Pol.</i>	<i>Politica</i>
As. Mos.	<i>Assumptio Mosis</i>
August.	Augustine
<i>De civ. D.</i>	<i>De civitate Dei</i>
Caes.	Caesar
<i>B Afr.</i>	<i>Bellum Africum (anonymous)</i>
<i>B Civ.</i>	<i>Bellum Civile</i>
<i>B Gal.</i>	<i>Bellum Gallicum</i>
<i>B Hisp.</i>	<i>Bellum Hispaniense (anonymous)</i>
Cass. Dio	Cassius Dio
Catull.	Gaius Valerius Catullus
Cels.	Celsus
'Αλ. λογ.	'Αληθής λόγος
Char.	Chariton
<i>Chae. Call.</i>	<i>De Chaerea et Callirhoe</i>
Cic.	Marcus Tullius Cicero
<i>Att.</i>	<i>Epistulae ad Atticum</i>
<i>Cluent.</i>	<i>Pro Cluentio</i>
<i>Deiot.</i>	<i>Pro rege Deiotaro</i>
<i>Fin.</i>	<i>De finibus</i>
<i>Leg.</i>	<i>De legibus</i>
<i>Mil.</i>	<i>Pro Milone</i>
<i>Phil.</i>	<i>Orationes Philippicae</i>
<i>Pis.</i>	<i>In Pisonem</i>
<i>Rab. perd.</i>	<i>Pro Rabirio perduellionis reo</i>
<i>Rep.</i>	<i>De republica</i>
<i>Tusc.</i>	<i>Tusculnae disputationes</i>
<i>Verr.</i>	<i>In Verrem</i>
Clem. Al.	Clemens Alexandrinus
<i>Protr.</i>	<i>Protrepticus</i>
Clod. Lic.	M. Clodius Licinius
Cratin.	Cratinus
Ctes.	Ctesias
Curt.	Quintus Curtius Rufus
Dem.	Demosthenes
<i>Meid.</i>	<i>Against Meidias</i>
Diod. Sic.	Diodorus Siculus
Dion. Hal.	Dionysius Halicarnassensis
<i>Ant. Rom.</i>	<i>Antiquitates Romanae</i>

Enn.	Quintus Ennius
<i>Ann.</i>	<i>Annales</i>
Epict.	Epictetus
<i>Diss.</i>	<i>Dissertationes ab Arriano digestae</i>
<i>Etym. Magn.</i>	<i>Etymologicum Magnum</i>
Eur.	Euripides
<i>Bacch.</i>	<i>Bacchae</i>
<i>Cyc.</i>	<i>Cyclops</i>
<i>El.</i>	<i>Electra</i>
<i>Frag.</i>	<i>Fragmenta</i>
<i>IT</i>	<i>Iphigenia Taurica</i>
<i>Rhes.</i>	<i>Rhesus</i>
Euseb.	Eusebius
<i>Praep. evang.</i>	<i>Praeparatio evangelica</i>
Hdt.	Herodotus
Heraclid. Lemb.	Heraclides Lembus
<i>Excerpta polit.</i>	<i>Excerpta politarium</i>
Hes.	Hesiod
<i>Theog.</i>	<i>Theogonia</i>
Hom.	Homer
<i>Il.</i>	<i>Ilias</i>
<i>Od.</i>	<i>Odyssea</i>
Hor.	Horace
<i>Epist.</i>	<i>Epistulae</i>
<i>Sat.</i>	<i>Satiriae or Sermones</i>
Hsch.	Hesychius
Ign.	Ignatius
<i>Ep. inter.</i>	<i>Epistulae interpolatae et epistulae suppositiciae</i>
<i>Sm.</i>	<i>Ad Smyrnaeos</i>
Jos.	Flavius Josephus
<i>AJ</i>	<i>Antiquitates Judaicae</i>
<i>Ap.</i>	<i>Contra Apionem</i>
<i>BJ</i>	<i>Bellum Judaicum</i>
<i>Vit.</i>	<i>Vita</i>
Liv.	Titus Livius
<i>AUC</i>	<i>Ab urbe condita libri</i>
<i>Perioch.</i>	<i>Periocha</i>
Luc.	Lucian
<i>Dial. D.</i>	<i>Dialogi Deorum</i>
<i>Dial. M.</i>	<i>Dialogi Marini</i>
<i>Lis cons.</i>	<i>Lis consonantium (Judicium vocalium)</i>
<i>De mort. Peregr.</i>	<i>De morte Peregrini</i>

<i>Prom.</i>	<i>Prometheus</i>
<i>Ver. hist.</i>	<i>Verae historiae</i>
Mart.	Martial
<i>Epigr.</i>	<i>Epigrammaton (vel spectaculorum) liber</i>
<i>Mart. Ign.</i>	<i>Martyrium Ignatii Antiocheni (martyrium Antiochenum)</i>
Men.	Menander
<i>Fragm. long.</i>	<i>Fragmenta longiora apud alios auctores servata</i>
Non.	Nonius Marcellus
Orig.	Origen
<i>C. Cels.</i>	<i>Contra Celsum</i>
<i>Comm. Mt.</i>	<i>Commentarium in evangelium Matthaei</i>
Ov.	Ovid
<i>Am.</i>	<i>Amores</i>
<i>Ars am.</i>	<i>Ars amatoria</i>
<i>Ib.</i>	<i>Ibis</i>
<i>Met.</i>	<i>Metamorphoses</i>
<i>Pont.</i>	<i>Epistulae ex Ponto</i>
Paus.	Pausanias
Philo	Philo Judaeus of Alexandria
<i>Abr.</i>	<i>De Abrahamo</i>
<i>Agr.</i>	<i>De agricultura</i>
<i>Decal.</i>	<i>De decalogo</i>
<i>Flacc.</i>	<i>In Flaccum</i>
<i>Ios.</i>	<i>De Iosepho</i>
<i>Leg.</i>	<i>Legatio ad Gaium</i>
<i>Mos.</i>	<i>De vita Mosis</i>
<i>Opif.</i>	<i>De opificio mundi</i>
<i>Poster. C.</i>	<i>De posteritate Caini</i>
<i>Prov.</i>	<i>De Providentia</i>
<i>Som.</i>	<i>De Somniis</i>
<i>Spec. leg.</i>	<i>De specialibus legibus</i>
<i>Virt.</i>	<i>De virtutibus</i>
Phot.	Photius
<i>Bibl.</i>	<i>Bibliotheca</i>
<i>Lex.</i>	<i>Lexicon</i>
Pl.	Plato
<i>Grg.</i>	<i>Gorgias</i>
<i>Phd.</i>	<i>Phaedo</i>
<i>Resp.</i>	<i>Respublica</i>
Plaut.	Plautus
<i>Amph.</i>	<i>Amphitruo</i>



<i>Asin.</i>	<i>Asinaria</i>
<i>Aul.</i>	<i>Aulularia</i>
<i>Bacch.</i>	<i>Bacchides</i>
<i>Capt.</i>	<i>Captivi</i>
<i>Cas.</i>	<i>Casina</i>
<i>Cist.</i>	<i>Cistellaria</i>
<i>Curc.</i>	<i>Curculio</i>
<i>F. Carb.</i>	<i>Fragment Carboriara</i>
<i>Men.</i>	<i>Menaechmi</i>
<i>Mil.</i>	<i>Miles gloriosus</i>
<i>Most.</i>	<i>Mostellaria</i>
<i>Per.</i>	<i>Persa</i>
<i>Poen.</i>	<i>Poenulus</i>
<i>Pseud.</i>	<i>Pseudolus</i>
<i>Rud.</i>	<i>Rudens</i>
<i>Stich.</i>	<i>Stichus</i>
<i>Trin.</i>	<i>Trinummus</i>
Plin.	Pliny (the Elder)
<i>HN</i>	<i>Naturalis historia</i>
Plut.	Plutarch
<i>Mor.</i>	<i>Moralia</i>
<i>Aet. Rom.</i>	<i>Aetia Romana et Graeca</i>
<i>Apophth. Lac.</i>	<i>Apophthegmata Laconica</i>
<i>An vit.</i>	<i>An vitiositas ad infelicitatem sufficiat</i>
<i>De fort. Rom.</i>	<i>De fortuna Romanorum</i>
<i>De garr.</i>	<i>De garrulitate</i>
<i>De sera</i>	<i>De sera numinis vindicta</i>
<i>Par. Graec. et Rom.</i>	<i>Parallela Graeca et Romana</i>
<i>Quest. conv.</i>	<i>Quaestiones convivales</i>
<i>Quomodo adul.</i>	<i>Quomodo adulescens poetas audire debeat</i>
<i>Reg. et imp. apophth.</i>	<i>Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata</i>
Vit.	<i>Vitae parallelae</i>
<i>Alex.</i>	<i>Alexander</i>
<i>Ant.</i>	<i>Antonius</i>
<i>Artax.</i>	<i>Artaxerxes</i>
<i>Brut.</i>	<i>Brutus</i>
<i>Caes.</i>	<i>Caesar</i>
<i>Cleom.</i>	<i>Cleomenes</i>
<i>Demetr.</i>	<i>Demetrius</i>
<i>Eum.</i>	<i>Eumenes</i>
<i>Fab. Max.</i>	<i>Fabius Maximus</i>
<i>Flam.</i>	<i>Flamininus</i>

<i>Per.</i>	<i>Pericles</i>
<i>Pomp.</i>	<i>Pompeius</i>
<i>Pyrrh.</i>	<i>Pyrrhus</i>
<i>Tim.</i>	<i>Timoleon</i>
<i>Tit. Flam.</i>	<i>Titus Flaminius</i>
<i>Fragment</i>	
<i>De prov. Alex.</i>	<i>De proverbii Alexandri</i>
Polyb.	Polybius
Posidon.	Posidonius
Ps.-Apoll.	Pseudo-Apollodorus (mythographer)
<i>Bibl.</i>	<i>Bibliotheca</i>
Ps.-Luc.	Pseudo-Lucian
<i>Am.</i>	<i>Amores</i>
Quint.	Quintilian
<i>Decl.</i>	<i>Declamationes</i>
<i>Inst.</i>	<i>Institutio oratoria</i>
Sall.	Sallustius
<i>Cat.</i>	<i>Bellum Catilinae</i> or <i>De Catilinae coniuratione</i>
<i>F. Amp.</i>	<i>Fragmenta ampliora</i>
<i>Hist.</i>	<i>Historiae</i>
<i>Iug.</i>	<i>Bellum Iugurthinum</i>
Sen.	Seneca (the Elder)
<i>Contr.</i>	<i>Controversiae</i>
<i>Contr. exc.</i>	<i>Controversiae earundem excerpta</i>
Sen.	Seneca (the Younger)
<i>Clem.</i>	<i>De clementia</i>
<i>Dial.</i>	<i>Dialogi</i>
1	<i>De providentia</i>
2	<i>De constantia sapientis</i>
3-5	<i>De ira libri 1-3</i>
6	<i>Consolatio ad Marciam</i>
7	<i>De vita beata</i>
<i>Epist.</i>	<i>Epistulae morales ad Lucilium</i>
Soph.	Sophocles
<i>Aj.</i>	<i>Ajax</i>
<i>Ant.</i>	<i>Antigone</i>
<i>OT</i>	<i>Oedipus Tyrannus</i>
Suidas	<i>Suidae Lexicon</i> (or <i>Suda</i> ).
Suet.	Suetonius
<i>Aug.</i>	<i>Divus Augustus</i>
<i>Caes.</i>	<i>Caesar</i>
<i>Calig.</i>	<i>Gaius Caligula</i>

<i>Claud.</i>	<i>Divus Claudius</i>
<i>Dom.</i>	<i>Domitianus</i>
<i>Galb.</i>	<i>Galba</i>
<i>Iul.</i>	<i>Divus Iulius</i>
<i>Ner.</i>	<i>Nero</i>
Tac.	Tacitus
<i>Ann.</i>	<i>Annales</i>
<i>Germ.</i>	<i>Germania</i>
<i>Hist.</i>	<i>Historiae</i>
Ter.	Publius Terentius Afer
<i>An.</i>	<i>Andria</i>
<i>Eun.</i>	<i>Eunuchus</i>
<i>Phorm.</i>	<i>Phormio</i>
Tert.	Tertullian
<i>Apol.</i>	<i>Apologeticus</i>
Theophr.	Theophrastus
<i>Char.</i>	<i>Characteres</i>
Thuc.	Thucydides
Tim.	Timaeus Grammaticus
<i>Lex.</i>	<i>Lexicon Platonicum</i>
Val. Max.	Valerius Maximus
Vett. Val.	Vettius Valens
Xen.	Xenophon
<i>An.</i>	<i>Anabasis</i>
Xen. Eph.	Xenophon Ephesius
<i>Epb.</i>	<i>Ephesiaca</i>

## 2. Papyri and Non-Literary Sources

<i>BGU</i>	<i>Ägyptische Urkunden aus den königlichen Museen zu Berlin : Griechische Urkunden.</i>
DB	Inscription of Darius I at Behistun.
<i>IG 4<sup>2</sup> 1</i> (Epidauros)	<i>Inscriptiones Graecae, Voluminis IV, editio minor, Fasc. 1. Inscriptiones Epidauri.</i>
<i>P Oxy.</i>	<i>Oxyrhynchus Papyri.</i>
<i>Urk</i>	<i>Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums.</i>

## 3. Early Jewish Literature

4QpNah.	The Commentary on Nahum from cave 4, also called 4Q169
11QTemple <sup>a</sup>	The Temple Scroll A from cave 11, also called 11Q19
<i>Apoc. Esdr.</i>	<i>The Apocalypse of Esdras</i>
<i>As. Mos.</i>	<i>Assumption of Moses</i>
T. 12 Patr.	Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs
<i>T. Benj.</i>	<i>Testament of Benjamin</i>
<i>T. Levi</i>	<i>Testament of Levi</i>
Tg.	Targum
<i>Frg. Tg.</i>	<i>Fragmentary Targum</i>
<i>Sam. Tg.</i>	<i>Samaritan Targum (Samaritan Pentateuch)</i>
<i>Tg. Esth. I</i>	<i>Targum Rishon to Esther</i>
<i>Tg. Esth. II</i>	<i>Targum Sheni to Esther</i>
<i>Tg. Jon.</i>	<i>Targum Jonathan</i>
<i>Tg. Lam.</i>	<i>Targum of Lamentation</i>
<i>Tg. Onq.</i>	<i>Targum Onqelos</i>
<i>Tg. Neof.</i>	<i>Targum Neofiti</i>
<i>Tg. Ps.-J.</i>	<i>Targum Pseudo-Jonathan</i>

## 4. Modern Works

ABD	Freedman, David Noel. <i>The Anchor Bible Dictionary</i> .
AE	<i>Année Epigraphique</i> (Paris).
AJP	<i>American Journal of Philology</i> .
ANEP	Pritchard, James Bennett. <i>The Ancient Near East in Pictures Relating to the Old Testament</i> .
ANRW	Vogt, Joseph, Hildegard Temporini, and Wolfgang Haase, eds. <i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung</i> .
APE	<i>American People's Encyclopedia</i> .
BAR	<i>Biblical Archaeology Review</i> .
BDAG	Bauer, Walter, and Frederick W. Danker. <i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> .
BDB	Brown, Driver, Briggs, Robinson, and Gesenius. <i>A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> .
CBQ	<i>The Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i> .
DELL	<i>Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine</i> .

- DNP *Der neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike.* Herausgegeben von Hubert Cancik und Helmuth Schneider.
- EB *Encyclopædia Britannica.*
- EDB Freedman, David Noel; Allen C. Myers and Astrid B. Beck. *Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible.*
- EDNT Balz, Horst Robert, and Gerhard Schneider. *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament.*
- EWLS Schwenck, Konrad. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der lateinischen Sprache.*
- EWNT Balz, Horst, and Gerhard Schneider. *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament.*
- FGrH Jacoby, Felix. *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker.*
- GKC Gesenius, Friedrich Wilhelm, E. Kautzsch and Sir Arthur Ernest Cowley. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar.*
- HALOT Koehler, Ludwig, Walter Baumgartner, M. E. J. Richardson, and Johann Jakob Stamm. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament.*
- HTR *Harvard Theological Review.*
- FGrH Jacoby, Felix. *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker.*
- FS Dinkler Andresen, Carl, and Günter Klein. *Theologia Crucis – Signum Crucis: Festschrift für Erich Dinkler zum 70. Geburtstag.*
- FS Käsemann Friedrich, Johannes, Wolfgang Pöhlmann, and Peter Stuhlmacher. *Rechtfertigung: Festschrift für Ernst Käsemann zum 70. Geburtstag.*
- ICC *International Critical Commentary.*
- IEJ *Israel Exploration Journal.*
- JBL *Journal of Biblical Literature.*
- JSNT *Journal for the Study of the New Testament.*
- KEKNT Meyer, H. A. W. *Kritisch Exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament.*
- L&N Louw, J. P., and Eugene Albert Nida. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains.*
- LCL *Loeb Classical Library.*
- LEW Walde, *Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch.*
- LSAF Lewis, Charlton T., and Charles Short. *A Latin Dictionary: Founded on Andrews' Edition of Freund's Latin Dictionary.*

LSJ	Liddell, Henry George and Robert Scott. <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> . 9th ed. Rev. and augm. throughout by Henry Stuart Jones.
MED	<i>Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners of American English</i> .
MM	Moulton, James Hope, and George Milligan. <i>The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament</i> .
NBL	Görg, Manfred, and Bernhard Lang. <i>Neues Bibel-Lexikon</i> .
NCBC	<i>New Century Bible Commentary</i> .
NCE	<i>The New Catholic Encyclopaedia</i> .
NE	Åström, Kenneth, Christer Engström, Kari Marklund and Statens kulturråd. <i>Nationalencyklopedin</i> .
NIBD	<i>Nelson's Illustrated Bible Dictionary</i> .
NIDOTTE	VanGemeren, Willem. <i>New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology &amp; Exegesis</i> .
NIGTC	<i>The New International Greek Testament Commentary</i> .
OCB	Metzger, B. M. and M. D. Coogan (eds.), <i>Oxford Companion to the Bible</i> .
OCD	Hornblower, Simon, and Antony Spawforth. <i>The Oxford Classical Dictionary</i> .
OEANE	Meyers, Eric M., and American Schools of Oriental Research. <i>The Oxford Encyclopedia of Archaeology in the Near East</i> .
OLD	Glare, <i>Oxford Latin Dictionary</i> .
PCG	Kassel, Rudolf, and Colin Austin. <i>Poetae Comici Graeci</i> .
Pauly-W	Pauly, August Friedrich; Wissowa, Georg; Wilhelm Kroll and Kurt Witte. <i>Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft: Neue Bearbeitung</i> .
RAAN	<i>Rendiconti Accademia. Archeologia Lettere Belle Arti Napoli</i> .
TBD	Elwell Walter A. and Philip Wesley Comfort. <i>Tyndale Bible Dictionary</i> .
TDNT	Kittel, Gerhard, Gerhard Friedrich, Geoffrey William Bromiley, and Ronald E. Pitkin. <i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> .
TDOT	Botterweck, G. Johannes, and Helmer Ringgren. <i>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament</i> .
TLL	<i>Thesaurus linguae latinae</i> .

TRE	Krause, Gerhard, Gerhard Müller, Sven S. Hartman, Gustaf Wingren, Frank Schumann, and Michael Wolter. <i>Theologische Realenzyklopädie</i> .
TWOT	Harris, R. Laird, Gleason Leonard Archer, and Bruce K. Waltke. <i>Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament</i> .
WNID	Gove, Philip Babcock, and Merriam-Webster Inc. <i>Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language, Unabridged</i> .
WUNT	<i>Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament</i> .
ZNW	<i>Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche</i> .
ZTK	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i> .

## 5. General

Att.	Attic
aor.	aorist
ca.	<i>circa</i> , about
cf.	<i>confer</i> , compare
col(s).	column(s)
con.	<i>contra</i> , against
DSS	Dead Sea Scrolls
ed.	editor (pl. eds.)
e.g.	<i>exempli gratia</i> , for example
et al.	<i>et alii</i> , and others
F	fragment
f.	following page ( <i>pl. ff.</i> )
fasc.	fascicle
Gk.	Greek
ibid.	<i>ibidem</i> , in the same place
i.e.	<i>id est</i> , that is
impv.	imperative
Lat.	Latin
LXX	Septuagint
ms(s).	manuscript(s)
n.	footnote ( <i>pl. nn.</i> )
N.B.	<i>nota bene</i> , note carefully
n.d.	no date
n.p.	no publisher

NT	New Testament
OT	Old Testament
par.	parallel
pr.	<i>prae-fatio</i> , preface
sg.	singular
s.v.	<i>sub voce/verbo</i> , under the word

## 6. Signs

In quotations, numbers in superscript (<sup>1</sup>) are used for verse numbers and numbers in bold (1) are line numbers. Square brackets are used when a word from the original text is inserted after the translation of that word, or when an implied word not present in the original text is inserted (fix [it] upon poles [πῆξαι ἀνὰ σκολόπεσσι]).<sup>1</sup> Parentheses are used when comments by the present author are inserted (that the king may forgive him [comment by the present author]).<sup>2</sup> In Latin texts, inequality signs (<*cives*>) are used to indicate a word inserted in the edition of the text.<sup>3</sup> Braces ({from you}) are used to indicate a word that is missing in an alternative reading.<sup>4</sup> In texts from Qumran, double brackets are used to indicate missing letters or words ([[. . .]]).<sup>5</sup> In quotations of original texts in footnotes, a vertical line (|) indicates verse endings in text written in hexameter or iambic verse.<sup>6</sup>

When it comes to references to ancient text, as far as possible when applicable, the numbers indicate book, chapter and paragraph/line, not pages in some specific edition of the text. There is confusion on this point, and references given in scholarly contributions are from time to time difficult to find. In texts by Herodotus, for instance, often only two numbers are used (Hdt. 3.125 [the LOEB-edition]); here, for the sake of clarity, a third number is used (Hdt. 3.125.3 [Rosén's edition]). When texts are known under different names, both names are mentioned when necessary (Sen. *Dial.* 6 [*Consol.*] 20.3); when texts have different numberings for other reasons than the above-mentioned, both numbers are given (Plin. *HN.* 8.47 [18]). When a text occurs as a fragment in the text of another author, the latter is given as well (Ctesias, *FGrH* 3c, 688 F 1b.1.10 [Diod. Sic. 2.1.10]).

<sup>1</sup> Hom. *Il.* 18.177.

<sup>2</sup> Hdt. 6.30.1.

<sup>3</sup> See, e.g., Cic. *Verr.* 2.4.26.

<sup>4</sup> See, e.g., Gen 40.19.

<sup>5</sup> See, e.g., 4QpNah (4Q169) *Frag.* 3+4 col. 1. line 7.

<sup>6</sup> See e.g., Hom. *Od.* 22.170–77.



## Chapter One

# Introduction

You know that after two days the Passover is coming, and the Son of Man will be handed over to be crucified.<sup>1</sup>

By these words the Matthean Jesus reveals what will occur within a few days. A present-day reader, with the actual outcome in mind, imagines Jesus thorn-crowned and nailed to a cross with outstretched arms, beneath a sign with the wording “King of the Jews,” between robbers and praying for the perpetrators. But what is the message of the text *without* knowledge of the actual outcome? A present-day reader views the text in the light of the well-known event on Calvary, but how would the text be read without Calvary? What vision would the expression εἰς τὸ σταυρωθῆναι trigger for a reader – or a listener – without knowledge of the execution of Jesus? In other words, what were the connotations of the concept presently labeled “crucifixion” before the execution of Jesus?

This prehistory of the punishment of crucifixion has been the subject of numerous studies. Text after text by ancient authors is presented. Studies on the passion of Jesus generally devote one or a few paragraphs to the prehistory of the punishment, where the authors refer to alleged crucifixion accounts in pre-Christian texts. These references – not least the terminology used in the references – are to be studied in the present investigation. The texts usually contain some of the familiar verbs ἀνασταυροῦν or ἀνασκολοπίζειν or the related nouns σταυρός and σκόλοψ in Greek texts, *crux* or *patibulum* in combination with a fitting verb in the Latin texts or the verb תלה in the Hebrew.

### 1. The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the present investigation has a resemblance to that which Martin Hengel expresses in his book *Crucifixion*: “The whole work is meant to be a preparation for a more comprehensive ‘*theologia crucis*’ of

---

<sup>1</sup> Matt 26.2 (NRSV).

the New Testament.”<sup>2</sup> In the end of the book, Hengel repeats his aim and adds some features to the result of his study.

I am well aware that this study remains essentially incomplete, for now at the end I should really begin all over again with a detailed exegesis of the evidence about the cross in the writings of Paul. As it is, I am breaking off where theological work proper ought to begin. The preceding chapters are no more than ‘historical preliminaries’ for a presentation of the *theologia crucis* in Paul.<sup>3</sup>

The present investigation is not intended to continue down the theological path, as wished by Hengel. Instead, it will, as Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn does, add a second consideration to the “historical preliminaries” given by Hengel. This will be done both by adding some new aspects as well as further stressing other aspects Hengel deals with briefly. These aspects, the ones mentioned by Hengel and developed by Kuhn, as well as those added by the present investigation, deal with the problem of which texts describe the punishment of crucifixion and how they do so. Before the question *wie es eigentlich gewesen* one ought to ask *wie es eigentlich geschrieben*. The latter question is not sufficiently addressed by the scholars studied here.

The investigation will begin by asking *which* pre-Christian texts describe the punishment Jesus suffered – and primarily *in what way* they do so philologically. When that is done, the focus will be moved, via the Old Testament and other ancient Jewish texts, to the New Testament. There, the texts describing the death of Jesus will be studied in the light of the older texts.

Before the theological issues come into question, before any historical conclusions should be drawn, and before the texts can become a partner in the hermeneutical process, the problem of what the texts in their present state describe ought to be resolved. This is what the present investigation attempts to do.

## 2. The Scholarly Discussion

### 2.1. Predecessors

The present scholarly discussion of crucifixion was initiated by the Flemish philologist and – in the scholastic sense – humanist JUSTUS LIPSIUS. It began when he published his essay *De Cruce* in 1593/4, after his re-conversion to the Catholic Church. His aim was, besides giving a testi-

---

<sup>2</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, xii.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 86.

mony of his devotion to Catholicism,<sup>4</sup> to explain some aspects of crucifixion in antiquity, not to deal with the theological aspects. Lipsius' basic question is "what the crux was, and what it was like; where, why, how, and for how long it was used."<sup>5</sup> His approach to the texts is the ancient historian's point of view,<sup>6</sup> although he is quoting fathers of the Church to a greater extent than pre-Christian authors. Lipsius describes how severely the ancient authors regarded crucifixion and offers an exposé of Latin and Greek terms (*crux* and σταυρός). He pinpoints the double usage of *crux*, in both a wide, general sense (*laxa*) and a narrower sense (*adstricta*). The narrower sense refers to some kind of execution on wood (in most examples), while the wide sense refers to various kinds of anxiety and suffering.<sup>7</sup>

He also discusses some Greek terms related to *crux* and *cruci figere*, mainly by references to Church Fathers. The Greek counterparts to *crux* are σταυρός and σκόλωψ, and both refer to various forms of standing poles, often pointed, according to Lipsius. He mentions, though, that Lucian probably connects σταυρός with the letter tau (Τ).<sup>8</sup> Lipsius appears to mean, with the help of the lexicographer Hesychius, that the verbs (ἀνα)σταυροῦν, (ἀνα)σκολοπίζειν, προσηλοῦν and κρεμᾶν [*sic*] all refer to crucifixion more or less.<sup>9</sup>

Lipsius spends several pages on the shape of the *crux*.<sup>10</sup> He distinguishes between *crux simplex*<sup>11</sup> and *crux compacta*,<sup>12</sup> terms that he apparently invented.

The *crux simplex* is some kind of vertical object of wood – a pole, an erected beam or the trunk of a tree.<sup>13</sup> A victim was tied with ropes (*affixio*) to this object<sup>14</sup> or impaled (*infixio*) upon it.<sup>15</sup>

The *crux compacta* was more complex, made by two joined wooden stakes or beams. "This is a full and true *crux*, by which the arms are spread out."<sup>16</sup> Thus, it is called *patibulum* "not only once" according to

<sup>4</sup> DE LANDTSHEER, "Justus Lipsius' *De Cruce* and the Reception of the Fathers," 106.

<sup>5</sup> LIPSIUS, *De Cruce*, 13 "Quid Crux, & Cuiusmodi fuerit: Vbi, Quare, Quomodo, & Quatenus vsurpata."

<sup>6</sup> DE LANDTSHEER, "Justus Lipsius' *De Cruce*," 104.

<sup>7</sup> LIPSIUS, *De Cruce*, 13–15.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 16; 23.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 15–18.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 18–27.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 18–21.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 21–22.

<sup>13</sup> For some illustrations, see LIPSIUS, *De Cruce*, 18–19.

<sup>14</sup> LIPSIUS, *De Cruce*, 18–19.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 20–21.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 21. "Hec est plena & vera Crux, in qua brachia etiam explicantur."

Lipsius, who in this way connects *patibulum* with spreading of the arms.<sup>17</sup> The *crux compacta* could be formed as the letter X (*crux decussata*), or the letter T (*crux commissa*). It could also have the horizontal beam attached below the top of the vertical beam (*crux immissa* [†]). To prove his point, Lipsius has several references and quotations from the Church fathers, fewer to the pre-Christian authors. It was on a *crux immissa*, Lipsius concludes, that Jesus had to suffer and die.<sup>18</sup>

He then aims at showing that several ancient peoples used crucifixion.<sup>19</sup> The Romans used it as their primary punishment, usually for slaves, which Lipsius exemplifies with several references to pagan authors.<sup>20</sup> When it comes to the execution of Jesus, Lipsius states that he was not sentenced by Jewish law (if so, he would have been stoned), but by Roman law (which the inscription *rex Iudeorum* on the *titulus* – the sign – ordered by Pilate, indicates).<sup>21</sup>

The discussion continues with Lipsius mentioning several features that, according to him, were part of a regular crucifixion (*modus vulgaris*). First, the victims were flogged with lashes (*flagella*) or rods (*virgae*) to make their sufferings worse.<sup>22</sup> Second, they were led to a place of execution, dragging or carrying the whole *crux* or a part of it (*aut certe eius partem*) on their shoulders.<sup>23</sup> Lipsius does not come to any conclusion on what Jesus carried – whether it was only the crossbeam or the whole cross. Third, the victims (as well as Jesus, according to Lipsius) were undressed before they were attached, usually to the already standing *crux*.<sup>24</sup> Fourth, in the majority of cases the victims were nailed to the *crux*. This is the reason behind the frequent usage of *προσηλοῦν* in the Greek texts. Lipsius translates the verb with the apparent neologism *clavi-fixio*.<sup>25</sup> Fifth, Lipsius appears to doubt the usage of a footrest (*suppedaneum*),<sup>26</sup>

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., 21.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., 27–29.

<sup>19</sup> Syrians, Jews, Egyptians, Persians, Africans, Greeks and Romans (Lipsius, *De Cruce*, 29–30).

<sup>20</sup> LIPSIVS, *De Cruce*, 30–32.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., 32–33.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., 36–39.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., 39–40.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid., 41–43.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., 43 (“Atque ab hac re Græcis passim ipsa crucifixio, προσήλωσις dicta : quasi dicas *clavi-fixio*”).

<sup>26</sup> Ibid., 45–47. Lipsius mentions, though, the discussions among Church Fathers about a fifth extremity of the *crux*, which is situated in the middle of the *crux* (quintum, quem in mediâ cruce collocant, vbi lignum transuersum scindit transitq (Lipsius, *De Cruce*, 47). Jeanine De Landsheer suggests that Lipsius refers to a device that was used when the two parts of the cross were joined together (DE LANDTSHEER, “Justus Lipsius’ *De Cruce*,” 112). This suggestion, however, seems awkward. Lipsius is not ex-

although he is aware that it is common in pictorial depictions (as his illustration on page 47 shows) and is mentioned in later sources. Sixth, he mentions the *titulus*, which was carried before the victims and sometimes hung around the neck of the suspended.<sup>27</sup> Seventh, Lipsius devotes three chapters to the question of the *causa mortis*: whether the death occurred by means of intense pain or starvation.<sup>28</sup> He chooses the former alternative. Lipsius suggests that the common method of hastening death by crushing the bones (*crurifragium*) was not used on a regular basis, perhaps only in Judea. Eighth and lastly, in a regular crucifixion there were soldiers stationed at the execution place to guard the corpse from being taken too early from the *crux* to be buried.<sup>29</sup>

He deals also with some rare forms of crucifixion (*modus rarus*).<sup>30</sup> The *patibulum* and *furca* punishments are not easy to envision, according to Lipsius. The ancient texts do not describe the punishments in detail. Lipsius suggests that a *furca* was a punishment tool in the shape of a fork or a yoke, placed on the victims' neck while their arms were attached to it.<sup>31</sup> They were then dragged towards the execution place and were flogged from time to time during the walk. After that, the *furca* was attached to a suspension tool in the form of a pole or a tree, and thus became more or less like a crucifixion. Lipsius relies here on several ancient authors, such as Livy, Plautus and Suetonius. It is noteworthy that Lipsius places the use of *patibulum* in the section of *modus rarus*. He also mentions a subsequent conjoining of the *patibulum* to the awaiting *crux*, referring to Plautus and the Latin grammarian and lexicographer Nonius.<sup>32</sup>

Lipsius mentions also some *crux* punishments in this section, and uses here *crux* in the sense of a simple pole. Victims were attached to such a *crux* for diverse purposes – custody, torture and sometimes execution by,

---

PLICIT enough to draw that conclusion. The text could be used as support for the existence of a *sedile* – the subsequently more or less famous sitting device of the cross (cf. BLINZLER, *Der Prozeß Jesu*, 360; HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 30; HENGEL and SCHWEMER, *Jesus und das Judentum*, 612; O'COLLINS, "Crucifixion," 1209; SCHNEIDER, "σταυρός," 573; TZAFERIS, "The Archaeological Evidence for Crucifixion," 99). But Lipsius is still not explicit enough to draw such a conclusion. Neither Lipsius nor the ancient authors mention any *sedile* in this sense.

<sup>27</sup> LIPSIVS, *De Cruce*, 48.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, 49–52.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 52–53.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 54–69.

<sup>31</sup> See LIPSIVS, *De Cruce*, 61, for illustrations.

<sup>32</sup> LIPSIVS, *De Cruce*, 57. Lipsius' comment on Plautus' text is, "Nota verba & seriem: *Ferre, deinde Affigi.*" His view becomes even clearer further down the same page.

for instance, fire or being torn to death by wild beasts.<sup>33</sup> Lipsius closes this section by mentioning that he has found some texts that describe the attaching of corpses to *crucēs*.<sup>34</sup>

He continues with a discussion on the material of Jesus' cross, and the fact that it was higher than the crosses of the criminals. He devotes the last chapters to the question of how long crucifixion was used. He marvels at how Constantine could turn the cross into a sign of salvation, and finishes with a *laudatiuncula crucis*.<sup>35</sup>

Lipsius' main contribution is his survey of ancient texts, as well as his having coined a great part of the nomenclature used in almost every subsequent study on the punishment of crucifixion. Due to his inclination to refer mainly to the fathers of the Church, his opinion of what the various terms designate is in danger of being colored by what might be called an ecclesiastical understanding of the death of Jesus. Thus, a study of the usage of the terms *before* the death of Jesus is needed. Lipsius' observation that *crux* could be used in both a wide, general sense (*laxa*) and a narrower sense (*adstricta*) will be approved by the present investigation.

In 1867 AUGUST ZESTERMANN published the book *Die bildliche Darstellung des Kreuzes und der Kreuzigung Jesu Christi historisch entwickelt*. The otherwise art-oriented book contains a lengthy study on the historical and philological background of the punishment of Jesus. This part was enlarged and published the following year in the article "Die Kreuzigung bei den Alten."

Zestermann begins with a survey of crucifixions in the ancient world. He concludes that this form of punishment was used regularly, at least during the last centuries B.C.E.<sup>36</sup> According to him, "ἀνασταυρόω, σκολοπίζω [*sic* (ἀνασκολοπίζειν?)]" may refer to impaling as well as crucifixion, but the punishment evolved chronologically from impaling to crucifixion.<sup>37</sup> Zestermann deals further with the terminology in his article "Die Kreuzigung bei den Alten." Here he states that the verbs ἀνασταυροῦν and ἀνασκολοπίζειν originally referred to impaling, since they are derived from σταυρός and σκόλοψ, which mean "pole." He repeats, although less explicitly, that the punishment of impaling preceded crucifixion. In later times the verbs were used in connection with crucifixion.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> Ibid., 66–68.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid., 68–69.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid., 69–78.

<sup>36</sup> ZESTERMANN, *Die bildliche Darstellung*, 9–13.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid., 11–13 (11).

<sup>38</sup> ZESTERMANN, "Die Kreuzigung," 339–51.

In addition to the verbs, Zestermann mentions the Greek nouns *σάνις* and *ἵκριον* (the latter with the comment that it appears to occur only in Christian texts) and the Latin nouns *crux*, *patibulum* and *stipes*. While *σταυρός*, *σκόλωψ*, *crux* and *stipes* refer to a vertical pole, *ἵκριον* and *patibulum* refer to the crossbeam.<sup>39</sup> It was the *patibulum* that the condemned carried to the place of execution.<sup>40</sup> Apparently Zestermann means that all the terms (except *ἵκριον*) could also refer to a whole cross in some texts.<sup>41</sup> Following Lipsius and using his Latin terminology, Zestermann describes three shapes of the crosses used by the Romans: the four-armed cross (*crux immissa* [†]); the three-armed cross (*crux commissa* [T]) and the so-called St. Andrew's cross (*crux decussata* [X]).<sup>42</sup>

Zestermann states, contrary to Lipsius in his opinion, that crucifixion was the worst form of punishment in the ancient world.<sup>43</sup> The victims could be both men and women. Criminals and persons from the lower classes of the societies were predominant.<sup>44</sup> The main method of crucifixion is possible to trace if only countries subjected to Rome are studied, according to Zestermann. The condemned were usually scourged before they were forced to carry the crossbeam to the execution spot. The accusation of the condemned was made public through an inscription (*titulus*). The execution was seldom carried out in regular execution areas. Instead, places in which the execution could make the most public impact were chosen. The condemned and the crossbeam were somehow hoisted up on the cross, on which the condemned usually was nailed naked and had to suffer a terrible death struggle.<sup>45</sup>

The investigation by Zestermann offers a detailed discussion on the various aspects of the crucifixion methods, as well as a critical dialogue with Lipsius. However, some aspects need further consideration. Zestermann does not say much about what a crucifixion is in his eyes. This becomes clear when the issue of impaling is in focus. Is impaling a kind of crucifixion, a previous form of crucifixion, or another form of punishment? Is suspension of a corpse a crucifixion? Is it possible to make such a detailed description of crucifixion as Zestermann does without determining all texts containing the relevant verbs and nouns as references to actual crucifixions? These questions will be addressed in the present investigation.

---

<sup>39</sup> ZESTERMANN, *Die bildliche Darstellung*, 13–23.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 15–18 (and n. 32).

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, 17.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, 26–48.

<sup>43</sup> ZESTERMANN, “Die Kreuzigung,” 351–60.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, 360–65.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, 365–404.

In the book *Kunstgeschichte des Kreuzes*, published in 1870, JACOB STOCKBAUER investigates the figurative expressions of the death of Jesus in monograms and crucifixes. Like Zestermann, Stockbauer offers a description of the historical background of the punishment. In this part, Stockbauer leans heavily on Zestermann's investigation, and will thus only be treated briefly.<sup>46</sup> Stockbauer adds, however, some observations that should be noticed. Having stressed that the punishment of crucifixion was familiar to the first readers of the Gospels, he says that it is only known to the modern world through second-hand information. Thus, the modern reader lacks something the Gospel authors took for granted. The description of the punishment in the Gospels is very sparse. In addition, the rich diversity of the execution form as depicted in the ancient texts causes some problems when it comes to tracing references to crucifixions, according to Stockbauer.<sup>47</sup> He thereby identifies one of the basic problems which the present investigation attempts to address.

In 1875 OTTO ZÖCKLER published the monograph *Das Kreuz Christi*. It was followed by an English translation in 1877, *The Cross of Christ*, which is the edition used in the present investigation. Zöckler is primarily occupied with the various shapes of crosses during the phases of history, mainly within Christianity. He does not add much of interest for the present investigation. However, in one part of the book named "the cross in the pre-Christian and extra-Christian religions," he offers some observations that have a bearing on this investigation.

Crucifixion, which Zöckler sees as one of the oldest and most widespread forms of death punishment, was an independent form of execution. It was a goal, complete in itself. Crucifixion was not a preparatory effort for another kind of terminating punishment. Instead, other forms of punishment could precede crucifixion. Crucifixion was then the final dishonoring exposure of the dead or dying victim. The parallel forms of punishment – impaling, hanging, etc. – could have the same function, according to Zöckler.<sup>48</sup>

Zöckler's method, to single out crucifixion as a distinct and complete punishment, will be considered further in the present investigation.

In 1878 HERMANN FULDA published the book *Das Kreuz und die Kreuzigung*. The book is an investigation of the crucifixion in Christian and non-Christian texts. Fulda wants to make a critical evaluation of Lipsius' *De Cruce* and the various studies that followed him.

A crucifixion is, according to Fulda, the suspension of a living person doomed to suffer an extended death struggle. Fulda calls for carefulness

---

<sup>46</sup> STOCKBAUER, *Kunstgeschichte des Kreuzes*, 8 n. 1.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, 7–8.

<sup>48</sup> ZOECKLER, *The Cross of Christ*, 50–51.



in the study of crucifixion due to the imprecise use of the terminology, especially in the non-Biblical ancient texts. This lack of defined terminology mirrors a tendency to treat all kinds of suspension punishment as one group.<sup>49</sup> Fulda points out the *furca* as an earlier form of punishment in the Roman world. According to Fulda, the *furca* was some kind of yoke placed on the neck and passed down each arm. The victim was then led around in disgrace.<sup>50</sup>

Fulda doubts that the tool used in crucifixion was always a cross in a regular sense, that is, a vertical pole with a horizontal crossbeam. He proposes that the executioners used whatever kind of construction they could find. This was at least the case when numerous crucifixions occurred simultaneously. It is unlikely that the soldiers constructed a regular cross for each condemned person in the mass crucifixions of Darius, Alexander the Great or Quintilius Varus. Often a simple pole was used, or a tree trunk or whatever was at hand, Fulda suggests.<sup>51</sup>

The *furca* was later replaced with a wooden bar, *patibulum*, otherwise used as a locking device on doors. The victim was attached to the bar and then forced to walk in humiliation. This form of punishment developed into a means of execution. The *patibulum* was sometimes attached to a standing pole and the result was a crucifixion.<sup>52</sup> On the basis of this form of punishment, Fulda concludes that texts mentioning “cross-bearing” refer to a carrying of the crossbeam, not the whole cross. Fulda is not aware of any text that refers to a raised cross that has the crossbeam already attached to it.<sup>53</sup> Thus, he has doubts about what he labels as the regular form of the cross (*crux immissa*).<sup>54</sup> Fulda suggests that the crucifixion of Jesus was carried out on a simple pole (*crux simplex*), without a crossbeam. Thus, in the case of Jesus it was not a *patibulum* that he carried, but a simple pole.<sup>55</sup> Fulda draws this conclusion from the use of the punishment in the ancient countries of the East, the passion narratives and the early fathers of the Church.<sup>56</sup>

Fulda’s major contributions are both his survey of the ancient texts and his critical reading of the previous investigations on the theme of crucifixion. Fulda’s investigation raises, however, some questions.

His view of impaling and its relation to crucifixion is somewhat unconventional. He observes that the ancient authors, Greek and Roman,

<sup>49</sup> FULDA, *Das Kreuz*, 57–79 (§ 10).

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, 116–17; 254–63 (excurs B).

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, 106–13 (§ 14).

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, 116–20.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, 118–21; 137–40.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, 120–21.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, 200.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, 219–20.

labeled impaling as “crucifixion.” Fulda draws the conclusion that they saw impaling as a crucifixion.<sup>57</sup> In spite of his own observation of the tendency among the ancient authors to treat the various suspension punishments as one group, he does not take into consideration the possibility that the shared terminology may indicate that both kinds of suspension simply were parts of a larger entity. There also appears to be a tension between Fulda’s definition of crucifixion as a slow and painful form of execution and his suggestion that impaling is a kind of crucifixion. Thus, the issue of definition and the relation between impaling and crucifixion need further consideration.

Fulda’s lengthy discussion of the shape of the cross and the use of the *patibulum* contains some features that need further discussion. While Fulda knows no texts that depict a complete raised cross, i.e., a vertical pole with an attached crossbeam, he does not offer any texts in support of his own thesis. Fulda’s discussion is to some extent ambivalent. He proposes that *σταυρός* and *crux* refer to a simple pole, but at the same time emphasizes the existence and use of the *patibulum*. When the *patibulum* is attached to the pole it is still a *σταυρός* or *crux*. During such a crucifixion the *σταυρός* or *crux* looks like a cross in the regular sense (*crux immissa*) – not a *crux simplex*. Hence, a simple pole when not in use, but often a complete cross when used. The meaning of *σταυρός/crux* and *patibulum* and their relationship to each other need further discussion as well.

In 1899 THEODOR MOMMSEN published his *Römisches Strafrecht*. In spite of the impact his study had on the knowledge of the Roman juridical system it only mentions crucifixion briefly. He refers to various usages of crucifixion. In oldest times the victim was undressed and his head was covered. A *furca* was put on his neck and the arms were tied to it. The *furca* and the victim were then brought to the execution place and lifted up and attached to a waiting pole.<sup>58</sup>

Mommsen offers a rather detailed account of how a crucifixion occurred. But he adds that crucifixion was only one form of capital punishment, besides others such as being put in a sack with poisonous snakes or burned to death.<sup>59</sup> Mommsen indicates that it was through the advent of Christianity that crucifixion came into focus in a new way – and in the end was abolished by Constantine. This possibility will be further discussed in the present investigation.

---

<sup>57</sup> Ibid., 113–16.

<sup>58</sup> MOMMSEN, *Römisches Strafrecht*, 918–21.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid., 921.

## 2.2. Intermediate Studies

In the years between the productive nineteenth century and the rise of the important debate between Hengel and Kuhn, a series of minor but nevertheless noteworthy studies on the subject of crucifixion were published.

In 1957 the book *Jerusalem und Rom im Zeitalter Jesu Christi* by ETHELBERG STAUFFER appeared. Stauffer devoted one chapter to crucifixion in ancient Palestine.<sup>60</sup> He offers a brief overview of the history and use of crucifixion in Palestine. Stauffer's book is often referred to in the literature on this subject.<sup>61</sup> He makes a distinction between the old Israelite custom of suspending corpses of killed or executed persons and crucifixion. He opposes the theory that Alexander Janneus was the first to use the punishment in Palestine and finds the punishment, which already the Persians used, in several older accounts from the region. Stauffer stresses the variation regarding both the terminology and the use of the punishment form.<sup>62</sup> Still, he acknowledges a series of features as elements of crucifixion. Beside the scourging, the carrying of the crossbeam and the nailing of hands and feet, Stauffer mentions the T-shape of the cross and the *titulus*.

In 1960 JOSEF BLINZLER published the book *Der Prozeß Jesu*, with one chapter and two *excursus* on the crucifixion of Jesus.<sup>63</sup> In 1969 the fourth, renewed and revised, version was published posthumously, which is the one used in the present investigation. Blinzler offers a brief overview of the history and use of crucifixion. As was the case with Stauffer, Blinzler's book is often referred to in the literature on crucifixion.<sup>64</sup> He attributes the origin of crucifixion to the Persians. Perhaps the punishment was created in order not to defile the soil, which was sacred to the god Ormuzd. The punishment was later used by Alexander the Great, his Diadochs and especially the Carthaginians, from whom the punishment reached Rome. Rome used crucifixion to secure peace for the Romans. Jewish law did not know crucifixion; instead it proposed stoning.<sup>65</sup> The overall method, also in the case of Jesus, was that the condemned was undressed and scourged, then nailed or tied to the crossbeam, which he

---

<sup>60</sup> STAUFFER, *Jerusalem und Rom im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, 123–27.

<sup>61</sup> E.g., BLINZLER, *Der Prozeß Jesu*, 359, 68, 75 (selection); CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 3, 43, 52, 61, 73, 91, 100; HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 75; WINTER, *On the Trial of Jesus*, 74, 90–96, 143.

<sup>62</sup> STAUFFER, *Jerusalem und Rom*, 127.

<sup>63</sup> BLINZLER, *Prozeß*, 357–84.

<sup>64</sup> E.g., BROWN, *The Death of the Messiah*, 2.316; CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 35; HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 25, 29, 31, 91; WINTER, *Trial*, 70, 74, 77, 105, 203.

<sup>65</sup> BLINZLER, *Prozeß*, 357–59.

himself carried to the execution place, where the vertical pole already was standing.<sup>66</sup>

In 1961 PAUL WINTER published the book *On the Trial of Jesus*, containing one chapter on crucifixion. In 1974 a revised second edition was released posthumously, which is the edition used in the present investigation. In the first half of the article, Winter criticizes the conclusion of Stauffer, who finds a connection between the Jews and the punishment of crucifixion before Hasmonean times. According to Winter, it is not possible to treat any of the texts Stauffer uses as examples of crucifixion. "The very fact that the Jews had no such institution as crucifixion was responsible for their not having a word for it," Winter concludes.<sup>67</sup> As punishment in Palestine, the crucifixion was introduced and used only by the Romans. In addition to the scourging, the carrying of the crossbeam and the nailing of hands, Winter proposes that the feet were left dangling.<sup>68</sup> He supports his thesis with the fact that the Gospels never mention any nailing of Jesus' feet.<sup>69</sup>

The seventh volume of *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* was published in 1964. It contained the article "σταυρός, σταυρόω, ἀνασταυρόω" by JOHANNES SCHNEIDER.<sup>70</sup> Schneider begins with the assumption that the punishment of crucifixion originated, or at least first came into use, among the Persians. Later the punishment was used by Alexander the Great, the Diadochs and the Carthaginians. According to Schneider the punishment came from the latter to the Romans, who called the execution tool *crux*. Greeks, and Romans during the days of the republic, did not crucify free men. Only barbarians did that.<sup>71</sup> Schneider states that this form of execution was regarded as one of the worst.<sup>72</sup> It was not prescribed by Jewish law. Idolaters and blasphemers could be hanged on a tree, but not as an execution. It occurred after stoning as an additional penalty. The suspension showed that the executed were cursed by God. The saying in Deuteronomy 21.23 was connected with crucifixion in Judaism, Schneider concludes.<sup>73</sup>

---

<sup>66</sup> Ibid., 360.

<sup>67</sup> WINTER, *Trial*, 93.

<sup>68</sup> Ibid., 95-96.

<sup>69</sup> Ibid., 95, n. 23. However, the revisers, Burkill and Vermes, mention the finding of the crucified male at Giv'at ha-Mivtar in 1968, which contradicts Winter's thesis (94, n. 19).

<sup>70</sup> The English translation of the volume, which is used here, was published in 1971.

<sup>71</sup> SCHNEIDER, "σταυρός, κτλ.," 573.

<sup>72</sup> Ibid., 573-74.

<sup>73</sup> Ibid., 573-74.

When it comes to the crucifixion of Jesus, Schneider notes that the Gospels do not have any special theology of the cross, as Paul does. The Gospels only tell the story of the crucifixion. They are kerygmatic and cultic retellings of the sacrificial death of Jesus. It appears nevertheless that the crucifixion of Jesus followed the current custom, although some Jewish practices were added – beside the stupefying drink and wine mixed with myrrh, the body was taken down from the cross on Sabbath evening. The form of the cross Jesus was nailed to resembled other crosses, perhaps higher than usual. It was an upright post with a crossbeam. Schneider adds that it stood alone, at some distance from the crosses of the two malefactors.

Schneider defines σταυροῦν outside the New Testament as meaning “to put up posts” or “to protect by a stockade.” The transferred sense “to crucify” is rare. In the Septuagint, it is used twice for חלה in the sense “to hang on the gallows.” In pre-Roman times the verb ἀνασταυροῦν meant “to fence around” or “to enclose” and was identical with ἀνασκολοπιζειν, according to Schneider. With Roman times came the meaning “to crucify.”<sup>74</sup>

CARL DANIEL PEDDINGHAUS discusses the punishment of crucifixion in the unpublished doctoral thesis *Die Entstehung der Leidensgeschichte* from 1965. Although the focus is on the passion of Jesus, Peddinghaus gives a survey of ancient texts in the first section of the thesis. His main contribution for the present investigation is his discussion of how to define “crucifixion.” Peddinghaus incorporates Stockbauer’s insight – the diversity in the implementation of the punishment – and proposes a two-level definition:<sup>75</sup> a narrow one with only executionary suspensions, and a wider one where also suspensions of corpses are included.

Peddinghaus sees a distinction between the West (Occident) and the East (Orient); in the former the executionary suspension was in use, while the latter used suspension of corpses.<sup>76</sup> In the West the punishment was used by the Carthaginians to suppress slaves and mercenaries and by the Greeks to punish high treason, while the East used it as an instrument of fear and triumph.<sup>77</sup> The punishment of crucifixion became known to the Romans through the Punic wars.<sup>78</sup> They used it to instill fear into slaves and other non-free humans.<sup>79</sup>

---

74 Ibid., 581–84.

75 PEDDINGHAUS, *Leidensgeschichte*, 12.

76 Ibid., 14.

77 Ibid., 15.

78 Ibid., 25.

79 Ibid., 31.

The main contributions of the intermediate studies are their distinct descriptions of a crucifixion in general and the crucifixion of Jesus in particular. Winther's reversed argument that the absence of terminology might reflect the absence of a punishment, as well as Peddinghaus' two-level definition, will be further developed. These authors do not quote the predecessors to any great extent, but offer a knowledge that is quite consistent with them.

### 2.3. Main Contributors

The two main contributions to the present discussion of crucifixion in the ancient Mediterranean world come from Martin Hengel and Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn. In 1975 Kuhn's first article on the topic, "*Jesus als Gekreuzigter*," was published. In the following year Hengel published the article "*Mors turpissima crucis*." In this article he criticizes several of Kuhn's conclusions. One year later Hengel addressed a larger audience with a revised and enlarged English translation of the article, published in book form with the title *Crucifixion*. This is the edition primarily used in the present investigation. Due to some issues connected with the translation, the German article will also be consulted. When it comes to Kuhn, he published in the years 1978 and 1979 two articles concerning the discovery of an allegedly crucified male in Giv'at ha-Mivtar.<sup>80</sup> Kuhn's most important contribution to the field, the article "Die Kreuzesstrafe während der frühen Kaiserzeit," was published in 1982. Kuhn responded to Hengel in this article, which is also the article mainly used in the present investigation. During 1978–83 the *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* was published. Kuhn was the author of the articles on ἀνασταυροῦν, κρεμαννύναι, ξύλον, σταυρός, σταυροῦν and συσταυροῦν.<sup>81</sup> In 1990, Kuhn wrote part of the article "Kreuz" in the *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*.<sup>82</sup> Finally, Kuhn wrote the articles related to crucifixion in the *Neues Bibel-Lexikon*.<sup>83</sup>

The aim of MARTIN HENGEL is to explore the Pauline "folly message of the cross" through a study of crucifixion in the ancient world, or as he put it in his summary of *Crucifixion*:

---

<sup>80</sup> KUHN, "Zum Gekreuzigten von Giv'at ha-Mivtar," 118–22, and "Der Gekreuzigte von Giv'at ha-Mivtar," 303–34.

<sup>81</sup> The English translation, *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*, which is used in the present investigation, was published in 1990–93.

<sup>82</sup> KUHN, "Kreuz," 713–25.

<sup>83</sup> KUHN, "Kreuz," 546–47; "Kreuzigung," 548–49; "Kreuztitel," 551 and "Kreuztragen," 551–52.

I have attempted to give a survey of the use of crucifixion as a penalty in the Greco-Roman world, as a contribution towards a better understanding of Paul's remark about the μωρία of the λόγος τοῦ σταυροῦ.<sup>84</sup>

Hengel's focus is the understanding of a central theme in Paul's theology. He begins with First Corinthians 1.18 and describes the folly message of a crucified Son of God through a series of quotations of extra-Biblical texts. By revealing the deep aversion against crucifixion in the Greco-Roman and Jewish world, Hengel portrays the oddness of the Pauline "word of the cross" – a "stumbling-block" for the Jews and "folly" for the gentiles. He describes the absence of the theme of crucifixion in general, and a crucified god in particular, in the mythical traditions of the ancient world. This aspect shows, according to Hengel, "the deep aversion from this cruelest of all penalties in the literary world."<sup>85</sup> This historical context sparked the Gnostic dogma of docetism, according to Hengel.<sup>86</sup>

The part of Hengel's book that is of main interest for the present investigation is that which begins in Chapter 4. Hengel intends to "make a further attempt to illuminate the attitude of the ancient world to crucifixion in more detail."<sup>87</sup> Hengel shows that crucifixion was used not only by the Persians, but by barbarian peoples in general.<sup>88</sup> While both Greek and Roman historians were fond of stressing that crucifixion was a barbarian punishment, the Greeks and later especially the Romans nevertheless used crucifixion from time to time. There is, however, a variation in the methods of crucifixion. The crucified victim could be either dead or alive – although a crucifixion in "the strict sense" required a living victim – and the use of a crossbeam is not always clear.<sup>89</sup>

Regarding the Greek terminology of crucifixion, Hengel mentions a peculiar feature. Neither ἀνασταυροῦν nor ἀνασκοπιζειν occur in any of the few detailed accounts of crucifixion in the pre-Roman texts. To describe the fate of the Persian satrap Artayctes, Herodotus uses the verb προσπασσαλεύειν, which Hengel translates as "to nail." This diversity in crucifixion methods continued into the Roman era. Hengel draws his conclusion:

---

<sup>84</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 87.

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.*, 14.

<sup>86</sup> "Thus we can understand all too well how in the pseudo-scientific popular Platonic arguments used in Gnosticism, this scandal, which deeply offended both religious and philosophical thought in antiquity, was eliminated by the theory that the Son of God had only *seemed* to be crucified. In reality he did not suffer at all" (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 21).

<sup>87</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 22.

<sup>88</sup> Cf. ZOECKLER, *The Cross of Christ*, 60.

<sup>89</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 24.

[C]rucifixion was a punishment in which the caprice and sadism of the executioner were given full rein. All attempts to give a perfect description of *the* crucifixion in archaeological terms are therefore in vain; there are too many different possibilities for the executioner.<sup>90</sup>

Hengel concludes that crucifixion as a capital punishment was a bloody event. Not only were the victims usually nailed to the cross; they were also tortured, mainly by flogging, prior to the crucifixion. This made crucifixion a gruesome reality in the minds of the people, not least to the Christians who were in danger of being subjected to it up to the time of the edicts of toleration in 311/313 C.E.

According to Hengel, crucifixion was the *summum supplicium*, the supreme penalty, among the Romans. It was widespread and frequent, in spite of the relatively scarce references from Roman times, according to Hengel (contra Kuhn). The punishment was primarily used on slaves and foreigners, but occasionally on Roman citizens guilty of serious crimes against the state. Crucifixion was a punishment that spread horror among the common people, not least among slaves, since crucifixion was a typical slave punishment.

Hengel treats crucifixion in the Greek-speaking world separately, since the sources are much fuller in Latin than in Greek texts, according to Hengel. He stresses that the punishment was used in the West as well as the East. To make a distinction between the Latin “West” and the Greek “East,” or even Persian “East” and the Greek “West,” would be a mistake. Several accounts of crucifixion occur in “Western” texts, as e.g., Herodotus shows. A feature that makes the study of crucifixion in the Greek texts difficult is the occurrence of a slightly corresponding punishment. In this unspecified punishment, named ἀποτυμpanισμός, the criminals were fastened to a *board* for public display, torture or execution. The punishment comes close to crucifixion in its aggravated form where the victims were nailed instead of being tied or put in irons. Beyond the disputed meaning of ἀποτυμpanισμός, there are sufficiently clear instances of crucifixion among Greeks. After he has mentioned authors like Plato, Diodorus Siculus, Polybius and Strabo, as referring to crucifixion in their works, Hengel makes an observation regarding the nature of the punishment in the Greek-speaking world.

Whereas it seems clear so far that crucifixion and impaling – the two are closely connected – appear in connection with crimes of *lèse-majesté* and high treason, or in the context of acts of war, in the Roman period this form of execution appears more fre-

---

<sup>90</sup> Ibid., 25.



quently as a punishment for slaves and violent criminals from among the population of the provinces.<sup>91</sup>

What is of interest for the present investigation is not primarily the evolution of the nature of the crime, but Hengel's remark about the close relation between impaling and crucifixion. Having noticed this, Hengel drops the theme of the relation between the two kinds of suspension. Hengel completes his study by devoting two pages to the question of crucifixion among the Jews. He concludes that Deuteronomy 21.23 plays an important role in the Jewish understanding of crucifixion.

Hengel's work has made a significant impact on the study of the theological implications of the crucifixion of Jesus in the letters of Paul. He has also deepened the understanding of the punishment of crucifixion in the ancient world. As noticed, Hengel has a different focus in his book than that of the present investigation. However, while his focus is on the theology of the cross in the letters of Paul, he deals with issues relevant for this investigation in his comparative study on the theme of crucifixion. Hengel's major contribution is his extended survey of the Greco-Roman texts. There are, nonetheless, some details in his discussion that call for further discussion.

First, there is no definition of "crucifixion." Hengel revolves around a definition on several occasions without making a definition. Instead he points out problems connected with the issue of definition. As noticed, Hengel calls attention to the fact that the form of crucifixion varied considerably.<sup>92</sup> However, the question is whether the variety Hengel identifies is sufficient. For example, how is crucifixion related to impaling? As Hengel noticed, the two punishments are closely connected – but how closely? Are they two distinct entities that could be studied separately, or is impaling a kind of crucifixion? In *Crucifixion* Hengel translates the verb ἀνασταυροῦν with both "crucifixion" and "impaling," and the undefined "fastened to a stake," without further explanation.<sup>93</sup> In his discussion of the fate of "the just man" in Plato's *Republic* he translates the verb ἀνασχινδυλεύειν with "impaled," but refers to it as a "crucifixion."<sup>94</sup> A discussion concerning impaling as a form of suspension and the relation between this suspension form and the verbs ἀνασταυροῦν and ἀνασκολοπιζειν is lacking in Hengel's book. This feature becomes even more acute if the ancient authors' ambivalent use of the verbs is taken into consideration. Thus, Hengel points out correctly that there is not always a

---

<sup>91</sup> Ibid., 76.

<sup>92</sup> Ibid., 24.

<sup>93</sup> E.g., "crucified" (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 26); "impaled" (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 74); "fastened to a stake" (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 24).

<sup>94</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 28.

clear distinction between whether the victim was dead or alive when crucified. But that is not the whole picture. It appears even more challenging to decide whether the victim was crucified at all.

Second, the lack of distinct definition makes some of the references rather unclear. The method used in the search for references to crucifixions is unclear. The texts Hengel refers to in his study of crucifixion contain various kinds of suspension. As a reader of Hengel's book one is not sure of what kinds of suspension he refers to. Consequently one is also uncertain about what Hengel is looking for in the ancient texts. Is it sufficient, for example, that one of the verbs ἀνασταυροῦν and ἀνασκολοπιζειν occurs in a text to define it as a reference to "crucifixion"? Another question is on what basis Hengel singles out crucifixion as a defined punishment in the ancient world. Is it possible at all to talk of crucifixion as a distinct entity in the ancient Greek texts prior to the crucifixion of Jesus? Hengel seems to interpret the situation like this, due to his use of the term "crucifixion" as a label for a whole series of texts. However, Hengel does not present much support for his decision. Thus, Hengel seems neither to define what he is looking for, nor to mention on what basis he judges a text to be a relevant crucifixion reference. It appears that not only the undefined punishment labeled ἀποτυμπανισμός causes problems in the search for crucifixion. As Hengel points out, it is sometimes difficult to draw a distinct line between an execution by suspension and a suspension of a corpse.<sup>95</sup> But a greater problem is that the punishment of impaling is even more difficult to separate from crucifixions, due to the fact that they share the basic terminology. Thus, it is possible to apply the problem Hengel identifies in connection with ἀποτυμπανισμός to impaling as well. The criteria by which the text selection occurs need to be clarified.

In his investigation Hengel notices a tendency in the later tradition to over-interpret ancient texts when he comments on the fate of Polycrates, when they "saw him as the prototype of the crucified victim."<sup>96</sup> Later he criticizes Mommsen for making "too little distinction between the various forms of executions."<sup>97</sup> It seems that Hengel may be in danger of repeating both of these mistakes. He identifies the problems but appears not to draw the appropriate consequences from them. The present investigation will consider the implications of what Hengel outlines in his significant contribution to the study of crucifixion, and thereby bring his observations one step further.

---

<sup>95</sup> Ibid., 24.

<sup>96</sup> Ibid., 24.

<sup>97</sup> Ibid., 39, n. 1.

The aim of HEINZ-WOLFGANG KUHN is to describe the punishment of crucifixion during the early Roman Principate.<sup>98</sup>

Das Ziel dieser Untersuchung ist es, die Wirklichkeit und die Wertung der Kreuzesstrafe in der Umwelt des Ältesten Christentums zu belegen, um damit den Kontext für eine präzisere theologische Erfassung der urchristlichen Deutungen der „sehr bestimmten Form“ des Tode Jesu, nämlich seines Todes am Kreuz, bereitzustellen. Insofern ist das, was hier vorgelegt wird, eine Voruntersuchung, die sich nur am Rande mit den urchristlichen Texten selbst beschäftigt. Es geht hier also um *‘historical preliminaries’*, mit denen auch MARTIN HENGEL in der englischen Fassung seiner gleich unten noch näher zu charakterisierenden Untersuchung die von ihm vorgelegte Arbeit über die Kreuzesstrafe kennzeichnet.<sup>99</sup>

Kuhn focuses on contextualizing the crucifixion of Jesus. While Hengel had the theology of Paul in mind, Kuhn has the crucifixion itself. The theological implications are discussed in his first article on the topic.<sup>100</sup> The overall chronological framework of Kuhn’s study is more limited than that of Hengel and the present investigation. However, Kuhn moves beyond his defined time span in several parts of the article and discusses, in addition to the crucifixion method itself, the definition, the terminology and the history of crucifixion. He begins with a survey of the oldest extra-Biblical and Biblical accounts of the execution of Jesus, before he deals with the issue of definition.

Kuhn stresses that the methods of crucifixion could vary to a great extent. Nevertheless, he delivers four characteristics that in his opinion constitute a crucifixion. First, it is a suspension. Second, it is a completed or intended execution. Third, the execution tool was a pole, with or without a crossbeam. Fourth, it resulted in an extended death struggle.<sup>101</sup>

In his discussion of the terminology of crucifixion, Kuhn focuses entirely on his defined time span. On this basis the main Latin terms used are *crux* and *patibulum*, while the Greek counterparts are derivatives of the stem *σταυρ-*, the verbs *ἀνασκολοπιζειν*, *κρεμαννύναι* and *προσηλῶν* and the noun *ξύλον*. Kuhn mentions the verbs *הלך* and *גלגל*, and the later *הקל*, which he states is used in the Hebrew and Aramaic texts from Tannaitic times.

According to Kuhn it is difficult to give an exact account of the history of crucifixion. He begins with Herodotus and notes that Herodotus mentions crucifixion in connection with the Medes and especially the Persians. Kuhn points out the story of Darius’ crucifixion of Sandoces as

<sup>98</sup> Kuhn defines “die frühe Kaiserzeit” as extending from Augustus (27 B.C.E. – 14 C.E.) to Antonius Pius (138–161 C.E.).

<sup>99</sup> KUHN, “Die Kreuzesstrafe,” 650–51.

<sup>100</sup> KUHN, “Jesus als Gekreuzigter,” 1–46.

<sup>101</sup> KUHN, “Die Kreuzesstrafe,” 679.

important, since it fits well within his above-mentioned definition. Sandoces was crucified, but when Darius came to better thoughts he changed his decision and released the crucified, but still living, Sandoces. According to Kuhn the accounts of clear crucifixions are rare in the poetic, mythological and philosophical texts of the pre-Hellenistic Greek world. In the texts from the Hellenistic and Roman times the number of accounts increases, but drops significantly during the first 150 years of the Common Era.

In his detailed survey of texts, in which he moves within his defined time span and applies his definition, Kuhn acknowledges the problems connected with this task and excludes texts that do not refer to obvious crucifixions. Kuhn describes his intention as:

1. Sammlung und Sichtung von Belegen auch für die angrenzenden Zeiträume.
2. Sorgfältige und kritische Erwägungen über Umfang und Art der zur Verfügung stehenden Quellen.
3. Beantwortung der Frage, welchen antiken Hinweise auf die Kreuzesstrafe – über die Zeugnisse für vollzogene Kreuzigungen hinaus – vor allem Rückschlüsse auf die Praxis zulassen.<sup>102</sup>

Kuhn then presents 27 references, with some sub-references, to crucifixions, geographically and chronologically categorized. In four thematic chapters he discusses various issues related to crucifixion, during the first two centuries C.E.

He begins with a discussion of which groups were subjected to crucifixion. The usual victims were persons from the lower levels of the society, i.e., predominantly slaves and freedmen, rebels and criminals. Being both cruel and shameful the crucifixion did not fit the higher levels of the society. Kuhn points out (contra Hengel) that it is difficult to tie formulas such as *summum supplicium*, *ultimum supplicium* directly to crucifixion, since they are used for various forms of capital punishments. Thanks to the extended death struggle and preceding torture, mainly by flogging, the crucifixion was regarded as a particularly cruel execution form. The theme of cruelty of crucifixion is present in the studied texts, but, according to Kuhn, surprisingly absent in accounts of the Gospels. A rather similar tendency is to be found when it comes to the theme of the shamefulness of crucifixion. The sources that describe the shame of the cross from the defined time span are rare.

Kuhn's article has deepened the understanding of punishment of crucifixion during the early Principate. Through his critical reading of the ancient texts, also outside the defined time span, Kuhn has pointed out what

---

<sup>102</sup> Ibid., 690.

he considers to be problems in earlier investigations. He has also created a textual basis for the study of crucifixion in the defined time span through his critical reading. As mentioned earlier, Kuhn also has another focus in his article than that of the present investigation, but during his detailed survey of the Greco-Roman texts he makes several observations that are relevant for this investigation. From this point of view Kuhn's major contributions are his discussions about the definition of crucifixion and his critical reading of the ancient texts. Kuhn's critique of Hengel's investigation will also be taken into consideration. Nevertheless, some details in his article call for further discussion and three weaknesses will be addressed.

First, Kuhn does make a clear definition of crucifixion, a definition of what *he*, i.e., a citizen of the (post-) Christianized Western world, means by crucifixion. It is essential for scholars to define the terminology they use. This will also be done by the present investigation. It is natural to take a definition as one's point of departure. However, the question of what *the ancient authors*, i.e., pre-Christian Mediterranean peoples, meant by crucifixion is just as important. To be more exact, what did the ancient authors mean when they used, e.g., ἀνασταυροῦν and ἀνασκολοπιζειν? Is the meaning of, e.g., ἀνασταυροῦν the same when used by a Christian author in the second century as it was when used by an author during the fourth century B.C.E.?

Second, Kuhn focuses on "die frühe Kaiserzeit," a time when crucifixion seems to have become a defined punishment. The question is whether this also is the case in the pre-Roman texts that Kuhn refers to as "crucifixions." It appears that his methods to determine a text as a reference to crucifixion are not necessarily applicable to, e.g., the Greek texts from Archaic or Classical times. Kuhn assumes that crucifixion was a defined entity in the older texts as well, which may be awkward. As a consequence, Kuhn could be in danger of repeating the mistake he observes in Hengel's investigation, when he labels seemingly undefined suspensions in the older Greek texts as "crucifixions."

Third, the issue Kuhn addresses when he points out the problem of determining some of the ancient texts in focus as references to crucifixion seems also relevant when dealing with Greek and Latin texts from the first centuries C.E. It appears not only to be difficult to use Kuhn's time-defined method on the older texts, as the previous comment suggests, but also that the problems connected with the older texts are present in the texts from his defined time span. Kuhn indicates that the sole appearance of a verb, e.g., ἀνασταυροῦν, is not sufficient to track down relevant references of crucifixion. Still, Kuhn uses that very method himself. He identifies the problem when dealing with the older Greek texts, but the

question is whether the problem is also relevant when dealing with some of the Greek and Latin texts from the first centuries of the Common Era. Do all texts that Kuhn refers to from this era specify what kind of suspension they describe?

In his investigation Kuhn identifies several important problems related to the search of crucifixion references and his detailed definition is of great value. The present investigation attempts to bring Kuhn's contribution further by applying his definition, taking the ancient authors' own use of the terminology into consideration, and drawing out the consequences of some of the problems Kuhn identifies.

#### 2.4. Recent Studies

In 1992 the *Anchor Bible Dictionary* was published, which contained GERALD O'COLLINS' article "Crucifixion."<sup>103</sup> An unusual feature of O'Collins' article is that he labels suspensions of corpses as "crucifixions."<sup>104</sup> When it comes to crucifixion among non-Romans, O'Collins mentions Herodotus' references of crucifixion as a form of execution among Persians (with references to Hdt. 1.128.2; 3.125.3, 132.2 and 3.159.1), as well as several other ancient peoples. The Romans may have acquired the practice from the Carthaginians.<sup>105</sup>

Like Hengel, O'Collins mentions that criminals in the Greek-speaking world were sometimes fastened to a board, *tympanum*, for public display. The punishment came close to crucifixion when they were nailed to the board instead. From time to time the Greeks, such as Alexander the Great, used crucifixion.<sup>106</sup> O'Collins notices a shift in crimes punished by crucifixion. In pre-Roman times crucifixion was used in the context of war or as punishment for high treason in the Greek-speaking East. During Roman rule crucifixion was also used to punish slaves and criminals.<sup>107</sup> During the Hasmonean period crucifixion was occasionally practiced among the Jews. O'Collins mentions also that Deuteronomy 21.22–23 was connected with crucifixion in pre-Christian times, as shown by Qumran documents.<sup>108</sup>

The crucifixion became popular among the Romans since it was easier to carry out than other severe punishments, and it was useful as a public spectacle. Good Roman citizens were horrified by this punishment, but they were not in danger of being subjected to it. Crucifixion was useful

---

<sup>103</sup> O'COLLINS, "Crucifixion," 1207–10.

<sup>104</sup> *Ibid.*, 1207.

<sup>105</sup> *Ibid.*, 1207.

<sup>106</sup> *Ibid.*, 1207.

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid.*, 1207.

<sup>108</sup> *Ibid.*, 1207.

during war to strengthen the morale of the Roman troops – and to weaken that of their enemies.<sup>109</sup> Although there was a regular form of crucifixion, the executioners could vary the method of crucifixion according to their own pleasure.<sup>110</sup>

O'Collins' article offers much knowledge in few pages of a handy lexicon. Still, some features need further consideration, such as the issue of definition (is a suspension of a corpse a "crucifixion"?) and how much knowledge a present-day reader can get from the ancient texts.

The book *The Crucifixion of Jesus – History, Myth, Faith* by GERARD SLOYAN was published in 1995. This book is mainly occupied with the death of Jesus from a theological perspective, but deals also with the question of what kind of ancient punishment crucifixion was. Having concluded that Jesus died a both shameful and painful death, Sloyan turns to the torture of crucifixion. In this part Sloyan makes an observation of importance for the present investigation, when he identifies the often unspecified accounts of assumed crucifixions.<sup>111</sup> It is often impossible to decide whether victims were dead or alive while being impaled, hanged or crucified. It is also hard to determine whether nails were used and what the cross looked like.

However, his observation appears to need further consideration. Sloyan still defines one of Herodotus' apparently unspecified texts, when he refers to Herodotus 1.128 as a text "where Astyages the Median impaled (*aneskolópise*) the Magians."<sup>112</sup>

In his monograph *Ancient Jewish and Christian Perceptions of Crucifixion*, published in 2008, DAVID W. CHAPMAN investigates the perceptions of crucifixion among Jews and Christians. Although Chapman focuses on the *perception* of crucifixion, he builds his investigation on texts that he assumes to be references of crucifixion. Chapman's major contribution for the present investigation is his identification of the lack of clear boundaries between the various suspension punishments. It is often difficult to "differentiate too rigidly categories of 'crucifixion,' 'impalement,'" Chapman suggests.<sup>113</sup> This suggestion will be approved by the present investigation.

What needs further consideration is to draw the full consequences of Chapman's observations. Chapman continues down the path entered by Peddinghaus – a two-level definition – and hesitates to label all suspen-

<sup>109</sup> Ibid., 1207–08.

<sup>110</sup> Ibid., 1208–09.

<sup>111</sup> SLOYAN, *The Crucifixion of Jesus*, 14–15.

<sup>112</sup> Ibid., 15.

<sup>113</sup> CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 32.

sions of human bodies as instances of crucifixions.<sup>114</sup> But, having said that, Chapman still leans heavily on Hengel's investigation and labels a whole series of texts as crucifixions – even evident post-mortem suspensions, i.e., outside his own definition. However, Chapman's suggestion to use the label "suspension" for punishments that do not cohere with the punishment of "crucifixion" in the normal English sense will be adopted in the present investigation.

### 3. Basic Problems and Method

The source material of the present investigation is the preserved and accessible Greek, Latin and Hebrew/Aramaic literature from the advent of written texts in the studied languages until approximately the time when the New Testament texts were completed. Later texts are left out in an effort to limit the possibility of reading the texts – and understanding the terminology – in the light of the execution of Jesus.<sup>115</sup> Hence, early Christian texts outside the New Testament will not be taken into consideration here.<sup>116</sup> Moreover, due to the vast quantity of source texts, the study of secondary literature cannot be exhaustive.

As has been said, the present investigation is intended to add some essential features to the efforts made by Hengel, challenged by Kuhn and prepared by Lipsius *et al.* This will be done by further stressing aspects that occur briefly in these investigations as well as adding some new aspects. To achieve this, two interrogatory fields must be addressed: the questions of terminology and definition. These fields are mutually related insofar as a decision made on the one side affects the outcome of the other side.

---

<sup>114</sup> Ibid., 32.

<sup>115</sup> Pictorial descriptions of the death of Jesus are also left out simply by the fact that they are not literary and apparently are of later date. The known depictions of the death of Jesus (see, e.g., REFSUM, *Kors/krucifix*, 1.10–13) may, however, add some knowledge if they are shown to be early and not affected by the growing Christian theological traditions concerning the death of Jesus. This is also true regarding the so-called *staurogram* found in early Christian manuscripts (see, e.g., HURTADO, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts*, 135–54).

<sup>116</sup> These texts as well as their non-Christian parallels and pictorial descriptions up to the time of Constantine will be the subject of a separate and methodologically different study.



### 3.1. The Terminology

The basic list of terms used in the present investigation in the effort to find texts was built on the terms used in the Greek text of the New Testament. The next step was to add the Hebrew/Aramaic and Latin counterparts through a comparative study of ancient translations. This list was then expanded with terms mentioned by the earlier investigations studied above. The sole reading of texts in translation has also added terms. The terminology behind every form of suspension in the texts has been studied. On this basis, a search list containing the relevant stems was created.<sup>117</sup>

The first terms that call for attention are verbs derived from the *σταυρ-*stem, which is the one mainly used in the New Testament. In this group are *σταυροῦν*, with or without the prefix *ἀνα* – as well as the assumed counterpart *ἀνασκοποῦν* (although not used in the New Testament). As has been seen in the overview of previous research, *ἀνασταυροῦν* and *ἀνασκοποῦν* are connected, which also makes the stem *σκολοπ* interesting. Not least the relation between these verbs will be studied.

In close relation to the former group are some nouns that are related to the New Testament name for the device onto which Jesus was executed, the *σταυρός*. The Latin counterpart appears to be *crux*, and is thus of interest. The Hebrew language appears to lack a specific term for a suspension tool used in the suspension of humans. Instead the generic *עץ* is used, a common noun denoting “wood.” Both Greek and Latin texts could use comparable generic nouns in the same way (*ξύλον*, *δένδρον* and *lignum*, *arbor*). Also related are various terms denoting the shape or parts of constructions that could be used as suspension tools, particularly the common *σκόλωψ*, which is semantically close to *σταυρός*, but also such as *χάραξ*, *stipes*, *furca* and *patibulum*. It will be asked how and in what sense these nouns are used in the ancient texts.

Another group of terms is the one that appears to focus upon the act of suspension itself. In Acts 5.30 the common verb *κρεμαννύναι* refers to the crucifixion of Jesus. This verb appears to be used in many different situations. The phrase *עץ (ה) עולה*, which is of interest in the present investigation, is usually translated by *κρεμαννύναι* and *ἐπὶ ξύλου* in the

---

<sup>117</sup> This list was then used in mainly computer-based searches of the studied text corpus. Wildcards (? and \*) and boolean operators (AND, OR, and NOT) are used in searching. A question mark (?) can usually be used to substitute a single character (?? for two characters, etc.) and an asterisk (\*) can substitute zero or more characters. Thus, a search of \*σταυρ\* will find inflected forms of *ἀνασταυροῦν*, *σταυροῦν* and *σταυρός*. The context of the hits and parallel texts, if there were any, was then studied, which resulted in the occurrence of some additional terms as well. This led to new searches, and so on.

Septuagint.<sup>118</sup> The Latin counterpart of κρεμαννύναι and ἤλθ appears to be *suspendere* and *tollere* which also will be taken into consideration.<sup>119</sup> κρεμαννύναι, ἤλθ/ἄλθ and (*sus*)*pendere* share more or less the same range of meaning and denote “hang up” in the broadest sense. However, the verb κρεμαννύναι, with or without the prefix ἀνα-, has been assumed to refer to crucifixions by the studied scholars and will thus be studied more closely. To this group belongs also a series of verbs built on the verb ἄρτᾱν (ἀναρτᾱν, ἐξαρτᾱν, προσαρτᾱν).<sup>120</sup>

The next group contains verbs that allude to an act of nailing, such as προσηλοῦν, κατ- or καθηλοῦν and προσπασσαλοῦν, as well as related nouns (ἦλος; πάσσαλος; *clavi*). The verbs are of interest due to the fact that they may be more distinct in their meaning than, e.g., ἀνασταυροῦν, in the sense that they indicate that an act of nailing was a part of the suspension.

Related to the previous group are some terms that refer to the act of attaching, but not necessarily nailing. In this group πηγνύναι, προσδεῖν and *affigere* fit. The first verb, πηγνύναι, is also used in combination with the prefix ἀνα- or προσ-. προσπηγνύναι is used in Acts 2.23 as a reference to the crucifixion of Jesus.

The last group is a cluster of verbs with disparate meaning and use, such as ἀναπεῖρειν, ἀποτυμπανίζειν and ἀνασκινδυλεύειν. As has been seen, the problem with the verb ἀποτυμπανίζειν is addressed by Hengel, and is thereby worth notice.<sup>121</sup> The verb ἀνασκινδυλεύειν is interesting since it occurs in Plato’s famous text on the fate of the just man.<sup>122</sup> ἀναπεῖρειν is interesting since it appears to be connected with impaling, which is challenging as far as its connection with crucifixion is concerned.

The usage of these disparate but yet associated (all used in connection with bodily human suspensions) terms will be studied. The terminological question is simply, when and in what sense are these terms used?

### 3.2. The Definition

To answer the question asked above, how the *ancient* terminology is used, the question of the *contemporary* terminology is fundamental. What kind of phenomenon is being asked about in the present investigation? In other words, what is a crucifixion? What kind of actions does the label

<sup>118</sup> Gen 40.19; Deut 21.22; Josh 8.29, 10.26; Esther 5.14, 8.7 (LXX).

<sup>119</sup> Gen 40.19; Acts 5.30 (Vulgate).

<sup>120</sup> These latter verbs are of interest since the verb ἀναρτᾱν occurs in a text by Diodorus Siculus that is of interest; it describes an execution with a resemblance to crucifixion (Diod. Sic. 33.15.1 [Posid. F 110.5-9]).

<sup>121</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 70-71.

<sup>122</sup> Plato, *Resp.* 362A.

“crucifixion” encompass when used in connection with bodily punishments?<sup>123</sup> The aim here is to coin an implied definition of what it is that will be studied in this investigation. At the end of the investigation the question of definition will once again come into focus for an evaluation in the light of the studied texts.

The punishment of crucifixion is ranked among the capital punishments of the ancient world. The article on crucifixion in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* goes as follows.

Crucifixion – an important method of capital punishment, particularly among the Persians, Seleucids, Carthaginians, and Romans from about the 6th century BC to the 4th century AD. Constantine the Great, the first Christian emperor, abolished it in the Roman Empire in AD 337, out of veneration for Jesus Christ, the most famous victim of crucifixion.<sup>124</sup>

The English label “crucifixion” – a capital punishment – contains some additional features, which become visible in *The Oxford English Dictionary* definition of “crucifixion”:

**crucifixion** 1. a. The action of crucifying, or of putting to death on a cross. b. *spec. the Crucifixion*: that of Jesus Christ on Calvary.<sup>125</sup>

According to the same lexicon, “to crucify” is defined as:

**crucify** 1. a. *trans.* To put to death by nailing or otherwise fastening to a cross; an ancient mode of capital punishment among Orientals, Greeks, Romans, and other peoples; by the Greeks and Romans considered especially ignominious.<sup>126</sup>

The *MacMillan English Dictionary* offers these definitions of the same terms.

**crucifixion** noun 1 [C/U] a method of killing someone by fastening them to a CROSS with nails or rope 2 **the Crucifixion** the occasion when Jesus Christ was killed on the CROSS according to the Bible.<sup>127</sup>

**crucify** verb [T] 1 to kill someone by fastening them to a CROSS with nails or rope.<sup>128</sup>

*Webster’s Third New International Dictionary* follows the same pattern:

<sup>123</sup> The term can also be used as an informal label for being harshly criticized by, e.g., the media – a spiritual crucifixion. Cf. s.v. in the *MacMillan English Dictionary*: “**crucify** ... 2 *informal* to criticize someone in a very cruel way: *I’m going to get crucified by the media for this.*”

<sup>124</sup> S.v. *EB*.

<sup>125</sup> S.v. *Oxford English Dictionary*.

<sup>126</sup> S.v. *Oxford*.

<sup>127</sup> S.v. *Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners of American English*.

<sup>128</sup> S.v. *Macmillan*.

**crucifixion** **1 a** : the act of crucifying **b** *usu cap* : the crucifying of Christ – *usu.* used with the **2** : the state of one who is crucified : death upon a cross **3** : extreme and painful punishment : intense persecution, affliction, or suffering : TORTURE : mental suffering for a principle or cause.<sup>129</sup>

**crucify** **1** : to put to death by nailing or binding the hands and feet to a cross **2** : to destroy the power or ruling influence of : subdue completely : MORTIFY (they that are Christ's have *crucified* the flesh — Gal 5:24[AV]) **3 a** : to treat cruelly (as in severe punishment) : TORTURE, TORTURE **b** : to harry, persecute, or pillory esp. for some cause or principle : DENIGRATE (- a political leader).<sup>130</sup>

Thus, in the English-speaking world a crucifixion is an *execution performed by attaching a victim to a cross*. Kuhn's elaborate definition is close to this, but adds two essential features.

Für die Zwecke unserer Darstellung muß aufgrund der antiken Quellen eine abgrenzende Bestimmung dafür versucht werden, was hier unter Kreuzesstrafe im eigentlichen Sinn verstanden wird: Gemeint ist eine durch jegliche Art von 'Aufhängen' vollzogene (oder beabsichtigte) Hinrichtung an einem Pfahl oder Ähnlichen (weithin in unserer Zeit wohl ein Pfahl mit einem Querbalken), für die das Andauern der Todesqual im Gegensatz zu einem Erhängen durch Strangulation, aber auch zur Pfählung wesentlich ist (das Kreuz mit Querbalken war in urchristlicher Zeit wohl am ehesten als *crux commissa*, also wie ein großes T, gestaltet).<sup>131</sup>

Kuhn delivers four characteristics that in his opinion constitute a crucifixion. Features added to the hitherto mentioned ones are in italics. First, it is a suspension. Second, it is a completed *or intended execution*. Third, the execution tool is a pole, with or without a crossbeam. Fourth, *it results in an extended death struggle*.

Chapman follows this position and hesitates to label all suspensions of human bodies as instances of crucifixion.

This thesis, however, following traditional English usage, will continue to use "crucifixion" to mean the executionary suspension of a person on a cross-shaped object (allowing for a certain flexibility in shapes).<sup>132</sup>

The term "crucifixion" is used in the present investigation when referring to a punishment that contains the normal English definition (an execution; on a cross) as well as Kuhn's added characteristics (the execution attempt could have been aborted; an extended death-struggle). This is in harmony with the common opinion of what a crucifixion is and will be called *a traditional view*. A crucifixion is that which happened to Jesus on Calvary according to the mainstream traditions of the church.

<sup>129</sup> S.v. *Webster's Third New International Dictionary*.

<sup>130</sup> S.v. *Webster's*.

<sup>131</sup> KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 679.

<sup>132</sup> CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 32.

It follows that the suspension of a corpse as well as the custom of suspending a human being by forcing a pointed pole into the abdomen or rectum – called “impaling” in the present investigation – ought to be excluded from the label “crucifixion.” When the label “crucifixion” is used in the present investigation it refers to:

*An attempted or completed execution by suspension, in which the victim is nailed or tied with his limbs to a vertical execution tool, usually a pole, with or without crossbeam, and thereby publicly displayed, in order to be subjected to an extended, painful death struggle.*

### 3.3. The Basic Questions of the Investigation

Having the two central areas in mind, terminology and definition, certain analytical questions emerge. These questions will form the setting in which the texts will be studied.

First, what is the ancient – pre-Christian – terminology of crucifixion? The center of attention will be on how the ancient authors describe the punishment of crucifixion on a philological level. How the whole group of various, yet associated, terms is used in the ancient texts will be studied. Of special interest are the usage of *σταυρός* and the usage of, and relationship between, *ἀνασταυροῦν* and *ἀνασκολοπίζειν*, *crux* and *patibulum*. In what sense are they used? The questions are also applied to constructions with *חלה* and its counterparts. How are these terms and idioms translated in the ancient translations, and what do these translations say about the ancient perception of the terms?

Second, what can be said about the punishment that the terms describe? What do the texts describe? Here the danger of circular argumentation must be kept in mind. A group of terms is selected on the basis of their common theme, the terms are studied, and the question of what these terms describe is asked. To avoid circular argumentation, the broader picture is brought into focus. A wider group of terms is studied – all terms used in relation to any kind of bodily suspension (of both humans and animals), as well as suspensions of various non-bodily objects. The texts in which these terms occur will then be studied in order to see how the suspension terminology in the widest sense is used. From this group the texts describing bodily suspensions will be studied in order to see how they are used. The last step is to select the texts that describe a punishment which coheres with a traditional view of crucifixion. This group of texts is then studied in order to reach an understanding of how the ancient texts describe the punishment of crucifixion.

Third, how do the New Testament authors describe the death of Jesus on a philological level? What is the message of the text of the New Testament? The aim is to draw a picture of the event described on the basis

of *the texts themselves*, not on that of a traditional understanding of the crucifixion.

Fourth, how is the punishment of crucifixion defined by previous scholars? The explicit and implicit definitions by scholars, the normal English usage of the word, and the definition used by the present investigation will be evaluated in the light of the ancient texts.

Fifth, how do the insights from the present study of the ancient texts cohere with the contributions of the major lexica and dictionaries? The area of lexicography will be discussed. The usage of the terms in the studied texts will be compared to the presentation of the terms in the lexica.

Sixth, how has the punishment of crucifixion been described, and how should it be described in the light of the present investigation? The purpose is to offer a scientific presentation of crucifixion based on the reading of the ancient text material.

### 3.4. *Considerations of Theory*

What will be done in the present investigation is to study a group of words that on various levels are connected with the punishment of crucifixion. Here the possibility that they derive some of their present distinctiveness from the death of Jesus is taken into consideration. To reach behind – before – the Jesus event, an attempt is made to study the texts without this distinctiveness. Instead of anachronistically bringing the death of Jesus to the ancient texts, they are studied in the present investigation as if they were unknown as far as their suspension account is concerned. The investigation is thus deliberately minimalistic concerning the level of information that could be derived from the texts. To be minimalistic in the view of the present investigation is to strip down the information of each text to its explicit features. This is done in an effort to limit the danger of anachronism, here to read the death of Jesus into the actual text. The answer to the question of what the texts describe is searched for mainly synchronically, in the texts themselves, in their contexts and in the light of texts of the same genre and time, but also diachronically, from the advent of preserved literature of the language in focus.

The source material will be studied with the help of methodological tools belonging to the scholarly areas of philology and semantics. There appears to be no distinct manual that states what a philological method is, or even a consensus about what the label “philology” stands for.<sup>133</sup> Here

---

<sup>133</sup> The designation is commonly used in connection with the emergence of comparative philology in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, e.g., after the discovery of Sanskrit (ROBERTSON, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, vi–xv; 8–30). Cf. BLACK and DOCKERY, *Interpreting the New Testament*, 243–46; MARSHALL, *New Testament In-*

only some general remarks of the craftsmanship used in the present study of ancient Greco-Roman texts will be presented. In addition to philology, insights from recent studies on semantics will be added. Thus, the investigation is not a thorough semantic study. It is rather some aspects of the contemporary scholarly area of semantics that will be used. The matter of establishing meaning in a text will hence be dealt with through an amalgam of philology and semantics.

### 3.4.1. Philology

The label "philology"<sup>134</sup> is here used for the scientific study of the elements of an ancient language: its structure, morphology, syntax and phonetics.<sup>135</sup> The label "linguistics" is used for the humanistic and scientific study of languages and literature in a larger sense.<sup>136</sup> The opinion held by the present author is that philology deals with the details of (mainly ancient written) language, while linguistics deals with the (contemporary and ancient, spoken and written) language as a larger entity, not least in comparison to other languages.

For classical philology, *written* accounts transmitted from antiquity are the objects of interest. The aim is to reach an understanding of the terms used in these texts. The craftsmanship in classical philology concerns with the effort to grasp the sense of a word through a comprehensive examination of the written text in its linguistic context. The stance held here is that every word needs to be studied, and the question of what the specific word signifies needs to be asked. This effort demands a careful study of how the specific word is used elsewhere, by the same author and by others. Does the usage of the word change over time? On another level, a word is interpreted within its argumentative context: the immediate context of the single pericope or the text as a whole; the context of the author's ideas as they are presented in the texts; the context of the genre in which the author writes; the context of ancient thought as expressed in

---

*terpretation*, 80; PORTER, "The Greek Language of the New Testament," 115; SHEPPARD, "Biblical Interpretation in the 18th & 19th Centuries," 256-80; THISELTON, "Semantics and New Testament Interpretation," 80.

<sup>134</sup> A confusion seems to exist in the usage of the labels "philology" and "linguistics" (BLACK and DOCKERY, *Interpreting the New Testament*, 250 (§ 4); cf. DEMOSS, *Pocket Dictionary for the Study of New Testament Greek*, 97). They are sometimes seen as synonyms, and sometimes as opposite realities. For a discussion of the problem, see BROWN, "Philology," 127-47.

<sup>135</sup> GIESSLER-WIRSIG, "Auxiliary Sciences to History," 2559.

<sup>136</sup> INEICHEN and STOELLGER, "Linguistics," 3,283. Cf. PORTER, "The Greek Language of the New Testament," 113; LYONS, *Linguistic Semantics*, 11-12.

the ancient texts.<sup>137</sup> Yet another level is the philological context of the interpreted words – the syntax. The syntax usually offers a clear indication of what a text might mean – and what it cannot mean. Thus, classical philology as it is understood by the present author focuses on the quest for a correct, in the sense *intended*, meaning of words in a written text.

What is discussed here is scarcely a fixed *methodology*, but a collection of thoughts on what is done and why. The *what* is an effort to carefully determine the sense of a word by paying rigorous attention to both internal and external features. The *why* is a quest for understanding of texts that makes possible the interpretation and usage of the words it contains. Interpretation and general understanding are based on a philological understanding.

### 3.4.2. Semantics

Classical philology will be the spine of the present investigation, but coupled with insights from the area of semantics in general, and *lexical* semantics in particular. Semantics is the philosophical and scientific study of *meaning* in the broadest sense.<sup>138</sup> In comparison with philology, semantics is a relatively new scientific method. It developed more or less independently from several scientific disciplines, which led to some confusion regarding both what it should be called (semantics, semiotics, semology, semasiology) and what it should contain. The common opinion today appears to be that semantics is a study of meaning, first and foremost of linguistic (i.e., concerning both written and spoken, contemporary and ancient language) meaning. It is in this sense that the label is used by the present investigation.

The area of semantics may add some tension to the traditional view of philology expressed above. However, in order not to become too atomistic and neglect the larger view of the language system in general, the area of semantics is essential.<sup>139</sup>

The contribution of Johannes P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida threw light on a specific problem in the art of translation.<sup>140</sup> Since the advent of

<sup>137</sup> SILVA, *Biblical Words and Their Meaning*, 137–69; THISELTON, “Semantics and New Testament Interpretation,” 82–85.

<sup>138</sup> Or to use Saeed’s introductory sentence, “[s]emantics is the study of meaning communicated through language” (SAEED, *Semantics*, 1). Cf. LYONS, *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*, 400.

<sup>139</sup> BARR, *The Semantics of Biblical Language*, 296. Cf. BLACK and DOCKERY, *Interpreting the New Testament*, 250 (§ 2).

<sup>140</sup> See NIDA and LOUW, *Lexical Semantics of the Greek New Testament*, 1–121; LOUW and NIDA, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, 1.vi–xx; LOUW, “Semantics,” 1077–81.



the genre of bilingual dictionaries, the dominant method of describing a foreign word was to use a familiar word.<sup>141</sup> Semantics in those days was chiefly the same as the study of the historical development of a word (etymology). Words were assumed to inherit a fixed basic meaning, which was the key to a correct understanding of it. However, during the last century there emerged a distinction between semantics and etymology. Etymology became limited to the historical development of the words, while semantics was more concerned with the relationship between meaning – defined as the reality the communication intended to describe – and the linguistic signs used to describe this reality.

*Meaning* was not something a word possessed, but the reality that the word transferred. The transferred reality – the meaning – came into focus instead of the word itself. From this perspective it became awkward to express the meaning of a word by simply using another word. Louw discusses this problem in his article on semantics in *Anchor Bible Dictionary*:

Therefore, *paradidōmi* in Greek does not “mean” *betray* in English, but is a Greek term denoting a meaning for which the English term *betray* can be used in certain contexts. The relevant meaning for which *paradidōmi* is used in Greek comprises a set of semantic features, namely, (1) an interpersonal activity, (2) involving handing over on someone (either of the in-group or the out-group) to an authority, (3) to deal with such a person according to will or jurisdiction, and (4) usually implying punishment. In English this same set semantic features can be largely expressed by terms such as *betray*, *hand over*, *turn over to*, etc. The term *betray* will not signify an out-group person, while *hand over* or *turn over to* usually do not pertain to an in-group person though it could be used of such a person in certain contexts. *Betray* is semantically more marked than *hand over* or *turn over to*. *Betray* also involves a component of lack of loyalty which is not signified by *paradidōmi*. The meaning denoted by *paradidōmi* is closer in semantic space to that of *hand over* than to that of *betray*. Nevertheless, the English terms are close enough to be used to translate *paradidōmi* in particular contexts. They are not “meanings” of *paradidōmi*; they are “translational equivalents.”<sup>142</sup>

The solution of this problem according to Louw and Nida is to collect semantically related terms in a semantic “domain” in which the words function, and to delimit the meaning of the specific word with a short sentence. As an example of this perspective, they describe the verb *παράδιδόναι* under four different domains.<sup>143</sup>

<sup>141</sup> I.e., a word was explained by another word which the lexicographer assumed to be of similar meaning. For an older discussion on this theme, see BARR, *The Semantics of Biblical Language*, 215–16.

<sup>142</sup> LOUW, “Semantics,” 1078.

<sup>143</sup> Domain 13: “Be, Become, Exist, Happened.” *παράδιδόναι* occurs for the first time under the latter sub-domain “Happened,” together with *διδόναι*. Their meaning is

John A. L. Lee moves this approach further in his monograph *A History of New Testament Lexicography*, when he shows the twofold problem of lexicons' and dictionaries' surprising dependence on their predecessors in combination with the stiff tradition of defining a word simply by another word – “the reign of a gloss,” in Lee's terminology. Lee notices a break in the tradition in 1988, the year when Louw and Nida's lexicon appeared, and outlines the next steps in the development of semantics.

While not explicitly offering a plan for the future of New Testament lexicography, their lexicon (1988), along with the extensive preparatory and companion works, has reset the agenda in two major respects. By the adoption of the domain arrangement it has brought into focus lexical structure as a vital element of the vocabulary. The full description of how a word is used requires sensitivity to its place in the complex web of sense-relations of which it is a part. This will need to be one of the concerns of future work. Secondly, as has already been emphasized in the book, by rejecting the gloss method and adopting definitions as the means of describing meaning, Louw and Nida have blazed a trail to follow.<sup>144</sup>

Lee proposes, as did Louw and Nida, that the statement of meaning of, e.g., a Greek word needs to be explained by a *definition*, instead of the gloss method. A definition in this point of view is a sentence that marks out the area of meaning the word.

---

described as “to grant someone the opportunity or occasion to do something – ‘to grant, to allow’” (L&N 13.142).

Domain 33: “Communication.” *παραδιδόναι* occurs for the second time under the sub-domain “Teach.” The meaning is described as “to pass on traditional instruction, often implying over a long period of time – ‘to instruct, to teach’” (with a reference to 2 Pet 2.21) (L&N 33.237).

Domain 37: “Control, Rule.” *παραδιδόναι* occurs for the third time under the sub-domain “Hand Over, Betray,” together with *παριστάναι*. Their meaning is described as “to deliver a person into the control of someone else, involving either the handing over of a presumably guilty person for punishment by authorities or the handing over of an individual to an enemy who will presumably take undue advantage of the victim – ‘to hand over, to turn over to, to betray’” (with references to Matt 5.25; Mark 9.31 and Matt 26.16). And they add as a comment: “As is the case in English, a number of languages make a clear distinction between legitimate handing over of a presumably guilty person to a civil authority and the betrayal of a person in the in-group to someone in the out-group” (L&N 37.111).

Domain 57: “Possess, Transfer, Exchange.” *παραδιδόναι* occurs for the fourth time under the sub-domain “Give.” The meaning is described as “to hand over or to convey something to someone, particularly a right or an authority – ‘to give over, to hand over’ (with a reference to Luke 4.6). They add as a comment that “in some languages, however, it is impossible to speak of ‘handing over authority.’ In some instances one may use a causative expression, for example, ‘to cause someone to have’” (L&N 57.77).

<sup>144</sup> LEE, *New Testament Lexicography*, 180.

The method used in the present investigation is to study the usage a word and thereby try to define its *range of meaning*.<sup>145</sup> The aim is to trace a lexicographical “meaning” of words within the semantic field of suspension punishments. One example is the quest for the area of meaning of ἀνασταυροῦν. The effort is to determine what the verb can refer to, and, if possible, what it cannot refer to. The area of meaning of each specific word will be studied and defined in relation to the other studied words. Thus, if possible words will be separated and their uniqueness defined.

The question of method not is limited to a mere discussion of the tools used in the following chapters, but is tied to the core of this study. The methodological consideration of how relevant texts are found and in what way they are used is the pivot around which other questions revolve.

Unless stated otherwise, the translations of the ancient texts are made by the present author and the general information about the ancient authors comes from *Der Neue Pauly* and *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*.

#### 4. Content of The Book

In Chapter 2, ancient Greek literature from Homer until the turn of the first century of the Common Era is studied. This chapter also contains the Jewish authors Flavius Josephus and Philo Judaeus. The reason behind the choice is the Roman and Hellenistic influence that their texts reveal, as well as convention among scholars. In Chapter 3, ancient Latin literature will be studied, and the latter time limit is the same as it was with the Greek literature. In Chapter 4, the ancient Hebrew and Aramaic literature of the Old Testament times will be studied, as well as ancient translations of these texts. Chapter 5 deals with the execution of Jesus, which is read in the same sense as the previous texts and read in the light of these. Chapter 6 constitutes a discussion with various lexica and scholars in three interrogatory fields. Chapter 7 presents the conclusions.

---

<sup>145</sup> “Bedeutungsfeld,” with Trier’s terminology (TRIER, “Das sprachliche Feld,” 440–49).



## Chapter Two

# Greek Literature

In the present chapter, literature written in Greek from Homer until the turn of the first century will be in focus. The reason for the former limit is simply that Homer represents the advent of preserved Greek literature. The latter limit is placed when both Christianity and its texts are becoming influential.

The aim is to study the usage of the terminology assumed to be connected with the punishment of crucifixion according to a traditional view.<sup>1</sup> Some additional terms will also be studied. These terms refer to executions or suspensions in a wider sense and are relevant to broaden the knowledge of suspension punishments. The questions that guide the reading are simple: How do the authors use the terminology? To what kind of punishment do the terms refer – or rather, what can a present-day reader know about the punishment the texts describe?

The terminology in focus here comprises members of the *σταυρ-* and *σκολοπ-*family. The usage of *ἀνασταυροῦν* (with or without the prefix *ανα-*) and *ἀνασκολοπίζειν* (not used without the prefix), as well as the related *σταυρός* and *σκόλοψ*, are crucial here. The usage of the common *κρεμαννόναι* in connection with human bodily suspensions, as well as verbs that appear to refer to some act of nailing, such as *καθηλοῦν*, *προσηλοῦν*, and *προσπασσαλεύειν*, are also important. The common feature of the latter is that they are etymologically connected with “nail” (*ἦλος*) or “peg” (*πάσσαλος*). Some rare terms which are used in connection with punishments that might be suspension punishments, such as *ἀνασχινδυλεύειν*, *ἀποτυμπανίζειν*, *ἀναρτᾶν*, and *ἀναπέριεν*, will be studied as well.

### 1. The Archaic Era

#### 1.1 *Homer*

Already in antiquity the two epic works known as the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* were attributed to Homer (unknown dating). Written in dactylic

---

<sup>1</sup> See the introduction, pp. 26–29.

hexameter, the language is an amalgam of apparently older Greek and Greek of the eighth century, with predominantly Ionic and Aeolic influences. The diverse language is an argument against the unity of the works.<sup>2</sup>

The author(s) do(es) not use any of the major terms that are commonly connected with the punishment of crucifixion. However, some analogous formulations and punishments ought to be noticed. The text contains a message from Iris to Achilles about Hector's desire to maltreat Patroklos' body:

Men are killing one another  
[the Argives] defending the corpse of the dead,  
while the Trojans rush eagerly to drag [it] to windy Ilios;  
most eager is the glorious Hector;  
the heart bids [him] cut the head from the tender neck  
and fix [it] upon poles [πῆξαι ἀνά σκολόπεσσι].<sup>3</sup>

Is it possible that the last three words of the quotation have some influence on the subsequent usage of the compound ἀνασκολοπίζειν? This text is the only example of the two words written side by side in the texts studied in the present investigation. If this assumption is correct, it is possible to suspect that ἀνασκολοπίζειν refers to some type of suspension on some type of pole. In the text quoted above it is easy to perceive some kind of pointed pole or rod onto which a head is stuck.

In Homer's texts σκόλωψ usually refers to stakes, probably pointed, in or beside trenches as a part of a trap or fortification (*Il.* 7.441; 8.343; 9.350). Notice especially 12.55 and 12.63 of the *Iliad* where the author describes the stakes as "pointed" (σκολόπεσσιν ὀξέσιν). In the Loeb edition A.T. Murray translates σκόλωψ in the *Iliad* 15.1 and 344 with "palisade."<sup>4</sup> However, it is possible that both texts refer to pointed stakes in the trenches mentioned in the texts. In *Odyssey* 7.45, where Odysseus sees the palisade on top of the walls of the city of Phaeacians, σκόλωψ simply refers to "poles" without further descriptions.

Homer's use of the etymologically analogous noun σταυρός does not offer any help. Homer uses only σταυρός, always in the plural, in the sense "poles" in a wide sense. The σταυροί are poles placed as a fence or defense both around the dwelling of Peleus' son in the last book of the

<sup>2</sup> FORSSMAN, "Homerische Sprache," cols. 683–86.

<sup>3</sup> Hom. *Il.* 18.172–77. οἱ δ' ἀλλήλους ὀλέκουσιν | οἱ μὲν ἀμυνόμενοι νέκυος πέρι τεθνηῶτος, | οἱ δὲ ἐρύσσασθαι ποτὶ Ἴλιον ἠνεμέοσσαν | Τρῶες ἐπιθύουσι· μάλιστα δὲ φαίδιμος Ἴκτωρ | ἐλκόμεναι μέμονεν· κεφαλὴν δὲ ἐ θυμὸς ἄνωγε | πῆξαι ἀνά σκολόπεσσι ταμόνθ' ἀπαλῆς ἀπὸ δειρής.

<sup>4</sup> MURRAY, *LCL*.

*Iliad* (Hom. *Il.* 24.453) and in the court of the swineherd Eumaios in the *Odyssey* (Hom. *Od.* 14.11).

Thus, in the Homeric texts *σταυρός* and *σκόλωψ* are used in what could be called their basic sense. They refer to poles of any kind, probably pointed in the case of *σκόλωψ*.

A kind of suspension punishment is also to be found in Odysseus' answer to Eumaios regarding the punishment of the suitors in the twenty-second book of the *Odyssey*:

Odysseus of many counsels, answering him, said;  
 "I and Telemachos will keep the noble suitors  
 within [the] halls, how fierce they ever be;  
 turn back you two [bend/tie Melanthius'] feet and hands above  
 (to throw [him] into [the] chamber, to tie boards [σανίδας] behind [him]),  
 and having tied a twisted rope from him  
 going to draw [him] up high, to come near [the] roof beams  
 that he, being alive for a long time, may suffer grievous pains.<sup>5</sup>

The punishment is not easily envisioned, but appears to have some similarities with the punishment of Artaÿctes (Hdt. 7.33.1; 9.120.4). Both the suitors and Artaÿctes were attached to *σάνις*.<sup>6</sup> The explicit suspension and the extended sufferings enhance the importance of the account. Thus, a punishment having some parallels with the punishment of crucifixion as it is traditionally understood is described.

The author appears not to hesitate when it comes to describing horrible punishments and violence, suspension punishments included. This makes a conclusion drawn by Hengel awkward. He stresses the paucity of the theme of crucifixion in Homer and the rest of the mythical tradition. Hengel mentions for instance the punishment of the wicked Lycurgus in Homer's *Iliad*:

Thereafter the gods who lived at ease were angry with [Lycurgus],  
 and the son of Kronos struck him blind; he was not long-lived then,  
 since he had become hateful to the immortal gods;  
 so I would not fight the blessed gods.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Hom. *Od.* 22.170–77. τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς | "ἦ τοι ἐγὼ καὶ Τηλέμαχος μνηστήρας ἀγαυοὺς | σχήσομεν ἔντοσθεν μεγάρων μάλα | περ μεμαώτα· | σφῶϊ δ' ἀποστρέψαντε πόδας καὶ χεῖρας ὑπερθεν | [ἐς θάλαμον βαλέειν, σανίδας δ' ἐκδήσαι ὕπισθε,] | σειρήν δὲ πλεκτὴν ἐξ αὐτοῦ πειρήναντε | κίων' ἀν' ὑψηλὴν ἐρύσαι πελάσαι τε δοκοῖσιν, | ὡς κεν δηθὰ ζωὸς ἐὼν χαλέπ' ἄλγεα πάσχη."

<sup>6</sup> Artaÿctes, however, was nailed (see the text on pp. 52–55).

<sup>7</sup> Hom. *Il.* 6.138–41. τῷ μὲν ἔπειτ' ὀδύσαντο θεοὶ βεῖα ζῶντες, | καὶ μιν τυφλὸν ἔθηκε Κρόνου πάϊς· οὐδ' ἄρ' ἔτι δὴν | ἦν, ἐπεὶ ἀθανάτοισιν ἀπήχθετο πᾶσι θεοῖσιν· | οὐδ' ἂν ἐγὼ μακάρεσσι θεοῖς ἐθέλομι μάχεσθαι.

When Diodorus Siculus describes the same event he uses ἀνασταυροῦν as a description of Lycurgus' final fate.<sup>8</sup> According to Hengel, ἀνασταυροῦν is used with reference to crucifixion in Diodorus Siculus' text. The lacking punishment in Homer is an example of a deep aversion against crucifixion, according to Hengel.

The extraordinary paucity of the theme of crucifixion in the mythical tradition, even in the Hellenistic and Roman period, shows the deep aversion from this cruelest of all penalties in the literary world.<sup>9</sup>

However, the paucity in the text in Homer is an *argumentum e silentio* regarding the conception of crucifixion in archaic times. The verb in Diodorus Siculus' text could just as well be an example of an interpolation from a time when suspensions labeled as ἀνασταυροῦν were frequent. What happens in these texts is simply that the one connects the fate of Lycurgus with ἀνασταυροῦν, while the other does not. What implications follow this choice is an open question – not least until the issue of in what sense other authors use ἀνασταυροῦν is solved.

The significance of the absence of ἀνασταυροῦν and ἀνασκολοπίζειν in Homer's texts is a matter of conjecture. One possibility might be that the language reflected in the Homeric epic texts has its origin in a stage before the mentioned verbs evolved.

### 1.2. Aesop

As legendary a figure as Homer, the famous fable-teller Aesop (6<sup>th</sup> cent. B.C.E.)<sup>10</sup> uses suspension terminology in some of his fables.<sup>11</sup> Aesop uses the σταυρ-stem once. In a fable about a murderer and a mulberry tree, a man with blood on his hands is described as being seized and in some way suspended on a mulberry tree (συλλαβόμενοι εἰς τινα συκάμινον αὐτὸν ἐσταύρωσαν [Aesop, 157.6–7]). The text does not offer any indication on how he was suspended, if suspended at all. To draw any conclusions from Aesop's texts is even more difficult than it was from Homer's texts. But if the plain form of the verb is significant for Aesop, and the edition has the original form of the verb, it may strengthen the assumption that the compounds are of a later date.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>8</sup> Dioid. Sic. 3.65.5 (pp. 82–83).

<sup>9</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 14.

<sup>10</sup> The dating of Aesop is based on Herodotus (Hdt. 2.134–35). The dating and his existence remain uncertain although numerous fables were attributed to him during the following centuries.

<sup>11</sup> The text used by the present investigation follows the numbering and text of the Teubneriana edition.

<sup>12</sup> However, the edition by Perry suggests συλλαβόντες, ἐπὶ τινος συκαμίνοῦ ἀνεσταύρωσαν (152.4–5).



Aesop uses a different terminology in a similar type of account. In a fable about a shepherd and a wolf, the wolf is executed when his true nature is revealed. The shepherd appears to be described as having attached or suspended the wolf on a tree in order to kill him (εις δένδρον αὐτὸν ἀναρτήσας ἀπέκτεινεν) [Aesop, 276.9–10]. Neither does this text specify in what way the suspension occurred. The verb ἀναρτᾶν appears to be used in connection with impaling otherwise.<sup>13</sup>

### 1.3 *Conclusion – The Archaic Era*

The conclusion that can be drawn from texts of the archaic era, regarding the terminology related to crucifixion, is that ἀνασκολοπίζειν may not yet have come into use, at least in the case of Homer. Hengel's point on the aversion against crucifixion in Homer and the mythical tradition is problematic. Homer is not reluctant to describe either horrible acts of torture, punishment, or sheer violence (e.g., the rest of Hom. *Od.* 22) or suspension punishments (Hom. *Od.* 22.170–77; *Il.* 18.176–77).

## 2. *Historians of the Classical Era*

### 2.1. *Herodotus*

Herodotus of Halicarnassus (ca. 485–ca. 424) frequently occurs in studies on crucifixion, and will thus be discussed both closely and at length in the present investigation.<sup>14</sup> Herodotus' history describes, in East Ionic as with several of the early prose authors, the hostilities between Greeks and non-Greeks, with special attention to the Persians.

A common practice among scholars is to give the Persians glory, or rather blame, for inventing the punishment of crucifixion.<sup>15</sup> It is probably Herodotus' focus on Persia, in combination with his impact on the field of history writing, that makes Herodotus both frequent and important in various studies of crucifixion. Herodotus offers almost exclusively second-hand information about the conflicts he describes since he did not personally experience these wars. He did, however, travel a great part of the known world, as his extended ethnological and geographical excursions indicate. Beyond this, Herodotus offers many anecdotal narratives which

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Diod. Sic. 33.15.1 (Posid. F 110.5–9).

<sup>14</sup> The text from Rosén's edition *Herodoti Historiae* will be used in the present investigation.

<sup>15</sup> E.g., BLINZLER, *Der Prozess Jesu*, 357; SCHNEIDER, "σταυρός, κτλ.," 573; HEID, *Kreuz, Jerusalem, Kosmos*, 7 (Heid mentions the Medes as an alternative).

have brought him to a greater audience but also made his achievement as a historian dubious.

Hengel finds at least ten references to crucifixion in the texts of Herodotus, Kuhn at least six.<sup>16</sup> All these texts, except two (7.33.1 and 9.120.4 [par. 9.122.1]), contain either the verb ἀνασταυροῦν or the verb ἀνασκολοπίζειν. Hengel mentions that “Herodotus uses the verb ἀνασκολοπίζειν of living men and ἀνασταυροῦν for corpses.”<sup>17</sup> Hengel labels, nevertheless, 3.125.3 and 6.30.1 as references to crucifixions, texts that both contain ἀνασταυροῦν and describe suspensions of corpses.<sup>18</sup> He adds, though, a few pages later that the former text does not describe a crucifixion “in the strict sense.”<sup>19</sup> Hengel notices that neither ἀνασταυροῦν nor ἀνασκολοπίζειν occurs “in the only detailed account of a crucifixion given by Herodotus.”<sup>20</sup> Instead, the verb προσπασσαλεύειν is used in the account of the fate of the Persian satrap Artaxctes (7.33.1 and 9.120.4). Kuhn problemizes the issue of Herodotus’ use of ἀνασταυροῦν and ἀνασκολοπίζειν and points out that the occurrences of ἀνασταυροῦν are too few to make such a clear distinction as Hengel does.<sup>21</sup> There is thus disagreement and some confusion both about how Herodotus refers to the punishment of crucifixion in general, and about how he uses the verbs ἀνασταυροῦν and ἀνασκολοπίζειν in particular.

In a series of texts Herodotus uses the verb ἀνασταυροῦν in connection with alleged crucifixions.<sup>22</sup> Herodotus’ use of the verb, and especially its relation to his use of ἀνασκολοπίζειν,<sup>23</sup> are to some extent surprising.

### 2.1.1. Herodotus’ Use of ἀνασταυροῦν

The verb ἀνασταυροῦν occurs first in the text that describes the well-known fate of the tyrant Polycrates of Samos at the hands of the Persian

<sup>16</sup> Hengel: Hdt. 1.128.2; 3.125.3; 3.132.2; 3.159.1; 4.43.2, 7 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 22); 4.202.1 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 69); 6.30.1 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 22); 7.33 [sic] (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 25); 7.194.1f (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 22) and 9.120 [sic] (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 25).

Kuhn: Hdt. 1.128.2; 3.132.2; 3.159.1; 4.43.2, 6; 4.202.1; 6.30.1; 7.33 [sic]; 7.194.1f (KUHN, “Die Kreuzesstrafe,” 682); 9.78.3; 9.120.4 (KUHN, “Die Kreuzesstrafe,” 683 n. 192). See also, KUHN, “Zum Gekreuzigten von Giv’at ha-Mivtar,” 302; KUHN, “Kreuz II,” 714.

<sup>17</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 24.

<sup>18</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 22 n. 1.

<sup>19</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 24.

<sup>20</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 24.

<sup>21</sup> KUHN, “Die Kreuzesstrafe,” 683 n. 192.

<sup>22</sup> Hdt. 3.125.3; 4.103.1; 6.30.1; 7.194.1, 238.1; 9.78.3.

<sup>23</sup> Hdt. 1.128.2; 3.132.2; 3.159.1; 4.43.2, 6; 4.202.1.

satrap Oroetes. Oroetes, appointed as viceroy of Sardis by Cyrus the Great, decides to kill Polycrates. He induces the otherwise fortunate Polycrates to leave Samos, in spite of several warnings from Polycrates' seers and friends. Polycrates' daughter has a vision in a dream. She sees her father hanging high in the air. She tries to stop her father by all means, but he does not listen to any counsel and sails to meet Oroetes. Polycrates meets his fate in the city of Magnesia. Herodotus describes the event as follows:

Having killed him in a way not fit to be told Oroetes suspended [ἀνεσταύρωσε] [Polycrates].<sup>24</sup>

This text is significant in two ways for Herodotus' use of the verb. First, it is unspecified, i.e., it does not describe what kind of suspension it portrays. It could, for instance, be either an impaling or a crucifixion. Second, it does not describe an execution. The victim was already dead – it is a *post-mortem* suspension. There is nothing in the context that indicates what kind of suspension is at hand.<sup>25</sup> In this undefined fashion Herodotus uses the verb throughout his texts. To get some information about the suspension method, the context must be considered. Some lines later, the suspension of Polycrates is referred to with the verb ἀνακρεμαννύναι.<sup>26</sup> The sole occurrence of this verb is not sufficient to link the account to crucifixion (the same verb is used in 9.122.1).<sup>27</sup>

Both these verbs, ἀνασταυροῦν and ἀνακρεμαννύναι, are also found in Herodotus' seventh book. The story deals with the Greek campaign of Xerxes and some events that occurred just before the famous battle at the narrow coastal plain of Thermopylae. Xerxes' fleet had arrived at the Thessalian Magnesia. After they had endured a three-day storm, they rounded the Magnesian headland and entered the gulf of Pagasae where they made anchorage. Fifteen ships left the gulf after a while and headed southeast. They sighted ships near the city of Artemisium on the island of

<sup>24</sup> Hdt. 3.125.3. ἀποκτείνας δέ μιν οὐκ ἀξίως ἀπηγήσιος Ὀροίτης ἀνεσταύρωσε.

<sup>25</sup> Herodotus' account of the death of Polycrates is regularly labeled as a crucifixion, as noticed by Hengel (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 24). See, e.g., OCD, 1212; NUTTON, "Polybos," col. 48; COBET, "Polycrates," cols. 69–70; ZESTERMANN, "Die Kreuzigung," 345. Fulda supports his interpretation of the event as a crucifixion by referring to a parallel account in Valerius Maximus 6.9 (FULDA, *Das Kreuz*, 187). However, that text does not describe the punishment more explicitly than that he was attached to a *crux* (*continuo enim captos praedones crucibus adfixit*). When Philo recapitulates the execution of Polycrates he uses the more defined verb προσηλοῦν (Philo, *Prov.* 2.24–25). This is an indication that the later tradition at least interpreted Polycrates' execution as a suspension by nailing.

<sup>26</sup> Hdt. 3.125.4. Πολυκράτης δὲ ἀνακρεμάμενος ἐπετέλεε πᾶσαν τὴν ὄψιν τῆς θυγατρὸς (Polycrates being suspended fulfilled the whole dream of the daughter).

<sup>27</sup> See p. 54.

EuBoia, which they failed to recognize as Greek, and held their course right into the midst of their enemies. The Persian captain was the otherwise unknown Sandoces.<sup>28</sup> Herodotus has some biographical notes on Sandoces:

Being one of the royal judges, king Darius had seized [Sandoces] some time before and suspended [ἀνεσταύρωσε] [him], according to the following accusation: Sandoces had given an unjust judgment for a bribe. When he had been suspended [ἀνακρεμασθέντος], Darius found that the good deeds done to the royal house by him outnumbered the offenses. Darius perceived this and understood that he had acted with more haste than wisdom, and released [Sandoces]. Thus, in this way [he] escaped destruction at the hands of king Darius and was still alive.<sup>29</sup>

This text contains some features that need comments. Sandoces is described as being alive when Darius I, the son-in-law of Cyrus the Great, suspended him. This feature appears to contradict the assumption that Herodotus used ἀνασταυροῦν when referring to suspension of corpses and ἀνασκολοπίζειν for execution by suspension. However, Herodotus does not describe an execution in this text, only a temporary suspension of a *living* body, since Sandoces survived the punishment. Elsewhere Herodotus always uses ἀνασκολοπίζειν for executions by suspension.<sup>30</sup> The obvious question whether Herodotus would have switched verb if Sandoces had died is left unanswered.<sup>31</sup>

With the notion of the living Sandoces taken into consideration, the punishment of Sandoces, referred to with ἀνασταυροῦν, shares several features with the death Jesus suffered according to a traditional view. However, the occurrence of the verb ἀνακρεμαννύναι and the assumption mentioned above are, as will be seen, the only connection between

<sup>28</sup> Sandoces was a viceroy from Cyme, the largest of the Aeolian cities of Asia Minor, and had a Persian father, Thamasius.

<sup>29</sup> Hdt. 7.194.1–3. τὸν δὲ πρότερον τούτων βασιλεὺς Δαρεῖος ἐπ' αἰτίῃ τοιῆδε λαβὼν ἀνεσταύρωσε ἔοντα τῶν βασιλῆϊων δικαστέων ὁ Σανδώκης ἐπὶ χρήμασι ἄδικον δίκην ἔδικασε. ἀνακρεμασθέντος ὦν αὐτοῦ λογιζόμενος ὁ Δαρεῖος εὐρὲ οἱ πλεῖα ἀγαθὰ τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων πεποιημένα ἐς οἶκον τὸν βασιλῆϊον εὐρῶν δὲ τοῦτο ὁ Δαρεῖος καὶ γνοὺς, ὡς ταχύτερα αὐτὸς ἢ σοφώτερα ἐργασάμενος εἶη, ἔλυσε. βασιλέα μὲν δὲ Δαρεῖον οὕτω διαφυγῶν μὴ ἀπολέσθαι περιῆν.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. Hdt. 1.128.2; 3.132.2; 3.159.1; 4.43.2, 6; 4.202.1.

<sup>31</sup> If the historical event behind the texts is brought into the picture here, some additional features emerge. The image of the surviving Sandoces fits crucifixion better than impaling. It ought to be less probable to survive a regular impaling than a crucifixion, since impaling usually implied a lethal penetration of vital organs of the torso. The form of impaling which caused an extended death struggle (i.e., not internal impaling but a form where the pole was inserted just under the skin of the back, so as not to damage internal organs) appears to be a later custom (see, e.g., SVENSSON, *Sanningen om Spanelöggen*, 186). The only extant illustrating evidence of the ancient method of impaling does not describe this method. See ANEP, figs. 362, 368 and 373.

the verb ἀνασταυροῦν and crucifixion in Herodotus. On that basis, the connection ought to be deemed weak.

The aim of connecting ἀνασταυροῦν with crucifixion becomes even more difficult when three other texts by Herodotus are considered. The first text describes a suspension of heads from decapitated victims, in this case enemies of the Taurians. In the context, Herodotus describes the savageness of Taurian customs:

They sacrifice to the virgin [goddess] the shipwrecked and any Greek whom they take through sea raids, in this way: After the first rites, they hit the head [of the victim] with a club. Then, according to some, they throw the body down from the cliff, for the temple stands on a cliff, and suspend [ἀνασταυροῦσι] the head.<sup>32</sup>

The verb ἀνασταυροῦν is used in this text to describe how the Taurians fixed the head on a pole. Apparently they impaled it in some way. The event is described more clearly with a different terminology a few sentences later:

And when they have taken prisoners of war they treat them in the following way: Each one cuts off a [prisoner's] head and carries it away to his house where he impales it on a tall post [ἐπὶ ξύλου μεγάλου ἀναπέρας] and places it high above the house, above the smoke vent for the most part. They say that these [heads] are placed above as guards to the whole house.<sup>33</sup>

The verb ἀναπέρειν in this text is a counterpart to ἀνασταυροῦν in the previous text. The verb ἀναπέρειν is never used in connection with alleged crucifixions in the texts studied in the present investigation.<sup>34</sup>

The second text describes an event that took place in the aftermath of the great battle at Thermopylae. The Persians defeated the resistance of the Greek coalition and killed the leader of the Greeks, the Spartan king Leonidas.

Xerxes passed through [the place] of the dead and hearing that [Leonidas] had been both king and general of the Lacedaemonians, he gave orders to cut off and suspend [ἀνασταυρῶσαι] Leonidas' head.<sup>35</sup>

<sup>32</sup> Hdt. 4.103.1–2. θύουσι μὲν τῇ Παρθένῳ τοὺς τε ναυηγούς, καὶ τοὺς ἄνθρωποις Ἑλλήνων ἐπαναχθέντες, τρῶπῳ τοιῶδε· καταρξόμενοι ῥοπάλῳ παίουσι τὴν κεφαλὴν. οἱ μὲν δὴ λέγουσι, ὡς τὸ σῶμα ἀπὸ τοῦ κρημνοῦ ὠθέουσι κάτω (ἐπὶ γὰρ κρημνοῦ ἴδρυται τὸ ἶρόν), τὴν δὲ κεφαλὴν ἀνασταυροῦσι. Cf. 7.238.1.

<sup>33</sup> Hdt. 4.103.3. πολεμίους δὲ ἄνδρας, τοὺς ἄνθρωποις χειρῶσανται, ποιέουσι τάδε· ἀποταμῶν ἕκαστος κεφαλὴν ἀποφέρεται εἰς τὰ οἰκία, ἔπειτα ἐπὶ ξύλου μεγάλου ἀναπέρας ἰστᾶ ὑπὲρ τῆς οἰκίης ὑπερέχουσαν πολλόν, μάλιστα δὲ ὑπὲρ τῆς καπνοδόκης· Φασὶ δὲ τοῦτους φυλάκους τῆς οἰκίης πάσης ὑπεραιωρέεσθαι.

<sup>34</sup> Herodotus uses the verb in 4.94.3 when he talks about bodies pierced on a spear (λόγῃ).

The text is not clear on whether it was the head or the body of Leonidas that was suspended, and in what way it was suspended. The last clause (ἀποταμώντας τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀνασταυρῶσαι) could be translated “to cut off Leonidas’ head and impale [him].”<sup>36</sup> However, the most plausible reading is that the text describes a suspension of a head.<sup>37</sup> This reading does not need any implied αὐτόν. The object of ἀνασταυροῦν is τὴν κεφαλὴν as it is in the almost identical clause in the previous text (4.103.2).<sup>38</sup> The suspension of the head is probably depicted as being impaled on a sharp skewer, like the evident impaling in the previous text (4.103.2). In the next text (6.30.1) when describing the opposite event – a suspended corpse, with the decapitated head left out – Herodotus clearly describes that the object was the body (σῶμα αὐτοῦ), while the head was sent away (see below).<sup>39</sup>

The third text appears to describe, as mentioned, the impaling of the corpse of a decapitated victim. This event occurred in the aftermath of the Persian capture of the Anatolian city of Miletus. The Greek tyrant Histiaeus of Miletus was a functionary loyal to the Persian king.<sup>40</sup> This made him a threat to the rival Persian grandees, e.g., Harpagus, the general of Darius I, and the Sardinian satrap Artaphrenes, the brother of Darius. Due to some acts of double-dealing Histiaeus became prey for the Persians, and Harpagus met Histiaeus and his forces when he landed his fleet in Mysia. Histiaeus was caught in the battle, which slew the greater part of his army, and was about to be stabbed when he cried out in the Persian language and revealed who he was. He was taken prisoner and brought on the way to Darius. Herodotus postulates that Darius would have treated Histiaeus well and forgiven his guilt because of his previous

<sup>35</sup> Hdt. 7.238.1. Ξέρξης διεξῆγε διὰ τῶν νεκρῶν καὶ Λεωνίδεω ἀκηκόως, ὅτι βασιλεὺς τε ἦν καὶ στρατηγὸς Λακεδαιμονίων, ἐκέλευσε ἀποταμώντας τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀνασταυρῶσαι.

<sup>36</sup> See Macan’s comment on the text (Herodotus, *Herodotus, the seventh, eighth, & ninth books*, vol. 1, part 1, 351).

<sup>37</sup> Contra Zestermann (ZESTERMANN, *Die Kreuzigung*, 344 n. 1). For parallels of defiled bodies and executions by decapitation, see Hdt. 3.16.1–2; 8.118.4; Xen. *Anab.* 1.10.1; 2.6.1; 3.1.17; Plut. *Crass.* 32.

<sup>38</sup> Hdt. 9.78.1 supports this reading.

<sup>39</sup> If a historical consideration is brought into the picture here too, the following argument would be appropriate. It appears less probable to force a 12-inch nail through the bones of the skull in order to attach the skull to a “cross” than to simply impale it – i.e., attach it to a pointed stake. However, a text from the Greek historian and geographer Strabo contradicts this assumption. Strabo seems to describe nailing of skulls (Strabo, 4.4.5): the Gauls brought home the heads of conquered enemies and nailed (προσπαταλεῦειν) them to the entrances of their homes.

<sup>40</sup> For example, he joined Darius I in the campaign against the Scythians and protected the important bridge over the river Ister (i.e., Danube) (Hdt. 4.137–39).

good deeds towards Persia. Herodotus assumes also that it was to rule out this possibility that Artaphrenes and Harpagus killed Histiaeus when he was being brought to Sardis. Histiaeus was most likely dead and decapitated when Artaphrenes and Harpagus hanged him on a pole.

But now, because of this (that the king might forgive him [comment by the present author]), and in order that he may not flee and once again become powerful at the court, Artaphrenes, satrap of Sardis, and Harpagus, who had captured [Histiaeus], when [Histiaeus] was brought to Sardis, suspended [ἀνεσταύρωσαν] his body there on the spot and sent his embalmed head to King Darius at Susa.<sup>41</sup>

Darius buried the head with full observance as he would with anyone who had done good deeds toward him and Persia. The text does not mention any preceding execution of Histiaeus. However, the fact that Artaphrenes and Harpagus sent Histiaeus' head to the Persian king is an indication that Histiaeus was decapitated before he was suspended. Thus, it appears that Histiaeus was suspended post-mortem. The text does not, however, reveal in what way Histiaeus' corpse was suspended.<sup>42</sup>

Left to study is one text – the fourth in sequence – found in the ninth book. This text is peculiar in the way both ἀνασταυροῦν and ἀνασκολοπίζειν are used. The text deals with the aftermath of the defiling of Leonidas' head. After the battle at Plataea, the Aeginetan Lampon gave advice to Pausanias, the Greek leader and nephew of Leonidas. Lampon's advice dealt with the corpse of the Persian Mardonius, nephew and son-in-law of Darius I. Mardonius was killed in the battle at Plataea. Herodotus states that Mardonius had joined Xerxes in defiling Leonidas' corpse after the battle of Thermopylae.<sup>43</sup> Lampon suggested that Pausanias should seize the opportunity and revenge the defiling of Leonidas' corpse.

“When Leonidas was killed at Thermopylae, Mardonius and Xerxes cut off and suspended [ἀνεσταύρωσαν] the head. Do the same to [Mardonius] and you will receive

<sup>41</sup> Hdt. 6.30.1. νῦν δὲ μιν αὐτῶν τε τούτων εἶνεκα, καὶ ἵνα μὴ διαφυγὼν αὐτίς μέγας παρὰ βασιλείῃ γένηται, Ἄρταφρένης τε ὁ Σαρδίαν ὑπαρχος καὶ ὁ λαβῶν Ἄρπαγος, ὡς ἀπίκετο ἀγόμενος ἐς Σάρδις, τὸ μὲν αὐτοῦ σῶμα αὐτοῦ ἀνεσταύρωσαν, τὴν δὲ κεφαλὴν ταριχεύσαντες ἀνήνεικαν παρὰ βασιλέα Δαρείων ἐς Σοῦσα.

<sup>42</sup> How and Wells interpret the verb ἀνασταυροῦν in Hdt. 6.30.1, together with 3.159.1; 7.238.1, as references to impaling (HOW and WELLS, *A Commentary on Herodotus*, 2.74). It is, however, worth noticing that there are some differences between the three texts. In 3.159.1 Herodotus uses the verb ἀνασκολοπίζειν, in a text that does not reveal the nature of the punishment. In 7.238.1 ἀνασταυροῦν is used, but it appears to be the head that was suspended. The same object is found in 6.30.1, but the text does not show *how* the head was suspended.

<sup>43</sup> Herodotus puts Mardonius in a central role in Xerxes' invasion on several levels (see s.v. *OCD*).

praise foremost from all Spartans, and then from all other Greeks. Having suspended [ἀνασκολοπίσας] Mardonius, you will be avenged for your uncle Leonidas.” This is what [Lampon] said with the intention to please [Pausanias]. But [Pausanias] answered [him] this: “Oh, [my] Aeginetan friend, I admire your friendliness and forethought, but you have missed the mark of good judgment. [First,] you have lifted me, [my] fatherland and [my] deeds up to the skies, then you cast me down to [mere] nothingness when you advise [me] to maltreat a dead, and say that I shall be better spoken of if I do so.”<sup>44</sup>

This text is crucial as far as the relationship between ἀνασταυροῦν and ἀνασκολοπίζειν is concerned. The text refers to the defiling, and supposed impaling, of Leonidas’ head with ἀνασταυροῦν. The text refers also forward to a suggested act of revenge with the other verb – ἀνασκολοπίζειν.<sup>45</sup> The odd thing about the text is that ἀνασκολοπίζειν has a corpse as (in this case imaginary) object – just as ἀνασταυροῦν usually has. The two verbs are in this text close to what commonly are called synonyms. The only difference that can be traced is that the event referred to with ἀνασταυροῦν has happened and the event referred to with ἀνασκολοπίζειν has not yet happened. Thus, in this text ἀνασταυροῦν points backwards and ἀνασκολοπίζειν forwards. The question is whether this is sufficient to explain the use of the different verbs. The switch of verb is probably only an example of *variatio*, i.e., that Herodotus changed the verb for stylistic reasons. Thus, the verbs are used in a similar way, yet not identical. Regardless of the usage of the verbs, the text does not add any information regarding the method of Leonidas’ suspension.

In conclusion, these texts indicate that the usage of ἀνασταυροῦν in the texts of Herodotus covers various kinds of suspensions of corpses or body parts, and one aborted suspension with resemblance to the punishment of crucifixion. It does not include any kind of execution by suspension.

### 2.1.2. Herodotus’ Use of ἀνασκολοπίζειν

One of the texts containing the verb ἀνασκολοπίζειν has already been dealt with above, where it is a recommendation of an unspecified suspen-

<sup>44</sup> Hdt. 9.78.3–79.1. “Λεωνίδεω γὰρ ἀποθανόντος ἐν Θερμοπύλῃσι Μαρδόνιος τε καὶ Ξέρξης ἀποταμόντες τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀνεσταύρωσαν τῷ σὺ τὴν ὁμοίην ἀποδιδούς ἔπαινον ἕξεις πρῶτα μὲν ὑπὸ πάντων Σπαρτιητέων, αὐτὶς δὲ καὶ πρὸς τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων· Μαρδόνιον γὰρ ἀνασκολοπίσας τετιμωρήσασαι ἐς πάτρων τὸν σὸν Λεωνίδην.” ὁ μὲν δοκέων χαρίζεσθαι ἔλεγε τάδε, ὁ δ’ ἀνταμείβετο τοῖσδε: “ὦ ξεῖνε Αἰγινῆτα, τὸ μὲν εὐνοεῖν τε καὶ προορᾶν ἄγαμαί σευ, γνώμης μέντοι ἡμάρτηκας χρηστῆς· ἐξάρας γὰρ με ὕψου καὶ τὴν πάτρην καὶ τὸ ἔργον, ἐς τὸ μηδὲν κατέβαλες παραινέων νεκρῷ λυμαίνεσθαι, καὶ ἦν ταῦτα ποιέω, φὰς ἄμεινόν με ἀκούσεσθαι.”

<sup>45</sup> Pausanias gives an example of a later interpretation of this event when he refers to it in the first century C.E. Pausanias stresses that the suspension of Mardonius never happened (Paus. 3.4.10).



sion and does not describe an actual event. There is one more text from Herodotus where the verb is used in a similar fashion.

The event is described in Herodotus' third book and follows Oroetes' defiling of Polycrates' corpse. The Persian king Darius I punished Oroetes for all his wrongdoing and conquered Samos. All of Oroetes' slaves and his property were brought to Susa. Among the followers of Oroetes was Democedes of Croton, the most skilled physician of his time. When Darius later strained his foot and his Egyptian physicians failed to cure him, a rumor about the skill of one of Oroetes' slaves came to Darius' attention. Democedes was immediately brought to Darius and he cured the King. Darius greatly rewarded Democedes. The Egyptian physicians, who had failed to cure the Persian king, were about to be executed when Democedes interceded to save his Egyptian counterparts.

When the Egyptian physicians, who earlier tried to cure the king, were about to be suspended [ἀνασκολοπιεῖσθαι] for being less skillful than a Greek physician, [Democedes] rescued them by interceding with the king.<sup>46</sup>

The text does not unveil the nature of the planned execution. It differs from the previously mentioned text from Hdt. 9.78.3–79.1 in that it is a planned execution, instead of a planned defiling of a corpse. Otherwise, it does not add much to the overall understanding of the verb and to what it refers.

Herodotus' use of the verb beyond this is rather homogeneous. The verb occurs in four other texts, all describing various kinds of executions by suspension. The first text comes from a critical account in which Herodotus deals with the rise of Cyrus the Great. The Median king Astyages had two dreams about his daughter Mandane: First, a stream of water flowed out of her and overflowed all Asia, and then a vine grew from her and covered all Asia. The message from the dream interpreters scared him and he sought to kill Mandane's son Cyrus. However, Astyages' servants failed to kill the child. When Cyrus was ten years old, he revealed his royal heritage while playing king with some friends. The dream interpreters then persuaded Astyages to let his captured grandson go free. They said that the dreams had already been fulfilled in the children's play; Cyrus would not become king twice. When the Persians some years later revolted against Media and scattered the Median army – under the leadership of Cyrus, now the ruler of the growing kingdom of Persia – Astyages reacted as Herodotus describes it:

---

<sup>46</sup> Hdt. 3.132.2. τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους ἱητρούς, οἱ βασιλέα πρότερον ἰώντο, μέλλοντας ἀνασκολοπιεῖσθαι, διότι ὑπὸ Ἑλλήνου ἱητροῦ ἐσσώθησαν, τούτους βασιλέα παραιτησάμενος ἐρρύσατο.

[He captured] first the dream interpreters among the Magi, who had persuaded him to let Cyrus go, and suspended [ἀνεσκολόπισε] them.<sup>47</sup>

Neither in this text is it possible to determine in what way the dream interpreters were suspended, but it indicates weakly that the suspension was an execution act since it does not indicate any execution preceding the suspension.

The second text is the famous account of the mass execution at Babel. While Darius was occupied with the aftermath of the conquest of Samos, the greatest of all city-states, the Babylonians staged a long prepared revolt against the Persian king. When Darius heard about the revolt he rallied all his forces and led them against Babylon. After a siege of the town, Darius managed to conquer it through a Persian infiltrator, Megabyxus' (also called Megabyzus) son Zopyrus. Darius finally destroyed the gates and the walls of the city, which Cyrus the Great did not in the first conquest of Babylon, and punished the leaders of the people.

Darius suspended [ἀνεσκολόπισε] the most prominent of the men, about three thousand, but he gave back the city to the other Babylonians, to be inhabited.<sup>48</sup>

The text is silent about which form of suspension the three thousand suffered, but the suspension appears to be an execution on the same ground as the previous text. This event is regularly interpreted as a mass crucifixion.<sup>49</sup>

The third text from Herodotus deals with the fate of Sataspes, cousin of the Persian king Xerxes. He had raped the virgin daughter of Zopyrus and was on the brink of being executed by the Persian king Xerxes.

He used force towards a maiden, the daughter of Zopyrus, son of Megabyxus. Then, when he therefore was about to be suspended [ἀνασκολοπιεῖσθαι] by King Xerxes, the mother of Sataspes, who was Darius' sister, interceded. She said that she herself would impose a heavier punishment on him than [Xerxes].<sup>50</sup>

<sup>47</sup> Hdt. 1.128.2. πρῶτον μὲν τῶν μάγων τοὺς ὄνειροπόλους, οἱ μὲν ἀνέγνωσαν μετεῖναι τὸν Κῦρον, τοὺτους ἀνεσκολόπισε.

<sup>48</sup> Hdt. 3.159.1. ὁ Δαρεῖος τῶν ἀνδρῶν τοὺς κορυφαίους μάλιστα ἐξ τρισχιλίου ἀνεσκολόπισε, τοῖσδε [λοιποῖς Βαβυλωνίοις] ἀπέδωκε τὴν πόλιν οἰκέειν. Cf. the Behistun inscription which mentions that only the rebel leaders were objects of the punishment (DB 3.92).

<sup>49</sup> E.g., FULDA, *Das Kreuz*, 50, 109; HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 22 n. 1; KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 683 n. 192; O'COLLINS, "Crucifixion," 1207; STAUFFER, *Kreuz und Kreuzigung*, 123; STOCKBAUER, *Kunstgeschichte des Kreuzes*, 10; ZESTERMANN, *Die Kreuzigung*, 345; ZUGIBE, *The Crucifixion of Jesus*, 52.

<sup>50</sup> Hdt. 4.43.2. θυγατέρα γὰρ Ζωπύρου τοῦ Μεγαβύξου ἐβίησατο παρθένον ἔπειτα μέλλοντος αὐτοῦ διὰ ταύτην τὴν αἰτίην ἀνασκολοπιεῖσθαι ὑπὸ Ξέρξῳ βασιλέος ἢ μήτηρ τοῦ Σατάσπεος ἐούσα Δαρεῖου ἀδελφεῖ παρητήσατο φάσά οἱ αὐτὴ μέζω ζημίην ἐπιθήσειν ἢ περ ἐκεῖνον.

The punishment was an expedition, which his mother invented to save Sataspes from a certain death. Sataspes was forced to circumnavigate the African continent – “Libya” in Herodotus’ terminology – and return to Egypt by the Arabian Gulf. Xerxes gave his approval and Sataspes went to Egypt where he received a ship and a crew, and sailed west through the Mediterranean Sea. He passed Gibraltar – “the pillars of Heracles” in Herodotus’ terminology – and headed southwards. After several months at sea, always with more water ahead, he gave up and returned to his fate in Egypt. At his return, he appears to have made up an explanation of why this mission failed.

But Xerxes, who did not acknowledge his account as true, suspended [ἀνεσκολόπισε] [Sataspes] because he did not fulfill the appointed task, [thus] punishing him [according to] the first judgment [against him].<sup>51</sup>

Neither does this text reveal what kind of punishment Sataspes first was threatened by and to which he was later subjected.

In the fourth and last text the Battiadan king Arcesilaus III, the ruler of Cyrene, returned to his homeland in North Africa from where he had previously been banished. He defied an oracle from the priestess in Delphi and punished his enemies harshly. The result was death. He was slain by the inhabitants in the Cyrenaean city of Barce. Arcesilaus’ mother, Pheretime, sought revenge and turned to the Persians. To capture the men who were guilty of Arcesilaus’ murder the Persians put the city of Barce under siege, and after nine months the Persian leader Amasis took the city by fraud.

When the most guilty of the Barcaeans were handed over from the Persians to her, Pheretime suspended [ἀνεσκολόπισε] [them] around the wall. She cut the breasts of their women and stuck them too on the wall.<sup>52</sup>

This text is unusually graphic and detailed, according to How and Wells.<sup>53</sup> Just as in the previous texts, the suspension appears to be an execution. Nevertheless, it does not reveal in what way the Barcaeans were suspended. The question whether the Barcaeans were impaled on separate poles beside the wall or on the poles of the wall itself, or whether they were nailed to the wall or somehow suspended above the wall, is also left unanswered. There appears to be a close resemblance between the execution form of the Barcaeans and how the breasts (καὶ τούτοισι) were at-

<sup>51</sup> Hdt. 4.43.6. Ξέρξης δὲ οὐ οἱ συγγινώσκων λέγειν ἀληθέα, οὐκ ἐπιτελέσαντά γε τὸν προκειμένον ἄεθλον ἀνεσκολόπισε τὴν ἀρχαίην δίκην ἐπιτιμῶν.

<sup>52</sup> Hdt. 4.202.1. τοὺς μὲν νυν αἰτιωτάτους τῶν Βαρκαίων ἢ Φερετίμη, ἐπεῖτε οἱ ἐκ τῶν Περσέων παρεδόθησαν, ἀνεσκολόπισε κύκλω τοῦ τείχεος, τῶν δὲ σφι γυναικῶν τοὺς μαζοὺς ἀποταμοῦσα περιστίζει καὶ τούτοις τὸ τεῖχος.

<sup>53</sup> HOW and WELLS, *A Commentary on Herodotus*, 1.296.

tached to, beside, or on top of the wall. But the terminology used in connection with the breasts (περιστίζειν) does not shed light on the execution form of the Barcaeans.<sup>54</sup>

In conclusion, these texts indicate that the usage of ἀνασκολοπίζειν in the texts of Herodotus covers various forms of suspension that appear to be executionary (it is at least not explicitly said that the victims were killed before the suspension). Twice it is used of events which had not yet happened: a planned execution (3.132.2) and advice to maltreat a corpse (9.78.3). The latter text is problematic in several ways. The Liddell & Scott lexicon states that ἀνασταυροῦν and ἀνασκολοπίζειν are “used convertibly” in this text, which may be a correct observation.<sup>55</sup> The verbs are obviously related; they stand within a few sentences, conjoined with the advice to do the same (τὴν ὁμοίην ἀποδιδούς) with Mardonius as had happened to Leonidas. Still, the verb ἀνασκολοπίζειν does not include any event of completed defiling of a corpse. Thus, Schneider’s statement that the verbs are “identical” may be too strong.<sup>56</sup> The question whether the usage of ἀνασκολοπίζειν includes crucifixion is left unanswered by Herodotus.

The four remaining texts do not offer any solution. On the one hand, there is nothing in the texts of Herodotus to abolish the assumption that ἀνασκολοπίζειν does cover crucifixion, that is, a punishment that coheres with the definition in the introduction of the present investigation. But, on the other hand, neither is there anything that supports it, other than a general assumption that ἀνασκολοπίζειν simply means “to crucify.” The texts containing the verb ἀνασκολοπίζειν could just as well refer to impaling.<sup>57</sup> Thus, the verb ἀνασκολοπίζειν as used by Herodotus is not possible to specify further than that it refers to some kind of execution by suspension.

### 2.1.3. Herodotus’ Use of Nail Terminology

Beyond the use of the prime verbs, ἀνασταυροῦν and ἀνασκολοπίζειν, Herodotus has two texts in which he describes the fate of the Persian Artaxerxes. In the first text, he deals with the accomplishments of the Persian king Xerxes on his march against Greece. He had marched through Asia Minor with his troops and reached the Hellespont. Herodotus describes the geography of the region and mentions briefly, almost as a gloss, an

<sup>54</sup> For another account of the event, see Heraclid. Lemb. *Excerpta polit.* sect. 16. (Corpus Aristotelicum, fragmenta varia, category 8 treatise title 611, line 101–109). This text does not, however, shed any further light on the punishment form.

<sup>55</sup> S.v. *LSJ*.

<sup>56</sup> SCHNEIDER, “ἀνασταυρώω,” 583.

<sup>57</sup> Cf. the use of the noun in Hdt. 9.97.

event that will occur on the Chersonese peninsula on the opposite side of the Hellespont.

There, not long afterwards, during Ariphron's son Xanthippus' leadership of the Athenians, [the Greeks] took Artayctes, a Persian man and governor of Sestus, and attached/nailed him alive to a board [ζώνοντα πρὸς σανίδα προσδιεπασσάλευσαν]. [Artayctes] used to bring women into the temple of Protesilaus at Eleaus and do impious deeds [there].<sup>58</sup>

It is worth noticing that Herodotus describes Artayctes as being alive (ζώνοντα) when nailed, a feature lacking in Herodotus' texts with ἀνασκολοπίζειν. The event itself is dealt with at some length in the next text, and the philological issues will be addressed there.

In the second text, on the last pages of his chronicle on the Persian war (9.116–22), Herodotus describes the fate of the cunning and wicked Artayctes at the hands of the Athenian Xanthippus, father of the famous Pericles. Artayctes was the viceroy of Xerxes. As a governor of Sestus, he ruled the province where the event took place. Through deceit, Artayctes made Xerxes give him the permission to rob the tomb of Protesilaus in Eleaus of its treasures. Artayctes brought the treasures to Sestus and then defiled the temple in Eleaus. His action kindled the anger of the Athenians who had invaded the strategically important peninsula of Chersonesus. The Athenians put Artayctes' fortress under siege. Artayctes and his son were captured after a breakout and carried to Sestus. The people of Eleaus entreated that Artayctes should be executed in justice to Protesilaus and the general in charge was of the same opinion.

They carried away [Artayctes] to the headland where Xerxes had bridged the strait, or, according to others, to the hill above the town of Madytus, and hanged him attached/nailed to boards [πρὸς σανίδας προσπασσαλεύσαντες ἀνεκρέμασαν]. And they stoned his son before his eyes.<sup>59</sup>

<sup>58</sup> Hdt. 4.202.1. ἔνθα μετὰ ταῦτα, χρόνῳ ὕστερον οὐ πολλῷ, ἐπὶ Ξανθίππου τοῦ Ἀρίφρονος στρατηγοῦ Ἀθηναίων, Ἀρταῦκτην ἄνδρα Πέρσην λαβόντες Σηστοῦ ὕπαρχον ζῶντα πρὸς σανίδα προσδιεπασσάλευσαν, ὃς καὶ ἐς τοῦ Πρωτεσίλειω τὸ ἱρὸν ἐς Ἐλαιούνητα ἀγινεόμενος γυναϊκάς ἀθέμιστα ἔρδεσκε.

<sup>59</sup> Hdt. 9.120.4. ἀπαγαγόντες δὲ αὐτὸν ἐς τὴν ἀκτὴν, ἐς τὴν Ξέρξης ἔξευξε τὸν πόρον, (οἱ δὲ λέγουσι ἐπὶ τὸν κολωνὸν τὸν ὑπὲρ Μαδύτου πόλιος) σανίδας προσπασσαλεύσαντες ἀνεκρέμασαν, τὸν δὲ παῖδα ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσι τοῦ Ἀρταῦκτεω κατέλευσαν. It is not known what Herodotus refers to with the words: “οἱ δὲ λέγουσι.” The exact scene of the execution appears to be in dispute. For more examples of the execution of family members in connection with a suspension punishment, see Pl. *Grg.* 473C–D; Diod. Sic. 34/35.12.1; Joseph. *BJ* 1.97 (par. Joseph. *AJ* 13.380.); Plut. *Cleom.* 38.2.

The execution of Artaxctes is referred to again in 9.122.1, this time with the verb ἀνακρεμαννύναι.<sup>60</sup> One of the striking features of the execution of Artaxctes, which is one of only two events that even could come into question as being references to crucifixion (the other is the aborted execution of Sandoces), is that they contain neither ἀνασταυροῦν and ἀνασκολοπίζειν, nor σταυρός and σκόλοψ. Instead, the suspension act is described by the verbs προσδιαπασσαλεύειν and προσπασσαλεύειν and referred to with ἀνακρεμαννύναι, and the crucifixion tool is σανίς. The facts that Herodotus in 7.33.1 adds ζώντα, which rules out the possibility that the text refers to a suspension of a corpse – post-mortem – and that the verbs προσδιαπασσαλεύειν and προσπασσαλεύειν occur in both texts, show that the suspension was an execution and that it included an act of nailing.<sup>61</sup>

Otherwise, Herodotus uses the verb προσπασσαλεύειν once, which might shed light on the usage of the verb in focus. The verb is used in the description of how a man from Halicarnassus took a tripod from a temple and nailed it to the wall of his own house (φέρων δὲ πρὸς τὰ ἑωυτοῦ οἰκία προσεπασσάλευσε τὸν τρίποδα).<sup>62</sup> Beyond this, it is worth noticing that the noun πάσσαλος is used in the sense of a sharp peg, or nail, used to fix the head of a stuffed horse.<sup>63</sup> These two texts strengthen the connection between the verbs used by Herodotus and nailing.

---

<sup>60</sup> Hdt. 9.122.1. τούτου δὲ τοῦ Ἀρταῦκτεω τοῦ ἀνακρεμασθέντος.... For Herodotus' use of ἀνακρεμαννύναι in connection with alleged crucifixions, see 3.125.4; 7.194.2. Cf. 5.114.1, a text that appears to be far from a crucifixion. It refers to the suspension of the head of Onesilus, the leader in the Cyprian revolt against Darius.

<sup>61</sup> The reason behind the shifting of prefix in the Rosén edition, between προσδια- and προσ-, appears to be without significance in these texts. The verb with the double prefixes is a *hapax legomenon*. Usually the verb διαπασσαλεύειν appears to focus more on the “stretching out” feature in the nailing act (e.g., Plut. *Artax.* 17.5), while προσπασσαλεύειν focuses on the “attaching” feature (e.g., Hdt. 1.144; Strabo, 4.4.5).

<sup>62</sup> Hdt. 1.144.3.

<sup>63</sup> Hdt. 4.71.4. This text might also, as a by-product, illuminate the punishment of impaling. In his description of the Scythians in the fourth book, Herodotus mentions some customs in connection with the burial of their kings. Having strangled a series of persons from the king's staff and put them in his tomb, they strangled fifty of his trustiest servants together with their best horses. Then they emptied and cleansed their bellies, filled them with chaff and sewed them up again. These stuffed servants and horses were then fixed on a wooden construction. They drove thick stakes through the horses lengthwise to the neck (ἔπειτα τῶν ἵππων κατὰ τὰ μήκηα ξύλα παχέα διελάσαντες μέχρι τῶν τραχήλων). They put bridles in the horses' mouths, thereby stretching out the heads of the horses, and fastened them with pegs (πασσάλων). Then they took the strangled men and mounted them on the horses. They did this by driving an upright stake through their bodies, passing up the spine to the neck, and attaching that to the horse (ἔπειαν νεκροῦ ἐκάστου παρὰ τὴν ἀκανθαν ξύλον ὀρθὸν διελάσασσι μέχρι τοῦ τραχήλου).

These features taken together cause the description of Artayctes' execution act, together with the report of the aborted execution of Sandoces, to have the closest resemblance to a crucifixion in *corpus Herodoteum*.<sup>64</sup> This makes the *completed execution* of Artayctes of special interest in the present investigation. Thus, Hengel's statement that the description of Artayctes' fate is "the only detailed account of a crucifixion given by Herodotus" appears too generous.<sup>65</sup> The event might in fact be the *only* account that could come into question as being a crucifixion in the texts by Herodotus.

It is, lastly, worth noticing that the executed person was a Persian and that the executors were Greek. Thus, if it is correct to label the event as a crucifixion, it appears that the *Greeks* carried out one of the first crucifixions in Greek literature, and that the crucified person was *Persian* – not *vice versa*, as one might expect.

#### 2.1.4. Conclusion – Herodotus and Crucifixion

When it comes to the terminology of crucifixion in the texts of Herodotus, the first observation is shared by all texts: the material is too limited to draw any far-reaching conclusions. Only some minor characteristics can be seen. Herodotus appears to use the verbs ἀνασταυροῦν and ἀνασκοποῖζειν in slightly different ways. One characteristic is that the usage of ἀνασταυροῦν covers various kinds of suspensions. The suspended objects are corpses or body parts, with one exception: when the term refers to what appears to be an aborted crucifixion (7.194.1). It does not include any kind of complete execution by suspension. Another characteristic is that the usage of ἀνασκοποῖζειν covers various forms of suspensions that appear to be *executions* by suspension. Twice it is used of events that had not yet happened; a planned execution (3.132.2) and ad-

---

In this text the noun πάσσαλος appears to refer to a sharpened peg, a kind of nail in other words, used to fix the heads of the horses by straightening the bridles and attaching them to the wooden construction or the ground with the pegs. It is also worth notice that Herodotus uses the noun ξύλον when referring to the piercing stake, not σκόλωψ, which might be expected (Herodotus does not in fact use the noun σκόλωψ at all).

<sup>64</sup> There are some problems with Eva Keul's argument that Herodotus refers to a form of "planking" (ἀποτομπανισμός). "In 479 B.C. the Athenians did away with the Persian leader Artayctes by exposing him to the elements, tied to a post (Hdt. 7,33)" (KEULS, *The Reign of the Phallus*, 8). The texts do not mention any post; instead the execution tool appears to be a plank. Neither do the texts mention any use of ropes; instead nails appear to be used. And the event itself is described in Hdt. 9.120, not in 7.33 as Keuls states.

<sup>65</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 24.

vice to maltreat a corpse (9.78.3). The verb ἀνασκολοπίζειν does not include any event of completed defiling of a corpse.

However, when it comes to the knowledge a present-day reader can get from Herodotus' use of the verbs, it is possible to conclude that none of the verbs means simply "to crucify." Hengel comes close to this when he discusses the problems connected with how to reach a decision about what kind of suspension a specific text describes.

A particular problem is posed by the fact that the *form* of crucifixion varied considerably. Above all, there is not always a clear distinction between crucifixion of the victim while he is still alive and the display of the corpse of someone who has been executed in a different fashion. As a rule, Herodotus uses the verb ἀνασκολοπίζειν of living men and ἀνασταυροῦν for corpses.... The common factor in all these verbs (ἀνασταυρίζειν added [comment by the present author]) is that the victim – living or dead – was either nailed or bound to a stake, σκόλοψ or σταυρός.<sup>66</sup>

These important observations could be developed further. Both ἀνασκολοπίζειν and ἀνασταυροῦν *may* refer to crucifixions in some instances, but it is not possible to link them directly to this punishment form, as Hengel mentions. Nevertheless, since it is not only difficult to determine whether they refer to an execution or suspension of corpse, but also whether the victim was crucified, impaled or suspended in another way, the verbs are even more unspecific than Hengel admits. The victims could not just be nailed or bound to a stake; they could also be impaled or suspended in another way. Our present-day readers are not only uncertain whether the victims were dead or alive; often they do not even know what kind of suspension the texts refer to at all.

Kuhn's remark that Hengel draws too far-reaching conclusions regarding Herodotus' use of the verbs is thus a step in the right direction.<sup>67</sup> However, Kuhn's observation could also be developed further. As mentioned, both verbs appear simply to be used in the broad sense "to suspend" in some way. The present question whether the suspension was done by, e.g., crucifixion or impaling appears to be subordinated for Herodotus. The focus seems only to be on the fact that a suspension occurred, not the way it was carried out. Hence, caution is required when dealing with both verbs, not just with ἀνασταυροῦν, which is where Kuhn puts his question mark.

Thus, both Hengel and Kuhn seem to draw more information from the verbs than the texts actually offer. In the end, both verbs are undefined in the same way and to the same degree – with one exception. When it comes to the question whether the victim was dead or alive, is it possi-

<sup>66</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 24.

<sup>67</sup> KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 683 n. 192.



ble to trace a weak distinction. Five out of six occurrences of the verb ἀνασταυροῦν clearly deal with suspensions of corpses.<sup>68</sup> The remaining text (7.194.1) refers to an aborted execution. Five out of seven occurrences of the verb ἀνασκολοπίζειν refer to unspecified executions.<sup>69</sup> The remaining texts are a planned execution (3.132.2) and advice to maltreat a corpse (9.78.3–79.1). The renegade texts in 3.132.2; 7.194.1 and 9.78.3 make a clear distinction between the verbs impossible. There is only a tendency that the use of ἀνασταυροῦν leans toward maltreatment of corpses while ἀνασκολοπίζειν is used more in connection with executions (as Hengel puts it).

A major difference between the verbs, if they are used interchangeably in 9.78.3–79.1, is that the usage of ἀνασκολοπίζειν appears to cover the usage of ἀνασταυροῦν (not *vice versa*). That is, ἀνασκολοπίζειν might refer to a post-mortem suspension (9.78.3–79.1) while ἀνασταυροῦν never refers to an ante-mortem suspension – an execution.

Still, it is only in two exceptional cases somewhat clear in *what way* these suspensions were carried out (the crucifixions of Sandoces in 7.194.1–3 and Artayctes in 9.120.4). These exceptional cases depend without exception on contextual features (an outdrawn death struggle which was possible to survive in the former text, and a fatal nailing to an execution tool with a likewise outdrawn death struggle in the latter text).

In summary, the verbs are undefined when it comes to the suspension form as a whole (contra Hengel), but they appear slightly definable when it comes to the issue whether the victims were dead or alive (contra Kuhn).<sup>70</sup>

Beyond the use of the verbs ἀνασταυροῦν and ἀνασκολοπίζειν, Herodotus offers an account with resemblance to the punishment of crucifixion. Here he uses a different terminology, the verbs προσδιαπασσαλεύειν and προσπασσαλεύειν, when describing the fate of Artayctes. These texts are of special interest since they are the clearest accounts of an executionary suspension where the victim appears to have been attached by nailing.

It is possible to draw the following conclusions from these texts. They indicate a variety of the execution methods. The victims appear still to be nailed, but the execution tool is a board instead of a cross or a pole. It appears not problematic to describe the same punishment form with different prefixes (προσδια- and προσ-) in the compound of the verb.

<sup>68</sup> Hdt. 3.125.3; 4.103.1; 6.30.1; 7.238.1; 9.78.3.

<sup>69</sup> Hdt. 1.128.2; 3.159.1; 4.43.2, 6; 4.202.1.

<sup>70</sup> When Kuhn argues, contra Hengel, for his conclusion regarding Herodotus' use of ἀνασταυροῦν he does not mention 4.103.1–3, which also describes a suspension of a dead person, or at least part of one (KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 683 n. 192). The fact that the verb, without exception, does not refer to any execution could at least be considered as a tendency.

Ultimately, three things might be said about the texts of Herodotus regarding the punishment of crucifixion as defined in the introduction. First, the suspensions are unspecified to a higher degree than what is regularly assumed. Several of the accounts that are commonly labeled as “crucifixions” in the texts of Herodotus are not possible to label otherwise than as “unspecified suspensions.” They cannot be determined as crucifixions with a satisfying degree of certainty. Second, neither of the verbs ἀνασταυροῦν and ἀνασκολοπίζειν means “to crucify” *per se*. They are used in a variety of fashions. For a modern reader they mean “to suspend” in a wide sense. In general, the verb ἀνασταυροῦν refers to various suspensions of corpses and body parts, while ἀνασκολοπίζειν appears to refer to execution by various suspensions. Third, the closest call on execution by crucifixion comes in the texts that use the verbs προσδιαπασσαλεύειν and προσπασσαλεύειν.

As a result, all texts but the aborted execution of Sandoces and the execution of Artaÿctes ought to be excluded in the effort to create a textual basis for the study of crucifixion in the texts of Herodotus. It is, again, not possible to draw the conclusion that the other texts containing ἀνασταυροῦν and ἀνασκολοπίζειν do not refer to crucifixions at all. The rejected texts *may* refer to crucifixions, but it is impossible to determine to what extent they actually are relevant references due to the lack of additional internal or external textual evidence.

The knowledge that can be drawn from the texts of Herodotus concerning the death punishment of crucifixion is thus slim. Chiefly two observations are possible, and these deal only with a crucifixion-like punishment. They cannot be determined as references to proper crucifixions. First, both Sandoces and Artaÿctes were obviously alive when suspended. They also stayed alive for a while on the execution tool: Sandoces long enough for the king to change his mind and rescue Sandoces; Artaÿctes long enough to see his son being stoned before his eyes. Second, the execution of Artaÿctes occurred on a board on which he appears to have been nailed. The account of the attempted execution of Sandoces is silent as far as the execution tool is concerned.

When it comes to the rejected texts – texts containing unspecified suspensions, impaling and suspension of corpses – some minor observations could be made. These observations offer some understanding of the suspension punishment as a larger entity. Crucifixion is also a suspension punishment, not *the* suspension punishment. It is one part of a broad punishment group. Conclusions drawn about the punishment of crucifixion cannot always be applied to the whole group of suspension punishments – and *vice versa*.

Six of the rejected texts refer to unspecified suspensions. In four of the texts ἀνασκολοπίζειν is used; all seem to refer to executions by suspension, and they do not mention any preceding killing.<sup>71</sup> In two texts ἀνασταυροῦν is used, both referring to the suspension of corpses.<sup>72</sup> There are two instances of impaling in the text of Herodotus; the verb ἀνασταυροῦν is used in both texts.<sup>73</sup> The two instances of impaling in Herodotus indicate that the objects were decapitated heads, not whole corpses or living persons. There is no clear tendency regarding the subjects or the objects in these punishments, other than that the Persians are frequent in the role of executors. The victims of the unspecified suspension and the impaling were a diverse group, as were the reasons behind the actions.

The distinction between ἀνασταυροῦν and ἀνασκολοπίζειν that might be traced in the texts of Herodotus is lost after him, as noticed by Hengel.<sup>74</sup> A remaining question is how Herodotus' more or less contemporary authors use the verbs. This will be studied briefly in the following pages.

## 2.2. *Thucydides*

Hengel also mentions Thucydides.<sup>75</sup> Thucydides (between 460 and 455–ca. 400) wrote in Old Attic about events connected with the Peloponnesian wars, which occurred during the years from 431 to 411 B.C.E., when his eight book stops abruptly in mid-narrative.

In one text, Thucydides deals with a revolt in Egypt, which the Libyan king Inaros started and mastered. The revolt occurred simultaneously as the Archidamian War raged on the Greek mainland.<sup>76</sup> The Persian king Artaxerxes I responded to the revolt by sending the Persian Megabyzus (Megabyxus in Herodotus' terminology) with a large army to Egypt. The Persian army returned almost all of Egypt to Artaxerxes. Thucydides describes the fate of Inaros as follows:

Inaros, the Libyan king, who caused everything concerning the Egyptian [revolt], was captured through a betrayal and suspended [ἀνεσταυρώθη].<sup>77</sup>

<sup>71</sup> Hdt. 1.128.2; 3.159.1; 4.43.2, 6; 4.202.1.

<sup>72</sup> Hdt. 3.125.2; 6.30.1.

<sup>73</sup> Hdt. 4.103.1; 7.238.1.

<sup>74</sup> See HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 24.

<sup>75</sup> Thuc. 1.110.3 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 22 n. 1).

<sup>76</sup> The "Ten-year War" in Thucydides' terminology, i.e., the first phase of the main Peloponnesian War.

<sup>77</sup> Thuc. 1.110.3. Ἰνάρωσ δὲ ὁ Λιβύων βασιλεύς, ὃς τὰ πάντα ἔπραξε περὶ τῆς Αἰγύπτου, προδοσίᾳ ληφθεὶς ἀνεσταυρώθη.

In contrast to Herodotus' use of ἀνασταυροῦν, the object of the verb in Thucydides' text is not said to be a corpse. The text could describe an execution. The execution method is however unknown, due to the uncertainty regarding Thucydides' use of the verb.<sup>78</sup> This is the only time Thucydides uses the verb ἀνασταυροῦν. He never uses ἀνασκολοπίζειν. Hence, it is not possible to draw any conclusions on Thucydides' use of the verb. There are only two vague indications that might be considered. Elsewhere, Thucydides uses the verb with different prefixes or without prefix in connection with construction of palisades.<sup>79</sup> It is plausible to assume that pointed poles were used in fortifications, which could incline the interpretation of ἀνασταυροῦν towards impaling.

There is also one loosely connected text which is worth notice here. The object of the verb is different, but its usage here might offer second-hand information about a specific connotation of the verb. When Thucydides describes the Syracusan defense of the harbor during an Athenian assault, he mentions the hazardous pointed poles in the water outside the old dockyard.<sup>80</sup>

But the most hazardous part of the stockade was the hidden [part]: some of the poles which had been driven in did not appear above the water, so that it was dangerous to approach [them], for anyone who did not see them was in danger of running the ship upon them, just as upon a reef. However, divers went down and sawed off these for reward, although the Syracusans put [them] back [ἐσταύρωσαν] again.<sup>81</sup>

This defense line prevented the Athenians from ramming the Syracusan ships. Anyone who attempted to approach the stockade carelessly was in danger of having his ship sunk by the submerged sharpened poles, i.e., figuratively "impaled". These observations are nothing but circumstantial evidence and do not close the case regarding Thucydides' use of ἀνασταυροῦν, but they indicate that impaling may be a more plausible reading of the verb than crucifixion.<sup>82</sup> This makes it difficult to use this

<sup>78</sup> When Ctesias describes Inaros' fate below (*FGrH* 3c, 688 F 14.39), he seems to have an impaling in mind (acknowledged by Hengel [HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 22 n. 1]).

<sup>79</sup> E.g., περισταυροῦν in 2.75.1; προσταυροῦν in 4.9.1; διασταυροῦν in 6.97.2; and perhaps, depending on how Aesop's texts are dated, the first known occurrence in Greek literature of the plain verb, σταυροῦν, in 6.100.1 (cf. 7.25.7).

<sup>80</sup> Thuc. 7.25.5–8.

<sup>81</sup> Thuc. 7.25.7. χαλεπωτάτη δ' ἦν τῆς σταυρώσεως ἡ κρύφιος; ἦσαν γὰρ τῶν σταυρῶν οὐς οὐχ ὑπερέχοντας τῆς θαλάσσης κατέπηξαν, ὥστε δεινὸν ἦν προσπλεῦσαι, μὴ οὐ προιδῶν τις ὥσπερ περὶ ἔρμα περιβάλλῃ τὴν ναῦν. ἀλλὰ καὶ τούτους κολυμβηταὶ δυόμενοι ἐξέπριον μισθοῦ. ὁμως δ' αὐθις οἱ Συρακόσιοι ἐσταύρωσαν.

<sup>82</sup> Contra Zestermann, Zöckler and Blinzler who label the punishment in Thuc. 1.110.3 as "crucifixion" (ZESTERMANN, *Die Kreuzigung*, 346; ZOECKLER, *The Cross of Christ*, 60 n. 1; BLINZLER, *Der Prozess Jesu*, 367 n. 3).

text as support for the view that the Persians used “crucifixion as a form of execution.”<sup>83</sup>

### 2.3. *Ctesias*

Hengel also mentions the fragmentary texts of Ctesias.<sup>84</sup> Ctesias (late 5<sup>th</sup> cent. B.C.E.) was born in Cnidus and a contemporary of Xenophon. He wrote in Ionic at least a history of Persia (*Persica*) and the first separate work on India (*Indica*). Ctesias was a physician at the court of the Persian king Artaxerxes II and an itinerant history writer. His historical context was thus the opposite of Herodotus’ as far as the Greco-Persian conflict is concerned.

The Ctesian texts of interest in this investigation occur in the writings of Diodorus Siculus, Plutarch and Photius.<sup>85</sup> The texts found within the writings of Diodorus Siculus and Plutarch will be dealt with in connection with each author.<sup>86</sup> The four texts from Photius – which all use the apparently late form ἀνασταυρίσειν – originate from Ctesias’ *Persica* and are preserved in Photius’ *Bibliotheca*, a text of medieval origin.

The first text deals with the fate of the eunuch Petisacas whom Cyrus sent to catch Astygius (or “Astyages” according to Herodotus’ spelling). Petisacas was persuaded to abandon Astygius in some desolate land to perish of hunger and thirst, which he later did. Nevertheless, the crime was revealed and, after an urgent request by Astygius’ daughter Amities, Cyrus handed over Petisacas to her for punishment.

She dug out the eyes and flayed the skin and then suspended [ἀνεσταύρισεν] [it/him].<sup>87</sup>

On the basis of this text alone, it is not possible to determine in what way Petisacas – or his skin – was suspended. Nevertheless, the following two texts may provide information about Ctesias’ use of the verb.

In the second text, Ctesias describes the aftermath of the same revolt in Egypt that Thucydides deals with in his text above.<sup>88</sup> The Ctesian version of the fate of Inarus goes as follows.

[Amestris] suspended [ἀνεσταύρισεν] [Inarus] on three stakes [σταυροῖς].<sup>89</sup>

<sup>83</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 22 n. 1.

<sup>84</sup> Ctesias, *FGrH* 3c, 688 F 14.39; F 14.45 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 22 n. 1).

<sup>85</sup> Photius was a Greek scholar of the Byzantine Period.

<sup>86</sup> I.e., Diod. Sic. 2.1.10; 2.18.1; Plut. *Artax.* 17.5.

<sup>87</sup> Ctesias, *FGrH* 3c, 688 F 9.6. ἡ δὲ τὸς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐξορύξασα καὶ τὸ δέρμα περιείρασα ἀνεσταύρισεν.

<sup>88</sup> Cf. Thuc. 1.110.3.

<sup>89</sup> Ctesias, *FGrH* 3c, 688 F 14.39. καὶ ἀνεσταύρισεν μὲν ἐπὶ τρισὶ σταυροῖς. Cf. *FGrH* 3c, 688 F 26.7 (Plut. *Artax.* 17.5), a text which also mentions an impaling upon three stakes.

This text shows that Ctesias uses the verb ἀνασταυρίζειν in connection with what appears to be some kind of impaling. It is difficult to see that the text should describe Inarus as crucified on three crucifixion tools simultaneously.<sup>90</sup> This text is the only indication in the Ctesian texts preserved by Photius of what Ctesias refers to with the verb. Beyond this, the remaining occurrences of the verb do add some features regarding the understanding of the verb.

The next text describes an event that occurred in the aftermath of the death of Cyrus II. Cyrus' mother, the wife of Darius II, Parysatis, went to Babylon. While mourning the death of Cyrus, she recovered with difficulty Cyrus' head and hand and sent them to Susa, one of the two royal residences created by Darius I. According to Ctesias, it was a eunuch named Bagapates who had cut off Cyrus' head and hand by order of King Artaxerxes (or "Artaxerxes" in Xenophon's spelling). When Parysatis was playing at dice with the king, she won the eunuch Bagapates as a prize. She then implemented her revenge.

Having the skin stripped off he was suspended [ἀνεσταυρίσθη] by Parysatis.<sup>91</sup>

The text appears to describe that the eunuch was flayed and suspended in some way.

Plutarch has a variation on the theme. In a text based on Ctesias he describes a flaying and a suspension. In the Plutarchian text, a eunuch named Masabates is impaled slantwise on three stakes while the *skin* was nailed separately (σῶμα πλάγιον διὰ τριῶν σταυρῶν ἀναπῆξαι, τὸ δὲ δέρμα χωρὶς διαπατταλεῦσαι).<sup>92</sup>

In the last text, Ctesias describes the punishment of the man who murdered Megabyzus' son Zopyrus. According to Ctesias, Zopyrus revolted against the Persian king after Megabyzus' death. He visited Athens where he was well received, thanks to the deeds his mother Amestris had done toward the Athenians. From Athens, he sailed with some Athenian troops to the Carian city of Caunus and summoned it to surrender. The inhabitants said that they were ready to do so, provided the Athenians who accompanied him were not admitted to the city. While Zopyrus was mounting the wall, a Caunian named Alcides struck him in the head with a stone and killed him. Ctesias describes, briefly as usual, the fate of Alcides as follows.

<sup>90</sup> Cf. Plut. *Artax.* 17.5 (Ctesias, *FGrH* 3c, 688 F 26.7).

<sup>91</sup> Ctesias, *FGrH* 3c, 688 F 16.66. τὸ δέρμα περιαιρεθεὶς ἀνεσταυρίσθη ὑπὸ Παρυσάτιος.

<sup>92</sup> Ctesias, *FGrH* 3c, 688 F 26.7 (Plut. *Artax.* 17.5).

[Zopyrus'] grandmother Amestris suspended [ἀνεσταύρισεν] the Caunian.<sup>93</sup>

Neither does this text reveal what kind of suspension it portrays. The conclusion that could be drawn from the Ctesian text is that the use of the verb ἀνασταυρίζειν leans toward impaling.<sup>94</sup> The texts from Ctesias preserved in Photius are, however, problematic to use in the study of the ancient usage of the verb due to their late date of origin.

#### 2.4. *Xenophon*

Xenophon (ca. 430–ca. 354) lacks reports of crucifixion. There is a text with the verb ἀνασταυροῦν, but the verb probably refers to an impaling. The text occurs in a speech by Xenophon in his *Anabasis* where he refers to the fate of Cyrus II. After the coronation of his elder brother Artaxerxes II, Cyrus went to Sardis and prepared for a coup d'état, supported by his mother. He marched against his brother with an army of regular contingents from Asia Minor, reinforced with Greek mercenaries. He led his army to Babylonia and fought a major battle at Cunaxa in 401 B.C.E., in which Cyrus lost his life. According to the apparently Persian custom of treating slain rebels, the head and right hand of Cyrus were cut off and brought to the King. The speech by Xenophon refers to Artaxerxes' defiling of Cyrus' corpse:

Who, even in the case of his full brother, when he already was dead, cut off the/his head and hands and suspended [ἀνεσταύρωσεν] them.<sup>95</sup>

The text describes that the body of Cyrus II was dismembered, and that the head and hands were impaled. It is at least possible to conclude that the text weakens the connection between ἀνασταυροῦν and crucifixion.

#### 2.5. *Conclusion – Historians of the Classical Era*

The outcome of the study of crucifixion in texts by Greek historians of the Classical Era is thus meager. The only clear tendency that can be seen from the text material is that none of the prime verbs, ἀνασταυροῦν or ἀνασκολοπίζειν, mean “to crucify.” They may occasionally refer to crucifixions, but these occasions cannot be traced only by the sole occur-

<sup>93</sup> Ctesias, *FGrH* 3c, 688 F 14.45. Ἀμῆστρις δὲ ἡ μάμμη τὸν Καόνιον ἀνεσταύρισεν.

<sup>94</sup> The remaining text with ἀνασταυροῦν does not affect this assumption (Ctesias, *FGrH* 3c, 688 F 1b.1.10 [Diod. Sic. 2.1.10]).

<sup>95</sup> Xen. *An.* 3.1.17. ὃς καὶ τοῦ ὁμομητρίου ἀδελφοῦ καὶ τεθηκότος ἤδη ἀποτεμῶν τὴν κεφαλὴν καὶ τὴν χεῖρα ἀνεσταύρωσεν. Ctesias appears to offer the same description but he does not mention the impaling (*FGrH* 3c, 688 F 16.66. Cf. Xen. *An.* 1.10.1).

rences of the verbs. The verbs refer to several suspension forms such as unspecified suspensions of corpses (Hdt. 3.125.3; 6.30.1; 7.238.1), unspecified executionary suspensions (Hdt. 1.128.2; 3.132.2, 159.1; 4.43.6, 202.1), assumed impaling of heads (Hdt. 4.103.1–2; 9.78.3), assumed impaling of whole humans (Thuc. 1.110.3; Ctesias, *FGrH* 3c, 688 F 14.39 [ἀνασταυρίζειν]; Xen. *An.* 3.1.17), and suspensions with some resemblance to the punishment that today is called crucifixion (Hdt. 7.194.1–3).

Two general features are striking in the texts. First, the verb ἀνασκολοπίζειν disappears after Herodotus. Second, after Herodotus, the verb ἀνασταυροῦν starts to lean toward impaling instead of unspecified suspensions of corpses as the case was in Herodotus' texts.

Thus, the overall impression of ἀνασταυροῦν is that it refers to various instances of impaling in the majority of the texts, or defiling of corpses and what might be an aborted crucifixion, as far as Herodotus is concerned. When it comes to execution forms, the connection between ἀνασταυροῦν and impaling is by far stronger than the connection with crucifixion. To identify a text containing ἀνασταυροῦν as a reference to an execution by crucifixion, something more than the sole occurrence of the verb is needed. Preferably something in the context that indicates, for instance, that the suspension at hand was lethal (i.e., not a post-mortem suspension); that the victim was subjected to an outdrawn suffering (excluding abdominal impaling); possibly that nails were used – all that connect the suspension with a traditional understanding of crucifixion. These features are lacking in the texts studied above. The exceptions are the texts describing Sandoces' aborted suspension (Hdt. 7.194.1–3), which implies an outdrawn ante-mortem suspension, and the execution of Artajctes (Hdt. 7.33.1; 9.120.4), which implies the use of nails.

When it comes to the verb ἀνασκολοπίζειν, the verb does not show any tendency to lean toward impaling. It is, however, not possible to trace any tendency in another direction either (e.g., toward crucifixion). The only conclusion that can be drawn from the texts of the studied time span is based on Herodotus' use of the verb, as he is the only historian that uses it. He uses ἀνασκολοπίζειν when referring to various unspecified lethal suspensions.

The closest these texts come to a crucifixion in the sense defined by the present investigation are in two texts of Herodotus in which he uses the verbs προσδιαπασσαλεύειν and προσπασσαλεύειν. Thus, the assumed basic crucifixion terminology (ἀνασταυροῦν, ἀνασκολοπίζειν, or σταυρός) is not used when a punishment that has parallels to the execution form of Jesus is described. The texts show that a suspension punishment during the Classical Era could comprise an act of nailing as well as a living suspension victim.



### 3. Philosophical Literature of the Classical Era

#### 3.1. *Plato*

Hengel mentions two texts from Plato (ca. 429–347 B.C.E.). The suspension in the first text Hengel labels as “crucifixion,” and the latter as both “impaling” and “crucifixion.”<sup>96</sup> The first text is found in the dialogue of *Gorgias*. The dialogue partners in this section are Polus and Socrates, and Polus delivers a harsh example of unjust actions in the form of a rhetorical question.

How do you mean? If a man is caught while unjustly plotting [to make himself] a tyrant, and when he has been caught and tortured, castrated, had the eyes burnt out, and after many other grievous torments of every kind have been inflicted on him, and seeing them inflicted on his kids and wife, [he is] finally suspended [ἀνασταυρωθῆ] or tarred and burnt; will this man be happier than if he escapes and appoints [himself] as tyrant and passes his days as ruler of the city, doing whatever he likes, being envied and accounted happy by all citizens and foreigners as well? Is this, as you say, impossible to refute?<sup>97</sup>

In spite of Hengel’s label, it is difficult to determine what kind of suspension Plato makes Polus refer to with the verb ἀνασταυροῦν. It is the only time Plato uses the verb.<sup>98</sup>

The second text comes from the *Republic* and deals with the fate of the “just man.” The fate of the just man is from time to time compared with the suffering and crucifixion of Jesus.<sup>99</sup> The meaning of the terminology is hard to specify. In the text, Glaucon addresses Socrates in their dialogue about the quest for justice.

[It needs] to be said, even if the spoken words are too coarse, you must not suppose that it is I who speak thus, oh Socrates, but those who approve injustice above justice. They will say this: That the man is disposed to be flogged, tortured, bound, to have his eyes burnt out; and at last, after he had suffered every kind of evil, he will be suspended

<sup>96</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 27–28. See also, O’COLLINS, “Crucifixion,” 1209, who labels Pl. *Grg.* 473C–D (erroneously referred to as Pl. *Grg.* 473B–C by O’Collins) as a crucifixion.

<sup>97</sup> Pl. *Grg.* 473C–D. πῶς λέγεις; ἐὰν ἀδικῶν ἄνθρωπος ληφθῆ τυραννίδι ἐπιβουλεύων, καὶ ληφθεὶς στρεβλώται καὶ ἐκτέμνηται καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐκκάηται, καὶ ἄλλας πολλὰς καὶ μεγάλας καὶ παντοδαπὰς λώβας αὐτὸς τε λωβηθεὶς καὶ τοὺς αὐτοῦ ἐπιδῶν παῖδάς τε καὶ γυναῖκα τὸ ἔσχατον ἀνασταυρωθῆ ἢ καταπιττωθῆ, οὗτος εὐδαιμονέστερος ἔσται ἢ ἐὰν διαφυγὼν τύραννος καταστῆ καὶ ἄρχων ἐν τῇ πόλει διαβῆ ποιῶν ὅ τι ἂν βούληται, ζηλωτὸς ὢν καὶ εὐδαιμονιζόμενος ὑπὸ τῶν πολιτῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ξένων; ταῦτα λέγεις ἀδύνατον εἶναι ἐξελέγχειν;

<sup>98</sup> He does not use the noun σταυρός. Nor does he use any term based on the σκολοπ-stem.

<sup>99</sup> E.g., BENZ, “Der gekreuzigte Gerechte bei Plato,” 1031–74.

[ἀνασχιנדυλευθήσεται] and understand that [it is] to seem just, not to be [just], that we ought to desire.<sup>100</sup>

It is not possible to fully determine in what way Plato uses the rare ἀνασχιנדυλεύειν (Attic form of -σχιנדυλεύειν).<sup>101</sup> In Liddell-Scott the verb, with the alternative form -σχινδαλεύειν, is described as a synonym of ἀνασκολοπίζειν.<sup>102</sup> There is no instance of the simple form of the verb, σχιנדυλεύειν, on the TLG-E disc beside the ninth-century scholar and patriarch Photius of Constantinople who labels σχινδαλεύειν as a synonym of ἀνασταυροῦν.<sup>103</sup> If the etymology of the verb should be taken into consideration it suggests a connection with both the noun σχινδάλαμος, “splinter,” and the verb ἀνασχίζειν, “rip up,” and could thus indicate a connection between ἀνασχιנדυλεύειν and impaling.<sup>104</sup> However, etymology can be notoriously misleading.<sup>105</sup> When it comes to Plato’s text, scholars regularly label the fate of the just man as “crucifixion.”<sup>106</sup>

<sup>100</sup> Pl. *Resp.* 361E–362A. λεκτέον οὖν· καὶ δὴ κἄν ἀγροικότερως λέγηται, μὴ ἐμὲ οἴου λέγειν, ᾧ Σώκρατες, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἐπαινοῦντας πρὸ δικαιοσύνης ἀδικίαν. ἐροῦσι δὲ τὰδε, ὅτι οὕτω διακείμενος ὁ δίκαιος μαστιγῶσεται, στρεβλώσεται, δεδήσεται, ἐκκαυθήσεται τῷφθαλμῷ, τελευτῶν πάντα κακὰ παθὼν ἀνασχιנדυλευθήσεται καὶ γνώσεται ὅτι οὐκ εἶναι δίκαιον ἀλλὰ δοκεῖν δεῖ ἐθέλειν.

<sup>101</sup> The translator of the text in the Loeb edition, Paul Shorey, translates the verb “crucified,” but admits that “impaled” is closer to the truth. He refers to Cic. *Rep.* 3.27. It is not clear in what way that text would support “impaling” as a translation for ἀνασχιנדυλεύω [SHOREY, *LCL* (124 n. c)].

<sup>102</sup> S.v. LSJ. Cf. s.v. Hsch. (ἀνασχιנדυλεύεσθαι: ἀνασκολοπισθῆναι); Tim. *Lex.* (ἀνασχιנדυλευθῆναι: ἀνασκολοπισθῆναι, ἀνασταυρωθῆναι); *Etym. Magn.*

<sup>103</sup> S.v. Phot. *Lex.*

<sup>104</sup> For the translations, see the words in LSJ. Herodotus uses the verb ἀνασχίζειν when he describes how Harpagus rips open the belly of a hare and uses it as an envelope for his message to Cyrus (λαγὸν μηχανησάμενος καὶ ἀνασχίσας τούτου τὴν γαστέρα καὶ οὐδὲν ἀποτίλας, ὡς δὲ εἶχε, οὕτω ἐσέθηκε βυβλίον, γράψας τὰ οἱ ἐδόκεε [Hdt. 1.123.4]). This is a rather vague indication of what could be an interesting denotation of the verb. Note that, when the author of the Christian text *Acta et Martyrium Apollonii* related to the fate of the just man, he used ἀνασκολοπίζειν (*Act. Mar. Ap.* 40).

<sup>105</sup> Cf. the usage of ἀνασκολοπίζειν in the texts studied below and the comments on the verb in the Discussion chapter (see pp. 283–84).

<sup>106</sup> E.g., BENZ, “Der gekreuzigte Gerechte bei Plato,” 1036–39; EDWARDS, *The Gospel According to Mark*, 467; HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 27; O’COLLINS, “Crucifixion,” 1.1209; STAUFFER, *Jerusalem und Rom*, 124. For a suggestion that the fate of the just man was an impaling, see ALLEN, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 110; COLLINS, *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible*, 591.

### 3.2 Aristotle

Aristotle (384–322 B.C.E.) has a text with a vague reference to the fate of the Persian king Darius I in his *Politics* where he discusses the monarchy and its threats.

And similarly [could threats come] through fear. For this was one of the causes as [we mentioned] in the case of the republic and the monarchy. For instance, Artaphrenes [killed] Xerxes fearing the accusation about Darius, because he had suspended [ἐκρέμασεν] [Darius], when Xerxes had ordered him not to, thinking that [Xerxes] would pardon [him], being forgetful because he had been at dinner.<sup>107</sup>

This text does not indicate what kind of suspension Darius suffered. The author uses the verb κρεμαννύναι, a verb with a very broad usage. The punishment at hand could be an example of a regular hanging (i.e., death by suffocation through a snare around the neck) as well as impaling or crucifixion. No examples of such hanging, however, have been found in connection with Persia from this time, during the present study. Since other texts appear to connect the Persians with a suspension form that is close to impaling or crucifixion, it probably describes a suspension in that sense. Which of these two punishments, if either, the text refers to is nonetheless impossible to determine.

### 3.3. Conclusion – Philosophical Literature of the Classical Era

The outcome of the study of the death punishment of crucifixion as described by the philosophical literature of the Classical Era is also meager. The philosophers were apparently familiar with suspension punishments, and could use various terms when describing them. It is however not possible to determine which kind of suspension punishment the specific texts describe.

## 4. Tragedy, Comedy and Orators of the Classical Era

### 4.1. Aeschylus

Aeschylus (ca. 525/4–456/5 B.C.E.) has two texts which contain depictions of suspensions that ought to be labeled as impalings. In his play *Eumenides*, Aeschylus describes an event before the temple of Apollo at Delphi. The Pythian has given an oracle before she goes into the temple, and

<sup>107</sup> Arist. *Pol.* 1311b, 36–40. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ διὰ φόβον· ἐν γὰρ τι τοῦτο τῶν αἰτίων ἦν, ὥσπερ καὶ περὶ τὰς πολιτείας, καὶ περὶ τὰς μοναρχίας· οἷον Ξέρξην Ἀρταπάνης φοβούμενος τὴν διαβολὴν τὴν περὶ Δαρείου, ὅτι ἐκρέμασεν οὐ κελεύσαντος Ξέρξου, ἀλλ' οἴόμενος συγγνώσεσθαι ὡς ἀμνημονοῦντα διὰ τὸ δειπνεῖν.

shortly returns in great fear. After delivering a second message she leaves the shrine. The doors open and the inner part of the temple is visible. Orestes is standing in the center while the Furies lie sleeping; Apollo and Hermes come out from the inner part of the temple. After a short dialogue Orestes, Hermes and Apollo go out and the Ghost of Clymnestra appears and has a dialogue with the Furies. Apollo returns, expels the ghost and delivers a harsh account of various punishments that indicate where the ghost should be instead of at the shrine of Apollo.

It is indeed not fitting [for you] to approach this house;  
[fitting is] where beheading, tearing out of eyes  
and slaughter are custom and [where] by destruction of seed  
young men's virility is ruined, [where] there is mutilation and  
stoning, and [where] they moan an intense lamentation  
[who are] impaled [παγέντες] beneath the spine.<sup>108</sup>

The suspension mentioned by Aeschylus in this text appears to be an impaling. Aeschylus describes a slightly more problematic punishment in his play about the well-known fate of the Titan Prometheus, a common theme in Greek literature:

Lofty-minded son of Themis [who are] wise in counsel,  
against my will, and yours, with brazen [nails] that no one can loose  
I will nail you [προσπασσαλεύσω] to this desolate crag,  
that neither sound nor shape of mortal men  
shall [you] see, but, scorched by a bright flame of the sun,  
the bloom of [your] skin shall change.<sup>109</sup>

What kind of suffering Prometheus had to sustain in the poem is hard to determine. Prometheus is simply mentioned as being nailed or fettered.<sup>110</sup> The odd thing is the object – something “*which is fixed or firmly set.*”<sup>111</sup> Line four in the same play and some parallel texts identifies this as a rock.<sup>112</sup> The first text where Prometheus develops into a character of weight is Hesiod's *Theogony*:

<sup>108</sup> Aesch. *Eum.* 185–90. οὔτοι δόμοισι τοῖσδε χρίμπεσθαι πρέπει· | ἀλλ' οὐδὲ  
καρανιστήρες ὀφθαλμωρῦχοι | δίκαι σφαγαί τε σπέρματός τ' ἀποφθορᾶ | παίδων  
κακοῦται χλοῦνις, ἥδ' ἄκρωνία, | λευσμός τε, καὶ μύζουσιν οἰκτισμὸν πολὺν | ὑπὸ  
ράχιν παγέντες.

<sup>109</sup> Aesch. *PV* 18–23. τῆς ὀρθοβούλου Θέμιδος αἰπυμήτα καί, | ἄκοντά σ' ἄκων  
δυσλῦτοις χαλκεύμασι | προσπασσαλεύσω τῶδ' ἀπανθρώπων πάγω, | ἴν' οὔτε φωνὴν  
οὔτε του μορφὴν βροτῶν | ὄψει, σταθευτός δ' ἡλίου φοίβη φλογί | χροιάς ἀμείψεις  
ἄνθος.

<sup>110</sup> Several terms used in Lucian's account of Prometheus's torture are used in other accounts commonly labelled as crucifixions (see Luc. *Prom.* 1–2).

<sup>111</sup> S.v. “παγός,” LSJ.

<sup>112</sup> E.g., Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 2.1246–50; Luc. *Prom.* 1–2.

And [Zeus] bound the cunning Prometheus with unbreakable bonds, grievous chains, and drove a shaft through [his] middle; and he let loose a long-winged eagle; [the eagle] used to eat [his] immortal liver, but [it] grew back to its former shape by night, as much as the long-winged bird was eating all day.<sup>113</sup>

This text neither mentions the object Prometheus was attached to, nor uses the regular terminology.<sup>114</sup> It is possible that the phrase μέσον διὰ κίων' ἐλάσσας alludes to some kind of impaling, but that allusion is vague. Thus, neither does this text illuminate the torture of Prometheus as Aeschylus describes it.

#### 4.2. Sophocles

Sophocles (496/5–406 B.C.E.) has a text in his play *Antigone* that is of interest in the present investigation. The scene is the same as in Sophocles' well-known play *Oedipus the King*, an open space before the royal palace at Thebes, which was once that of Oedipus. The time is at daybreak in the morning after the fall of the two brothers, Eteocles and Polyneices, and the flight of the defeated Argives. The dialogue, which the text below comes from, is between the leader of the chorus of Theban elders, a guard who was set to watch the corpse of Polyneices, and Creon, the new king of Thebes. The discussion deals with the contrasting post-mortem treatments of the hero Eteocles and the traitor Polyneices by King Creon. Eteocles received an honored burial while Polyneices was left to unburied shame, as food for birds and dogs. But Polyneices' corpse was buried (by Polyneices' sister Antigone, as revealed later) and the guard becomes the deliverer of bad news for Creon. Creon becomes furious and demands that the guard should find the responsible person:

Now, as Zeus still has my reverence,  
 know this well – I tell you on my oath –  
 if you do not find the very hand behind this burial  
 and reveal [him] before my eyes,  
 Hades alone shall not be enough for you, not before,

<sup>113</sup> Hes. *Theog.* 521–25. δῆσε δ' ἄλυκτοπέδησι Προμηθέα ποικιλόβουλον, | δεσμοῖς ἀργαλέοισι, μέσον διὰ κίων' ἐλάσσας· | καὶ οἱ ἐπ' αἰετὸν ὄρσε τανύπτερον· αὐτὰρ ὁ γ' ἦπαρ | ἦσθιεν ἀθάνατον, τὸ δ' ἀέξετο ἴσον ἀπάντη | νυκτός, ὅσον πρόπαν ἦμαρ ἔδοι τανυσίπτερος ὄρνις. It is also possible to translate ἀλυκτοπέδαι with “galling bounds.” The noun also occurs in Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 2.1249, a text which also refers to the Prometheus myth. See the commentary by George W. Mooney on ἀλυκτοπέδαι (MOONEY, *The Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius*, 221).

<sup>114</sup> The verb used is δεῖν.

being hanged alive [ζῶντες κρεμαστοί], you have revealed [the very hand behind] this outrage.<sup>115</sup>

It is not possible to determine what kind of suspension Sophocles has Creon refer to with κρεμαστός – a text that Fulda labels as a crucifixion.<sup>116</sup> It is, however, worth notice that the suspension occurred ante-mortem (ζῶντες). Sophocles uses κρεμαστός later in the same play when he refers to some kind of hanging.<sup>117</sup> Another candidate may be the punishment referred to in the play *Ajax*, where a prisoner is tied to a pillar beneath the roof (δεθείς πρὸς κίων' ἑρκείου στέγης), and thus probably suspended in some way.<sup>118</sup>

### 4.3 Euripides

Euripides (between 485 and 480–406 B.C.E.) has a group of references to different suspensions, most likely various forms of impaling, which should be mentioned briefly. The first of these comes from the play *Bacchae* where the “second messenger,” towards the end of the song, sings about the fate of Pentheus, the son of the hero Echion. Pentheus was the successor of Cadmus as king of Thebes, and it is said that he resisted the Bacchic worship when it was introduced. Pentheus, however, hid himself in a tree to witness secretly the orgies of the Bacchanals. He was discovered by them and taken for a wild beast, and torn in pieces by his own mother and her two sisters in a Bacchic frenzy. Before his mother realized what had happened, she took his head and fixed it on the top of a thyrsos [πήξασ' ἐπ' ἄκρον θύρσον] and carried it away.<sup>119</sup>

The next text comes from the play *Electra* where Orestes, son of king Agamemnon, had killed his mother's lover and father's murderer Aegisthus, and so avenged their father's death. Orestes says to his sister Electra:

<sup>115</sup> Soph. *Ant.* 304–09. ἀλλ', εἴπερ ἴσχει Ζεὺς ἔτ' ἐξ ἐμοῦ σέβας, | εὖ τοῦτ' ἐπίστασ', ὄρκιος δέ σοι λέγω, | εἰ μὴ τὸν αὐτόχειρα τοῦδε τοῦ τάφου | εὐρόντες ἐκφανεῖτ' ἐς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐμούς, | οὐχ ὕμιν Ἄιδης μόνος ἀρκέσει, πρὶν ἂν | ζῶντες κρεμαστοὶ τήνδε δηλώσηθ' ὕβριν.

<sup>116</sup> FULDA, *Das Kreuz*, 53.

<sup>117</sup> Soph. *Ant.* 1221 (τὴν μὲν κρεμαστὴν ἀχένοσ κατεῖδομεν). Cf. Soph. *OT.* 1263, 66.

<sup>118</sup> Soph. *Aj.* 108. The actual meaning of the phrase is uncertain. Hugh Lloyd-Jones translate the phrase “bound to the pillar of the hut I live in” and does not indicate any suspension (LLOYD-JONES, *LCL*). For a discussion about the terminology, see the commentary of Jebb (Sophocles, *The Plays and Fragments*, part 7, *The Ajax*, 27).

<sup>119</sup> Eur. *Bacch.* 1141 (for a similar use of πηγνύναι see Eur. *Cyc.* 302–03). A thyrsos is a rod wreathed in ivy and vine-leaves with a pine cone at the top, used in the worship of Dionysus.

I bring him who is dead to you,  
 which you, if you desire, should expose [as] a prey for wild animals,  
 or as spoil for birds, the children of the air,  
 fix [the body and] press it down on a pole [πήξασ' ἔρεισον σκόλοπι].<sup>120</sup>

Euripides' words point towards an impaling by placing the body on an apparently sharpened pole and pressing it down.

In the next text, from the play *Iphigenia in Tauris*, the Taurian king Thoas urges his people to seize the Hellenes that "we may throw [them] from the hard rock or fix [their] body on the stake (σκόλοπι πήξωμεν)".<sup>121</sup> This text appears to refer to impaling and not crucifixion as suggested by O'Collins and Fulda.<sup>122</sup> This conclusion is based on the fact that Euripides never used the word σκόλωψ to designate the execution tool in crucifixion.<sup>123</sup> The previous text is an example of this. The fact that he uses the same terminology (i.e., πηγνύναι and σκόλωψ) in both texts indicates that both texts offer examples of impaling. Plutarch, who starts the fragment "Whether Vice be Sufficient to Cause Unhappiness" in his *Moralia* by quoting Euripides, uses the same terminology. In his lecture Plutarch asks, "But will you nail him to a cross or impale him on a pole?"<sup>124</sup> When Plutarch uses the verb καθηλοῦν in connection with σταῦρος, he may refer to crucifixion, and through the use of πηγνύναι in connection with σκόλωψ, to impaling. This indicates that Plutarch, who apparently was familiar with Euripides' terminology, understood πηγνύναι and σκόλωψ as a reference to impaling, not to crucifixion.<sup>125</sup> This may also indicate the nature of the punishment in King Thoas' request.

The last text comes from *Rhesus*. The indefinable Rhesus mentions to his dialogue partner, the Trojan leader Hector, a punishment that is of interest.

<sup>120</sup> Eur. *El.* 895–99. αὐτὸν τὸν θανόντα σοι φέρω, | ὃν εἴτε χρήξεις θηρῶν ἀρπαγὴν πρόθεσ, | ἢ σκῦλον οἰωνοῖσιν, αἰθέρος τέκνοις, | πήξασ' ἔρεισον σκόλοπι.

<sup>121</sup> Eur. *IT* 1429–30. κατὰ στόφλου πέτρας | ῥίψωμεν ἢ σκόλοπι πήξωμεν δέμας.

<sup>122</sup> O'COLLINS, "Crucifixion," 1207; FULDA, *Das Kreuz*, 53.

<sup>123</sup> Cf. Eur. *Frag.* 878; *El.* 895–99; *Rhes.* 116; *Bacch.* 983. In *Bacch.* 983 σκόλωψ seems to refer to "tree" in the broad sense. King Pentheus was searching for the wild Bacchanals from a cliff or a tree (ἀπὸ πέτρας ἢ σκόλωπος ὄψεται) and probably not from a pole. There appears to be a parallelism between πέτρα and σκόλωψ in both *Bacch.* 983 and *IT* 1430.

<sup>124</sup> Plut. *An vit.* 499D. ἀλλ' εἰς σταυρὸν καθηλώσεις ἢ σκόλοπι πήξεις;

<sup>125</sup> Cf. Hdt. 4.103.1–3. When Herodotus describes the cruelty of the Taurians he mentions their custom of decapitating their enemies and impaling their heads on a tall pole in front of their homes (ἀποταμῶν ἕκαστος κεφαλὴν ἀποφέρεται ἐς τὰ οἰκία, ἔπειτα ἐπὶ ξύλου μεγάλου ἀναπείρας).

No man of good courage would lower himself to secretly  
kill the foe, but to meet him face to face.

This one who sits, you say, in a thievish ambush  
and prepares [his plot], I will take alive  
and at the gates' outlet impale [ἀμπεύρας] through the spine  
and set up as a feast for winged vultures.

Being a robber and plunderer of the temples of the gods  
he ought to die through this fate.<sup>126</sup>

The combination of ἀναπέριεῖν and ῥάχις indicates that the text describes an impaling. This brief survey of Euripides suggests that he does not refer to any crucifixions in his texts.

#### 4.4. Demosthenes

Demosthenes (384–322 B.C.E.) refers in his speech against Meidias to a punishment that is of interest in this investigation. The brutal Meidias had offended the young Demosthenes and his family. When Meidias was charged for this crime he did not appear in court and tried in every way to stay out of court. Years later Demosthenes had his opportunity to present his accusations against Meidias. A part of his speech contains the mentioned text.

No, not even when he spoke to that [audience (i.e., people in a market place)] was he ashamed; unjustly he brings so much evil on someone. But having set one goal before [him], to destroy me by every means, he thought it necessary to leave no possibility untried, as it is necessary that if any man, having been insulted by [Meidias], claimed redress and refused to keep silent, this one man should be removed by banishment, without an opportunity of escape, should even be taken convicted for desertion, should be accused of capital charge, all but being fastened by nails [προσηλωσθαι]. And yet, when [Meidias] is convicted of this, as well as of his insults when I was a chorus master, what leniency or what compassion shall he justly obtain from you?<sup>127</sup>

<sup>126</sup> Eur. *Rhes.* 510–17. οὐδεὶς ἀνὴρ εὖψυχος ἀξιοῖ λάθρα | κτεῖναι τὸν ἐχθρόν,  
ἀλλ' ἰὼν κατὰ στόμα. | τοῦτον δ' ὄν ἴζειν φῆς σὺ κλωπικὰς ἔδρας | καὶ μηχανάσθαι,  
ζῶντα συλλαβῶν ἐγὼ | πυλῶν ἐπ' ἐξόδοισιν ἀμπεύρας ῥάχιν | στήσω πετεινοῖς γυψὶ  
θουνατήριον. | ληστὴν γὰρ ὄντα καὶ θεῶν ἀνάκτορα | συλῶντα δεῖ νιν τῷδε κατθανεῖν  
μόρφ.

<sup>127</sup> Dem. *Meid.* 21.105. ἀλλ' οὐδὲ πρὸς οὓς ἔλεγ' αὐτοὺς ἡσχύνθη, εἰ τοιοῦτο  
κακὸν καὶ τηλικούτον ἀδίκως ἐπάγει τῷ, ἀλλ' ἐν' ὄρον θέμενος παντὶ τρόπῳ μ'  
ἀνελεῖν, οὐδὲν ἔλλείπειν ᾤετο δεῖν, ὡς δέον, εἴ τις ὑβρισθεὶς ὑπὸ τούτου δίκης ἀξιοῖ  
τυχεῖν καὶ μὴ σιωπᾶ, τοῦτον ἐξόριστον ἀνηρῆσθαι καὶ μηδαμῇ παρεθῆναι, ἀλλὰ καὶ  
λιποταξίου γραφὴν ἠλωκέναι καὶ ἐφ' αἵματι φεύγειν καὶ μόνον οὐ προσηλωσθαι.  
καίτοι ταῦθ' ὅταν ἐξελεγχθῆ ποιῶν πρὸς οἷς ὑβρίζε με χορηγοῦντα, τίνος συγγνώμης ἢ  
τίνος ἐλέου δικαίως τεύξεται παρ' ὑμῶν;



The example of nailing (προσηλοῦν) that Demosthenes gives in his speech against Meidias in a court is some kind of punishment in which nails were used. However, neither the subject nor the object of the suspension is given in this text. Thus, the text does not add much information to the understanding of crucifixion, other than that nails somehow could be used in punishments.

#### 4.5. Conclusion – Tragedy, Comedy and Orators of the Classical Era

The present section does not add much to the knowledge of crucifixion. The lesson that could be learned is that dramatic and rhetorical texts of the Classical Era are familiar with various forms of suspension punishments in general and impaling in particular.

## 5. Greek Historians of the Hellenistic Era

### 5.1. Polybius

Polybius (ca. 200–ca. 118 B.C.E.) wrote in his *Histories* about Rome's rise to dominion of the Mediterranean countries and about the world in which it happened.<sup>128</sup>

Both Hengel and Kuhn refer to crucifixions in Polybius' texts.<sup>129</sup> Polybius is of special importance for the present investigation since his texts are commonly used to trace the time and the events when the punishment of crucifixion is assumed to have entered the Roman Empire.<sup>130</sup> Polybius uses ἀνασταυροῦν throughout his texts, with two exceptions where the plain verb is used. ἀνασκολοπιζειν is used in one fragmentary text.

#### 5.1.1 Unspecified Suspension Punishments in Polybius

Also Polybius' texts are mainly unspecified as far as the suspension form is concerned. The first occurrence of ἀνασταυροῦν is a good example of this. The text deals with a tense situation in the Sicilian city of Messina, which was under Carthaginian dominance. The event took place during

<sup>128</sup> See also, DEROW, "Polybius," 1209–10.

<sup>129</sup> Hengel: Polyb. 1.11.5, 24.6 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 23 n. 10; 46 n. 1); 1.79.4f. (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 23 n. 10; 46 n. 1 [the reference is to 1.74.9 but that appears to be erroneous, see n. 133 below]); 1.86.4 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 23 n. 10). On page 74 Hengel refers to 1.8.21.3 but also this reference appears to be erroneous; it should be 8.21.3. Kuhn: Polyb. 1.11.5 (KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 684 n. 197).

<sup>130</sup> E.g., HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 23; HENGEL and SCHWEMER, *Jesus und das Judentum*, 611; KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 684; O'COLLINS, "Crucifixion," 1207; SCHNEIDER, "σταυρός, κτλ.," 573; ZESTERMANN, "Die Kreuzigung," 347.

the first Punic war. The Mamertines, a band of Campanian mercenaries who served under the Syracusan tyrant Agathocles, removed the Carthaginian commander from the citadel and handed over the authority to the Romans. The Romans had intervened to weaken the Carthaginian supremacy of the areas surrounding the Roman peninsula. When the Roman consul Appius Claudius was installed in the citadel, the Carthaginians reacted with disappointment.

The Carthaginians suspended [ἀνεσταύρωσαν] their commander, considering him to be folly, and at the same time a coward, in abandoning the citadel.<sup>131</sup>

The text does not reveal in what way the commander was suspended. The only feature that links the text to an assumed crucifixion is the sole occurrence of ἀνασταυροῦν. Still, both Hengel and Kuhn label this text as a crucifixion account.<sup>132</sup> An unusual feature of the account is that the victim was the Carthaginian commander and that he was suspended by his own soldiers.

This text shares both these features, an unspecified use of ἀνασταυροῦν and the soldiers' execution of their own commander, with two additional suspension texts in Polybius (1.24.5–6, 79.2–5). Due to their proximity with the previous text they will not be studied separately. In spite of the unspecified use of ἀνασταυροῦν, Hengel labels the suspensions as “crucifixions” in both these texts.<sup>133</sup> When it comes to the use of ἀνασταυροῦν, Polybius uses the verb in two other texts and he does so in a slightly different fashion (see 5.54.6–7 and 8.21.2–3 under the next heading).

Belonging to the present group is also a text found in a notice, which seems to be a gloss without connection with its context in the fragmentary tenth book. This is the only text within the *corpus Polybium* which uses the verb ἀνασκολοπίζειν.

<sup>131</sup> Polyb. 1.11.5. κάρχηδόνιοι δὲ τὸν μὲν στρατηγὸν αὐτῶν ἀνεσταύρωσαν, νομίσαντες αὐτὸν ἀβούλωσ, ἅμα δ' ἀνάνδρως, προέσθαι τὴν ἀκρόπολιν.

<sup>132</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 23 n. 10; 46 n. 1; KUHN, “Die Kreuzesstrafe,” 684 n. 197.

<sup>133</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 23 n. 10; 46 n. 1 (the last reference, to 1.74.9 in both the German edition and the English translation, appears to be erroneous since that text does not refer to any suspension at all. The previous reference on page 23 n. 10 [138 n. 49, in the German text], is correct as 1.79.4f). Also Fulda labels the text in 1.24.5–6 as “crucifixion” (FULDA, *Das Kreuz*, 50).

They suddenly let down the portcullis, which they had raised a little higher through an engine, and threw themselves upon [them], and having seized them they suspended [ἀνεσκολόπισαν] them before the walls.<sup>134</sup>

This text indicates neither what kind of suspension it refers to nor who the victims or the perpetrators are. It is hard to draw any conclusion regarding the change of verb on the basis of this text alone.

### 5.1.2. Post-mortem Suspension in Polybius

The first text that uses ἀνασταυροῦν in a slightly different fashion deals with the suspension of the corpse of the Median satrap Molon, who revolted against the Seleucid king Antiochus III (the Great). Molon led an army in an attack against Antiochus, but half of his army deserted to Antiochus in the beginning of the battle. Molon, who knew what had happened and saw that he was surrounded on all sides, realized that he would suffer torture if he were taken alive, and committed suicide.

After plundering the enemy's camp, the king ordered that Molon's corpse [σῶμα] should be suspended [ἀνασταυρῶσαι] in the most conspicuous place in Media. Which those appointed to the work immediately did, for they carried [the corpse] to Callonitis and suspended [ἀνεσταύρωσαν] it at the ascent to Mount Zagrus.<sup>135</sup>

The suspension object of the second text is the corpse of the Seleucid Achaeus, viceroy of Antiochus III. Hengel refers to this suspension as an impaling, without further explanation.<sup>136</sup> Achaeus was one of Antiochus' relatives who turned against him. After a hunt, Achaeus was captured when he had been lured to leave the citadel of Sardis. Handed over to Antiochus, his fate was to be decided by a council.

When the council had assembled, there were many suggestions about which punishment was proper to inflict on him. It was decided to first cut off the extremities of the miserable [Achaeus], and after this, having cut off his head and sewn it up in the skin of an ass, to suspend [ἀνασταυρῶσαι] the corpse.<sup>137</sup>

<sup>134</sup> Polyb. 10.33.8. οἱ δὲ καταρράκτας, οὓς εἶχον ὀλίγον ἐξωτέρω διὰ μηχανημάτων ἀνημμένους, αἰφνίδιον κατήκαν καὶ ἐπεβάλοντο, καὶ τούτους κατασχόντες πρὸ τοῦ τείχους ἀνεσκολόπισαν.

<sup>135</sup> Polyb. 5.54.6–7. ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς διαρπάσας τὴν παρεμβολὴν τῶν πολεμίων, τὸ μὲν σῶμα τοῦ Μόλωνος ἀνασταυρῶσαι προσέταξε κατὰ τὸν ἐπιφανέστατον τόπον τῆς Μηδίας, ὃ καὶ παραχρήμα συντέλεσαν οἱ πρὸς τούτοις τεταγμένοι· διακομίσαντες γὰρ εἰς τὴν Καλλωνίτιν πρὸς αὐταῖς ἀνεσταύρωσαν ταῖς εἰς τὸν Ζάγρον ἀναβολαῖς.

<sup>136</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 74.

<sup>137</sup> Polyb. 8.21.2–3. καθίσαντος δὲ τοῦ συνεδρίου, πολλοὶ μὲν ἐγίνοντο λόγοι περὶ τοῦ τίσι δεῖ κατ' αὐτοῦ χρῆσασθαι τιμωρίαις· ἔδοξε δ' οὖν πρῶτον μὲν ἀκρωτηριάσαι τὸν τάλαιπῶρον, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτεμόντας αὐτοῦ καὶ καταρράψαντας εἰς ὄνειον ἄσκον ἀνασταυρῶσαι τὸ σῶμα.

It is not possible to determine what kind of suspension these texts describe. It is, however, clear that both texts describe post-mortem suspensions and that they are connected with the Seleucid king Antiochus III. Whether this is an indication that the Seleucids usually had corpses as suspension objects, i.e., whether they did not practice executionary suspensions, is difficult to say.<sup>138</sup>

In sum, the texts studied in the present section indicate that Polybius uses ἀνασταυροῦν when he refers to unspecified post-mortem suspensions.

### 5.1.3. Ante-Mortem Suspension in Polybius

There is one text that offers some surprising features. It deals with the joint suspensions of Spendius, in company with ten of his mercenary leaders, and Hannibal II.<sup>139</sup> Spendius was a runaway Roman slave and Carthaginian mercenary who rebelled, together with Numidian and Libyan subjects, against his former leaders in Carthage. The Carthaginians failed to pay their mercenaries what they were demanding and faced the Truceless War (241–237 B.C.E.) led by Spendius and a Libyan named Mathos and a throng of foreign soldiers.

After this they took the captives around Spendius [and Spendius himself] to the walls and suspended [ἔσταύρωσαν] them openly. And those around Mathos, having noticed that Hannibal behaved with negligence and overconfidence, attacked [Hannibal's] palisade and killed many of the Carthaginians, and drove everyone out of the encampment, all baggage came under their dominion, and they seized the general Hannibal alive [ζωγρία]. They led him at once to Spendius' pole [σταυρόν] and harshly took revenge; they took down [Spendius' corpse] and then placed [ἀνέθεσαν] [Hannibal], still living [ζῶντα], [on the pole] and slaughtered thirty of the Carthaginians of highest rank around the corpse of Spendius; thus Fortune purposely gave either side alternately an opportunity of outdoing the other in mutual vengeance.<sup>140</sup>

<sup>138</sup> When Diodorus Siculus gives his version of this account he uses ἀνασταυροῦν in both texts. It is impossible to decide if this is an indication that he considered both events to be suspensions of corpses, or did not make any distinction between whether they were living or dead.

<sup>139</sup> Hannibal II (ca 269–258 B.C.E.) was son of the Carthaginian general Hannibal I. The famous Hannibal the Great (247/46–183 B.C.E.), labeled Hannibal IV in *DNP*, was the eldest son of Hamilcar Barca.

<sup>140</sup> Polyb. 1.86.4–7. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα προσαγαγόντες πρὸς τὰ τεῖχη τοὺς περὶ τὸν Σπένδιον αἰχμαλώτους ἐσταύρωσαν ἐπιφανῶς. οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Μάθω κατανοήσαντες τὸν Ἀννίβαν ῥαθῦμως καὶ κατατεθαρρηκότως ἀναστρεφόμενον, ἐπιθέμενοι τῷ χάρακι πολλοὺς μὲν τῶν Καρχηδονίων ἀπέκτειναν, πάντας δ' ἐξέβαλον ἐκ τῆς στρατοπεδείας, ἐκυριευσαν δὲ καὶ τῆς ἀποσκευῆς ἀπάσης, ἔλαβον δὲ καὶ τὸν στρατηγὸν Ἀννίβαν ζωγρία. τοῦτον μὲν οὖν παραχρήμα πρὸς τὸν τοῦ Σπενδίου σταυρὸν ἀγαγόντες καὶ τιμωρησάμενοι πικρῶς ἐκείνῳ μὲν καθεῖλον, τοῦτον δ' ἀνέθεσαν ζῶντα καὶ

Polybius does not explicitly show what kind of suspension he refers to – or what the *σταυρός* actually was, beyond being some kind of suspension tool. However, the suspension appears to be an execution. Polybius stresses twice that Hannibal was still living while suspended. This feature, the emphasized fact that he was alive, could in addition be interpreted as an indication that the usual suspension objects were corpses. This text may thus reflect a deviation from a prevailing rule. It is noticeable that Polybius here drops the prefix of the verb. This is the only time Polybius uses the plain verb *σταυροῦν*, as well as the noun *σταυρός*.

It is possible to trace two vague indications that, at least, make it as plausible to identify the suspensions as impalings as it is to identify them as crucifixions. First, Polybius uses a related verb, *ἀποσταυροῦν*, when he refers to palisades, i.e., fortifications made of standing and probably pointed poles.<sup>141</sup> Is this an indication that Polybius had pointed poles in mind when he referred to *σταυρός*? Second, Polybius uses the verb *ἀνατιθέναι*, “to lay upon,”<sup>142</sup> unusual in connection with crucifixion. Once again, these indications do not prove that the described suspensions actually are examples of impaling. They show that it is just as plausible to interpret these texts as references to impaling.<sup>143</sup>

#### 5.1.4. Conclusion – Polybius and Crucifixion

The result of the study of crucifixion in Polybius is in the end meager. Not one single text could with a sufficient degree of certainty be judged to contain a reference to crucifixion. All texts refer to unspecified suspensions. Two texts refer to post-mortem suspensions (5.54.6–7; 8.21.2–3); one appears to refer to an ante-mortem suspension (1.86.4–7).

It is, as noted earlier, impossible to draw the conclusion that the texts containing *ἀνασταυροῦν* and *ἀνασκολοπιζειν* do not refer to crucifixions at all. The rejected texts *may* refer to crucifixions, but it cannot be deter-

---

*περικατέσφαξαν τριάκοντα τῶν Καρχηδονίων τοὺς ἐπιφανεστάτους περὶ τὸ τοῦ Σπενδίου σῶμα, τῆς τύχης ὡσπερ ἐπίτηδες ἐκ παραθέσεως ἀμφοτέροις ἐναλλὰξ διδούσης ἀφορμὰς εἰς ὑπερβολὴν τῆς κατ’ ἀλλήλων τιμαρίας.*

<sup>141</sup> Polyb. 4.56.8; 16.30.1.

<sup>142</sup> S.v. LSJ. See also II.3 in the same paragraph where the verb is understood as “set up and leave in a place,” in this case a “cross” according to LSJ, with a reference to the above-mentioned text, Polyb. 1.86.6. The text used by the lexicon to support its reading is thus problematic in this sense. Polybius also uses the verb in 4.24.2, 49.1; 6.35.8, 40.3; 23.2.6, 7.4, with various meanings. Polyb. 4.49.1 may be used to strengthen the interpretation of the verb in the above-mentioned LSJ article, II.3. However, *σταυρός* is not the object in 4.49.1.

<sup>143</sup> Diodorus Siculus uses the verb *προσηλοῦν* when he describes the fate of Hannibal II (25.5.2), which indicates that he may have understood the suspension as some form of nailing suspension.

mined to what extent they actually are relevant references, due to their lack of additional contextual evidence. Thus, it is unknown to what kind of suspension these texts refer, i.e., impaling, crucifixion or something similar.

### 5.2. *Diodorus Siculus*

Diodorus Siculus (first century B.C.E.) offers several texts that are assumed to include references to crucifixions. His βιβλιοθήκη contains – according to himself – a universal history from mythological times. In reality, he concentrates on Greece and his homeland of Sicily, and ends his history at the beginning of Caesar's Gallic war in 60/59 B.C.E.

Hengel and Kuhn refer to several texts in Diodorus Siculus as crucifixion accounts.<sup>144</sup> In these texts Diodorus Siculus uses primarily ἀνασταυροῦν. In addition to these texts, he refers to a series of various suspensions with verbs such as σταυροῦν, κρεμαννύναι, ἀνασκολοπίζειν, προσηλοῦν and nouns such as σκόλοψ and σταυρός. The richness of accounts causes Hengel to use several of Diodorus Siculus' texts as examples of the widespread use of crucifixion in the ancient world.<sup>145</sup>

#### 5.2.1. Unspecified Suspensions in Diodorus Siculus

Several of the texts in which Diodorus Siculus uses the terminology in focus are unspecified when it comes to the nature of the suspension. The first text where ἀνασταυροῦν occurs – defined as a crucifixion account by both Hengel and Kuhn – is an example of this.<sup>146</sup> The text, which apparently has its origin in the writings of Ctesias, occurs in the description of the legendary Assyrian king Ninus' campaign in Arabia. In the initial phase of the campaign when Ninus' military power was on its rise, he successfully attacked Media.

<sup>144</sup> Hengel: Diod. Sic. 2.1.10 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 23 n. 4); 2.18.1 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 22 n. 3); 2.44.2 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 23 n. 5); 3.65.5 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 13); 5.32.6 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 23 n. 7); 17.46.4 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 73 n. 14); 18.16.3 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 29 n. 21); 19.67.2 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 74); 25.5.2, 10.2 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 23 n. 10); 26.23.1 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 23 n. 10; 37 n. 10); 34/35.12.1 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 24 n. 12); 37.5.3 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 79).

Kuhn: Diod. Sic. 2.1.10 (KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 683 + n. 193); 20.55.2, 69.4–5; 20.103.6 (KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 683); 37.5.3 (KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 687 [a reference to Hengel]).

<sup>145</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 22–23.

<sup>146</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 23 n. 4; KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 683 n. 193.

And the king of that [country], Pharnus, having gone into battle with a noteworthy force and been defeated and lost the larger part of the soldiers, and himself being taken captive along with seven of his sons and wife, was suspended [ἀνεσταυρώθη].<sup>147</sup>

Among the unspecified texts there is Diodorus Siculus' account of the fate of Cyrus the Great. In this text, defined by Hengel as a crucifixion account, Diodorus describes the mighty women of Scythia and exemplifies their skills by giving his version of the death of the Persian King.<sup>148</sup>

Cyrus, the king of the Persians, the most powerful in his days, made a campaign with noteworthy forces to Scythia. [But] the Queen of the Scythians slaughtered the Persian soldiers and she suspended [ἀνεσταύρωσε] Cyrus who had been imprisoned.<sup>149</sup>

Another example of the same category and defined as a crucifixion account by Hengel is found in a text that contains the verb ἀνασκολοπιζειν.<sup>150</sup> Diodorus Siculus has preserved this text from the Stoic philosopher, scientist and historian Posidonius. It contains a description of the savageness of the Gauls:<sup>151</sup>

Following their savageness [they manifest] foreign ungodliness also concerning the sacrifices. For they suspend [ἀνασκολοπιζουσι] the evildoers [in honor] for [their] gods after they have kept them in prison for five years, and dedicate [them together] with many other [offerings] of first fruits by constructing very great fires.<sup>152</sup>

It is not possible to determine what kind of suspension ἀνασκολοπιζειν refers to. Diodorus only uses the verb in this single text.<sup>153</sup> It is possible to argue on an etymological basis that the verb is used in the sense "to impale."<sup>154</sup> The problem is, however, that none of the texts studied in the

<sup>147</sup> Diod. Sic. 2.1.10 (Ctesias, *FGrH* 3c, 688 F 1b.29–31). ὁ δὲ ταύτης βασιλεὺς Φάρνος παραταξάμενος ἀξιολόγῳ δυνάμει καὶ λειφθείς, τῶν τε στρατιωτῶν τοὺς πλείους ἀπέβαλε καὶ αὐτὸς μετὰ τέκνων ἑπτὰ καὶ γυναικὸς αἰχμάλωτος ληφθεὶς ἀνεσταυρώθη.

<sup>148</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 23 n. 5.

<sup>149</sup> Diod. Sic. 2.44.2. Κύρου μὲν γὰρ τοῦ Περσῶν βασιλέως πλείστον ἰσχύαντος τῶν καθ' αὐτὸν καὶ στρατεύσαντος ἀξιολόγοις δυνάμειν εἰς τὴν Σκυθίαν, ἡ βασίλισσα τῶν Σκυθῶν τό τε στρατόπεδον τῶν Περσῶν κατέκοψε καὶ τὸν Κῆρον αἰχμάλωτον γενόμενον ἀνεσταύρωσε.

<sup>150</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 23 n. 7.

<sup>151</sup> Diodorus Siculus make a distinction between the Gauls and the Celts (see 5.32.1). Hengel connects the present text with the Celts (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 23).

<sup>152</sup> Diod. Sic. 5.32.6 (Posidon. F 169.193–96). ἀκολουθῶν δὲ τῇ κατ' αὐτοῦ ἀγριότητι καὶ περὶ τὰς θυσίας ἐκτόπως ἀσεβοῦσι· τοὺς γὰρ κακούργους κατὰ πενταετηρίδα φυλάξαντες ἀνασκολοπιζουσι τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ μετ' ἄλλων πολλῶν ἀπαρχῶν καθαγίζουσι, πυρὰς παμμεγέθεις κατασκευάζοντες.

<sup>153</sup> He uses the noun σκόλοψ once in 33.15.1. See that text below.

<sup>154</sup> This might be the case in Oldfather's translation of the text in the Loeb edition (Diod. Sic. 5.32.6 [OLDFATHER, *LCL*]).

present investigation support such an etymological reading, with one possible exception (see the study of the verb in the Discussion chapter).<sup>155</sup> The verb appears to be used simply in the same sense as ἀνασταυροῦν, at least after Herodotus. ἀνασκολοπίζειν seems, though, not to carry the same connotation of impaling. Neither is it possible to determine the nature of suspension in the previous two texts (Diod. Sic. 2.1.10 [Ctesias, *FGrH* 3c, 688 F 1b.29–31; 2.44.2). This feature is also shared by eleven other texts by Diodorus Siculus – several of them labeled as “crucifixions” by scholars studied in the present investigation.<sup>156</sup>

### 5.2.2. Post-Mortem Suspensions in Diodorus Siculus

Diodorus Siculus offers one post-mortem suspension in his texts.<sup>157</sup> The text deals with the suspension of the Phocian general Onomarchus by the Macedonian king Philip II. Being defeated twice, but then reinforced by Thessalian forces, Philip won and a great slaughter of the Phocians took place.

In the end more than six thousand of the Phocians and the mercenaries were killed, among them the general himself, and no less than three thousand were seized. Philip suspended [ἐκρέμασε] Onomarchus and threw the rest into the sea as temple-robbers.<sup>158</sup>

The suspension form in the text is unspecified. Diodorus uses the verb (ἀνα)κρεμαννύναι in connection with various forms of suspensions.<sup>159</sup> There is, however, a parallel text that sheds some light on the suspension

<sup>155</sup> See pp. 271–74, 83–84.

<sup>156</sup> Diod. Sic. 14.53.4 (labeled as a crucifixion account by Fulda [FULDA, *Das Kreuz*, 53]); 17.46.4 (labeled as a crucifixion account by Fulda [FULDA, *Das Kreuz*, 53] and Hengel [HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 73 n. 14]); 18.16.2–3 (labeled as a crucifixion account by Hengel [HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 29 n. 21]); 19.67.2 (labeled as a crucifixion account by Hengel [HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 74]); 20.55.2, 69.4–5; 20.103.6 (labeled as a crucifixion account by Kuhn [KUHN, “Die Kreuzesstrafe,” 683]); 26.23.1 (labeled as a crucifixion account by Hengel [HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 23 n. 10; 37 n. 10]); 34/35.12.1 (Posid. F 148.1–8); 37.5.3 (Posid. F 213.18–20) (labeled as a crucifixion account by Hengel [HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 24 n. 12; 79]).

<sup>157</sup> Correctly labeled as post-mortem suspension by Hengel (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 69; 73).

<sup>158</sup> Diod. Sic. 16.35.6. τέλος δὲ τῶν Φωκῶων καὶ μισθοφόρων ἀνηρέθησαν μὲν ὑπὲρ τοὺς ἑξακισχιλίους, ἐν οἷς ἦν καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ στρατηγός, ἤλωσαν δὲ οὐκ ἐλάττους τῶν τρισχιλίων. ὁ δὲ Φίλιππος τὸν μὲν Ὀνόμαρχον ἐκρέμασε, τοὺς δ' ἄλλους ὡς ἱεροσύλους κατεπόντισεν.

<sup>159</sup> For examples of ἀνακρεμαννύναι in connection with hanging: 19.11.7. κρεμαννύναι in connection with undefined suspension: 17.46.4; 20.55.2. κρεμαννύναι in connection with undefined suspension of living victims: 20.54.7. κρεμαννύναι in connection with an undefined suspension of a corpse: 16.35.6.



in the quoted text above. In 16.61.2 Diodorus Siculus mentions that Onomarchus was cut to pieces before he was suspended.<sup>160</sup>

The architect of the seizure of the shrine, Philomelus, threw himself from a cliff in a crisis of war, while his brother, Onomarchus, having received the command over the desperate [people], was cut to pieces [κατακοπείς] in Thessaly, together with the Phocians and mercenaries under his command, and suspended [ἔσταυρώθη].<sup>161</sup>

This indicates that “the general,” who was among the killed, and Onomarchus in the previous text (16.35.6) are the same person. Thus, it appears that Onomarchus was dead when suspended, which indicates that κρεμάννωναί in this text does not refer to an execution through suspension – i.e., an ante-mortem suspension. The plain form σταυροῦν occurs here for the first time in the texts of Diodorus Siculus. It is difficult to see any significance of the dropped prefix, as the next text will show.

### 5.2.3. Possible Impaling Accounts in Diodorus Siculus

The first text, however, contains neither suspension nor impaling; it is only interesting because of the terminology that occurs in the text. The text describes the defense of the harbor of Lilybaeum in western Sicily when the Carthaginian forces prepared for an attack.

The Romans, having observed the attack of the forces, blocked the mouth of the harbor again with stones and construction material and poled [ἔσταύρωσαν] the channels with large timbers [ξύλους] and anchors.<sup>162</sup>

Diodorus uses the plain form of the verb, σταυροῦν, in connection with construction of something like an underwater defense line of poles.<sup>163</sup> Thus, the latter two texts show that Diodorus Siculus uses the verb in a broad sense, in both the meanings “to erect a pole” and “to suspend upon a pole.”

<sup>160</sup> According to Pausanias, Onomarchus was shot down (κατηκοντίσθη) by his own troops (Paus. 10.2.5).

<sup>161</sup> Diod. Sic. 16.61.2. ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἀρχιτέκτων τῆς καταλήψεως τοῦ ἱεροῦ Φιλόμελος κατὰ τινα περίστασιν πολεμικὴν ἑαυτὸν κατεκρήμνισεν, ὁ δὲ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ Ὀνόμαρχος διαδεξάμενος τὴν τῶν ἀπονοηθέντων στρατηγίαν μετὰ τῶν συμπαραταξαμένων ἐν Θετταλίᾳ Φωκῶων καὶ μισθοφόρων κατακοπείς ἔσταυρώθη.

<sup>162</sup> Diod. Sic. 24.1.2. οἱ δὲ Ῥωμαῖοι θεασάμενοι τὴν εἰσβολὴν τῆς δυνάμεως, λίθοις καὶ χώμασιν ἐκ δευτέρου τὸ στόμιον τοῦ λιμένος ἔχωσαν καὶ ξύλοις μεγίστοις καὶ ἀγκύραις τὰ βάθη ἔσταύρωσαν.

<sup>163</sup> Cf. the description by Thucydides of the maritime defense line in the harbor of Syracuse on the opposite side of Sicily (Thuc. 7.25.5–8). It is plausible that Diodorus Siculus was familiar with this defense form and refers to the same thing in 24.1.2. If so, the range of meaning of σταυροῦν could incorporate the use of pointed poles, and thus perhaps impaling.

The following text, however, contains a suspension with resemblance to impaling. The text describes the extreme cruelty of the Thracian king Diegylis. Having ascended the throne, he started to treat his subjects as if they were slaves or captive enemies. This attitude towards his people made them hate him. When Attalus, the king of Pergamum, heard that Diegylis was hated by his own people because of his wickedness, he started to use an opposite policy. Attalus treated the captured Thracians humanely and then released them. This action towards the captives gave him a reputation of mercy, which made Diegylis furious.

Hearing this, Diegylis surrounded the hostages, [left by those] who were departing, with fearful outrages and lawless torture, of whom some were children of most tender age and nature. For even of those, some having their bodies dismembered in various ways, others heads, hands and feet cut off, some were suspended [ἀνήρτητο] on poles [σκόλοψιν], others on trees [δένδρεσιν].<sup>164</sup>

The text does not fully describe the suspension form. Hengel defines it correctly as impaling.<sup>165</sup> The suspension, at least the former one, appears to be some kind of impaling due to the combination of the rare verb ἀναρτᾶν in combination with σκόλοψ.<sup>166</sup>

#### 5.2.4. Possible Ante-Mortem Suspensions in Diodorus Siculus

There are three texts by Diodorus Siculus in which, on various levels, he indicates living victims and uses ἀνασταυροῦν. In the first text, he describes the deeds of – according to himself – the third Dionysus, among whose cruel deeds the treatment of the Thracian king Lycurgus is well known. When Dionysus was about to cross the Hellespont he concluded a treaty of friendship with Lycurgus. Having led the first part of his Bacchantes into what he supposed to be friendly land, Lycurgus gave orders to his soldiers to attack Dionysus and his company. The plot was nevertheless revealed to Dionysus through a betrayal.

Therefore he sailed across [the Hellespont] secretly to his own army, and then it is said that Lycurgus, having made an attack upon the Maenads in the [city] called Nysium, killed them all, but, having brought the forces over [the Hellespont], Dionysius con-

<sup>164</sup> Diod. Sic. 33.15.1 (Posidon. F 110.5–9). ἃ δὴ πυνθανόμενος ὁ Διήγγυλις τῶν μὲν ἀποχωροῦντων τοὺς ὁμήρουσ δειναῖς ὕβρεσι καὶ παρανόμοις αἰκίαις περιέβαλλεν, ὧν ἦσαν τινες τῶν ἀσθενεστάτων παίδων ἡλικίᾳ καὶ φύσει. καὶ γὰρ τούτων οἱ μὲν δι-αμεμελισμένοι τὰ σώματα ποικίλως, οἱ δὲ κεφαλὰς καὶ χεῖρας καὶ πόδας ἀφρημένοι καὶ τούτων οἱ μὲν ἐπὶ σκόλοψιν, οἱ δὲ ἐπὶ δένδρεσιν ἀνήρτητο.

<sup>165</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 24 n. 12; 69 n. 1.

<sup>166</sup> It is easier to envision that the body parts were simply stuck on pointed poles – thus “impaled.”

quered the Thracians through a battle and seized Lycurgus alive [ζωγρήσαντα] and, having brought upon him all kinds of outrage, suspended [ἀνασταυρώσαι] him.<sup>167</sup>

The text does not reveal what kind of suspension Dionysus used when he suspended Lycurgus. Hengel labels the suspension as a crucifixion and observes, as noted, that Homer mentions the fate of Lycurgus but lacks the suspension in his account (Hom. *Il.* 6.130–43).<sup>168</sup> When it comes to Hengel's observation mentioned in connection with Homer, it could be as beneficial to move the focus to Diodorus Siculus. It is more plausible that Diodorus Siculus added something to the text than that Homer removed the same thing.

The text contains at most an indication of a living victim. Lycurgus was at least alive when captured. Once again it is stressed that the victim was alive. This might be yet another indication that the regular suspension object was a corpse. The theme is present also in the next text.

The second text, in which Diodorus Siculus crowns his history of the Carthaginian commander Hamilcar, mentions a suspension in a comparable way. Hengel also labels this text as a reference to crucifixion.<sup>169</sup> The victim was captured "alive." Diodorus Siculus describes Hamilcar's enlargement of the Carthaginian Empire, to the "Pillars of Heracles," and his accomplishments.

Having made war against Iberians and Tartessians, together with Istolatus, [the] general of the Celts and his brother, [Hamilcar] cut down them all, among them the two brothers together with the other distinguished leaders. He took over and enrolled three thousand survivors among his soldiers. Indortes raised again [an army of] fifty thousand [men], but before [the] battle was turned, having fled to a hill and become besieged by Hamilcar and fled again by night, the most of his [forces] was cut down, and Indortes himself was taken alive [ζωγρίας]. Having put out his eyes and maltreated [him], Hamilcar suspended [ἀνεσταύρωσε] the body [σῶμα]. But he released the other prisoners, being more than ten thousand.<sup>170</sup>

---

<sup>167</sup> Diod. Sic. 3.65.5. διόπερ λάθρα τούτου διαπλεύσαντος πρὸς τὸ σφέτερον στρατόπεδον, τὸν μὲν Λυκοῦργόν φασιν ἐπιθέμενον ταῖς μαινάσιν ἐν τῷ καλουμένῳ Νυσίῳ πάσας ἀποκτείνειν, τὸν δὲ Διόνυσον περαιώσαντα τὰς δυνάμεις μάχη κρατῆσαι τῶν Θρακῶν, καὶ τὸν Λυκοῦργον ζωγρήσαντα τυφλῶσαι τε καὶ πᾶσαν αἰκίαν εἰσενεγκάμενον ἀνασταυρώσαι.

<sup>168</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 13 (see the comments on pp. 39–40).

<sup>169</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 23 n. 10.

<sup>170</sup> Diod. Sic. 25.10.1–2. πολεμήσας δὲ Ἰβηρας καὶ Ταρτησίους μετὰ Ἰστολατίου στρατηγού τῶν Κελτῶν καὶ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ πάντας κατέκομεν, ἐν οἷς καὶ τοὺς δύο ἀδελφοὺς σὺν ἄλλοις ἐπιφανεστάτοις ἡγεμόσι· καὶ τρισχιλίους ζῶντας παραλαβὼν ἔταξεν εἰς τὰς ἰδίας στρατιάς. Ἰνδόρτης δὲ πάλιν ἀθροίσας πεντακισμυρίους, καὶ πρὶν πολέμου τραπεῖς καὶ φυγῶν εἰς λόφον τινά, καὶ πολιορκηθεὶς ὑπ' Ἀμίλκα καὶ νυκτὸς πάλιν φυγῶν, τὸ πλεῖστον αὐτοῦ κατεκόπη, αὐτὸς δὲ Ἰνδόρτης καὶ

The suspension method is unspecified. Diodorus Siculus stresses that Indortes was taken alive, but the question is what Diodorus Siculus means with σῶμα. He uses the noun when he refers to both corpses (e.g., 1.20.2, 6; 1.49.4) and living bodies (e.g., 1.70.4, 79.3; 3.7.2). In many cases when σῶμα is referring to a living body, the statements are reciprocal – somebody does something with their own body (for examples beyond 1.70.4, see 2.12.3, 23.1). This weakens the possibility that σῶμα in the quoted text refers to Indortes as being alive and that the text in that case would describe an execution.

In the third text, Diodorus Siculus describes the fight between the Libyans, supported by the Carthaginians, and Dionysius of Syracuse. As a part of the defense strategy Dionysius ordered that the city of Camarina should be evacuated and its residents moved to Syracuse. The fear of Carthaginian savageness sparked a hasty withdrawal from the city.

The event that had happened to Selinus and Himera, and Acragas as well, frightened the people when they perceived the savageness of the Carthaginians just as [if they were] eyewitnesses. For there was no mercy [shown towards] the captives by the [Carthaginians]; they were without sympathy for the unfortunate, whom they suspended [ἀνεσταύρουσιν] and upon whom they inflicted insufferable outrages.<sup>171</sup>

The text does not reveal to what kind of suspension it refers. The last clause indicates living victims, upon whom insufferable outrages were inflicted. These three texts might indicate that Diodorus Siculus also could describe executions by suspensions, still without revealing the suspension method.

### 5.2.5. Suspension by Nailing in Diodorus Siculus

In addition to the previously studied texts by Diodorus Siculus, there are three accounts of interest for the present investigation. In the first text, Hengel finds an example of the use of crucifixion in India through a threatening letter from the Indian king Strabobates to the legendary and partly mythical figure Semiramis.<sup>172</sup> Diodorus refers to the letter in which Strabobates discredits Semiramis and he concludes as follows.

---

ζωγρίας ἐλήφθη, ὃν τυφλώσας Ἀμίλκας καὶ τὸ σῶμα αἰκισάμενος ἀνεσταύρωσε· τοὺς δὲ ἄλλους αἰχμαλώτους ὄντας μυρίων πλείους ἀπέλυσε.

<sup>171</sup> Diod. Sic. 13.111.4. ἡ γὰρ περὶ Σελινοῦντα καὶ Ἰμέραν, ἔτι δὲ Ἀκράγαντα, γενομένη συμφορὰ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐξέπληττε, πάντων καθάπερ ὑπὸ τὴν ὄρασιν λαμβανόντων τὴν τῶν Καρχηδονίων δεινότητα. οὐδεμία γὰρ ἦν παρ' αὐτοῖς φειδῶ τῶν ἀλίσκομένων, ἀλλ' ἀσυμπαθῶς τῶν ἡτυχηκότων οὐδὲ μὲν ἀνεσταύρουσιν, οἷς δ' ἀφορήτους ἐπήγον ὕβρεις.

<sup>172</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 22 n.3.

He threatened to nail her to a pole [σταυρῷ προσηλώσειν] after he had defeated her.<sup>173</sup>

In this text, Diodorus Siculus mentions a threat of suspension by nailing. The verb προσηλοῦν, in combination with the noun σταυρός, could be seen as indication of a crucifixion.<sup>174</sup> It is however not possible to draw the conclusion that σταυρός refers to a cross in this text, since Diodorus appears to use the word when referring to a pole in the sense of both a standing bare post in 17.71.6 and an unspecified pole in 25.5.2. But if the use of σταυρός in 20.54.7 (see p. 86) is taken into consideration, the probability that σταυρός does refer to a suspension tool on which the victims were nailed, and – if alive – crucified, ends up on a satisfactory level.

The next text refers to the serial suspension of Spondius and Hannibal II. It is plausible that Diodorus Siculus in this text offers his interpretation of the Polybian text studied above.<sup>175</sup>

Hamilcar suspended [ἀνεσταύρωσεν] Spondius. But having taken Hannibal [as] prisoner Matho nailed him [προσήλωσεν] to the same pole [σταυρόν]; thus it seems as if Fortune deceitfully assigned success and defeat crosswise to these offenders against the human nature.<sup>176</sup>

The combination of the terms ἀνασταυροῦν, προσηλοῦν and σταυρός indicates that the suspensions included an act of nailing, which gives the text a resemblance to the punishment of crucifixion as defined in the present investigation. Yet on the basis of the present text, it is impossible to determine whether the victims were alive or dead when suspended. It is thus not possible to label the text as a reference to *execution* by nailing on a σταυρός.

In connection with the study of crucifixion, a hitherto unnoticed text by Diodorus Siculus is of interest. The text is important in that it appears to offer a glimpse of information about the punishment of crucifixion, although it contains neither a crucifixion nor an impaling. The nailing that occurs in the text is some kind of torture. The text describes an event that occurred in North Africa. The Diadochs had crowned themselves as kings, and Agathocles, the former tyrant of Syracuse, followed their example.<sup>177</sup> Agathocles made a campaign against Utica, the oldest Phoenici-

<sup>173</sup> Diod. Sic. 2.18.1. ἡπέλει καταπολεμήσας αὐτὴν σταυρῷ προσηλώσειν.

<sup>174</sup> See REIJNERS, *The Terminology of the Holy Cross*, 2.

<sup>175</sup> Cf. Polyb. 1.86.4–7 (“Spendius” in Polybius’ terminology) on pp. 76–77.

<sup>176</sup> Diod. Sic. 25.5.2. ὅτι τὸν Σπόνδιον ἀνεσταύρωσεν Ἀμίλκας. ὁ δὲ Μάθος Ἀννίβαν εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν σταυρὸν αἰχμάλωτον λαβὼν προσήλωσεν, ὥστε δοκεῖν τὴν τύχην ὡσπερ ἐπιτήδες ἐναλλάξ τὰς εὐημερίας καὶ τὰς ἥττας ἀπονέμειν τοῖς περὶ τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην φύσιν ἡσθεηκόσιν.

<sup>177</sup> Lit., they “assumed the diadem” and Antigonus “behaved like a king” (διάδημα περιέθετο καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν ἐχρημάτιζε βασιλεύς [20.53.2]) while Ptolemy “called himself king” (ἀνέλαβε τὸ διάδημα καὶ πρὸς ἅπαντας ἀνέγραφεν ἑαυτὸν βασιλέα [20.53.3]).

an settlement on the North African coast, which had deserted him. He made a sudden attack on Utica and took as prisoners three hundred citizens who were caught outside the city. When Utica rejected an offer of surrender, he constructed a siege engine and hung (κρεμάσας) prisoners upon it. At first, the citizens of Utica hesitated to use their various missiles since the target had their fellow citizens attached to its body. Nevertheless, when the enemy pressed on, they were forced to defend themselves against the siege engine. Thus, the living shields of Utican men were in danger of being killed by their own.

While resisting the enemy, using all kinds of missiles, they killed some of the men stationed on the machine. They also killed some of [their fellow] citizens who were hanging [τῶν κρεμαμένων πολιτῶν] [on the machine] and nailed [προσκαθήλωσαν] some to the machine with sharp-pointed [missiles] on whatever spots of the body [their missiles] happened [to strike], so that the wanton violence and vengeance together nearly resembled a σταυρός-punishment [σταυρῶ παραπλησίαν].<sup>178</sup>

The initial suspension form is not the crucial feature in the text; it is the way the inhabitants of Utica perceived the fate of their fellow citizens – nailed in various ways to the siege engine. Diodorus Siculus shows in the text that he associated σταυρός with nailing (προσκαθηλοῦν).<sup>179</sup> Thus, this text increases the possibility that Diodorus Siculus in his texts describes a punishment with resemblance to the punishment of crucifixion, as defined by the present investigation. In the text above, Diodorus Siculus also might offer a glimpse of his own view of a σταυρός-punishment. On the basis of the closing words of the quotation, it is plausible to assume that the punishment according to Diodorus Siculus is to be *killed* through nailing on a σταυρός.

### 5.2.6. Conclusion – Diodorus Siculus and Crucifixion

The result of the study of crucifixion in Diodorus Siculus is more substantial than that of previously studied authors. Diodorus Siculus offers several suspension accounts. He mentions one post-mortem suspension (16.35.6 [κρεμαννύναι], 61.2 [σταυροῦν]), what might be one impaling account (33.15.1 [σκόλοψ, ἀναρτᾶν]), and three ante-mortem suspen-

---

As a result the rest of the kings (i.e., Seleucus, Lysimachus and Cassander) “proclaimed themselves as kings” (ἀνηγόρευον ἑαυτοὺς βασιλεῖς [20.53.3]), which also Agathocles did (ἑαυτὸν ἀνηγόρευσε βασιλέα [20.54.1]).

<sup>178</sup> Diod. Sic. 20.54.7. ὅπερ καὶ συνέβη γενέσθαι ἀμυρόμενοι γὰρ τοὺς πολεμίους καὶ παντοίοις βέλεσι χρώμενοι καὶ τὰ τῶν ἐφεστηκότων τῇ μηχανῇ σώματα κατηκίσαντο καὶ τινὰς μὲν τῶν κρεμαμένων πολιτῶν κατηκόντισαν, τινὰς δὲ τοῖς ὀξυβέλεσι πρὸς τῇ μηχανῇ προσκαθήλωσαν καθ’ οὓς ποτε τύχοι τοῦ σώματος τόπους, ὥστε σταυρῶ παραπλησίαν εἶναι τὴν ὕβριν ἅμα καὶ τὴν τιμωρίαν.

<sup>179</sup> The double prefix appears not to carry any significance.

sions.<sup>180</sup> However, the majority of Diodorus Siculus' texts are unspecified as far as the suspension's nature is concerned.<sup>181</sup> Beyond these texts, there are three texts that are slightly more informative if the aim is to study the punishment of crucifixion as it is traditionally understood.<sup>182</sup>

Neither ἀνασταυροῦν nor σταυροῦν means "to crucify" in his texts. These verbs appear to be used interchangeably and Diodorus Siculus uses them when he refers to post-mortem and ante-mortem suspensions, the erecting of maritime defense lines, as well as unspecified suspensions. Diodorus Siculus also uses ἀνασκολοπίζειν and κρεμαννύναι in this latter sense.<sup>183</sup>

What is of interest for the present investigation is that Diodorus Siculus appears to be familiar with an execution form that contains the nailing to a σταυρός, i.e., a punishment resembling crucifixion as defined in the present investigation – but he does not link this punishment to ἀνασταυροῦν or σταυροῦν. He links it to σταυρός instead (20.54.7). The combination of people hanging (κρεμαννύναι) and being nailed (προσκαθηλοῦν), penetrated with sharp missiles, caused the spectators, according to Diodorus Siculus, to refer to σταυρός, perhaps even in the sense "cross" or "crucifixion." Thus, this text appears to establish a connection between verbs containing the noun ἥλος, the noun σταυρός and a punishment resembling crucifixion in a traditional sense. This text makes it also reasonable to assume that crucifixion in Diodorus Siculus' eyes is an *execution*.

As mentioned earlier, the texts left out *may* refer to crucifixions, but it is not possible to determine to what extent they actually do so. There is nothing in these texts that makes it impossible to understand the verbs ἀνασταυροῦν and σταυροῦν as references to crucifixion; the problem is that nothing in these texts supports that reading either.

<sup>180</sup> Diod. Sic. 3.65.5; 25.10.1–2; 13.111.4 (all ἀνασταυροῦν).

<sup>181</sup> Diod. Sic. 2.1.10 (ἀνασταυροῦν), 44.2 (ἀνασταυροῦν); 5.32.6 (ἀνασκολοπίζειν); 14.53.4 (ἀνασταυροῦν); 17.46.4 (κρεμαννύναι); 18.16.2–3 (ἀνασταυροῦν); 19.67.2 (ἀνασταυροῦν); 20.55.2 (κρεμαννύναι), 69.4–5 (ἀνασταυροῦν); 20.103.6 (ἀνασταυροῦν); 26.23.1 (ἀνασταυροῦν); 34/35.12.1 (ἀνασταυροῦν); 37.5.3 (ἀνασταυροῦν).

<sup>182</sup> Diod. Sic. 3.65.5 (ἀνασταυροῦν), 25.10.1–2 (ἀνασταυροῦν); 13.111.4 (ἀνασταυροῦν).

<sup>183</sup> When it comes to the occurrence of ἀνασκολοπίζειν, it is problematic to draw any far-reaching conclusions from texts preserved as fragments in the texts of other authors (e.g., 2.1.10; 5.32.6; 33.15.1). The author who preserved the text might have affected the terminology, as may be the case in the only Polybian text that uses ἀνασκολοπίζειν (Polyb. 10.33.8).

### 5.3. Conclusion – Historians of the Hellenistic Era

Polybius' texts are difficult to associate with the punishment of crucifixion. His suspension accounts are unspecified or refer to post-mortem suspensions, with only one exception that might describe an ante-mortem suspension (1.86.4–7). What kind of executionary suspension the text refers to is, however, unknown. Diodorus Siculus also offers a spectrum of suspension forms and uses ἀνασταυροῦν and σταυροῦν interchangeably to describe them. The verbs are thus not used in the sense “to crucify” by Diodorus Siculus. ἀνασκολοπίζειν and κρεμαννύναι appears to be used in the same sense. Diodorus Siculus' major contribution lies in his use of σταυρός. In the perception of σταυρός, which becomes visible in one text, it is possible to find connections to both nailing and executionary suspensions. Thus, with Diodorus Siculus' texts the probability of crucifixion references becomes at least satisfactory. A σταυρός could be used in an executionary suspension in which nails were used in Hellenistic times.

## 6. Papyrus and Fragmentary texts of the Hellenistic Era

### 6.1. Papyrus Hellenica

One papyrus from the vast findings in Oxyrhynchus mentions a suspension. The unidentified author deals with some events around the turn of the fourth century B.C.E. The fragmentary text deals with the actions following a mutiny by some Cypriot mercenaries, stationed outside the city of Caunus in southeastern Caria. Having made an unsuccessful voyage, they left the city.

Having done [th]is and urged th[e herald] to proclaim that each one of the soldiers should [g]o to their own [camp], he rounded up among the Cyprians the Carpasi[an and] sixty [of the oth]ers and killed them, but suspended [ἀνεσταύρωσεν] the general.<sup>184</sup>

It is not possible to determine what kind of suspension the papyrus describes.<sup>185</sup> The usage of the verb in contemporary and older texts is too

<sup>184</sup> Hellenica (*P Oxy.* 5.842), *FG7H* 2a, 66 F 1.15.5 (433–38). [... ταῦτα δὲ πο<ι>ήσας καὶ κελεύσας κηρύξαι τῶν κήρυκα βαί]νειν ἕκαστον τῶν στρατιωτῶν ἐπὶ τῆ[ν] ἑαυτοῦ, συ]νέλαβε τῶν Κυπρίων τὸν τε Καρπασέ[α καὶ τῶν ἄλ]λων ἐξήκοντα, καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἀπέκτεινε, τὸν δὲ στρα]τηγὸν ἀνεσταύρωσεν. The text is also available in another edition; *Fragmenta Londinensia*, col. 18, sect. 5, line 18–23 (BARTOLETTI, *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*, 33). The editor prefers a different conjecture in connection with the lacuna in line 435 (15). Bartoletti reads τῶν κήρυκα χω]ρεῖν instead of τῶν κήρυκα βαί]νειν.

<sup>185</sup> Bruce labels the suspension as a “crucifixion” in his commentary on the fragment (BRUCE, *Commentary*, 129).



diverse to draw any conclusion from a single occurrence. Nevertheless, this text is used by the Bauer lexicon (BDAG) to support the view that ἀνασταυροῦν refers to “crucifixion.”<sup>186</sup> It is hard to specify the text further than that it appears to describe some kind of ante-mortem suspension.

### 6.2. Alexis

Alexis, a poet of the Middle and New Comedy, probably living in Athens, has a play that ought to be noticed. The last line of the text, only preserved as a fragment, describes a punishment the angry speaker wishes on the “parasite” (παραμασύντην) and probably also on Theodotus. He wishes to “attach [him] to the wood” (ἀναπήξαιμ’ ἐπὶ τοῦ ξύλου).<sup>187</sup> The translation and interpretation of the text as a whole are awkward; this is also the case with the last line. As Arnott has noticed, the verb ἀναπηγνύναι is usually used in connection with impaling.<sup>188</sup> But he puts a question mark in the margin regarding the use of the noun ξύλον, and mentions correctly that ξύλον is not the normal word for an impaling stake. The noun referred in Athens at this time mainly to another construction of wood upon which those condemned could be attached in various ways, nailing included, according to Arnott.<sup>189</sup> This usage of ξύλον could not be confirmed by the present study. The suspension form in the text is in the end unspecified.

### 6.3. Conclusion – Papyrus and Fragmentary texts of the Hellenistic Era

These two texts do not add anything beyond being good examples of how difficult it is to trace a specific punishment form in ancient texts. Both texts are reminders of the carefulness that ought to be observed in a quest for crucifixion.

<sup>186</sup> S.v. BDAG.

<sup>187</sup> Alexis, 224.10 (KASSEL-AUSTIN, *PCG* 2.148 [or 222.10 following the older numbering in KOCK, *Comicoorum Atticorum Fragmenta*]). The whole fragment 224: τοῦτο γὰρ νῦν ἐστὶ σοι | ἐν ταῖς Ἀθήναις ταῖς καλαῖς ἐπιχώριον | ἅπαντες ὀρχοῦντ’ εὐθὺς ἂν οἴνου μόνον | ὁσμὴν ἴδωσιν. B. συμφορὰν λέγεις ἄκραν. | A. φαίης ἂν εἰς συμπόσιον εἰσελθὼν ἄφνω. | καὶ τοῖς μὲν ἀγενεῖσις ἴσως ἔπεστί τις | χάρις· ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ δὴ τὸν γόητα Θεόδοτον, | ἢ τὸν παραμασύντην ἴδω τὸν ἀνόσιον | βαυκιζόμενον τὰ λευκά τ’ ἀναβάλλονθ’ ἄμα, | ἥδιστ’ ἂν ἀναπήξαιμ’ {ἂν αὐτόν} ἐπὶ τοῦ ξύλου λαβόν.

<sup>188</sup> Arnott exemplifies with the texts mentioned under “ἀναπήγνυμι” in LSJ; Ar. *Ecccl.* 843 and Plut. *Artax.* 17.5 (ARNOTT, *Alexis*, 645).

<sup>189</sup> ARNOTT, *Alexis*, 645.

## 7. Historians of the Roman Era

### 7.1. Strabo

Strabo (ca. 64 B.C.E.–after 24 C.E.) wrote a work that documents peoples and describes the geography of the countries known to Greeks as well as Romans during the reign of Augustus. Strabo's *Geography* is thus an important source for ancient geography as well as ancient history. Strabo has some references to suspensions in which he uses the terminology in focus. Hengel refers to two of these texts and interprets them as crucifixion accounts.<sup>190</sup>

#### 7.1.1. Suspension Texts in Strabo

The first text is of special interest since it appears to contradict a basic assumption of the present investigation. The text occurs within Strabo's description of the Iberian tribe of Cantabri. Strabo mentions rumors about the Cantabrians' "rawness and bestial insensibility."<sup>191</sup>

Regarding the insensibility of the Cantabrians it is also told that when some captured [Cantabrians] had been attached to poles [ἀναπεπηγότες ἐπὶ τῶν σταυρῶν] they continued to chant the paean of victory. Now, such patterns of manner would indicate a certain savageness.<sup>192</sup>

The suspension in this text is hard to specify. Hengel describes the victims as being "nailed to the cross."<sup>193</sup> However, the verb ἀναπηγνύναι calls for cautiousness. Strabo only uses this verb in this single text. The difficulty is that other authors use the verb mainly in connection with impaling.<sup>194</sup> This feature makes the text challenging. It is easy to assume that impaling kills more or less instantly since it damages vital organs of the abdomen. The verb used in the present text implies an impaled victim who sings, which contradicts the mentioned assumption. Thus, the text shows that it is not possible to state that ἀναπηγνύναι once and for all means impaling in the sense in which it is defined by the present investi-

<sup>190</sup> Strabo, 3.4.18 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 47); 14.1.39 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 75).

<sup>191</sup> Strabo, 3.4.17 (οὐ μόνον τὰ πρὸς ἀνδρείαν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ πρὸς ὀμότητα καὶ ἀπόνοιαν θηριώδη).

<sup>192</sup> Strabo, 3.4.18. τῆς δ' ἀπονοίας καὶ τοῦτο λέγεται τῆς Καντάβρων, ὅτι ἀλόντες τινὲς ἀναπεπηγότες ἐπὶ τῶν σταυρῶν ἐπαιάνιζον. τὰ μὲν οὖν τοιαῦτα τῶν ἡθῶν ἀγριότητός τινος παραδείγματα ἄν εἴη.

<sup>193</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 47.

<sup>194</sup> Cf. Ar. *Eccl.* 843 (more exactly: "pierced"); Plut. *Artax.* 17.5 and probably Alexis, 224.10. Especially the text in Plut. *Artax.* 17.5 ought to be considered here, while it also uses ἀναπηγνύναι in combination with σταυρός (καὶ τὸ μὲν σῶμα πλάγιον διὰ τριῶν σταυρῶν ἀναπηξαι).

gation. It could be used in a suspension, which allows the victim to be alive for a while when suspended. What could be said in the end is that the suspension in the text is some kind of enduring suspension. It is, however, still too bold, not least on the basis of the overall usage of ἀναπηγνύναι, to state that they were “nailed to the cross” as Hengel does.<sup>195</sup>

In addition to this text, there are four suspension accounts in Strabo’s texts. In the first text, in which he depends on Posidonius, Strabo describes the Gallic peoples. Among the barbaric customs of these northern tribes were several forms of human sacrifice.

We are also told of other kinds of human sacrifices; for they shoot down [κατετόξευον] anyone with arrows and suspend [ἀνεσταύρου] [them] in the temples, and having built a colossus of straw and wood and thrown into this cattle and all kinds of wild animals and human beings, they make a burnt-offering.<sup>196</sup>

The suspension form is unspecified in this text, which is the only text where the verb ἀνασταυροῦν is used within the texts of Strabo. However, earlier authors use the verb κατατοχεύειν when referring to *lethal* shootings.<sup>197</sup> Could this be characteristic of the verb? If so, this feature implies vaguely that Strabo refers to a post-mortem suspension in the text – and uses ἀνασταυροῦν.

The second text comes from a section of description of various people by Strabo. The text deals with the fate of Hermeias, the former slave and now the tyrant of Atarneus and Assus.

Menon of Rhodes, who at that time served as general for the Persians, having pretended [to be] a friend, called [Hermeias] to himself, both [in the name of] hospitality and for pretended business reasons. But having seized him he sent him thus to the king, and there [Hermeias] was suspended [κρεμασθεῖς] and killed.<sup>198</sup>

The suspension form is unknown. However, the suspension appears to be an execution, which makes it an ante-mortem suspension. Jones translates the phrase κάκει κρεμασθεῖς ἀπώλετο with “where he was put to death by hanging” in the Loeb edition, but there is nothing in the text that supports such a reading (if he uses “hanging” in a traditional sense of hanging

<sup>195</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 47.

<sup>196</sup> Strabo, 4.4.5 (Posidon. F 34.26–29). καὶ ἄλλα δὲ ἀνθρωποθυσίαν εἶδη λέγεται· καὶ γὰρ κατετόξευόν τινες καὶ ἀνεσταύρου ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς καὶ κατασκευάσαντες κολοσσόν χόρτου καὶ ξύλων, ἐμβαλόντες εἰς τοῦτον βοσκήματα καὶ θηρία παντοῖα καὶ ἀνθρώπους, ὠλοκαύτου.

<sup>197</sup> Hdt. 3.36.4; Thuc. 3.34.3 (see s.v. LSJ).

<sup>198</sup> Strabo, 13.1.57. Μέμων δ’ ὁ Ῥόδιος ὑπηρετῶν τότε τοῖς Πέρσαις καὶ στρατηγῶν, προσποιησάμενος φιλίαν καλεῖ πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ξενίας τε ἅμα καὶ πραγμάτων προσποιητῶν χάριν, συλλαβῶν δ’ ἀνέπεμψεν ὡς τὸν βασιλέα, κάκει κρεμασθεῖς ἀπώλετο.

by the neck with a snare).<sup>199</sup> Strabo uses the verb κρεμαννύναι also in 14.1.16 (see below) but that text does not shed light on the meaning of the present text.

In the third text, which contains his description of tyranny, Strabo mentions its peak under Polycrates and his brother. Having portrayed his brilliance and fortune Strabo gives an account of the death of Polycrates.<sup>200</sup>

Having learned this (one of Polycrates' signs of fortune [comment by the present author]) the king of the Egyptians, they say, declared in some prophetic way that, in short, life would come to an unhappy end for a man who had been exalted by welfare. And indeed, this happened; for having been seized through treachery by the satrap of the Persians, he was suspended [κρεμασθῆναι].<sup>201</sup>

The suspension form is unspecified. Also in this text Jones translates κρεμαννύναι with "hanged," although not "by hanging" as in the previous text.<sup>202</sup>

The last text from Strabo is a brief glimpse of a past suspension in a geographical description of regions of Ephesus.

The city lies on the plain by the mountain called Thorax, on which Daphitas the grammarian is said to have been suspended [σταυρωθῆναι], because he reviled the king through a distich.<sup>203</sup>

This last text also contains an unspecified suspension. The plain form of the verb is noteworthy; it is, however, difficult also in this text to see any significance in the dropped prefix.

### 7.1.2. Conclusion – Strabo and Crucifixion

Of the five suspension texts, Strabo appears to refer to an unspecified post-mortem suspension in one text (4.4.5 [ἀνασταυροῦν]) and to an unspecified ante-mortem suspension in one text (13.1.57 [κρεμαννύναι]). In two other texts, he does not offer any information about the nature of the suspension (14.1.16 [κρεμαννύναι]; 14.1.39 [σταυροῦν]). In addition to these texts, Strabo has a text that causes problems for the present investi-

<sup>199</sup> JONES, *LCL*.

<sup>200</sup> Cf. Hdt. 3.125.2; Philo, *Prov.* 2.24–25.

<sup>201</sup> Strabo, 14.1.16. πυθόμενον δὲ τοῦτο τὸν Αἰγυπτίων βασιλέα φασὶ μαντικῶς πως ἀποφθέγξασθαι ὡς ἐν βραχεὶ καταστρέψει τὸν βίον εἰς οὐκ εὐτυχὲς τέλος ὁ τοσοῦτον ἐξηρμένος ταῖς εὐπραγίαις· καὶ δὴ καὶ συμβῆναι τοῦτο· ληφθέντα γὰρ ἐξ ἀπάτης ὑπὸ τοῦ σατράπου τῶν Περσῶν κρεμασθῆναι.

<sup>202</sup> JONES, *LCL*.

<sup>203</sup> Strabo, 14.1.39. κείται δ' ἐν πεδίῳ πρὸς ὄρει καλουμένῳ Θώρακι ἢ πόλιν, ἐφ' ᾧ σταυρωθῆναι φασὶ Δαφίταν τὸν γραμματικὸν λοιδορήσαντα τοὺς βασιλέας διὰ διστίχου.

gation (3.4.18 [ἀναπηγνύναι, σταυρός]). On the terminological level (ἀναπηγνύναι) the text leans toward impaling while the contextual level (the suspended person was alive for a while) leans away from it. The text describes some kind of endurable human suspension. It is in the end hard to draw any conclusions regarding the punishment of crucifixion from Strabo's texts, other than that he was familiar with a form of ante-mortem suspension.

### 7.2. *Dionysius of Halicarnassus*

Dionysius of Halicarnassus (ca. 60–?) lived and taught rhetoric in Rome from about 30 B.C.E. He also wrote a work on the history of Rome from mythical times up to the outbreak of the First Punic War, *Roman Antiquities*. Hengel finds two crucifixion accounts in Dionysius Halicarnassus' texts.<sup>204</sup> The events described in these texts are rather different.

In the first text, Dionysius of Halicarnassus mentions a slave uprising under the consulship of Postumus Cominius and Titus Larcius. There was a quarrel between Rome and the neighboring cities of the Latins, who withdrew from the state of friendship that they had with the Romans. While the dispute was building up, numerous slaves seized the opportunity and formed a conspiracy against the state. Their plan was to take hold of the heights of Rome and set part of the town on fire. But their plans were revealed.

And at once, those collected from the homes and those brought in from the country, as many as the informers declared to be a part of the conspiracy, after being scourged and maltreated by torture, were all suspended [ἀνεσκολοπίσθησαν].<sup>205</sup>

The form of the suspension is unspecified in the text. This is the only time Dionysius uses the verb ἀνεσκολοπίζειν or speaks about a human suspension at all.

In the other text, Dionysius of Halicarnassus describes an act of torture, which contains some interesting features. The event was probably the prelude to a public execution of a slave in the Forum in Rome.

Those who led the slave to the punishment, having stretched out both his arms and tied them to a [beam of] wood [ξύλω προσδήσαντες], which extended across his chest and

<sup>204</sup> Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 5.51.3; 7.69.2 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 29 n. 21; 55 n. 8).

<sup>205</sup> Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 5.51.3. καὶ αὐτίκα οἱ μὲν ἐκ τῶν οἰκῶν συλληφθέντες, οἱ δ' ἐκ τῶν ἀγρῶν ἀναχθέντες, ὅσους ἀπέφαινον οἱ μηνυταὶ μετασχεῖν τῆς συναμοσίας, μάστιγι καὶ βασάνους αἰκισθέντες ἀνεσκολοπίσθησαν ἅπαντες. ταῦτα ἐπὶ τούτων ἐπράχθη τῶν ὑπάτων.

shoulders as far as the wrist, were following [him] lacerating [his] naked [body] with whips.<sup>206</sup>

Besides Hengel, also Stockbauer sees the text as a reference to cross-bearing.<sup>207</sup> However, the text is only a description of a slave tied to a beam of wood who is beaten with whips. Nothing in the text suggests that the slave was crucified after the torture. Nothing in the text suggests that the ξύλον was the horizontal beam of a cross (†), as Stockbauer proposes. The text only indicates that the slave was tortured in a certain way and then executed, as implied earlier in the story.

There is in fact a similar account in the far end of *Roman Antiquities* in which the subsequent execution is described.

When the decree about the punishment had been ratified, stakes [πάτταλοι] were fixed in the Forum, and men being brought forward in groups of three hundred, having their elbows bent behind [them], they were tied [προσεδοῦντο] naked to the stakes [παττάλους]. Then, having been scourged with whips in the sight of all, they had the back tendons of their neck cut off with an ax. And after them another three hundred, and again other large [groups] were destroyed, in all four thousand five hundred. And they did not even receive burial, but having been dragged out of the Forum to an open place in front of the city, they were torn asunder by birds and dogs.<sup>208</sup>

The victims were tied to the stakes and tortured in a way that is quite similar to the one in the previous text – without being crucified. Hence, it is difficult to define the events in the Forum (*Ant. Rom.* 5.51.3) as an instance of “cross-bearing.” The only conclusion that can be drawn is that they simply were tortured in some way. The text in 5.51.3 reveals that the scourging could be followed by a suspension, but not what kind of suspension. Thus, in the end none of the texts of Dionysius of Halicarnassus is of much help in the study of crucifixion, other than being yet another example of the diversity of the punishment forms.

<sup>206</sup> Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 7.69.2. οἱ δ' ἄγοντες τὸν θεράποντα ἐπὶ τὴν τιμωρίαν τὰς χεῖρας ἀποτείναντες ἀμφοτέρας καὶ ξύλω προσδήσαντες παρὰ τὰ στέρνα τε καὶ τοὺς ὤμους καὶ μέχρι τῶν καρπῶν διήκοντι παρηκολούθουον ξαίνοντες μάλιστα γυμνὸν ὄντα.

HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 29 n. 21; 55 n. 8; STOCKBAUER, *Kunstgeschichte*, 19.

<sup>208</sup> Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 20.16.2. κυρωθέντος δὲ τοῦ περὶ τῆς τιμωρίας δόγματος πάτταλοι τε κατεπάγησαν ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ, καὶ παραγόμενοι κατὰ τριακοσίους ἀνδρας, περιηγμένοι τοὺς ἀγκῶνας ὀπίσω προσεδούντο τοῖς παττάλοις γυμνοί· ἔπειτα μάλιστα αἰκισθέντες ἀπάντων ὀρώντων ἀπεκόπτοντο τῷ πελέκει τοὺς ὑπὸ ταῖς κεφαλαῖς νωτιαίους τένοντας· καὶ μετὰ τούτους ἕτεροι τριακόσιοι, καὶ αὖθις ἄλλοι τοσοῦτοι διεφάρησαν, οἱ σύμπαντες τετρακισχίλιοι καὶ πεντακόσιοι. καὶ οὐδὲ ταφῆς ἔτυχον, ἀλλ' ἔλκυσθέντες ἐκ τῆς ἀγορᾶς εἰς ἀναπεπταμένον τι πρὸ τῆς πόλεως χωρίον ὑπὸ οἰωνῶν καὶ κυνῶν διεφορήθησαν. Dionysius uses πάσσαλος in an unusual fashion in the text. The noun refers usually to small sticks or wooden nails (see s.v. LSJ), but appears to denote larger beams of wood in this text.

### 7.3. *Flavius Josephus*

Flavius Josephus (37/38–ca. 100 C.E.) wrote about the political situation of the Jews of his time as well as the history of the Jewish people. As a descendant of the Hasmonean family, he belonged to the priestly aristocracy and came to play an important role as a political and military leader during the early stages of the Jewish revolt against Rome 66–73 C.E. He was captured by the Romans, chose to cooperate with them, traveled to Rome with Titus after the fall of Jerusalem, and lived in Rome for the rest of his life.<sup>209</sup>

Both Hengel and Kuhn refer to several texts by Josephus, which they interpret as crucifixion accounts.<sup>210</sup> Josephus uses ἀνασταυροῦν exclusively in his references to suspension (while Philo uses ἀνασκολοπίζειν exclusively).<sup>211</sup> Josephus also uses σταυρός in some texts, sometimes in combination with κρεμαννύναι or προσηλοῦν. Josephus does not use the σκολοπ-stem at all. Josephus' texts will chiefly be divided into two groups. The first group contains texts with suspension accounts, which lack information about what kind of suspension they describe. The texts of the second group do contain such information, sometimes with indications that the suspension at hand might be a crucifixion.

Josephus describes suspension punishments in at least twenty-eight texts and uses the σταυρ-terminology, i.e., ἀνασταυροῦν, σταυροῦν and σταυρός, in the majority of these.

#### 7.3.1. Texts Without Indications of the Suspension Form

The majority of the texts by Josephus are unspecified when it comes to the nature of the suspension. A selection of these texts will be studied briefly in the following pages. The main discussion of the texts comes at the end of this section.

The first text could be challenging to find under the present heading. The *Testimonium Flavianum*, as it is generally called, comes from *Jewish Antiquities* and refers to the death of Jesus. Thereby it falls outside the

<sup>209</sup> See also, FELDMAN, "Josephus," 990–91; MASON, *Josephus and the New Testament*, 35–52.

<sup>210</sup> Hengel: *BJ* 1.97/113 (par. *AJ* 13.380); 2.75 (par. *AJ* 17.295); 2.241, 253, 306–08; 3.321; 5.289, 449–51; 7.202; *AJ* 12.256; 18.79; 19.94; 20.102, 129 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 8; 24–26; 31 n. 24; 35 n. 7; 40; 47; 49 n. 11; 60; 71 n. 10; 74–75; 84 n. 3; 85 n. 4).

Kuhn: *Vit.* 417–21; *BJ* 1.97/113 (par. *AJ* 13.380); *BJ* 2.75 (par. *AJ* 17.295); *BJ* 2.241 (par. *AJ* 20.129); *BJ* 2.253; *BJ* 2.306–08; *BJ* 3.321; *BJ* 5.289; 5.449–51; 7.202–03; *AJ* 12.256; *AJ* 13.380ff.; *AJ* 17.295; *AJ* 18.63f.; 18.65–80; *AJ* 18.79; *AJ* 19.94; *AJ* 20.102, 129 ("Die Kreuzesstrafe," 660–61, 62 + n. 64; 680, 94, 95; 707 + n. 356; 708, 10, 11 + n. 380; 714, 15 n. 414 and 416; 717, 18, 21 n. 455; 724, 25, 27, 34 + n. 518; 739, 52, 53, 54, 56, 57).

<sup>211</sup> As noticed by HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 24.

text corpus in focus of the present investigation,<sup>212</sup> but since it is well known, it is useful as an example of a basic problem which is dealt with in this investigation. The genuineness of the *Testimonium Flavianum* is disputed and most scholars regard the text as partly interpolated.<sup>213</sup> It appears to interrupt the ongoing story with assumed Christian utterances.<sup>214</sup> Here the text from the Loeb edition will be studied without any deeper text-critical discussion, since the reference to the σταυρός is outside the assumed Christian utterances and is thus not disputed.

At this time lived Jesus, a wise man, if one ought to call him a man. For he was a doer of incredible works, a teacher of such people as receive the truth with pleasure; he won over [to his side] many Jews and many of the Greeks. This one was the Messiah. And when Pilate, at the suggestion of the first men among us, had condemned [him] to [the] pole [σταυρῶ], those who first loved him did not give up [their love]. For he appeared for them alive again on the third day as the prophets of God had said [about] that, as well as countless other wonderful [things] about him. And the tribe of Christians, named after him, has not disappeared up to this day.<sup>215</sup>

A reader in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, with the Gospel accounts and church art in mind, gets a rather clear image of the punishment at hand, even though Josephus does not explain what kind of punishment he refers to. Josephus simply mentions that Pilate condemned Jesus to the σταυρός, without

<sup>212</sup> I.e., only texts which are not influenced by the execution form of Jesus.

<sup>213</sup> E.g., FELDMAN, "Josephus," 990-91; MASON, *Josephus and the New Testament*, 163-75; KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 661; STEGEMANN, "Jesus," cols. 911-12. For a rather convincing argumentation for the genuineness of the *Testimonium Flavianum*, see WHEALEY, *Josephus on Jesus*, xiii-207 (see also VICTOR, "Das Testimonium Flavianum: Ein authentischer Text des Josephus," 72-82).

<sup>214</sup> In spite of the fact that the passage is found in all Greek manuscripts and ancient translations, Origen states that Josephus did not admit "Jesus to be Christ" (τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἡμῶν οὐ καταδεξάμενος εἶναι Χριστόν) (Orig. *Comm. Mt.* 10.17.36-39). Origen says further that Josephus "disbelieved in Jesus as Christ" (ἀπιστῶν τῷ Ἰησοῦ ὡς Χριστῷ) (Orig. *C. Cels.* 1.47). The assumed Christian statements (e.g., εἶγε ἄνδρα αὐτὸν λέγειν χρῆ; ὁ χριστὸς οὗτος ἦν; ἐφάνη γὰρ αὐτοῖς τρίτην ἔχων ἡμέραν πάλιν ζῶν τῶν θείων προφητῶν ταῦτά τε καὶ ἄλλα μυρία περὶ αὐτοῦ θαυμάσια εἰρηκότων) are also missing in a tenth-century text by the Christian Arab author Agapius.

<sup>215</sup> Joseph. *AJ* 18.63-64. γίνεται δὲ κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον Ἰησοῦς σοφὸς ἄνηρ, εἶγε ἄνδρα αὐτὸν λέγειν χρῆ ἦν γὰρ παραδόξων ἔργων ποιητής, διδάσκαλος ἀνθρώπων τῶν ἡδονῇ τάληθῆ δεχομένων, καὶ πολλοὺς μὲν Ἰουδαίους, πολλοὺς δὲ καὶ τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ ἐπηγάγετο ὁ χριστὸς οὗτος ἦν. καὶ αὐτὸν ἐνδείξει τῶν πρώτων ἀνδρῶν παρ' ἡμῖν σταυρῷ ἐπιτετιμηκότος Πιλάτου οὐκ ἐπαύσαντο οἱ τὸ πρῶτον ἀγαπήσαντες· ἐφάνη γὰρ αὐτοῖς τρίτην ἔχων ἡμέραν πάλιν ζῶν τῶν θείων προφητῶν ταῦτά τε καὶ ἄλλα μυρία περὶ αὐτοῦ θαυμάσια εἰρηκότων. εἰς ἔτι τε νῦν τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἀπὸ τοῦδε ὀνομασμένον οὐκ ἐπέλιπε τὸ φύλον.



further explanation. It is not possible to draw any firm conclusion on the basis of the sole occurrence of *σταυρός*.<sup>216</sup>

Several texts by Josephus share this vagueness. Some of these texts are used in various studies of crucifixion. The first text from *Jewish Antiquities* is an example of this. The text is found in Josephus' description of the murder of the Roman emperor Gaius Caligula. The murder was planned to occur during a theatrical performance in the royal palace. Josephus offers a brief description of the dramatic act in which a suspension was a crucial part.

An actor was introduced, by whom a leader of robbers was suspended [*σταυροῦται*], and the pantomime dancer introduced [the] drama Cinyras, in which [the hero] was killed as well as his daughter Myrrha, and a great quantity of artificial blood was poured, around both the suspended [*τὸν σταυρωθέντα*] and Cinyras.<sup>217</sup>

Hengel uses this text as evidence that crucifixion was a bloody event, while Kuhn simply refers to it as a crucifixion.<sup>218</sup> As Hengel correctly observes, Josephus describes the execution form as a bloodstained event. However, what shows that the suspension at hand is a crucifixion? Josephus uses the plain form of his regular verb twice but offers no further information about the suspension form. Thus, it is only possible to connect the blood with *some kind* of suspension, which Josephus refers to with the verb *σταυροῦν*.<sup>219</sup> It is hard to see any significance in the dropped prefix, though it occurs twice within the same text that happens to describe a theatrical performance.<sup>220</sup>

Another example of an unspecified suspension occurs when Josephus in *Jewish War* describes the situation in the land during the reign of Nero. Nero had appointed Felix as a procurator of Judea and Felix took actions against some rebellious Jews.

<sup>216</sup> For Josephus' use of the noun otherwise, see *BJ* 2.308; 5.451; 7.202; *AJ* 11.261, 66, 67. N.B., 3.125; 5.469, 70, where *σταυρός* denotes poles or timber in general.

<sup>217</sup> Joseph. *AJ* 19.94. *καὶ γὰρ μῖμος εἰσάγεται, καθ' ὃν σταυροῦται ληφθεὶς ἡγεμών, ὃ τε ὀρχηστὴς δράμα εἰσάγει Κινύραν, ἐν ᾧ αὐτὸς τε ἐκτείνετο καὶ ἡ θυγάτηρ Μύρρα, αἰμά τε ἦν τεχνητὸν πολὺ καὶ τὸ περὶ τὸν σταυρωθέντα ἐκκεχυμένον καὶ τὸ περὶ τὸν Κινύραν.*

<sup>218</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 31 n. 24; KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 695–96.

<sup>219</sup> If it is possible to label the text as a crucifixion reference, it contradicts Hewitt's words that "crucifixion seems to have been originally one of those bloodless punishments which enable men to satisfy a superstitious horror of shedding blood, especially tribal blood, and at the same time to lengthen the victim's period of agony" (HEWITT, "The Use of Nails in the Crucifixion," 37).

<sup>220</sup> Cf. Joseph. *AJ* 2.77 and 17.295, where Josephus uses the plain verb independently of any theatrical context, so that cannot be seen as a criterion for Josephus' usage of the plain verb form.

This one [seized] alive the robber-chief Eleazar who had ravaged the country for twenty years and many of those [that were] with him, and sent them to Rome. There was a countless multitude of robbers being suspended [ἀνασταυρωθέντων] by him, and [those] of the people being detected among them he punished.<sup>221</sup>

Both Hengel and Kuhn see this text, among others, as evidence of mass crucifixions.<sup>222</sup> However, this text suffers the same problem as the previous one. The suspension form is not specified beyond the use of ἀνασταυροῦν. The text describes *some kind* of mass suspensions, which Josephus refers to with the verb ἀνασταυροῦν.

As a last example, belonging to this group are also texts that stress the cruel display of the suspended victim. One such text is found in Josephus' description of Jerusalem under Roman siege. He mentions how the Roman commander Titus desired to frighten the inhabitants.

It happened in this fight that a Jew was taken alive, whom Titus ordered to be suspended [ἀνασταυρωσάι] before the walls, [to see] whether the others would surrender, after being terrified by the sight.<sup>223</sup>

Hengel refers to this text as an example of crucifixion as a terrifying sight.<sup>224</sup> However, the suspension form is not specified beyond the use of ἀνασταυροῦν in this text either. The text describes *some kind* of terrifying suspension, which Josephus refers to with the verb ἀνασταυροῦν.<sup>225</sup> It is difficult to limit (ἀνα)σταυροῦν as simply meaning "to crucify." Josephus uses the verb in the more unspecific sense "to suspend," referring to an unspecified suspension punishment.<sup>226</sup> An effort to further limit the range of meaning of the verb depends only on the context.

<sup>221</sup> Joseph. *BJ* 2.253. οἶτος τόν τε ἀρχιληστήν Ἐλεάζαρον ἔτεσιν εἴκοσι τήν χώραν λησάμενον καί πολλοὺς τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ ζωγήσας ἀνέπεμψεν εἰς Ῥώμην τῶν δ' ἀνασταυρωθέντων ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ληστῶν καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ κοινωνία φαραθέντων δημοτῶν, οὓς ἐκόλασεν, ἄπειρόν τι πλήθος ἦν.

<sup>222</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 26 n. 17; KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 711. Hengel mentions in the same footnote also Joseph. *BJ* 2.75; 2.241, 306; 308; *AJ* 17.295; 20.129. He mentions also *BJ* 3.321; 5.289, but it is not clear whether he also identifies these as mass crucifixions.

<sup>223</sup> Joseph. *BJ* 5.289. συνέβη δ' ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ μάχῃ καὶ ζωρηθῆναι τινα τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ὃν ὁ Τίτος ἀνασταυρώσαι πρὸ τοῦ τείχους ἐκέλευσεν, εἴ τι πρὸς τὴν ὄψιν ἐνδοίεν οἱ λοιποὶ καταπλαγέντες.

<sup>224</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 8, 26 n. 17. Hengel mentions also Joseph. *BJ* 3.321; 5.289; 7.202–03.

<sup>225</sup> In *Jewish Antiquities* Josephus recounts some narratives from Biblical and early Jewish texts, which also contain undefined suspensions. Two texts (*AJ* 11.17, 103) deal with the story in which Cyrus expresses his support for the rebuilding of the temple in Jerusalem (*Ezra* 6.6–12 and *1 Esdras* 6.27–33), but they do not add anything concerning the understanding of the verb beyond the use of ἀνασταυροῦν.

<sup>226</sup> See also Joseph. *BJ* 2.75, 241; 7.202–03; *AJ* 18.79; 20.102, 129.

The last text of the present section contains an interesting feature. The text deals with the capture of Machaerus. A young man named Eleazar had been captured by the Romans, and a Roman general acted swiftly.

He ordered a pole [σταυρόν] to be erected as if he would suspend [κρεμῶν] Eleazar instantly. A deep pain fell upon those that had seen this from the citadel and they wailed vehemently crying that the calamity was not endurable. Whereupon Eleazar therefore begged them not to let him undergo the most pitiable of deaths and to provide their own safety by yielding to the power and fortune of the Romans, since everyone already had been subdued.<sup>227</sup>

This text could be used as support for the theory that crucifixion was the worse form of execution – if it could be proven that the intended suspension in the text was a crucifixion. But that is the problem of this text as well. The “most pitiable of deaths” is here only connected with a suspension in which a σταυρός was used.<sup>228</sup> Nothing is said about the shape of the σταυρός, how and in what condition Eleazar was planned to be suspended. The text is thus unspecified beyond the usage of σταυρός.

The texts mentioned above are interesting from several perspectives. They describe the execution form as a terrifying sight, a bloody event, sometime with multitudes of victims, the most pitiable of deaths – and in particular, they refer to the death of Jesus. The question is, nevertheless, how useful they are in a study of the death punishment of crucifixion as it is understood in a traditional sense. Both Hengel and Kuhn use them and define all texts as references to the punishment of crucifixion, even though the suspension method is not specified beyond the use of ἀνασταυροῦν and σταυρός.<sup>229</sup> The pivotal question is if it is possible to determine whether the texts refer to crucifixions on the sole basis of the

---

<sup>227</sup> Joseph. *BJ* 7.202–03. ὁ μὲν γὰρ προσέταξε καταπηγνύναι σταυρόν ὡς αὐτίκα κρεμῶν τὸν Ἐλεάζαρον, τοῖς δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ φρουρίου τοῦτο θεασαμένοις ὀδύνη τε πλείων προσέπεσε, καὶ διωλύγιον ἀνώμαζον οὐκ ἀνασχετὸν εἶναι τὸ πάθος βοᾶντες. ἐνταῦθα δὴ τοίνυν Ἐλεάζαρος ἰκέτευεν αὐτοὺς μῆτε αὐτὸν περιδεῖν ὑπομείναντα θανάτων τὸν οἴκτιστον καὶ σφίσιν αὐτοῖς τὴν σωτηρίαν παρασχεῖν τῇ Ῥωμαίων εἴξαντας ἰσχυρὴν καὶ τύχη μετὰ πάντας ἦδη κεχειρωμένους.

<sup>228</sup> Cf. Hdt. 1.110.3, 112.1; Dion. Hal. 3.30.6; Philo, *Leg.* 129–30; *Mos.* 2.248–50; *Spec. Leg.* 3.160–61. All these texts label punishment forms completely different than crucifixion as the most terrible or the like.

<sup>229</sup> *BJ* 2.75 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 26 n. 17; KUHN, “Die Kreuzesstrafe,” 707); *BJ* 2.241 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 26 n. 17; KUHN, “Die Kreuzesstrafe,” 707); *BJ* 2.253 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 26 n. 17; KUHN, “Die Kreuzesstrafe,” 711); *BJ* 5.289 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 26 n. 17; KUHN, “Die Kreuzesstrafe,” 717); *BJ* 7.202–03 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion* 8 n. 17, KUHN, “Die Kreuzesstrafe,” 718); *AJ* 18.63–64 (KUHN, “Die Kreuzesstrafe,” 661); *AJ* 18.79 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 60; KUHN, “Die Kreuzesstrafe,” 694); *AJ* 19.94 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 31 n. 24, 35 n. 7; KUHN, “Die Kreuzesstrafe,” 695); *AJ* 20.102 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 49 n. 11; KUHN, “Die Kreuzesstrafe,” 710).

occurrence of the *σταυρ*-terminology. A negative answer to that question is suggested in the present investigation. The common feature of the hitherto studied texts is that it is difficult to determine what kind of suspension punishment they describe. Josephus uses the *σταυρ*-terminology in the texts, but he does not offer any further information about the suspension form.

### 7.3.2. Texts With Indications of the Suspension Form

In his *Jewish Antiquities* Josephus refers to several suspension punishments that have features connected with the traditional understanding of crucifixion. The first eleven references recount suspensions in the Hebrew Bible.<sup>230</sup>

The first text in the present category comments on the fate of the chief baker in Genesis 40. When the cupbearer and the chief baker had told their dreams, Joseph said that the cupbearer should be released after three days while the chief baker had only three days left of his life.

On the third [day], having been suspended [*ἀνασταυρωθέντα*], he would become food for the birds, not being able to defend himself. And these things turned out in the end just as Joseph said. For on the foretold day, having offered on his birthday, the king suspended [*ἀνεσταύρωσε*] the chief baker, but released the cupbearer from the chains and restored him in the same service.<sup>231</sup>

Two years later, when Pharaoh had had some dreams, the cupbearer remembered Joseph and his dream interpretation.

[The cupbearer] came and mentioned Joseph to him and also the vision, which he had seen in the prison, and [that] the events turned out as this one said; that the chief of the bakers was executed by suspension [*σταυρωθείη*] on the same day, and it happened to this one according to the interpretation of the dream, foretold by Joseph.<sup>232</sup>

These texts do not explicitly specify to what kind of suspension they refer. It is, however, possible to take the phrase “not being able to defend himself” (*οὐδὲν ἀμύνειν αὐτῷ δυνάμενον*) as an indication of a living victim suspended with his limbs tied or nailed to the execution tool. But

<sup>230</sup> Joseph. *AJ* 2.73, 77; 4.202; 6.374; 11.17, 103, 208, 246, 267, 280, 289.

<sup>231</sup> Joseph. *AJ* 2.73. τῇ τρίτῃ δ' αὐτὸν ἀνασταυρωθέντα βορὰν ἔσσεσθαι πετεινοῖς οὐδὲν ἀμύνειν αὐτῷ δυνάμενον. καὶ δὴ ταῦτα τέλος ὁμοιον οἷς ὁ Ἰώσηπος εἶπεν ἀμφοτέροις ἔλαβε· τῇ γὰρ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ προειρημένην γενέθλιον τεθυκῶς ὁ βασιλεὺς τὸν μὲν ἐπὶ τῶν σιτοποιῶν ἀνεσταύρωσε, τὸν δὲ οἰνοχόον τῶν δεσμῶν ἀπολῶσας ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτῆς ὑπηρεσίας κατέστησεν.

<sup>232</sup> Joseph. *AJ* 2.77. καὶ προσελθὼν ἐμήνυσεν αὐτῷ τὸν Ἰώσηπον τὴν τε ὄψιν, ἣν αὐτὸς εἶδεν ἐν τῇ εἰρκτῇ, καὶ τὸ ἀποβὰν ἐκείνου φράσαντος, ὅτι τε σταυρωθείη κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ἡμέραν ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν σιτοποιῶν κάκεινφ τοῦτο συμβαίη κατὰ ἐξήγησιν ὄνειρατος Ἰωσήπου προειπόντος.

this is a weak indication.<sup>233</sup> Josephus appears to use the plain form of the verb in this text in the same way as the compound.

Josephus recounts a number of stories from the Biblical texts, which offer some information on the suspension form beyond the occurrence of ἀνασταυροῦν. Several texts are connected with the book of Esther.<sup>234</sup> When Josephus has referred to Mordecai's intervention to save the Persian king (11.208) he turns to Haman's plot to kill Mordecai. Haman had ordered a tree (ξύλον) to be cut down and made into a suspension tool for Mordecai (11.246). When the king heard that Haman had prepared a pole (σταυρός [11.261, 66]) he ordered that Haman should be punished instead.

When the king had heard [this] he decided to inflict on Haman no other punishment than that which had been intended for Mordecai; and he ordered him instantly to be hanged on that pole [τοῦ σταυροῦ κρεμασθέντα] to be killed.<sup>235</sup>

In the last word of the Greek text Josephus offers an indication that, at least, Haman's suspension in the text was an execution, which puts the suspension in the Mordecai-Haman drama in a different light. Josephus appears to refer to an execution by suspension with ἀνασταυροῦν. In the above-quoted text, Josephus alternates his terminology by using κρεμαννύναι and σταυρός. He appears to use κρεμαννύναι and σταυρός in the same way that he uses ἀνασταυροῦν, as is suggested some paragraphs later. Josephus recapitulates the event when he has the Persian king state:

I have suspended [ἀνεσταύρωσα] the one who prepared these things against them, with his family, before the gates of Susa; for the all-seeing God has brought this punishment upon him.<sup>236</sup>

In addition to the book of Esther, Josephus describes a suspension in *Jewish Antiquities* when he recounts some events described in the early Jewish text of First Maccabees. The Seleucid ruler Antiochus IV (Epiphanes) forced Hellenistic religion upon the Jewish homeland. Many of the Jews complied with the king's commands, some willingly, others

<sup>233</sup> Feldman labels the suspension of the chief baker as "the Roman method of crucifixion" without any further discussion (Flavius Josephus, *Judean Antiquities* 1-4, 3.152 n. 213). Feldman does mention the dropped prefix in 2.77.

<sup>234</sup> Joseph. *AJ* 11.208, 246, 61, 66-67, 80, 89. The name of Mordecai should be "Mardocai" according to Josephus, but the well-known spelling from the Biblical text is used here.

<sup>235</sup> Joseph. *AJ* 11.267. ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ἀκούσας οὐκ ἄλλη τιμωρία περιβάλλειν ἔκριεν τὸν Ἀμάνην ἢ τῇ κατὰ Μαρδοχαίου νενομημένη, καὶ κελεύει παραχρημα αὐτὸν ἐξ ἐκείνου τοῦ σταυροῦ κρεμασθέντα ἀποθανεῖν.

<sup>236</sup> Joseph. *AJ* 11.280. καὶ τὸν ταῦτα κατ' αὐτῶν μηχανησάμενον πρὸ τῶν πυλῶν τῶν ἐν Σούσοις ἀνεσταύρωσα μετὰ τῆς γενεᾶς, τοῦ πάντα ἐφορῶντος θεοῦ ταύτην αὐτῷ τὴν δίκην ἐπιβαλόντος.

by fear of the prescribed punishment (οἱ μὲν ἔκοντι οἱ δὲ καὶ δι' εὐλάβειαν τῆς ἐπηγγελμένης τιμωρίας). However, some refused.

Indeed, they were scourged and their bodies maltreated; while still alive and breathing they were suspended [ζῶντες ἔτι καὶ ἐμπνέοντες ἀνεσταυροῦντο]; and their wives and their children, whom they had circumcised against the policy of the king, they strangled by hanging them from the necks of [their] suspended parents [τῶν ἀνεσταυρωμένων γονέων].<sup>237</sup>

Both Hengel and Kuhn refer to this text as a reference to crucifixion, even though Josephus does not specify the form of suspension punishment otherwise than that the victims are alive.<sup>238</sup> This feature is, nevertheless, worth notice. The question is why Josephus stresses that the victims were alive and breathing in this text. Also this text offers an indication that the regular suspension objects were corpses.

Another unusual feature which occurs in the text is that Josephus mentions hanging. Strangulation by hanging is also a form of execution by suspension. In this text, strangulation is mentioned in connection with a suspension punishment referred to with ἀνασταυροῦν, yet distinguished from it on the terminological level. Thus, it is plausible to assume that the usage of (ἀνα)σταυροῦν in the texts of Josephus does not incorporate execution by hanging.

In his *Jewish War* Josephus also illustrates a suspension of a living victim. It occurs in Josephus' description of the cruel Hasmonean ruler Alexander Jannaeus. After an extended war with his Jewish subjects, the Syrian king Demetrius attacked Alexander. In the neighborhood of Sichem, rebel Jews joined Demetrius' forces and they marched against Jerusalem. Demetrius won the fight and Alexander took refuge in the hills. Moved by Alexander's lack of fortune, many Jews under Demetrius joined him after the battle and Demetrius withdrew. The remainder of the Jewish forces under Demetrius continued their war against Alexander, but were soon captured and brought to Jerusalem.

The deeds of cruelty advanced for him by excess of wrath to a degree of impiety; for when he had suspended [ἀνασταυρώσας] eight hundred of those taken captive in the

---

<sup>237</sup> Joseph. *AJ* 12.256. καὶ γὰρ μαστιγούμενοι καὶ τὰ σώματα λυμαινόμενοι ζῶντες ἔτι καὶ ἐμπνέοντες ἀνεσταυροῦντο, τὰς δὲ γυναῖκας καὶ τοὺς παῖδας αὐτῶν, οὓς περιέτεμνον παρὰ τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως προαίρεσιν, ἀπήγγχον ἐκ τῶν τραχήλων αὐτοῦ τῶν ἀνεσταυρωμένων γονέων ἀπαρτῶντες. Cf. *As. Mos.* 8.1 (*qui confitentem circumcisionem in cruce suspendit*) and *I Macc.* 1.60–61 (ἐκρέμασαν τὰ βρέφη ἐκ τῶντραχήλων αὐτῶν) that also describe Antiochus IV's manner.

<sup>238</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 74–75; KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 708.

midst of the city, he cut the throats of their wives and children before their eyes. And he saw this while he was drinking and lying with the concubines.<sup>239</sup>

The point of the account requires living suspended victims; they could see the dreadful deeds before their eyes.<sup>240</sup> This execution by Alexander Jannaeus is recapitulated a few paragraphs later, when Diogenes, a friend of Alexander, was killed under the leadership of Alexander's wife Alexandra. Diogenes was accused of being responsible for having advised the king to execute the eight hundred by suspension.<sup>241</sup>

In *Jewish Antiquities* 13.380, which appears to be a parallel account, Josephus stresses that Alexander Jannaeus' victims were "still alive."

Having shut up the most powerful of them in the city of Bethoma he besieged [them], and having taken the city and become their ruler he led [them] away to Jerusalem and did the most cruel deed of them all; while feasting in a conspicuous place with the concubines he ordered eight hundred of them to be crucified [ἀνασταυρώσαι], and while they were still alive [ἔτι ζώντων] he cut the throats of their children and wives before their eyes.<sup>242</sup>

The information that can be extracted from these texts is that they describe living suspended victims; the suspensions appear to be executions.

The next text, in which Josephus describes the Roman siege of the city of Jotapa, follows the same theme. When a Jewish deserter came to the Roman commander Vespasian to betray his people, Vespasian became suspicious, remembering an event that showed the faithfulness of the Jews.

<sup>239</sup> Joseph. *BJ* 1.97. προύκοπεν δὲ αὐτῷ δι' ὑπερβολὴν ὀργῆς εἰς ἀσέβειαν τὸ τῆς ὀμότητος τῶν γὰρ ληφθέντων ὀκτακοσίους ἀνασταυρώσας ἐν μέσῃ τῇ πόλει γυναικᾶς τε καὶ τέκνα αὐτῶν ἀπέσφαζεν <ἐν> ταῖς ὄψεσι καὶ ταῦτα πίνων καὶ συγκατακέιμενος ταῖς παλλακίσιν ἀφεώρα.

<sup>240</sup> For other depictions of this cruel method, see Hdt. 9.120.4; Diod. Sic. 34/35.12.1; Plut. *Cleom.* 59.

<sup>241</sup> Joseph. *BJ* 1.113. "Thus they themselves killed Diogenes, a distinguished man who was a friend of Alexander's, accusing him of being an adviser regarding the suspension of the eight hundred by the king" (Διογένην γοῦν τινα τῶν ἐπισήμων, φίλον Ἀλεξάνδρου γεγεννημένον, κτείνουσιν αὐτοὶ, σύμβουλον ἐγκαλοῦντες γεγονέναι περὶ τῶν ἀνασταυρωθέντων ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως ὀκτακοσίων).

<sup>242</sup> Joseph. *AJ* 13.380. κατακλείσας δὲ τοὺς δυνατωτάτους αὐτῶν ἐν Βεθομᾶς πόλει ἐπολιόρκει, λαβὼν δὲ τὴν πόλιν καὶ γενόμενος ἐγκρατῆς αὐτῶν ἀπήγαγεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, καὶ πάντων ὀμώτατον ἔργον ἔδρασεν· ἐστιώμενος γὰρ ἐν ἀπόπτῳ μετὰ τῶν παλλακίδων ἀνασταυρώσαι προσέταξεν αὐτῶν ὡς ὀκτακοσίους, τοὺς δὲ παῖδας αὐτῶν καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας ἔτι ζώντων παρὰ τὰς ἐκείνων ὄψεις ἀπέσφαττεν). It is thought that the Nahum Peshier from cave 4 of the Dead Sea Scrolls also describes the cruelty of Alexander Jannaeus (CHARLESWORTH, *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 277–78; FITZMYER, *To Advance the Gospel*, 131). The text (4QpNah frags. 3–4 col. I line 7) mentions that "he suspended living men" (מִיִּדּוֹ מְשַׁחֵם חַיִּים).

[Vespasian] had suspicions about the deserter, knowing the faithfulness the Jews [show] to each other and the disrespect [they had] toward punishment; because earlier, one of those from Jotapa, having been taken, endured every kind of outrage under torture and having said nothing about the affairs within [the city] to the enemies while they examined him through fire, he was suspended [ἀνεσταυρώθη] while smiling at death.<sup>243</sup>

It is possible that the victims' disrespect toward the punishment occurred after the suspension. The text implies consciousness while the victim was suspended.

However, the reading of these four latter texts also offers some additional and no less important information. As mentioned, it is possible to assume that the suspension objects were usually corpses, since Josephus sometimes stresses that the victims were alive (and breathing).<sup>244</sup> In fact, some supplementary texts of the present category strengthen this assumption. These texts refer to unspecified post-mortem suspension. They do not describe executions.

The first text refers to the text – well known for the present topic – in Deuteronomy 21.22–23, which describes the proposed punishment of a criminal. Josephus specifies the criminal as a blasphemer, perhaps by reference to the transgression described in Leviticus 24.16 as proposed by Thackeray.<sup>245</sup>

He that blasphemes God, after being stoned, let him be suspended [κρεμάσθω] all day and buried in a dishonored and unnoticed way.<sup>246</sup>

<sup>243</sup> Joseph. *BJ* 3.320–21. τῷ δ' ἦν μὲν δι' ὑπονοίας ὁ αὐτόμολος, τό τε πρὸς ἀλλήλους πιστὸν εἰδότε τῶν Ἰουδαίων καὶ τὴν πρὸς τὰς κολάσεις ὑπεροψίαν, ἐπειδὴ καὶ πρότερον ληφθεὶς τις τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰωταπάτης πρὸς πᾶσαν αἰκίαν βασάνων ἀντέσχεν καὶ μηδὲν διὰ πυρὸς ἐξερευνώσει τοῖς πολεμίοις περὶ τῶν ἔνδον εἰπῶν ἀνεσταυρώθη τοῦ θανάτου καταμειδιῶν.

<sup>244</sup> Joseph. *AJ* 12.256; 13.380. Cf. Polyb. 1.86.4–7.

<sup>245</sup> Joseph. *AJ* 4.202 (THACKERAY and MARCUS, *LCL*). See also Josephus, *Judean Antiquities* 1–4, 400–01 n. 594.

<sup>246</sup> Joseph. *AJ* 4.202. ὁ δὲ βλασφημήσας θεὸν καταλευσθεὶς κρεμάσθω δι' ἡμέρας καὶ ἀτίμως καὶ ἀφανῶς θάπτέσθω. Cf. *BJ* 4.317, which is loosely related to Deut 21.22–23, i.e., the same Biblical text as *AJ* 4.202 is related to. Josephus describes the situation in Jerusalem under Idumaeen cruelty and uses ἀνασταυροῦν in connection with what appears to be a Jewish suspension punishment. During a fight in Jerusalem, the Idumaeans were guilty of vast cruelty. When they had ravaged the city and killed the high priest, they even maltreated the corpses. “They proceeded so far in impiety as to cast out [the corpses] without burial, although Jews are so careful about funeral rites that they even take down those suspended by sentence and bury [them] before sunset” (προήλθον δὲ εἰς τοσοῦτον ἀσεβείας, ὥστε καὶ ἀτάφους ρίψαι, καίτοι τοσαύτην Ἰουδαίων περὶ τὰς ταφὰς πρόνοιαν ποιουμένων, ὥστε καὶ τοὺς ἐκ καταδίκης ἀνεσταυρωμένους πρὸ δύντος ἡλίου καθελεῖν τε καὶ θάπτειν). By the loose connection to Deut 21.22–23 the text may also refer to post-mortem suspensions. It is thus problematic to use this text as an indication that the Jews used execution by crucifixion.



The second text deals with the fate of Saul and his sons, and thus refers to the story in First Samuel 31.8–11.

The following day while the Philistines were stripping the corpses of the enemies, they came upon the bodies of Saul and his sons, and after they had stripped [them] they cut off their heads and sent a message around the country telling that the enemies were fallen. And they dedicated the armor to the temple of Astarte, but suspended [ἀνεσταύρωσαν] the bodies to the walls of the city of Bethsan, which is now called Scythopolis.<sup>247</sup>

This text connects ἀνασταυροῦν with a post-mortem suspension of decapitated victims.<sup>248</sup> Thus, the usage of (ἀνα)σταυροῦν obviously covers suspension of living victims, i.e., executions, as well as post-mortem suspensions.

Josephus' use of ἀνασταυροῦν otherwise may indicate that he also uses the σταυρ-terminology in connection with a punishment resembling crucifixion as defined in the introduction. A text in Josephus' *Life* is an example of this. Josephus describes some events that occurred when he had joined the Roman forces and was with the Roman emperor Titus during the siege of Jerusalem.

I was sent by Titus with Cerealius and a thousand horsemen to a certain village called Tekoa to prospect whether it was a place to prove suitable for an entrenched camp; as I returned from that place I saw many captives suspended [ἀνεσταυρωμένους] and recognized three who had been my acquaintances. I felt pain in my soul and went with tears to Titus and told him [about them]. He commanded immediately that they should be taken down and obtain the greatest care. Two of them died while being treated, but the third was brought back to life.<sup>249</sup>

---

<sup>247</sup> Joseph. *AJ* 6.374. τῆ δ' ἐπιούση σκυλεύοντες οἱ Παλαιστῖνοι τοὺς τῶν πολεμίων νεκροὺς ἐπιτυγχάνουσι τοῖς τοῦ Σαούλου καὶ τῶν παίδων αὐτοῦ σώμασι καὶ σκυλεύσαντες ἀποτέμνουσιν αὐτῶν τὰς κεφαλὰς, καὶ κατὰ πᾶσαν περιήγγειλαν τὴν χώραν πέμπαντες ὅτι πεπτώκασιν οἱ πολέμιοι· καὶ τὰς μὲν πανοπλίας αὐτῶν ἀνέθηκαν εἰς τὸ Ἀστάρτειον ἱερόν, τὰ δὲ σώματα ἀνεσταύρωσαν πρὸς τὰ τεῖχη τῆς Βηθσάν πόλεως, ἣ νῦν Σκυθόπολις καλεῖται.

<sup>248</sup> Feldmann labels the suspension as an "impaling" without further discussion (Josephus, *Judean Antiquities* 1–4, 4.203).

<sup>249</sup> Joseph. *Vit.* 420–21. πεμφθεὶς δ' ὑπὸ Τίτου Καίσαρος σὺν Κεραλίῳ καὶ χιλίοις ἰπεῦσιν εἰς κώμην τινὰ Θεκῶαν λεγομένην προκατανοήσαν εἰ τόπος ἐπιτήδειός ἐστιν χάρακα δέξασθαι, ὡς ἐκείθεν ὑποστρέφων εἶδον πολλοὺς αἰχμαλώτους ἀνεσταυρωμένους καὶ τρεῖς ἐγνώρισα συνήθεις μοι γενομένους, ἤλγησά τε τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ μετὰ δακρῶν προσελθὼν Τίτῳ εἶπον. ὁ δ' εὐθύς ἐκέλευσεν καθαιρεθέντας αὐτοὺς θεραπειὰς ἐπιμελεστάτης τυχεῖν. καὶ οἱ μὲν δύο τελευτῶσιν θεραπευόμενοι, ὁ δὲ τρίτος ἔζησεν.

This text is a good candidate for being labeled as a crucifixion account.<sup>250</sup> This is based on the fact that the text describes not only a living victim, but also a suspension form that is possible to survive. Suspension by impaling or hanging does not fit the description of the text in the same way. The genre of the text might also strengthen this account, since the text occurs in Josephus' autobiographical *Life*.

In the next text, Josephus reports how the Roman procurator Florus used the suspension punishment in a new way. Florus went to Jerusalem to punish some Jews who had made themselves guilty of insulting him. He ordered that these should be handed over to him. When this did not happen and the Jewish leaders instead pleaded for their people, Florus ordered that the soldiers should ravage the agora and kill any that they might encounter.

It was a flight out of narrow lanes and a slaughter of those who were caught; no method of seizure was left out, and many of the moderate people were seized and led up before Florus. He maltreated them with whips and suspended them [ἀνεσταύρωσεν]. The total number of those killed that day, with wives and children – for they did not even spare the infants – was about three thousand and six hundred together. The new cruelty of the Romans made the offense heavier; Florus dared to do at that time that which no one [had dared] before, to scourge before the tribunal and nail to a pole [σταυρῶ προσηλώσαι] men of equestrian rank, who, though Jews by birth, anyway were of Roman dignity.<sup>251</sup>

The use of the verb προσηλοῦν in combination with σταυρός indicates that the suspension contained an act of nailing. The new feature of the punishment was that Jews socially and politically connected with the Romans were executed. This notion strengthens the common assumption that Romans mainly suspended foreigners and people of lower social and political rank.

The last text is well-known and it describes the situation during the Roman siege of Jerusalem. The famine forced inhabitants to sneak out of town in their search for food. Robbers ravaged the city.

<sup>250</sup> As Mason does in his commentary on Josephus' *Life* (Josephus, *Life of Josephus*, 167 [n. 1734]).

<sup>251</sup> Joseph. *BJ* 2.306–08. φυγή δ' ἦν ἐκ τῶν στενωπῶν καὶ φόνος τῶν καταλαμβανομένων, τρόπος τε ἀρπαγῆς οὐδεις παρελείπετο, καὶ πολλοὺς τῶν μετρίων συλλαβόντες ἐπὶ τὸν Φλώρον ἀνήγον· οὓς μάλιστα προαικισάμενος ἀνεσταύρωσεν. ὁ δὲ σύμπας τῶν ἐκείνης ἀπολομένων τῆς ἡμέρας ἀριθμὸς σὺν γυναιξίν καὶ τέκνοις, οὐδὲ γὰρ νηπίων ἀπέσχοντο, περὶ τρισχιλίους καὶ ἑξακοσίους συνήχθη. βαρυτέραν τε ἐποίει τὴν συμφορὰν τὸ καινὸν τῆς Ῥωμαίων ὀμότητος· ὁ γὰρ μηδεὶς πρότερον τότε Φλώρος ἐτόλμησεν, ἄνδρας ἱππικοῦ τάγματος μαστιγῶσαι τε πρὸ τοῦ βήματος καὶ σταυρῶ προσηλώσαι, ὧν εἰ καὶ τὸ γένος Ἰουδαῖον ἀλλὰ γοῦν τὸ ἄξιωμα Ῥωμαϊκὸν ἦν.

The famine made them bold [enough] for the excursions and it remained [for them, if] being unseen, to be taken by the enemy. And when caught they defended themselves out of necessity, and after a fight it seemed too late to beg for mercy. They were scourged and subjected to all kinds of outrage in torture until death and suspended [ἀνεσταυροῦντο] opposite the walls. On the one hand, the calamity seemed pitiable to Titus, when five hundred or sometimes even more were caught every day; on the other hand, he did not think it safe to release those caught by force, and to guard so many would make [them] a watch over those appointed to guard [them]. But surely, the main reason for not ceasing [with the suspensions] was that he believed that they might surrender at this sight, not to be handed over, having to suffer in the same way. So the soldiers, out of rage and hatred, nailed [προσήλουν] the captured in different postures for amusement, and by way of the multitude, room was wanting for the poles [τοῖς σταυροῖς] and poles [σταυροὶ] [wanting] for the bodies.<sup>252</sup>

The use of the verb *προσήλουν* in combination with *σταυρός* shows that the suspensions in the text have a resemblance to crucifixion in the sense that they include an act of nailing. Some of the victims appear, however, to have been killed before their suspension.<sup>253</sup> Thus, the usage of (ἀνα)σταυροῦν seems to cover both executions by suspension, post-mortem suspensions, and acts of nailing in connection with suspension punishments.

A remaining question is whether (ἀνα)σταυροῦν covers other suspension punishments such as impaling and hanging. To reach at least a slightly more defined range of meaning, an earlier mentioned text together with a new one needs to be considered.

A text which describes the cruelty of Antiochus IV (Epiphanes) was studied above. Josephus states in the text that Jews were suspended alive, “and their children, whom they had circumcised against the policy of the king, they strangled by hanging them from the necks of [their] suspended parents” (ἀπήγχον ἐκ τῶν τραχήλων αὐτούς τῶν ἀνεσταυρωμένων

---

<sup>252</sup> Joseph. *BJ* 5.449–51. τολμηροὺς δὲ πρὸς τὰς ἐξόδους ὁ λιμὸς ἐποίει, καὶ κατελείπετο λανθάνοντας εἰς τοὺς πολεμίους ἀλίσκεσθαι. λαμβανόμενοι δὲ κατ’ ἀνάγκην ἡμύοντο, καὶ μετὰ μάχην ἰκετεύειν ἄωρον ἐδόκει. Μαστιγοῦμενοι δὴ καὶ προβασιζόμενοι τοῦ θανάτου πᾶσαν αἰκίαν ἀνεσταυροῦντο τοῦ τείχους ἀντικρῦ. Τίτω μὲν οὖν οἰκτρὸν τὸ πάθος κατεφαίνετο, πεντακοσίων ἐκάστης ἡμέρας ἔστι δ’ ὅτε καὶ πλειόνων ἀλίσκομένων, οὔτε δὲ τοὺς βίᾳ ληφθέντας ἀφεῖναι ἀσφαλὲς καὶ φυλάττειν τοσοῦτους φρουρὰν τῶν φυλαζόντων ἑώρα· τό γε μὴν πλεον οὐκ ἐκάλυεν τάχ’ ἂν ἐνδοῦναι πρὸς τὴν ὄψιν ἐλπίσας αὐτούς <ὡς>, εἰ μὴ παραδοῖεν, ὅμοια πεισομένων. προσήλουν δὲ οἱ στρατιῶται δι’ ὄργην καὶ μῖσος τοὺς ἀλόντας ἄλλον ἄλλω σχήματι πρὸς χλεῦην, καὶ διὰ τὸ πλῆθος χώρα τ’ ἐνέλειπε τοῖς σταυροῖς καὶ σταυροὶ τοῖς σώμασιν.

<sup>253</sup> This reading depends on the interpretation of σῶμα. Josephus uses the noun in the sense of both “body,” as distinct from soul (ψυχή), and “corpse” in, e.g., *BJ* 2.476.

γονέων ἀπαρτῶντες).<sup>254</sup> Thus, when referring to something that appears to be an execution by hanging, Josephus uses a different terminology. It is plausible to take this text as an indication that the usage of ἀνασταυροῦν does not cover execution by hanging.

When it comes to the punishment of impaling, it becomes slightly more problematic. Josephus does not refer to any proper impaling. The closest he gets to the theme of impaling are two texts that describe a case of torture and a supposed accident. The first text describes the situation inside Jerusalem during the siege mentioned above, when famine drew people to horrible acts.

They invented terrible methods of torture in the search for food: blocking up the passages of the genitals of the pitiful with peas, piercing through the fundaments with sharp skewers [ράβδοις δ' ὀξεΐαις ἀναπείροντες τὰς ἔδρας]; and one suffered [so much even] by hearing [about] the horror [that it led] to confession of possession of one bread or that he would reveal one handful of barley meal that was hidden.<sup>255</sup>

The second text that contains an incident with some resemblance to impaling describes a plot against Herod the Great. Two men said under torture that they were sent by his son Alexander to kill Herod. The plot was that they would kill Herod while he was hunting beasts. They could then say that he fell from his horse and was accidentally impaled by his own spear (δυνατὸν γὰρ εἶναι λέγειν ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἵππου κατενεχθεὶς ἐμπαρεῖη ταῖς αὐτοῦ λόγχαις).<sup>256</sup> Neither of these texts contains the punishment of impaling according to the definition in the introduction. Nevertheless, they describe two events with some proximity to impaling, or rather piercing in the latter case. It is possible at least to conjecture, on the basis of these texts, that Josephus uses a different terminology when he comes close to the field of impaling.

These latter texts are useful in the attempt to trace the outer limits of the usage of ἀνασταυροῦν. The verb, as used by Josephus, appears to refer to executions by suspension, in which nailing was sometimes a part, and to post-mortem suspension. It does not seem to refer to impaling and hanging.

---

<sup>254</sup> Joseph. *AJ* 12.256. τὰς δὲ γυναῖκας καὶ τοὺς παῖδας αὐτῶν, οὓς περιέτεμνον παρὰ τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως προαίρεσιν, ἀπήγγον ἐκ τῶν τραχήλων αὐτοῦ τῶν ἀνεσταυρωμένων γονέων ἀπαρτῶντες.

<sup>255</sup> Joseph. *BJ* 5.435. δεινὰς δὲ βασάνων ὁδοὺς ἐπενόουν πρὸς ἔρευναν τροφῆς, ὀρόβοις μὲν ἐμφράττοντες τοῖς ἀθλοῖς τοὺς τῶν αἰδοίων πόρους, ράβδοις δ' ὀξεΐαις ἀναπείροντες τὰς ἔδρας, τὰ φρικτὰ δὲ καὶ ἀκοαῖς ἔπασχέ τις εἰς ἐξομολόγησιν ἐνὸς ἄρτου καὶ ἵνα μηνύσῃ δράκα μίαν κεκρυμμένην ἀλφίτων.

<sup>256</sup> Joseph. *AJ* 16.315.

## 7.3.3. Conclusion – Josephus and Crucifixion

Josephus often does not specify the nature of the suspension punishments in the texts in focus. He uses ἀνασταυροῦν in the broad sense “to suspend a living or dead person in some way on a (wooden) construction.” σταυρός is the primary designation of such a suspension structure (he uses ξύλον twice in *AJ* 11.246 and a wall in 6.374). Thus, if the aim is to trace anything more specific, the σταυρ-terminology is not sufficient. If the aim is to trace the punishment of crucifixion as it is traditionally understood, the majority of Josephus’ texts are ambiguous. A present-day reader cannot decide what kind of suspension form they describe. In order to find references to crucifixions, something more is needed, beyond the σταυρ-terminology. When Josephus uses the σταυρ-terminology in combination with προσηλοῦν, which implies an act of nailing, it is an example of this additional information. Another example is when the text indicates that the victims were alive when suspended, which implies that the suspension was an execution.

To reach some conclusions regarding Josephus and the punishment of crucifixion, several features have to be considered. The texts which contain additional information about the suspension fall into two subgroups. The first, and rather vague, group indicates where the outer limits of the usage of ἀνασταυροῦν as used by Josephus might be.<sup>257</sup> A reasonable conjecture is that the verb does not cover impaling (*BJ* 5.435 and *AJ* 16.315) or hanging (*AJ* 12.256). If this is correct, Josephus uses the σταυρ-terminology slightly more specifically and in a different fashion than previous authors.<sup>258</sup> The second group indicates what is within these limits:<sup>259</sup> some kind of limb suspension of a living or dead person on a (wooden) pole. The conclusions that can be drawn concerning the death punishment of crucifixion in Josephus’ texts are, in the end, rather meager.

The first group of conclusions deals with the terminological issue, and only a handful of texts can come into consideration. ἀνασταυροῦν, as used by Josephus, does not mean “to crucify” in a traditional sense. In

---

<sup>257</sup> Joseph. *AJ* 12.256: hanging is mentioned with a different terminology; *BJ* 5.435 and *AJ* 16.315 come close to impaling and a different terminology is used.

<sup>258</sup> In the older Greek literature the verb leans toward impaling as its primary usage (see, e.g., Hdt. 4.103.1–3; Thuc. 1.110.3; Ctesias, *FGrH* 3c, 688 F 14.39; Xen. *An.* 3.1.17; Plut. *De fort. Rom.* 325D.5, with comments).

<sup>259</sup> Joseph. *AJ* 12.256 (describes living victims but indicates simultaneously that the usual suspension objects were corpses); 2.73, 77 (a living victim who appears to have his arms tied or nailed, perhaps to the execution tool); *Vit.* 420–21 (a suspension form which is possible to survive); *BJ* 1.97 (living victim); 2.306–08 (victims nailed); *BJ* 3.320–21 (living victim); *BJ* 5.449–51 (victims nailed, but possibly dead).

some texts, Josephus uses the verb in connection with executions by suspension, in which nailing sometimes was a part.<sup>260</sup> However, since he also uses the verb when he refers to an act of displaying mutilated corpses, it is obvious that the usage of the verb covers both suspension forms, i.e., both execution by suspension and suspension of corpses.<sup>261</sup> The suspension tool is *σταυρός*. *σταυρός* as used by Josephus does not mean “cross” (†). *σταυρός* appears to be a (wooden) pole of any kind on which a living or dead person is suspended. The use of *προσηλοῦν* in combination with *σταυρός* implies that the victims were sometimes attached with nails.<sup>262</sup> The suspension object could be a corpse or a living person who is suspended to be executed. Both suspension objects create a terrifying sight.

When it comes to the plain form, *σταυροῦν*, Josephus appears simply to use the term interchangeably with *ἀνασταυροῦν* without any distinction between them. It is possible to argue that the use of the plain form in *Jewish Antiquities* 19.94 is due to its context of theatrical performance, but that does not explain the usage in Josephus’ description of the cup-bearer’s fate in *Jewish Antiquities* 2.77.<sup>263</sup>

In *Jewish Antiquities* 4.202 only the semantically broad verb *κρεμαννύναι* is used. In *Jewish War* 7.202–03 and *Jewish Antiquities* 11.267/280 the verb is used in combination with both *ἀνασταυροῦν* and *σταυρός*.<sup>264</sup> It is thus reasonable to conclude that Josephus uses *κρεμαννύναι* as a reference to both suspension of corpses and executions by suspension.

The second group of conclusions deals with the thematic issue. If the aim is only to trace executions by crucifixion as defined in the present investigation, the issue is complicated. Texts that refer to post-mortem suspensions are ruled out together with those that do not explicitly describe living victims (or perhaps mention nailing, if one deems that to be a crucial part of the punishment). Among disqualified texts are, due to their vagueness, the texts that portray the suspension as a terrifying and blood-stained act or as being the most pitiable punishment form – and surprisingly enough, Josephus’ account of the execution of Jesus.<sup>265</sup> Left is a group of texts containing indications of crucifixion on various levels.<sup>266</sup> However, none of these texts shows explicitly that the suspension at hand

<sup>260</sup> Joseph. *BJ* 2.306–08 and 5.449–51.

<sup>261</sup> Joseph. *AJ* 6.374.

<sup>262</sup> Joseph. *BJ* 2.306–08; 5.449–51.

<sup>263</sup> Josephus appears not to be influenced by LXX regarding the usage of verb, since LXX has *κρεμαννύναι* (Gen 40.19, 22; 41.13).

<sup>264</sup> *ἀνασταυροῦν*: *AJ* 11.267/280; *σταυρός*: *BJ* 7.202–03; *AJ* 11.267/280).

<sup>265</sup> Joseph. *BJ* 5.289; 7.202–03; *AJ* 19.94.

<sup>266</sup> Joseph. *Vit.* 420–21; *BJ* 2.306–08; 5.449–51.

really is a crucifixion. In the end, there are no firm crucifixion accounts in the *corpus Josephum*.

Josephus offers only vague indications in a few texts containing additional information, which gives the punishment at least some similarity to crucifixion.<sup>267</sup> Thus, the conclusions that can be drawn from these texts are not directly connected with the punishment of crucifixion. It is only possible to say that they *may* offer some information about crucifixion.

Therefore, the punishment of crucifixion as portrayed by Josephus *may* contain these features: First, Josephus implies that nails could be used in the suspension act (*BJ* 2.306–08 and 5.449–51). However, this is close to a circular argument since the texts are made plausible through the occurrence of the actual verb, *προσηλοῦν*. Second, the victim's arms could be attached, perhaps to the execution tool in some way (*AJ* 2.73). Third, relatives of the suspended were from time to time tortured and killed in sight of the victim (*BJ* 1.97). Fourth, the victims could be scourged before the suspension (*BJ* 2.306–08). Fifth, suspension could be used for acquiring information from enemies during war (*BJ* 3.320–21). Sixth, it is mainly the Romans who use the suspension punishment against the Jewish people in Josephus' texts. It is, however, not possible to exclude the possibility that Josephus understood the prescribed punishment in Deuteronomy 21.22–23 as a reference to execution by crucifixion.<sup>268</sup> If this assumption is correct, the Jewish people used crucifixion according to Josephus' accounts of the events under the Hasmonean ruler Alexander Janneus (*BJ* 1.97/113 [par. *AJ* 13.380]).

The suspension punishments as portrayed by Josephus do contain variations. The executors could use their imagination when they implemented the punishments (*BJ* 5.449–51). The result is that the only secure conclusion that can be drawn from Josephus' texts is that the suspension methods might appear rather diverse in different situations.

#### 7.4. *Plutarch*

Plutarch (ca. 45 – before 125 C.E.) spent most of his life in the Boeotian town of Chaeronea. He was nevertheless familiar with Athens and traveled to both Egypt and the Roman Peninsula. The last thirty years of his life Plutarch spent as a priest at Delphi and was devoted to the study of

---

<sup>267</sup> E.g., Joseph. *BJ* 2.306–08, which combines *ἀνασταυροῦν* and *σταυρός* with *προσηλοῦν*, which indicates an act of nailing, and *AJ* 13.380, which states that the suspended were “still alive” (*ἔτι ζώντων*) and thus rules out the possibility of a post-mortem suspension.

<sup>268</sup> Joseph. *BJ* 4.317.

the ancient pieties. Both Hengel and Kuhn refer to several crucifixion accounts in Plutarch's texts.<sup>269</sup>

#### 7.4.1. Unspecified Suspensions in Plutarch

As was the case in almost all hitherto studied texts, the majority of the suspension accounts in Plutarch's texts are unspecified when it comes to the suspension method. Three examples of these texts, defined as crucifixions by either Hengel or Kuhn or both, will be studied here.

The first text comes from Plutarch's description of the Roman consul and dictator Fabius Maximus and deals with an event during Hannibal's campaign in Italy. Hannibal once made a great error when he decided to move his forces. Due to a misinterpretation of a city name, native guides led the forces into a geographical trap. Hannibal's enemy, Fabius Maximus, seized the opportunity, attacked, and killed eight hundred of Hannibal's troops.

Thereby Hannibal wanted to retreat, and, having perceived the mistake of his position and the danger, he suspended [ἀνεσταύρωσε] the guides and gave up the intention to force out the enemies and to attack from the passes [of which] they were masters.<sup>270</sup>

Plutarch does not specify the suspension form in this text, while Kuhn labels it as a crucifixion.<sup>271</sup> The next text comes from Plutarch's description of Alexander the Great and deals with Alexander's reaction to the death of Hephaestion. When they had arrived at Ecbatana in Media, Hephaestion caught a fever. But Hephaestion, being a proud soldier, did not submit to the physician's orders. As soon as the physician had gone off to the theater, Hephaestion sat down to eat and he drank a great amount of wine. As a result, he fell sick and died after a short while.

---

<sup>269</sup> Hengel: Plut. *Artax.* 17.5 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 22 n. 1); *Alex.* 72.3 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 73 n. 14 [the reference seems erroneous; it should be 72.2]); *Caes.* 2.2–4 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 80 n. 28 [missing in Hengel's Index on p. 96]); *Tit. Flam.* 9.4 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 76); *Mor.* 499D (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 32 n. 25; 69 n. 1; 75 n. 17); 554A/B (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 9 n. 19; 77 + n. 22).

Kuhn: Plut. *Alex.* 55.5; 59.4; 72.2 (KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 683; 689 n. 239); *Ant.* 81.1 (KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 689 n. 239); *Caes.* 2.2, 4 (KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 680 n. 171; 689 n. 239); *Demetr.* 33.3; *Eum.* 9.2; *Fab. Max.* 6.3; *Per.* 28.2; *Flam.* 9.3 (KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 689 n. 239); *Mor.* 207B (KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 702); 554A–B (KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 690 n. 239).

<sup>270</sup> Plut. *Fab. Max.* 6.3, ἐκ τούτου βουλόμενος Ἄννιβας ἀπαγαγεῖν τὸ στράτευμα, καὶ τὴν διαμαρτίαν τοῦ τόπου νοήσας καὶ τὸν κίνδυνον, ἀνεσταύρωσε μὲν τοὺς ὁδηγούς, ἐκβιάζεσθαι δὲ τοὺς πολεμίους καὶ προσμάχεσθαι τῶν ὑπερβολῶν ἐγκρατεῖς ὄντας ἀπεγίνωσκε.

<sup>271</sup> KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 689 n. 239.



Alexander could not endure this grief. He immediately ordered all horses and mules to be shorn and took down the battlements of the surrounding cities. He suspended [ἀνεσταύρωσεν] the wretched physician, and silenced flutes and all music in the camps for a long time, until an oracle from Ammon directed him to honor Hephaestion and sacrifice [to him] as a hero.<sup>272</sup>

Neither in this text does Plutarch specify the suspension form, while both Hengel and Kuhn do so.<sup>273</sup> As the third and last example, Plutarch refers to a suspension in his portrayal of Marcus Antonius. He mentions an incident that occurred after the death of Antonius. The text portrays Cleopatra in house arrest and Caesar just arrived.

One of Antonius' children, Antyllus, [the son he had with] Fulvia, was betrayed by the boy-ward Theodorus and killed. And when the soldiers were cutting off his head, the boy-ward took a very costly stone, which [the boy] wore around his neck, and sewed [it] into [his own] girdle. Having denied it and been discovered he was suspended [ἀνεσταυρώθη].<sup>274</sup>

Plutarch does not specify the suspension form, which is labeled as a crucifixion by Kuhn.<sup>275</sup> Two additional texts by Plutarch are unspecified in the same way. Hengel and Kuhn, however, do not define them as crucifixions.<sup>276</sup> In all these texts Plutarch uses (ἀνα)σταυροῦν undefined. It is not possible to determine to what kind of suspension he refers.

The verb ἀνασκολοπίζειν is also used in an unspecified sense by Plutarch. The text comes from fragment four in *De proverbiiis Alexandri*, whose authenticity is disputed. The text is the only one using the verb ἀνασκολοπίζειν. It is hard to see any significance in the shift of verb. It is noticeable that this verb only occurs in texts preserved as fragments.<sup>277</sup> This might reflect a tendency of using ἀνασκολοπίζειν instead of ἀνασταυροῦν, belonging to the time when the Plutarchian text was (re)used by a later author.

<sup>272</sup> Plut. *Alex.* 72.2. τοῦτ' οὐδενὶ λογισμῷ τὸ πάθος Ἀλέξανδρος ἤνεγκεν, ἀλλ' εὐθὺς μὲν ἵππους τε κείραι πάντας ἐπὶ πένθει καὶ ἡμίονους ἐκέλευσε καὶ τῶν πέριξ πόλεων ἀφείλε τὰς ἐπάλλξεις, τὸν δὲ ἄθλιον ἱατρὸν ἀνεσταύρωσεν, αὐλοὺς δὲ κατέπαυσε καὶ μουσικὴν πᾶσαν ἐν τῷ στρατοπέδῳ πολὺν χρόνον, ἕως ἕξ Ἀμμωνος ἦλθε μαντεῖα τιμᾶν Ἐφαιστίωνα καὶ θύειν ὡς ἥρωϊ παρακελεύουσα.

<sup>273</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 73 n. 14; KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 683, 689 n. 239.

<sup>274</sup> Plut. *Ant.* 81.1. τῶν δ' Ἀντωνίου παίδων ὁ μὲν ἐκ Φουλβίας Ἄντυλλος ὑπὸ Θεοδώρου τοῦ παιδαγωγοῦ παραδοθεὶς ἀπέθανε· καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ τῶν στρατιωτῶν ἀποτεμνόντων, ὁ παιδαγωγὸς ἀφελὼν ὃν ἐφόρει περὶ τῷ τραχήλῳ πολυτιμώτατον λίθον εἰς τὴν ζώνην κατέβραυεν· ἀρνησάμενος δὲ καὶ φωραθεὶς ἀνεσταυρώθη.

<sup>275</sup> KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 689 n. 239.

<sup>276</sup> Plut. *Par. Graec. et Rom.* 311E (the only text in which Plutarch uses the plain form, σταυροῦν); Plut. *De garr.* 508F–509A (ἀνασταυροῦν).

<sup>277</sup> Cf. Polyb. 10.33.8, a fragment which also introduces the verb ἀνασκολοπίζειν for the first time in the same way.

In addition to these texts, Plutarch uses κρεμαννύναι in connection with unspecified suspension. One example is found in his description of the Macedonian Demetrius. During a war against the Athenians, Demetrius encountered a ship.

He seized a ship that carried grain and was going to Athens; he suspended [ἐκρέμασε] the passenger and the skipper; therefore, when the other [ships that carried provisions] turned away because of fear, there was an acute famine in [the] city, and beside the famine also straits of other kinds.<sup>278</sup>

The semantically wide verb κρεμαννύναι is used in various situations by Plutarch – in connection with hanging (Plut. *Brut.* 31.5) and as a counterpart to ἀνασταυροῦν (Plut. *Caes.* 2.4 and *Cleom.* 38.2).<sup>279</sup> It is thus difficult to define the suspension form. Plutarch's mentioning that the suspension caused fear among the other Athenians is nonetheless worth notice.

#### 7.4.2. Suspension Accounts With Additional Information

Plutarch offers, however, several texts that contain some additional information. When it comes to ἀνασταυροῦν the verb is used in two significant ways.

In the work *Fortune of the Romans* (*De fortuna Romanorum*) Plutarch uses the verb ἀνασταυροῦν in a way unfamiliar from the perspective of a traditional view. The event is mentioned in Plutarch's description of a failed attack on Rome by the Gauls. The Gauls managed to find a way into the city by climbing the steep Tarpeia cliffs. They entered the city unnoticed by the guards and even by the dogs, who were asleep. The fortune of Rome, however, was rescued by the sacred geese that were kept near the temple of Juno. The birds, easily disturbed and frightened by noise, sounded the alarm and thus saved Rome.

And to this day, in memory of the events that day, a suspended [ἀνεσταυρωμένος] dog leads the procession, while a highly revered goose sits upon a very costly blanket in a litter.<sup>280</sup>

The text does not specify how the dog was suspended. However, a dog simply impaled on a stake is easier to imagine in the text and fits the pic-

<sup>278</sup> Plut. *Demetr.* 33.3. καὶ ναῦν τινα λαβὼν ἔχουσαν σίτον καὶ εἰσάγουσαν τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις ἐκρέμασε τὸν ἔμπορον καὶ τὸν κυβερνήτην, ὥστε τῶν ἄλλων ἀποτρεπομένων διὰ φόβον σύντονον λιμὸν ἐν ἄστει γενέσθαι, πρὸς δὲ τῷ λιμῷ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπορίαν.

<sup>279</sup> Plutarch uses κρεμαννύναι undefined also in *Reg. et imp. apophth.* 194B.

<sup>280</sup> Plut. *De fort. Rom.* 325D. πομπεῖται δὲ μέχρι νῦν ἐπὶ μνήμῃ τῶν τότε συμπτωμάτων κῶων μὲν ἀνεσταυρωμένος, χῆν δὲ μάλα σεμνῶς ἐπὶ στρωμνῆς πολυτελοῦς καὶ φορείου καθήμενος.

ture better than a dog nailed to a cross.<sup>281</sup> In any case, it is of importance to notice that Plutarch uses ἀνασταυροῦν in connection with suspended animals.

Plutarch also uses ἀνασταυροῦν when he describes post-mortem suspensions. The first text is a brief statement that is found in Plutarch's description of the Corinthian Timoleon. When Timoleon had occupied Messana with his Corinthian forces and marched against Syracuse, the Carthaginian leader Mago, the youngest brother of Hannibal (the Great), was frightened. He left Sicily and went back to Africa. Timoleon conquered Syracuse easily when the Carthaginian forces were absent. However, they discovered that the city did not have enough citizens to carry on everyday business. It was almost desolate. To solve this problem, and to increase their military strength, they wrote to Corinth urging them to send settlers to Syracuse from Greece.

For the land should not lie uncultivated and they expected a great war from Africa, having learned that the Carthaginians, after Mago had killed himself, suspended [ἀνεσταυρωκένοι] his corpse, angry because of his command, and that they were assembling a great force, with the intention of crossing over into Sicily at this time next year.<sup>282</sup>

The text does not specify in what way they suspended Mago's corpse. It does show, however, that the usage of ἀνασταυροῦν covers post-mortem suspensions. It is also worth notice that σῶμα once again refers to a corpse in this situation.<sup>283</sup>

Plutarch offers one more post-mortem suspension. The text deals with the death of the Agiad king, Cleomenes III of Sparta. When Cleomenes had been defeated by Antigonos in the battle of Sellasia, he fled to Ptolemy Euergetes. Ptolemy treated Cleomenes with some degree of generosity. However, this was changed by the successor, Ptolemy Philopator. Together with thirteen of his friends, Cleomenes managed to rally the inhabitants of Alexandria in a revolt against the Egyptian king. This attempt failed and the Spartans committed suicide. When the report of Cleomenes' and his soldiers' suicide spread, his people wailed and lamented while the Egyptian king took revenge.

---

<sup>281</sup> As Babbit interprets the text in his translation in the Loeb edition (Plut. *De fort. Rom.* 325D [BABBIT, *LCL*]). Pliny the Elder refers to the event as a dog attached by its shoulders to a *furca*, probably some kind of fork-shaped rod or stick (*vivi in furca sabucea armo fixi* [Plin. *HN.* 29.57 (11)]).

<sup>282</sup> Plut. *Tim.* 22.8. ἢ τε γὰρ χώρα σχολάζειν ἔμελλε, καὶ πολὺν πόλεμον ἐκ Λιβύης προσεδέχοντο, πυνθανόμενοι τοὺς Καρχηδονίους τοῦ μὲν Μάγωνος ἑαυτὸν ἀνελόντος ἀνεσταυρωκένοι τὸ σῶμα διὰ τὴν στρατηγίαν ὀργισθέντας, αὐτοὺς δὲ συναγειν μεγάλην δύναμιν, ὡς ἔτους ὄρα διαβησομένους εἰς Σικελίαν.

<sup>283</sup> See the comments on Diod. Sic. 25.10.1–2 above.

Ptolemy, when he heard of this, ordered that Cleomenes' body should be suspended [κρεμάσαι] after being flayed, and that the children, the mother and the women that were with her should be killed.<sup>284</sup>

The orders of Ptolemy were implemented and in the last paragraph of the description of Cleomenes, Plutarch refers to the event once more.

A few days afterward, those who were keeping watch upon the suspended [ἀνεσταυρωμένον] body of Cleomenes saw that a very large snake had coiled [itself] around the head and were hiding the face, so that no flesh-eating bird would fly to [it].<sup>285</sup>

Hengel uses these texts as one of several evidences that the Diadochi used crucifixion, even though neither of these texts specify the suspension form beyond the use of ἀνασταυροῦν.<sup>286</sup> That Cleomenes was flayed before the suspension and that the suspension object is referred to as σῶμα (see Plut. *Tim.* 22.8) are indications of a post-mortem suspension. Otherwise it is noticeable that Plutarch uses κρεμαννύναι interchangeably with ἀνασταυροῦν in the text. The text shows as well that the corpses were occasionally – or perhaps even frequently – left on the suspension tool without burial. In that way the animals, in this case birds, could feed on them.

Plutarch uses κρεμαννύναι in the following text in yet another fashion and introduces another form of suspension. The text does not refer to a crucifixion; instead, a regular hanging is described. However, the terminology used is of interest.

When the city was destroyed, a woman was seen hanging [κρεμαμένη] in a noose, [with] a dead child hanged/attached [ἐξηρητημένη] to her neck, and with a burning torch she was setting fire the house.<sup>287</sup>

The text apparently refers to a hanging; the combination of ἀγχόνη and τράχηλος is a good indicator of this punishment. Thus, in this text κρεμαννύναι is connected with hanging, which shows that the usage of this verb incorporates hanging as well as the suspension form referred to with the verb ἀνασταυροῦν.

<sup>284</sup> Plut. *Cleom.* 38.2. ὁ δὲ Πτολεμαῖος, ὡς ἔγνω ταῦτα, προσέταξε τὸ μὲν σῶμα τοῦ Κλεομένου κρεμάσαι καταβυρσώσαντας, ἀποκτεῖναι δὲ τὰ παιδιά καὶ τὴν μητέρα καὶ τὰς περὶ αὐτὴν γυναῖκας.

<sup>285</sup> Plut. *Cleom.* 39.1. ὀλίγαις δὲ ὕστερον ἡμέραις οἱ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Κλεομένου ἀνεσταυρωμένον παραφυλάττοντες εἶδον εὐμεγέθη δράκοντα τῇ κεφαλῇ περιπελεγμένον καὶ ἀποκρύπτοντα τὸ πρόσωπον, ὥστε μὴδὲν ὄρνεον ἐφίπτασθαι σαρκοφάγον.

<sup>286</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 74.

<sup>287</sup> Plut. *Brut.* 31.5. ὄψθη δὲ τῆς πόλεως διαφθαρῆσις γυνὴ κρεμαμένη μὲν ἐξ ἀγχόνης, παιδίον δὲ νεκρὸν ἐξηρητημένη τοῦ τραχήλου, λαμπάδι δὲ καιομένη τὴν οἰκίαν ὑφάπτουσα.

The last text of the present group adds another punishment form to the list. It appears not to refer to a suspension at all, not even a death punishment. In his *Lives (Vitae parallellae)* Plutarch describes Pericles' war against Samos and mentions an instance of torture that ought to be noticed, due to some familiar terms. After an eight-month siege Pericles captured Miletus. In his narrative Plutarch mentions a description, in his opinion false, of the events following the conquest of the city. Duris the Samian accused the Athenians and Pericles of great brutality.

But [Duris] appears not to speak truth [when he said] that [Pericles], having brought the Samian trireme captains and marines to the market place of Miletus and attached them to boards [σανίσι προσδήσας], and when they by this time had been in bad conditions for ten days, commanded to kill [them], having [their] heads crushed with clubs, and then cast [their] bodies unburied.<sup>288</sup>

Bernadotte Perrin translates the phrase σανίσι προσδήσας with "crucifixion" in the Loeb edition and Kuhn uses the text as an example of crucifixion in Plutarch's texts.<sup>289</sup> Yet in order to determine the suspension form as a crucifixion, an extra terminological feature is needed, since it is not possible to link either the verb or the noun directly to crucifixion.<sup>290</sup> This crucial feature is absent. Instead, the text contains elements that appear to contradict it. The verb προσδεῖν is usually used in the sense "to tie" by Plutarch.<sup>291</sup>

What the text appears to describe is that the soldiers were tied, or perhaps shackled, to planks in the market place of Miletus. Thus, instead of an execution it was some kind of open-air custody. It seems that this method of "planking" was known and used in the ancient Greek world.<sup>292</sup> For example, Aristophanes lets his character Mnesilochus be

<sup>288</sup> Plut. *Per.* 28.2. ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἀληθεύειν ἔοικεν, ὡς ἄρα τοὺς τριηράρχους καὶ τοὺς ἐπιβάτας τῶν Σαμίων εἰς τὴν Μιλησίων ἀγορὰν καταγαγὼν καὶ σανίσι προσδήσας ἐφ' ἡμέρας δέκα κακῶς ἦδη διακειμένους προσέταξεν ἀνελεῖν, ξύλοις τὰς κεφαλὰς συγκόψαντας, εἶτα προβαλεῖν ἀκήδευτα τὰ σώματα.

<sup>289</sup> Plut. *Per.* 28.2 (PERRIN, *LCL*); Kuhn, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 689 n. 239.

<sup>290</sup> Hdt. 7.33.1 (πρὸς σανίδα διεπασσάλευσαν) and 9.120.4 (πρὸς σανίδας προσπασσαλεύσαντες) mentions σανίς in connection with an apparent crucifixion. But the connection with crucifixion is the distinct verbs προσπασσαλεύειν and διαπασσαλεύειν, not σανίς. It is problematic to link the verb προσδεῖν to nailing in the same way.

<sup>291</sup> Cf. Plut. *Par. Graec. et Rom.* 307C where Heracles *tied* Pyraechmes to two foals and by this method tore his body apart (πῶλοις δὲ προσδήσας καὶ εἰς δύο μέρη διελὼν τὸν Πυράχμην). A historical argument could be considered here. The time span that is mentioned in the text is problematic in combination with a crucifixion. No other description of executionary suspension by, e.g., nailing comes near a ten-day death struggle.

<sup>292</sup> See Hengel's discussion on the theme (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 69ff).

tied to a board in similar way in his comedy *Thesmophoriazusae*.<sup>293</sup> As Hengel correctly points out, this punishment, which he labels ἀποτυμpanισμός, in its aggravated form could end up being comparable to crucifixion.<sup>294</sup> In the case of Mnesilochus, he was somehow fastened by nails (1003 [ἦλος]) and in this way he was hanged (1027, 1053, 1110 [κρεμαννύναι]). In fact, this observation by Hengel strengthens the basic assumption of the present investigation. There were no distinct lines between the various suspension punishments. The important feature was the suspension *per se*, not how (by nailing, impaling, etc.) or when (post-mortem or as an execution) or where (on a cross, on a simple pole or on a plank) it was carried out. This is at least what the imprecise use of the terminology suggests.

The additional information that Plutarch offers in the texts of the present section is that the usage of ἀνασταυροῦν covers suspension, perhaps impaling, of animals. It also covers post-mortem suspensions. In these texts, Plutarch shows that he uses κρεμαννύναι in almost the same sense as ἀνασταυροῦν. The range of meaning of κρεμαννύναι includes the range of ἀνασταυροῦν. The difference is that the usage of κρεμαννύναι covers, beyond everything ἀνασταυροῦν covers, hanging by snare as well.

### 7.4.3. Nailing Accounts in Plutarch

Plutarch offers three suspension accounts in which an act of nailing appears to be involved. The first two texts refer to the same event, and it is a well-known suspension done by Julius Caesar. The first text, which is found in Plutarch's description of the young Caesar, concerns an adventurous situation. Pirates near the island of Pharmacusa had caught Caesar, but the pirates did not know whom they had in their custody. Caesar agreed to pay for his release and sent friends to acquire money. While his friends were gone, Caesar made a good impression on his guards. He wrote poems and speeches, which he read aloud to them, and often laughingly threatened to hang them all (κρεμᾶν αὐτούς). When his ransom had arrived from Miletus and Caesar had been set free, he immediately set to sea and caught the robbers. He took their money as booty and put the pirates in prison in Pergamum. Caesar went in person to the governor Junius – it was Junius' duty to punish the captives.

But [Junius], having his eyes upon the money (for [the sum] was not small) and saying that he would consider the case of the captives at his leisure, Caesar left him there and

<sup>293</sup> Ar. *Tesm.* 939–40. “Order the archer, having stripped me naked, to tie me to the board” (γυμνὸν ἀποδύσαντά με κέλευε πρὸς τῆ στανίδι δεῖν τὸν τοξότην).

<sup>294</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 70.

went to Pergamum and having brought forth the robbers he suspended [ἀνεσταύρωσεν] them all, just as he had often foretold them on the island, while it seemed to them that he joked.<sup>295</sup>

Plutarch does not specify the suspension form in the text, but he does connect κρεμαννύναι with ἀνασταυροῦν. Hengel labels the event as a crucifixion.<sup>296</sup> Plutarch recapitulates this event in the next text and uses there a more specific terminology that connects the suspension with nailing.<sup>297</sup> Thus, the suspension that the text at hand describes may be some kind of crucifixion-like punishment. It is, however, still not possible to link ἀνασταυροῦν itself directly with crucifixion.

Plutarch comes a little closer to crucifixion as defined by the present investigation in the second account, which is found in his *Moralia*. Here Plutarch once again mentions Caesar's flight from Sulfa and his capture by pirates.

He wrote speeches and poems and read them aloud for them, and those who did not applaud [them] exceedingly he called stupid and barbarians and with laughter threatened to hang [κρεμᾶν] them. Which he also did not long afterwards. For when the ransom was received and he was set free, he rallied men and ships from Asia and seized the robbers and nailed [προσήλωσεν] them.<sup>298</sup>

The combination of κρεμαννύναι and προσηλοῦν shows that the usage of κρεμαννύναι incorporates suspension by nailing as well. The texts do not reveal whether the suspensions were executions or occurred post-mortem. It is worth notice that the suspension in the text was later perceived as a post-mortem suspension. When Suetonius interprets the event he explicitly says that Caesar as an act of mercy cut the pirates' throats before he attached them to the *crux*.<sup>299</sup>

The last nailing account shows that the punishment could occur on various (punishment) tools. In his description of Caesar Augustus and his

<sup>295</sup> Plut. *Caes.* 2.4. ἐκείνου δὲ καὶ τοῖς χρήμασιν ἐποφθαλμιῶντος (ἦν γὰρ οὐκ ὀλίγα) καὶ περὶ τῶν αἰχμαλώτων σκέψεσθαι φάσκοντος ἐπὶ σχολῆς, χαίρειν ἕσασα αὐτὸν ὁ Καῖσαρ εἰς Πέργαμον ᾤχετο, καὶ προαγαγὼν τοὺς ληστὰς ἅπαντας ἀνεσταύρωσεν, ὡς περ αὐτοῖς δοκῶν παίζειν ἐν τῇ νήσῳ προειρήκει πολλάκις.

<sup>296</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 79–80.

<sup>297</sup> Plut. *Reg. et imp. apophth.* 205F–206A.

<sup>298</sup> Plut. *Reg. et imp. apophth.* 205F–206A. λόγους δὲ καὶ ποιήματα γράφων ἀνεγίνωσκεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ τοὺς μὴ λίαν ἐπαινοῦντας ἀναισθήτους καὶ βαρβάρους ἀπεκάλει καὶ μετὰ γέλωτος ἠπέιλει κρεμᾶν αὐτούς· ὃ καὶ μετ' ὀλίγον ἐποίησεν. τῶν γὰρ λύτρων κομισθέντων ἀπολυθεὶς καὶ συναγαγὼν ἄνδρας ἐξ Ἀσίας καὶ πλοῖα συνήρπασε τοὺς ληστὰς καὶ προσήλωσεν.

<sup>299</sup> Suet. *Iul.* 74.1. *quoniam suffixurum se cruce ante iurauerat, iugulari prius iussit, deinde suffigi* (see the text on pp. 167–68)

capture of Alexandria, Plutarch has a brief account of the fate of the Roman procurator Eros.

Having heard that Eros, the administrator of the [affairs] in Egypt, bought a quail which had defeated all others in the fighting and was unconquered, [and that] he had roasted and eaten it, [Augustus] sent for him and examined [him]. [When Eros] had confessed [Augustus] ordered [him] to be nailed [προσηλωθῆναι] to a ship's mast.<sup>300</sup>

In this text, προσηλοῦν is used alone and appears to refer to some kind of nailing punishment. Kuhn defines it as a crucifixion, in spite of the fact that Plutarch describes it neither as an execution (the nailing could just as well have occurred post-mortem) nor as a suspension (he could have been nailed in some way sitting on the deck).<sup>301</sup> It is nevertheless still possible to interpret this text as a reference to a nailing on an upright post without crossbeam (i.e., *crux acuta* or *crux simplex*).<sup>302</sup>

These texts show that Plutarch also used ἀνασταυροῦν and κρεμάννυμαι in connection with προσηλοῦν. Together these terms indicate that the suspensions sometimes involved acts of nailing. One text also shows that nailing punishments could occur on various tools.

#### 7.4.4. Plutarch's Use of σταυρός

Plutarch uses the noun σταυρός in a rather diverse way in his texts. In his description of Titus Quinctius Flaminius he quotes a short poem which ought to be mentioned briefly.

“Without bark and leafless, O traveler, on this ridge,  
a mighty pole [σταυρός] is fixed for Alcaeus.”<sup>303</sup>

The text does not reveal for what the σταυρός was intended. Hengel nevertheless labels the text as a possible crucifixion account.<sup>304</sup> Plutarch uses the noun otherwise in a way that appears to have a closer resemblance to

<sup>300</sup> Plut. *Reg. et imp. apophth.* 207B. ἀκούσας δὲ ὅτι Ἔρωσ ὁ τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ διοικῶν ὄρνυγα τὸν κρατοῦντα πάντων ἐν τῷ μάχεσθαι καὶ ἀήττητον ὄντα πριάμενος ὀπτῆσας κατέφαγε, μετεπέμψατο αὐτὸν καὶ ἀνέκρινεν ὁμολογήσαντα δ' ἐκέλευσεν ἰστῶ νηὸς προσηλωθῆναι.

<sup>301</sup> KUHN, “Die Kreuzesstrafe,” 702.

<sup>302</sup> Cf. KUHN, “Die Kreuzesstrafe,” 702. Kuhn indicates that it is nonetheless possible to see the mast as a “cross,” by referring to Artem. *Oneir.* 2.53 in which Artemidorus mentions the cross shape of a mast with sail constructs. See the discussion in chapter 6, p. 277.

<sup>303</sup> Plut. *Tit. Flam.* 9.3. ἀφλοιοὺς καὶ ἀφυλλοὺς, ὁδοιπὸρε, τῶδ' ἐπὶ νότῳ | Ἀλκαίῳ σταυρὸς πῆγγυται ἡλίβατος·

<sup>304</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 76.



impaling than to crucifixion, when he refers to fortifications where pointed poles usually were used.<sup>305</sup>

The next text, which probably depends on the writings of Ctesias, moves the usage of σταυρός even further towards impaling. The text deals with the fate of the eunuch Mastabates at the hands of Cyrus' mother Parysatis.<sup>306</sup> It was Mastabates that had cut off the head and right hand of Cyrus. Parysatis won the eunuch in a game and sprang into action.

Before the king became suspicious of the matter, she put [the eunuch] in the hands of the punishers and ordered [them] to flay [him] alive, and to attach [ἀναπήξαι] the body diagonally upon three poles [σταυρῶν], and to nail [διαπατταλεῦσαι] the skin separately.<sup>307</sup>

The dead or dying eunuch appears to be described as impaled – or rather pierced – on three stakes. The usage of the verb ἀναπηγνύναι seems not to cover crucifixion.<sup>308</sup> However, the verb διαπασσαλεῦν may point in another direction. On the etymological level the verb is connected with “nailing,” a notion that appears to be confirmed by the use of the verb.<sup>309</sup> But the object in the present text was Mastabates' skin, nailed separately, not his body.

In the work *Can Vice Cause Unhappiness* (*An vitiositas ad infelicitatem sufficiat*) Plutarch uses several important terms in a short but well-known sentence. The sentence is a rhetorical question within a lengthy discussion.

Will you nail him to a pole [σταυρὸν καθηλώσεις] or attach him to a stake [σκόλοπι πήξεις];<sup>310</sup>

Hengel labels this text as a reference to both crucifixion (first half) and impaling (second half).<sup>311</sup> He is on the right track. In the first half of the sentence, Plutarch appears to have an act of nailing in mind as καθηλοῦν implies. However, as has been suggested in the present section, the usage of σταυρός is ambiguous. Plutarch does not use σταυρός with the distinct meaning of “cross.” Instead, σταυρός appears to be used when he refers

<sup>305</sup> E.g., Plut. *Pomp.* 35.1, 62.4; *Dion.* 48.2 (note ἀποσταυροῦν).

<sup>306</sup> Cf. Ctesias, *FGrH* 3c, 688 F 16.66.

<sup>307</sup> Plut. *Artax.* 17.5. καὶ πρὶν ἐν ὑποψίᾳ γενέσθαι βασιλέα τοῦ πράγματος ἐγχειρίσασα τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν τιμωριῶν προσέταξεν ἐκδεῖραι ζῶντα, καὶ τὸ μὲν σῶμα πλάγιον διὰ τριῶν σταυρῶν ἀναπήξαι, τὸ δὲ δέρμα χωρὶς διαπατταλεῦσαι.

<sup>308</sup> Cf. Ar. *Eccl.* 843 (more exactly: “pierced”). Alexis, 224.10 could also be mentioned here, but the uncertainty of that text makes it less valuable to be used in the search for the range of meaning of ἀναπηγνύναι.

<sup>309</sup> Cf. Plut. *Apophth. Lac.* 238C; *Aet. Rom.* 264C, D; *Hdt.* 7.33.1; Ar. *Eq.* 371 (διαπατταλεῦθήσεται χαμαὶ [see s.v. Hsch.]).

<sup>310</sup> Plut. *An vit.* 499D. ἀλλ' εἰς σταυρὸν καθηλώσεις ἢ σκόλοπι πήξεις;

<sup>311</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 69 n. 1; 75 n. 17.

to a “pole” in general or to the kind used in fortifications, probably pointed, in particular.<sup>312</sup> Thus, it is difficult to draw elaborate conclusions from the noun by itself. What is left is the verb καθηλοῦν, which implies attachment by nails. The phrase is ambiguous. The noun leans toward impaling while the verb implies nailing. It is likewise difficult to draw far-reaching conclusions from the latter part of the sentence. Plutarch uses σκόλωσ once more and there it is used interchangeably with σταυρός.<sup>313</sup> Plutarch does not use the verb πηγνύναι in any distinct way; it just means “attach” or “fix” in the broadest sense.<sup>314</sup> These features make this sentence somewhat awkward within the realm of the present investigation. The reader has to lean heavily on the verb καθηλοῦν to define the text as a reference to crucifixion. The only firm conclusion that can be drawn is that the text describes two variants of suspension: one that involves an act of nailing and one that does not.

The next text is found in *On the Delays of the Divine Vengeance (De sera numinis vindicta)* and it is assumed to include one of the few references to cross-bearing.<sup>315</sup> In his discussion of punishments, Plutarch mentions briefly something that appears to be a kind of custom connected with execution by suspension.

And for the body of [those] who are being punished, each one of [the] criminals carries their own pole [σταυρόν]; vice frames out each instrument of itself by her punishment.<sup>316</sup>

The question is what the criminals carried. A common interpretation is that it was a cross.<sup>317</sup> However, considering Plutarch’s overall use of

<sup>312</sup> Plut. *Pomp.* 35.1; 62.4; *Dion.* 48.2; *Artax.* 17.5 does not offer any information about the nature of the σταυρός.

<sup>313</sup> Plut. *Pomp.* 62.3-4.

<sup>314</sup> E.g., *Tit. Flam.* 9.4 (N.B., it is the σταυρός itself that is “attached” or “fixed.” The text does not refer to anything “attached” to the σταυρός); *Caes.* 57.4.

<sup>315</sup> Beside the present text and the references in the Gospels, *Char. Chae. Call.* 4.2.7 (and the recapitulation in 4.3.10) and *Artem. Oneir.* 2.56 are assumed to mention cross-bearing.

<sup>316</sup> Plut. *De sera.* 554A-B. καὶ τῷ μὲν σώματι τῶν κολαζομένων ἕκαστος κακούργων ἐκφέρει τὸν αὐτοῦ σταυρόν, ἢ δὲ κακία τῶν κολαστηρίων ἐφ’ ἑαυτὴν ἕκαστον ἐξ αὐτῆς τεκταινέται.

<sup>317</sup> See, e.g., ALLEN, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Matthew*, 111; BEASLEY-MURRAY, *John*, 344; BENZ, “Der Gekreuzigte Gerechte bei Plato,” 1054; BLINZLER, *Der Prozess Jesu*, 360; BOCK, *Jesus According to Scripture*, 535; BØE, *Cross-Bearing*, 66-67; BROWN, *The Death of the Messiah*, 2.914; DAVIES and ALLISON, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, 610; EVANS, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, 499; FULDA, *Das Kreuz und die Kreuzigung*, 138-39; GREEN, “The Meaning of Cross-Bearing” 127; HAENCHEN, FUNK and BUSSE, *John*, 192; HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 77; KUHN, “Die Kreuzstrafe,” 689; “σταυρός,” 268; MARSHALL, *The Gospel of Luke*, 863; NOLLAND, *Luke 9:21-18:34*, 482; PLUMMER, *A Criti-*

σταυρός, that interpretation is problematic. It is still obvious that σταυρός is some kind of punishment tool, probably a suspension tool, but which kind? As mentioned earlier, a pointed pole – the suspension tool used in an impaling – lies closer at hand than a cross (†). The text also contains another feature that may be worth notice. Some paragraphs later in the text (554D) Plutarch mentions another punishment: “to put the evildoer on a rack or suspend him” (στρεβλοῦν ἢ κρεμαννύναι τὸν πονερόν). στρεβλοῦν is usually used with the meaning “to twist,” “stretch out” – in the transferred sense “to stretch out on a rack” or “to torture.”<sup>318</sup> But could the “stretching out” in this text refer to a suspended (κρεμαννύναι) victim on a cross in a crucifixion? Probably not, since the verb is never used with that meaning elsewhere in the texts studied in the present investigation.

Plutarch appears to use the verb in the sense of some kind of torture. For example, in *Artaxerxes* 14.5 he gives his account of the death of Mithridates at the hands of Cyrus’ mother Parysatis. He was “stretched out” or “racked” for ten days (ἐφ’ ἡμέρας δέκα στρεβλοῦν) before he was killed by dropping molten brass in his ears.<sup>319</sup> The evildoer in 554D was probably put in some kind of shackles (cf. *Plut. Per.* 28.2). It is still not possible to completely rule out the possibility of a connection between στρεβλοῦν and crucifixion. However, in the present text στρεβλοῦν and κρεμαννύναι seem to refer to different punishments (ἤ): a kind of stretching of limbs and an unspecified suspension.

In the same paragraph, Plutarch mentions prisoners who play at dice or draughts “with the rope hanging above the head” (ὕπερ κεφαλῆς τοῦ σχοινοῦ κρεμαμένου). Thus, in the same text as the assumed “cross-bearing,” Plutarch mentions torture, probably by stretching out the limbs on a rack, an unspecified suspension and a threat of hanging. Whether these latter punishments are connected with the reference to assumed cross-bearing is an open question.

#### 7.4.5. Conclusion – Plutarch and Crucifixion

Plutarch uses mainly the verb ἀνασταυροῦν in his suspension accounts.<sup>320</sup> The plain form of the verb is used once.<sup>321</sup> The noun σταυρός is used in

---

*cal and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Luke*, 528; STOCKBAUER, *Kunstgeschichte des Kreuzes*, 41; ZESTERMANN, “Die Kreuzigung bei den Alten,” 374.

<sup>318</sup> See s.v. LSJ.

<sup>319</sup> It appears implausible that the text would depict Mithridates as surviving for ten days nailed to a cross. Cf. however *Plut. Per.* 28.2, which mentions the same time span in a related form of punishment.

<sup>320</sup> *Plut. Fab. Max.* 6.3; *Tim.* 22.8; *Alex.* 72.2; *Caes.* 2.4; *Ant.* 81.1; *Cleom.* 39.1; *De fort. Rom.* 325D; *De garr.* 508F–509A.

three texts, once in combination with the verb καθηλοῦν.<sup>322</sup> As usual, the usage of κρεμαννύναι is broad; it is used in connection with both ἀνασταυροῦν and hanging.<sup>323</sup> ἀνασκολοπίζεῖν is used once in a fragment.<sup>324</sup> Some of the texts contain features that indicate that the punishment at hand is *not* a crucifixion, in spite of the translator's interpretation and the terminology.<sup>325</sup> Three texts indicate that the suspension at hand involves an act of nailing.<sup>326</sup> As in the case of several of the previous authors, the texts of Plutarch contain a number of references to unspecified suspensions.<sup>327</sup> There are only three texts from Plutarch indicating that the suspension forms at hand might be some kind of crucifixion, at least suspension by nailing.<sup>328</sup>

Thus, some conclusions can be drawn from the texts of Plutarch. κρεμαννύναι is used in the broadest sense. It covers various suspension forms. In Plutarch the verb is simply used in the sense "to suspend" in some way. One interesting feature of Plutarch is that he uses the verb ἀνασταυροῦν in almost the same way. ἀνασταυροῦν is used by Plutarch in the sense "to suspend on some kind of vertical wooden construction," in a broad sense. Thus, as far as ἀνασταυροῦν is concerned, both the dog<sup>329</sup> and the pirates<sup>330</sup> were "suspended on some kind of wooden construction," without further definition. In order to define the suspension form further, something else is needed, such as the verb προσηλοῦν, which is used in connection with the pirates.<sup>331</sup> The connection between προσηλοῦν and ἀνασταυροῦν shows that ἀνασταυροῦν could refer to suspensions in which nailing was a crucial part. It is, however, not possible to draw the conclusion that *all* occurrences of ἀνασταυροῦν refer to the same thing. Plutarch's usage of the verb is too diverse for that. Plu-

<sup>321</sup> Plut. *Par. Graec. et Rom.* 311E.

<sup>322</sup> Plut. *Tit. Flam.* 9.3; *An vit.* 499D [with καθηλοῦν]; *De sera.* 554A–B.

<sup>323</sup> Plut. *Demeter.* 33.3; *Cleom.* 38.2 [with ἀνασταυροῦν]; *Brut.* 31.5 [hanging]; *Reg. et imp. apophth.* 194B.

<sup>324</sup> Plut. *De prov. Alex.* 4.3.

<sup>325</sup> Plut. *Per.* 28.2 (the phrase σάνισι προσδήσας is translated as "crucifixion" by Perrin in the Loeb edition [PERRIN, *LCL*]); *Artax.* 17.5 [ἀναπηγνύναι; σταυρός]; *De fort. Rom.* 325D [ἀνασταυροῦν].

<sup>326</sup> Plut. *Caes.* 2.4; *Reg. et imp. apophth.* 205F–206A; 207B.

<sup>327</sup> Plut. *Fab. Max.* 6.3 [ἀνασταυροῦν]; *Tim.* 22.8 [ἀνασταυροῦν]; *Alex.* 72.2 [ἀνασταυροῦν]; *Demeter.* 33.3 [κρεμαννύναι]; *Ant.* 81.1 [ἀνασταυροῦν]; *Cleom.* 38.2, 39.1 [κρεμαννύναι; ἀνασταυροῦν]; *Reg. et imp. apophth.* 194B [κρεμαννύναι]; *Par. Graec. et Rom.* 311E [σταυροῦν]; *De garr.* 508F–509A [ἀνασταυροῦν].

<sup>328</sup> Plut. *Caes.* 2.4 [κρεμαννύναι; ἀνασταυροῦν]; *Reg. et imp. apophth.* 205F–206A [κρεμαννύναι; προσηλοῦν]; *Reg. et imp. apophth.* 207B [προσηλοῦν].

<sup>329</sup> Plut. *De fort. Rom.* 325D.

<sup>330</sup> Plut. *Caes.* 2.4.

<sup>331</sup> Plut. *Caes.* 2.4; *Reg. et imp. apophth.* 205F–206A.

tarch's use of *σταυρός* is not helpful either, due to his diverse use of the noun. A conclusion that does need to be drawn regarding Plutarch's use of *σταυρός* is that his texts are difficult to use in the study of crucifixion. A *σταυρός* appears to be, in the texts of Plutarch, simply a wooden pole, preferably a sharpened one, in the broadest sense. In the end, the results of the study of crucifixion in the texts of Plutarch are meager. He describes people suspended in various ways, and the message appears to be that a suspension occurred – whether it was a crucifixion or not.

### 7.5. *Appian*

The Greek historian Appian of Alexandria (90/95–160 C.E.) moved to Rome and wrote a work covering a millennium of Roman history. Appian offers several suspension accounts in his texts. Hengel refers to a number of these and labels them crucifixions – especially in his discussion of crucifixion as a slave punishment.<sup>332</sup> The first noticeable feature of Appian's texts is that he only uses the plain form of the verb, *σταυροῦν*, never the compound, *ἀνασταυροῦν*. Besides the verb, he also uses *σταυρός* and *κρεμάννυναι/κρημνήναι*.

#### 7.5.1. Appian's Use of *σταυροῦν* and *σταυρός*

The first text of interest deals with the aftermath of the first Punic war. The Carthaginians had to subject themselves to the harsh Roman demands in a peace treaty. When they had to pay war indemnity to the Romans, the Gallic mercenaries demanded at the same time payment for their service under the Carthaginians. Even the African mercenaries demanded payment although they were under Carthaginian sovereignty. Moreover, they did so even more arrogantly when they saw how weakened and humbled the Carthaginians were.

[The African soldiers] were also angry with them on account of the killing of the 3000, whom [the Carthaginians] had suspended [*ἐσταυρώκεσαν*] because of their desertion to the Romans.<sup>333</sup>

When the Carthaginians refused their demand, both the Gallic and the African mercenaries began a revolt in the Carthaginian homeland. The present text, however, does not reveal the nature of the suspension, and Appian's overall use of the verb does not point toward crucifixion.

<sup>332</sup> Hengel: *App. Mith.* 29 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 79); 97 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 23 n. 11 and 75 n. 18); *B civ.* 1.120 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 55), 4.29 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 56 + n. 9).

<sup>333</sup> *App. Sici.* 2.3. ἐχαλέπαινον τε αὐτοῖς τῆς ἀναιρέσεως τῶν τρισχιλίων, οὓς ἐσταυρώκεσαν τῆς ἐς Ῥωμαίους μεταβολῆς οὐνεκα.

In the previous text, Appian uses the verb *σταυροῦν* in a familiar way.<sup>334</sup> However, in *The Punic Wars* he uses the verb in what may be its basic meaning – to erect a pole. In that sense it was used in connection with the construction of fences, or fortifications as in the present text. The text describes Scipio’s building of trenches and fortifications during the attack on Carthage. The phrase of interest goes as follows.

He filled all [the trenches] with pointed stakes [ἔσταύρωσε πάντα ξύλοις ὀξέσιν]. And in addition to the stakes [τοῖς σταυροῖς] he palisaded [ἐχαράκωσε] the ditches.<sup>335</sup>

Scipio did not crucify everything with sharp stakes; he raised pointed stakes within all the trenches. Appian uses here the verb *σταυροῦν* in the semantically broad meaning “to set a pole in an upright position.” Appian seems to use the verbs *σταυροῦν*, *ἀποσταυροῦν*, *διασταυροῦν* and *προσσταυροῦν* without any major distinction between them; all have to do with “setting up (pointed) poles in upright positions” in various ways.<sup>336</sup> In the present text, Appian also uses the verb *χαρακοῦν* in a similar sense. There is, however, a distinction between *σταυροῦν* and *χαρακοῦν*. The former is used in connection with the erection of single standing pointed poles *within* the trench – a lethal trap for anyone who fell into the trench and was in immediate danger of being impaled. The latter is used in connection with the erection of the combined (pointed) poles (*σταυροί, χάρακες, ξύλοι ὀξέες*) *beside* the trench – i.e., a fortification. Beyond the use of *σταυροῦν* in *Pun.* 119, Appian also specifies *σταυρός* as “pointed wood” (ξύλον ὀξύ). Otherwise the noun is used in connection with various fortifications, seemingly interchangeable with *σταύρωμα*.<sup>337</sup> These features make it difficult to define *σταυρός* as “cross” (†) in the Appian texts.

### 7.5.2. Appian’s Use of *κρεμαννύναι*

An interesting verb in the texts of Appian is *κρεμαννύναι* with its equivalent *κρημνῆναι*.<sup>338</sup> For these verbs refer several times to the suspension of

<sup>334</sup> Appian uses the verb once more in the same way: see App. *B civ.* 5.70.

<sup>335</sup> App. *Pun.* 119. ἔσταύρωσε πάντα ξύλοις ὀξέσιν. καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς σταυροῖς τὰς μὲν ἄλλας τάφρους ἐχαράκωσε.

<sup>336</sup> *σταυροῦν*: *Pun.* 119; *B civ.* 5.70. *ἀποσταυροῦν*: *B civ.* 1.118. *διασταυροῦν*: *B civ.* 4.109. *προσσταυροῦν*: *B civ.* 4.79; 5.33.

<sup>337</sup> *σταυρός*: App. *Iber.* 6.15.90; *B civ.* 4.79; 5.36; 5.71. A text that is absent in the Loeb edition but present on the TLG-E disc, *Celt.* 17a, uses the noun in the same way (τοῦ δὲ Καίσαρος Γαίου περὶ τὰς πόλεις σταυροὺς πηξαμένου ὑψηλοῦς καὶ τοῖς σταυροῖς ἐπιθέντος γεφυρώματα ὁ μὲν κλύδων ἐχώρει διὰ τῶν σταυρωμάτων ὑπὸ τοῖς γεφυρώμασι, Ῥωμαίοις δὲ ἀδεῆς καὶ ἐπίμονον ἦν τὸ ἔργον). *σταύρωμα*: *Pun.* 8.21; *B civ.* 4.79.

<sup>338</sup> S.v. LSJ.

humans (preferably slaves). In his work *The Mithridatic Wars* Appian mentions four suspensions. The translator of the text in the Loeb edition, Horace White, translates κρεμαννύναι with “hanged” twice and “crucified” once, and κρημνήναι with “crucified” once.<sup>339</sup> The texts are as follows:

But Perediccas, who ruled the Macedonians after Alexander, seized and suspended [ἐκρέμασε] Ariarathes, the ruler of Cappadocia, either because he caused a revolt or to gain possession of his land for the Macedonians, and placed Eumenes the Cardian [as ruler] over the people.<sup>340</sup>

And [Metrophanes] – by experiencing a favorable wind Bruttius could not overtake him, [instead Bruttius] destroyed Sciathos, which was a storehouse of plunder for the barbarians – suspended [ἐκρέμασε] some of them who were slaves and cut off the hands of [some/the] freemen.<sup>341</sup>

No one informed Tigranes that Lucullus was approaching. For surely, the first that said [this] had been suspended [ἐκεκρέμαστο] by him, having considered that he disturbed the cities.<sup>342</sup>

And [the deserters whom] Mithriades caught he suspended [ἐκρήμνη], put out [their] eyes and burned.<sup>343</sup>

None of these texts indicates to what kind of suspension they refer. Hengel nevertheless interprets Mith. 29 and 97 as crucifixions.<sup>344</sup> In his book *The Civil Wars* Appian offers some texts containing κρεμαννύναι. White translates these verbs with “crucify,” “hang” and “suspend.”<sup>345</sup> Some of the texts containing the verb κρεμαννύναι offer some variations on the theme of suspension.

<sup>339</sup> App. *Mith.* 8 (WHITE, *LCL*: “hanged”), App. *Mith.* 29 (WHITE, *LCL*: “crucified”); App. *Mith.* 84 (WHITE, *LCL*: “hanged”); App. *Mith.* 97 ([κρημνήναι] WHITE, *LCL*: “crucified”).

<sup>340</sup> App. *Mith.* 8. Περδίκκας δέ, ὃς ἐπὶ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τῆς Μακεδόνων ἦρχεν, Ἀριάραθην, Καππαδοκίας ἡγούμενον, εἴτε ἀφιστάμενον εἴτε τὴν ἀρχὴν αὐτοῦ περιποιούμενος Μακεδόσιν, εἴλε καὶ ἐκρέμασε, καὶ ἐπέστησε τοῖς ἔθνεσιν Εὐμένην τὸν Καρδιανόν.

<sup>341</sup> App. *Mith.* 29. καὶ αὐτόν αἰσὶν ἀνέμῳ χρώμενον ὁ Βρῆτιος οὐ καταλαβὼν Σκιάθον ἐξείλεν, ἣ τῆς λείας τοῖς βαρβάροις ταμίειον ἦν, καὶ δούλους τινὰς αὐτῶν ἐκρέμασε καὶ ἐλευθέρων ἀπέτεμε τὰς χεῖρας.

<sup>342</sup> App. *Mith.* 84. Τιγράνη δ' οὐδεὶς ἐμήνυεν ἐπιόντα Λεύκουλλον· ὁ γὰρ τοὶ πρῶτος εἰπὼν ἐκεκρέμαστο ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, συνταράσσειν αὐτὸν τὰς πόλεις νομίσαντος.

<sup>343</sup> App. *Mith.* 97. καὶ τούσδε μὲν ὁ Μιθριδάτης ἐρευνόμενος ἐκρήμνη καὶ ὄφθαλμοὺς ἀνῶρυτε καὶ ἔκαεν.

<sup>344</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 23 n. 11 and 79.

<sup>345</sup> App. *B civ.* 1.71 (WHITE, *LCL*: “suspended” [twice]), 119 (WHITE, *LCL*: “crucified”), 120 (WHITE, *LCL*: “crucified”); 2.90 (crucified, hung up [the verb used twice]); 3.3 (WHITE, *LCL*: “crucified”); 4.29 (WHITE, *LCL*: “crucifixion”), 35 (WHITE, *LCL*: “crucified”), 81 (WHITE, *LCL*: “crucified”).

Censorinus cut off [Octavius'] head and sent [the head] to Cinna, and [it] was suspended [ἐκρεμάσθη] in the forum in front of the rostra; this [was] the first [head of] a consul [that was suspended]. But after him the heads of others slain were suspended [ἐκρήμαντο] [there].<sup>346</sup>

The only information this text offers is that the head was suspended in some way, not in what way. Later in *The Civil Wars* Appian returns twice to the custom initiated on that day. In the first text (App. *B civ.* 4.20), he refers to the fate of Cicero.<sup>347</sup> Cicero's head and hand were suspended in front of the rostra in the forum – the very place where Cicero was accustomed to making public speeches. Hengel refers to this text as an *impaling* of a corpse, without further discussion.<sup>348</sup> The suspension of Cicero's head is rather similar to the one in the quotation above. However, in the second text, Appian mentions another head that was put on display, but this time on Antony's house instead of in the forum. But the verb used in this text is προτιθέναι, thus simply “attach,” which indicates that the intention of the action was simply to put the head on display, and not to suspend it in some special way.<sup>349</sup> It is reasonable to assume that Appian uses the verb κρεμαννύναι with the same meaning in the text cited above (App. *B civ.* 1.71), that is, simply to put something on public display – the method used to accomplish this being subordinated.

Appian uses κρεμαννύναι in this unspecified way throughout *The Civil Wars*. Support for translating the verb with “crucify” is not to be found. White nevertheless translates the verb consistently with “crucify” or “crucifixion” when it refers to the suspension of humans.<sup>350</sup> The texts in focus are quite analogous.

He also suspended [ἐκρέμασεν] a Roman prisoner in the space between the two armies, showing to his own men the spectacle that they should suffer, if they did not prevail.<sup>351</sup>

<sup>346</sup> App. *B civ.* 1.71. ὁ δὲ Κησωρίνος αὐτοῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐκτεμὼν ἐκόμισεν ἐς Κίνναν, καὶ ἐκρεμάσθη πρὸ τῶν ἐμβόλων ἐν ἀγορᾷ πρῶτου τοῦδε ὑπάτου. μετὰ δ' αὐτὸν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀναιρουμένων ἐκρήμαντο αἱ κεφαλαί.

<sup>347</sup> App. *B civ.* 4.20. ἡ κεφαλὴ δὲ τοῦ Κικέρωνος καὶ ἡ χεὶρ ἐν ἀγορᾷ τοῦ βήματος ἀπεκρέμαντο ἐπὶ πλείστον, ἔνθα πρότερον ὁ Κικέρων ἐδημηγόρει.

<sup>348</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 47 n. 3.

<sup>349</sup> App. *B civ.* 4.29. καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν ὁ μὲν Ἀντωνίου οἱ προσφερομένην οὐχ ἑαυτῷ προσήκειν εἰπὼν ἔπεμψεν ἐς τὴν γυναῖκα, ἡ δὲ ἀντὶ τῆς ἀγορᾶς ἐκέλευσεν ἐπὶ τῆς συνοικίας προτεθῆναι.

<sup>350</sup> App. *B civ.* 1.119 (WHITE, *LCL*: “crucified”); 225 (WHITE, *LCL*: “crucified”); 393 (WHITE, *LCL*: “crucified”); 523 (WHITE, *LCL*: “crucified”); 4.191 (WHITE, *LCL*: “crucifixion”); 201 (WHITE, *LCL*: “crucified”); 277 (WHITE, *LCL*: “crucified”).

<sup>351</sup> App. *B civ.* 1.119. αἰχμάλωτον τε Ῥωμαίων ἐκρέμασεν ἐν τῷ μεταίχμιῳ, δεικνὺς τοῖς ἰδίοις τὴν ὄψιν ὧν πείσονται, μὴ κρατοῦντες.



The other texts use the verb in the same way, i.e., unspecified.<sup>352</sup> Among these texts there is the famous “crucifixion” of Spartacus’ throng of 6000 rebellious slaves along the road from Capua to Rome.<sup>353</sup> In one text, the verb is used twice, in connection with different objects.

Afterwards Cassius suspended [ἐκρέμασεν] Theodotus who escaped when he had found [him] in Asia.... The Alexandrians took [Caesar’s] cloak and suspended [ἐκρέμασαν] [it] around a trophy.<sup>354</sup>

This latter text illuminates Appian’s use of κρεμαννύναι/κρημνῆναι. It simply means “to suspend” in the broadest way. To define the verb as a reference to suspension by crucifixion, a feature beyond the verb is needed. This feature is lacking in the mentioned texts. Thus, the support for White’s translation is lacking as well. The overall use of κρεμαννύναι and κρημνῆναι in Appian’s texts is therefore in the sense “to suspend,” without further definition. Not one single text specifies the verb as a reference to suspension by crucifixion.

### 7.5.3. Conclusions – Appian and Crucifixion

The terms studied in the present investigation of Appian are the noun σταυρός and the verbs σταυροῦν and κρεμαννύναι/κρημνῆναι. The verb σταυροῦν is used twice in unspecified suspensions of humans.<sup>355</sup> On the other hand, the verb is also used in the meaning “to erect poles,” apparently pointed ones (App. *Pun.* 119). This feature makes it difficult to draw the conclusion that Appian had a crucifixion in mind when he used the verb σταυροῦν. With only the texts in focus it is just as plausible to assume that suspension at hand was an impaling, a conjecture strengthened by the use of the noun σταυρός seems only to be used with the meaning “pointed pole” (as Appian defines it in *Pun.* 119). This does not prove that the suspensions in Appian actually were instances of impaling, but it opposes the common conclusion that they were crucifixions.

The texts that contain the verb κρεμαννύναι/κρημνῆναι are undefined.<sup>356</sup> They refer to various kinds of suspensions of humans, body parts or other things. In every instance the verb is used in the sense “to suspend,” without further definition. To interpret the verb as a reference to crucifixion, an additional feature is needed – something in the context

<sup>352</sup> App. *B civ.* 1.120; 3.3; 4.29, 35, 81.

<sup>353</sup> App. *B civ.* 1.120.

<sup>354</sup> App. *B civ.* 2.90. Θεόδοτον δὲ διαδράντα Κάσσιος ὕστερον ἐκρέμασεν, εὐρῶν ἐν Ἀσίᾳ.... καὶ τὴν χλαμύδα αὐτοῦ λαβόντες οἱ Ἀλεξανδρεῖς περὶ τρόπαιον ἐκρέμασαν.

<sup>355</sup> App. *Sici.* 2.3; *B civ.* 5.70.

<sup>356</sup> App. *Mith.* 8; 29; 84; 97; *B civ.* 1.71, 119, 120; 2.90; 3.3; 4.29, 35, 81.

that indicates the nature of the suspension. This feature is missing in the texts. Thus, the support for translating Appian's text which contains the verb κρεμαννύναι/κρημνῆναι with "crucifixion" is absent.

A characteristic in texts by Appian is that slaves appear to be preferred victims of suspensions. It seems that Appian portrays the suspension form as a "slave punishment" in the first place. Thus, Hengel is on the right track when he stresses that suspension punishments, referred to with σταυρός, σταυροῦν and κρεμαννύναι/ κρημνῆναι by Appian, preferably were used on slaves.<sup>357</sup> The problem is that Hengel interprets these suspensions as crucifixions. An already mentioned text from the *Mithridatic Wars* implies this, when it states that "[Metrophanes] suspended [ἐκρέμασε] some of them who were slaves and cut off the hands of [some/the] freemen."<sup>358</sup> The freemen escaped with the loss of a limb while the slaves were suspended. While the other suspension texts in *Mithridatic Wars* do not support this assumption, the majority of the texts in *The Civil Wars* do.<sup>359</sup> The quoted text above has a parallel which mentions that slaves were suspended while the freemen were thrown down from the Tarpeian rock.<sup>360</sup>

#### 7.6. Conclusion – Historians of the Roman Era

The tendency found in the previous eras continues into the Roman era as well; none of the studied terms *per se* means "to crucify." They are used too diversely to allow such a conclusion to be drawn. ἀνασταυροῦν is used in the sense "to suspend a dead or living person in some way on a preferably wooden construction." κρεμαννύναι could be used in the same sense (Appian), but is mainly used in the broadest sense "to suspend anything in some way on something." This makes the paragraph on the verb in BDAG problematic when it refers to Appian's texts (*Mith.* 8; 29 and *B civ.* 2.90) to support the notion that "[t]he verb κ.[ρεμαννύναι] by itself can also mean *crucify*."<sup>361</sup>

Josephus uses (ἀνα)σταυροῦν in a more narrow sense compared to earlier authors, and does not use the verb in connection with impaling. The verb is instead used in what appear to be various forms of limb suspensions – perhaps including a punishment that could be labeled "crucifixion". When it comes to Plutarch, both κρεμαννύναι and ἀνασταυροῦν are instead used in the same wide sense, "to suspend on a vertical wooden

<sup>357</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 51–63.

<sup>358</sup> App. *Mith.* 29.

<sup>359</sup> The texts that contradict the assumption are: App. *B civ.* 1.119 and 2.90. Texts that refer to suspensions of slaves are: App. *B civ.* 1.120, 3.3; 4.29, 35, 81.

<sup>360</sup> App. *B civ.* 3.3.

<sup>361</sup> S.v. BDAG.

construction.” Hence, the frequent reference to his texts in studies of crucifixion is problematic.

## 8. Philosophical and Poetical Literature of the Roman Era

### 8.1. *Philo Judaeus*

Philo Judaeus was born in Alexandria during the second decade B.C.E. and died around 50 C.E. Philo was a prominent member of the Alexandrian-Jewish community and a leading advocate of Jewish culture. His family was influential in both the Jewish diaspora and the eastern Roman administration. Together with Flavius Josephus, Philo was the most significant author of Jewish-Greek literature.<sup>362</sup>

Philo has several accounts that refer to suspensions of interest in the present investigation; both Hengel and Kuhn refer to quite many of them as crucifixion accounts.<sup>363</sup> As Hengel observes, Philo uses ἀνασκολοπίζειν exclusively while Josephus uses ἀνασταυροῦν.<sup>364</sup> The texts will be dealt with in the order of their occurrence in the Loeb Classical Library.

#### 8.1.1. Unspecified Suspensions in Philo

Several of Philo’s texts use the suspension metaphorically. They usually refer to Biblical texts. One of these texts is unspecified as far as the suspension nature is concerned. The text occurs within the tract *On the Posterity and Exile of Cain* (*De Posteritate Caini*) and comments, in the ongoing lecture, on the text in Deuteronomy 21.23, important for the present investigation.

And as the lawgiver says, “all life shall be hanging [κρεμαμένη] before him,” having no unshaken base, but being constantly carried in contrary directions by circumstances, which pull in different ways. On which account [Moses] says in a different place, “cursed by God is he that hangs on tree” [κεκατηραμένον ὑπὸ θεοῦ τὸν κρεμάμενον ἐπὶ ξύλου] (Deut 21.23), because he ought to hang on God.<sup>365</sup>

<sup>362</sup> See also, BORGAN, “Philo of Alexandria,” 333–42; RAJAK, “Philon,” 1167–68.

<sup>363</sup> Hengel: *Flacc.* 72 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 27 n. 19; 35 [the reference appears to be erroneous. It says 72.84f, but should be 72, 84f]; 81); *Flacc.* 84 (35; 81); *Poster. C.* 61 (31 n. 25; 67 n. 4); *Som.* 2.213 (31 n. 25; 67 n. 4). Kuhn: *Flacc.* 72 (KUHN, “Die Kreuzesstrafe,” 702 + n. 318; 704 + n. 335); *Flacc.* 84 (701–2 + n. 318; 705 n. 335); *Poster. C.* 61 (705 n. 335).

<sup>364</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 24.

<sup>365</sup> Philo, *Poster. C.* 25–26. καὶ ἔστιν αὐτῶ, ὅπερ ἔφη ὁ νομοθέτης, πᾶσα ἡ ζωὴ κρεμαμένη, βάσιν οὐκ ἔχουσα ἀκράδαντον, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τῶν ἀντισπῶντων καὶ

The text simply refers to the Septuagint without defining the suspension form.<sup>366</sup> Philo uses the same verb as in the Septuagint, κρεμαννύναι. The Biblical text refers to a post-mortem suspension, but the question of which kind of suspension the text describes appears to be of no significance for Philo.

Belonging to the unspecified suspension accounts is a text that is probably Philo's most known suspension account, labeled as a crucifixion by both Hengel and Kuhn.<sup>367</sup> The text from *Flaccus (In Flaccum)* describes some cruel deeds done towards the Jews in Alexandria under the anti-Jewish administration of Avillius Flaccus. The torture and the subsequent suspension in the text turned into popular entertainment.

Many who were alive, having tied one of the feet by the ankle, they dragged and meanwhile crushed into pieces by leaping upon [them], having [so] designed the most cruel death. And when they were dead they raged no less against [them, inflicting] more grievous outrages on the bodies, and dragged [them], I almost said, through all narrow [streets] of the city until the corpse, the skin, the flesh and the muscles being wasted by the unevenness and roughness of the ground, and previously united parts of [their] composition being torn apart, separated and scattered from one another, were destroyed. And those who did these things, just as [people employed] in theatrical mimes, mimicked the sufferers. But the friends and the relatives of those who were sufferers, simply because they grieved over the circumstances of their relatives, were led away, scourged, tortured, and after as much outrage as their bodies were capable of, the last punishment at hand was a pole [σταυρός].<sup>368</sup>

---

ἀντιμεθελκόντων αἰε φορουμένη πραγμάτων. οὐ χάριν ἐν ἑτέροις "κεκατηραμένον ὑπὸ θεοῦ τὸν κρεμάμενον ἐπὶ ξύλου" φησίν (Deut 21.23), ὅτι, θεοῦ δέον ἐκκρέμασθαι.

<sup>366</sup> The quotation differs slightly from the text used in Rahlfs' edition, which reads "κεκατηραμένους ὑπὸ θεοῦ πᾶς κρεμάμενος ἐπὶ ξύλου."

<sup>367</sup> E.g., HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 27 n. 19; 35; 81; KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 702 + n. 318; 704 + n. 335.

<sup>368</sup> Philo, *Flacc.* 70–72. πολλοὺς δὲ καὶ ζῶντας τοῖν ποδοῖν τὸν ἕτερον ἐκδήσαντες κατὰ τὸ σφυρὸν εἴλκον ἅμα καὶ κατηλόων ἐναλλόμενοι θάνατον ὀμότατον ἐπινοήσαντες· καὶ τελευτησάντων, οὐδὲν ἦττον ἀτελεότητα μηνιῶντες βαρυτέρας αἰκίας τοῖς σώμασιν ἐπέφερον, διὰ πάντων ὀλίγου δέω φάναι τῶν τῆς πόλεως στενωπῶν κατασύροντες, ἕως ὁ νεκρὸς δοράς, σάρκας, ἵνας ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν ἐδάφων ἀνωμαλίας καὶ τραχύτητος περιθρυφθεῖς, καὶ τῶν ἠνωμένων μερῶν τῆς συμφύιας διασπάραντων καὶ διασπαρέντων ἀλλαχόσε ἄλλων, ἐδαπαρήθη. καὶ οἱ μὲν ταῦτα δρῶντες ὡσπερ ἐν τοῖς θεατρικοῖς μίμοις καθυπεκρίνοντο τοὺς πάσχοντας τῶν δ' ὡς ἀληθῶς πεπονθῶτων φίλοι καὶ συγγενεῖς, ὅτι μόνον ταῖς τῶν προσηκόντων συμφοραῖς συνήλγησαν, ἀπήγοντο, ἐμαστιγοῦντο, ἐτροχίζοντο, καὶ μετὰ πάσας τὰς αἰκίας, ὅσας ἐδόνατο χωρῆσαι τὰ σώματα αὐτοῖς, ἢ τελευταία καὶ ἑφεδρος τιμωρία σταυρὸς ἦν.

Colson prefers not to translate the phrase καθυπεκρίνοντο τοὺς πάσχοντας literally with "mimicked the sufferers." Based on the occurrence of the verb in *Flacc.* 32 and *Ios.* 50, 166 he suggests stressing a nuance of the phrase with the proposed meaning of "pretended to be the sufferers," that they "assumed the air of the injured parties," instead of actually imitating the sufferers. This reading will give more point to the following

The σταυρός, which is the final destination for the grieving relatives in the text, is difficult to define. σταυρός is used in combination with ἀνασκοποῦν in *Flacc.* 84, where it refers to an execution tool (see that text below on pp. 136–37). Philo's use of σταυρός otherwise does not support a general interpretation of σταυρός as an execution tool. It simply refers to some kind of regular pole in a wide sense. The noun occurs twice, both times in connection with terminology used in various kinds of fences or fortifications.<sup>369</sup> The only conclusion that can be drawn regarding the events Philo describes in the text is that the climax of the cruelty was a suspension. It is impossible to decide whether the victims were impaled, nailed, or suspended in another way, nor whether the victims were dead or alive.

The next text is of special interest for the present investigation. The text from the tract *On Joseph (De Iosepho)* recapitulates the events in Genesis 40, where Joseph interprets the dreams of his fellow prisoners. The chief cupbearer had a fortunate dream that Joseph interpreted as a token of his fate to be reinstated in his former office after three days. The dream of the chief baker was, however, a bad omen.

The three baskets are symbols of three days. Having waited these [days] the king will order you to be suspended [ἀνασκοποῦσθαι] and the head to be cut off, and birds will fly down and feast upon your flesh, until you are wholly consumed.<sup>370</sup>

The event itself is described a few sentences later. The chief baker was confused and upset. When the three days had passed, the king's birthday came and the inhabitants of the country, especially those of the palace, held a festive banquet.

Therefore, while they were banqueting and the servants enjoyed [themselves] as in a public feast, [the king], having remembered the eunuchs in the prison, ordered [them] to be brought [to him], and having seen the judgment of the dreams, he confirmed [them] by ordering [one] to get his head cut off and then to be suspended [ἀνασκοποῦσθαι], and [the other] to be restored to his former office, which [Joseph] interpreted.<sup>371</sup>

---

ἀληθῶς, according to Colson (Philo, *Flacc.* 72 [COLSON, *LCL*]). However, the combination of καθυπεκρίνεσθαι and θεατρικός μῖμος seems to strengthen the literal translation of the phrase above.

<sup>369</sup> *Agr.* 11 (χάρακας καὶ σταυρούς) and *Spec. leg.* 4.229 (χαρᾶκώματα καὶ σταυρούς καὶ σκόλοψ). The noun σκόλοψ occurs for the only time in the latter text.

<sup>370</sup> Philo, *Ios.* 96. “τὰ τρία κανὰ σύμβολον τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἐστίν· ἐπισχῶν ταύτας ὁ βασιλεὺς ἀνασκοποῦσθαι σε καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτμηθῆναι κελεύσει καὶ καταπτάμενα ὄρνεα τῶν σῶν εὐωχηθήσεται σαρκῶν, ἄχρις ἂν ὅλος ἐξαναλωθῆς.”

<sup>371</sup> Philo, *Ios.* 98. ἐστιωμένων οὖν τῶν ἐν τέλει καὶ τῆς θεραπείας εὐωχομένης ὥσπερ ἐν δημοθιῶν, τῶν κατὰ τὸ δεσμοτήριον εὐνούχων ὑπομνησθεὶς ἀχθῆναι κελεύει καὶ θεασάμενος τὰς τῆς τῶν ὄνειρων διακρίσεως ἐπισφραγίζεται, προστάξας

Some features in these texts are worth notice. First, Philo uses a different verb than the texts used in Rahlfs' edition of the Septuagint, ἀνασκολοπίζειν instead of the semantically broader κρεμαννύναι.<sup>372</sup> It is possible to interpret Philo's use of ἀνασκολοπίζειν in *Poster C. 61*, where he combines it with προσηλοῦν, as an indication that he understood the suspension in Genesis 40.19 and 22 as some kind of crucifixion. In the present text, though, Philo does not reveal what kind of suspension he describes other than it occurred post-mortem (as in the Septuagint).

In the following text from the tract *On Special Laws (De specialibus legibus)* Philo reasons about the punishment of murder.

But since this was not possible, he ordained another punishment [for them] commanding those who had killed to be suspended [ἀνασκολοπίζεσθαι]. And having established this [injunction] he hastened back to his natural humanity, being humane even towards those who had behaved cruelly, and said: "do not let the sun set upon suspended persons [ἀνεσκολοπισμένους], but let the [them] be concealed by earth before sunset."<sup>373</sup>

Philo describes a post-mortem suspension in the text. Otherwise, it is hard to extract any further information regarding the suspension form.<sup>374</sup> There is, however, another noticeable feature in the text. Philo lets the person in charge of the execution show humanity toward the corpses. Thus it appears possible to be humane toward an already dead person. Hence, it ought to be possible to be inhumane toward a corpse as well. A post-mortem suspension seems to be a punishment to the same extent,

---

τὸν μὲν ἀνασκολοπισθῆναι τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτηθέντα, τῷ δὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἦν διεῖπε πρότερον ἀπονεύμαι.

<sup>372</sup> The corresponding texts in LXX read as follows: (Gen 40.19) τὰ τρία κανᾶ τρεῖς ἡμέραι εἰσίν· ἔτι τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἀφελεῖ Φαραῶν τὴν κεφαλὴν σου ἀπὸ σοῦ καὶ κρεμάσει σε ἐπὶ ξύλου, καὶ φάγεται τὰ ὄρνεα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὰς σάρκας σου ἀπὸ σοῦ and (Gen 40.22) καὶ ἐμνήσθη τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ ἀρχιοινοχοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ ἀρχιστοιχοῦ ἐν μέσῳ τῶν παίδων αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπεκατέστησεν τὸν ἀρχιοινοχὸν ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔδωκεν τὸ ποτήριον εἰς τὴν χεῖρα Φαραῶν, τὸν δὲ ἀρχιστοιχὸν ἐκρέμασεν, καθὰ συνέκρινεν αὐτοῖς Ἰωσηφ. See the discussion on the text in chapter 4.

<sup>373</sup> Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 3.151–52. ἐπεὶ δὲ τοῦτ' οὐκ ἐνεδέχεται, τιμωρίαν ἄλλην προσδιατάττεται κελεύων τοὺς ἀνελόντας ἀνασκολοπίζεσθαι. καὶ τοῦτο προστάξας ἀνατρέχει πάλιν ἐπὶ τὴν αὐτοῦ φιλανθρωπίαν, ἡμεροῦμενος πρὸς τοὺς ἀνήμερα εἰργασμένους, καὶ φησι μὴ ἐπιδυέτω ὁ ἥλιος ἀνεσκολοπισμένοις, ἀλλ' ἐπικρυπτέσθωσαν γῆ πρὸ δύσεως καθαιρεθέντες.

<sup>374</sup> Colson interprets the suspension as a crucifixion, possibly post-mortem. He admits, though, that the verb simply could denote "hanged up." But by taking the two other texts where Philo uses ἀνασκολοπίζειν (Colson mentions *Post. C. 61* and *Som. 2.213*) into consideration, he connects the verb with nailing (COLSON, *LCL*, 7.571, n. c). However, Philo uses ἀνασκολοπίζειν in four other texts (*Ios.* 96, 98; *Spec. Leg.* 3.151–52 (twice); *Flacc.* 83, 84), which do not have the connection with nailing.

independently of whether the victim is dead or alive.<sup>375</sup> If this inference is correct, the question – important for the present investigation – of whether the suspension was an execution or not is subordinated in the given text. The essential feature is that a suspension occurred regardless of the victim's status.

### 8.1.2. Suspensions by Nailing in Philo

When it comes to tracing Philo's use of ἀνασκολοπίζειν, an allegorical text comes in handy. The text occurs in the tract *On the Posterity and Exile of Cain* (*De Posteritate Caini*), and is a part of an ongoing allegorical discourse.

The [soul] that subjects itself to bodily couplings has as inhabitants the mentioned. Being interpreted, Acheiman means "my brother," and Sesein "outside me," and Thalamain "one hanging." For [it is] a necessity, for the soul that loves the body, that the body should be acknowledged as a brother, and that the external good things should be honored especially. All [souls] in this state depend on lifeless [things], and like the suspended [ἀνασκολοπισθέντες], [they are] nailed to [προσῆλωνται] perishable materials until death.<sup>376</sup>

Philo offers some additional information in this text. He combines ἀνασκολοπιζειν with προσηλοῦν and thereby gives an indication that he could connect ἀνασκολοπιζειν with nailing. Hengel's and Kuhn's decision to label the text as a crucifixion reference is nevertheless a too far-reaching conclusion.<sup>377</sup> What the text says is that the soul that loves the body is attached to it in the same way that a suspended person is nailed to some kind of suspension tool.<sup>378</sup> Philo's etymological comment on πῆλη (Θαλαμειν) is also worth notice. πῆλη corresponds to κρεμαννύναι in Philo's eyes. Lastly, Philo indicates that he connects ἀνασκολοπίζειν and προσηλοῦν with an ante-mortem suspension – an execution. The people in the metaphor died after being nailed. Thus, Philo shows that the sus-

<sup>375</sup> This observation has a bearing on the interpretation of *Flacc.* 70–72 as well. The last punishment that their bodies (σῶμα) were subjected to might have been inflicted post-mortem.

<sup>376</sup> Philo, *Poster. C.* 61. ἡ μὲν οὖν σωματικαῖς συζυγίαις ὑποβάλλουσα αὐτὴν οἰκίητορας ἔχει τοὺς λεχθέντας· ἐρμηνεύεται δὲ ὁ μὲν Ἀχειμᾶν ἀδελφός μου, ὁ δὲ Σεσεῖν ἐκτός μου, ὁ δὲ Θαλαμειν κρεμᾶμενός τις· ἀνάγκη γὰρ ψυχαῖς ταῖς φιλοσωμάτοις ἀδελφὸν μὲν νομίζεσθαι τὸ σῶμα, τὰ δὲ ἐκτός ἀγαθὰ διαφερόντως τετιμῆσθαι· ὅσαι δὲ τοῦτον διάκεινται τὸν τρόπον, ἀψύχων ἐκκρέμανται καὶ καθάπερ οἱ ἀνασκολοπισθέντες ἄχρη θανάτου φαρταῖς ὕλαις προσῆλωνται.

<sup>377</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 31 n. 25; 67 n. 4; KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 705 n. 335.

<sup>378</sup> Cf. Pl. *Phd.* 83C–D; Plut. *Quest. conv.* 718D.

pension he describes in his allegory has some resemblance to the punishment of crucifixion as defined in the present investigation.<sup>379</sup>

### 8.1.3. Ante-mortem Suspensions in Philo

Beyond these texts, Philo has two more ante-mortem suspensions. The first text is found in the tractate *On Joseph (De Iosepho)* and deals with allegorical interpretations based on some figures in the Egyptian administration. The unfortunate one in this text is once again the chief baker. His death is connected with the lack of bread-food.

On which account he who has failed on these [points] is properly put to death, having been suspended [κρεμασθείς] suffering an evil similar to that he has inflicted; for he himself has also suspended [ἀνεκρέμασε] and racked/tortured the starving man with hunger.<sup>380</sup>

The suspension form is unspecified. Both Colson and Young translate κρεμαννῶναι and ἀνακρεμαννῶναι with “hanged” in their translations, and Young specifies his understanding of the verb ἀνακρεμαννῶναι with the phrase “and suffocated.”<sup>381</sup> The text itself does not support their decision to translate the verbs with “hanged,” especially not the addition “and suffocated.” The combination of ἀνακρεμαννῶναι and παρατείνειν (often used in the sense “to stretch out”)<sup>382</sup> makes some kind of racking more plausible than hanging in a snare.

The last, but no less important, text describes a similar cruel spectacle like that in the text from *Flaccus* 70–72 above. Philo reasons about the observance of the royal holidays and accuses Flaccus of using the birthday of the αὐτοκράτορ as an opportunity for cruel acts, instead of honoring the celebrations by abstaining from punishments.

<sup>379</sup> A combination of ἀνασκοποπιζειν and προσηλοῦν is also found in *Som.* 2.213, which Hengel labels as a crucifixion (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 31 n. 25; 67 n. 4.). In the tract *Prov.* 2.24–25 (mentioned by neither Hengel nor Kuhn), Philo uses προσηλοῦν alone in his description of Polycrates’ fate.

<sup>380</sup> Philo, *Ios.* 156. οὐ χάριν καὶ ὁ περὶ ταῦτ’ ἐξαμαρτῶν εἰκότως θνήσκει κρεμασθείς, ὁμοιον κακὸν ᾧ διέθηκε παθῶν· καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἀνεκρέμασε καὶ παρέτεινε τὸν πεινῶντα λιμῶ.

<sup>381</sup> Young: “On which account he who has erred on these points very appropriately is put to death by hanging, suffering an evil similar to that which he has inflicted; for he also has hanged, and suffocated, and stretched out the famishing man by means of hunger” (Philo, *Ios.* 156 [YONGE, *The Works of Philo Judaeus*, 485]). Colson: “[A]nd therefore the offender in this is properly put to death by hanging, suffering what he has made others to suffer, for indeed he has hanged and racked the starving man with hunger” (Philo, *Ios.* 156 [COLSON, *LCL*]).

<sup>382</sup> See s.v. LSJ.



I know instances before this when some who had been suspended [ἀνεσκολοπισμένω] when this holiday was at hand were taken down and returned to [their] relatives [in order] to be deemed worthy of burial and to obtain the customary rites. For it used to be considered that [the] dead ought to have something good from an emperor's birthday and that the sanctity of the festival ought to be maintained. But [Flaccus] did not [order] those who had already died on poles [σταυρῶν] to be taken down; [instead] he ordered living [ζώντας] [individuals] to be suspended [ἀνασκολοπιζέσθαι], to whom the time gave little, but not permanent, respite to postponement from punishment, [but] not complete quittance. And he did this after maltreating [them] with blows in the middle of the theater, and torturing [them] with fire and sword. And the spectacle had been divided. The first part of the show lasted until the third or fourth hour; Jews were scourged, suspended [κρεμάμενοι], tortured (on the wheel?), maltreated, being dragged toward death through the middle of the orchestra. After this beautiful exhibition came dancers and mimes and flute-players and all other amusement of theatrical contests.<sup>383</sup>

The suspensions in the text end up rather close to the punishment of crucifixion as it is traditionally understood. That Philo describes both a suspension that is possible to survive (impaling being less probable) and an ante-mortem suspension, as well as the earlier use of ἀνασκολοπίζειν in connection with προσηλοῦν, speaks in favor of this assumption. That προσηλοῦν is lacking in the present text and that Philo does not mention any lengthy death struggle speaks against it. The conclusion that can be drawn is that the text describes one form of suspension that is possible to survive and one (the same?) executionary suspension.

#### 8.1.4. Conclusion – Philo and Crucifixion

As noticed by Hengel, Philo used ἀνασκολοπίζειν exclusively in his references to assumed crucifixion.<sup>384</sup> However, if the aim is to trace references to punishments resembling crucifixions, it is not ἀνασκολοπίζειν that plays the crucial part in Philo's texts – it is προσηλοῦν (*Poster C.* 61; *Som.* 2.213) and the context. The combination of ἀνασκολοπίζειν and

<sup>383</sup> Philo, *Flacc.* 83–85. ἤδη τινὰς οἶδα τῶν ἀνεσκολοπισμένων μελλούσης ἐνίστασθαι τοιαύτης ἐκεχειρίας καθαιρεθέντας καὶ τοῖς συγγενέσιν ἐπὶ τῷ ταφῆς ἀξιοθῆναι καὶ τυχεῖν τῶν νενομισμένων ἀποδοθέντας· ἔδει γὰρ καὶ νεκροὺς ἀπολαύσαι τινοσ χρηστοῦ γενεθλιακαῖς αὐτοκράτορος καὶ ἅμα τὸ ἱεροπρεπὲς τῆς πανηγύρεως φυλαχθῆναι. ὁ δ' οὐ τετελευτηκότας ἐπὶ σταυρῶν καθαιρεῖν, ζώντας δ' ἀνασκολοπιζέσθαι προσέταττεν, οἷς ἀμνηστίαν ἐπ' ὀλίγον, οὐ τὴν εἰς ἅπαν, ὁ καιρὸς ἐδίδου πρὸς ὑπέρθεσιν τιμωρίας, οὐκ ἄφεσιν παντελεῖ. καὶ ταῦτ' εἰργάζετο μετὰ τὸ πληγαῖς αἰκίσασθαι ἐν μέσῳ τῷ θεάτρῳ καὶ πυρὶ καὶ σιδήρῳ βασανίσαι. καὶ ἡ θέα διενενέμητο· τὰ μὲν γὰρ πρῶτα τῶν θεαμάτων ἄχρι τρίτης ἢ τετάρτης ὥρας ἐξ ἐωθινοῦ ταῦτα ἦν· Ἰουδαῖοι μαστιγοῦμενοι, κρεμάμενοι, τροχιζόμενοι, κατακικιζόμενοι, διὰ μέσης τῆς ὀρχήστρας ἀπαγόμενοι τὴν ἐπὶ θανάτῳ· τὰ δὲ μετὰ τὴν καλὴν ταύτην ἐπίδειξιν ὀρχησθαι καὶ μῖμοι καὶ αὐληταὶ καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα σκηνηκῶν ἀθύρματα ἀγῶνων.

<sup>384</sup> E.g., HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 24.

προσηλοῦν, and the ante-mortem suspensions (*Ios.* 156; *Flacc.* 83–85), favor the assumption that Philo refers to a punishment with similarities to a traditional view of crucifixions in his texts. The majority of the texts refer to suspensions as examples in allegorical or moral discourses.<sup>385</sup> Some of the texts recapitulate Biblical or historical events.<sup>386</sup> A few refer to experiences from Philo's own lifetime.<sup>387</sup>

In the end, the texts of Philo do not offer much information about the punishment of crucifixion. A few vague conclusions might be drawn. One could argue that Philo interprets the fate of the chief baker in Genesis 40 as a crucifixion – at least a nailing suspension – to a higher degree than the text preserved in the Septuagint. He does this by using ἀνασκοποῦν (which he otherwise connects with προσηλοῦν) instead of the semantically broader κρεμαννύναι.

Last but not least, Philo's experiences of the pogroms under Flaccus show that a suspension with several parallels to a traditional view of crucifixion was – at least on this occasion – the peak of a gruesome process.

## 8.2. Chariton

Chariton (first cent. B.C.) refers to at least two bodily suspensions in his novel *Callirhoe*. The eight books deal with the story of love between the beautiful Callirhoe, daughter of the Syracusan ruler Hermocrates, and Chaereas. Both Hengel and Kuhn refer to several crucifixion accounts in Chariton's text.<sup>388</sup> The author uses the verbs ἀνασταυροῦν and ἀνασκοποῦν twice each, and the word σταυρός sixteen times.<sup>389</sup>

### 8.2.1. The Suspension of Theron

The personality of the handsome Chaereas changed in an outburst of jealousy. Some disappointed suitors, who felt robbed of their proposed wife, set up a trap for Chaereas and lured him into deep anger towards his wife. The result was that Chaereas hit Callirhoe with a vicious kick and thereby caused her apparent death. Callirhoe was hastily buried. However, the pirate Theron robbed her tomb and found her alive. He took her aboard his ship and later sold her as a slave in Miletus. Later the tomb

<sup>385</sup> I.e., Philo, *Poster C.* 25–26; *Som.* 2.213.

<sup>386</sup> I.e., Philo, *Ios.* 96; *Prov.* 2.24–25.

<sup>387</sup> I.e., Philo, *Flacc.* 70–72, 83–85.

<sup>388</sup> Hengel: *Char. Chae. Call.* 3.4.18 (*Crucifixion*, 49 n. 10; 50 n. 14; 81 n. 35); 4.2.6ff (82 n. 36); 4.3.6 (32 n. 25 and 82 n. 36); 5.10.6 (82 n. 36). Kuhn: 4.2.6f; 4.3.3–10; 4.4.10; 5.10.6 (“Die Kreuzesstrafe,” 689 n. 233).

<sup>389</sup> ἀνασταυροῦν: *Char. Chae. Call.* 4.2.6; 8.8.2. ἀνασκοποῦν: 3.4.18; 8.7.8. σταυρός: 3.3.12; 3.4.18; 4.2.7 [twice]; 4.3.3, 5 [twice]; 6, 8, 9, 10; 4.4.10; 5.10.6; 6.2.10 [twice; one σταυρός is omitted in Codex Florentinus]; 8.8.4).

robbery was discovered and Theron was captured. At the trial Theron confessed and revealed the truth about the robbery of the tomb. He was sentenced to death. The listeners decided to sail for the rescue of Callirhoe.

This was agreed and ratified, and he thereupon dismissed the assembly. While Theron was led away a great part of the crowd followed [him]. He was suspended [ἀνεσκολοπίσθη] in front of Callirhoe's tomb, and from his cross [ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ] he saw the sea over which he had carried Hermocrates' daughter as captive, whom not even [the] Athenians had taken.<sup>390</sup>

The suspension as described in the text shows similarities to the punishment of crucifixion as it is traditionally understood. An instant death by impaling does not fit the picture as well as a crucifixion with its extended suffering.

### 8.2.2. The Suspension of Chaereas and his Cellmates

In Miletus, Callirhoe was married to the wealthy and eminent Dionysius. Whereas Chaereas was attacked by pirates and sold as a slave, Callirhoe believed he was dead due to a deceitful description of the event. To convince Callirhoe of Chaereas' death, Dionysius held funeral ceremonies and built a tomb, while Chaereas was working in chains in Caria. Sixteen of Chaereas' fellow prisoners broke their chains, killed the guard and tried to escape but were captured. The governor Mithridates was informed.

And this one, without even seeing them or listening to [their] defense, at once ordered the sixteen cellmates to be suspended [ἀνασταυρώσαι]. They were brought out chained together by feet and neck, and each of them carried the pole [τὸν σταυρὸν ἔφερε]. The punishers added this sad foreign appearance to the inevitable punishment as an example of fear to similarly [minded people]. Now Chaereas kept silence while being led away with the others, but Polymarchus, while carrying the pole [τὸν σταυρὸν], said: "We are suffering this because of you, oh Callirhoe. You are responsible for all the evil [inflicted] upon us."<sup>391</sup>

<sup>390</sup> Char. *Chae. Call.* 3.4.18. ἔδοξε ταῦτα καὶ ἐκυρώθη, διέλυσέ τε ἐπὶ τούτοις τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. ἀπαγομένῳ δὲ Θήρωνι μέγα μέρος τοῦ πλήθους ἐπικολούθησεν. ἀνεσκολοπίσθη δὲ πρὸ τοῦ Καλλιρῶς τάφου καὶ ἔβλεπεν ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ τὴν θάλασσαν ἐκείνην, δι' ἧς αἰχμάλωτον ἔφερε τὴν Ἑρμοκράτους θυγατέρα, ἣν οὐκ ἔλαβον οὐδὲ Ἀθηναῖοι.

<sup>391</sup> Char. *Chae. Call.* 4.2.6–7. κάκεινος οὐδὲ ἰδὼν αὐτοὺς οὐδὲ ἀπολογουμένους ἀκούσας εὐθὺς ἐκέλευσε τοὺς ἑξκαίδεκα τοὺς ὁμοσκήνους ἀνασταυρώσαι. προήχησαν οὖν πόδας τε καὶ τραχήλους συνδεδεμένοι, καὶ ἕκαστος αὐτῶν τὸν σταυρὸν ἔφερε· τῇ γὰρ ἀναγκαῖα τιμωρία καὶ τὴν ἔξωθεν φαντασίαν σκυθρωπὴν προσέθεσαν οἱ κολάζοντες εἰς φόβου παράδειγμα τοῖς ὁμοίοις. Χαιρέας μὲν οὖν συνα-

The approaching suspension appears to be of the same nature as the one in the previous text, although the author switches verb. The reason for this assumption is the harmony with the overall story. Beyond the verb switch, the reference to the “foreign” custom (τὴν ἕξωθεν φαντασίαν σκυθρωπήν) of carrying a σταυρός is worth notice. The event appears to be something new and foreign; that at least is what Chariton’s words indicate. This text may be the oldest reference to what usually is nowadays referred to as “cross-bearing.”<sup>392</sup> The problem is, however, that it is unknown what they actually carried.<sup>393</sup>

### 8.2.3. A Recapitulation of the Suspensions

After the reuniting of Chaereas and Callirhoe the inhabitants of Syracuse wanted to hear what happened to the couple after they had left Sicily. Chaereas hesitated but his father Hermocrates encouraged him and recapitulated the events known to the Syracusans. In his speech he talked to Chaereas and mentioned Theron’s fate:

Only Theron was still alive and you brought [him] to the assembly, and this one, having been tortured, was suspended [ἀνεσκολοπίσθη].<sup>394</sup>

In the next text, Chariton recapitulates the event connected with his imprisonment in Caria.

He who bought us, a servant of Mithridates, governor of Caria, gave orders [for us] to be chained and to dig. After some of the prisoners killed the prison guard, Mithridates ordered us all to be suspended [ἀνασταυρωθῆναι].<sup>395</sup>

It is noteworthy that different verbs are used in each account: ἀνασκολοπίζειν in connection with Theron’s suspension and ἀνασταυροῦν with Chaereas’. A few sentences later Chariton mentions an important feature regarding his overall understanding of the nature of the

παγόμενος ἐσίγα, Πολύχαρμος δὲ τὸν σταυρὸν βασιάζων “διὰ σέ” φησίν, “ὦ Καλλιρρόη, ταῦτα πάσχομεν. σὺ πάντων ἡμῖν τῶν κακῶν αἰτία.”

<sup>392</sup> The problematic dating of the novel plays a crucial part in this assumption. For other references to bearing an execution tool, in part or whole, beside the recapitulation of the event in 4.3.10, see Plut. *De sera*. 554 A–B; Artem. *Oneir.* 2.56; Matt. 27.32; Mark 15.21; Luke 23.26; John 19.17 (cf. also Plaut. *Mil.* 359–60; *F Carb.* 2.1, and perhaps Clod. Lic. F 3.1; *Lex Puteoli* [AE 1971, no 88 (Puteoli)], col. 2.8–14).

<sup>393</sup> See the discussion on Plut. *De sera*. 554A–B above.

<sup>394</sup> Char. *Chae. Call.* 8.7.8. Θήρωνα δὲ μόνον ἔτι ζῶντα εἰσήγαγες εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, κάκεινος μὲν βασανισθεὶς ἀνεσκολοπίσθη.

<sup>395</sup> Char. *Chae. Call.* 8.8.2. ὁ πριάμενος ἡμᾶς, δοῦλος Μιθριδάτου, στρατηγὸς Καρίας, ἐκέλευσε σκάπτειν ὄντας πεπεδημένους. ἐπεὶ δὲ τὸν δεσμοφύλακα τῶν δεσμοτῶν ἀπέκτεινάν τινες, ἀνασταυρωθῆναι πάντας ἡμᾶς Μιθριδάτης ἐκέλευσε.

suspension. While the execution process continued, Chaereas' identity was revealed to Mithridates.

Then Mithridates quickly ordered me to be taken down from the cross [τοῦ σταυροῦ], being near the end by then, and he held [me] among his closest friends.<sup>396</sup>

It appears that Chaereas is depicted as already suspended when the connection between him and Callirhoe is described as coming to Mithridates' knowledge. That he, and Theron to some extent, survived the suspension speaks in favor of the use of crucifixion and makes, for example, impaling or hanging a less probable interpretation of the text.

#### 8.2.4. Chariton's Use of σταυρός

As mentioned in the introduction, σταυρός occurs sixteen times in the novel. It refers twelve times to an unspecified torture or execution tool.<sup>397</sup> However, considering the overall story and the use of σταυρός in a small number of texts, this could be the tool used in the punishment of crucifixion. It is plausible through some indicia in the texts to link σταυρός three times to a suspension having clear parallels with the punishment of crucifixion. As mentioned above, the image of the suspended Theron locking out over the sea fits the extended death struggle of crucifixion better than the instant death of impaling (3.4.18). The texts which imply that Chariton survived and was able to descend from the σταυρός (4.3.6; 8.8.4) points in the same direction.<sup>398</sup>

Chariton's information in the account following Chaereas' rescue from the σταυρός (4.3.7–10) is also of value for the present investigation. When Chaereas grasps the truth about Callirhoe's marriage with Dionysius of Miletus, he falls on his knees and begs Mithridates to give him back the σταυρός (τὸν σταυρὸν μοι ἀπόδος [4.3.9]). In the ongoing story, he cries out that he had among other things carried a σταυρός because of Callirhoe (σταυρὸν ἐβάστασα [4.3.10]). In both these utterances, Chaereas refers back to the suspension tool from which he was taken down. Thus, it is possible to assume that the σταυρός in these texts is an execution tool used in crucifixion as defined in the present investigation. The form of this tool, e.g., *crux commissa* (T), *crux immissa* (†), *crux simplex* (I) or something else, is however not revealed.

<sup>396</sup> Char. *Chae. Call.* 8.8.4. ταχέως οὖν ὁ Μιθριδάτης ἐκέλευσε καθαιρεθῆναι με τοῦ σταυροῦ σχεδὸν ἤδη πέρας ἔχοντα, καὶ ἔσχεν ἐν τοῖς φιλάτοις.

<sup>397</sup> Char. *Chae. Call.* 3.3.12; 4.2.7 (twice); 4.3.3, 5 (twice), 8, 9, 10; 4.4.10; 5.10.6; 6.2.10 (twice).

<sup>398</sup> It is less plausible that Chariton would depict Chaereas as descending alive with a perforated torso from the pole after an impaling.

If this connection between crucifixion and σταυρός can be reckoned as firm, it puts two important texts in a different light. The σταυρός-bearing in Chariton's text (4.2.7; 4.3.10) could thus be considered as one of the few accounts of cross-bearing.<sup>399</sup> Some of the other accounts of cross-bearing, the Gospels and to some extent the dream interpreter Artemidorus, link the custom of bearing the execution tool to crucifixion.<sup>400</sup> These features taken together make it possible to define several of the suspension accounts in Chariton with some degree of certainty as crucifixions.

### 8.2.5. Conclusion – Chariton and Crucifixion

The outcome of the study of crucifixion in Chariton's *Callirhoe* is positive. The text contains two suspensions with resemblance to the crucifixion as it is traditionally understood: the executionary suspension of the tomb robber Theron (3.4.18 [ἀνασκοποῖζειν; σταυρός]; 8.7.8 [ἀνασκοποῖζειν]) and the aborted execution of Chaereas (4.3.3–10 [σταυρός]; 8.8.2–4 [ἀνασταυροῦν; σταυρός]). The former account uses the verb ἀνασκοποῖζειν and the latter ἀνασταυροῦν. It is hard to see any significance in the verb switch. The verbs appear to be used interchangeably by Chariton. It is, however, σταυρός that constitutes the connection between the suspensions of Chariton's text and crucifixion.

### 8.3. Conclusion – Philosophical and Poetical Literature of the Roman Era

The outcome of the study of the texts in the present section is diverse. Philo's numerous texts and abundant references to human suspensions add little to the overall understanding of the punishment of crucifixion. The texts bear witness that suspension punishments were frequently used, but they do not reveal what kind of suspension these were. Philo's contribution is a notion that nails could be used in human suspensions.

When it comes to Chariton the tendency is the opposite. Linked to the core of the story are two suspensions with close resemblance to the punishment of crucifixion. Both prime verbs are used in the novel; peculiarly enough the suspensions of Theron and Chaereas are described with one verb each. However, both verbs appear to refer to suspensions which end

<sup>399</sup> E.g., the earlier studied account in Plut. *De sera*. 554A–B is problematic to connect with crucifixion in this way. For more examples of a similar custom, see the comments on Plaut. *Mil.* 359–60 and *F Carb.* 2.1 in the following chapter.

<sup>400</sup> Matt. 27.32; Mark 15.21; Luke 23.26; John 19.17. The accounts of the Gospels let both Jesus and the robbers talk on their crosses (Matt. 27.44–50; Mark 15.34–37; Luke 23.34–46; John 19.26–30) and portray an extended death struggle. Artemidorus speaks of “nailing” and he uses the verb προσηλοῦν, in connection with cross-bearing (*Artem. Oneir.* 2.56).

up close to the punishment of crucifixion as it is traditionally understood. The novel reveals that a suspension which was possible to survive for a time was known to the author, and probably also to the readers. A distinctive feature of the punishment was the custom of carrying a *σταυρός*, whatever that might be, to the place of execution.

## 9. Conclusion – The Greek Literature

The outcome of the study of crucifixion in the Greek literature is remarkable, especially considering the abundance of crucifixion references found in the previous investigations. This contrast is closely related to the issue of definition. What you find depends on what you are looking for. The dilemma is that the previous investigators seldom define what they are looking for. They are simply looking for “crucifixion,” usually without further discussion (Kuhn is one of few exceptions).<sup>401</sup> Without any additional information the reader has to assume that they use the label “crucifixion” in the normal English sense, which coheres well with Kuhn’s elaborate definition of the label “crucifixion” (Kreuzigung). The discrepancy between the previously dominant notion of the usage of “crucifixion” in antiquity and the result of the present study is striking. What is left of the hundreds of references is only a handful of texts which offer modest information on the punishment.

### 9.1. The Terminology

The answer to *the first basic question* of the present investigation is thus surprising. The conclusion regarding the terminology of crucifixion in the pre-Christian Greek literature is that there is only a terminology of *suspension*. Within the semantic field of these terms, there are certainly punishments that are quite similar to the punishment of crucifixion in a traditional sense. The problem is, however, to sift out these. The cause of this problem is the non-distinct usage of the terminology. Its usage seems to be much wider than what is commonly assumed.

#### 9.1.1. The Verbs

It is difficult, if not impossible, to link the prime verbs, *ἀνασταυροῦν* and *ἀνασκολοπιζειν*, directly to the meaning “to crucify.” They are simply used too diversely – not to say contradictorily – to be connected directly with that meaning.

---

<sup>401</sup> See the discussions on the more or less implied definitions in the Discussion chapter (pp. 261–70).

ἀνασταυροῦν is commonly used in connection with suspension of corpses, whole<sup>402</sup> or in parts,<sup>403</sup> and impaling.<sup>404</sup> The verb is used in some texts for executionary, ante-mortem, suspensions.<sup>405</sup> In a few instances even a punishment possible to survive<sup>406</sup> and the use of nails<sup>407</sup> can be seen. However, the majority of the texts containing ἀνασταυροῦν and referring to human suspensions are undefined when it comes to nature of the suspension.<sup>408</sup> In addition, the verb without the prefix is used with no connection to human suspension in a number of texts.<sup>409</sup>

When it comes to ἀνασκολοπίζειν, the tendency is analogous. The verb is used when the author is referring to the suspension of corpses.<sup>410</sup> This verb, too, is used in some texts for executionary, ante-mortem, suspensions.<sup>411</sup> In one text it is used in connection with an outdrawn suffering,<sup>412</sup> and in one text it is possible to connect the verb with the use of nails.<sup>413</sup> As the case was with ἀνασταυροῦν, most of the texts containing ἀνασκολοπίζειν and referring to human suspensions are unspecified as far as the nature of the suspension is concerned.<sup>414</sup>

The major differences between ἀνασταυροῦν and ἀνασκολοπίζειν are, first, that the latter lacks the connection to impaling that ἀνασταυροῦν has, which is rather surprising if the etymology of the verbs is taken into

<sup>402</sup> E.g., Hdt. 3.125.3; Ctesias, *FGrH* 3c, 688 F 9.6; Polyb. 5.54.6–7; 8.2.1.2–3; Diod. Sic. 16.61.2 (σταυροῦν); Diod. Sic. 25.10.1–2; Joseph. *BJ* 5.449–51; Plut. *Tim.* 22.8; and possibly Strabo, 4.4.5 (Posidon. F 34.26–29); Plut. *Cleom.* 39.1.

<sup>403</sup> E.g., Hdt. 4.103.1–2, in combination with 4.103.3; 6.30.1; 7.238.1; 9.78.3; Xen. *An.* 3.1.17; Joseph. *AJ* 6.374.

<sup>404</sup> E.g., Ctesias, *FGrH* 3c, 688 F 16.66 (ἀνασταυρίζειν); and possibly Thuc. 1.110.3; Plut. *De fort. Rom.* 325D.

<sup>405</sup> E.g., Diod. Sic. 3.65.5; Joseph. *AJ* 12.256; 13.380; *BJ* 1.97; and possibly Polyb. 1.86.4–7 (σταυροῦν); Joseph. *AJ* 2.73, 77 (σταυροῦν); *BJ* 3.320–21.

<sup>406</sup> Hdt. 7.194.1–3; Joseph. *Vit.* 420–21; Char. *Chae. Call.* 8.8.2, in combination with 8.8.4.

<sup>407</sup> Diod. Sic. 25.5.2; Joseph. *BJ* 2.306–08; Plut. *Caes.* 2.4, in combination with, *Reg. et imp. apophth.* 205F–206A.

<sup>408</sup> E.g., Aesop, 157.6–7 (σταυροῦν); Pl. *Grg.* 473C–D; Polyb. 1.11.5; Hellenica (*P Oxy.* 5.842), *FGrH* 2a, 66 F 1.15.5 (433–38); Diod. Sic. 2.1.10 (Ctesias, *FGrH* 3c, 688 F 1b.29–31); 2.44.2; Strabo, 14.1.39 (σταυροῦν); Joseph. *AJ* 11.280; *AJ* 19.94 (σταυροῦν); *BJ* 2.253; 5.289; Plut. *Fab. Max.* 6.3; *Alex.* 72.2; *Ant.* 81.1; *Par. Graec. et Rom.* 311E (σταυροῦν); *De garr.* 508F–509A; App. *Sici.* 2.3; *B civ.* 5.70 (σταυροῦν); Char. *Chae. Call.* 8.8.2.

<sup>409</sup> E.g., Diod. Sic. 24.1.2; App. *Pun.* 119.

<sup>410</sup> Philo, *Ios.* 98.

<sup>411</sup> Char. *Chae. Call.* 8.7.8; Philo, *Flacc.* 84.

<sup>412</sup> Char. *Chae. Call.* 3.4.18.

<sup>413</sup> Philo, *Poster C.* 61 (in an allegory).

<sup>414</sup> E.g., Hdt. 1.128.2; 3.159.1; 4.43.6; 4.202.1; Polyb. 10.33.8; Diod. Sic. 5.32.6; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 5.51.3; Philo, *Ios.* 98; *Flacc.* 83.



consideration. Second, the writers did not use ἀνασκολοπίζειν in reports of a punishment possible to survive. Third, ἀνασκολοπίζειν is not used without the prefix and occurs exclusively in connection with human suspension. Besides that, it is worth notice that the usage of ἀνασκολοπίζειν has its peak in the Classical Era and then decreases significantly until Philo apparently picks up the verb again, and it returns in full strength during Atticism.

The general use of ἀνασταυροῦν is difficult to limit further than the vague sense “to suspend something in some way upon something.” When ἀνασταυροῦν is used in connection with human suspensions, the sense is “to suspend a corpse whole or in part, or sometimes a living person, on a suspension tool, preferably a wooden pole.” The latter usage coheres well with the use of ἀνασκολοπίζειν.

There are, however, when it comes to tracing the punishment of crucifixion, some other verbs than those discussed above that ought to be mentioned. Their common theme is that they indicate an act of nailing on various levels. The verbs (προσηλοῦν,<sup>415</sup> καθηλοῦν<sup>416</sup>, and προσπασσαλεύειν<sup>417</sup>), when coupled for instance with σταυρός, add the feature of nailing to the suspension accounts. An act of nailing (or binding) makes the choice of impaling as an interpretation of the suspension form less probable. In the few texts in which the authors imply the suspension form, they do not indicate that nailing and impaling were combined. Thus, an act of nailing is of greater value than being only something a present-day reader recognizes from the traditions of the church. The use of nails strengthens the connection between the suspension account and the traditional understanding of crucifixion on two levels. First, it makes impaling less probable. Second, it implies what might be called a distinctive feature of the traditional view of crucifixion – the piercing and bloodstained nails of the cross of Calvary.

Lastly, the widely used verb κρεμαννύναι is used just in the wide and unspecified sense, “to suspend.” Because of its wide range of meaning, it is almost useless as an indicator of crucifixion. If ἀνασταυροῦν needs a supporting feature, an indicator outside itself, κρεμαννύναι is, if possible, even more dependent on such indicators.

---

<sup>415</sup> E.g., Dem. *Meid.* 21.105; Diod. *Sic.* 2.18.1; 25.5.2; Joseph. *BJ* 2.306–08; 5.449–51 (in combination with σταυρός in the last four texts); Philo, *Poster C.* 61 (metaphorical); Plut. *Reg. et imp. Apophth.* 205F–206A; 207B (nailed to a ship’s mast).

<sup>416</sup> E.g., Plut. *An vit.* 499D (used in combination with σταυρός). Diod. *Sic.* 20.54.7 (προσκαθηλοῦν) ought also to be mentioned here.

<sup>417</sup> E.g., Hdt. 7.33.1 (προσδιαπασσαλεύειν); 9.120.4; Aesch. *PV* 18–23.

## 9.1.2. The Nouns

The noun *σταυρός* is, in the same sense as the prime verbs, difficult to link directly to the suspension tool in crucifixion (†). A *σταυρός* is a wooden pole of some kind. It appears that a *σταυρός* is pointed and used in fortifications in the majority of texts.<sup>418</sup> Only one non-suspension text among those studied here uses *σταυρός* without this connection.<sup>419</sup> When *σταυρός* is used in connection with human bodily suspensions, it seems to be only a simple wooden pole used in an unspecified suspension.<sup>420</sup> This at least is all that can be read out of the texts. A few texts describe living humans suspended in some way on a *σταυρός*,<sup>421</sup> and some imply the use of nails as attaching devices.<sup>422</sup> Two texts describe a criminal who appears to carry his own *σταυρός* toward the assumed execution spot.<sup>423</sup> Due to the diverse usage of the noun it is simply not possible to draw the conclusion that *σταυρός* means “cross” in the way it is often depicted (†).

A *σκόλοψ* is something pointed, for example a pole.<sup>424</sup> In this sense it is used in fortifications,<sup>425</sup> as the case was with *σταυρός*. A *σκόλοψ* could also be used as a suspension tool, for whole corpses<sup>426</sup> or body parts.<sup>427</sup> The difference between *σταυρός* and *σκόλοψ* is that the latter refers to anything pointed,<sup>428</sup> from a thorn to a pole, while a *σταυρός* is a more

<sup>418</sup> E.g., Hom. *Il.* 24.453; *Od.* 14.11; Thuc. 4.9.1; 7.2.5-8; Xen. *An.* 5.2.21; 7.4.14, 17; App. *Pun.* 119 (stressed as “pointed”); *Iber.* 6.15.90; *B. civ.* 4.79; 5.36; 5.71; Philo, *Agr.* 11; *Spec. leg.* 4.229.

<sup>419</sup> Hdt. 5.16.1-2.

<sup>420</sup> E.g., Ctesias, *FGrH* 3c, 688 F 14.39; *FGrH* 3c, 688 F 26.7 (Plut. *Artax.* 17.5); Polyb. 1.86.4-7; Strabo, 3.4.18; Joseph. *AJ* 18.63-64; Plut. *Tit. Flam.* 9.3; *Artax.* 17.5; Philo, *Flacc.* 70-72; 83-85; Char. *Chae. Call.* 3.3.12; 3.4.18; 4.2.7; 4.3.3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10; 4.4.10; 5.10.6; 6.2.10; 8.8.4.

<sup>421</sup> Strabo, 3.4.18; Joseph. *AJ* 11.267; Char. *Chae. Call.* 3.4.18; 8.8.4.

<sup>422</sup> Diod. Sic. 2.1.18.1; 25.5.2; Joseph. *BJ* 2.306-08; 5.449-51; Plut. *An. vit.* 499D.

<sup>423</sup> Plut. *De sera.* 554A-B; Char. *Chae. Call.* 4.2.6-7; 4.3.10.

<sup>424</sup> E.g., Hom. *Il.* 7.441; 8.343; 9.350; 12.55, 63; Eur. *El.* 895-99; *IT* 1429-30; Diod. Sic. 33.15.1 (Posid. F 110.5-9).

<sup>425</sup> E.g., Hdt. 9.97; Xen. *An.* 5.2.5; Eur. *Rhes.* 116.

<sup>426</sup> E.g., Diod. Sic. 33.15.1 (Posid. F. 110.5-9); Eur. *IT* 1429-30 (post-mortem).

<sup>427</sup> E.g., Hom. *Il.* 18.176-77.

<sup>428</sup> Evidence from the papyri and non-literary sources indicates this. In an Egyptian papyrus from the third century an anxious mother writes to her son: “he told me that you suffer in your foot because of a splinter” (εἶπέ μοι, ὅτι τὸν πόδα [sic (πόδα?)] πονεῖς ἀπὸ σκολάπου [sic (σκόλοπος?)]) (*BGU* 2.380.7-9). For an older papyrus, see *IG* 4<sup>2</sup> 1 (Epidaurus) 121.92. This meaning of *σκόλοψ* is echoed in the only occurrence of the word in the NT, 2 Cor. 12.7: “therefore, to keep me from being too elated, a thorn was given to me in the flesh, a messenger from Satan, to torment me, to keep me from being too elated” (διό, ἵνα μὴ ὑπεραίρωμαι, ἐδόθη μοι σκόλοψ τῇ σαρκί, ἄγγελος Σατανᾶ, ἵνα με κολαφίζῃ, ἵνα μὴ ὑπεραίρωμαι). Cf. Num. 33.55 (see s.v. MM and LSJ for more texts).

regular (bigger) pole, although often pointed. *σταυρός* is more frequently used in connection with suspension tools than *σκόλοψ*. There are, however, more suspension tools than those referred to with *σταυρός* and *σκόλοψ*. *σάνις* appears to be some kind of a board upon which a victim was suspended,<sup>429</sup> or in some cases simply tied onto.<sup>430</sup> Sometimes the generic noun *ξύλον* is used in reference to a suspension tool,<sup>431</sup> in apparently the same sense as *σταυρός* and *σκόλοψ*. All these nouns are used when the authors refer to a suspension tool of the seemingly diverse group of suspension punishments that occurred in the ancient Greco-Roman world.

### 9.1.3. The Terminological Problem

The problem is the imprecise usage of the terms.<sup>432</sup> They are *per se* simply not sufficient as indicators. None of the verbs means “to crucify” and none of the nouns means “cross.” In the light of this it is odd to see that so many scholars use this very method – the terms *per se* – to sift out their crucifixion references.

### 9.2. The Punishment

The answer to *the second basic question* of the present investigation requires another question. Could the lack of a distinct crucifixion terminology and the disparate usage of the various terms suggest that there was no defined punishment called “crucifixion” in the studied time span, i.e., before the execution of Jesus? If the aim still is to sift out punishments that cohere with the traditional view of crucifixion, i.e., containing all or some of the characteristics mentioned in the introduction, another method than the sole occurrence of one term is needed. The method used here is contextual. To single out a text as a crucifixion reference, an indicator in the context is needed. An indicator is another term or a description revealing that the punishment at hand carries some of the characteristics of a crucifixion.

The question whether the authors refer to crucifixion or not is of course strongly related to the question of definition. As has been seen in

<sup>429</sup> Hom. *Od.* 22.170–77; Hdt. 7.33.1; 9.120.4.

<sup>430</sup> Plut. *Per.* 28.2.

<sup>431</sup> E.g., Hdt. 4.103.3; Joseph. *AJ* 11.246; Philo, *Poster C.* 25–26; and possibly Alexis, 224.10.

<sup>432</sup> Reiners observes this: “[l]ike Herodotus and Thucydides he [Plato] employs the term *ἀνασταυροῦν* but here too the context gives no indication of the nature of the punishment” (REINERS, *Terminology*, 4); but he fails to draw the sufficient consequences of his own observation. He still labels undefined texts as “crucifixions” (REINERS, *Terminology*, 3–5).

the introduction, the definition of the term “crucifixion” coheres with that which, according to a traditional Christian understanding, happened to Jesus on Calvary – if nothing else is said. Neither Hengel nor Kuhn distance themselves from the normal English (or German) usage of the term.<sup>433</sup> If crucifixion is an execution on a standing suspension device, onto which the condemned was attached by his limbs with nails or rope, only a fraction of the texts referred to by Hengel and Kuhn, *et al.*, can be labeled as “crucifixion.”

A few words on an obvious alternative to the minimalistic view expressed in the present investigation ought to be mentioned. If by the label “crucifixion” one instead means whatever kind of attachment of a living person or a corpse, whole or a part, to any kind of device, almost every text mentioned by the scholars (as well as many additional texts) could be seen as relevant references. A few scholars opt for a wider definition, i.e., including post-mortem suspensions,<sup>434</sup> or at least discuss the diversity of the suspension punishment.<sup>435</sup>

However, the pivotal question advocated here is whether it is advisable to label all these texts in which the studied terminology is used, depicting different forms of human suspension, as “crucifixions.” If the diverse terminology and its usage indicate that a distinctive punishment labeled “crucifixion” was lacking in the studied time span, is it not anachronistic to use that very label? More will be said on this theme in the Discussion chapter.<sup>436</sup>

This conclusion becomes more relevant when considering the sparse, or often nonexistent, discussion of the area of definition among these scholars. One of the few exceptions is Kuhn.<sup>437</sup> His fairly distinct definition coheres well with what might be called a traditional view of crucifixion. No one will be surprised or offended by the suggestion, first, that a crucifixion is an attempted or completed execution; second, that the execution is a suspension, in which the victim is nailed or tied with his limbs

<sup>433</sup> Although Hengel in the ongoing discussion mentions a “crucifixion in the strict sense” (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 24) and thereby implies that he could also use the designation “crucifixion” in a non-strict sense. The difference between them appears to deal with whether the victim was alive or not. Hengel offers no clarification of the theme.

<sup>434</sup> O’COLLINS, “Crucifixion,” 1207.

<sup>435</sup> STOCKBAUER, *Kunstgeschichte des Kreuzes*, 7–8; STAUFFER, *Jerusalem und Rom*, 127; CHAPMAN, *Perception*, 32.

<sup>436</sup> See pp. 261–70.

<sup>437</sup> “Gemeint ist eine durch jegliche Art von ”Aufhängen” vollzogene (oder beabsichtigte) Hinrichtung an einem Pfahl oder Ähnlichen (weithin in unserer Zeit wohl ein Pfahl mit einem Querbalken), für die das Andauern der Todesqual im Gegensatz zu einem Erhängen durch Strangulation, aber auch zur Pfählung wesentlich ist” (KUHN, “Die Kreuzesstrafe,” 679).

to a vertical execution tool; third, that this is usually a pole, with or without crossbeam; fourth, that the victim is publicly displayed and subjected to an extended, painful death struggle. It is also consistent with the normal usage of the contemporary labels of the punishment in the Germanic languages.

The problem is that the combination of these unsurprising features excludes almost every ancient text – also the majority of the ones to which Kuhn refers. The absolute majority of the texts in which e.g. ἀνασταυροῦν and ἀνασκοποῖζειν are used cohere with the second feature: they describe some kind of suspension. Many of the texts contain features that have some resemblance to a traditional view of crucifixion. Several texts describe executionary suspensions,<sup>438</sup> or suspensions in which the victims appear to be nailed to the suspension tool.<sup>439</sup> There are, in addition, texts that mention features absent in Kuhn's definition, but often present in a traditional view of crucifixion, such as the carrying of a σταυρός<sup>440</sup> and a preceding scourging.<sup>441</sup>

However, if the aim is to sift out suspensions of living victims, who suffer an outdrawn painful execution on a pole, with or without crossbeam, the number drops significantly. Only a small number of texts indicate a living suspended victim.<sup>442</sup> This feature ought to exclude impaling and hanging (with no outdrawn death struggle) from the picture. Thus, if the aim is to find an ancient account of the punishment Jesus suffered according to the Christian traditions, i.e., a text which meets the four criteria that constitute a crucifixion according to Kuhn, only a modest number of texts are left.

Herodotus' only plausible contribution is his accounts of the execution of Artaÿctes.<sup>443</sup> The prevailing impression of these accounts is the absence of the assumed crucifixion terminology. Neither ἀνασταυροῦν, ἀνασκοποῖζειν nor σταυρός occurs in the texts. Instead, the suspension act is described by the verbs προσδιαπασσαλεύειν and προσπασσαλεύειν. In addition, the suspension tool appears to be a plank or a board (σάνις), not anything in the likeness of a cross (†).

Diodorus Siculus adds but one text to the group: his account of Agathocles' campaign against Utica.<sup>444</sup> He uses neither ἀνασταυροῦν nor

<sup>438</sup> E.g., Xen. *An.* 3.1.17; Diod. *Sic.* 3.65.5; Joseph. *AJ* 2.73, 77; 12.256; 13.380; *BJ* 1.97; 3.320–21; Char. *Chae. Call.* 8.7.8; Philo, *Flacc.* 84.

<sup>439</sup> Diod. *Sic.* 2.18.1; 25.5.2; Joseph. *BJ* 2.306–08; 5.449–51; Plut. *An vit.* 499D; Hdt. 7.33.1; 9.120.4.

<sup>440</sup> Plut. *De sera.* 554A–B; Char. *Chae. Call.* 4.2.6–7; 4.3.10.

<sup>441</sup> Joseph. *BJ* 2.306; *AJ* 12.256.

<sup>442</sup> Hdt. 7.194.1–3; Joseph. *Vit.* 420–21; Char. *Chae. Call.* 3.4.18.

<sup>443</sup> Hdt. 7.33.1; 9.120.4, 122.1.

<sup>444</sup> Diod. *Sic.* 20.54.7.

ἀνασκολοπίζειν in the text and does not describe a “normal” human suspension. The connection Diodorus Siculus makes between the citizens who were in danger of being nailed to the siege engine by their fellow Uticans and a σταυρός-punishment is interesting. Diodorus Siculus could at least envision a punishment in which the victim was executed by being nailed to a σταυρός.

The novelist Chariton has two key characters of his story suspended in a way that parallels several features of a traditional understanding of crucifixion. The text describes two ante-mortem suspensions which were possible to endure for a time. As a bonus, Chariton mentions a custom of making the victims themselves carry the execution tool.

In the end, the suspensions in Chariton come closest to the punishment that traditionally is labelled as “crucifixion.” Chariton shows that a suspension punishment in ancient Greek literature could be carried out in a way that coheres well with the basic events (an ante-mortem limb suspension) of the punishment which Jesus suffered on Calvary.

The remaining texts from authors such as Thucydides, Plato, Polybius, Josephus, Plutarch and Appian must be left out. The suspensions they describe cannot, with any degree of probability, be labeled as crucifixions.

There are, however, some conclusions in favor of the minimalistic approach of the present investigation that can be drawn from the otherwise rejected texts. Thucydides implies that ἀνασταυροῦν should be connected with impaling rather than with the punishment that the contemporary reader traditionally labels as crucifixion. Josephus’ contribution is to stress the variation in the implementation of the suspension punishments.<sup>445</sup> In spite of suspension accounts with parallels to the traditional view of crucifixion, such as the use of nails,<sup>446</sup> arms attached to the suspension device<sup>447</sup> and a preceding act of scourging,<sup>448</sup> none could be labeled as a crucifixion account. That is, they do not contain two or more of the characteristics of a crucifixion according to Kuhn’s definition – and a traditional view. Plutarch uses ἀνασταυροῦν in the widest sense – “to suspend something upon some wooden construction” – and appears to use σταυρός when referring to preferably pointed poles.

What is common ground for these otherwise rejected texts is that their diverse use of ἀνασταυροῦν and ἀνασκολοπίζειν stresses the diversity in the implementation of the suspension punishments at the expense of unity. It shows beyond doubt that neither of the verbs means “to crucify.”

---

<sup>445</sup> Joseph. *BJ* 5.449–51.

<sup>446</sup> Joseph. *BJ* 2.306–08; 5.449–51.

<sup>447</sup> Joseph. *AJ* 2.73.

<sup>448</sup> Joseph. *BJ* 2.306–08.

## Chapter Three

### Latin Literature

The texts in focus in this chapter are Latin texts from the advent of the Classical Latin language up to the beginning of the second century of the Common Era. Hengel comments on the occurrence of crucifixions in the Latin literature vis-à-vis the Greek that “the sources for crucifixion, which in the period of the empire markedly appears as a Roman punishment, are much fuller in Latin literature than in Greek.”<sup>1</sup>

Also in this chapter, the aim is to study the usage of the terminology assumed to be connected with the punishment of crucifixion as well as related terms. The guiding questions are simple: How do the specific authors use the terminology? To what kind of punishment do the terms refer – or rather, what knowledge can a present-day reader get from these texts about the form of punishment?

Due to the uncertainty concerning what the nouns *crux*, *patibulum*, *furca*, *stipes*, and *arbor infelix* refer to, they are often left untranslated in the quoted texts of this chapter. The noun *σταυρός* in the previous chapter had a prehistory, or at least a parallel usage, showing that it could refer to a simple “pole,” which makes *pole* a plausible translation of *σταυρός*. *crux* lacks this prehistory and has a significantly limited parallel use within a non-violent environment.<sup>2</sup> When the terms occur in the quoted texts only their number has been preserved; they are always written in the nominative case. The punishments are as a consequence labeled as *patibulum*-, *furca*- and *crux*-punishments. The nouns are consequently translated undetermined, unless the texts indicate that one specific and well-known punishment tool is in focus.

#### 1. Historians

##### 1.1. *Gaius Iulius Caesar*

Julius Caesar (100–44 B.C.E.) wrote about his campaign in Gaul and the Civil War. Besides these texts, there are some anonymous texts attributed

---

<sup>1</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 69.

<sup>2</sup> See Plin. *HN*. 14.12 (3).

to him about the Alexandrian, African and Spanish wars. These texts are often included in the *corpus caesianum*. Hengel refers to two crucifixions in these pseudepigraphal texts.<sup>3</sup>

Hengel uses the first text as one of several providing evidence that the Romans learnt the method of crucifixion from the Carthaginians.<sup>4</sup> The punishment is mentioned briefly. Caesar had sent forces in nightly raids to gain food. The Numidians tried to stop this with an ambush. A deserter revealed the plot to Caesar, and Caesar attacked. The Numidians were killed or fled as a result.

The next day, Juba attacked all the Numidians, who had lost [their] posts by flight and had retired to the camp, to a *crux* [*in cruce ... suffixit*].<sup>5</sup>

The interpretation of the text depends on what type of object the *crux* is, onto or upon which the victims were somehow attached. The noun is used once more in a text attributed to Caesar.

The same night I/we took spies, three slaves and one indigenous from the native legion. The slaves were suspended on a *crux* [*sunt in crucem sublati*], [while] the soldier was beheaded.<sup>6</sup>

Neither does this text reveal to what type of punishment tool the noun *crux* refers. The question is whether these two texts alone are sufficient to draw any conclusions about the usage of *crux*. The noun seems to refer to some type of punishment tool – without further definition. It appears that the only support Hengel has for his reading is a general assumption that *crux* means “cross” and that *suffigere* and *tollere* refer to an act of attaching a victim to a “cross.” That assumption will be examined in the following pages.

### 1.2. Gaius Sallustius Crispus

Sallust (c. 86–35 B.C.E.) left the inner circles of power in Rome a few years before the murder of Caesar and turned to history writing. Hengel refers to two crucifixions in the texts by Sallust.<sup>7</sup>

Sallust uses *crux* once and the derivatives (*ex*)*cruciare* and *cruciatius* several times in his texts.<sup>8</sup> *cruciare*, with or without the prefix, is used in a

<sup>3</sup> (Caes.) *B Afr.* 66 (23 n.10); *B Hisp.* 20 (38).

<sup>4</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 23 n. 10.

<sup>5</sup> (Caes.) *B Afr.* 66.4. *postero die Iuba Numidas eos qui loco amisso fuga se receperant in castra, in cruce omnes suffixit.*

<sup>6</sup> (Caes.) *B Hisp.* 20.5. *ea nocte speculatores prensi servi III et unus ex legione vernacula. servi sunt in crucem sublati, militi cervices abscisae.*

<sup>7</sup> Sall. *Iug.* 14.15 (23 n. 10); *Hist.* F 3.9 (40–41 n. 5).

<sup>8</sup> *crux* in *Iug.* 14.15; (*ex*)*cruciare* and *cruciatius* in *Cat.* 51.20; *Iug.* 14.21; 24.10; 26.3; 70.5; 82.3; *Hist. F. Amp.* Lep.59 (17); *Hist. F. Amp.* Cott.14 (3).



broad sense in Sallust's texts. It appears to describe some type of violent acts or torture without further specification.<sup>9</sup> Sallust appears also to connect the verb to a lethal punishment once.<sup>10</sup> He becomes slightly more specific the only time he uses *crux*.

Being captured by Jugurtha, some have been led to a *crux* [*in crucem acti*], and some have been led to wild beasts, [while] a few, whose lives have been spared, are left behind in the darkness of a dungeon, in sadness and sorrow, a life more grievous than death.<sup>11</sup>

The image of someone being led to a *crux* is easily perceived as some type of lethal punishment among the Numidians. However, it is still not possible to define either the nature of the suspension — if it was a suspension at all — or the form of the punishment tool.

The other text Hengel mentions is a fragment, which is an assumed Sallustian text preserved by a later author (the Latin grammarian and lexicographer Nonius Marcellus), and contains the only occurrence of *patibulum* in Sallust's texts.

In what had each most known (alt. why had the most famous) either been scourged, hung from a pole [*malo dependens*], or wickedly attached high up on a *patibulum* [*patibulo eminent affigebatur*] with unmutilated body?<sup>12</sup>

The text contains several interesting features. *malum* is referred to as a tool from which the tortured victim was left hanging to some extent, and at the end of the text a *patibulum* onto which the victims were attached high is described. Whether *patibulum* refers to a "crossbeam", i.e., a horizontal beam which together with the victim was attached high on a standing pole, or whether *patibulum* refers to the pole itself, i.e., just another kind of standing pole, is difficult to decide. The latter option is just as possible as the former. This text might thus indicate that Sallust — or at least the author who preserved the text — used both *malum* and *patibulum* in the way *crux* was used in the previous text. It is still not possible to determine to what type of punishment tools they referred to. Hengel's usage of these texts as references to crucifixion is therefore unsupported.

<sup>9</sup> Sall. *Cat.* 51.20; *Iug.* 14.21; 24.10; 70.5; 82.3.

<sup>10</sup> Sall. *Iug.* 26.3.

<sup>11</sup> Sall. *Iug.* 14.15. *capti ab Iugurtha pars in crucem acti, pars bestiis obiecti sunt, pauci, quibus relicta est anima, clausi in tenebris cum maerore et luctu morte gravioorem vitam exigunt.*

<sup>12</sup> Sall. *Hist.* F 3.9. *in quis notissimus quisque aut malo dependens verberabatur aut immutilato corpore improbe patibulo eminent affigebatur.*

## 1.3. Titus Livius

Titus Livius (59 B.C.E. – 17 C.E.) wrote about Roman history in his *Ab urbe condita libri* and covered the time from the assumed foundation of Rome until 9 B.C.E.<sup>13</sup> Both Hengel and Kuhn find several crucifixions in his writings.<sup>14</sup>

## 1.3.1. The Case against Horatius

Kuhn and Hengel do not label the first text as a crucifixion. It is nevertheless of interest since Livy describes a punishment with some resemblance to those in the other texts. Livy describes some legendary ancient events following the war between Rome and Alba Longa – a fight between the two triplet sets Horatii and Curatii. Only one of the Horatii, Horatius, survived the clash. On his triumphant return, Horatius met his sister weeping for one of the Curatii, whom she loved. Horatius became furious and killed his sister. The king found himself in the difficult situation of having to judge the successful hero. He appointed two men (*duumviri*) to judge Horatius' crime according to the law.

The horrible pronouncement of the law was: "The duumvirs shall judge [cases of] treason. If [the accused] appeals from the duumvirs [to the people], the appeal shall be heard. If [the appeal] is overruled, [the lictor] shall cover the head [of the accused]. [The lictor] shall hang [him] on a *infelix arbor* with a rope [*infelici arbori reste suspendito*] and scourge [him] either inside or outside the pomoerium."<sup>15</sup>

Horatius was condemned and the lictor was about to tie his hands when Horatius appealed. The appeal was brought before the people and Horatius' father interceded on behalf of his son. The father declared that his daughter had been justly slain and pointed out the impossibility of a conviction.

Meanwhile, having embraced the youth, showing the spoils of the Curatii fixed [*fixa*] on the spot now called *Pila Horatia*, the old man said: "Quirites, can you bear to see him, whom you saw marching and exalted, decorated by victory, tied under a *furca* [*sub furca vincutum*], in the midst of scourging and torture? A spectacle which hardly the eyes of the Albanians could bear without disgust. Go, lictor, bind the hands, which a little

<sup>13</sup> If nothing else is mentioned the references are to *Ab urbe condita libri*.

<sup>14</sup> Hengel: Liv. 22.13.9 (23 n. 10), 33.2; 28.37.2 (23 n. 10); 30.43.13 (29; 40 n. 2); 33.36.3; 38.48.13 (23 n. 10). Hengel also refers to Liv. 1.49 (43 n. 9) but that text does not mention any suspension). The reference to 38.28.12 (46 n. 1) appears erroneous; it ought to be 38.28.13 [cf. 23 n. 10].

Kuhn: Liv. 22.13.9 (719 n. 443), 22.33.2 (684); 29.18.14 (720 n. 447).

<sup>15</sup> Liv. 1.26.6–7. *lex horrendi carminis erat: duumviri perduellionem iudicent; si a duumviris provocarit, provocatione certato; si vincent, caput obnubito; infelici arbori reste suspendito; verberato vel intra pomerium vel extra pomerium.*

[time] ago were armed and made an empire for the Roman people. Go, cover the head of the liberator of this city. Suspend him on an *arbor infelix* [*arbore infelici suspende*]. Scourge him either inside the *pomoerium*, by means among javelins and spoils of the enemies, or outside the *pomoerium*, by means among the graves of the Curatii. For to what place can you lead this youth, where his own decoration will not liberate [him] from such a shameful punishment?"<sup>16</sup>

Horatius was released. The question of what kind of punishment Horatius was threatened with is not easily answered. The Roman *furca* is difficult to define.<sup>17</sup> The *furca* is generally supposed to be some kind of a two-armed yoke, which the condemned was forced to carry.<sup>18</sup> However, whether the *furca* was carried or not in Livy's texts is unclear. Livy uses the noun in different ways. In 2.36.1 Livy describes a slave who appears to be driven through the Circus Maximus, having been beaten "*sub furca*" (*sub furca caesum medio egerat circo*). It is possible to interpret the text as describing the *furca* as a carried device. Otherwise, the noun refers to a rod or stick, possibly fork-shaped.<sup>19</sup>

The *furca* in the quoted text above refers to some kind of punishment tool. This tool could be either a two-armed yoke or a pole, onto which the condemned was tied with a rope – or perhaps suspended from if it was standing and of sufficient height. Which one of these Livy aimed to describe – if he knew what a *furca* was at all – is difficult to decide. However, the *arbor infelix* may offer some guidance. Livy implies that the victim was in this case suspended on the *arbor infelix*. The question is whether *furca* and *arbor infelix* refer to the same punishment in the text. If so, the *furca* appears to be a pole onto which victims were suspended.

---

<sup>16</sup> Liv. 1.26.10–11. *inter haec senex iuvenem amplexus, spolia Curiatorum fixa eo loco qui nunc pila Horatia appellatur ostentans, "huncine" aiebat, "quem modo decoratum ovantemque victoria incedentem vidistis, Quirites, eum sub furca vincitum inter verbera et cruciatus videre potestis? quod vix Albanorum oculi tam deforme spectaculum ferre possent. i, lictor, colliga manus, quae paulo ante armatae imperium populo Romano pepererunt. i, caput obnube liberatoris urbis huius; arbore infelici suspende; verbera vel intra pomerium, modo inter illa pila et spolia hostium, vel extra pomerium, modo inter sepulcra Curiatorum. quo enim ducere hunc iuvenem potestis ubi non sua decora eum a tanta foeditate supplicii vindicent?"*

<sup>17</sup> FULDA, *Das Kreuz*, 254; KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 681 (732 n. 508).

<sup>18</sup> S.v. OLD; FULDA, *Das Kreuz*, 254–63 (see also "Tab. 2" in the end of the book for an illustration). When Suetonius describes an "old-style execution" (*antiqui moris supplicium* [Suet. *Claud.* 34.1]), he mentions that a *furca* was attached to the neck of the naked victim, who was then scourged to death (Suet. *Ner.* 49.2). See the comments on pp. 169–70.

<sup>19</sup> Liv. 1.35.9 refers to some kind of poles that supported a platform for knights and patricians in the Circus Maximus (*spectauere furcis duodenos ab terra spectacula alta sustinentibus pedes*); 28.3.7 refers to forks used to push down climbers (*etiam qui erexerant ad murum scalas, alii furcis ad id ipsum factis detrudebantur*).

If not, the *furca* may be a punishment tool that was carried. The latter option seems most plausible.

It is worth notice that Livy once uses an opposite expression, *felix arbor*, when he refers to a fruit-bearing tree.<sup>20</sup> The expression *arbor infelix* might then simply refer to a non-fruit-bearing tree, probably in a pejorative sense. However, the expression might also have a more distinctive usage since it has been used for a tree consecrated to the gods of the underworld.<sup>21</sup> The conclusion drawn in the present investigation is that the *furca* and the *arbor infelix* refer to two different punishment forms. The *furca* was used before the *arbor infelix*, as some kind of shame or torture device. The *arbor infelix* could be some kind of pole upon which the victim was suspended. Livy implies also – if the clause order is significant – that the scourging occurred after the punishment. Thus, the punishment on the *arbor infelix* might not be lethal at all.

### 1.3.2. Livy's Use of *crux*

Livy also offers a number of texts which all have the common theme that they contain *crux* in combination with *tollere*, *sufferre* or *affigere*.<sup>22</sup> An example is the text below, where Livy describes some events that occurred during Hannibal's campaign in Italy. Due to some Carthaginian problems with pronouncing Latin names, a guide misinterpreted a city name and led Hannibal's troops in the wrong direction.<sup>23</sup> Hannibal became furious.

And having beaten the guide with rods, he suspended [the guide] on a *crux* [*in cruce* *sublato*], to terrify the others.<sup>24</sup>

As in the case of Sallust, Livy uses both *crux* and its derivatives (*ex*)*cruciare* and *cruciat*. He appears to use the latter ones in the same way as Sallust, in reference to some kind of unspecified torture.<sup>25</sup> When it comes to *crux*, Livy does not use it beyond these punishment texts. As mentioned, there is no general, that is, nonviolent, usage of the noun that could guide the interpretative effort. The noun generally refers to some kind of device on which criminals were suspended.<sup>26</sup> *crux* appears thus to

<sup>20</sup> Liv. 5.24.2.

<sup>21</sup> S.v. *OLD*.

<sup>22</sup> Liv. 22.13.9; 28.37.2; 30.43.13; 33.36.3; 38.48.13; Liv. *Perioch.* 17.15.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Plut. *Fab. Max.* 6.3 above on p. 112.

<sup>24</sup> Liv. 22.13.8–9. *virgisque caeso duce et ad reliquorum terrorem in cruce sublato*.

<sup>25</sup> Liv. 1.26.10; 4.12.11; 9.10.4; 21.44.4; 24.5.11; 25.23.7; 26.12.12, 13.5, 14, 18; 29.18.14; 40.23.9.

<sup>26</sup> S.v. *OLD*.

have a more limited usage than its Greek counterpart σταυρός, which also, as mentioned, refers to poles in general. The question is, however, whether the usage is limited enough to cover only the execution tool used in the punishment of crucifixion as it is commonly depicted – a “cross” (†).

Livy offers a similar construction in six additional texts. The first contains a different verb. The event also occurred during Hannibal’s campaign. The winter had brought the fighting about Gereonium to a standstill. Livy refers to some events in Rome that occurred about this time. A Carthaginian spy was betrayed and caught; his hands were cut off and he was released. Somehow connected with this event was the punishment of some slaves.

And twenty-five slaves, because they had conspired in the campus Martius, were led to a *crux* [*in cruce[m] acti*].<sup>27</sup>

Livy does not specify the suspension form beside the use of *crux*. The second text contains yet another verb. The event comes from Livy’s description of Mago, Hannibal’s youngest brother, and his failed attempts to attack Carthago Nova and to reenter Gades. Livy describes Mago’s retribution when he found the gates of Gades closed.

He called forth the *sufetes*, who is the highest magistrate for the Phoenicians, together with the treasurer, and after he had mutilated [them] with rods he ordered that they should be attached on a *crux* [*cruci adfigi*].<sup>28</sup>

Livy offers in this text, too, no further information on the punishment form. However, his use of *affigere* otherwise may offer a hint. He uses the verb on several occasions in connection with acts of nailing or stabbing. Livy uses the verb to describe when people were pinned to the ground by spears (Liv. 4.19.5; 8.7.11; 29.2.1), a thigh pinned to a horse by an arrow or spear (Liv. 4.28.8) and spoils of enemies attached to walls (Liv. 10.7.9). Hence, it is not possible to exclude the possibility that *affigere* in combination with *crux* might describe an act of nailing on a pole. But Livy’s use of the terminology is still too unspecific to draw the conclusion that these texts are references to the punishment of crucifixion.

In the third text, Livy deals with some events after the fall of Carthage. A peace treaty had been signed and Scipio oversaw the disarming of the Carthaginian army and the return of deserters and runaway slaves.

---

<sup>27</sup> Liv. 22.33.1–2. *et servi quinque et viginti in cruce[m] acti, quod in campo Martio coniurassent.*

<sup>28</sup> Liv. 28.37.2. *ad conloquium sufetes eorum, qui summus Poenis est magistratus, cum quaestore elicuit, laceratosque verberibus cruci adfigi iussit.*

The deserters were treated more severely than the runaway [slaves]; those of Latin stock were beheaded with an ax, [while those with] Roman [names] were suspended on a *crux* [*in cruce[m] sublati*].<sup>29</sup>

The fourth text contains Livy's description of the aftermath of a slave insurrection in Etruria. Manius Acilius Glabrio, later consul in Rome and the one who defeated Antiochus the Great (III) at Thermopylae, suppressed the revolt.

On this occasion many were slaughtered, many were captured; others who had been the leaders of the conspiracy he scourged and attached to *cruces* [*crucibus adfixit*], [while] he returned others to [their] masters.<sup>30</sup>

The fifth text comes from Livy's retelling of a speech held by the Roman consul Gnaeus Manlius in the aftermath of the capture of Antiochus the Great. In a few words, Manlius offers a glimpse of the reputation of the Carthaginians. He comments on the Carthaginian senate:

Where it is said [that] the generals are suspended on a *crux* [*in cruce[m] tolli*].<sup>31</sup>

The sixth and last text of the present category is found in the probably later added summary of the seventeenth book.<sup>32</sup> Livy describes the fate of Hannibal (the Great).

Hannibal, the Carthaginian general, was suspended on a *crux* [*in cruce[m] sublatus est*] by his own soldiers, when the fleet which he commanded had been defeated.<sup>33</sup>

The common theme of these texts is that they do not contain any further description of the nature of the suspension. Hengel nevertheless labels six, and Kuhn two, of the texts as references to crucifixions.<sup>34</sup> This is awkward since Livy does not offer any information whether the victims were alive or dead when suspended; whether they were tied, nailed, impaled or attached in another way; or onto what they were attached, other

<sup>29</sup> Liv. 30.43.13. *de perfugis gravius quam de fugitivis consultum: nominis Latini qui erant securi percussi, Romani in cruce[m] sublati.*

<sup>30</sup> Liv. 33.36.3. *ex his multi occisi, multi capti; alios verberatos crucibus adfixit, qui principes coniurationis fuerant, alios dominis restituit.*

<sup>31</sup> Liv. 38.48.13. *ubi in cruce[m] tolli imperatores dicuntur.*

<sup>32</sup> See s.v. *OCD*.

<sup>33</sup> Liv. *Perioch.* 17.15. *Hannibal, dux Poenorum, victa classe, cui praefuerat, a militibus suis in cruce[m] sublatus est.*

<sup>34</sup> Hengel: 22.13.9; 22.33.2; 28.37.2; 30.43.13; 33.36.3; 38.48.14; Kuhn: 22:13.9; 22.33.2. Kuhn mentions in addition to these texts also Liv. 29.18.14 and seems to label it as a crucifixion (KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 720 n. 447). The problem is that this text appears to describe an act of torture and not a crucifixion as defined by Kuhn. The legatus threw the soldiers in chains, scourged them and tortured them in an unspecified way, and killed them *afterwards* (*tribunos militum in vincla coniectos, dein verberatos servilibusque omnibus suppliciis cruciatos occidit, mortuos deinde prohibuit sepeliri*).

than that it was called a *crux*. The only additional information comes from the text in which Livy describes the trial of Horatius, antiquated even for him (Liv. 1.26). Here Livy indicates that ropes were used, but in this text Livy uses a different terminology and may thus refer to what in his eyes was another kind of punishment than in the subsequent texts. When it comes to the texts with *crux*, the verb *affigere* might offer a glimpse since Livy uses it in connection with acts of nailing or stabbing. However, it is also possible to use this piercing connotation of the verb as an indication of impaling.

### 1.3.3. Conclusion – Livy

Livy refers to several punishments in his text, which fall into two categories. The first category is the *furca*- and *arbor infelix*-punishment. According to Livy both the *furca* and the *arbor infelix* were a punishment tool onto which a victim was tied and, in some cases when it comes to *arbor infelix*, was hanged beneath or upon. It is also possible to find vague indications that the punishment was not an execution, since the clause order indicates that the victims were scourged afterwards. The second category is the *crux*-punishment. The victim was attached to, or suspended upon, the *crux* in some way, although it is not known in *what* way. Neither is it known whether the victim was dead or alive; it is thus unknown whether it was an execution or not. Livy does not offer much help for the effort to define what a *crux* is. Thus, in the end the suspensions accounts in the texts by Livy are too vague to be of any help in the study of crucifixion.

### 1.4. Valerius Maximus

Valerius Maximus (first century C.E.) was active during Tiberius' reign and composed a set of books containing memorable deeds and sayings (*facta ac dicta memorabilia*). Hengel and Kuhn find some references to crucifixions in Valerius Maximus' texts.<sup>35</sup>

In some texts, Valerius Maximus simply refers to *crux* without further notice.<sup>36</sup> Hengel labels one of these as a crucifixion reference, but the text does not reveal anything beyond the notion that a slave was led to a

---

<sup>35</sup> Hengel: Val. Max. 2.7.12 (29–30; 51 + n. 1); 2.7 ext. 1 (23 n. 10; 46 n. 1); 6.3.5 (55 n. 8); 6.9.15 (80 n. 28); 6.9 ext. 2 (24 n. 13 [the reference is erroneous in the English translation; it should say 6.9 ext. 5 like the German Vorlage]; 31 n. 23 [correct reference]); 8.4.2 (59). Kuhn: Val. Max. 2.7.12 (719 + n. 441; 739; 755).

<sup>36</sup> Val. Max. 2.7.9; 9.2 ext. 3.

*crux*.<sup>37</sup> Valerius Maximus combines *crux* with a verb in a number of texts, such as the following.

When he had conquered Carthage and brought into his power all those who had deserted from our armies to the enemies, he punished the Roman [deserters] more severely than the Latins. He attached the former to *cruces* [*crucibus adfixit*] as runaways from [their] country, [and] beheaded the latter with an ax as faithless allies.<sup>38</sup>

This text does not reveal the nature of the punishment. Hengel both refers to and quotes the text.

Valerius Maximus (2.7.12) says that the older Scipio punished Roman deserters at the end of the Second Punic War more harshly (*gravius*) than the Latin allies: he crucified the former as renegades and traitors, but beheaded the latter as treacherous allies.<sup>39</sup>

Kuhn discusses the connection between slaves and the punishment of crucifixion and concludes regarding Valerius Maximus' text:

[D]as ist offenbar der einzige Beleg bis über die ersten beiden Jahrhunderte n. Chr. hinaus, der *servile supplicium* (oder ähnlich) ausdrücklich als Kreuzigung identifiziert.<sup>40</sup>

The question remains, however: is it possible to determine that the text refers to a crucifixion at all? Unless it is possible to show that *crux* simply means "cross" (†), the answer is negative.

Nor does a text that Hengel twice labels as a crucifixion reference reveal what kind of punishment it describes.<sup>41</sup> The text follows a description of flogging and beheading of Roman citizens.

This [action] of the Conscript Fathers was mild, if we care to look upon the violence of the Carthaginian senate in ordering military affairs, by which generals who mismanaged campaigns, even if fortune followed them, were attached to a/the *crux* [*cruci ... suffigebantur*].<sup>42</sup>

The text offers the same level of information as the previous one and it is thus difficult to determine the kind of punishment to which it refers.<sup>43</sup>

<sup>37</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 59. The text is Val. Max. 8.4.2 (*in crucem actus est*).

<sup>38</sup> Val. Max. 2.7.12. *si quidem devicta Carthagine, cum omnes, qui ex nostris exercitibus ad poenos transierant, in suam potestatem redeisset, gravius in Romanos quam in Latinos transfugas animadvertit: hos enim tamquam patriae fugitivos crucibus adfixit, illos tamquam perfidos socios securi percussit.*

<sup>39</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 29–30.

<sup>40</sup> KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 719 + n. 441 (cf. 739, 55).

<sup>41</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 23; 46 (cf. also FULDA, *Das Kreuz*, 51).

<sup>42</sup> Val. Max. 2.7 ext. 1. *leniter hoc patres conscripti, si Carthaginiensium senatus in militiae negotiis procurandis violentiam intueri velimus, a quo duces bella pravo consilio gerentes, etiam si prospera fortuna subsecuta esset, cruci tamen suffigebantur.*

<sup>43</sup> See also the text in Val. Max. 6.2 ext. 3.



The absence of a definite article in the Latin language becomes pivotal in this text (at least for a reader familiar with Greek). Are the generals attached to a single unidentified *crux* or are they handed over to *the crux* figuratively? Three other texts by Valerius Maximus are equally unspecified, in spite of Hengel's classification of them.<sup>44</sup>

The noun *patibulum* is used once by Valerius Maximus, in a description of cruelty. The character of the text is a certain Damasippius.

By his orders the heads of the leaders were mixed with the heads of sacrificial victims, and the mutilated body of Carbo Arvina was borne around attached to a *patibulum* [*patibulo adfixum*].<sup>45</sup>

The carrying device is a beam of some kind. A contemporary reader with some knowledge of Christian theology and art could easily imagine that the body was attached to a beam that was destined to be a crossbeam of what today is deemed to be a regular a cross. However, such understanding of the text depends on whether it is possible to link the noun to the sole meaning of a crossbeam, in the sense of a *vertical beam* of a cross (†). The text *per se* does not shed any further light on the usage of *patibulum*. The light should come from other occurrences of *patibulum*. When it comes to *furca*, Valerius Maximus follows the main usage of the noun and uses it as some kind of torture device. The head of a household “led a slave of his, who had been beaten with rods, under a *furca* to punishment.”<sup>46</sup> Why and for what purpose this was done, the text is silent about.

#### 1.4.1. Conclusion – Valerius Maximus

Valerius Maximus uses mainly *crux* in his texts, but he does not reveal to what the noun refers. It is some kind of device onto which a victim is attached in some way. A *patibulum* is some kind of beam, which could be used to carry a beheaded corpse, and a *furca* is some kind of torture device.

#### 1.5. Cornelius Tacitus

Tacitus (ca. 56–after 118) produced several historical treatises. Beyond his well-known reference to Jesus, Tacitus mentions quite a few suspension

<sup>44</sup> Val. Max. 6.3.5 (*cruci fixit*); 6.9.15 (*crucibus adfixit*); 6.9 ext. 5 (*cruci adfixit*).

<sup>45</sup> Val. Max. 9.2.3. *cuius iussu principum civitatis capita hostiarum capitibus permixta sunt, Carbonisque Arvinae truncum corpus patibulo adfixum gestatum est.*

<sup>46</sup> Val. Max. 1.7.4. *servum suum verberibus mulcatum sub furca ad supplicium egisset.* The noun is also used in Val. Max. 5.1 ext. 5 and 7.2 ext. 17 but there as a geographical reference to the Caudine Forks, a narrow mountain gorge in Samnium (these texts might offer a imaginary glimpse of what a *furca* looked like).

punishments. Both Hengel and Kuhn label several of these as crucifixions.<sup>47</sup> Kuhn considers Tacitus, together with Suetonius, to be the primary source of historical knowledge of crucifixion in the early Roman Principate.<sup>48</sup>

### 1.5.1. Tacitus' Use of Assumed Crucifixion Terminology

Neither Hengel nor Kuhn acknowledges the first text, perhaps because Tacitus does not use the regular terminology. He nevertheless describes a suspension punishment that ought to be noticed. When he describes the juridical praxis of the Germans, he mentions two forms of death penalties.

Punishments are distinguished according to the transgressions: Traitors and deserters they suspended on trees [*arboribus suspendunt*]; cowards, poor fighters and [those with] notoriously degenerate vices they plunged into swamps, with a hurdle put over them.<sup>49</sup>

As was the case with previous authors, it is not possible to determine what specific kind of suspension punishment Tacitus ascribes to the Germans. This feature might be more central than it appears to be at first glance. Perhaps it was not necessary for Tacitus to specify in what way the Germans suspended their worst criminals. They were suspended in one way or another – like many others in Tacitus' world – and that was enough. As mentioned before, Tacitus uses neither *affigere* nor *crux* or *patibulum* in the present text, but he uses *arbor* in a similar fashion in a later text.<sup>50</sup>

In the second text, Tacitus briefly mentions a punishment that is described in connection with the aftermath of the war between Vitellius and Vespasian. Lucilius Bassus, loyal to Vitellius, was sent out to restore order in Campania. The mere sight of the soldiers had its effect, except in the city of Tarracina, loyal to Vespasian.

<sup>47</sup> Hengel: Tac. *Ann.* 1.61.4 (23 n. 8); 4.72.3 (23 n. 8); 14.33.2 (23 n. 9); 15.44.4 (26); *Hist.* 4.3.2 (60).

Kuhn: Tac. *Ann.* 1.61.4 (681); 4.72.3 (681; 705 + n. 342); 14.33.2 (706 + n. 346); 15.44.4 (659 + n. 42; 696–97); *Hist.* 2.72.1f (691; 721, 30); 4.3.2 (681; 692); 4.11.3 (692).

<sup>48</sup> KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 68 ff.

<sup>49</sup> Tac. *Germ.* 12. *distinctio poenarum ex delicto: proditores et transfugas arboribus suspendunt, ignavos et imbelles et corpore infames caeno ac palude, iniecta insuper crate, mergunt.*

<sup>50</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 1.61.1–3 (pp. 163–64).

[The Tarracines found] comfort [in seeing] the slave of Vergilius Capito, whom we had mentioned as the betrayer of Tarracina, attached to a *patibulum* [*patibulo adfixus*] wearing the same rings he had received from Vitellius.<sup>51</sup>

Both Hengel and Kuhn identify this text as a reference to crucifixion.<sup>52</sup> There is, however, nothing either in the text or in Tacitus' overall use of *patibulum* that supports Hengel's and Kuhn's reading.<sup>53</sup> It is difficult to specify what Tacitus refers to with *patibulum*, other than that it is an object onto which people were attached in some way, in some condition and for some purpose. The verb *affigere* used here, in *Ann.* 4.3 (in combination with *patibulum*) and in *Ann.* 15.44 (in connection with *crux*), does not reveal the nature of the punishment either. One cannot infer anything more than simply an act of unspecified attaching to some kind of pole or a beam.

Hengel refers, in addition, to some texts in Tacitus' *Histories* when he discusses crucifixion as a "slave punishment."<sup>54</sup> It is correct that both texts mention a punishment that was apparently used on slaves (*supplicium in servilem modum* [2.72]; *servili supplicio* [4.11]), but neither text shows what kind of punishment a "slave punishment" was in Tacitus' eyes. As Hengel observes, Livy and Valerius Maximus mention slaves in connection with a *crux*-punishment. But that, as proposed by the present investigation, is not a sufficient basis for concluding that Tacitus connects slaves with a *crux*-punishment – and connects a *crux*-punishment with the punishment traditionally called "crucifixion".

Tacitus mentions several suspensions in his *Annales*. The first text below contains *patibulum* and is observed by both Hengel and Kuhn.<sup>55</sup> However, Tacitus mentions briefly also another kind of punishment in the same paragraph, some lines earlier, which is not observed by them. Both punishments become visible by quoting a larger portion of the text.

In the middle of the field were the whitening bones, scattered or piled, [of men who] had either fled or resisted. Nearby lay fragments of weapons, together with skulls fastened on trunks of trees [*truncis arborum antefixa ora*]. [In] the neighboring groves were barbarous altars, on which they had sacrificed tribunes as well as first-rank centurions. And survivors of the disaster, [who] had escaped the battle or [their] chains, reported that here the legates fell, [and] there the eagles were seized. [They described] where the first wounds had been inflicted upon Varus, where the miserable man found death by a stroke of his own hand. [They described] the tribunal where Arminius had harangued

<sup>51</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 4.3. *solacio fuit servus Vergilii Capitonis, quem proditorem Tarracensium diximus, patibulo adfixus in isdem anulis quos acceptos a Vitellio gestabat.*

<sup>52</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 60; KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 681; 692.

<sup>53</sup> See Tac. *Ann.* 1.61.1–3; 4.72.3; 14.33.2.

<sup>54</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 4.11; 2.72 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 51 n. 1).

<sup>55</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 23 n. 8; KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 687.

[his army], the numbers of *patibula* [*quot patibula captivis*] for the captives, the pits, and how he insulted the standards and the eagles by [his] arrogance.<sup>56</sup>

It is difficult to decide what kind of tools these *patibula* refer to on the basis of this single text, and, as mentioned, Tacitus' overall use of the noun does not solve the problem. In the context of the noun, however, are the tree-trunks on which skulls were attached. It appears that Tacitus in the first occurrence (*truncis arborum antefixa ora*) describes one kind of punishment and in the second (*quot patibula captivis*) simply some other kind of tool used in some other kind of punishment. To reach further the focus must be on the remaining occurrences of *patibulum* in Tacitus' texts.

In the first text of the *Annales*, Tacitus briefly mentions an act of violence that contained an act of attaching to a *patibulum*. The Roman centurion Olennius had punished the northern tribe of Frisians, who had violated the peace, by handing over some of them to bondage. Tacitus describes the reaction of the Frisians as follows.

Hence [came] anger and complaint, and since [there was] no relief, [they sought] liberation by war. The soldiers who were [appointed to collect] the tribute were seized and attached to a/the *patibulum* [*patibulo adfixi*].<sup>57</sup>

Also this text is difficult to define. It is simply not possible to decide what kind of punishment Tacitus describes. The absence of a definite article becomes once again crucial.<sup>58</sup> It is possible, though not probable, that they in some way were attached to some kind of device big enough for several soldiers (plural) to be attached to the same (singular) *patibulum*.

In the third text of the *Annales*, things become more interesting since Tacitus uses *patibulum* side by side with *crux*. The text occurs in connection with Tacitus' description of the situation in Britain under Suetonius Paulinus. Suetonius had marched straight through the midst of the enemy to London(ium). Tacitus compared the fate of inhabitants of London with that of the municipality of Verulamium. Due to the Verulamianian

<sup>56</sup> Tac. Ann. 1.61.1-3. *medio campi albertia ossa, ut fugerant, ut restiterant, disiecta vel aggerata. adiacebant fragmina telorum equorumque artus, simul truncis arborum antefixa ora. lucis propinquis barbarae arae, apud quas tribunos ac primorum ordinum centuriones mactaverant. et cladis eius superstites, pugnam aut vincula elapsi, referebant hic cecidisse legatos, illic raptas aquilas; primum ubi vulnus Varo adactum, ubi infelici dextera et suo ictu mortem invenerit; quo tribunali contionatus Arminius, quot patibula captivis, quae scrobes, utque signis et aquilis per superbiam inluserit.*

<sup>57</sup> Tac. Ann. 4.72.3. *hinc ira et questus, et postquam non subveniebatur, remedium ex bello. rapti qui tributo aderant milites et patibulo adfixi.* Cf. 1.61.4. Note, in his *Germania* 12.1, Tacitus does imply the use of trees instead of *patibulum*. "They suspend traitors and deserters in trees" (*proditores et transfugas arboribus suspendunt*).

<sup>58</sup> Cf. Val. Max. 2.7 ext. 1 (p. 160).

indolence, the city fell and seventy thousand Roman citizens and allies were killed. Tacitus offers a dense description of their fate.

For indeed, it was not to seize [prisoners] or to sell [them], or any commerce of war, that [the enemy] hastened, but [they hastened] with slaughters, *patibula*, fires and *cruces*, just like men who shall pay the penalty but only after they had taken vengeance.<sup>59</sup>

The uncertainty regarding the translation of *patibulum* is not resolved by this text. The text appears to contain a rhetorical effect. The point is that the villains were murderers (those who committed *caedes*). To emphasize this, three – different or connected – horrible things somehow related to an act of killing are mentioned (*patibulum*, *ignis* and *crux*).<sup>60</sup>

However, this rhetorical feature may blur the picture regarding the usage of *patibulum* even more. The way Tacitus mentions both *patibulum* and *crux* in the same sentence – with a different form of punishment in between – may suggest that they do not refer to two parts of one and the same punishment tool. Perhaps Tacitus mentions two different punishment forms, one in which *patibulum* is used and one in which *crux* is used. It is thus awkward to argue that *crux* is a standing pole while *patibulum* refers to the crossbeam with this text in mind.<sup>61</sup> It is plausible to assume that both tools are used in the spectrum of punishment forms described in ancient texts – which from time to time were suspensions. In the eyes of Tacitus there is probably a distinction between *patibulum* and *crux* – why would he otherwise mention them both? – but that distinction is not possible to trace in his texts. For the contemporary reader it is lost.

Tacitus' *magnum opus* – as far as the topic of crucifixion in general and the fate of Jesus in particular are concerned – contains several features of interest. While describing the aftermath of the great fire of Rome, Tacitus mentions Nero's scapegoats and reveals the cruelty of the king.

But neither human efforts, nor generosity of the first man or the appeasing of god could banish the malicious belief that the conflagration was ordered. Therefore, to get rid of the rumors Nero substituted as guilty and inflicted the most outrageous punishments upon those stigmatized by their shameful acts, the multitude called Christians. During the reign of Tiberius the founder of the name, Christus, was subjected to an execution [*supplicio adfectus erat*] by Pontius Pilate, and the destructive superstition was restrained for the moment [until] it broke out again, not only in Judea, where the evil began, but in

<sup>59</sup> Tac. *Ann.*, 14.33.2. *neque enim capere aut venundare aliudve quod belli commercium, sed caedes patibula ignes cruces, tamquam reddituri supplicium at praerepta interim ultione, festinabant.*

<sup>60</sup> Thus read as, *sed caedes: patibula, ignes, cruces.*

<sup>61</sup> See, e.g., BLINZLER, *Der Prozeß Jesu*, 360; O'COLLINS, "Crucifixion," 1208–09; SCHNEIDER, "σταυρός, κτλ." 573–74; STAUFFER, *Jerusalem und Rom*, 127; WINTER, *On the Trial of Jesus*, 95–96; ZESTERMANN, *Die bildliche Darstellung*, 13–23.

the capital also, where all [things] horrible and shameful from all parts [of the world] came together and become popular. First, then, [the members of the sect] who confessed were arrested; next, upon their information a great multitude was convicted, not so much according to the accusation of conflagration as for hatred against mankind. And mockery was added to [their] passing away, by being covered with wild beast's skin in order to be torn to death by dogs, or being attached to *cruces* [*crucibus adfixi*], or being put into flames, and, where the daylight had withdrawn, being burnt serving as lamps by night. Nero had offered his gardens for the spectacle and held a show in the circus in order to wear a charioteer's [dress] and mingled with the people or standing on a chariot. Hence, although he had been focusing on criminals and they had deserved the unusual punishment, compassion was stirred, just as it was not for the public benefit they were destroyed, but for [the cruelty of] one single man.<sup>62</sup>

Nothing in the text suggests that Tacitus connects the punishment [*supplicio*] of Jesus with the attaching to *cruces* [*crucibus adfixi*] of the Christians.<sup>63</sup> It is thus difficult to argue that the punishments are the same. The only possible argument in favor of interpreting both punishments as one and the same is a general assumption that a *summum supplicium* by definition is crucifixion.<sup>64</sup> The problem is, however, that Tacitus does not offer any negative or strengthening attribute to the noun in the quoted text above. It is just referred to as "a punishment." On the other hand, when he describes the punishment of Jews under Quadratus (*Ann.* 12.54) and mentions a capital punishment, he uses there a different, and stronger, terminology (*capite poenas*). The label "ultimate punishment" [*novissima exempla*] at the end of the text appears to cover not only the attachment to *cruces*, but also the fate of being killed by dogs as well as being burnt in Nero's gardens.

---

<sup>62</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 15.44. *sed non ope humana, non largitionibus principis aut deum placamentis decedebat infamia, quin iussum incendium crederetur. ergo abolendo rumori Nero subdidit reos et quaesitissimis poenis adfecit, quos per flagitia invisos vulgus Christianos appellabat. auctor nominis eius Christus Tiberio imperitante per procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio adfectus erat; repressaque in praesens exitiabilis superstitio rursus erumpebat, non modo per Iudaeam, originem eius mali, sed per urbem etiam, quo cuncta undique atrocita aut pudenda confluunt celebranturque. igitur primum correpti qui fatebantur, deinde indicio eorum multitudo ingens haud proinde in crimine incendiū quam odio humani generis convicti sunt. et pereuntibus addita ludibria, ut ferarum tergis contacti laniatu canum interirent, aut crucibus adfixi aut flammandi, atque ubi defecisset dies, in usum nocturni luminis urerentur. hortos suos ei spectaculo Nero obtulerat et circense ludicrum edebat, habitu aurigae permixtus plebi vel curriculo insistsens. unde quamquam adversus sontis et novissima exempla meritos miseratio oriebatur, tamquam non utilitate publica, sed in saevitiam unius absumerentur.*

<sup>63</sup> The punishment form that was inflicted upon Jesus is not specified by Tacitus, as observed by Kuhn (KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 658).

<sup>64</sup> So HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 33–38.

## 1.5.2. Conclusion – Tacitus

Tacitus uses in several texts a terminology, such as *patibulum*, *crux* and *affigere*, which is commonly connected with the punishment of crucifixion. However, the rather surprising – and apparently the only plausible – conclusion that can be drawn on the basis of a reading of Tacitus' text is that it cannot be decided whether he describes a crucifixion in a traditional sense, surprisingly enough not even in the case of Jesus. Tacitus describes several kinds of punishments in his texts, but he is not specific enough for the present reader to decide what kind of punishments.

1.6. *Gaius Suetonius Tranquillus*

Suetonius (76–138 C.E.) constitutes the latter time limit for the present investigation. In his most famous work *De vita Caesarum* he offers a set of twelve biographies of the Roman rulers from Caesar to Domitian. In these texts both Hengel and Kuhn find several references to crucifixions.<sup>65</sup>

1.6.1. Suetonius' Use of *crux* and Accompanying Verbs

In one text Suetonius offers an example of Caesar's gentle mind in his description of Caesar's early travel to Rhodes for philosophical and rhetorical studies. On the way across the Aegean Sea, Cilician pirates kidnapped him. The pirates failed to identify their prisoner, who was then released by a ransom and later returned and seized his kidnappers.<sup>66</sup>

Also when it came to take vengeance his nature was most gentle. When he had brought the pirates, by whom he had been taken, into his dominion, since he had earlier sworn to attach them on a *crux* [*suffixurum se cruci*], he let them be attached [*suffigi*], but only after he had ordered to cut [their] throats.<sup>67</sup>

In the text, in which Hengel detects a reference to crucifixion,<sup>68</sup> Suetonius does not offer any indications beyond the use of *suffigere* and *crux*. The text implies, however, that it is a relief to be killed before the suspension. This feature could be seen as an indication of a connection between *crux* and outdrawn suffering. To approach the answer to the question of what

<sup>65</sup> Hengel: Suet. *Iul.* 74.1 (80); *Calig.* 12.2 (60); *Galb.* 9.2 (40); *Dom.* 11.1 (80).

Kuhn: Suet. *Calig.* 12.2 (693; 722); *Dom.* 10.1 (693; 721), 11.1 (693; 722); *Galb.* 9.1 (703–4; 737).

<sup>66</sup> Suet. *Iul.* 4.2 (cf. Plut. *Caes.* 1–2).

<sup>67</sup> Suet. *Iul.* 74.1. *sed et in ulciscendo natura lenissimus piratas, a quibus captus est, cum in dicionem redeisset, quoniam suffixurum se cruci ante irauerat, iugulari prius iussit, deinde suffigi.*

<sup>68</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 80.

kind of punishment the studied terms refer to, the question of Suetonius' overall use of the terminology becomes urgent.

Suetonius uses the *crux* in the same uninformative way in four more texts: alone (*Calig.* 12.2) or in combination with (*af*)*figere* (*Dom.* 10.1, 11.1) or *afficere* (*Galb.* 9.1). In the text from Suetonius' biography on Caligula, labeled as a crucifixion by both Hengel and Kuhn, Suetonius mentions a punishment briefly in connection with the assumed murder of Tiberius.<sup>69</sup> When Caligula was about to suffocate Tiberius, a freedman cried out at the sight of the barbarity. He was simply "led to a *crux* immediately (*confestim in crucem acto*)," without any further description.<sup>70</sup> In the text from Suetonius' biography of Domitian, labeled as a crucifixion by Kuhn,<sup>71</sup> Suetonius offers another account of the same category. Suetonius exemplifies the cruelty of Domitian by mentioning not only that he killed the rhetor Hermogenes of Tarsus simply because of some allusions in his texts, but also that the scribes who had copied the work "were attached to a *crux*" (*cruci fixis*).<sup>72</sup> In another text from the same biography, Suetonius continues to describe the king's cruelty and adds that it was not just excessive, but also cunning and unpredictable. Suetonius describes how Domitian invited his stewards to his bedchamber to be lulled into security, the day before he was to be "attached to a *crux*" (*cruci figeret*).<sup>73</sup> Both Hengel and Kuhn label also this text as a reference to crucifixion.<sup>74</sup>

Another text, labeled as a crucifixion account by Hengel,<sup>75</sup> offers at least some additional information. Suetonius describes Galba's rule over the province of Terraconensis in Spain. Galba was cruel when it came to punishing criminals.

For he cut off a hand of a money-changer who handled the money dishonestly, and attached [*adfixit*] the hand to a table, and a guardian, who was made heir for an orphan whom he had killed with venom, [Galba] punished with a *crux* [*cruce adfecit*]; and when the man invoked the laws and declared that he was a Roman citizen, [Galba], as if he would lighten the punishment by consolation and honor, ordered [the *crux*] to be re-

<sup>69</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 60; KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 722.

<sup>70</sup> Suet. *Cal.* 12.2. *puluinum iussit inici atque etiam fauces manu sua oppressit, liberto, qui ob atrocitatem facinoris exclamauerat, confestim in crucem acto.*

<sup>71</sup> KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 693; 721.

<sup>72</sup> Suet. *Dom.* 10.1. *item Hermogenem Tarsensem propter quasdam in historia figurarum, librarum etiam, qui eam descripserant, cruci fixis.*

<sup>73</sup> Suet. *Dom.* 11.1. *Erat autem non solum magnae, sed etiam callidae inopinataeque saevitiae. actorem summarum pridie quam cruci figeret in cubiculum vocavit, assidere in toro iuxta coegit, securum hilaremque dimisit, partibus etiam de cena dignatus est.*

<sup>74</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 60; KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 693, 722.

<sup>75</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 40.



moved and a *crux* [*crucem*] much higher than the others, and painted white, to be erected [for him].<sup>76</sup>

Beyond the notion that *crucēs* usually not were white, the text also indicates that *affigere* could be used with a hand as an object. It is easy to see the text as depicting that the hand was nailed in some way to the table, but the text is silent regarding what happened. When Suetonius comes to the *crux*, he leaves out the usual attach-terminology and uses the semantically very wide *affigere*. The text also indicates a group of punishment poles, out of which the white and tallest emerges. Apart from these texts, there are some additional references to punishments in Suetonius' texts that ought to be noticed.

### 1.6.2. The Ancient Custom

When Suetonius is about to describe the cruelty of Claudius, he once again refers to a punishment in which a pole or a stake is present. Claudius executed convicted criminals at once in his own presence.

When [he was] at Tibur he felt a strong desire to see a punishment by the ancient custom [*antiqui moris supplicium*]; the guilty were [already] tied to a *palus* [*deligatis ad palum*], when [he noticed that] the executioner was missing; whereupon [an executioner] was sent for from Rome [and Claudius] continued steadfastly to wait [for him] until the evening.<sup>77</sup>

It is hard to trace the significance of Suetonius' use of *palus* in the text. He appears to make a distinction between *palus* and *crux* in some way (since he switches noun), but it is not clear in *what* way. Suetonius mentions an "ancient" punishment form once more in his description of Nero's fate. Nero saw the end of his rule; his numerous enemies within the state were closing in on him. Nero prepared a grave for himself anxiously, and received a letter which showed that he had been declared to be an enemy by the senate and that they were seeking to punish him according to an older custom (*ut puniatur more maiorum*).<sup>78</sup> When Nero asked what kind of punishment it was, he was told that the victim was stripped naked, fastened by the neck on a *furca* and then beaten to death by rods

---

<sup>76</sup> Suet. *Galb.* 9.1. *nam et nummulario non ex fide versanti pecunias manus amputavit mensaeque eius adfixit, et tutorem, quod pupillum, cui substitutus heres erat, veneno necasset, cruce adfecit; implorantique leges et civem Romanum se testificant, quasi solacio et honore aliquo poenam leuaturus, mutari multoque praeter ceteras altiore et dealbatam statui crucem iussit.*

<sup>77</sup> Suet. *Claud.* 34.1. *cum spectare antiqui moris supplicium Tiburi concupisset et deligatis ad palum noxiis carnifex deesset, accitum ab urbe vesperam usque opperiri perseveravit.*

<sup>78</sup> Suet. *Ner.* 49.2.

(*et cum comperisset nudi hominis cervicem inseri furcae, corpus virgis ad necem caedi*).<sup>79</sup> The question whether these two texts describe the same punishment is unanswerable. Suetonius treats them, nevertheless, apart from the other punishments through his usage of a different terminology (*palus* and *furca*) and by labeling them as having their origin in an ancient custom (*antiqui moris* and *more maiorum*). The problem is that it is not possible to define which kind of contemporary punishment he distinguishes them from.

### 1.6.3. Conclusion – Suetonius

Suetonius uses the terminology in a way that does not allow a definite interpretation of the nature of the punishments. It is difficult to draw any far-reaching conclusions from these texts. Thus, the urgent question of Suetonius' overall use of the terminology is not answered. Suetonius does not say what kind of punishment – or rather punishments – he refers to. The two “older” punishment forms – some kind of attaching to a *palus* or a *furca* in order to be executed with rods in the latter example – differ in some way from the other punishments described by Suetonius, but *how* they differ is unknown. Suetonius (like the previous authors for that matter) does not offer enough information to define the contemporary punishment as crucifixion, as Hengel and Kuhn do in almost every case. Suetonius makes a distinction between *palus* and *crux* but it is unknown what constitutes this distinction.

### 1.7. Clodius Licinius

Texts by M. Clodius Licinius are only preserved as fragments in other ancient texts. One fragment from his *Libri Rerum Romanarum*, preserved by Nonius, labeled as a crucifixion account by Hengel, contains some interesting words.<sup>80</sup>

... having been tied to *patibula*. They are tied and carried around, fastened to a *crux*.<sup>81</sup>

Due to the uncertainty of what (the neuter gender of the participle makes a human object unlikely) was attached to the *patibulum*, the fragment is of less importance. If it could be proved that the text describes humans attached to a *patibulum*, which was carried around and in the end was attached to a *crux*, the text would have been of great importance. In the

<sup>79</sup> Ibid.

<sup>80</sup> PETER, *Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae*, 2.78; HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 55 n.

8.

<sup>81</sup> Clod. Lic. F 3.1 (Non. s.v. *patibulum*). *deligata ad patibulos. deligantur et circumferuntur, cruci defiguntur*.

present state the text may be taken as an indication that a *patibulum* could be attached to a *crux* – if the two clauses were joined from the beginning. It is worth notice that the same verb (*deligare*), which occurs twice in this brief text, also occurs in texts that describe various ways of attaching humans to poles.<sup>82</sup>

## 2. Playwrights

### 2.1. *Titus Maccius Plautus*

Plautus (c. 205–184 B.C.E.) wrote the earliest Latin plays that have survived complete. The plays are thought to be adaptations of earlier Greek texts, which are however lost. His plays are especially useful for the present investigation since they may echo a rather old understanding of the terminology in focus. Both Hengel and Kuhn find several references to crucifixions in Plautus' texts.<sup>83</sup> Hengel labels Plautus as the first writer that offers evidence of Roman crucifixions and says that he "describes crucifixions more vividly and in greater detail than any other Latin writer."<sup>84</sup>

Plautus uses *crux* frequently,<sup>85</sup> as well as the derivatives *cruciatus* and *cruciare*. He also combines *cruciatus* with *crux*, which indicates that there might be something more than an etymological connection between the terms.<sup>86</sup> It is, however, not possible to tell *which* connection. The related verb is *cruciare* (also *ex-*, *dis-* and *percruciare*), and Kuhn labels one of the

<sup>82</sup> Liv. 2.5.6; 8.7.19; Suet. *Ner.* 29.1.

<sup>83</sup> Hengel: *Asin.* 548ff (52 n. 3); *Bacch.* 362 (52); *Capt.* 469 (7 n. 13); *Cas.* 611 (7 n. 13); *F. Carb.* 2 (62); *Men.* 66 (7 n. 13), 849 (7 n. 13); *Mil.* 372f (52); *Most.* 359ff (52 n. 3), 1133 (52 n. 3); *Per.* 352 (7 n. 13), 855 (52 n. 3 [*crux* occurs on line 856]); *Poen.* 347 (7 n. 13); *Rud.* 518 (7 n. 13); *Stich.* 625ff (52–53 n. 3); *Trin.* 598 (7 n. 13). Hengel refers also to *Mil.* 539f (52 n. 3) but that appears to be an erroneous reference. Hengel interprets Plautus' frequent usage (at least 34 times) of the phrase (*maxima*) *mala crux* as references to the "terrible cross" (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 7 + n. 13) and states that he sees numerous crucifixions in his texts (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 52 + n. 3).

Kuhn: *Bacch.* 4.4.37 (764 [probably an erroneous reference; it should be 4.4.47. The text corresponds to *Bacch.* 686–88 in the edition used by Hengel and the present investigation]); *F. Carb.* 2 (681); *Mil.* 2.4.7 (700 [corresponds to *Mil.* 359–60]).

<sup>84</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 52.

<sup>85</sup> *crux* is found in *Amph.* 1034A; *Asin.* 548, 940; *Aul.* 59, 522, 631; *Bacch.* 584, 902; *Capt.* 469; *Cas.* 93, 416, 611, 641, 977; *Curc.* 611, 693; *F. Carb.* 2 (in combination with *patibulum*); *Men.* 66, 328, 849, 915, 1017; *Mil.* 184, 310, 372; *Most.* 359, 743, 849–50, 1133; *Per.* 295, 352, 795, 856; *Poen.* 271, 347, 495, 496, 511, 789, 799, 1309; *Pseud.* 335, 839, 846, 1182, 1249; *Rud.* 176, 518, 1070, 1162; *Stich.* 625; *Trin.* 598.

<sup>86</sup> Cf. *Amph.* 1034A.

texts containing *cruciare* (*Bacch.* 686–88) as a reference to crucifixion.<sup>87</sup> In this text Plautus mentions a *carnifex*, which indicates that the perceived punishment was an execution. Sometimes *furcifer* (*Pseud.* 361) and *patibulatum* (*Most.* 56) are used in the same sense as *cruciatu*s. In addition to these designations, Plautus refers to a punishment tool with *mala crux* on several occasions. That the punishment in focus is negative is clear beyond all doubt, but *what* it is that is negative is harder to trace.<sup>88</sup> Plautus uses also, besides *crux*, *patibulum* and *furca* in several texts.<sup>89</sup>

The majority of the texts labeled as crucifixions, mainly by Hengel, simply contain the noun *crux*, often in combination with the adjective *malus*. These texts are, however, not possible to define beyond the notion that the punishment at hand is something bad. The actors wish someone to suffer some kind of severe punishment, as Ergasilus does when he wishes the profession of parasite to “*maximam malam crucem*.”<sup>90</sup> Plautus does not reveal what kind of punishment the text refers to. The same terminology and level of information are found in a series of texts labeled as crucifixions by Hengel.<sup>91</sup> Some of these texts indicate that the punishment at hand is some kind of a suspension punishment.<sup>92</sup> Other texts are, nevertheless, more informative when it comes to the nature of the punishment.

The first is mentioned by Hengel (though not by Kuhn) as one crucifixion among others.<sup>93</sup> The slave Tranio asks if there is any person who will take his place in being tortured (*excruari*) in exchange for a sum of money.

I will give a talent [to him] who will be the first to run to the *crux* [*crucem*] [for me]; but on [one] condition, that twice the feet and twice the arms are fastened [*offigantur*].<sup>94</sup>

When Plautus here makes Tranio describe an act of attaching arms and legs to a *crux* it is a step forward, as far as the study of crucifixion is con-

<sup>87</sup> KUHN, “Die Kreuzesstrafe,” 764 [*Bacch.* 4.4.37 according to the edition used by Kuhn].

<sup>88</sup> This is also the case in other texts Hengel refers to (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 7 n. 13) in the same discussion, e.g., *Enn. Ann.* 11.359 (F 4).

<sup>89</sup> *patibulum*: *Mil.* 360 and *F. Carb.* 2. *furca*: *Cas.* 389, 438; *Cist.* 248; *Men.* 943; *Per.* 855.

<sup>90</sup> Plaut. *Capt.* 469.

<sup>91</sup> *Cas.* 611; *Men.* 66, 849; *Per.* 352; *Rud.* 518; *Stich.* 625 (only *crux*); *Trin.* 595–99. Beyond these texts Hengel connects the nickname *Crucisalus* in *Bacch.* 362 with crucifixion as well as the simple *crux* in *Most.* 1133.

<sup>92</sup> Plautus uses such an expression in *Bacch.* 902–03 and connects it in addition with the Forum (cf. also *Men.* 912–15; *Poen.* 789–95; *Rud.* 1162).

<sup>93</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 52 n. 3.

<sup>94</sup> Plaut. *Most.* 359–60. *ego dabo ei talentum, primus qui in crucem excucurrerit; | sed ea lege, ut offigantur bis pedes, bis brachia.*

cerned. It is easy to compare the punishment of Jesus as it is described in the Gospels. Yet there are some features that need to be considered. First, the text does not say explicitly that the punishment at hand is a crucifixion in a traditional sense. It shows that Plautus could imagine a punishment form in which a victim was somehow attached with arms and legs to some kind of punishment tool called *crux*. Second, the text does not say that the punishment which the reader gets a glimpse of in this text is a faithful representation of all other *crux*-punishments in Plautus' text. This *might* be the case, of course, but the text material does not contain enough indications to draw the conclusion that this is the case.<sup>95</sup>

In addition to the texts identified by Hengel, Kuhn labels as a reference to crucifixion a text with resemblance to the previous one.<sup>96</sup> Sceledrus is standing in front of a door with his arms stretched out to prohibit Philocomasium from entering unnoticed. Seeing this, Palestrio says to Sceledrus:

I think that in that position you will immediately be moved outside the gate, with arms spread out, carrying a *patibulum*.<sup>97</sup>

Plautus describes outstretched arms also in this text, and adds another intriguing feature – the carrying of a *patibulum*, which might be the whole or a part of the execution tool. As with the last text, it is easy to draw parallels to a traditional perception of the Gospel accounts. However, one feature ought to be considered in this text too. It is difficult to uphold the common assumption that there is a clear distinction between the terms, i.e., that *crux* simply refers to the standing pole while *patibulum* refers to the crossbeam. Their ranges of meaning may overlap. It appears that *patibulum* could refer to a standing pole, or some other kind of torture device, as some of the following texts will show.<sup>98</sup> Having said this, it should be acknowledged that the text still refers to a punishment in which the arms were stretched out and that a *patibulum* was carried.

This fact might shed light on the other texts, such as the one that occurs later in the same paragraph of Plautus' play. The text, labeled as a crucifixion by Hengel,<sup>99</sup> does not stand out from the others on the terminological level. Sceledrus simply exclaims the he knows that the *crux* will

<sup>95</sup> Hengel also labels the *crux* mentioned in *Asin.* 548 as a reference to crucifixion (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 52 n. 3).

<sup>96</sup> KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 700.

<sup>97</sup> Plaut. *Mil.* 359–60. *credo ego istoc extemplo tibi esse eundum actutum extra portam, dispessis manibus, patibulum quom habebis.*

<sup>98</sup> See the discussion above concerning the texts in Sall. *Hist.* F 3.9; Tacitus, *Hist.* 4.3; Tacitus, *Ann.* 1.61.1–3; 4.72.3; 14.33.2 (cf. KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 681).

<sup>99</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 57 n. 11.

be his tomb (*scio crucem futuram mihi sepulcrum*).<sup>100</sup> Yet the *crux* of this text becomes more interesting when combined with the previous text. With a slight amount of imagination the shape of crucifixion in the traditional sense is easily perceived – though not revealed. However, it is possible that the switching between *crux* and *patibulum* is only an example of *variatio*, both referring to the same, for us unidentified, punishment tool. Another possibility is that they are not connected at all. The nouns may refer to two different – and complete – punishment tools.

There is an additional text in which Plautus also describes what appears to be a custom in which the condemned were forced to carry their own execution tools, and it is found in a fragment. This is the only text both Hengel and Kuhn label as a reference to crucifixion.<sup>101</sup>

Let him carry a *patibulum* through the city; let him thereafter be attached to a *crux* [*adfigatur cruci*].<sup>102</sup>

It is even easier to see parallels to the Gospel account in this text.<sup>103</sup> The text might thus be used as support for the thesis that Jesus only carried the crossbeam (*patibulum*) to Golgotha where the other part of the cross, the standing pole (*crux*?), was waiting affixed to the ground.<sup>104</sup> There is, however, one feature that ought to be noticed also in this text. Plautus does not say that the *patibulum* was necessarily an intended part of the *crux* – that the *patibulum* was subsequently attached to the *crux*. The carrying of *patibulum* might as well be a separate punishment – an example of a degrading act similar to that of carrying a *furca*. If this is the case, Plautus describes two punishments. First, a walk in disgrace which ended with the removal of the *patibulum* (perhaps then handed over to another victim of the humiliating walk). Second, Plautus relates that “thereafter” (*deinde*) some kind of attaching – of the victim – to a *crux* occurred.<sup>105</sup> The above-mentioned texts which contain *patibulum* do not contradict this reading.

As mentioned above, *patibulum* might be a punishment tool in the same category as *furca*, that is, a punishment tool which could be carried separately, and not necessarily as a prelude to crucifixion by means of

<sup>100</sup> Plaut. *Mil.* 372.

<sup>101</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 62; KUHN, “Die Kreuzesstrafe,” 681.

<sup>102</sup> Plaut. *F. Carb.* 2. *patibulum ferat per urbem, deinde adfigatur cruci.*

<sup>103</sup> See, e.g., KUHN, “Kreuztragen,” cols. 551–52.

<sup>104</sup> See, e.g., BROWN, *The Death of the Messiah*, 2.913. Zestermann discusses several problems with the common theory of Jesus as carrying the *patibulum* which was then attached to the waiting *crux*. Nevertheless, he still connects the events and sees the text as describing an act in which the victim was forced to carry a beam of wood to the execution site (ZESTERMANN, *Die bildliche Darstellung*, 22 n. 32).

<sup>105</sup> Cf. ZESTERMANN, *Die bildliche Darstellung*, 22 n. 32.

being a part of the execution tool. Plautus refers to the carrying of *furcae* in two texts.<sup>106</sup> These texts do not offer any further information on the surrounding circumstances. A *furca* is simply something that could be carried as some kind of punishment. A victim could also be beaten with rods under a *furca* (*caesus virgis sub furca*).<sup>107</sup> The tool itself is not easily defined. It is worth notice that Plautus also uses *furca* in a neutral way, when referring to some kind of a “yoke” (*Cas.* 438). At the very end of the play *Persa*, Plautus makes the actors refer briefly to both *furca* and *crux* in the same breath.<sup>108</sup> These features taken together indicate that it is unwise to draw clear division lines between the terms in focus. The usages of *patibulum*, *furca*, and to some extent *crux*, appear to overlap to a further extent than usually noticed.

### 2.1.1. Conclusion – Plautus

Plautus uses *crux*, *patibulum* and *furca* in several texts. He is especially fond of the expression *mala crux*. The noun *crux* is, however, difficult to link directly to the punishment of crucifixion, as defined in the present investigation, cohering with a traditional sense. A *crux* is a device used in some kind of bad punishment, often with slaves as objects.<sup>109</sup> But, the punishment might still be constituted by some kind of attachment to a pole, sometimes preceded by an act of carrying a beam. This makes Plautus’ texts – the oldest Latin texts of the present investigation – the closest call in the search for crucifixion so far. However, the essential features which show that the *patibulum* was carried to the *crux* in order to be attached to it are lacking, together with other indications which would reveal that Plautus’ texts should be directly connected with the punishment Jesus was subjected to according to the main traditions of the church.

### 2.2. *Publius Terentius Afer*

Terence (?–159 B.C.E.), born in Carthage and transported to Rome as a slave to the household of a senator called Terentius according to Suetoni-

<sup>106</sup> See *Cas.* 389 (the verb *ferre* could be understood both in the sense “to carry” and figuratively “to endure”); *Cist.* 248 (an insertion in the Latin text from several fragments, not present in Riley’s translation).

<sup>107</sup> Plaut. *Men.* 942.

<sup>108</sup> It could also be noticed that Plautus refers to a regular hanging with ropes some lines earlier in the same play (*restim tu tibi cape crassam ac suspende te* [*Per.* 815]).

<sup>109</sup> Plaut. *Amph.* 1034A (in what appears to be a later addition to Plautus text); *Asin.* 940; *Aul.* 59, 522, 631; *Bacch.* 584; *Cas.* 93, 416, 641, 977; *Curc.* 611, 693; *Men.* 328, 915, 1017; *Mil.* 184, 310; *Most.* 743, 849–50; *Per.* 295 (note, *affigere*); 795 (*crux* as nickname); 846–47 (*crux* is placed in relationship to *furca*); *Poen.* 271, 495, 96, 511, 789, 99, 1309; *Pseud.* 335, 839, 846, 1182, 1294; *Rud.* 176, 1070; *Stich.* 625.

us, wrote six plays which all survived. Hengel refers to one "cross" in Terence's texts, but neither this text nor Terence's other texts shed any light over what kind of punishment *crux* refers to.<sup>110</sup> In the text mentioned by Hengel, the character Pamphilus calls another character named Davus "*furcifer*" (Ter. *An.* 618) and asks him what kind of punishment he thinks he deserves.<sup>111</sup> Davus answers "*crucem*" (Ter. *An.* 621) without any further explanation. Thus, Terence does not shed any light on the usage of the terminology in focus, other than that it is once again unspecified.

### 3. Rhetorical and Philosophical Texts

The texts of the rhetorical tradition of the ancient Roman world use mainly suspension accounts as instruments to achieve a purpose in their speech. Thereby the accounts are of interest for the present investigation, since they bear witness to the perception of the punishments in focus as well as the persuasive force of the sheer mention of these.

#### 3.1. Marcus Tullius Cicero

One of the most famous and well-quoted Latin authors, as far as crucifixion is concerned, is Cicero (106–43 B.C.E.). It is primarily Cicero's texts that are used to show the deep aversion to crucifixion in Roman society.<sup>112</sup> Both Hengel and Kuhn find several crucifixions in Cicero's speeches against Verres and for Rabirius.<sup>113</sup> Cicero's texts revolve around a severe punishment that is referred to with *crux*. The word occurs most frequently in two orations, which will be dealt with in the following pages.

##### 3.1.1. Cicero's Oration against Gaius Verres

Cicero pursued the trial against the corrupt Roman politician Verres with such skill that Verres had to flee Rome. Verres was notoriously guilty, but expected to be set free by bribing the jury. The Roman courts of the

<sup>110</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 53 n. 3. In another play, not mentioned by Hengel, Terence uses the familiar expression *mala crux* twice (*Phorm.* 368, 544). These texts do not reveal anything concerning the actual punishment.

<sup>111</sup> Terence uses *furcifer* also in *Eun.* 798, 862, 989.

<sup>112</sup> Especially Cicero's speech against Verres and his defense of Rabirius (see, e.g., HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 33–45).

<sup>113</sup> Hengel: *Verr.* 2.5.12 (37 n. 11; 53); 2.5.158ff (40 n. 3); 2.5.168 (33 n. 1); 2.5.169 (33 n. 1; 51); *Rab. perd.* 4.13 (43–44); 5.16 (42).

Kuhn: *Verr.* 2.5.12 (684 n. 197); 2.5.163 (737); 2.5.168, 69 (767); 2.5.169 (719 n. 442); 2.5.170 (704 n. 133; 767); *Rab. perd.* 3.10 (762 + n. 692; 767 n. 712); 4.11 (763 n. 696; 767 n. 712); 4.13 (762, 63 + n. 696; 767).



time had a bad reputation. Through the trial of Verres the senatorial order had an opportunity to change that. As Cicero points out, it is rather the court that is on trial than Verres.<sup>114</sup> The texts found in Cicero's orations against Verres contain several occurrences of *crux*. The word occurs most frequently in the fifth book of the undelivered second pleading in the prosecution against Verres. This is the only part of the oration to which Hengel and Kuhn refer. Cicero uses, nevertheless, *crux* in other parts of the second pleading as well.

Cicero's use of the noun is rather consistent. In the first text, he is engaged in an effort to describe the wickedness of Verres, who had punished Roman citizens in various ways.

Some he had killed by ax, some he put to death by imprisonment, some he suspended on a *crux* (*in crucem sustulit*) while they cried out their rights as freemen and Roman citizens.<sup>115</sup>

There is, however, no further information to be found in this text. Some lines later Cicero once again condemns Verres for having afflicted Roman citizens "with execution, with torture, with *crux*" (*cum civis Romanos morte, cruciatu, cruce adfecerit*) (2.1.9). The following seven *crux*-texts of the oration go on in the same manner.<sup>116</sup>

Cicero uses *crux* in almost the same way in the next text, but adds an unusual – and essential – feature to the knowledge of the punishment method.

With what face have you in fact presented yourself in the gaze of the Roman people? [You have even] not [yet torn down] that *crux*, which is even now at this time stained with blood of Roman citizens.... Is your city elected [to be a place that] when anyone

<sup>114</sup> SIMON and OBBINK, "Marcus Tullius Cicero," 1558–61.

<sup>115</sup> Cic. Verr. 2.1.7. *quos partim securi percussit, partim in vinculis necavit, partim implorantes iura libertatis et civitatis in crucem sustulit.*

<sup>116</sup> Cic. Verr. 2.1.13 "was suspended on a *crux*" (*sublatum esse in crucem*); 2.3.6 "crucis raised for the punishment of Roman citizens" (*crucis ad civium Romanorum supplicia fixas*); 2.3.59 "Finally, I say nothing of the *crux*, the witness which he wished to be for them [an example] of his own humanity as well as benevolence" (*crucem denique illam praetermitto, quam iste civibus Romanis testem humanitatis in eos ac benevolentiae suae voluit esse*); 2.3.70 "for they wished to escape the many *crucis* [which] were placed before [them]" (*multas enim crucis propositas effugere cupiebant*); 2.3.112 "so many *crucis* (*cum tot crucis*); 2.4.24 "that *crux* on which he suspended a Roman citizen in sight of a multitude" (*illa crux in quam iste civem Romanum multis inspectantibus sustulit*); 2.5.7 "he was instantly crucified by order of the praetor" (*statim deinde iussu praetoris in crucem esse sublatum*).

enters it from Italy, he sees a *crux* of a Roman citizen before he sees a friend of the Roman people?<sup>117</sup>

In this text, Cicero indicates that the *crux*-punishment was somehow connected with bloodshed, if the blood is not to be understood metaphorically.<sup>118</sup> The blood revives the Gospel connection, since it could be seen as a witness of the use of nails or scourging, which is vital in Christian interpretations of Jesus' death, in both theology and art. However, the text does not prove anything beyond the notion that Cicero somehow connects blood with the *crux*. There is nothing in the text that contradicts a traditional reading, although there are, as has been seen so far, other texts that indicate a variety of methods when it comes to suspension punishments.

Some paragraphs later, Cicero describes a rather different suspension, which Verres carried out "openly in the middle of the assembly."<sup>119</sup> The chief magistrate of Messana, Sopater, was stripped naked in midwinter rain by the lictors on Verres' order. In the forum of Messana were some statues, and one of them became the suspension tool on this occasion.

On that [statue] he ordered Sopater, a man of noble family, at the time in possession of the chief magistracy, to be stretched out and tied [*divaricari ac deligari*]. What torture [*cruciatu*] he was subjected to must be evident for every mind, when he was tied naked in the open air, in the rain, in the cold.<sup>120</sup>

Cicero uses none of the other studied terms in the text beyond the label *cruciatu*s. However, when he mentions the use of the statues later in the same text he refers to them as *patibulum*.<sup>121</sup> The text thus indicates that Cicero knew various kinds of suspensions tools onto which the victim

<sup>117</sup> Cic. Verr. 2.4.26. *in populi Romani quidem conspectum quo ore vos commisistis? nec prius illam crucem quae etiam nunc civis Romani sanguine redundat.... vestrae urbs electa est, ad quam quicumque adirent ex Italia crucem <cives> civis Romani prius quam quemquam amicum populi Romani viderent?*

<sup>118</sup> I.e., "blood" as a metaphor for the life lost on the execution or torture tool. There has been a debate about whether crucifixion was a bloody or bloodless punishment. Hengel rejects (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 31 + n 24) the theory, advocated by Hewitt (HEWITT, "The Use of Nails in the Crucifixion," 37), that it was bloodless and supports his rejection with the text from Jos. AJ 19.94, which describes a theatrical – according to Hengel's interpretation – crucifixion that is dramatized with large quantities of artificial blood. He does not, however, refer to the above-quoted text from Cicero. See also Kuhn's discussion with Hengel on the topic (KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 695–96).

<sup>119</sup> Cic. Verr. 2.4.86.

<sup>120</sup> Cic. Verr. 2.4.86–87. *in ea Sopatrum, hominem cum domi nobilem tum summo magistratu praeditum, divaricari ac deligari iubet. quo cruciatu sit adfectus venire in mentem necesse est omnibus, cum esset vinctus nudus in aere, in imbri, in frigore.*

<sup>121</sup> Cic. Verr. 2.4.90. *tibi Marcelli statua pro patibulo in clientis Marcellorum fuit?*

was attached outstretched, and that the usage of *cruciatu*s apparently covers these kinds of suspensions as well.

When it comes to the important fifth book of the second pleading, the texts become abundant, and it is in this book that Hengel and Kuhn find their references. The first of these has a related punishment in its context, which is not mentioned by Hengel and Kuhn. In the oration Cicero refers to the slaves' situation in Sicily, with Verres' alleged treatment of them. Some slaves are described as condemned on charges of conspiracy and punished by being "led forth and tied to a *palus*."<sup>122</sup> A *palus* appears to be a simple pole of unspecified height onto which the victim was tied, apparently to be scourged to death. There are differences between this punishment and the *crux*-punishment in Cicero's texts. He appears not to use the terms interchangeably.<sup>123</sup>

There are, however, also similarities. Cicero uses *palus* in only two more texts, which are both found some chapters later in the same book. This time the alleged victims were pirates, whom Verres was supposed to punish by tying them to a *palus*.<sup>124</sup> But he failed to do so, due not to nobility but to greed. Verres sold them instead. To cover up his theft, he began to punish the pirates in smaller groups on different days. In the next paragraph, Cicero adds that Verres secretly began to add Roman citizens to the groups of pirates that were led to the *palus*. The Romans had their heads muffled up to prevent recognition, and they were led to the *palus* and to execution.<sup>125</sup> The impression of the event ends up close to the impression of other events in which *crux* is used. Being attached to a *palus* might be a lethal punishment, just as it was to be attached to a *crux*. It is thus questionable to make too far-reaching a distinction between them.

The actual text Hengel and Kuhn refer to occurs in the section following the first *palus*-texts above (2.5.10, 11).

What do you say, [you] good guard and protector of the province? Did you dare to take away from the midst of death and release the slaves, [who wanted] to take arms and make war against Sicily, [whom] you had gathered and judged [according to] the judgment of the council, when at this time they already had been handed over to punishment according to the inherited custom, clearly in order to reserve the *crux*, which you had

---

<sup>122</sup> Cic. *Verr.* 2.5.10. *producuntur, et ad palum alligantur*. See also 2.5.11. *ad palum alligati*.

<sup>123</sup> The verb, *alligare*, is only used in combination with *palus*, not *crux*, *furca* or *patibulum*.

<sup>124</sup> Cic. *Verr.* 2.5.71. *ut consuetudo est universos, ad palum alligasset*.

<sup>125</sup> Cic. *Verr.* 2.5.72. *itaque alii cives Romani, ne cognoscerentur, capitibus obvolutis e carcere ad palum atque ad necem rapiebantur*.

erected for condemned slaves [*quam damnatis crucem servis fixeras*], for uncondemned Roman citizens?<sup>126</sup>

Cicero does not indicate in this throughout rhetorical text what kind of punishment he refers to beyond the use of *crux*, and the obvious question is whether the noun is sufficient to identify the text as a crucifixion reference, as Hengel and Kuhn do.

The bulk of *crux*-texts occurs within a few chapters (2.5.162–71) of the same book as the previous text. It is in this section that Hengel and Kuhn find the majority of their texts.<sup>127</sup> Cicero is still addressing the wickedness of Verres. A former prisoner of Verres and Roman citizen of Compsa, Publius Gavius, had escaped and protested against Verres' punishment of him. That punishment is Cicero's topic in the next texts. Cicero accuses Verres of giving the order to seize Gavius, tie him naked in the middle of the forum of Messana, and to have the rods ready. Gavius cried out that he was a Roman citizen, but was nevertheless severely beaten, while a *crux* was made ready for him.<sup>128</sup> Cicero adds that Gavius never had seen such a plague.<sup>129</sup> The horrible crime was to drag a Roman citizen to the *crux*.<sup>130</sup> Verres did not care whether the victim was a Roman citizen or not; he was suspended on the *crux* anyhow.<sup>131</sup>

The climax of the account, as far as the description of the punishment form is concerned, comes with an accusation (2.5.169). Verres had ordered the Mamertines to place the *crux*, which they had erected [*crucem fixissent*] according to their custom, in such a way that the victim – Gavius – could see Italy and thus look toward his home from his *crux* [*ex cruce Italiam cernere ac domum suam prospicere*]. Cicero concludes:

And accordingly, o Judges, that single *crux* was fixed on this place [*crux sola ... in loco fixa est*] [for the first time] since the foundation of Messana. [A place] in view of Italy was chosen for [the purpose that] this one, dying of pain and torture, should perceive that the rights of liberty and the slavery [only] were separated by a very narrow strait, and Italia, on the other hand, should see her own nursling attached by the severe and extreme penalty [appropriate only to those in] slavery. To tie a Roman citizen is a crime,

<sup>126</sup> Cic. Verr. 2.5.12. *quid ais, bone custos defensorque provinciae? tu quos servos arma capere et bellum facere in Sicilia voluisse cognoras et de consilii sententia iudicaras, hos ad supplicium iam more maiorum traditos ex media morte eripere ac liberare ausus es, ut, quam damnatis crucem servis fixeras, hanc indemnatis videlicet civibus Romanis reserves?*

<sup>127</sup> See also SLOYAN, *The Crucifixion of Jesus*, 13 n. 13.

<sup>128</sup> Cic. Verr. 2.5.162.

<sup>129</sup> Cic. Verr. 2.5.162. *istam pestem viderat* (see, HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 37).

<sup>130</sup> Cic. Verr. 2.5.163, 164, 165 (*in crucem agere*). For an additional label of Verr. 2.5.165 as a crucifixion account, see HENGEL and SCHWEMER, *Jesus und das Judentum*, 611.

<sup>131</sup> Cic. Verr. 2.5.168 (*in crucem tolleretur*).

to scourge [him] is wickedness, and to kill [him] is almost parricide. What shall I [then] call suspending [him] on a *crux* [*in crucem tollere*]? It is in no way possible [to find] a word [which] is sufficient to label adequately such a horrible deed.<sup>132</sup>

Cicero adds an important feature in this well-known text, a suspended *and* living victim. The text makes impaling a less probable interpretation (at least abdominal or rectal, which probably kills the victim too quickly to fit the description of the event). Verres decreed that the suspended Gavius should see his homeland and die within sight of liberty.<sup>133</sup> Cicero thus describes in this text some kind of suspension, which appears to be possible to endure for some time. The text contains thus a suspension with such resemblance to the punishment of crucifixion in a traditional sense that it is a good candidate for being a crucifixion account.

In addition, Cicero labels this *crux*-punishment an extreme and severe punishment (*extremo summoque supplicio*) and connects it with slavery. The text thus speaks in favor of Hengel's effort to define crucifixion as both a slave punishment and *the* severe punishment – provided it is possible to show that the text describes a punishment that is identical with a traditional understanding of crucifixion. However, there are some problems in the text. In spite of the seemingly familiar account of the suspension, there are still no nails or any crossbeam mentioned. The victim could be attached in any way, in any position on any kind of pole. The victim is depicted as being alive while suspended, but not for how long (i.e., he is not described as talking while suspended). The victim could still be suspended in a way that kills rather instantly (e.g., impaled). Since these features cannot be ascertained, the text is only a candidate, and not one that qualifies as being a depiction of what is traditionally called "crucifixion."

The remaining occurrences of *crux* do not add anything new. Cicero mentions that it was the citizenship of Rome and freedom itself that Verres exposed to torture and led to the *crux*.<sup>134</sup> He mentions also that Verres erected a *crux* for Roman citizens inside the city.<sup>135</sup> The place of

---

<sup>132</sup> Cic. Verr. 2.5.169–70. *itaque illa crux sola, iudices, post conditam Messanam illo in loco fixa est. Italiae conspectus ad eam rem ab isto delectus est, ut ille in dolore cruciatuque moriens perangusto fretu divisa servitutis ac libertatis iura cognosceret, Italia autem alumnnum suum servitutis extremo summoque supplicio adfixum videret. Facinus est vincire civem Romanum, scelus verberare, prope parricidium necare: quid dicam in crucem tollere? Verbo satis digno tam nefaria res appellari nullo modo potest.*

<sup>133</sup> Cic. Verr. 2.5.170. *"spectet," inquit, "patriam; in conspectu legum libertatisque moriatur."*

<sup>134</sup> Cic. Verr. 2.5.170. *non tu hoc loco Gavius, non unum hominem nescio quem, sed communem libertatis et civitatis causam in illum cruciatum et crucem egisti.*

<sup>135</sup> Cic. Verr. 2.5.170. *nonne eum graviter tulisse arbitramini quod illam civibus Romanis crucem non posset in foro, non in comitio, non in rostris defigere?*

suspension – the monument of Verres’ wickedness – was well in sight for all ships that passed. The last occurrence of *crux* in Cicero’s Oration against Verres comes when Cicero concludes that if anyone should be qualified for the *crux* as punishment for his crimes, it is Verres.<sup>136</sup>

### 3.1.2. Cicero’s Defense of Rabirius

The texts found in Cicero’s defense of Gaius Rabirius also describe a punishment which is referred to with *crux*. This is the other text group in which Hengel and Kuhn find their texts. The Roman senator Rabirius was involved in the death of Lucius Appuleius Saturninus and was charged with *perduellio* (equivalent to high treason). Rabirius was heard before Caesar, who had procured himself as one of two *duumviri*. Caesar condemned Rabirius, who eventually appealed to the people. At the trial of this appeal, Rabirius was defended by Cicero. The defense speech is preserved in *Pro Rabirio reo perduellionis*.<sup>137</sup>

Cicero offers several utterances in which the apparent bad reputation of the *crux*-punishment – or rather *crux*-punishments – is noticeable. After he has wailed over the all too brief half hour he has been given for his defense, Cicero begins articulating a desirable reputation of being the consul who had the opportunity “to banish the executioner from the forum and the *crux* from the Campus.”<sup>138</sup> Already the ancestors did this when they abolished the monarchy and the kingly cruelty. Is it then proper “to order that a *crux* for [Roman] citizens should be erected and fixed on Campus Martius”?<sup>139</sup> The Porcian laws forbade a rod to be laid on any Roman citizen (scourging) and secured the citizens from the Licitor. Cicero stresses the insanity of delivering Rabirius to a *crux* in the light of this. Cicero dramatizes the cruel past, which was suppressed by the darkness of time as well as the light of freedom, with what ought to be a quotation from Livy.<sup>140</sup>

Cover the head, suspend [him] on an *arbor infelix* [*arbori infelici suspendito*].<sup>141</sup>

It appears thus as if Cicero connects the suspension on the *arbor infelix* with the *crux*-punishment, or at least sees some resemblance between

<sup>136</sup> Cic. Verr. 2.5.171.

<sup>137</sup> MAY, *Brill’s Companion to Cicero*, 130; SIMON and OBBINK, “Marcus Tullius Cicero,” 1558–61.

<sup>138</sup> Cic. Rab. perd. 3.10. *carnificem de foro, cruce[m] de campo sustulisse*.

<sup>139</sup> Cic. Rab. perd. 4.11. *qui in campo Martio ... cruce[m] ad civium supplicium defigi et constitui iubes*.

<sup>140</sup> Liv. 1.26.11.

<sup>141</sup> Cic. Rab. perd. 4.13. *caput obnubito, arbori infelici suspendito*.

them.<sup>142</sup> The resemblance might just be that both punishments were two various expressions of the diverse group of suspension punishments that have been used up to the time of Cicero. The climax of the oration, as far as his use of *crux* is concerned, comes in a well-known utterance.

Miserable is the loss of a good name in public courts, miserable is a property-depriving penalty, [and] miserable is exile. But still, in each calamity some trace of liberty remains. When death is placed before [us] finally, we may die in liberty, but the executioner, the veiling of the head and the very word *crux*, should not only be removed from the bodies of Roman citizens, but also from [their] thoughts, eyes and ears. For not only the result and the suffering of all these things, but even a proposal, an expectation, the mere mention of them is in the end unworthy of a Roman citizen and a free man. Or is it so, that the kindness of [their] masters delivers our slaves from fear of all these punishments by one touch of the liberating-rod, while neither our achievements, the lives we have lived, nor the honors bestowed by you, will deliver us from the scourging, from the executioner's hook, not even from the terror of a *crux*?<sup>143</sup>

Hengel sees this text as "important ancient evidence for the horror and disgust felt at crucifixion."<sup>144</sup> Kuhn challenges this assumption and correctly stresses the problem of using Cicero's rhetorical words as "charakteristischer zeitgeschichtlicher Beleg für das damals übliche Verständnis der Kreuzigung." However, he still locates the text within his own definition of crucifixion.<sup>145</sup> This is where the problem arises. It is still debatable to specify the *crux*-punishment further than that it is some kind of punishment that is sometimes a suspension punishment, which sometimes is possible to endure for a while.

### 3.1.3. Conclusion – Cicero

Thus, it is not sufficient to draw the conclusion that the punishment at hand is a crucifixion on the sole basis of the occurrence of *crux*. Cicero's

---

<sup>142</sup> Hengel connects also these punishments (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 44).

<sup>143</sup> Cic. *Rab. perd.* 5.16. *miseram est ignominiam iudiciorum publicorum, miseram multam bonorum, miserum exilium; sed tamen in omni calamitate retinetur aliquod vestigium libertatis. mors denique si proponitur, in libertate moriamur, carnifex vero et obductio capitis et nomen ipsum crucis absit non modo a corpore Romanorum sed etiam a cogitatione, oculis, auribus. harum enim omnium rerum non solum eventus atque percussio sed etiam condicio, expectatio, mentio ipsa denique indigna cive Romano atque homine libero est. an vero servos nostros horum suppliciorum omnium metu dominorum benignitas vindicta una liberat; nos a verberibus, ab unco, a crucis denique terrore neque res gestae neque acta aetas neque vestri honores vindicabunt?*

<sup>144</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 44.

<sup>145</sup> KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 767. See, Kuhn's excursus on the text (KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 761–67). Cf. also BLINZLER, *Der Prozeß Jesu*, 357.

usage of the noun in his other texts does not alter this conclusion.<sup>146</sup> The *crux*-punishment in Cicero's texts is at least in some instances a lethal suspension punishment which appears to be endurable for a while. It is however not clear for how long. Again, it is possible that both the crime Verres was accused for and the punishment Rabirius was threatened with had a close resemblance to the punishment Jesus suffered seven decades later according to a traditional understanding of the Gospel accounts. The problem is that not even Cicero's texts are explicit enough to draw the conclusion that the suspensions at hand are crucifixions in this sense.

### 3.2. Lucius Annaeus Seneca (the Elder)

The elder Seneca (ca. 50 B.C.E.—ca. 40 C.E.) was born of an equestrian family in Spain. Much of his life is unknown, but he appears to have spent a good part of his life in Rome — this is at least what his knowledge of contemporary rhetoric suggests.<sup>147</sup> Hengel finds some references to crucifixions in Seneca's books.<sup>148</sup> Seneca uses *crux* in several texts, and the oldest preserved occurrence of the compound *crucifigere*, from which the term "crucifixion" is derived, is found in Seneca's texts.<sup>149</sup>

The first text Hengel refers to deals with the punishment of a slave who refused to give poison to his sick master.<sup>150</sup> Seneca states in the preface that the master in his will had pointed out that the heirs should punish the slave for the deed, even though the slave acted on orders of the master himself. Seneca calls the punishment method *crucifigere*.<sup>151</sup> Seneca does not use *crucifigere* in the main texts, only in the prefaces. With the

<sup>146</sup> Cic. *Att.* 7.11.2; 14.15.1, 16.2; *Cluent.* 187; *Deiot.* 26; *Fin.* 5.84, 92; *Mil.* 60; *Phil.* 13.21; *Pis.* 42, 44; *Tusc.* 1.102.

<sup>147</sup> The text and numbering used in the present investigation come from Håkansson's edition in *Biblioteca scriptorum graecorum et romanorum Teubneriana*. Hengel and Kuhn refer, however, to the hybrid text in the Loeb edition which is in part an amalgam of the text of *Controversiae* and some summaries a later excerptor has provided, called *Excerpta* (see the preface of the Loeb edition (WINTERBOTTOM, *LCL* [1.vii–xxiv]) and SUSSMAN, "The Artistic Unity of the Elder Seneca's First Preface and the *Controversiae* as a Whole," 286 n. 3).

<sup>148</sup> Hengel: *Sen. Contr. exc.* 3.9 (57 n. 11); *Contr.* 7.4.5 (49 n. 12); *Contr. exc.* 8.4 (75 n. 17).

<sup>149</sup> *Sen. Contr. exc.* 3.9; *Contr. exc.* 7.7. The question of when the verbal compounds evolved, e.g., when *cruci figere* generally became *crucifigere*, in Latin appears problematic to answer. The occurrence of the compound in Seneca's texts may be due to a general development in Latin orthography and thus of less significance. If so, texts where the noun and the verb are written separately (e.g., Suet. *Dom.* 11.1; Quint. *Decl.* 274.13) need to be taken into consideration here also.

<sup>150</sup> The label of the text is *Crux servi venenum domino negantis* (*Sen. Contr. exc.* 3.9).

<sup>151</sup> *Sen. Contr. exc.* 3.9. *cavit testamento, ut ab heredibus crucifigeretur.*



usage of the verb in the later writings in mind, it is easy to assume that the verb simply means “to crucify.” However, the writer does not shed much light over what is behind the concept. He otherwise uses a familiar terminology. The cunning master had ordered that a *crux* should be prepared for the slave at the same time as his poison was prepared (*tunc huic parari iussit crucem cum sibi venenum*). The slave would suffer the *crux* (*crucem pati*) even if he gave the poison to his master. The slave found himself in a hopeless situation. If he lost the case he would die; if he won he would be returned to the master who wanted to lead him to the *crux* (*a quo in crucem petitur*).

On one side is the law, on the other the will, on both sides a *crux*.<sup>152</sup>

The punishment is simply referred to with *crux*. This is also the case in the texts not mentioned by Hengel.<sup>153</sup> Hengel’s next texts follow the same pattern. The object of the text is a son who failed to support his mother. He is in chains and unhappy because of what he can see.

He sees shackles of his captivity, slaughter, wounds and the *crux* of the unredeemed.<sup>154</sup>

The peak of *crux* occurrences comes after this text, in the section that deals with the madman who married his daughter to a slave.<sup>155</sup> This *crux*-stained section does not, however, shed any light over the punishment at hand. Seneca just uses the word without further explanation.

The last text deals with the issue of suicide. A man who kills himself shall be left unburied. The argument for the wickedness of this is that nature itself gives everyone a burial.

The bodies of those attached to a *crux* flow down into [their] graves.<sup>156</sup>

Even a decomposed corpse is in some way buried, according to Seneca. However, neither this text nor the preceding reveal to what kind of punishment they refer.

The only conclusion to be drawn from the texts of Seneca the Elder is that *crucifigere* refers to the same unspecified punishment form that is

<sup>152</sup> Sen. *Contr. exc.* 3.9. *ex altera parte lex est, ex altera testamentum, crux utrimque.*

<sup>153</sup> Sen. *Contr. exc.* 7.6; *Contr.* 7.6.3 (in combination *cruciari*); 7.6.4 (in combination with *furcifer*); 7.6.6 (twice and in combination with *cruciari*); 7.6.9 (twice and in combination with *furcifer*); 7.6.10, 11, 12 (twice); 7.6.14; 7.7.5. (twice); 7.7.9 (twice); 10.5.7.

<sup>154</sup> Sen. *Contr.* 7.4.5. *videt catenas captivitatis suae et caedes et volnera et cruces eorum, qui non redimuntur.*

<sup>155</sup> Sen. *Contr.* 7.6.1–24.

<sup>156</sup> Sen. *Contr. exc.* 8.4. *suffixorum corpora a crucibus in sepulturam suam defluunt.*

connected with the noun *crux*.<sup>157</sup> So in the end the actual relationship between this punishment and the punishment labeled as crucifixion in a traditional sense is still unknown.

### 3.3. Lucius Annaeus Seneca (the Younger)<sup>158</sup>

The younger Seneca (between 4 B.C.E. and 1 C.E. – 65) was born in Spain under the same circumstances as his father, the elder Seneca. He studied grammar and rhetoric in Rome and was attracted by Stoicism. Seneca became quaestor and gained with the years a considerable reputation as an orator. He refers to several punishments in an interesting way. Both Hengel and Kuhn find a number of crucifixions in Seneca's texts.<sup>159</sup>

The first text, however, might serve as an example of the treacherous familiarity some texts contain. The text reveals an event which could easily be connected with a traditional view of crucifixion.

Nails pierce [his] skin [*figunt cutem clavi*] and wherever he rests [his] wearied body, he presses upon a wound, [his] eyes are open in unbroken sleeplessness. But the greater [his] torment is, the greater [his] glory will be.... Although he drugs himself with un-mixed wine and diverts [his] anxious mind and deceives [it] with a thousand pleasures, he will [no more] fall to sleep on [his] pillow than that other on [his] *crux*.<sup>160</sup>

The nails and the *crux*, paired with words of suffering and glory and stupefying wine, form a striking parallel to the Gospel accounts of the death of Jesus.<sup>161</sup> But with a second consideration the picture changes. There is a change of subject in the excluded sentence of the quotation. Seneca describes the endurance of Regulus in the first part of the text, while dealing

<sup>157</sup> This notion is based on the assumption that the prefaces are authentic. The language in the prefaces appears, however, slightly different in comparison to the main text.

<sup>158</sup> The text and numbering follow the Teubneriana edition.

<sup>159</sup> Hengel: Sen. *Dial.* 2.15.1 (28 n. 20); *Dial.* 3.2.2 (30–31 + n. 23), *Dial.* 5.3.6 (31 n. 23; 37 n. 12), *Dial.* 6.20.3 (25 + n. 16); *Dial.* 7.19.3 (67); *Clem.* 1.23 (37 n. 12), 1.26.1 (59); *Epist.* 14.5 (35 n. 7); 98.12 (65); 101.11, 12 (30), 101.14 (7 n. 12; 39 n. 1 [erroneous reference by the translator]). Hengel is ambivalent regarding his interpretation of two texts: Sen. *Epist.* 14.5 and *Dial.* 6.20.3. He labels them not only crucifixions according to the references above, but also as examples of impalement (69 n. 1).

Kuhn: Sen. *Dial.* 3.2.2 (750); *Dial.* 6.20.3 (680 n. 169 [Kuhn labels, however, the text as a reference to “der Todesstrafe der Pfählung = Spießung” in n. 170 on the same page], 700, 716 n. 425); *Clem.* 1.26.1 (685, 720 + n. 448); *Epist.* 14.5 (755); 101.12 (700, [indirectly on 752], 755).

<sup>160</sup> Sen. *Dial.* 1.3.9–10. *figunt cutem clavi et quocumque fatigatum corpus reclinavit, vulnere incumbit, in perpetuam vigiliam suspensa sunt lumina: quanto plus tormenti tanto plus erit gloriae.... mero se licet sopiat et aquarum fragoribus avocet et mille voluptatibus mentem anxiam fallat: tam vigilabit in pluma quam ille in cruce.*

<sup>161</sup> It is also possible to add the subsequent words of suffering for a just cause (*sed illi solacium est pro honesto dura tolerare et ad causam a patientia respicit*).

with the contrasting fate of Maecenas in the second part. Thus, the wine is separated from the nails, and nothing in the earlier part of the text says that the piercing nails were used in a suspension. Seneca refers once more to Regulus' fate with *crux* in *Epist.* 98.12.3, when he mentions a series of various punishments. However, that text does not add anything beyond the usage of *crux*.<sup>162</sup> As a matter of fact, the later tradition interprets the fate of Regulus as not being suspended at all, but being trapped inside a barrel lined with nails – a so-called iron maiden.<sup>163</sup> Thus, this seemingly familiar text is not as complete a parallel to the Gospel accounts as the first glance might suggest. It appears nevertheless that Seneca connects Regulus' pain from the nails with a *crux*, which makes the text interesting for the present investigation. Hence, this text by Seneca might be the first crucifixion account, i.e., a punishment that meets the four criteria that constitute a crucifixion.<sup>164</sup>

Nothing is said, though, about the form of Regulus' suspension tool. The essential question of whether it is possible to see *crux* as an equivalent of "cross," and hence the act of being executed on a *crux* as an equivalent to "crucifixion," still calls for attention. What value has the noun *crux* by itself in the effort to trace references to the punishment of crucifixion in a traditional sense? In other words, is a *crux* always a cross (†)? To get closer to an answer, some other texts by Seneca the Younger will be considered.

The texts following the previous one offer a mixture as far as the level of information is concerned, from the notion of a suspended victim that appears to have his limbs outstretched on the *crux* (*in cruce membra distendere*) to the sheer mention of a *crux*. In the latter texts, the *crux* is only an example in a whole list of cruel punishments.<sup>165</sup> Seneca was familiar with a great variety of punishment forms, and in fact he was also familiar with a whole spectrum of various *crux*-punishments. That, at least, is what one of Seneca's most well-known texts indicates. Seneca delivers the scene as an example of his ongoing philosophical discussion of consolation.

I see *cruces* there, not indeed of a single kind but different constructions by different [people]. Some had suspended [their victims] with the head toward the ground, others had driven *stipes* through the private parts [of the victims], others had spread out [their]

---

<sup>162</sup> Sen. *Epist.* 98.12.3. *singula vicere iam multi: ignem Mucius, crucem Regulus, venenum Socrates, exilium Rutilius, mortem ferro adactam Cato*. Nothing is added beyond the usage of *crux*.

<sup>163</sup> August. *De civ. D.* 1.15; Tert. *Apol.* 50.6.

<sup>164</sup> See the introduction (p. 28).

<sup>165</sup> Sen. *Dial.* 3.2.2; *Dial.* 5.3.6; *Clem.* 1.23.1, 26.1; *Epist.* 14.5, 98.12.

arms on a *patibulum*. I see cords, I see scourges, and for each limb and joint there is an engine of torture.<sup>166</sup>

Seneca describes a scene of various suspensions, among them a rectal impaling, and refers to them all as "*crux*." Thus, Seneca also appears to use *crux* somehow in the sense "a torture or execution device [of wood?] onto which a victim was suspended in some way." A more specific definition of *crux* appears impossible. Kuhn observes the variation but still refers to the text as an indication "von der Variabilität der Form der *Kreuzigung* (emphasis added)."<sup>167</sup> This could be seen as a contradiction of his own definition of crucifixion on the previous page (679) in the same article.<sup>168</sup> However, on this same page Kuhn briefly mentions that *crux* could sometimes be used in the sense "'Marterholz' im allgemeinen."<sup>169</sup> With this utterance Kuhn comes close to Seneca's – and the previous ancient authors' – use of *crux*. Fulda uses the text as evidence that the ancient authors saw impaling as a form of *crucifixion*.<sup>170</sup> The translator of the Loeb edition was apparently puzzled by this text. His usual method of translating *crux* with "cross" was insufficient. He then chose to translate *crux* in this text with "instruments of torture" and thereby, perhaps by accident, he comes close to a definition of *crux* that appears to cohere with the hitherto studied usage of the Latin designation *crux*.<sup>171</sup>

Several terms occur in two other texts by Seneca. Also this first text is delivered as an example of a philosophical discussion. Seneca is in the middle of a speech about the happy life, virtue and desire.

Though they tried to release themselves from the *cruces*, to which each one of you nails himself with his own nails [*in quas unusquisque vestrum clauos suos ipse adigit*], they will nevertheless, when brought to punishment, each hang on a single *stipes*; while they who bring upon themselves their own [punishment] are divided upon so many *cruces* as

<sup>166</sup> Sen. *Dial.* 6.20.3. *video istic cruces ne unius quidem generis sed aliter ab aliis fabricatas: capite quidam conversos in terram suspendere, alii per obscena stipitem egerunt, alii brachia patibulo explicuerunt; video fidiculas, video verbera, et membris singulis articulis singula nocuerunt machinamenta.*

<sup>167</sup> KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 680 n. 169.

<sup>168</sup> "Gemeint ist eine durch jegliche Art von 'Aufhängen' vollzogene (oder beabsichtigte) Hinrichtung an einem Pfahl oder Ähnlichen (weithin in unserer Zeit wohl ein Pfahl mit einem Querbalken), für die das Andauern der Todesqual im Gegensatz zu einem Erhängen durch Strangulation, aber auch zur Pfählung wesentlich ist" (KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 679).

<sup>169</sup> KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 679. See also the etymological discussion in FULDA, *Das Kreuz*, 18, and ZESTERMANN, *Die bildliche Darstellung*, 15–17 n. 27.

<sup>170</sup> FULDA, *Das Kreuz*, 114–15.

<sup>171</sup> BASORE, *LCL*.

they had desired. But they are neat to insult others. I might believe that they are free to do so, if some [of them] did not spit upon spectators from the *patibulum*!<sup>172</sup>

It is not easy to unravel this dense description. Seneca visualizes a suspension execution in which nails could be used. How the three nouns, *crux*, *stipes* and *patibulum*, refer to the execution tool cannot be fully determined. It is plausible to assume that *crux* refers to the execution tool in general, as some kind of collective noun, but that does not necessarily lead to the conclusion that *stipes* and *patibulum* are different parts of that execution tool.<sup>173</sup> It appears that two groups are depicted: the first group are said to be nailed to *stipes*, which Seneca appears to use in connection with impaling in the previous texts (see also the next text), while the latter group are somehow attached to a device which is called both *patibulum* and *crux*. There is also a possibility that the words are only examples of *variatio sermonis*. Hengel translates both *crux* and *stipes* with “cross” in his discussion of the text.<sup>174</sup>

Both *crux* and *stipes* occur in the next text, which is found in Seneca’s moral essays. This text thus also serves as an example in an ongoing discussion. Seneca describes some threats originating in the powers at work in society.

Visualize for yourself this location, the prison, the *crux*, the racks, the hook, the *stipes* which is driven through a man until it emerges through his mouth, [human] limbs which are torn apart by chariots driven in opposite directions, that shirt which is smeared and interwoven with inflammable materials, and all other [things] beyond [these], devised by cruelty.<sup>175</sup>

The *crux* is simply mentioned without adding further knowledge, while Seneca’s usage of *stipes* in the text strengthens the notion of *stipes* as a simple pointed pole or stake used in impaling.

The last text from Seneca, as far as the suspension punishment is concerned, will be dealt with at length. This text, also an example in the ongoing discussion, contains several pregnant expressions – and Seneca uses

<sup>172</sup> Sen. *Dial.* 7.19.3. *cum refigere se crucibus conentur, in quas unusquisque vestrum clauos suos ipse adigit, ad supplicium tamen acti stipitibus singulis pendent; hi, qui in se ipsi animum advertunt, quot cupiditatibus tot crucibus distrahuntur. at maledici in alienam contumeliam venusti sunt. crederem illis hoc vacare, nisi quidam ex patibulo suo spectatores conspuerent!*

<sup>173</sup> Contra Basore (BASORE, *LCL*).

<sup>174</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 67.

<sup>175</sup> Sen. *Epist.* 14.5. *cogita hoc loco carcerem et cruces et eculeos et unicum et adactum per medium hominem, qui per os emergeret, stipitem et distracta in diversum actis curribus membra, illam tunicam alimentis ignium et inlitam et textam, et quicquid aliud praeter haec commenta saevitia est.*

them in a challenging way. The discussion revolves around the futility of the fear of death.

Thence [came] the most disgraceful of prayers from Maecenas, in which he did not refuse [to suffer] weakness, deformity, and ultimately the pointed *crux*, as long as he might prolong his breath of life amid these sufferings.

Fashion [me] with a disabled hand,  
 a disabled foot, [to be] a cripple.  
 Build upon [me] a crook-backed hump,  
 shake [my] teeth until they grind.  
 Everything is well, as long as [my] life remains.  
 Sustain me now, though I sit on the pointed *crux*.

If it had struck him, which was the most wretched [thing], he prefers a postponement of punishment as much as he strives for life. I should regard him as most despicable if he wished to live all the way up to the *crux*: "Truly," he cries, "you may cripple me, as long as the breath of life remains in [my] shattered and useless body. You may distort [me], deformed and monstrous, as long as you add [a little more] time before the end. You may affix [me] to be sitting and subject [me] to the pointed *crux*." Is it [worth] so much to press upon one's wound and to be suspended fixed on a *patibulum*, if it only separates [you from that] which is the best in the sufferings, the end of the punishment? Is it [worth] so much to possess breathing, if I only have to give it up? ... Can anyone be found who would prefer to waste away among punishments, to pass away limb by limb, to let out life drop by drop, rather than expire once and for all? Can anyone be found who would prefer to be driven to that *infelix lignum*, already disabled, already distorted, the breast and shoulder deformed into an ugly hump, he would have many reasons to die even beside the *crux*, than to draw the breath of life among such numbers of out-drawn torments.<sup>176</sup>

---

<sup>176</sup> Sen. Epist. 101.10-14. *inde illud Maecenatis turpissimum votum, quo et debilitatem non recusat et deformitatem et novissime acutam crucem, dummodo inter haec mala spiritus prorogetur:*

*debilem facito manu, debilem pede coxo,  
 tuber adstrue gibberum, lubricos quate dentes;  
 vita dum superest, benest; hanc mihi, vel acuta  
 si sedeam cruce, sustine.*

*quod miserrimum erat, si incidisset, optatur et tamquam vita petitur supplicii mora. contemptissimum putarem, si vivere vellet usque ad crucem: "tu vero" inquit "me debiles licet, dum spiritus in corpore fracto et inutili maneat. depraves licet, dum monstroso et distorto temporis aliquid accedat. suffigas licet et acutam sessuro crucem subdas." est tanti vulnus suum premere et patibulo pendere districtum, dum differat id, quod est in malis optimum, supplicii finem? est tanti habere animam, ut agam? ... invenitur aliquis, qui velit inter supplicia tabescere et perire membratim et totiens per stilicidia emittere animam quam semel exbalare? invenitur qui velit adactus ad illud infelix lignum, iam debilis, iam pravus et in foedum scapularum ac pectoris tuber elisus, cui multae moriendi causae etiam citra crucem fuerant, trahere animam tot tormenta tracturam?*

This text contains several problems. Hengel uses the translation from the Loeb edition with some minor changes and labels the text a crucifixion reference.<sup>177</sup> However, the translation given above suggests that Seneca implies both impaling on a *crux* and an unspecified suspension on a *patibulum*. The *acuta crux* ought to be a sharpened pole, which in combination with the verb *sedere* indicates a rectal impaling, such as that in the previous text. Hengel's suggestion is that the sharp feature does not belong to the pole itself but to a peg that Hengel thinks was used as a seat to support the body of the crucified.<sup>178</sup> His suggestion may appear somewhat surprising since there are no texts that mention any supportive seat on any suspension tool. Though Lipsius, as has been seen in the introduction, mentions the five extremities of the *crux*, he neither uses the label *sedile* nor mentions the discussed text (Sen. *Epist.* 101.10–14).<sup>179</sup> The origin of the label *sedile* in the sense of a sitting device on a suspension tool is unknown to the present author.

The interpretation of the present text is thus uncertain. The only firm conclusions that can be drawn are that it describes an ante-mortem suspension and that Seneca connects this execution form with the old formula *infelix lignum*.

### 3.3.1. Conclusion – Seneca the Younger

One of Seneca's texts (Sen. *Dial.* 1.3.9–10) coheres quite well with a traditional view of crucifixion. The text shows that nails could be used in an executionary suspension on a *crux*. However, the text reveals neither *how* the nails were used nor how the suspension tool appeared. Due to Seneca's other texts (foremost Sen. *Dial.* 6.20.3; Sen. *Epist.* 101.10–14) it is impossible to tie *crux* to anything more specified than being an execution device (of wood?) onto which a victim was suspended to be executed. Seneca appears to use *stipes* in a slightly more definable way. The noun refers twice to a pointed stake, which is used in some kind of impaling.<sup>180</sup> The range of meaning of *crux* may cover the usage of *stipes* in Seneca's text, but the range of meaning of *stipes* appears not to cover that of *crux*. A *crux* is not necessarily pointed. When it comes to *patibulum*, it appears also to be rather specified. Apart from the uncertainty in the last text, Seneca's use of *patibulum* approaches the common notion of *patibulum* as a crossbeam. A *patibulum* is some kind of vertical beam used in suspension punishments onto which a victim could be attached with outstretched arms. Seneca implies also that he was familiar with the use of

<sup>177</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 30–31.

<sup>178</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 30.

<sup>179</sup> LIPSIUS, *De Cruce*, 45–47.

<sup>180</sup> Sen. *Dial.* 6.20.3; *Epist.* 14.5.

nails in suspension executions.<sup>181</sup> In spite of the occurrence of familiar themes, the diversity of Seneca's texts makes them problematic to draw far-reaching conclusions from.

### 3.4. *Gaius Plinius Secundus*

Pliny the Elder (23/4–79 C.E.) is best known for his *Naturalis historia*. The work is an encyclopedia on the major parts of Pliny's contemporary knowledge. Hengel finds two references to crucifixions in Pliny's texts.<sup>182</sup>

A peculiar feature of Pliny is his usage of *crux*. He uses the noun in a way that corresponds to the older usage of *σταυρός* in Greek. Pliny refers to some vines, which were supported by a *crux*.<sup>183</sup> This is the only time the noun is used in this way in the texts studied in the present investigation. Pliny's usage of the noun thus contradicts the notion that *crux* is used only in connection with punishments.<sup>184</sup> Beside this text Pliny also uses the noun in a way more familiar, at least for the present investigation, when he expresses the medical usage of human hair that is torn down from a *crux* and a fragment of a nail from a *crux*.<sup>185</sup> The latter is interesting since it once again implies the use of nails in connection with a *crux*-punishment, although it does not say *which* punishment.<sup>186</sup> Pliny uses also *furca* in a related way in one text when he refers to the memory of the failed conquest of the Capitol Hill in Rome by the Gauls.<sup>187</sup> The guard dogs failed to wake while the easily disturbed geese exposed the intrusion. While the geese were honored, the dogs were attached alive by their shoulders to a *furca*.<sup>188</sup>

The first text that will be treated at length describes a similar event. This time Pliny's effort is to describe different species of lions.

Polybius, Aemilianus' companion, brings back the report that when [lions] become aged they will attack men, since the strength needed to pursue in the chase of wild animals is no longer present. Thus [the lions started] to besiege cities of Africa, and for that reason [lions] were attached to a *crux* [*cruci fixos*], [which] both he and Scipio saw, in order to

<sup>181</sup> Sen. *Dial.* 1.3.9–10; 7.19.3.

<sup>182</sup> Plin. *HN.* 28.46 (32 n. 26); 36.107 (43 n. 9).

<sup>183</sup> Plin. *HN.* 14.12 (3). *pendere in tam alta cruce*. Cf. Plin. *HN.* 17.212 (35) for *patibulum* and 14.32 (4) for *furca* used in the same sense.

<sup>184</sup> See s.v. *OLD*.

<sup>185</sup> Plin. *HN.* 28.41 (9) and 28.46 (11).

<sup>186</sup> I.e., whether it is a crucifixion or not. Hengel labels the text a crucifixion reference (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 32 n. 26).

<sup>187</sup> Cf. Plut. *De fort. Rom.* 325D.

<sup>188</sup> Plin. *HN.* 29.57 (11).



frighten the other [lions] from the same crime through fear of being punished with the same punishment.<sup>189</sup>

Pliny depicts lions as suspended by being somehow attached to some kind of pole. Any notion beyond this has to be based outside the text. Pliny refers to the event with the familiar expression *cruci figere*, which is impossible to limit to the meaning “to attach to a cross, crucify.” It is thus awkward to offer the above quoted text as support for such reading, as is done in the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*.<sup>190</sup> Nothing in the text beyond the use of *crux* suggests that the author depicted the lions as being crucified on actual crosses (†).

Pliny uses a similar expression in the next text, which is a part of his description of the marvelous buildings of Rome. When describing the sewers – seven rivers flowing beneath the city in artificial channels – he gives both praise and blame to their constructor, Tarquinius Priscus. Praise for the solid and firm construction that had withstood both earthquakes and the weight of the city above for seven hundred years. Blame for the punishment of the lower classes that were forced to build them. The heavy and endless work caused workers to commit suicide, which then became a common way to escape the troubles.

For [this evil], the king invented a new, non-devised, remedy, [seen] neither before nor afterwards: he attached to *cruces* all bodies of [those] who had committed suicide, that they should be a spectacle for [their] fellow-citizens and a prey for wild [animals] and birds.<sup>191</sup>

Pliny describes an act of post-mortem suspension on *cruces*, and indicates that the corpses were left on the *crux* for a while.<sup>192</sup> Hengel’s labeling of the text as a reference to crucifixion appears to be based on a general assumption that *crux* means “cross.”<sup>193</sup> Pliny’s earlier connection between nail and *crux* could be seen as some kind of support for this assumption,<sup>194</sup> but it does not establish a direct connection between *crux* and “cross.”

<sup>189</sup> Plin. *HN*. 8.47 (18). *Polybius, Aemiliani comes, in senecta hominem ab his adpeti refert, quoniam ad persequendas feras vires non suppetant; tunc obsidere Africae urbes, eaque de causa cruci fixos vidisse se cum Scipione, quia ceteri metu poenae similis abstererentur eadem noxa.*

<sup>190</sup> S.v. *OLD*.

<sup>191</sup> Plin. *HN*. 36.107 (24). *novum, inexcogitatum ante posteaque remedium invenit ille rex, ut omnium ita defunctorum corpora figeret cruci spectanda civibus simul et feris volucribusque laceranda.*

<sup>192</sup> See also *Hdt.* 3.125.4; *Soph. Ant.* 205ff; *Suet. Aug.* 13.

<sup>193</sup> Also Zöckler labels the suspension as a crucifixion (ZOECKLER, *The Cross of Christ*, 60 + n. 2).

<sup>194</sup> Plin. *HN*. 28.41 (9) and 28.46 (11).

The noun *crux* as used by Pliny appears to be only an execution device or a tool used for the disgrace of corpses. Whether Pliny's use of *crux* could be linked to the punishment tool of crucifixion or not is still an open question.

### 3.5. Marcus Fabius Quintilianus

Quintilian (c. 35–the nineties C.E.) taught rhetoric for twenty years; Pliny the Younger is found among his pupils. Quintilian was the greatest – or among the greatest – of the state-financed rhetors during the reign of Vespasian.<sup>195</sup> Quintilian mentions some punishments of interest in his books. Two of these are labeled crucifixions by Hengel.<sup>196</sup>

In several texts Quintilian only mentions a *crux* without further notice.<sup>197</sup> In other texts his language becomes slightly richer, as far as his depicting of the punishment is concerned. Two of them are only references to Cicero and will not be dealt with further.<sup>198</sup> This is also the case with one of the texts Hengel labels as a crucifixion account (Quint. *Inst.* 4.2.17), a text which only mentions that a shepherd was suspended on a *crux* (*in crucem sustulit*). The next text, however, contains a detail of interest.

Whenever we attach delinquents to *cruces* [*cruci figimus*], the most frequented roads are chosen, where the greatest number [of people] are able to see [them] and be stirred up by this fear. For every punishment has less to do with the offence than with the example.<sup>199</sup>

Thereby the suspension punishment is again shown to be a horrible view, but it is, once again, impossible to say *which* suspension punishment.

### 3.6. Quintus Curtius Rufus

Curtius Rufus wrote his history during the first, or beginning of the second, century C.E. He has a reference to the punishment of the inhabitants of Tyre by Alexander the Great, which Hengel regards as a crucifixion.<sup>200</sup>

<sup>195</sup> The texts of Pseudo-Quintilian (The Greater Declamations) are left out due to their late date.

<sup>196</sup> Hengel: Quint. *Inst.* 4.2.17 (55 n. 8); *Decl.* 274 (50 + n. 14).

<sup>197</sup> Quint. *Inst.* 6.1.54; 8.2.4; *Decl.* 380 (in the title, the prescript and sect. 1).

<sup>198</sup> Quint. *Inst.* 8.4.4, 5 (both have *in crucem tollere*).

<sup>199</sup> Quint. *Decl.* 274.13. *quotiens noxios cruci figimus, celeberrimae eliguntur viae, ubi plurimi intueri, plurimi commoveri hoc metu possint. omnis enim poena non tam ad delictum pertinet quam ad exemplum.*

<sup>200</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 73.

It was a sad spectacle the wrath of the king offered for the victors, two thousand [Tyrians], who had escaped the rage [of the Macedonians], hung attached to *cruces* [*crucibus adfixi*] all along a vast extent of the beach.<sup>201</sup>

There is thus no indication of any suspension form even in this well-known account, often assumed to be a crucifixion account.<sup>202</sup> The Tyrians were suspended in some way on some kind of poles.

Curtius Rufus has some additional accounts, in which he describes similar events. In his speech at Hecatompylus (omitted by Arrian) Alexander encourages his forces to pursue Darius' assumed heir Bassus. Once Darius was dead, Alexander's troops felt that their goal was achieved. But Alexander stressed that the man who betrayed Darius was too dangerous to be left free. A small overlooked spark often starts a big fire (Curt. 6.3.11).

Are you going to permit this man to be king? I cannot wait to see him attached to a *crux* [*cruci adfixum*], paying the fitting penalty to all kings, all peoples and all loyalty, which he had violated.<sup>203</sup>

The following account goes on in the same way. Alexander punished those who surrendered from the Sogdian rock by scourging them and attaching them to *cruces* at the foot of the rock.<sup>204</sup> When Alexander punished the chieftain of the so-called Musicani tribe, he simply suspended him on a *crux*.<sup>205</sup> The texts by Curtius Rufus thus indicate that Alexander the Great suspended his victims, but they do not reveal in what way they were suspended.

## 4. Poetry

The poetical traditions of the ancient Roman world may serve as a reflection of the perception of the punishments in focus of the present investigation, just as the texts of the rhetorical tradition did.

---

<sup>201</sup> Curt. 4.4.17. *triste deinde spectaculum victoribus ira praebuit regis: duo milia, in quibus occidendis defecerat rabies, crucibus adfixi per ingens litoris spatium pependerit.*

<sup>202</sup> E.g., O'COLLINS, "Crucifixion," 1207; ZIAS, "Crucifixion in Antiquity" (an article from Internet); HENGEL and SCHWEMER, *Jesus und das Judentum*, 611.

<sup>203</sup> Curt. 6.3.14. *hunc vos regnare patiemini? quem equidem cruci adfixum videre festino omnibus regibus gentibusque et fidei, quam violavit, meritas poenas solventem.*

<sup>204</sup> Curt. 7.11.28. *quos omnis verberibus adfectos sub ipsis radicibus petrae crucibus iussit adfigi.*

<sup>205</sup> Curt. 9.8.16. *quo Alexander in crucem sublato.*

#### 4.1. Gaius Valerius Catullus

The Roman poet Catullus (c. 84–c. 54 B.C.) came to Rome as a young man and stayed there during the turbulent years of slave rebellion, the returned threat of Mithriades and the growing threat of piracy in the Mediterranean. These events did not, however, leave many traces in his texts. Catullus has one text that contains an important feature. In a poem to a certain Juventius, Catullus describes a suspension, labeled as crucifixion by Hengel, which shares a peculiar feature with one of Seneca's texts.<sup>206</sup>

I snatched from you, while playing, honeyed Juventus, a little kiss sweeter than sweet ambrosia. Truly I did not carry it away unpunished; for more than an hour I remember I was attached to/hanging from the top of a *crux*, while I purged myself [for my crime] against you. Neither by weeping could I in the least take away your cruelty.<sup>207</sup>

Here a form of *crux*-punishment surfaces again that is difficult to label as a crucifixion in a traditional sense. The text is silent about the way in which he is attached to – or hanging from – the *crux*. The mentioned top of the *crux* moves it in the direction of being a suspension tool used in impaling.<sup>208</sup> However, the outdrawn death struggle probably excludes impaling as an alternative. It is not necessary to understand *summa* as referring to the *top* of the *crux*, it could also be read as a referent to a *high crux*. Since it is an open question which reading is most plausible, this text is yet another example of an unspecified punishment account.

#### 4.2. Quintus Horatius Flaccus

Horace (65–8 B.C.E.) was one of the greatest lyricists of ancient Rome. He associated himself with Brutus in Athens, but with the fall of the latter Horace lost everything. Horace managed to return to Italy and began to write poems, which brought him into contact with Virgil and Varius Rufus – and particularly Maecenas. The connection with Maecenas secured Horace's financial position and his popularity rose. Horace mentions *crux* in three texts; two of these simply mention a *crux* without further notice.<sup>209</sup> The other text combines the noun with a verb. Hengel refers to this text as a crucifixion reference.<sup>210</sup>

<sup>206</sup> Sen. *Epist.* 101.10–14.

<sup>207</sup> Catull. 99.3–6. *surrupui tibi, dum ludis, mellite Iuventi, | saviolum dulci dulcius ambrosia | verum id non impune tuli: namque amplius horam | suffixum in summa me memini esse cruce, | dum tibi me purgo nec possum fletibus ullis | tantillum vestrae demere saevitiae.*

<sup>208</sup> See, MERRILL, *Catullus*, 213.

<sup>209</sup> Hor. *Epist.* 1.16.48; *Sat.* 2.7.47.

<sup>210</sup> Hor. *Sat.* 1.3.8off (58 n. 13).

If anyone attaches to a *crux* [*in cruce suffigat*] a slave, who being ordered to take away the dish were to gorge himself with half eaten fishes and lukewarm sauce, he would be called more insane than Labeo among [those who are] in their senses.<sup>211</sup>

As the case was in the vast majority of the previous texts, neither does this text reveal anything new regarding the nature of the punishment. Horace's usage of *crux* is thus difficult to define.

#### 4.3. *Publius Ovidius Naso*

Ovid (43 B.C.E.–17 C.E.) left the public life of politics for poetry and gained prominence as a writer. Ovid was the leading poet of Rome by 8 C.E., when he suddenly was banished by Augustus for disputed reasons.

Ovid has one text which Hengel interprets as an allusion to the punishment of *arbor infelix*, while Kuhn labels it as a crucifixion account.<sup>212</sup>

This wood offered hanging for the wretched neck; for the executioner these *cruces* offered the dreadful; this filth handed over the shadow to the raucous horned owl; vultures and screech owls laid eggs in the branches.<sup>213</sup>

Hengel or Kuhn *might* be correct in their understanding of this dense text, but the text *per se* supports neither Hengel's nor Kuhn's reading. What Ovid here depicts in vivid colors is not easily perceived. It could be the same punishment that is described in the first two lines. If this reading is satisfying, the text refers to some kind of hanging by snare on a device called *crux*. But it could also mean one of the different punishment forms at hand. The wood in line 17 could also be a wax tablet that mentions the punishments and thus have nothing to do with the material of the torture tools.

Ovid uses, however, *crux* in one additional text, which points in another direction. An outdrawn suffering, not coherent with hasty death by hanging, flickers briefly in another poem by Ovid.

They say [that those] in prison hope for freedom as much as a [man] being suspended on a *crux* utters prayers.<sup>214</sup>

Consciousness on a *crux* is a plausible indication of crucifixion as defined by the present investigation. Thus, Ovid's contribution to the crucifixion

<sup>211</sup> Hor. Sat. 1.3.80–83. *si quis eum servum, patinam qui tollere iussus | semesos piscis tepidumque ligurrierit ius, | in cruce suffigat, Labeone insanior inter | sanos dicatur.*

<sup>212</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 39 n. 1; KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 764.

<sup>213</sup> Ov. Am. 1.12.17–20. *praebuit illa arbor misero suspendia collo, | carnifici diras praebuit illa cruces; | illa dedit turpes raucis bubonibus umbras, | vulturis in ramis et strigis ova tulit.*

<sup>214</sup> Ov. Pont. 1.6.37–38. *carcere dicuntur clausi sperare salutem | atque aliquis pendens in cruce nota facit.*

quest is contradictory. It is again shown that *crux* can be used in connection with a crucifixion-like punishment, but it is also shown that the usage of *crux* is wider than just being a “cross”.

#### 4.4. *Marcus Valerius Martialis*

Born in Spain, Martial (between 38 and 41–between 101 and 104) spent his productive years in Rome. He was acquainted with the poetical elite of his time. Hengel and Kuhn refer to a text in which Martial describes how a play that represented the execution of the robber chief Laureolus could be performed in Martial’s days.<sup>215</sup>

As Prometheus was tied to a rock in Scythia, and fed the rigorous birds with too much flesh, Laureolus offered a Scottish bear [his] unprotected abdomen, suspended on no unreal *crux*. [His] mangled limbs lived, but the joints were dripping blood, the whole body was in no place in [the shape of a] body.<sup>216</sup>

Thus, it appears that the play contained an actual execution of a participant. The text does not, however, reveal to what kind of authentic device the unfortunate person was attached.<sup>217</sup>

#### 4.5. *Decimus Iunius Iuvenalis*

The Roman satirist Juvenal (c. 60–c. 135), friend of Martial, wrote angry and ironic satires with rhetorical influences. His satires might reflect realities of the Roman social life; some texts are read in that way by Hengel and Kuhn.<sup>218</sup> Juvenal offers a colorful conversation between a man and his cunning wife, which is quoted in full length by Hengel.

“Erect a *crux* for [that] slave!” [says the wife]. “With what crime has the slave himself deserved [that] punishment?” [asks the husband]. “Who is the witness? Who accuses [him]? Give [him at least] a hearing! No delay is [too] long [when dealing with] the execution of a man” [says the husband]. “Oh you fool, is a slave a human being? He has

<sup>215</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 35–36; KUHN, “Die Kreuzesstrafe,” 695 + n 276, 741.

<sup>216</sup> Mart. *Epigr.* 7. *qualiter in Scythica religatus rupe Prometheus | adsiduam nimio pectore pavit avem, | nuda Caledonio sic viscera praebuit urso | non falsa pendens in cruce Laureolus. | vivebant laceri membris stillantibus artus | inque omni nusquam corpore corpus erat.*

<sup>217</sup> Coleman appears to identify a problem regarding the variety among the suspension tools. “The emphatic position of *non* immediately before *falsa* suggests a parallel between crucifixion and the custom of binding *damnati* to a stake. What we regard as a cruciform shape was not a prerequisite for a *crux*” (COLEMAN, *Martial*, 91–93 [91]). However, Coleman still labels *crux* as being a “cross” without further discussion, and adds that *crux* is sometimes used together with a *patibulum*, by means of “crossbeam.”

<sup>218</sup> Hengel: Juv. 6.219f (57–58); 8.187f (35); 14.77f (54). Kuhn: 6.219 (721); 8.187 (695). For a discussion on Juvenal’s value as source for the historical situation, see s.v. *OCD* and the references given there.

done nothing, you say. This is my will, in this way I command; let my will be the reason [for the punishment].”<sup>219</sup>

The text indicates that slaves could be subjected to punishments arbitrarily, at least in Juvenal’s satires. But neither does this text reveal what kind of punishment the *crux*-punishment was. The noun stands alone without further explanation.

This is also the case in Juvenal’s other texts in which *crux* occurs. In the first text, Juvenal refers to the same play as Martial did above.<sup>220</sup> Juvenal praises the acting skill of one Lentulus, who played the robber chief Laureolus, and states that he deserved a real *crux*.<sup>221</sup> In the second, Juvenal concludes that the same crime could produce different punishments: one gets a *crux* while the other gets a crown.<sup>222</sup> In the last text of this chapter, Juvenal offers a chilling view of what might be a glimpse of the aftermath of a suspension punishment.

The vulture hastens from beasts of burden and dogs, even from [corpses] which have been left on *cruces*, and brings a piece of the carcass to [its] offspring; so this is the food on which the vulture feeds as an adult, when it builds its nest in its own tree.<sup>223</sup>

The text indicates that victims, executed on the *crux* or executed *before* the suspension, were left to rot on the suspension tool. As in the absolute majority of the previous texts, this text reveals neither what the *crux* was, nor in what way or in what condition the victims were attached to the device.

## 5. Inscription

Last but not least, there is a marble plate with a *lex locationis* (legal rules for contractors). The inscription (probably from the first century C.E.) was found in Pozzuoli (the ancient colony of Puteoli) and mentions both *crux* and *patibulum* in the same sentence in an intriguing way. The text is of special interest for the present investigation since it is a *lex*, but it is not

---

<sup>219</sup> Juv. 6.219–23. ‘*pone crucem servo.*’ ‘*meruit qu crimine servus | supplicium? quis testis adest? quis detulit? audi; | nulla umquam de morte hominis cunctatio longa est.*’ | ‘*o demens, ita servus homo est? nil fecerit, esto: | hoc volo, sic iubeo, sit pro ratione voluntas.*’

<sup>220</sup> Mart. *Epigr.* 7.

<sup>221</sup> Juv. 8.188. *dignus vera cruce.*

<sup>222</sup> Juv. 13.103–05. *multi | committunt eadem diverso crimina fato: | ille crucem sceleris pretium tulit, hic diadema.*

<sup>223</sup> Juv. 14.77–80. *vultur iumento et canibus crucibusque relictis | ad fetus properat partemque cadaveris adfert: | hic est ergo cibus magni quoque vulturis et se | pascentis, propria cum iam facit arbore nidos.*

easy to interpret. John Granger Cook uses the tablet as an indication, among others, of the custom to make the victim carry his/her own cross-beam.<sup>224</sup> The text contains regulations connected with executions. Using the commonly abbreviated inscription orthography, the engraver left out several endings, important for the present investigation, that would be helpful in determining what the text describes. The part of the inscription that is of interest here goes as follows.

QUI SUPPLIC DE SER SERVAVE PRIVATIM SUMER VOLET UTI IS SUMI VOLET ITA SUPPLIC SUMET SI IN CRUC | PATIBUL AGERE VOLET REDEMPT ASSER VINCUL RESTES VERBERATORIB ET VERBERATOR PRAEBER D ET | QUISQ SUPPLIC SUMET PRO OPER SING QUAE PATIBUL FERUNT VERBERATORIBQ ITEM CARNIF HS IIII D D | QUOT SUPPLIC MAGISTRAT PUBLIC SUMET ITA IMPERAT QUOTIENSUMQ IMPERAT ER PRAESTU ESSE SU | PPLICIUM SUMER CRUCES STATUERE CLAVOS PECEM CERAM CANDEL QUAEQ AD EAS RES OPUS ERUNT REO | GRATIS PRAEST D ITEM SI UNCO EXTRAHERE IUSSUS ERIT OPER RUSSAT ID CADAVER UBI PLURA | CADAVERA ERUNT CUM TINTINNABULO EXTRAHERE DEBEBIT.<sup>225</sup>

Cook bases his translation of the text on a reconstruction that reads the crucial parts of the text as follows: *in cruc[em] patibul[um] agere ...* (to bring the patibulum to the cross ...).<sup>226</sup> The meaning of this sentence is rather clear-cut in the light of a traditional view of crucifixion – and the assumed custom of “cross-bearing.” When the reader comes a few lines further and the inscription mentions that the executioner has to erect some *crux* and to acquire nails (line 12) the image is unmistakable. However, if the reading continues and the reader sees that the executioner besides the nails has to acquire pitch, wax, and candles (absent in a traditional understanding of crucifixion), the picture becomes blurred. If the

<sup>224</sup> COOK, “Envisioning Crucifixion,” 266–67.

<sup>225</sup> *Lex Puteoli*, col. 2.8–14 (AE 1971, no 88 [Puteoli]). BOVE, “Due nuove iscrizioni di Pozzuoli e Cuma,” 212.

<sup>226</sup> Cook’s translation shows that he reconstructs the noun as *patibulum*. “Whoever will want to exact punishment on a male slave at private expense, as he [the owner] who wants the [punishment] to be inflicted, he [the contractor] exacts the punishment in this manner: if he wants [him] to bring the *patibulum* to the cross, the contractor will have to provide wooden posts, chains, and chords for the floggers and the floggers themselves. And anyone who will want to exact punishment will have to give four sesterces for each of the workers who bring the *patibulum* and for the floggers and also for the executioner.

Whenever a magistrate exacts punishment at public expense, so shall he decree; and whenever it will have been ordered to be ready to carry out the punishment, the contractor will have gratis to set up stakes (*cruces*), and will have gratis to provide nails, pitch, wax, candles, and those things which are essential for such matters. Also if he will be commanded to drag [the cadaver] out with a hook, he must drag the cadaver itself out, his workers dressed in red, with a bell ringing, to a place where many cadavers will be.” COOK, “Envisioning Crucifixion,” 265–66.



inscription is also read in the light of uncertainty connected with the texts expressed by the present investigation, the clarity fades significantly.

Cook mentions briefly in a footnote a different reconstruction of line 9.<sup>227</sup> The interpretation of the text would head in another direction if taken as *patibul[atum]*. Thereby it becomes a generic term for the torture of execution *victims*, who were taken to the *crux*. Cook also mentions briefly the dilemma with the plural case of the verb *ferre* in line 10.<sup>228</sup> The strophe obviously could not refer to a victim who carries his *patibulum* (in the sense “crossbeam”) toward the execution place where the rest of the execution tool (*crux*) awaits. It is the workers, *QUAE PATIBUL FERUNT* (who [plural] bring the *patibul[ ]*), who shall be paid. It refers to several people who bring the *patibul[um]*, or preferably the victim – *patibul[atum]* –, toward the execution place.

It is also possible to read the strophe *VOLET ITA SUPPLIC SUMET SI IN CRUC PATIBUL AGERE* as referring to the act of bringing *the slave* to a *crux* or a *patibulum*.<sup>229</sup> Such a reading coheres better with the accounts of the literary context than Cook’s does.

In the end, the text with potential of being the missing evidence for a custom of carrying a *patibulum* towards a waiting *crux* is seriously weakened due to the uncertainty of the abbreviated forms and the lack of other texts which reveal that there was a custom of letting the condemned himself carry the crossbeam toward the awaiting bare pole and subsequently be attached to it.<sup>230</sup>

## 6. Conclusion – The Latin Literature

What then can be said about the punishment of crucifixion in the Latin literature until the turn of the first century of the Common Era? The guiding questions that have been in focus are: How is the terminology used by the authors? To what kind of punishment do they refer? What can the present-day reader learn about the crucifixion punishment in Latin literature?

---

<sup>227</sup> COOK, “Envisioning Crucifixion,” 265 + n. 12.

<sup>228</sup> COOK, “Envisioning Crucifixion,” 266.

<sup>229</sup> See, GARDNER and WIEDEMANN, *The Roman Household*, 24–26.

<sup>230</sup> Thus, Cook’s otherwise convincing article has the same weakness as several earlier investigations. The texts, especially those referred to under Cook’s heading “Carrying the *Patibulum*,” are not as explicit as Cook suggests. Cook also mentions another inscription that should show the reluctance toward crucifying a Roman citizen (COOK, “Envisioning Crucifixion,” 273). The text (POTTER and DAMON, “The *senatus consultum de cn. pisone patre*,” 20–21) mentions only attaching to a *crux* (*c[ivem] R[omanum] cruci fixisse*).

### 6.1. The Terminology

The answer to *the first basic question* of the present investigation is surprising also regarding the Latin literature. The first observation coheres to some extent with the one drawn in the previous chapter. There is a *suspension* terminology in which the usage of the specific terms is generally much wider and more diverse than it is possible to cover with the label “crucifixion.” The difference is that *crux* refers to a suspension tool in a higher degree than *σταυρός*. Latin is more distinct compared to Greek in its usage of the studied terminology. The usage of the terms appears less disparate than the usage of corresponding terms in Greek. But they are still not distinct enough to be tied directly to crucifixion in the sense that the occurrence of one word, e.g., *crux*, is a sufficient indicator of a crucifixion.

The second observation is that the usages of the specific terms overlap to a greater extent than what appears to be acknowledged by the previous investigations. This observation causes some problems regarding the relation between certain terms. It is, e.g., difficult to uphold the notion that *crux* simply refers to the standing pole while *patibulum* refers to the crossbeam.<sup>231</sup> *crux* is the primary designation for a vertical suspension or torture tool. The primary designations for a carried torture device are *patibulum* and *furca*. The carrying of a *patibulum* is connected with the shameful – and possibly separate – punishment of being forced to walk in disgrace (*sub furca*), rather than constituting the half part of a subsequent suspension on a simple pole.

The third observation concerns the ranges of meaning of the specific terms, with special attention to what might be called their ecclesiastical evolution. As has been said already, *crucifigere* did not exclusively mean “to crucify” at the time of Jesus. It is used in the sense “to attach in some way to a vertical torture device.” The term is however easier to connect with the punishment of crucifixion as this punishment is traditionally understood than, e.g., (ἀνα)σταυροῦν. (*af*)*figere* is not limited to denoting the act of nailing a victim to a cross. It is used in the sense “to attach” in a wider sense. *patibulum* did not simply mean “crossbeam.” *patibulum* refers generally to a beam, preferably horizontal, often used in connection with punishments. It became “crossbeam” within Christian theology. And *crux* did not simply mean “cross” before Jesus; it became “cross” after the groundbreaking death of Jesus, in the eyes of the developing Christian churches. It is safe to say that the traditional notion of the way

<sup>231</sup> Contra BLINZLER, *Der Prozeß Jesu*, 360; O’COLLINS, “Crucifixion,” 1208–09; SCHNEIDER, “σταυρός, κτλ.” 573–74; STAUFFER, *Jerusalem und Rom*, 127; WINTER, *On the Trial of Jesus*, 95–96; ZESTERMANN, *Die bildliche Darstellung*, 13–23. See, e.g., Tac. *Ann.* 14.33.2 where *patibulum* and *crux* may refer to two different punishment forms.

Jesus died charged *crux*, *patibulum* and *crucifigere* with a distinct – and new – denotation.

The majority of the ancient texts are silent when it comes to defining what kind of device lies behind the notion *crux*. But some texts indicate that it can hardly be a “cross” in the traditional sense (†). Pliny the Elder uses *crux* when referring to a device onto which a lion may have been impaled.<sup>232</sup> He also uses *crux* when referring to a supporting device for vines.<sup>233</sup> The Younger Seneca, and perhaps Catullus, use *crux* when they refer to poles used in possibly rectal impalings.<sup>234</sup> There are, in addition, other quite similar suspensions in which the authors use other terms; Sallust uses *patibulum* (*Hist.* F 3.9), Tacitus mentions trees (*Germ.* 12) and Cicero a statue used similarly (*Verr.* 2.4.26–27). Hence, *crux* does not “mean” cross (†). The English term “cross” implies two crossing lines, an implication the Latin *crux* lacks. The field of etymology is of no help in any effort to trace a supposed original meaning of *crux*.<sup>235</sup>

When it comes to *patibulum*, the etymology is more helpful. A connotation of being outstretched is evident,<sup>236</sup> although the question why an act of stretching out the arms occurred and what that act implied is, as has been seen, still unresolved.

The field of usage, however, is much more helpful than etymology. Seneca sets the present-day reader on the right track in the search for the range of meaning of *crux* when he reveals that there are various forms of *crucēs*.<sup>237</sup> *crux* appears to be a collective label for various punishment tools. This understanding of the noun harmonizes it with its derivatives (*cruciatus*; [ex]*cruciare*). It is recognized that *cruciatus* and its verb refer to a whole variety of torture and violent acts.<sup>238</sup> The present investigation adds *furcifer* and *patibulum* to the same category. With the reading of

<sup>232</sup> Plin. *HN.* 8.47 (18).

<sup>233</sup> Plin. *HN.* 14.12 (3).

<sup>234</sup> Sen. *Epist.* 101.10–14; Catull. 99.3–6.

<sup>235</sup> See s.v. *LEW*; *DELL*; *TLL*. See also Zestermann’s and Hitzig’s discussions on the topic (ZESTERMANN, *Die bildliche Darstellung*, 15–17 n. 27; HITZIG, “Cruz,” cols. 1728–29).

<sup>236</sup> See s.v. *EWLS* and “Pateo” in *LEW*.

<sup>237</sup> Sen. *Dial.* 6.20.3. I see *crucēs* there, not indeed of a single kind but different constructions by different [peoples]. Some had suspended [their victims] with the head toward the ground, others had driven *stipes* through the private parts [of the victims], others had spread out [their] arms on a *patibulum*. I see cords, I see scourges, and for each limb and joint there is an engine of torture (*video istic crucēs ne unius quidem generis sed aliter ab aliis fabricatas: capite quidam conversos in terram suspendere, alii per obscena stipitem egerunt, alii brachia patibulo explicuerunt; video fiduculas, video verbera, et membrīs singulis articulis singula nocuerunt machinamenta*). See the text above on pp. 187–88.

<sup>238</sup> S.v. *OLD*.

*crux* proposed by the present investigation, the step between *crux* and these words becomes smaller.

The observation of the diverse usage of *crux* is actually not new. The *Oxford Latin Dictionary* is on the right track in its definition of *crux*.

*crux*-*ucis*. *f.* [dub.] GENDER: masc., ENN. *Ann.* 360. GRACCH. *orat.* 36 (Fest.p. 150M).

1 Any wooden frame on which criminals were exposed to die, a cross (sts. also, a stake for impaling). **b** (in various phrs. denoting crucifixion or impalement; see also CRVCIFIGO).

...

2 (pregn.) Death by the cross. crucifixion; (in imprecations) *i in malam ~ucem* (and sim. phrs.), go and be hanged! **b** (transf.) extreme discomfort; torture.

...

3 (colloq., often *mala ~ux*) Anything which causes grief or annoyance, a plague, torment. etc.<sup>239</sup>

Also Kuhn has noticed the disparate use of *crux* and suggests that the noun is sometimes used in the meaning "Marterholz' im allgemeinen."<sup>240</sup> The problem is that Kuhn, and others, still use *crux* as the only criterion for sifting out crucifixion accounts. It appears that they have not taken the practical result of this observation into consideration. One of the aims of the present investigation is to consider this observation: the noun *crux* (or *patibulum*) by itself is not a sufficient marker for a crucifixion account. To specify an account as a reference to crucifixion, something more is needed.

The pivot around which the outcome of the present chapter revolves is the question of how influential the early text by Plautus is. Plautus uses the noun in a way that ends up rather close to being a "cross" (†). Thus early in the Latin literature *crux* might mean something which has a resemblance to the modern English "cross." The question is whether this meaning was embedded in the noun to such an extent that *crux* actually means "cross" after Plautus. The answer to that question ought to be negative. Plautus shows that the noun *could* be used in this sense rather close to the advent of preserved written Latin, but later texts show clearly that this is not always the case. The usage of *crux* is more diverse than only referring to a "cross."

David W. Chapman, who will be the main dialogue partner of the next chapter, observes well the diverse usage of the Latin terminology. "[T]he ... terminology could give the misleading impression that execution via the *crux* had only a limited range of shapes and practices."<sup>241</sup> There is indeed a variety in the suspension methods, as Chapman correctly points

<sup>239</sup> S.v. *OLD*.

<sup>240</sup> KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 679.

<sup>241</sup> CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 8.

out. But, having said this, he finds it peculiar that Pliny the Elder labels a post-mortem suspension a “crucifixion.”<sup>242</sup> A problem with Chapman’s method (which will be dealt with further in the next chapter) becomes visible here. Pliny does *not* label the event as a crucifixion. What Pliny does is that he uses *figere* and *crux* – which, once again, does not mean “to crucify.”<sup>243</sup> It thus appears that Chapman himself applies “a limited range of shapes and practices” to the terminology. It is not strange that Pliny uses *figere* and *crux* in connection with the suspension of a corpse. This is in fact consistent with the overall usage of the terms.

### 6.2. *The Punishment*

The answer to *the second basic question* of the present investigation is the following observation. The lack of a distinct crucifixion terminology and the disparate use of the terms in the group of suspension punishments, in the hitherto studied texts, suggest that there was no defined punishment called crucifixion before the execution of Jesus. The shapes of the crucifixion punishment familiar to the present-day reader appear to be formed after Jesus’ death.

The question whether the authors used crucifixion or not falls back on the question of definition. If the label “crucifixion” is used in a traditional sense, referring to an execution on a standing suspension device, onto which the victim was attached by nails or rope with its limbs, then only a fraction of the texts Hengel and Kuhn, and others, refer to could be labeled as references to crucifixion. If the label “crucifixion” instead is used for everything that is some kind of attaching to some kind of device of living person, or a whole corpse or a part of a corpse, almost all the texts adduced by Hengel and Kuhn and others (as well as many additional texts) could be seen as references to crucifixion.

This conclusion is of course categorical, but still relevant, since the question of definition is all too briefly dealt with by these scholars. The silence on the theme of definition is surprising. The exception is Kuhn, as mentioned.<sup>244</sup> If his definition is used, the majority of the texts Kuhn

---

<sup>242</sup> CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 9.

<sup>243</sup> Plin. *HN*. 36.107 (24).

<sup>244</sup> “Gemeint ist eine durch jegliche Art von ”Aufhängen” vollzogene (oder beabsichtigte) Hinrichtung an einem Pfahl oder Ähnlichen (weithin in unserer Zeit wohl ein Pfahl mit einem Querbalken), für die das Andauern der Todesqual im Gegensatz zu einem Erhängen durch Strangulation, aber auch zur Pfählung wesentlich ist” (KUHN, “Die Kreuzesstrafe,” 679). It is also possible to add the brief definition Fulda offers in an ongoing discussion; “[d]er Ursprung der eigentlichen Kreuzigung, d. h. des Aufhängens Lebender Menschen, damit sie durch langsam tödenden Schmerz sterben, zeigt auf den tiefern Orient hin“ (FULDA, *Das Kreuz und die Kreuzigung*, 49 (cf. 54).

himself refers to must be rejected. Left are a small number of texts, which are candidates for being labeled as crucifixion accounts according to the definition used in the present investigation. There are four criteria that constitute a crucifixion. First, it is an attempted or completed execution. Second, the execution is carried out by means of a suspension, in which the victim is nailed or tied with his limbs to a vertical execution tool. Third, the suspension tool is a pole, with or without crossbeam. Fourth, the victim is publicly displayed, in order to subject the victim to an extended, painful death struggle, often in disgrace.

The problem is that the combination of these four not especially surprising features excludes almost every ancient text. Quite a lot of Latin texts fit well with the second feature; they describe some kind of suspension. Several texts contain features that have *some* resemblance to the traditional view of crucifixion. Plautus' texts are good examples of this. Plautus connects a *crux*-punishment with a fastening of both hands and feet.<sup>245</sup> He could also speak of outspread arms in connection with *patibulum*.<sup>246</sup>

But, as mentioned in the previous chapter, if the aim is to find *antemortem* suspensions of victims who suffer an outdrawn painful execution, the evidence shrinks drastically. A few texts indicate a living suspended victim.<sup>247</sup> As was the case in the previous chapter, this feature ought to exclude impaling and hanging from the picture and is thus a sign of an execution and what might be an outdrawn death struggle. Thus, if the aim is to find an ancient account of the punishment Jesus suffered according to the Christian traditions – a text meeting the four criteria that constitute a crucifixion – only one text is left:

Nails pierce [his] skin [*figunt cutem clavi*] and wherever he rests [his] wearied body, he presses upon a wound, [his] eyes are open in unbroken sleeplessness. But the greater [his] torment is, the greater [his] glory will be.... Although he drugs himself with un-mixed wine and diverts [his] anxious mind and deceives [it] with a thousand pleasures, he will [no more] fall to sleep on [his] pillow than that other on [his] *crux*.<sup>248</sup>

As have been seen, this text indicates that nails could be used in what appears to be a suspension account.<sup>249</sup> If the text is correctly understood, it

<sup>245</sup> Plaut. *Most.* 348–62.

<sup>246</sup> Plaut. *Mil.* 359–60.

<sup>247</sup> Cic. *Verr.* 2.5.169–70; Ov. *Pont.* 1.6.37–38.

<sup>248</sup> Sen. *Dial.* 1.3.9–10. *figunt cutem clavi et quocumque fatigatum corpus reclinavit, vulneri incumbit, in perpetuam vigiliam suspensa sunt lumina: quanto plus tormenti tanto plus erit gloriae.... mero se licet sopiat et aquarum fragoribus avocet et mille voluptatibus mentem anxiam fallat: tam vigilabit in pluma quam ille in cruce.*

<sup>249</sup> A reading that contradicts later traditions about Regulus' fate (August. *De civ. D.* 1.15; Tert. *Apol.* 50.6).

implies that Regulus was suspended by being nailed alive to a device called *crux*, and subjected to an outdrawn death struggle – thus crucified, according to the introduction.<sup>250</sup> But, the problem is that Senecas' other texts indicate that was not the only form of *crux* punishment.<sup>251</sup>

The reason behind this meager result, and the reason behind the problems with finding crucifixion accounts in the ancient texts, might be that there was no specific crucifixion punishment – a defined entity containing the four criteria – in the ancient world. Instead, it appears as if there was a whole spectrum of various suspension punishments, which all shared terminology.

---

<sup>250</sup> See the introduction (pp. 28–29).

<sup>251</sup> E.g., Sen. *Dial.* 6.20.3; *Epist.* 101.10–14.





## Chapter Four

# The Old Testament and Early Jewish Literature

The aim of the present chapter is to study the punishment of crucifixion in Biblical and early Jewish literature. A discussion with lexicography, in this case Hebrew and Aramaic, will be blended with the study of the texts to a further extent than in previous chapters. The reason behind this decision is the limited text corpus called the Hebrew Bible or the Old Testament depending on the reader's view of the texts. In the present investigation the label "Old Testament" will be used, not with a negative bias, but as a natural label of an – in comparison to the New Testament – older text corpus. These texts will in addition also be considered in various translations, which rules out the label "Hebrew Bible."

The study of the Old Testament falls outside the scope of texts in focus for Hengel and Kuhn. Instead of their contributions, special attention will be paid to David W. Chapman's monograph *Ancient Jewish and Christian Perceptions of Crucifixion*, since it offers an extensive survey of the Old Testament texts from a perspective related to that of the present investigation.<sup>1</sup>

Chapman offers several important observations regarding the often vague terminology used in connection with suspension punishments.

This suggests that in studying the ancient world the scholar is wise not to differentiate too rigidly categories of "crucifixion," "impalement," and "suspension" (as if these were clearly to be distinguished in every instance). Hence, any study of crucifixion conceptions in antiquity must grapple with the broader context of the wide variety of penal suspension of human beings.<sup>2</sup>

According to Chapman, a clear diversity in the various suspension accounts calls for sensitivity in the act of interpretation. One and the same term may refer to several different suspension forms.<sup>3</sup>

The core of Chapman's book is his initiated study of the Old Testament suspension texts, not least in the light of the ancient translation and

---

<sup>1</sup> CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 97–177.

<sup>2</sup> CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 32.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 9, 12–13, 30–33.

variants. There is no need to repeat that study here. However, some diverging conclusions and methodological considerations will be discussed.

In the present chapter the Hebrew Bible and the Septuagint will form the spine of the investigation, but the Targums will also be consulted briefly. First some comments on the terminology studied in this chapter. The Hebrew verb תלה is used twenty-nine times in the Old Testament, and has humans as suspension objects in the majority of the texts.<sup>4</sup> The verb is commonly translated with κρεμάννυμαι in the Septuagint.<sup>5</sup> The texts with תלה refer not only to suspensions of humans, but also to life hanging in doubt (Deut 28.66); harps hung on willows (Ps 137/6.2); a thousand bucklers hung on the neck of the beloved (Song 4.4); the earth suspended on nothing (Job 26.7); the whole weight of Eliakim's ancestral house hung on him (Isa 22.24); a peg to hang things on (Ezek 15.3); and mighty warriors who hung shield, helmet and quivers on Tyre (Ezek 27.10–11). In all examples תלה is translated with κρεμάννυμαι.

A peculiar characteristic of the Septuagint is that the verb κρεμάννυμαι, frequently used in ancient Greek texts, is scarcely used beyond being a translation of תלה.<sup>6</sup> κρεμάννυμαι is used only thirty times in the protocanonical texts of the Septuagint, seven times in the deuterocanonical texts and eight times in connection with suspensions of other objects than humans.<sup>7</sup>

The verb σταυροῦν, the one used in the New Testament and frequently used in ancient literature, mainly with the prefix ἀνα, is only used once and there it is a translation of תלה.<sup>8</sup>

Another verb used is יקע. Its usage is difficult to define. That, at least, is what the rather diverse translation suggestions of some lexica suggest.<sup>9</sup> The translators of the Septuagint also appear puzzled by its meaning.<sup>10</sup> The question whether יקע is related to חקע is interesting, since חקע has a more limited usage than יקע. חקע is used in connection with various kinds

<sup>4</sup> Gen 40.19, 22; 41.13; Deut 21.22, 23; Josh 8.29; 10.26; 2 Sam 4.12; 18.10; 21.12; Esth 2.23; 5.14; 6.4; 7.9, 10; 8.7; 9.13, 14, 25; Lam 5.12. For non-human suspensions, see: Deut 28.66; Is 22.24; Ezek 15.3; 17.22; 27.10, 11; Ps 137.2; Job 26.7; Song 4.4.

<sup>5</sup> Esth 7.9 is the only exception, where σταυροῦν is used instead.

<sup>6</sup> The exceptions besides the deuterocanonicals are 2 Sam 18.9 where it is used as a translation of חזק and נתן, and Ezek 17.22 where it stands for נתן.

<sup>7</sup> κρεμάννυμαι: Gen 40.19, 22; 41.13; Deut 21.22, 23; Josh 8.29; 10.26 (twice); 2 Sam 4.12; 18.9 (twice); 18.10; 1 Esdr 6.31; Esth 2.23; 5.14; 7.10; 8.7; 9.13, 14, 25 (twice); Judith 8.24; 14.1, 11; 1 Macc 1.61; 2 Macc 6.10; 15.33; Lam 5.12. For suspensions of other things than humans: Deut 28.66; Ps 136.2; Song 4.4; Job 26.7; Ezek 15.3; 17.22; 27.10, 11. Beyond this, ἐκκρεμάννυμαι is used in Gen 44.30 and ἐπικρεμάννυμαι in Hos 11.7 and Is 22.24.

<sup>8</sup> Esth 7.9. See however the remarks on the text on pp. 225–26.

<sup>9</sup> S.v. HALOT; BDB; TWOT; NIDOTTE.

<sup>10</sup> Num 25.4.

of nailing or attaching, and is usually translated with  $\pi\eta\gamma\upsilon\nu\nu\alpha\iota$ .<sup>11</sup> If a direct relation between the verbs could be confirmed, the possibility that יקע is used in connection with suspensions with nailing as a crucial part increases.<sup>12</sup> The Aramaic זקה appears to be an equivalent of the Hebrew תלה and is used in the book of Ezra in connection with a suspension punishment.<sup>13</sup>

## 1. The Old Testament

### 1.1. Genesis

The first suspension account is found in the Joseph narrative of the book of Genesis. Being in an Egyptian jail, Joseph interpreted with the help of God the dreams of two fellow prisoners. The chief cupbearer would be restored to his former office, while the message for the chief baker was different.

Yet within three days Pharaoh shall lift up your head {from you} and suspend you on a tree [וְתָלָה אוֹתְךָ עַל־עֵץ], and the birds shall eat your flesh from you. And it came to pass on the third day [which was] Pharaoh's birthday, that he made a feast for all his servants, and he lifted the head of the chief cupbearer and the head of the chief baker in the midst of his servants. He restored the chief cupbearer to his cupbearing and he gave the cup into the Pharaoh's hand, but he suspended [תָּלָה] the chief baker as Joseph had interpreted to them.<sup>14</sup>

The event is recapitulated in Genesis 41.13 with the same terminology.<sup>15</sup> What kind of suspension these texts refer to is hard to say.<sup>16</sup> The decision whether this text deals with an execution by suspension or with suspension of a corpse depends on the interpretation of the first מעליך, enclosed with braces ({from you}), in verse 19. If it is taken as a gloss and omitted,<sup>17</sup> as in two medieval manuscripts, it is likely that the first lifting of the head is the same as the second (v. 20) which refers to some kind of honoring act (although ironic in the case of the chief baker) – not a decap-

<sup>11</sup> 1 Sam 31.12.

<sup>12</sup> See, *TDOT* 15.669.

<sup>13</sup> Ezra 6.11.

<sup>14</sup> Gen 40.19–22. בעוד שלשת ימים ישא פרעה את־ראשך מעליך ותלה אותך על־עץ ואכל העוף את־בשרך מעליך: <sup>20</sup> ויהי ביום השלישי יום הולדת את־פרעה ויעש משתה לכל־עבדיו וישא את־ראש שר המשקים ואת־ראש שר האפים בתוך עבדיו: <sup>21</sup> וישב את־שר המשקים על־משקו ויתן הכוס על־כף פרעה: <sup>22</sup> ואת שר האפים ותלה כאשר פתח להם יוסף:

<sup>15</sup> Gen 41.13. ואתו תלה; ἐκείνον δὲ κρεμασθήναι.

<sup>16</sup> Labeled as a crucifixion by Fulda (*FULDA, Das Kreuz*, 52).

<sup>17</sup> Cf. SKINNER, *Genesis*, 463.

itation. If the first מעליך is kept,<sup>18</sup> the text describes a decapitation and thus implies a post-mortem suspension. The latter case is, however, problematic; why did the writer of the text use the phrase ישא אחר־ראשך in two so different ways within two verses? Gerhard von Rad advocates such a reading, with two different liftings of heads, and suggests that the reason is irony. According to him there was an actual custom behind the text, in which a petitioner kneels or stands with a bowed head while a dignitary takes him under the chin and raises – uplifts – the head.<sup>19</sup> Also the chief baker's head will be uplifted – but *from him*. The translators of the Septuagint kept the phrase (ἀπὸ σοῦ) and interpreted the event as an assumed decapitation. The Septuagint essentially reproduces the Hebrew text in Greek.<sup>20</sup> In the end, both readings, post- and ante-mortem suspension, appear plausible.

The targums use צלב, and the cognate צליבה, when commenting on the fate of the chief baker. Chapman argues that the verb is used with the meaning “to crucify” in the same sense that ἀνασταυροῦν is used in his opinion, and he translates צליבה with “cross.”<sup>21</sup> However, as has been seen in Chapter 2, there are serious problems with the effort to link ἀνασταυροῦν directly to the meaning “to crucify.” צלב is in the same sense mainly a counterpart to the Hebrew תלה having a wider usage than the simple meaning, “to crucify.”<sup>22</sup> The difference is that צלב is not used in connection with non-human suspensions as תלה is.

<sup>18</sup> Chapman argues in favour of keeping the first מעליך (CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 101–04).

<sup>19</sup> VON RAD, *Genesis*, 372.

<sup>20</sup> Gen 40.19–22 (LXX). ἔτι τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἀφελεῖ Φαραω τὴν κεφαλὴν σου ἀπὸ σοῦ καὶ κρεμάσει σε ἐπὶ ξύλου, καὶ φάγεται τὰ ὄρνεα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὰς σάρκας σου ἀπὸ σοῦ. – <sup>20</sup> ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρα γενέσεως ἦν Φαραω, καὶ ἐποίηε πότον πᾶσι τοῖς παισὶν αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἐμνήσθη τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ ἀρχαιονοχοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ ἀρχιστοιτοιοῦ ἐν μέσῳ τῶν παίδων αὐτοῦ <sup>21</sup> καὶ ἀπεκατέστησεν τὸν ἀρχαιονοχόν ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔδωκεν τὸ ποτήριον εἰς τὴν χεῖρα Φαραω, <sup>22</sup> τὸν δὲ ἀρχιστοιτοιοῦν ἐκρέμασεν, καθὰ συνέκρινεν αὐτοῖς Ἰωσηφ.

<sup>21</sup> CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 25–26.

<sup>22</sup> For discussion on the theme see BAUMGARTEN, “Does TLH in the Temple Scroll refer to Crucifixion?” 472–81 and HALPERIN, “Crucifixion, the Nahum Peshet, and the rabbinic Penalty of Strangulation,” 32–46. Baumgarten is correct in stressing that תלה cannot be exclusively linked to crucifixion. However, his suggestion that the verb refers to hanging in a noose is no better (as Halperin correctly states). Baumgarten only switches one limited usage of the verb to another, while Halperin wants to switch it back. It is conjectural to go beyond the notion that the verb refers to some kind of unspecified bodily suspension. Chapman bases his hesitation toward Baumgarten's argument (regarding the usage of צלב) mainly on later sources (e.g., later Aramaic dialects and rabbinic texts) (CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 18–25). In the same sense one could also add that the צלב-stem is used in the modern Hebrew language (עבריה) for “cross” and



mainly used in the sense “to turn away in disgust” or “to dislocate.”<sup>29</sup> The latter usage is present in the description of Jacob’s dislocated hip (Gen 32.25). Koehler–Baumgartner’s suggestion of a meaning in *hiph’il* is “to display with broken legs and arms” with the alternative “to impale, break upon a wheel” which indicates the ambiguous nature of the verb.<sup>30</sup> The alternative meaning “to impale” comes up rather surprisingly, but that obviously depends on the definition of the word “impaling.” Nothing in the usage of *קטף* in the Old Testament indicates that the verb has to do with the penetration of the abdomen (or rectum) by a pointed pole.<sup>31</sup> The *hiph’il* form of the quoted text above stresses the causative and uses the verb euphemistically; the condemned were, so to say, turned away, separated (thus “dislocated”) from the people and probably suspended in the sun in some way.<sup>32</sup> However, the verb does not show in *what* way – or in what condition (i.e., dead or alive).<sup>33</sup> To take the verb as a referent to some kind of suspension, instead of a sole act of dismembering, fits better within the setting of the apparently old and widespread custom of suspending a villain or a defeated enemy.<sup>34</sup> To suspend a villain was ap-

<sup>29</sup> S.v. *HALOT*; BDB. See also POLZIN, “HWQY<sup>c</sup> and Covenantal Institutions in Early Israel,” 231–33.

<sup>30</sup> S.v. *HALOT*. Cf. *NIDOTTE*. The lexicographers may have the old Greek punishment of “racking” people in mind. See Plut. *De sera*. 554D; Philo, *Ios*. 156.

<sup>31</sup> The surprising translation of Num 25.4 in NRSV (“[t]ake all the chiefs of the people, and impale them in the sun before the LORD, in order that the fierce anger of the LORD may turn away from Israel”) is probably influenced by *HALOT* and *TDOT*. Both lexica suggest that the verb is used in the meaning “impale” in Num 25.4.

<sup>32</sup> See s.v. *TWOT*. The verb could refer to the removal of an individual from a group (e.g., Jer 6.8; Ezek 23.17). For discussion on whether the text describes an act of “throwing down” from a cliff (as suggested by SMITH, *The Religion of the Semites*, 419 n. 2 and SNAITH, *Leviticus and Numbers*, 302), see GRAY, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Numbers*, 381. Gray says that “[t]he exact mode of execution intended is uncertain,” but nevertheless opposes the translation “hanging” in the *Revised Version* with the argument that “the Hebrews used another word” for that, namely *חלה*. He does not, however, define what he means by “hanging.”

<sup>33</sup> See, e.g., BUDD, *Numbers*, 279.

<sup>34</sup> Beyond all the texts suggested by Hengel, *et al.*, there are other reports that could be considered here, which have not hitherto been observed in connection with the present topic. The first text is found on a stele from Amada, with a copy in the Chnum temple on Elephantine. The text is from pharaoh Amenhotep II’s time and deals with the aftermath of a revolt in Nubia against the king’s authority. “It was to the delight of his father Amun that he returned after he himself had slain with his club seven chieftains who were in the district of Tekhsy and who were placed upside down at the brow of the falcon ship of his Majesty, the name of which is as follows: ‘Akheperurē<sup>c</sup> causes the Two Lands to endure.’ Thereupon six men from among the foe were hung in front of the rampart of Thebes and the hands likewise. The other enemy was then transported south to Nubia and hung on the rampart of Napata in order that men should see the victories of his Majesty for ever and ever in all the lowlands and hill countries of Nubia

parently a punishment used by the Jews of the time. The question is whether the dismembering of villains was used by the Jews to the same extent.

It could be noticed that the translator(s) of the Septuagint did not use the verb ἐξηλιάζειν, which fits quite well as a translation of the phrase נגד השמש (...) והוקע אותם (...), especially since the verb is used as a translation of the simple ויקיעם in 2 Samuel 21.6, 9. ἐξηλιάζειν coheres with the phrase נגד השמש (...) והוקע אותם better than the simple ויקיעם, at least when the etymology is taken into consideration. The translator of the Septuagint rendered the phrase in Numbers 25.4 literally, παραδειγματίσων αὐτοὺς (...) ἀπέναντι τοῦ ἡλίου.<sup>35</sup>

The Hebrew and Aramaic variants diverge significantly when describing the event. The Samaritan Pentateuch<sup>36</sup> and Targum Onqelos<sup>37</sup> talk only of “slaying” (הרג) or “killing” (קחל) the villains, while Targum Neofiti mentions both a suspension (צלב) and a suspension object (צליב).<sup>38</sup> According to Targum Pseudo-Jonathan<sup>39</sup> the villains should be suspended (צלב) on wood or a pole (קיס).

When it comes to the issue of deciding what kind of event the text describes, the reader is left in darkness. It is not possible to get beyond the notion that God ordered the villains to be suspended in the open sun in some way and in some condition. On the one hand, if the sun aspect is stressed by means of torture, one might argue that the suspension occurred ante-mortem. The suspension was in that case an execution in which the sun was a vital part of the torture.<sup>40</sup> On the other hand, the sun

---

since he has conquered the southerners and subdued the inhabitants of the north, even the limits of the whole world and that whereon Rē shines” (CUMMING and HELCK, *Egyptian Historical Records of the Later Eighteenth Dynasty*, 374.1297.1–1298.8). A second example is found in *The Code of Hammurabi* 153, “If a seignior’s wife has brought about the death of her husband because of another man, they shall impale that woman on stakes” (MEEK, “The Code of Hammurabi,” 153).

<sup>35</sup> Num 25.4 (LXX). καὶ εἶπεν κύριος τῷ Μωϋσῆ Λαβὲ πάντας τοὺς ἀρχηγοὺς τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ παραδειγματίσων αὐτοὺς κυρίῳ ἀπέναντι τοῦ ἡλίου, καὶ ἀποστραφήσεται ὄργη θυμοῦ κυρίου ἀπὸ Ἰσραὴλ.

<sup>36</sup> Num 25.4 (*Sam. Tg.*). ויאמר יהוה אל משה אמר ויהרגו את האנשים הנצמדים לבעל פעור וישבו חרון אף יהוה מִישראל:

<sup>37</sup> Num 25.4 (*Tg. Onq.*). ואמר יי למשה דבר ית כל ריש עמא ודון וקטול דחייב קטול קדם יי לקביל שמשא ויתוב תקופ רגוזא דיוי מִישראל:

<sup>38</sup> Num 25.4 (*Tg. Neof.*). ואמר יי למשה דבר ית כל ראשי עמא ואקים יתהון בסנהדרין קדם יי ויהוון דיינין כל מן דמתחייב קטלה יצלבון יתיה על צליבה וקברין ית נבלתהון עם מטמעי שמשא בכדן יתזור תקופ רגוזא דיי מן ישראל:

<sup>39</sup> Num 25.4 (*Tg. Ps-J.*). ואמר יי למשה סב ית כל ריש עמא ומני יתהון דיינין וידונו דיינין דקטולין ית עמא דטעו בתר פעור ותצלוב יתהון קדם מימרא דיי על קיסא קבל שמשא בקריצתא ועם מטמעי שמשא תחית יתהון ותקברינון ויתוב תקופ רגוזא דיי מִישראל:

<sup>40</sup> Cf. 2 Sam 21.6, 9, although no sun is mentioned there. They were instead only suspended before the Lord (however, see the translation in LXX).

would have been destructive also for a corpse, by hastening the process of decomposition.<sup>41</sup> The diverse vocabulary in the variants and ancient translations enhances the uncertainty concerning what the Hebrew *Vorlage* describes. It is still possible to connect the Jewish people with a suspension punishment, but not to determine *which* punishment.

### 1.3. Deuteronomy

The last text from the Pentateuch is of great interest since it becomes theologically important in the New Testament.<sup>42</sup> The text is a part of the abundance of new or reinforced laws of Deuteronomy.

If a sin worthy of death rests on a man, and he is killed and you suspend him on tree [ותלית אהו על־עץ], his corpse shall not [remain] on the tree [על־העץ]. You shall bury him the same day, for accursed by God is he who is suspended [תלין] [on tree?]. You shall not defile your land which the LORD your God gives to you as an inheritance.<sup>43</sup>

In spite of some interpretative problems,<sup>44</sup> the text evidently refers to a post-mortem suspension of some kind. This reading is based on the assumption that the waw of ותלית indicates sequence and not apposition.<sup>45</sup> This option ought to be deemed the natural one, but the reading of the phrase as non-sequential may explain the opposite order in the reference to the text in the Temple Scroll (11QT<sup>Temple</sup> 64.8).<sup>46</sup> The text appears not to describe an *execution* by suspension.

The Septuagint coheres with the Masoretic text quite well, but adds ἐπι ξύλου in verse 23.<sup>47</sup> The targums apply the to some extent Aramaic counterpart of תלה, צלב (Onqelos, Neofiti and Pseudo-Jonathan), and Onqelos labels the suspension tool in verse 22 as צליב while it is called קיס in Pseu-

<sup>41</sup> See the comments on Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 3.151–52 (pp. 134–35).

<sup>42</sup> Gal 3.13.

<sup>43</sup> Deut 21.22–23. וכי־תהיה באיש חטא משפט־מוות והוקם ותלית אהו על־עץ: <sup>23</sup> לא־תלין גבלחו על־העץ כִּי־קבור תקברונו ביום ההוא כִּי־קללת אלהים תלוי ולא תשפא את־אדמתך אשר יהיה אלהיך נתן לך תלה:

<sup>44</sup> See, CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 117–120.

<sup>45</sup> See, *ibid.*, 118.

<sup>46</sup> See the text on p. 230. For a discussion on some problems regarding the interpretation of the Hebrew text, see CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 117–20.

<sup>47</sup> Deut 21.22–23 (LXX). εἰάν δὲ γένηται ἐν τινὶ ἁμαρτία κρίμα θανάτου καὶ ἀποθάνῃ καὶ κρεμάσῃτε αὐτὸν ἐπὶ ξύλου, <sup>23</sup> οὐκ ἐπικοιμηθήσεται τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ ξύλου, ἀλλὰ ταφῆ θάψετε αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ, ὅτι κεκατηραμένος ὑπὸ θεοῦ πάς κρεμάμενος ἐπὶ ξύλου· καὶ οὐ μιανεῖτε τὴν γῆν, ἣν κύριος ὁ θεός σου δίδωσίν σοι ἐν κληρῶ.



do-Jonathan.<sup>48</sup> Philo uses ἀνασκολοπίζειν and κρεμαννύναι when he refers to the text,<sup>49</sup> while Josephus uses κρεμαννύναι and ἀνασταυροῦν.<sup>50</sup>

#### 1.4. Joshua

In Joshua the people of Israel seem to be once more connected with a suspension punishment. After Joshua had conquered the city Ai by an ambush he treated the king as follows:

He suspended the king of Ai on the tree [תָּלָה עַל־הָעֵץ] until the time of the evening. And at the sunset, on Joshua's command, they took down his corpse from the tree [מִן־הָעֵץ] and threw it at the entrance of the gate of the city and raised a large heap of stones over it, [which remains] to this day.<sup>51</sup>

The text does not reveal whether the king was dead or alive when he was taken to the tree, or in what way he was suspended.<sup>52</sup> While the terminology of the Masoretic text is nearly identical with the text in Deuteronomy 21.22–23 (except that גַּע has the definite article in the Masoretic text), the translators of the Septuagint add surprisingly that the suspension tool was fork-shaped (ξύλου διδύμου).<sup>53</sup> The text diverges from the Masoretic on this point, but still it does not reveal whether the king was dead or alive when being suspended. Targum Jonathan applies צלב and צליבא.<sup>54</sup>

The close parallel regarding both content and terminology in Joshua 10.26–27 has the five Amorite kings killed before they were hanged on trees.

And Joshua struck them afterwards and killed them and suspended them upon five trees [וַיִּהְיוּ תְלוּיִם עַל־הָעֵצִים], and they were suspended on the trees [וַיִּתְּלֵם עַל הַשָּׁמַיִם עֵצִים],

<sup>48</sup> Deut 21.22 (Tg. Onq.) וַיִּתְּלֵם עַל צְלִיבָא; (Tg. Neof.) על קיסה (Tg. Ps.-J.) וַיִּתְּלֵם עַל קיסה.

<sup>49</sup> Philo *Spec. Leg.* 3.151; *Poster C.* 26. Chapman defines the former as a reference to crucifixion and the latter as a reference to hanging on a noose (CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 132–35).

<sup>50</sup> Joseph. *AJ* 4.202; *BJ* 4.317. The latter text is only loosely connected with Deut 21.22–23.

<sup>51</sup> Josh 8.29. וַיִּתְּלֵם עַל־הָעֵץ עַד־הָעֶרֶב וַיִּקְבֹּא הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ בְּצָהַר וַיִּרְדּוּ אֲחֻזַּת־הַלַּחַם מִן־הָעֵץ וַיִּשְׂלֹכוּ אוֹתָהּ אֶל־פֶּתַח שַׁעַר הָעִיר וַיִּקְיֹמוּ עָלָיו גַּל־אֲבָנִים גָּדוֹל עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה:

<sup>52</sup> Boling interprets the event as “some highly formalized custom” without further comments (BOLING, *Joshua*, 242.).

<sup>53</sup> Josh 8.29 (LXX). καὶ τὸν βασιλέα τῆς Γαι ἐκρέμασεν ἐπὶ ξύλου διδύμου, καὶ ἦν ἐπὶ τοῦ ξύλου ἕως ἑσπέρας· καὶ ἐπιδύοντος τοῦ ἡλίου συνέταξεν Ἰησοῦς καὶ καθείλοσαν αὐτοῦ τὸ σῶμα ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου καὶ ἔρριψαν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν βόθρον καὶ ἐπέστισαν αὐτῷ σωρὸν λίθων ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης.

<sup>54</sup> Josh 8.29 (Tg. Jon.). וַיִּתְּלֵם עַל צְלִיבָא עַד עֶרְבַּת רַמְשָׁא וּכְמִיעַל שְׁמֵשׁא פְקִיד וַיִּשְׂלֹשׁ וַאֲחִיזוּ יָת גְּבִילִתָּיהָ מִן צְלִיבָא וּרְמוֹ יָתָהּ בְּמַעְלָנָא דְחַרְעָה קַרְתָּא וְאַקִּימוּ עָלָיהּ דְגִיר אֲבָנֵי רַב עַד יוֹקָא הַדְרִין:

evening. And it happened at the time of the sunset [that] Joshua commanded [the Israelites/the army commanders who had come with him] and they took them down from the trees [העצים] and threw them into the cave where they had been hidden and laid great stones against the entrance of the cave [which remain there] to this very day.<sup>55</sup>

This text, too, indicates that the Jewish people, at least in the time of the conquest, were familiar with some kind of post-mortem suspension punishments (if the waw of ויהלם implies sequence).<sup>56</sup> The terminology of the Septuagint reflects the Hebrew text well.<sup>57</sup>

Again Targum Jonathan applies צלב and צליבא.<sup>58</sup> Chapman has some remarks on the terminology of the Targum.

Especially notable is the use of the phrase על צליבא צלב in the Targum on Joshua 8.29, where the combination verb and noun, alongside a lack of any other means of execution, might easily have connoted crucifixion to the early reader. However, this should not be pressed too far, since similar phraseology appears to indicate a post-mortem penalty in the Targum on Joshua 10.26.<sup>59</sup>

According to Chapman the terminology of the Targum on Joshua 10.26 is out of the box, so to speak. It becomes explicit and unconventional. But it is as a matter of fact the box that is the problem – the view of what is conventional – not the terminology of the Targum passage in focus. The terminology in the Targum is quite consistent with the other studied terms. That is at least what the hitherto studied texts in the present investigation suggest. צלב appears to be the Aramaic verb for suspending humans – thus to some extent a counterpart of הלה – and the צליב is the suspension tool used in such (human) suspension. It is, as Chapman to some extent suggests, unwise to press the combination צלב and צליבא beyond being some kind of human suspension.

<sup>55</sup> Josh 10.26–27. וַיִּשָׁע אֶחְרֵיכֵן וַיְמִיתֵם וַיְהַלֵּם עַל הַמָּשָׁח עֲצִים וַיְהִי תְלוּיִם עַל-הָעֵצִים עַד-הָעֶרֶב: <sup>27</sup> וַיְהִי לַעֲתָ בּוֹא הַמָּשָׁח צָנָה יְהוֹשֻׁעַ וַיְרִידוּם מֵעַל הָעֵצִים וַיִּשְׁלֹכֵם אֶל-הַמַּעְרָה אֲשֶׁר נִחְבְּאוּ-שָׁם וַיִּשְׂמוּ וַיִּשְׂמוּ אֲבָנִים גְּדוֹלוֹת עַל-פִּי הַמַּעְרָה עַד-עֶצְם הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה:

<sup>56</sup> Boling states that the event was neither a hanging nor crucifixion but simply a “public exposure of the corpses after execution so as to inspire fear” (BOLING, *Joshua*, 286).

<sup>57</sup> Josh 10.26–27 (LXX). Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἐκρέμασεν αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ πέντε ξύλων, καὶ ἦσαν κρεμάμενοι ἐπὶ τῶν ξύλων ἕως ἑσπέρας. <sup>27</sup> καὶ ἐγενήθη πρὸς ἡλίου δυσμᾶς ἐνετείλατο Ἰησοῦς καὶ καθεῖλον αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν ξύλων καὶ ἔρριψαν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ σπήλαιον, εἰς ὃ κατεφύγισαν ἐκεῖ, καὶ ἐπεκύλισαν λίθους ἐπὶ τὸ σπήλαιον ἕως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας.

<sup>58</sup> Josh 10.26–27 (*Tg. Jon.*). וַיִּשָׁע אֶחְרֵיכֵן וַיְמִיתֵם וַיְהִי תְלוּיִם עַל-הָעֵצִים עַד-הָעֶרֶב: וַיִּשְׁלֹכֵם אֶל-הַמַּעְרָה אֲשֶׁר נִחְבְּאוּ-שָׁם וַיִּשְׂמוּ וַיִּשְׂמוּ אֲבָנִים גְּדוֹלוֹת עַל-פִּי הַמַּעְרָה עַד-עֶצְם הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה:

<sup>59</sup> CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 153.

## 1.5. The Books of Samuel

The next text appears at the end of 1 Samuel, which deals with the death of Saul. The verb חקע is used in the text, which is usually used in connection with various forms of forceful action with the hands (thrust, drive, strike, clap), and thus nailing of various kinds or penetration by a sharp object.<sup>60</sup> The verb is usually translated with various forms of *πηγνύναι* in the Septuagint.<sup>61</sup>

And it happened on the third day, when the Philistines came to strip the slain, that they found Saul and his three sons fallen at Mount Gilboa. They cut off his head and stripped off his armor and they sent [them] into and round about the land of the Philistines, to carry the good news [of victory into] the house of their idols and to the people. They put his armor in the temple of Astarte and they fastened [חקעו] his body to the wall of Bet-shan.<sup>62</sup>

That this text describes a post-mortem suspension is beyond all doubt. An act of nailing might also be a crucial part of the suspension method, at least suggested by the verb, which distinguishes this text from the previous ones.<sup>63</sup>

The Septuagint uses *καταπηγνύναι*. The Targum Jonathan applies צלב as translation for the Hebrew חקע, which might be taken as an indication that the range of meaning of צלב interestingly enough covers “attaching,” and perhaps even “nailing.” Thereby צלב appears to designate *the event of suspending and/or attaching, possibly by nailing, a human in some condition (dead or alive), or a part of a corpse, on something (i.e., a wall or a צליב)*. The verb refers not only to the punishment traditionally called “crucifixion.”

The event is retold a bit differently in 1 Chronicles. There “they put his [Saul’s] armor in the temple of their Gods and fastened [חקעו] his head in the temple of Dagon.”<sup>64</sup> The texts diverge in what was attached and where it occurred. However, they use the same verb.

When Josephus comments on the fate of Saul and his sons he uses ἀνασταυροῦν.<sup>65</sup> Chapman’s comment on Josephus’ usage of ἀνασταυ-

<sup>60</sup> See Judg 3.21; 4.21; 16.14; 2 Sam 18.14; Is 22.23, 25; Jer 6.3, and s.v. HALOT; BDB; NIDOTTE.

<sup>61</sup> Gen 31.25; Judg 3.21; 2 Sam 18.14; Jer 6.3. The diverging texts are Judg 4.21 (ἐγκροῦν); 16.14 (κατακροῦν); Is 22.23 (ιστάναί), 25 (στρηγιζεῖν).

<sup>62</sup> 1 Sam 31.8–10. וַיְהִי מִמָּחָרָת וַיָּבֹאוּ פְּלִשְׁתִּים לַפֶּשֶׁט אֶת־הַחֲלָלִים וַיִּמְצְאוּ אֶת־שְׂאוֹל וְאֶת־שְׁלֵשָׁת  
בָּנָיו נִפְלָיִם בְּהַר הַגִּלְבָּעַ: <sup>9</sup> וַיַּכְרוּ אֶת־רֹאשׁוֹ וַיַּפְשִׁיטוּ אֶת־כְּלָיו וַיִּשְׁלְחוּ בְּאֶרֶץ־פְּלִשְׁתִּים סָבִיב לְבָשָׂר בֵּית עַצְבֵיהֶם  
וְאֶת־הָעַם: <sup>10</sup> וַיִּשְׂמוּ אֶת־כְּלָיו בֵּית עַשְׁתְּרוֹת וְאֶת־גִּידוֹ חֲקַעוּ בְּחוֹמַת בֵּית שֵׁן:

<sup>63</sup> See MCCARTER, 1 Samuel, 442, and חקע in BDB; NIDOTTE; TDOT; TWOT.

<sup>64</sup> 1 Chr 10.10. וַיִּשְׂמוּ אֶת־כְּלָיו בֵּית אֱלֹהֵיהֶם וְאֶת־גְּלִגְלוֹתוֹ חֲקַעוּ בֵּית דָּגוֹן. See Braun’s comments on the text (BRAUN, 1 Chronicles, 148, 150).

<sup>65</sup> Joseph. AJ 6.374.

ροῦν in combination with the fact that the suspension object was a wall and not a σταυρός is illuminating.

Josephus' employment of ἀνασταυρόω is noteworthy here in that the bodies are suspended onto something other than a σταυρός.<sup>66</sup>

In fact, Josephus' usage of the verb here is not noteworthy at all. Instead it is consistent with the overall usage of the verb. As has been seen, it is impossible to limit the range of meaning of ἀνασταυροῦν to denote only a suspension on a σταυρός. Chapman's problem with the text owes to his (among others') inclination to limit ἀνασταυροῦν to simply mean "to crucify." However, in the lines before the text quoted above he makes a crucial observation.

Although Josephus employs his typical crucifixion terminology (ἀνεσταύρωσαν), the context in the *Antiquitates* indicates that these bodies are already corpses prior to their decapitated "crucifixions." This serves as a reminder that, not only is the Greek terminology more flexible than our English equivalents, but also Josephus was likely less concerned to delineate a particular methodology of executionary punishment when he employed the term ἀνασταυρόω and more interested in associating any suspension of the human body with the same class of penalty as crucifixion.<sup>67</sup>

With that, Chapman has identified the problem, but he does not see the full implications, since he still finds it remarkable that the suspension tool was something else than a σταυρός. The reason behind Josephus' reluctance "to delineate a particular methodology of executionary punishment"<sup>68</sup> might be that there was no well-defined entity called "crucifixion" in his days. There was a spectrum of various suspension punishments that could change from time to time.

The theme of post-mortem suspension continues in the next text, which is found in 2 Samuel. The text deals with the aftermath of the murder of Saul's son Ish-bosheth.

David commanded the young men and they slew them and cut off their hands and feet, and hung [וַיִּתְּקוּ] them beside the pool in Hebron, and they took the head of Ish-bosheth and buried [it] in the tomb of Abner in Hebron.<sup>69</sup>

The problem of this text is not whether the victims were dead or alive – they were obviously dead – but rather *what* was suspended. The text does not reveal whether it was the dismembered hands and feet that were sus-

<sup>66</sup> CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 151.

<sup>67</sup> Ibid.

<sup>68</sup> Ibid.

<sup>69</sup> 2 Sam 4.12.

וַיִּצְוּ דָוִד אֶת־הַנְּעָרִים וַיְהַרְגֵם וַיִּקְצְצוּ אֶת־יְדֵיהֶם וְאֶת־רַגְלֵיהֶם וַיִּתְּלוּ עַל־הַבְּרֵכָה  
בְּחֶבְרוֹן וְאֵת־רֹאשׁ אִישׁ־בּוֹשֶׁת לָקְחוּ וַיִּקְבְּרוּ בְּקִבְר־אֲבִנֵר בְּחֶבְרוֹן:

pended or the rest of the body.<sup>70</sup> Still, the text uses a familiar terminology (חלה) and the event belongs to the group of human suspensions in the Old Testament on the same conditions as the other texts. The Septuagint does not alter the expressions of the Hebrew text or shed any further light on the event.<sup>71</sup> It reproduces the Hebrew terms with its own counterpart. Targum Jonathan applies צלב. Both the texts in 1 Samuels 31 and the text in 2 Samuels 4 are dealt with surprisingly briefly by Chapman.<sup>72</sup>

The next texts, also from 2 Samuel, use a different terminology and offer a variation on the suspension theme. The rather damaged Masoretic texts deal with the fate of seven of King Saul's sons. When a famine struck King David and his people, the Lord told David that it was caused by Saul's attack on the Gibeonites. To get the blessing of the Gibeonites, David asked what they wanted, and their answer went as follows.

Let seven men of his sons be given to us, so that we may suspend them [וְהוֹקְעֵנֶם] before the LORD, on Saul's Gibeah, [whom] the LORD chose. And the king said, "I will give [them]."<sup>73</sup>

And David kept his word.

And he gave them into the hand of the Gibeonites, and they suspended them [וַיִּקְעוּם] on the mountain before the LORD, and the seven fell together; they were killed in the first days of the harvest, in the first [days] of the barley harvest.<sup>74</sup>

Exactly in what sense יקע is used in the verses is uncertain.<sup>75</sup> It is hard to trace a more limited meaning beyond the notion that it refers to some kind of suspension "before the Lord," whatever that means.<sup>76</sup> The victims

<sup>70</sup> See, e.g., ANDERSON, 2 Samuel, 72.

<sup>71</sup> 2 Sam 4.12 (LXX). καὶ ἐνετείλατο Δαυιδ τοῖς παιδαρίοις αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀποκτένουσιν αὐτοὺς καὶ κολοβοῦσιν τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν καὶ τοὺς πόδας αὐτῶν καὶ ἐκρέμασαν αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τῆς κρήνης ἐν Χεβρων· καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν Μεμφιβοσθε ἔθαψαν ἐν τῷ τάφῳ Αβεννηρ υἱοῦ Νηρ.

<sup>72</sup> CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 150–51.

<sup>73</sup> 2 Sam 21.6. יִסְרְלְנוּ שְׁבַע אָנָשִׁים מִבְּנֵי וְהוֹקְעֵנֶם לִיהוָה בְּגִבְעַת שְׂאוּל בְּחִיר יְהוָה ס וַיֹּאמֶר הַמֶּלֶךְ אָנִי אֶתֶּן:

<sup>74</sup> 2 Sam 21.9. וַיִּתְּנֵם בְּיַד הַגִּבְעוֹנִים וַיִּקְעוּם בְּהָר לִפְנֵי יְהוָה וַיִּפְּלוּ שְׁבַעֲהֶם יַחַד וְהָם הָמְחוּ בַיּוֹם קָצִיר בְּרֵאשִׁיטִים חָחֵלַת קָצִיר שְׁעָרִים:

<sup>75</sup> McCarter nevertheless sees crucifixion "as the most plausible interpretation" (MCCARTER, 2 Samuel, 442).

<sup>76</sup> The translators of the Swedish *Bibel 2000* translate the *biph'al* form verb with the unusual "cut them in pieces" ("hugga dem i stycken") and the *hoph'al* form with "dismembered" ("sönderstyckade"). This translation is surprising in the light of their translation of the same form of the verb in Num 25.4 with "suspend them" ("häng upp dem"). For a defense of this interpretation, see POLZIN, "HWQY" and Covenantal Institutions in Early Israel," 227–40. Polzin, however, stresses too much the "dislocation feature" by means of dismembering. It is preferable – and consistent with other forms of punishments of the time and area (not least Num 25.4) – to leave the verb as a reference

were suspended before the Lord.<sup>77</sup> It appears that the translators of the Septuagint understood the event as a suspension “in the sun.”<sup>78</sup> They used the neologism ἐξηλιάζειν and probably understood קָטַף as “to suspend (in the sun [cf. Num 25.4]).”<sup>79</sup> According to some lexica, the *hiph'el* form of קָטַף may refer to crucifixion or impaling,<sup>80</sup> a meaning that is difficult to find support for in the Biblical texts.<sup>81</sup> The aftermath of the event is described three verses later.

David went and took the bones of Saul and bones of Jonathan, his son, from the citizens of Jabesh-gilead, who had stolen them from the square of Beth-shan, where the Philistines had suspended them [קָטַף] (*qere* – הלואם) on the day [the] Philistines had struck down Saul on [Mount] Gilboa. He brought up from there the bones of Saul and the bones of Jonathan, his son, and they gathered the bones of those who had been suspended [המוקפים].<sup>82</sup>

What could be said about these texts is nothing more than that they describe some kind of (public) suspension. If it is possible to show that the verb signifies an ante-mortem suspension, the suspension (in combination with the sun?) is an essential part of the execution. Whether this latter option has anything to do with the usage of the unusual verb forms in both the Masoretic text (קָטַף) and the Septuagint (ἰστανῆναι as translation of תלה) cannot be decided. Targum Jonathan employs צלב in all three texts. Josephus uses ἀνασταυροῦν when he refers the suspension on the walls of Beth-shan.<sup>83</sup>

to some kind of suspension (see CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 155). In NRSV the verb is understood as a reference to impaling, which is a too limiting reading that lacks support.

<sup>77</sup> Smith states for some reason that the suspension hardly could have been above the earth due to the verb קָטַף, which he translates with “fell” (SMITH, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 375).

<sup>78</sup> See s.v. LEH; STOCKBAUER, *Kunstgeschichte*, 4–5. A problem with an etymological understanding of the verb is the fact that it was not used in Num 25.4, where it would fit quite well from an etymological point of view.

<sup>79</sup> 2 Sam 21.6, 9 (LXX). δότω ἡμῖν ἑπτὰ ἄνδρας ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐξηλιάζωμεν αὐτούς τῷ κυρίῳ ἐν Γαβαων Σαουλ ἐκλεκτοῦς κυρίου. καὶ εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεύς Ἐγὼ δώσω....<sup>9</sup> καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτούς ἐν χειρὶ τῶν Γαβαωνιτῶν, καὶ ἐξηλίασαν αὐτούς ἐν τῷ ὄρει ἕναντι κυρίου, καὶ ἔπεσαν οἱ ἑπτὰ αὐτοὶ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό. καὶ αὐτοὶ δὲ ἐθανατώθησαν ἐν ἡμέραις θερτισμοῦ ἐν πρώτοις ἐν ἀρχῇ θερτισμοῦ κριθῶν. Note also ἡλιάζειν in 2 Sam 21.14.

<sup>80</sup> S.v. HALOT; NIDOTTE.

<sup>81</sup> HALOT supports the suggestion on an Akkadian verb (s.v. HALOT), while NIDOTTE without textual support simply states that the verb possibly is used “in the sense of exposure through impaling the bodies” (s.v. NIDOTTE).

<sup>82</sup> 2 Sam 21.12–13. וַיִּלָּךְ הַיּוֹד וַיִּקַּח אֶת־עֲצָמוֹת שְׂאוּל וְאֶת־עֲצָמוֹת יְהוֹנָתָן בְּנוֹ מֵאֵת בְּעָלֵי יָבִישׁ גִּלְעָד אֲשֶׁר גָּבְּוּ אֹתָם מֵרְחֹב בֵּית־דָּשֵׁן אֲשֶׁר הָלְזוּם שָׁם הַפְּלִשְׁתִּים בְּיוֹם הַכּוֹת פְּלִשְׁתִּים אֶת־שְׂאוּל בְּגִלְבָּעַ: <sup>13</sup> וַיַּעַל מִשָּׁם אֶת־עֲצָמוֹת שְׂאוּל וְאֶת־עֲצָמוֹת יְהוֹנָתָן בְּנוֹ וַיֹּאסְפוּ אֶת־עֲצָמוֹת הַמוֹקְפִים:

<sup>83</sup> Joseph. *AJ* 6.374.

## 1.6. Ezra

In the sixth chapter of the book of Ezra, there is a different kind of suspension text. At the end of the decree of Cyrus concerning the temple in Jerusalem, something that might be a Persian punishment becomes visible. Cyrus ordered that his people should support the building of the temple.

And of me is a decree given, that every man that change this edict, a [beam of] wood [אָ] should be torn out from his house and

1. being suspended [חָקַק] let him be beaten [חָמַק] on it,
2. be erected [חָקַק] and let him be fastened to it [חָמַק],
3. be erected [חָקַק] and let him be stricken on it [חָמַק],

and his house made a dunghill because of this.<sup>84</sup>

There are some specific problems regarding the phrase חָמַק חָקַק, as the three translations show. The participle of the Aramaic חָקַק, a verb that appears to be an Aramaic counterpart to the semantically wide Hebrew חָקַק,<sup>85</sup> can refer both to the raising of the beam, אָ (alt. 2 and 3), or the suspension of the victim (alt. 1).<sup>86</sup> The combination with חָמַק, commonly used in references to various striking of hands,<sup>87</sup> does not shed any light on the meaning of the text.<sup>88</sup> Thus, it is not clear what the eventual suspension refers to and whether the victim was beaten *on* the wood (flogging) or smitten *by* the wood (some kind of impaling).<sup>89</sup>

The versions do not solve the problem either. The corresponding text in 1 Esdras 6.31 simply states that the victim was suspended on the wood, and leaves out the beating or smiting.<sup>90</sup> The text of Ezra 6.11 in the Septuagint (2 Esdras 6.11) implies that the victim was fixed to the wood.<sup>91</sup> This reading follows Codex Alexandrinus, which uses the verb πηγνύναι, while Codex Vaticanus uses πλήσσειν (to strike). The text of Vaticanus

<sup>84</sup> Ezra 6.11. אָמַן שִׁים שְׁעָם דִּי כְּל־אָנָּא דִּי יְהֵשָׁנָא פִּתְחָא דְּנָה יְהֵסָא אָ מִן-בֵּיתָהּ חָקַק חָמַק  
(cf. 1 Esd 6:32) עֲלֵהּ וּבִיתָהּ נָלוּ יְהַעֲבֵד עַל-דָּנָה:

<sup>85</sup> S.v. HALOT; TWOT.

<sup>86</sup> אָ is the Aramaic equivalent for the Hebrew חָקַק.

<sup>87</sup> See, Is 55.12; Ezek 25.6; 26.9; Psa 98.8; Dan 2.34.

<sup>88</sup> WILLIAMSON, *Ezra-Nehemiah*, 72.

<sup>89</sup> Bertram's statement that חָקַק is used in the sense of "impaling a wrongdoer" in Ezra 6.11 is thus unsupported (BERTRAM, "ὑψος, κτλ," 610 n. 38). Also Batten suggests some kind of impaling. (BATTEN, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 146).

<sup>90</sup> 1 Esdras 6.31 (LXX). καὶ προσέταξεν ἵνα ὅσοι ἐὰν παραβῶσιν τι τῶν προειρημένων καὶ τῶν προσγεγραμμένων ἢ καὶ ἀκυρώσωσιν, λημφθῆναι ξύλον ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐπὶ τούτου κρεμασθῆναι καὶ τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ εἶναι βασιλικὰ.

<sup>91</sup> 2 Esdras 6.11 (LXX). καὶ ἀπ' ἐμοῦ ἐτέθη γνώμη ὅτι πᾶς ἄνθρωπος, ὃς ἀλλάξει τὸ ρῆμα τοῦτο, καθαιρεθήσεται ξύλον ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ καὶ ὠρθωμένος παγῆσεται ἐπ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὁ οἶκος αὐτοῦ τὸ κατ' ἐμὲ ποιηθήσεται.

thus supports a reading that implies a beating *on* the wood. Josephus refers to the text twice and uses ἀνασταυροῦν in both texts.<sup>92</sup> Thus, neither is Josephus' usage of the text of any help in the effort to solve the interpretative problems of this text.

### 1.7. Esther

The peak of the Old Testament when it comes to the frequency of suspension accounts is the book of Esther. The suspension punishment is here interwoven with the core of the story. In the beginning the author explains the event that will soon rescue the Jew Mordecai. He reveals a plot by the eunuchs Bigthan and Teresh to kill the Persian king Ahasuerus (i.e., Xerxes).

When the plot was investigated and found [to be so], they were both suspended on tree [וַיִּהְיוּ שְׁנֵיהֶם עַל-עֵץ]. And [the event] was recorded in the annals before the king.<sup>93</sup>

What kind of suspension this punishment refers to is not further described.<sup>94</sup> The translators of the Septuagint simply state that the eunuchs were suspended (ἐκρέμασεν αὐτούς). The surprise of the Septuagint is that the reference to the suspension tool [על-עץ] is left out.<sup>95</sup> The two targums on Esther, the paraphrasing *Rishon* and the more midrash-like *Sheni*, apply צלב and תלה.<sup>96</sup>

The next step in the story, as far as the suspension punishment is concerned, comes when Mordecai refuses to kneel down or pay honor to Haman and thereby kindles his anger. Haman decides to take revenge on the whole Jewish people, but Mordecai and queen Esther intercede and Haman's plans fail. By the initiative of Haman's wife and friends, Haman constructs a suspension tool to hang Mordecai on.

Then said his wife Zeresh and all his friends to him, "let a tree [עץ] fifty cubits high be made and in the morning tell the king to suspend [וַיִּהְיוּ] Mordecai on it; then go joyful with the king to the banquet." The advice/thing pleased Haman and he had the tree [הָעֵץ] made.<sup>97</sup>

<sup>92</sup> Joseph. *AJ* 11.17, 103.

<sup>93</sup> Esth 2.23. וַיִּבְקַשׁ הַדָּבָר וַיִּסְמָא וַיִּתְּלוּ שְׁנֵיהֶם עַל-עֵץ וַיִּחְבֵּךְ בְּסֶפֶר הַדְּבָרִי הַיָּמִים לִפְנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ:

<sup>94</sup> Cf. BUSH, *Ruth, Ester*, 373. Paton excludes both crucifixion and impaling with reference to the height of the tree, which is mentioned later (5.14). "This can only have been a gallows" (PATON, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 191).

<sup>95</sup> Esth 2.23 (LXX). ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ἤτασεν τοὺς δύο εὐνούχους καὶ ἐκρέμασεν αὐτούς· καὶ προσέταξεν ὁ βασιλεὺς καταχωρίσαι εἰς μνημόσυνον ἐν τῇ βασιλικῇ βιβλιοθήκῃ ὑπὲρ τῆς εὐνοίας Μαρδοχαίου ἐν ἐγκωμίῳ. Cf. 9.13.

<sup>96</sup> Esth 2.23 (*Tg. Esth. I*) על קיסא ... ואצטליבו; (*Tg. Esth. II*) על קייסא ... ויחליון.

<sup>97</sup> Esth 5.14. וַתֹּאמֶר לוֹ זֶרֶשׁ אִשְׁתּוֹ וְכָל-אֶחָיו יַעֲשֶׂה-עֵץ גְּבוּהַ חֲמִשִּׁים אַמָּה וּבִבְקֶר אָמַר לַמֶּלֶךְ וַיִּהְיוּ אֶת-מָרְדֳּכָי עָלָיו וְבָאֵם-הַמֶּלֶךְ אֶל-הַמִּשְׁתָּה שָׂמַח וַיֵּשֶׁב הַדָּבָר לִפְנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ וַיַּעַשׂ הָעֵץ:



A surprising feature is the height of the tree, or pole. Fifty Hebrew cubits would measure about seventy-five feet or twenty-three meters.<sup>98</sup> If the height of the pole is correctly understood, no other suspension tool even comes close to this height.<sup>99</sup> Chapman suggests that “tall crosses were known in the Roman period.”<sup>100</sup> However, the text he refers to (Suet. *Galb.* 9.1) only mentions that the guardian’s *crux* was “much higher than the others and painted white.”<sup>101</sup> No other texts denoting tall suspension tools have been found during the study of the present investigation. The Septuagint simply reproduces the Hebrew  $\gamma\epsilon$  with  $\xi\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\omicron\nu$ .<sup>102</sup> Here both targums apply  $\text{צלב}$ , as they do in the following texts.<sup>103</sup>

That night the king could not sleep and ordered that the annals should be read for him, and Mordecai’s rescue of the king was thus revealed. Then Haman came “to ask the king to suspend [לְתַלֵּוֹת] Mordecai on the tree [עַל־הָעֵץ] that he had prepared for him.”<sup>104</sup> In that way Haman entangled himself instead of Mordecai.

Then Harbona, one of the eunuchs [who were] before the king, said, “moreover, the tree [הָעֵץ] which Haman made for Mordecai, whose words saved the king, stands at the house of Haman, fifty cubits high.” And the king said, “Suspend him [תְּלַהֲוֵהוּ] on it.” And they suspended Haman on the tree which he had prepared for Mordecai, and the wrath of the king abated.<sup>105</sup>

The description of the suspension in this text does not add much regarding the nature of the suspension punishment. The text does, however, stand out from another perspective. The translators of the Septuagint

<sup>98</sup> For a defense of a literal understanding of the height, see BUSH, *Ruth, Esther*, 414.

<sup>99</sup> “Its enormous size” is one of the characteristic exaggerations of the book of Esther according to Paton, and it excludes the possibilities that it could refer to a tool used in impaling or crucifixion (PATON, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 240).

<sup>100</sup> CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 165.

<sup>101</sup> Suet. *Galb.* 9.1. *multoque praeter ceteras altiore et dealbatam statui cruce inussit*. Chapman leans also on Hengel (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 40–41 + n. 5), but the texts Hengel refers to suffer the same weakness; they do not offer any measurements beyond being “high.”

<sup>102</sup> Esth 5.14 (LXX). εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτὸν Ζωσαρα ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ φίλοι κοπήτω σοι ξύλον πηχῶν πεντήκοντα, ὄρθρου δὲ εἰπὼν τῷ βασιλεῖ καὶ κρεμασθήτω Μαρδοχαῖος ἐπὶ τοῦ ξύλου· σὺ δὲ εἰσελθε εἰς τὴν δοχὴν σὺν τῷ βασιλεῖ καὶ εὐφραίνου. καὶ ἤρresεν τὸ ῥήμα τῷ Ἀμαν, καὶ ἤτοιμάσθη τὸ ξύλον.

<sup>103</sup> Esth 5.14; 7.9–10; 8.7; 9.14, 25 (Chapman mentions that both targums use  $\text{צלב}$  in Esth 2.23 as well, which is not the case [CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 167]).

<sup>104</sup> Esth 6.4. לְאָמַר לְמֶלֶךְ לְתַלֵּוֹת אֶת־מֶרְדֵּכַי עַל־הָעֵץ אֲשֶׁר־הֵכִין לוֹ. The Septuagint has κρεμάσαι τὸν Μαρδοχαῖον ἐπὶ τῷ ξύλῳ.

<sup>105</sup> Esth 7.9–10. וַיֹּאמֶר תְּרַבְּנָה אַחַד מִן־הַפְּרִיסִים לְפָנָי הַמֶּלֶךְ בְּשֵׁם הַיְהוָה עֲשֵׂה הָמָן לְמֶרְדֵּכַי אֲשֶׁר דָּבַר־טוֹב עַל־הַמֶּלֶךְ עַמְּד בְּבֵית הָמָן בְּבֵהַם הַמְּשִׁים אַחַס וַיֹּאמֶר הַמֶּלֶךְ תְּלַהֲוֵהוּ עָלָיו: <sup>10</sup> וַיִּתְּלוּ אֶת־הָמָן עַל־הָעֵץ אֲשֶׁר־הֵכִין לְמֶרְדֵּכַי וַחֲמַת הַמֶּלֶךְ שָׁבָה:

translate הלה with σταυροῦν.<sup>106</sup> This is the only time σταυροῦν is used in the main text of the Septuagint.<sup>107</sup> Why the translator used this verb here is unknown. One difference between the texts is that it is the king himself who utters the word here.

Then Esther managed to abolish Haman's plan to destroy the Jews in all provinces of the king.

Then king Ahasuerus said to Esther the queen and to Mordecai the Jew, "See, I have given the house of Haman to Esther, and they have suspended Haman on the tree [הָלְיוּ עַל-הָעֵץ], because he [tried to] lay his hand on the Jews."<sup>108</sup>

The Septuagint ends up close to the Masoretic text (αὐτὸν ἐκρέμασα ἐπὶ ξύλου). Esther continues her effort to abolish the aftermath of Haman's plot and asks the king about permission also to let the ten sons of Haman "be suspended on the tree" [הָלְיוּ עַל-הָעֵץ].<sup>109</sup> The sons were, however, suspended post-mortem – a fact that did not induce the author of the Book of Esther to change terminology. This is yet another indication that the state of the victim, i.e., dead or alive, was not important.

In the end the Jews could celebrate, because the plot Haman devised against the Jews struck himself, and "he and his sons were suspended on the tree" [וְהָלְיוּ אֹתוֹ וְאֶת-בָּנָיו עַל-הָעֵץ].<sup>110</sup> In these latter texts, the Septuagint lacks the references to the suspension tool [עַל-הָעֵץ]. Josephus refers to the pole as a σταυρός,<sup>111</sup> and uses ἀνασταυροῦν once.<sup>112</sup>

According to Chapman, "Josephus, like the Greek recensions, also freely employs crucifixion terminology in his paraphrase of the Esther narratives."<sup>113</sup> The problem is that the "crucifixion terminology" appears not to be a crucifixion terminology – only a *suspension* terminology. None of the terms can be tied to the sole meaning "to crucify" or "cross." Chapman is on the right track when, some lines later, he mentions that "one cannot be absolutely certain that Josephus has a slow lingering death on a *crux* in mind by using this terminology."<sup>114</sup> In the light of the general usage of the Greek terminology the case may be the opposite.

<sup>106</sup> Not mentioned by Paton, who advocates "hanging" as the punishment at hand (PATON, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 266).

<sup>107</sup> The verb occurs also once in the expanded Greek text of Esther (Esth 8.12r). The text states that "Haman and his household were suspended by the gates of Susa" (πρὸς ταῖς Σούσων πύλαις ἐσταυρώσθαι σὺν τῇ πανοικίᾳ).

<sup>108</sup> Esth 8.7. וַיֹּאמֶר הַמֶּלֶךְ אֶתְשׂוּרֶשׁ לְאַסְתֵּר הַמַּלְכָּה וְלְקַרְנֵי הַיְהוּדִי הַגֵּה בֵּית־הַסֵּן נְתַתִּי לְאַסְתֵּר  
וְאֹתוֹ הָלְיוּ עַל-הָעֵץ עַל אֲשֶׁר-שָׁלַח יָדוֹ בְּיַהְדֵּי־יָם:

<sup>109</sup> Esth 9.13.

<sup>110</sup> Esth 9.25.

<sup>111</sup> Joseph. *AJ* 11.261, 66, 67.

<sup>112</sup> Joseph. *AJ* 11.280.

<sup>113</sup> CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 165.

<sup>114</sup> *Ibid.*, 166.

One can be absolutely certain that Josephus did not have only a slow lingering death on a *crux* in mind by using this terminology.

### 1.8. Lamentation

The last text in this section is a strophe in the last chapter of Lamentation. The writer laments over the treatment of the people of Israel in the occupied country after the destruction of Jerusalem in 586/7 B.C.E.

Princes were suspended by their hand [בְּיָדָם נִחְלָיו];  
 faces of elders were not honored.  
 Young men carried the mill,  
 and stumbled under the tree [בְּעֵץ].<sup>115</sup>

There are two interpretative problems connected with these verses. The first problem concerns what happened to the princes. They appear to be suspended in some way but it is not clear in what way – with special attention to the hand. The ב in יָדָם could refer either to the anatomical part of the body from which they were suspended, or to the agent, the enemy whose “hand” suspended them. The latter option is to be preferred. The singular case of יָד fits better as a referent to the “hand” of evildoers than as a notion that the princes were somehow suspended by attaching only one arm to the suspension tool. The Septuagint and the Targum on Lamentations have the hand in the plural case.<sup>116</sup>

As noted by Chapman, a hand of the enemy is mentioned in 5.8, which could support the reading of ב as a referent to the agent, while the Septuagint has the hands in the plural, which could support the reading of ב as a referent to the hands of princes. He draws, however, too far-reaching conclusions on the plural case in the early translations.

The use of the plural “hands” here likely indicates that at least some early translators understood the princes as being suspended from their own hands. If this form of suspension were thought to be means of death for the princes, then, to a Jewish reader in Greco-Roman antiquity, crucifixion (as a form of execution where the victims are suspended by their hands) would have been an obvious mode of death for these princes.<sup>117</sup>

Even if it were possible to prove that the text depicts that the princes were suspended by the hands, it does not automatically make the text a

<sup>115</sup> Lam 5.12–13. פְּרִים בְּיָדָם נִחְלָיו | שְׂנֵי זְקָנִים לֹא נִקְדְּרוּ: |<sup>13</sup> בַּחֲרִים שָׁחוּן נִשְׁאוּ | וְנָעֲרִים בְּעֵץ  
 פְּשָׁלוּ:

<sup>116</sup> Lam 5.12–13 (LXX). ἄρχοντες ἐν χερσὶν αὐτῶν ἐκρεμάσθησαν, πρεσβύτεροι οὐκ ἔδοξάσθησαν.<sup>13</sup> ἐκλεκτοὶ κλαυθμὸν ἀνέλαβον, καὶ νεανίσκοι ἐν ξύλῳ ἤσθένθησαν.  
 Lam 5.12–13 (Tg. Lam.). רַבְרַבִּין בִּידְהוֹן אַצְטַלִּיבוּ אִפִּי סְבִיא לֹא אַתְהֲדְרוּ: <sup>13</sup> עוֹלִימִיא רִיחִיא נְשָׁלוּ  
 וּרְבִיין בַּצְלִיבָת קִיסָא תְקָלוּ:

<sup>117</sup> CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 158.

reference to the punishment of crucifixion as defined by Chapman.<sup>118</sup> It is, for example, impossible to decide whether the suspension occurred ante-mortem or not.

The second problem has to do with the young men. Once again the כ is in focus, this time the one in בעץ. Did they stumble on a tree, or stagger under a tree? The various uses of the prefix in the context do not offer any assistance.<sup>119</sup> The Septuagint basically reproduces the Hebrew text.<sup>120</sup>

## 2. The Deuterocanonical Texts

The deuterocanonicals contain no references of interest for the present investigation. The closest are the notions of suspended decapitated heads in the book of Judith (14.1, 11) and Second Maccabees (15.33–35) and infants suspended from their mothers' necks First Maccabees (1.61).<sup>121</sup> These suspensions resemble earlier ones, but they do not offer any additional information regarding the suspension punishments in general or the punishment of crucifixion in particular.

## 3. The Dead Sea Scrolls<sup>122</sup>

The Dead Sea Scrolls contain two phrases that have been frequent in the scholarly discussion on crucifixion.<sup>123</sup> The texts are found in the Nahum Pesher and the Temple Scroll. The text in the Nahum Pesher comments on Nahum 2.12–13a.

The lion tore [in pieces] enough for his whelps  
and strangled for his lionesses;

<sup>118</sup> Ibid., 32 (see also the Discussion Chapter, p. 266–67).

<sup>119</sup> Locative: Lam 5.2 (בְּחַיִּי), 11 (בְּצִיּוֹן, בְּעָרֵי); 14 (בְּחַרְרִים). Instrumental: Lam 5.4 (בְּכַסְּיָהּ), 9 (בְּנַפְשִׁי).

<sup>120</sup> Lam 5.12–13 (LXX). ἄρχοντες ἐν χερσὶν αὐτῶν ἐκρεμάσθησαν, πρεσβύτεροι οὐκ ἐδοξάσθησαν. <sup>13</sup> ἐκλεκτοὶ κλαυθμὸν ἀνέλαβον, καὶ νεανίσκοι ἐν ξύλῳ ἠσθένησαν.

<sup>121</sup> Cf. 2 Macc 6.10. For extra-Biblical parallels, see Plut. *Brut.* 31.5; Joseph. *AJ* 12.256).

<sup>122</sup> Hebrew letters in superscript are additions or corrections in the actual scroll (e.g., 11QTemple<sup>a</sup> col. 64, line 9: חמס<sup>א</sup> משפט). Letters in brackets are erased from the scroll (e.g., 11QTemple<sup>a</sup> col. 64, line 11: ביום (ה) הקיברמ(ה)).

<sup>123</sup> E.g., BAUMGARTEN, “Does *TLH* in the Temple Scroll refer to Crucifixion?” 472–81; CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 57–66; CHARLESWORTH, *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 273–89; FITZMYER, “Crucifixion,” 129–35; HALPERIN, “Crucifixion,” 32–46; KUHN, “Die Kreuzesstrafe,” 706–09; YADIN, “Pesher Nahum (4QpNahum) Reconsidered,” 1–12.

he has filled with prey his caves  
and his dens with torn [flesh].

See, I [am] against you, says the LORD of hosts.<sup>124</sup>

The damaged text the Nahum Peshier lacks several words in the section, but two lines are preserved well enough to describe a familiar theme. The restoration attempts of letters and words in the lacunae (within double brackets [[. . .]]) are kept at a minimum, since they are only various levels of conjecture.<sup>125</sup>

Interpreted, this concerns the furious young lion 7 [[. . . rev]]enge on those seeking smooth things, who suspended men alive [יחלה אנשים חיים] 8 [[. . .]] before in Israel, because to the one suspended alive on wood [לתלוי חי על העץ], he proclaimed: See, I am against [you].<sup>126</sup>

The mention of a victim being suspended alive on wood is evident. The text echoes some apparently known event in the past (Alexander Jannaeus' execution of the eight hundred Pharisees is commonly suggested).<sup>127</sup> The text, labeled as a crucifixion account by Hengel, Kuhn and Chapman,<sup>128</sup> describes some kind of an ante-mortem suspension – but does not reveal *which* kind. The event is mentionable by the author of the Peshier since it is a violation of the Jewish tradition in Deuteronomy 21.22–23 – a *post-mortem* suspension. The offense was that the wicked man suspended men, in this case alive, not that he did it in a particular way (e.g., nailed them with outstretched limbs on a cross-shaped execution tool). The reason why the author of the Peshier stresses that they were *alive* while suspended could be, as has been seen earlier, that the norm was a *post-mortem* suspension (coherent with Deut 21.22–23).<sup>129</sup>

The other text is found in the last paragraphs of the Temple Scroll. This part of the scroll treats miscellaneous laws such as the ones against crimes punishable by suspensions.

<sup>124</sup> Nah 2.13–13a. אַרְיֵה סָרַף בְּרִי גִרוֹתָיו וּמְצַק לְלִבָּאֲתָיו וַיִּמְלֵא סָרַף חֲרָיו וּמַעֲתָיו סָרַף: הֲגִי אֲלֶיךָ נָאִם יְהוָה זָבָאוֹת....

<sup>125</sup> Examples of elaborate restorations in the present texts can be seen in, e.g., GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ and TIGCHELAAR, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1.337; 2.1287.

<sup>126</sup> 4QpNah Frags. 3+4 col. 1, line 6–8. פִּשְׁרוֹ עַל כַּפִּיר הַחֲרוֹן 7 נְקוּמוֹת בְּדוֹרְשֵׁי הַחֲלִיקוֹת אֲשֶׁר יִחְלֶה אַנְשֵׁים חַיִּים 8 [בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל מִלְּפָנֶיךָ כִּי לְתֹלוֹי חַי עַל הָעֵץ [זִקְרָא הֲגִי אֲלֵיכֶם]:

<sup>127</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 84; KUHN, “Die Kreuzesstrafe,” 707–08 + n. 361; CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 61–62; VANDERKAM, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*, 50.

<sup>128</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 84 + n. 3; KUHN, “Die Kreuzesstrafe,” 708 + n. 361; CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 57–66 (see also, e.g., DUNN, *The Theology of Paul*, 209 n. 5; FITZMYER, *To Advance the Gospel*, 129–35; GARCIA, “See My Hands and My Feet,” 327; O’COLLINS, “Crucifixion,” 1.1207).

<sup>129</sup> See, e.g., the comments on Joseph. *AJ* 12.256 (pp. 107–08).

If 7 a man is a slanderer and delivers his people to a foreign nation and does evil against his people 8 you shall suspend him on the wood and he shall die [ותחליחמה אותו על העץ וימת]. On the words of two witnesses and on the words of three witnesses 9 he shall be put to death and they shall suspend him [on] the wood [ועליו יהלך אותו העץ] [(. . .)]. If there is in a man a sin [worthy of the] death sentence and he has fled into 10 the midst of the heathens and he has cursed his people and children of Israel, you shall suspend also him the wood [ותחליחמה גם אותו על העץ] 11 and he shall die, and you shall not let a corpse remain on the wood overnight, you shall indeed bury it/him by day, for 12 a [man] suspended on wood [הלוי על העץ] is cursed by God and men, thus you shall not defile the land which I 13 am giving to you [as] inheritance.<sup>130</sup>

The author of this well-preserved text reverses the word order of the commandment in Deuteronomy 2.22–23 in line 8, and places the death after the suspension, as noted by Yigael Yadin.<sup>131</sup> In this way the text of line 8 describes an ante-mortem suspension, an execution. However, in line 9 the word order reverts to the same as the text in Deuteronomy, and thus describes a post-mortem suspension.<sup>132</sup> Kuhn among others identifies this text as a crucifixion account.<sup>133</sup> However, the text does not reveal the suspension method. At most, it could be said that the perpetrator should either be suspended in some way on some kind of wood to be executed, or have his corpse suspended in some way on some kind of wood.

There are some additional texts as well, which will be mentioned briefly. A severely damaged fragment from cave 4 (4QPseudo-Moses<sup>a</sup>) appears to mention a suspension on wood and uses a terminology close to the one in the Temple Scroll (except the bird).<sup>134</sup> An even more damaged text from cave 4 appears to refer to Joseph's dream interpretation in Numbers 40, and thereby the fate of the chief baker.<sup>135</sup> But the possible terms of interest occur within the lacunae.<sup>136</sup> Like most texts from cave 4, the copy

<sup>130</sup> 11QTemple<sup>a</sup> col. 64, line 8–13. כי 7 יהיה איש רכיל בעמו ומשלים את עמו לגוי נכר ועושה רעה בעמו 8 ותחליחמה אותו על העץ וימת על פי שנים עדים ועל פי שלושה עדים 9 יומת והמה יהלך אותו העץ vacat כי יהיה באיש חשף משפט מות ויברח אל 10 תוך הגוים ויקלל את עמו יאת בני ישראל ותחליחמה גם אותו על העץ 11 וימות ולוא תלך נבלחמה על העץ כי קבור תקוברם(ה) ביום ההוא כי 12 מקוללי אלהים ואנשים תלוי על העץ ולוא חטמא את האדמה אשר אנוכי 13 נותן לכה נחלה:

<sup>131</sup> YADIN, *Temple Scroll*, I, 374–75, 2.289–90. Cf. CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 127.

<sup>132</sup> See, YADIN, *Temple Scroll*, 2.290.

<sup>133</sup> KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 708 + n. 361 (see also, e.g., BETZ, "Jesus and the Temple Scroll," 81–83; DUNN, *The Theology of Paul*, 209 n. 5; FITZMYER, *To Advance the Gospel*, 129–35; GARCIA, "See My Hands and My Feet," 327–28; O'COLLINS, "Crucifixion," 1.1207).

<sup>134</sup> 4QpsMoses<sup>a</sup> (4Q385a), F 15, col. I, line 3. תלוי על העץ ועוף [ . . . ]

<sup>135</sup> 4Q223\_224, Unit 2, col. V, line 14–18.

<sup>136</sup> As it also does in a damaged fragment of Tobit, which is reconstructed with תלה in a lacuna (4Q200, F 1, col. II, line 3).

of the Temple Scroll is damaged. The text coheres well with the one from cave 11 above, but all terminology of interest is damaged.<sup>137</sup>

In light of the sparse information given in the Dead Sea Scrolls, the discussion of whether the scrolls describe crucifixions or not becomes rather peculiar.<sup>138</sup> The text material is simply too limited to draw any conclusions beyond the one drawn above: that the perpetrator should be suspended by the Israelites, or has been suspended by the lion of wrath, in some way on some kind of wood to be executed (although the execution is only implied in 4QpNah). If Chapman is correct in his view that there has now been a long scholarly consensus that the Dead Sea Scrolls contain references to crucifixion, it is not just noteworthy, but even alarming.<sup>139</sup> The conclusion that the scrolls contain references to crucifixion cannot be drawn from the published text material. Chapman has a good point in his remarks on Baumgarten.

[Baumgarten's] lexical arguments are found insufficient due to the semantic range of תלה (which can embrace crucifixion as well as other forms of suspension). However, this same lexical range does not by itself make it impossible to clearly limit this passage to convey only death by crucifixion. With that in mind, in affirming that bodily suspension was the means of death in the Temple Scroll, this *could* very well have included crucifixion, though the method employed cannot be definitely determined on the basis of lexis alone.<sup>140</sup>

תלה has a wide usage, but precisely the broad scope of the usage makes it impossible to limit תלה to crucifixion – as Chapman himself does in his comments on the texts above. Once again, he identifies the problem, but does not draw out the consequences to their full extent, since he still labels the events as crucifixion accounts.<sup>141</sup>

#### 4. The Apocryphal Old Testament

The Assumption of Moses (sometimes labeled the Testament of Moses) contains two brief utterances which Hengel, Kuhn and Chapman label as

<sup>137</sup> 4Q524, F 14, line 2–4.

<sup>138</sup> E.g., BAUMGARTEN, “Does *TLH* in the Temple Scroll refer to Crucifixion?” 472–81; FITZMYER, “Crucifixion,” 129–35; GARCIA, “See My Hands and My Feet,” 327–28; HALPERIN, “Crucifixion, the Nahum Peshier, and the rabbinic Penalty of Strangulation,” 32–46; KUHN, “κρεμάσθῃμι,” 2.316; YADIN, “Peshier Nahum (4QpNahum) Reconsidered,” 1–12.

<sup>139</sup> CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 60. See also BERRIN, *Peshier Nahum Scroll from Qumran*, 165, 170–71.

<sup>140</sup> CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 128.

<sup>141</sup> *Ibid.*, 57–66, 125–32.

crucifixion accounts.<sup>142</sup> The text describes an aging Moses seeing into the events that lie ahead for the Jewish people. During these events a powerful king of the west will conquer them, take them captive, burn part of their temple and “suspend [*crucifigit*] some [of them] around their colony.”<sup>143</sup> Later an even greater king – a king of the kings of the earth – will arise and “suspend on *crux* [*in cruce suspendit*] those who confess to their circumcision.”<sup>144</sup> This text does not shed any light over what kind of suspension punishment it refers to.<sup>145</sup>

The Testament of Levi offers a peculiar term, ἀποσκολοπίζειν.<sup>146</sup> The Liddell and Scott lexicon suggests “to remove stumbling-blocks” as the meaning of the verb.<sup>147</sup> The verb has also been understood as a reference to crucifixion.<sup>148</sup> It is probably wise not to draw any conclusion on the basis of these few occurrences of the verb.

The testament of Benjamin contains a prophecy, or a Christian interpolation, of a coming messianic character who “shall enter into the first temple, and there shall the Lord be treated in a spiteful manner, and be disdained, and be lifted up upon a tree [καὶ ἐπὶ ξύλου ὑψωθήσεται].”<sup>149</sup> The text does not offer any indications beyond the notion that the suspension tool is made of wood.

The Apocalypse of Esdras contains a brief reference to a σταυρός punishment. In the text, God speaks to Esdras in words that have clear connections with the death of Jesus as it is portrayed in the Gospels.

I, being immortal, received a pole [σταυρός], tasted vinegar and gall, was buried in a tomb,<sup>2</sup> and I rose up my chosen ones.<sup>150</sup>

<sup>142</sup> *As. Mos.* 6.9 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 85 n. 5; KUHN, “Die Kreuzesstrafe,” 707 + n. 356; 714; CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 71–74); 8.1 (KUHN, “Die Kreuzesstrafe,” 708; CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 71–74).

<sup>143</sup> *As. Mos.* 6.9. *aliquos crucifigit circa coloniam eorum.*

<sup>144</sup> *As. Mos.* 8.1. *qui confitentem circumcisionem in cruce suspendit.*

<sup>145</sup> Tromp suggests in his critical edition of the text that the *crucifigere* of 6.9 refers to a crucifixion while the *suspendere in cruce* of 8.1 “is possibly, but not necessarily the same as ‘to crucify,’” which he sees as the meaning of *suspendere* (TROMP, *The Assumption of Moses*, 203–04, 218).

<sup>146</sup> *T. Levi* 4.5. The verb occurs also in Aquinas’ version of Isaiah 57.4, and Eusebius’ commentary on the Psalms (23.685.29 on the TLG-disc).

<sup>147</sup> S.v. *LSJ*.

<sup>148</sup> In the translation of the Spark edition the verb is mentioned as an alternative reading in a footnote, and the translation “to crucify him” is suggested (SPARKS, *The Apocryphal Old Testament*, 528).

<sup>149</sup> *T. Benj.* 9.3. καὶ εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὸν πρῶτον ναόν, καὶ ἐκεῖ Κύριος ὑβρισθήσεται, καὶ ἐξουθενωθήσεται, καὶ ἐπὶ ξύλου ὑψωθήσεται.

<sup>150</sup> *Apoc. Esdr.* 7.1–5. ἐγὼ ἀθάνατος ὢν σταυρὸν κατεδεξάμην, ὄξος καὶ χολὴν ἐγευσάμην, ἐν τάφῳ κατετέθην, καὶ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς μου ἀνέστησα.



Beyond the reference to *στραυρός* there is no further information in this text about what kind of punishment it refers to.

## 5. Conclusion – Old Testament and Early Jewish Literature

The Old Testament contains several suspension accounts. None of these can be defined as accounts of crucifixions in a traditional sense.<sup>151</sup> Instead they describe various unspecified suspensions. These suspensions occurred mainly post-mortem.<sup>152</sup> There is in fact not one single obvious account of an ante-mortem suspension in the Old Testament.

### 5.1. *The Terminology*

When it comes to *the first basic question* of the present investigation, some conclusions can be drawn. The terms *הלה* and *κρεμαννύναι* appear to be used in the same sense in the Old Testament. They both refer to a whole variety of suspensions. When *הלה* is combined with *גע* it denotes some kind of post-mortem suspension, if it is possible to say anything about the status of the suspension victim.<sup>153</sup> The text with the clearest theological implications for the study of the New Testament, Deuteronomy 21.22–23, describes a post-mortem suspension. In the Septuagint *στραυροῦν* is only used once.<sup>154</sup>

Chapman observes sufficiently the problem regarding the diversity of suspension punishments several times, but his implementation of these observations is insufficient. Regarding the suspension in Numbers 25.4, he states that the exact meaning of *קע* is rather elusive. This is what the variety in which the verb is rendered in the versions suggests. “The general theme of these renderings involves the idea of public exposure (often by suspension).”<sup>155</sup> The only thing that could be said, according to Chapman, is that the Lord commands Moses to execute the one responsible for the idolatry in some unknown fashion – “[t]he actual method of execution is a means of some debate among early translators and Jewish

<sup>151</sup> Cf. REIJNERS, *Terminology*, 9.

<sup>152</sup> Post-mortem: Deut 21.22–23; Josh 10.26–27; 1 Sam 31.9–12; 2 Sam 4.12. The only possible candidates for describing some kind of an ante-mortem suspension are: Num 25.4; 2 Sam 21.6, 9 and perhaps 21.12–13.

<sup>153</sup> Post-mortem: Deut 21.22; Josh 10.26–27; Esth 9.13. Unspecified: Gen 40.19; Josh 8.29; Esth 2.23; 7.9–10; 8.7.

<sup>154</sup> Esth 7.9–10 (twice if the Greek addition to the book of Esther is counted [Esth 8.12r]).

<sup>155</sup> CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 111.

commentators.”<sup>156</sup> This is true, but not only for יקע and Numbers 25.4. As a matter of fact, it is also the case with תלה and the majority of the suspensions of the Old Testament.<sup>157</sup> The only conclusion that can be drawn from the various suspension accounts is that they describe some kind of unknown form of public execution – or unknown form of suspension of corpses.

Chapman has similar comments in combination with his exposé of the Greek terminology, which will be mentioned here although it was the topic of Chapter 2, since it further illuminates a methodological problem. He notes the important ambiguity in suspension accounts as to whether a person was suspended before or after death, and adds that most sources do not reveal enough information to allow the present reader to decide what kind of punishment the text describes. It is difficult to decide whether a person is being impaled or nailed alive to a cross, according to Chapman.<sup>158</sup>

In part, this calls for the interpreter to be sensitive to matters of personal and regional lexical style. But it is quite conceivable, especially when considering the ἀνασταυρώω word group, that the fundamental distinction within the terms is not “crucifixion vs. other post-mortem suspensions,” but rather “suspension of persons vs. suspension of other objects.” Crucifixion represents a sub-portion of the larger conceptuality of human bodily suspension. In fact, many (if not most) of the concepts in a Greek-speaking audience concerning human suspension (both as a means to and as a subsequent penalty after death) may come into play when that same audience hears of an act of crucifixion.<sup>159</sup>

Having said that, Chapman still labels Lucian’s mythological exposé of Prometheus’ torture on Mount Caucasus as a crucifixion.<sup>160</sup> He even uses the text as evidence that both ἀνασταυροῦν and ἀνασκοπιζειν could refer to “crucifixion” in the narrow English sense of the word,<sup>161</sup> in the sense of “the execution of a living person on a cross (particularly one shaped like †).”<sup>162</sup> It is true that Lucian applies ἀνασταυροῦν, ἀνασκοπιζειν and σταυροῦν to the punishment, but that does not make it a

<sup>156</sup> Ibid., 116. Cf. his concluding remarks on the Latin and Greek terminology (CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 9, 12–13).

<sup>157</sup> Cf. HIRSCH, *The Crucifixion*, 55.

<sup>158</sup> CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 12.

<sup>159</sup> Ibid., 13.

<sup>160</sup> Chapman refers to Lucian, *Prom.* 1, 2, 4, 7, 10, 15, 17 (CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 12 n. 52).

<sup>161</sup> CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 11–12.

<sup>162</sup> Ibid., 7.

crucifixion account according to Chapman's own definition.<sup>163</sup> Prometheus is described as being attached not to a cross, but to a rock – and in addition as surviving the event.

Chapman observes a development in the early Jewish texts regarding the descriptions of the suspensions. This is correct, insofar as the early Jewish texts use ἀνασταυροῦν to a further extent. But it is not correct to draw the conclusion that the users interpreted these texts as crucifixions.<sup>164</sup> As has been seen, it is difficult to tie ἀνασταυροῦν directly to the punishment of crucifixion.

The critique against Chapman's otherwise splendid study can be exemplified by a last quotation. It comes from Chapman's summary of crucifixion terminology and suspension.

While one might be able to speak of a general method of crucifixion in Roman practice, in fact there were many variations on execution by suspension, though the same Latin and Greek terms designate both the variations and the (hypothetical?) norm.<sup>165</sup>

There was simply no norm, not even a hypothetical one. To speak of a *general* method of crucifixion in Roman times is itself hypothetical. Chapman observes correctly the problem of diversity, but he could have pushed the implications of his own observations several steps further.

### 5.2. The Punishment

What, then, can be said about suspension punishments in the Old Testament as an answer to *the second basic question*? In the end, no suspension accounts can be labeled crucifixion accounts in a traditional sense. All texts refer to various suspensions of humans, which occurred post-mortem,<sup>166</sup> and possibly ante-mortem.<sup>167</sup> These diverse suspensions are performed by both the people of Israel<sup>168</sup> and their adversaries.<sup>169</sup>

The texts from the apocryphal Old Testament do not add much in the present quest and will be left without comments. However, the Dead Sea Scrolls offer two texts about suspensions of humans. In one of them it is even stressed that they were alive – an executionary suspension. But it is speculative to go beyond this notion. The common assumption that the

<sup>163</sup> “However, following traditional English usage, we will continue to use ‘crucifixion’ to mean the executionary suspension of a person on a cross-shaped object (allowing for a certain flexibility in shapes)” (CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 32).

<sup>164</sup> CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 175.

<sup>165</sup> *Ibid.*, 30.

<sup>166</sup> Deut 21.22–23; Josh 10.26–27; 1 Sam 31.9–12; 2 Sam 4.12; Esth 9.13.

<sup>167</sup> Num 25.4; 2 Sam 21.6, 9.

<sup>168</sup> Num 25.4; Deut 21.22–23; Josh 8.29; 10.26–27; 2 Sam 4.12; Esth 9.13, 25.

<sup>169</sup> Gen 40.19–22; 1 Sam 31.9–12; 2 Sam 21.6, 9; Ezra 6.11; Esth 2.23; 5.14; 7.9–10;

Dead Sea Scrolls contain references to crucifixion cannot be upheld. However, the Scrolls tell once again that suspension punishments were part of Jewish society.

## Chapter Five

# The New Testament

The ancient pre-Christian literature is the core of the present investigation, although the New Testament is also of great importance for the present investigation. It describes, four times, the most famous crucifixion in history. The fuzzy images of the ancient texts are assumed to become clear in the New Testament. Hengel sees the gospels as *the* premier descriptions.

We have very few more detailed descriptions, and they come only from Roman times: the passion narratives in the gospels are in fact the most detailed of all.<sup>1</sup>

Chapman puts the gospels in the same category. It is here that the fullest description is found. He concludes:

In reporting this event, the New Testament texts provide significant details into the procedures employed in crucifixion (e.g. preceded by scourging, the carrying of the *patibulum* by the victim, the use of nails, the placement of a *titulus*, mob derision, etc.) . . .<sup>2</sup>

Thus, on the basis of these observations a study of the punishment of crucifixion ought to have high expectations for the accounts of the New Testament.

There is, however, an earlier voice with a different message. In Stockbauer's opinion the descriptions in the New Testament are not that colorful after all.

Die Evangelisten berichten die Kreuzigung Christi ohne näheres Eingehen auf die Art und Weise ihrer Vollziehung. Sie war ja dortmals noch als allgemein üblich in praktischer Anwendung und den Lesern, für die die Evangelien zunächst geschrieben wurden, im Voraus bekannt.<sup>3</sup>

There are thus opposite views on what level of information the New Testament offers. The question is thus how much information the New Testament texts do offer. This issue will be addressed in the present chapter.

---

<sup>1</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 25.

<sup>2</sup> CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 78.

<sup>3</sup> STOCKBAUER, *Monogramm, Kreuz & Crucifix*, 1 (cf. BROWN, *The Death of the Messiah*, 945).

The suspension terminology is primarily σταυρός and σταυροῦν. In the passion narrative, the evangelists use these terms exclusively.<sup>4</sup> The dominating usage of the plain verb in the New Testament is unique within the Greek text-corpus up to the turn of the first century C.E. Several of the terms common in earlier Greek are never (ἀνασκολοπίζειν) or seldom (κρεμαννύναι, προσπηγνύναι, ἀνασταυροῦν) used. ἀνασταυροῦν is only used once, in Hebrews 6.6, and there in a challenging way. The usage of the compound decreases toward the last centuries B.C.E. but increases again under the influence of Atticism. When it comes to κρεμαννύναι and προσπηγνύναι both are used in Acts, and κρεμαννύναι alone in Galatians.

## 1. The Gospels

The accounts of the gospels will be treated thematically. The sayings and the narrative material that appear to have a common theme or to describe the same or a similar event will be grouped together. The order of the sayings or events will mainly follow the gospel of Mark.

### 1.1. *Jesus Foretells His Passion*

In a series of five texts, the evangelists portray the earthly Jesus as foretelling his imminent death.<sup>5</sup> However, when Jesus according to the evangelist begins to speak of the passion he does not say much regarding the execution form. He simply states that he is going to be killed, without further notice.

And he began to teach them that it was necessary for the Son of Man to suffer greatly and to be rejected by the elders, the chief priests and the scribes, and to be killed [ἀποκτανθῆναι] and after three days to rise again.<sup>6</sup>

Both Matthew and Luke use the same terminology as Mark.<sup>7</sup> The second saying goes as follows.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. REIJNERS, *Terminology*, 11.

<sup>5</sup> A series of three predictions of the passion is presented in ALAND, *Synopsis of the Four Gospels*, 151, 57, 224. Here two more sayings are added; one follows the transfiguration account (154–55) and the second is found in the introduction to the passion narrative (276).

<sup>6</sup> Mark 8.31–32. καὶ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς ὅτι δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πολλὰ παθεῖν καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ τῶν ἀρχιερέων καὶ τῶν γραμματέων καὶ ἀποκτανθῆναι καὶ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστῆναι.

<sup>7</sup> Matt 16.21; Luke 9.22.

And they asked him, "Why are the scribes saying that it is necessary for Elijah to come first?"<sup>12</sup> And he said to them, "Elijah is coming first to restore all things. How then is it written about the Son of Man, that he shall suffer greatly and be treated with contempt?"<sup>8</sup>

This saying, or its parallel in Matthew 17.12, does not add anything beyond the notion of unspecified sufferings. The third saying follows the first one closely.

For he taught his disciples and said to them, "The Son of Man will be handed over into human hands, and they will kill him [ἀποκτενοῦσιν αὐτόν], and having been killed [ἀποκτανθεῖς] he will he will rise again after three days."<sup>9</sup>

Matthew follows Mark by using ἀποκτείνειν once, while Luke only mentions the handing over (παραδίδοσθαι).<sup>10</sup> The fourth saying goes on in the same manner, but Matthew adds a feature that Mark lacks.<sup>11</sup>

See, we are going up to Jerusalem, and the Son of Man shall be handed over to the chief priests and the scribes, and they shall condemn him to death, and they shall hand him over to the gentiles to be mocked, to be scourged and suspended [σταυρώσαι], and on the third day he shall rise again.<sup>12</sup>

Mark and Luke use only ἀποκτείνειν as before.<sup>13</sup> Matthew adds here for the first time that the end of Jesus' life will be connected with an act referred to with σταυροῦν.

Luke does not mention any specific mode of death of Jesus before the actual passion account.<sup>14</sup> He does, however, recapitulate such a saying in his description of the event after the resurrection.

Remember how he spoke to you, while he was still in Galilee, saying that the Son of Man must be handed over to the hands of sinful men, and be suspended [σταυρωθῆναι], and on the third day rise again.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>8</sup> Mark 9.11–12. καὶ ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν λέγοντες, ὅτι λέγουσιν οἱ γραμματεῖς ὅτι Ἠλίαν δεῖ ἐλθεῖν πρῶτον; ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτοῖς, Ἠλίας μὲν ἐλθὼν πρῶτον ἀποκαθιστάνει πάντα, καὶ πῶς γέγραπται ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἵνα πολλὰ πάθη καὶ ἐξουδενηθῆ;

<sup>9</sup> Mark 9.31. ἐδίδασκεν γὰρ τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ἀποκτενοῦσιν αὐτόν, καὶ ἀποκτανθεὶς μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστήσεται.

<sup>10</sup> Matt 17.22–23; Luke 9.43b–44.

<sup>11</sup> See ALLEN, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 219; DAVIS and ALLISON, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 3.79–82; HAGNER, *Matthew 14–28*, 576.

<sup>12</sup> Matt 20.18–19. ἰδοὺ ἀναβαίνομεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδοθήσεται τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσιν καὶ γραμματεῦσιν, καὶ κατακρινοῦσιν αὐτὸν θανάτῳ, καὶ παραδώσουσιν αὐτὸν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν εἰς τὸ ἐμπαῖξαι καὶ μαστιγῶσαι καὶ σταυρώσαι, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθήσεται.

<sup>13</sup> Mark 10.33–34; Luke 18.31–33.

<sup>14</sup> See FITZMYER, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 2.1546.

Thus, according to Luke, Jesus did connect the way in which he would be killed with *σταυροῦν*.

Beyond the saying about the slaying and suspension (*ἀποκτενεῖτε καὶ σταυρώσετε*) of prophets, wise men and scribes (23.34), Matthew offers a fifth foretelling of Jesus' fate. The text is placed as an introduction to the passion narrative.

And it happened when Jesus had finished all these words, he said to his disciples, "You know that it will be Passover after two days and the Son of Man is handed over to be suspended [*εἰς τὸ σταυρωθῆναι*]." Then the chief priests and the elders of the people were gathered in the court of the high priest called Caiaphas, and they conspired to seize Jesus by stealth and kill him [*ἀποκτείνωσιν*].<sup>16</sup>

These five sayings describe a Jesus who knew what was going to happen to him, but they still do not reveal what kind of punishment they refer to. They do not offer any information beyond the notion that Jesus would be killed (*ἀποκτείνειν*) and that the method is called *σταυροῦν*.

A Johannine saying of Jesus could also be added. During the nightly conversation with Nicodemus, Jesus connects his fate with a well-known Old Testament event.

And as Moses lifted up [*ὑψωσεν*] the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up [*ὑψωθῆναι δεῖ*].<sup>17</sup>

The saying implies some kind of suspension, but nothing more.<sup>18</sup> In order to come any further towards a better understanding of the way Jesus died, other sayings and narratives ought to be considered.

### 1.2. To Carry One's Own Cross

A saying containing *σταυρός* is found in one of Jesus' speeches on discipleship. Much has been written about what it means "to carry one's own cross."<sup>19</sup> The image is closely related to that of Jesus carrying the

<sup>15</sup> Luke 24.6b–7. μνήσθητε ὡς ἐλάλησεν ὑμῖν ἔτι ὢν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ, λέγων τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὅτι δεῖ παραδοθῆναι εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων ἀμαρτωλῶν καὶ σταυρωθῆναι καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστῆναι.

<sup>16</sup> Matt 26.1–4. καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς πάντας τοὺς λόγους τούτους, εἶπεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, οἶδατε ὅτι μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας τὸ πάσχα γίνεται, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται εἰς τὸ σταυρωθῆναι. τότε συνήχθησαν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ εἰς τὴν αὐλήν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως τοῦ λεγομένου Καϊάφα, καὶ συνεβουλεύσαντο ἵνα τὸν Ἰησοῦν δόλω κρατήσωσιν καὶ ἀποκτείνωσιν.

<sup>17</sup> John 3.14. καὶ καθὼς Μωϋσῆς ὑψωσεν τὸν ὄφιν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, οὕτως ὑψωθῆναι δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

<sup>18</sup> Beasley-Murray does not argue convincingly for a connection between *ὑψοῦν* and crucifixion. He leans heavily on the assumption that the Aramaic ܦܪܝ means "lift up on a cross, crucify" (BEASLEY-MURRAY, *John*, 50).

<sup>19</sup> For a recent study, see BØE, *Cross-Bearing*, 14–50.



cross(beam) towards Calvary and his crucifixion. But what is Jesus actually talking about according to the evangelist? In the text, Jesus refers to something that was apparently familiar.

And he called the crowd and his disciples to [himself] and said to them, "If anyone wants to follow me, let him deny himself and take up his pole/suspension tool [τὸν σταυρὸν] and follow me. For he who wants to save his life shall lose it; and he who loses his life for me and for the gospel shall save it."<sup>20</sup>

Matthew and Luke use the same saying in their gospels, with minor changes.<sup>21</sup> Luke adds that the event should occur daily (καθ' ἡμέραν).<sup>22</sup> However, is Jesus with σταυρός referring to a cross (†) or a vital part of it (the crossbeam), i.e., to something that corresponds to the common view of the tool on which Jesus later died?

To answer such a question, a brief recapitulation of Chapter 2 is needed. In the older Greek literature, σταυρός refers to "pole" in general<sup>23</sup> and occurs only in the plural. The noun later became used as a designation of an execution or torture tool onto which a victim was attached. Thus, before the death of Jesus, the saying in the quoted text would probably have described people on their way towards some kind of execution or an act of torture. They were carrying a tool through which they were about to be executed, or a tool upon which they should be suspended after their execution, or a tool that would be used in an act (perhaps separate) of torture, likely to be followed by their execution. It was a plausible fate to end up on a σταυρός, dead or alive, and one could also be forced to carry it, in whole or in part, to the place where it should be used. However, neither this text nor its gospel parallels offer any further information on which punishment they refer to or what the condemned carried. Neither do the five (possibly seven) extra-Biblical texts that might describe a similar custom solve the problem.<sup>24</sup> It could not be decided whether the carrying of the device was a separate punishment (the

<sup>20</sup> Mark 8.34–35. καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τὸν ὄχλον σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· εἴ τις θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἀκολουθεῖν, ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἄράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθεῖτω μοι. ὃς γὰρ ἐὰν θέλη τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι ἀπολέσει αὐτήν· ὃς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσει τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου σώσει αὐτήν.

<sup>21</sup> Matt 16.24–25 (cf. 10.38); Luke 9.23–24.

<sup>22</sup> Fitzmyer sees a shifted focus due to καθ' ἡμέραν, from a harsh picture of self-denial to the brink of death to the challenge of daily Christian living (FITZMYER, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 1.783–88).

<sup>23</sup> Zealously and apparently correctly stressed by Jehovah's Witnesses.

<sup>24</sup> For carrying of a σταυρός, see Char. *Chae. Call.* 4.2.7 [retold in 4.3.10], Artem. *Oneir.* 2.56 and Plut. *De sera.* 554A–B. For carrying of a *patibulum*, see Plaut. *Mil.* 359–60; *F Carb.* 2.1 (and perhaps Clod. Lic. F 3.1; *Lex Puteoli*, col. 2.8–14 (AE 1971, no 88 [Puteoli]).

carried device left aside) or a prelude to the coming suspension (the carried device attached to the suspension tool or being the whole suspension tool).

So, what is the message of the texts? The point of the present investigation is that the texts are not necessarily intended to visualize “the cross” (†) but *any kind* of suspension or torture device used in both ante- and post-mortem suspensions or acts of torture. A device connected with death, pain and shame – in an unspecified way; not with all the distinctive features with which the church later filled the label “crucifixion.” A person carrying a σταυρός is not necessarily on the way to Calvary, so to speak, but on a path towards an unspecified execution or torture form. Thus, contra the common view expressed in commentaries, it is not possible to fully define what the texts describe Jesus as talking about.<sup>25</sup>

### 1.3. A People’s Call for Execution

The next text group describes utterances of a similar, yet completely different type. The similarity between the previous texts and the present text is that an expression based on the σταυρ-stem is used. The difference is how the expression is expressed. The previous ones had a positive touch (at least by means of its goal). The present text is entirely negative. Here the word is found in a public cry in Jerusalem, in front of Pilate, Barabbas and Jesus. Pilate could not find any ground for the accusations from the Jewish authorities against Jesus. He offered to flog Jesus and then release him.

But they shouted out together, “away with this one [αἶρε τοῦτον], release Barabbas for us” (who for a certain insurrection made in the city and a murder had been thrown in prison). But Pilate, desiring to release Jesus, spoke to them again; but they shouted back saying, “suspend, suspend him [σταύρου σταύρου αὐτόν].” And he said to them the third time, “What evil has this man done? I have not found anything worthy of death in him; I will therefore chastise him and release him.” But they insisted with loud voices and demanded that he be suspended [αὐτόν σταυρωθῆναι].<sup>26</sup>

<sup>25</sup> E.g., ALLEN, *S. Matthew*, 110; COLLINS, *Mark*, 408; EVANS, *Mark 8:27–16:20*, 25; GOULD, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 156; SWETE, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, 181. See, however, GUNDRY, *Mark*, 435–36, for a good discussion on some problems with the saying.

<sup>26</sup> Luke 23.18–23a. ἀνέκραγον δὲ παμπληθεὶ λέγοντες, αἶρε τοῦτον, ἀπόλυσον δὲ ἡμῖν τὸν Βαραββᾶν· ὅστις ἦν διὰ στάσιν τινὰ γενομένην ἐν τῇ πόλει καὶ φόνον βληθεὶς ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ. πάλιν δὲ ὁ Πιλάτος προσεφώνησεν αὐτοῖς θέλων ἀπολύσαι τὸν Ἰησοῦν· οἱ δὲ ἐπεφώνουν λέγοντες, σταύρου σταύρου αὐτόν. ὁ δὲ τρίτον εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· τί γὰρ κακὸν ἐποίησεν οὗτος; οὐδὲν αἴτιον θανάτου εἶδρον ἐν αὐτῷ παιδεύσας οὐδὲν αὐτόν ἀπολύσω. οἱ δὲ ἐπέκειντο φωναῖς μεγάλαις αἰτούμενοι αὐτόν σταυρωθῆναι.

The cry of the people is mentioned by all four gospels with minor changes.<sup>27</sup> The four gospels also state that the cry was successful.

And their voices prevailed. Pilate gave the sentence that their will should be done. And he released the one that for insurrection and murder had been thrown in prison, whom they asked for, but Jesus he delivered [παρέδωκεν] to their will.<sup>28</sup>

While Luke lets Jesus be handed over to the people, without further specification, the other three gospels state that he was handed over ἵνα σταυρωθῆ.<sup>29</sup> All gospels are coherent when it comes to not specifying what lies ahead, beyond the usage of σταυρῶν.<sup>30</sup>

#### 1.4. The Road to Golgotha

Next comes an event in which σταυρός is used. It has been the subject of many descriptions. In connection with Good Friday it has been discussed and revered for centuries how Jesus fell under the weight of the cross (beam?) on the path toward Calvary. After Jesus had been mocked by the Roman soldiers,<sup>31</sup> it happened as follows according to Mark.

And they led him out to be suspended (on a pole) [ἵνα σταυρώσουσιν αὐτόν]. And they forced one passing by, Simon of Cyrene [who was] coming from the country, the father of Alexander and Rufus, to carry his pole [ἵνα ἄρῃ τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ].<sup>32</sup>

When this text is read by a 21<sup>st</sup>-century person from the Western world, the picture is clear: Jesus on the cross with outstretched arms on the crossbeam, nailed to his hands and feet, a crown of thorns on the head beneath the King of the Jews-sign. The quoted text above is but a slight

<sup>27</sup> Matt 27.22–23 (σταυρωθήτω); Mark 15.13–14 (σταύρωσον αὐτόν). The text in John is slightly different since the people's selection of Barabbas (John 18.39–40) is separated from the cry for punishment of Jesus (19.15 [ἄρον ἄρον, σταύρωσον αὐτόν]). Between these texts comes the cry for punishment by the chief priests and their officers (19.6 [σταύρωσον]). For Luke's doubling of the verb, see FITZMYER, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 2.1491.

<sup>28</sup> Luk 23.23b–25. καὶ κατίσχυον αἱ φωναὶ αὐτῶν. καὶ Πιλάτος ἐπέκρινεν γενέσθαι τὸ αἷτημα αὐτῶν ἀπέλυσεν δὲ τὸν διὰ στάσις καὶ φόνον βεβλημένον εἰς φυλακὴν ὃν ἤτονοντο, τὸν δὲ Ἰησοῦν παρέδωκεν τῷ θελήματι αὐτῶν.

<sup>29</sup> Matt 27.26; Mark 15.15; John 19.16a.

<sup>30</sup> E.g., Nolland's remark that the verb "is used exclusively of the Roman means of execution upon a cross" (NOLLAND, *Luke 18.35–24.53*, 1135) is thus awkward, especially when coupled with his comment contra Fitzmyer, "[i]n this context there is no need to discuss the question of possible Jewish practice of crucifixion." The question as to which punishment Jesus later suffered is not as evident as Nolland assumes.

<sup>31</sup> Matt 27.27–31a; Mark 15.16–20a; John 19.2–3.

<sup>32</sup> Mark 15.20b–21. καὶ ἐξάγουσιν αὐτόν ἵνα σταυρώσουσιν αὐτόν. καὶ ἀγγαρεύουσιν παράγοντά τινα Σίμωνα Κυρηναῖον ἐρχόμενον ἀπ' ἀγροῦ, τὸν πατέρα Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Ρούφου, ἵνα ἄρῃ τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ.

step back in time. The whole crucifixion drama as depicted by the church is, so to speak, embedded in the epic walk toward Calvary. Here occurs a phenomenon similar to the one that was mentioned above regarding the reading of the text on discipleship (to carry one's own σταυρός). The two texts share the same problem. The problem is that the reader reads more between the lines than in the lines themselves. When it comes to the walk toward Calvary, the gospels do not say that Jesus fell or struggled under the weight of the σταυρός, contrary to the common assumption.<sup>33</sup> The synoptics say that Simon was forced to carry the σταυρός, without saying why. The only support that can be squeezed out of the accounts is Mark and Matthew's usage of αἴρειν, which might imply that the σταυρός was lying on the ground.

And they led him away to be suspended (on a pole). As they went out they found a man from Cyrene named Simon; they forced this man to take up his pole [ἵνα ἄρῃ τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ].<sup>34</sup>

This walk is also retold by Luke and John with some variations.

And as they led him away, they took hold of one Simon of Cyrene [who was] coming from the country and laid upon him the pole [τὸν σταυρὸν], to carry it after Jesus.<sup>35</sup>

They took Jesus therefore; and carrying his own pole [βαστάζων αὐτῷ τὸν σταυρὸν] he went out to the [place] which is called the Place of the Skull, which is called Golgotha in Hebrew.<sup>36</sup>

A striking variation on the theme is John's affirmation that Jesus carried his own cross. There is no Simon of Cyrene in John's account.<sup>37</sup>

<sup>33</sup> E.g., BROWN, *The Death of the Messiah*, 2.914–15; BERNARD, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 2.626; FRANCE, *The Gospel of Mark*, 640; GOULD, *St. Mark*, 289; HAGNER, *Matthew 14–28*, 834; NOLLAND, *Luke 8:35–24:53*, 1136; PLUMMER, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 528; WESTCOTT and WESTCOTT, *The Gospel According to John*, 273. See however the correct observation in a 19<sup>th</sup>-century commentary on Luke: “[W]e are left in ignorance of the motive which soon led the Roman soldiers charged with the execution to lay hold of Simon of Cyrene for this office. Did Jesus faint under the burden, or did Simon testify his sympathy with Him rather too loudly; or was there here one of those abuses of military power which are readily indulged in the case of a foreigner? We cannot tell” (GODET, SHALDERS and CUSIN, *A Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke*, 2.330–31).

<sup>34</sup> Matt 27.31b–32. καὶ ἀπήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ σταυρῶσαι. ἐξερχόμενοι δὲ εὗρον ἄνθρωπον Κυρηναῖον ὀνόματι Σίμωνα· τοῦτον ἠγγάρευσαν ἵνα ἄρῃ τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ. Mark 15.21 and Matt 27.32 use verbatim expressions for the phrase “to take up his pole” (ἵνα ἄρῃ τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ).

<sup>35</sup> Luke 23.26. καὶ ὡς ἀπήγαγον αὐτόν, ἐπιλαβόμενοι Σίμωνά τινα Κυρηναῖον ἐρχόμενον ἀπ’ ἀγροῦ ἐπέθηκαν αὐτῷ τὸν σταυρὸν φέρειν ὀπισθεν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ.

<sup>36</sup> John 19.17. παρέλαβον οὖν τὸν Ἰησοῦν· καὶ βαστάζων αὐτῷ τὸν σταυρὸν ἐξήλθεν εἰς τὸν λεγόμενον Κρανίου Τόπον, ὃ λέγεται Ἑβραϊστὶ Γολγοθά.

What is happening in these texts? Jesus or/and Simon of Cyrene was carrying a *σταυρός*. But is it clear what the *σταυρός* denotes and for what purpose it was carried? Considering the hitherto studied texts, the answer ought to be negative. Neither the Biblical nor the extra-Biblical texts describing someone who carries an execution or a torture tool towards his own punishment are explicit on the theme.<sup>38</sup> These texts do not mention anything about for what purpose the carrying occurred.

As has been seen in the previous chapters, there are five (or seven) texts that describe a condemned man who is carrying such tool toward a punishment.<sup>39</sup> As also noted, it is uncertain whether the carrying of the tool was a separate punishment (like a walk *sub furca*) or intended to be a part of a coming execution (the condemned carried the execution tool or a part of it) – or something completely different.

The common interpretation that Jesus was carrying the crossbeam (*patibulum*) is not supported by the Biblical texts.<sup>40</sup> The theory may be based on the logical conclusion that a solid pole together with a solid crossbeam ought to be too heavy to be carried. Thus, according to this view Jesus must have been carrying only a part (assumed to be the crossbeam) of the execution tool (the assumed cross). With this assumption in mind, it appears that a search began for texts depicting the carrying of a crossbeam. A theory that the Latin term *crux* referred to “cross” (i.e., the vertical pole) while *patibulum* referred to “crossbeam” was handy. With the above-mentioned theory in mind, the meaning of the strophe “*patibulum ferat per urbem, deinde adfigatur cruci*” was evident.<sup>41</sup>

However, this assumption faces some problems, as shown in the chapter on the Latin texts. Plautus does not explicitly state that the *patibulum* was intended to be attached to the waiting *crux*. As has been seen, *crux* and *patibulum* could be used almost synonymously in Latin texts. The

<sup>37</sup> See BROWN, *The Death of the Messiah*, 2.916–17, for more on the absence of Simon in John.

<sup>38</sup> This causes Mann’s words, that “the physical details of this barbarous method of execution were all too familiar to the inhabitants of Syria-Palestine, and the references are legion both in the classical literature and elsewhere” (MANN, *Mark*, 644), to be only conjectural.

<sup>39</sup> For the carrying of *σταυρός*, see Char. *Chae. Call.* 4.2.7 (retold in 4.3.10), Artem. *Oneir.* 2.56 and Plut. *De sera.* 554A–B. For the carrying of *patibulum*, see Plaut. *Mil.* 359–60 and *F Carb.* 2.1.

<sup>40</sup> Contra, e.g., BEASLEY-MURRAY, *John*, 244; BLINZLER, *Der Prozeß Jesu*, 360; BROWN, *The Death of the Messiah*, 2.912–13; COLLINS, *Mark*, 737; DAVIES and ALLISON, *Matthew*, 613 + n. 31; HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 32; HENGEL and SCHWEMER, *Jesu und das Judentum*, 614; LACHS, *A Rabbinic Commentary on the New Testament*, 430; LUZ, *Matthew 21–28*, 524; MANN, *Mark*, 645; NOLLAND, *Matthew*, 1188; PLUMMER, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 528.

<sup>41</sup> Plaut. *F Carb.* 2.1. Cf. Tacitus *Ann.* 14.33.

pair *crux* and *patibulum* do not automatically describe what a contemporary reader tends to read out from the texts about Jesus' walk toward Calvary.<sup>42</sup> Thus, in the end it is not clear what the texts describe as happening on the *via dolorosa*.

### 1.5. The Execution

With the walk as a prelude, the evangelists point toward the coming great account of the death of Jesus. The problem is that not much is coming, as far as information about the execution form is concerned. Matthew and Mark describe how Jesus was brought to a place called Golgotha, where Jesus was offered a blend of wine and gall (Matthew) or myrrh (Mark), which he declined.

And they suspended him [σταυροῦσιν αὐτόν] . . . It was in the third hour they suspended him [ἔσταύρωσαν αὐτόν]. And the inscription of the charge against him read, "The King of the Jews."<sup>43</sup>

Concise – and very uninformative. Mark's account is remarkably silent on the theme of the punishment method. Matthew's words are fairly close to Mark.<sup>44</sup>

And when they had suspended him . . . (σταυρώσαντες δὲ αὐτόν . . .).<sup>45</sup>

The other gospels are no exception. Luke and John simply state that when they had arrived at the place called the Skull (Luke) or at the Place of the Skull, called Golgotha in Hebrew (John):

There they suspended him . . . (ἐκεῖ ἔσταύρωσαν αὐτόν . . .).<sup>46</sup>

<sup>42</sup> See Zöckler's discussion on Plautus' text (ZÖCKLER, *Das kreuz Christi*, 102–03 n. 2. Cf. also KUHN, "Die Kreuzstrafe," 648–793 (681).

<sup>43</sup> Mark 15.23–26. καὶ σταυροῦσιν αὐτόν . . . ἦν δὲ ὥρα τρίτη καὶ ἔσταύρωσαν αὐτόν. καὶ ἦν ἡ ἐπιγραφή τῆς αἰτίας αὐτοῦ ἐπιγεγραμμένη, ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων.

<sup>44</sup> Only Mark mentions that the suspension occurred in the third hour (15.25). See BROWN, *The Death of the Messiah*, 2.960–62.

<sup>45</sup> Matt 27.35. Davies and Allison have a correct observation on Matthew: "It is perhaps surprising that the crucifixion itself is mentioned only in passing.... On the matters of what sort of cross was used to crucify Jesus and how he was fastened upon it Matthew is mute" (DAVIES and ALLISON, *Matthew*, 613). See also HAGNER, *Matthew* 14–28, 835.

<sup>46</sup> Luke 23.33. See Nolland's remark on Luke: "None of the Gospel accounts provides any description of the actual crucifixion of Jesus. For information on the Roman practice of crucifixion, we must rely principally upon ancient literary accounts (a good range of these may be readily consulted in Hengel, *Crucifixion*). These have more recently been supplemented by the discovery of the remains of a Jewish victim of crucifixion in the excavation of ancient cave tombs at Giv'at ha-Mivtar, just north of Jerusalem near Mount Scopus and immediately west of the road to Nablus" (NOLLAND, *Luke*

Where they suspended him . . . (ὅπου αὐτὸν ἐσταύρωσαν . . .).<sup>47</sup>

Raymond Brown offers a crucial observation regarding the texts, and what they offer.

We now come to the centerpiece of passion, the crucifixion itself, more often portrayed in art than any other scene in history – with great variation in the shape and position of the crosses, in how Jesus is affixed to the cross, in how he is clothed, in his expressions of anguish, etc. Yet in all comparable literature, has so crucial a moment ever been phrased so briefly and uninformatively?<sup>48</sup>

The whole account of the gospels so far rests solely on the meaning of the diversely used verb σταυροῦν. So far nothing has been said about the notorious crossbeam – neither on Jesus' (and/or Simon's) shoulders nor attached to the pole. In fact, nothing is said about the shape or the nature of the execution tool, other than that it is a σταυρός.<sup>49</sup>

---

18:35–24:53, 1145). Thus, Nolland sees the sparseness in the Gospel account and suggests, on the one hand, that the fuller accounts are to be found in ancient texts. This view does not only contradict Hengel's view quoted in the beginning of the present chapter, but it is also unsupported *per se* as has been seen in the previous chapters. On the other hand, Nolland refers to the "crucified man" from Giv'at ha-Mivtar, a finding that will be discussed in the end of the following chapter.

<sup>47</sup> John 19.18. In the *Baker New Testament Commentary* the briefness of the Johannine account is observed, but the author(s) refer instead to the gospel of Luke (23.26–32) for "a much more complete account" (HENDRIKSEN and KISTEMAKER, *Exposition of the Gospel According to John*, 2.424–425).

<sup>48</sup> BROWN, *The Death of the Messiah*, 945. This crucial observation does not, however, prevent Brown from offering, on the following pages, a detailed description of the death of Jesus as well as detailed descriptions of extra-Biblical crucifixions. For a similar approach, see DUNN, *Jesus Remembered*, 781 n. 93. The absence of any crucifixion description in BENEDICT XVI, *Jesus von Nazareth*, 2.226–29 is encouraging.

<sup>49</sup> Davies and Allison see the problem with the sparseness of the Gospel accounts ("[o]n the matters of what sort of cross was used to crucify Jesus and how he was fastened upon it Matthew is mute" [DAVIES and ALLISON, *Matthew*, 613]) and the diverse suspension accounts in the extra-Biblical texts (see quotation below), but draw nevertheless too far-reaching conclusions. "Although crucifixion could take different forms (cf. Seneca, *Cons. Marc.* 20:3; Josephus, *Bell.* 5:451), it seems most likely that Jesus hung not upon a vertical stake or a T- or X-shaped cross but upon a crossbeam which was set in a notch below the top of an upright pole; for the story of Simon, which involves a *patibulum*, excludes execution upon a simple vertical stake or an X-shaped cross; and if the inscription was indeed placed above Jesus' head (v. 37; Lk 23:38) then we readily imagine it as affixed to the vertical pole above the crossbeam. This is already the picture in Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* 2:24:4) and is the dominant tradition in Christian art" (DAVIES and ALLISON, *Matthew*, 613 n. 31). As has been seen, the texts describing Simon of Cyrene carrying Jesus' σταυρός do not even indicate that the carried device was a *patibulum* and are thus futile to use as evidence that the σταυρός of Jesus resembles the assumed shape of a cross (†).

There is no reference to any nails found in the text. No nails are mentioned in connection with the execution narratives in the gospels. The only references in the gospels are found outside the passion narratives. The major one occurs in the Johannine post-resurrection narrative (John 20.25) when Thomas wants to see the marks of nails in Jesus' hands. The minor, or weaker, one is when the Lukan Jesus shows his hands and feet to his disciples (Luke 24.39). Luke does not mention the reason behind Jesus' showing his hands and feet. However, if the major account is taken into consideration there is a possibility for marks of crucifixion nails. John 20.25 offers indirect evidence that nails were used when Jesus' hands were attached to the σταυρός.<sup>50</sup> As far as the passion narratives are concerned, the prevailing impression is still the sparseness of the crucifixion description.

### 1.6. The Criminals

The fate of the two criminals does not add any information regarding the way they were executed. The criminals are told about in all four gospels, but their fate is barely visible.<sup>51</sup> Luke has the fullest description of the criminals after his addition about Jesus' words to the daughters of Jerusalem.<sup>52</sup>

There were also two others, evildoers, led with him to be killed [ἀναιρεθῆναι]. And when they came to the place that is called the Skull, they suspended [ἐσταύρωσαν] him and the evildoers, one on the right and one on his left.<sup>53</sup>

John introduces the criminals in the beginning of the execution account, while Matthew and Mark place the reference to them at the end.<sup>54</sup> When they recur in the synoptics (John is silent) they are simply presented as "suspended (on wood)" or "hanged."

One of the evildoers, who were hanged [τῶν κρεμασθέντων], railed on him, saying, "Are you not the Messiah? Save yourself and us." But the other answered and rebuking him said, "Do you not fear God, since you are under the same judgment? And we in-

<sup>50</sup> Cf. also the comments on Col. 2.14 (p. 255). That nails were used in suspension of victims is also indicated by the usage of nails as medical amulets in antiquity, as mentioned in the Mishnah (*Sabbath*, 6.10): "They may go out ... with a nail [from] a suspended [person] as a means of healing (ובמסמר מן הצלב משום רפואה) ... ויצאין".

<sup>51</sup> Matt 27.28; Mark 15.27; Luke 23.32-33; John 19.18.

<sup>52</sup> Luke 23.27-31.

<sup>53</sup> Luke 23.32-33. ἤγοντο δὲ καὶ ἕτεροι κακοῦργοι δύο σὺν αὐτῷ ἀναιρεθῆναι. καὶ ὅτε ἦλθον ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον τὸν καλούμενον Κρανίον, ἐκεῖ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτὸν καὶ τοὺς κακοῦργους, ὃν μὲν ἐκ δεξιῶν ὃν δὲ ἐξ ἀριστερῶν. Cf. Matt 27.44 (οἱ συσταυρωθέντες σὺν αὐτῷ); Mark 15.32b (οἱ συσταυρωμένοι σὺν αὐτῷ).

<sup>54</sup> Cf. BROWN, *The Death of the Messiah*, 2.968.



deed [have been condemned] justly, for we are receiving the due reward for that which we have done; but this man has done nothing wrong.”<sup>55</sup>

Thus, the criminals are also victims of an almost anonymous execution form. They are however described as being able to talk while suspended, which makes a regular impaling fit the description less well than some kind of limb-suspension.

### 1.7. The Mocking of Jesus

The synoptics describe some events that occurred while Jesus was suspended. The general attitude toward the suspended Jesus is portrayed as negative.

Those who were passing by derided him, shaking their heads and saying, “Ha, you who would destroy the temple and rebuild it in three days, save yourself, and come down from the pole [ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ].” In the same way also the chief priests, while mocking him among themselves and with the scribes, said, “He saved others; he cannot save himself. Let the Christ, the king of Israel, now come down from the pole [ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ], that we may see and believe.”<sup>56</sup>

Matthew’s account is close to Mark’s, while Luke’s account is much briefer.<sup>57</sup> The accounts show that Jesus was attached in such a way that he could not release himself. The Markan account implies, at most, that the σταυρός of Jesus was tall enough to cause the mockers to ask Jesus to come *down* from the σταυρός.

The σταυρός appears to extend above the head of Jesus. Luke adds after the mockery that there was a sign (*titulus*) attached *above* the head of Jesus.<sup>58</sup> The other gospels mention the sign earlier.<sup>59</sup> A challenging feature is that they have different wordings.<sup>60</sup>

<sup>55</sup> Luke 23.39–41. εἰς δὲ τῶν κρεμασθέντων κακούργων ἐβλασφήμει αὐτὸν λέγων, οὐχὶ σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός; σῶσον σεαυτὸν καὶ ἡμᾶς. ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ ἕτερος ἐπιτιμῶν αὐτῷ ἔφη, οὐδὲ φοβῆ σὺ τὸν θεόν, ὅτι ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ κρίματι εἶ; καὶ ἡμεῖς μὲν δίκαιως, ἄξια γὰρ ὧν ἐπράξαμεν ἀπολαμβάνομεν· οὗτος δὲ οὐδὲν ἄτοπον ἔπραξεν.

<sup>56</sup> Mark 15.29–32. καὶ οἱ παραπορευόμενοι ἐβλασφήμουν αὐτὸν κινουῦντες τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν καὶ λέγοντες, οὐὰ ὁ καταλύων τὸν ναὸν καὶ οἰκοδομῶν ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις, σῶσον σεαυτὸν καταβάς ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ. ὁμοίως καὶ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς ἐμπαίζοντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους μετὰ τῶν γραμματέων ἔλεγον, ἄλλους ἔσωσεν, ἑαυτὸν οὐ δύναται σῶσαι· ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἰσραὴλ καταβάτω νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ, ἵνα ἴδωμεν καὶ πιστεύσωμεν.

<sup>57</sup> Matt 27.39–42; Luke 23.35–36.

<sup>58</sup> Luke 23.38. Also Matthew places the sign above Jesus (Matt 27.37).

<sup>59</sup> Matt 27.37; Mark 15.26; John 19.19.

<sup>60</sup> See BROWN, *The Death of the Messiah*, 2.963–64. Cf. BLINZLER, *Der Prozeß Jesu*, 367–68; SWETE, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, 381. Craig Evans suggests rather surprisingly that “Mark’s Greek inscription parallels closely the forms found in the other Gospels” (EVANS, *Mark 8:27–16:20*, 503).

This is Jesus, the King of the Jews [οὗτός ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων].<sup>61</sup>

The King of the Jews [ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων].<sup>62</sup>

This [man is] the King of the Jews [ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων οὗτος].<sup>63</sup>

Jesus the Nazorean, the King of the Jews [Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων].<sup>64</sup>

No other ancient text has been found that describes such a sign as being attached above a condemned suspended victim. The texts appear instead to describe a sign hung around the neck of the victim *before* the execution.<sup>65</sup>

### 1.8. The Death of Jesus

When it comes to the expiration of Jesus, he is described as being alive while suspended. Attached to the core of the narrative is Jesus talking on the σταυρός. The event goes as follows according to Matthew.

From the sixth hour there was darkness over all the land until the ninth hour. And about the ninth hour Jesus said with a loud voice, ἤλι ἤλι λεμα σαβαχθάνι, that is, “My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?” Some of them who stood there, when they had heard it, said that this [man] is calling [for] Elijah. And at once one of them ran and got a sponge, filled it with sour wine, put it on a stick, and gave it to him to drink. The others said, “Let [him] be, let us see whether Elijah will come to save him.” Jesus screamed with a loud voice and gave up his breath.<sup>66</sup>

It is beyond doubt that Jesus, according to the Gospel accounts, was suspended ante-mortem – it was an execution. Jesus was suspended in some

<sup>61</sup> Matt 27.37.

<sup>62</sup> Mark 15.26.

<sup>63</sup> Luke 23.38.

<sup>64</sup> John 19.19.

<sup>65</sup> Contra BEASLEY-MURRAY, *John*, 346; BLINZLER, *Der Prozeß Jesu*, 362; HENGEL and SCHWEMER, *Jesus und das Judentum*, 614–15. See Suet. *Calig.* 32.2; *Dom.* 10.1. Cf. also the fourth-century author Cass. Dio, 54.3.7. The remark by Davies and Allison on the theme is thus correct, “[b]ut we know of no evidence that the résumé was then fastened to the cross as a sort of ridiculing epitaph. Perhaps the singularity of the *titulus* being so displayed was the cause of its being remembered” (DAVIES and ALLISON, *Matthew*, 615).

<sup>66</sup> Matt 27.45–50. ἀπὸ δὲ ἕκτης ὥρας σκότος ἐγένετο ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ἕως ὥρας ἐνάτης. περὶ δὲ τὴν ἐνάτην ὥραν ἀνεβόησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς φωνῇ μεγάλῃ λέγων, ἤλι ἤλι λεμα σαβαχθάνι; τοῦτ' ἐστίν, Θεέ μου θεέ μου, ἵνατί με ἐγκατέλιπες; τινὲς δὲ τῶν ἐκεῖ ἐστηκότων ἀκούσαντες ἔλεγον ὅτι Ἥλιαν φωνεῖ οὗτος. καὶ εὐθέως δραμῶν εἰς ἐξ αὐτῶν καὶ λαβὼν σπόγγον πλήσας τε ὄξους καὶ περιθειὺς καλάμῳ ἐπότιζεν αὐτόν. οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ ἔλεγον ἄφες ἴδωμεν εἰ ἔρχεται Ἥλιος σώσων αὐτόν. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς πάλιν κράζας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ἀφῆκεν τὸ πνεῦμα. See also Mark 15.34–37; Luke 23.46; John 19.28–30.

way on a σταυρός in order to be executed. No parallel for a death cry at the point of death while suspended has been found during the present investigation.<sup>67</sup>

## 2. Acts

In Acts the execution of Jesus is mentioned in a proclamatory setting. The terminology is more diverse than it was in the gospels. The first text is a good example of this.

You men, Israelites, listen to these words; Jesus of Nazareth, a man attested to you by God through mighty works, wonders and signs, which God did among you through him, as you yourselves know, this man, handed over to you by the determined will and foreknowledge of God, you have by lawless hands attached [to an execution device] and executed [προσπήξαντες ἀνείλατε].<sup>68</sup>

The text presents Peter as saying that Jesus was attached to something in such a way that he expired, but it still does not say in which way.<sup>69</sup> Some verses later in the same chapter Peter uses the terminology used in the

---

<sup>67</sup> There is surprising silence about the fact that two of the best manuscripts of the New Testament, the Codices Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, describe Jesus as being killed by a soldier's spear instead of the suspension *per se*. Matt 27.49 according to codex Sinaiticus: "The others said, 'Let [him] be, let us see whether Elijah will come to save him.' Another took a spear and pierced his side, and out came water and blood" (ΟΙΔΕΛΟΙΠΟΙΕΛΕΓΟ | ΑΦΕCΙΔΩΜΕΝΕΙ | ΕΡΧΕΤΑΙΗΛΙΑC C C W | C W N (corrected from C W C A I in the codex) ΑΥΤΟΝΑΛΛΟC | ΔΕΛΑΒWΛΟΓΧΗ | ΕΝΥΞΕΝΑΥΤΟΥΤΗ | ΠΛΕΥΡΑΝΚΑΙΕΞΗΛ | ΘΕΝΥΔΩΡΚΑΙΑΙ | ΜΛ).

The reading is usually reckoned as intrusion from John 19.34 (e.g., METZGER, *A Textual Commentary*, 59; BROWN, *The Death of the Messiah*, 2.1065–66; NOLLAND, *Matthew*, 1201). However, it might be worth a second thought considering the diverse methods that are described in the studied suspension accounts. If there was no fixed punishment form called crucifixion in the time of Jesus, a reading that Jesus died by the spear instead of a "cross" is more plausible (see PENNELLS, "The Spear Thrust," 99–115; DAVIES and ALLISON, *Matthew*, 627 n. 81). Such a reading would, e.g., contextualize the death cry (see DAVIES and ALLISON, *Matthew*, 627), which becomes less surprising if it is read as a reaction to a spear thrust.

<sup>68</sup> Acts 2.22–24. ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλῖται, ἀκούσατε τοὺς λόγους τούτους· Ἰησοῦν τὸν Ναζωραῖον, ἄνδρα ἀποδεδειγμένον ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς ὑμᾶς δυνάμεσι καὶ τέρασι καὶ σημείοις οἷς ἐποίησεν δι' αὐτοῦ ὁ θεὸς ἐν μέσφ ὑμῶν, καθὼς αὐτοὶ οἶδατε, τοῦτον τῇ ὀρισμένη βουλῇ καὶ προγνώσει τοῦ θεοῦ ἔκδοτον διὰ χειρὸς ἀνόμων προσπήξαντες ἀνείλατε.

<sup>69</sup> The BDAG goes some steps too far when it offers "nail (to a cross)" as meaning of προσπηγνύναι. See also Barrett who discusses the connection between the text and crucifixion (BARRETT, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 141).

gospels, when he refers to Jesus as “this Jesus whom you suspended” [τοῦτον τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὃν ὑμεῖς ἐσταυρώσατε].<sup>70</sup>

Two other speeches by Peter reflect the terminology used in Deuteronomy 21.22–23. In both texts Peter accuses the Jewish leadership of having killed Jesus and “suspended him on wood” [κρεμάσαντες ἐπὶ ξύλου].<sup>71</sup> Also Paul of Acts refers to Jesus’ execution tool with ξύλον once.<sup>72</sup>

### 3. The Epistles Attributed to Paul

In the epistles which commonly are directly connected with Paul, the verb σταυροῦν is used ten times and the noun σταυρός seven times.<sup>73</sup> In these epistles the noun occurs three times.<sup>74</sup> In all instances the words occur in various settings of conflict and are mainly used figuratively. Paul uses the words in a theological and metaphorical sense.

In the letter to the Romans, Paul’s argument for the inadequacy of a continued life in sin for a Christian is “that our old man was executed/suspended with [Christ] [συνεσταυρώθη].”<sup>75</sup> The σταυρ-stem is not used beyond this in Romans.

In the Corinthian correspondence, the words are introduced in direct connection with the conflict. Paul points out the inappropriateness of a divided church, with a rhetorical question.

Is Christ divided? Was Paul suspended [ἐσταυρώθη] for you, or were you baptized in the name of Paul?<sup>76</sup>

Paul stresses that he has not contributed to the division; his mission is to preach about Christ, and especially about the σταυρός of Christ (1.17). The essence of Paul’s gospel is the σταυρός of Christ (1.18). He preached a Christ who has been suspended on a σταυρός (1.23). The only thing he

<sup>70</sup> Acts 2.36 (a similar expression is used in 4.10). Page notes the emphasis made by the author by placing ὃν ὑμεῖς ἐσταυρώσατε last in the sentence (PAGE, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 93).

<sup>71</sup> Acts 5.30; 10.39.

<sup>72</sup> Acts 13.29.

<sup>73</sup> Rom. 6.6 (συνεσταυρώθη); 1 Cor 1.13 (ἐσταυρώθη), 23 (ἐσταυρωμένον), 2.2 (ἐσταυρωμένον), 8 (ἐσταύρωσαν); 2 Cor 13.4 (ἐσταυρώθη); Gal 2.19 (συνεσταύρωμαι), 3.1 (ἐσταυρωμένος), 5.24 (ἐσταύρωσαν), 6.14 (ἐσταύρωται). σταυρός: 1 Cor 1.17, 18; Gal 5.11, 6.12, 14; Phil 2.8, 3.18.

<sup>74</sup> Eph 2.16; Col 1.20, 2.14.

<sup>75</sup> Rom 6.6. ὅτι ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος συνεσταυρώθη.

<sup>76</sup> 1 Cor 1.13. μεμέρισται ὁ Χριστός; μὴ Παῦλος ἐσταυρώθη ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, ἢ εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Παύλου ἐβαπτίσθητε;

wanted to know among the Corinthians was Christ, and him as being suspended on a σταυρός [καὶ τοῦτον ἐσταυρωμένον] (2.2), suspended [ἐσταύρωσαν] by the rulers of this age (2.8). In Second Corinthians, Paul adds that Jesus was suspended [ἐσταυρώθη] in weakness (2 Cor 13.4).

In Galatians, Paul presents himself as being together with Christ on the σταυρός [Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι] (Gal 2.19) and the Galatians as having Jesus displayed for their eyes as suspended on the σταυρός [ἐσταυρωμένος] (3.1).

In the next occurrence of the theme, Paul refers to Deuteronomy 21.22–23 in such a way that two basic problems call for attention. Paul uses this text when he deals with the theological meaning of the death of Jesus.

Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us. For it is written, cursed is everyone who is suspended on wood [ὁ κρεμάμενος ἐπὶ ξύλου].<sup>77</sup>

First, does Paul stress the nature of the suspension tool? If so, it is worth noticing that the Hebrew text of Deuteronomy 21.23 appears to say that a person suspended *on anything* is cursed by God.<sup>78</sup> There is no particular suspension tool mentioned.<sup>79</sup> The currently almost universally added strophe “on wood” is absent, not only in the Hebrew text, but also in the old versions (Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion), Peshitta, Targumim Onqelos, Neofiti and Pseudo-Jonathan. The suspension tool is added in the Vulgate, Septuagint and the Temple Scroll (11QTemple 64.12). This is puzzling, considering how important the wood-feature appears to become for Paul (who essentially follows the Septuagint in his quotation in Gal 3.13).

Secondly, Paul’s usage of the text puts the definition question in focus. The implied definition of the present investigation – built upon Kuhn’s definition – places Deuteronomy 21.22–23 outside the boundaries of “crucifixion.” To put it in other words, a crucifixion is essentially that which happened to Jesus – an *execution by suspension*, and that is not what Deuteronomy 21.22–23 describes. Paul nevertheless connects the text of Deuteronomy with the death of Jesus.

Thus, Paul connects the death of Jesus, an ante-mortem suspension, with the text of Deuteronomy 21.22–23, which describes a post-mortem suspension. He connects an event within the boundaries of the definition of the label “crucifixion” with a text that describes an event that falls out-

<sup>77</sup> Gal 3.13. Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς ἐξηγόρασεν ἐκ τῆς κατάρας τοῦ νόμου γενόμενος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα, ὅτι γέγραπται, ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ὁ κρεμάμενος ἐπὶ ξύλου.

<sup>78</sup> See the comments on the text, on pp. 216–17.

<sup>79</sup> Longenecker discusses how Paul’s quotation differs from the Old Testament readings, without mentioning the added suspension tool of v. 23 (LONGENECKER, *Galatians*, 122).

side the boundaries. Is it then possible to uphold a definition that contradicts the view of Paul? Is it possible to say that crucifixion is one thing (an execution), while Paul apparently says that it is another thing (not necessarily an execution)? The answer is yes.

The reason for this is that it pinpoints the basic theory of this investigation: the late date of the present label “crucifixion.” It might be challenging for a contemporary reader that Paul connects the death of Jesus with Deuteronomy 21.22–23, but not for Paul (or the author of the Temple Scroll, for that matter). The present reader sees a distinct punishment form called “crucifixion” which is not compatible with Deuteronomy 21.22–23. Paul did not see this distinct punishment. For Paul, *σταυρός* and *σταυροῦν* refer to a diverse suspension punishment in which a person could be suspended alive in order to be killed (like Jesus) or suspended as a corpse after an execution (as in Deut 21.22–23).

Thus, Galatians 3.13 is a witness that Paul – as well as his Jewish and non-Jewish predecessors – saw the suspension punishments as a large and diverse entity. The way Jesus happened to die was but *one* form of a whole spectrum of suspension punishment. If this conclusion is correct, it will strengthen the basic thesis of the present investigation that the ancient world – the Jewish included – was simply not interested in what way or in what condition a victim was suspended. The important feature was something else: that someone in some condition was displayed as defeated and in shame.

As a consequence, it appears that it was not important for Paul that Jesus died on the *σταυρός*. If this view is correct, Paul’s point of view in Galatians 3.13 is that Jesus could have been stoned before the suspension and then been suspended on wood – post-mortem – he would be a curse anyhow. Beyond the texts of Paul, also the Temple Scroll links Deuteronomy 21.22–23 to an executionary suspension.<sup>80</sup> From a Jewish point of view, it is not so important whether the condemned were dead or alive when suspended, or in what way they were suspended. A suspended decaying body in the countryside would defile the land anyway. Paul follows this Jewish view when he connects Deuteronomy 21.22–23 with the execution of Jesus.

It is worth notice that the original Jewish position (at least the one expressed in Deut 21.22–23) appears not to be locked to a suspension tool of wood, as the position expressed in the Temple Scroll and by Paul does.

In the rest of Galatians, Paul returns to use *σταυρός* as a representative for the heart of the message (5.11; 6.12). Those who belong to Christ have suspended [*ἔσταυρωσαν*] their flesh with its passions and desires (5.24). The only thing that matters for Paul is the *σταυρός* of Christ, through

<sup>80</sup> 11QTemple<sup>a</sup> (11Q19) col. 64, line 6–13, on pp. 229–30.

which the world is suspended [ἔσταύρωται] and dead to him, and he to the world (6.12).

In Philippians, Paul refers directly to the death of Jesus and the tool by which he died (i.e., not metaphorically or using it as a rhetorical tool), when he states that Jesus humbled himself and became obedient unto death – and specifies that the death occurred on a σταυρός (Phil 2.8). Otherwise Paul uses the noun figuratively, as a representative for the message about Christ, as he does in the next occurrence of σταυρός in Philippians, when he complains about some adversaries who are “enemies of the σταυρός of Christ” (3.18).

In the disputed epistles, the author uses σταυρός in a rather Pauline way. Ephesians uses σταυρός as a label of the instrument through which Jesus has brought reconciliation between Jews and Gentiles (Eph 2.16). In Colossians it is the blood of the σταυρός that brought reconciliation, this time between God and all things (Col 1.20). And he did this by erasing the record that stood against the believers with its legal demands by “nailing it to the σταυρός” [προσηλώσας αὐτὸ τῷ σταυρῷ] (2.14). If the etymology of the verb is stressed, this verse is the only direct indication of any nails used to attach Jesus to the σταυρός.<sup>81</sup>

#### 4. The Epistles Not Attributed to Paul

The epistle to the Hebrews presents a special problem in the field of σταυρ-terminology. ἀνασταυροῦν, frequently used in the extra-Biblical ancient texts, is used for the only time in the Biblical texts. And it is assumed to be used in an unfamiliar way.

If they fall away, it is impossible to again renew to repentance [ἀνακαινίζειν] those who have once been enlightened, and have tasted the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Spirit, and have tasted the goodness of the word of God and the powers of the age to come, since they [again] for themselves suspend [ἀνασταυροῦντας] the son of God and subject him to disgrace.<sup>82</sup>

<sup>81</sup> As noted, the only reference to any nails beyond this is when John, and possibly Luke, mention the marks of nails in Jesus' hands in the post-resurrection narrative (John 20.25; Luke 24.39).

<sup>82</sup> Heb 6.4–6. ἀδύνατον γὰρ τοὺς ἅπαξ φωτισθέντας, γευσαμένους τε τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς ἐπουρανίου καὶ μετόχους γενηθέντας πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ καλὸν γευσαμένους θεοῦ ῥῆμα δυνάμεις τε μέλλοντος αἰῶνος καὶ παραπεσόντας, πάλιν ἀνακαινίζειν εἰς μετάνοιαν, ἀνασταυροῦντας ἑαυτοῖς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ παραδειγματίζοντας.

The denotation of the prefix ἀνα in ἀνασταυροῦν has been subjected to a lengthy discussion.<sup>83</sup> The context implies the meaning “again” instead of simply “up.”<sup>84</sup>

On the one hand, as the Bauer lexicon stresses, the prefix ἀνα in ἀνασταυροῦν always simply denotes “up” in the earlier Greek literature.<sup>85</sup> However, some other compound verbs with ἀνα are used in a different way. ἀναγεννᾶν (1 Pet 1.3, 23) ought to denote “to be born *again*,” ἀναζῆν (Luke 15.24; Rom 7.9) “to *come back* to life” and ἀναθάλλειν (Phil 4.10) “to bloom *again*.” ἀναβλέπειν denotes “to look up” (Matt 14.19) but also “to *regain* sight” (Matt 11.5; Luke 7.22), ἀνιστάναι denotes not only “to raise up” but especially in the sense “to bring *back* to life” (e.g., Matt 17.9; Mark 8.31; Luk 18.33; Joh 20.9). Thereby it is at least possible that ἀνασταυροῦν could be seen as some kind of homonymous neologism denoting “to suspend *again*.”<sup>86</sup> Prefixes can be used in a way that diverges from their basic usage in both Greek and Latin.<sup>87</sup>

On the other hand, it is not necessary to force such meaning on ἀνα. The reason behind the author’s choice of ἀνασταυροῦν instead of the expected σταυροῦν might be rhetorical. The verb follows another verb with the same prefix, ἀνακαινίζειν.<sup>88</sup> It is impossible to again [πάλιν] “deliver up to the new” [ἀνακαινίζειν] the once enlightened, since they, in that case, [again (πάλιν)] deliver Jesus up to the σταυρός, for their own sake. Thus, the “again” is implied by the context (not least by ἑαυτοῖς; the Son of God will be once again suspended, this time “for the apostates *themselves*”),<sup>89</sup> not forced upon ἀνα. The somewhat tautologous expression πάλιν ἀνακαινίζειν – the verb itself includes an idea of repeated action<sup>90</sup> – strengthens the assumption that πάλιν influences the understanding of both verbs. Thus, ἀνασταυροῦν appears here to be used in the same way as σταυροῦν would have been.<sup>91</sup>

<sup>83</sup> See discussion and references in ATTRIDGE and KOESTER, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 170.

<sup>84</sup> S.v. BDAG. Cf. BRUCE, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 138 n. 7; SCHNEIDER, “σταυρός,” 584.

<sup>85</sup> S.v. BDAG.

<sup>86</sup> Cf. ELLINGWORTH, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 324–25.

<sup>87</sup> A partly similar phenomenon can be seen in a Latin verb. The prefix *in*, which usually makes a noun negative (e.g., *infelix*) or has its usual prepositional usage in compound with a verb (e.g., *incendare*), gets another usage in *instaurare* (e.g., Val. Max. 1.7.4). The verb, with an obvious etymological connection to σταυρός (s.v. *OLD*), denotes that something should be built, started or restored *again*. Thus, the usage of *instaurare* is close to that of *restaurare* (the origin of the English word “restore”).

<sup>88</sup> See MOFFATT, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 79.

<sup>89</sup> See WESTCOTT, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 153.

<sup>90</sup> See ELLINGWORTH, *Hebrews*, 323.

<sup>91</sup> S.v. L&N. Cf. KUHN, “ἀνασταυρώω,” 92.



There is one additional occurrence of the *σταυρ*-stem in Hebrews, but that text (12.2) simply mentions that Jesus endured the *σταυρός*, without further information. Beside Philippians 2.8, this is the only time outside the gospels where *σταυρός* is used strictly literally.<sup>92</sup>

## 5. Revelation

The last occurrence of the *σταυρ*-stem in the canonical text follows the steps of the majority of the previous texts.

Their corpses [lie] in the street of the great city, which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where also their Lord was suspended [*ἐσταυρώθη*].<sup>93</sup>

This symptomatically uninformative text ends the text survey of the present investigation.

## 6. Conclusion – The New Testament

The New Testament contains several references to suspension punishments, in which *σταυρ*-terminology is mainly used.<sup>94</sup> The majority of the texts refer to the execution of Jesus, but a small number of other victims are mentioned as well.<sup>95</sup> One common theme is the meager description of the suspension punishments; this is striking in the gospel accounts of the death of Jesus.

The answer to *the third basic question* of the present investigation is that the gospel authors only offer a series of brief and more or less non-informative reports. Before the execution account *per se*, the Jesus of the gospels talks about his imminent death, without any clarifying additions except that he will be suspended on a *σταυρός*.<sup>96</sup> There is also a speech about discipleship by Jesus, reflected in some accounts, in which Jesus uses *σταυρός* metaphorically.<sup>97</sup> The problem is that these texts do not

<sup>92</sup> Cf. KUHN, “σταυρός,” 268.

<sup>93</sup> Rev 11.8. και τὸ πτῶμα αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τῆς πλατείας τῆς πόλεως τῆς μεγάλης, ἧτις καλεῖται πνευματικῶς Σόδομα καὶ Αἴγυπτος, ὅπου καὶ ὁ κύριος αὐτῶν ἐσταυρώθη.

<sup>94</sup> ἀνασκοιοπιζειν is not used. σκόλοψ is used once (2 Cor 12.7), but without reference to a suspension punishment.

<sup>95</sup> The two criminals executed together with Jesus (Matt 27.28; Mark 15.27; Luke 23.32–33; John 19.18); prophets, wise men and scribes (Matt 23.34); “our old self” (Rom 6.6); Paul metaphorically suspended (1 Cor 1.13; Gal 2.19).

<sup>96</sup> Matt 16.21; 17.22–23; 20.18–19; 26.1–4; Mark 8.31–32; 9.31; Luke 9.22; 9.43b–44 (Luke 24.6b–7).

<sup>97</sup> Matt 16.24–25; Mark 8.34–35; Luke 9.23–24.

reveal what carrying a σταυρός actually is. What are left are six glimpses of the execution of Jesus.

First, the cry for the execution of Jesus, attested by all four gospels.<sup>98</sup> The people, or at least a part of them, together with the high priest and some officers, shout σταύρου σταύρου αὐτόν and add nothing to that. Second, the result of the cry according to the gospels. Jesus is handed over ἵνα σταυρωθῆ and nothing is added to that. Third, the description of the carrying of the execution tool. Jesus is aided (the synoptics) or himself carries (John) his σταυρός, without any further explanation of what he actually is carrying (e.g., whether it was a part of the tool or the whole tool), or for what purpose it was done.<sup>99</sup> Fourth, the all too brief descriptions of the execution itself. Nothing is added beyond the use of σταυροῦν.<sup>100</sup> Fifth, the descriptions of Jesus suspended on the σταυρός. Jesus is alive and talking while suspended.<sup>101</sup> This indicates that the suspension method is described as endurable, at least for a while. This makes impaling less probable and hanging impossible as the suspension of the texts. Beyond that, Jesus is derided on the σταυρός.<sup>102</sup> He is challenged to come *down* from the σταυρός, which suggests both that he is attached in such a way that he could not release himself and that the σταυρός is high to some extent. Sixth, the description of the events surrounding the resurrection, which to some extent refer back to the execution. But these texts do not add anything but the notion that Jesus is τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον.<sup>103</sup> It is in the events after the resurrection that John, and perhaps Luke, mention the nails indirectly.<sup>104</sup>

Thus, in the end the gospel accounts of the execution form that ended Jesus' life are strikingly sparse.<sup>105</sup> What can be said about it constitutes only some vague contours: According to the gospels Jesus is executed by a suspension punishment. A σταυρός is carried by Jesus and/or a passer-by named Simon. It is not clear what is carried and for what purpose it was carried. On the execution locus, Jesus is somehow attached to a σταυρός. No nails are mentioned in the suspension accounts. They are implied in the post-resurrection account of John. Jesus expires after several hours on the σταυρός, still quickly enough to surprise the soldiers.

<sup>98</sup> Matt 27.22–23; Mark 15.13–14; Luke 23.18–23a; John 18.39–40; 19.6, 15.

<sup>99</sup> Matt 27.31b–32; Mark 15.20b–21; Luke 23.26; John 19.16b–17.

<sup>100</sup> Matt 27.35; Mark 15.23–26; Luke 23.33; John 19.17.

<sup>101</sup> Matt 27.45–47; Mark 15.34; Luke 23.46; John 19.28–30.

<sup>102</sup> Matt 27.39–42; Mark 15.29–32; Luke 23.35–36.

<sup>103</sup> Matt 28.5; Mark 16.6 (Luke 23.7).

<sup>104</sup> John 20.25; Luke 24.39.

<sup>105</sup> The gospel accounts of Jesus' execution might thus be troublesome to label as, e.g., "defensible historical account of his crucifixion" (O'COLLINS, "Crucifixion," 1209). There is not much of a description to label as "historical account."

The contribution of Acts and the letters is also meager. In both Acts and the epistles, the execution tool of Jesus is referred to as ξύλον, by a reference to Deuteronomy 21.22–23.<sup>106</sup> Paul uses the σταυρ-stem as both a vehicle for, and the center of, his message. By rhetorical questions (e.g., 1 Cor 1.13) in order to pinpoint the core of the gospel (e.g., 1 Cor 1.18), Paul connects the σταυρ-stem with the heart of his mission. The σταυρ-stem is both a tool and the message in Paul's hands. But when it comes to the effort to understand the descriptions of the event on Calvary, Paul has less to offer. The only direct reference to the event is the reference to the σταυρός in Philippians 2.8. In Ephesians 2.16 the σταυρός is the instrument of reconciliation, while it is the blood of the σταυρός in the Colossians 1.20. It is also Colossians which offers the second indirect indication of nails used in the execution of Jesus (2.14).

The letter of Hebrews offers a disputed usage of ἀνασταυροῦν (6.6), but the text does not add anything to the knowledge of what is described as happening on Calvary. Revelation picks up the piercing theme from John and Zechariah but ends up as uninformative as so many previous texts.

The positive evaluation of the gospel accounts of Hengel and Chapman is thus challenged. The accounts are only slightly more comprehensive, but only when it comes to the length of the accounts. They are not more detailed. They only offer some more information about the preceding events and the aftermath of the suspension. When it comes to the suspension itself, they are just as meager as other text. Thereby, Stockbauer's observation of the level of information offered by the gospels does most justice to the texts.

There is, however, one additional question that needs to be addressed. As mentioned in the introduction,<sup>107</sup> the possibility that the studied words derive some of their present distinctiveness from the death of Jesus is taken into consideration in this investigation. However, when the Gospels were written, that process was already a reality. There is a good possibility that σταυρός, when used by the evangelists, already had been charged with a distinct denotation – from Calvary. When, e.g., Mark used the noun it could have meant “cross” in the sense in which the Church later perceived it. That could be seen as an explanation for the scarcity of additional information about the nature of the punishment. In the period about 40 years after the death of Jesus, a contemporary reader/hearer of the Gospels probably knew what was going on when a σταυρός was mentioned, since people might have seen one or heard stories about it. But present-day readers do not have the same level of secondary infor-

<sup>106</sup> Acts 5.30; 10.39; Gal 3.13.

<sup>107</sup> See pp. 30–31.

mation. They are left with what the texts themselves have to offer. Hence, the Gospel accounts probably show that σταυρός *could* signify “cross” in the mentioned sense, but they do not show that it always did so.

Thus, the contribution of the New Testament is a description of the archetype of crucifixion, *the* crucifixion, but not the archetype of the contemporary or traditional view of crucifixion. The contemporary or traditional label “crucifixion” obviously contains much more than the New Testament offers. The source of this label is then to be found elsewhere.

If the suggestion of a holistic view of the terminology is heeded, that there was no distinct punishment of “crucifixion” before the death of Jesus, it is plausible to say that crucifixion, so to speak, came into being on Calvary – or rather in the later Christian interpretation of the texts describing the events on Calvary.

## Chapter Six

# Discussion with Reference Literature and Scholars

In the present chapter the insights from previous chapters regarding the suspension punishments in general and crucifixion punishment in particular will form the basis for a discussion with some important lexica and dictionaries as well as scholars who have studied the topic of crucifixion. The discussion will follow three main lines: the issue of definition, that of terminology, and not least the conclusions earlier scholars have drawn from the source material, with special attention to the *presentation* of their insights.

The three fields of discussion are to some extent overlapping. The view of the (modern) definition is interwoven with the opinion of the usage of the (ancient) terms, and both have a bearing on how the studied punishment is understood – and thus described. The same text can thus appear in two or three sections, but different aspects of the text are in focus. *Which* aspect is indicated by the headings.

### 1. Discussion One – The Definition of Crucifixion

After this survey of ancient suspension accounts, the center of attention will be moved back to the implied definition for evaluation. What kind of actions should thus be covered by the designation “crucifixion”? Special attention will be paid to punishments which are somehow related to the punishment traditionally called “crucifixion,” such as impaling, hanging, and suspension of corpses (i.e., other forms of human suspensions). Some of the studied investigations, as well as some additional monographs, dictionaries and articles, deal more or less briefly with the question.

It is now obvious that not every occurrence of, e.g., (ἀνα)σταυροῦν, ἀνασκοποῦν, σταυρός, *crux*, *patibulum* or הלה should be labeled “crucifixion.” There ought to be other criteria used to sift out this kind of punishment than the sole occurrence of one of the studied terms. As has been seen in previous chapters, the major criterion is the context. There are, however, some more or less visible opinions about what a crucifixion is. These will be addressed here. The key problem is whether the closest variations of suspension punishments – suspension of corpses and impal-

ing – should be covered by the designation “crucifixion” or not. There are some contradictory opinions in this field, and an attempt to clarify the issue will be made here.

### 1.1. An Execution

The majority of scholars do not to include the suspension of corpses within the designation “crucifixion.” During his survey of the historical origin of crucifixion, Fulda offers a brief definition of crucifixion.

Der Ursprung der eigentlichen Kreuzigung, d. h. des Aufhängens lebender Menschen, damit sie durch langsam tödenden Schmerz sterben, zeigt auf den tiefern Orient hin.<sup>1</sup>

A crucifixion is, according to Fulda, the suspension of a living person doomed to suffer an extended death struggle.

As has been seen,<sup>2</sup> Kuhn follows Fulda’s view and excludes both impaling and suspension of corpses from the designation “crucifixion,” but he adds:

Die antiken Texte bzw. die dort benutzten Wörter unterscheiden die möglichen Vorgänge nicht immer deutlich, so daß – jedenfalls dem heutigen Leser – öfter nicht klar ist, was gemeint ist (es geht vor allem um die Unterscheidung von Kreuzigung im eigentlichen Sinn, von Pfählung Lebender und einer entsprechenden Behandlung bereits Hingerichteter).<sup>3</sup>

Kuhn mentions that the methods of crucifixion could vary to a great extent. The diversity in the implementation of the punishment results in problems for determining what the ancient texts refer to.

Der Vorgang dessen, was man mit Kreuzigung bezeichnen kann, variiert sehr stark. Die deutsche und z. B. auch die englische Sprache verbindet mit ‘Kreuz’, dass eine vertikale Linie von einer horizontalen ‘gekreuzt’ wird. Das griechische und lateinische Hauptstichwort für „Kreuz“, σταυρός und *crux*, setzen das bekanntlich nicht voraus, sondern bezeichnet an sich einfach das „Marterholz“ im allgemeinen (so *crux*) bzw. den „Pfahl“ (so σταυρός).<sup>4</sup>

Nevertheless, Kuhn offers his four features that together constitute a crucifixion.<sup>5</sup> These suggestions have been approved by the present investigation and used to coin the implied definition presented in the introduction.

<sup>1</sup> FULDA, *Das Kreuz*, 49 (cf. 54).

<sup>2</sup> Introduction, p. 28; KUHN, “Die Kreuzesstrafe,” 679.

<sup>3</sup> KUHN, “Die Kreuzesstrafe,” 679.

<sup>4</sup> KUHN, “Die Kreuzesstrafe,” 679.

<sup>5</sup> First, it is a *suspension*. Second, it is a completed or intended *execution*. Third, the execution tool was a *pole*, with or without a crossbeam. Fourth, it resulted in an *extended death struggle*.

These characteristics cohere well with the common perceptions of the English designation “crucifixion.”<sup>6</sup>

Chapman, too, hesitates to label all suspensions of human bodies as instances of crucifixions, and follows a traditional English usage of the term. A crucifixion is “the executionary suspension of a person on a cross-shaped object.”<sup>7</sup> Of these two scholars, Kuhn offers the most elaborate definition, with his four characteristics of the punishment in focus. The majority of common lexica and dictionaries treat the punishment of crucifixion as a form of capital punishment – an execution.<sup>8</sup>

### 1.2. In the Strict Sense, an Execution

Hengel’s view of the punishment of crucifixion is harder to trace. He appears to represent a slightly different approach even though he also stresses the variations in the suspension method. Hengel does not offer any elaborate definition in the sense Kuhn did, or identify the limits of the designation “crucifixion” as Chapman did.

Hengel’s opinion about the outer limits for the designation “crucifixion” becomes slightly visible during his discussion on the usage of the ancient terms. He has some important observations regarding the variations in texts that contain references to crucifixions, as has been seen in the conclusions on Herodotus above.<sup>9</sup> It is not always clear whether the crucifixion victim was dead or alive.<sup>10</sup> Thereby Hengel appears to include a post-mortem suspension in his definition of crucifixion. But with some additional features found in his text taken into consideration, his opinion becomes less visible.

First, the English translation of his comment on Herodotus’ use of the terminology, “[a]s a rule, Herodotus uses the verb ἀνασκολοπίζειν of living men and ἀνασταυροῦν for corpses,”<sup>11</sup> differs slightly from the German edition: “Herodot gebraucht für das Aufhängen Lebender in der

<sup>6</sup> S.v. *OED*; *WNID*; *MED*.

<sup>7</sup> CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 32.

<sup>8</sup> S.v., e.g., *DNP*; *OCD*; *NCE*; *NIBD*; *APE*; *EB*.

<sup>9</sup> See p. 56.

<sup>10</sup> “A particular problem is posed by the fact that the *form* of crucifixion varied considerably. Above all, there is not always a clear distinction between crucifixion of the victim while he is still alive and the display of the corpse of someone who has been executed in a different fashion. In both cases it was a matter of subjecting the victim to the utmost indignity. As a rule, Herodotus uses the verb ἀνασκολοπίζειν of living men and ἀνασταυροῦν for corpses. Ctesias, on the other hand, uses only ἀνασταυρίζειν for both. The common factor in all these verbs is that the victim – living or dead – was either nailed or bound to a stake, σκόλοψ or σταυρός. The texts do not always make it clear whether cross-beams were used here” (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 24).

<sup>11</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 24.

Regel das Verb ἀνασκολοπίζειν und für das Pfählen des Leichnams ἀνασταυροῦν.<sup>12</sup> In the German version it appears that Hengel suggests that Herodotus uses ἀνασταυροῦν for impaling of corpses, while the English translation simply leaves this out. One problem is that Hengel does not define what he refers to with “Pfählung.” Some lines later he describes the different alternatives for attachment with “festgenagelt bzw. ausgebunden,” which indicates that he does not have a regular impaling in mind after all.<sup>13</sup> In another chapter, he places crucifixion and impaling side by side, and stresses the close connection between them.<sup>14</sup>

Second, Hengel adds a crucial thought on the same page as the text discussed above.

Polycrates of Samos, for instance, the most famous example in antiquity, was not crucified in the strict sense; he was lured by the satrap Oroites into Persian territory, killed ‘in an unspeakable (cruel) way’ and his body fastened to a stake: ἀποκτείνας δέ μιν οὐκ ἄξιως ἀπηγήσιος Ὀροίτης ἀνεσταύρωσε (Herodotus, *History*, 3.125.3). Nevertheless, later tradition saw him as the prototype of the crucified victim whose fate represented a sudden change from supreme good fortune to the uttermost disaster.<sup>15</sup>

Thus, a suspension of a corpse is not a crucifixion *in the strict sense*, according to Hengel. Having said that, Hengel leaves the reader in uncertainty regarding in what sense *he* uses the label “crucifixion.” Is it only crucifixion in “the strict sense”, as he mentions in the latter text, or is it the crucifixion whose form “varied considerably,” as he mentions earlier on the same page?

Thus, Hengel shows indirectly that in his opinion a crucifixion in the strict sense is an execution while impaling and suspension of corpses are something else. It follows that Hengel’s border of the designation “crucifixion” is more flexible than Kuhn’s and Chapman’s. There are, however, scholars that go further down this path.

### 1.3. *Not Necessarily an Execution*

Another way is to include suspensions of corpses in the designation “crucifixion.” This opinion is expressed in some New Testament dictionaries. In his article “Crucifixion” in the *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, O’Collins defines “Crucifixion” as:

<sup>12</sup> HENGEL, “Mors turpissima crucis,” 138.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 139.

<sup>14</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 76.

<sup>15</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 24.



The act of nailing or binding a living victim or sometimes a dead person to a cross or stake (*stauros* or *skolops*) or a tree (*xylon*).<sup>16</sup>

Similarly, the *Oxford Companion to the Bible* defines “Crucifixion” as:

The act of nailing or binding a person to a cross or tree, whether for executing or for exposing the corpse.<sup>17</sup>

According to John R. Donahue in the *Eerdmans’ Dictionary of the Bible*, a “crucifixion” is:

A particularly horrible mode of punishment by which a person (or sometimes the corpse of an executed victim) was nailed or bound to a cross (Gk. *staurós*, †; also in the form of an X- or T-shaped structure), or to a stake or tree.<sup>18</sup>

Hence, the post-mortem punishments which Chapman and the implied definition of the present investigation label as “suspensions” are included in the designation “crucifixion.” Yet the question of what to do with impaling, and how – if possible – to distinguish this punishment from the punishment Jesus was subjected to according to a traditional view, are still left out by the authors.

#### 1.4. Uncertainty, but Nevertheless a Crucifixion

In addition to these more or less divergent positions regarding the definition of the punishment, several scholars hesitate to mark the boundaries and only stress the variation of the punishment form in the ancient world. The common theme is the uncertainty of how crucifixion is described in the texts.

With the sacrifice of Jesus on the cross in mind, Stockbauer describes crucifixions in the pre-Christian texts in terms of human sacrifices. Regarding the crucifixions in the ancient Greek texts, Stockbauer offers some important observations.

Was wir gegenwärtig mit bewusster oder unbewusster Berücksichtigung der weltgeschichtlichen Hinrichtung auf Golgatha als Kreuzigung uns denken, das war im Alterthum nicht so streng weder im Begriff noch in der Wirklichkeit fixiert. Die Eigentümlichkeiten der verschiedenen Völker spiegeln sich ja nicht bloss im Grossen und Bedeutenden, sondern auch im Kleinen und Unbedeutenden und in diesem noch weit mehr ab, weil es mit dem täglichen Leben und den Lebensgewohnheiten mehr verwachsen, gleichsam mehr abgegriffen die Spuren der Hände aufweist, die es behandelt haben. So ist auch die Strafe der Kreuzigung bei verschiedenen Völkern sehr verschieden: ja bei einem und demselben Volke wieder nach Zeit und Umständen und Verhältnissen anders, und es lässt sich nicht bloss im Vorneherein kein allgemein gültiger Modus

<sup>16</sup> O’COLLINS, “Crucifixion,” 1207.

<sup>17</sup> METZGER and COOGAN, “Crucifixion,” 141.

<sup>18</sup> DONAHUE, “Crucifixion,” 298.

aufstellen, der überall wäre in Uebung gewesen, wir werden sogar an der Hand der Geschichte noch an gar vielen dunkeln Stellen vorbeikommen, bei denen wir Gewissheit und Licht vermissen. Um einigermaßen klare Begriffe zu gewinnen, wollen wir die verschiedenen Berichte über solche Hinrichtungen am Kreuze getrennt durchgehen, und aus den Erzählungen und Ausdrucksweisen der Autoren die Vorstellungen uns zu gewinnen suchen, die sie mit dem Begriff „Kreuzigung“ verbanden.<sup>19</sup>

Thus, the rich diversity of the various *crucifixion* (N.B.) forms causes problems when it comes to tracing references to crucifixions, according to Stockbauer. Also Stauffer stresses the diversity in the *crucifixion* accounts of ancient texts.

Die antiken termini für die Kreuzigungsstrafe sind recht verschieden. Die Formen der Kreuzigungsstrafe sind noch viel verschiedener.<sup>20</sup>

Gerard S. Sloyan has made a similar observation in his book *The Crucifixion of Jesus* when he describes the torture of crucifixion.

From the full range of texts it is impossible to be sure whether impaling corpses on a stake (*skólops* or *staurós*) or hanging the condemned up to die is in question. Again, whether the victims were affixed by nails or lashed with thongs is not clear in individual citations, any more than whether an upright stake alone or a crossbeam also was used.<sup>21</sup>

Both Stockbauer, Stauffer and Sloyan pinpoint the variation regarding the terminology and the use of the punishment form, and stress the variations within *crucifixion*. All various forms of punishments are still labeled as crucifixions.

Chapman makes, however, a significant contribution to this section when he identifies the absent clear boundaries between the various suspension punishments.<sup>22</sup>

This suggests that in studying the ancient world the scholar is wise not to differentiate too rigidly categories of “crucifixion,” “impalement,” and “suspension” (as if these were clearly to be distinguished in every instance). Hence, any study of crucifixion conceptions in antiquity must grapple with the broader context of the wide variety of penal suspension of human beings.<sup>23</sup>

These critical suggestions about the variations and often imprecise accounts are approved by the present investigation. But, having made this observation, Chapman still leans heavily on Hengel’s investigation and labels as crucifixion references texts that are too unspecific to draw any

<sup>19</sup> STOCKBAUER, *Kunstgeschichte des Kreuzes*, 7–8.

<sup>20</sup> STAUFFER, *Jerusalem und Rom*, 127.

<sup>21</sup> SLOYAN, *The Crucifixion of Jesus*, 14–15.

<sup>22</sup> CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 31–32.

<sup>23</sup> CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 32.

conclusion about<sup>24</sup> or describe other kinds of punishments.<sup>25</sup> In spite of the present uncertainty of the designation “crucifixion,” Chapman uses it widely. Thereby Chapman represents a methodological problem which he shares with several scholars. This problem will be addressed under the following heading.

### 1.5. A Better Way: A Suspension Among Others

In spite of a well-defined narrow definition (e.g., Kuhn), a less-defined narrow definition (e.g., Hengel), a well-defined wide definition (e.g., O’Collins) or the mere stressing of the variations (e.g., Chapman), scholars still detect crucifixion events in texts that fall outside or contradict their own definition, or should be left unspecified due to the uncertainty.

Kuhn sees crucifixions in references that are not possible to define when it comes to the suspension method.<sup>26</sup> Kuhn can also label as crucifixion references that contain other kinds of punishments.<sup>27</sup>

Hengel labels as crucifixion a whole series of references that are impossible to define as far as the suspension method is concerned<sup>28</sup> as well as a

<sup>24</sup> E.g., the suspension used by Alexander the Great and the Diadochs. Chapman refers to HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 73–74, where the majority of the mentioned texts are impossible to define (CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 44 + n. 14).

<sup>25</sup> Chapman refers, e.g., to the torture of Prometheus (CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 11 n. 50).

<sup>26</sup> E.g., Polyb. 1.11.5 (KUHNS, “Die Kreuzesstrafe,” 684 n. 197); Diod. Sic. 2.1.10 (683 + n. 193); Joseph. *AJ* 19.94 (695–96); *BJ* 2.253 (711); Plut. *Fab. Max.* 6.3 (689 n. 239); *Alex.* 72.2 (683, 689 n. 239); *Ant.* 81.1 (689 n. 239); *Per.* 28.2 (689 n. 239); Philo, *Flacc.* 72 (702 + n. 318; 704 + n. 335); Liv. 29.18.14 (720 n. 447); Tac. *Hist.* 2.72.1f (691; 721, 30); Suet. *Calig.* 12.2 (639; 722); *Dom.* 10.1 (693; 721); *Dom.* 11.1 (693; 722); Galb. 9.1 (703–4; 737); Plaut. *Bacch.* 686–88 (764 [*Bacch.* 4.4.37 according to the edition used by Kuhn]).

<sup>27</sup> Plut. *Per.* 28.2 (KUHNS, “Die Kreuzesstrafe,” 689 n. 239); Ov. *Am.* 1.12.17–20 (764).

<sup>28</sup> E.g., Thuc. 1.110.3 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 22 n. 1); Pl. *Grg.* 473C–D (27–28); Polyb. 1.11.5; 1.24.5–6, 79.2–5 (23 n. 10; 46 n. 1); Diod. Sic. 2.1.10 (23 n. 4); 2.44.2 (23 n. 5); 5.32.6 (23 n. 7); Strabo, 14.1.39 (75 + n. 18); Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 5.51.3 (29 n. 21); Joseph. *AJ* 19.94 (31 n. 24); *BJ* 2.253 (26 n. 17); Plut. *Alex.* 72.2 (73 n. 14); App. *Mith.* 29 (79); 97 (23 n. 11; 75 n. 18); *B civ.* 1.120 (55); 4.29 (56 + n. 9); Philo, *Flacc.* 72 (27 n. 19; 35; 81); Caesar, *B Afr.* 66.4 (23 n. 10); *B Hisp.* 20 (38); Liv. 22.13.9 (23 n. 10); 22.33.2; 28.37.2 (23 n. 10); 30.43.13 (29; 40 n. 2); 33.36.3; 38.48.13 (23 n. 10); Val. Max. 2.7.12 (29–30; 51 + n. 1); 2.7 ext. 1 (23 n. 10; 46 n. 1); Tac. *Ann.* 1.61.4 (23 n. 8); 4.72.3 (23 n. 8); 14.33.2 (23 n. 9); *Hist.* 4.3.2 (60); Suet. *Iul.* 74.1 (80); *Calig.* 12.2 (60); *Galb.* 9.2 [the reference should be 9.1] (40); *Dom.* 11.1 (80); Curt. *Alex.* 4.4.17 (73); Hor. *Sat.* 1.3.80–83 (58 n. 13).

reference containing an apparent impaling.<sup>29</sup> He could also, without any comments, label as impaling an account that uses the same terminology.<sup>30</sup>

O'Collins mentions that "[i]n his *History*, Herodotus notes that the Persians practiced crucifixion as a form of *execution* (emphasis added),"<sup>31</sup> with a reference to a text (Hdt. 3.125.3) which clearly describes an antemortem suspension, not an execution.<sup>32</sup> In addition, he labels an apparent impaling (Eur. *IT* 1429–30) as crucifixion.<sup>33</sup>

Chapman correctly states that the terms by themselves are not sufficient to single out crucifixions among other kinds of suspension.<sup>34</sup> Yet, in the same clause, he refers to Hengel's extended list of references to crucifixions – in which Hengel does exactly that. Chapman also labels as crucifixion the mythological punishment in which the titan Prometheus was fettered to a rock for a while and then released.<sup>35</sup>

There is indeed a problem concerning both the effort to define (or in most cases, not to define) crucifixion and the effort to select references to this punishment. Two simple questions are too often absent: what are the scholars looking for and, when that question is answered, how do they find it? Once these questions are answered, the next question is: what shall be said about texts that do not fit the picture? Peddinghaus has the solution within reach in his discussion of the content of the designation "crucifixion."

Von ‚Kreuzigung im engeren Sinne‘ werden wir fortan überall dort sprechen, wo der Delinquent an dem errichteten Marterinstrument durch Erschöpfung oder langsames Ersticken den Tod findet; von ‚Kreuzigung im weiteren Sinne‘ hingegen reden wir überall dort, wo der Tod zwar auch durch die Exekution eintritt, dies aber durch das ‚Pfählen‘ oder eine dem Strangulieren verwandte Form des Aufhängens der Fall ist. Wo allerdings von dem Aufhängen oder der *Zurschaustellung des Leichnams* die Rede ist, werden wir trotz gleicher Terminologie der griechischen Quellen nicht von ‚Kreuzigung‘ reden. Die Schwierigkeit einer derartigen Abgrenzung von den Quellen her wird die nun folgende Auswertung deutlich machen. *Die Auswertung* soll einmal im Hinblick auf die Terminologie und die daraus zu entnehmende Art und Weise des Vollzugs, zum andern hinsichtlich des Personenkreises der geahndeten Vergehen und der Wertung dieser Strafe vorgenommen werden.<sup>36</sup>

Peddinghaus proposes some kind of a two-level definition: a narrow one with only executionary suspensions, and a wider one where impaling and

<sup>29</sup> Ctesias, *FGrH* 3c, 688 F 14.39 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 22 n. 1).

<sup>30</sup> Polyb. 5.54.6–7 (HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 74).

<sup>31</sup> O'COLLINS, "Crucifixion," 1207.

<sup>32</sup> The text is mentioned by O'Collins together with 1.128.2; 3.132.2; 3.159.1.

<sup>33</sup> O'COLLINS, "Crucifixion," 1207.

<sup>34</sup> CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 43.

<sup>35</sup> Lucian, *Prom.* 1, 2, 4, 7, 10, 15, 17 (CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 11 n. 50).

<sup>36</sup> PEDDINGHAUS, *Die Entstehung der Leidensgeschichte*, 12.

suspensions of corpses are also included. For other suspensions, other labels are needed.

Chapman follows Peddinghaus and hesitates, as mentioned, to label all suspensions of human bodies as instances of crucifixions (which, however, he does not follow in the end). Chapman offers a suggestion similar to Peddinghaus'. After stating that he will follow the traditional English usage of the label "crucifixion,"<sup>37</sup> he addresses the question of what to do with the texts that fall outside this label. He states that "'suspensions' will serve as the broader term for the lifting up of a human body (living or dead) on some device for exposure."<sup>38</sup>

A way to solve the problem addressed in the present section is thus to coin a multiple-level definition (Peddinghaus).<sup>39</sup> The solution is to stop using the designation "crucifixion" for anything beside the execution of Jesus – *and punishments that clearly share the central features with it*.<sup>40</sup> All other kinds of punishments, the descriptions which use the studied terminology, ought to be labeled "suspension punishments" (Chapman). As has been said earlier, within the group of "suspension punishments," there are surely crucifixions (i.e., punishments that share crucial features of the death of Jesus), but a present-day reader lacks too often the ability to sift these out, with some few exceptions when contextual features become helpful in the quest. Kuhn said that the ancient writers used the terminology in such a way that it is not always clear to what they refer.<sup>41</sup> It is more correct to say that it is *seldom* clear to what they refer.

There is yet another aspect of this issue. The designation "crucifixion" – without an elaborate re-definition – is problematic to use in the study of ancient suspension punishments. The designation is in danger of being anachronistic, since the punishment apparently did not exist as a distinct entity in the pre-Christian ancient world. In older texts, the designation "crucifixion" must be used with caution. It is better to speak of various forms of "punishments with similarities to the punishment of crucifixion."<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 32.

<sup>38</sup> CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 32.

<sup>39</sup> Cf., Lipsius' discussion about how *crux* could be used in both a wide, general sense (*laxa*) and a narrower sense (*adstricta*) (LIPSIUS, *De Cruce*, 13–15).

<sup>40</sup> See pp. 53–56, 342.

<sup>41</sup> KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 679.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. the discussion of a contemporary "crucifixion" from CNN's homepage in which the author struggles with the fact that the mentioned suspension occurred post-mortem while he (or someone else involved) had a desire to use the label "crucifixion."

"Saudi Arabian officials beheaded and then publicly displayed the body of a convicted killer in Riyadh on Friday.... The Saudi Interior Ministry said Ahmed Al-Shamlani Al-Anzi was sentenced to death and then "crucifixion" – having his body displayed in

The designation “crucifixion” may have its linguistic origin in the last decades B.C.E. (Seneca the Elder), but acquired its present denotation from Calvary. Crucifixion is that which happened to Jesus.

A common and widespread opinion is to trace the origin of “crucifixion” to Persia, or at least to the husky areas of the Eastern part of the ancient world.<sup>43</sup> The connection with Persia consists of some texts from Herodotus, Thucydides and not least the Old Testament.<sup>44</sup> A better approach is to acknowledge the impact of the death of Jesus also on this field. The origin of crucifixion was on Calvary – or rather the Christian interpretation of the event on Calvary. Thus, the origin of crucifixion is not to be found in Persia, but in the church.

### 1.6. Conclusion – The Definition of Crucifixion

The answer to *the fourth basic question* of the present investigation is that a comprehensive definition is often lacking in the scholarly contributions. There are, however, some exceptions to this rule, with Kuhn as the major example. Both the explicit and implicit definitions used in the present investigation follow Kuhn – and the traditional English usage of the term. A crucifixion was a suspension, a completed or intended execution on a pole, with or without a crossbeam, and it ended in an extended death struggle. The connotations of crucifixion come from Calvary, and from there the denotations should also be taken.

---

public – for the kidnapping and killing of an 11-year-old boy and for the killing of the boy’s father, according to the official Saudi Press Agency. Amnesty International issued a statement deploring the punishment, with the group’s Hassiba Hadj Sahraoui saying in a statement it is “horrific” that beheadings and crucifixions “still happen.” Even though the word “crucifixion” is used to describe the public display, the act has no connection to Christianity and the crucifixion of Jesus. The bodies are not displayed on crosses, Lamri Chirouf, who researches Saudi Arabian issues for Amnesty, explained. The Saudi Interior Ministry asserted that Al-Anzi’s body was displayed as a warning that those involved in similar crimes would suffer the same fate, the press agency reported.... Chirouf, the Saudi Arabian researcher for Amnesty International, said his understanding of how the Saudi government carries out crucifixion jibed with Saudi Press Agency’s account. Government officials do use crucifixions, or public displays of executed bodies, as a tool to deter people from committing such a crime, he said. This latest case was classified as an offense of rebellion, one that basically rejected all of the rules of religion and society, he said. Chirouf said those crucified are beheaded first and then their heads are sewn back on their bodies. Then, the corpse is mounted on a pole or a tree.” (May 30, 2009. <http://edition.cnn.com/2009/WORLD/meast/05/30/saudi.arabia.execution>).

<sup>43</sup> E.g., BLINZLER, *Der Prozess Jesu*, 357; FULDA, *Das Kreuz*, 49 (cf. 54); HENGEL and SCHWEMER, *Jesus und das Judentum*, 611; HEID, *Kreuz, Jerusalem, Kosmos*, 7 (Heid mentions the Medes as an alternative); SCHNEIDER, “σταυρός,” 573.

<sup>44</sup> Hdt. 1.128.2; 3.132.2, 159.1; 4.43.2, 7; Thuc. 1.110.3; Ezra 6.11 (and the book of Esther).

## 2. Discussion Two – The Terminology of Crucifixion

Under this heading the usage of the central terms according to some important lexica and dictionaries will be discussed. The proposed meaning of the terms by each lexicon will be compared to the usage of the same terms in the texts studied in the present investigation.

### 2.1. The Greek Terminology

#### 2.1.1. ἀνασταυροῦν and ἀνασκοποῖζειν

The third edition of the so-called “Bauer lexicon” (BDAG) is one of the main tools for the study of the New Testament. Its proposed meaning of the terms is thus influential. The paragraph on ἀνασταυροῦν focuses on a problem with the Biblical *hapax legomenon* in Hebrews 6.6. The problem is the assumed usage of ἀνασταυροῦν with the meaning to crucify *again*. The paragraph goes as follows:

**ἀνασταυρόω** (s. σταυρόω Hdt. et al.) always simply *crucify* (ἀνά=up; cf. Pla., Gorg. 473C; Hellen. Oxy. XV, 5; Polyb. 1, 11, 5; 1, 24, 6; Diod. S. 2, 1, 10; 2, 44, 2; 13, 111, 5; 14, 53, 5; Plut., Fab. 177 [6, 5], Cleom. 823 [39, 2]; Chariton 4, 2, 6; Aesop., Fab. 152 P. [=σταυρόω 264H.]; POxy. 842, col. 18, 22; Jos., Bell. 2, 306; 5, 449, Ant. 2, 73; 11, 246, Vi. 420); hence Hb 6:6 ἀνασταυροῦντας ἑαυτοῖς τὸν υἱὸν τ. θεοῦ may mean *since, to their own hurt, they crucify the Son of God*, of apostate Christians; but the context seems to require the fig. mng. *crucify again* (ἀνά=again), and the ancient translators and Gk. fathers understood it so; cf. L-S-J-M s.v., and Lampe s.v. 2. – AVitti, Verb. Dom. 22, '42, 174–82. – TW.<sup>45</sup>

As proposed in the paragraph, the prefix ἀνά is not used in the meaning “again” in the older Greek texts. But having identified the problem, the lexicon itself becomes a problem when suggesting a solution – that the verb simply means “to crucify.” The designation “crucify” is not defined in any particular way, and thus has to be understood in the normal English sense. The difficulty is that the majority of the texts proposed to support the reading “crucify” are unclear when it comes to the punishment form.

The text in Plato’s dialogue *Gorgias* (Pl. *Grg.* 473C) is not possible to elucidate as far as the suspension method is concerned. Plato uses the σταυρ-stem only in this one text, where Polus exemplifies some unjust actions for Socrates. The reference to the papyrus *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* suffers a similar weakness. It mentions only that the general was suspended (ἀνεσταύρωσεν) in some way. A few lines later, the lexicon mentions another papyrus from *Oxyrhynchus* (*P Oxy* 5.842). This one, however, is

<sup>45</sup> S.v. BDAG.

identical to the mentioned papyrus Hellenica Oxyrhynchia. They are simply two fragmentary copies of the same text and should not be mentioned separately. All references to Polybius (1.11.5, 24.6), Plutarch (Plut. *Fab. Max.* 6.3; *Cleom.* 39.1)<sup>46</sup>, the reference to Aesop (152) and the majority of the references to Diodorus Siculus (2.1.10, 44.2; 14.53.5 [4?]) ought to be rejected on the same basis: they are simply too vague in their description of the punishment. Their only contribution is the use of the verb. They do not reveal in what sense the verbs are used.

The five remaining texts are slightly more informative. One of the mentioned texts by Diodorus Siculus (13.111.5 [4?]) could be labeled as a kind of ante-mortem suspension, albeit not *which* kind.<sup>47</sup> The references to Josephus, with one exception (*AJ* 11.246),<sup>48</sup> end up rather close to the aim of the BDAG, i.e., to show that ἀνασταυροῦν means “simply crucify.” Two texts mention nailing in connection with the suspension of either dead or living victims (*BJ* 2.306–08; 5.449–51),<sup>49</sup> and two texts imply living victims suspended in some way (*AJ* 2.73; *Vit.* 420–21).<sup>50</sup> None of these texts, however, is explicit enough to be recognized as a reference to crucifixion. The reference to Chariton (*Chae. Call.* 4.2.6)<sup>51</sup> is relevant: the text suggested by the lexicon does not show what kind of suspension it refers to, but the other suspension accounts in the novel show that the suspension at hand was a suspension that was possible to survive. As mentioned, a limb-suspension fits the picture better than an impaling, which kills instantly. Thus, the suspension in the text – or rather Chariton’s other texts – has similarities with a crucifixion according to a traditional view.

Is it possible to label “some kind of suspension” as “crucifixion” without an elaborate (re)definition of the designation “crucifixion”? The answer ought to be negative. As a consequence, only one out of the eighteen references from the BDAG could, with at least some satisfactory level of plausibility, be labeled as some kind of crucifixion account and be used as support for the proposed meaning “simply crucify.” Seventeen ought to be rejected.

The Liddell and Scott lexicon is for the study of Classical Greek what the Bauer lexicon is for the study of the New Testament. Liddell and Scott’s

---

<sup>46</sup> The references in BDAG do not cohere with the references in the edition used in the present investigation (which is given in the main text).

<sup>47</sup> See p. 84.

<sup>48</sup> Joseph. *AJ* 11.246 only mentions the advice of Haman’s wife to suspend Mordecai on the tall ξύλον.

<sup>49</sup> See pp. 106–07.

<sup>50</sup> See pp. 100, 105–06.

<sup>51</sup> See pp. 139–40.



*Greek-English Lexicon* is more modest in its statements on how the various terms are used. The comments given here are only marginal notices.

**ἀνασταυρ-ίζω**, *impale*, Ctes.*Fr.*29.59 (Pass.). -**δω**, = *foreg.*, Hdt.3.125, 6.30, al.; identical with ἀνασκολοπίζω, 9.78:—Pass., Th. 1.110, Pl.*Grg.*473c. II. in Rom. times, *affix to a cross, crucify*, Plb. 1.11.5, al., Plu.*Fab.*6, al. 2. *crucify afresh*, Ep.*Hebr.*6.6. -**ωσις**, εως, ἡ, *crucifixion*, X.*Eph.*4.2.<sup>52</sup>

The statement that ἀνασταυροῦν is basically used in the the sense “impale” is basically correct, but it would be too categorical to say that it was always used in this sense in pre-Roman times. In several texts it is not possible to infer anything about the suspension form.<sup>53</sup> The suggestion about Ctesias’ usage of the rare ἀνασταυρίζειν is correct.<sup>54</sup> Ctesias appears to refer to impaling exclusively. The remark that ἀνασταυροῦν is identical to ἀνασκολοπίζειν in Herodotus 9.78 is perhaps too strong. Herodotus does not use both verbs when referring to the same historical event. He uses ἀνασταυροῦν in the text when referring to an event that has happened and ἀνασκολοπίζειν when referring to an event that has not yet happened, though both were post-mortem suspensions. Thereby also the paragraph on ἀνασκολοπίζειν is unsupported to some extent.

**ἀνασκολοπ-ίζω**:—Pass., with fut. Med. -σκολοπιόμην (in pass. sense) Hdt.3.132, 4.43, but Pass. -σκολοπισθήσομαι Luc.*Prom.*7: aor. -εσκολοπίσθην ib.2.10: pf. -εσκολόπισμαι Id.*Peregr.*13:—*fix on a pole or stake, impale*, Hdt.1.128, 3.159, al.; in 9.78 it is used convertibly with ἀνασταυρώω, as in Ph.1.237,687, Luc.*Peregr.*11. -**ῖσις**, εως, ἡ, *impaling*, Sch.A.*Pr.*7, Eust.1136.54.<sup>55</sup>

The references to Philo (Ph.1.237, 687) have not been found during the present study. The whole corpus of Philo’s texts has, however, been studied in Chapter 2 above without finding any text that supports the claim made in the lexicon. It is hard to see how Philo could have used the verbs convertibly since he strictly uses only one of them. Also the reference to Lucian is partly problematic. Lucian has been left out of the main discussion of the present investigation due to his late date, but since he is mentioned several times by Liddell & Scott here, he will be dealt with briefly. When Lucian uses ἀνασκολοπίζειν in *De morte peregrini* he is referring

<sup>52</sup> S.v. LSJ.

<sup>53</sup> Pl. *Grg.* 473C–D; Polyb. 1.11.5; *Hellenica (P Oxy.* 5.842), *FGrH* 2a, 66 F 1.15.5 (433–38); Diod. Sic. 2.1.10 (Ctesias, *FGrH* 3c, 688 F 1b.29–31); 2.44.2; Joseph. *AJ* 11.280; *BJ* 2.253; 5.289; Plut. *Fab. Max.* 6.3; *Alex.* 72.2; *Ant.* 81.1; *De garr.* 508F–509A; App. *Sici.* 2.3; Char. *Chae. Call.* 8.8.2.

<sup>54</sup> The verb is only used by Ctesias. However, the verb is not used in fragment 29 of Ctesias, but is found in Ctesias, *FGrH* 3c, 688 F 9.6, 14.39, 14.45, 16.66 (see the texts on pp. 61–63).

<sup>55</sup> S.v. LSJ.

to the death of Jesus. However, that does not make him use the verb interchangeably with ἀνασταυροῦν since he never uses the latter verb in connection with Jesus. To say that Lucian uses the verbs interchangeably, one ought to show a text in which Lucian uses both verbs when referring to the same kind of event. The authors of the lexicon paragraph do not mention any text of that kind. However, they could have mentioned the beginning paragraphs of Lucian's *Prometheus*, where the verbs are used together and perhaps even interchangeably.<sup>56</sup>

The relation between ἀνασταυροῦν and ἀνασκολοπίζειν is interesting in several ways. It is likely that there was some kind of distinction between the verbs – as Herodotus' overall usage indicates. This distinction has been lost during the ages. The ancient authors after Herodotus switched between the verbs in a way that scholars of the twenty-first century cannot fully perceive – but this does not make the verbs identical. Some tendencies can be still traced, as the chapter on the Greek literature above indicates. While ἀνασταυροῦν shows a clear tendency toward impaling, the case with ἀνασκολοπίζειν is the opposite. With perhaps one exception (see the conclusion below), ἀνασκολοπίζειν cannot be linked to any acts of impaling in the normal English sense, i.e., a lethal piercing of the abdomen (or rectum) by a pointed device.<sup>57</sup> The supporting feature for a connection between ἀνασκολοπίζειν and impaling is the etymology, but in this case the etymology appears to be misleading. Thus, the verbs are not identical. At most, they share range of meaning to some extent. The knowledge of *which* extent is nevertheless lost.

### 2.1.2. σταυροῦν

The paragraph on σταυροῦν in BDAG begins correctly with what may be the historical or basic usage of the verb (to erect a pole), and continues with a special usage of the verb (the execution of Jesus) that is found in the gospels. The problem is, however, that BDAG also here supports the special usage of the verb (to crucify) with texts that do not offer that support.

**σταυρῶ** (σταυρός; in the sense 'fence w. stakes' Thu. et al.) ... 1. to fasten to a cross, *crucify* (Polyb. 1, 86, 4; Diod. S. 16, 61, 2; Epict. 2, 2, 20; Artem. 2, 53; 4, 49; Esth 7:9; 8:12r; Jos., Ant. 2, 77; 17, 295)...<sup>58</sup>

It is not possible to say that Polybius, Diodorus Siculus and Epictetus use the verb with the meaning "to crucify" or "to fasten to a cross." What

<sup>56</sup> Luc. *Prom.* 1–2.

<sup>57</sup> S.v. *WNID*; *MED*. See KUHN, "Die Kreuzesstrafe," 680 n. 170) and the remarks on the verb in the conclusion of the present section below (pp. 283–84).

<sup>58</sup> S.v. *BDAG*.

they describe are unspecified suspensions of dead (Diodorus Siculus)<sup>59</sup> or living (Polybius)<sup>60</sup> victims. In the case of Epictetus and Artemidorus, the verb is used in philosophical discussions, i.e., they do not refer to any actual event, which they should do if used as support for the meaning suggested in the lexicon. In the book of Esther, the verb is used the only time in the Old Testament, and it describes the unspecified suspension of Haman on a tree (ξύλον) seventy-five feet, or twenty-three meters, high.<sup>61</sup> The reference in the expanded Greek text (8.12r) does not add anything other than that it was some kind of suspension. Josephus uses the verb undefined in one of the referred texts (*AJ* 17.295 [par. *BJ* 2.75]), but appears to refer to both an ante-mortem and limb suspension in the other (*AJ* 2.77).<sup>62</sup> The latter text might then be a reference to a crucifixion in a traditional sense. As a consequence, eight out of nine texts in the paragraph above are impossible to use in the way they are intended – to show that the verb means “to fasten to a cross, *crucify*.”<sup>63</sup>

The paragraph on the verb in Liddell-Scott has some minor issues that will be mentioned briefly. The assumed historical usage of the verb is described well, but the special usage becomes again too narrow.

**σταυρ-όω**, (σταυρός) *fence with pales*, Th.7.25; σ. τὰ βάθη ξύλοις D.S.24.1:—Pass., Th.6.100. II. *crucify*, Plb.1.86.4, *Ev.Matt.*20.19, Critodem. in *Cat.Cod.Astr.*8(4).200: metaph., σ. τὴν σάρκα *crucify* it, *destroy* its power, *Ep.Gal.*5.24, cf. 6.14: ἦλος ἐσταυρωμένος *nail from a cross*, as amulet, Asclep.Jun. ap. Alex.Trall.1.15. **-ωμα**, ατος, τό, *palisade* or *stockade*, Th.5.10, 6.64,74, X. *HG*3.2.3, etc. **-όσιμος**, ον, *deserving crucifixion*, Hsch. s.v. σκολοπώνυμον. **-οσις**, εως, ἡ, *stockade*, Th.7.25.<sup>64</sup>

It is not possible to draw the conclusion that the verb is used in the same sense by Polybius as it is commonly supposed to be used in the gospel of Matthew. The text by Polybius mentions an ante-mortem suspension, but it could be an impaling just as much as a crucifixion-like punishment. As in the previous sections, the text material does not support the assumption that σταυροῦν means “to crucify.”

The Louw-Nida lexicon offers longer definitions of the various terms instead of a single word.<sup>65</sup> However, this lexicon has also incorporated

<sup>59</sup> See pp. 80–81.

<sup>60</sup> See pp. 76–77.

<sup>61</sup> See p. 225.

<sup>62</sup> See p. 100.

<sup>63</sup> S.v. BDAG.

<sup>64</sup> S.v. LSJ.

<sup>65</sup> See the discussion in the introduction, pp. 32–35 (cf. LEE, *A History of New Testament Lexicography*, 177–90).

some minor overstatements regarding the usage of various terms. The paragraph on ἀνασταυροῦν focuses on the problems associated with the verb in Hebrews 6.6, and does so well. However, the paragraph on σταυροῦν, κτλ., contains some issues that need comments.

20.76 **σταυρῶ; προσπήγνυμι; κρεμάννυμι ἐπὶ ξύλου** (an idiom, literally ‘to hang on a tree’): to execute by nailing to a cross — ‘to crucify.’

σταυρῶ: ὅπου αὐτὸν ἐσταύρωσαν ‘there they nailed him to the cross’ Jn 19:18. It is rare that one can find in receptor languages a technical term or phrase meaning specifically ‘to crucify.’ In general, a phrase must be employed, since this type of execution is no longer practiced. One can, for example, use such expressions as ‘to nail to a cross bar’ or ‘to nail up on wood’ or even ‘to nail up high’....<sup>66</sup>

The lexicon defines what might be called a collective usage of the terminology in the New Testament. However, it would be fairer to reflect the wide usage of σταυροῦν and προσπηγνύναι, and the special denotation each term has. σταυροῦν is used in the New Testament in the sense “to suspend on a σταυρός,” προσπηγνύναι in the sense “to attach or nail to,” while κρεμάννυμι ἐπὶ ξύλου is used in the sense “to suspend on tree.” It could be noticed that, when the lexicon describes the problem of finding a fitting term for the words in the receptor languages in the last sentence of the quotation, it happens to encircle even better (with minor elaboration by the present author) the collective usage of the mentioned terms in ancient texts – and the New Testament. The words are used by the ancient authors in the sense “to nail/attach to a σταυρός” or “to nail up on wood” or even “to nail up high.”

### 2.1.3. σταυρός

In the paragraph on σταυρός, BDAG follows the same pattern as the previous paragraphs. It begins appropriately wide, but later becomes slightly too narrow.

**σταυρός, οὐδ, ὄ** (Hom. et al. in the sense ‘upright, pointed stake’ or ‘pale’; s. Iren. 1, 2, 4 cj. [Harv. I, 18, 4]; as name of an aeon Hippol., Ref. 6, 31, 6)

1. a pole to be placed in the ground and used for capital punishment, cross (Diod. S. 2, 18, 1; Plut. et al.; Epict. 2, 2, 20; Diog. L. 6, 45; ApcEsd. 7:1 p. 32, 8 Tdf.; AscIs 3:18; Philo, In Flacc. 84; Jos., Ant. 11, 261; 266f.; ... a stake sunk into the earth in an upright position; a cross-piece was oft. attached to its upper part (Artem. 2, 53), so that it was shaped like a T or thus: †... The condemned carried their crosses to the place of execution (Plut., Mor. 554a ἑκαστος κακούργων ἐκφέρει τὸν αὐτοῦ σταυρόν; Chariton 4, 2, 7 ἑκαστος τ. σταυρὸν ἔκφερε; Artem. 2, 56.—Pauly-W. IV 1731) J 19:17; in the synoptics

<sup>66</sup> S.v. L&N.

Simon of Cyrene was made to carry the cross for Jesus (Σίμων 4) Mt 27:32; Mk 15:21; Lk 23:26....<sup>67</sup>

It is correct that the noun denotes “a pole to be placed in the ground and used for capital punishment,” but that does not make it a “cross” (†). In Diodorus Siculus’ text (2.18.1) the σταυρός is an object onto which Semiramis is threatened to be attached or nailed (προσηλοῦν).<sup>68</sup> No further description is given there. Diodorus Siculus uses the noun also when he refers to things that can barely be labeled as “cross,” e.g., a standing bare bronze pole (17.71.6). As has been seen in Chapter 2, Plutarch appears to use σταυρός mainly when referring to standing pointed poles.<sup>69</sup> Epictetus also uses the noun in the same philosophical discussion that was mentioned in the previous section. Diogenes Laertius only mentions a young man who is throwing stones on a σταυρός, without further comments. The apocryphal texts, Apocalypse of Esdras and Ascension of Isaiah, appear to be Christian interpolations. They seem to refer simply to the σταυρός of Jesus, without adding further information. The text by Philo contains, among other cruel acts, an ante-mortem suspension of some kind.<sup>70</sup>

The reference to the *shape* of the σταυρός is unsupported in the same sense. The text which should support the image of a T-shaped cross or a regular cross (†) only says that a σταυρός resembles the mast of a ship, without further description.<sup>71</sup> It is a good assumption that the mast of an ancient ship had some kind of yard to hold up and spread the sail.<sup>72</sup> With the yard suspended without sail, the mast would have been fairly “cross-shaped.” But there is a significant leap from that assumption to stating that this was the universal form of mast, the one Artemidorus and his readers automatically envisioned when they said/heard κατάρτιος (mast). If there were an obvious similarity between a κατάρτιος and a σταυρός in the sense “cross” (†), why did other ancient authors not pay attention to that?<sup>73</sup>

Finally, as has been seen in the previous chapter, it is hard to define *what* the condemned actually carried on their way toward an often unspecified punishment. The texts are not explicit enough to determine that

<sup>67</sup> S.v. BDAG.

<sup>68</sup> See pp. 84–85.

<sup>69</sup> See pp. 120–23.

<sup>70</sup> See pp. 136–37.

<sup>71</sup> Artem. *Oneir.* 2.53.

<sup>72</sup> Cf. KONEN, “Schiffbau,” 169–70.

<sup>73</sup> For a discussion on Christian examples of this, see HURTADO, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts*, 147–48.

the condemned actually carried a cross (†), or even that it was an execution tool. The conclusion that they carried some kind of unspecified torture device, intended to be used in separate punishment and not subsequently conjoined with the suspension tool, is as plausible as the proposal in the lexicon.

When it comes to Liddell-Scott, the lexicon encircles the usage *σταυρός* in a relevant way in the beginning, but goes once again too far when defining its special usage.

**σταυρός**, ὁ, *upright pale or stake*, σταυρούς ἐκτός ἔλασσε διαμπερὲς ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα πυκνοὺς καὶ θαμέας Od.14.11, cf. Il.24.453, Th.4.90, X. An.5.2.21; of piles *driven* in to serve as a foundation, Hdt.5.16, Th.7.25. II. *cross*, as the instrument of crucifixion, D.S.2.18, Ev.Matt.27.40, Plu.2.554a; ἐπὶ τὸν σ. ἀπάγεσθαι Luc.Peregr.34; σ. λαμβάνειν, ἄραι, βαστάζειν, metaph. of voluntary suffering, Ev.Matt.10.38, Ev.Luc.9.23, 14.27: its form was represented by the Greek letter T, Luc.Jud.Voc.12. b. *pale for impaling a corpse*, Plu.Art.17.<sup>74</sup>

The texts from Diodorus Siculus, Plutarch and Lucian do not specify the *σταυρός* beyond that it is some kind of pole. The last clause of the paragraph, however, comes close to a proper rendering of the usage of *σταυρός*. An elaborate form could be: *σταυρός is a pole for suspending a corpse or for executing a person.*

The paragraph on *σταυρός* in Louw-Nida stresses several important features of the noun, together with some minor overstatements.

**6.27 σταυρός, οὗ m:** a pole stuck into the ground in an upright position with a cross-piece attached to its upper part so that it was shaped like a T or like a † — ‘cross.’ εἰστήκεισαν δὲ παρὰ τῷ σταυρῷ ‘they stood near the cross’ Jn 19:25. In Mt 27:32 (τοῦτον ἠγγάρουσιν ἵνα ἄρῃ τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ ‘they forced him to carry Jesus’ cross’) the reference is probably to the crosspiece of the cross, which normally would have been carried by a man condemned to die.

Because of the symbolism associated with the cross, translations of the NT in all languages preserve some expression which will identify the cross, not only as a means of capital punishment, but as having a particular form, namely, an upright pole with a crossbeam. In some receptor languages the term for a cross means simply ‘crossbeam.’ In other instances it is composed of a phrase meaning ‘crossed poles.’ It is important, however, to avoid an expression which will suggest crossed sticks in the form of X rather than a cross consisting of an upright with a horizontal beam.<sup>75</sup>

The opinion that a *σταυρός* is “a pole stuck into the ground in an upright position” is quite consistent, but it is hard to find support for the added

<sup>74</sup> S.v. LSJ.

<sup>75</sup> S.v. L&N.

clause, “with a crosspiece attached to its upper part so that it was shaped like a T or like a cross (†).” As seen in the previous chapter, the suggestion that Jesus carried only the crossbeam is unsupported in the same way. It is not possible to say that a man condemned to die “normally” would have to carry the crossbeam of his waiting execution tool. The other suggestions in the paragraph are important, however, not least to show the impact that the death of Jesus had on the meaning of the terms.

The lexicon makes an important remark in the same paragraph about the nature of *σταυρός*. This remark, though it deals with the time *after* Jesus, enhances the notion of the wide usage of the noun expressed by the present investigation.

If at all possible one should employ a term or phrase which may be used in an extended sense, since in so many contexts the term ‘cross’ refers not only to the instrument of Christ’s death, but to the event of execution. It also becomes a symbol of the message of forgiveness and of reconciliation. Because of these extended meanings, it is important to choose a form which can, if at all possible, support these additional meanings.<sup>76</sup>

#### 2.1.4. κρεμαννύναι

The verb *κρεμαννύναι*, as suggested in the BDAG, is used in connection with the suspension of humans. However, the lexicon’s suggestion of its special usage is again unsupported.

**κρεμάννυμι** (this form of the present not in the Gk. Bible, but Job 26:7 has *κρεμάζω*. The word, in mngs. 1 and 2, Hom. et al.; ins, pap, LXX, TestSol, TestAbr; TestLevi 2:7; JosAs 22:5; ParJer; GrBar 9:8; ApcMos 17; ApcrEzk P 2 verso 10; Philo; Jos., Vi. 147 al.) fut. *κρεμάσω* LXX; 1 aor. *ἐκρέμασα*, pass. *ἐκρεμάσθη*.

1. to cause to hang, trans. *hang* (*up*) ἐπὶ ξύλου *on the tree* i.e. *cross* (cp. Gen 40:19; Dt 21:22; Esth 8:7) Ac 5:30; 10:39. The verb κ. by itself can also mean *crucify* (Diod. S. 17, 46, 4; Appian, Mithrid. 8 §25; 29 §114 δούλους ἐκρέμασε, Bell. Civ. 2, 90 §377; Arrian, Anab. 6, 17, 2; 6, 30, 2; 7, 14, 4). Pass. Lk 23:39 (cp. Appian, Bell. Civ. 3, 3 §9; Sb 6739 [255 BC], 9).<sup>77</sup>

In fact, it is not possible to link *κρεμαννύναι* alone to the meaning “to crucify.” It is simply used in the sense “to suspend” something or someone in some way. Nothing in the texts from Pentateuch (Gen 40.19; Deut 21.22) indicates that the victims were suspended on crosses (†). All references to Diodorus Siculus, Appian and Arrian share the same weakness – it cannot be determined on *what* the suspension occurred.<sup>78</sup> It is not even

<sup>76</sup> S.v. L&N.

<sup>77</sup> S.v. BDAG.

<sup>78</sup> See the discussion on Appian’s texts on pp. 126–29.

specified what the criminals in Luke 23.39 were suspended on, beyond the usage of  $\sigma\tau\alpha\upsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon\nu$  (Matt 27.44; Mark 15.32b; Luke 23.33; John 19.18).

## 2.2. The Latin Terminology

The major lexical tool in the study of classical Latin, the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, offers in several ways a consistent definition of *crux*.

**crux**~**ucis**. *f.* [dub.] GENDER: masc., ENN. *Ann.* 360. GRACCH. *orat.* 36 (Fest.p.150M).

1 Any wooden frame on which criminals were exposed to die, a cross (sts. also, a stake for impaling). **b** (in various phrs. denoting crucifixion or impalement; see also CRUCIFIGO).

....

2 (pregn.) Death by the cross, crucifixion; (in imprecations) *i in malam ~ucem* (and sim. phrs.), go and be hanged! **b** (transf.) extreme discomfort; torture.

....

3 (colloq., often *mala ~ux*) Anything which causes grief or annoyance, a plague, torment. etc.<sup>79</sup>

This definition of *crux*, especially its first and third parts, ends up close to the usage of the noun in the texts examined in the present study. In fact, this definition is also highly useful for  $\sigma\tau\alpha\upsilon\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$  (see the conclusion below). The related paragraph on *crucifigere* goes as follows:

**crucifigo** ~igere ~ixi ~ixum, *tr.* Often written as two words. [dat. of CRUX + FIGO] To attach to a cross, crucify.<sup>80</sup>

It ought to be added that the verb is always written as two words in the preserved texts before Seneca the Elder. In addition, the verb refers to various acts of attaching to a *crux*. However, as has been seen in Chapter 3 – and not least in the paragraph on *crux* above – a *crux* is not always a “cross” (†). Thus, it cannot be said that *crucifigere* means “to crucify.” The main usage of the verb is in the sense “to attach a human to any wooden construction for torture or execution.” The paragraph on *patibulum* is largely correct.

**patibulum** ~i, *n.* Also ~us *m.* [PATEO + -BVLVM] GENDER: ~os (acc. pl.) CLOD. *hist.* 3.

1 A fork-shaped yoke or gibbet to which criminals were fastened.

....

2 A fork-shaped prop for vines.

....

3 A bar for fastening a door (acc. Non. P.366M).<sup>81</sup>

---

<sup>79</sup> S.v. *OLD*.

<sup>80</sup> S.v. *OLD*.

<sup>81</sup> S.v. *OLD*.



The absence of any “crossbeam” in the paragraph is encouraging, and rather surprising in view of how the noun is used by so many scholars.

### 2.3. The Hebrew-Aramaic Terminology

The Hebrew terminology is as a rule correctly described by the studied lexica. The main issues with the lexica have been addressed in connection with the specific Old Testament texts.

The widely used *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* by Brown, Driver and Briggs (BDB) describes the usage of הָלַח very well. The paragraph goes as follows in abbreviated form.

הָלַח vb. hang — Qal 1. *hang up* any object: acc. of hands and feet of slain. 2. *specif. put to death by hanging*, c. acc. pers.; abs. הָלַח; *one hanged*; acc. pers. + עָלָה. Niph. *be hung up*. Pi. *hang up* for display, c. acc. rei (ב loc.).<sup>82</sup>

The suggestions given here cohere well with the outcome of the study of the Old Testament in the previous chapter. The paragraphs on עָרַב, both in BDB and in other lexica, are witnesses to the problem with the usage of the verb, not least in Numbers 25.4.

עָרַב vb. be dislocated, alienated — Qal *dislocated* (Jacob’s thigh); elsewhere fig. of שָׁבַר *tom away, alienated* from any one, sq. עָרַב. Hiph. of solemn form of execution. Hoph. pass. of Hiph.<sup>83</sup>

The *Hebrew & Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament (HALOT)*:

עָרַב: ? alternative form of עָרַב :: Nöleke *Neue Beitr.* 198; Joüon *Biblica* 7:285f; Arb. *qa‘qa‘a* to crack (when wrenching one’s ankle), *waqa‘a* to fall, II to wound (the back of a camel); *waqa* to hit.

qal: (...): — 1. to turn away in disgust Jr 6, Ezk 23,17f — 2. to dislocate (a thigh) Gn 32,26 (Sept. *σπαράσσειν* to grow stiff, numb). †

hif: (...): (dead?) to display with broken legs and arms (alt. to impale, break upon a wheel, → Kalperud *Fschr. Mowinkel* 119f.) Nu 25,4, שָׁבַרָה → עָרַב (Sept. *παραδειγματίζειν*), 2S 21,6 with “ל, and , with “ עָרַב (Sept. *ἐξηλιαίσειν*), a dead body cj. 1S 31,10 (rd. *עָרַב* for *עָרַב*); Akk. *ina zaqīpi zuqqupu* and simil., to impale on a stake (CAD Z:54b, 58), BArm. עָרַב (JJelitto *Peinliche Strafen* 14ff; Barrios 2:83f.: de Vaux *Inst.* 1:244f. cf. הָלַח; GKuhn ZAW 39:272f; Reicke-R. *Hw.* 1435). †

hof: (...): (dead) to be exposed with legs and arms broken (Sept. *ἐξηλιασμένοι* 2S 21,13; cf.,<sup>14</sup> Sept.<sup>LBA</sup>. †<sup>84</sup>

<sup>82</sup> S.v. BDB.

<sup>83</sup> S.v. BDB (abbreviated by the present author).

<sup>84</sup> S.v. HALOT (abbreviated by the present author).

The *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* (TWOT):

903 **אָקַף** (*yāqāʿ*) **be alienated, dislocate (Qal); hang (Hiphil)**. (ASV and RSV essentially the same.)

Of the eight usages of this word, half are causative. Gen 32:25 [H 26], “So the socket of Jacob’s thigh was dislocated while he wrestled,” clearly establishes the basis for the metaphoric sense meaning “be alienated, separated.” The Hiphil clearly brings out the causative, although it serves euphemistically for the idea of execution by hanging or, more likely at that time, by impaling (as in Num 25:4 as NASB translates “and execute them in broad daylight... so that the fierce anger of the Lord may turn away from Israel”). Normally in ancient Israel execution was carried out by stoning (לָקַח or הָרַג, q.v.). For the curse associated with hanging, see Deut 21:23, see the synonym הָלַךְ “hang.” The several references to hanging bodies may refer not to death by hanging, but to the exhibition of the corpses of those killed some other way (cf. 2 Sam 21:12; Josh 10:26).<sup>85</sup>

The *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology & Exegesis* (NIDOTTE):

**אָקַף** (*yāqāʿ*), q. turn aside, be suddenly alienated; put out of joint (H3697).

ANE Arab. *qaʿqaʿa*, wrench, dislocate (e.g., ankle, foot); *waqaʿa*, fall.

OT 1. In its q. form the vb. אָקַף is not unlike אָקַף, turn away (H5936), and like it, it refers to a turning primarily in a nonphysical sense, as in turning aside in disgust (cf. Judah’s flirtations, Ezek 23:17–18). God is the subject, who threatens to turn from his people in disgust (Jer 6:8). The metaphorical use may derive from the ordinary usage of dislocating bones (Gen 32:25 [26]).

2. The hi. and ho. forms of אָקַף refer to broken things, usually limbs (2 Sam 21:6, 9, 13, possibly in the sense of exposure through impaling the bodies).<sup>86</sup>

It is not easy to find any consensus about how the verb is used in *hiphʿil* and *hophʿal*. The choice is between impaling and an act of displaying a condemned/victim with broken arms and leg. The step between them ought, however, to be labeled a giant leap.

2.4. *Conclusion – The Terminology of Crucifixion*

The general tendency in the studied lexica is to be accurate in their general remarks on the various terms, but going too far in their specific remarks on the same terms. This conclusion will sum up the observations made during the study of the texts in previous chapters. The usage of the various terms in the ancient texts will be described by a definition, a short sentence, which is coined to encircle the range of meaning of each term.<sup>87</sup> If usage in the Biblical texts is different compared to the extra-Biblical, it will be mentioned.

<sup>85</sup> S.v. TWOT.

<sup>86</sup> S.v. NIDOTTE.

<sup>87</sup> LEE, *Lexicography*, 184–85.

2.4.1. Verbs of the *σταυρ*-Stem

The Greek terms are used by the studied lexica in ways that diverge from the proposed meanings. In the studied text of the extra-Biblical and pre-Christian ancient literature, ἀνασταυροῦν is used in the sense “to raise a wooden pole” and in the extended sense “to suspend someone or something on a pole (or similar structure)” in a wide sense. The verb has a tendency to be used in connection with suspensions on *pointed* poles – thus impalings.<sup>88</sup> The plain form of the verb, σταυροῦν, is often used as an equivalent of ἀνασταυροῦν in both Biblical and extra-Biblical texts. However, the plain form appears to be used in what might be its original usage, the sense “to erect a pole (or similar structure),” i.e., fencing. It is also connected with the raising of apparently *pointed* poles in earlier texts.<sup>89</sup> This observation might be only a consequence of its limited – and predominantly late – usage in comparison with the compound. But taken together, the tendency is evident. There is a connection between (ἀνα)σταυροῦν and impaling. This ought to be mentioned in the definition. The usage of verbs of the *σταυρ*-stem in the studied texts is:

**ἀνασταυροῦν** – “to suspend someone (dead or alive) or something on a pole (or similar structure),” in the older Greek literature often on a pointed pole – “to impale.”

**σταυροῦν** – “to erect a pole (or similar structure),” in the older Greek literature often a pointed pole; to suspend someone (dead or alive) or something on a pole (or the like),” in the older Greek literature often on a pointed pole – “to impale.”

## 2.4.2. ἀνασκολοπίζειν

ἀνασκολοπίζειν is used in the same category of texts in almost the same sense, but with two crucial differences. First, the verb lacks chiefly the tendency to be connected with pointed poles. This is surprising if the etymology is taken into consideration.<sup>90</sup> It is regularly used in the sense “to suspend someone or something on a pole (or similar structure).” Herodotus uses ἀνασκολοπίζειν and ἀνασταυροῦν in a peculiar way, when mainly applying ἀνασκολοπίζειν for the suspension of living men and ἀνασταυροῦν for corpses. Second, the verb is only used in connection with human suspensions. The usage of ἀνασκολοπίζειν in the studied texts is:

<sup>88</sup> Hdt. 4.103.1–2; Xen. *An.* 3.1.17; Plut. *De fort. Rom.* 325D; See also Ctesias’ peculiar (late?) form of the verb, ἀνασταυρίζειν (Ctesias, *FGrH* 3c, 688 F 14.39, F 16.66).

<sup>89</sup> Thuc. 6.100.1; 7.25.7; Diod. Sic. 24.1.2; App. *Pun.* 119.

<sup>90</sup> See the remarks on σκόλωσθ on pp. 284–85.

**ἀνασκολοπίζειν** – “to suspend someone (dead or alive) on a pole (or similar structure).” Herodotus uses the verb in the sense “to suspend living victims in order to execute them.”

But how about the etymology of the verb? As has been said earlier, the verb is surprisingly difficult to link to impaling. Kuhn observes this: “[e]inen einigermaßen wahrscheinlichen Beleg für dieses Verb in Sinne der Todesstrafe def Pfälung = Spießung kenne ich nicht.”<sup>91</sup> There is, however, one text in which ἀνασκολοπίζειν is connected with impaling. Hesychius makes the following remarks on σκόλοψ (probably when used as a skewer).

**Hesych. Σ 1072.1–3.** In old times they used to suspend [ἀνεσκολόπιζον] those doing evil; they sharpened poles [and stuck them] through the length of the back, like the roasting fish on a spit.<sup>92</sup>

This fifth-century text is the only text in which the connection is clear. The parallelism between the fish on a skewer and the impaled is evident. There is thus a text that offers the connection Kuhn did not find. However, this usage of the verb appears to be absent in the pre-Christian texts.

### 2.4.3. σταυρός

Both ἀνασκολοπίζειν and ἀνασταυροῦν have different words for “pole,” σκόλοψ and σταυρός, as a distinct part. σκόλοψ and σταυρός are mostly used with the meaning of “palisade” or “fence.” Both nouns only occur in the plural in older Greek literature.<sup>93</sup> σκόλοψ is not as frequent as σταυρός and mainly used in the sense “pointed stake.”<sup>94</sup> The common use of the word in the meaning of “splinter” or “thorn” may strengthen the image of sharpened wood.<sup>95</sup> Thus, in Homer σκόλοπες were used in

<sup>91</sup> KUHN, “Die Kreuzesstrafe,” 680 n. 170.

<sup>92</sup> Hesych. Σ 1072.1–3. τὸ γὰρ παλαιὸν τοὺς κακουργοῦντας ἀνεσκολόπιζον, ὀξύνοντες ξύλον διὰ τῆς ραχέως καὶ τοῦ νώτου, καθάπερ τοὺς ὀπταμένους ἰχθῦς ἐπὶ ὀβελίσκων.

<sup>93</sup> For σκόλοψ, see, e.g., Hom. *Il.* 8.343; *Od.* 7.45; Hdt. 9.97.1; Xen. *An.* 5.2.5. For σταυρός, see, e.g., Hom. *Il.* 24.453; *Od.* 14.11; Thuc. 4.90.2; Xen. *An.* 5.2.21.

<sup>94</sup> In Homeric texts σκόλοψ usually refers to stakes, probably pointed, in or beside trenches as a part of a trap or fortification (*Il.* 7.441; 8.343; 9.350. Notice especially 12.55 and 63, where the author describes the stakes as “pointed” [σκολόπεσσιν ὀξέσιν]). *Il.* 15.1 and 344 could refer to pointed stakes in the trenches mentioned in both texts. In *Il.* 18.177 Hector’s heart bids him to decapitate the fallen Patroclus and impale his head on the stakes on the wall. Cf. also Cass. Dio, 40.40.5. The image of a pointed stake is decisive in Luc. *Ver. hist.* 1.30 where the teeth of a mythical giant whale are described as sharp as σκόλοπες. Hesychius defines the word σκόλοπες as “sharp, straight [poles of] wood” (ὀξέα ξύλα ὀρθά) (s.v. Hsch. [cf. s.v. σκόλοπιν ὡς ὀπτάσιν]).

<sup>95</sup> See p. 146.

fortifications, especially as a lethal trap in or beside trenches used to repulse attackers.<sup>96</sup> A steep trench with pointed stakes inside, sometimes combined with a palisade of pointed stakes, was a dangerous obstacle for an attacking force.

σταυρός is used when referring to “a raised pole” in a wide sense, or “a pole onto which something or somebody (dead or alive) is suspended,” and is not limited to the meaning of “pointed stake” like σκόλωψ. Thus, σταυρός refers to all kinds of standing poles, including pointed ones, while σκόλωψ appears only to refer to pointed poles.<sup>97</sup> A transferred sense is used when σταυρός refers to the suspension tool used in suspension of corpses (post-mortem) or executionary suspensions (ante-mortem). As mentioned above, an elaboration of the definition of *crux* in the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* is useful here. A σταυρός is:

**σταυρός** – “a pole or wooden frame on which corpses were suspended or victims exposed to die.”

#### 2.4.4. κρεμαννύναι

The verb κρεμαννύναι, very common and diversely used<sup>98</sup> in extra-Biblical Greek, occurs only 40 times in the Septuagint and eight times in the New Testament. When κρεμαννύναι is used without the added (Biblical) limitation ἐπὶ ξύλου, it refers to suspensions in the widest sense. When the limiting words are added, it is used mainly in the sense “to suspend corpses on wood.”<sup>99</sup> The compound ἀνακρεμαννύναι is used in connection with suspension of humans to a higher degree in extra-Biblical Greek.<sup>100</sup> κρεμαννύναι is thus used in the sense:

**κρεμαννύναι** – “to suspend” in general. With the prefix ἀνα it is mainly used in the sense “to suspend someone (dead or alive) on something.”

<sup>96</sup> Hom. *Il.* 7.441; 9.350; 12.54–64. σκόλωψ lies in this way semantically close to χάραξ, χάραξ usually designates a pointed stake or a pale and in plural a palisade. However, the verbs related to χάραξ, χαράσσειν and ἀναχαράσσειν (Att. –αττειν) are not connected with impaling. They refer rather to the act of sharpening the pole (see the words in LSJ).

<sup>97</sup> Contra DELLING, “σκόλωψ,” 410. Hesychius defines the word σταυροί as “firmly planted poles, stakes, and all [poles of] wood which stands” (οἱ καταπεπηγότες σκόλοπες, χάρακες, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐστῶτα ξύλα) (s.v. Hsch.). See, e.g., Hdt. 5.16.1, 2.

<sup>98</sup> For “hang (up)” in a broad sense see, e.g., Hom. *Il.* 8.19; Hdt. 1.66.4.

<sup>99</sup> (Gen 40.19–22); Deut 21.22–23; Josh 10.26.

<sup>100</sup> E.g., Hdt. 2.121.7.2; 3.125.4; 7.194.2; 9.120.4; 122.1.

2.4.5. *crux*

The usage of the Latin terms is correctly represented by the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Some additional information will however be mentioned briefly.

*crux* is some kind of pole.<sup>101</sup> In connection with suspension of humans it is also some kind of pole, onto which humans were attached in some way. A few texts indicate that a pointed pole was used in what appears to be an impaling.<sup>102</sup> In one instance, the victim was attached with nails.<sup>103</sup> The suspensions in Latin texts – on *crux* – appear to be executionary, i.e., occurring ante-mortem, to a higher degree than those in Greek texts – suspensions on  $\sigma\tau\alpha\rho\upsilon\sigma$ . In the studied texts a *crux* is:

*crux* – “a standing pole in general; mainly a pole on which victims were suspended to die, attached (by the limbs) or impaled; or a pole on which corpses were exposed.”

2.4.6. *patibulum*

*patibulum* is a pole or a beam in a broad sense. When used in connection with punishments of humans it is also a pole or a beam in a wide sense.<sup>104</sup> It could be used as a punishment or torture tool used in connection with *crux*<sup>105</sup> and perhaps also as an equivalent to *crux*.<sup>106</sup> A condemned person could be forced to walk attached to a *patibulum*,<sup>107</sup> but it is not sure in what way or in what sense he or she walked. It may be only a variant of walking *sub furca*.<sup>108</sup> The etymology could be interpreted as support for the notion that a spreading of arms was connected with the noun.<sup>109</sup> In the studied texts *patibulum* is used in the following sense:

*patibulum* – “a beam or pole in a wide sense; a beam, a yoke or perhaps a standing pole to which victims were attached (by their limbs); a beam or a yoke which a condemned person carried with outspread arms.”

<sup>101</sup> E.g., a support for vines (Plin. *HN*. 14.12 [3]).

<sup>102</sup> Sen. *Epist.* 101.10–14 (cf. Catull. 99.3–6).

<sup>103</sup> Sen. *Dial.* 1.3.9–10.

<sup>104</sup> See Val. Max. 9.2.3; a corpse was carried around attached to a *patibulum* (cf. also Tac. *Hist.* 4.3; *Ann.* 1.61.4; 4.72.3; 14.33.2; Plaut. *Most.* 55–56).

<sup>105</sup> Plaut. *F. Carb.* 2.

<sup>106</sup> See Sall. *Hist.* F 3.9, where the victim may have been attached to a standing *patibulum*.

<sup>107</sup> Plaut. *Mil.* 359–60.

<sup>108</sup> Liv. 1.26.10; Suet. *Ner.* 49.2.

<sup>109</sup> S.v. *TLL*, *EWLS*. Cf. LIPSIUS, *De Cruce*, 21.

### 2.4.7. The Hebrew-Aramaic Terminology

תלה refers in both *qal* and *hiph'il*, *hoph'al* to various acts of suspension, mainly of humans.<sup>110</sup> When על עץ is added, the construction refers only to the suspension of humans.<sup>111</sup> All these suspensions occurred post-mortem, or it cannot be decided whether they occurred post- or ante-mortem.<sup>112</sup>

יקע is more elusive when it comes to pinpointing its usage. יקע is used in a rather diverse sense. Some type of turning away of the mind (disgust) or limbs (dislocation) appears to be the main usage in *qal*.<sup>113</sup> The usage in *hiph'il* and *hoph'al* goes in another direction – toward suspension of humans, but it is not possible to determine *which* kind of suspension. This unspecified suspension may in one instance have been an executionary, ante-mortem, suspension.<sup>114</sup>

### 2.4.8. The Terminology of Crucifixion

The main conclusion regarding the terminology of crucifixion is that there does not appear to be any terminology of crucifixion – before the death of Jesus. All the mentioned terms share a crucial feature: none of them can be determined to mean “to crucify” or “cross” – *by themselves*. If this conclusion is correct, the majority of scholars have used an unsatisfactory method in their process of text selection. It is better to let the absence of fixed terminology illuminate the absence of a fixed punishment.

## 3. Discussion Three – The Description of Crucifixion

### 3.1. The Scholarly Contributions

The previously discussed issues of definition and terminology run deep into the present interrogatory field. How could – or rather should – the punishment labeled “crucifixion” be described? The majority of the scholars see crucifixion as an executionary suspension on a cross. In addition, several of them stress the variation in the methods of crucifixion and call for carefulness when it comes to reading the texts and drawing con-

---

<sup>110</sup> Gen 40.22; 41.13; Deut 21.23; 2 Sam 4.12; 18.10; 21.12; Esth 2.23; 5.14; 9.14; Lam 5.12. For non-human suspensions, see: Deut 28.66; Is 22.24; Ezek 15.3; 17.22; 27.10, 11; Ps 137.2; Job 26.7; Song 4.4.

<sup>111</sup> Gen 40.19; Deut 21.22; Josh 8.29; 10.26; Esth 5.14; 6.4; 7.9, 10; 8.7; 9.13, 25.

<sup>112</sup> The uncertain texts are Gen 40.19–22; Josh 8.29.

<sup>113</sup> Gen 32.26; Jer 6.8; Ezek 23.17–18.

<sup>114</sup> Num 25.4.

clusions from them. In spite of this, many scholars offer vivid depictions of the method of crucifixion.

The previously discussed topic is closely related to the issue of description, but not identical. While the definition issue deals with what the contemporary designation "crucifixion" contains, the description issue deals with the *presentation* of the punishment. Under the present heading, the discussion will thus approach the area of the historical reconstruction of the punishment of crucifixion. What is a relevant presentation of the punishment at hand? Or to put it another way, what can be said about *how* a crucifixion was carried out? The way a crucifixion is described by the scholars reveals how much knowledge they have, in their opinion, about crucifixion.

Hengel does not offer any illustration in his book *Crucifixion*, but together with Anna Maria Schwemer he does so in the recent monograph *Jesus und das Judentum*. A typical crucifixion is described in the book as follows.

Das Kreuz bestand aus einem in die Erde gerammten Pfahl und dem Querholz. Der Verurteilte, der das Querholz (*patibulum*) selbst an die Richtstätte zu tragen hatte, wurde zuerst mit beiden Händen am Querholz angenagelt oder festgebunden und dann am Pfahl hochgezogen. Die Annagelung war wohl das Übliche. Sie führte zusammen mit der Geißelung durch den Blutverlust schneller zum Tode. Es gab zwei Formen: Die *crux commissa* glich einem T, die *crux immissa* unserem Kreuz. Die Höhe war sehr verschieden, die Füße befanden sich oft nur wenige Zentimeter über dem Boden. In der Regel hatte das Kreuz eine kleine Sitzstütze, das sog. *sedile*. In dieser schrecklichen Lage konnten die Gekreuzigten bei kräftiger Statur tagelang am Leben bleiben, bis sie durch die Hitze, den Blutverlust, vor allem aber durch Kreislaufkollaps infolge völliger Unbeweglichkeit starben.<sup>115</sup>

Hengel and Schwemer present several distinct features such as a two-parted cross, the pole standing on the execution place and the crossbeam, which the criminal carried himself, usually nailed to it; the criminal suspended with his feet a few centimeters above the ground, sitting on a wooden plug.

Stauffer gives an account of what he sees as a typical crucifixion. After concluding that both the terminology and the method of crucifixion were diverse in the ancient world, he still offers a sketch of the usual crucifixion method during Roman times.

Der Verurteilte wird zunächst erbarmungslos geißelt. Dann schleppt er den Querbalken seines Kreuzes durch die Stadt auf den Richtplatz, wo der senkrechte Kreuzestamm bereits im Boden eingerammt ist. Dort wird er nackt ausgezogen. Dann nagelt man ihn mit ausgespannten Armen an den Querbalken an, zieht den Balken am Kreuz

---

<sup>115</sup> HENGEL and SCHWEMER, *Jesus und das Judentum*, 612.



zesstamm hoch und befestigt ihn zwei bis drei Meter über dem Erdboden, so daß das fertige Kreuz normalerweise die Form eines lateinischen T hat. Nun nagelt man die Füße des Verurteilten am Kreuzesstamm fest. Über dem Kopf des Gekreuzigten aber bringt man den Titulus an, eine Tafel mit kurzer Urteilsbegründung.<sup>116</sup>

Stauffer's description adds that the criminal was suspended naked, that his feet were nailed to the trunk of the T-shaped cross, and that a sign telling the nature of the crime was attached over his head.<sup>117</sup>

Also Blinzler offers a detailed description of a regular crucifixion, and he does so in the following terms:

Der Verurteilte wurde entkleidet und – nach vollzogener Geißelung, die bei Jesus vorweggenommen war – am Boden mit ausgestreckten Armen an das Querholz genagelt, das er selbst zur Richtstatt hatte tragen müssen. Das Querholz wurde dann mit dem Körper hochgezogen und an dem senkrecht in der Erde stehende Pfahl befestigt, worauf die Füße angenagelt wurden. Ein ungefähr in der Mitte des Pfahls angebrachter Holzklotz stützte den hängenden Körper; von einer Fußstütze wissen die alten Berichte nichts. Das aus Pfahl und Querholz gebildete Kreuz hatte entweder die Form eines T (*crux commissa*) oder eines + (*crux immissa*). Die Höhe des Kreuzes war verschieden. Meist war es aufgerichtet wenig mehr als mannshoch, so daß die Füße des Gekreuzigten den Boden fast berührten.<sup>118</sup>

Blinzler mentions also nailed feet (but no footrest) just above the ground and a seat in the form of a wooden plug.

Winter's description of what in his view was the Roman execution form goes as follows:

After sentence had been passed, the condemned person was scourged, the scourging being of such a severe nature that loss of blood and frequently a general weakening in the condition of the doomed man took place. This evidently happened in the case of Jesus, making it necessary for the executioners to compel a man who passed by to assist him in carrying the cross (Mc 15, 21) after his flagellation (Mc 15, 15). A heavy wooden bar (*patibulum*) was placed upon the neck of the condemned man, and his outstretched arms were fastened to the beam. In this position, he was led to the place of execution. There he was lifted up, the beam being secured to a vertical stake (*simplex*), fixed in the ground, so that his feet hung suspended in the air. The arms of the prisoner were usually tied with ropes to the patibulum, though sometimes nails may have been driven into the prisoner's palms. No nails were used for affixing the feet. They were either left dangling a short distance above the ground, or were fastened to the post by ropes. Stripped of his clothes, the condemned was left on his cross till death intervened.<sup>119</sup>

<sup>116</sup> STAUFFER, *Jerusalem und Rom*, 127.

<sup>117</sup> Stauffer's description appears contradictory when he suggests that the *titulus* was attached *above* the head of the victim while suspended on a T-shaped cross.

<sup>118</sup> BLINZLER, *Der Prozeß Jesu*, 360.

<sup>119</sup> WINTER, *On the Trial of Jesus*, 95–96.

The feet were not nailed, according to Winter, but left dangling or tied just above the ground.

Schneider offers also a detailed description of the, in his opinion, regular method of crucifixion.

Crucifixion took place as follows. The condemned person carried the *patibulum* (cross beam) to the place of crucifixion – the stake was already erected. Then on the ground he was bound with outstretched arms to the beam by ropes, or else fixed to it by nails. The beam was then raised with the body and fastened to the upright post. About the middle of the post was a wooden block which supported the suspended body; there was no foot-rest in ancient accounts. The height of the cross varied; it was either rather more than a man's height or even higher when the offender was to be held up for public display at a distance. On the way to execution a tablet was hung around the offender stating the *causa poenae*, and this was affixed to the cross after execution so that all could see.

.... Scourging usually preceded it. The condemned person was exposed to mockery. Sometimes he was stripped and his clothes were divided among the executioners, though this was not the common rule. Crucifixion took place publicly on streets or elevated places. Usually the body was left to rot on the cross. But it could also be handed over for burial. The physical and mental sufferings which this slow death on the cross involved are unimaginable.<sup>120</sup>

According to Schneider, the footrest was absent in ancient accounts while the wooden seat was present. The condemned usually kept his clothes and was not suspended naked.

O'Collins' description of the regular form of a crucifixion goes as follows:

Generally the victims were crucified alive; at times it was a matter of displaying the corpse of someone already executed in another way.... Whether living or already dead, the victims suffered a degrading loss of all dignity by being bound or nailed to a stake.... Under the Roman Empire, crucifixion normally included a flogging beforehand. At times the cross was only one vertical stake. Frequently, however, there was a crosspiece attached either at the top to give the shape of a "T" (*crux commissa*) or just below the top, as in the form most familiar in Christian symbolism (*crux immissa*). The victims carried the cross or at least the transverse beam (*patibulum*) to the place of execution, where they were stripped and bound or nailed to the beam, raised up, and seated on a *sedile* or small wooden peg in the upright beam. Ropes bound the shoulders or torso to the cross. The feet or heels of the victims were bound or nailed to the upright stake. As crucifixion damaged no vital organs, death could come slowly, sometimes after several days of atrocious pain.<sup>121</sup>

O'Collins' description adds the possibility of an already executed victim and nailed or tied feet.

<sup>120</sup> SCHNEIDER, "σταυρός," 573–74.

<sup>121</sup> O'COLLINS, "Crucifixion," 1208–09.

Marcus J. Borg and John Dominic Crossan set out, from the gospel of Mark, to “retell a story everyone thinks they know too well and most do not seem to know at all.”<sup>122</sup> Their description of the events on Calvary extends over several pages, and will be given here in abridged form. When the crowd in Jerusalem had shouted “Crucify him,” Pilate handed over Jesus to be crucified.

Prisoners condemned to death by crucifixion were normally required to carry the horizontal bar of the cross to the place of execution, where the vertical bar was a post permanently positioned in the ground. But Mark tells us that the soldiers compelled a passerby, Simon of Cyrene, to carry Jesus’s cross [*sic*]. Though Mark does not say why, presumably it was not an act of kindness toward Jesus, but because Jesus had become too weak to carry the wooden beam himself.... At 9 AM, at the place named Golgotha, “the place of the skull,” the soldiers crucified Jesus. Mark refers to the event itself with only a short phrase: “And they crucified them (15:24). He did not need to say more, for his community was very familiar with the Roman practice of crucifixion. But we today may need some explanation.... As a form of public terrorism, the uprights of the crosses were usually permanently in place just outside a city gate on a high or prominent place. The victim usually carried or dragged [*sic*] the crossbar along with notice of the crime to be attached to one of those uprights at the place of execution.... [V]ictims were often crucified low enough to the ground that not only carrion birds but scavenging dogs could reach them. And they were often left on the cross after death until little was left of their bodies for a possible burial.”<sup>123</sup>

The description offered by the famously critical scholars Borg and Crossan is thus loaded with pragmatically based conjectures. Beside the clear-cut use of the carried crossbeam and the fixed pole, they add the dragging of the crossbeam and dog-friendly height of the crucified victim – both features absent in the text studied in the present investigation.<sup>124</sup>

A contribution from the field of archaeology is offered by Vassilos Tzaferis.

In peacetime, crucifixions were carried out according to certain rules, by special persons authorized by the Roman courts.... Following the beating, the horizontal beam was placed upon the condemned man’s shoulders, and he began the long, grueling march to the execution site, usually outside the city walls. A soldier at the head of the procession carried the *titulus*, an inscription written on wood, which stated the defendant’s name and the crime for which he had been condemned. Later, this *titulus* was fastened to the victim’s cross. When the procession arrived at the execution site, a vertical stake was fixed into the ground. Sometimes the victim was attached to the cross only with ropes. In such a case, the *patibulum* or crossbeam, to which the victim’s arms were already

<sup>122</sup> BORG and CROSSAN, *The Last Week*, IX.

<sup>123</sup> BORG and CROSSAN, *The Last Week*, 145–46.

<sup>124</sup> For lengthier description of crucifixion than those mentioned above, see, e.g., GNILKA, *Wie das Christentum entstand*, 1.308–13.

bound, was simply affixed to the vertical beam; the victim's feet were then bound to the stake with a few turns of the rope. If the victim was attached by nails, he was laid on the ground, with his shoulders on the crossbeam, which was then raised and fixed on top of the vertical beam. The victim's feet were then nailed down against this vertical stake.... In order to prolong the agony, Roman executioners devised two instruments that would keep the victim alive on the cross for extended periods of time. One, known as a *sedile*, was a small seat attached to the front of the cross, about halfway down. This device provided some support for the victim's body and may explain the phrase used by the Romans, "to sit on the cross."... The second device added to the cross was the *suppedaneum*, or foot support. It was less painful than the *sedile*, but it also prolonged the victim's agony. Ancient historians record many cases in which the victim stayed alive on the cross for two or three or more days with the use of a *suppedaneum*.<sup>125</sup>

Tsaferis offers thus a rich and detailed account of crucifixion in which the victims stayed alive by the help of a *suppedaneum*.

There are similar kinds of crucifixion descriptions in public lexica as well. For instance, Eerdman's *Dictionary of the Bible* describes crucifixion as follows.

As a public mode of execution crucifixion gave free vent to the sadistic impulses of the executioners (Josephus *BJ* 5.11.1 [451]; Seneca *Dial.* 6.20.3; *Ep.* 101). It was preceded by scourging and other forms of torture. Criminals were often required to wear a placard around their necks listing the reason for execution (Suetonius *Caligula* 32.2; *Domitian* 10.1; Eusebius *HE* 5.1.44; cf. Mark 15:26 par.). Victims were nailed with long spikes or tied in various painful positions to crosses or wooden planks. There is some evidence for a saddle or *sedile* to support the body of the crucified one, which served to prolong the punishment and prevent death by asphyxiation. Often crucified people lingered for days, and death came ultimately from loss of blood or asphyxiation. Both men and women were crucified. Normally as a horrible deterrent to future criminals, the bodies were left on the crosses to decompose.<sup>126</sup>

Donahue adds thus that he has seen evidence for the elusive *sedile*. The *Tyndale Bible Dictionary* continues in the same way.

Crucifixion was universally recognized as the most horrible type of execution. In the East, in fact, it was used only as a further sign of disgrace for prisoners already executed, usually by decapitation. In the West the condemned criminal was scourged (whipped), usually at the place of execution, and forced to carry the crossbeam to the spot where a stake had already been erected. A tablet stating the crime was often placed around the offender's neck and was fastened to the cross after the execution. The prisoner was commonly tied or sometimes nailed to the crossbeam (with the nails through the wrists, since the bones in the hand could not take the weight). The beam was then raised and fixed to the upright pole. If the executioners wished a particularly slow, agonizing death, they might drive blocks or pins into the stake for a seat or a step to support the feet.

<sup>125</sup> TZAFERIS, "The Archaeological Evidence for Crucifixion," 98–100.

<sup>126</sup> DONAHUE, "Crucifixion," 298.

Death came about either through loss of blood circulation followed by coronary failure or through the collapse of one's lungs, causing suffocation. That could take days, so often the victim's legs would be broken below the knees with a club, causing massive shock and eliminating any further possibility of easing the pressure on the bound or spiked wrists. Usually a body was left on the cross to rot, but in some instances was given to relatives or friends for burial.<sup>127</sup>

*The Oxford Classical Dictionary* presents the punishment of crucifixion as follows:

**Crucifixion** ... The general practice was to begin with flagellation of the condemned, who was then compelled to carry a cross-beam (*patibulum*) to the place of execution, where a stake had been firmly fixed in the ground. He was stripped and fastened to the cross-beam with nails and cords, and the beam was drawn up by ropes until his feet were clear of the ground. Some support for the body was provided by a ledge (*sedile*) which projected from the upright, but a footrest (*suppedaneum*) is rarely attested, though the feet were sometimes tied or nailed. Death probably occurred through exhaustion: this could be hastened through breaking the legs. After removal of the body the cross was usually destroyed.<sup>128</sup>

*The Encyclopædia Britannica* describes a crucifixion in the following way:

There were various methods of performing the execution. Usually, the condemned man, after being whipped, or "scourged," dragged the crossbeam of his cross to the place of punishment, where the upright shaft was already fixed in the ground. Stripped of his clothing either then or earlier at his scourging, he was bound fast with outstretched arms to the crossbeam or nailed firmly to it through the wrists. The crossbeam was then raised high against the upright shaft and made fast to it about 9 to 12 feet (approximately 3 metres) from the ground. Next, the feet were tightly bound or nailed to the upright shaft. A ledge inserted about halfway up the upright shaft gave some support to the body; evidence for a similar ledge for the feet is rare and late. Over the criminal's head was placed a notice stating his name and his crime. Death, apparently caused by exhaustion or by heart failure, could be hastened by shattering the legs (*crurifragium*) with an iron club, so that shock and asphyxiation soon ended his life.<sup>129</sup>

### 3.2. Evaluation of the Scholarly Contributions

It is not an exaggeration to say that, in spite of minor variations, there is a rather consistent and clear-cut opinion about how a crucifixion was carried out in the ancient world. There is a consensus about several features in a crucifixion:

---

<sup>127</sup> ELWELL and COMFORT, *Tyndale Bible Dictionary*, 337.

<sup>128</sup> S.v. *OCD*.

<sup>129</sup> S.v. *EB*.

1. a preceding scourging,
2. attachment of the arms (mainly by nailing) to the cross-beam (*patibulum*),
3. that the cross-beam was then carried out to the execution spot where a fixed bare pole waited,
4. suspension and attachment of the victim together with the cross-beam to the standing pole,
5. that the cross was shaped as a T (*crux commissa*) or regular cross (*crux immissa*),
6. that the victim was suspended with the feet just above the ground, either nailed or tied to the pole or left dangling,
7. a wooden plug (*sedile*) on the middle of the pole and a footrest (*supernadeum*) offered support for the victim,
8. a sign (*titulus*), which proclaimed the nature of the crime was attached to the cross.

These suggestions become peculiar, especially considering the very sparse information the actual texts really offer. The aim of the scholars was to give a description of the general method of crucifixion in the ancient world. The major problem is that there was no general method of crucifixion in the ancient world, not even in the land of Israel, not even in the days of Jesus. Thus, the vivid descriptions above are in danger of being mere speculations.

What they do is to pinpoint randomly occurring features within the spectrum of suspension punishments. They are random in the sense that it is simply not possible to say that a general public suspension, not even in Roman times, usually was constituted by the above-mentioned eight features. The scourging and to some extent also the *titulus* (numbers one and eight) can be found, but it is hard to link even one of the other features (two to seven) to the suspension punishment as it is described. The texts are too vague and diverse to draw any of these conclusions.

It is possible to argue pragmatically for some features, for example, that the theory of the carried crossbeam and the previously fixed waiting bare pole appears most plausible for a 21<sup>st</sup>-century reader. It is pragmatic in the same sense to assume that a suspended body needed more support than nails in the palms, which are assumed to be ripped out by the weight of the body. Thus some kind of supportive device would be plausible. Yet the authors quoted above do not present these as pragmatic theories, but as textual and historical facts. The problem is that textual evidence for a crossbeam carried toward, and afterwards attached onto, a waiting pole and for a supportive device is nonexistent.

There are some accounts of a carried wooden beam or yoke (*patibulum*), but it is not obvious what was carried and why it was carried. When it comes to the commonly mentioned wooden seat (*sedile*) there is not one single text that tells of any such thing.<sup>130</sup> Every form of footrest (*suppedaneum*) is absent in the studied texts.<sup>131</sup> For instance, the widely used names of the various forms of crosses, *crux commissa* (the T-shaped) and *crux immissa* (the regular cross), are never used in the ancient texts, but were coined by Lipsius in the sixteenth century. The texts offer very sparse information about how a σταυρός or a *crux* was shaped.

The effort to construct a detailed definition of *the* suspension punishment is in danger of being in vain since the texts are too diverse. Hengel points to the problem in an already quoted text – if Hengel's label "*crucifixion*" is replaced by "*suspension punishment*." The text in rewritten form would be:

Suspension punishment was a punishment in which the caprice and sadism of the executioner were given full rein. All attempts to give a perfect description of *the* suspension punishment in archaeological terms are therefore in vain; there are too many different possibilities for the executioner.<sup>132</sup>

In fact, the comments on the diverse usage of crucifixion above (section two of the present chapter) fit even better when applied to the spectrum of suspension punishments than to one particular form of it.

The features that can be seen in connection with punishments where the assumed "crucifixion terminology" is used are:

1. that it is some kind of public suspension,
2. that the suspension object is a living or dead person, whole or in part, being suspended to die, for torture or to humiliate the corpse,
3. that the victims commonly are slaves or other humans deemed as unfree,
4. that the suspension tool could be nearly anything – a pole, a plank, a city wall, a house wall, the rostra, a statue, and so on,
5. that the victim from time to time was scourged or otherwise tortured in connection with the suspension, e.g., by being forced to a shameful walk attached to a torture tool.

<sup>130</sup> The closest is the mention of a pointed *crux* by Seneca the Elder (Sen. *Epist.* 101.10–11), but to interpret this as a support for a *sedile* is difficult (pp. 189–91).

<sup>131</sup> Mommsen refers to the Christian text Justin. *Dial.* 91 and Irenaeus, *Ad haer.* 2.24 for evidence of a *suppedaneum* (MOMMSEN, *Römisches Strafrecht*, 920 n. 1). Both texts mention however, as Lipsius did, only the five extremities of the *crux*. What these refer to is only a matter of conjecture.

<sup>132</sup> The original text is found in HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 25.

But these features do not occur all together in the texts in which the studied terminology is used. It is rare that more than one can be identified in each text respectively. Thus the vast majority of the events that the texts describe, so often called crucifixion by scholars, cannot be labeled otherwise than as *suspensions*.

### 3.3. A Description of Crucifixion

One kind of suspension punishment is what has become known through the death of Jesus as “crucifixion.” In the end, a depiction of crucifixion is but a retelling of the execution of Jesus, as it is portrayed by the gospels. However, as has been seen, not even the gospels are explicit enough to support all features of crucifixion mentioned above in the present section. That scourging occurred and that a sign proclaiming the crime was attached to the execution tool is evident. The attaching of the bodies to the *σταυρός* occurred and it is also plausible that it was done by nailing, due to texts outside the passion narrative.

Then things become difficult. The gospels do not support the carrying of a crossbeam to a waiting pole and a subsequent joining of them. The gospels do not reveal anything regarding the shape or the height of the execution tool. On the basis of the New Testament texts, nothing is known about what the *σταυρός* looked like, other than that it apparently extended above the head of Jesus (where the sign was attached). Neither do the gospels offer any direct knowledge of whether the feet were attached or left dangling. The gospels (or any other ancient text) do not indicate any use of a sitting device or a footrest attached to the execution tool.

What can be said about the suspension of Jesus – and indirectly about the punishment of crucifixion – are only some notes in the margin compared to the full-blown pictures earlier in the present section.

1. the suspension was an executionary suspension,
2. after he was scourged, Jesus himself or a passer-by carried a *σταυρός* to the execution place,
3. there Jesus was stripped of all or some of his clothes and suspended, possibly by being nailed to the execution tool with his hands (more probably) and feet (less probably),
4. and a sign indicating the nature of the crime was attached to the *σταυρός*.

What has been said beyond this is not to be found in the Biblical text, or in the pre-Christian Jewish and Greco-Roman literature, but in texts with their origin after the advent of Christianity – and in the minds of scholars.



#### 4. Test Case I – The Archaeological Challenge

Although it is outside the scope of the present investigation, the area of archaeology ought to be mentioned. The question is simple: does archaeological evidence topple the outcome of the present investigation?

The well-known so-called “crucified man,” found in Giv‘at ha-Mivtar northeast of Jerusalem in 1968, sparked a lengthy discussion.<sup>133</sup> This discovery is a heel-bone pierced with a large iron nail. Having the traditional view of crucifixion in mind, assuming that there was a distinctive form of punishment called “crucifixion,” which cohered with the traditional view of the execution of Jesus, the picture is clear – the heel-bone is the long-awaited archaeological proof of crucifixion. But, considering the possibility that there was no punishment called “crucifixion” until the time when the owner of the heel-bone died, but a whole spectrum of various forms of spontaneously occurring suspension punishments, which all shared the basic terminology, the picture becomes blurred.

The heel-bone is only evidence that *one* male in the mid- to late 20s somehow had *one* of his heels pierced by a nail during the first century C.E. *How* and *why* the nail got there is a matter of conjecture. It is possible to argue that the plausibility that the nail was stuck in the heel during an act of crucifixion is reasonably high, *if it is possible to show that execution by nailing victims to a wooden pole was the prevailing form of execution in the 20s*. Beyond the heel-bone, there are only texts. Moreover, the texts are not explicit enough to show that this form of suspension was *the* form used. Thus, the heel-bone is not a proof of crucifixion. At best, it is an indication that the way Jesus was executed according to the traditional view (i.e., with feet [and hands] nailed to an execution tool) was used one more time during the same century. The heel-bone is in fact evidence that contradicts the well-defined traditional view of crucifixion, since the nail was inserted from the side of the heel-bone. The common description of Jesus’ nailed feet is that they were nailed to a footrest with one nail from above.

The importance of the discovery has been exaggerated in comparison to its scientific value as proof of one specific form of suspension. As the case was with the ancient texts, scholars read too much into it. They have

---

<sup>133</sup> For the discussion see, e.g., HAAS, “Anthropological Observations on the Skeletal Remains from Giv‘at ha-Mivtar,” 38–59; TZAFERIS, “Jewish Tombs at and near Giv‘at ha-Mivtar,” 18–32; NAVEH, “The Ossuary Inscriptions from Giv‘at ha-Mivtar,” 33–37; KUHN, “Der Gekreuzigte von Giv‘at ha-Mivtar,” 303–34; TZAFERIS, “Crucifixion,” 44–53; ZIAS and SEKELES, “The Crucified Man from Giv‘at ha-Mivtar,” 22–27; TZAFERIS, “The Archaeological Evidence for Crucifixion,” 91–113; SHANKS, “New Analysis of the Crucified Man,” 115–36; CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 76–79. Cf. also HABERMAS, *The Historical Jesus*, 173.

drawn too far-reaching conclusions from a heel-bone that for some reason has a large nail in it. Tzaferis uses not only this, in his opinion, archaeological evidence, but also his own all too vivid historical reconstruction, and sets out to, with his own words, “reconstruct the crucifixion” of the man whose bones he excavated at Giv‘at ha-Mivtar.<sup>134</sup> Such a reconstruction is doomed to go too far. This reconstruction purports to explain in detail not only the event that took the man’s life – but also his appearance.

Despite the prenatal anomalies, the man’s face must have been quite pleasant, although some might say that it must have been a bit wild. His defects were doubtless almost imperceptible, hidden by his hair, beard and moustache. His body was proportionate, agreeable and graceful, particularly in motion.<sup>135</sup>

## 5. Test Case II – Challenging the Basic Theory

If the theory that the death of Jesus influenced the denotation of the main terminology studied here is correct, it should be visible in texts with their origin after the death of Jesus. The Vulgate is a text influenced by a Christian interpretation of the events of Calvary. It reflects a Christian reading of the Old Testament from the early fifth century, and is thus a good example of *how* a Christian interpretation of assumed crucifixions might look.<sup>136</sup>

In Genesis 40.19–22 the Masoretic text says that he was suspended on wood (ותלה אותך על־עץ; ותלה) and the Septuagint essentially reproduces the Hebrew text in Greek (καὶ κρεμάσει σε ἐπὶ ξύλου; ἐκρέμασεν). The Vulgate becomes more explicit, however, and specifies the mentioned suspension tool of wood (עץ; ξύλον) as *crux* and *patibulum*.<sup>137</sup> Could this be an evolution in the perception of the punishment form? The answer ought to be positive. When the Vulgate was translated, the translators connected at least *crux* with the death of Jesus. This suggests that translator(s) of the Vulgate understood the suspension in Genesis 40.19–22 as a crucifixion.

In the suspension in Numeri 25.4 the Masoretic text deploys the elusive verb יקע (והקע אותם ליהודה) and the Septuagint follows the imprecise

<sup>134</sup> TZAFERIS, “Evidence,” 100.

<sup>135</sup> TZAFERIS, “Evidence,” 103.

<sup>136</sup> Thus assuming that the Masoretic text reflects a time prior to the translation of the Septuagint, in spite of its medieval origin.

<sup>137</sup> Gen 40.19–22. *post quos auferet Pharao caput tuum ac suspendet te in cruce et lacerabunt volucres carnes tuas ...* <sup>22</sup> *alterum suspendit in patibulo ut coniectoris veritas probaretur*. See also Gen 41.13.

expression quite well (παραδειγμάτισον αὐτοὺς ... ἀπέναντι τοῦ ἡλίου). But as the case was in the previous text, the Vulgate narrows the view concerning the suspension form by adding that the villains were suspended on a *patibulum*.<sup>138</sup>

In the important text in Deuteronomy 21.22–23 the Masoretic text uses לָחַת and גָּזַע and the Septuagint coheres well the Masoretic text with κρεμαννύναι and ξύλον, but adds ἐπὶ ξύλου in verse 23. The Vulgate follows the Septuagint instead of the expected Masoretic text in verse 23, and adds that the cursed must be suspended on wood (*in ligno*) to be cursed by God.<sup>139</sup> The Vulgate specifies the גָּזַע and the ξύλον of verse 22 as a *patibulum*.<sup>140</sup>

In Joshua's description of the fate of the king of Ai, the Masoretic text uses the terminology לָחַת and גָּזַע, common in the present setting, and the translators of the Septuagint use κρεμαννύναι and ξύλον. The Vulgate probably follows the addition of the Septuagint (ξύλου διδύμου) and states that the king was suspended on both *patibulum* and *crux*.<sup>141</sup>

In the related account in Joshua 10.26–27, both the Masoretic text and the Septuagint use the same terminology as in the previous text, while the translators of the Vulgate translate גָּזַע and ξύλον with *stipes*.<sup>142</sup> In this example the Vulgate is not more explicit than the Masoretic text or the Septuagint.

When it comes to the Books of Samuel, the first two texts share the same feature and have a weaker language in the Vulgate. The text in 1 Samuel 31.8–10, which deals with the death of Saul, uses the verb נָקַח which is translated with καταπηγνύναι in the Septuagint and with the semantically wide *suspendere* in the Vulgate. The text that deals with the aftermath of the murder of Saul's son Ish-bosheth in 2 Samuel 4.12 returns to the usual terminology (חָתַת). Neither the Septuagint nor the Vul-

<sup>138</sup> Num 25.4. *ait ad Mosen tolle cunctos principes populi et suspende eos contra solem in patibulis ut avertatur furor meus ab Israhel.*

<sup>139</sup> Cf. PARKER, "Vulgate," ABD 6.860; BROWN, JOHNSON and O'CONNELL, "Texts and Versions," 1100–01 (68.131–140).

<sup>140</sup> Deut 21.22–23. *quando peccaverit homo quod morte plectendum est et adiudicatus morti adpensus fuerit in patibulo* <sup>23</sup> *non permanebit cadaver eius in ligno sed in eadem die sepelietur quia maledictus a Deo est qui pendet in ligno et nequaquam contaminabis terram tuam quam Dominus Deus tuus dederit tibi in possessionem.*

<sup>141</sup> Josh 8.29. *regem quoque eius suspendit in patibulo usque ad vesperum et solis occasum praecepitque et deposuerunt cadaver eius de cruce proieceruntque in ipso introitu civitatis congesto super eum magno acervo lapidum qui permanet usque in praesentem diem.*

<sup>142</sup> Josh 10.26–27. *percussitque Iosue et interfecit eos atque suspendit super quinque stipites fueruntque suspensi usque ad vesperum* <sup>27</sup> *cumque occumberet sol praecepit sociis ut deponerent eos de patibulis qui depositos proiecerunt in speluncam in qua latuerant et posuerunt super os eius saxa ingentia quae permanent usque in praesens.*

gate alters the expressions of the Hebrew text, or sheds any further light on the event. While the Septuagint deploys κρεμαννύναι the Vulgate has *suspendere*.<sup>143</sup>

As for the two texts from 2 Samuel 21.6, 9, which use the elusive verb עָרַף in the Masoretic text and ἐξηλιιάζειν in the Septuagint, the Vulgate describes the event outright as a crucifixion (*crucifigere*).<sup>144</sup>

In Esther the first suspension account, the plot by Bigthan and Teresh to kill the Persian king, deploys the familiar עַל-הַלָּהּ while the translators of the Septuagint simply state that the eunuchs were suspended (ἐκρέμασεν αὐτούς) and leaves out the suspension tool. The translators of the Vulgate mention the suspension tool and go one step further and specify the עַל as a *patibulum*.<sup>145</sup>

In the next text, Haman's erection of a suspension tool for Mordecai, the Masoretic text again uses עַל and הַלָּהּ and the Septuagint simply reproduces the Hebrew עַל with ξύλον and הַלָּהּ with κρεμαννύναι, while the Vulgate specifies the suspension tool as a *crux*.<sup>146</sup>

The text in which the king heard of Mordecai's good deed (Esth 7.9–10) brings a surprising feature. While the translators of the Septuagint translate הַלָּהּ with σταυροῦν, the translators of the Vulgate chose a weaker terminology by using the semantically wide *appendere*, not *crucifigere* as one might expect as a translation of σταυροῦν.

Esther saved the Jews and Haman was subjected to the punishment he had planned for Mordecai (Esth 8.7). While the translation of the Septuagint ends up close to the Masoretic text (αὐτὸν ἐκρέμασα ἐπὶ ξύλου), the translators of the Vulgate tighten up the words and specify the עַל as *crux*. While the Septuagint lacks the references to the suspension tool [עַל-הַלָּהּ] in the last references in the book of Esther, the translators of the Vulgate state that the עַל was a *patibulum* (9.13) or a *crux* (9.25) respectively.

Thus, the terminology of the Vulgate is more specific than the Masoretic text and the Septuagint. This feature strengthens the hypothesis that

<sup>143</sup> 2 Sam 4.12. *praecepit itaque David pueris et interfecerunt eos praecidentesque manus et pedes eorum suspenderunt eos super piscinam in Hebron caput autem Hisboseth tulerunt et sepelierunt in sepulchro Abner in Hebron.*

<sup>144</sup> 2 Sam 21.6 *dentur nobis septem viri de filiis eius et crucifigamus eos Domino in Gabaath Saul quondam electi Domini et ait rex ego dabo; 2 Sam 21.9 et dedit eos in manu Gabaonitarum qui crucifixerunt illos in monte coram Domino et ceciderunt hii septem simul occisi in diebus messis primis incipiente messione hordei.*

<sup>145</sup> Esth 2.23 (Vulgate). *quaesitum est et inventum et adpensus uterque eorum in patibulo mandatumque historiis et annalibus traditum coram rege.*

<sup>146</sup> Esth 5.14 (Vulgate). *responderuntque ei Zares uxor eius et ceteri amici iube parari excelsam trabem habentem altitudinem quinquaginta cubitos et dic mane regi ut adpendatur super eam Mardocheus et sic ibis cum rege laetus ad convivium placuit ei consilium et iussit excelsam parari crucem.*

there was a tendency to apply the known execution form of Jesus to accounts of unspecified suspensions.<sup>147</sup>

As mentioned, Chapman observes a development in the early Jewish texts regarding the descriptions of the suspensions.<sup>148</sup> However, as has been seen, the development only deals with the frequency of ἀνασταυροῦν, not with descriptions of crucifixions.<sup>149</sup> It is still not possible to link ἀνασταυροῦν directly to the punishment of crucifixion. Hence, the development in the tendency to interpret the text of the Old Testament as crucifixion is not to be seen in the early Jewish texts as Chapman suggests, but in texts with Christian influences, such as the Vulgate. It is in the Vulgate that the characteristics Chapman searches for flourish, not in the pre-Talmudic Jewish interpretations and translations.

Thus, the Vulgate lends support to the thesis that the event on Calvary charged parts of the suspension terminology with a new and well-defined meaning.

---

<sup>147</sup> The assumption that there was an evolution from the sparse Hebrew accounts in the Old Testament to a more colorful description in the Vulgate rests on the theory that the medieval Masoretic text preserves the terminology of these accounts from a time that antedates the translation of the Septuagint.

<sup>148</sup> See p. 235.

<sup>149</sup> CHAPMAN, *Perceptions*, 175.



## Chapter Seven

# Conclusion

### 1. Answers to the Basic Questions of the Investigation

*First, what is the ancient – pre-Christian – terminology of crucifixion?* The answer is that there was no such terminology. There was only a terminology of *suspension* – a group of words and idioms that were used more or less interchangeably when referring to various forms of suspension (both human and nonhuman suspensions in several cases). Within this group there is a group of suspension *punishments*, and within the latter is a group of *executionary* (ante-mortem) suspension punishments, and within the last is a group of punishments that were carried out by a *limb suspension*, in which sometimes *nails* were used, and which sometimes resulted in an *outdrawn suffering* on some kind of suspension tool. The problem is that no specific terminology is linked to this particular form of execution – before the execution of Jesus.

When it comes to the individual terms, some conclusions can be drawn. A *σταυρός* is a pole in the broadest sense. It is not the equivalent of a “cross” (†). In some cases, it is a kind of suspension device, used for the suspension of corpses, torture or in a few cases executionary suspensions. Very little or nothing is said about what it was made of or how it looked.

(ἀνα)σταυροῦν and ἀνασκολοπίζειν are used more or less interchangeably. There might have been a distinction between them occasionally – as Herodotus’ usage shows – but that distinction is now in essence lost. The only clear difference is that the verbs are used in a way which contradicts their etymology. (ἀνα)σταυροῦν has a clearer tendency to be connected with pointed poles than ἀνασκολοπίζειν, which is peculiar in the light of the usage of σκόλοψ.

*crux* and *patibulum* are not used in the sense “cross or standing bare pole” and “crossbeam.” A *crux* is some kind of torture or execution device, and so is *patibulum*. The difference is that *crux* to a higher degree than *patibulum* refers to a standing pole. *crux* is more firmly connected with the suspension of humans than *σταυρός*. The ecclesiastically pregnant term *crucifigere* did not evolve until the final years before the Com-

mon Era, and its usage is hard to define beyond denoting “to attach in some way to a *crux*.”

תלה is mainly used in connection with human post-mortem suspensions, especially when combined with עץ. תלה is translated with κρεμαίνονται, which rather surprisingly is used only in that way. The elusive יקע is also used for human suspension; of what kind is, however, unknown. In the clear majority of the texts, the Vulgate applies what, through the execution of Jesus, had become a crucifixion terminology. This is an indication that at least the translator(s) of the Vulgate had a tendency to let the way Jesus died reflect the reading of texts which did not describe that punishment.

It has been noticed that the ancient languages (i.e., Greek, Latin, Hebrew/Aramaic) lacked a special term for “crucifixion.” What has now been added is that the reason for this might lie in the fact that there was no specific punishment of crucifixion. The present author cannot see anything that speaks against the assumption that this absence of specificity is what it is all about: antiquity had no special terminology for crucifixion because there was no particular punishment called “crucifixion.”

*Second, what can be said about the punishment that the terms describe?* The punishment consists in fact of punishments. There is a large group of terms and idioms which refer to various acts of suspension, and this is almost all that can be said about “the punishment” – it comprises various acts of suspension. The disparate verbs refer mainly to acts of suspension upon, or attachment onto, various torture or execution devices, which are referred to with various nouns. The variation is the only firm theme. The message of the texts in which the studied terminology is used appears to be that a punishment could be carried out in a way that was simply fitting for the moment. What is described as happening to Jesus on Calvary might then be only a momentary expression of local caprice. If the previous and subsequent executions had been described in texts, they might have been described quite differently. What has become the solid image in the center of the Christian faith might be just a freak of fate, not an expression of a well-defined and long-used execution form.

*Third, how do the New Testament authors describe the death of Jesus on the philological level?* The New Testament authors are strikingly silent about the punishment Jesus had to suffer on Calvary. The vivid pictures of the death of Jesus in the theology and art of the church – and among scholars – do not have their main source here. Perhaps crucifixion as it is known today did not even come into being on Calvary, but in the Christian *interpretation* of the event. Before the death of Jesus, it appears that



there was no crucifixion proper. There was a whole spectrum of suspension punishments, which all shared terminology. What is described as happening on Calvary was, so to speak, crucifixion in the making, if it is allowed to allude to a famous book suite.

*Fourth, how is the punishment of crucifixion defined by previous scholars?* The theme of definition occurs sparsely among the studied scholars. With one major exception (Kuhn), the opinion of what a crucifixion is has to be read more or less between the lines. The scholars may offer some words in the ongoing discussion that indicate what is on their minds. When nothing else is said, the conclusion that they use the designation “crucifixion” in the normal English sense must be drawn. Taken together, in view of the absent definition and the normal usage of the term, the absolute majority of scholars have held the opinion that the designation “crucifixion” is coherent with the punishment that struck Jesus according to the main Christian traditions. But it would be of great benefit for this often implied definition to be spelled out. The label “crucifixion” as it is commonly understood comes from the description of the groundbreaking event on Calvary. Thus, Calvary should be the beacon for which features the label “crucifixion” shall contain. This is level one of the definition. Level two is to label all other human suspensions as – “suspensions.” Human suspensions that lack one or more features (i.e., post-mortem suspension or impaling) must not be labeled “crucifixions.”

*Fifth, how do the insights from the present study of the ancient texts cohere with the contributions of the major lexica and dictionaries?* The outcome of the comparative study is that they are incoherent. At the heart of the discrepancy is the usage of the labels “cross” and “crucifixion” in the lexica and dictionaries. The label “cross” is commonly applied to many more texts which contain σταυρός than those which – with at least a decent amount of certainty – can be determined to contain a reference to the punishment tool used in a crucifixion in a traditional sense. In the same way, the label “crucifixion” is applied to a large number of texts where the only qualifier is the occurrence of, e.g., (ἀνα)σταυροῦν or ἀνασκοιοῦν. In short, a lot of texts are identified as references to “crucifixion” on the basis of a simple conjecture.

*Sixth, how has the punishment of crucifixion been described, and how should it be described in the light of the present investigation?* It could without exaggeration be said that the punishment of crucifixion has been vividly depicted. It does not require a lengthy search to find a full-blown description of how a crucifixion was carried out in antiquity. It seems on

the basis of these depictions that the ancient accounts of crucifixion are both frequent and clear-cut, *but they are not*. The ancient texts that with any likelihood describe crucifixions are both rare and vague. This observation includes the texts of the New Testament.

The vague and diverse suspension accounts ought to affect the effort to describe a crucifixion, or rather *the* crucifixion. An illustration of crucifixion cannot be anything else than a retelling of what can be gleaned from the New Testament texts concerning the execution of Jesus. First, that it was an executionary suspension. Second, that after being scourged Jesus (and/or Simon) carried a  $\sigma\tau\alpha\upsilon\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ , whatever that might be, to the execution place. Third, that Jesus was undressed and attached to a  $\sigma\tau\alpha\upsilon\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ , perhaps by being nailed. Fourth, that a sign probably indicated the nature of the crime. Features beyond these are not to be found in the New Testament or the older literature of the Greco-Roman world.

Other punishments should not be characterized further than that they were some kind of suspension on some kind of suspension device of a whole human in some condition or a part of a human. A more detailed account cannot be given on a general level, but must be confined to a specific text. Such an account is, however, only a description of a single text, not a presentation of a customary form of punishment.

## 2. Conclusion

The frequent and colorful depictions of crucifixions and the death of Jesus mentioned in the previous chapter are essentially without support in the studied text material. Neither biblical nor extra-biblical texts up to the turn of the first century offer such detailed descriptions as the mentioned scholars do. These scholars seem to imply that all texts in which the terms occur are crucifixion accounts from which they can extract information and, despite the texts' diversity, add it together. The problems connected with this scholarly procedure have been the topic of the present investigation.

It is not impossible to find references to crucifixion in the ancient text material, but it takes more than the occurrence of a single term. It is not, of course, possible to draw the conclusion that crucifixions did not occur. There were probably suspensions in ancient times that cohered well with the suspension of Jesus. Yet that is not the problem. The problem is to determine with a decent level of probability that a text describes such a punishment. The overwhelming majority of texts are simply not comprehensible enough for that.

The support for colorful depiction of the death of Jesus must thus be found somewhere else. This “else” will be the topic in a forthcoming investigation by the present author.



## Epilogue

The outcome of this study was not what I anticipated. Having embarked on a quest to find all references to crucifixion in the ancient literature that I could read, it was not in my wildest fantasy during my years as parish minister that one day I would put a question mark in the margin of the sole texts that constitute the basis of the Christian faith.

But what is the significance of this question mark? It did catch world-wide attention. There was, however, a major misunderstanding that frequented media mainly in the beginning. Their message tended to be that I questioned whether Jesus actually died or not.<sup>1</sup> That, at least, was the impression of many readers (and was expressed in an abundance of e-mails). Even a modest headline such as the one in the Daily Mail was too often read as “Jesus may not have *died* on the cross (my emphasis),” instead of “Jesus may not have died on the *cross* (my emphasis)” which is coherent with what I have proposed. The question whether Jesus died or not is a question concerning the historicity of textual accounts – and that is beyond the scope of my present study.<sup>2</sup> Such a question should enter once the texts have been studied and evaluated. Only when the question *wie es eigentlich geschrieben* has been answered is it time to ask the question *wie es eigentlich gewesen*, and the latter question has not been central in the present investigation. I have, as mentioned, proposed a question mark,

---

<sup>1</sup> I.e., The Daily Telegraph: “Jesus did not die on cross, says scholar”; CNN: “Gospels don’t say Jesus was crucified, scholar claims”; Dnews: “Jesus wurde nicht gekreuzigt”; In dies: “Gesù non è morto in croce”; Futur Quantique: “Jésus n’est pas mort crucifié”; France Soir: “Jésus ne serait pas mort sur la croix”; El Economista: “Jesús no murió en la cruz, según un teólogo europeo”; HLN: “Jesus werd nooit gekruisigd”, zegt theoloog”; Loewak: “Evidence shows: Jesus never crucified”; NU Wetenschap: “Jezus werd niet gekruisigd”; Express: “Jezus Christus stierf niet aan het kruis”; Dnevik: “Isus nije umro na križu”; 24 Sata: “Švedski teolog: Isus Krist nije umro razapet na krstu”; Cosmo: “Ο Χρισός μπορεί να μην σταυρώθηκε τελικά”; One India News: “No proof of Jesus’ crucifixion, claims scholar”; Vårt land: “Jesus ble ikke korsfestet”; Eyan: “Sænskur guðfræðingur veldur fjaðrafoki. Jesú aldrei krossfestu”; правда: “Ісус помер не на хресті: шведський теолог”; СВІЖЕ: “Вчені заявляють, що Ісус помер не на хресті”; Jyllands-posten: “Påstand: Jesus blev ikke korsfæstet”; Sveriges radio: “Ny forskning visar: Jesus dog inte på korset”.

<sup>2</sup> For further information about the reception of my doctoral thesis, log onto the website <http://www.exegetics.org>.

but that does not deal with whether Jesus died or not. My concerns deal with what level of information could be derived from texts that describe the punishment of crucifixion and the death of Jesus. The question is not *if* Jesus died, *why* he died, or in *what sense*. It is a matter of *how* the texts up to the time when the New Testament was completed describe the event.

The belief that Jesus is the one who died for all sins, that he is the Son of God who sits on His right side and will return in glory to judge the living and the dead, has not been challenged by the present investigation. What may have been challenged is the textual basis for a traditional understanding of crucifixion.

# Bibliography

## 1 Primary Sources (Texts and Translations)

### *The Acts of John*

Bonnet, M. (ed.). *Acta Joannis*, "Acta apostolorum apocrypha," vol. 2.1. Leipzig: Mendelssohn, 1898 (repr. 1972).

### *Aeschylus*

*Aeschylus*. With an English Transl. by Herbert Weir Smyth. 2 vols. *LCL*. London: William Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1922.

### *Aesop*

*Aesopica*. Vol. 1, Greek and Latin Texts. B. E. Perry (ed.). Urbana: The University of Illinois Press, 1952.

*Corpus fabularum Aesopicarum*. Vol. 1, Fasc. 1. A. Hausrath (ed.). Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Lipsiae: in aedibus B. G. Teubneri, 1957.

*Corpus fabularum Aesopicarum*. Vol. 1, Fasc. 2. A. Hausrath (ed.). Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Lipsiae: in aedibus B. G. Teubneri, 1956.

### *Alexis*

Arnott, W. Geoffrey. *Alexis: The Fragments: A Commentary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

*Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta*. Theodor Kock (ed.). 3 vols. Lipsiae: B.G. Teubneri, 1880.

Kassel, Rudolf, and Colin Austin (eds.). *Poetae Comici Graeci*. Berolini: de Gruyter, 1983-.

### *The Amada Stele*

Cumming, Barbara and Wolfgang Helck. *Egyptian Historical Records of the Later Eighteenth Dynasty*. Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1982.

### *Ancient Lexicons*

Gaisford, T. (ed.). *Etymologicum magnum*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1848 (reprinted Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1967).

Hesychius of Alexandria. *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*. Kurt Latte and Peter Allan Hansen (eds.). Hauniae: Ejnar Munksgaard editore, 1953.

Photius, Saint. *Photii Patriarchae Lexicon*. Christos Theodoridis (ed.). Berlin: de Gruyter, 1982-.

Timaeus, the Sophist. *Lexique Platonicien*. Maddalena Bonelli (ed.). Leiden: Brill, 2007.

*Apocrypha and Pseudo-Epigrapha*

Sparks, H. F. D. *The Apocryphal Old Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.

*Apollonius Rhodius*

Mooney, George W. *The Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius*. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1964.

*Appian*

Appian. *Roman History*. With an English translation by Horace White. *LCL*. London and Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 2002.

*Aristotle*

Aristotle. *The Politics*. With an English Transl. by H. Rackham. *LCL*. London: William Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1932.

*Bible*

*Biblia Sacra Iuxta Vulgatam*, 4th revised edition. Edited by Robert Weber. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1969, 1983, 1994.

*New Revised Standard Version of the Bible*. The Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1989.

*Bibel 2000* (Swedish Bible). Uppsala: *Svenska Bibelsällskapet* (Swedish Bible Society), 2000.

*The Behistun Inscription*

Darius, L. W. King and R. Campbell Thompson. *The Sculptures and Inscription of Darius the Great on the Rock of Behistûn in Persia: A New Collation of the Persian, Sussian, and Babylonian Texts, with English Translations, etc.* London: British Museum (distributor), 1907.

Tolman, Herbert Cushing. *The Behistan Inscription of King Darius*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University, 1908.

*Caesar*

Caesar. *Alexandrian, African and Spanish Wars*. With an English Transl. by A. G. Way. *LCL*. London: William Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955.

—. *C. Iulii Caesaris Commentarii Rerum Gestarum*. Wolfgang Hering (ed.). *Bibliotheca scriptorum graecorum et romanorum Teubneriana*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1987–.

*Catullus*

*Catullus*. With an English Transl. by Tibullus, G. P. Goold, J. W. Mackail, J. P. Postgate and Francis Warre Cornish. Revised by G. P. Goold. 2nd ed. *LCL*. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1995.

Merrill, Elmer Truesdell. *Catullus*. College Series of Latin Authors. Boston and London: Ginn & Company, Publishers, 1893.

*Cassius Dio*

Cassius Dio. *Dio's Roman History*. With an English Translation by Ernest Cary on the Basis of the Version of Herbert Baldwin Foster. *LCL*. London: W. Heinemann; New York: The Macmillan Co., 1914.



*Chariton*

Chariton. *Callirhoe*. With an English Transl. by G. P. Goold. *LCL*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995.

*Cicero*

*M. Tullii Ciceronis Scripta Quae Manserunt Omnia*. C. F. W. Müller, W. Friedrich, Hermann Knoellinger, and Antoine de La Sale (eds.). 10 vols. Bibliotheca Teubneriana. Lipsiae: In aedibus B.G. Teubneri, 1878.

Cicero. *Pro Lege Manilia; Pro Caecina; Pro Cluentio; Pro Rabirio Perduellionis*. With an English Translation by H. Grose Hodge. Cicero in Twenty-Eight Volumes. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: W. Heinemann, 1979.

— . *The Verrine Orations*. With an English Translation by L. H. G. Greenwood. *LCL*. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. press; London: W. Heinemann, ltd., 1960.

*Clodius Licinius*

Clodius Licinius. *Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae*. Peter, Hermannus (ed.). Vol. 2. Lipsiae: B. G. Teubneri, 1906.

*Curtius Rufus*

Curtius Rufus. *Historiae*. Carlo M. Lucarini (ed.). Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Berolini: De Gruyter, 2009.

— . *History of Alexander*. With an English Translation by John Carew Rolfe. 2 vols. *LCL*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: Heinemann, 1946.

*The Code of Hammurabi*

Meek, T. J. "The Code Of Hammurabi." In J. B. Pritchard (Ed.), *The Ancient Near East: An Anthology of Texts and Pictures*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1958.

Richardson, M.E.J. *Hammurabi's Laws: Text, Translation, and Glossary*. London; New York: T & T Clark, 2004.

*Clodius Licinius*

Peter, Hermann. *Historicum Romanorum reliquiae*. Stuttgart: Teubner, 1967.

*Ctesias (Fragments of Greek Historians)*

Jacoby, Felix. *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker*. Zweiter Teil. Zeitgeschichte. A. Universalgeschichte und Hellenika. Nr. 64–105. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1926.

— . *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker*. Dritter Teil. Geschichte von Staeden und Voelkern (Horographie und Ethnographie). C. Autoren ueber Einzelne Laender. Nr. 608a–856 (Ersten Band: Aegypten-Geten Nr. 608a–708). Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1958.

*The Dead Sea Scrolls*

García Martínez, Florentino and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

Yadin, Yigael. *The Temple Scroll*. 3 vols. + suppl. English ed. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, Institute of Archaeology of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Shrine of the Book, 1977–83.

*Demosthenes*

Demosthenes. *Against Meidias, Androtion, Aristocrates, Timocrates, Aristogeiton*. With an English Translation by J. H. Vince. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, 1930.

*Diodorus Siculus*

Diodorus Siculus. *Diodorus of Sicily*. With an English Transl. by C. H. Oldfather. Repr. ed. *LCL*. London: William Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1946.

*Dionysius of Halicarnassus*

*The Roman Antiquities of Dionysius of Halicarnassus*. With an English Transl. by Earnest Cary, on the Basis of the Version by Edward Spelman: 7 vols. *LCL*. London: William Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1939 (1953).

*Euripides*

*Euripides*. With an English Transl. by David Kovacs. *LCL*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994.

*Florus*

Florus. *Epitome of Roman History*. With an English Transl. by Cornelius Nepos, E. S. Forster, and John Carew Rolfe. Repr. ed., *LCL*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: W. Heinemann, 1984.

*Greek Comics and Poets*

Kassel, Rudolf and Colin Austin. *Poetae Comici Graeci*. Vol 2, Agathenor-Aristonymus. Berolini et Novi Eboraci: de Gruyter, 1991.  
Kock, Theodor. *Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta*. Lipsae: B. G. Teubner, 1880-88.

*Herodotus*

*Herodotus, the seventh, eighth, & ninth books*. With introduction, text, apparatus, commentary, appendices, indices, maps, by Reginald Walter Macan. London: Macmillan and CO., Limited, 1908.

*Herodotus*. With an English Transl. by A. D. Godley. Repr. ed., 4 vols. *LCL*. London: W. Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1981.

Rosén, Haiim B. (ed.). *Herodoti Historiae*. 2 vols. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Leipzig: Teubner, 1987-97.

*Hesiod*

Hesiod. *The Homeric Hymns, and Homerica*. With an English Transl. and an Introduction by Hugh G. Evelyn-White. London: Heinemann, 1914.

*Hesychius of Alexandria*

Latte, Kurt. *Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon*. (A-O) Vols. 1-2. Copenhagen: E. Munksgaard, 1:1953; 2:1966.

Hesychius, Alexandrinus and Maoriz Schmidt. *Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon*. (Π-Ω) Vols. 3-4. Halle: n.p, 3:1861; 4:1862 (repr. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1965).

*Homer*

Homer. *Iliad*. With an English Translation by A. T. Murray and William F. Wyatt. 2nd ed. 2 vols. *LCL*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1999.

- . *The Odyssey*. With an English Translation by A. T. Murray and George Dimock. 2 vols. *LCL*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995.

### Horace

Horace. *Satires, Epistles and Ars Poetica*. With an English Translation by H. Rushton Fairclough. *LCL*. London: Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970.

### Josephus

*Josephus*. With an English Transl. by H. St J. Thackeray et al. 13 vols. Repr. ed. *LCL*. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1997–8.

- . *Judean Antiquities 1–4*. Translation and Commentary by Louis H. Feldman. Vol. 3. Leiden, Boston and Köln: Brill, 1999.
- . *Life of Josephus*. Translation and Commentary by Steve Mason. Vol. 9. Leiden, Boston and Köln: Brill, 2000.

### Julius Caesar

(Julius Caesar.) *Alexandrian, African and Spanish Wars*. With an English Translation by A. G. Way. *LCL*. London: W. Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1960.

*C. Iulii Caesaris Commentarii Rerum Gestarum*. Wolfgang Hering (ed.). Leipzig: Teubner, 1987–.

### Juvenal

*Juvenal and Persius*. With an English Translation by Persius and Susanna Morton Braund. *LCL*. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 2004.

### Lex Puteoli

Bove, Lucio. “Due iscrizioni da Pozzuoli e Cuma.” *Labeo* 13 (1967), 22–48.

— . “Due nuove iscrizioni di Pozzuoli e Cuma.” *RAAN* 41 (1966), 207–39.

Girard, P. F. and F. Senn. *Les lois des Romains*. Naples: 1977.

Hinard, François and Jean Christian Dumont. *Libitina. Pompes funèbres et supplices en Campanie à l'époque d'Auguste. Édition, traduction et commentaire de la Lex Libitinae Puteolana*. Paris: De Boccard, 2003.

### Livy

*Livy V*. With an English Transl. by B. O. Foster. *LCL*. London: W. Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976.

*Livy VIII*. With an English Transl. by Frank Gardner Moore. *LCL*. London: W. Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949.

*Livy XI*. With an English Transl. by Evan T. Sage. *LCL*. London: W. Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949.

*Titi Livi Ab Urbe Condita Libri*. Ed. altera / quam curavit Mauritius Müller. ed: Lipsiae: in aedibus B. G. Teubneri, 1902.

### Martial

Coleman, Kathleen M. *M. Valerii Martialis Liber Spectaculorum*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

### Mishnah

Blackman, Philip. *Mishnayoth*. London: The Judaica Press, 1954.

Danby, Herbert. *The Mishnah*. London: Oxford University Press, 1992.

*The New Testament*

- Aenoth, Frid and Constantine Tischendorf (eds.). *Novum Testamentum Vaticanum*. Lipsiae: Giesecke et Devrient, 1857.
- Aland, Kurt. *Synopsis of the Four Gospels: Greek-English Edition of the Synopsis Quatuor Evangeliorum*. On the Basis of the Greek Text of Nestle-Alan 27th Edition and Greek New Testament 4rd Edition: The English Text is the Second Edition of the Revised Standard Version. 11th ed. Stuttgart: German Bible Society, 2000.
- Nestle, Eberhard; Erwin Nestle; Kurt Aland, Barbara Aland and Universität Münster. Institut für Neutestamentliche Textforschung. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 27. Aufl., rev. ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993.
- Tischendorf, Constantine (ed.). *Bibliorum Codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus*. St. Petersburg: 1862.

*The Old Testament*

- Kittel, Rudolf; Karl Elliger; Wilhelm Rudolph and Hans Peter Rieger. נביאים וכתובים תורה = *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Ed. 4. emendata / ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1990.
- Rahlfs, Alfred. *Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes = Η ΠΑΛΑΙΑ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ ΚΑΤΑ ΤΟΥΣ Ο΄*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979.
- Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum* (first volumes: Societatis Literarum) Göttingensis editum. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931-.

*Ovid*

- Ovid. *The Art of Love, and Other Poems*. With an English Transl. by J. H. Mozley and G. P. Goold. 2nd ed. 6 Vols. *LCL*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: Heinemann, 1985.

*Papyrus and Non-literary Sources*

- Aegyptische Urkunden aus den koeniglichen Museen zu Berlin Herausgegeben von der Generalverwaltung*. Griechische Urkunden: zweiter Band. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1898.
- Bartoletti, Vittorio. *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia: Fragmenta Londinensia* (P. Oxy. 5.842). Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Leipzig: Teubner, 1959.
- Helk, Wolfgang. *Urkunden der 18. Dynastie: Text der Hefte 17-19*. Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums. IV. Abt. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag Berlin, 1984.
- . *Urkunden der 18. Dynastie: Übersetzung zu den Heften 17-22*. Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums. IV. Abt. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag Berlin, 1984.
- Steindorff, Georg and Wolfgang Helck. *Urkunden des Ägyptischen Altertums. IV Abt. Urkunden der 18. Dynastie: Übersetzung zu den Heften 17-22*. Berlin: Akad.-Vlg, 1984 (Neudruck der Ausgabe von 1961).
- von Gaertringen, Friedrich Hiller (ed.). *Inscriptiones Graecae: Voluminis IV*. Editio minor. Fasc. 1. *Inscriptiones Epidauri*. Berolini: de Gruyter, 1929.

*Pausanias*

- Pausanias' Description of Greece*. With an English Transl. by William Henry Samuel Jones, Henry Arderne Ormerod and Richard Ernest Wycherley. *LCL*. London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1918.

*Philo*

*Philo*. With an English Transl. by F. H. Colson, G. H. Whitaker and R. Marcus. 10 vols. and 2 supplementary vols. *LCL*. Cambridge, Mass. London: Harvard University Press, 1929–62.

Yonge, Charles Duke. *The Works of Philo Judaeus, the Contemporary of Josephus, Bohn's Ecclesiastical Library*. London: H.G. Bohn, 1854–90.

*Plato*

Plato. *The Republic*. With an English Transl. by Paul Shorey. 2 vols. *LCL*. London: William Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1930.

*Plautus*

Plautus. With an English Transl. by Paul Nixon. 5 vols. *LCL*. London: William Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950–51.

*T. Macci Plauti Comoediae*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1890.

*Pliny the Elder*

C. *Plini Secundi Naturalis Historiae*. Ludwig von Jan (ed.). 6 vols. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum Et Romanorum Teubneriana. Lipsiae: Teubner, 1854.

Pliny the Elder. *Natural History*. With an English Transl. by H. Rackham, W. H. S. Jones, and D. E. Eichholz. Revised. ed. 10 vols., *LCL*. London: Heinemann, 1947.

*Plutarch*

Plutarch. *Lives*. With an English Trans. by B. Perrin. 11 vols. *LCL*. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1998–2002.

— *Moralia*. With an English Trans. by F. C. Babbitt et al. 15 vols. *LCL*. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1968–71.

*Polybius*

Polybius. *The Histories*. With an English Transl. by W. R. Paton. Repr. ed., *LCL*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: W. Heinemann, 1960.

*Quintilian*

Håkanson, Lennart (ed.). *Declamationes Maiores Quintiliano Falso Ascriptae*. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Stuttgartiae: In aedibus B.G. Teubneri, 1982.

Quintilian. *The Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian*. With an English Transl. by Harold Edgeworth Butler. 4 vols., *LCL*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: W. Heinemann, 1969.

— *The Lesser Declamations*. With an English Transl. by D. R. Shackleton Bailey. 2 vols. *LCL*. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 2006.

*Sallustius*

*Sallust*. With an English Transl. by J. C. Rolfe. Repr. & rev. ed. *LCL*. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press; London: W. Heinemann, 1947.

C. *Sallusti Crispi Catilina. Iugurtha: Fragmenta Ampliora*. Alfons b Kurfess, and Axel W. Ahlberg (eds.). Bibliotheca scriptorum graecorum et romanorum Teubneriana. Lipsiae: in aedibus B. G. Teubneri, 1968.

*Seneca the Elder*

Seneca the Elder. *Declamations*. With an English Transl. by M. Winterbottom. 2 vols. *LCL*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974.

L. *Annaei Senecae. Oratorum et rhetorum*. H. J. Müller (ed.). *Bibliotheca scriptorum graecorum et romanorum*. Pragae and Lipsiae: F. Tempsky, 1887.

L. *Annaeus Seneca maior. Oratorum et rhetorum sententiae, divisiones, colores*. Lennart Håkanson (ed.). *Bibliotheca scriptorum graecorum et romanorum Teubneriana*. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1989.

*Seneca the Younger*

L. *Annaei Senecae. De Beneficiis; De Clementia*. Carl Hosius (ed.). *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana*. Lipsiae: in aedibus B.G. Teubneri, 1914.

— *Dialogorum*. Emil Hermes (ed.). *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum Et Romanorum Teubneriana*. Lipsiae: in aedibus B.G. Teubneri, 1905.

Seneca the Younger. *Epistles*. With an English transl. by Richard M. Gummere. 3 vols. *LCL*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1917–1925.

— *Moral Essays*. With an English Translation by John W. Basore. London: William Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1928.

*Sophocles*

Sophocles. *The Plays and Fragments*. With Critical Notes, Commentary, and Transl. in English Prose by Richard C. Jebb. Cambridge, University Press, 1906.

— With an English Transl. by Hugh Lloyd-Jones. *Sophocles*. 3 vols. *LCL*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994.

*Strabo*

Strabo. With an English Transl. by H. L. Jones. 8 Vols. *LCL*. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press; London: W. Heinemann, 1960–67.

*Suetonius*

Suetonius. With an English Transl. by J. C. Rolfe. *LCL*. London: Heinemann, 1959.

— *Praeter Caesarum Libros Reliquiae*. G. Brugnoli (ed.). *Bibliotheca Teubneriana*. Leipzig: Collegit G. Brugnoli, 1972.

*Suidas*

Adler, Ada (ed.). *Suidae Lexicon*. 4 vols. *Lexicographi graeci*. 1.1–1.4. Lipsiae: B.G. Teubner, 1.1:1928; 1.2:1931; 1.3:1933; 1.4:1935 (repr. Stuttgart: 1.1:1971; 1.2:1967; 1.3:1967; 1.4:1971).

*Tacitus*

*Cornelii Taciti Libri Qui Supersunt*. Interum Edidit Erich Koestermann. Vol 2. Facs. 2. *Germania, Agricola, Dialogus De Oratoribus*. *Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana*. Lipsiae: Teubneri, 1964.

Tacitus. *The Histories*. With an English Transl. by Clifford H. Moore. Repr. ed. *LCL*. London: W. Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1956.

— *The Annals*. With an English Transl. by John Jackson. Repr. ed. *LCL*. London: W. Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1956.

— *Agricola*. Translated by M. Hutton. Revised by R. M. Ogilvie. *Germania*. Translated by M. Hutton. Revised by E. H. Warmington. *Dialogus*. Translated by Sir W. Peter-

son. Revised by M. Winterbottom (Reprinted.). *LCL*. London: William Heinemann. Cambridge, 1946.

### Terence

*Publii Terentii Comoediae Sex* With a commentary by the Rev. E. St. John Parry, M.A. Bibliotheca Classica. London: Whitaker and Co., 1857.

### Thucydides

*Thucydides*. With an English Transl. by Charles Forster Smith. *LCL*. London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's sons, 1919.

### Targums

Chilton, Bruce D. *The Aramaic Bible. Vol. 11, the Isaiah Targum*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1987.

Clarke, Ernest G. *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan of the Pentateuch: Text and Concordance*. Hoboken, N.J.: Ktav Pub. House, 1984.

Clarke, Ernest G., and Sue Magder. *The Aramaic Bible. Vol. 5 B, Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Deuteronomy*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998.

DeMoss, Matthew S. *Pocket Dictionary for the Study of New Testament Greek*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2001.

Grossfeld, Bernard. *The Aramaic Bible. Vol. 6, the Targum Onqelos to Genesis*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988.

—. *The Aramaic Bible. Vol. 7, the Targum Onqelos to Exodus*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988.

—. *Aramaic Bible. Vol. 8, the Targum Onqelos to Leviticus and the Targum Onqelos to Numbers*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988.

—. *The Aramaic Bible. Vol. 9, the Targum Onqelos to Deuteronomy*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988.

Heide, Albert van der. *The Yemenite Tradition of the Targum of Lamentations: Critical Text and Analysis of the Variant Readings*. *Studia post-Biblica* 32. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1981.

Klein, Michael L. *Genizah Manuscripts of Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch*. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1986.

Levine, Étan. *The Aramaic Version of Lamentations*. New York: Hermon Press, 1976.

Maher, Michael. *The Aramaic Bible. Vol. 1 B, Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1992.

McNamara, Martin. *The Aramaic Bible. Vol. 1a, Targum Neofiti 1: Genesis*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1991.

McNamara, Martin; Michael Maher, and Robert Hayward. *The Aramaic Bible. Vol. 2, Targum Neofiti 1: Exodus*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994.

—. *The Aramaic Bible. Vol. 3, Targum Neofiti 1: Leviticus*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994.

McNamara, Martin; Ernest G. Clarke, and Shirley Magder. *The Aramaic Bible. Vol. 4, Targum Neofiti 1: Numbers*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1995.

McNamara, Martin. *The Aramaic Bible. Vol. 5 a, Targum Neofiti 1: Deuteronomy*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1997.

Díez Macho, Alejandro. *Neophyti 1: Targum Palestinense Ms. De La Biblioteca Vaticana*. Seminario Filológico Cardenal Cisneros Del Instituto Arias Montano. Textos Y Estudios. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1968.

- Grossfeld, Bernard. *The Aramaic Bible. Vol. 18, the Two Targums of Esther*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1991.
- Sperber, Alexander. *The Bible in Aramaic: Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts*. 3rd ed. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2004.
- Tal, Abraham. *The Samaritan Targum of the Pentateuch: A Critical Edition*. 3 vols. Texts and Studies in the Hebrew Language and Related Subjects 4–6. Tel-Aviv: Tel-Aviv University, 1980–1983.

### *Thucydides*

- Thucydides*. With an English Transl. by Charles Forster Smith. Repr. ed. *LCL*. London: W. Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1931.

### *Valerius Maximus*

- Valerius Maximus. *Facta Et Dicta Memorabilia*. John Briscoe, Julius Epitoma Paris, and Januarius Epitoma Nepotianus (eds.). Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Stutgardiae: Teubner, 1998–.
- . *Memorable Doings and Sayings*. With an English Transl. by D. R. Shackleton Bailey. *LCL*. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 2000.

### *Xenophon*

- Xenophon. *Anabasis*. With an English Transl. by Carleton L. Brownson and John Dillery. Rev. ed. *LCL*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998.

## 2. Reference Works

- Αναγνωστόπουλος, Βασίλης Δ. *Λεξικό Ρημάτων της Αρχαίας Ελληνικής*. Αθήνα: Εκδόσεις Πατάκη, 1999.
- Åström, Kenneth; Christer Engström; Kari Marklund and Statens kulturråd. *Nationalencyklopedin*. Ett uppslagsverk på vetenskaplig grund utarbetat på initiativ av Statens Kulturråd. Höganäs: Bra böcker, 2000.
- Balz, Horst Robert and Gerhard Schneider. *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990–93.
- Bauer, Walter and Frederick W. Danker. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3. ed. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Black, David Alan and David S. Dockery. *Interpreting the New Testament: Essays on Methods and Issues*. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 2001.
- Blass, Friedrich; Albert Debrunner and Friedrich Rehkopf. *Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Griechisch*. 18., durchges. Aufl. ed., Göttinger Theologische Lehrbücher. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001.
- Blomqvist, Jerker and Poul Ole Jastrup. *Greisk Grammatik: Graesk Grammatik*. København: Akademisk Forl., 1991.
- Botterweck, G. Johannes and Helmer Ringgren. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. 16 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974–.
- Brown, Francis; S. R. Driver; Charles A. Briggs; Edward Robinson and Wilhelm Gesenius. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament: With an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951.



- Brown, Raymond Edward; Joseph A. Fitzmyer and Roland Edmund Murphy. *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1996.
- Catholic University of America. *New Catholic Encyclopedia*. 2nd ed. 15 vols. Washington: Catholic University of America; Detroit: Thomson/Gale, 2003.
- Cancik, Hubert and Helmuth Schneider. *Der Neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike*. Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, 1996–2003.
- Clark, M. and O. Thyen (eds.). *The Oxford-Duden Concise German Dictionary: German-English/English-German*. Edited by the Dudenredaktion and the German Section of the Oxford University Press Dictionary Department. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Elwell, Walter A. and Philip Wesley Comfort. *Tyndale Bible Dictionary*. Tyndale reference library. Wheaton: Tyndale House Publishers, 2001.
- Ernout, A., A. Meillet and Jacques Andre. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine: Histoire des mots*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Paris: Klincksieck, 1985.
- Fahlbusch, Erwin and Geoffrey William Bromiley. *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*. 5 vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans; Leiden: Brill, 1999–2003.
- Freedman, David Noel (ed.). *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. 1st ed. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Freedman, David Noel; Allen C. Myers and Astrid B. Beck. *Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2000.
- Garvin, James Louis (ed.). *The Encyclopedia Britannica: Thirteenth Edition: Being Volumes One to Twenty-Eight of the Latest Standard Edition with the Three New Volumes Covering Recent Years and the Index Volume*: 32 vol. London and New York: Encyclopædia Britannica Co., 1926.
- Gesenius, Friedrich Wilhelm; E. Kautzsch and Sir Arthur Ernest Cowley. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. 2d English ed. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1910.
- Glare, P. G. W. *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. New York: Clarendon Press; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- Gove, Philip Babcock and Merriam-Webster Inc. *Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language, Unabridged*. Cologne: Könenmann, 1993.
- Görg, Manfred and Bernhard Lang. *Neues Bibel-Lexikon*. Zürich: Benziger, 1988 / 1991–2000.
- Harris, R. Laird; Gleason Leonard Archer and Bruce K. Waltke. *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*. 2 vols. Chicago: Moody Press, 1980.
- Hornblower, Simon and Antony Spawforth. *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. 3rd ed. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Jenni, Ernst and Claus Westermann. *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1997.
- Kittel, Gerhard; Gerhard Friedrich; Geoffrey William Bromiley and Ronald E. Pitkin. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Translator and Editor: Geoffrey W. Bromiley*. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76.
- Koehler, Ludwig; Walter Baumgartner; M. E. J. Richardson and Johann Jakob Stamm. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Study Edition 2 vols. Leiden, Boston and Köln: E.J. Brill, 2001.
- Krause, Gerhard; Gerhard Müller; Sven S. Hartman; Gustaf Wingren; Frank Schumann and Michael Wolter. *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1976–2004.
- Lewis, Charlton T. and Charles Short. *A Latin Dictionary: Founded on Andrews' Edition of Freund's Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1879.

- Lockyer, Herbert, and Thomas Nelson Publishers. *Nelson's Illustrated Bible Dictionary: An Authoritative One-Volume Reference Work on the Bible, with Full-Color Illustrations*. Nashville: T. Nelson, 1986.
- Louw, J. P. and Eugene Albert Nida. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains* (Rondal B. Smith, part-time editor; Karen A. Munson, associate editor). 2nd ed. New York: United Bible Societies, 1989.
- Liddell, Henry George and Robert Scott. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed. Rev. and augm. throughout by Henry Stuart Jones and Roderick McKenzie. With a Revised Supplement. Oxford: Oxford University Press; New York: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners of American English*. Oxford: Macmillan Education, 2002.
- Metzger, B. M. and M. D. Coogan (eds.), *Oxford Companion to the Bible*, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Metzger, Bruce Manning and United Bible Societies. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, Second Edition. A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament (4th Rev. Ed.). London and New York: United Bible Societies, 1994.
- Meyers, Eric M. and American Schools of Oriental Research. *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Archaeology in the Near East*. 5 vols. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Moulton, James Hope and George Milligan. *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament: Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Nonliterary Sources*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1944.
- Moulton, J. H., F. W. Howard and N. Turner. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* (4 vols.). Edinburgh: Clark, 1929-76.
- Oxford English Dictionary* (Electronic Resource). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Pauly, August Friedrich; Wissowa, Georg; Wilhelm Kroll and Kurt Witte. *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft: Neue Bearbeitung*. 83 vols. Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, 1893-1980.
- Porter, Stanley E. *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament*. New Testament tools and studies. Vol. 25. Leiden and New York: Brill, 1997.
- Porter, Stanley E. and David Tombs. *Approaches to New Testament Study*. Journal for the study of the New Testament, vol. 120. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Powell, J. Enoch. *A Lexicon to Herodotus*. Cambridge: The University Press, 1938.
- Robertson, Archibald Thomas the Elder. *A Grammar of the Greek Testament in the Light of Historical Research*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1914.
- Schwenck, Konrad. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der lateinischen Sprache: Mit Vergleichung der Griechischen und Deutschen*. Frankfurt am Main: Verlag von Heinrich Ludwig Brönnner, 1827.
- Smyth, Herbert Weir and Gordon M. Messing. *Greek Grammar*. Rev. ed. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956.
- The American People's Encyclopedia: A Modern Reference Work*. Bicentennial ed. 20 vols. New York: Excelsior Trading Corp., 1976.
- Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*. Editus Auctoritate et Consilio Academicorum Quinque Germanicarum Berolinensis Goettingensis Lipsiensis Monacensis Vidobonensis. Lipsiae: in Aedibus B. G. Teuberni, 1894-.
- VanGemeren, Willem. *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology & Exegesis*. 5 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Pub. House, 1997.

- Vogt, Joseph; Hildegard Temporini and Wolfgang Haase (eds.). *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der Neueren Forschung*. Berlin and New York: W. de Gruyter, 1972–.
- Walde, Alois. *Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Zweite umgearbeitete Auflage. Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1910.
- Zerwick, Max. *Biblical Greek Illustrated by Examples*. Vol. 114. English ed., adapted from the fourth Latin ed. Rome: Scripta Pontificii Institutii Bibliici, 1963.

### 3. Secondary Literature

- Allen, Willoughby C. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Matthew*. The International Critical Commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, vol. 26. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1907.
- Anderson, A. A. 2 *Samuel*. WBC 11. Dallas: Word Books Publisher, 1989.
- . *Psalms 1–72*. NCBC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972.
- Andresen, Carl and Günter Klein. *Theologia Crucis – Signum Crucis: Festschrift für Erich Dinkler zum 70. Geburtstag*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1979.
- Arnott, W. Geoffrey. *Alexis: The Fragments: A Commentary*. Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries, 31. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Attridge Harold W. and Helmut Koester. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. Hermeneia – a Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989.
- Bammel, Ernst. *Judaica: Kleine Schriften*. WUNT 37. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1986.
- Barr, James. *The Semantics of Biblical Language*. Eugene: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 1961.
- Barrett, C. K. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. Vol. 1. Preliminary Introduction and Commentary on Acts I–XIV. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.
- Batten, Loring W. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah*. New York: Scribner, 1913.
- Bauer, Walther. *Das Leben Jesu im Zeitalter der neutestamentlichen Apokryphen*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1909.
- Baumgarten, J. M. "Does TLH in the Temple Scroll Refer to Crucifixion?" *JBL* 91 (1972), 472–81.
- Beasley-Murray, George R. *John*. WBC 36. Dallas: Word Books, Publishers, 1987.
- Benedikt XVI/Joseph Ratzinger. *Jesus von Nazareth. Band I: Von der Taufe im Jordan bis zur Verklärung*. Freiburg: Herder Verlag, 2007.
- . *Jesus von Nazareth. Band II: Vom Einzug in Jerusalem bis zur Auferstehung*. Freiburg: Herder Verlag, 2011.
- Benz, Ernst. "Der gekreuzigte Gerechte bei Plato, im Neuen Testament und in der alten Kirche." In *Abhandlungen der Geistes – und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse / Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur*. Heft 12 (Mainz: Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, 1950), 3–46.
- Bernard, J. H. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John*. Paged continuously. Alan Hugh McNeile (ed.). New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1929.
- Berrin, Shani L. *Pesher Nahum Scroll from Qumran: An Exegetical Study of 4Q169*. Leiden and Boston: Brill Academic Publishers, 2004.

- Bertram, Georg. "ἕψος, κτλ." *TDNT* 8.602–20.
- Betz, Otto. "Jesus and the Temple Scroll." In *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. J. E. Charlesworth (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 75–103.
- . "Problem des Prozesses Jesu." *ANRW* II 25.1, 565–647.
- Blinzler, Josef. *Der Prozess Jesu*. 4., erneut rev. Aufl. ed. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1969.
- Bock, Darrell L. *Jesus According to Scripture: Restoring the Portrait from the Gospels*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic; Leicester: Apollos, 2002.
- Bøe, Sverre. *Cross-Bearing in Luke*. WUNT II 278. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Boling, Robert G. *Joshua: A New Translation with Notes and Commentary*. The Anchor Bible, vol. 6. New York: Doubleday, 1982.
- Borg, Marcus J. and John Dominic Crossan. *The Last Week: The Day-by-Day Account of Jesus's Final Week in Jerusalem*. 1st ed. San Francisco: HarperOne, 2006.
- Borgen, Peder. "Philo of Alexandria." *ABD* 5.333–42.
- Braun, Roddy L. *1 Chronicles*. WBC 14. Dallas: Word Books Publishers, 1986.
- Brodersen, Kai (the signature of the article, "K.BR.," does not exist in the list of abbreviation of the authors in the beginning of the volume, but "K.BRO." which is the abbreviation for Kai Brodersen. The name may thus be erroneous). "Cicero." *DNP* 2 cols. 1191–96.
- Brown, Raymond E. *The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave: A Commentary on the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels*. 1st ed., The Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday, 1994.
- . *The Gospel According to John*. 1. ed., The Anchor Bible, 29 A. Garden City: Doubleday, 1970.
- Brown, Raymond E.; D. W. Johnson and Kevin G. O'Connell, "Texts and Versions." *NJBC* 1100–01 (68.131–40).
- Brown, Schuyler. "Philology." In *The New Testament and its Modern Interpreters*, ed. Eldon Jay Epp and George W. MacRae (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 127–47.
- Bruce, I. A. F. *An Historical Commentary on the "Hellenica Oxyrhynchia," Cambridge Classical Studies*. London: Cambridge U.P., 1967.
- Bruce, Frederick Fyvie. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1990.
- Budd, Phillip J. *Numbers*. WBC 5. Dallas: Word, Incorporated, 1998.
- Bush, Fredric W. *Ruth, Ester*. WBC 9. Dallas: Word Books Publisher, 1996.
- Calboli, Gualtiero. "Seneca (der Ältere)." *DNP* 11 cols. 409–11.
- Chapmann, David W. *Ancient Jewish and Christian Perceptions*. WUNT, 2. Reihe, 224. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Charlesworth, James H. *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. 1st ed., The Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Cobet, Justus. "Polycrates." *DNP* 9 cols. 69–70.
- Cook, John Granger. "Envisioning Crucifixion: Light from Several Inscriptions and the Palatine Grafitto." In *Novum Testamentum* 50 (2008), 262–85.
- Coleman, Robert G. "Latin Language." *OCD* 817–20.
- Collins, Adela Yarbo. *Mark: A Commentary*. Hermenia – A Critical and Historical Commentary to the Bible. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.
- Collins, J. J. "Exegetical notes: The Archæology of Crucifixion." *CBQ*, volume 1 (1939), 154–59.
- . *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible: An Inductive Reading of the Old Testament*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1988.

- Curtius, Georg and Ernst Wilhelm Oskar Windisch. *Grundzüge der Griechischen Etymologie*. 5. unter Mitwirkung ed. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1879.
- Davis, W. D. and Dale C. Allison. *The Gospel According to Matthew*. ICC (3 vols.). Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988–97.
- De Landtsheer, Jeannine. "Justus Lipsius' *De Cruce* and the Reception of the Fathers." In *Neulatinisches Jahrbuch: Journal of Neo-Latin Language and Literature* 2 (2000), 97–122.
- Delling, Gerhard. "σκόλωσ." *TDNT* 7.409–13.
- Derow, Peter Sidney. "Polybius." *OCD* 1209–10.
- Dinkler, Erich. *Signum Crucis: Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament und zur Christlichen Archäologie*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1967.
- Distelrath, Götz. "Seneca (der Jüngere)." *DNP* 11 cols. 411–19.
- Donahue, John R. "Crucifixion." *EDB* 298–99.
- Dreyer, Boris. "Polybios." *DNP* 10 cols. 41–48.
- Dunn, James D. G. *Beginning From Jerusalem: Christianity in the Making, Vol. 2*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans Pub., 2009.
- . *Jesus Remembered: Christianity in the Making, Vol. 1*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans Pub., 2003.
- . *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans Pub., 1998.
- Edwards, James R. *The Gospel According to Mark*. The Pillar New Testament commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Leicester: Apollos, 2002.
- Ellingworth, Paul. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. *NIGTC*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.
- Epp, Eldon Jay and George W. MacRae. *The New Testament and Its Modern Interpreters*. The Bible and Its Modern Interpreters. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- Evans, Craig A. *Mark 8:27–16:20*. *WBC* 34b. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 2001.
- Feldman, Louise H. "Josephus." *ABD* 3.990–91.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *Dödahavsruellarna: 101 frågor och svar*. Stockholm: Verbum, 1994.
- . "Crucifixion in Ancient Palestine, Qumran Literature, and the New Testament." *CBQ*, vol. 40 (1978), 493–513.
- . *To Advance the Gospel: New Testament Studies*. New York: Crossroad, 1981.
- . *The Gospel According to Luke: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. 1st ed. 2 vols., The Anchor Bible. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1981.
- France, R. T. *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans; Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2002.
- Friedrich, Johannes; Wolfgang Pöhlmann and Peter Stuhlmacher. *Rechtfertigung: Festschrift für Ernst Käsemann zum 70. Geburtstag*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck]; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976.
- Forssman, Bernhard. "Homerische Sprache." *DNP* 5 cols. 683–86.
- Fulda, Hermann. *Das Kreuz und die Kreuzigung: Eine antiquarische Untersuchung nebst Nachweis der vielen seit Lipsius verbreiteten Irrthümer: Zugleich vier Excurse über verwandte Gegenstände*. Breslau: Wilhelm Koebner, 1878.
- Garcia, Jeffrey Paul. "See My Hands and My Feet: Fresh Light on a Johannine Midrash." In *John, Jesus, and History, volume 2: Aspects of Historicity in the Fourth Gospel*. Anderson Paul N., Felix Just, S.J., and Tom Thatcher (eds.) (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009), 325–33.
- Gardner, Jane F. and Thomas E. J. Wiedemann. *The Roman Household: A Sourcebook*. London and New York: Routledge, 1991.

- Giessler-Wirsig, Eva. "Auxiliary Sciences to History." In *The Encyclopedia of Christianity* (1999), 2.558–62.
- Gnilka, Joachim. *Wie das Christentum entstand* (3 vols.) Freiburg: Herder, 2004.
- Godet, Frédéric Louis; Edward William Shalders and M. D. Cusin, *A Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke*. New York: I. K. Funk & co., 1881.
- Gould, Ezra Palmer. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Mark*. New York: C. Scribner's sons, 1922.
- Gray, George Buchanan. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Numbers*. ICC. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1965.
- Green, Michael P. "The Meaning of Cross-Bearing." In *Bibliotheca Sacra: A Quarterly Published by Dallas Theological Seminary* (Dallas: Dallas Theological Seminary, 1996), 123–27.
- Gundry, Robert H. *Mark: A Commentary on his Apology for the Cross*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1993.
- Haas, N. "Anthropological Observations on the Skeletal Remains from Giv'at ha-Mivtar." *IEJ* 20 (1970), 38–59.
- Haenchen, Ernst; Robert Walter Funk and Ulrich Busse. *John: A Commentary on the Gospel of John* (Translation of Das Johannesevangelium) Hermeneia – a critical and historical commentary on the Bible. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Habermas, Gary R. *The Historical Jesus: Ancient Evidence for the Life of Christ*, Rev. ed. of: Ancient evidence for the life of Jesus. Joplin: College Press Publishing Company, 1996.
- Hagner, Donald A. *Matthew 14–28*. WBC 33b. Dallas: Word Books Publisher, 1995.
- Halperin, David J. "Crucifixion, the Nahum Peshet, and the rabbinic Penalty of Strangulation." *JJS* 32 (1981), 32–46.
- Heid, Stefan. *Kreuz, Jerusalem, Kosmos: Aspekte frühchristlicher Staurologie*. Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum. Ergänzungsband 31. Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 2001.
- Hendriksen, William and Simon J. Kistemaker. *New Testament Commentary: Exposition of the Gospel According to John, Accompanying biblical text is author's translation*. New Testament Commentary, vols. 1–2. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1953.
- Hengel, Martin. *Crucifixion in the Ancient World and the Folly of the Message of the Cross*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977 (reprinted 1986 as the article "Crucifixion" in the book *The Cross of the Son of God*. London: Xpress Reprints, 1986. The article was translated into French in 1981 [*La crucifixion dans l'antiquité et la folie du message de la croix*, *Lectio Divina*. 105. Paris: Cerf, 1981]).
- . "Mors turpissima crucis. Die Kreuzigung in der antiken Welt und die ‚Torheit‘ des ‚Wortes vom Kreuz.‘" In *Rechtfertigung: Festschrift für Ernst Käsemann zum 70. Geburtstag* (Johannes Friedrich, Wolfgang Pöhlmann, and Peter Stuhlmacher [eds.] Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck]; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976), 125–85.
- Hengel, Martin and Anna Maria Schwemer. *Jesus und das Judentum*. Vol. 1, Geschichte des Frühen Christentums. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- Hewitt, J. "The Use of Nails in Crucifixion." *Harvard Theological Review* 25 (1932), 29–45.
- Hirsch, Emil Gustav. *The Crucifixion: Viewed from a Jewish Standpoint*. Third ed. New York: Bloch Publishing Co., 1921.
- Hitzig, H. F. "Crux." In Pauly-W 4 (1901), cols. 1728–1731.

- How, Walter Wybergh and Joseph Wells. *A Commentary on Herodotus: With Introduction and Appendixes*. Repr. (with corrections) ed. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1936.
- Hurtado, Larry W. *The Earliest Christian Artifacts: Manuscripts and Christian Origins*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 2006.
- Ineichen, Hans and Philipp Stoellger. "Linguistics." In *The Encyclopedia of Christianity* (1999), 3.283–86.
- Keil, C. F. and F. Delitzsch. *Commentary on the Old Testament* (10 Vols). Reprinted from the English edition originally published by T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1866–91. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1996.
- Keuls, Eva C. *The Reign of the Phallus: Sexual Politics in Ancient Athens*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.
- Konen, Heinrich. "Schiffbau." *DNP* 11 cols. 165–71.
- Kuhn, Heinz-Wolfgang. "ἀνοσταυρώω." *EDNT* 1.92.
- "Der Gekreuzigte von Giv'at ha-Mitvar. Bilanz einer Entdeckung." *Theologia Crucis – Signum Crucis: Festschrift für Erich Dinkler zum 70. Geburtstag* (Carl Andresen, and Günter Klein [eds.]. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1979), 303–34.
- "Die Kreuzstrafe während der frühen Kaiserzeit. Ihre Wirklichkeit und Wertung in der Umwelt des Urchristentums." *ANRW* II.25.1, 648–793.
- "Jesus als Gekreuzigter in der frühchristlicher Verkündigung bis zur Mitte des 2. Jahrhunderts." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 72 (1975), 1–46.
- "κρεμάννυμι," *EDNT* 2.316.
- "Kreuz," *NBL* 2.546–47.
- "Kreuz: II. Neues Testament und frühe Kirche (bis von Justin)." *TRE* 19.713–25.
- "Kreuzigung," *NBL* 2.548–49
- "Kreuztitel," *NBL* 2.551.
- "Kreuztragen," *NBL* 2.551–52.
- "σταυρός," *EDNT* 3.267–70.
- "σταυρώω," *EDNT* 3.270–71.
- "συσταυρώω," *EDNT* 3.313.
- "ξύλον," *EDNT* 2.487.
- "Zum Gekreuzigten von Giv'at ha-Mitvar. Korrektur eines Versehens in der Erstveröffentlichung." In *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche* 69 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1978), 118–22.
- Kyle, Donald G. *Spectacles of Death in Ancient Rome*. London and New York: Routledge, 1998.
- La Potterie, Ignace de. *La passione di Gesù: secondo il vangelo di Giovanni*. Milano: San Paolo, 1999.
- Lachs, Samuel Tobias. *A Rabbinic Commentary on the New Testament*. New Jersey: Ktav Publishing House, Inc., 1987.
- Latacz, Joachim. "Homerost." *DNP* 5 cols. 686–99.
- Lintott, A. W. *Violence in Republican Rome*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
- Lipsi, Iusti (Justus Lipsius). *De Cruce: Libri tres: Ad sacram profanamque historiam utiles: Una cum Notis*. Antverpiae: Officina Plantiniana, Apud Viduam et Ioannem Moretum, 1594.
- Lee, John A. L. *A History of New Testament Lexicography*, Studies in Biblical Greek. New York: P. Lang, 2003.
- Longenecker, Richard N. *Galatians*. *WBC* 41. Dallas: Word, Incorporated, 2002.
- Louw, Johannes P. "Semantics." In *ABD* 5.1077–81.
- *Semantics of New Testament Greek*, Semeia Studies. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1982.

- Luz, Ulrich. *Matthew 21–28: A Commentary*. Hermenia – A Critical and Historical Commentary to the Bible. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005.
- Lyons, J. *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.
- . *Linguistic Semantics: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Mann, C. S. *Mark: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. The Anchor Bible, vol. 27. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1988.
- Mason, Steve. *Josephus and the New Testament*. 2nd ed. ed. Peabody: Hendrickson; Northam: Roundhouse, 2004.
- Marshall, I. Howard. *New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Principles and Methods*. Revised second ed. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 1979.
- . *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Grand Rapids: The Paternoster Press; William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1978.
- Matthews Victor H.; Don C. Benjamin (eds.) and Society of Biblical Literature. *Honor and Shame in the World of the Bible*. Semeia. Vol. 68. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1995.
- May, James M. *Brill's Companion to Cicero: Oratory and Rhetoric*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2002.
- McCarter, P. Kyle. *1 Samuel: A New Translation with Notes and Commentary*. The Anchor Bible, vol. 8. New York: Doubleday, 1980.
- McCarter, P. Kyle. *2 Samuel: A New Translation with Notes and Commentary*. The Anchor Bible, vol. 9. New York: Doubleday, 1984.
- McKim, Donald K. *Historical Handbook of Major Biblical Interpreters*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1998.
- Meister, Klaus. "Diodoros Siculus," *DNP* 3 cols. 592–94.
- . "Herodotos." *DNP* 5 cols. 469–75.
- Metzger, B. M. and M. D. Coogan. "Crucifixion," *OCB* 141.
- Meyer, H. A. W. *Kritisch Exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament*. Fünfte, verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage (14 vols.). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht's Verlag, 1864–69.
- Moffatt, J. J. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark International, 1924.
- Mommsen, Theodor. *Römische Strafrecht, Systematisches Handbuch der Deutschen Rechtswissenschaft, 1:4*. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1899.
- Naveh, J. "The Ossuary Inscriptions from Giv'at ha-Mitvar." *IEJ* 20 (1970), 33–37.
- Nida, Eugene Albert and J. P. Louw. *Lexical Semantics of the Greek New Testament*. Resources for Biblical Study, No. 25. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Nolland, John. *Luke: 1–9:20*. *WBC* 35a. Dallas: Word Books Publisher, 1989.
- . *Luke 9:21–18:34*. *WBC* 35b. Dallas: Word Books Publisher, 1993.
- . *Luke 18:35–24:53*. *WBC* 35c. Dallas: Word Books Publisher, 1993.
- . *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. *NIGTC*. Grand Rapids and Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2005.
- Nutton, Vivian. "Polybos." *DNP* 9 cols. 48–49.
- O'Collins, Gerald. "Crucifixion." *ABD* 1.1207–10.
- Page, Thomas Ethelbert. *The Acts of the Apostles*. London: Macmillan, 1886
- Parker, D. C. "Vulgate." *ABD* 6.860–62.
- Paton, Lewis Bayles. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Esther*. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1908.



- Peddinghaus, Carl Daniel. *Die Entstehung der Leidensgeschichte: Eine traditions-geschichtliche und historische Untersuchung des Werdens und Wachsens der erzählenden Passionstradition bis zum Entwurf des Markus* (2 vols.). Heidelberg: unpublished doctoral thesis at Evangelisch-Theologischen Fakultät der Rupert-Karl Universität, 1965.
- Pelling, C. B. R. "Plutarchos." *DNP* 9 cols. 1159–65.
- Pennels, Stephen. "The Spear Thrust (Mt. 27.49b, v.l. / Jn 19.34)." *JSNT* 19 (1983), 99–115.
- Pines, Shlomo. "The Jewish Christians of Early Centuries of Christianity According to a New Source." In *Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities*, vol. 2 (Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1968), 237–310.
- Plummer, Alfred. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Luke*. London: T&T Clark International, 1896.
- Polzin, Robert. "HWQY<sup>c</sup> and Covenantal Institutions in Early Israel." *HTR* vol. 62 (1969), 227–40.
- Porter, Stanley E. "The Greek language of the New Testament." In *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament* (1997), 99–130.
- Porter, Stanley E. and David Tombs. *Approaches to New Testament Study, JSNT*. Vol. 120. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Potter, D. S. and Cynthia Damon. "The 'Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre'." In *AJP* vol. 120, No. 1 (Spring, 1999), 13–42.
- Pritchard, James Bennett. *The Ancient Near East in Pictures Relating to the Old Testament*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1954.
- Rajak, Tessa. "Philon." *OCD* 1167–68.
- Refsum, Grete. *Kors/krucifix* (3 vols.). Oslo: unpublished doctoral thesis at Statens Håndverks og Kunstindustriskole, 1991.
- Reed, Jeffrey T. "Modern Linguistics and the New Testament: A Basic Guide to Theory, Terminology, and Literature." In *Approaches to New Testament Study (JSNT)*. Vol. 120. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 222–264.
- Reijnders, Gerardus Q. *The Terminology of the Holy Cross in Early Christian Literature: As Based upon Old Testament Typology*. Graecitas Christianorum Primaeva, Fasc. 2. Nijmegen: Dekker & Van de Vegt, 1965.
- Rivkin, Ellis. *What Crucified Jesus?* Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1984.
- Runia, David T. "Philo von Alexandria." *DNP* 9 cols. 850–56.
- Saeed, John I. *Semantics*. Third Edition. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.
- Schienenmann, Gottfried. "Crux." *DNP* 3 cols. 225–26.
- Schmidt, Peter Lebrecht and Joachim Latz. "Philologie." *DNP* 15/2, cols. 237–327.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *The Gospel According to St. John*. 3 vols. New York: Crossroad, 1982.
- Schneider, Johannes. "σταυρός, σταυρώω, ἀνασταυρώω." *TDNT* 7.572–84.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. *Sectarian law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Courts, Testimony, and the Penal Code*. Brown Judaic Studies (no. 33). Chicago: Scholars Press, 1983.
- Shanks, Hershel. "New Analysis of the Crucified Man." In *Jesus: The Last Day*. Molly Dewsnap Meinhardt (ed.). (Washington: Biblical Archaeological Society, 2003), 115–36.
- Sheppard, G. T. "Biblical Interpretation in the 18th & 19th Centuries." In *Historical Handbook of Major Biblical Interpreters* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1998), 256–80.
- Silva, Moisés. *Biblical Words and Their Meaning: An Introduction to Lexical Semantics*. Rev. and expanded ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994.

- Simon, John Hedley and Dirk Obbink, "Marcus Tullius Cicero." *OCD* 1558–64.
- Skinner, John. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis*. ICC. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1969.
- Sloyan, Gerard Stephen. *The Crucifixion of Jesus: History, Myth, Faith*. Minneapolis (Great Britain): Fortress Press, 1995.
- Smith, Henry Preserved. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel*. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1899.
- Smith, W. Robertson. *The Religion of the Semites*. London: A. and C. Black, 1907.
- Snaith, N. H. *Leviticus and Numbers*. NCBC. London: Nelson, 1967.
- Stauffer, Ethelbert. *Jerusalem und Rom im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*. Bern: Francke, 1957.
- . "Jesus, Geschichte und Verkündigung." *ANRW* II.25.1, 3–130.
- Stegemann, Ekkehard W. "Jesus." *DNP* 5 cols. 910–22.
- Stern, G. *Meaning and Change of Meaning: With Special Reference to the English Language*. Göteborgs Högskolas årsskrift 38. Göteborg: Wettergren & Kerber, 1931.
- Stockbauer, Jacob. *Kunstgeschichte des Kreuzes: Die bildliche Darstellung des Erlösungstodes Christi im Monogramm, Kreuz & Crucifix*. Schaffhausen: F. Hurter, 1870.
- Stroud, William. *A Treatise on the Physical Cause of the Death of Christ and its Relation to the Principles and Practice of Christianity*. London: Hamilton and Adams, 1847.
- Summers, Walter C. "Notes on the Controversiae of the Elder Seneca." In *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 5, No. 1 (Jan. 1911), 17–23.
- Sussman, Lewis A. "The Artistic Unity of the Elder Seneca's First Preface and the Controversiae as a Whole." In *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 92, No. 2 (Apr. 1971), 285–91.
- Svensson, Sixten. *Sanningen om Snapphanelögnen*. Osby: Kulleförlaget, 2007.
- Swete, Henry Barclay (ed.). *The Gospel According to St. Mark: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes and Indices*. London and New York: MacMillan and co., limited; The MacMillan company, 1898.
- Taylor, Bernard A.; John A. Lee; Peter R. Burton and Richard E. Whitaker (eds.). *Biblical Greek Language and Lexicography: Essays in Honor of Frederick W. Danker*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2004.
- Thiselton, Antony C. "Semantics and New Testament Interpretation." In *New Testament Interpretation* (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 1979), 74–100.
- Trier, Jost. "Das sprachliche Feld: Eine Auseinandersetzung." In *Neue Jahrbücher für Wissenschaft und Judgenbbildung* 10 (1934), 428–49.
- Tromp, Johannes. *The Assumption of Moses: A Critical Edition with Commentary*. Leiden, New York and Köln: E. J. Brill, 1992.
- Tzaferis, V. "Jewish Tombs at and near Giv'at ha-Mivtar." *IEJ* 20 (1970), 18–32.
- . "Crucifixion: The Archaeological Evidence – Remains of a Jewish Victim of Crucifixion Found in Jerusalem." *BAR* 11 (1985), 44–53.
- . "The Archaeological Evidence for Crucifixion." In *Jesus: The Last Day* (Washington: Biblical Archaeological Society, 2003), 91–113.
- Ullmann, Stephen. *Semantics: An Introduction to the Science of Meaning*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962.
- VanderKam, James C. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.
- Victor, U. "Das Testimonium Flavianum: Ein authentischer Text des Josephus", *NovT* 52 (2010), 72–82.
- von Rad, Gerhard. *Genesis: A Commentary*. Rev. ed., Old Testament Library. London: SCM Press, 1991.
- Walbank, Frank William. *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957–79.

- Walvoord, John F., Roy B. Zuck and Dallas Theological Seminary. *The Bible Knowledge Commentary: An Exposition of the Scriptures*. Wheaton: Victor Books, 1983–1985.
- Wenham, Gordon J. *Genesis 1–15*. WBC. Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1987.
- . *Genesis 16–50*. WBC. Waco: Word Books, 1994.
- Westcott, Brooke Foss (ed.). *The Epistle to the Hebrews the Greek Text With Notes and Essays*. Third edition 1903. Reprinted 1906, 1909, 1914, 1920. London: Macmillan, 1920.
- Westcott, Brooke Foss and Arthur Westcott (eds.). *The Gospel According to St. John Introduction and Notes on the Authorized Version*, Greek text and “Revised version” on opposite pages. London: J. Murray, 1908.
- Whealey, Alice. *Josephus on Jesus: The Testimonium Flavianum Controversy from Late Antiquity to Modern Times*. New York: Lang, 2003.
- Willcock, M. M. “Homer.” *OCD*, 718–20.
- Williamson, H. G. M. *Ezra-Nehemiah*. WBC 16. Dallas: Word Books Publisher, 1985.
- Winter, Paul; T. Alec Burkill and Geza Vermes. *On the Trial of Jesus*. 2d ed. Berlin; New York: De Gruyter, 1974.
- Yadin, Yigael. “Peshet Nahum (4QpNahum) Reconsidered.” *IEJ* 21 (1921), 1–12.
- Zestermann, August. *Die bildliche Darstellung des Kreuzes und der Kreuzigung Jesu Christi historisch Entwickelt. I. Abt. Das Kreuz vor Christo*. Leipzig: A. Edelmann, 1867.
- . “Die Kreuzigung bei den Alten.” *Annales de l’Académie royale d’archéologie de Belgique* 24 (1868), 337–404.
- Zias, Joe and James H. Charlesworth. “Crucifixion: Archeology, Jesus, and the Dead Sea Scrolls.” In *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. J. E. Charlesworth (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 273–89.
- Zias, Joseph and Eliezer Sekeles. “The Crucified Man from Giv‘at ha-Mivtar: A Reappraisal.” *IEJ* 35 (1985), 22–27.
- Zoekler, Otto, and Maurice J. Evans. *The Cross of Christ: Studies in the History of Religion and the Inner Life of the Church*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1877.
- Zöckler, Otto. *Das Kreuz Christi: Religionshistorische und Kirchlich-Archäologische Untersuchungen: Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Philosophie der Geschichte*. Gütersloh: Druck und Verlag von C. Bertelsmann, 1875.
- Zugibe, Frederick T. *The Crucifixion of Jesus: A Forensic Inquiry*. New York: M. Evans and Co., 2005.

#### 4. Internet

- Zias, Joe, “Crucifixion in Antiquity: The Evidence.” <http://www.centuryone.org/crucifixion2.html>.



# Index of Ancient Sources

## I. Greek Literature

<i>Acta et Martyrium Apolloni</i>		4-79	126, 146
40	66	4.81	127, 128, 130
		4.109	126
Aescylus		4.191	128
<i>Eum.</i>		4.201	128
185-90	68	4.277	128
		5.33	126
<i>PV</i>		5.36	126, 146
18-23	68, 145	5.70	125, 126, 128, 144
		5.71	126, 146
Aesop		<i>Celt.</i>	
152	272	17a	126
152.4-5	40	<i>Iber.</i>	
157.6-7	40, 144	6.15.90	126, 146
276.9-10	40	<i>Mith.</i>	
Apollonius Rhodius		8	126, 127, 129, 279
<i>Argon.</i>		29	125, 126, 127, 129, 130, 267, 279
2.1246-50	68	84	126, 127, 129
2.1249	69	97	125, 126, 127, 129, 267
Appian		<i>Pun.</i>	
<i>B civ.</i>		8.21	126
1.71	127, 128, 129	119	126, 129, 144, 146, 283
1.118	126	<i>Sici.</i>	
1.119	127, 128, 129, 130	2.3	125, 129, 144, 273
1.120	125, 127, 128, 129, 130, 267	Aristophanes	
1.225	128	<i>Eccl.</i>	
1.393	128	843	89, 90, 121
1.523	128		
2.90	127, 129, 130		
3.3	127, 128, 129, 130		
4.29	128, 130		
4.20	128		
4.29	125, 127, 128, 267		
4.35	127, 128, 130		

- Eq.*  
371 121 8.8.2 138, 140, 144, 273  
8.8.2-4 142  
8.8.4 138, 141, 144, 146
- Tesm.*  
939-40 117  
1003 117  
1027 117  
1053 117  
1110 117
- Aristotle  
*Pol.*  
1311b, 36-40 67
- Artemidorus  
*Oneir.*  
2.53 120, 122, 140, 275,  
277  
2.56 142, 241, 245  
4.49 275
- Cassius Dio  
40.40.5 284  
54.3.7 250
- Chariton  
*Chae. Call.*  
3.3.12 138, 141, 146  
3.4.18 138, 139, 142, 144,  
146, 149  
4.2.6 138  
4.2.6f 138, 272  
4.2.6ff 138  
4.2.6-7 139, 146, 149  
4.2.7 122, 138, 141, 146,  
241, 245  
4.3.3 138, 141, 146  
4.3.3-10 138, 142  
4.3.5 138, 141, 146  
4.3.6 138, 146  
4.3.7-10 141  
4.3.8 138, 141, 146  
4.3.9 138, 141, 146  
4.3.10 122, 138, 140, 141,  
146, 149, 241, 245  
4.4.10 138, 141, 146  
5.10.6 138, 141, 146  
6.2.10 138, 141  
8.7.8 138, 140, 142, 144,  
149
- Ctesias  
*FGrH* 3c, 688  
F 1b.1.10 63  
F 1b.29-31 78, 80, 144, 273  
F 9.6 61, 144, 273  
F 14.39 60, 61, 64, 109, 146,  
268, 273, 283  
F 14.45 61, 63, 273  
F 16.66 62, 63, 120, 144,  
273, 283  
F 26.7 61, 62, 146
- Demosthenes  
*Meid.*  
21.105 72, 145
- Diodorus Siculus  
1.20.2 83  
1.49.4 83  
1.70.4 83  
1.79.3 83  
2.1.10 61, 63, 78, 80, 86,  
87, 144, 267, 272,  
273  
2.12.3 83  
2.18.1 61, 78, 84, 145, 146,  
149, 277, 278  
2.23.1 83  
2.44.2 78, 79, 80, 86, 144,  
267, 272, 273  
3.7.2 83  
3.65.5 78, 82, 86, 87, 144,  
149  
5.32.1 79  
5.32.6 78, 79, 86, 87, 144,  
267  
13.111.4 84, 86, 87, 272  
13.111.5 272  
14.53.4 80, 86, 272  
14.53.5 272  
16.35.6 80, 81, 86  
16.61.2 80, 81, 86, 144, 275  
17.46.4 78, 80, 86, 279  
17.71.6 84, 277  
18.16.2-3 80, 86  
18.16.3 78

19.11.7	80	Heraclidus Lembus	
19.67.2	78, 80, 86	<i>Excerpta polit.</i>	
20.53.2	85	Sect. 16	52
20.53.3	85		
20.54.1	85	Herodotus	
20.54.7	80, 84, 86, 87, 145, 149	1.66.4	285
20.55.2	78, 80, 86	1.110.3	99
20.69.4-5	78, 80, 86	1.112.1	99
20.103.6	78, 80, 86	1.123.4	66
24.1.2	81, 144, 283	1.128	23
25.5.2	77, 78, 84, 85, 144, 145, 146, 149	1.128.2	22, 42, 44, 50, 57, 59, 64, 144, 268, 270
25.10.1-2	83, 86, 87, 115, 144	1.144	54
25.10.2	78	1.144.3	54
26.23.1	78, 80, 86	2.121.γ.2	286
33.15.1	26, 41, 79, 82, 86, 87, 146	2.134-35	40
34/35.12.1	53, 78, 80, 86, 103	3.16.1-2	46
37.5.3	78, 80, 86	3.36.4	91
		3.125.2	VII, 59, 92
		3.125.3	22, 42, 43, 57, 64, 144, 268
Dionysius of Halicarnassus		3.125.4	43, 54, 193, 286
<i>Ant. Rom.</i>		3.132.2	22, 42, 44, 49, 52, 55, 57, 64, 268, 270
3.30.6	99		
5.51.3	93, 94, 144, 267	3.159.1	22, 42, 44, 47, 50, 57, 59, 64, 144, 268, 270
7.69.2	93		
20.16.2	94	4.43.2	42, 44, 50, 57, 59, 270
Euripides		4.43.6	42, 44, 51, 57, 59, 64, 144
<i>Bacch.</i>		4.43.7	42, 270
983	71	4.71.4	54
1141	70	4.94.3	45
Cyc.		4.103.1	42, 57, 59
302-03	70	4.103.1-2	45, 64, 144, 283
<i>El.</i>		4.103.1-3	57, 71, 109
895-99	71, 146	4.103.2	46
<i>Frag.</i>		4.103.3	45, 144, 147
878	71	4.137-39	46
		4.202.1	42, 44, 51, 53, 57, 59, 64, 144
<i>IT.</i>		5.16.1	285
1429-30	71, 146, 268	5.16.2	285
1430	71	5.16.1-2	146
		5.114.1	54
<i>Rhes.</i>		6.30.1	VII, 42, 46, 47, 57, 59, 64, 144
116	71, 146		
510-17	72	7.33	42, 55

- |               |  |                 |  |
|---------------|--|-----------------|--|
| 7.33.1        | 39, 42, 54, 64, 117,<br>121, 145, 147, 149             | 22<br>22.170-77 | 41<br>39, 41, 147                                |
| 7.194.1       | 42, 55, 57   | Josephus        |  |
| 7.194.1-3     | 44, 57, 64, 144, 149                                   | <i>AJ</i>       |  |
| 7.194.1f      | 42   | 2.72-73         | 213  |
| 7.194.2       | 54, 286  | 2.73            | 100, 109, 111, 144,<br>149, 150, 213, 272        |
| 7.238.1       | 42, 45, 46, 47, 57,<br>59, 64, 144                     | 2.77            | 97, 100, 109, 110,<br>144, 149, 213, 275         |
| 8.118.4       | 46   | 3.125           | 96   |
| 9.78          | 273  | 4.202           | 100, 104, 110, 217                               |
| 9.78.1        | 46   | 5.469           | 96   |
| 9.78.3        | 42, 52, 56, 57, 64,<br>144                             | 5.470           | 96   |
| 9.78.3-79.1   | 48, 49, 57   | 6.374           | 100, 105, 108, 109,<br>144, 219, 222             |
| 9.97          | 52, 146, 284   | 11.17           | 98, 100, 224                                     |
| 9.116-22      | 53   | 11.103          | 98, 100, 224                                     |
| 9.120         | 42, 55   | 11.208          | 100, 101   |
| 9.120.4       | 39, 42, 53, 57, 64,<br>103, 117, 145, 147,<br>149, 286 | 11.246          | 100, 101, 108, 147,<br>272                       |
| 9.122.1       | 42, 43, 54, 149, 286                                   | 11.261          | 96, 101, 226                                     |
| Hesiodus      |  | 11.266          | 96, 101, 226                                     |
| <i>Theog.</i> |  | 11.261-67       | 101  |
| 521-25        | 69   | 11.267          | 96, 100, 101, 110,<br>146, 226                   |
| Hesychius     |  | 11.280          | 100, 101, 110, 144,<br>226, 273                  |
| Σ 1072.1-3    | 284  | 11.289          | 100, 101   |
| Homer         |  | 12.256          | 95, 101, 104, 107,<br>109, 144, 149, 228,<br>229 |
| <i>Il.</i>    |  | 13.380          | 53, 95, 103, 104,<br>110, 111, 144, 149          |
| 6.130-43      | 83   | 13.380ff.       | 95   |
| 6.138-41      | 39   | 14.11           | 284  |
| 7.441         | 38, 146, 284, 285                                      | 16.315          | 108, 109   |
| 8.19          | 285  | 17.295          | 95, 97, 98, 275                                  |
| 8.343         | 38, 146, 284   | 18.63f.         | 95   |
| 9.350         | 38, 146, 284, 285                                      | 18.63-64        | 96, 99, 146                                      |
| 12.54-64      | 285  | 18.65-80        | 95   |
| 12.55         | 38, 146, 284   | 18.79           | 95, 98, 99                                       |
| 12.63         | 38, 146, 284   | 19.94           | 95, 97, 99, 110, 144,<br>178, 267                |
| 15.1          | 38, 284  | 20.102          | 95, 98, 99                                       |
| 15.344        | 38, 284  | 20.129          | 95, 98   |
| 18.172-77     | 38   |                 |  |
| 18.176-77     | 41, 146  |                 |  |
| 18.177        | 284  |                 |  |
| 24.453        | 39, 146, 284   |                 |  |
| <i>Od.</i>    |  | <i>BJ</i>       |  |
| 7.45          | 38, 284  | 1.97            | 53, 95, 102, 109,<br>111, 144, 149               |
| 14.11         | 39, 146  |                 |  |



1.113	95, 103, 111	Philo	
2.75	95, 98, 99, 275	<i>Agr.</i>	
2.241	95, 98, 99	11	133, 146
2.253	95, 97, 99, 144, 267, 273	<i>Flacc.</i>	
2.306	98, 149	32	132
2.306-08	95, 106, 109, 110, 111, 144, 145, 146, 149, 150, 272	70-72	132, 134, 136, 138, 146
2.308	96, 98	72	131, 132, 267
2.476	107	83	134, 144
3.320-21	104, 109, 111, 144, 149	83-85	137, 138, 146
3.321	95, 98	84	131, 133, 134, 144, 149
4.317	104, 111, 217	<i>Ios.</i>	
5.289	95, 98, 99, 110, 144, 273	50	132
5.435	108, 109	96	133, 134, 138, 213
5.449-51	95, 107, 109, 110, 111, 144, 145, 146, 149, 150, 272	98	133, 134, 144, 213
5.451	96, 247	156	136, 137, 213, 214
7.202	95, 96	166	132
7.202-03	95, 98, 99, 110	<i>Leg.</i>	
<i>Vit.</i>		129-30	99
417-21	95	<i>Mos.</i>	
420-21	105, 109, 110, 144, 149, 272	2.248-50	99
Lucian		<i>Poster C.</i>	
<i>De mort. Peregr.</i>		25-26	131, 137, 147
34	278	26	217
<i>Prom.</i>		61	131, 134, 135, 137, 144, 145
1	234, 268	<i>Prov.</i>	
1-2	68, 274	2.24-25	43, 92, 135, 138
2	234, 268	<i>Som.</i>	
4	234, 268	2.213	131, 134, 135, 137, 213
7	234, 268	<i>Spec. Leg.</i>	
10	234, 268	3.151	217
15	234, 268	3.151-52	134, 216
17	234, 268	3.160-61	99
<i>Ver. hist.</i>		4.299	133, 146
1.30	284	Plato	
Pausanias		<i>Grg.</i>	
3.4.10	48	473C-D	53, 65, 144, 267, 271, 273
10.2.5	80		

<i>Phd.</i>		59	103
83C-D	135		
<i>Resp.</i>		<i>Crass.</i>	
361E-362A	66	32	46
362A	26	<i>De fort. Rom.</i>	
Plutarch		325D	109, 114, 123, 124, 144, 192, 283
<i>Aet. Rom.</i>		<i>De garr.</i>	
264C	121	508F-509A	113, 123, 124, 144, 273
264D	121	<i>De prov. Alex.</i>	
<i>Alex.</i>		4-3	123
55.5	111	<i>De sera.</i>	
59.4	111	554A	278
72.2	111, 112, 123, 124, 144, 267, 273	554A-B	122, 123, 140, 142, 146, 149, 241, 245
<i>An vit.</i>		554D	122, 123, 214
499D	71, 111, 121, 123, 145, 146, 149	<i>Demetr.</i>	
<i>Ant.</i>		33-3	111, 113, 123, 124
81.1	111, 113, 123, 124, 144, 267, 273	<i>Dion.</i>	
<i>Apophth. Lac.</i>		48.2	120, 121
238C	121	<i>Eum.</i>	
<i>Artax.</i>		9.2	111
14.5	123	<i>Fab. Max.</i>	
17.5	54, 61, 62, 89, 90, 111, 121, 124, 146	6.3	111, 112, 123, 124, 144, 267, 272, 273
<i>Brut.</i>		<i>Flam.</i>	
31.5	114, 116, 123, 228	9.3	111
<i>Caes.</i>		<i>Mor.</i>	
1-2	167	194B	114, 123, 124
2.2	111	205F-206A	119, 124
2.2-4	111	207B	111, 119, 124
2.4	111, 114, 118, 123, 124, 144	238C	121
57.4	122	264C	121
<i>Cleom.</i>		264D	121
38.2	53, 114, 115, 123, 124	325D	109, 114, 123, 124, 192, 283
39.1	116, 123, 124, 144, 272	307C	117
		311E	113, 123, 124

499D	71, 111, 121, 123, 149	4.24.2 4.49.1	77 77
508F-509A	113, 123, 124	4.56.8	77
554A	278	5.54.6-7	74, 75, 77, 144, 268
554A/B	111	6.35.8	77
554A-B	122, 123, 140, 142, 149, 241, 245	6.40.3 8.21.2-3	77 74, 75, 77, 144
554D	122, 123, 214	8.21.3	73
718D	135	10.33.8 16.30-1	74, 87, 113, 144 77
<i>Par. Graec. et Rom.</i>		23.2.6	77
307C	117	23.7.4	77
311E	113, 123, 124, 144		
<i>Per.</i>		Posidonius	
28.2	112, 117, 123, 124, 147, 267, 267	F 34.26-29 F 110.5-9 F 148.1-8 F 169.193-96 F 213.18-20	91, 144 26, 41, 82, 146 80 79
<i>Pomp.</i>		Strabo	
35.1	120, 121	3.4.17 3.4.18 4.4.5 13.1.57 14.1.16 14.1.39	90 90, 92, 146 46, 54, 90, 92, 144 91, 92 91, 92 90, 92, 144, 267
62.3-4	121		
62.4	120, 121		
<i>Quest. conv.</i>		Sophocles	
718D	135	<i>Aj.</i> 108	70
<i>Reg. et imp. apophth.</i>		<i>Ant.</i> 205ff 304-09 1221	193 70 70
194B	114, 123, 124		
205F-206A	119, 124, 144, 145		
207B	111, 119, 124, 145		
<i>Tim.</i>		<i>OT</i> 1263	70
22.8	115, 116, 123, 124, 144		
<i>Tit. Flam.</i>		Thucydides	
9.3	120, 123, 146	1.110.3 2.75.1 3.34.3 4.9.1 4.90.2 6.97.2 6.100.1 7.25.5-8	59, 60, 61, 64, 109, 144, 267, 270 60 91 60, 146 284 60 60, 283 60, 81, 146
9.4	111, 122		
Polybius			
1.11.5	73, 74, 144, 267, 272, 273		
1.24.5-6	74, 267		
1.24.6	73, 272		
1.79.2-5	74, 267		
1.79.4f	73, 74		
1.86.4	73, 275		
1.86.4-7	76, 77, 85, 87, 104, 144, 146		
1.86.6	77		

7.25.7	60, 283	3.1.17	46, 63, 64, 109, 144, 149, 283
Xenophon		5.2.5	146, 284
<i>Anab.</i>		5.2.21	146, 284
1.10.1	46	7.4.14	146
2.6.1	46	7.4.17	146

## 2. Latin Literatur

(Caesar)		<i>Rab. perd.</i>	
<i>B Afr.</i>		3.10	176, 182
66	152	4.11	176, 182
66.4	152, 267	4.13	176, 182
		5.16	176, 183
<i>B Hisp.</i>		<i>Tusc.</i>	
20	152, 267	1.102	184
20.5	152		
Catullus		<i>Verr.</i>	
99.3-6	196, 203, 286	2.1.7	177
		2.1.9	177
Cicero		2.1.13	177
<i>Att.</i>		2.3.59	177
7.11.2	184	2.3.70	177
14.15.1	184	2.3.112	177
14.16.2	184	2.4.24	177
		2.4.26	178
<i>Cluent.</i>		2.4.26-27	203
187	184	2.4.86	178
		2.4.86-87	178
<i>Deiot.</i>		2.4.90	178
26	184	2.5.7	177
		2.5.10	179
Fin.		2.5.11	179
5.84	184	2.5.12	176, 180
5.92	184	2.5.71	179
		2.5.72	179
<i>Mil.</i>		2.5.158ff	176
60	184	2.5.162	180
		2.5.162-71	180
<i>Phil.</i>		2.5.163	176
13.21	184	2.5.163	180
		2.5.164	180
<i>Pis.</i>		2.5.165	180
42	184	2.5.168	176, 180
44	184	2.5.169	176, 180
		2.5.169-70	181, 206
<i>Rep.</i>		2.5.170	176, 181
3.27	66	2.5.171	182

Clodius Licinius		<i>Asin.</i>	
F 3.1	140, 170, 241	548	171
		548ff	171
Curtius Rufus		940	171, 175
4.4.17	195, 267		
6.3.11	195	<i>Aul.</i>	
7-11.28	195	59	171, 175
9.8.16	195	522	171, 175
		631	171, 175
Ennius			
<i>Ann.</i>		<i>Bacch.</i>	
11.359 (F 4)	172	362	171, 172
		584	171, 175
Horatius		686-88	171, 172, 267
<i>Epist.</i>		902	171
1.16.48	196	902-03	172
<i>Sat.</i>		<i>Capt.</i>	
1.3.8off	196	469	171, 172
1.3.80-83	197, 267		
2.7.47	196	<i>Cas.</i>	
		93	171, 175
Juvenal		389	172, 175
6.219	198	416	171, 175
6.219f	198	438	172, 175
6.219-23	199	611	171, 172
8.187	198	641	171, 175
8.187f	198	977	171, 175
8.188	199		
13.103-05	199	<i>Cist.</i>	
14.77f	198	248	172, 175
14.77-80	199		
		<i>Curc.</i>	
Martial		611	171, 175
<i>Epigr.</i>		693	171, 175
7	198, 199		
		<i>F. Carb.</i>	
Ovid		2	171, 172, 174, 286
<i>Am.</i>		2.1	140, 142, 241, 245
1.12.17	197		
1.12.17-20	197, 267	<i>Men.</i>	
		66	171, 172
<i>Pont.</i>		328	171, 175
1.6.37-38	197, 206	849	171, 172
		912-15	172
Plautus		915	171, 175
<i>Amph.</i>		942	175
1034A	171, 175	943	172
		1017	171, 175

<i>Mil.</i>		<i>Rud.</i>	
184	171, 175	176	171, 175
310	171, 175	518	171, 172
359-60	140, 142, 171, 173, 206, 241, 245, 286	1070	171, 175
360	172	1162	171, 172
372	171, 174	<i>Stich.</i>	
372f	171	625	171, 172, 175
		625ff	171
<i>Most.</i>		<i>Trin.</i>	
55-56	286	595-99	172
56	172	598	171
348-62	206		
359	171	Pliny the Elder	
359ff	171	<i>HN.</i>	
359-60	172	8.47 (18)	193, 203
743	171, 175	14.12 (3)	151, 192, 203, 286
849-50	171, 175	14.32 (4)	192
1133	171, 172	17.212 (35)	192
		28.41 (9)	192, 193
<i>Per.</i>		28.46 (11)	192
295	171, 175	29.57 (11)	114, 192
352	171, 172	36.107 (24)	192, 193, 205
795	171, 175		
815	175	Quintilian	
846-47	175	<i>Decl.</i>	
855	171, 172	274	194
856	171	274.13	194
		380	194
<i>Poen.</i>		<i>Inst.</i>	
271	171, 175	4.2.17	194
347	171	6.1.54	194
495	171, 175	8.2.2	194
496	171, 175	8.4.4	194
511	171, 175	8.4.5	194
789	171, 175		
789-95	172	Sallust	
799	171, 175	<i>Cat.</i>	
1309	171, 175	51.20	152, 153
		<i>Hist.</i>	
<i>Pseud.</i>		F 3.9	152, 153, 173, 203, 286
335	171, 175	F <i>Amp.</i> Lep.59 (17)	152
361	172	F <i>Amp.</i> Cott14 (3)	152
739	171		
839	175		
846	171, 175		
1182	171, 175		
1249	171, 175		

<i>Iug.</i>		101.10-11	295
14.15	152, 153	101.10-14	190, 191, 196, 203, 207, 286
14.21	152, 153		
24.10	152, 153	101.11	186
26.3	152, 153	101.12	186
70.5	152, 153	101.14	186
82.3	152, 153		
<b>Seneca the Elder</b>		<b>Suetonius</b>	
<i>Contr.</i>		<i>Aug.</i>	
		13	193
7.4.5	184, 185	<i>Caes.</i>	
7.6.1-24	185	74.1	119
7.6.3	185	<i>Calig.</i>	
7.6.4	185	12.2	167, 168, 267
7.6.6	185	32.2	250
7.6.9	185	<i>Claud.</i>	
7.6.10	185	34.1	155, 169
7.6.11	185	<i>Dom.</i>	
7.6.12	185	10.1	167, 168, 250, 267
7.6.14	185	11.1	167, 168, 184, 267
7.7.5	185	<i>Galb.</i>	
7.7.9	185	9.1	167, 168, 169, 225, 267
10.5.7	185	9.2	167, 267
<i>Contr. exc.</i>		<i>Iul.</i>	
3.9	184, 185	4.2	167
7.6	185	74.1	167, 267
7.7	184	<i>Ner.</i>	
8.4	184, 185	29.1	171
<b>Seneca the Younger</b>		49.2	155, 169, 286
<i>Clem.</i>		<b>Tacitus</b>	
1.23	186	<i>Ann.</i>	
1.23.1	187	1.6.1-3	162, 163, 163-64, 173
1.26.1	186, 187	1.61.4	162, 164, 267, 286
<i>Dial.</i>		2.72	163
1.3.9-10	186, 191, 192, 206, 286	4.11	163
2.15.1	186	4.72.3	162, 163, 164, 173, 267, 286
3.2.2	186, 187	12.54	166
5.3.6	186, 187		
6.20.3	186, 188, 191, 203, 207, 247		
7.19.3	186, 189, 192		
<i>Epist.</i>			
14.5	186, 187, 189		
98.12	186, 187		
98.12.3	186, 187		

- |               |                                 |                  |                            |
|---------------|---------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|
| 14.33.2       | 162, 163, 165, 173,<br>267, 286 | 8.7.11           | 157                        |
| 14.33         | 245                             | 8.7.19           | 171                        |
| 15.44         | 163, 166                        | 9.10.4           | 156                        |
| 15.44.4       | 162                             | 10.7.9           | 157                        |
| <i>Germ.</i>  |                                 | 21.44.4          | 156                        |
| 12            | 162, 164, 203                   | 22.13.8-9        | 156                        |
| <i>Hist.</i>  |                                 | 22.13.9          | 154, 156, 158, 267         |
| 2.72          | 163                             | 22.33.1-2        | 157                        |
| 2.72.1f       | 162, 267                        | 22.33.2          | 154, 158, 267              |
| 4.3           | 163, 286                        | 24.5.11          | 156                        |
| 4.3.2         | 162, 267                        | 25.23.7          | 156                        |
| 4.11          | 163                             | 26.12.12         | 156                        |
| 4.11.3        | 162                             | 26.13.5          | 156                        |
| Terence       |                                 | 26.13.14         | 156                        |
| <i>An.</i>    |                                 | 26.13.18         | 156                        |
| 618           | 176                             | 28.3.7           | 155                        |
| 621           | 176                             | 28.37.2          | 154, 156, 157, 158,<br>267 |
| <i>Eun.</i>   |                                 | 29.2.1           | 157                        |
| 798           | 176                             | 29.18.14         | 154, 156, 158, 267         |
| 862           | 176                             | 30.43.13         | 154, 156, 158, 267         |
| 989           | 176                             | 33.36.3          | 154, 156, 158, 267         |
| <i>Phorm.</i> |                                 | 38.28.13         | 154                        |
| 368           | 176                             | 38.48.13         | 154, 156, 158, 267         |
| 544           | 176                             | 40.23.9          | 156                        |
| Titus Livius  |                                 | <i>Perioch.</i>  |                            |
| <i>AUC</i>    |                                 | 17.15            | 156, 158                   |
| 1.26          | 159                             | Valerius Maximus |                            |
| 1.26.6-7      | 154                             | 1.7.4            | 161, 256                   |
| 1.26.10       | 156, 286                        | 2.7 ext. 1       | 159, 160, 164, 267         |
| 1.26.10-11    | 154-55                          | 2.7.9            | 159                        |
| 1.26.11       | 182                             | 2.7.12           | 159, 160, 267              |
| 1.35.9        | 155                             | 5.1 ext. 5       | 161                        |
| 2.5.6         | 171                             | 7.2 ext. 17      | 161                        |
| 2.36.1        | 155                             | 6.2 ext. 3       | 160                        |
| 4.12.11       | 156                             | 6.3.5            | 159, 161                   |
| 4.19.5        | 157                             | 6.9 ext. 5       | 159, 161                   |
| 4.28.8        | 157                             | 6.9              | 43                         |
| 5.24.2        | 156                             | 6.9.15           | 159, 161                   |
|               |                                 | 8.4.2            | 159, 160                   |
|               |                                 | 9.2 ext. 3       | 159, 160                   |
|               |                                 | 9.2.3            | 161, 286                   |



## 3. Papyri and Non-Literary Sources

<i>Alexis</i>		<i>Lex Puteoli</i>	
224.10	89, 90, 121, 147	AE 1971, no88 (Puteoli)	
		Col. 2.8-14	140, 200, 241
<i>Amada Stele</i>		Col. 2.9	201
374.1297.1-1298.8	214-15	Col. 2.10	201
		Col. 2.12	200
<i>BGU</i>		<i>Oxyrhynchus Papyri</i>	
2.380.7-9	146, 285	P Oxy. 5.842	88, 144, 271, 273
<i>Code of Hammurabi</i>		<i>Papyrus Hellenica</i>	
156	215	FGrH 2a, 66	
<i>Egyptian Historical Records of the Later Eighteenth Dynasty</i>		F 1.15.5 (433-38)	88, 144, 271, 273
374.1297.1-1298.8	214-15		
<i>IG 4<sup>2</sup> 1 (Epidauros)</i>			
121.92	146, 284		

## 4. Old Testament

<i>Genesis</i>		40	230
31.25	219		
32.25	214	<i>Deuteronomy</i>	
32.26	287	21.22	26, 210, 233, 279, 287, 299
40	133, 138	21.22-23	22, 103, 111, 131, 213, 216, 217, 229, 230, 233, 235, 252, 253, 254, 259, 286, 299
40.19	26, 110, 134, 210, 211, 233, 279, 287	21.23	12, 17, 210, 216, 253, 254, 287, 299
40.19-22	211, 212, 235, 286, 287, 299	28.66	210, 287
40.20	211		
40.22	110, 134, 210, 287	<i>Joshua</i>	
41.13	110, 210, 211, 287, 299	8.29	26, 210, 213, 217, 233, 235, 287, 299
44.30	210	10.26	26, 210, 218, 286, 287
<i>Leviticus</i>		10.26-27	217, 218, 233, 235, 299-300
24.16	104		
<i>Numbers</i>			
25.4	210, 213, 214, 215, 221, 222, 233, 234, 235, 281, 287, 299		
33.55	146		

*Judges*

3.21 219  
4.21 219  
16.14 219

*1 Samuel*

31.8-10 300  
31.8-11 104, 219, 221  
31.9-12 233, 235  
31.12 211

*2 Samuel*

4.12 210, 220, 221, 233,  
235, 287, 300  
18.9 210  
18.10 210, 287  
18.14 219  
21.6 215, 221, 222, 233,  
235, 300  
21.9 215, 221, 222, 233,  
235, 300  
21.12 210, 287  
21.12-13 222, 233

*1 Chronicles*

10.10 219

*Ezra*

6.6-12 98  
6.11 211, 223, 235, 270

*Esther*

2.23 210, 224, 225, 233,  
235, 287, 300  
5.14 26, 210, 224, 225,  
235, 287, 300  
6.4 210, 225, 287  
7.9 210, 275, 287  
7.9-10 225, 233, 235, 301  
7.10 210, 287  
8.7 26, 210, 225, 226,  
233, 235, 287, 301  
9.13 210, 226, 233, 235,  
287, 301  
9.14 210, 225, 287  
9.25 210, 225, 226, 235,  
287, 301

*Job*

26.7 210

*Psalms*

98.8 223  
137/6.2 210  
137.2 210, 287

*Song of Songs*

4.4 210

*Isaiah*

22.23 219  
22.24 210, 287  
22.25 219  
55.12 223  
57.4 232

*Jeremiah*

6.3 219  
6.8 214, 287

*Lamentations*

5.2 228  
5.4 228  
5.8 227  
5.9 228  
5.11 228  
5.12 210, 287  
5.12-13 227, 228  
5.14 228

*Ezekiel*

15.3 210, 287  
17.22 210, 287  
23.17 214  
23.17-18 287  
25.6 223  
26.9 223  
27.10 210, 287  
27.10-11 210  
27.11 210

*Daniel*

2.34 223

*Hosea*

11.7 210

*Nahum*

2.12-13a 228, 229

## 5. Old Testament Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha and Septuagint

<i>1 Esdras</i>		<i>Assumption of Moses</i>	
6.27-33	98	6.9	232
6.31	210, 223	8.1	102, 232
6.32	223		
<i>2 Esdras</i>		<i>Esther</i>	
6.11	223	8.12r	226, 233, 275
<i>1 Maccabees</i>		<i>Judith</i>	
1.60-61	102	8.24	210
1.61	210, 228	14.1	210, 228
		14.11	210, 228
<i>2 Maccabees</i>		<i>Testament of Benjamin</i>	
6.10	210, 228	9.3	232
15.33	210		
15.33-35	228	<i>Testament of Levi</i>	
		4.5	232
<i>Apocalypse of Esdras</i>			
7.1-5	232		

## 6. Targums

<i>Samaritan Targum</i>		<i>Targum Lamentations</i>	
<i>Num</i>		<i>Lam</i>	
25.4	215	5.12	227
<i>Targum Esther I</i>		<i>Targum Neofiti</i>	
<i>Esth</i>		<i>Nums</i>	
2.23	224, 225	25.4	215
<i>Targum Esther II</i>		<i>Deut</i>	
<i>Esth</i>		21.22	
2.23	224, 225	216-17	
<i>Targum Jonathan</i>		<i>Targum Onqelos</i>	
<i>Josh</i>		<i>Num</i>	
8.29	217, 218	25.4	
10.26	218	215	
10.26-27	218	<i>Deut</i>	
		21.22	
		216-17	
<i>2 Sam</i>			
4.12	221		

Targum Pseudo-Jonathan		<i>Deut</i>	
<i>Num</i>		21.22	216-17
25.4	215		

## 7. Early Jewish Literature

Dead Sea Scrolls		<i>4QpsMoses<sup>a</sup> (4Q385a)</i>	
<i>4Q200</i>		F 15	
F 1		Col. 1, line 3	230
Col. II, line 3	230		
<i>4Q223_224</i>		<i>11QTemple</i>	
Unit 2		Col. 64, line 8	216, 230
Col. V, line 14-18	230	Col. 64, line 8-13	230
<i>4Q524</i>		Col. 64, line 6-13	254
F 14		Col. 64, line 9	228, 230
Line 2-4	231	Col. 64, line 11	228
<i>4QpNab</i>		Col. 64, line 12	253
Frgs. 3+4		Mishnah	
Col. 1, line 6-8	229	<i>Sabbath</i>	
Col. 1 line 7	103	6.10	248

## 8. New Testament

<i>Matthew</i>		27.28	248, 257
5.25	34,	27.31b-32	244, 258
10.38	241	27.32	140, 142, 244
11.5	256	27.35	246, 258
14.19	256	27.37	247, 249, 250
16.21	238, 257	27.39-42	249, 258
16.24-25	241, 257	27.44	248, 280
17.9	256	27.44-50	142
17.12	239	27.45-47	258
17.22-23	239, 257	27.45-50	250
20.18-19	239, 257	27.49	251
20.19	275	28.5	258
23.34	240, 257	<i>Mark</i>	
26.1-4	240, 257	8.31	256
26.2	1	8.31-32	238, 257
26.16	34	8.34-35	241, 257
27.22-23	243, 258	9.11-12	239
27.26	243	9.31	34, 239, 257
27.27-31a	243		

15.13-14	243, 258	19.18	247, 248, 257, 280
15.15	243	19.19	249, 250
15.16-20a	243	19.26-30	142
15.20b-21	243, 258	19.28-30	250, 258
15.21	140, 142, 244	19.34	251
15.23-26	246, 258	20.9	256
15.25	246	20.25	248, 255, 258
15.26	249, 250		
15.27	248, 257	<i>Acts</i>	
15.29-32	249, 258	2.22-24	251
15.32b	248, 280	2.23	26
15.34	258	2.36	252
15.34-37	142, 250	5.30	25, 26, 252, 259
16.6	258	10.39	252, 259
		13.29	252
<i>Luke</i>		<i>Romans</i>	
4.6	34	6.6	252, 257
7.22	256	7.9	256
9.22	238, 257		
9.23-24	241, 257	<i>1 Corinthians</i>	
9.43b-44	239, 257	1.13	252, 257, 259
15.24	256	1.17	252
18.31-33	239	1.18	15, 252, 259
18.33	256	1.23	252
23.7	258	2.2	252, 253
23.18-23a	242, 258	2.8	252, 253
23.26	140, 142, 258		
23.23b-25	243	<i>2 Corinthians</i>	
23.26	244	12.7	146, 257
23.27-31	248	13.4	252, 253
23.32-33	248, 257		
23.33	246, 258, 280	<i>Galatians</i>	
23.34-46	142	2.19	252, 253, 257
23.35-36	249, 258	3.1	252, 253
23.38	247, 249, 250	3.13	216, 253, 254, 259
23.39	280	5.11	252, 254
23.39-41	249	5.24	28, 252, 254
23.46	250, 258	6.12	252, 254
24.6b-7	240, 257	6.14	252
24.39	248, 255, 258		
		<i>Ephesians</i>	
<i>John</i>		2.16	252, 254, 259
3.14	240		
18.39-40	243, 258	<i>Philippians</i>	
19.2-3	243	2.8	252, 254, 257, 259
19.6	243, 258	3.18	252, 254
19.15	243, 258	4.10	256
19.16a	243		
19.16b-17	258		
19.17	140, 142, 244, 258		

*Colossians*

1.20 252, 254, 259  
 2.14 248, 252, 254, 259

*Hebrews*

6.4–6 255  
 6.6 238, 259, 271, 276  
 12.2 257

*1 Peter*

1.3 256  
 1.23 256

*2 Peter*

2.21 34

*Revelation*

11.8 257

## 9. Patristic Sources

## Augustine

*De civ. D.*

1.15 187

## Eusebius

*Commentary on the Psalms*

23.685.29 232

## Irenaeus

*Adv. haer.*

2.24 295  
 2.24.4 247

## Justin

*Dial.*

91 295

## Origen

*C. Cels.*

1.47 96

*Comm. Mt.*

10.17.36–39 96

## Tertullian

*Apol.*

50.6 187

## Index of Modern Authors

An asterisk (\*) indicates that the references are only selections.

- Aland, K. 238  
Allen, W. 66, 122, 239, 242  
Allison, D. C. 122, 245, 246, 247, 250, 251  
Anderson, A. A. 221  
Arnott, W. G. 89  
Attridge, H. W. 256  
Austin, C. 89  
Babbit, F. C. 114  
Barr, J. 32, 33  
Barrett, C. K. 251  
Bartoletti, V. 88  
Basore, J. W. 188, 189  
Batten, L. W. 223  
Baumgarten, J. M. 212, 228, 231  
Beasley-Murray, G. R. 122, 240, 245, 250  
Benedict XVI 247  
Benz, E. 65, 66, 122  
Bernard, J. H. A. 244  
Berrin, S. L. 231  
Bertram, G. 223  
Black, D. A. 30, 31, 32  
Blinzler, J. 5, 11, 41, 60, 122, 165, 183, 202, 245, 249, 250, 270, 289  
Bock, D. L. 122  
Bøe, S. 122, 240  
Boling, R. G. 217, 218  
Borg, M. J. 291  
Borgen, P. 131  
Bove, L. 200  
Braun, R. L. 219  
Brown, R. E. 11, 122, 174, 237, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 251, 299  
Brown, S. 31  
Bruce, F. F. 256  
Bruce, I. A. F. 88  
Budd, P. J. 214  
Bush, F. W. 224, 225  
Busse, U. 122  
Chapman, D. W. 11, 23-24, 28, 148, 204-05, 209, 212, 213, 216, 217, 218-21, 222, 225-29, 230, 231, 232, 233-35, 237, 259, 263-69, 297, 301  
Charlesworth, J. 130, 228  
Cobet, J. 43  
Coleman, K. 198  
Collins, A. 242, 245  
Collins, J. J. 66  
Comfort, P. W. 293  
Coogan, M. D. 251  
Cook, J. G. 199-201  
Colson, F. H. 132, 133, 134, 136  
Crossan, J. D. 291  
Cumming, B. 215  
Cusin, M. D. 244  
Damon, C. 201  
Davies, W. D. 122, 245, 246, 247, 250, 251  
De Landtsheer, J. 3, 4  
Delling, G. 285  
DeMoss, M. S. 31  
Derow, P. S. 73  
Dunn, J. D. G. 229, 230, 247  
Dockery, D. S. 30, 31, 32  
Donahue, J. R. 265, 292-93  
Ellingworth, P. 256  
Elwell, W. A. 293  
Evans, C. A. 122, 242, 249  
Feldman, L. 95, 96, 101, 105  
Fitzmyer, J. A. 103, 228, 229, 230, 231, 241, 243

- Forssman, B. 38  
 France, R. T. 244  
 Fulda, H. 8-10, 43, 50, 70, 71, 74, 80,  
     122, 155, 160, 188, 205, 211, 262, 270  
 Funk, R. W. 122  
 García, J. P. 230, 231  
 García Martínez, F. 229  
 Gardner, J. F. 201  
 Giessler-Wirsig, E. 31  
 Gnillka, J. 291  
 Godet, F. L. 244  
 Gould, E. P. 242, 244  
 Gray, G. B. 213, 214  
 Green, M. P. 122  
 Gundry, R. H. 242  
 Haas, N. 297  
 Habermas, G. R. 297  
 Haenchen, E. 122  
 Hagner, D. A. 239, 244, 246  
 Halperin, D. J. 212, 228, 231  
 Heid, S. 41, 262, 270  
 Helck, W. 215  
 Hendriksen, W. 247  
 \*Hengel, M. 1-2, 14-18, 19, 20, 21, 22,  
     24, 26, 39, 40, 41, 42, 55, 56, 57, 59,  
     61, 65, 73, 74, 75, 78, 79, 82, 83, 84,  
     90, 91, 93, 94, 95, 97, 98, 99, 102,  
     112, 113, 116, 118, 119, 120, 121,  
     125, 127, 128, 130, 131, 132, 135,  
     137, 148, 151, 152, 153, 154, 158,  
     159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 167, 168,  
     170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 176, 177,  
     179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185,  
     186, 189, 191, 192, 193, 194, 196,  
     197, 198, 205, 209, 229, 231, 237,  
     259, 263-64, 266-68, 288, 295  
 Hewitt, J. 97, 178  
 Hirsch, E. G. 234  
 Hitzig, H. F. 203  
 How, W. W. 47, 51  
 Hurtado, L. 24, 277  
 Ineichen, H. 31  
 Johnson, D. W. 299  
 Jones, H. J. 91, 92  
 Kassel, R. 89  
 Keuls, E. 55  
 Kistemaker, S. J. 247  
 Kock, T. 89  
 Koester, H. 256  
 Konen, H. 277  
 \*Kuhn, H.-W. 2, 11, 14, 16, 19-22, 24,  
     28, 42, 56, 73, 74, 78, 95, 97, 98, 99,  
     102, 112, 113, 117, 120, 131, 132,  
     135, 138, 143, 148-50, 154, 158, 159,  
     160, 162, 163, 167, 168, 170, 171,  
     172, 173, 174, 176, 177, 179, 180,  
     182, 183, 186, 188, 197, 198, 204-05,  
     209, 229, 230, 231, 253, 262-64, 267,  
     269-70, 281, 284, 305  
 Lachs, S. T. 245  
 Lee, J. A. L. 34, 275, 282  
 Lipsius, J. 2-6, 7, 8, 24, 191, 269, 286,  
     295  
 Lloyd-Jones, H. 70  
 Longenecker, R. N. 253  
 Louw, J. P. 32-33, 275, 278  
 Luz, U. 245  
 Lyons, J. 31, 32  
 Mann, C. S. 245  
 Marshall, I. H. 30, 122  
 Mason, S. 95, 96, 106  
 May, J. M. 182  
 McCarter, P. K. 219, 221  
 Meek, T. J. 215  
 Merrill, E. T. 196  
 Metzger, B. M. 251, 265  
 Moffatt, J. J. 256  
 Mommsen, T. 10, 18, 295  
 Mooney, G. W. 69  
 Murray, A. T. 38  
 Naveh, J. 297  
 Nida, E. A. 32-34, 275, 278  
 Nolland, J. 122, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247,  
     251  
 Nutton, V. 43  
 Obbink, D. 177, 182  
 O'Collins, G. 5, 22-23, 50, 65, 66, 71,  
     73, 148, 165, 195, 202, 229, 230, 242,  
     245, 258, 264-65, 267-68, 290-91  
 O'Connell, K. G. 299  
 Oldfather, C. H. 79  
 Page, T. E. 252  
 Parker, D. C. 299  
 Paton, L. B. 224, 225, 226  
 Peddinghaus, C. D. 13, 14, 23, 268-69  
 Pennels, S. 251  
 Perrin, B. 117, 124  
 Perry, B. E. 40



- Peter, H. 170  
 Plummer, A. 122, 244, 245  
 Polzin, R. 214, 221  
 Porter, S. 31  
 Potter, D. S. 201  
 Rajak, T. 131  
 Refsum, G. 24  
 Reijnders, G. Q. 85, 233, 238  
 Robertson, A. T. 30  
 Rosén, H. B. 41, 54  
 Saeed, J. 32  
 Schneider, J. 5, 12-13, 41, 52, 165, 202,  
 256, 270, 290  
 Schwemer, A. M. 5, 73, 180, 195, 245,  
 250, 270, 288-89  
 Sekeles, E. 297  
 Shalders, E. W. 244  
 Shanks, H. 297  
 Shepard, G. T. 31  
 Shorey, P. 66  
 Silva, M. 32  
 Simon, J. H. 177, 182  
 Skinner, J. 211  
 Sloyan, G. 23, 180, 266  
 Smith, H. P. 222  
 Smith, W. R. 214  
 Snaith, N. H. 214  
 Sparks, H. F. D. 232  
 Stauffer, E. 11, 12, 50, 66, 148, 165, 202,  
 266, 289  
 Stegemann, E. 96  
 Stockbauer, J. 8, 13, 50, 94, 123, 148,  
 222, 237, 259, 265-66  
 Stoellger, P. 31  
 Sussman, L. A. 184  
 Svensson, S. 44  
 Swete, H. B. 242, 249  
 Thackeray, H. S. J. 104  
 Thiselton, A. 31, 32  
 Tigchelaar, E. J. C. 229  
 Trier, J. 35  
 Tromp, J. 232  
 Tzaferis, V. 5, 292, 297-98  
 VanderKam, J. C. 229  
 Victor, U. 96  
 Von Rad, G. 212  
 Wells, J. 47, 51  
 Wenham, G. J. 213  
 Westcott, A. 244  
 Westcott, B. F. 244, 256  
 Whealey, A. 96  
 White, H. 127, 128, 129  
 Wiedemann, T. E. J. 201  
 Williamson, H. G. M. 223  
 Winter, P. 11, 12, 14, 165, 184, 202,  
 289-90  
 Winterbottom, M. 184  
 Yadin, Y. 228, 230, 231  
 Yonge, C. D. 136  
 Zestermann, A. 6-7, 8, 43, 46, 50, 60,  
 73, 123, 165, 174, 188, 202, 203  
 Zias, J. 195, 297  
 Zugibe, F. T. 50  
 Zöckler, O. 8, 15, 60, 193, 246



# Index of Subjects

An asterisk (\*) indicates that the references are only selections.

## I. English Terms

- Ancient punishment 155, 169-70, 179-80  
191, 196, 203, 204, 206, 214, 222, 223, 249, 261, 264, 266, 268, 272, 273, 274, 275, 278, 280, 282, 283, 284, 286, 305
- Capital punishment 16, 20, 27, 166, 263, 276, 277, 278  
-abdomal 29, 64, 90, 181, 214, 274  
-rectal 29, 181, 188, 191, 203, 214, 274
- Carthage 11, 12, 13, 22, 27, 74, 76, 84, 115, 125, 126, 152, 158, 160, 175
- Iron maiden 187
- \*Crucifixion 1-2, 24-30, 37, 143-50, 151, 201-07, 209-11, 233-36, 237-38, 257-60, 260-70, 271-87, 287-96
- Jews 12, 15, 17, 22, 23, 95, 96, 97, 101, 102, 103, 104, 106, 107, 132, 137, 166, 196, 215, 226, 243, 246, 250, 255, 300
- Dismembering/mutilating 45, 46, 47, 48, 51, 55, 58, 59, 62, 63, 64, 70, 71, 75, 82, 121, 128, 129, 146, 161, 211, 212, 213, 219, 220, 228, 284, 292
- Outdrawn suffering/Death struggle 7, 8, 19, 20, 28, 29, 39, 44, 57, 64, 117, 137, 139, 141, 142, 149, 167, 197, 206, 207, 262, 270, 292, 303
- Egyptians 4, 49, 51, 59, 61, 92, 111, 115, 120, 136, 211, 214-15, 257
- Papyrus 88-89, 146, 271, 272
- Hanging (by snare) 8, 67, 70, 80, 91-92, 102, 106, 107, 108, 109, 114, 116, 118, 123, 136, 141, 149, 175, 197, 206, 212, 213, 217, 218, 226, 258, 261, 281, 282
- Persians 4, 11, 12, 15, 16, 22, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 59, 61, 62, 63, 67, 79, 91, 92, 101, 223, 224, 264, 268, 270, 300
- \*Impaling 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 16, 17, 18, 26, 29, 41, 43, 46, 48, 56, 58, 59, 60, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 64, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 75, 77, 78, 80, 81, 82, 85, 86, 89, 93, 107, 108, 109, 118, 121, 122, 123, 128, 129, 130, 137, 139, 141, 144, 145, 149, 150, 159, 181, 188, 189, 191, 214, 276, 277, 283, 284, 285, 286, 303
- Punic Wars 13, 74, 93, 125, 126, 160

Romans 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16,  
22, 23, 27, 74, 76, 81, 90, 95, 97, 99,  
106, 111, 112, 114, 125, 128, 152,  
155, 158, 160, 164, 165, 167, 168,  
176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182,  
183, 196, 198, 243, 244, 289, 291, 292

Scourging 11, 12, 94, 149, 150, 154, 156,  
178, 182, 183, 195, 237, 289, 290,  
292, 293, 294, 296

Slave punishment 4, 13, 16, 17, 20, 22,  
93, 125, 127, 129, 130, 152, 157, 158,  
159-60, 161, 163, 175, 179-80, 181,  
184, 185, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 295

### Suspension

-ante-mortem 57, 64, 76, 81, 82, 87, 88,  
89, 91, 92, 93, 135, 126, 137, 138,  
144, 150, 191, 212, 215, 222, 228,  
229, 230, 233, 235, 250, 253, 272,  
275, 277, 286, 287, 303

-of body parts 62, 63, 64, 70, 75, 82,  
128, 211, 219, 220

-post-mortem 7, 13, 18, 22, 23, 24, 29,  
42, 43, 44, 46, 47, 48, 54, 55, 56, 57,  
58, 59, 64, 69, 75, 76, 77, 80, 83, 86,  
87, 88, 91, 92, 93, 102, 104, 105, 150,  
107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 115, 116,

118, 119, 120, 128, 132, 134, 135,  
137, 138, 144, 145, 146, 148, 164,  
193, 205, 211, 212, 213, 215, 216,  
218, 219, 220, 226, 229, 230, 233,  
234, 235, 242, 253, 254, 261, 262,  
263, 264, 265, 269, 273, 278, 283,  
285, 286, 287, 295, 303, 304, 305

-survivable 44, 57, 106, 109, 137, 141,  
143, 144, 145, 272

-on tree 162, 164

### To carry (ones own)

-cross 140, 200, 240-42, 277, 278, 289

-crossbeam 7, 9, 11, 12, 174, 175, 200,  
201, 202, 279, 291, 292, 293, 296

-execution tool 174

-torture device 94, 173, 202, 241, 242,  
245

Torture 5, 16, 20, 23, 28, 41, 65, 66, 68,  
69, 75, 82, 85, 93, 94, 104, 107, 108,  
111, 117, 123, 132, 137, 140, 141,  
153, 154, 156, 158, 161, 172, 173, 177,  
178, 180, 181, 188, 197, 201, 202,  
203, 204, 215, 234, 241, 242, 245,  
266, 267, 280, 286, 292, 295, 303, 304

Ultimate punishment 16, 20, 166, 181

## 2. Greek Terms

\*ἀνασταυροῦν 1, 25-26, 35, 37, 143-  
50, 234-35, 255-56, 271-274, 283

\*ἀνασκοποῖζειν 1, 25-26, 37, 143-50,  
271-274, 283-84

πάσσαλος 26, 37, 55, 94

προσπασσαλέυειν 26, 37, 53-54, 57-  
58, 64, 68, 117, 121, 145, 149

σκόλοψ 1, 3, 6, 7, 25, 37, 38, 39, 54, 55,  
56, 71, 78, 79, 82, 87, 121, 122, 133,  
146, 147, 257, 263, 283, 284, 285, 303

-pointed 38, 39, 71, 82, 285, 146, 257,  
284, 285

\*σταυροῦν 13, 14, 25, 60, 77, 78, 81, 86,  
87, 88, 92, 95, 97, 110, 113, 124, 125-  
26, 129-30, 140, 144, 210, 212, 226,  
233, 234, 238, 239, 240, 243, 246,  
247, 252, 254, 256, 274-76, 280, 283,  
300

-to raise pointed poles 60, 126, 129,  
283

\*σταυρός 1, 25-26, 29, 37, 143-47,  
241-42, 240-42, 246-251, 257-60,  
276-79, 284-85

—as regular pole 3, 6, 7, 10, 38, 39, 85,  
97, 110, 120–21, 125, 133, 146–49,  
151, 157, 241, 276–78, 284–85, 303

—pointed 3, 38–39, 77, 121–23, 125, 126,  
129, 146–47, 150, 276–77, 284–85  
—to carry (ones own) 122, 139, 140,  
146, 149, 240–42, 243–46, 247

### 3. Hebrew/Aramaic Terms

חלה 1, 13, 19, 25, 26, 29, 135, 210–11,  
212, 213, 214, 216, 218, 221, 222,  
223, 224, 226, 229, 230, 231, 233,  
234, 261, 281, 287, 298, 299, 300, 304

צלב 19, 212, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219,  
221, 222, 224, 225

צליבה 212, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 227

יקע 210–11, 213, 214, 215, 221, 222, 233,  
234, 281, 287, 298, 300, 304

זקף 19, 211, 223, 240, 281

חקע 210, 219, 299

עץ 25, 211, 216, 217, 223, 224, 225, 226,  
227, 228, 229, 230, 233, 281, 287,  
298, 299, 300, 304

### 4. Latin Terms

*arbor infelix* 151, 154, 155, 156, 159,  
182, 197  
—suspended on 154, 155, 156, 162, 182,  
197

—to carry (ones own) 155, 161, 174, 175

*palus* 169, 170, 179

*clavi* 4, 26, 186, 200, 206

*patibulum* 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 19, 25,  
151, 153, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165,  
167, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175,  
178, 179, 188, 189, 190, 191, 198,  
199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 237,  
241, 245, 246, 247, 261, 280, 286,  
288, 289, 290, 291, 293, 294, 295,  
298, 299, 300, 303  
—to carry (ones own) 173, 174, 201,  
202, 245, 293

\**crux* 151–52, 201–07, 280–81, 286  
—*immissa* 4, 7, 9, 141, 288, 289, 290,  
294, 295  
—*commissa* 4, 7, 28, 141, 288, 289, 290,  
294, 295  
—pointed 190, 191, 285, 286, 295  
—*simplex* 3, 9, 10, 120, 141, 191  
—suspended on 119, 120, 141, 152, 156,  
157, 158, 159, 177, 180, 181, 187,  
188, 191, 193, 195, 196, 197, 198,  
199, 202, 232, 286, 299, 300  
—to carry (ones own) 4

*sedile* 5, 191, 288, 290, 292, 293, 294,  
295

*stipes* 7, 25, 151, 187, 188, 189, 191, 203,  
299

*crucifigere* 184, 185, 202, 203, 232, 280,  
300, 303

*suppedaneum* 4, 292, 293, 295

*furca* 5, 9, 10, 25, 115, 151, 154, 156,  
161, 169, 170, 172, 174, 175, 179,  
192, 202, 245, 286